The loanword (Gairaigo) influx into the Japanese language: contemporary perceptions andresponses

Author:
Tomoda, Takako

Publication Date:
2005

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.26190/unsworks/22948

THE LOANWORD (*GAIRAIGO*) INFLUX INTO THE JAPANESE LANGUAGE: CONTEMPORARY PERCEPTIONS AND RESPONSES

BY

TAKAKO TOMODA

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Sociology, University of New South Wales.

2005

ABSTRACT

Loanwords have been entering Japanese for centuries but the rate has accelerated postwar and the predominant source is English. *Gairaigo* have received a mixed response from scholars, government, the media and the public. Opponents claim they cause confusion and have called for limits to protect the language and culture. From the 1980s, language planning bodies turned their attention to *gairaigo* and, in the early 2000s, took steps to limit their use. This research examines and evaluates the perceptions and responses of Japanese people and language planners to *gairaigo* over this period.

Scholarly and popular works, the media, and policy discussions by language planners were analysed under the rubric of corpus planning proposed by Ferguson (1979) and Cooper (1989). The level of purism was evaluated within the framework of Thomas (1991). To obtain quantitative data on public perceptions of *gairaigo,* a survey was conducted and the results compared with published opinion poll data.

Scholars who supported *gairaigo* concentrated on its enrichment of the corpus, imagery, nuance, and its internationalising effects. Opponents focused on the confusing nature of new *gairaigo* particularly for older people, damage to the language and culture, creation of social divisions, and excessive Westernisation. Both globalisation and universal English education were considered causes of the influx. Policy discussions focused on comprehension levels of new *gairaigo,* generational differences, and overuse of *gairaigo* by government, especially in aged care. Lists of replacement words were produced but public response has been mixed.

A majority of people surveyed expressed negative views of *gairaigo*, but only a small minority held strong views. Most were tolerant of *gairaigo* use and were willing to use new *gairaigo*. Tolerance decreased with age but there was no clear relationship with English language ability. Opinion poll data did not demonstrate any longitudinal increase in negative views of *gairaigo* over the 1980s and 90s. It was concluded that public support for government intervention was generally weak and was not assisted by the archaising approach taken to replacing *gairaigo* with *kango*. Recommendations for alternative responses were made.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor Ms Frances Lovejoy and co-supervisor Professor Ann Daniel for their ongoing support and advice. In particular, I wish to thank Ms Lovejoy for believing in me and providing encouragement throughout this long journey.

I feel extremely fortunate to have great friends in Japan willing to help with the collection of data and wish to thank all of them for their kindness, effort and support. Without them the collection of this data set would not have been possible. It is impossible to name them all but I wish to express my particular gratitude to Professor Igarashi, Professor Sasamori, Professor Yoshida, Professor Megumi, Ms Konagaya, Mr Yanase, Ms Takahashi, Ms Aoki, Ms Kishimura, Ms Ito, Ms Fukano, Mr Inoue, Mr Kawasaki, Mr Nakatani, and Mr Kagoyama for their help with the distribution and collection of questionnaires and wish to express my appreciation to all those people who took the time to complete a questionnaire and make comments.

I would also like to thank Mr Nishitani and Ms Asai of NHKBCRI, Mr Yanagisawa of NLRI, Mr Watanabe of Kanamojikai, Mr Tsuda of Ehimeken Sōmubu as well as Ms Sakaguchi and Ms Hatta of Monash Asian Studies Research Library for their help with accessing documents.

My appreciation goes to Helen Saville for her proofreading and comments, and I wish to express my deep gratitude to Brian May and my mother, Tomoda Mutsuko, for all their patience and emotional support.

Finally, I wish to dedicate this thesis to the memory of my father, Tomoda Hideaki.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Background

The increase in loanwords (*gairaigo*) has emerged as the number one issue in opinion polls on the Japanese language (Bunkachō, 2000). In addition, the prevalence and usage of *gairaigo* has received considerable attention in the press and in scholarly writings. Commentators are divided over the significance of this change and on what, if any, response should be made. They can be broadly divided into those who accept the loanword influx as either a welcome or unavoidable phenomenon and those who view loanwords as a destructive influence on the Japanese language and culture.

Since the late nineteenth century the Japanese language has been the subject of a series of official language planning (LP) events. In the prewar period the focus was upon the standardisation of Japanese and in the postwar period this shifted to reform of the writing system. In the case of *gairaigo*, the main question that concerned official LP was how these should be rendered into *katakana*. Since the 1990s, however, issues relating to language usage have received more official attention and this has made *gairaigo* an object for planning measures.

Nation states vary considerably in their policies with regard to the national language and their responses to foreign languages. France has pursued a policy of linguistic nationalism that aims to promote the spread of French and prohibit the use of new loanwords imported from English, in particular from American English (Hausmann, 1986; Thody, 1995). Australia has adopted a more pluralist approach that, while confirming the centrality of English, views other languages as economic and cultural resources that should be fostered (Djite, 1994; Lo Bianco, Bryant & Baldauf, 1997). Despite a considerable inflow of Americanisms, corruption of the language has not emerged as a major issue nor has there been a policy response. Japan falls somewhere between these two policy approaches. The status of Japanese as the national language is well established and minority languages receive little encouragement, while English language education is widely and actively promoted and English loanwords are tolerated (Honna, Tajima & Minamoto, 2000; Butler & Iino, 2005). Concurrently with the spread of English, the loanword influx has increased and a number of commentators have linked these phenomena.

The postwar increase in *gairaigo* has received considerable attention in recent decades as a topic of discussion amongst scholars, social commentators and in the media.

Viewpoints are many and varied, ranging from puristic criticism to enthusiastic praise. Scholarly debates in support of *gairaigo* tend to concentrate on the modernisation and enrichment of the corpus, and the positive images and additional nuances brought by *gairaigo* (Ishino, 1983; Kajima, 1994). Opponents tend to focus on the confusing nature of new *gairaigo* particularly for older people, damage to the language and culture, and the social divisions created by *gairaigo* (Suzuki, 1985). Many commentators have linked the *gairaigo* influx to internationalisation and some have attributed it to universal English education (Ishiwata, 1989; Honna, 1995). Opponents tend to view these factors as leading to excessive Westernisation, confusion, and cultural shallowness (Ōno, Morimoto & Suzuki, 2001; Ishii, 1998). Others see it as part of the inevitable, or even welcome, phenomenon of globalisation to which Japan must respond in a positive manner (Ishiwata, 1989; Shibata, 1993).

In recent policy discussions, planners focused on the comprehension of new *gairaigo* and generational differences. The overuse of *gairaigo* by government, especially in the context of aged care, also received considerable attention. There have been calls to adopt an exclusionist approach to new loanwords, along the lines of the French legislation, but there have been no moves in this direction to date (Mizutani & Ōno, 1995). Instead, lists of replacement words for difficult *gairaigo* were produced for use by government agencies.

The need for this research

Borrowing from English is currently the main source of vocabulary growth in technical fields, and possibly in the language as a whole. *Gairaigo* have become a social and cultural issue that has been debated at length in journals and in the media. They have also been the subject of recent language planning measures aimed at curbing their use and how to respond to the rapid increase in *gairaigo* is a question that seems likely to concern language planners for some time to come.

Researchers have tended to focus on measuring the level of loanwords, linguistic aspects of the nativisation process, the functions of loanwords and the images that surround them. Questions regarding *gairaigo* have been included in surveys of public opinion of the Japanese language in order to assess people’s comprehension of certain loanwords and their general experience of loanwords. However, sociological aspects of this phenomenon, such as people's attitudes, opinions and interpretations of the loanword

influx have received less investigation. Nevertheless, it is these aspects that need to be examined in order to inform language policy and planning. The director of the National Language Research Institute, Kai Mutsuro, observed that most Japanese research into *gairaigo* has been from the point of view of English language and English language acquisition, whereas there has been relatively little research done from the viewpoint of the study of the Japanese language (Kai, 2001).

Aims of the thesis

In order to inform ongoing language policy and planning, this research aims to:

- examine the sociolinguistics of the postwar loanword influx with particular reference to: the dimensions of the phenomenon; the arguments, issues and debates it has prompted; and the responses of Japanese people;
- identify the language planners, analyse their actions and the rationales for their responses to *gairaigo*; and
- recommend approaches the Japanese government could consider in relation to *gairaigo*.

Research approach

The various issues and opinions about *gairaigo* need to be examined and evaluated in order to develop a policy that responds to public concerns and takes account of political and economic realities. The following approach was taken:

- The history of official language planning organs, their policy agendas and the resultant planning measures were reviewed and any policies relating to *gairaigo* were singled out for particular attention. Since the study is mostly concerned with the last two decades of the twentieth century, both general policy discussions and responses to *gairaigo* are examined in greater detail during this period.
- Research on the level, source, functions (social and linguistic) and responses to the borrowing of foreign words was examined with particular regard to the social functions of *gairaigo* and responses of Japanese people to *gairaigo*.
- Commentary by academics, social commentators, language planners, journalists, business people and members of the public in letters to the press was collected to determine the nature and variety of opinions on issues relating to *gairaigo*. Particular attention was paid to individuals and groups that had an influence on language planning.

- Quantitative data on people's experiences, reactions and opinions of *gairaigo* were obtained via a survey on *gairaigo* conducted in Japan and through the compilation of the published results of questions relating to *gairaigo* in general language surveys conducted in Japan.

These data were combined to inform recommendations for the future direction of Japanese language policy in its response to loanwords.

Transliteration and treatment of Japanese terms and writing style

This dissertation uses the Modified Hepburn system of romanisation except that ん is always given as 'n'. Another exception is where a word is conventionally written using a different system in the English language literature. Macrons are placed on long Japanese vowels except in the case of place names, and words commonly used in English. The Japanese convention that family names precede personal names is followed. In cases where two people share a common family name, an initial is added in citations (e.g. Suzuki T.). Italics are used for book and newspaper titles and Japanese words other than proper nouns, such as names of people, places, government agencies, clubs and companies. For Japanese terms, other than personal names, the Japanese script version is given when it is defined or the first time it appears. Spelling is Australian and stylistic aspects are based on the *Style Manual* (Department of Finance & Administration, 2002). References are based on APA style (American Psychological Association, 2001). All translations are my own except where otherwise specified.

DEFINITION OF JAPANESE TERMS

The following is a brief discussion and definition of terms relating to the Japanese language.

The Japanese language

A number of terms are used to refer to the Japanese language:

Kokugo 国語: Means 'National Language' (of Japan) and is the main term used to refer to the standardised version of Japanese and Japanese as a school subject. Although Japan has no official national language, since Japanese is the only language routinely used by government it is, in effect, the national language.

Nihongo 日本語: Simply means 'Japanese language' but the main contexts in which it is used are when distinguishing Japanese from another language and in the teaching of Japanese as a foreign language.

The Japanese writing system

Four main types of script are used in Japanese writing: *hiragana, katakana, kanji, rōmaji*. The following is a brief overview.

Kanji 漢字: This script was borrowed directly from China but has undergone modification and simplification in Japan. *Kanji* typically have two forms of pronunciation: ***on*-reading** (*on-yomi* 音読み) and ***kun*-reading** (*kun-yomi* 訓読み). The *on*-readings are pronunciations based on Chinese that were imported together with the *kanji* or words containing the *kanji*. Since there have been a number of waves of borrowing from Chinese, the same *kanji* may have multiple *on*-readings (Miller, 1967; Kindaichi, Hayashi & Shibata, 1988). *Kun*-readings are derived from ancient Japanese and reflect the use of Chinese characters as written representations of native Japanese words. The rules and conventions for the use of the various *on-yomi* and *kun-yomi* are complex and beyond the scope of this study.

Hiragana 平仮名: Following the introduction of *kanji* their use was adapted to local needs. One adaptation was the use of *kanji* for their sound value. This resulted in the gradual development of the two *kana* scripts, *hiragana* and *katakana*. *Hiragana* are derived from cursive forms of *kanji* that have been simplified and used to represent phonological units (called *mora*) of the Japanese language on the basis of one *hiragana* for one *mora*. Mora are similar to syllables but are rhythmically based (see Shibatani, 1990). In some cases *hiragana* are written next to *kanji*, but much smaller, in order to

assist the reader with the pronunciation of difficult *kanji*. These small *hiragana* are called ***furigana*** 振り仮名. When words (particularly verbs and adjectives) are written with a combination of *kanji* (generally for the stem) and *hiragana* (usually for the inflection), for example, 行きます, the *hiragana* are referred to as ***okurigana*** 送り仮名.

Katakana カタカナ: Like *hiragana*, *katakana* were derived from *kanji* and are used to represent the *mora* of Japanese. *Katakana* were formed by simplifying the block forms of *kanji*. The resultant script is square in form, compared with the rounded *hiragana*. There is a one-to-one correspondence between *hiragana* and *katakana* with each *mora* of Japanese being represented by one *hiragana* and one *katakana*. These two parallel phonological scripts are referred to collectively as ***kana***.

Kanjikana-majiribun 漢字仮名混じり文: In modern Japanese *kanji*, *hiragana* and *katakana* are combined when writing general prose in a form of writing called *kanjikana-majiribun*. *Kanji* tend to be used for content words of either Chinese or Japanese origin, *hiragana* tend to be used for grammatical features, and *katakana* are generally used for loanwords from European languages, slang, commercial names and some scientific names.

Rōmaji ローマ字: The Roman alphabet is referred to as *rōmaji*. It is not generally used in formal Japanese prose, but in commercial texts *rōmaji* are often incorporated together with the three traditional scripts mainly to represent foreign words and brand names. The other main use of *rōmaji* is in the teaching of Japanese to foreigners. There are three main systems of *rōmaji*: Shūsei-Hebonshiki (Modified Hepburn), Kunreishiki and Nipponshiki (Seely, 1991).

With regard to styles of Japanese the following terms are frequently used:

Kanbun 漢文: Refers to the styles of official writing that were used in the prewar era. These styles were modelled on classical Chinese, so *kanbun* is often referred to as Sino-Japanese. It is contrasted with *gendaibun* 現代文, the modern written style, that replaced it.

Sōrōbun 候文: Was a formal written style that developed from *kanbun* and shared many of its characteristics. However, unlike *kanbun*, it could be written in a mix of *kanji* and *kana*. Its main use was in formal correspondence.

Wabun 和文: Refers to the styles of classical Japanese which were written mainly in *kana* according to the vernacular of the Heian (794-1185) aristocracy. These were characterised by the use of native Japanese vocabulary and syntax, and elegant phraseology. Their main use was in poetry and literature.

Keigo 敬語: Refers to styles of speech used to express formality and respect. These are more elaborate than common styles of speech and require specific training to master.

GLOSSARY OF JAPANESE PROPER NOUNS

Japanese Government Agencies

Gaimushō 外務省	Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Kōseishō 厚生省	Ministry for Health and Welfare
Monbushō 文部省	Ministry of Education, later called:
Monbukagakushō 文部科学省	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT)
Bunkachō 文化庁	Agency for Cultural Affairs, which incorporates:
Kokugoka 国語課	National Language Section
Sōrifu 総理府	Prime Minister's Office (PMO), later called:
Naikakufu 内閣府	Cabinet Office

Japanese Newspapers

Asahi	*Asahi Shinbun*
Mainichi	*Mainichi Shinbun*
Nikkei	*Nihon Keizai Shinbun*
Sankei	*Sankei Shinbun*
Tōkyō	*Tōkyō Shinbun*
Yomiuri	*Yomiuri Shinbun*

ACRONYMS USED IN THE TEXT, REFERENCE LIST AND IN-TEXT CITATIONS

FLC	Foreign Loan Words Committee (Gairaigo-iinkai) 外来語委員会
GISPRI	Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute (Chikyūsangyōbunka-kenkyūjo) 地球産業文化研究所
LDP	Liberal Democratic Party (Jiyūminshutō) 自由民主党
JETRO	Japan External Trade Organisation (Nihonbōeki-shinkōkai) 日本貿易振興会
JNA	Japan Newspapers Association (Nihonshinbun-kyōkai) 日本新聞協会
JWA	Japan Writers' Association (Nihonbungeika-kyōkai) 日本文芸家協会
LIDS	Language Issues Discussion Society (Kokugomondai-kyōgikai) 国語問題協議会
LP	Language planning
MEXT	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (Monbukagakushō)
MITI	Ministry of International Trade and Industry (Tsūshōsangyōshō) 通商産業省
NHK	Nipponhōsō-kyōkai 日本放送協会 (Japan Broadcasting Corporation)
NHKBCRI	NHK Broadcasting Culture Research Institute (NHK Hōsōbunka-kenkyūjo) NHK 放送文化研究所
NHKBLC	NHK Broadcasting Language Committee (NHK Hōsōyōgo-iinkai) NHK 放送用語委員会
NLC	National Language Council (Kokugo-shingikai) 国語審議会
NLRI	National Language Research Institute (Kokuritsu-kokugo-kenkyūjo) 国立国語研究所
NLS	National Language Section (Kokugoka) 国語課
NRK	Nihon-rōmajikai 日本ローマ字会 (Society for the Romanisation of the Japanese Alphabet)
NTC	Newspaper Terminology Committee (Shinbunyōgo-kondankai) 新聞用語懇談会
SCAP	Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers
TRC	Terminology Rectification Committee (Yōgotekiseika-iinkai) 用語適正化委員会

The following poem illustrates one issue associated with *gairaigo*:

A salary man's *senryū* *

会議終え	*kaigioe*	The meeting is over,
まずは辞書引く	*mazuwajishohiku*	Immediately, I look up the dictionary
外来語	*gairaigo*	to check all the *gairaigo*.

*17-syllable satirical or humorous poem

Yamafuji, Bitō, & Daiichiseimei (2004)

CHAPTER 1

LOANWORDS AND THE JAPANESE LANGUAGE

Part 1 discusses and defines the terms used for the various categories of words in Japanese with a particular focus on the term *gairaigo*. Part 2 provides an account of the history of word borrowing in Japan and changes in their orthography in order to place current borrowing phenomena in an historical context. Following this is a summary of research into changes in the amounts and proportions of *gairaigo* over the past century, with particular reference to the postwar period. In the final section, the roles, functions and uses of *gairaigo* in contemporary Japan are examined and the related research is reviewed.

PART 1: CATEGORIES OF JAPANESE WORDS

In general, the Japanese lexicon is divided into three main categories: 1. *wago*, 2. *kango* and 3. *gairaigo*. In addition, a fourth category, *konshugo*, is usually added to include words that combine features of the three main categories. These categories of words are defined as follows:

Main categories

Wago 和語, also referred to as *Yamato kotoba*, literally mean 'Japanese words' (both *Wa* and *Yamato* referred to Japan). This term is used to refer to words whose ancestry is traceable back to ancient Japanese prior to Chinese influence, and to words whose pronunciation and morphology is in accord with native Japanese linguistic conventions. *Wago* can be written in *kana* or *kanji* but when *kanji* is used the pronunciation is *kun-yomi* (Umesao, Kindaichi, Sakakura & Hinohara 1989).

Kango 漢語 literally means 'Han (i.e. Chinese) words'. In a narrow sense, these are words that were introduced from Chinese in various eras but the term generally includes words that were developed in Japan (called *waseikango*) using conventions for word formation and pronunciation derived from Chinese. *Kango* comprise *kanji* that are read using the *on-yomi* pronunciation. They are also called Sino-Japanese words (Kindaichi et al., 1988; Shibatani, 1990).

Gairaigo 外来語 literally means 'came from the outside words' and is frequently glossed as 'loanword'. The term first appeared in an academic paper in 1897 and in a dictionary in 1911, both by Kanazawa Shōzaburō. The definition in the dictionary was 'words

borrowed from foreign languages' (Hida, 1998). However, in modern times the term *gairaigo* is generally used in a narrower sense than 'loanword'. Umesao et al. (1989, p.318) have proposed the following definition: 'Words borrowed in relatively recent times from European languages, this usually does not include those words borrowed from China in olden times.' This excludes *kango* even when they were actually borrowed from China. The exclusion of *kango* is a general feature of definitions of *gairaigo* but the specification of European languages overly narrows the definition since, as Shibatani (1990) notes, some *gairaigo* are derived from non-European languages. Other terms have been proposed as glosses for 'loanword', including *yōgo* 洋語 (Western words), *shakuyōgo* 借用語 (borrowed words) and *hakuraigo* 舶来語 (imported from the West words), but these have not gained popular currency (Iwabuchi, 1993; Shibata, 1993).

Konshugo 混種語 literally means 'combination words'. Umesao et al. (1989, p.738) offer the following definition: 'combinations of different word types. For example, *wago* plus *kango* e.g. *ishidan* 石段 (stone stairs); *wago* plus a Euro-American word e.g. *bōrugami* ボール紙 (cardboard), *hanzubon* 半ズボン (short pants); a combination of words that originated from different foreign languages e.g. *erekigitā* エレキギター (electric guitar) i.e. Dutch plus English'. Kindaichi et al. (1988, pp.424-5) define *konshugo* as words that combine two or more word categories. They give three basic types: 1. combinations of *kango* plus *wago*, 2. *kango* plus *gairaigo*, and 3. *wago* plus *gairaigo*. Of these, those that attract attention are combinations that use *wago*-based inflexions to enable *kango* and *gairaigo* to function as other than nouns. For example, verbs such as *ai-suru* 愛する (to love), *renshū-suru* 練習する (to practise), *sutāto-suru* スタートする (to start); and adjectives such as *kajuaruppoi* カジュアルっぽい (casual-ish), *derakkusuna* デラックスな (deluxe). Nevertheless, *konshugo* tend to be nouns e.g. *keshigomu* 消しゴム (eraser) and *gasukan* ガス管 (gas pipe). Another type involves affixes derived from English that are attached to *wago* or *kango*. For example, *ganbarizumu* がんばりズム (try-hard-ism), *posutobanpaku* ポスト万博 (post-world-trade-exhibition). In a broader sense, words that combine *kanji* using different classes of *on*-reading such as *go-on* plus *kan-on* e.g. *gakkō* 学校 (school) could be regarded as *konshugo*. In addition, words such as *tēmasongu* テーマソング (theme song) that combine German plus English, words that combine English plus Portuguese such as *kafusubotan* カフスボタン (cuff button), could all be treated as *konshugo*.

The above system of classification of Japanese words has the attraction of simplicity but it presents some problems. It appears to divide words into groups according to their origin, i.e. Japan, China, other country, and mixed; however, it actually classifies them according to their apparent rather than actual origin. Words included in the *kango* portion include words that were borrowed from Chinese as well as words that were developed in Japan. This second group of *kango* was coined according to methods of word formation that were based on Chinese models but which had then been adapted to Japanese needs e.g. *sushi* 寿司 and Shinto 神道. Moreover, such words were developed in Japan for Japanese purposes, so they are actually of Japanese origin. Nevertheless, since their apparent origin is China, they are classed as *kango*. In addition, many *kango* are calques coined to render new concepts derived from European languages into Japanese. Words such as *shakaigaku* 社会学 (sociology) have their origin in Europe and are therefore a kind of loanword but, since their morphology resembles loans from Chinese, they are classified as *kango*.

A difficulty with the *konshugo* category is the lack of clarity in the inclusion criteria. If verbs based on *kango* plus *suru*, words comprising mixed types of *on*-reading, and words comprising *gairaigo* derived from different source languages are included, as Umesao et al. (1989) suggest, the size of this category becomes very large indeed. However, it appears that these types are generally excluded by researchers concerned with the proportion of word types in Japanese, thereby limiting *konshugo* to combinations of the three main word classes. Another approach is to distribute *konshugo* over the other three categories according to whether *kango*, *wago* or *gairaigo* elements dominate. When a *konshugo* contains an obvious *gairaigo* component, it is likely that the non-linguist would take this approach and not distinguish it from *gairaigo*, so this thesis generally takes this viewpoint and includes *konshugo* that contain a *gairaigo* component within discussions of *gairaigo*.

Other word categories

Besides the above four categories, words can also be classed as *gaikokugo* 外国語 (foreign words), *katakanago* カタカナ語 (*katakana* words), *waseieigo* 和製英語 (Japan-made English), *ryūkōgo* 流行語 (fad words), *shingo* 新語 (new words) and *zōgo* 造語 (coined words). There is a high level of overlap between these terms and *gairaigo* but the distinctions between these terms do illustrate some of the other difficulties in defining which words belong to the category of *gairaigo*.

One feature sometimes attributed to *gairaigo* is naturalisation. For a word to be considered *gairaigo* its usage needs to have stabilised in Japanese. This not only involves a lengthy period of use but also changes in pronunciation, morphology and semantics associated with the borrowing process. In contrast, when a word is a new loan, and is used in the same manner as in the source language, it can be considered ***gaikokugo*** or ***katakanago*** (Kindaichi et al., 1988; Toyama, 1994).

A difficulty with this distinction is that once a word has been incorporated into spoken or written Japanese, it immediately undergoes modification in its representational form since it is written in *katakana,* in its pronunciation when used by a Japanese speaker, and in its meaning when used in a Japanese context. In addition, the length of time required for a new word to be incorporated is difficult to determine and will vary with the social group, so time is not a clear inclusion criterion (Umegaki, 1963).

In many Japanese surveys of language use, the terms *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* are used together (e.g. Bunkachō, 2000). This is in recognition of the difficulty in distinguishing these two terms. Consequently, the term *gaikokugo* should be viewed as the newer more foreign-sounding component of *gairaigo,* rather than as a separate category. Another difficulty with the term *gaikokugo* is that its main usage is as a generic term for any 'foreign language', rather than as a term for recent loanwords, so it is open to misinterpretation. In this thesis, *gaikokugo* is included within the scope of the term *gairaigo.*

A type of loanword that receives comment in the literature is the **internationalism** (Thomas, 1991; Hoffer, 1996). In Japan, these are generally classed as *gairaigo* or *gaikokugo* although some scholars do differentiate them as *kokusaikyōtsūgo* 国際共通語 or *kokusaitsūyōgo* 国際通用語 (Ishiwata, 1985; Inoue, 2001). In this thesis they are regarded as a form of *gairaigo*.

Waseieigo literally means 'Japan-made English' and is sometimes referred to as 'Japlish' or 'Japaglish'. It refers to words coined in Japan from elements that originated from English. These words have often undergone transformations in both pronunciation and meaning such that they are no longer recognisable as English. For example, *bēsuappu* ベースアップ is formed from 'base' plus 'up' and carries the meaning of 'an increase in the

base wage'. Terms such as these are not direct loans and their meaning is opaque to English speakers, so they are, in a sense, actually new Japanese words. Nevertheless, they are distinct from *wago* and are usually included in the *gairaigo* portion since they are clearly foreign-sounding and are difficult to distinguish from other sub-categories of *gairaigo* (see Bunkachō, 1997 for a discussion and Morito, 1978 for examples).

Other terms in currency are ***ryūkōgo*** 流行語 and ***shingo*** 新語. The first refers to fad words that are popular with certain groups and the second to new words that have appeared in more general contexts. Many of these terms are abbreviations (***ryakugo*** 略語) derived from English, such as *sekuhara* セクハラ (from 'sexual harassment'), or forms of *waseieigo*, such as *parasaito-shinguru* パラサイト・シングル ('parasite-single' i.e. grown children who won't leave home and live off their parents). Some combine Japanese and English-derived elements, e.g. *panpī* パンピイ (from the Japanese *ippan* 一般 'ordinary' and the English 'people'), while others are derived from Japanese alone e.g. *mangakissa* マンガ喫茶 (comic-coffee-shop) (IMIDAS, 1999). The overlap between these two terms is considerable and there is no clear means of differentiating whether a word is simply 'new' or 'faddish'. Moreover, such words could be classified into any of the four main categories, although most tend to be considered *gairaigo* or *konshugo* (Hida, 1981).

Word categories in Japanese are fraught with definitional difficulties and clear boundaries are difficult to discern (see Tanaka, 1984). Nevertheless, the three main types established by convention, i.e. *wago*, *kango* and *gairaigo*, remain the simplest and most readily identifiable categories that encompass most of the lexicon, with *konshugo* acting as a repository for the remainder. While apparently based on word origin, these categories are actually based on morphology, with the main inclusion criteria being as follows:

Wago: pronunciation according to Japanese rules, use of *kun*-reading, inflection according to Japanese rules, written in *kana* and/or *kanji*.

Kango: pronunciation according to Sino-Japanese rules, use of *on*-reading, inflection according to Japanese or Sino-Japanese rules, mainly written in *kanji* but *katakana* may be used to replace *kanji*.

Gairaigo: pronunciation based on non-Chinese source language and modified (at least partially) according to Japanese rules, inflection according to Japanese or Sino-Japanese rules, mainly written in *katakana*. Occasionally written in *kanji* and/or *hiragana*, with some being written in *rōmaji* or alphabet as in the source language.

***Konshugo*:** the only morphological feature of relevance is the combination of elements from two or more different word categories (usually *kango* or *wago* plus *gairaigo*), written in *kana* and/or *kanji*.

A definition of *gairaigo*

In order to encompass the principal characteristics of those words generally regarded as *gairaigo* the following definition is proposed:

> *Gairaigo* is a category of the Japanese lexicon comprising words derived from foreign languages, other than Chinese, that retain at least some of the morphological and phonological features of the source language. These words may have been borrowed directly or may be a result of novel combinations of borrowed elements from non-Chinese foreign sources. Recently borrowed *gairaigo* that have not been naturalised into Japanese usage are often referred to as *gaikokugo*. Words classed as *ryūkōgo, shingo* and *zōgo* are frequently *gaikokugo* but not all words in these two categories are *gaikokugo*. *Gairaigo* that have been derived from English, but exhibit features not evident in the source language, are often referred to as *waseieigo*. There is also overlap with words classed as *konshugo* when the *konshugo* contains a *gairaigo* component. Therefore, the term *gairaigo* can encompasses *gaikokugo* and *waseieigo,* plus some *ryūkōgo, shingo, zōgo* and *konshugo.*

In a number of surveys the definitional overlap between *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* has been dealt with by using both terms (i.e. *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo*), whereas in other surveys *katakanago* and other terms have also been used. Nevertheless, the term *gairaigo* is more popular, broader in scope, and less ambiguous than these other terms. Therefore, in the present study the term *gairaigo* is used in the broad sense as defined above.

Proportions of the principal word categories

Of the four main word classes, *kango* and *wago* generally comprise the largest proportions in the print media. In a survey of ninety magazines published in 1956, the National Language Research Institute (NLRI) found the following overall proportions of distinct words: *wago* (36.7%), *kango* (47.5%), *gairaigo* (9.8%) and *konshugo* (6.0%) (NLRI, 1964; Higa, 1979). However, there was considerable variation according to the type of magazine. Domestic and women's magazines had much higher proportions of *wago* (44.7% average) and lower proportions of *kango* (39.1% average), compared to magazines in the practical and popular science category (28.8% & 60.3%)(Shibatani, 1990). In a survey of the cultural review, *Chūōkōron*, for the same year, the following

proportions of distinct words (including names) were found: *wago* (57.5%), *kango* (30.9%), *gairaigo* (2.4%) and *konshugo* (9.2%) (NLRI, 1987; Miyajima, 1989).

Word proportions tend to vary according to genre. In books aimed at school students, the proportion of *wago* was higher in fiction than in non-fiction. As the age at which the book was aimed increased, the relative proportion of *wago* fell, from 82.1% in fiction aimed at primary school students to 52.6% in non-fiction aimed at high school students, while *kango* increased from 12.9% to 41.6%. In the case of *gairaigo*, however, there was more in non-fiction than fiction but the differences were not pronounced (i.e. 4.5% in high school non-fiction compared to 2.8% in fiction) (NLRI, 1989; Nomura & Yanase, 1989). Higher proportions of *kango* are associated with more technical writing (Kabashima, 1980). Over the last 1,000 years the proportion of *kango* has been increasing while *wago* has been decreasing, and since the Meiji period this trend has accelerated. In addition there has been an ongoing increase in *gairaigo* (Sugito, 1989).

PART 2: WORD BORROWING IN JAPAN

A brief history

As in other languages, the Japanese vocabulary comprises words borrowed from other languages at different periods in history. In prehistoric times, both words and cultural innovations mainly entered Japan via the Korean peninsula, although a southern Austronesian influence is also discernible. Words introduced in this early period have become so deeply embedded in the Japanese language that their origin can be difficult to unravel (Miller, 1967). From at least the first century, items bearing Chinese characters had entered Japan, but it was not until the beginning of the fifth century that texts written in Chinese were sent from the kingdom of Paekche on the Korean peninsula, together with scholars who could read them. During this century, scribes, presumably literate immigrants, began to record events in an official capacity using Chinese (Seeley, 1991).

In the sixth century, at a time of political turmoil in the Korean peninsula, envoys, monks and emigrants entered Japan bringing with them Buddhism and books written in Chinese. The first temple was begun in 577 AD by immigrant monks and nuns and the new religion was adopted by some members of the ruling elite. Buddhism became a state-sponsored religion in 594 AD, with one of its early adherents being Prince Shōtoku (572-622 AD). He is said to have learned to read the sutras, but at this time the reading and writing of Buddhist texts was still mainly the preserve of immigrants and their descendents who

were literate in Chinese. Nevertheless, the imported language was already undergoing change, since a Buddhist inscription dated to 596 AD shows a shift towards Japanese word order (Kidder, 1977; Seeley, 1991).

In the early seventh century, a series of reforms was introduced which aimed to establish a Japanese state modelled on China (Tsunoda, de Barry & Keene, 1964). This required not only adopting the structure of the Chinese state, but also its terminology, and meant that reading and writing in Chinese was required for administrative purposes. To facilitate this, formal education was provided at a state-sponsored institute, the Daigakuryō, established between 661 and 672 (Seeley, 1991). In a sense, these reforms were the first clear instances of language planning in Japan. They determined the writing system to be used, the official language of state records and the form of education in the new language, as well as introduced a series of new terminologies.

During the Nara (710-794) and Heian (794-1185) periods, the adopted writing system gradually evolved in response to Japanese needs. Word order changed and the use of *kanji* to phonologically represent Japanese words increased. The practice of simplifying *kanji* was probably adopted from China and appears in texts as early as 702 AD. By the ninth century, such simplifications were commonly used for their phonological value only, and by the tenth century, early forms of the phonologically based *hiragana* and *katakana* orthographies had emerged (Habein, 1984; Seeley, 1991).

This period of Japanese history saw the introduction of new words on a massive scale. Buddhism brought with it an immense technical vocabulary, much of it comprising Chinese calques of Sanskrit words, although some words appear to have entered Japanese directly, such as *ama* 尼 (nun) from Pali and *kawara* 瓦 (tile) from Sanskrit. Nevertheless, Chinese was the main source of new words, after a principle that Miller has termed ‘total availability’, meaning that literate Japanese regarded any Chinese word as a potential loan (Miller, 1967, p.244). With the adoption of a Chinese-style administration, Chinese philosophy, medicine, astrology, architecture, literature and a host of new technologies, came loanwords for each of the related innovations.

Languages such as old Korean and Ainu also contributed words but Chinese remained the principal source of loanwords until the modern era. Nevertheless, between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, contact with merchants and missionaries brought the first wave of

loanwords from Portuguese, Spanish and Latin. During this period over 500 words entered Japanese (Yazaki, 1964) and a few, such as *tabako* 煙草 (cigarette), *botan* ボタン (button), *pan* パン (bread) and *kappa* 合羽 (raincoat), still remain in modern Japanese. This influence was, however, abruptly halted by the suppression of Christianity after 1597 and a large number of words, such as *anjo* (angel), *arutaru* (altar) and *paraiso* (paradise) disappeared. Nevertheless, European influence continued via Dutch traders who were allowed to operate through Nagasaki. From 1641 the study of the Dutch language began, and after 1720 restrictions on books were relaxed and the study of Dutch learning (*rangaku*) was encouraged (Yonekawa, 1996). This period of Dutch learning introduced many terms for European goods and some, such as *kōhī* 珈琲 (coffee), *bīru* ビール (beer), *buriki* ブリキ (tin-plate) and *garasu* 硝子 (glass), have remained (Miller, 1967).

In the Edo period (1603-1867), the spread of education and the renewed study of Chinese and Confucianism brought another major period of borrowing from Chinese. More *kanji* came into popular use and a diversity of *kanji* was often used for the same word, as were variant forms of *kanji*. The resultant complexity made it necessary to use *furigana* for difficult words (Seeley, 1991). In the late Edo and Meiji (1868-1912) periods, an increased interest in European science brought with it a need to translate European books and develop new terms for the new concepts and objects referred to in these books. Some terms associated with chemistry and medicine were adopted directly from Dutch, such as *mesu* メス (knife, scalpel), *arukōru* アルコール (alcohol), *gasu* ガス (gas) and *capuseru* カプセル (capsule) (Ishiwata, 1989). Another form of borrowing was the creation of calques. Scholars drew on their knowledge of classical Chinese to find appropriate *kango* or used novel combinations of *kanji* to represent the meanings of terms requiring translation from Dutch or other European languages (Takada, 1989; Seely, 1991). Words such as *daisūgaku* 代数学 (algebra) and *kyōsanron* 共産論 (communism) are calques that derive from this period (Toki, 1960). In other cases, the calques were adopted from bilingual dictionaries compiled for Chinese (Seeley, 1991). Many of the neologisms that appeared during this period had an ephemeral existence, but others remain in modern Japanese (Ishiwata, 1989).

The forced opening of Japanese ports to American and European traders from the 1860s brought direct contact with European traders in Yokohama and an influx of new goods

and new terms. Following the Meiji Restoration, the adoption of modernisation as an official policy led to a further increase in calques and direct loans from European languages, and more widespread learning of European languages (Yonekawa, 1996; Stanlaw, 1996).

Not only did the number of *gairaigo* increase throughout the Meiji and Taishō (1912-1926) periods, there was also diversification in the sources of these words. Whereas Dutch had been the main source in the Edo period, in the Meiji and Taishō periods German, French, English and Russian become major sources. Over this period the influence of English grew. Contact in the port of Yokohama gave rise to a local trade pidgin that included numerous English loans (Loveday, 1996). However, the spread of English into the broader population began with the establishment of the new education system in 1872 and the offering of English as an obligatory subject for boys in middle schools (Koike, 1978). In 1877 it was introduced in the newly-established Tokyo University and from this time on the use of English words became a feature of the speech of students. In addition, the introduction and popularisation of European sports, such as baseball, lawn tennis and rowing, in the late 19th century brought with them vocabularies of English loanwords that were used by enthusiasts. From 1888 to the start of the First World War, English gradually replaced Dutch as the main foreign language in education (Yonekawa, 1996). As the influence of Dutch declined, new English loans began to replace existing Dutch loans from about 1890, and by 1920 about 50% of loanwords from European languages were derived from English (Matsuda, 1985). The rise of English reflected both the rising status of England and the USA as world powers, their importance as trading partners and sources of technology, and the spread of English language education in Japan. Nevertheless, in certain fields other European languages had a dominant influence. German was notable as a source of technical terms in medicine, of which some, such as *rentogen* レントゲン (X-ray) and *arerugī* アレルギー (allergy), are still in common use. The influence of French in fashion and cooking was also significant with words such as *appurike* アップリケ (applique), *negurije* ネグリジェ (negligee), *gurume* グルメ (gourmet), and *guratan* グラタン (gratin) forming part of everyday vocabulary.

From the beginning of the First World War until the Kanto earthquake of 1923, *gairaigo* grew rapidly and spread amongst the general population. This was associated with a period of rapid industrial growth, the spread of school education and the advent of mass

circulation print media. With the Russian revolution and the spread of the union movement, words such as *interigencha* インテリゲンチャ (intelligentsia) were adopted from Russian and *puroretaria* プロレタリア (proletariat) from German (Yonekawa, 1996).

Between 1923 and 1935 Americanisms became more common. The period from the beginning of the Shōwa period (1926) was known as the 'Three S Era' due to the popularity of Sports, Screen and Speed. Baseball, skiing, American movies and jazz become popular, as did their related loanwords (Yonekawa, 1996). In 1928, a professor of English claimed to have found 1,400 English loanwords while reading Japanese newspapers and magazines (Miller, 1967). Many of the new *gairaigo* of this period were not borrowed directly, but locally coined from English elements, such as the celebrated *mobo* モボ (modern boy) and *moga* モガ (modern girl), and the still-popular *sararīman* サラリーマン (salary-man).

This period of intense borrowing from English slowed with the Great Depression and the rise of ultra-nationalism in the 1930s and was brought to a halt by the outbreak of the Second World War. After 1941, *gairaigo* derived from English and *rōmaji* were viewed as enemy language so their use was actively suppressed (Shibata 1975, Sakagami, 2000). The study of English, which had already been reduced in 1931, was dropped from the middle school curriculum for girls and further reduced for boys (Koike, 1978). Many English loanwords that had come into general use were replaced with *kango* forms. Established words such as *anaunsā* アナウンサー (radio announcer) and *rekōdo* レコード (record) were replaced by *hōsōin* 放送員 (lit. broadcasting person) and *onban* 音盤 (lit. euphonic board) (Stanlaw, 1982). The influx of English-derived *gairaigo* that characterised the early decades of the century was not only halted but largely erased, at least from the contemporary print media.

After 1946, the dominance of American English as the source of borrowings into Japanese was not only reestablished but increased, as the occupation forces reorganised Japanese society, the economy and education. Since the language of the occupation forces was English, the value of English increased immediately and a boom in English language textbooks ensued (Loveday, 1996). English again became an important, though no longer compulsory, school subject especially for those aiming at university entrance (Koike, 1978).

In March 1953 Television broadcasting began (Shimoda, 1996). Numerous terms such as *suponsā* スポンサー (sponsor), *kuizushō* クイズショー (quiz show) and *rihāsaru* リハーサル (rehearsal) entered common speech and sports terminologies reached a wider audience (Yonekawa, 1996). The dominance of English as source of new loans continued. In a survey by NLRI of magazines published between January and December 1956, 80.8% of non-Chinese loanwords were derived from English with French accounting for 5.6% (NLRI, 1964).

With the era of rapid economic growth in the 1960s, came an influx of loanwords associated with the new consumer items that were advertised in the mass media, and an increased interest in fashion brought in words such as *ereganto* エレガント (elegant) and *surimu* スリム (slim). Economic concepts were also borrowed from America and words such as *karuteru* カルテル (cartel), *torasuto* トラスト (trust) and *māketingu* マーケティング (marketing) began to appear in the media (Yonekawa, 1996). The dominance of English remains till the present and Miller (1967) has characterised the postwar wave of borrowing as one of 'total availability' of English.

Written representations of *gairaigo*

When words were adopted directly from Chinese in the pre-modern period, they were written in *kanji*, just as they were in Chinese (allowing for variations in the style of characters). However, when the word was derived from a non-Chinese language it could be represented in a number of ways. Forming a calque made up of *kanji* that closely approximated the meaning of the borrowed term was a common method. This resulted in a word that was not obviously foreign and could be difficult to distinguish from a loan taken from Chinese or from a word that had been coined in Japan. Another approach was to choose *kanji* for their sound value in order to approximate the sound of the word in the source language e.g. 珈琲 *(kōhī)* from the Dutch for 'coffee'. This method had been in use prior to contact with Western languages and was frequently used for place names.

Whereas many calques aimed only at representing the meaning of the new term using the resources of *kanji*, others attempted to combine both the meaning and pronunciation of the lending language in the Japanese rendition. One rendition of 'club' combined the *kanji ku* 倶 (together), *raku* 楽 (enjoy) and *bu* 部 (group) to form a phonological as well as semantic approximation – *kurabu* 倶楽部 (Seeley, 1991, p.137). In other cases, combinations of *kanji* that approximated the meaning were coined and novel

pronunciations based on the source language attributed to them. For example, the word for 'tobacco' was borrowed from Portuguese and written in *kanji* as 煙草 which means 'smoke herb'. This would normally be pronounced *ensō* but the original pronunciation *tabako* was attributed instead.

The use of a combination of three scripts, with *katakana* being used for foreign words, appears to have been first introduced in a book on Western countries by Arai Hakuseki published in 1715 (Sakagami, 2000). This style was adopted by scholars of Dutch learning (Hida, 1998). In the later Edo period, as the influx of new words from European languages began to gain momentum, the practice of using *kanji* to represent the sound of new loanwords began to give way to the use of *kana* alone. In the early Meiji era, *gairaigo* could be written in *kanji*, *hiragana* or *katakana* or in a combination of *kanji* plus *furigana* (written as *katakana* or *hiragana*), but from 1911 the system used by Arai was adopted by the Ministry of Education (Monbushō) for use in school textbooks (Habein, 1984; Hida, 1998; Sakagami, 2000). However, some *gairaigo* continued to be written in *kanji* (Hida, 1998). From late Meiji onwards, *katakana* became the dominant method of writing foreign words and foreign names. Many of the old *kanji* renditions gradually fell into disuse and came to be written in *katakana*. For example, a survey of language use in the monthly magazine *Chuōkōron* found that the names of many foreign countries that were written in *kanji* in 1916 were written in *katakana* in 1926 (NLRI, 1987). Nevertheless, according to Monbushō policy in the Taisho era, either *katakana* or *hiragana* could be used. In the postwar era, the use of *katakana* for *gairaigo* became a firm policy in 1954 and, while some early *gairaigo* still retain their *kanji* renditions e.g. 缶 *(kan)* 'can', the practice of using *katakana* for foreign words and for loanwords has persisted to the present (Seely, 1991, p.172; Hida, 1998; Bunkachō, 1997).

Overview of research into *gairaigo*

Much of the research on *gairaigo* has been concerned with the nativisation processes foreign words undergo when adopted into Japanese. These include changes in orthography and pronunciation as the word is rendered into *katakana*, morphological changes such as abbreviation and combination, syntactic changes (principally nominalisation), and semantic changes. Examples of this approach can be found in the work of Ichikawa (1931), Pierce (1971), Quackenbush (1974), Neustupny (1978), Higa (1979), Hattori (1980), Sonoda (1983), Ishiwata (1986), Hoffer & Honna (1988), Hoffer

(1990), Kay (1995), Honna (1995) and others. Research on nativisation processes is generally beyond the scope of this study.

Other researchers have investigated the proportions of *gairaigo* and variation in the level of *gairaigo* over time and media type (see NLRI, 1989; Nomura & Yanase, 1989; Sugito, 1989, Miyajima, 1989; Takashi, 1990; Tomoda, 1999; 2005 and others). The principal findings of this research are summarised below.

Linguistic and social functions of *gairaigo* have been examined by Shibata (1975), Stanlaw (1982), Haarman (1984a; 1984b; 1986; 1989; 1990), Matsuda (1985), Morrow (1987), McCreary (1990), Takashi (1990; 1991; 1992), Honna (1995), Hayashi and Hayashi (1995), Loveday (1996), Tomoda (1999), Sakagami (2000), Hoffer (1990; 2002) and others. Aspects of this research relate directly to the concerns of this study and are discussed in the relevant sections below. Issues considered beyond the scope of this study include codeswitching and multilingualism (see for example Haarmann, 1989; Hoffer, 1996).

Numerous opinion polls have included questions addressing Japanese people's perceptions, comprehension, attitudes and beliefs in relation to *gairaigo*. This research forms one of the data sources for this study. An overview of the scope of this research is included in Chapter 2 and data are incorporated into Chapters 5 to 7.

Measures of the proportion of *gairaigo* in modern Japanese

Estimates of the proportion of *gairaigo* in Japanese dictionaries published in the 1980s indicate that *gairaigo* comprised around 10% of the Japanese lexicon (see table 1.1). However there is a preponderance of *gairaigo* in technical fields. Of the estimated 9.95% of *gairaigo* in the 1989 edition of the *Nihongodaijiten* (Great Dictionary of Japanese), 3.25% are technical terms (Tomoda, 1999). Nomura (1984) found that *gairaigo* comprised 58% of entries in the 1980 edition of *Gendaiyōgo no kisochishiki*, a popular dictionary of current terminology, and this represented an increase of 15% on the 1960 edition.

The number of *gairaigo* in dictionaries is, however, not necessarily a measure of the level of *gairaigo* actually in use in Japanese, since dictionaries tend to contain both archaic and rare words besides those in common use. Evidence suggests that the proportion of *gairaigo* varies greatly according to the type of media. The study of ninety magazines

published in 1956 found that, overall, *gairaigo* comprised 9.8% of which 95.1% were nouns. However the *gairaigo* proportion ranged from 5% in magazines dealing with criticism and literature to 9.9% in lifestyle and women's magazines (Ishiwata, 1960; NLRI, 1962; 1964; Umehara, 1982; Shibatani, 1990). A survey of three major newspapers published in 1966 found a lower proportion of *gairaigo,* at 9% of word types (NLRI, 1970). In advertising however, *gairaigo* can comprise more than 20% of the vocabulary used but this large proportion is heavily affected by the inclusion of product names (25% of total *gairaigo*) and words borrowed principally for special effect (Nomura & Yanase, 1989; Takashi, 1990; 1991). At the lower end of the scale, the proportion of *gairaigo* in children's books was between 2.4 and 4.8% and, in high school textbooks on Japanese history, it was only 1.0% (NLRI, 1983; Nomura & Yanase, 1989). One study of *gairaigo* in seven people's spoken language over 42 hours revealed that 10.1% of word types and 3.2% of word tokens were *gairaigo* (Hayashi et al., 1982). In a 1989 study of television vocabulary that covered seven stations, *gairaigo* comprised only 3.5% of types and 3.1% of tokens (NLRI, 2000). These studies suggest that in the postwar period the proportion of *gairaigo* in use can vary from 1% to over 20% depending on language domain, but that a figure of around 9-10% seems modal in written Japanese as well as in dictionaries, with a lower level of use in the spoken language.

Measures of the increase in *gairaigo*

It is generally accepted that there has been an increase in both the number and proportion of *gairaigo* in Japanese over the last century. Nevertheless, the level of increase varies considerably according to the method of measurement. The number of entries included in a *gairaigo* dictionary is one measure of the number of *gairaigo* adopted, but it proves to be unreliable, since the criteria for inclusion can vary from dictionary to dictionary and time to time. For example, whereas a loanword dictionary published in 1912 contained around 1,500 entries and a 1990 dictionary had 30,500 entries, Arakawa's *gairaigo* dictionary of 1941 already had 60-70,000 entries (Tomoda, 1999). This would seem to indicate that the numbers of *gairaigo* had peaked and then declined but, while there have probably been fluctuations, Arakawa's dictionary was unusually comprehensive and the general trend seems to have been upwards. A study of four technical glossaries for mechanical engineering found an increase in the proportion of *gairaigo* from 0% in 1886 to 21.0% in 1955, and of *konshugo* from 6.5% to 16.9% (Sugito, 1989).

More meaningful data can be obtained by examining changes in the proportion of *gairaigo* in general dictionaries, since these do not aim to include every possible instance of *gairaigo* – only those the compilers believe to be relevant to users. Masui (1999) examined the proportion of *gairaigo* in three editions of the Kōjien, a popular comprehensive dictionary, and found an increase from around 8.5% in 1983, to 10.2% in 1998. In the fourth edition one in four new words was *katakanago* and in the fifth edition this had increased to one in three. Table 1.1 shows that, over the last century, the proportion of *gairaigo* in dictionaries increased fairly steadily from a little over 1% to around 10%.

Table 1.1. Number and percentage of *gairaigo* (grg) in Japanese dictionaries

Dictionary title	Publication date	Total grg	Proportion of grg
Genkai	1891	551	1.4%
Reikai Kokugojiten	1956	1,428	3.5%
Iwanami's Kokugojiten	1963	2,918	5.1%
Kadokawa Kokugojiten	1969	4,709	7.8%
Shinmeikai Kokugojiten	1972	4,558	7.8%
Kōjien, 3rd ed.	1983	na	8.5%**
Shinmeikai Kokugojiten, 3rd ed.	1987	6,675*	11.8%*
Nihongodaijiten	1989	13,300*	9.95%*
Kōjien, 4th ed.	1991	na	9.2% approx**
Kōjien, 5th ed.	1998	na	10.2% approx**

(adapted from Hayashi et al., 1982; Matsuda, 1986; *Tomoda, 1999; **Masui, 1999)

Longitudinal measures of the change in the proportion of *gairaigo* in print are few. One study investigated the cultural review, *Chūōkōron*, and found an increase from 0.9% in 1906, to 3.7% in 1976 (Miyajima, 1989). This represents a very gradual increase, but due to its literary nature, this magazine is likely to be at the lower end of the scale of *gairaigo* use. Also, there is a difficulty with this study in the interpretation of the figures for *konshugo*. These increased from 8.5% to 10.6% over the period, but it is not clear what proportion of these hybrid words contained a *gairaigo* component and what the inclusion criteria were. The magazine survey found 6.0% of *konshugo* compared with 9.8% of *gairaigo* (NLRI, 1964). Therefore the high proportion of *konshugo* in the *Chūōkōron* study suggests this may include a significant component that could otherwise have been classed as *gairaigo*, and this led to a reduction in the proportion of words classed as *gairaigo* in the study. In samples of government white papers on labour, Tomoda (2005), using script type as the criterion, found an increase in *gairaigo* between 1960 and 1997 but this was small and the overall level of *gairaigo* use in these documents was even lower than in the *Chūōkōron* study.

Measures of the increase in *gairaigo* are also available from opinion polls. A survey by NHK conducted in 1991 revealed that 86% of people polled believed that there had been an increase in the use of *gairaigo* and 51.7 % thought they had increased a lot (Ishino, Maruta, Kisa & Yasuhira, 1992). This result is typical of other surveys (see Chapter 2). While these cannot provide accurate assessments of the level of increase in *gairaigo*, they do indicate the level of public awareness of an increase.

Measures of the proportion of *gairaigo* derived from English

In the postwar period English has been the main source of *gairaigo*. In the study of ninety Japanese magazines in 1956, 80.8% of 2,964 *gairaigo* were derived from English, with French comprising 5.6%, followed by German at 3.3% (NLRI, 1964). This dominance of English was not a new phenomenon. A study of *gairaigo* used in the Taisho period (1912-1925), found that 51.9% were derived from English, but second and third place were occupied by Dutch (27.8%) and Portuguese (14.2%), followed by French (3.7%) and German (1.2%) (Shibatani, 1990). In the *Chūōkōron* study, English-derived *gairaigo* were found to be the most numerous in all issues sampled between 1906 and 1976. Moreover, the number increased over the period with a steady rise from 21 in 1906 to 56 in 1936, a decline to 46 in 1946, and a sharp rise in the postwar period to 119 in 1956 and 180 in 1976. Dutch was in second place until 1916 but declined after this time as French and German increased (Miyajima, 1989). An increase has also been evident in dictionaries. Ozawa (1976) reported that English-derived loanwords comprised 2.8% of the 200,000 entries in the 1955 edition of the *Kōjien* and 3.6% in the 1972 edition. While this was only a small increase in percentage terms, it represented an increase from 5,632 to 7,499 entries over the two editions of this comprehensive dictionary.

In general, the proportion of *gairaigo* borrowed from English varies considerably with the genre. Loveday (1996) estimated that 99% of the computer terminology listed in the 1985 edition of *Gendaiyōgo* was English based, as was 75% of marketing terminology, but in law the proportion was only 5%. While there is variation in the source of *gairaigo* according to the topic area, with German having strong representation in medicine and rock-climbing, and French in fashion and cooking, the overall dominance of English as a source of *gairaigo* in modern Japanese is unmistakable and generally accepted.

Measures of the dominance of English in Japan

That English is the main foreign language learned in Japan is not a disputed issue,

however, the extent of the dominance of English is difficult to measure. Regarding books translated from foreign languages into Japanese, Morrow (1987), using 1980 UNESCO figures, found that 72% were translated from English. Inoue attempted to measure the value placed on various foreign languages. In terms of sales of textbooks for the language programs offered on NHK radio in 1995, English was far ahead of the second language, Chinese, with over 1.2 million copies sold, compared to less than 100,000. In third place was French followed by German, Korean and Spanish. A survey of dictionaries sold in Tokyo bookshops in October 1994, found around 75 different titles for English, around 15 for German and French, and around 12 for Chinese. In universities, there were a little over 160 English language courses compared to around 40 for Chinese, French and German. Of the 408 conversation schools in the Tokyo phone directory in 1990, all offered English, the second most common offering being Chinese in around 60% of schools, followed by French, Spanish, German and Italian (Inoue, 1997). Of the European languages, the figures suggest a ranking of English, French then German. English was far ahead as the dominant foreign language in Japan but Chinese generally outranked the other European languages.

Functions and roles of *gairaigo* in modern Japanese

The most straightforward reason for borrowing a word from another language is the filling of a lexical gap. Upon their arrival in Japan in the mid-sixteenth century, the Portuguese brought with them items of material culture that were new to Japan. As these items were adopted, so were the words that designated them. An enduring example is *botan* ボタン (from *botao*) which still occupies the lexical niche for which it was borrowed and is still used in Japanese to refer to buttons (Miller, 1967). In modern times, the advent of new goods and technologies is frequently accompanied by direct borrowing, as in the cases of *shanpū* シャンプー (shampoo) and *konpyūtā* コンピューター (computer).

In other cases the process involves transformation, since both the word and its referent modified to suit local conditions and needs. The word *tenpura* 天ぷら was originally derived from the Portuguese *tempero* or *temperar* (Miller, 1967), but it has been adapted both phonologically and semantically to such an extent that it has come to refer to a style of cooking that is distinctively Japanese. This semantic shift not only applies to words that have been retained in the language for so long that their meaning has evolved, it can be found in more recent borrowings as well. *Manshon* マンション is derived from

‘mansion’, however the referent is not a large expensive house but an apartment in a multistory block. The *kango* word *yashiki* 屋敷 remains in use for actual mansions.

Another feature of *gairaigo* use is their coexistence with non-*gairaigo* terms. *Gairaigo* such as *biru* ビル (a contraction of ‘building’) are used alongside *wago* words such as *tatemono* 建物 (building), and *raisu* ライス (rice) coexists with the traditional terms *gohan* 御飯 and *meshi* 飯. This phenomenon suggests that the adoption of *gairaigo* involves more complex processes than simply filling lexical gaps. Researchers have noted that when new *gairaigo* are adopted alongside existing words they tend to have a narrower meaning than they had in the source language, and than the pre-existing Japanese term (Shibatani, 1990). In the above examples, *biru* refers to modern multistory buildings, rather than to buildings in general, and *raisu* is only used in the context of Western-style meals. Therefore, this borrowing can still be seen as a response to a need to fill a specific semantic niche.

Nevertheless, *gairaigo* are not only adopted in order to fill more and more small semantic niches, they can also replace existing terms and dominate a niche. *Kamera* カメラ has largely replaced the *kango* calque *shashinki* 写真機 and *konpyūtā* has replaced *denshikeisanki* 電子計算機. In both cases, the referents were essentially the same but a new *gairaigo* written in *katakana* has been successful in dominating a semantic niche previously occupied by a *kango* term.

There are a number of possible explanations for new *gairaigo* being used in preference to existing terms. Higa (1979) proposed that when a loanword and a calque are both used, the longer term is usually replaced by the shorter, however, Sakagami (2000) found that *gairaigo* were chosen over native words even when they were longer. She proposed that socio-cultural factors were also important in determining which word was chosen.

Morrow (1987) observed that when a Japanese term and a loanword with the same denotative meaning coexist, they tend to vary in nuance and are used in different situations. In a study of examples of discourse, Hayashi and Hayashi (1995) found speakers chose *gairaigo* for their connotations in order to achieve a desired goal.

The notion that a major reason for borrowing lies in the images that surround *gairaigo* has been discussed by a number of commentators. Quackenbush (1974) noted that English

loanwords were used in advertising to give products an air of being modern and exotic. Stanlaw (1982; 1987) observed that loanwords from English carried the connotations of 'modern', 'Western' and 'sophisticated', and this was an important factor in their heavy use in advertising and popular songs. Matsuda (1986) remarked that advertisers used exotic-sounding words to envelop their merchandise in mysterious glamour. Haarmann (1984a; 1986) identified the use of foreign languages by advertisers as a strategy aimed at creating a pleasant cosmopolitan mood. He found that the use of the particular language varied according to the kind of ethno-cultural stereotype the advertiser wished to induce, with English being associated with modernity and French with elegance. In some advertising texts, he noted that the function of the foreign loanwords was not to convey information, since the words used were unlikely to be understood by most readers, but to assist in providing the desired image. Sakurai (1999), in a study of Japanese school students, also found that most did not understand the English they encountered in television commercials but, compared with light viewers, heavy viewers tended to think English loanwords enriched Japanese and preferred products named in English but all had a generally positive view of English use.

In a study of English-derived loanword use in advertising, Takashi (1990; 1992) classified *gairaigo* into five functional categories which, in descending order of frequency, were: 1. special-effect givers, 2. brand names, 3. lexical-gap fillers, 4. technical terms, and 5. euphemisms. She found that 45% of loanword tokens could be classified as 'special-effect givers', while only 16% were used to fill a lexical gap. Yamada (1993) questioned Takashi's distinction between lexical-gap fillers, technical terms and brand names on the basis that words in all of these categories aimed to fill lexical gaps of one kind or another.

Takashi (1990; 1992) found the image that advertisers aimed to signal by the use of loanwords was evidently one of modernity and sophistication, since they were prominent in advertisements for modern-style products but not in traditional products. In a study of colour terms, Yamada (1993) found that fashion magazines were more likely than newspapers to use *gairaigo* in preference to native terms. Their use in fashion was primarily for special effect, but there were also cases of euphemistic use. Sakagami (2000), in a study of Japanese magazines, also identified stylistic aspects and euphemism as motivations for choosing *gairaigo* over native words. These stylistic reasons included:

adding a sense of prestige, status or glamour; providing a refreshing change from words repeatedly used in the media; and avoiding repetition within a text (p.257).

The adoption of *gairaigo* as euphemisms has often been commented on (see Loveday, 1986; McCreary, 1990; Hoffer, 1990; Honna, 1995). Such euphemistic usage is not only associated with sexual matters – *gairaigo* are used to soften the effect of native words in other domains. An example is the frequent use in advertising of *rōn* ローン (loan) in place of *shakkin* 借金 or *kashitsuke* 貸し付け (loan), and *kurejitto* クレジット (credit) instead of *geppu* 月賦 (time-payment). In these cases, the loanwords do not carry the connotations of financial difficulty that the Japanese words do. They seem friendlier and less hard-edged. An air of unreality associated with their newness and vagueness of meaning is produced and this makes borrowing money seem less embarrassing (Hoffer, 1990; Honna, 1995; Tomoda, 1999). In view of their functions, such euphemisms can be regarded as a kind of special-effect giver, although some may also function to fill lexical gaps.

Many *gairaigo* have an ephemeral nature. They enter the language, enjoy a period of popularity as fad words, and then drop out of use as their modern, fashionable feeling is lost. Examples of *gairaigo* which have had a brief period of currency but are now fading are not difficult to find, for example, *bijinesugāru* or *bījiī* (business-girl), *zukku* (Dutch: doeck), *gōgō* (go-go), *saike* (psychedelic), *manekingāru* (mannequin-girl), *mirukuhōru* (milk-hall) and *hottopantsu* (hot-pants). *Gairaigo* that used to be fashionable, such as *nauna* (now-ish) and *fiibā-suru* (do fever i.e. get excited), now sound out-of-date and embarrassing to use (Matsuda, 1986; Hoffer 1990; Tomoda, 1999). Not all fad words in Japanese are *gairaigo* but they comprise a large proportion. Toyama (1986) expressed the view that the use of old words restricts lifestyle change, whereas new words such as *gairaigo* have a role in bringing in new lifestyles.

The use of *gairaigo* has long been associated with the speech of students. When foreign language education became widespread in the Meiji period, students began to incorporate European words into their speech (Loveday, 1996). Now, English is studied by almost all school students, and by 1991, 94% of 15 year-olds went on to high school and therefore studied English for at least six years. Even though the quality of English education in Japanese schools has received considerable criticism, through studying English, students do acquire a considerable passive vocabulary. This stimulates them to use the words they

have learned and makes them receptive to English loans that appear in the media (Matsuda, 1986; Hoffer, 1990; Honna, 1995). Takashi (1990; 1991) noted that fewer *gairaigo* were used in advertisements aimed at older age-groups and more were used when the target was students or a younger age group. Nakagawa (1996) found that students used many coined words that incorporated English elements and that these words were often incomprehensible to older people. It is likely that the study of English, coupled with an interest in the new and fashionable, are major factors in the popularity of *gairaigo* amongst young people.

An increased use of *gairaigo* as a feature of in-group, informal communication has been noted by McCreary (1990). *Gairaigo* are also a feature of the language of particular groupings of people. Their use among students and young people has been remarked upon by Ishiwata (1986), Loveday (1996) and others. They are also a major component of the vocabularies of enthusiasts for certain sports. The prevalence of *gairaigo* in baseball has been noted by Matsuda (1986), McCreary (1990) and others. In addition, enthusiasts for sports such as surfing, social dancing, and golf employ numerous *gairaigo*. Another domain of high *gairaigo* usage is the sex industry. *Gairaigo* use in sexual contexts has been noted by Stanlaw (1982), Loveday (1996), McCreary (1990), Honna (1995), and the prevalence of *gairaigo* and *waseieigo* in pages devoted to sex in Japanese 'sports' newspapers illustrates this phenomenon. Some technical jargons, such as those associated with electronics and computers, employ considerable numbers of *gairaigo* (Tomari, 1985).

Gairaigo have also become a feature of the language of government officials. In a 1985 survey of 340 employees of the Hokkaido provincial government, 81% said that the number of *katakana* words used in government had increased (Mogami, 1986). The popularity of *gairaigo* and *katakana* terms was also evident in the names given to government projects and white papers (Mogami, 1984; 1991). In the dialect of Japanese used in the Japanese community of Hawaii, many more loanwords were regularly employed than in Japan, but when conversing with a person from Japan a speaker of Hawaiian Japanese tended to avoid many of these loanwords (Quackenbush, 1974; Higa, 1975; 1979). These uses of *gairaigo* all point to the knowledge and use of particular sets of *gairaigo* functioning as markers of in-group identity.

It has often been noted that Japanese tend to view foreign things as desirable and accord

them a high status (Tomari, 1985; Shibata, 1993). In the Meiji era, the adoption of the trappings of European culture was a mark of the urban elite and such items were referred to as *haikara* ハイカラ ('high-collar' – a reference to the style of European dress). Foreign language ability was, and continues to be, a mark of the intelligentsia. When academics and other *interi* インテリ (intelligentsia) speak publicly, many tend to use foreign words that are known only to a proportion of their listeners. Such usage within subgroups of the intelligentsia can be considered a marker of in-group status, but when addressed to a broader audience its primary function is to produce the special effect of enhancing the status of the speaker.

Summary of the functions of *gairaigo*

The following schema collapses Takashi's (1990; 1992) five groups into two and adds an additional type, in-group speech, to make three main functional types of *gairaigo*. Under each type a number of sub-types are listed to give an indication of the scope intended for the category, but these do not include all possibilities.

1. Lexical-gap-fillers

   These are words borrowed to fulfill a semantic niche in the designation of objects, institutions and concepts. Such niches typically include:

   - Terms for imported goods, services and institutions
   - Names of products, brands, businesses, projects, clubs, songs, magazines etc
   - Technical terms associated with new technologies, sports and arts
   - Terms for new concepts, viewpoints and behaviours
   - Single terms used for existing things which had previously required a phrase to describe

2. Special-effect-givers

   Words in this category are used less for the designation of objects or concepts, and more for their connotation, image and social effect. Such words include:

   - Mood inducers: terms used in advertising, fashion etc aimed at producing an image or mood
   - Highlighters: used in place of a common term to make it stand out, increase the impact, or focus attention on the language use
   - Euphemisms and other kinds of obfuscation: used to disguise unpleasant concepts or things the user wishes to remain vague

- Status enhancers: words used instead of more common, lowly or rustic sounding words to create a more elevated tone
- Lighteners: Terms used in place of serious or heavy sounding native (often *kango*) words to produce a lighter, more friendly effect
- Fad words and fashionable expressions: new, stylish words that have wide currency

3. In-group speech-markers

   These words have the function of indicating that their users belong to a particular social group. They are characterised by greater in-group usage and lesser comprehension amongst out-group persons. Such words include:

   - Students' speech, youth slang, and words prevalent among other sub-groups
   - Technical jargons, sports jargons, officialese and academic jargon
   - Expatriate dialects, for example Hawaiian Japanese

These categories are not intended to be exclusive, since a particular *gairaigo* may have more than one function. Within the lexical gap category, the names of new goods and services are likely to have been chosen for their appeal, so they could also be considered special effect givers. There is also the question of what constitutes a lexical gap. In the above system the term 'gap' is interpreted broadly. When a new term is introduced to summarise a concept that previously required a number of words to express, it fulfills the need for a concise term but it does not introduce a new concept.

Concluding comments

Although loanwords have long been a feature of language change in Japan, there is empirical evidence for an increase in both their number and proportion over the last century, and particularly in the postwar period. There is, however, considerable variation in the level *gairaigo* usage according to the language domain. While English remained the main source of *gairaigo* throughout the twentieth century, the dominance of English has been increasing and it seems that there has been a trend towards the increasing use of English elements to create new words, rather than direct borrowing.

There appear to have been changes in how loanwords are used and in their functions within the language. More abstract words are being used, phrases are being borrowed or invented, and *gairaigo* are used as parts of speech other than nouns. These are not new phenomena but they appear to have become more common in the postwar period. The

imagery surrounding *gairaigo* has been an important factor in their increasing adoption. Their new, modern, fashionable image plays an important part in their high level of use in advertising and in youth slang. They also have status-enhancing effects which make them attractive to a wide spread of the population. Additional features are their indirectness, vagueness, and friendliness which make them suitable for a wide range of euphemistic functions.

The next chapter examines the theoretical and methodological aspects of this investigation of the issues surrounding *gairaigo* and the associated LP responses.

CHAPTER 2

THEORY AND METHOD

LANGUAGE PLANNING, LOANWORDS AND SOCIETY

Part 1 defines terms in language planning, discusses theoretical aspects and finishes with a descriptive framework. Part 2 details the approaches taken in this investigation, data sources, methods of data collection, as well as the design and content of the questionnaire. For each of the categories of data, the related hypotheses are stated.

PART 1: THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE PLANNING

Discussion of key terms

There are differences in the usage of terms within and between the English and Japanese literatures on language planning. These are examined and defined for the purposes of ongoing discussion.

Language Policy and Language Planning

In the English language academic discourse the terms ‘language policy’, ‘language planning’ and ‘language problem’ frequently appear with reference to intentional interventions aimed at altering language usage. Cooper (1989) discussed these terms and their various definitions and proposed that the term ‘language planning’ be used in a broad sense to encompass them. He found that the term ‘language problem’ tended to be used in the context of rational policies and measures to achieve specific goals. Language policy tended to refer to the goals of planning measures but the terms ‘language policy’ and ‘language planning’ were often used interchangeably. In addition, he noted that these terms were frequently restricted to the activities of the nation state or other authoritative bodies, but argued that individuals and unofficial organisations have undertaken significant language planning activities. The resultant definition for language planning (LP) offered by Cooper (1989) was a broad one: ‘Language planning refers to deliberate efforts to influence the behaviour of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes’ (p.45).

Neustupny (1974; 1978) also argued for a division based on a macroscopic/microscopic approach with the term ‘language policy’ for macroscopic measures, such as standardisation, and ‘language cultivation’ referring to microscopic measures that

address issues of correct usage, style etc. Developing nations tend to focus on policy, but once the main policy issues have been sorted out, there is a shift in focus towards cultivation. In postwar Japan, he argued, the main policy issues had been decided, so the focus of activity was upon cultivation.

In Japanese writings the most commonly used terms include:

Gengo-seikatsu 言語生活 (language life): The scope of this term is broad and is similar to 'sociolinguistics' (Shibata, 1985). It can be used in discussions of language change and issues relating to language, including planning. Neustupny saw the emergence of this term in the postwar period as indicating a shift from concern with language policy towards issues relating to language cultivation (1974; 1978).

Kokugo(kokuji)mondai 国語(国字)問題 (National Language issue): This term is perhaps the most widespread. *Kokugo* refers to the National Language which is standard Japanese and *mondai* is problem or issue. The inclusion of *kokuji* (National Script) in this term indicates that issues relating to the written language play a major role. This term is usually used in discussions about cultural as well as usage aspects of the language and the need for solutions or reforms (Shiota, 1973).

Gengo-seisaku 言語政策 (language policy) and *kokugokokuji-seisaku* 国語国字政策 (National Language policy): These terms refer to the policies of official language planning agencies. The first term is more general, while the second refers specifically to policies on Japanese and Japanese script.

Kokugo-shisaku 国語施策 (National Language measure): This term refers to the actual measures, such as the issuing of guidelines, taken by official language planning agencies (Shiota, 1973).

In the case of unofficial agencies, when they issue policies for language use, these tend to be referred to as *hōshin* 方針 (guidelines) and are not included within the scope of the terms *kokugo-seisaku* or *kokugo-shisaku*. Such groups may also present *teigen* 提言 (suggestions, proposals) to government requesting that particular policies or measures be adopted.

Consequently, there is no commonly used term in Japanese that encompasses all the concepts that Cooper places under the umbrella of 'language planning'. Like Cooper, this thesis uses the term language planning, and the acronym LP, as one that encompasses the language policies, measures and activities of both official and

unofficial or semiofficial bodies as well as individuals. However, in the following discussions, the emphasis will be more on official forms of LP than on unofficial ones. When referring to a particular policy or set of policies the more specific term 'language policy' is used.

The term 'language planning' can be subdivided into three main aspects as follows:

1. **Corpus planning** refers to changes being made in the spoken or written code of the language such as standardisation, script reform and coining new terms etc.
2. **Status planning** involves the allocation of a particular status and function to a particular language or variety of a language.
3. **Acquisition planning** refers to the teaching of the language and other measures intended to enhance language spread (Cooper, 1989, p.31).

There is considerable overlap between these aspects, and the usefulness of the distinction between status and corpus planning has been questioned (Rubin, 1983). Revision of the corpus is often a feature of changing the status, and planning for acquisition is also linked to the status of the language. Nevertheless, the distinction has explanatory power and is used in this thesis. Japanese equivalents to these terms are not often used. The main subdivision of LP is *kokuji-mondai* (script issues).

Language change, LP and the social context

Charles Ferguson (1977) noted that all languages change, but much of this change is gradual, so the users of the language are frequently unconscious of it and the causes of the change are not readily apparent. Other forms of change are the result of personal decisions, pressure from others and education. He pointed out that, in the past, the general approach of American linguists was to study the changes in the language without looking at planning processes and he argued that a theory of language change was incomplete unless the influence of language planning was taken into account (Ferguson, 1983).

Language planning measures seldom emerge from a grass-roots level. They tend to be proposed by institutions and by active individuals. Therefore, in the study of LP the functions of institutions and the activities of influential individuals require attention. In some countries, official language academies have long histories as arbiters of the correct forms of the language but their pronouncements have not always been adopted by the

populace. In other countries, major planning activities have been successful even though undertaken by individuals, or small groups, who had no official status (Tauli, 1974; Thody, 1995; Cooper, 1989). Therefore the success or failure of an instance of LP does not only depend on whether it is officially sponsored or not. Its worth as a proposal, its timeliness, and the degree to which it gains both public and official acceptance are all factors. Consequently, the viewpoints and attitudes of the public and of political elites also need to be considered when examining instances of LP.

In general, planners aim to introduce changes that will, in their estimation, make the language better or more correct in some way. This inevitably involves evaluation, conscious or unconscious, of the range of options, usually in terms of concepts such as purity, beauty and efficiency. The evaluations of planners tend to reflect the idealisations, stereotypes and attitudes of the particular speech community, but once they become a component of planning decisions these require explicit rationalisation (Ferguson, 1977). Therefore the discussions of LP bodies can reveal the attitudes and preconceptions of the planners.

LP can have broader goals than language improvement. The development of technical terminologies may be part of national economic development. LP can aim to enhance and maintain national or ethnic identity, legitimise the power of new elites, and maintain or enhance cultural linkages (Fishman, 1974). In the case of corpus planning, Fishman has discussed the importance of the sociocultural context and how notions of modernisation and tradition interact. In coping with the needs of modernisation, the traditional corpus is often inadequate and new lexical items are required. However, in the introduction of new technical terms it is not always sufficient for the term to be adequate for technical needs, it also needs to be legitimated and domesticated into the society in which it is used. To be effective, corpus planners need to rationalise their proposals and tell the public or target audience why these are desirable, admirable and exemplary (Fishman, 1983). A planning measure needs to gain acceptance before it can effect a change in the language and, as Cooper put it: ‘the public may greet the proposed reform with enthusiasm, indifference, scorn or disgust’ (1989, p.122). It is important, therefore, in the study of LP, to determine the goals of planners, examine how planners communicate their message and analyse the arguments that are used to justify LP measures.

Improving efficiency

Some planners aim to modernise the language and improve its efficiency. Tauli (1974) argued for this approach. Taking the view that language is a means of communication, the efficiency of which can be evaluated in terms of its economy, clarity, ease of learning, regularity and expressive adequacy, he argued for a rational approach to LP based on scientific linguistics in order to improve the language. He opposed the application of historical or puristic principles, decried the harm done by the incompetent manipulation of languages by dilettantes and prejudiced scholars and called for a scientific theory of LP that 'methodically investigates the ends, principles, methods and tactics of language planning' (p.56). His view of the ideal language was one in which a minimum of means attains the maximum of results. Such a language would convey all the necessary information and shades of meaning, be economical and easy to use, be aesthetic, and be elastic and adaptable. In order to reform a language, Tauli noted the need for authority, favourable conditions and intensive propaganda. He acknowledged that rational reforms needed to counter people's desire for stability, inertia, conservatism and a mystical, emotional attitude in support of traditional use. However, he argued that such reforms were necessary and the replacement of old tools with newer more efficient ones is a natural feature of development.

Language and identity

Although the instrumental advantages are frequently cited when arguing the need for a particular reform, not all planners are principally concerned with language as a tool. Language is also a marker of national or ethnic identity (Fishman, 1996). Particularly in new nation states, the perceived need for a language that has a uniting function may override instrumental concerns. The new state of Indonesia adopted Malay as the national language in 1945, even though it was not the dominant language (only 3-4% of the population were native speakers), nor the main language of learning (Ferguson, 1977; Alisjahbana, 1974). Viewed as a tool, Dutch was the language that was best suited to modernisation. In contrast, Malay was not standardised, had a scanty literature and lacked modern terminologies. However, from the viewpoint of national unification, a non-colonial lingua franca was needed and Malay, despite its deficiencies, satisfied this primary need. In the case of Hebrew, it was revived from being a literary language that was no longer spoken to become the dominant spoken language of the state of Israel. Its

emergence did not result from official LP, but from a need for the emerging Zionist movement to have a lingua franca that reflected a shared culture (Glinert, 1991). In the Faeroe Islands, with a population of only 40,000, the local people developed a local spoken language variety into a written language and replaced Danish, to make Faeroese the dominant language of education (Ferguson, 1983). In each of these cases, the more pragmatic option would have been to adopt a language that had already been modernised or had a larger number of native speakers; however, local concerns led to the selection of a language that was an imperfect tool as a modern language. The language was then actively modernised to adapt it to the needs of modern society. As Ferguson (1979) has noted, a response to a language problem that is considered reasonable and natural in one country may not be acceptable in another. When examining LP approaches, both the instrumental aims as well as the social, cultural and political needs require consideration.

Language as culture

Beyond being an expression of national identity, language can have a more profound significance. Fishman (1996), in a comparative study of people's beliefs about their languages, found that a number of views were held across languages. Some believed in the sanctity, morality, perfection and essential goodness of their language. The language was regarded as a heritage and the expression of the unique cultural identity or soul of their ethnic group and of its spiritual values. Strong emotional attachments were found, with expressions of love for the language recurring. The language was identified with family, kinship and considered a bond between generations. It was regarded as more than a means of communication, with people extolling the special beauty, melodious quality, inspirational effect of their language, its richness and the emotional depth of expression that is only possible when using it. When it comes to LP, these seemingly irrational, but pervasive, beliefs play important roles in decision making and tensions frequently arise (Fishman, 1996).

National development

There is commonly a linkage between the development of a modern nation state and the introduction of LP. Fishman (1974) has drawn parallels between the aims of planning for economic development, cultural planning and LP. Like economic planning, LP is usually introduced into traditional societies by elites who have contact with the outside

world. Its espoused aim is to provide rational solutions to problems for the benefit of the nation, but its effect is often a shift in power within the nation. Like economic planning, LP can have wide-ranging effects on a society and also have unexpected consequences resulting from linkages that the planners had not considered. Measures aimed at modernisation can also be a form of Westernisation and can therefore have effects upon the society beyond that of simply facilitating communication. In other cases, LP is explicitly used by states against minorities by ignoring their language, ridiculing its users or by active repression (deVries, 1991). Therefore LP measures that aim to modernise a language cannot be considered neutral – they are value laden and political. Consequently the motives of the planners need to form an aspect of LP research, as do the consequences, intended or otherwise, of the measures they introduce.

Modernisation of the corpus

One of the issues that many languages face is the need for modernisation, particularly of the vocabulary, in response to technological and social change. Typical responses to this need include: directly borrowing a term from another language, indirect borrowing of the term through the process of calquing, coining a new term using lexical resources from within the language, and the creation of entirely new words. Which process is chosen may be influenced by the structural features of the language, but more significant factors are the degree to which LP is involved and how LP is viewed in the particular nation. Whereas in China state directives on national language have a long history and tend to be observed, in the USA such central planning would not be feasible or acceptable, so the power of the planners varies considerably between these two countries. In Sweden the issue is not so much one of power but of social acceptance. LP is an activity undertaken by the Swedish Academy, which incorporates both state and non-state elements, whose role is to consider language problems, issue word lists for general consumption and provide advice to industry, but it lacks coercive power. Nevertheless, its LP activities are regarded as legitimate by the population (Ferguson, 1979).

Beyond the power of the planners is the cultural and political acceptability of the proposed additions to the corpus. Broadly speaking, the arguments of those who propose positive measures to change the language corpus tend to polarise according to whether the proponent considers historical usage to be the model of correctness or

whether the proponent has another model in mind. Even in seemingly neutral areas, such as a terminology for chemistry, the planner needs to consider whether to borrow a term or coin it. If the borrowing option is chosen, then there are the issues of which language is an acceptable source and what degree of nativisation is imposed. If coining is the option, should it be modern or classical in form and, if classical, what tradition is most appropriate? In the development of new words, a balance needs to be struck between the modern (often Western) and the traditional that is acceptable to the public (Fishman, 1983). This is by no means an easy task, since, in their choices, the planners cannot avoid revealing their viewpoint.

For believers in the essential beauty of a language, there is also the question of how an already perfect language can require change. Even when the need is accepted, there arises the issue of how to make changes in a manner that does not damage the beauty of the language or contaminate its purity. When modernisation of the corpus is required, the issues are: 1. whether to draw upon internal resources and, if so, of which variety, dialect or class; or 2. to adopt loanwords from other languages. If the limitation of only using traditionalist roots in the formation of new words is imposed, this can lead to an archaising of what needed to be modernised. If borrowing is the option, either a source language needs to be selected or the more anonymous 'internationalisms' can be adopted (Fishman, 1996).

In the selection of methods for expanding and extending the corpus, efficiency and expediency are not the only criteria – less objective criteria that reflect the culture, beliefs and attitudes are also involved. This applies not only to LP proponents but to those who oppose positive measures. In general, LP opponents share the notion that language change is best left alone, but they also hold a diversity of views on language and culture which are expressed in their arguments. In any analysis of debates concerning corpus planning and the measures proposed by planners, the beliefs of the participants (planners, opponents and recipients) need to be considered.

Language purism

The notion of language purity, and its psychosocial dimensions, has been examined by Thomas (1991). Language purification endeavours are evident in so many languages that he considered purism a universal in standardised languages. It is closely linked with nationalism and is frequently associated with perceived threats to identity. The main

aims of purists are improvement of the language and, more particularly: 1. promotion of the prestige of the language and hence its speakers; 2. maintaining or strengthening solidarity amongst speakers through mutual intelligibility and; 3. separating in-group members (i.e. speakers of the language) from non-group members (p.59). He argued that purism emerges from elites and tends to proceed in a top-down fashion. While puristic LP measures can be enforced by governments, they do not endure unless there is a change in the national consciousness, and are often abandoned once there is political change.

The arguments presented in support of language purification tend to be non-rational and ideological, and centre on aesthetic criteria – sometimes with a strong emotional component. He characterised the dimensions of purist attitudes and approaches as follows:

1. Archaising: conforming to historical, classical or traditional usage;
2. Ethnographic: drawing on dialects and traditional folk culture;
3. Elitist: conforming to a standard usage and rejecting non-standard and sub-standard forms;
4. Reformist: including language revival, renewal or modernisation, and removal of colonialist influences;
5. Xenophobic: rejecting foreign elements, either generally or with respect to particular groups.

In addition, there are non-puristic viewpoints:

- Rational, instrumental approaches to LP,
- Laissez-faire, allowing change without LP intervention (Thomas, 1991, pp.75-80).

Loanwords are a principal target of xenophobic puristic concern but the extent of this can vary according to a number of criteria, including:

1. The degree of integration of the word into the phonological and morphological system, including whether it is obviously marked as foreign;
2. How long the word has been accepted as occupying an important niche in the lexico-semantic system, i.e. the degree of naturalisation;
3. Whether the word is represented in a wide variety of languages and can be considered an internationalism;

4. Which language the word was borrowed from, particularly whether it was from a competing language.
5. The presence or absence of a native synonym which could replace it.

Calques are subject to a similar set of concerns but tend to be better tolerated. Some purists, however, consider them a greater threat due to their effects at a grammatical level (Thomas, 1991, pp.68-71).

In the earlier stages, xenophobic purists aim to make others aware of the nature and identity of the external threat and explain how they propose to enhance or safeguard aspects of the language and culture. These frequently include its purity, richness and euphony as well as the need for intelligibility, particularly in regard to ordinary people. When purists are involved in LP processes, these tend to involve the replacement of loanwords, using measures ranging from raising awareness of the need for self-censorship in the use of loanwords, to the establishment of an academy to coin neologisms and proscribe usage. When replacement is actively undertaken by the puristic planner, a number of decisions need to be made. For example, technical terminologies may or may not be included, the foreign words may be purged or allowed to coexist, and the sources and creation mechanisms of neologisms need to be decided (Thomas, 1991).

In order to measure the degree of xenophobic purism in different languages and contexts, Thomas proposed a series of criteria for evaluating whether a puristic LP measure was mild, moderate or extreme, based on the thoroughness to which the measures were carried out, the types of words targeted, and the degree to which the population was affected (Thomas, 1991, pp.146-77). In this study, aspects of Thomas' framework are used in the analysis of both viewpoints on loanwords and LP measures.

Descriptive framework for LP

The emerging paradigm for the investigation of LP is an empirical one, in which the socio-cultural and political context is taken into account and the full cycle of language planning is examined (Christian, 1988). Cooper (1989) discussed various ways in which LP can be viewed:

1. as the management of innovation;
2. as an instance of marketing;

3. as a tool in the acquisition and maintenance of power; and
4. as an instance of decision making.

Resulting from his analysis of these approaches, he proposed that, in order to provide a descriptively adequate account of any instance of LP, the following series of questions need to be addressed:

> 'What actors attempt to influence what behaviours of which people for what ends under what conditions by what means through what decision-making processes and with what effect' (p.98).

This thesis attempts to address each of these aspects, although not in the same order as in the above statement.

According to Hansen (1996), intellectuals have played key roles in instigating reforms in Japan and driving the activities of official LP bodies. Other **actors** include official and semi-official LP bodies, the media, and politicians. The history of the main bodies is outlined in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 identifies influential individuals based on their writings and involvement in LP bodies.

The **behaviour** (i.e. *gairaigo* use) was outlined and quantified in Chapter 1. An historical account of the LP aspects of this behaviour, and the **target groups,** is provided in Chapter 3, and the activities of LP bodies since the late 1980s are discussed in Chapter 8. The **ends** to which various LP proposals are aimed, and their associated **rationales,** can be found in the discussions of individual actors in Chapter 4, and LP bodies in Chapter 8.

The social, cultural, and political **conditions** under which LP proposals are made can affect the kind of proposals that are made and their reception. The influx of *gairaigo* has been a public issue for a considerable time, so this dimension is a particularly complex one and occupies a considerable proportion of this thesis. The historical conditions are outlined in Chapter 3. Scholarly and public discussion about *gairaigo* as an issue for Japanese society is examined in Chapters 4 and 8, and public opinion is evaluated in Chapters 5 to 7.

The **means** by which policies are made and implemented is outlined in the historical account in Chapter 3, and discussed in greater depth in Chapter 8. Although it has been

claimed that Japanese LP is not influenced by politics, political machinations were particularly evident in decisions made with regard to the Japanese script in the 1960s and 1970s (Miyajima, 1977a; Gottlieb, 1995a). Therefore an evaluation of the influence and inter-linkages of the main LP bodies in the 1980s and 1990s is included in Parts 1 and 2 of Chapter 8. The structures and **decision-making processes** of the main LP bodies are outlined in Chapter 3, and for the 1990s, in Chapter 8.

An evaluation of the **effects** of decisions must be limited to the short term since, in most cases, decisions have only recently been made and proposed measures only partially implemented. Nevertheless, their early reception is examined in Chapter 8. An evaluation of the measures and some predictions regarding the possible outcomes of these proposals can be found in Chapter 9.

PART 2: METHOD

Approaches taken in this investigation

This research, as outlined in the Introduction, examines the postwar loanword influx in terms of its dimensions and the responses of the language planners and the Japanese people. In order to gain a rounded view of the *gairaigo* phenomenon, this study combines both qualitative and quantitative data derived from a variety of sources. These data sources can be divided into documentary and survey types as follows:

a. Documentary data

- Quantitative and qualitative data on *gairaigo* and language change
- Qualitative data on language planning proposals and processes
- Qualitative data on language issues and debates

b. Survey data

- Quantitative data from general public opinion surveys on language issues
- Quantitative data from a specific survey on *gairaigo*
- Qualitative data from respondents to the specific survey on *gairaigo*

The main types of data, their collection, treatment and reporting are discussed below.

Gairaigo and language change

This aspect was considered preliminary to the main part of the study and consequently the data were summarised and presented in Chapter 1. This involved:

a. collecting and organising existing quantitative research on the degree and nature

of the change in *gairaigo* usage, to determine whether the postwar influx of *gairaigo* had a quantitative basis;

b. undertaking quantitative analysis (see Tomoda, 1999);

c. examining qualitative research on the historical processes involved in word borrowing in Japan,

d. organising qualitative and quantitative data on the roles and functions of *gairaigo* in contemporary Japan.

Historical context of Japanese LP

The history of LP over the last century was examined using a range of secondary and primary materials. Particular attention was given to *gairaigo* and the period since the late 1980s. The agencies and groups involved in, or influential on, LP during this period were identified, and their activities, viewpoints and the main issues are discussed in Chapter 3.

Influential individuals

A number of individuals, mostly scholars, who were particularly influential and/or vociferous with regard to language issues, were identified and their views on *gairaigo* examined. An effort was made to include a range of representative viewpoints. Brief biographies of the individuals were constructed, extracts of their works translated, the key aspects of their arguments summarised, and these are reported in Chapter 4.

Language issues in the public arena

The way *gairaigo* were discussed in materials accessible to the general public was examined in detail using books, journals, newspaper and magazine articles, letters to newspapers, and web materials that expressed viewpoints on the state of the Japanese language and *gairaigo*. Extracts were translated and the materials organised according to the dominant issues, themes and positions taken. These are presented in Chapter 4.

Planning bodies and processes

The structure, membership and processes of official, semi-official and unofficial LP bodies were examined to determine, as far as possible, hierarchical and other relationships, level of cross-membership and channels of influence on LP processes. This is discussed in Chapters 4 and 8.

Policy deliberations, positions and measures

With regard to the range of LP bodies, their aims, viewpoints, rationales, and measures regarding *gairaigo* were identified and examined. Policy deliberations, reports and proposals, mainly from NLC and FLC, were translated and extracts are presented in Chapter 8. Key policy papers were interpreted in light of the extent to which the views of influential opinion makers and groups were reflected, and any proposed measures were evaluated.

Public opinion surveys

Numerous surveys of public opinion on language issues have been conducted in the postwar period. The results of these surveys have been used to inform policy makers and policy makers have had input into the content of the surveys. In order to determine the extent to which the viewpoints of opinion makers and language planners coincide with those of the general public, the results of Japanese public opinion surveys were collected and the results of questions relating to *gairaigo* were tabulated. Comparisons were drawn between surveys, in order to obtain longitudinal views of trends in public opinion on *gairaigo* and *gairaigo* related issues. Data from these surveys are reported and discussed in Chapters 5 to 7.

The main bodies involved in conducting surveys were Bunkachō and NHK. In addition, some significant surveys were conducted by Sōrifu, *Yomiuri* news agency and Ehime Prefecture. In tables 2.1 to 2.5 (below) the title, year and month(s) of each survey is given and the number of respondents is recorded in ( ) where available.

<u>Bunkachō surveys</u>

These surveys began in 1995 and are conducted by the Kokugoka section of Bunkachō as part of its support role to NLC. The stated aims of the surveys were: 'In the changing modern society, to survey the state of people's attitudes to the language, and contribute to the drafting of language policy' (Bunkachō, 2002e, p.1).

The results were published as booklets by Kokugoka. The reported data were in the form of frequencies and percentages with a breakdown according to gender, age group, region and occupation. Cross-tabulations between questions were generally not provided, nor were significance tests. Interpretation of the data was limited to descriptions of the results.

Table 2.1. Bunkachō Surveys

Survey Date*	Title of survey (number of respondents)	References
1995.4	Opinion poll on Japanese (2,212)	Bunkachō (1995a)
1997.1	Opinion poll on Japanese (2,240)	Bunkachō (1997b)
1997.12	Opinion poll on Japanese (2,190)	Bunkachō (1998)
1999.1	Opinion poll on Japanese: *Keigo, kanji, gairaigo* (2,200)	Bunkachō (1999)
2000.1	Opinion poll on Japanese: Language use, Japanese in the era of internationalisation (2,196)	Bunkachō (2000)
2001.1	Opinion poll on Japanese: Language use in the home and workplace (2,192)	Bunkachō (2001)
2002.11	Opinion poll on Japanese: Japanese language ability of Japanese people (2,200)	Bunkachō (2003)

* in Japanese government publications the year ends in March, so a survey conducted in January 1999 is considered as 1998. The above dates reflect the actual months of the surveys.

NHK surveys

The first mass opinion poll (*yoronchōsa* 世論調査) on language matters was conducted in 1979. The stated purpose of this project was 'to investigate the language life of modern Japanese people by carrying out a thorough survey of the actual condition of language use and attitudes towards language, to provide data of use in the improvement of the language of broadcasting, and also to contribute to the development of the Japanese language' (Kajiki, 1996b, p.18). Other surveys have also been conducted. The following is a list of all the NHK surveys from 1970 till 2000 that contained questions pertinent to *gairaigo*.

Data were published in *Hōsōkenkyū-to-chōsa* in the form of articles by members of the Broadcasting Research Division (*Hōsōkenkyūbu*) of NHK. The data reported were mainly percentage responses, with some instances of demographic breakdown being included, but these were usually incomplete. Occasionally cross-tabulations were provided but without significance tests. The data were discussed in the articles, usually from the perspective of how this affected NHK policy.

Table 2.2. NHK Surveys

Survey Date*	Title of survey (number of respondents)	References
1973.8-9	Survey of comprehension level (100 selected *gairaigo*) (600)	Ishino (1974b)
1973.8	Is it all right to use these 150 *gairaigo* in the media? (200)	Ishino (1974a)
1973.9-10	Questionnaire to intellectuals [Level of naturalisation and acceptance of media use (of 150 *gairaigo*)] (209)	Ishino (1974c)
1979.9	Opinion poll on language (2,639)	Ishino, Hidaka, Tsutsumi, & Aida (1980)
1982.6	Survey of *katakana* words (273)	Ishino (1982)
1983.10-12	Survey of the generation gap in language (529)	Inagaki & Ishino (1984)
1983	*Gairaigo* used government project names nationwide	Mogami (1984)
1986.2	Opinion poll on language (1,542)	Ishino & Inagaki (1986)
1988.2	2nd survey of the language environment: Gairaigo (1,329)	Ishino, Maruta & Tsuchiya (1988)
1989a.2	Survey of 100 viewers (100)	Mogami (1989)
1989b.2	3rd survey of modern people's language environment: perceptions of the standard (language forms) (1,185)	Ishino, Maruta & Tsuchiya (1989)
1990.3	4th survey of modern people's language environment: attitudes and beliefs about language (1,203)	Ishino, Maruta, & Tsuchiya (1990)
1991.2	5th survey of modern people's language environment: Japanese in the era of internationalisation (1,329)	Ishino & Yasuhira (1991)
1991.3	5th survey of modern people's language environment (part 2): academics in the field of Japanese language education (162)	Tsuchiya (1991)
1991.11	6th survey of modern people's language environment: Japanese into the future (1,335)	Ishino, Maruta, Kisa & Yasuhira (1992)
1993.5	Survey of Japanese people's attitudes 1993 (3,814)	Hashimoto & Takahashi (1994)
1994.11	Interest in language study/foreign countries and language proficiency (500)	Hara & Hattori (1995)
1995.3	9th survey of modern people's language environment: Mass communication and *gairaigo* (1,176)	Ōnishi & Kajiki (1995)
1996.3	10th survey of modern people's language environment: Japanese people and the spoken language (1,251)	Kajiki (1996a)
1996.11	7th survey of language variants	Fukakusa & Sakamoto (1997)
1999.2	National survey of the level of understanding of *gairaigo* (1,331)	Fukakusa (1999)
1999.12	Broadcasting and Japanese (1,341)	Mogami & Yamashita (2000)
2000.5	Broadcasting and Japanese (1,428)	Yamashita & Katō (2000)

Note: The titles of NHK surveys can vary from source to source since some did not have formal titles.

Yomiuri surveys

Yomiuri carries out periodical surveys of the general public on a wide range of social, political and economic issues. Since the 1970s the following two surveys have contained questions relating to *gairaigo*.

Table 2.3. *Yomiuri* Surveys

1979	Opinion poll on *gairaigo* (n.a.)	Ishino (1980)
1989.11	*Yomiuri* national opinion poll (2,181)	Sōrifu (1991)

Sōrifu surveys

The following three surveys contained questions of relevance to *gairaigo*. Data were presented in periodicals published by the Public Relations Section (Kōhōshitsu) of Sōrifu. Only percentages were provided with no demographic breakdown, statistical tests or interpretation.

Table 2.4. Sōrifu Surveys

1977.8	Opinion poll on the national language (8,170)	Sōrifu (1979)
1992.6	Opinion poll on the national language (2,284)	Sōrifu (1992)
1995.10	Opinion poll on foreign relations (2,093)	Sōrifu (1997a)

Survey by Ehime Prefectural Government

The purpose of the survey was to investigate how the people of Ehime Prefecture viewed the language used in documents produced by the prefectural office and the spoken language used by officials. The questionnaire included a section on *katakanago*.

Table 2.5: Ehime Survey

1987.7	Language usage handbook No.2: The people's views of the language used by prefectural government offices (148)	Ehime-ken Sōmubu-gakujibunshoka (1987)

The results were published in one of the handbooks produced by the prefecture on language usage. Frequencies, percentages and demographic features are provided.

Results from the above surveys are used:

- as a gauge of public opinion on issues relating to *gairaigo*;
- to determine whether the results of the present survey are consistent with other surveys conducted at a similar time; and
- to examine trends in public opinion on *gairaigo.*

By comparison with the above surveys the present survey can be located within the survey literature and questions of validity addressed.

Specific questionnaire on *gairaigo*

Although questions on *gairaigo* have been included in numerous public opinion surveys, these questions have tended to be general and not explore respondents' responses to *gairaigo* in depth. In addition, in the reported data, analysis of demographic data is

scanty and the relationships between questions are seldom explored. Therefore, in order to obtain data from ordinary Japanese people on a range of issues associated with *gairaigo,* a questionnaire was designed and administered. The data are reported in Chapters 5 to 7.

Content and design of the questionnaire on *gairaigo*

The present survey is in the form of a questionnaire that includes questions similar to those included in the above surveys, as well as more in-depth questions on *gairaigo*. The questionnaire was designed in 1995-6, based on a combination of the kinds of questions that had been included in published public opinion polls, the *gairaigo*-related issues that had appeared in the academic and popular literature, and the requirements of this research for in-depth data. Since that time, *gairaigo* as an issue for planning has rapidly gained momentum and there have been some shifts in the foci of discussions. Consequently, in hindsight, there are some items that could have been deleted and some that could have been added.

The nineteen-item questionnaire aimed to sample the responses of Japanese native speakers from a variety of backgrounds and age groups with regard to *gairaigo*. It required respondents to attempt to give objective assessments of a range of issues relating to *gairaigo* and language change, as well as to give personal opinions and experiences. In general, the possible options were specified in order to provide data suitable for quantitative analysis, but written responses were also requested for some items. The information collected by the questionnaire will allow comparison with data obtained from the literature with regard to:

1. definition of the term *gairaigo*
2. level and increase in *gairaigo* use
3. comprehension of *gairaigo*
4. acceptance of *gairaigo*
5. images attributed to *gairaigo* and *gairaigo* users
6. opinions on the state of the Japanese language and the nature of language change

Sampling method

Conducting a random sample from the Japanese population was not feasible. Therefore a ‘snowballing’ approach was taken. Personal contacts in Japan were asked to distribute questionnaires to their colleagues, friends, family, students and people in their local

community and to collect the questionnaires back and return them. Around 1,000 questionnaires were distributed using this method during 1997 and 1998 and about 90% were returned. The contact people were informed that the questionnaire was anonymous and the results would be used in academic research but they were not aware of the aims of the research, beyond what was indicated on the questionnaire. Respondents were free to choose whether to fill in the questionnaire or not and were allowed as much time as they wished to complete it.

Structure of the questionnaire

The questionnaire began with demographic data followed by nineteen questions covering 55 response items. The questions related to the following broad areas:

1. The definition of the term '*gairaigo*' Q. G

2. Change in the level of *gairaigo* usage

   These questions aimed to obtain the respondents' objective assessment of the increase or decrease in *gairaigo* usage:
   - over the previous ten years Q. 1
   - in various media and situations Q. 8
   - in the future Q. 4

3. Response to the level of *gairaigo* usage

   Three questions sought respondents' opinions and feelings on various issues regarding the level of *gairaigo* usage as follows:
   - opinion on current level of *gairaigo* use Q. 2
   - approval / disapproval of future increase in *gairaigo* use Q. 5
   - level of discord experienced when exposed to a high level of *gairaigo* Q. 6

4. Opinions on the manner of *gairaigo* usage and *gairaigo* users

   Three questions aimed to investigate respondents' opinions and feelings about the way *gairaigo* are used in the Japanese language as follows:
   - the way *gairaigo* is currently used Q. 3
   - feelings about *gairaigo* usage Q. 13
   - opinion on manner of *gairaigo* usage and adoption Q. 14

5. Encounters with unknown *gairaigo*

   Four questions aimed to examine the extent to which each respondent was exposed to *gairaigo* which they did not understand and to determine their reactions to such words.
   - frequency of such encounters Q. 9
   - media and situations in which such encounters occur Q. 10
   - emotional reaction to such an encounter Q. 11
   - enthusiasm for using new *gairaigo* Q. 12

6. Opinions on issues concerning the Japanese language

These questions aimed to determine respondents' views on a range of issues extant in the literature, which relate directly or indirectly to *gairaigo*.

- effect of *gairaigo* on the Japanese language Q. 7, Q. 16
- reasons for introducing *gairaigo* Q. 15
- current state of the Japanese language Q. 17
- level of use of *kanji* in the future Q. 18

Questionnaire items

The following details each item in the questionnaire and the reasons for its inclusion.

The Japanese questionnaire is in the Appendix.

Demographics

Each respondent was asked to provide the following demographic data:

A: Age group: 16-19; 20-24; 25-29; 30-34; 35-39; 40-49; 50-59; 60-69; 70 and above.

Since there appears to have been an increase in the total number of *gairaigo* in use, it seems likely that different age groups will perceive this to different degrees. In addition, the association of *gairaigo* with modernity suggests the possibility of generational differences in response to *gairaigo*.

B: Gender: M/F

The research of Stanlaw (1982) and Loveday (1996) suggested a possible gender difference in the use of *gairaigo.*

C: Student status:

1. high school student 2. tertiary student; student's major: ( )

The effect of studying English for university entrance examinations may produce a negative opinion of 'examination English' (Kobayashi, 2000). A student's major area of study may be linked to their attitude to *gairaigo*.

D: Occupation

Yes: (job type:) No:

Type of employment could be a factor in attitudes to *gairaigo*, considering the apparent tendency for *gairaigo* to concentrate in technical jargons, the mass media and the bureaucracy.

E: Foreign language speaking ability

The following six options were provided as descriptors of the person's ability to speak the following selection of languages presented on a table:

English, German, French, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Other ( ).

1. can talk about specialist topics such as your job
2. can engage in everyday conversation without difficulty

3. can manage travel conversation
4. can understand some but cannot speak well
5. can hardly make self understood
6. cannot speak at all

F: Foreign language reading ability

The following six options were provided as descriptors of the person's ability to speak the following selection of languages presented on a table:

English, German, French, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Other ( ).

1. can read newspapers and magazines and generalist books easily
2. can read newspapers and magazines and generalist books fairly well
3. can read in the area of own interest fairly well
4. can read simple short sentences
5. can hardly read
6. cannot read at all

Information on foreign language competence was included since the respondent's ability in this area may influence attitudes and opinions on *gairaigo*. Similar scales are included in NHK surveys (Ishino & Yasuhira, 1991).

Questions

G: Which of the following do you think '*gairaigo*' refers to? (choose 1 only)

1. names of overseas places and people.
2. words written in *katakana*, which are fashionable, such as those used by young people.
3. words which come from Europe and America, and from China, which are written in either *kanji* or *katakana*.
4. words written in *katakana* which are taken mainly from Europe and America. Not including words taken from China written in *kanji*.

Data from this question was reported in Tomoda (2000) and is not included in this thesis.

Q.1. Do you think that the amount of *gairaigo* used in Japanese has increased over the last ten years? (choose 1 only)

1. I think it has increased very much
2. I think it has increased a fair amount
3. I do not think it has changed
4. I think it has decreased a fair amount
5. I think it has decreased very much

This interval was chosen since an estimate of this nature could reasonably be expected of respondents from any age group. It is comparable with a question asked in the NHK 1991 survey, but the timeframe was changed from 'recently' to 'over the last ten years', to avoid the vagueness of the word 'recently'.

Q.2. What do you think of the current level of *gairaigo* that you see and hear in everyday language? (choose 1 only)

1. I think it is too much
2. I think it is a lot
3. I think it is just right
4. I think there is comparatively little of it
5. I think there is too little of it

This question is comparable with ones in NHK 1982, NHK 1988 and Sōrifu 1992. However, words such as 'too much' or 'a lot' were avoided in the question to eliminate the possibility of introducing bias into the response.

Q.3. What do you think of the way *gairaigo* is used in current Japanese? (choose 1 only)

1. I think it is very good
2. I think it is good
3. I cannot say whether it is good or not
4. I do not think it is very good
5. I do not think it is good at all

This question is comparable to that of Sōrifu 1977 but the options have been varied. It is also comparable to NHK 1979 and 1986 but the word 'frequently' was not used in the question.

Q.4. What do you think the future level of *gairaigo* usage will be?

1. I think it will increase a lot
2. I think it will increase
3. I do not think it will change
4. I think it will decrease
5. I think it will decrease quite a bit

When compared to question one, this question could provide information on whether respondents believed past trends would continue into the future. It is also possible that a respondent's opinion about *gairaigo* is affected by their belief about the future of *gairaigo*.

Q.5. If the level of *gairaigo* usage were to increase in the future, what would you think?

1. I think it would be very good
2. I think it would be good
3. I cannot say whether it would be good or not
4. I do not think it would be very good
5. I do not think it would be good at all

Comment:

This follows on from questions three and four and samples opinion on *gairaigo*.

Q.6. When you hear *gairaigo* being used a lot in everyday language, does it disturb (*ki-ni-naru*) you?

1. it disturbs me a lot
2. it disturbs me a fair bit
3. it does not affect me
4. it does not make me feel disturbed
5. it does not make me feel disturbed at all

Considering the amount of negative commentary about *gairaigo* to be found in both the popular press and in scholarly articles, it is likely that some respondents experience negative reactions to the frequent use of *gairaigo*. This question is similar to questions two and three, but is more personalised and specific.

Q.7. What do you think of the opinion that the use of many *gairaigo* confuses the Japanese language and will eventually ruin it?

1. I think that is exactly right
2. I think that there is a tendency to that
3. I do not think it is as bad as all that
4. I do not think that is correct
5. On the contrary, I think the use of lots of *gairaigo* enriches the language

This allows a direct response to this well-publicised opinion on the effect of *gairaigo* on the Japanese language.

Q.8. What do you think of the number of *gairaigo* you see and hear in the following? (for a-h presented in a table)

1. I think the number has increased a lot
2. I think the number has increased
3. I think the number is the same as before
4. I think the number has decreased
5. I think the number has decreased quite a bit

a. television, radio programs
b. advertisements, posters
c. various brochures and instruction manuals
d. newspapers
e. magazines
f. in the workplace or in school classes
g. conversation with friends or acquaintances
h. conversations among children or young people

It is possible that change has been uneven, so response to question one would not provide a sufficiently detailed picture. In retrospect, an additional option should have been added, i.e. government publications. At the time of survey construction, however, this was a much less significant issue than it later became.

Q.9. Do you notice that there are *gairaigo* that you do not understand in the language that you read or hear in everyday life?

1. I frequently have that experience
2. I sometimes have that experience
3. I do not have that experience often
4. I seldom have that experience

One explanation of negative views of *gairaigo* is they are not understood by many people. To determine whether this is the case in this sample, the responses to this question will be compared with responses to questions 2, 3, 6 and 7.

Q.10. Where do you see or hear *gairaigo* that you do not know the meaning of? (Choose up to 4 from the options below)

1. television, radio programs
2. advertisements, posters
3. various brochures and instruction manuals
4. newspapers
5. magazines
6. in the workplace or in school classes
7. conversation with friends or acquaintances
8. conversations among children or young people

It could be expected that there would be at least a partial correlation between this question and question 8. However, the degree of change in *gairaigo* use and the experience of unknown *gairaigo* may not correspond.

Q.11. What sort of feeling do you get when you see or hear a *gairaigo* that you do not know? (choose as many as you like from the following)

1. do not feel anything
2. feel irritated
3. feel unpleasant
4. feel ashamed
5. feel worried that I am behind the times
6. I want to know the meaning right away
7. I am impressed by the person using it
8. ignore it
9. think that it should be said in Japanese
10. Other ( )

Questions 2, 6 and 7 examine respondents' opinions and reactions to *gairaigo* usage in general, whereas this question focuses on particular reactions to unknown *gairaigo*. Since the emotional and behavioral reactions to such an experience could be complex, respondents could choose a number of options as well as include their individual response.

Q.12. Are you enthusiastic about beginning to use new *gairaigo* that you have learned the meaning of in your everyday conversation? (choose 1)

1. I often start using them
2. I sometimes start using them
3. I do not start to use such words much
4. I seldom use them
5. I will not use them at all

Since the level of *gairaigo* appears to have been increasing, a proportion of people must be adopting these new words. This question allows the identification of those who readily adopt *gairaigo* and those who reject such new words.

Q.13. What is your feeling about the use of *gairaigo*?
(choose as many as you like from the following)

1. that person seems intelligent
2. that person seems snobbish
3. that person seems fashionable
4. the *gairaigo* gives a sense of newness
5. it an unnecessary / unnatural thing to do
6. the meaning becomes hard to understand
7. they can express subtle nuances of meaning
8. they destroy the traditional order of Japanese language
9. they give an impression of shallowness
10. they give an international feeling
11. they produce a good sense of vagueness
12. they seem out of place
13. they produce a strong impression
14. they seem like an act of mimicry
15. Other ( )

The number of responses that a respondent may have is difficult to list exhaustively. It is also possible that responses are complex. Therefore, a range of response options is provided, from which the respondent can choose any number as well as add their own.

Q.14. What do you think of the use of *gairaigo*?
(Circle 1. I think so; 2. I don't think so; or 3. I can't say; for each of the statements a-h)

a. the Japanese language has enough vocabulary so *gairaigo* shouldn't be used
b. to avoid the incorrect use of *gairaigo*, they shouldn't be used much
c. they should only be used for things that cannot be expressed in Japanese
d. they should be brought in freely
e. only words relating to current topics should be introduced
f. their use should be limited to words which ordinary people can understand
g. we should carefully choose the words to use
h. it doesn't matter how much we use them as long as we understand the meaning
Other ( )

This follows on from questions 3 and 7. It explores the respondent's attitude to *gairaigo* usage in more depth and allows individual comment. The options were selected to cover a range of opinions found in the literature.

Q.15. Why do you think Japanese people incorporate *gairaigo* into the Japanese language?
(Circle 1. I think so; 2. I don't think so; or 3. I can't say; for each of the reasons a-f)

a. because Japanese people have a tendency to copy foreign things
b. because there are no Japanese words that fit
c. because it is a natural part of the internationalisation process
d. because Japanese people have a high degree of enthusiasm for learning foreign languages
e. because Japanese people lack creativity in making new words
f. because it is easy to incorporate foreign words into the Japanese language
Other ( )

Six reasons were selected based on those found in the literature on *gairaigo* and upon general stereotypes of Japan and creativity. In addition, respondents have the option of providing their own reason.

Q.16. Please give your opinions on the following statements about the effect *gairaigo* have had on the Japanese language.
(Circle 1. I think so; 2. I don't think so; or 3. I can't say; for each of the statements a-e)

a. they enrich the Japanese vocabulary
b. they confuse the Japanese language
c. they accelerate the internationalisation of the Japanese language
d. they modernise the Japanese language
e. they introduce confusion in communication
Other ( )

The opinions chosen for response were selected from the range found in the literature on *gairaigo*. One of these (b), was the focus of question 7. It was included in this question to complete the range of opinions and to provide a measure of reliability of response.

Q.17. In short, do you think that the Japanese language is confused at present?

1. I think that's exactly right
2. I think there is something of that tendency
3. I don't think it is as bad as that
4. I don't think that is the case

Question 7 was similar, but focused on *gairaigo*, so it did not examine the possibility that a respondent may consider the Japanese language to be confused but not attribute this to the influence of *gairaigo*.

Q.18. Do you think the amount of *kanji* used in everyday life will decrease in the future?

1. I think it will decrease quite a bit
2. I think it will decrease somewhat
3. I don't think it will change
4. I think it will increase somewhat
5. I think it will increase quite a bit

Since *gairaigo* are written in *katakana*, any change in the proportion of *gairaigo* is

likely to be related to a change in the proportion of *kanji* in use. This question examines the extent to which this putative link is recognised by respondents.

Data analysis and reporting

The questionnaire data were entered into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis (Frude, 1993). Response frequencies for each demographic parameter and each question are tabled in Chapters 5 to 7. Some demographic parameters, such as age group, were recoded into new variables that combined numerically smaller categories, in order to facilitate analysis. Reporting focuses on age and English reading level since these are the most relevant to LP.

Significance tests were conducted for demographic parameters and between questions. Since the data were categorical or ordinal in nature, non-parametric methods were used. Pearson's Chi Square (χ^2) was used to test relationships between variables. This test was chosen because it is a robust test that is appropriate for nominal variables. When 20% or more of the cells had expected counts less than 5, the data was re-coded to enable valid analyses using Chi Square. In the case of 2 X 2 tables, the Continuity Correction was reported (Howell, 1987; Seigel & Castellan, 1988).

When ordinal data and data presented on a Likert-type scale were involved, Spearman's Correlation Coefficient (rho ρ) was used to determine whether any correlation was evident. Cramer's V (also known as phi) was used to measure strength of association between variables (Howell, 1987; Seigel & Castellan, 1988).

Some questions invited respondents to write comments in addition to their responses. All comments were recorded and when the comments were numerous they were categorised according to similarity. Translations of representative examples are reported following the numerical data for the questions. For each comment, gender (M/F) and age group, e.g. 20-25, are given and, where relevant, the response option to the question in ( ) and the reported English reading ability score in [ ].

Hypotheses

These are grouped according to type of data.

1. Hypotheses relating to language issues

It was expected that:

1.1. The issues discussed with regard to *gairaigo* in Japan would include those identified by Fishman (1996): efficiency and accuracy, development and modernisation, internationalisation and globalisation, nation and ethnicity, tradition and culture, richness, purity and beauty.

1.2. Puristic, nationalistic and xenophobic viewpoints would be evident.

2. Hypotheses relating to LP bodies

It was expected that:

2.1. Decision-making processes would be controlled by government or other elite groups.

2.2. There would be close linkages between LP bodies.

3. Hypotheses relating to planners

In the arguments and pronouncements of planners and planning bodies it was expected that:

3.1. Proposed changes would be presented as improvements.

3.2. Instrumental arguments would dominate policy documents.

3.3. Policy documents would reflect the views of influential individuals and groups.

3.4. Puristic aims and rationales would be evident.

4. Hypotheses tested by the questionnaire

The questionnaire allowed the testing of the following hypotheses:

General

It was expected that respondent's experiences of *gairaigo* would reflect generalities found in the literature.

4.1a. Respondents would report that the level of *gairaigo* use had increased.

4.1b. The language domains of greatest increase would relate to the mass media.

4.1c. Most respondents would have encountered *gairaigo* they could not understand.

4.1d. Such *gairaigo* would be mainly encountered in the mass media.

4.1e. Most people would have a negative view of *gairaigo*.

Linkages

It was expected that there would be linkages between viewpoints on *gairaigo*.

4.2a. Comprehension of *gairaigo* would be linked to a positive view of *gairaigo*.

4.2b. A positive view of *gairaigo* would be linked to acceptance of a future increase in *gairaigo*.

4.2c. *Gairaigo* would be linked to notions of fashion, newness and modernity.

4.2d. The increase in *gairaigo* would be linked to internationalisation.

4.2e. A positive view of *gairaigo* would be linked to using new *gairaigo*.

4.2f. Belief that the language was confused would be linked to a negative view of *gairaigo*.

4.2g. Believing that *gairaigo* had an internationalising effect would be linked to useingnew *gairaigo*.

Age effects

Older people would be:

4.3a. more likely to perceive a large increase in *gairaigo.*

4.3b. less approving of the way *gairaigo* were used.

4.3c. more likely to encounter *gairaigo* they did not understand.

4.3d. less approving of increases in *gairaigo.*

4.3e. less likely to adopt and use new *gairaigo.*

4.3f. more likely to link *gairaigo* with confusion in Japanese.

4.3g. less likely to link *gairaigo* with modernisation, fashion and newness.

4.3h less likely to link *gairaigo* with modernisation and newness.

4.3j. more likely to approve of restrictions on *gairaigo*.

English language ability related effects

People with a higher English ability would:

4.4a. have a more positive view of *gairaigo.*

4.4b. be more approving of increases in *gairaigo.*

4.4c. be less likely to encounter *gairaigo* they did not understand.

4.4d. be more likely to adopt and use new *gairaigo.*

4.4e. be less likely to think Japanese is confused.

4.4f. be less likely to link *gairaigo* with confusion.

4.4g. be more likely to link *gairaigo* with internationalisation.

4.4h. be less likely to attribute *gairaigo* increase to cultural reasons.

4.4i. be less likely to approve of restrictions on *gairaigo*.

5. Longitudinal hypotheses

It was expected that the following longitudinal effects would be evident across the public opinion surveys:

5.1. The rate of increase in *gairaigo* would have accelerated.

5.2. Problems with understanding *gairaigo* would have increased.

5.3. Negative views of *gairaigo* would have increased.

5.4. Belief in language confusion would have increased.

Concluding comments

In the following chapters, a range of issues associated with *gairaigo* are addressed. These chapters work from general to specific, beginning with an historical account of LP, then comments and opinions on *gairaigo* issues, the results of surveys, and LP arguments and proposals from groups and individuals. In each section there is a combination of both qualitative and quantitative data, but the overall trend is for more qualitative data in the earlier chapters and more quantitative data in the later chapters.

CHAPTER 3

LANGUAGE PLANNING IN MODERN JAPAN

Part 1 outlines the main bodies involved in language planning in contemporary Japan. In Part 2, research into language planning is discussed. Part 3 presents a chronological account of LP and foreign language education over the last century and concludes with an overview of LP in the postwar period.

PART 1: LANGUAGE PLANNING BODIES IN CONTEMPORARY JAPAN

The principal LP bodies in Japan during the 1990s were a number of government, semi-government and non-government bodies. The following sections outline the structures, roles and activities of these bodies during this period.

Bodies with direct support from the central government

During the 1990s the LP bodies located in Bunkachō within Monbukagakushō were:

National Language Council (NLC)

National Language Section (NLS)

National Language Research Institute (NLRI) (MEXT, n.d.1)

Official LP bodies outside Bunkachō included:

Japan Foundation

Prime Minister's Office

Administrative reforms changed the above structure in the early 2000s, as outlined below.

National Language Council (NLC)

NLC was set up in 1934 as the successor to previous national language planning bodies (Amanuma & Ukita, 1961; Shiota, 1973; Umesao et al., 1989). It operated during the 1990s under an ordinance revised in 1962, as an advisory council (*shingikai*) (Gottlieb, 1995a; Carroll, 2001). Its role was to 'deliberate on matters relating to Japanese orthography' (MEXT, 1994, p.1).

NLC consisted of experts and specialists and had up to 50 members from various fields who were appointed by the Minister of Education, Science and Culture on recommendation of the Director-General of Bunkachō, who could also appoint temporary members whose expertise was required. In addition, NLC meetings were attended by approximately seven members of Bunkachō including the Director-General,

Deputy Director and the Head of NLS. Members were appointed for two years, which was the term of a particular Council, and appointments could be renewed. The Council could elect its Chair, establish subcommittees and working parties. For decision making, a quorum of over 50% attendance was required. Each member (excluding Bunkachō attendees) had one vote with the Chair being able to cast a deciding vote (Bunkachō, 2002b).

Table 3.1. Major policies and reports of the National Language Council

Year	Title	Status
1946	Tōyō-kanji list (Nov)	Notice, Directive
	Modern *kana* usage (Nov)	
1948	Table of *on* and *kun* readings for Tōyō-kanji (Feb)	Notice, Directive
1949	Table of Tōyō-kanji character fonts (Apr)	Notice, Directive
1952	Honorific language henceforth (Apr)	Proposal
1954	Notation of loanwords (Mar)	Report
1959	Guide to the use of *okurigana* (Jul)	Notice, Directive
1966	Specific strategies for improving National Language policy (Jun)	Inquiry
1972	Revised guide to the use of *okurigana* (Jun)	Report
	Revised list of *on* and *kun* readings for Tōyō-kanji (Jun)	Report
	Regarding the promotion of *kokugo* education (Jun)	Proposal
1973	Revised list of *on* and *kun* readings for Tōyō-kanji (Jun)	Notice, Directive*
	Tōyō-kanji guide to the use of *okurigana* (Jun)	
1981	Jōyō-kanji list (Mar)	Report
	Jōyō-kanji list (Oct)	Notice, Directive*
1986	Revised modern *kana* usage (Mar)	Report
	Modern *kana* usage (Jul)	Notice, Directive*
1991	Notation of loanwords (Feb)	Report
	Notation of loanwords (Jun)	Notice, Directive*
1993	Regarding the problems affecting contemporary Japanese (Jun)	Report
	Ideal national language policy to suit the new era (Nov)	Inquiry
1995	Ideal language policy to suit the new era: Progress report (Nov)	Report
1998	Ideal language policy to suit the new era: Progress report (Jun)	Report
2000	Honorific expression in modern society (Dec)	Report
	Characters not listed in the Jōyō-kanji list (Dec)	
	Optimum response of the Japanese language to global society (Dec)	

* In effect as of 2002 (Bunkachō, 1994; Asamatsu, 2001; Bunkachō, 2002d)

Generally, NLC produced biannual reports and a final report (*hōkoku* 報告) at the end of a term. At the request of the Minister it conducted inquiries (*shimon* 諮問) and submitted recommendations (*tōshin* 答申) to the Minister, who had power of veto. These were circulated by the Minister to relevant departments for comment, and then on to Cabinet. It could also make independent proposals (*kengi* 建議) to the Minister

(Bunkachō, 2002b). Cabinet could issue new policies as directives (*kunrei* 訓令) that were binding on government agencies and had legal status in relation to government documents, including those used in education but not in relation to the media, industry or the public, and also more general notices (*kokuji* 告示) that were aimed primarily at the public, but were not binding (Toyoda, 1972). These were published in the Government Gazette and reported in the press (Hirota, 1964; MEXT, 1994; Gottlieb, 1995a; Carroll, 2001). Table 3.1 lists the major products of NLC in the postwar period and the policies in effect in 2002. It is worthy of note that none of the policies associated with the postwar reforms are currently considered to have official status.

NLC was dissolved on 31 December 2000 and its operations were taken over by the National Language Subcommittee (Kokugo-bunkakai 国語分科会) of the new Cultural Affairs Council (Bunka-shingikai 文化審議会) established in January 2001 (Asamatsu, 2001). It continues to deliberate on issues handed on by the last NLC (MEXT, 2002). Issues relating to *gairaigo* were transferred to the Foreign Loan Words Committee (FLC) established in August 2002 within NLRI (Tanaka, 2003). Between 2003 and 2004 it released three reports on *gairaigo* (FLC, 2003a; 2003b; 2004).

National Language Section (**NLS**)

Located within Bunkabu 文化部 (Cultural Department) of Bunkachō, this was the section of the public service responsible for the day-to-day administration and implementation of National Language policy. Its activities included providing administrative support to NLC, publication of policies, guidelines, and educational material, research on Japanese language, as well as conducting regular public opinion polls on language issues, including *gairaigo* (see Chapter 2). These polls aimed to investigate how social change affected current public opinion on language matters, in order to provide data to inform language planning (Asamatsu, 1995).

NLS played a key role in the dissemination of language policy via liaison with other government departments at national and prefectural level, meetings with educational institutions and bodies, the distribution of its publications to schools, community centres and libraries, as well as through the sale of publications to the public. Since 1973, NLS has published a series of twin booklets aimed at a general readership, called *Kotoba-shirīzu* (Language Series) – one providing an explanation of various language issues and policies, the other structured as questions and answers. 64,600 copies of each

provided free to 62,033 schools and other institutions, and a further 20,000 copies are printed for sale to the public (Ujihara, 1994). The stated aim of this series was to 'deepen the knowledge and awareness of all citizens with regard to the language and heighten a sense of taking care of the language' (Nirasawa, 1995, p.105). Since 1980, a series of videos has been produced to 'describe efforts to enhance the beauty and richness of the Japanese language'. Discussion sessions on Japanese language policy were held since 1993 to inform the public about reports from NLC and to obtain the views of regional experts. The results were reported back to NLC (MEXT, 1994; Nirasawa, 1995, pp.104-5; Carroll, 2001).

National Language Research Institute (NLRI)

NLRI was established in 1948 to provide data that would assist NLC in policy formation (Nagano, 1972). It was an autonomous organization under the jurisdiction of Bunkachō, but with independent representation on NLC. The Institute engaged in research efforts which encompassed Japanese linguistics, sociolinguistics and language teaching (NLRI, 1988; 2002). While it had no direct LP function, the data NLRI produced were used in policy formulation. It publishes research reports, the *Kokogo-Nenkan* (Language yearbook), and until 1988 the journal *Gengoseikatsu* (Language life) (Gottlieb, 1995a; Carroll, 2001).

In 2001 NLRI was removed from the jurisdiction of Bunkachō and made an independent research institution. The English name was changed to National Institute for Japanese Language but the Japanese name remained unchanged (NLRI, 2002).

Relationships between LP bodies under Bunkachō

Although NLC had semi-autonomous status, its activities were closely associated with NLS and NLRI. These were considered the three pillars of LP (Kaneda, 1967).

> 'NLC has been the main body conducting deliberations on Japanese language issues and has worked on various improvements. Bunkachō is working to publicise current issues, so that the ideas in the reports about them can be utilised' (MEXT, n.d.2).
>
> 'In preparing Japan's important national language policies, the government asks for and listens to the opinions of NLC. In order for the Council to hold discussions, it requires a base of data collected through objective means and information derived from scholarly research and study. To that end, NLRI performs scientific research related to the Japanese language and its role in the lives of the Japanese people, and conducts activities to build a secure basis for rationalising the Japanese language' (Monbukagakushō, 2001, p.151).

In brief, NLRI provided the basic research; Bunkachō via NLS provided administrative support, conducted surveys, and engaged in publicity; and NLC discussed issues and made recommendations. Overarching control, however, was with the Minister, since both directions to agencies and approval of recommendations occurred at this level.

Japan Foundation (Kokusaikōryū-kikin)

Japan Foundation was established in 1972. Its main activity is promoting cultural exchange, of which the teaching of Japanese as a foreign language is an important aspect. It has no direct links with the LP bodies under Bunkachō and, although it is involved in Japanese language teaching, its activities lie outside Japan, whereas NLRI is concerned with Japanese language teaching in Japan (Carroll, 2001; Japan Foundation, n.d.). Consequently, its LP role is confined to that of a disseminator of standard Japanese abroad.

Prime Minister's Office (Sōrifu)

Sōrifu carried out regular surveys of the 'movement in the basic awareness of citizens of the country and society to obtain data for the purpose of general administration'. This was fed back to the Cabinet and various ministries (Sōrifu, 1997b, p.2). The majority of the surveys were on issues relating to government policy. Since 1968, polls of public opinion on the National Language have been conducted. The data provided by this office informs the politicians who will ultimately approve LP decisions and influence appointments to LP agencies. In 2001, the rank of Sōrifu was raised, placing it above the other ministries, and the name changed to Cabinet Office (Naikakufu) (IMIDAS, 2001).

Semi-official bodies

These bodies have independent status but their operations have official sanction.

Japan Broadcasting Corporation (NHK)

Radio broadcasting began in 1925 with the establishment of the Tokyo Broadcasting Station, which became Nipponhōsō-kyōkai (NHK) the following year. Whereas NHK had been the official national broadcaster in the prewar era, it lost this status in 1951 and since then, NHK has been a publicly funded non-commercial national broadcaster without any official status. However, its operations committee is appointed by the Diet and its operations are subject to Diet approval, so it is still widely viewed as the official broadcaster. NHK operates both radio and television stations within Japan and

broadcasts to foreign countries in 22 languages. It is a major provider of foreign language learning materials via its broadcasts and publications (Gotō, 1983; Inoue, 1997; Carroll, 1995; 2001).

As the only public broadcaster, NHK has long played an important role as an arbiter of correct spoken usage. A 1989 survey showed that 69% of Japanese respondents thought the language of NHK announcers was standard Japanese. Conscious of this role, NHK has established guidelines for language use in broadcasting and has produced a pronunciation and accent dictionary for announcers since 1943 that is regularly updated (Carroll, 1995; 2001).

NHK Broadcasting Language Committee (NHKBLC)

Set up in 1934 to 'improve the language of broadcasting and promote the development of the Japanese language', its functions were to establish policy and examine language use in broadcasting (Kindaichi et al., 1988, pp. 833-4). It changed to its current name in 1961. Its present role is to advise on policy and research in two main areas: 1. the pronunciation, choice and orthography of words used in broadcasting, and 2: language usage in news and general programs (NHKBCRI, 2000). It comprises around 14 members, about half of whom are from NHK and the others are intellectuals, critics, writers and researchers in Japanese language, such as members of NLRI and university academics, covering a broad range of the Japanese language establishment. They meet about 14 times per year in different regions to discuss issues relating to NHK and to make recommendations on language usage (Asai, 1987; Carroll, 1995; NHK, 2001).

NHK Broadcasting Culture Research Institute (NHKBCRI)

Founded in 1946, it comprises four divisions plus a broadcasting museum. Language use and broadcasting terminology is examined by the Broadcasting Research Division in conjunction with NHKBLC. Since 1948 it has conducted numerous surveys on topics including, broadcasting language, public attitudes and dialects. Some projects have been in cooperation with NLRI, which provided computing resources. The first survey of *gairaigo* was in 1969 to examine *gairaigo* use in television news. Three small-scale opinion polls were conducted in 1973, and in 1979 the first large opinion poll was carried out. Since then, comprehension and opinion on *gairaigo* have been regularly surveyed (Asai, 1987; Hōsōkenkyūbu, 1994; Carroll, 1995; 2001; NHK, 2001; Okamoto, 2002).

Since 1951, NHKBCRI has published a monthly research report called *Bunkengeppō* and later *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa*. From 1963 to 1999 it published the English language journal *Studies of Broadcasting*, which was superseded by *NHK Broadcasting Studies* in 2002 (Hōsōkenkyūbu, 1994; Carroll, 1995, 2001; NHK, 2001; Okamoto, 2002).

Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute (GISPRI)

Established on December 1, 1988 as a nonprofit foundation, having received the permission of the Minister of International Trade and Industry, its stated purpose is:

> 'Under the conviction of Japan's role and responsibility in the international community which should be heightened to a level appropriate to its international economic and social standing, the purpose of GISPRI is to conduct research in such areas as global resources and environmental issues, the international order, and relationships between industry/economy and culture/society; to submit general policy proposals based on this research to entities both in Japan and abroad; and to promote greater international exchange of information and ideas; and thus contribute to the prosperity of global society' (GISPRI, 2000, p.1).

The main areas of activity were international economics, industry, politics and environmental issues. However, in 1991 a research committee called 'Japanese language in the global era' was established. The rationale for the committee was that the communication skills of Japanese people were not sufficient for the information era. Specifically, Japanese lacked skills in debate and logical argumentation. Therefore, there was a need to research and discuss the current state of the Japanese language as a communication tool (Kinoshita, 1992; GISPRI, 1993).

<u>Unofficial bodies</u>

These comprise a range of societies and industry groups. Some have direct involvement in official LP bodies, while others attempt to influence policy by lobbying government, producing publications and using the mass media.

Nihon-Rōmajikai (NRK)

The first Rōmajikai was established in 1885, but dissolved in 1892, and the subsequent history of the rōmaji movement involved a number of splits and reformations (see Ōno, 1983; Koizumi, 1989; Twine, 1991a; Unger, 1996). In its statement of aims, NRK says: 'The future of Japan depends on the education of the people. The orthography is the tool required for learning, so in order to raise the level of education among the people and

spread education widely, the orthography has to be easier to learn and understand. Nihonshiki-rōmaji is the most suitable orthography for this purpose' (Nihon-Rōmajikai, 2001, p.1).

Kanamojikai

The *kana* movement dates back to the 1860s (see Twine, 1991a; Hansen, 1996), but Kanamojikai was established in 1920, with the aims of the abolition of *kanji* and the adoption of horizontal writing in *katakana* with breaks between words (Kanamojikai, 1971; Kindaichi et al., 1988). Kanamojikai produces a journal, undertakes research, and maintains a website that airs the opinions of its members and provides guidelines for writing.

Language Issues Discussion Society (LIDS)

LIDS was established in 1959 to oppose the reformist group Gengoseisaku-o-hanashiaukai and the language reforms of NLC (Sugimori, 1983). Prominent members included Funahashi Seiichi, Ōno Susumu, Fukuda Tsuneari, Hayashi Ōki, Tokieda Motoki, and Naruse Masakatsu as well as other academics, writers and critics. LIDS issues a journal, *Kokugo-kokuji*, written using pre-reform orthography, i.e. old forms of *kanji* and historical *kana* use, which is circulated widely to newspapers, broadcasters and publishers. An advocate of the abolition of all postwar language reforms, LIDS makes submissions to government and NLC, comments publicly on language policy, and publishes books, of which a number have been best sellers (Tsuchiya, 1992; LIDS, 2001).

Japan Newspapers Association (JNA)

Newspapers and publishers have long been involved in language planning. The Newspaper Terminology Committee (NTC) was established in 1953 under the auspices of the JNA in order to standardise orthography across newspapers, discuss language policy, and provide a united voice to the public on issues relating to language use. In 1955, NTC produced the first of a number of Lists of Replacement Terms for Newspaper Use (*Shinbunyōgo-iikaeshū*) which provided revised orthographies for many words in line with the recently introduced *kanji* lists. Lists of *gairaigo*, foreign names and technical terms were also produced to standardise spelling. These were based on the NLC 1954 directive, but were considerably more detailed (Katayama, 1983; Kindaichi et al., 1988). About 80 newspaper and broadcasting companies are involved in NTC and

are represented by the heads of their editorial committees. Once a month, thirty of these representatives meet to discuss various issues. Their reports are presented at the biannual general meeting at which decisions are made (Kanetake, 2004).

PART 2

Overview of research into language planning in Japan

Language planning in Japan has been examined by a number of researchers. Shiota (1973) discussed the definition of terms relating to language planning and provided a detailed history of language issues, including script and standardisation, since Meiji, with discussions on the achievements of the language councils and Monbushō. Tokugawa (1992) discussed standardisation and dialects. Neustupny (1983) and Coulmas (2002) gave overviews of official language planning in modern Japan and Seely (1991) provided a history of the Japanese writing system and LP with a focus on script issues.

Regarding the Meiji period, Twine (1991a) examined conflicting viewpoints on language reform and the role of LP in the establishment of the Japanese state, and Hansen (1996) provided an account of the roles of certain individuals in early Japanese LP. In a history of language reform in the pre-war period, Ōno (1983) examined the background to the proposals for abandoning *kanji*, and the movements and bodies that aimed to reform the writing system. He analysed the arguments of reformist groups and influential intellectuals of the time, and also provided a history of the development of the spoken style. Miyajima (1977) gave an overview of LP from Meiji (1886) to 1945 with analysis of the political and ideological issues behind the policies, as well as an examination of the beneficiaries of various policies. The reform process in the period from Meiji to 1961 was discussed by Fukuda (1962). He examined the activities of both official and unofficial LP bodies, the main arguments and opinions of reformists, anti-reformists, and influential individuals in both official and unofficial capacities.

The recommendations of the 1946 US Educational Mission to Japan and of their local counterpart, the Japanese Education Committee, regarding reform of the national language, were discussed by Tsuchimochi (1993). Unger (1996) also examined the political processes associated with the postwar reforms, with particular emphasis on proposals for romanisation and experiments using *rōmaji* in education. The political and social situation under the US occupation was discussed by Sugimori (1983), along with

the roles of influential foreigners and the opinions of Japanese intellectuals involved in the reform process. He also looked at the conflicts between reformist and anti-reformist elements within NLC. A detailed discussion of the political conflicts relating to the postwar script reforms can be found in Sugimori (1983) and Gottlieb (1994; 1995a; 1995b). Suzuki Y. (1977b) analysed the social conditions at the time of the postwar reforms and the machinations within the NLC. He examined the bureaucratic aspects of the reform process, evaluated the success of the reforms, and looked at the effects on school education.

Suzuki Y. (1977a) examined the revision of language policies in the 1970s and analysed the political implications, disputes and theoretical positions of intellectuals in the 25 years following the end of the war. He looked at the effect of the *kanji* counter-reforms of the 1970s on school education. An account of the activities of the NLC over the period 1981 to 2000 can be found in Asamatsu (2001), and Carroll (1997; 2001) provided an examination of LP issues in the 1980s and 1990s.

On the theoretical side, Tokieda (1962) examined the theories of language that were the basis of language policies since Meiji, in order to investigate problems in the language policies of the time. He was critical of the way LP was being carried out and proposed suggestions and directions for LP in the future. Kabashima (1972) discussed the method and approach to language reform taken in Japan and the need for concrete data to guide long term development. Neustupny (1978) examined the approaches taken to the 'treatment' of language problems in Japan via official policy, education, the media, publishing and the private domain. He argued that it was unlikely that LP would return to the active reformist approach that characterised the postwar era. Gottlieb (1995a) identified the underlying imperatives of LP as being modernisation in the Meiji period, followed by imperialism in the early twentieth century, democratisation in the immediate postwar period, followed by conservatism in the 1960s and 1970s.

The role of technological change in LP has received some attention. Unger (1987) examined LP issues in script reform from the viewpoint of the need to modernise the Japanese script for the computer age. Gottlieb (1993) discussed the effect of the advent of the word processor on Japanese and the LP implications.

With regard to *gairaigo*, Carroll (2001) provided an examination of the deliberations of

LP agencies on a range of issues, including *gairaigo* and discussed LP in the 1980s and 1990s in relation to broader social issues.

The majority of researchers on LP have concentrated on script issues, since this has been the focus of LP activity. The areas receiving most attention are standardisation since the Meiji period, and the immediate postwar reforms, in particular those relating to limits on *kanji*. While there has been some general research on *gairaigo*, the results of which may feed into the policy making process, policy proposals relating to *gairaigo* have, to date, received little research interest.

Educational policy with regard to foreign languages has received considerable research attention and a detailed examination is beyond the scope of this thesis. Historical overviews can be found in Koike (1978) and Ike (1995). More policy-focused discussions can be found in Atagi (1996) and Roesgaard (1998). The prewar period is discussed by Ōmura (1978) with a focus on methods of teaching English. An overview of the postwar period until the 1970s can be found in Hoshiyama (1978). The educational reforms of the 1980s are examined by Schoppa (1991), while McConnell (1991) and Hood (2001) focused on the reforms introduced by the Nakasone government (1982-1987) and the associated economic agenda. Curriculum reforms and the state of English teaching in the 1990s are examined by Roesgaard (1998), Koike and Tanaka (1995) and Honna et al. (2000). The 2003 Action Plan is discussed by Butler and Iino (2005).

PART 3

Language planning and reform in modern Japan: 1880s to early 2000s

In order to place responses to *gairaigo* in the context of LP in general, this part provides an overview of the main events in language planning and reform from the Meiji restoration to the end of the Pacific War, followed by a more detailed account of events in the postwar period and a brief discussion of foreign language education.

The prewar era

With the Meiji restoration of 1868 Japan entered a tumultuous period of rapid modernisation in governance, technology and education using the Western powers as models for reform. At this time, the Japanese language was characterised by regional dialects, spoken styles that reflected class and social grouping, and a variety of written

styles that ranged from approximate renditions of speech to highly formalised styles that were closer to classical Chinese than to Japanese speech. This situation was seen by reformers as an impediment to modernisation and numerous proposals for standardisation and other reforms were made, including: 1. the development of a more colloquial written style; 2. placing limits on the number of *kanji* taught in schools and used in print; 3. standardisation of the *kana* syllabaries and the adoption of phonologically-based (i.e. regular), rather than historically-based (i.e. irregular), *kana* spelling; 4. the adoption of a standard spoken form of Japanese; 5. the abolition of *kanji* in favour of *kana* alone or *rōmaji*; 6. the adoption of English (see Umehara, 1982; Maruya, 1983; Ōno, 1983; Twine, 1991a; Gottlieb, 1995a).

Attempts were made to implement all but the last of these proposals, with the first and fourth having the most success. Script reform proved controversial with *kana* reform and *kanji* limits being implemented and abandoned a number of times during the Meiji (1868-1912) and Taisho (1912-1926) periods. Supporters of script reform and the colloquial style included writers, the press and publishers as well as reformist scholars and officials influenced by Enlightenment ideals of democracy and human rights. Other scholars supported the retention of the classical style and regarded the colloquial as coarse and vulgar (Twine, 1991a; Hansen, 1996). Nevertheless, the colloquial style made headway in school textbooks and newspapers during the first three decades of the twentieth century but, following the Manchurian Incident of 1931, the ascendancy of the militarists made further reform politically difficult as the language came to be closely associated with nationalist ideology (Shiota, 1973; Gotō, 1983; Gottleib, 1995a; Unger, 1996).

Although *gairaigo* increased considerably during this period, this does not seem to have emerged as an issue for planners. However, concerns were raised amongst some scholars. The anthropologist Yanagita Kunio viewed *gairaigo* as an aspect of colonisation by the Western Powers and deplored the way Japanese despised their own language, as the first step in submission to Western tastes (Oguma, 2002).

After 1937, and during the war years, ideological arguments that linked traditional language use with nationalistic values of veneration of the emperor and an idealised view of what constituted the essence of Japanese culture prevailed over both modernist viewpoints that aimed at radical script reform and more pragmatic arguments for script

simplification. Nevertheless, some reformers continued to propose their reforms throughout this period, albeit in a muted fashion. Following the arrest in 1939 of some promoters of *rōmaji* as anti-nationalists, promoters of *kana* also felt themselves under threat and went underground (Shiota, 1973). Contrary to the general trend, in 1938, the army, which had hitherto adhered to traditional and even archaic language forms, initiated a radical reform of language use that limited the use of *kanji* for weapon names to 1,235 and adopted phonological *kana* and *furigana* use. This reversal of policy was due to the recognition that communication problems, linked to the use of difficult *kanji* in the naming of weapons and weapon parts, was leading to accidents and impeding the effectiveness of the military (Shiota, 1973; Ōno, 1983; Gottleib, 1995a; Seely, 1991).

The postwar period until 1981

With the defeat of Japan, the political climate changed in favour of the proponents of modernist language reform and there was an immediate shift in policy. MacArthur directed that all signs in public buildings be romanised (Shiota, 1973; Unger, 1996). Three reformist Japanese associations banded together in 1945 and proposed a series of reforms to the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers (SCAP), and in 1946 two of them, Nippon-rōmajikai and Kanamojikai, offered to cooperate with SCAP in working towards the abolition of *kanji* in favour of horizontally written *katakana* and *rōmaji* (Gottlieb, 1995a). In 1945, Robert K. Hall, Chief of the Education Section of SCAP, argued that the Japanese language required democratisation and to this end recommended that *katakana* be used exclusively by the occupation forces and that romanisation be introduced for school textbooks. Although not accepted, Hall and Ando Masatsugu presented the case for limitations on *kanji*, and the use of *rōmaji* or *katakana* after a transitional period, to the U.S. Education Mission. The Mission supported the alphabetisation of Japanese script but the Japanese Education Committee opposed this. Their suggestions for reform focused on the need for the colloquial style, phonological *kana* usage and limits on the number of *kanji*. Consequently, SCAP did not attempt to impose romanisation, saying that script reform was a matter for the Japanese themselves. (Tsuchimochi, 1993; Unger, 1996).

One important sign of reform came with the drafting of the new constitution in 1946. Unlike its Meiji predecessor, which was written in *kanbun*, it used the modern style of Japanese in order to be comprehensible to ordinary people and enhance the

democratisation process (Twine, 1991b). Nevertheless, the language of the constitution still retained some historical *kana* use and employed a wide range of *kanji* (Sugimori, 1983).

When NLC held its first postwar meeting in November 1945, with the *rōmaji* advocate Toki Zenmaro as Chair and support from Hoshina Koichi within Monbushō, the reformers rapidly introduced a range of reforms. Newspaper groups were also keen for reform (Suzuki, Y., 1977b). In 1946, a list of 1,295 *kanji* (Jōyō-kanjihyō) was proposed for general use. However, opposition led to the formation of a committee that included representatives of major newspapers, to deliberate further. The result was a revised list of 1,850 *kanji* (Tōyō-kanjihyō) for use in the press, government and education that was issued in November 1946. This included a footnote stating that *gairaigo* should be written in *kana*, but made no further specification. In the same year, a proposal for the modernisation of *kana* use (Gendaikanazukai) along phonological lines was also accepted. However, this made no mention of how to write *gairaigo* (Seely, 1991; Gottlieb, 1995a; Bunkachō, 1997a). Other reforms included reduction of the number of readings for *kanji* and simplification of their shapes.

While these reforms had no legislative backing, they were generally effective, since, once adopted by Monbushō, they formed the basis for script use in government documents and school textbooks. The reformers also had the backing of SCAP and the general mood of the country was conducive to reform. Private publishers were free to work outside the reforms, but much of the print media were supportive. In 1947, six major newspaper companies and the Kyōdō news agency, who were all represented on NLC, announced they would adopt both the *kanji* list and the new *kana* rules, with the result that other newspapers followed (Shiota, 1973). Besides the limitation on *kanji*, the adoption of these reforms by government was a major step in the unification of written styles, since it marked the end of the *kanbun* style in government documents, thereby making them more accessible to the population.

Kokugoka was reestablished in 1947 under the Textbooks Bureau of Monbushō. Its roles were to research Japanese language, organise and integrate the written language, provide administrative support to NLC, and research *rōmaji* (Kaneda, 1967). In 1948 NLC issued a list of 881 *kanji* (Kyōiku-kanji) to be taught during the nine years of compulsory education, since it was considered that teaching 1,850 *kanji* was impractical.

This reflected the viewpoint of some reformers that further reductions in *kanji* use were only a matter of time – a view that raised the concern of conservatives, some of whom resigned from NLC. Following this first wave of reforms, language reform emerged as an issue in the press and, in response to criticisms, Monbushō conducted a public opinion poll that indicated that while most people were supportive of language reform, there was substantial concern over some of the details (Shiota, 1973; Gottlieb, 1995a).

The same year, NLRI was set up to undertake research into the Japanese language in order to inform policy decisions. NLC was reorganised in 1949 to become a body that examined and deliberated on issues relating to the improvement of the Japanese language and promotion of language education. Under the new structure, NLC had a broader membership, was more independent of Monbushō control, and had the power to initiate inquiries, formulate policy proposals and issue directives to Monbushō and other ministries (Kaneda, 1967; Takebe, 1977; Gottlieb, 1995a). From this time onwards, Councils had fixed terms and were numbered consecutively (see table 3.2).

Table 3.2. National Language Councils since 1949: Council number and duration

No.	Duration	No.	Duration	No.	Duration
1	1949.07 – 1952.04	9	1968.10 – 1970.06	17	1986.12 – 1988.12
2	1952.04 – 1954.04	10	1970.07 – 1972.06	18	1989.02 – 1991.02
3	1954.07 – 1956.07	11	1972.11 – 1974.11	19	1991.09 – 1993.08
4	1956.11 – 1958.11	12	1975.01 – 1977.01	20	1993.11 – 1995.11
5	1959.03 – 1961.03	13	1977.04 – 1979.03	21	1996.07 – 1998.07
6	1961.10 – 1963.10	14	1979.06 – 1981.05	22	1998.12 – 2000.12
7	1964.01 – 1966.01	15	1982.03 – 1984.03		
8	1966.06 – 1968.05	16	1984.04 – 1986.04		

Adapted from Bunkachō (2002a)

In 1950, NLC issued a paper outlining its role and duties. It listed a number of points to be kept in mind when investigating language problems:

> Will any change being considered make compulsory education easier or not?
> Will it make the linguistic life of the community in general, and the use and understanding of *kanji* in particular, more efficient or not?
> Is it suitable for use by the general public?
> Will it influence the creation or transmission of culture?
> (Gottlieb, 1995a, pp.148-51).

What is notable about this list is the focus on practical considerations and the absence of ideological statements. Such practical considerations led to further revisions of the *kanji*

limits, with the addition of 92 *kanji* for use in personal and place names in 1951, and a revision of some *kanji* in the list of 1,850 as requested by the press in 1954. This second revision, however, was not adopted by government agencies, leading to two slightly different lists – one for the press and the other for government and school textbooks (Shiota, 1973; Gottlieb, 1995a).

Whereas the main concerns of NLC were in the area of script reform, some attention was paid to honorific speech (*keigo*). Its 1952 recommendations noted that, whereas the old system was based on superior-inferior relations, modern democratic use should be based on mutual respect for each other as human beings (Shiota, 1973; Sugimori, 1983; Carroll, 2001). The same year, a style guide for government documents (Kōyōbunsakusei no yōryō) was issued that specified the use of plain, easy to understand language, including the replacement of difficult *kango* (Shiraishi, 1960).

Another issue that arose in the 1950s was how to deal with the increasing use of *gairaigo* that accompanied the occupation. Rather than deal with the desirability of these new *gairaigo*, NLC addressed the appropriate way to write these words in order to standardise their variant spellings. In its 1954 report (Gairaigo no hyōki), it was decided that *katakana* be used for *gairaigo.* However, the question of whether the best approach was to approximate the sound of the word in its source language, or to assimilate it into the Japanese phonological system, remained unresolved. Although no clear policy eventuated, a preference for the conventional style was expressed and this was adopted as a quasi-official directive. For example, *baiorin* バイオリン (violin) was preferred over the innovative *vaiorin* ヴァイオリン (Shiraishi, 1960; Shiota, 1973; Sugimori, 1983; Kindaichi et. al., 1988; Gottlieb, 1995a; Bunkachō, 1997a).

By the mid 1950s, many of the reforms that had been proposed for most of the twentieth century had been brought in. Limits had been placed on *kanji*, the colloquial style had been adopted in government and *kana* usage had been made more phonologically consistent. More radical reform proposals, such as the adoption of *rōmaji*, did not find sufficient support and remained unrealised, but the Japanese language had undergone considerable simplification when compared to the prewar situation.

In the late 1950s, anti-reformist forces became more organised, particularly in response to the new rules on *okurigana* submitted to Cabinet in 1958. The question of whether

more or less *okurigana* should be used divided NLC into factions, referred to as: Hyōonha (Phonological Faction) who supported an increase in *okurigana* as an aid to pronunciation, and Hyōiha (Semantic Faction) who regarded additional *okurigana* as unnecessary and a debasement of the value of *kanji*. The resultant compromise, promulgated in 1959, produced an inconsistent system that lent itself to the charge that, rather than improving the language, these reforms were creating confusion (Shiota, 1973; Gottlieb, 1995a). This issue spilled over into the political arena and polarised viewpoints. Both reformers and traditionalists formed lobby groups in 1958 and 1959 respectively. The Language Policy Discussion Group (Gengoseisaku-o-hanashiaukai) (LPDG) supported reform and included members of Kanamojikai and *rōmaji* groups, the Chair and Deputy Chair of NLC, business leaders, and 70 members of the Diet. In opposition to the reforms, the Language Issues Discussion Society (Kokugomondai-kyōgikai) was formed comprising conservative members of NLC and academics such as Ōno Susumu. The influential Japan Writer's Association (JWA) weighed into the dispute on the side of the traditionalists in 1960 and against the new *okurigana* rules (Yoshida, 1962; Sugimori, 1983; Gottlieb, 1995a).

A walkout by five conservatives, led by Funahashi Seiichi, in the final NLC meeting in 1961, in protest over the dominance of NLC by reformers, further highlighted divisions. They published a public statement criticising Hyōonha and their reforms, which they characterised as causing confusion in the language. This incident became a major issue in the press and NHK took it up on television. The Association of Writer's of Children's Books (Jidōbungeika-kyōkai) came out in support of the reforms, whereas JWA supported their director, Funahashi, in opposition (Yoshida 1962; Gottlieb 1994). The issue was raised in the Diet and conservative members of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) attributed communist motivations to script reformers (Gottlieb, 1994; 1995a). JWA released a report titled *Kokugo o mamorutame no ketsugi* (Resolution on Protecting the National Language), which claimed that Monbushō was dictating language policy and demanded that, when passages of literature were included in official textbooks, their written style should not be altered. They also stated:

> 'it is very obvious that people are using *gaikokugo* excessively and neglecting the Japanese language. In other words, the mixed use of incorrect *gaikokugo* and incorrect Japanese has increased. This phenomenon brings a high risk that the Japanese language will be colonised. In addition, fad words (*ryūkōgo*) have become crass. We believe that

> these phenomena indicate the Japanese language is in crisis, so we will strive to make the Japanese language clear, correct and beautiful.' (Yoshida, 1962, p.59; Sugimori, 1983, p.158).

These comments in relation to *gairaigo* appear to be the first indication that the level and manner of usage of *gairaigo* had become an issue for those interested in LP, albeit as a secondary one to script issues.

This political furore led to a major change in membership of the sixth NLC, appointed in October 1961, with members of both the reformist and traditionalist factions being removed. Toki Zenmaro, who chaired the first six postwar Councils and was a member of Rōmajikai, and Matsuzaka Tadanori of Kanamojikai, were both removed. In April 1962, a revision of the ordinance under which NLC was established reduced its role to *shimonkikan* (advisory council), placed selection of Council members under the Minister, gave the Minister control over the issues to be investigated, disallowed public access to Council meetings, and dissolved the Rōmaji Research Division (Shiota, 1973; Takebe, 1977; Gottlieb, 1994; 1995a). NLC lost its autonomous status and power to directly issue recommendations or directives, was required to report to the Minister, and membership was reduced from up to 70 to up to 50 (Kaneda, 1967).

The new NLC undertook to evaluate the results of previous policies, but a dispute over script issues soon arose. A new appointee, Yoshida Tomizō, formally requested in December 1962 that NLC commit to the retention of *kanjikana-majiribun* as the basis for further reform, but the final report of the sixth Council was more of a discussion on the pros and cons of differing approaches to language reform. Calls for a clear commitment to *kanji* continued through the seventh Council. It was proposed to change the status of the *kanji* list from that of a limit to a standard or recommended minimum, however no firm proposal eventuated (Shiota, 1973; Gottlieb, 1994; 1995a).

Within the ruling LDP, anti-reformist politicians formed the Sub-committee on Language Problems (Kokugomondai-nikansuru-shōiinkai) in January 1966 to investigate language policy. In June, the Education Minister requested that the newly appointed eighth Council halt further reforms and begin a cycle of revision of the postwar reforms (LDP Seimuchōsakai, 1968; Gottlieb, 1994). Consequently, NLC began revision of the List of *on* and *kun* Readings and the Guidelines for *Okurigana* (Bunkachō, 1991).

Meanwhile, the Sub-committee on Language Problems called for expert opinion. Kindaichi Haruhiko, Sugimori Hidehisa, Ōno Susumu and others were invited to speak. An interim report was issued in November 1966 which affirmed *kanjikana-majiribun* as basic to Japanese (Gottlieb, 1995a). Using this report as the basis, the Sub-committee continued its deliberations to release a final report (*Kokugomondai nitsuite no ketsuron*) to LDP in May 1968 (Shiota, 1973; Suzuki, Y., 1977b; Gottlieb, 1995a). This report argued that the Japanese language carried Japanese culture, the reforms had disordered the language and that a disordered language resulted in a disordered nation. It made seven main proposals:

1. Limits on *kanji* should be relaxed.
2. Forms of *kanji* should be based on the correct (i.e. traditional) rather than the new (i.e. simplified) forms.
3. Historical *kana* use should be respected.
4. Tables of *on-yomi* and *kun-yomi* should be broadened (i.e. more readings accepted) and *okurigana* use should be minimised.
5. Vertical writing should be standard in government documents and the horizontal style only used when unavoidable.
6. Mixed writing of words in *kana* and *kanji* should be rectified and the overuse of *gairaigo* should be corrected.
7. Confusion in *keigo* use should be corrected in schools (Shiota, 1973).

These were accepted by LDP executive the same month. The report effectively became government policy on the same day that the eighth Council issued its final report (Shiota, 1973; Suzuki, Y., 1977b; Gottlieb, 1995a).

In response, the pro-reform LPDG presented arguments against each of the proposals and petitioned the LDP Policy Affairs Research Committee (Jimintō-seimuchōsakai) in June to suspend their implementation. As a result, these counter-reforms were not implemented. However, the proposals do evidence a growing concern over the use of *gairaigo* and the state of the spoken language (Shiota, 1973; Ōno, 1983).

In 1968, under a reorganisation of Monbushō, a new bureau, Bunkachō, was established. NLRI was placed under Bunkachō jurisdiction and NLC became an attached body (Bunkachō, 2002c).

The eighth NLC report (1968) included no new initiatives but listed four important points to be passed on to the next Council: 1. the status of the *kanji* list should be changed from a limit to a guideline, and *kanji* not on the list should not be proscribed, 2. the number of allowable *on* and *kun* readings should be increased, 3. the trend to using too many *okurigana* should be reversed, and 4. the public should be made aware that Cabinet directives were not binding on the entire populace (Bunkachō, 1969; Shiota, 1973; Gottlieb, 1995a).

The ninth Council, whose membership was almost the same, produced draft revised policies on *on* and *kun* readings and on *okurigana* use, which were released for consultation in 1971. These draft proposals received considerable public criticism in the press and from educational bodies. Monbushō responded in support of the established policy, due the difficulties that further changes would present for education. Consequently, the draft proposals were withdrawn pending further revision (Shiota, 1973; Gottlieb, 1995a).

In June 1972, the tenth NLC submitted recommendations on *okurigana* use and *on* and *kun* readings. These stated that *kanjikana-majiribun* was the basis of the Japanese writing system, which implied support for the ongoing retention of *kanji* (Nagano, 1972). NLC also made a proposal titled 'Regarding the Promotion of Kokugo Education' which echoed the JWA and LDP sub-committee by saying it was extremely important that *kokugo* be 'clear, accurate, beautiful and rich (*heimeide tekikakude utsukushiku yutaka*)', and that 'all people heighten their awareness and cultivate a spirit of cherishing the national language'. They requested that 'those in government and related fields develop appropriate strategies and plans to realise these.' The proposal made the following points about *kokugo*. It is the:

1. core around which individual and social identity is formed. It is indispensable in the creation of culture,
2. basis for the transmission of ideas and culture from generation to generation, and
3. core of all education.

Regarding the media, the recommendation said that since they have a great influence on people's language life, they should take care with their language use and raise people's awareness of the language. As a result of this proposal *Kotoba-shirīzu* began in 1973 (Bunkachō, 1991, p.81-2; Ujihara, 1994).

A committee was set up in 1974 to revise the *kanji* list in line with new NLC policy, which aimed not to limit the number of *kanji,* but to provide a guide to usage. In 1977, a list of 1,900 *kanji* was proposed and public opinion widely canvassed. Debate on the number of *kanji,* and which particular *kanji* to include, continued till a list of 1,945 Jōyō-kanji (characters for general use) and a further 166 *kanji* for use in names was formalised in 1981. The expanded list received general support from the media and, although its status was only that of a guideline, it was generally adopted (Seeley, 1991; Asamatsu, 1994; 2001).

These changes were viewed as a victory for the conservatives and right-wingers in LDP, whereas critics saw them as a retrogressive attempt to return to the unrestricted prewar situation. Suzuki Y. (1977a) characterised the anti-reform faction as consisting of old men born in the Meiji period, who had one foot in the grave, but were making policy for a modern age based on out-of-date notions (p. 43). Also, it was argued that the increases placed additional burdens on school students and were inappropriate in an era of internationalisation (Gottlieb, 1995a). Tanaka (2001) argued that the notion of the National Language (*kokugo*) was embedded in nationalism along with the flag, the nation and the emperor. Although language reforms appeared to be concerned only with issues of orthography, actually they were issues of ideology. That is why the *rōmaji* and *kana* movements could never penetrate the heart of the establishment – they were movements in rebellion against the established ideology of *kokugo.*

Suzuki Y. (1977b) interpreted the appearance of numerous articles and books on the Japanese language since the mid 1970s as a sign of people's dissatisfaction with the postwar reforms and a rise in right-wing political power. The 1970s also saw a peak in writings on the nature of Japanese identity and culture (Nihonjinron). Miller strongly criticised these as neo-nationalist viewpoints that conflated notions of race and language and revived quasi-mystical notions about the uniqueness of the Japanese language (1980; 1982). A somewhat different interpretation was offered by Yoshino (1992), as a result of interviews with educators and businessmen. He found that interest in Nihonjinron amongst businessmen was often motivated by a need to explain international differences in communication styles that had become apparent to them in their contact with foreigners and was not necessarily linked to a nationalist or conservative viewpoint.

In the 1960s and 70s, reformers who wanted radical script reform lost much of the influence they had had in the immediate postwar period and some of the reforms they had made were rolled back. However, on balance, the conservative reaction had only a moderate effect, since its main achievements were the addition of only 95 *kanji* to the recommended list, an expansion of the number of allowable readings, and some modifications to *okurigana* use. Reforms to *kana* use remained, as did the simplified forms of *kanji*. Nevertheless, radical script reform that aimed at the phasing out of *kanji* was removed as a possible agenda. Neustupny (1978) described the approach taken in the 1970s as one of 'cultivation' rather than 'policy' and it is true that no new policies were introduced – existing ones were modified. Even so, a change in policy direction was evident from the mid-1960s onwards.

The reasons for this shift are complex. From a practical viewpoint, restrictions on the number of *kanji* had some anomalous effects, such as the loss of one *kanji* in common compound words and the loss of the *kanji* for everyday items. Since these changes led to a writing style that seemed odd to people used to the old system, it was hardly surprising that they supported steps to eliminate these apparent anomalies. The proposed *okurigana* reforms were also flawed on practical grounds, since they could result in more, rather than fewer, characters being written with only minor standardisation benefits. Beyond these considerations were the ideological and political tensions that dominated the times, but further discussion of these is outside the scope of this account.

LP in the 1980s

With the establishment of the official list of Jōyō-kanji in 1981, NLC turned its focus to other issues. In the four years to 1986 it reconsidered *kana* usage, but rather than return to prewar usage, it recommended there be no changes to the 1946 reforms, although it added that historical *kana* use be respected (Gottlieb, 1995a; Asamatsu, 2001).

In the period 1986 to 1991, NLC revisited the issue of how to write *gairaigo* and foreign names. The guidelines, issued in the 1991 report *Gairaigo no hyōki nitsuite*, were aimed at government and the media, but not at specialist fields or commerce. They addressed the same issues as in 1954 but were more accepting of variation and innovation. For example, a word written in *katakana* in the innovative style e.g. *romantikku* ロマンティック (romantic) was just as acceptable as one written in the more conventional style e.g. *romanchikku* ロマンチック. There were no clear recommendations

as to which style was preferable, beyond saying that the conventional style was sufficient and the *katakana* spelling used should reflect the pronunciation in current use in Japan. Issues relating to the desirability of more or less *gairaigo* use were not mentioned (Bunkachō, 1995b; 1997a).

The use of *gairaigo* by government offices also received attention, with criticism appearing in the press over the use of new *gairaigo* that ordinary people could not understand. In 1989, the Minister for Health and Welfare (later to become Prime Minister) Koizumi Junichirō, expressed the opinion that proper Japanese words that older people could understand should be used in place of words such as *hōmu-helpā* (home-helper) and *man-pawā* (manpower), so he set up the Terminology Rectification Committee (TRC) to replace these words (Kajiki, 1996b; NLRI, 2000).

Another feature of Japanese LP in the 1980s was increased interest in the teaching of Japanese. Japan Foundation actively promoted Japanese learning overseas and in 1988, a national examination for teachers of Japanese as a foreign language (*Nihongokyōiku-nōryokukentei-shiken*) was introduced. The *kokugo* curriculum was also revised in response to a concern that schools focused excessively on written Japanese to the neglect of speaking and listening. Reforms issued by Monbushō in 1989 aimed to place more emphasis on these two aspects (Kajiki, 1996b).

LP from the early 1990s until 2000

In the early 1990s the script issues that had dominated policy debates in the postwar period appeared to have been resolved. Accordingly, the focus of the 19th Council shifted to broader issues. In the 1993 report *Gendai no kokugo o meguru shomondai*, the Council stated: ‘from now on NLC will not only concern itself with the writing system but with issues of language use, such as everyday speech, *keigo*, standard language and dialects’. One of the areas identified was the flood of new words, including *gairaigo* (Bunkachō, 1994, pp.85-6).

During the life of the 19th NLC, new policy directions were also being initiated from outside. An issue that had emerged in the 1980s was the need to improve Japanese communication styles, particularly the use of indirect and unclear styles of speech and writing (Honna et al., 2000). In 1991, GISPRI set up the committee ‘Japanese in the global age’, which included members with strong NLC connections such as Mizutani

and Nishio. It aimed to examine current language issues and propose language policies to the central government (Kinoshita, 1992). The Committee consulted with a range of agencies, including Monbushō, Gaimushō, Japan Foundation, JETRO and Bunkachō, and a series of proposal were developed. In addition, both Kinoshita and Suzuki T. published articles in *Chūōkōron* (1992.9) in order to arouse public interest. On 23 February 1993, GISPRI presented 'A Proposal on the Establishment of a Japanese Language Policy in the Global Age' to the Prime Minister and to the media via a press conference (see Chapter 8 for details)(GISPRI, 1993, p.19).

The Minister for Education, Akamatsu Ryōko, requested the 20th Council to begin an inquiry into an 'ideal language policy to suit the new era' (Bunkachō, 1994, p.80). This was the first instruction from a Minister to NLC since 1966 and it set the agenda for NLC deliberations until 2000. Five main areas were discussed:

1. language usage
2. responding to the shift to an information age
3. responding to an international society
4. Japanese language (*kokugo*) education and research
5. the writing system

Under these headings a wide range of issues were discussed including, confusion in the language, increase in fad words and *gairaigo*, *gairaigo* use by government, generational differences in language use, and the effects of internationalisation (Bunkachō, 1997a).

In December 2000, NLC released three final reports (see table 3.1). Discussions on *gairaigo* were mainly included in the third report, although there were some comments in the first (NLC, 2001). These, and subsequent events, are discussed in greater depth in Chapter 8.

Following the dissolution of NLC in December 2000, the new Foreign Loan Words Committee took on the task of carrying out the recommendations of NLC and issued a series of lists of *gairaigo* with Japanese replacements (FLC, 2003a; 2003b; 2004). These are discussed in Chapter 8.

Activities that relate to each of status, corpus and acquisition planning are evident in the postwar period. Examples of corpus planning dominate and include the development of official *kanji* lists, policies on *kana* and *okurigana* use, and the use of *gairaigo*. Since

Japanese was the dominant language in Japan, there were fewer examples of status planning. A notable one was the use of modern Japanese in the 1946 constitution (Gottlieb, 1995b). Acquisition planning was mainly concerned with the teaching of Japanese in schools in Japan. This overlapped with script reform, due to the effect of these corpus planning measures on textbooks and the curriculum. In recent decades, however, there has been increasing interest in teaching Japanese as a foreign language overseas, and in the language learning needs of Japanese children returning from overseas and foreign workers in Japan (White, 1988; Mizutani, 1995).

Foreign languages in Japanese education

Since *gairaigo* are derived mainly from European languages, there is likely to be a relationship between the adoption and acceptance of *gairaigo* and people's knowledge and attitudes to European languages. For most of the twentieth century, Japan promoted the learning of foreign languages, mainly European languages and particularly English. This language spread policy with regard to English is likely to be a factor in the expansion of English-derived *gairaigo* and, as such, is an indirect, but nevertheless significant, aspect of LP policy with regard to *gairaigo*.

A brief history of foreign language education in Japan

While English had been taught in pre-Meiji Japan since at least 1809, the main foreign language learned was Dutch (Doi, 1976; Ōmura, 1978). The Meiji policy of catching up with the West produced a rapid expansion in the teaching of English, French and German. With the introduction of the new education system in 1872, English became a compulsory subject in middle schools for boys and was offered in some primary schools (Ōmura, 1978; Ike, 1995; Koike & Tanaka, 1995). In the later Meiji period, the early enthusiasm for Westernisation met with a reaction. Concerns were raised over the loss of Japanese values. The relative autonomy of early Meiji schools was curtailed and a more centralised system, with an emphasis on nationalism and moral training, was developed and the focus on English declined somewhat (Roesgaard, 1998). In 1883, Japanese, rather than English, was adopted as the medium of instruction at Tokyo University and by 1890, most foreign teachers in universities had been replaced by Japanese (Ike, 1995). There was some opposition to the compulsory teaching of English with proposals for it to be made an elective subject in 1916 and 1927 (Ike, 1995). Nevertheless, English remained in the syllabus and was the dominant foreign language

taught by the twentieth century.

In 1935, an Education Reform Council was established to address a perceived threat from the Western culture that was being absorbed via education (Roesgaard, 1998). During the Showa period till 1945, as nationalistic ideologies increased their influence on political processes, calls for the abolition of compulsory English instruction in schools increased and in 1931 the number of hours of English was reduced. There were further reductions during the war years, but it was not abolished altogether (Ike, 1995). A notable shift during this period was the replacement of the English and American cultural content of English textbooks with passages referring to Japanese history and cultural values (Hino, 1988).

In the immediate postwar years, English language instruction once more became a general feature of the school curriculum. Although it was not made a compulsory subject, since it was a component of university entrance examinations it was generally offered (Ike, 1995). In textbooks, the cultural content returned to its earlier focus on England and America (Hino, 1988). The audio-lingual method gained in popularity as more attention was placed on spoken English, but since the university entrance exams remained fixed on grammar, reading and composition, there was no fundamental shift in the approach used in high schools (Koike & Tanaka, 1995).

In the 1960s and 1970s, the main issues were the style of teaching, the nature of the university entrance examinations and the number of hours devoted to English learning in schools. The need for improvement in listening and speaking was emphasised and university entrance examinations received ongoing criticism but they remained fixed on reading and translation ability and English courses in universities remained focused on literature. There was also a push to abolish compulsory English classes in the high school curriculum and make English an elective subject, since, for the majority of students, English study was a time wasting and unnecessary activity. Although this did not happen, English instruction was reduced in middle schools in 1978 (Koike, 1978; Hoshiyama, 1978; Koike & Tanaka, 1995; Ike, 1995).

English language education in Japan was examined by the Ad hoc Committee for Education Reform set up by Prime Minister Nakasone in 1984 as part of his internationalisation agenda. It recommended more focus on communication, more class

hours per week, intensive programs for students and in-service training for teachers. In addition, it proposed the hiring of native English speakers from abroad. As a result, the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Program began in 1985 (McConnell, 1991; Koike & Tanaka, 1995; Hood, 2001). Nevertheless, the effectiveness of English teaching and the poor performance of Japanese students on standardised English tests continued to be an object of criticism (see Hayes, 1979; Morrow, 1987; Schoppa, 1991).

In the 1990s, there was some broadening of focus in foreign language education, with the JET program expanding to include native speakers of French and German in 1990 (Koike & Tanaka, 1995). By 1995, there were 4,243 assistant language teachers from eight countries and every public high school received at least one teacher (Honna et al., 2000).

Efforts to improve English outcomes continued. In the revised curriculum of 1994, which reduced the school week to 5 days, the number of credits allocated to English in high schools exceeded those for *kokugo*. This caused some consternation (Roesgaard, 1998). Critics of universal English education argued that the focus should be on producing a proportion of graduates who are highly proficient in English. The majority does not need English and should concentrate on more productive areas of study (Suzuki T., 2001).

Despite attempts to reform English education, the performance of Japanese on the TOEFL test remained poor throughout the 1990s, causing concern to business and government alike, and there were calls for radical change (Inoguchi, 1999). Hashimoto (1997) noted that even though Japanese policy was committed to achieving practical communication skills in English, the ways in which English was actually taught were entrenched, and these were unlikely to achieve such a goal.

To address the problem, the Committee to Promote Revision of English Education in Japan was convened in 2000. In 2001 it presented recommendations ranging from curriculum revisions and teacher training, to the introduction of content-based courses in special high schools (Yoshida, 2003). In 2003, the Action Plan to Cultivate Japanese with English Abilities was released and implemented soon afterwards. It identified English as a common global language and saw a growing need in the 21st century for more Japanese who are capable of communicating with other countries. It called for all

levels of the education system to work together to achieve English skills commensurate with average world standards, based on objective indicators (MEXT, 2003; Butler & Iino, 2005). The plan specified a series of measures to be taken to improve English language education, including 100 'Super English Language High Schools', more English in elementary schools, and moves to replace university entrance examinations with standardised English tests. Some recommendations addressed Japanese language skills: 'In order to cultivate communication abilities in English, the ability to express appropriately and understand accurately the Japanese language, which is the basis of all intellectual activities, will be fostered'. The areas to be targeted included enhancing students' thinking ability, strength of expression and verbal communication ability (MEXT, 2003, p.11).

Discussion of English language LP

The promotion of learning European languages has long been an aspect of Japanese LP. The primary motivation for this ongoing effort has varied somewhat over time but questions of security, modernisation and trade have been central. English acquisition has been a feature of education throughout the postwar period but consciousness of the role of English as an international language, and the importance of communicative competence, seems to have spread since the 1980s. With the trade friction of the 1980s, the need for internationalisation, interpreted mainly as opening up trade and employment to America, led to new programs such as JET (McConnell, 1991).

With the recession of the 1990s, the need for Japan to regain international competitiveness in the face of globalisation seems to have been a major factor in spurring the wave of reforms evident after 2000 (Butler & Inno, 1995). While these did not change the role of English as a subject for all students, they were a move away from the egalitarian approach to public education that dominated the postwar period. Also, there appears to be an increasing awareness of the need to take a broader approach to language policy that includes the learning of other foreign languages.

Concluding comments

Until the 1990s, *gairaigo* had only received peripheral attention from language planners. In the late 19th and early 20th century the focus was on status issues associated with the standardisation of Japanese. Corpus issues relating to the modernisation of the language received little LP attention, even though this was a period of intensive borrowing and

calquing. As the century progressed, corpus issues received increasing attention but the focus was on orthographic reform and met with mixed success. The acquisition of English, French and German was encouraged and supported from the late 19th century until the beginning of the Pacific War, when English and French became enemy languages. Over this period there was considerable borrowing, which received no official response until the war prompted the replacement of certain *gairaigo*.

Efforts from reformers to modernise *kana* usage and place limits on the number of *kanji* were largely unsuccessful for the first half of the 20th century, but following Japan's defeat and the consequent loss of control by the conservative elite, these measures were rapidly introduced. The immediate postwar period also brought another wave of borrowing, but the only LP measure introduced was with regard to *katakana* orthography. In the 1960s and 1970s, conservatives gained the upper hand, some of the orthographic reforms were rolled back and the usage of *gairaigo* gradually emerged as an issue, but no official LP measures were taken. In the 1980s, the level and manner of usage of *gairaigo* emerged as an issue of greater public concern and discussion but official LP remained fixed on the same orthographic issues. There was a significant change in focus in the early 1990s but it was not until the 2000s that clear policy emerged (details can be found in Chapters 4 and 8).

Although Japanese LP and English LP are generally treated as distinct issues, in both cases, official action since the 1990s was linked to questions of usage and concerns over the challenges of internationalisation/globalisation. The ineffectiveness of English language education, particularly in relation to oral and aural skills, has been an issue since the 1960s but it was in the 1980s and 1990s that issues relating to spoken language, international communication and trade emerged in a well-articulated form and this led to a series of reforms. In the case of Japanese LP, the situation was less clear but similar arguments were proposed, and there was a policy shift. The details of this and the associated policy discussions are covered in Chapter 8.

The next chapter explores the issues and themes that emerge from discussions of *gairaigo* in both popular and more academic literature.

CHAPTER 4

GAIRAIGO AS A LANGUAGE ISSUE

Part 1 identifies influential individual actors in LP. These are scholars and other opinion makers whose views are widely known and are likely to have influenced public opinion and LP bodies. In Part 2, views and arguments against and in support of *gairaigo* are identified and organised thematically, with representative viewpoints and data from a wide range of sources including the scholars profiled. Many of these arguments have recurred throughout the postwar period and even prior to this. However the focus of this section is the 1980s and 1990s – the period when issues relating to *gairaigo* gained more public attention and *gairaigo* emerged as a subject for language planning.

PART 1

Profiles of influential individuals

Whereas Part 1 of Chapter 3 identified one type of actor in LP, i.e. institutions and groups, this section focuses on individuals who are likely to have influenced LP through their activities on LP bodies, or expressing views on *gairaigo* in books, newspapers, magazines and the electronic media, thereby influencing public and scholarly opinion. This list is not exhaustive but it covers a range of individuals whose differing views can be found recurrently in the literature. For each, their positions are listed followed by a brief profile of their background and viewpoints. Further references to these people can be found in Part 2 below and in Chapter 8.

Mizutani Osamu (b. 1932)

Director of NLRI (1990-1998), subsequently honorary director; became Head of the International Communication Research Institute at Nagoya Foreign Language University in 2002, and Head of Nagoya Foreign Language University in 2004. Head of the Society for Teaching Japanese. NLC member 1990-2000, was Head of the committee that dealt with 'Responding to an international society' in Councils 20-22, which included the issue of *gairaigo*. Long-term member of NHKBLC. Member of the GISPRI research committee. Deputy Chair of FLC (2002-) (Nichigai Associates, 2002; Tanaka, 2003). Specialising in Japanese linguistics, phonology and Japanese language education, he is arguably the most influential person in Japanese LP through his positions on LP bodies, writings and interviews. With regard to LP he can be considered a moderate who does not take sides in debates about the postwar language reforms –

preferring to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of differing proposals. In the case of *gairaigo,* he tended to acknowledge the concerns of opponents while pointing out the difficulties associated with imposing limitations and framed the debate in terms of clarity and comprehension, rather than the type of vocabulary used (Mizutani, 1994b).

Kindaichi Haruhiko (1913-2004)

Professor at Sophia University 1974-1985, became Professor at Musashino Women's University in 1985. NLC member 1962-1972. NHKBLC member for 32 years until 1994 (NHKBCRI, 2004, June). His father, Kyōsuke, famous for his study of Ainu folklore, was a leading figure in Councils 1 to 4 and a key proponent of modern *kana* usage. He was also a long-term NHKBLC member. Haruhiko was a well-known *kokugo* scholar and dictionary editor who wrote widely on issues concerning the Japanese language. He was a supporter of the postwar reforms and generally tolerant of language change. His main concern was advocating proper *wago* usage but in his later years he also expressed concern over aspects of *gairaigo* use (Kindaichi, 1966; 1988).

Suzuki Takao (b. 1926)

Professor, then Director of the Institute of Cultural and Linguistic Studies at Keio University until 1990. Subsequently, Professor at Kyōrin University. NLC member 1972-1979 but resigned (Ōno, Morimoto & Suzuki, 2001). Member of GISPRI research committee (GISPRI, 1993). His background is in medicine and Islamic studies (McGill University), but he has written in both Japanese and English on a wide range of subjects from ecology to language reform. In Japan he is a popular writer who has made sociolinguistic issues accessible to the general public through his straightforward explanations and discussions. A long-term opponent of limits on *kanji* and a critic of English language education in Japan, he has written extensively about the problems of modern *gairaigo* use, especially by the news media and government. The Westernisation of Japan is another of his concerns (Suzuki T., 1981; 1991; 2001; Nichigai Associates, 2002).

Ōno Susumu (b. 1919)

Honorary Professor at Gakushūin University, Tokyo. Executive member of LIDS. NLC member 1966-1972. A famous *kokugo* scholar specialising in ancient Japanese, known for his theory of a linkage between Japanese and Tamil, he has written numerous books,

including best-sellers dealing with Japanese language and script issues. A long-term opponent of limitations on *kanji*, he sees *kanji* as a strength of the Japanese writing system and has consistently expressed an anti-*gairaigo* position (Ōno, 1983; Nichigai Associates, 2002).

Shibata Takeshi (b. 1918)

Researcher at NLRI (1949-1963) and became Head of the Dialect Mapping Section. Subsequently, Professor at Tokyo Foreign Language University (1964-1970), then Honorary Professor. NLC member 1966-1972. Long-term member of NHKBLC (until at least 1997) (Nichigai Associates, 2002). One-time director of NRK and member of Kanamojikai, he is a supporter of the postwar reforms and advocate of further reform. 'My fundamental hope is for a standard writing system in which each word is always written the same way. There should only be one reading for each *kanji*, like in China. It is all right for Japanese to be written all in *kana* or *rōmaji* and for this to be another form of Japanese' (in Ōnishi, 1997, p.8).

Kabashima Tadao (b. 1927)

Professor at Kyōto City University. His field is Japanese linguistics and he has written numerous books and articles on change in the Japanese language, script issues and reform. He has not expressed a position for or against *gairaigo*, treating it as one aspect of language change (Kabashima, 1972; 1981; 1983).

Morimoto Tetsurō (b. 1925)

Editor at *Asahi*, later Professor at Tokyo Women's University. NHKBLC member 1998-2002. Known as a literary critic, social commentator and writer, he is against the Americanisation of Japan and critical of current *gairaigo* usage.

Toyama Shigehiko (b. 1923)

Professor of English at Ochanomizu University 1968-1989, then professor of Japanese cultural history at Shōwa Women's University (1989-). NHKBLC member c. 1985-1994 (Nichigai Associates, 2002). A writer of journal articles and books on English literature and Japanese language, he is interested in language change and its causes, but with regard to *gairaigo* in broadcasting he has been critical (Toyama, 1986; 1990; 1994).

Maruya Saiichi (b. 1925)

Graduate of Tokyo University department of English literature. A novelist, translator and recipient of a number of literary prizes, he also writes on issues relating to the Japanese language. A well-known critic of the postwar reforms and of *gairaigo* usage, he writes using pre-reform *kana* (Maruya, 1978; 1989).

Mogami Katsuya

NHKBCRI researcher, then Professor at Atomi Women's University. A prolific writer of journal articles and research papers, he is known for his highlighting of the use of *gairaigo* by government (Mogami, 1984; 1986; 1989; 1991; 1997; Mogami & Yamashita, 2000).

Suzuki Shūji (b. 1923)

Professor at Tokyo Kyōiku University, Hiroshima University, then Osaka Kyōiku University (retired). NLC member 1982-1991. A writer of books and articles on Chinese literature and Japanese language, he is proponent of *kanji* and the *kanjikana-majiribun* style (Suzuki S., 1983; 1990).

Tsuchiya Michio (b. 1935)

Associate Professor at Yokohama Sōei Junior College. Executive member of LIDS and editor of their journal. Known as a literary critic and writer on *kokugo* issues, he is a strong critic of the postwar language reforms and of *gairaigo* usage (Tsuchiya, 1992; Nichigai Associates, 2002).

Ishiwata Toshio (b. 1928)

NLRI 1954-1976, Professor at Ibaraki University, then Japan Women's University. NLC member 1991-1995. With a background in statistical research he has written numerous articles on Japanese language, a dictionary and books on *gairaigo*. He takes a fairly neutral position on language change, is tolerant of *gairaigo* and supportive of *wago* (Ishiwata, 1959; 1960; 1985; 1986; 1989; 1990; Nichigai Associates, 2002).

Ishino Hiroshi (b. 1937)

Chief Researcher in Broadcasting Language Research Section of NHKBCRI, then Professor at Jōsai International University. Has written numerous articles and a book on *gairaigo*, in which he expresses concern about *gairaigo* use in broadcasting and government (Ishino, 1974a; 1980; 1983; Ishino & Inagaki, 1986; Nichigai Associates,

2002).

Jinnouchi Masataka (b. 1954)

Professor at Kanseigakuin University specialising in sociolinguistics and dialects. FLC member. Although he is not against all *gairaigo*, he has written articles in which he criticised *gairaigo* use by bureaucrats (Jinnouchi, 1997; 2003; Nichigai Associates, 2002).

Kai Mutsurō (b. 1939)

Head of Language Education Research Section at NLRI, then Director 1988-2005. NLC member 1998-2000. Head of FLC. His main area of research in NLRI was vocabulary. He has been critical of *gairaigo* usage, particularly in government (Kai, 2001; Nichigai Associates, 2002).

Sekine Kenichi (b. 1957)

Deputy Director of editorial board of *Yomiuri*. FLC member. Wrote articles and contributed to the news column, *Shinnihongo no genba*, on topics relating to *gairaigo*, particularly from the perspective of newspapers. He was critical of *gairaigo* use by government and in politics, arguing that those who cannot understand these terms are disadvantaged (Nichigai Associates, 2002; Sekine, 2003).

Inoue Fumio (b. 1942)

Hokkaido University, then Professor at Tokyo Foreign Language University. NLC member 1996-1998, NHKBLC member. With a background in sociolinguistics, he has written a number of articles and books on Japanese language including young people's language, in which he supported the use of internationalisms, recognised the productivity of *gairaigo* and called for the greater use of *wago* (Inoue, 2001; Yamashita, 2002).

Koizumi Junichirō (b. 1942)

LDP politician. Minister for Health and Welfare 1988-1989, 1996-1997. Prime Minister 2001-present. He set up TRC in 1989 and reestablished it in 1998 (NLRI, 2000; *Yomiuri*, 2002, November 22; Nichigai Associates, 2002). He was behind the establishment of FLC (*Kagakukōgyō-nippō*, 2003, June 16) and his dislike of *katakanago* is well-known (Asami, 1998, January 20).

PART 2: VIEWPOINTS ON THE POSTWAR *GAIRAIGO* INFLUX

Scholars have written extensively about *gairaigo* and the effects that borrowing from European languages, in particular from English, is having upon Japan and the Japanese language. Discussion on the *gairaigo* influx is, however, not just the preserve of academics and social commentators – it has become an issue of interest to various strata of society and a topic of discussion in the mass media and general publishing. Some issues have also been investigated empirically through questions included in opinion polls (see Chapters 5-7). In the following sections, the main issues of discussion and research are organised under the broad categories of:

- amount of *gairaigo*;
- comprehension problems with *gairaigo*;
- *gairaigo* use in the mass media;
- relationship between *gairaigo* and age group;
- issues associated with *gairaigo* use in government and politics;
- various causes of the *gairaigo* influx;
- reasons why individuals adopt *gairaigo*;
- effects on Japanese language and society; and
- how to respond to *gairaigo*.

Amount of *gairaigo*

The amount of *gariaigo* in use and the increase in *gairaigo* have been topics of comment and debate amongst Japanese scholars and writers over the postwar period (Ogaeri, 1960; Suzuki T, 1981; Tomari, 1985; Maruya, 1989; Kindaichi, 1994; Jinnouchi, 2003). Amongst the general public, concerns about *gairaigo* have been an ongoing feature of letters to newspapers and broadcasters (see Miller, 1977; Yoneda, 1982; Yoshizawa, 1982; Toyama, 1990; Ishino, 1983; Loveday, 1996, Katayama, 1983; Sekine, 2003). For example, in letters to the editor: an 18 year-old man said there were too many *katakanago* that he could not understand (*Asahi*, 1975, September 23); a 74 year-old man complained that in every field there is more *katakanago* than necessary (*Mainichi*, 1998, September 22); a 53 year-old man commented on how often there were letters from elderly people frustrated by the number of *katakanago* and complained about the problems he experienced (*Sankei*, 2000, August 24).

Considerable data on public opinion have been obtained through mass surveys. In 1977,

Sōrifu found that 29.8% of females and 36% of males often felt that there were too many *gairaigo* used among the expressions they read or heard in everyday life (Umehara, 1982). In a survey conducted in 1992, the majority of people (70%) thought that too many *gairaigo* were being used (Sōrifu, 1992). In the 1977 survey, 27.5% regarded the use of *gairaigo* as 'undesirable' (Umehara, 1982). When asked whether they liked the way *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* were used in everyday life, 33.6% did not (Sōrifu, 1979). When this same question was asked in 2000, the proportion who did not like the way *gairaigo* were used was 35.5% (Bunkachō, 2000). The results of these surveys appear to indicate a considerable and growing degree of dissatisfaction with the level and manner of *gairaigo* usage, but it is not possible to determine whether this reflects a global dislike of *gairaigo* or dissatisfaction with certain aspects of *gairaigo* usage.

Comprehension of *gairaigo*

Both the concerns of scholars and complaints to the media tend to focus on the question of comprehension (Maruya, 1978; Tomari, 1985; Suzuki T., 1981; 1991; Suzuki S., 1983; Mogami, 1984; Shibata, 1993; *Yomiuri*, 2002).

The level of comprehension of new *gairaigo* has been examined by NHK. In 1973, a survey of 100 *gairaigo*, which the researchers regarded as naturalised, revealed that 40% were misunderstood by at least half of the respondents. This demonstrated a gap in perception between the NHK researchers and the general public in the degree to which certain words had been accepted. For example, many people thought *mania* マニア (mania) meant 'a person who has a hobby' and that *ribēto* リベート (rebate) meant 'bribe' (Ishino, 1974b). Since some of the words were still not listed in the 1974 edition of *Shinmeikai-kokugojiten*, a popular dictionary, it was not surprising that many people did not understand them and still less surprising that some people found them confusing (Tomoda, 1999).

In 1988, NHK assessed both recognition and comprehension of fifteen words which were commonly used in the media without explanation. The average recognition rate was 77%, but the comprehension rate was only 50%. In eight of the fifteen words, less than two thirds of the people who could recognise the word were able to identify the meaning the word was attempting to convey. *Disukaunto* (discount) was frequently misunderstood as meaning 'very cheap', *sofutouea* (software) was thought to mean 'the

instructions that come with an appliance', and *nīzu* (needs) was misconstrued as meaning 'hope' or 'expectation' (Ishino, Maruta & Tsuchiya, 1988). In 1995, in a similar survey of 15 *gairaigo*, the average recognition rate was 59%, but the comprehension rate was 36%. In the case of some words e.g. *infura* インフラ (infrastructure), of those who recognized the word only 34% actually understood it and 43% thought it was the same as *infure* インフレ (inflation) (Ōnishi & Kajiki, 1995).

While it is difficult to make specific comparisons across these surveys, since different sets of words were used, they reveal a distinct gap between recognition and comprehension for new *gairaigo,* despite their frequent appearance in the media. There is, however, a difficulty with the interpretation given to the above results. The researchers have apparently used the definition of the word as used in English as the measure of accuracy, but when *gairaigo* are adopted into Japanese they frequently undergo semantic modifications, one of which is a blurring of their semantic specificity (Tomoda, 1999). Also, if the words were presented in context, respondents may have shown a higher comprehension rate.

Even though the above figures may overstate the situation, opinion polls have revealed that the public is conscious of not comprehending *gairaigo*. NHK asked, in four surveys, whether people had trouble understanding *gairaigo* or *gaikokugo* that appeared on TV. In 1991 the proportion who replied 'often' was 16.1%, in 1995 it was 22.5%, in 1996 it was 25.6% and in 2000 it had increased to 28.1% (Ishino & Yasuhira, 1991; Ōnishi & Kajiki, 1995; Kajiki, 1996a; Yamashita & Katō, 2000). In 2000, people were asked which of a range of problems with the language they had encountered. The top choice was not understanding *gairaigo* (45.8%), followed by not understanding *shingo* and slang (42.4%) (Bunkachō, 2000). These figures suggest that more and more people are having trouble understanding *gairaigo,* and this has become an issue for many people.

The reasons for these comprehension difficulties are likely to be a combination of the increased number of new *gairaigo* in use and a change in the nature of borrowing. In the past, *gairaigo* were mainly introduced as names for new goods and services, such as *rajio* (radio), *terebi* (television), and *posuto* (post box). A study by Arakawa (1931, cited in Higa, 1979) found that about 92% of English loanwords were nouns. Although the adoption of concrete nouns relating to new goods and services continues to account for the majority of new *gairaigo*, there seems to have been a shift towards the adoption

of more verbs, adjectives, abstract nouns, acronyms and strings of words. Such words are more likely to be confusing, since they have no tangible referent. This diversification in the forms of contemporary borrowing is likely to be a significant factor in creating the perception of an increase in *gairaigo* in general and in difficult to comprehend *gairaigo* (Tomoda, 1999).

The short life of many *gairaigo* has received comment (Matsuda, 1986; Tomoda, 1999). This has been linked by Sekine (2003) to the naturalisation process. *Gairaigo* are adopted for their newness but once they become naturalised this is lost, as is their appeal. For example, in the 1980s and 1990s the word *amenitī* (amenity) was used a lot but it is seldom seen anymore. In *Yomiuri* it reached a peak in 1988 but declined sharply in 1989, had a low level of use during the 1990s and had almost disappeared by 2000. Even when this word was being used a lot, the comprehension level was not high, since a 1999 survey showed it to be only 31.5% and in 2002 it was less than 25% (Bunkachō, 1999; FLC, 2003a). This high level of turnover is likely to increase people's impression of there being a high level of *gairaigo* use.

***Gairaigo* and the mass media**

In the media and advertising, attention has focused on: the high level of *gairaigo* use, the use of *gairaigo* that ordinary people cannot understand (see above), the way the media use *gairaigo*, and the role of the media in introducing *gairaigo*.

Overuse of *gairaigo*

Newspapers have received criticism for using too much *gairaigo* (*Mainichi* 1998, September 22; *Yomiuri*, 2002). According to managing editor Katayama (1983), *Asahi* received a constant stream of letters from readers complaining about *gairaigo* overuse. Sekine (2003) reported many complaints from readers who said they could not understand the meaning of articles due to the incomprehensible *katakanago*. Disputes over the use of particular words by the press regularly appear. For example, in *Asahi* (1999, June 4) a reporter, Satō Kazuo, used *ribenji* リベンジ (revenge) in a headline about a baseball match. Even though it was a quotation from one player, this usage sparked a large number of letters and complaints. In response, he explained that he used 'revenge' because he wanted to appeal to younger people and a headline needs to be provocative to get attention. An ordinary word is not so effective, he said. Subsequently, a number of support letters were received. A man in his 40s sent a letter saying

‘revenge’ sounds better, lighter and sporty compared with the Japanese word (*Asahi*, 1999, June 9). A 60 year-old man praised this word saying it can be used as a light-sounding sports term and he thinks it will have a long life (*Mainichi*, 1999, June 25, p.5). A copywriter also supported the use of ‘revenge’ saying this term does not have a dark, heavy feeling (which the Japanese equivalent *fukushū* does) (Izumi, 1999, June 19). In this case, the use of a new *gairaigo* was rejected by some readers but was applauded by others who appreciated the special lightening effect that the new term brought.

The level of use in broadcasting has been criticised by scholars (Toyama, 1990; Ōno, et al., 2001; Mizutani, 2003). NHK and NHKBCRI often receive letters and phone calls from the public complaining over excessive *gairaigo* use (Ishino, 1983; Yamashita, 2002). In surveys of people’s opinions on the frequent use of *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* on television and in newspapers, NHK found the proportion who thought this was ‘not so good’ or ‘not good’ was 49.2% in 1979 and 56.3% in 1986 (Ishino & Inagaki, 1986). Following the Great Kansai Earthquake of 1995, the news media received considerable criticism for using words such as *raifurain* ライフライン (lifeline, i.e. water, gas, electricity supplies) and *infura* インフラ (infrastructure) in materials aimed at survivors. These were words that many people could not understand and, it was said, this led to greater anxiety (Ōnishi & Kajiki, 1995).

NHK received criticism over the use in program names of *katakanago* and English-sounding expressions, such as ‘Midnight Journal’ and ‘Hello Science’ (Suzuki T, 1991; Mizutani, 1994b). As far back as 1964, Yazaki reported that 55.7% of television and 49.3% of radio program titles sampled over one week contained *gairaigo*. NHK surveyed radio and television program titles from 1950 to 1970 in 5 year intervals and found a steady increase in the amount of *gairaigo* used (Kanno, 1986). A high level of *gairaigo* in naming was also found in other media. Tsuchiya (1992) examined empirically the titles of Japanese magazines and found that of 450 magazines titles, two-thirds contained *gairaigo*.

Criticisms of *gairaigo* overuse in the press have been countered by the results of research conducted by *Yomiuri*. All the *katakanago* in the news sections (excluding advertisements) were counted and the average number of words per page was found to be: 52.5 words in 1969, 57.1 words in 1998, and 53.5 words in 2002. So there was little

evidence of change over this period (Sekine, 2003). Even so, the perception remains. In 1999, a survey asked retired *Asahi* employees what changes they wanted the newspaper to make. The number one request was to reduce the use of *katakanago* (NLRI, 2000).

Quackenbush (1974), Stanlaw (1982; 1987), Haarman (1984a; 1984b; 1986; 1989), Takashi (1991) and Loveday (1996) have all noted the high level of *gairaigo* in Japanese advertising and commented on the imagery that surrounds their usage, i.e. modernity, fashionableness, elegance, prestige and exoticism. An article in *Asahi* reported interviews with audio manufacturers in Japan and found that all of them considered it crucial to use English in naming and labelling their products. They said that the image of English was high-tech and cool, whereas Japanese sounds rustic. So, even though some people say that Japanese should be used, the manufacturers have no intention of changing to Japanese, since this would result in a loss of sales (Suzuki T., 1991, pp.226-8). In some cases, however, *gairaigo* use may be counterproductive. In a letter to the editor, a 68 year-old woman said there was so much *katakanago* and English in TV commercials that she could not understand them! (*Sankei*, 2000). Some commentators have criticised the high use of *gairaigo* in advertising (Maruya, 1978; Tsuchiya, 1992). Even so, *gairaigo* in advertising has not proven to be an issue of major contention, compared to its use in other domains and some critics of *gairaigo* are even willing to accept this aspect of *gairaigo* usage (Kindaichi, 1988; Ekuni, 1993).

Introducing new *gairaigo*

The mass media have been identified as vectors for the introduction of new *gairaigo* (Yazaki, 1964; Quackenbush, 1974; Shibata, 1975; Sonoda, 1983; Haarmann, 1984a; *Mainichi*, 1999, December 2). According to Quackenbush (1974), most Japanese do not themselves borrow words from English. They acquire loanwords by hearing them used on Japanese radio or television and by reading their *katakana* representations in the popular press. The actual borrowers of these words are journalists, writers and advertisers who have some knowledge of English. Writers of advertising copy, in particular, deliberately use numerous foreign words and create foreign-sounding neologisms in order to make their advertisements sound modern or exotic and for snob appeal. Sonoda (1983) also observed that most English loanwords have entered Japanese through print, particularly via translated materials that leave certain words untranslated, and that it is Japanese bilinguals who interpret these words to the rest of

the community. On the other hand, Kanno (1986) argued that it was not in the interests of the mainstream mass-media (newspapers and broadcasting) to use a lot of *gairaigo,* for two main reasons. Such words can cause comprehension problems, and readers vary in their acceptance of *gairaigo* usage. The media has to appeal to as many people as possible, so using terms that their readers or listeners cannot understand is likely to annoy them. While some people find *gairaigo* attractive and respond well to their use, others dislike them and will be alienated.

Mogami (1984) and Kindaichi (1988) argued that government plays a more significant role in introducing *gairaigo* through using them in reports and project names, which the media duly reports (1984). Sekine (2003; 2003, January 7) concurred, saying that even when news editors aimed to avoid *gairaigo,* there was nothing they could do when politicians and government departments used them, especially when they were used as proper nouns.

<u>*Gairaigo* and age-group</u>

The use of *gairaigo* has long been associated with younger people (Ishiwata, 1986; Yonekawa, 1996). Conversely, lack of comprehension of *gairaigo* is associated with older people. Suzuki T. (1985a) claimed the overuse of Western words by the young had resulted in a division between old people's and young people's language.

In a survey of 70 opinion articles and letters on *gairaigo* in three major national newspapers over 1998-9, it was found that letters complaining of difficulties with *gairaigo* were most commonly from people aged 60 years and over (NLRI, 2000). Stanlaw (1982) found that younger people used fewer *gairaigo* when conversing with older people and Takashi (1992) found there were fewer *gairaigo* in advertisements aimed at older people. There were also age differences in the acceptance of *gairaigo*. A survey compared the views of intellectuals, most of whom were in their 50s, with university students, regarding whether 150 *gairaigo* were naturalised into Japanese. It found a marked difference between the groups in the case of 81 words, 73 of which the students were more likely to regard as naturalised. When asked whether a word should be used in broadcasting, there was, however, not much difference between the groups, since both based their judgments on its comprehensibility (Ishino, 1983).

A 1988 NHK survey found that the group of respondents with the highest *gairaigo*

comprehension rate was males aged 25-29 years (63%). The lowest was males and females aged 60 years and over (28%) (Ishino, Maruta & Tsuchiya, 1988). In 1997, another survey found the lowest comprehension rate in those aged 60 years and over (Bunkachō, 1997b). In a study of comprehension of English used in advertising, Loveday (1996) found that comprehension was highest in those aged 18-29 years (approximately 42%) and it declined steadily as age increased beyond this, to a low of 9.2% in the 70-79 years age-group (pp.180-1).

Age difference in language use is an international phenomenon, so it is hardly surprising that it can be found in Japan. Regarding young people's language, besides a higher level of *gairaigo* use, the main issues tend to be inaccurate *keigo*, lack of distinction between male and female language usage, strange slang (often involving *gairaigo*), and certain kinds of abbreviation (e.g. *ra-nuki-kotoba*) (Bunkachō, 1994). However, when the issues of age and *gairaigo* are discussed, the focus tends to be more on the problems the aged have with these new words.

<u>*Gairaigo* in government and politics</u>

Concerns about the high level of *gairaigo* use by government have been voiced by Suzuki T. (1981; 1991), Suzuki S. (1983), Mogami (1984), Kindaichi (1988), Ekuni (1993), Mizutani and Ōno (1995), Jinnouchi (1997) and others, with particular reference to the comprehension problems that new *gairaigo* cause. Mogami (1986) noted that, while guidelines for the use of plain, everyday language date back till at least 1951, the use of new *gairaigo* in government publications clearly contradicted these guidelines. He said that the increasing use of *gairaigo* may be part of a misguided top-down push by government to use English words to internationalise Japan (Mogami, 1984). When bureaucrats and politicians use *gairaigo*, these are then reported in the media with the result that these words are forced on the public (Suzuki S., 1983; Mogami, 1984; Sekine, 2003).

NHK found that, out of a sample of 11,835 names of local government projects, 2,970 (25.2%) contained *gairaigo* and many names used novel *gairaigo*. The national government also tended to use new *gairaigo* in project names (Mogami, 1984). Mogami (1991) found that new *gairaigo* were used in government white papers without explanation and Tomoda (1999) noted that many of these words were not listed in contemporary Japanese dictionaries. In 1983, NHK surveyed the attitudes of 1,000 local

government employees to the use of *katakana* words and found that 84% thought they were used too frequently (Inagaki, 1986). *Asahi* (1988, May 13) reported that even bureaucrats could not read government documents without their own internal handbook of *gairaigo*. The Hokkaido regional government conducted a survey of 800 residents on government-client relations and language use in 1984. Of the requests they received for reform in written language, the largest proportion (36%) concerned the avoidance of jargon and specialist terms, followed by requests to cease using formalised expressions (*oyakushoteki-hyōgen*) and the overuse of *gairaigo* (24%).

Of particular controversy was the use of new *gairaigo* in aged care. Research found that numerous new *gairaigo* were used and there was inconsistency in naming across jurisdictions (NLRI, 2000). Commentators have agued that, since elderly people are the group that has the greatest difficulty in understanding *gairaigo*, words such as *sukurīningu* スクリーニング (screening) and *deisābisu* デイサービス (day-service) should not be used (Suzuki T., 1991; *Yomiuri*, 2002, November 25; Nakayama, 2003). The counter view was that *gairaigo* could be appropriate in this context since they soften the effect of terms that would seem unpleasantly direct when expressed in Japanese (*Yomiuri*, 2002, November 25; Mizutani, 2003). Many of these words serve as euphemisms for age and death, for example, *shirubā* シルバー (silver), *tāminaru-keā* ターミナルケアー (terminal-care), and *towairaito-sutei* トワイライトステイ (twilight-stay).

Politicians have been a target of criticism for overuse of *gairaigo*. Suzuki T. (1981; 1991) and Matsui (1992) have claimed that many people cannot understand or misunderstand the terms being used. In a letter to the editor in 1988, an eighty year-old man said he became an adult at the time English was an enemy language so he did not learn English. Now, when listening to direct broadcasts from the Diet, there are so many *gairaigo* that he cannot follow the discussion. Compound words such as *burijjibanku* ブリッジバンク (bridge-bank) are particularly difficult for him. He said he has the right to vote and to participate in society but cannot understand enough to be involved (NLRI, 2000). Katayama (1983) said that the overuse of *gairaigo* by politicians, such as Prime Minister Nakasone, in speeches and press conferences was a problem for newspapers, since reporters had no time to translate these words and therefore had to use them in their articles.

The use of incomprehensible *gairaigo* by government has been an ongoing issue since

the 1980s and shows little sign of abating. Unlike some other issues, it receives widespread support, even from those who are generally tolerant of *gairaigo* (Suzuki. S., 1983; Kindaichi, 1988; Jinnouchi, 1997).

Causes of the *gairaigo* influx

The causes of the *gairaigo* influx are difficult to determine empirically, but they have been the topic of much, often heated, discussion amongst commentators. Ishino (1983) proposed four main reasons: 1. compulsory English education, 2. internationalisation, 3. increase in information and its spread via mass communications, and 4. the structure of Japanese. McCreary (1990) proposed different explanations: a 'local and personal hypothesis' in which *gairaigo* were used for particular purposes within groups; an 'historical hypothesis' based on the long-term tendency of Japanese to borrow words; and a 'technical hypothesis' based on the needs created by modernisation. Of these, the second two cover areas that have received considerable comment in Japan. Other explanations, in particular the postwar language reforms, have also been proposed. These discussions are summarised below.

Change, modernisation and need

The most direct reason given for the increase in *gairaigo* is the accelerating pace of change in the modern world. Writing in the mid-1950s, Ogaeri (1960) compared the present with the prewar period and said that now a large number of *gairaigo* have been stabilised, due to improvements in the availability of foods and foreign-style clothes, modernisation of housing, use of machinery etc. Such *gairaigo* are known by all people, not just intellectuals.

As new technologies and social structures emerge or are imported, a need arises for new words. This lexical gap can be met by adapting existing words to encompass the new concepts, coining new words, or adopting words from other languages to fill the gap. In Japanese, each of these methods is used, but as the pace of change continues to accelerate, and since many new concepts and objects are imported from the West, the adoption of words from European languages has become the most convenient way of creating the required new terms (McCreary, 1990; Honna, 1995). The high level of *gairaigo* in technical terminologies, e.g. in computing, is evidence of this process (Loveday, 1996).

While technical change is doubtless a driver of new word formation, it is not a sufficient explanation, since it does not account for terms for which a lexical gap is not evident nor does it account for borrowing as the means of gap filling, rather than coining new words using internal resources as is done in Chinese.

The nature of Japan and Japanese

Historically, Japanese people have long been willing to import culture and language from foreign countries that they regard as advanced, and modify these imports to suit local conditions (Miller, 1967; Hoffer & Honna, 1988; Suzuki S., 1990). In the past, this importation was mostly from China, but later the focus shifted to European countries (Matsuda, 1986; McCreary, 1990; Suzuki S., 1990). In the current wave of borrowing, English has simply replaced Chinese as the language of choice. Just as was the case for Chinese in the past, any English word has now become a potential loan (Miller, 1967; Quackenbush, 1974). Suzuki S. (1990) said that Japanese people have an insatiable desire to absorb civilisation, so it is useless to warn people that absorbing *gairaigo* will confuse the language (p.76).

A related argument, that has been used by both critics and supporters of *gairaigo*, is that the structure of the Japanese language makes it conducive to borrowing, since foreign words can easily be inserted into Japanese syntax and converted into verbs and adjectives (Umehara, 1982; Ishino, 1983; Kindaichi in NHK, 1985; Ōnishi, 1997; Morimoto in Ōno et al., 2001). The presence of *katakana* allows for the direct phonological rendition of foreign words (Honna, 1995). Furthermore, the highlighting effect of *katakana* makes *katakana* words more attractive (Tomoda, 1999).

Internationalisation and information influx

The increasing use of *gairaigo* has been interpreted as resulting from increased contact with other countries. Even in the 1960s, *gairaigo* were associated with internationalisation (Yamada & Nanba, 1999). Shibata (1993) argued that as Japan becomes an international society more and more new terms need to be adopted, and since there is no time to coin new Japanese words, the adoption of *gairaigo* is inevitable. Other commentators also regarded increased *gairaigo* usage as unavoidable (Toki, 1960; Ishino, 1983; Ekuni, 1993) or as a sign of Japan's integration into the global community (Ishiwata, 1989). Mizutani said that it may be unavoidable to use *katakanago* to express new facts and ideas in the process of internationalisation. If we

create new words via translation into *kanji*, it is unlikely that such words would gain acceptance. Even if broadcasters make an effort to translate all foreign words into comprehensible Japanese, he said, it is difficult to see how much can be done, considering the volume of information and the need for instantaneous transmission (1994b). While there is a range of views on the inevitability and desirability of increasing *gairaigo* use, even those who are more tolerant of new *gairaigo* tend to stress the need for selectivity and proper usage (Toki, 1960; Shibata, 1993; Ekuni, 1993; Mizutani, 1994b).

Some scholars argue that *gairaigo* are not just an effect of internationalisation. Stanlaw (1990) described *gairaigo* as a cultural bridge that assists in Japan's internationalisation. Suzuki S. (1990) said that the great variety of new words digested by Japan in the postwar period showed the vitality of the society.

Foreign influence and attitude to the West

A number of Japanese academics take the view that the Japanese attitude towards the West, America in particular, is one of excessive adulation. This results in an unquestioning acceptance of Western things, including *gairaigo* (Yazaki, 1964; Suzuki T., 1985b; Mizutani & Ōno, 1995; Ōno et al., 2001).

Another explanation given for borrowing from English, rather than another language, is the global prestige of English. Higa (1979) argued that the level of borrowing from English is an indirect measure of the dominance of English speaking countries and the relative subordinance of Japan. Hirai (1963) said the fact that *gairaigo* are used a lot in everyday life might show that Japan has become internationalised, however, we must not miss the fact that it also shows the shallowness of the ultra-Westernised (in Yamada & Nanba, 1999). Kindaichi said: 'with regard to *gairaigo*, the level of influx of Western words (*yōgo*) is intolerable, everyone criticises this but it never changes. This is because Japanese regard Western things as superior and due to a decline in the ability to translate into *kango*' (Kindaichi, 1994, p.17). Some take the argument further, claiming that Japanese have an inferiority complex towards the West (Tsuchiya, 1992; Nakajima, 1993). Suzuki T. expressed the view that 'Japan, with its fusion of Eastern and Western culture, should warn the world of the dangers of excessive Westernisation and Americanisation' (p.31), and said: 'unless we change our fundamental devotion to American culture, it doesn't matter how much we try to reduce *katakana* English, it will

not change (p.76)' (Ōno et al., 2001).

Other Japanese scholars deny the adulation argument and see the spread of English as part of global integration (Ishiwata, 1989). Shibata (1993) said that, for the general public, both *gairaigo* and Western things were mostly regarded as good. Suzuki S. (1990) said that now that Japan is part of international society, the use of English by politicians, academics and business people is natural and not something to be upset about.

Foreign language education

A frequently expressed view is that new loanwords generally enter the language via print or the electronic media, rather than through everyday spoken contact with European languages. Such words are brought in by people who are more skilled in the foreign language than the general population. This process has been ongoing since Meiji but has accelerated over the twentieth century and has increasingly focused on English (Quackenbush, 1974; Higa, 1979; Sonoda, 1983; Miyajima, 1989).

The influx of words from English in the postwar period has been associated with English language education. Stanlaw (1990) said that the cause of the *gairaigo* influx was the spread of English education, not advertising or the media. Almost all students learn English at school and all students require English for university entrance. So Japanese people, particularly the young, have a considerable knowledge of English and are consequently receptive to English words (Sonoda, 1983; Ishino, 1983; Matsuda, 1986; Ishiwata, 1986; Takashi, 1990; Hoffer, 1990; 2002). Honna (1995) noted that an enormous amount of energy was devoted to learning English in Japan but English was not used for everyday communication. Instead, this English knowledge was used for intra-linguistic purposes, such as the creation of names and new terms.

A related argument is that the lack of success of many Japanese with their English language learning has led to a complex mix of fear and awe of English. This impedes Japanese people from conversing in English, while leaving them with an unfulfilled desire to use English (Ishii, 1998). This fear is evident in a comment by Hirai, who said that 'misuse or wrong pronunciation is the shame of the Japanese people' (in Yamada & Nanba, 1999), and in the numerous criticisms that can be found in the press of the accuracy of Japanese English, *waseieigo* and *gairaigo* usage (Konomi, 1993; Nishida,

1998; Hayashi, 2004).

Kabashima (1981) believed that the combination of the Japanese knowledge of English and the climate of internationalisation would lead to an ongoing increase in *gairaigo*. Suzuki T. argued that with compulsory English education, all resistance to English had gone (1985a). He was also of the view that universal English education was both unnecessary and undesirable, since it was linked to the flood of *gairaigo* (1988; 2001). Nevertheless, the popularity of English shows no sign of waning. In a 1995 survey, 78.1% of respondents said that the foreign language they wanted to learn was English (Hara & Hattori, 1995).

For Japanese students, Ide (1973) said that the basic English words used in *gairaigo* assisted them in learning English vocabulary. Kajima (1994) wrote a book on how to use *gairaigo* in teaching English to university students. Daulton (1999) examined a number of studies and found that loans incorporating basic English words were helpful for learners. Although there was some semantic shift, radical shift was uncommon. So, teachers should use these words as a resource. In contrast, at a symposium titled 'Expelling Incomprehensible *Katakana* English', Araki (2001, December 28) said that the flood of strange *katakana* English was interfering with English language learning.

Since most new *gairaigo* are derived from English, it has been suggested that these *gairaigo* make it easier for English speakers to learn Japanese (Inoue, 2001). However, others claim that, due to the phonological and semantic changes that *gairaigo* undergo in the borrowing process, learning *gairaigo* poses a problem for learners of Japanese. Even though the words were derived from English, native English speakers have trouble recognising them when they are used in Japanese and foreigners who are proficient in Japanese also have difficulty using *gairaigo* appropriately (Shibata, 1970; Quackenbush, 1977; Motwani, 1991; Matsui, 1992; Shepherd, 1996).

The notion that the use of *gairaigo* internationalises the language and makes Japanese easier for foreigners was strongly criticised by Japanese scholars (Suzuki T., 1988; Tsuchiya, 1992). Matsui (1992) said that the use of *katakanago* and alphabet did not help promote internationalisation or facilitate communication with English speakers – it brought miscommunication between Japanese. He also claimed foreign scholars of Japan and Japanese language learners tend to have a bad opinion of *gairaigo*. Suzuki T.

(1988) made the stronger argument that *gairaigo* present a barrier to learners, translators and the internationalisation of Japanese – an opinion echoed by Nishida (1998).

Some foreign commentators were also critical of *gairaigo* usage (Milward, 1980; Passin, 1982; Motwani, 1993; Nishida, 1998). An article on an international conference in Japan noted that the foreign presenters used proper Japanese, while it was the Japanese who used a lot of English *gairaigo*. It criticised the usage of English words by the Japanese academics, saying that while all those present understood Japanese, not all the overseas attendees were from English speaking countries (Nagai, 1988).

The role of translation

Japan has long been an importer of information and this process has involved translation of materials from foreign languages into Japanese. In earlier times, when books were translated from Chinese, content words tended to be adopted directly. With the shift towards translating from European languages, numerous new content words were created by calquing, but others were adopted directly (Seely, 1991). In the postwar period, calquing using *kanji* has declined in favour of direct borrowing. Numerous reasons have been given for this. Kikuchi (1996) said that after the war there was little enthusiasm for using *kango* as translations for new words. Maruya (1978) said the Japanese military forced *kango* on people. So, in reaction, they rushed to *katakanago*. Other reasons include: problems finding suitable Japanese words, the difficulty of calque creation, the increase in the amount of material requiring translation leading to an inability of translators to keep up, the attitudes of translators and their clients, and the shallowness and laziness of modern people (Matsuda, 1986; McCreary, 1990; Nakajima, 1993; Mizutani, 1994b).

Even critics of *gairaigo* are less than enthusiastic about *kango* calques. Toki (1960) said replacing *gairaigo* with *kango* of the same meaning just creates a phonological problem. Yazaki (1964) agreed: 'the careless borrowing of *gaikokugo* is a problem but so is translating them into *kango* since it just increases homophones' (p.214). Iwabuchi (1993) said: 'now it is difficult to come up with new *kanji* words because there are too many foreign things coming into society (p.13). Various proposals for how to translate *gairaigo* are discussed below.

Language reforms and government policy

Ishino (1983) reasoned that the *gairaigo* increase was the inevitable result of decisions taken as far back as Meiji to modernise Japan. A number of other commentators are of the view that the postwar language reforms were a major cause (Maruya, 1978; 1989; Suzuki T., 1991; Mizutani, 1994b). Maruya (1978) attributed the postwar influx of *gairaigo* directly to the restrictions placed on the numbers of *kanji*. Since there were fewer *kanji* available for use, and the number of readings for the remaining *kanji* were also restricted, the word-formation power of *kanji* was damaged. This, he argued, reduced the productive power of the language. Consequently, borrowing from English became the main source of new words, but these *katakana* words do not have the same productive power and, since people do not understand the root meanings of these *gairaigo*, this leads to misinterpretation. Suzuki T. (1981, p.15) argued that while words written in *kanji* are relatively difficult to learn, their meanings are clear. He contrasted these with *katakana gairaigo* that are easily read but difficult to understand. He characterised *kanji* as 'a good bitter medicine', while *katakana gairaigo* were 'sugar-coated poison'.

This view is, however, not supported by all scholars. Shibata (1970) argued against a causal link between *kanji* restriction and *gairaigo* increase. Suzuki S. (1990) pointed out that when the postwar limitations were brought in, newspapers were successful in finding replacement words using the available *kanji*. Also, it is still possible to make new words using the *kanji* on the lists.

The dispute over the *kanji* reforms is one that has been ongoing throughout the postwar period. In earlier decades, *gairaigo* was a peripheral issue to this, but in the last twenty years its increase has come to be interpreted as a major effect of these reforms.

Reasons why individuals adopt and use *gairaigo*

There is considerable overlap between the putative causes of the *gairaigo* influx and the reasons given for individuals and groups choosing to adopt and use new *gairaigo*. There is also a tendency to attribute particular attitudes and character traits to *gairaigo* users.

Fashion and image

The notion that *gairaigo* are fashionable is a pervasive one. Ishiwata (1986) commented that, during the Edo period, the use of Dutch words was in fashion. In the 1930s

Ishikawa (1931) observed that people used English to seem fashionable. In the postwar period English-derived, and to a lesser extent French-derived, *gairaigo* have continued to be in fashion.

The image of English-derived *gairaigo* is generally considered, even by its critics, to be modern, new, fresh, up-to-date, fashionable, up-market and sophisticated (Quackenbush, 1974; Ishiwata, 1986; Takashi, 1990; Hoffer, 1990; Nakajima, 1993; Ōno in Mizutani & Ōno, 1995; Shibata in Ōnishi, 1997; Morimoto in Ōno et al., 2001). Matsuda (1986) commented that in the fashion world designers and copywriters love to use exotic-sounding words to envelope the merchandise in mysterious glamour. Takashi (1992) argued that the positive social value of English associated with internationalisation and a higher living standard made these words attractive. Haarman (1986; 1989) argued that foreign words are used in fashion magazines to generate a cosmopolitan mood. Stanlaw (1990) said that *gairaigo* seem more chic and sophisticated, that is why they are used in advertisements. In writing, *gairaigo* can be used to add a bright, elegant, fresh tone that Japanese words lack (Ogaeri, 1960; Matsuda, 1986). Others have commented on the strange, almost magical power of *katakana* words (*Nikkei*, 1988, March 27; Sakagami, 2000).

The contrary view, expressed by some critics of *gairaigo*, is that such usage is not fashionable but 'shallow' (Yazaki, 1964; Umegaki, 1965; Ishii, 1998), 'frivolous' (Iwabuchi, 1993), or 'vulgar' (Nakajima, 1993). Morimoto observed that NHK uses a lot of *katakango* because they think it sounds fashionable and criticised them for using fashionable-sounding but incomprehensible words such as 'hazard-map' even when reporting disasters (Ōno et al., 2001, p.185).

There has also been some discussion about differences in the images of *kango* and *wago*. Opponents of *kanji* tend to view *kango* as archaic, a burden on learning and a barrier to modernisation (Nomura, 1989; Kikuchi, 1996). Horiuchi (1990) said *kanji* seem old-fashioned and have lost popularity. *Kango* seem hard and lack rhythm, whereas *gairaigo* seem soft and improve sentence flow. Even those concerned about the *gairaigo* influx admit *kango* have an old-fashioned image. Mizutani said that *kanji* do not have the productivity they had in the Meiji era and *kango* give an antique impression (Mizutani & Ōno, 1995). Suzuki T., on the other hand, has frequently expressed the view that *kango* are precise and their meanings are transparent compared

to the vague *katakanago*. *Kanji* can express both concrete and abstract notions clearly and are an important part of intellectual development (1974; 1985c; 1988; 1991).

Watanabe (1974) argued that there was a fundamental distinction between the native *yamatokotoba* (i.e. *wago*) and *kango,* which were borrowed. He said that *kango* were used a lot when talking about something intellectual or highbrow and were difficult for ordinary people. They had an elite image and were suitable for expressing foreign ideas and things bureaucratic or intellectual, but lacked the emotional depth of *wago*. He considered *wago* to have a special beauty and emotive power that all Japanese could understand and experience. They were consequently egalitarian in a manner that the foreign *kango* were not.

Kindaichi (1988) said that *wago* were easy to understand even when used as compounds and the meaning was clear to both the eye and ear. In the case of *wasei-kango*, people can guess the general meaning when they see them but not when they are heard, due to the problem of homophony. In the case of *yōgo* (i.e. *gairaigo*) these cannot be understood when seen or heard. But unfortunately they seem more high-class when compared to *wago* and *kango*. Of the three, *wago* seem the most commonplace. He complained: 'it is pathetic that *wago* are used for words with bad meanings. Japanese people should recognise the beauty of *wago*' (Kindaichi, 1986, p.213). Morimoto (in Ōno et al., 2001) argued that in the past *kango* were considered to have greater dignity than *wago* due to their foreign origin. This led to their overuse and also inhibited the development of *wago*.

The notion that *gairaigo* are fashionable and this accounts for their popularity is both pervasive and long-lived. This is, of course, a circular argument and consequently lacks explanatory power. *Gairaigo* have been increasing for far too long to simply be a fashion trend. While 'fashion' may not be a satisfactory explanation in itself, the ongoing popularity of modern American culture and *gairaigo* appear to be linked phenomena.

Group identity

The use of particular *gairaigo* as a mark of group identity has received some comment. Ogaeri (1960) observed that in the prewar period, using foreign words written in *katakana* was a feature of the writing of intellectuals. Sakagami (2000) said that

contemporary *gairaigo* use conveyed a sense of the intellectual and belonging to a special group that was in touch with new ideas from foreign countries.

In the postwar period, with the influx of American popular culture, the use of English became a feature of the speech of the younger generation (Ishiwata, 1986). The prevalence of *gairaigo* in computer jargon and sports jargon could also be considered to have a group marking effect. It is notable that despite the high level of *gairaigo* in the sports pages, newspapers receive few complaints about this aspect of *gairaigo* usage (Sekine, 2003). Even those scholars who voice concern over the level and use of *gairaigo* find their use in jargon less objectionable. 'Numerous *yōgo* can be found in the areas of clothing, cosmetics, cars, hotels, entertainment and sport. These are aimed at people with a particular interest and this does not usually present a serious problem' (Kindaichi, 1988, vol.1, p.61).

Status and elitism

Familiarity with foreign culture, foreign language ability and the use of European words have been features of educated elites and academic jargons since at least the Edo period, when Dutch learning was popular. In the Meiji period, adoption of Western ways and foreign language ability were considered marks of elite education. Since the war, the adoption of the trappings of American culture and a good knowledge of English have been features of the educated elite. Shibata (1975) observed that the addition of English loanwords to an academic article gave a favourable impression. Ishiwata (1986) claimed that *gairaigo* use in conversation was higher when both people were well educated and the topic was academic. Stanlaw (1982) noted that male college students tended to use *gairaigo* more commonly in academic discussions than in everyday speech, and white-collar workers used a lot of *gairaigo* when making sales presentations. Loveday (1996) found greater levels of comprehension and acceptance of English in advertising among the university educated and white-collar workers. It has been proposed that the adoption of new *gairaigo* into Japanese is mainly via the writings of educated Japanese who have spent many years learning English (Sonoda, 1983).

Miller (1977) observed that Japanese people showed a particular respect for writing that was impenetrable. Mogami (1989) commented that bureaucrats intentionally use difficult words to lend greater authority to their pronouncements. Also, the general public tends to view difficult words with respect. Ishiwata (1989) commented on the

prevalence of *gairaigo* in officialese and Hoffer (1990) has drawn a parallel between the use of Latin words and phrases by educated elites in Europe and the use of Chinese and English in Japan. Tomoda (1999) argued that the current tendency for officials to adopt words from English is the latest stage in the long-term development of officialese. As was once the case with Chinese, new words are borrowed from English not just out of necessity, but for the prestige they bring to the elites who first borrow and use them.

On the negative side, the use of many borrowed words in Japanese could be considered intellectual snobbery (Ogaeri, 1960), showing off (Suzuki T., 1985b) or attempting to sound superior (Morimoto in Ōno et al., 2001). Suzuki T. (1988) and Ishiwata (1989) both noted that Japanese people use English loanwords to impress others with their erudition. In a newspaper article, Tsushima Yūko interpreted the increased use of English in book and movie titles written in *katakana*, rather than in Japanese translation, as resulting from people wishing to show off their intelligence. She was also worried about the loss of Japanese vocabulary and regarded the level of use of American English as abnormal (*Mainichi*, 1998, April 23). Ishii (1998) regarded the level of use of English words as a measure of shallowness in intellectual capability and a sign of shallow elitism. Morimoto said people use *gairaigo* 'to sound superior and think they are being 'international'. It's pathetic!' (Ōno et al., 2001, p.81).

Yazaki (1964) claimed that Japanese use English or French just to get attention, but when people hear such words they pretend to understand because they are afraid of revealing their ignorance. This kind of attitude will only increase the use of *gairaigo* beyond that which is necessary, he said (p.19). Suzuki T. (1991) said that even when newscasters on NHK used meaningless sentences that contained *gairaigo*, everyone pretended that they understood. Morimoto said: 'these days, people pretend they understand new *katakana* words so that they will not appear stupid, but they actually don't understand what they mean' (Ōno et al., 2001, p.68).

Since achievement in English is highly valued in Japan, if only because it is required for examination success, it is to be expected that those who have worked hard to gain this skill would wish to use it. It could also be expected that those in elite positions would have spent a considerable amount of their time learning English. As Hoffer (1990; 1996) has observed, borrowing from a prestige language is a widespread phenomenon. In the case of Japan, English has joined, and partially replaced, Chinese as a prestigious source

of new words.

Euphemism, nuance and vagueness

The euphemistic role of *gairaigo* has received considerable attention and was discussed in Chapter 1 (Hoffer, 1990; Honna, 1995; Loveday, 1996; Tomoda, 1999). Jinnouchi (2003) said the reason Japanese people keep on adopting *gairaigo* is they like to use euphemisms. It is also a likely factor in the choice of *gairaigo* in aged care and their acceptance (Honna, 1995). Suzuki T. commented: 'when you use *katakanago* [to express something unpleasant], it is indirect and lessens the shock. I suppose this appeals to a deep-seated aspect of Japanese sensibility' (Ōno et al., 2001, p.186). Toyama (1986, p.39) observed: 'in Japanese society, saying things clearly or directly is considered rude, and saying things vaguely or indirectly is considered polite. This favours the use of unclear *gairaigo*. *Gairaigo* are words that have no colour (i.e. existing connotations). In this sense such *gairaigo* are useful in communication'. Kajima (1994) argued that traditional Japanese words have a range of meanings and connotations. People are sensitive to these so there are times when they prefer *gairaigo* which are free of these connotations and can be used casually.

Toki (1960) defended some aspects of *gairaigo* usage on the basis that these new words carried a different nuance to existing Japanese words and this added more variety to expression. Toyama (1986) said that Japanese people's liking for *gairaigo* was a reflection of delicate linguistic sensibility, not of an inferiority complex or vanity.

The vagueness of many *gairaigo* has been commented on (Toyama, 1986; Shibata, 1993; Honna, 1995). Shibata (1993) viewed this as a positive attribute, saying that because *gairaigo* do not have a strong effect, people welcome these words. In advertising, vagueness can be an advantage, since it allows for the effects of image and mood to dominate (Haarman, 1986; Takashi, 1990; Tomoda, 1999). Kobayashi (1999) said that *gairaigo* were used to good effect in Japanese pop songs, since, due to their vagueness, they could conjure up a diversity of images and stimulate the imagination.

The overuse of vague *katakanago* has, however, received considerable criticism. Morimoto said: 'one reason why politicians use *gairaigo* is to soften the effect of using a clear word' (Ōno et al., 2001, p.81). Mizutani warned: 'if people use vague *katakana* a lot, the content of communication will also become vague' (Mizutani & Ōno, 1995,

p.15). An editorial from the Foreign Correspondents' Club said that defining the meaning of loanwords was a problem for Japanese courts and such words could be misconstrued to the benefit of special interest groups (Johnston, 2005, February). Honna (1995, p.53) wryly observed that the accumulated knowledge of English vocabulary shared by the population has allowed English to be used for prudery, hypocrisy, evasion and deceit.

The fluidity and woolliness of the meanings that surround new *gairaigo* can cause comprehension difficulties, but this can also allow them to be used with effect in situations where clarity is not desired. In Chapter 1, such words were classed as special-effect givers.

Innovation and self-expression

Some commentators have observed that new *gairaigo*, and in particular *waseieigo*, are not simply the result of copying words from English, but involve innovation. Seidensticker (1987) said the free use of *gairaigo* showed the vitality of the language. Stanlaw (1987; 1990) said that *gairaigo* shows Japanese skillfulness in importing language, by using English as a stimulus to create new words. Horiuchi (1990) and Shibata (1993) have both pointed out that *gairaigo* had become productive and there were established ways of coining new words, based on English elements, which had resulted in numerous *waseieigo*. Yamada (1995) argued that Japanese people were not simple copycats, but outstanding creators of new English by shortening and combining English words in new ways. Others see the use of English within Japanese contexts as a form of individual self expression. In *Japlish*, Larsen (1995) observed that the Japanese used English to create very individualistic statements. Hoffer and Honna (1988) found that English words are sometimes adopted as a part of sophisticated plays on words and noted that innovative language use has a long history in Japan.

In other cases, however, *waseieigo* are not praised as innovative but criticised or ridiculed for their incorrect use of English (see Tsushima, 1998; Araki, 2001). This does, however, often miss the point, since in many cases the words and phrases were not intended as accurate translations for foreigners to read, but to provoke images in the minds of their Japanese users (Seaton, 2001).

Effects of *gairaigo* on Japanese language and society

The increase in *gairaigo* has been interpreted as having a range of effects on the Japanese language and on Japanese society. These range from it being a modernising and internationalising phenomenon to it being a cause of confusion, social division and cultural decline.

Internationalising and enriching

Arakakwa (1943) argued that *gairaigo* contained the keys to the development of an international language. Rather than each country translating a word so that the word is different in every language, leading to a multiplication of new words, it was preferable that each language used the same international word. In this way the adoption of *gairaigo* would lead to the development of an international language. Other commentators also viewed *gairaigo* as having an internationalising effect (Ogaeri, 1960; Ishino, 1983). Inoue (2001) also commented on the usefulness and convenience of internationalisms and thought they should be used in Japanese without translation.

Kabashima praised the Japanese attitude to language, saying that Japanese people were active in adopting things from overseas and using them to enrich their life. This was done without dumping existing things, rather, the good aspects of old and new coexisted in an unsystematic fashion. This attitude is shown in the Japanese orthography and vocabulary, in which old and new elements both coexist. He said that in the future *gairaigo*, rather than *kango*, would increase because Japanese will continue to use *gairaigo* freely, and with the internationalisation of political, economic and social issues, the related terms will be exchanged across languages. Also, since all Japanese have some knowledge of English, both the external and internal conditions favored an increase in *gairaigo* (1981, p.180). Shibata (1993) said that as Japan becomes more of an internationalised society, it will become impossible to block the influx of *gairaigo*.

Even amongst those who are not keen supporters of *gairaigo*, their advantages are sometimes noted. Kindaichi (1966) said that while it was true that the increase in *gairaigo* since the war had created some inconvenience in communication, some *gairaigo* introduced concepts that did not previously exist in Japanese and these have enriched the vocabulary. So we should appreciate the cases where these words have brought a greater range of expression (pp.151-2).

Leading to cultural loss, Westernisation and colonisation

Concerns have frequently been expressed over the impact massive borrowing, particularly from English, is having on Japanese culture and identity. These concerns are not restricted to the effects of *gairaigo*, but arise out of an on-going series of debates about Japanese culture and its responses to outside influences that have their roots in the Meiji period. The Meiji Minister for Education, Mori Arinori (1847-1889), viewed civilisation and the adoption of Western culture as essentially linked phenomena. As a means to civilisation, he advocated the substitution of the inferior Japanese language with English and was an ardent supporter of English language education (Umehara, 1982). Needless to say, Mori's proposal was not adopted, but others also found deficiencies in Japanese as a language for a modern state and made proposals for its modernisation and improvement. These included radical proposals such as the adoption of the Roman alphabet and the abolition of *kanji* in favour of *kana* alone, as well as more moderate proposals for reform, such as limits on the number of *kanji*.

In opposition to proposals for the Westernisation of Japanese language and culture, other Japanese scholars viewed Western culture as a threat. Miller (1977) argued that the Japanese concern about the use of English words was part of a more general view that conceived the West as a corruptor of Japanese culture. Shiga Shigetaka, in 1881, warned of the danger posed by colonialism (Ike, 1995). In 1927, the founder of Japanese folklore studies, Yanagita Kunio (1875-1962), was also worried about Western dominance and expressed concern about the invasion of Japanese by *gairaigo*. He argued for the minimisation of foreign language use and deplored the way Japanese treated their national language, saying: 'to despise our own language is the first step in submitting ourselves to Western tastes' (Oguma, 2002, p.194). Although a researcher of folklore, in order to counter the threat of Western languages, he supported the spread of standard Japanese even at the expense of local dialects.

In the postwar period, scholars have continued to voice concerns over the cultural effects of *gairaigo* and Westernisation. Yazaki (1964) attributed the postwar *gairaigo* influx, in part, to excessive admiration of America and Europe. Tsuchiya (1992) interpreted both the use of foreign actors in commercials and the overuse of *gairaigo* to a 'Western complex' on the part of Japanese. Some commentators have even seen *gairaigo* as cultural colonisation. Suzuki T. (1991) said: 'recently, the number of

publications with English titles has suddenly increased. The content of these is, however, all in Japanese and the readership is Japanese. I wonder whether there is any other country in which publications aimed at the general public use foreign language titles that their readers do not necessarily understand. If there is such a country, it must be another country's colony' (p.223). Iwabuchi (1993) went further and said that in view of the number of *gairaigo* in use in Japanese, Japan could be considered a Euro-American colony. He called on Japanese people to be more aware of their language use or Japan would become a real colony. Some foreign observers have interpreted the *gairaigo* increase in a similar fashion to its Japanese critics. Milward (1980, p. 66) observed: 'it is as if they were tiring of their own elegant language and culture, and were intent on importing all the most repulsive features of Western languages and civilisation'.

In an interview, when asked whether the influx of *katakanago* was cultural colonisation, Mizutani said that he did not think so. 'If the increase of *katakanago* means colonisation, then wearing Western clothes is also an example of colonisation. Having confidence in our own way of thinking and taking in items of use is fine' (Mizutani & Ōno, 1995). Nevertheless, in a later interview he said: 'in the Japanese context internationalisation means Westernisation, put even more directly it is Americanisation. Even though international relations with China and Korea are not minor and are growing, the foreign words that are entering Japanese are from English with a few from French, hardly any derive from Chinese or Korean – just some foods. There must be reasons for the overwhelming domination of English loans. A large element in this is the desire for things American' (Mizutani, 2003). Here Mizutani accepted that Japan was becoming Americanised but distinguished this from cultural colonisation.

Survey evidence also reveals the Japanese focus on America. The most commonly held image of a foreigner is of an American, the country in which people are most interested is America, and America has long been the top destination for overseas trips (Ishino & Yasuhira, 1991; Hara & Hattori, 1995).

Haarmann (1990) argued that language can provide a measure of acculturation processes and that the replacement of core vocabulary, such as numerals, body parts and colour terms, by foreign loanwords was a key indicator. In the case of Japanese, the replacement of native Japanese numerals by those derived from Chinese demonstrated a high grade of acculturation. In another paper, he acknowledged the high level of foreign

language use in the Japanese media, but argued that the particular manner in which Japanese used foreign languages was not an aspect of internationalisation or cultural exchange. Rather, it was a reflection of Japanese cultural values and patterns of language use (Haarmann, 1986). Loveday (1996) discussed whether the coexistence of word pairs, comprising a Japanese and a *gairaigo* form for the same referent (e.g. *gohan* and *raisu*), can be regarded as Westernisation or acculturation. Like Haarmann he concluded that actual acculturation was more apparent than real. However, Yamada (1993) found that some Japanese colour terms were being replaced by terms derived from English. This phenomenon was more pronounced in fashion magazines but was also evident in newspapers. This suggested that English was not just contributing new words to Japanese but measurable acculturation processes were also underway.

In contrast to views of *gairaigo* as a threat to Japanese culture, there has been a long discourse that conceives Japanese culture as one that can assimilate new influences without suffering damage (see Ichikawa, 1931; Shibata, 1970). The one-time Vice-Minister for Education, Sawayanagi Masatarō (1865-1927) claimed that the Japanese people have always had the ability to take the strengths of others and assimilate them (Oguma, 2002, p.88). Ishiwata (1989) viewed the Japanese approach to language use as flexible and eclectic rather than purist, and argued that this eclecticism led Japanese to borrow and incorporate features of other languages in the past, so it was likely that this would continue into the future.

Causing social division

The increasing use of *gairaigo* has been viewed as a cause of social division. Suzuki T. (1985a) expressed the view that *gairaigo* overuse, besides separating the language into young and old people's language, was also creating languages specific to certain groups and this was damaging the classlessness and homogeneity of Japanese society. On the other hand, Umegaki predicted: 'in the future, in the younger generation, there will be those who cannot distinguish between English and Japanese words. So eventually *gairaigo* will no longer be an issue' (1963, p.8).

Another view is that the overuse of *katakana* specialist terms creates a division between those who understand and those who do not. This leads to discrimination according to knowledge between ordinary people and specialists, and between those who have knowledge of English and those who do not (Watanabe, 1974; Tomari, 1985). Mogami

(1984; 1989; 1991) argued that the overuse of *gairaigo* by government departments causes division and confusion, since ordinary people cannot understand these words. Jinnouchi (2003) said that it was important to take notice of the results of surveys on *gairaigo* comprehension and avoid creating groups who were disadvantaged by not knowing *gairaigo*.

Confusing the language

The notion that the Japanese language is confused or disordered (*midareteiru*), or is becoming confused, is one that has sparked much debate in the postwar era and remains an ongoing issue. For example, in May 2002, *Yomiuri* started a column on language issues and within two weeks had received nearly 300 responses. Over 80% dealt with aspects of language confusion (Hashimoto, 2002). Numerous kinds of confusion and causes of confusion have been proposed and it is beyond the scope of this study to examine all these debates in detail. Nevertheless, since *gairaigo* are frequently implicated, a short discussion is warranted.

The origins of the discourse on confusion in Japanese can be traced back to the late eighteenth century and discussions on this topic may be found in the prewar period. However, they appear to emerge with greater frequency in the mid-1970s and were current during the 1990s (Carroll, 2001, p.79). While the basic notions have been similar in postwar discussions of confusion in Japanese, the foci have been various. These have included: honorific language (*keigo*), the writing system, female language, spoken language use, reforms in *kanji*, language use in the media, use of non-standard grammar, accent changes, young people's language and *gairaigo* use (Carroll, 2001).

The view that *gairaigo* were a source of confusion has been expressed. Toki (1960) viewed the modern usage of *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* as creating confusion in the language. Mogami (1984) said the use of novel *gairaigo* by government confused the public. Suzuki T. (1985a) also said the use of too many *gairaigo* was confusing the language. Questions on whether the language is confused have been included in numerous surveys and have consistently shown that a majority of people think Japanese is confused (see also Chapter 8). This appears to indicate a general concern over the state of the language, but does little to clarify the nature of the concern. Nevertheless, some likely sources of this concern are evident from the results of other survey questions. In 1989 NHK asked 1,185 people what they thought about current language

use. ‘Strange slang’ topped the list (68.9%) followed by ‘confusion in *keigo* use’ (65.4%), ‘coarseness in women's language’ (63.5%), with ‘increase in *gairaigo* that I cannot understand’ (58.6%) in fourth place (Ishino, Maruta & Tsuchiya, 1989, p.17). When the same question was asked in 1996 the list remained essentially the same (Kajiki, 1996a, pp.66-7). Three NHK surveys (1979, 1986 and 1996) that polled people’s opinions of current language included the same four issues (see table 4.1). Women’s speech was consistently a major source of concern but incomprehension of *gairaigo* was also one of the top four issues, ranking third in 1979 and 1986.

Table 4.1: What is your opinion on people's current language use?

Top four options	1979	1986	1996
Women’s language has become coarse	69%	53%	62%
Strange slang and ways of speaking have increased	60%	55%	69%
Gairaigo that I can't understand have increased	51%	45%	58%
The use of *keigo* is confused	50%	43%	63%

Ishino, Hidaka, Tsutsumi & Aida (1980); Ishino & Inagaki (1986); Kajiki (1996a)

When people were asked in 1991 what anticipated future changes in Japanese they would most dislike, ‘*keigo* use disappears’ topped the list (59.0%) followed by ‘no difference in male and female speech’ (46.4%), ‘*kanji* use disappears’ (35.5%), ‘pronunciation and accent becomes foreign-like’ (34.4%), then ‘*gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* increases more’ (21.0%) (Ishino & Yasuhira, 1991, p.10). The same year, NHK repeated this question with a group characterised as ‘intellectuals’. The most disliked future change was ‘foreign-like accent’ (48%) followed by ‘loss of *keigo* and regional dialects’ (41% each), then ‘increase in *gairaigo*’ and ‘loss of *kanji*’ (40% each) (Tsuchiya, 1991, p.15). So, intellectuals also rated *gairaigo* increase as a significant problem.

Bunkachō also polled public opinion on the issue of language confusion. They found that 73.6% of respondents agreed with the proposition ‘current Japanese is confused’ (1995a). However, in a subsequent survey, the question was rephrased to ‘thinking about the language you encounter in your everyday life, do you think current Japanese is confused?’ and a cline of responses was offered. In this case, 32.7% responded that it was ‘very confused’ and 53.2% opted for ‘fairly confused’ (Bunkachō, 2000). This demonstrated that, while a majority was willing to say that Japanese was confused, only a third held a strong view on the matter. Unfortunately, surveys on language confusion have not specifically asked whether the *gairaigo* influx was a cause of confusion.

The notion that the language is confused is not, however, accepted by some

commentators. Kindaichi (1966) said: 'I agree that in recent times there has been an increase in those who say that the language is confused. But this is because there has been a greater interest in the language and there are greater opportunities to express opinions' (p.23). Shibata said: 'people tend to regard the coexistence of alternative terms as confusion but this is just evidence that the language is changing. People always think their own usage is correct and that any deviation from their own standard is "confusion" so they get upset' (in Ōnishi, 1997, p.10).

Damaging the language

Mizutani (1994a) found the increase in *katakanago* alarming and predicted that in 30 years most nouns could be in *katakana*. He called on Japanese people to protect the language by stopping using *gairaigo* and changing sentences that contain *gairaigo* into those that do not. Maruya (1978; 1989) and Suzuki T. (1981) both claimed that while *gairaigo* were easy to read, they were difficult to understand. Suzuki S. (1983) argued that, whereas the new words coined using *kanji* during the Meiji period were clear in meaning, many new *gairaigo* terms are easily misunderstood and should be avoided. Matsui (1992) said that many people use *gairaigo* without knowing the meaning. This brought miscommunication and damaged the basic role of language. Frequent use of *katakanago* was a sign of poverty in language life. Morimoto said excessive *gairaigo* use damaged communication and impoverished the language and people's thinking (in Harada, 2001).

Tanaka (1989) was concerned about the Anglicisation of Japanese, and said that Japanese pronunciation should be protected. Even though *gairaigo* are used of necessity, they shouldn't make Japanese sound like English.

Yonehara, a translator, saw the adoption of strings of *gairaigo* as damaging the structure of the language (Harada, 2001). Ishikawa (1931) and Matsuda (1986) showed that Western languages have already had a profound effect on the structure of Japanese. He detailed a number of effects that the translation of Western books into Japanese has had on the Japanese language itself including additional and greater use of personal pronouns, development of the passive voice, variation in sentence structure, and development of colloquial styles. These effects have made their way so far into Japanese that the contemporary writing style of the educated elite has been heavily influenced by English structure and style. Such changes are more profound than the

adoption of new lexical items, but they have not provoked the same intense debate.

Amongst those who express concern over the excessive use of *gairaigo*, a linkage between *gairaigo* use and a decline in *kanji* and *kango* is frequently drawn. Kabashima (1981) said: 'unless Japanese people decide to stop writing *kango* in *katakana*, *kanji* will be swallowed up by *katakana*' (p.190). Passin (1977) said that while Chinese words would still remain important, they were not likely to generate much new vocabulary. Most of this would come from the European languages via English. Maruya (1978) attributed the postwar influx of *gairaigo* directly to the restrictions placed on the numbers of *kanji* which, he argued, restricted the productive power of the language. This made borrowing from English the main source of new words but these *katakana* words do not have the same productive power and, since people do not understand the root meanings of these *gairaigo*, they lead to misinterpretation.

Suzuki T. (1981) said that *katakana gairaigo* were easily read but difficult to understand and this impeded communication. In 1990 he proposed the following argument: 'the criticism that most *katakana* English used in Japanese have different meanings from the original due to their being twisted to Japanify them is mistaken. For example, the *katakanago nīzu* is not actually being used as a translation of the English 'needs', but as a general substitute for all of these *kango*: *juyō* (demand), *yōkyū* (request) and *kibō* (wish). Most *katakana gairaigo* are not used with the original meaning in mind, they are just being used as phonological substitutes for the original *kango*' (Suzuki T., 1991, p.216). Essentially, Suzuki was saying that *gairaigo* were being used to replace existing *kango*, not to fill a lexical gap but to give a modern effect. Moreover, this usage made the meaning less precise.

Other scholars were not concerned about the negative effects of *gairaigo*. Ogaeri (1960) discussed the increased use of *gairaigo* in the postwar era and claimed that *gairaigo* had ceased to be a fad (and had become part of the language). He stressed the importance of knowledge of *gairaigo* for everyday life and recommended the correct use of both *kango* and *gairaigo*. Shibata (1993) said that, in an age of internationalisation, there was no time to come up with a translation, so the adoption of *gairaigo* was necessary. In such cases, it was important to clearly define the meaning and give the new word a place in the language to avoid confusion. Honna (1995) analysed the roles of *gairaigo* and the causes for their increase. He concluded that the best response was not to limit

gairaigo but to accommodate them for the enrichment of the Japanese language. Like many of the *gairaigo* opponents, Honna also identified the postwar limitations on *kanji* as a major cause for the *gairaigo* increase, but, unlike them, he supported these reforms.

How to respond to *gairaigo*

Critics of contemporary *gairaigo* use have called for various types of action. These range from legally enforced prohibitions to calls for greater care by individuals. The rationales for action are also diverse. They include the notion that Japanese culture is under threat as well as more instrumental concerns relating to comprehension.

Protect the language and culture

The notion that the Japanese language is under threat is not a new one. Japan's first Education Minister, Mori Arinori (1847-1889) predicted that Japanese was doomed to yield to the domination of English (in Chino, 2000). Opponents of *gairaigo* frequently warn against their effects. Tsuchiya (1992, p.149) said: 'Many people think that Japanese is OK, but this is just on the outside. Contemporary Japanese is being eaten by white ants and becoming hollow'. In 1995, Ōno warned: 'the Japanese language is facing a serious crisis… unless people have the sense that they need to protect their own language, it will fall to pieces' (Mizutani & Ōno, 1995, p.14). Morimoto said that it was time to revise the Japanese attitude of viewing America as number one. The careless overuse of *katakanago* and the desire to become a colony by dumping the Japanese language are attitudes that, if not changed, would wreck Japan (Ōno et al., 2001). Such proponents frequently call for measures to be taken to protect the language. These typically involve government action, greater responsibility on the part of the media and calls for individuals to alter their use.

The government's role

Ōno suggested establishing an institution, such as in France, to oversee the excessive use of *katakanago* (Mizutani & Ōno, 1995). Other opponents of *gairaigo* were, however, less confident about the effectiveness of government. Ishino (1983, p.69) said: 'there is a need for measures to control vocabulary. While it would be easy to organise a committee, it would be difficult for it to be effective, since it is difficult to force changes in language use. After all, the most important thing is individual attitude'. Even Suzuki T. was ambivalent: 'the influx of *gairaigo* is intolerable but it is not a good idea to regulate the *gairaigo* in everyday use the way it is done in France. However, there needs

to be a limit on the overuse of *gairaigo* in government offices, politics, and by the traffic police on signs' (Suzuki T., 1981, pp. 13-4).

In a 1989 survey, NHK found that while a majority of people agreed that confusion was not good (62.5%), majority support for government action to correct the confusion was not evident. 60.1% said: 'even if the language became fairly confused, there is no need for the government to take special measures', and only 32.9% said: 'the government should be more active in eliminating confusion' (Ishino, Maruta, & Tsuchiya, 1989, p.11). The type of confusion referred to was not clear and the kinds of measures that government could take were not specified. Therefore it is difficult to determine whether people did not support government action simply because they did not think it a practical solution, or whether they were principally opposed to government involvement.

Although there have been few calls for official regulations on *gairaigo* like those in France, there are frequent calls for government departments to take more care and responsibility. Mizutani said: 'the use of a lot of *katakanago* by government should be refrained from' (Mizutani & Ōno, 1995, p.16). Nakayama (2003) said that each department in the central government should prioritise the comprehension level of the public and their needs when selecting words. Others proposed more specific measures. Suzuki T. (1981, p.16) said that there should be a survey of *gairaigo* use in government and then regulations applied to the use of *gairaigo* by government. Kai (2001) suggested each department hire translators and try not to use *gairaigo* as specialist terms in an indiscriminate fashion. Then the increase in *gairaigo* could be prevented. Once *gairaigo* are put into government documents they are difficult to change, he said.

The media's role

The media have been called upon to limit *gairaigo*. According to Toyama (1990), Japanese should be used more in broadcasting and strange Japanese-English program titles should not be used. Ōno said that newspapers should avoid the use of too much *katakanago* (Mizutani & Ōno, 1995). Suzuki T. (1981, p.16) said that newspapers should actively get rid of *gairaigo*. Mogami (1989) advocated broadcasters take an active role in converting the incomprehensible words used by government, such as novel *katakanago*, into plain Japanese that people could understand. This would help break down the attitude that obscure terms have more authority. NHK, in a survey,

found that the public attributed blame to the mass media for language problems. 83.3% agreed that 'the mass media has a large responsibility for confusion in the language' (Ishino, Maruta & Tsuchiya 1989, p.15).

Other commentators were, however, less direct. Mizutani said: 'since newspapers, broadcasters and government send information out to many people they have a heavy responsibility with regard to language use' (Mizutani, 2003, p.7) and 'the function of broadcasting is not only to provide information but to provide it in a comprehensible manner' (Mizutani, 1994b, p.5). He did not, however, say how this could be achieved.

Suzuki S. (1990) thought that the problem of *gairaigo* in the media would take care of itself. He said: 'many *gairaigo* are long and in Japanese there is a tendency to drop words with too many syllables. In newspapers, space is limited, so words such as *konsensasu* with six spaces take up too much room to be useful in headlines, compared with *dōi* or *sandō* which only use two spaces. Long *gairaigo* will continue to be dumped. *Gairaigo* will be shortened and where possible replaced with better terms such as *kango*, but when such terms cannot be found they will be retained. This is a process that has happened throughout the history of Japanese. 'The iron rule is few syllables and few characters, so long or complex *gairaigo* will not be retained for long in the language' (p.227).

The role of the individual

Those who are concerned about *gairaigo* usage tend to admonish their readers to be more responsible for their own language (see Toki, 1960; Ishino, 1983; Ishiwata, 1985). Iwabuchi (1993, p.15) said: 'each person needs to be more aware of the Japanese language and be careful of how they use *gairaigo*'. Suzuki T. said: 'we need to give up our fanciful world view in which all standards, such as those of correctness and beauty, are based on those of foreign countries. We must construct our own minds, review our own attitudes to what is beautiful in the language, only then can we improve the language' (Ōno et al., 2001, p.201). Even Mizutani had some direct comments: 'it doesn't matter how many words are added to a dictionary, but there are limits to the working vocabulary used in everyday life, so when *gairaigo* are brought in something gets replaced. Therefore we should make an effort to express things in Japanese, without using *gairaigo*' (Mizutani, 2003, p.6).

Opponents of regulation

Other scholars did not see any need for regulation. Shibata (in Ōnishi, 1997, p.8) said: 'it doesn't matter whether *gairaigo* increases a lot. Although an effort to translate them is needed, it is all right to adopt them. They will never extinguish Japanese. I've read that 70% of English is *gairaigo*, so if Japanese is in danger of becoming extinct, this should have happened to English a long time ago'. Kindaichi was also confident that Japanese could survive the challenge of *gairaigo*: 'there is a tendency for people to worry about the future of Japanese due to the flood of *katakana* words. However, Japanese is a strong language, and will not disappear under the influence of *katakanago*' (Kindaichi, 1988, vol.1, p.73).

Some *kango* supporters were not in favour of government action. This view is, however, not surprising. A principal argument they used against the postwar language reforms was that government was interfering in people's lives and as Maruya (1989, p.34) said: 'it is utter folly for the state to tinker with [the language] arbitrarily'. When it comes to government departments controlling their own language use, the *kango* supporters do, however, seem more enthusiastic.

Alternatives to *gairaigo*

Whether the government takes positive measures or the limitation of *gairaigo* is left up to individuals and organisations, the issue inevitably arises of how to replace *gairaigo*. If borrowing ceases to be an option, then coining new terms using the resources of Japanese appears the only alternative. Just how to do this has received some comment.

Some advocate a return to the strategy of calquing using *kango*, as was the norm in the prewar era. Ōno favoured the use of *kango* and decried the postwar *kanji* limits which, he said, damaged its productivity (Mizutani & Ōno, 1995). Maruya (1989) also opposed the reforms and supported the use of *kanji*: '*katakana* words do not convey meaning (the way *kanji* do), are not productive, and tend to be long, so when they are shortened the meaning becomes even less clear' (p.201). Although Suzuki T. is another opponent of *kanji* limits, he is more cautious in advocating the *kango* position. In 2001, he said he aimed to write in plain language using *furigana* for difficult *kanji* and did not use *gairaigo* that were not well naturalised (Suzuki T., 2001).

Others prefer the use of *wago*. Kindaichi said: 'in Meiji, people took the word *economy*

and created *keizai* but people with a poor knowledge of *kanji* cannot get ideas like this. However, these days it is not a good idea to use difficult *kango* but it is a pity that *wago* that can be understood easily are not used to make new words. People seem to have the idea that *wago* is of low value, but Japanese people should rid themselves of this feeling. They should realise that there are many *wago* that have a beautiful sound and meaning and these should be respected. If they were more respected, new terms created from *wago* would increase' (1994, p.17). Morimoto, another supporter of *wago*, observed: 'in the past *kango* were used to express abstract ideas, this limited the opportunities for *wago* to develop in this area. But, since *kango* were loanwords, their meanings were often not completely clear. Even so, because people thought *kango* had dignity, *kango* were overused. The current overuse of *gairaigo* is no different from the overuse of *kango* in the Nara and Heian eras, when *kango* were being imported' (Ōno, et al., 2001, p.108).

Opponents of the *kango* solution point to the problems of homophones, and long incomprehensible *kango*. Ogaeri (1960) said that *kango* cause problems due to homophones. Toki (1960, p.16) reasoned: 'trying to keep Japanese pure will only create more confusion. Replacing *gairaigo* with *kango* of the same meaning creates a phonological problem (due to homophones and poor sounding combinations). So we have to allow *gairaigo* to be introduced but make sure they are used with the correct meaning. This is our future direction'. Shibata (in Ōnishi, 1997) said that when words were translated into *kango* they often became longish. If they were more than three or four syllables they would not be accepted. Yazaki (1964) said he disliked the careless borrowing of *gaikokugo*, but was not supportive of translating them into *kango*, since this just increases homophones. Mogami (1989) did not favour the use of difficult *kango* either, particularly in broadcasting, since such words were difficult to understand when heard.

Umesao (1989) argued that coining *kango* for scientific terms was a strategy that had failed since it produced numerous ambiguous and awkward terms and was neither effective in domestic or international contexts. Even so, he said borrowing needed to be selective. He made the unusual argument that writing Japanese in *rōmaji* 'will help protect Japanese from being eaten up by *gairaigo*'. After saying that he did not support *gairaigo* being spelt just as in English, since this would destroy the Japanese

phonological system, he argued that when written in *rōmaji* such words would become too long and this would make them less attractive (in Mogami, 1997, pp.19-20).

A number of commentators were not concerned about the kind of words that were used. Ogaeri (1960, p. 28) said: **'**the future of Japanese lies in the skillful use of those *kango* that are indispensable and those *gairaigo* that cannot be resisted to develop a language for our own people'. Shibata (1993, p.18) said: 'if I have to choose, I belong to the group that approves of *gairaigo*'. And, 'in Meiji they adopted new concepts and modernised the country by coining new *kango*. These new words no doubt seemed strange to the Chinese but the result was modernisation. The present time is like a second Meiji, we should adopt new words and concepts via *gairaigo* and Japanise them' (Shibata in Ōnishi, 1997, pp.12-3).

Another view is that the writing system needs to be adapted to accommodate the changes brought about by *gairaigo*. Matsui (1992) thought that the growth of *katakanago* could not be stopped, so a new way of using *katakana* needed to be developed. Kabashima predicted that 'in ten or so years there may be a shift away from *kanjikana-majiribun* with many *katakana* and some *rōmaji*, towards a form in which *rōmaji* and *hiragana* dominate with few *kanji*. *Katakana* are used as a substitute for *rōmaji* when writing *gairaigo* but this cannot express the pronunciation properly, so *rōmaji* may come to be used instead' (in Kabashima, Mizutani, Keen, Mikuni & Nishimura, 1983, pp.86-7).

Although there are numerous critics of *gairaigo* use, many are also critical of *kango*. By process of elimination, this only leaves *wago* as a means of creating new terms. However, compared to the number of opponents of *gairaigo*, the proponents of *wago* are few. As Kindaichi has lamented: 'it is pathetic that *wago* are used for words with bad meanings. Japanese people should recognize the beauty of *wago* (Kindaichi, 1985 in NHK, p.213). This means that most people are not willing to accept *wago* as a principal means of word generation. Consequently, the only courses of action would seem to be a return to *kango* or more *gairaigo*.

The point on which most *gairaigo* critics agree is the need for people to avoid *gairaigo* when addressing the general public. Suzuki T. (1985, p.17) expressed this view as follows: 'there are cases where it is reasonable to use a lot of Western words. However,

when politicians and the mass media are addressing the general public, and when teachers are talking to students, a lot of Western words should not be used'.

The difficulty with the self-regulatory model is that, as most people agree, *gairaigo* are popular. Why this is so is a disputed question, but few doubt that part of the reason *gairaigo* are adopted is because many people think it is fashionable to do so. So the critics are, in effect, arguing that the media should refrain from using the kind of fashionable language that appeals to their audiences. Proponents of personal restraint essentially argue that ordinary people should give up trying to be fashionable and, instead, use dry *kango* or countrified *wago*. Therefore, such approaches would appear to have little likelihood of success unless there is a profound change in conditions.

Given that laissez-faire and self-regulation have not had the impact that *gairaigo* critics desired, the other option was LP. Chapter 8 further explores viewpoints on LP, examines specific policy proposals and the measures taken. Prior to this, Chapters 5, 6 and 7 present and interpret survey data on the experiences and opinions of Japanese people regarding a number of the *gairaigo* issues that were discussed in Chapters 1 to 4.

CHAPTER 5

SURVEY RESULTS 1

This chapter reports data from the questionnaire on *gairaigo*. Part 1 analyses demographic data and Part 2 reports and discusses data from questions on *gairaigo* use.

PART 1: DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE SAMPLE

936 questionnaires were returned. Frequencies and valid percentages are reported. Nonparametric tests are conducted to examine relationships between demographic factors.

Age of respondents

Respondents were concentrated in the lower age-groups due to the number of students (see table 5.1). Census data is provided for comparison.

Table 5.1: Age distribution of respondents

Age group	Frequency	Valid %	Census* %
16-19 years	256	27.4	7.3
20-24 years	319	34.1	9.6
25-29 years	63	6.7	8.3
30-34 years	49	5.2	7.7
35-39 years	71	7.6	7.8
40-49 years	117	12.5	19.3
50-59 years	30	3.2	16.3
60-69 years	25	2.7	13.0
70 years and over	6	0.6	10.7
Total	936	100.0	100.0

* 1993 data for whole of Japan adjusted for 16 yrs and over (Asahi, 1994)

Students

568 respondents indicated that they were students. The majority (528) were at tertiary level, with the remaining 40 being high school students from Kudankōkō, a public high school in Tokyo. The majority of the university students were from Seijo University and Aoyama Gakuin University in Tokyo. These university students comprised 56.4% of the sample. The majority of students were female (383) and only 11 were over the age of 30 years. Most students were in third or fourth year, or post-graduate, with the majority majoring in education (349), followed by English or English literature (77).

Occupations

In total, 359 (40.9%) respondents indicated that they were employed and 518 (59.1%) said they were not employed, most of whom were students. Of those who said they were

employed, 193 were males and 163 were females. Occupations were grouped according to similarity and the range of job types is shown in table 5.2. The majority (95) considered themselves company employees *(kaishain)*, followed by 84 public servants *(kōmuin)*, 41 teachers and 27 employees of Shizuoka Television station.

Table 5.2: Occupations of employed respondents

Occupation	Frequency	Valid %
Company employee	95	25.7
Translator/interpreter	2	0.5
Shopkeeper	14	3.8
Public servant	84	22.8
Part-time job	13	3.5
Flight-staff/pilot	11	3.0
Nurse	12	3.3
Cameraman	1	0.3
System engineer	8	2.2
Teacher	41	11.1
Traditional arts	2	0.5
Manufacturing	2	0.5
Doctor/dentist	1	0.3
Chiropractic/acupuncture	2	0.5
Word-processing	4	1.1
Travel agent	10	2.7
Interior decorator	1	0.3
Co-op staff	2	0.5
Agriculture	1	0.3
Hair cutting	3	0.8
Paramedical	5	1.4
TV station employee	27	7.3
School owner	1	0.3
Advertising	7	1.9
Real estate	2	0.5
Librarian	1	0.3
Mechanic	1	0.3
Writer	1	0.3
Housewife	15	4.1
Total	369	100.0

Foreign language ability

Table 5.3 shows the numbers of respondents who reported they had at least some foreign language ability in English, French, German, Spanish, Chinese, and Korean. English was by far the most common foreign language read or spoken, with over 90% of respondents reporting some ability. In many cases, respondents only marked the level of the languages they knew on the questionnaire and left the others blank, so for some languages the level of missing values was high. Consequently, both actual and valid

percentages are reported. For most languages, respondents were slightly more likely to report their reading ability than speaking ability.

Table 5.3: Respondents with some foreign language ability

Language	Reading			Speaking		
	Freq.	%	Valid %	Freq.	%	Valid %
English	886	94.7	95.3	859	91.8	92.2
French	181	19.3	20.9	154	16.4	17.5
German	166	17.7	19.3	130	13.9	14.8
Chinese	110	11.8	15.8	85	9.0	12.0
Spanish	64	6.8	9.3	60	6.4	8.6
Korean	21	2.3	3.1	22	2.4	3.2

English ability

English was the only language in which there were sufficient numbers of respondents at each level for use in statistical analysis. Overall, respondents tended to rate their speaking ability lower than their reading ability. Since both these scales correlated strongly, and reading provided a more normal spread of frequencies, it was used as the main variable in further analyses. Where required, levels 1 and 2 were combined, as were 5 and 6 to make a four-point scale.

Table 5.4: English ability of respondents

Speaking level	Frequency	Valid %
1. can talk about specialist topics such as your job	26	2.8
2. can engage in everyday conversation without difficulty	69	7.4
3. can manage travel conversation	208	22.3
4. can understand some but cannot speak well	435	46.7
5. can hardly make self understood	121	13.0
6. cannot speak at all	73	7.8
Total	932	100.0

Reading level	Frequency	Valid %
1. can easily read newspapers, magazines & general books	18	1.9
2. can read fairly well newspapers, magazines & general books	153	16.5
3. can read fairly well in own interest area	270	29.0
4. can read simple short sentences	370	39.8
5. can hardly read	75	8.1
6. cannot read at all	44	4.7
Total	930	100.0

Gender

More females (558) 59.6% than males (373) 40.1% were polled. The gender imbalance is most pronounced amongst tertiary students, of whom 69.4% were female. In contrast, more of the secondary students were males (57.5%). Of employed persons, the

proportion of males was higher, at 54.2%.

Discussion

This sample, like the other surveys reported in these chapters, is not representative of the Japanese population as a whole. Consequently, its biases need to be considered when interpreting the data and a number of caveats given. The age structure of the sample is skewed towards young people, with those over 50 years being poorly represented. This means that data for these age-groups will be less reliable than for younger groups. Nevertheless, the overall sample size is quite large, and there are 61 people aged 50 years and over, so the effect of age can be investigated.

There are large proportions of students and white-collar occupations, while blue-collar and rural occupations are almost absent. Therefore, the results of the sample will reflect this bias. The data was mainly collected in Tokyo, so it is not representative of regional Japan.

Gender balance changes with age-group. The proportion of females in the sample declines progressively from 70.7% in the 16 to 19 age-group to 32.8% in the 50 years and over age-group (ρ = -0.219, p<0.001). The age group in which the proportion of males and females was exactly equal was 30-39 years. In the general population there are more males in the younger age-groups with parity being reached at 50-59 years (*Asahi*, 1994). The predominance of younger females in the sample is mainly due to the large number of Arts and Education students and the occupations of other respondents. Consequently, the predominance of females, and the relationship between age and gender, need to be considered when a gender effect is present.

The English ability of respondents seemed high compared with that of other opinion poll samples. In a 1991 poll, NHK included a comparable question on English speaking ability with results as follows:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	don't know
2.3%	3.6%	16%	17.7%	59.8%	1.1%

The first three options indicated a degree of confidence, so 21.9% could speak at least some English (Ishino & Yasuhira, 1991). In a 2000 NHK poll, only 5.4% reported they were confident in speaking English and over 75% were not confident at all (Yamashita & Katō, 2000). Most surveys did not publish data for English ability, so further

comparisons cannot be undertaken. Nevertheless, it seems likely that English ability is higher than usual in this sample and this is due to the nature of the student groups and the predominance of white-collar occupations.

Overall, as age rose, English reading ability declined (ρ = 0.112, p=0.001) with 13.1% of those aged 50 years plus reporting they could read no English, compared with 2.6% in the 20-29 years group. However, there was an overall increase in top-level readers with age, from a low of 0.4% in 16-19 years to 2.6% of the 40-49 years group, with a sudden jump to 11.5% in the 50 years plus age-group. Consequently, the older respondents were more polarised than other age-groups between good and poor readers. For English speaking, there was no significant correlation but a similar trend was evident.

Males tended to rate their English reading ability more extremely than females. 6.5% of males and 3.4% of females said they could not read English at all, while at the other end of the scale, a larger proportion of males (2.4%) indicated the top reading level, than did females (1.6%).

PART 2: DATA ON GAIRAIGO USE

For the following questions, the results of the questionnaire are presented and analysed.

Q.1. Perception of change in the amount of *gairaigo* in use
Q.2. General evaluation of current level *gairaigo* usage
Q.8. Perception of change in the amount of *gairaigo* used in various language domains
Q.4. Prediction of future level of *gairaigo* usage
Q.9. Encounters with *gairaigo* that are not understood
Q.10. Encounters with *gairaigo* that are not understood in various language domains

Where possible, these results are compared with those obtained from public opinion polls. The results are discussed in the light of both sources of numerical data and the written comments of respondents.

Perceptions of change in the amount of *gairaigo* in use

Almost 95% of the people polled thought that there had been an increase in the level of *gairaigo* in use over the previous ten years, thereby confirming hypothesis 4.1a, and more than half (55.5%) thought this increase had been large (see table 5.5).

Table 5.5: Q.1. Do you think the amount of *gairaigo* used in Japanese has increased over the last ten years?

Option	Frequency	Valid %	Cumulative %
1. it has increased a lot	519	55.5	55.5
2. it has increased a fair amount	362	38.7	94.2
3. there has been no change	52	5.6	99.8
4. it has decreased a fair amount	0	0	99.8
5. it has decreased a lot	2	0.2	100.0
Total	935	100.0	

(Due to the small number of responses to options 4 and 5, these were combined in further analyses.)

Comments (N= 6) No comments were canvassed but the following were written.

For each, gender (M/F), age-group in years, and response option (in brackets) is given.

1. F. 20-24 (1): I wonder whether words that are frequently used in the media, such as 'barrier-free' and 'happy-Monday', have increased due to the focus on Europe and America? I wonder whether we are following Europe and America? Myself, I find there are things that are easier to express in English, such as ideas that did not exist in Japan.
2. M. 20-24 (2): There is a tendency to avoid direct expression in Japanese in order to make the meaning vague.
3. M. 30-34 (2): I regard words that are not listed in the Kōjien dictionary but are listed in Imidas not to be *gairaigo* since they have not become stabilised, I regard them as *ryūkōgo*.
4. M. 25-29 (3): I don't pay attention.
5. M. 20-24 (3): I think that *waseieigo* has increased.
6. M. 60-69 (3): Japanese that sounds like *gairaigo* has increased.

Comments 3 to 6 provide some insight into the complexity that may underlie responses. If *gairaigo* are defined narrowly to include only naturalised loanwords, the level of increase would be much lower than if a broad definition were taken. Also, people who paid no attention to *gairaigo* may have chosen option 3 as 'don't know'. In comments 1 and 2 the issues of media use, new concepts, and vagueness were raised.

Demographic variables

There was a significant correlation between age-group and perception of an increase in *gairaigo* (ρ = -0.107, p=0.001). The proportion of respondents who reported a large increase in *gairaigo* over the previous ten years rose from 50.0% in the 16-19 year age-group to 68.9% in those aged 50 years and over, thereby confirming hypothesis 4.3a. The proportion that reported no change was below 10% in all age-groups, but rather than decline with age, there was an uneven rise from 5.9% in the 16-19 year group to 9.8% in 50 years and over. This trend was small but it may indicate that some older respondents were not engaging with this phenomenon.

Neither English reading nor speaking ability correlated with responses to this question. Nevertheless, in each case, a greater than average proportion of the top-level readers and speakers indicated a large increase. For example, 72.2% of top-level English readers selected 'increased a lot', compared with 47.7% of non-readers. This indicates that while those few respondents with high-level English language skills may be more sensitive to the *gairaigo* increase, there was little variation over the other levels of English language ability.

Comparison with other surveys

Surprisingly, there was no direct question of this sort in the other surveys examined. The most comparable one was in a survey conducted by NHK (see table 5.6).

Table 5.6: Comparison with a previous study with regard to perceived increase in *gairaigo*

NHK 1991.11: Recently, do you think you hear *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* more than before?

increased very much	increased a fair amount	not changed	decreased	don't know/no answer
51.7%	34.3%	11.8%	0.9%	1.3%

The results were very similar in the two surveys. Respondents' interpretations of the word *saikin* (recently) could have affected responses in the NHK survey, since this made the time-frame for change rather unclear. It is probable that *saikin* suggested a shorter time period than the ten years specified in the current study, with the result that more people chose the 'no change' option. Alternatively, the increase in *gairaigo* may have become more apparent in the period from 1991 to 1997/8. However, based on this data hypothesis 5.1 cannot be confirmed.

People's general evaluation of the current level of *gairaigo*

The majority (55.8%) thought that *gairaigo* were used a lot in everyday life. However, the attitude behind this response was somewhat difficult to interpret, since it could have been an attempt at an objective assessment of the current level of *gairaigo* use, or it could have been an evaluation on a continuum with the clearly disapproving 'too much' option. About 30% thought the current level was just right or that the *gairaigo* usage was not high. These responses would seem to indicate a general lack of concern with the current level of use, since only 12.4% chose the option that clearly indicated dissatisfaction with the current level of use (see table 5.7), so hypothesis 4.1e is not supported.

Table 5.7: Q.2. What do you think of the current level of *gairaigo* that you see and hear in everyday life?

Option	Frequency	Valid %	Cumulative %
1. they are used too much	115	12.4	12.4
2. they are used a lot	518	55.8	68.1
3. the level is just right	275	29.6	97.7
4. comparatively few are used	19	2.0	99.8
5. too few are used	2	0.2	100.0
Total	929	100.0	

(Due to the small number of responses to options 4 and 5, these were combined in further analyses.)

Comments (N=9) No comments were canvassed.

1. M. 35-39 (1): They are used extremely often.
2. M. 40-49 (1): *Katakana* words (are used too much).
3. F. 20-24 (1): I think there are too many *gairaigo* that middle school students and older people cannot immediately understand. I also find it troublesome. I always wonder why words that are similar to technical terms are used without translation.
4. F. 20-24 (2): Politicians and others use *gairaigo* excessively and indiscriminately.
5. M. 30-34 (2): If *ryūkōgo* are included in *gairaigo*, then there are too many.
6. M. 60-69 (2): *Gairaigo* should mainly be used for words that cannot be expressed using Japanese. There is too much use of *gairaigo* just for effect.
7. F. 16-19 (2): Amongst *gairaigo* there are too many specialist terms that I don't understand.
8. F. 35-39 (3): All around us *gairaigo* are used such a lot that I don't think that there is anything strange in using them.
9. M. 30-34 (chose no response): I am not conscious of using *gairaigo*.

Even with a small number of responses, a number of key issues were raised: difficulty with comprehension, indiscriminate use, use for effect, faddish nature, association with technical terminologies and politics, and age effect. Also, some people did not find their use strange.

Demographic variables

The tendency to choose the 'too much' option increased with age (ρ = -0.210, p<0.001), with 7.8% in the 16-19 age-group and 32.2% in 50 years and over, thereby confirming hypothesis 4.3b. In all age-groups over 50% said that a lot of *gairaigo* were in use. Similar results were found in other surveys (see below). In Sōrifu 1992.6, selection of 'too much' increased with age from 13.2% in 20-29 years to 45.5% in 60 years and over. In Bunkachō 2000.1, selection of 'often' increased from 42.0% in 16-19 years to 55.5% in 50-59 years (p.98).

With regard to English language reading ability, the relationship was curvilinear, 41.2%

of the top-level readers and 25.6% of the non-readers chose the 'too much' option, compared to 8.6% of the medium-level (level 3) readers. A similar result was found for English speaking level. So, hypothesis 4.4a was not supported.

Relationship to other questions

There was a significant correlation between questions one and two (ρ = 0.337, p<0.001, V=0.349), indicating that those who thought *gairaigo* had increased also tended to think it was used a lot or too much.

Comparisons with other surveys

Question 2 had some shortcomings as a survey question. It is unclear whether it is asking the respondent to make a judgement about the amount of *gairaigo* in use, or give an opinion on whether the amount is too much or not. Similar questions in other surveys fell broadly into those that included a 'too much' option and those that focused on whether there was 'a lot' of *gairaigo* or not (see table 5.8).

Table 5.8: Comparison with previous studies of attitudes to current *gairaigo* usage

A. Surveys that include a 'too much' option

1. NHK 1982.6: Recently, do you think there is too much *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo*?

too much	a lot	just right	not that much	few
33.0%	51.6%	12.1%	1.8%	0%

2. Sōrifu 1992.6: It has been said that *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* are used too much in every-day life. What do you think of this statement?

too much	a bit much	not that much	not too much	don't know
33.3%	36.6%	17.2%	7.7%	5.1%

B. Surveys using 'a lot'

3. NHK 1983.10-12: (local government employees) Do you think that *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* are currently used a lot?

a lot	usual amount	a little
84%	14%	1%

4. NHK 1988.2: Do you think that *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* are used a lot in daily life?

a lot	quite a lot	usual amount	rather few	few
36%	28%	26%	6%	3%

C. Surveys using 'often'

5. Bunkachō 2000.1: Do you feel that *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* are used a lot?

often	sometimes	no	don't know
51.6%	32.2%	13.8%	2.3%

6. Bunkachō 2002.11: Do you feel that *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* are used a lot?

often	sometimes	no	don't know
56.6%	29.5%	12.1%	1.7%

Whereas the question in the present survey was open, those of most other surveys were closed, and tended to lead the respondent by suggesting the correct option in the question, thereby introducing a bias. Nevertheless, some longitudinal comparisons can be attempted.

In both NHK 1982.6 and Sōrifu 1992.2, about 33% chose 'too much' compared with 12.4% in the present survey. However, the phrasing of the questions in the first two surveys introduced a bias towards selecting 'too much'. When the top two options were combined, the proportions were similar between Sōrifu 1992.2 and the present survey (69.9% & 68.1%). NHK 1982.6 was, however, much higher at 84.6%. This suggests a decline in the proportion of people who thought *gairaigo* were used a lot.

In NHK 1983.10-12, 84% chose 'a lot', compared with 51.6% in NHK 1982.6, however, when the options 'too much' and 'a lot' were combined in NHK 1982.6, the proportions were similar. In NHK 1988.2, however, the combination of the top two options was lower at 64% – again suggesting a decline.

The Bunkachō surveys were the most comparable, with 51.6% choosing 'often' in 2000 and 56.6% in 2003 – suggesting an increase over this period.

In general, the three groups of surveys suggest a decline in the proportion of the population that thought *gairaigo* were used a lot during the 1980s and into the 1990s, followed by an increase. However, given the variation in the way the questions were presented, it is also possible that there was no real change, so these data do not support hypotheses 5.1 or 5.3.

Perceptions of change in *gairaigo* in various language domains

In question 8, in all language domains, a larger proportion thought the number of *gairaigo* had increased than thought it had decreased (see table 5.9). Of the media domains, the largest perceived increases were in the categories of advertisements and posters (39.9%), magazines (35.1%), and television and radio programs (33.4%). In the personal domains (f-h), the level of increase was lower with the majority (50.6%) thinking there had been no change in the workplace and in school. This confirmed hypothesis 8.1b.

Compared with question 1, the level of increase indicated in this question is lower but

this effect is most likely due to the differing frame of reference (‘recently’ rather than ‘in the last ten years’).

Table 5.9: Q.8. Change in *gairaigo* in various domains of language use (%)

Domain	1. increased a lot	2. increased	3. no change	4. decreased	5. decreased a lot
a. television, radio programs	33.4	55.7	10.1	0.3	0.4
b. advertisements, posters	39.9	49.9	9.1	0.9	0.2
c. brochures, instruction manuals	24.8	53.0	21.1	0.8	0.3
d. newspapers	8.8	46.1	44.0	1.0	0.1
e. magazines	35.1	54.4	9.4	0.7	0.4
f. workplace, school classes	5.8	42.1	50.6	1.1	0.4
g. conversation with friends	7.9	41.3	48.5	2.0	0.3
h. conversation with children & young people	15.3	47.5	35.1	1.7	0.5

Comments (N=3) No comments were canvassed.

1. M. 40-49: I took ‘recently’ as meaning five years. If I had considered the last 10-15 years all my responses would be 1.
2. M. 60-69: For ‘a’ I chose ‘2’ but this is for TV only, since I don’t listen to radio much.
3. M. 60-69: Regarding ‘h’ there are a lot of coined words (*zōgo*).

These comments highlight the problems of overlapping domains and the meaning of ‘recently’ in the question. Respondents also wrote additional areas of increase including: computer terminology, business terminology, specialist terminology, mass communications, TV news, by politicians, in government documents, and by bureaucrats.

Demographic variables

There were no significant correlations between age-group in their perceptions of the level of change in *gairaigo* in radio and television programs, or in magazines (see table 5.10). The anomalous result for magazines may reflect less interest in this medium on the part of the older readers. In the other media domains, the perception of an increase rose with age. A similar age-related increase was evident in the personal language domains, with the exception of conversations with friends, in which the opposite effect was found. This indicates that while older people notice an increase in *gairaigo* use when talking to younger people, the use of *gairaigo* within peer groups tends to decrease with age. Presumably, this is because older people do not use new *gairaigo* when speaking with each other.

Table 5.10: Spearman Correlations (ρ) between reports of a large *gairaigo* increase in various domains of language use and proportions in two age-groups

Domain	16-19 yrs	over 50 yrs	ρ
a. television, radio programs	32.3%	34.4%	not significant
b. advertisements, posters	34.3%	55.0%	-0.092, p=0.005
c. brochures, instruction manuals	21.6%	42.4%	-0.136, p<0.001
d. newspapers	5.2%	8.5%	-0.161, p<0.001
e. magazines	36.7%	28.8%	not significant
f. workplace, school classes	5.2%	10.3%	-0.096, p=0.004
g. conversation with friends	10.4%	3.4%	0.123, p<0.001
h. conversation with children & young people	15.5%	22.0%	-0.075, p=0.023

No correlation was found between English reading ability and responses to question 8. However, as with question 1, the top-level readers tended to report a greater increase than the other levels.

Comparisons with other surveys

NHK has often asked questions about *gairaigo* in the broadcast media, with a particular reference to TV. However, these questions have been so variable that longitudinal comparison is difficult.

Table 5.11: Survey questions relating to level of *gairaigo* in the broadcast media

1. NHK 1982.6: Recently, do you think there is too much *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* in NHK broadcasts?

too much	a lot	just right	not much	few
4.4%	23.2%	55.7%	10.6%	0.4%

2. NHK 1991.11: Recently, a lot of *katakana* words have been used in the titles of TV programs, does this disturb you?

very much	a fair amount	not much	not at all	don't know / no answer
6.4%	18.9%	55.0%	18.9%	0.9%

3. NHK 1991.3: (academics, researchers & teachers) Recently, do you feel that there are more *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* on TV than before?

Yes	No
93%	6%

4. NHK 1991.2: Recently, do you feel that there are more *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* on TV than before?

often	sometimes	not much	seldom	don't know
46.9%	34.4%	14.4%	2.5%	1.8%

5. NHK 1995.3: Do you think that there are a lot of *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* being used in newspapers and on TV?

a lot	rather a lot	rather few	few	don't know / no answer
29.8%	40.0%	17.9%	3.7%	8.8%

Of these surveys, the most comparable to the present study is NHK 1991.2. A combination of the top two options indicates that 90.3% thought there had been an increase, compared with 89.1% in the present sample. NHK 1995.3 produced a lower figure (69.8%), but the question referred to both TV and newspapers – domains with quite different levels according to the present survey. When combined, these two domains would produce a figure of around 72% in the present survey. Unfortunately, the 1982 survey cannot be used for comparison since it only referred to NHK broadcasts – a domain in which *gairaigo* could be expected to be much lower than on commercial broadcasts. Overall, there was no support for any longitudinal trend or hypothesis 5.1.

In addition, NHK 1995.3 included a question about the language domains in which *gairaigo/gaikokugo* were most actively used. The top choice was television and radio (67.8%) followed by, advertisements (53.1%), newspapers & magazines (49.9%), young people (37.2%), companies (28.8%), etc. Another question asked in which subject areas *gairaigo/gaikokugo* were used a lot. The top choice was advertisements followed by politics & economics, entertainment & leisure, and sports. These results also point to the media being domains of high usage.

Predictions of the future level of *gairaigo*

Over 90% of respondents thought that the level of *gairaigo* usage would increase in the future, and 17.4% thought that it would increase a lot.

Table 5.12: Q.4. What do you think the future level of *gairaigo* usage will be?

Option	Frequency	Valid %	Cumulative %
1. will increase a lot	162	17.4	17.4
2. will increase	685	73.4	90.8
3. won't change	81	8.7	99.5
4. will decrease	4	0.4	99.9
5. will decrease quite a lot	1	0.1	100.0
Total	933	100.0	

Comments (N=8) No comments were canvassed.

1. M. 30-34 (2): I think the situations in which we have to use *gairaigo* will increase, such as computer terminology.
2. F. 40-49 (2): *Katakanago* will increase.
3. F. 16-19 (2): I wonder if the Japanese language will become like English sometime in the future.
4. F. 20-24 (2): They will increase in academic areas.

5. F. 20-24 (2): I think that they will increase while these words are presented with explanations in the news and in magazines aimed at salarymen. *Kanji* were introduced over 1,000 years ago as a means of writing Japanese and we have become used to using them without resistance, but I don't think Euro-American words can become Japanese.
6. M. 20-24 (2): Japan is in transition to a multicultural condition, so they will increase due to cultural exchange.
7. M. 60-69 (3): Proper *gairaigo* won't change.
8. M. 16-19 (3): It depends on the person. A movement against the use of *gairaigo* may develop.

The issues of technology, business and media use were again raised, and academic use added. One person associated a *gairaigo* increase with Japan's increasing multicultural nature and another foresaw Japanese becoming like English. In contrast, one questioned whether *gairaigo* can become Japanese, while another predicted a reaction against *gairaigo*.

Demographic variables

The tendency to predict a large future increase in *gairaigo* generally rose with age (ρ = -0.081, p=0.013), from 13.7% in the 16-19 age-group to a peak of 25.0% in the 30-39 years group, with 21.7% of those aged 50 years and over. This lends support to hypothesis 4.3a. It is likely that those who have had longer to observe the increase in *gairaigo* would be more likely to predict a continuation of this trend, but confidence in predicting future trends may also decline after a certain age.

The relationship with English reading ability was curvilinear, with the largest proportions of respondents who chose the 'large increase' option being the highest level readers (38.9%) and the non-readers (29.5%). Level 2 and level 3 English readers were the least likely to choose this option. A similar relationship was found for English speaking level.

Relationship to other questions

Respondents who thought there had been an increase in *gairaigo* over the last 10 years also tended to predict a future increase (ρ = 0.326, p<0.001), but respondents tended to predict a lesser degree of increase in the future than over the previous ten years. Correlation with question 18 (ρ = 0.159, p<0.001) indicated that prediction of a future increase in *gairaigo* was associated with a prediction of a decrease in the amount of *kanji* used in everyday life.

Encounters with *gairaigo* that are not understood

In response to question 9, the majority (68.6%) said they sometimes encountered *gairaigo* that they could not understand, 15.5% said they frequently had this experience (see table 5.13), thereby supporting hypothesis 4.1c.

Table 5.13: Q.9. Do you notice that there are *gairaigo* that you do not understand in the language that you read or hear in everyday life?

Option	Frequency	Valid %	Cumulative %
1. frequently	144	15.5	15.5
2. sometimes	638	68.6	84.1
3. not often	131	14.1	98.2
4. seldom	17	1.8	100.0
Total	930	100.0	

Comments (N=5) No comments were canvassed.

1. M. 40-49 (1): Especially in the computer field, words that look like *gairaigo* are increasing year by year.
2. M. 40-49 (1): In everyday conversation *gairaigo* have been gradually increasing but in government and bureaucracy incomprehensible words have increased drastically in the last 10 years.
3. F. 40-49 (2): There are many instances where we directly adopt words that did not exist in Japanese, such as computer and specialist terms, and this creates discrimination in access to information. People use words with vague meanings (without knowing the meanings).
4. M. 40-49 (2): The mass media and newspapers should limit the use of *gairaigo* to those that cannot be expressed in Japanese.
5. F. 16-19 (2): Business terms have increased. They are used often on TV news, but it is a problem when I don't understand them.

Again, the media, technology, business, government and vagueness were raised. Comprehension difficulty was a focus but it was not confined to older people. The discrimination argument was raised and limiting *gairaigo* was suggested.

Demographic variables

There was a correlation with age (ρ = -0.112, p=0.001). As age rose, the proportion that frequently encountered *gairaigo* they did not understand generally increased, up to a peak of 24.6% in the 50 years plus group, thereby confirming hypothesis 4.3c. However, the lowest age-group was actually 20-29 years (10.8%) followed by 16-19 years (14.6%). Overall, an increase in frequency of encounter correlated with a decline in English reading level (ρ = -0.188, p<0.001). However, the relationship was not linear,

since the mid-level readers reported more frequent encounters with not understood *gairaigo* than the higher and lower levels. A similar pattern of results was found for English speaking ability. So hypothesis 4.4c was supported but only partially.

Relationship to other questions

There was a positive correlation between perceiving an increase in *gairaigo* (Q.1) and encountering not understood *gairaigo* (ρ = 0.178, p<0.001). The largest group (352) thought *gairaigo* had increased 'a lot' and encountered *gairaigo* they did not understand 'sometimes'.

Comparisons with other surveys

Questions in other surveys all specified particular language domains, so are included in the next section.

Encounters with *gairaigo* that are not understood in various domains

Responses to question 10 are presented in descending order in table 5.14. Overall, respondents were much more likely to encounter *gairaigo* they did not understand in the electronic and print media than in daily conversation, thereby supporting hypothesis 4.1d. Television and radio programs were highest, followed closely by advertisements and posters. Of the mass media, newspapers were the lowest at 25.6%. This pattern of results is very similar to that of question 8.

Table 5.14: Q.10. Where do you see or hear *gairaigo* that you do not know the meaning of? (in descending order of frequency)

Domain	Freq.	Proportion %
1. television and radio programs	623	67.8
2. advertisements and posters	609	66.3
5. magazines	531	57.8
3. various brochures and instruction manuals	465	50.6
4. newspapers	235	25.6
8. in conversations among children or young people	197	21.4
7. in conversation with friends or acquaintances	110	12.0
6. in the workplace or in school classes	92	10.0

Comments (N = 2) No comments were canvassed.

F. 20-24: broadcasts of Diet sessions

F. 20-24: the news

Comments were written elsewhere about not being able to understand *gairaigo/katakanago* in economics, computers, news, broadcasts of parliament, politics and government. A man (60-69 years) commented that children and young people use a lot of coined words in conversation (that he could not understand).

Demographic variables

No significant correlation was found between age and response to domains 1, 4, 5, 6 and 8. Domain 2 was weakly correlated with age (ρ = -0.074, p= 0.025), as was domain 3 (ρ = -0.074, p= 0.024), indicating that older people were somewhat more likely to encounter *gairaigo* they did not understand in these domains. However, in domain 7, a stronger correlation (ρ = 0.139, p<0.001) indicated that younger people were more likely than older people to encounter such *gairaigo* in conversations with friends (19.5% aged 16-19, compared with 4.9% aged 50 plus). So hypothesis 4.3c does not hold in all areas of language use.

For English reading level, no significant correlation was found in domains 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7, indicating that no matter what a person's language level, they encountered words they did not understand in the mass media at much the same perceived level. However, in the workplace or at school, the poorer a person's self-rated English reading ability, the more they chose this option (ρ = -0.132, p<0.001). Although this was the domain most infrequently chosen overall, 23.8% of non-readers chose it (compared with 0% of level 1 readers). This suggests that when a person's English ability is poor they have more problems with *gairaigo*, confirming hypothesis 4.4c. A similar correlation was found for conversations among young people and children (ρ = -0.085, p= 0.010). However, this relationship was somewhat curved, with the level 1 readers indicating this domain more than expected (23.5% compared with 17.3% of level 2 readers and 26.2% of non-readers).

Comparisons with other surveys

Other surveys have asked how often people encountered *gairaigo* they did not understand, but with a focus on television and newspapers (see table 5.15). The majority encountered *gairaigo* they did not understand at least sometimes. Compared with question 9 of the present survey (15.5%), the proportion of frequent encounters in Bunkachō 1997.1 was somewhat higher, but the focus was on TV and newspapers, whereas question 9 sampled the more general 'everyday life' which could be expected to be lower than the media. The NHK surveys of 1995 and 1996 showed even higher proportions.

If the positive options 'often', 'sometimes' and 'occasionally' are combined in order to allow comparison across surveys, the following proportions are obtained: NHK 1991.2

(57.7%), NHK 1991.3 (59%), NHK 1995.3 (67.1%), NHK 1996.3 (80.1%) and Bunkachō 1997.1 (89.2%). This suggests the proportion grew between 1991 and 1997, and lends support to hypothesis 5.2. However, the sudden increase between 1995 and 1996 does suggest these comparisons need to be regarded with caution.

Table 5.15: Results of previous studies of people's understanding of *gairaigo*

1. NHK 1991.2: Have you experienced trouble understanding *gairaigo/gaikokugo* that appeared on TV?

often	sometimes	not often	seldom	don't know
16.1%	41.6%	27.5%	13.8%	1.0%

2. NHK 1991.3: same question (to intellectuals)

9%	50%	25%	16%	1%

3. NHK 1995.3: Have you experienced trouble understanding *gairaigo/gaikokugo* that appeared on TV or in newspapers?

often	sometimes	not often	seldom	don't know / no answer
22.5%	44.6%	18.0%	11.6%	3.3%

4. NHK 1996.3: same question

25.6%	54.5%	14.9%	4.8%	0.2%

5. Bunkachō 1997.1: Have you experienced trouble understanding *katakanago* that appeared on TV or in newspapers?

often	sometimes	occasionally	never	don't know / no answer
17.1%	37.5%	34.6%	10.2%	0.6%

Discussion of findings

Comparisons between questions in different surveys are problematic due to differences in the samples, the time, context and the structure of the questions. Nevertheless, when a number of surveys are considered, and adjustments made for the form of questions and responses, similarities should become apparent. The results of the above questions in this survey are broadly congruent with those of other surveys. These similarities suggest that the data obtained is from a sample not dissimilar to those of other surveys.

The data obtained from the present and other surveys indicate most people perceive an increase in *gairaigo* in recent years. This confirms hypothesis 4.1a. While the proportions found in the surveys are not comparable with the data for the various print media reported in Chapter 1, the overall results are congruent between these sources. The results of question 8 support hypothesis 4.1b, that the mass media is the main domain of increase. Moreover, the results support the reports of researchers and commentators with regard to larger *gairaigo* increases in the electronic media,

advertising and magazines compared with newspapers. The contrast between the newer media and the personal domains points to these media being conduits for new *gairaigo*.

As expected, in support of hypothesis 4.1c, a majority of people reported experiencing difficulties comprehending *gairaigo*. Moreover, this was in relation to the same mass media domains in which the largest increases were reported. This supports hypothesis 4.1d and the research and comment reported in earlier chapters. The results also suggest that while comprehension of newer *gairaigo* is a significant phenomenon, the majority of people only encounter this problem sometimes. The correlation between level of increase and frequency of comprehension problems, suggests that it is incomprehensible *gairaigo* that are the most salient, and the more of these a person encounters, the more they think the level of *gairaigo* is increasing.

The notion that the increase in *gairaigo* is more of an issue for older people (hypothesis 4.3a) is supported by the data. While it is hardly surprising that younger people reported less of an increase, the level of response reported by the youngest age group was still high. This suggests that the rate of increase has been great enough for even the youngest age group to notice it. As reported in the literature, the use of *gairaigo* appears greater amongst younger people. Older people tended to encounter more *gairaigo* in conversations with younger people than with their peers. Such an effect could be attributable to vocabulary differences between generations, but young people in the lowest age group also reported an increase with their peers and an even greater increase in conversations with children. In contrast, young people reported a lower level of increase at school than older people reported in the workplace. These results suggest that school is not a major conduit for new *gairaigo* for young people, even though that is where they would learn English.

Comprehension difficulties tended to increase with age, supporting hypothesis 4.3b, but these were present in all age groups, and the generations tended to agree on the language domains that presented the greatest difficulties. However, in conversations with friends, it was the younger people who were more like to encounter comprehension problems, presumably as a result of the greater frequency of *gairaigo* use.

The role of a person’s English language ability presented a complex picture. Those with higher English skills tended to notice a greater increase and predict a greater future

increase than the other levels. With regard to comprehension, those whose English skills were poorest tended to have more difficulties. This suggests English ability assists with understanding *gairaigo* and supports hypothesis 4.4c. However, both the high level readers and the poor readers were more inclined than the medium level readers to think *gairaigo* were used too much. It appears that when a person's confidence in English is high they are less tolerant of *gairaigo* than those who have learnt, or are in the process of learning, some English. Such people may find that *gairaigo* derived from English reinforce their memory or their learning, while those who already know these words from English may find the Japanised versions irritating. These results appear not to support hypothesis 4.4d, but in view of the somewhat ambiguous nature of question 2 this cannot be decided until the next chapter.

The comments revealed that respondents were concerned with similar issues to those of commentators. These included, comprehension difficulties, level of use in the mass media, technical and business terms, use by government and politicians and vagueness. Of particular concern were newly coined terms which some respondents took care to distinguish from naturalised *gairaigo*. Despite these concerns, there was only one call for limits on *gairaigo*. Other respondents were either unconcerned about *gairaigo* or saw them in a positive light, such as the young man who associated an increase in *gairaigo* with greater cultural exchange.

CHAPTER 6

SURVEY RESULTS 2: ATTITUDES TO GAIRAIGO USE

This chapter reports responses to the following questions and discusses them in relation to other surveys:

Q.3 and Q.5. General attitudes to *gairaigo*

Q.6. General responses to the use of a lot of *gairaigo*

Q.11. Emotional responses to encountering *gairaigo* that are not understood

Q.12. Responses to new *gairaigo* that have been learned

Q.13. Feelings about *gairaigo* users and use

Opinions on the way *gairaigo* are currently used

In question 2 it was not clear whether an opinion or an objective assessment was required, but question 3 directly examined attitude to current *gairaigo* usage. The majority (59.6%) was ambivalent, however the minority who did decide tended to be negative (28.9%). Nevertheless, strongly negative or positive opinions accounted for only 3.9% (see table 6.1).

Table 6.1: Q.3. What do you think of the way *gairaigo* are used in current Japanese?

Option	Frequency	Valid %	Cumulative %
1. think it's very good	11	1.2	1.2
2. think it's good	95	10.1	11.3
3. cannot say good or not	558	59.6	71.1
4. don't think it's very good	245	26.2	97.3
5. don't think it's good at all	25	2.7	100.0
Total	936	100.0	

Comments (N=10) No comments were canvassed.

English reading level is given in [ ].

1. M. 20-24 (2)[2]: In regard to abbreviated words in common use e.g. *PC, CAI gakushū, LDjidō,* [it is good].
2. F. 20-24 (3)[3]: Sometimes they are not being used according to the original meaning but it still produces a friendly feeling, so I can't say whether it is good or bad.
3. F. 35-39 (3)[4]: But there are also times when I don't like it.
4. F. 20-24 (3)[3]: It depends on the situation.
5. M. 40-49 (3)[4]: Depending on the particular word, there are times when something is better expressed using *gaikokugo*, but it is more often the case that the correct Japanese is lost.

6. M. 35-39 (3)[2]: The *katakana* words used in specialist areas, such as computers and economics, are incomprehensible.
7. F. 40-49 (3)[3]: This seems to be the fashion but I want people to use Japanese words when they are there.
8. M. 30-34 (3)[3]: If *ryūkōgo* are included in *gairaigo*, I think it is not desirable (there are often cases where they are used contrary to the original meaning, There are many cases of incorrect use).
9. F. 20-24 (4)[2]: Strangely, every one pays attention to these words, so I wonder if they (the users) are enjoying the feeling of being superior by using English etc.
10. F. 20-24 (5)[3]: Since they are combined with Japanese in a grammatically incorrect manner, the number of unattractive sentences is increasing.

The comments show that option 3 is not just an expression of no opinion – people had different views of *gairaigo* according to the situation but could not label them as all good or all bad.

Demographic variables

There was a significant tendency (ρ = 0.079, p= 0.016) for older people to dislike the way *gairaigo* were used (42.6% in 50 years plus) more than younger people (26.2% in 16-19 years), and a corresponding difference with regard to approval of the way *gairaigo* were used (10.6% in 16-19 years; 9.8% in 50 years plus). There was no correlation with English reading level, due to the highest levels of disapproval being in the top-level readers (50.0%) and the non-readers (34.0%) with the medium level readers being less disapproving. On the other hand, approval tended to increase as reading level fell (5.6% in top-level and 22.7% in non-readers).

Relationship to other questions

There was a negative correlation with question 1 (ρ = -0.132, p<0.001, V=0.125), indicating the more the perceived increase, the less positive the view on how *gairaigo* were used. However, the largest sub-group (296) thought *gairaigo* had increased a lot but were neutral regarding usage. As might be expected, there was a strong negative correlation between questions 2 and 3 (ρ = -0.388, p<0.001, V=0.257), indicating that those who thought *gairaigo* were used too much tended to view current usage negatively. Even so, this sub-group was quite small (87), compared with 326 who thought *gairaigo* were used a lot but took a neutral view. Frequency of encounter with *gairaigo* that are not understood (Q.9) correlated with opinion on the way *gairaigo* were used (ρ = -0.176, p<0.001, V=0.124), indicating the more frequently such *gairaigo*

were encountered the more negative the opinion of them. Nevertheless, by far the largest group (387) encountered such *gairaigo* 'sometimes' and 'could not say' whether the way *gairaigo* were used was good or bad. The next largest group (166) also encountered them 'sometimes' but thought usage was 'not very good'. So, although incomprehension was linked to a negative opinion, supporting hypothesis 4.2a, the negativity was not extreme.

Discussion

The preponderance of 'cannot say' responses suggests most people are ambivalent about *gairaigo*, but the comments, most of which were from such respondents, suggest that within this apparently noncommittal stance lay a variety of more complex viewpoints. When faced with deciding whether *gairaigo* were good or bad, at least some people could not decide, since they could think of both good and bad instances. The issues raised against *gairaigo* tended to focus on meaning, with a number being concerned over the proper use of *gairaigo* according to the meaning in the source language. There were three comments on the negative impact on Japanese.

As age increased so did disapproval of the way gairaigo are used, thereby supporting hypothesis 4.3b. Approval did not increase with English level so, hypothesis 4.4a was not supported. Rather, the data suggest the opposite effect. Amongst the comments, no effects for age or English ability were found.

Comparisons with other surveys

In the present, and most of the other surveys, more respondents tended to disapprove of *gairaigo* use than approved (see table 6.2). However, in light of the large proportion of 'cannot say' responses found in this survey and 'no feelings' in the Sōrifu and Bunkachō surveys, it seems that, while more people had a negative attitude than a positive one, the majority of people neither strongly liked nor disliked, or had mixed feelings about *gairaigo*. In the Bunkachō surveys both approval and disapproval increased between 2000 and 2002 and disapproval also increased with age.

The NHK surveys are less comparable since they focused on the news media. The increase in approval of *gairaigo* in the NHK surveys was interpreted as an increasing generosity towards *gairaigo* usage in mass communications. However, in both the 1979 and 1996 surveys the generation gap was pronounced. In 1979, the balance between liking and disliking shifted in the late 30s and 40s. In NHK 1996.3, this border was found in the 50s and 60s. This was interpreted as indicating that disapproval of *gairaigo*

usage was not something that grew with age, but was related to the attitudes of the pre and postwar generations (Kajiki, 1996a).

Table 6.2: Results of other studies with regard to like/dislike of current *gairaigo* usage

1. Sōrifu 1977.8: Do you like the way *gairaigo* and *kaikokugo* are used in everyday life?

like it	don't know	no feelings	do not like it
9.8%	7.8%	48.8%	33.6%

2. Bunkachō 2000.1: (same question as above)

13.3%	2.4%	48.8%	35.5%

3. Bunkachō 2002.11: (as above)

16.2%	2.0%	45.1%	36.6%

4. NHK 1979.9: What do you think of the frequent use of *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* on TV and in newspapers?

good	all right	don't know	not so good	not good
6.7%	36.6%	7.4%	40.1%	9.1%

5. NHK 1986.2: (as above)

good/all right	don't know	not so good/not good
35.3%	8.4%	56.3%

6. NHK 1996.3: (as above)

good	all right	don't know	not so good	not good
15.9%	43.5%	4.4%	29.8%	6.4%

Overall, no clear pattern emerged but there disapproval did not increase over time, so hypothesis 5.3 was not supported. If anything, approval appeared to increase.

Opinion on a possible future increase in *gairaigo*

Question 5 rephrased question 3, so that it referred to the indefinite future and focused on the level of *gairaigo* in use, rather than the way it was used. The majority (55.5%) was not willing to express an opinion on this question. Of those who did give an opinion, 15.7% thought a future increase in *gairaigo* usage was good, while 28.7% thought that it was not good (see table 6.3).

Table 6.3: Q.5. If the level of *gairaigo* usage were to increase in the future, what would you think?

Option	Frequency	Valid %	Cumulative %
1. very good	16	1.7	1.7
2. good	130	14.0	15.7
3. cannot say good or not	516	55.5	71.3
4. not very good	236	25.4	96.7
5. not good at all	31	3.3	100.0
Total	929	100.0	

Comments (N=168) People were asked to comment and 168 did so (17.7% of males & 19.9% of females with no correlation with age). The following are examples, arranged by category.

a. Difficulties in understanding and remembering *gairaigo*, and in communication (n=41)

F. 16-19 (3)[4]: Of the *gairaigo* that are used, there are many specialist terms that I don't understand.

F. 20-24 (3)[5]: It will be difficult to learn *gairaigo* when I get old. I'm also concerned that I won't be able to speak correct Japanese.

M. 35-39 (3)[3]: The transfer of ideas will become not smooth. (also F. 20-24, M. 20-24(4), and M. 16-19(4))

F. 40-49 (4)[5]: It is a real problem understanding and remembering them.

F. 16-19 (4)[3]: It is a problem if incomprehensible words increase.

F. 40-49 (4)[3]: The transfer of ideas will become difficult. If each person uses them with a different meaning, wrong usage will increase.

F. 20-24 (4)[4]: Too many people use them without understanding the meaning. (also 8 others with similar comments)

F. 20-24 (4)[4]: I think the number of people who use them without understanding the correct definition will increase.

F. 20-24 (4)[5]: Even though *gairaigo* use increases, many people use them without understanding the meaning and sentences become hard to understand.

F. 20-24 (4)[3]: There are many instances of incorrect usage.

F. 20-24 (4)[4]: The number of people who use them without understanding the correct definition will increase.

F. 20-24 (3)[3]: It is a problem if the number of people who use them without understanding increases even more. I have a tough time trying to figure out what such people want to say. However, if people understand then it is OK.

F. 25-29 (3)[4]: I think one's opinion becomes vague.

F. 20-24 (4)[4]: The meaning of words will become vague. (also 10 others with similar comments)

M. 16-19 (5)[2]: There are many words the meaning of which is incomprehensible.

b. Causes social division based on age, knowledge (n=7)

F. 16-19 (4)[5]: I don't think children and old people can understand them. (also 4 others with similar comments)

F. 16-19 (4)[2]: I think elderly people mostly don't understand, so I want them to stop using *gairaigo* in the news.

F. 16-19 (4)[4]: They are difficult for elderly people to understand, so *gairaigo* should be

replaced by Japanese that everyone can understand.

F. 16-19 (4)[3]: The idea that the more *gairaigo* you know, the more intellectual you are, will probably become more prevalent.

F. 40-49 (4)[2]: The number of *gairaigo* in computers and other technical fields being directly adopted into Japanese results in discrimination in access to information.

c. Gave conditions for the use of *gairaigo* (n=40)

Understanding

F. 16-19 (3)[3]: If people can understand the meaning properly, it is OK. (also 8 others with similar comments)

F. 40-49 (3)[2]: If translating into Japanese will bring misunderstanding then *gairaigo* are OK. (also 2 others with similar comments)

M. 20-24 (3)[3]: *Gairaigo* are OK as long as it is within the range that anybody can understand.

F. 35-39 (3)[4]: They are necessary for introduction of new technology, but overuse of *gairaigo* in everyday life is not good. (also another with same opinion)

F. 20-24 (4)[4]: Technical terms can't be helped, but they are unpleasant in everyday conversation.

No term in Japanese

F. 25-29 (2)[3]: It is OK to use *gairaigo* for things which do not exist in Japanese. However, replacing words that already exist in Japanese is not good (also 3 others).

F. 16-19 (3)[2]: It is necessary to use *gairaigo* when there are no corresponding words in Japanese, but it is not good to use them to look cool.

M. 35-39 (3)[5]: *Gairaigo* which are used with the correct meaning are good, however, *waseieigo* or words coined by the mass media are not good.

F. 16-19 (3)[4]: It is weird to use them when there is no need.

M. 30-34 (4)[2]: It is generally better to avoid *gairaigo*, but it is better to use them when there is no Japanese word that fits exactly and conveys the same nuance.

M. 30-34 (5)[4]: Where there are no Japanese words that fit, that is a different case. But there are instances when *gairaigo* are intentionally used (often with incorrect meaning) even though there already is a Japanese word.

International effect

F. 25-29 (2)[1]: I think it is good that it makes foreign languages feel closer, but unless the usage is correct this is meaningless.

F. 35-39 (3)[4]: It would be good if the increase in *gairaigo* would remove the distance between foreign languages and enable Japanese (who live in an island country) to manage daily conversation in English at least. However, *gairaigo* should be used correctly.

F. 20-24 (3)[3]: I think the familiarity aspect (with foreign things) is good, but I am doubtful

[about this benefit] when the pronunciation and meaning is not correct.

M. 30-34 (3)[3]: The best way is if they are used correctly for internationalisation, not as fad words.

F. 20-24 (3)[3]: It is OK that *gairaigo* increase, however, I want to treasure Japanese as well. I think Japanese tend to be attracted to foreign things, but I want people to treasure Japanese language and tradition. *Gairaigo* have good and bad points.

F. 20-24 (5)[4]: At this time of internationalisation I think it helps to understand the original language of the *gairaigo* to some extent, however, I think they will create lots of misunderstanding as well.

d. Use with the original meaning and pronunciation (n=9)

M. 20-24 (2)[3]: It is OK if the meaning is the same as in the original language.

F. 20-24 (3)[3]: I think it is good when they are used with the correct (i.e. original) meaning.

M. 16-19 (4)[3]: Foreign words should be pronounced correctly. (also 4 others)

M. 40-49 (4)[2]: It is all right to use them with the correct pronunciation but Japanised *gairaigo* are not good.

F. 20-24 (4)[3]: It is not good to use them with a meaning that ignores the original meaning.

e. Criticism of Japanised forms (n=4)

M. 50-59 (2)[3]: There are many Japanised translated words, this is not true internationalisation.

M. 16-19 (3)[2]: *Waseieigo* etc are confusing, so a lot of these should not be used.

M. 16-19 (4)[4]: There are ones that are used in Japan, but not in the original country.

M. 60-69 (no response)[1]: The influx of coined words is not good.

f. Loss of Japanese language and culture, need for Japanese to be used (n=43)

M. 60-69 (4)[4]: There will only be people who do not know the unique Japanese culture.

F. 16-19 (5)[4]: Old Japanese traditions and culture will not be handed down.

F. 20-24 (5)[3]: The beauty of *Yamato-kotoba* will be spoiled, so from the viewpoint of preserving Japanese culture an increase in *gairaigo* is not good.

M. 40-49 (4)[4]: I am worried that under the current conditions where the level of language use is shallow and narrow, the overuse of *gairaigo* will lower the cultural level (even further).

F. 20-24 (4)[3]: I am concerned about the general atmosphere of looking down on the Japanese language.

F. 40-49 (4)[2]: I think the tendency to degrade the *Yamato kotoba* will get stronger.

F. 25-29 (4)[2]: I am concerned that language that can convey the unique nuance of Japanese will be lost.

F. 20-24 (5)[3]: Even now there are many Japanese who cannot speak Japanese properly and more *gairaigo* will just accelerate this phenomenon.

F. 16-19 (5)[6]: If it can be said in Japanese there is no need for *gairaigo.*

g. Advantages of *gairaigo* (n=17)

F. 20-24 (1)[4]: I think we will learn some foreign language naturally and be able to communicate with foreigners even though it is in broken speech.

M. 20-24 (2)[3]: Various cultures will come in via *gairaigo*.

F. 30-34 (2)[6]: My desire for knowledge will be increased.

M. 20-24 (2)[3]: I think it is no problem if they are international words.

M. 16-19 (2)[4]: It is convenient.

F. 16-19 (2)[3]: It is not a bad thing for the vocabulary to be increased. It is not necessarily the case that Japanese words are better.

M. 40-49 (2)[2]: In the case of business and technology, translated Japanese terms sometimes cannot convey the correct meaning of what is happening in Europe and America.

F. 20-24 (2)[2]: It is difficult to convey the fine nuance using translated Japanese words, therefore it is better to use foreign words just as they are, in order to convey the intention.

M. 25-29 (3)[4]: There are cases where *gairaigo* are better at conveying nuance. (another the same)

M. 35-39 (3)[4]: There is no need to translate into Japanese. If we use Japan-made-*gairaigo* with awareness, it is an interesting feature of Japanese culture.

M. 16-19 (3)[2]: Sometimes they are useful for English examinations.

h. Not concerned or thought change inevitable (n=7)

F. 20-24 (3)[3]: An increase in *gairaigo* wouldn't change things much.

M. 35-39 (3)[4]: Language is culture so it is obvious that it will change. In an information society the increase in *gairaigo* is unavoidable.

M. 20-24 (3)[3]: Even if Japanese changes as a result of the increase in *gairaigo*, it is natural for languages to change.

As with previous questions, the comments revealed a wide range of opinions within option 3. Meaning, in a variety of forms, seems to be the predominant concern of respondents, whether they approved or disapproved of *gairaigo*. *Gairaigo* tended to be bad when they were incomprehensible (in general or to certain groups), vague or used with the incorrect meaning, and good when they were clear, useful, introduced a new concept or added a nuance. *Waseieigo* and other coinages were not well regarded but *gairaigo* were frequently associated with internationalisation. Concern over the loss or spoilage of Japanese culture and language was expressed by a sizeable proportion of respondents. These included people from a range of age groups, so these views were not just the preserve of the elderly. There was no discernible effect for English level.

Demographic variables

Age did not correlate with response to question 5 so hypothesis 4.3d was not supported, Younger people tended to be less disapproving of a future increase (29.7% in 16-19 years compared with 37.3% in 50 years plus), but there was also considerable polarisation of opinion throughout the age-groups. There was no correlation with English level so hypothesis 4.4b was not supported.

Relationship to other questions

Q.1. Those who thought *gairaigo* had increased a lot tended to view a future increase more negatively (ρ = -0.074, p=0.023, V=0.103), but the largest group took a neutral view.

Q.3. A strong correlation (ρ = 0.595, p<0.001, V=0.488) indicated that people who did not approve of the way *gairaigo* were currently used, did not approve of a future increase, and vice versa. So hypothesis 4.2b is supported.

Q.9. Opinion on a future increase in *gairaigo* becomes more negative the more often a person encounters *gairaigo* they do not understand (ρ = -0.136, p<0.001, V=0.114), supporting hypothesis 4.2a.

Comparisons with other surveys

The most comparable to the present survey question is NHK 1983.10-12. In surveys 2 and 3, the questions are similar but the response options are not directly comparable to the present survey, since they do not allow a clearly ambivalent option. Surveys 3 and 5 have similar options but a leading question is used in survey 5. Despite these differences, most surveys indicate that, while the majority took either a noncommittal or a tolerant view of a future *gairaigo* increase, there was also a significant group opposing *gairaigo*. Only survey 4 demonstrated the opposite, but the question in this case referred specifically to television.

Excluding survey 4, in the 1990s more people were tolerant of a future increase than were intolerant. This was in sharp contrast to the 1983 survey, if only the ‘good’ option is considered, but if the first two options are combined (57.4%) it is almost the same as in 1995 (57.9%). In the case of intolerance, in 1991, this was 45.5% in survey 2 and 32.4% in survey 3, while in 1995 it was 47.0%. None of these figures point to a longitudinal increase in negative views over this period. So hypothesis 5.3 is not supported.

Table 6.4: Results of other studies with regard to a future increase in *gairaigo*

1. NHK 1983.10-12: If *katakana* words were to increase in the future, what would you think?

good	can't be helped	no particular feeling	not good
8.6%	48.8%	8.4%	33.6%

2. NHK 1991.2: If *gairaigo/gaikokugo* were to increase in the future, what would you think?

like it	all right	don't like it much	don't like it	don't know/no answer
12.4%	34.4%	34.2%	11.3%	7.7%

3. NHK 1991.11: If *gairaigo/gaikokugo* were to increase in the future, what would you think?

don't mind how much it increases	it's OK if it increases a little	better not to increase	better if it decreases	don't know / no answer
16.4%	47.6%	27.2%	5.2%	3.6%

4. NHK 1991.3: If *gairaigo/gaikokugo* on TV were to increase in the future, what would you think?

like it	can't say either	don't like it
9%	37%	54%

5. Bunkachō 1995.4: There is the opinion that *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* are seen and heard more in everyday life recently. If this were to increase more in the future, what would you think?

don't mind how much it increases	it's OK if it increases a little	better not to increase more	better if it decreases	don't know / no answer
13.1%	44.8%	40.4%	6.6%	5.0%

Discussion

While the majority was unwilling to evaluate a future increase in *gairaigo* as simply good or bad, there were more who rated such a development negatively than positively. Nevertheless, neither the results of this survey, nor those of most of the other surveys, suggested a great degree of concern about a general increase in *gairaigo*. Overall, there appears to be a wide range of viewpoints ranging from acceptance of any degree of increase to a desire for decrease. Of the comments, many were from people who disapproved of *gairaigo* due to problems with comprehension, followed by concerns about the effects on Japanese language and culture. Nevertheless, a considerable number commented on the proper use of *gairaigo*, and a smaller proportion commented on the positive features of *gairaigo*.

It could be expected that those concerned with the current level of use would be even more concerned with a further increase in the future, but when questions 3 and 5 are compared very similar proportions are found. The correlation with question 9 indicates that as comprehension problems increase so do negative views towards *gairaigo*.

Responses to the use of a lot of *gairaigo*

Question 6 aimed to determine whether a person experienced a negative emotional reaction to hearing a lot of *gairaigo* being used. The Japanese expression *ki-ni-naru* was used to gauge this, since it combines both the sense of conspicuousness and disturbance. This has been translated into English as 'disturb'. The majority reported feeling disturbed when they heard *gairaigo* a lot. This was hardly surprising, since, whenever a person feels that 'a lot' of *gairaigo* are being used, they also likely to be experiencing at least some level of a *ki-ni-naru* feeling. What is perhaps more salient is the 44% who were not disturbed, even when they heard a lot of *gairaigo* being used. This suggests that many people were rather tolerant of *gairaigo* use.

Table 6.5: Q.6. When you see or hear *gairaigo* being used a lot in everyday language, does it disturb you?

Option	Frequency	Valid %	Cumulative %
1. a lot	50	5.4	5.4
2. a fair bit	472	50.6	56.0
3. doesn't affect me	269	28.9	84.9
4. doesn't disturb me	112	12.0	96.9
5. doesn't disturb me at all	29	3.1	100.0
Total	932	100.0	

Comments (N=3) No comments were canvassed.

M. 60-69 (1): Because in many cases both the pronunciation and meaning are not correct.

M. 30-34 (2): I am annoyed when I can't get the meaning and it is possible to express it simply in Japanese.

F. 16-19 (2): In addition, *gairaigo*-like slang has increased, such as *shibukaji, deehaa* etc.

The person who was most disturbed was concerned over the inaccurate use of *gairaigo* rather than the fact of its use.

Demographic variables

As age increased, so did the tendency to feel disturbed (ρ = -0.137, p<0.001), supporting hypothesis 4.3b. Only 2.9% of 20-29 year-olds felt very disturbed, compared to 14.8% of people aged 50 years and over.

English reading ability was not correlated with response, but the top-level readers were much more disturbed than any other group (84.4% overall, with 16.7% being very disturbed), so hypothesis 4.4a was not supported.

Relationship to other questions

Feeling disturbed correlated with question 1 (ρ = 0.175, p<0.001, V=0.136), and more strongly with question 2 (ρ = 0.398, p<0.001, V=0.277). This indicated the more a person thought *gairaigo* had increased, the more disturbed they were likely to feel. As would be expected, the more a person felt disturbed, the less they liked the way *gairaigo* were used (Q.3) (ρ = -0.338, p<0.001, V=0.237), and the less they would like a future increase (Q.5) (ρ = -0.300, p<0.001, V=0.215). Even so, the largest sub-group were disturbed a fair amount but took a neutral view towards the way *gairaigo* were used, both now and in the future. A strong correlation (ρ = 0.329, p<0.001, V=0.222) with question 9 indicated the more frequently a person encountered a *gairaigo* they did not understand, the more disturbed they were likely to feel. These results support hypotheses 4.2a and 4.2b.

Discussion

Even though the proportion of those who felt disturbed a lot was low, more than half felt disturbed at least a fair amount. This is quite high, considering the age effect and the large proportion of younger respondents in this sample. One difficulty with interpretation is '*ki-ni-naru*' may have different meanings to different people. On one hand, people may feel disturbed because they do not like *gairaigo*, as shown by the correlation with question 3, but this feeling may also be provoked by not understanding the *gairaigo*, as suggested by the correlation with question 9 and comments 2 and 3. The high level of disturbance amongst top-level English readers may be due to this group having a different view of the meaning of 'a lot'. Since they know English well, English-derived *gairaigo* may also be more salient and hard to ignore, making this group particularly sensitive to *gairaigo* usage.

Comparisons with other surveys

Surveys 1 and 2 (see table 6.6) are fairly comparable and show a decline in strong *ki-ni-naru* feeling during the 1980s. The present survey is most comparable to *Yomiuri* 1989.11 and shows a similar proportion of disturbed feeling overall. Options 3, 4, and 5 are somewhat difficult to interpret since they are all versions of not feeling disturbed. Nevertheless, all surveys showed that over half the group felt at least a little disturbed. Over time, this proportion declined while the not disturbed proportion increased.

Table 6.6: Results of other studies with regard to *ki-ni-naru* feeling

1. NHK 1982.6: Are you disturbed by there being a lot of *gairaigo/gaikokugo*?

very much	a fair bit	not much	not at all
12.8%	53.8%	28.9%	4.0%

2. *Yomiuri* 1989.11: When you see or hear *gairaigo/gaikokugo* being used a lot in everyday language, does it disturb you?

very much	a fair bit	not much	not at all	no answer
12.2%	36.6%	37.6%	11.8%	1.9%

3. NHK 1991.11: Recently, a lot of *katakana* words have been used in TV program titles, does this disturb you?

very much	a fair bit	not much	not at all	no answer/don't know
6.4%	18.9%	55.0%	18.9%	0.9%

The results of these surveys do not support hypothesis 5.3. To the contrary, they suggest negative views toward *gairaigo* have decreased.

Feelings experienced when hearing *gairaigo* that are not understood

Respondents' reactions to *gairaigo* they did not understand can be broadly grouped into those that expressed a lack of concern (1,8), a negative reaction (2,3,4,5), and a positive reaction (6,7) (see table 6.7).

Table 6.7: Q.11. What sort of feeling do you get when you see or hear *gairaigo* that you do not know? (Choose as many as you like from the following)

Option	Count	% Responses	% Cases
1. not feel anything	91	5.7	9.9
2. feel irritated	93	5.8	10.1
3. feel unpleasant	160	10.0	17.4
4. feel ashamed	89	5.6	9.7
5. feel worried I'm behind the times	275	17.3	29.9
6. want to know meaning right away	515	32.3	55.9
7. feel impressed by the person using it	62	3.9	6.7
8. ignore it	40	2.5	4.3
9. think it should be said in Japanese	230	14.4	25.0
10. other	39	2.4	4.2
Totals (921 valid cases)	1,594	100.0	173.1

Negative emotional reactions (2,3,4) were fairly few, accounting for only 21.4% of total responses. By far the most common response was wanting to know the meaning right away (given by 55.9% of respondents), while 25% preferred Japanese words to be used, but this did not preclude 107 of them from also wanting to know the meaning. It seems that there is a degree of acceptance of new *gairaigo,* even amongst those who prefer it not to be used. Feeling worried about being behind the times was a common response, confirming the association of *gairaigo* with being up-to-date.

Comments (N=36) Examples of comments are grouped by category.

a. Learn the meaning (n=9)

F. 16-19: I don't know whether I'll use that word or not but to improve my vocabulary I'll check the meaning.

F. 25-29: I want to know the meaning.

F. 35-39: I think I have learned a new thing.

F. 16-19: I wonder what it means.

F. 16-19: I want to know what meaning the word is being used for.

F. 20-24: I try to figure out the meaning.

F. 20-24: I'll ask the meaning.

F. 30-34: I'll check it.

M. 30-34: Because there are some words that I must know for work (I want to know).

b. Troubled by not knowing the meaning (n=7)

M. 16-19: I get frustrated, in the case of English.

F. 16-19: I become puzzled wondering what it means.

F. 60-69: Sometimes it is a problem because I don't understand.

M. 20-24: I don't feel ashamed but it bothers me anyway.

F. 20-24: I wonder what it means.

F. 16-19: I try to figure it out from the context, however, I somehow feel dissatisfied.

F. 20-24: I think I'm behind the times.

c. Doubt the user knows the meaning (n=3)

F. 20-24: I doubt the user really understands the meaning.

F. 20-24: I wonder how many people understand the meaning.

M. 40-49: I'm suspicious about the motives of the person who used them.

d. Negative opinions of the user (n=4)

F. 20-24: I look down on the user.

M. 40-49: The user looks shallow.

F. 20-24: It is laughable.

M. 20-24: I think it is ridiculous.

e. Japanese should be used (n=6)

M. 40-49: I want the Japanese meaning to be added as well.

F. 70+: I want specialist terms to be explained.

M. 40-49: I think it is OK to use them if translating them changes the meaning.

F. 35-39: You shouldn't just use them, it is preferable to express it with a Japanese explanation so it is easy to understand.

M. 40-49: I often think they should say it in Japanese.

M. 16-19: *Gairaigo* should not be used for what you can easily say in Japanese.

f. Miscellaneous (n=3)

F. 20-24: I don't feel anything.

F. 30-34: It is natural that a language changes, it is a living thing.

F. 20-24: There are none that I don't know the meaning of.

Most comments (56%) were concerned with meaning. Not knowing the meaning could be an opportunity for learning, a cause for worry, or a stimulus for suspicion of the user's knowledge or personality. Even amongst those who said Japanese should be used (17%), most were concerned with knowing the meaning and wanted the *gairaigo* explained in Japanese as well, rather than not using *gairaigo* at all.

Demographic variables

There were no overall correlations with age-group. Tendency to feel ashamed declined as English reading level increased (ρ = -0.090, p=0.006).

Relationship to other questions

With regard to other questions, the correlations indicated a general consistency in positive or negative attitudes to *gairaigo*.

Liking the way *gairaigo* were used (Q.3) correlated with feeling impressed by the user (ρ = 0.109, p =0.001), and with wanting to know the meaning right away (ρ = 0.164, p <0.001), but 45.6% of those who thought the way *gairaigo* were used was not so good still wanted to know the meaning.

Feeling disturbed (Q.6) was correlated with feeling behind the times (ρ = 0.090, p =0.007), but not with wanting to know the meaning straight away.

Those who said they were worried they were behind the times tended to encounter more *gairaigo* they did not understand (ρ = 0.157, p <0.001). They were also more likely to start using new *gairaigo* (ρ = 0.103, p =0.002), as did those who wanted to know the meaning right away (ρ = 0.192, p <0.001).

Those who said it should be said in Japanese tended to encounter more *gairaigo* they did not understand (ρ = 0.169, p <0.001), be more disturbed (ρ = 0.218, p <0.001) and tended not to use new *gairaigo* they learned (ρ = -0.221, p <0.001), thereby supporting hypotheses 4.2a and 4.2e.

Discussion

Considering the large proportion who reported in Q.6 they were disturbed by *gairaigo* they did not understand (56%), the number of clearly negative responses was rather low (35.8%). This suggests a proportion of those who felt disturbed were more worried about being behind the times, than experiencing a specifically negative reaction to *gairaigo*. This was borne out by the lack of correlation with wanting to know the meaning. Wanting to know the meaning straight away was not only characteristic of a positive or tolerant attitude to *gairaigo*, it was also a response from those who held moderately negative views. The primacy of this response, and the focus of the comments, all pointed to knowing the meaning being the principal consideration amongst respondents. Of all the options, that of thinking it should be said in Japanese seems to represent the most anti-*gairaigo* viewpoint. This was borne out by the correlation with not using new *gairaigo*. However, the comments suggest that a proportion of these people did not mean that *gairaigo* should not be used at all, but that a Japanese explanation should be included. The correlation with option 4 and English reading ability showed that better English translated into greater confidence in the face of new *gairaigo*.

Responses to new *gairaigo* that have been learned

If a person decides to use a new word that they have learned, we can assume they accept its usage. Therefore question 12 provided an indirect assessment of attitude to *gairaigo*. Nonetheless, the behaviour polled in this question could also be affected by a general attitude towards innovation or risk taking.

Table 6.8: Q.12. Are you enthusiastic about beginning to use new *gairaigo* that you have learned the meaning of in your everyday conversation?

Option	Frequency	Valid %	Cumulative %
1. often start using them	42	4.6	4.6
2. sometimes start using them	380	41.3	45.8
3. don't start using them much	389	42.2	88.1
4. seldom use them	95	10.3	98.4
5. will not use them	15	1.6	100.0
Total	921	100.0	

Comments (N=3) No comments were canvassed.

F. 20-24 (2): Sometimes, according to necessity.
M. 40-49 (2): Very little.
M. 40-49 (3): I've tried out using them once.

Of the options, the only one that demonstrates a strongly negative reaction to *gairaigo* is option 5, which very few people chose. When options 4 and 5 were combined, 11.9% could be said to have been unenthusiastic about using new *gairaigo*, compared to 45.9% (options 1 & 2) who were willing to start using them. Regarding the 42.2% of hesitant responses, these could represent a dislike for *gairaigo* or a general hesitancy towards using new words. The comments suggest that options 2 and 3 may represent very similar behaviours, i.e. occasional use.

Demographic variables

Age did not correlate with starting to use new *gairaigo*, so hypothesis 4.3e was not supported. However, the oldest age group (17%) and the youngest (14.2%) were the most negative about starting to use them.

Overall, as English reading level rose, so did the use of new *gairaigo* (ρ =0.087, p= 0.008), thereby supporting hypothesis 4.4.d. But the relationship was actually more complex. Non-readers were more polarised in their response than other groups, with 11.6% saying they used new *gairaigo* often, 27.9% sometimes, and 7.0% saying they would not use them. In contrast, none of the top level readers chose these extreme options. The most enthusiastic adopters were the level 2 readers (54.7% chose 'often' or 'sometimes'), followed by the level 3 and 4 readers (46.1% & 45.2%), with the top level readers (44.4%) in fourth place.

Relationship to other questions

Starting to use new *gairaigo* correlated with positive opinion on the way *gairaigo* were used (ρ = 0.267, p<0.001, V=0.214), confirming hypothesis 4.2e. The largest sub-group (250) were those who couldn't say whether the way *gairaigo* was used was good or bad and sometimes started using new *gairaigo*, followed by those with the same opinion who didn't start using new *gairaigo* much (228). This demonstrates that option 3 of question 12 does not generally represent a negative response to *gairaigo*.

Somewhat surprisingly, of those who didn't think the way *gairaigo* were used was very good, 75 still said they started using new *gairaigo* sometimes. So even those who disliked modern *gairaigo* usage tended to use at least a few of the new *gairaigo* they had learnt. Conversely, those who were disturbed by a lot of *gairaigo* tended not to start using new *gairaigo* (ρ = -0.147, p<0.001, V=0.119). But amongst those who were

disturbed, 207 still began using new *gairaigo* at least sometimes.

A weak relationship (ρ = -0.076, p=0.022, V=0.104) was found with question 9. So, the more a person encountered not understood *gairaigo*, the less likely they were to use new *gairaigo*. However, most people 'sometimes' encountered *gairaigo* they did not understand, and began using new *gairaigo* they had learnt 'sometimes' or 'not much'. So, there was still a tendency for encounter with new *gairaigo* to be associated with use of new *gairaigo* once they were learned.

Discussion

While only a small proportion said they started using new *gairaigo* often, the majority did this at least occasionally. This was true of all age-groups, although to a lesser extent in the lowest and highest groups, and was even evident in some of those who had a negative view of *gairaigo*.

These results suggest that *gairaigo* are so pervasive that most people have to engage with them, even when not so inclined. For the young and old, who are less likely to be in the workforce, this level of engagement may be less, but this is not necessarily reflective of a refusal to use new *gairaigo*.

Feelings about *gairaigo* users and use

Of the descriptors of *gairaigo* users and *gairaigo* use, six could be regarded as positive (1,3,4,7,10,11), six as negative (2,5,8,9,12,14), with 6 and 13 being less clear.

The top option was 'makes the meaning hard to understand', followed by 'can express a subtle nuance' and 'gives a sense of newness' (see table 6.9).

There was a sharp drop to the options 'unnatural thing to do', 'the *gairaigo* user seems snobbish' and 'seems out of place', followed by impressions of 'shallowness' and 'mimicry'.

Few thought *gairaigo* destroyed the traditional order of Japanese.

Very few regarded *gairaigo* users as 'intelligent' or 'fashionable'.

Regarding hypothesis 4.2c, it was partially supported, since *gairaigo* were strongly linked to newness, but not to fashion.

Table 6.9: Q.13. What is your feeling about the use of *gairaigo*?

Option	Count	Responses %	Cases %
1. *gairaigo* user seems intelligent	72	3.0	7.9
2. *gairaigo* user seems snobbish	180	7.4	19.6
3. *gairaigo* user seems fashionable	37	1.5	4.0
4. *gairaigo* give a sense of newness	313	12.9	34.1
5. is an unnatural thing to do	185	7.6	20.2
6. the meaning becomes hard to understand	362	15.0	39.5
7. can express subtle nuance	331	13.7	36.1
8. destroy the traditional form of Japanese	83	3.4	9.1
9. give the impression of shallowness	124	5.1	13.5
10. give an international feeling	147	6.1	16.0
11. produce a good sense of vagueness	100	4.1	10.9
12. seem out of place	172	7.1	18.8
13. produce a strong impression	111	4.6	12.1
14. seem like mimicry	126	5.2	13.7
15. other	78	3.2	8.5
Totals	2,421	100.0	264.0

Comments (N=75) Examples of comments are grouped below.

English reading level is given in [ ].

a. Prefer Japanese (n=6)

F. 40-49 [1]: I wonder where Japanese 'identity' has gone to.

F. 20-24 [4]: I feel sad that the beautiful Japanese language seems to be being lost.

F. 20-24 [2]: It is not necessary to express using *gairaigo* what can be said in Japanese. They are not necessary. There are only a few people who understand and use them. It is strange that everyone uses words that they don't understand.

M. 30-34 [2]: I think there are many people who lack the attitude of speaking in plain language, this is not only about *gairaigo*.

b. Wonder if user really understands, vagueness (n=7)

M. 16-19 [4]: I feel like asking if they understand the meaning fully. (3 more with same opinion)

F. 40-49 [4]: I think I wonder if they know the meaning of the word they are using? And I wonder if they could say it in Japanese.

M. 20-24 [4]: I don't like the vagueness. (another similar)

c. User looks stupid, snobbish, unnatural (n=8)

F. 20-24 [4]: Stupid person, who cannot say it in Japanese.

F. 20-24 [5]: A person who uses *gairaigo* without knowing the meaning looks soft-headed.

F. 20-24 [3]: I feel like checking their brain when I see someone using *gairaigo* in a grammatically incorrect way.

F. 20-24 [4]: That person's stupidity will be revealed.

F. 20-24 [3]: The user sounds facile.

M. 16-19 [4]: I think the user is such a snob.

F. 20-24 [2]: The user can seem like a show-off, but it depends on the situation.

M. 20-24 [3]: It sounds artificial/unnatural in some cases.

d. Produces unpleasant feeling (n=5)

F. 16-19 [2]: I get irritated if *gairaigo* are used incorrectly.

M. 20-24 [2]: The original meaning of the *gairaigo* will be destroyed.

M. 25-29 [2]: I feel very annoyed when they are used with a different meaning from the original, or pronounced wrongly, or shortened like in *'risutora'*.

F. 16-19 [2]: When they are used too much I feel something is odd.

M. 60-69 [3]: It is difficult to put up with the strange English used in Japanese pop songs.

e. Depends on conditions (n=11)

F. 16-19 [3]: I get a different impression depending on the user.

F. 16-19 [3]: It depends, sometimes the user seems intelligent and the *gairaigo* can express a subtle nuance, other times the person seems snobbish and it gives an impression of shallowness.

F. 20-24 [4]: The correct user looks intelligent, but there many users without understanding and they look like show-offs.

M. 40-49 [6]: They should be used considering who you are talking to. They should not be used to someone who doesn't understand.

F. 40-49 [4]: *Gairaigo* should be used considering the other person's age.

f. User looks good (n=2)

M. 35-39 [4]: I think the user is hard-working/studious.

F. 16-19 [4]: I think the user has a wide circle of friends and is easy to get along with.

g. Positive view of *gairaigo* (n=6)

F. 25-29 [4]: When the Japanese translation is not suitable, I think it is better to use *gairaigo*.

F. 40-49 [4]: *Gairaigo* can convey the meaning accurately.

F. 40-49 [3]: The meaning that *gairaigo* give seems softer than that given by *kanji*.

F. 30-34 [3]: I think there are cases where translating into Japanese would make the meaning different.

M. 30-34 [2]: I want to be like those users who can use *gairaigo* correctly.

F. 16-19 [4]: There are cases in which they can express a subtle nuance, depending on the word. Therefore, I think *gairaigo* are convenient as long as they are not used more than necessary.

h. Natural phenomenon (n=30)

M. 16-19 [4]: It will become common to adopt *gairaigo* in conversation.

F. 40-49 [4]: I feel it is the trend of the times.

M. 40-49 [4]: They are in fashion at the time they are being used and most will fall out of use later.

F. 16-19 [4]: I think a language keeps on changing so we should use coined words actively. I don't think Japanese will get confused.

M. 20-24 [2]: I think it is very natural (plus 21 others).

F. 25-29 [4]: Using *gairaigo* is such a daily thing so I don't feel anything much.

F. 30-34 [6]: I think the only way is to follow the general trend.

M. 20-24 [3]: *Gairaigo* are part of fashion.

M. 35-39 [4]: We use them when needed in order to smoothen communication. So, it is not such a big matter.

The range of comments was similar to those for question 11. Again, issues of meaning predominated in both negative and positive comments (14). A number of comments criticised *gairaigo* users as being stupid, snobs or show-offs (9), but a similar number referred to positive characteristics (9). Fashion was mentioned a number of times. In general, positive views of *gairaigo* were expressed by 18 commentators, whereas only one mentioned the threat to Japanese. The largest group (24), however, said they didn't have any particular feeling or that it seemed natural.

Demographic variables

Thinking *gairaigo* were 'out of place' was highest in the 16-19 age-group (24.1%) and tended to decline as age rose (ρ = 0.092, p=0.005), but it rose again in the 50 years plus group (18.6%). English ability showed no clear effects.

Relationship to other questions

Table 6.10 presents question 13 options in descending order of frequency and indicates whether those who chose a particular option had an increased or decreased tendency, compared to average, to select the lower options when responding to questions 2, 3, 6, 7, 17, 9 and 12. When the difference is significant at $p<0.05$ an asterisk is added, and when at $p<0.001$ two asterisks are added. Based on the significant results, an overall assessment was made according to whether the option represented a more positive or negative view of *gairaigo* compared to average.

Option 10 correlated with question 1 (ρ =0.087, p=0.008) – 63.9% of those who thought *gairaigo* gave an international feeling also thought they had increased a lot, supporting hypothesis 4.2d.

Table 6.10: Relationship between options chosen in Q.13 and relative positivity or negativity towards *gairaigo* in responses to other questions

Q.13 options	Q.2. too much	Q.3. use is good	Q.6. *ki ni naru*	Q.7. grg confuse J.	Q.17. J. is confused	Q.9. not understand grg	Q.12. will use new grg	Overall attitude
	Questions							
6. hard to understand	inc**	dec**	inc**	inc**	inc*	inc**	dec**	neg
7. express nuance	dec	inc**	dec*	dec**	dec*	dec*	inc**	pos
4. newness	av	inc**	dec	dec	dec*	dec	inc**	pos
5. unnatural	inc	dec**	inc**	inc*	inc*	inc	dec*	neg
2. snobbish	inc*	dec**	inc**	inc*	inc*	inc*	dec*	neg
12. out of place	inc*	dec**	inc**	inc**	inc**	inc*	dec**	neg
10. internat'l feeling	dec	inc*	dec	av	dec	dec	inc*	pos
14. mimicry	inc*	dec**	inc**	inc*	inc*	inc	dec*	neg
9. shallowness	inc*	dec**	inc**	inc**	inc*	inc	dec**	neg
13. strong impression	dec	inc	dec*	dec	dec	dec	inc**	pos
11. good vagueness	inc	inc	dec	dec*	inc	dec	inc*	pos
8. destroy trad. order	inc**	dec**	inc**	inc**	inc**	inc*	dec**	neg
1. intelligent	dec	inc**	dec	dec	av	inc*	inc**	pos
3. fashionable	dec	inc*	dec*	dec*	av	inc	inc**	pos

inc: increased proportion selecting lower end of scale compared to average
dec: decreased proportion selecting lower end of scale compared to average
av: proportion very close to average
* significant difference between those who chose option and those who didn't (Chi Square) at $p<0.05$
** $p<0.001$

The above table confirms that options 1, 3, 4, 10 and 11 tended to indicate positive views of *gairaigo*, while options 2, 5, 8, 9, 12 and 14 tended to indicate negative viewpoints. In addition, it shows that option 13 tended to positive, while option 6 tended to negative.

It was evident that questions 3 and 12 produced the most consistent patterns of significant difference, as well as being questions that differentiated viewpoints on *gairaigo* use. Therefore, these results are presented in more detail in the two tables below.

Table 6.11 shows how those who chose each of the options in question 13 responded to question 3.

Table 6.11: Selection of Q.13 options by responses to Q.3 'What do you think of the way *gairaigo* are used in current Japanese?'

Q.13 options	Question 3 options: 1. v. good	2. good	3. can't say	4. not good	5. not good at all	Cramer's V
6	0.3%	7.2%	56.6%	32.0%	3.9%	0.154**
7	1.2%	12.4%	67.9%	18.5%	0%	0.191**
4	**1.3%**	15.7%	63.1%	18.9%	1.0%	0.180**
5	0%	6.5%	47.3%	**41.3%**	4.9%	0.199**
2	0%	6.7%	51.1%	38.3%	3.9%	0.156**
12	0%	4.7%	44.2%	41.9%	**9.3%**	0.283**
10	**2.0%**	13.6%	66.0%	17.7%	0.7%	0.112*
14	0%	3.2%	51.6%	36.5%	8.7%	0.201**
9	0%	4.8%	42.7%	**41.9%**	**10.5%**	0.256**
13	0.9%	**17.1%**	56.8%	25.2%	0%	0.103*
11	0%	12.1%	61.6%	26.3%	0%	0.072
8	0%	3.6%	38.6%	**48.2%**	**9.6%**	0.224**
1	**1.4%**	**25.0%**	54.2%	19.4%	0%	0.151**
3	0%	**24.3%**	62.2%	13.5%	0%	0.112*
Q.3 results	1.2%	10.2%	59.7%	26.2%	2.7%	

When compared to responses to question 3, the options that show the greatest shift to the positive are:

1. (user seems intelligent),
3. (user seems fashionable),
13. (produce a strong impression),
4. (produce a sense of newness) and,
10. (international feeling).

Those that show the greatest shift to the negative are:

8. (destroy traditional order of the language),
9. (produce a sense of shallowness),
12. (seem out of place) and,
5. (an unnatural thing to do).

Table 6.12 below shows how those who chose each of the options in question 13 responded to question 12.

With regard to beginning to use new *gairaigo*, those who chose options 13, 4, 11, 3 and 1 were considerably more enthusiastic than average, while those who chose options 12, 8 and 9 were the most likely to avoid using such words.

Table 6.12: Selection of Q.13 options by responses to Q.12 'Are you enthusiastic about beginning to use new *gairaigo* that you have learned the meaning of in your everyday conversation?'

	Question 12 options					
Q.13 option	1. often use	2. use sometimes	3. not much	4. seldom use	5. will not use	Cramer's V
6	1.9%	31.8%	51.7%	12.4%	2.2%	0.205**
7	6.0%	51.7%	35.0%	6.9%	0.3%	0.191**
4	7.0%	**55.0%**	32.6%	5.1%	0.3%	0.246**
5	3.8%	32.4%	48.1%	11.9%	3.8%	0.122*
2	5.0%	33.9%	45.6%	11.7%	3.9%	0.110*
12	3.5%	26.2%	45.9%	**18.6%**	**5.8%**	0.232**
10	6.8%	49.7%	37.4%	6.1%	0%	0.113*
14	4.0%	29.4%	53.2%	8.7%	4.8%	0.142*
9	4.0%	33.1%	41.9%	**12.9%**	**8.1%**	0.208**
13	**11.7%**	**52.3%**	30.6%	5.4%	0%	0.171**
11	6.0%	**56.0%**	32.0%	4.0%	2.0%	0.122*
8	6.0%	39.8%	32.5%	**14.5%**	**7.2%**	0.153**
1	**19.4%**	40.3%	30.6%	8.3%	1.4%	0.210**
3	**21.6%**	45.9%	29.7%	2.7%	0%	0.177**
Q.12 results	4.6%	41.3%	42.2%	10.3%	1.6%	

Discussion

Based on the above two tables, those who were most positive towards *gairaigo*, both in their views on *gairaigo* usage and in their personal adoption of new *gairaigo*, tended to choose options 1, 3, 4 and 13. That is, they thought *gairaigo* users seemed intelligent, and/or fashionable, and *gairaigo* gave a sense of newness, and/or produced a strong impression.

Conversely, those most negative in their views and behaviours tended to choose options 8, 9 and 12. That is, *gairaigo* gave an impression of shallowness, seemed out of place, and/or destroyed the traditional order of Japanese.

These results support hypotheses 4.2e. Nevertheless, even amongst those who thought *gairaigo* destroyed the traditional order of the language or produced a feeling of shallowness, there was still a tendency to use new *gairaigo*. It is perhaps a reflection of the ubiquity of *gairaigo* that even its detractors tended to adopt it.

Comparisons with other surveys

A number of the options in question 13 were based on those of previous surveys, but, since these were multiple response questions, comparisons across surveys in terms of percentages are not meaningful. Nevertheless, a ranking of the popularity of the responses can provide a gauge of which views were stronger.

Table 6.13: Results of other surveys relating to the effects of *gairaigo*

1. NHK 1988.2: What is your feeling about the use of *gairaigo/gaikokugo*? Choose as many as you like.

1. they destroy the traditional form of the Japanese language	16.3%
2. they express a sense of newness	50.1%
3. they make that person seem fashionable	4.7%
4. they make the user seem intelligent	6.9%
5. they make the user seem snobbish	9.6%
6. the meaning becomes unclear	36.8%
7. they can express a subtle nuance of meaning	33.0%
8. none of these	4.9%
9. don't know/no answer	3.1%

2. *Yomiuri* 1989.11: If you agree with any of the following opinions about *gairaigo,* please circle them.

1. they give a sense of newness	38.2%
2. there is a danger that the inherent beauty of Japanese language will be lost and its tradition will be distorted	28.8
3. sentences containing *gaikokugo* and *gairaigo* are hard to understand	33.1
4. I feel that *gaikokugo* and *gairaigo* are used just to show off/look good	25.1

3. NHK 1995.3: What are the good points about using *gairaigo/gaikokugo*? Choose any of the following.

1. they give a sense of newness	48.6%
2. they seem friendly	10.8%
3. they can express a subtle nuance of meaning	49.6%
4. they make the user seems fashionable	15.2%
5. they make the user seem intelligent	11.1%
6. other	1.5%
7. there are no particularly good points	8.5%
8. don't know/no answer	4.8%

What are the bad points about using *gairaigo/gaikokugo*?

1. they destroy the traditional form of Japanese	26.6%
2. there are many *gairaigo* that are difficult to understand	64.3%
3. it is difficult to get the meaning from the script, unlike *kanji*	46.7%
4. they give an impression (of the user) of shallowness	10.0%
5. they make the user seem snobbish	13.8%
6. other	2.1%
7. there are no particularly bad points	5.4%
8. don't know/no answer	3.3%

4. NHK 2000.5: What are the good points about using *gairaigo/gaikokugo*? Choose any of the following.

1. they can express a subtle nuance of meaning	46.1%
2. they give a sense of newness	28.9%
3. there are no particularly good points	18.3%
4. don't know/no answer	9.6%
5. they make the user seem intelligent	9.2%
6. they make the user seem fashionable	8.3%
7. they seem friendly	7.5%
8. other	0.1%

Table 6.13: continued

What are the bad points about using *gairaigo/gaikokugo*?

1. they destroy the traditional form of Japanese	26.5%
2. there are many *gairaigo* that are difficult to understand	54.9%
3. it is difficult to get the meaning from the script, unlike *kanji*	33.8%
4. they give an impression (of the user) of shallowness	8.3%
5. they make the user seem snobbish	7.8%
6. other	0.4%
7. there are no particularly bad points	8.0%
8. don't know/no answer	7.6%

In NHK 1988.2, the most comparable survey, producing a sense of newness was by far the most popular response, followed by making the meaning unclear and expressing a subtle nuance. In the present survey, the same three comprised the top options but it was problems with meaning that stood out. Although NHK 1995.3 and 2000.5 were structured differently, comprehension issues still stood out above the other options. While newness and nuance continued to make *gairaigo* attractive, NHK 2000.5 suggests *gairaigo* may be losing some of their sense of newness. Problems with understanding new *gairaigo* ranked highly overall, but NHK 1995.3 and 2000.5 pointed to a slight decline in this as an issue.

Considering the link between *gairaigo* and being up-to-date and fashionable, the low ranking of 'fashionable' in both NHK 1988.2 and the present survey seems rather odd. However, all the options that related to personal attributes ranked rather lowly, with the negative ones, such as snobbish and unnatural, being more popular than the positive ones. In NHK 1995.3 and 2000.5, positive and negative attributes were placed in separate tables and, under these conditions, 'fashionable' was more popular than 'snobbish', so it is likely that question format has an impact on results. Nonetheless, in all surveys people tended to choose options relating to features of *gairaigo*, rather than attributes of *gairaigo* users.

Destroying the traditional form of Japanese ranked fairly highly in NHK 1988.2 (ranked 4th) and the other surveys, but rather lowly in the present survey. Since there was no age effect, this was not due the relative youth of the sample. The difference to NHK 1988.2 may have been partly a dilution effect due to the number of options presented in NHK 1995.3 and 2000.5, since, when there were fewer options in the table (i.e. *Yomiuri* 1989.11), the ranking was third.

Of the options common across surveys, a 'sense of newness' was identified in the

present survey as being closely linked with an overall positive view of *gairaigo*, while 'destroys the traditional form of Japanese' was linked to an overall negative viewpoint. Across the surveys, 'sense of newness' consistently outranked 'destroys the traditional form of Japanese'. This suggests that more people were positive towards *gairaigo* than were negative. Even though 'sense of newness' appeared to decline between NHK 1995.3 and NHK 2000.5, there was no corresponding rise in 'destroys the traditional form of Japanese'. So, this does not indicate increasing negativity towards *gairaigo* and hypothesis 5.3 is not supported.

Summary and discussion of main findings

Regarding general attitude to *gairaigo*, the majority of people did not express clear approval or disapproval (Q.3), but more disapproved than approved. A very similar pattern of results was found in relation to a future increase (Q.5). There was a weak tendency for older people to be more disapproving, but only for Q.2. These results were consistent with other surveys and there was no evidence of any change in attitude over time. Correlation with other questions showed that the more a person thought *gairaigo* had increased, and the more often they encountered *gairaigo* they did not understand, the more likely they were to have a negative view.

Seeing or hearing a lot of *gairaigo* in everyday language disturbed the majority of respondents (Q.6), but 44% were not disturbed. Other surveys showed a similar tendency for tolerance and it seemed this had increased over time. Feeling disturbed tended to increase with age, also with perception of a larger increase in *gairaigo* (Q.1), and more frequent encounter with *gairaigo* that were not understood (Q.9).

Tendency to use new *gairaigo* that had been learned did not vary with age or English ability. Most people were willing to use new *gairaigo*, with only 11.9% using them seldom or refusing. This meant that even those who professed the belief that their use was not good tended to use them.

In questions 11 and 13, peoples' emotional responses to *gairaigo* were further explored. In a majority of cases (55.9%), the most common feeling people experienced when encountering a *gairaigo* they did not understand was wanting to know the meaning, followed by feeling behind the times (29.9%). Those who chose these options were more likely to use new *gairaigo* they had learned. A quarter of respondents thought it

should be said in Japanese. They were less likely to use new *gairaigo*. These responses were not related to age or English ability. In Q.13 as well, there were no clear associations with age or English ability. The largest proportion of respondents (39.5%) thought *gairaigo* use 'made the meaning hard to understand'. This was associated with a more negative view of *gairaigo*, and a resistance to using new *gairaigo*, but 33.7% still used new *gairaigo* at least sometimes. The next most popular options, 'can express subtle nuance' and 'gives a sense of newness', were associated with positive attitudes and an increased tendency to use new *gairaigo* (57.7% & 62.0% used new *gairaigo* at least sometimes). Based on tendency to use new *gairaigo*, the strongest negative view was 'seems out of place' (24.4% seldom or will not use new *gairaigo*), while the most positive view was 'the *gairaigo* user seems fashionable' (67.5% used new *gairaigo* at least sometimes), but these were only chosen by small numbers of respondents. 'Gives an international feeling' was a positive response, but it ranked only seventh, and the clearly negative 'destroys the traditional form of Japanese' ranked twelfth. So it seems that ideological questions did not concern most respondents. Comparisons with other surveys also showed that nuance and newness were the main good points, while difficulty in understanding was the main drawback.

Overall, the respondents tended to be mildly disapproving of *gairaigo* but were willing to use them. Their concerns tended to focus on difficulties in understanding, rather than on any putative negative effects on the language. Those who were positive were concerned with meaning, in the form of the additional nuances *gairaigo* brought, and with style – but more in the sense of 'newness' rather than 'fashion'.

CHAPTER 7

SURVEY RESULTS 3: OPINIONS ON GAIRAIGO AND THEIR EFFECTS

This chapter reports responses to the following questions and discusses them in relation to other surveys:

Q.17. Confusion in the Japanese language

Q.7. *Gairaigo* as a cause of confusion in Japanese

Q.16. Opinions on the effects of *gairaigo*

Q.15. Opinions on why *gairaigo* are incorporated

Q.14. Opinions on how *gairaigo* should be treated

The issue of confusion in Japanese generally, and in relation to *gairaigo* in particular, was polled in questions 17 and 7 respectively. In addition, confusion was included as an option in question 16.

Confusion in Japanese

Respondents were more likely to clearly agree with the notion that the Japanese language is confused (16%) than to clearly disagree (6.6%). However the majority took a milder view, with 62.7% saying there was a tendency towards confusion.

Table 7.1: Q.17. In short, do you think the Japanese language is confused at present?

Option	Frequency	Valid %	Cumulative %
1. that's exactly right	146	16.0	16.0
2. there's that tendency	574	62.7	78.7
3. it's not as bad as that	135	14.8	93.4
4. that's not the case	60	6.6	100.0
Total	915	100.0	

Comments (N=5) Comments were not canvassed.

1. M. 30-34 (1): It is not just *gairaigo*, there is confusion in *keigo* and an overuse of fad words.
2. F. 50-59 (1): In particular, accent is confused.
3. M. 40-49 (2): The generation of people who can use proper Japanese is declining.
4. M. 16-19 (2): This tendency is especially strong amongst young people.
5. M. 16-19 (4): There is no language that doesn't change.

Demographic variables

As age increased, agreement increased steadily (ρ = -0.111, p=0.001), supporting hypothesis 4.3f. Option 1 was chosen by 10.8% of the 16-19 age-group and 41.7% of

those aged 50 plus, in which it was equal with option 2 - the most popular option with all other age-groups. Option 4 declined with age from 9.6% of 16-19 years to 3.3% of 50 years and over.

With regard to English reading ability, no clear pattern was evident. The highest agreement was in the top-level readers (33.3%) and non-readers (22.4%), but the non-readers were also the most strongly polarised in their views. So hypothesis 4.4e could not be supported.

Relationship to other questions

A tendency to think the language is confused correlated with responses to:

Q.1. Thinking the number of *gairaigo* had increased in the previous ten years (ρ = 0.133, p< 0.001, V= 0.113). Of those who said Japanese was confused, 69.2% said *gairaigo* had increased 'a lot' compared with 48.3% of those who said Japanese was not confused.

Q.3. Thinking the way *gairaigo* are used is not good (ρ = -0.285, p< 0.001, V=0.205) but the largest subgroup (363) was neutral with regard to the way *gairaigo* were used, while thinking there was a 'tendency' for the language to be confused.

Q.5. Thinking a future increase in *gairaigo* is not good (ρ = -0.251, p< 0.001, V=0.177). However, the largest subgroup (339) was neutral on both questions. Of those who said Japanese was confused, 12.4% still said a future increase in *gairaigo* was 'good' or 'very good', compared with 26.7% of those who said it was not confused.

Q.9. Encountering not understood *gairaigo* (ρ = 0.115, p< 0.001, V=0.114). The largest subgroup (399) 'sometimes' encountered *gairaigo* they did not understand and thought there was a 'tendency' for Japanese to be confused. Of those who 'frequently' encountered *gairaigo* they did not understand, 29.2% agreed that Japanese was confused and 4.2% disagreed. Of those who 'seldom' encountered such *gairaigo,* even proportions (23.5%) agreed and disagreed.

Q.12. Not starting to use new *gairaigo* they had learned (ρ = -0.082, p= 0.014, V=0.132). The largest subgroup (243) said they thought there was a 'tendency' for Japanese to be confused, and they 'didn't start using new *gairaigo* much'. The next largest subgroup (236) also thought there was a tendency to confusion, but sometimes used new *gairaigo*. So thinking Japanese was confused did not preclude these people from using new *gairaigo*.

Discussion

The strongest relationships were with thinking the way *gairaigo* are used is 'not good' and disapproval of a future increase in *gairaigo* – supporting the converse of hypothesis 4.2f, but many respondents took neutral views. Encountering *gairaigo* that were not understood was more clearly related to belief in confusion in Japanese, since the largest sub-group agreed to both questions. Resistance to using new *gairaigo* was linked, but most people took a moderate viewpoint, and still tended to use the new *gairaigo* they learned, at least sometimes. It was also evident from the comments that respondents did not consider *gairaigo* to be the only aspect of Japanese that was confused.

Comparisons with other surveys

Language confusion has been polled in numerous surveys but the phrasing of the questions has varied (see table 7.2). The wording of Question 17 was the same as in NHK 1988.2, but the options were changed so they related to the level of agreement rather than level of confusion.

Surveys 1 to 7 are comparable since both the questions and options are similar. They seem to show that strong agreement that Japanese was confused increased between 1979 and 1999, while the proportion holding a milder level of agreement has been fairly stable, and strong disagreement has declined somewhat. The Bunkachō surveys are less comparable, since there was more variation in both the questions and the responses, but they still show a fairly consistent pattern of from 70% to over 80% agreeing.

With overall agreement at almost 80% the present survey fits in with the trend evident in surveys 1 to 7 as well as with Bunkachō 1995.4. However, strong disagreement was somewhat higher (6.6% compared to less than 2%). The young demographic of the present survey probably has the effect of increasing the group who think Japanese is not confused. It is also possible that the phrasing of the option 'not confused at all' in surveys 1 to 7 suggested such a degree of certainty that many who disagreed chose the milder option.

Whether the notion of language confusion increased during the 1990s and early 2000s is difficult to determine. NHK 1988.2 showed 87.7% for the top two categories and NHK 1999.1 showed the highest level at 88.8% – a similar result. Sōrifu 1992.6 showed 74.7% and Bunkachō 2002.11 showed 80.4% – an apparent increase. These results seem inconsistent, indicating that either public opinion has fluctuated in the range 70-90% or the samples used in the surveys differed considerably.

Table 7.2: Results of surveys with regard to confusion in Japanese

1. NHK 1979.9: In short, do you think the Japanese language is confused?

very confused	fairly confused	not really confused	not confused at all	don't know / no answer
13.4%	58.4%	22.0%	2.0%	4.2%

2. NHK 1986.2: Do you think the Japanese language is confused?

16.3%	59.5%	22.1%	1.5%	0.6%

3. NHK 1988.2: In short, do you think the Japanese language is confused at present?

34.5%	53.2%	9.8%	0.9%	1.7%

4. NHK 1989.2: It is often said that Japanese is confused. What do you think?

22.7%	66.6%	9.1%	0.5%	1.1%

5. Sōrifu 1992.6: Do you think the current Japanese language is confused?

20.4%	54.3%	18.4%	1.3%	don't know 5.5%

6. NHK 1996.3: In short, do you think the Japanese language is confused?

22.9%	60.8%	12.8%	0.9%	2.6%

7. NHK 1999.1: In short, do you think the Japanese language is confused?

34.2%	54.6%	7.8%	0.7%	2.7%

8. Bunkachō 1995.4: What do you think of the opinion: Current Japanese is confused?

agree	not agree	can't say which	don't know
73.6%	19.6%	5.6%	1.3%

9. Bunkachō 2000.1: Thinking about the language you encounter in your everyday life, do you think current Japanese is confused?

very confused	fairly	not much	not confused	don't know
32.7%	53.2%	9.6%	0.7%	3.8%

10. Bunkachō 2001.1: Do you think the language used by people you encounter in everyday life or people you see on TV is confused?

often	sometimes	occasionally	never	don't know
31.5%	40.1%	17.3%	9.7%	1.4%

11. Bunkachō 2002.11: Thinking about the language you encounter in your everyday life, do you think current Japanese is confused?

very confused	fairly confused	not confused much
24.4%	56.0%	15.8%

Overall these results suggest that language confusion remained a persistent notion over the 1990s but there is not sufficient evidence to conclude that it increased. So hypothesis 5.4 is not supported.

***Gairaigo* as a cause of confusion in Japanese**

Only 7.1% strongly agreed that the *gairaigo* influx would eventually ruin the language but 49.3% agreed, at least partially, that *gairaigo* were a cause of language confusion (see table 7.3), so hypothesis 4.1e was not supported. Overall, 23.6% clearly disagreed

but very few people (2.5%) regarded *gairaigo* as a source of language enrichment.

Table 7.3: Q.7. What do you think of the opinion 'the use of many *gairaigo* confuses the Japanese language and will eventually ruin it'?

Option	Frequency	Valid %	Cumulative %
1. that's exactly right	66	7.1	7.1
2. there's that tendency	393	42.2	49.3
3. it's not as bad as that	253	27.1	76.4
4. that's not correct	197	21.1	97.5
5. on the contrary, the use of many *gairaigo* enriches the language	23	2.5	100.0
Total	932	100.0	

Comments (N=11) No comments were canvassed.

a. Tended to agree

1. F. 20-24 (1)[3]: I think 'ruin' is a bit strong but they will surely damage it.
2. F. 16-19 (1)[3]: Amongst young people (including myself), those who can speak proper Japanese are a rarity.
3. F. 40-49 (2)[3]: In the long run there is that tendency.
4. M. 40-49 (2)[6]: There are more and more dead words.
5. M. 16-19 (2)[4]: We should continue to use Japanese properly as Japanese.
6. M. 30-39 (2)[2]: The thing that destroys Japanese is not *gairaigo*, it is Japanese who cannot use the Japanese language properly.
7. M. 40-49 (2)[3]: Over the span of 100 years a language will change, so I don't think it will become extinct.

b. Tended to disagree

8. M. 30-34 (4)[3]: No matter what form it takes, Japanese will not become extinct.
9. M. 20-24 (4)[5]: They do not confuse or destroy, they only change [the language].
10. M. 20-24 years (5)[2]: There will surely be a reaction [in favour of *gairaigo*].

c. Other

11. F. 20-29 (3)[4]: I think it depends upon how they are used.

Most (70%) comments were from those who agreed but their views tended to be moderate, concentrating on the negative effects of *gairaigo* on proper Japanese rather than on *gairaigo* as threatening the existence of the language. Agreement did not seem linked with age or English level.

Demographic variables

There was no correlation with age, so hypotheses 4.3g was not supported, but those aged 50 years and over were considerably more likely to choose option 1 (16.4%) than any other age group. English reading ability did not correlate, so hypotheses 4.4f was

not supported, but non-readers were the most likely to strongly agree (14.0%) followed by the top-level readers (5.6%). The non-readers were also the most polarised, with 23.3% disagreeing (option 4), compared with 16.7% of top-level readers.

Relationships between questions

There was a strong correlation between questions 7 and 17 (ρ = 0.426, p<0.001, V= 0.314), indicating that those who thought the language was confused tended to think *gairaigo* were a cause. However, people were much less likely to agree with the proposition in question 7 than in question 17, and more likely to disagree. Moreover, of those who thought the language was confused, only 26.7% also chose 'exactly right' in question 7, and 11% clearly disagreed that *gairaigo* was a cause and must have had other issues in mind. Question 7 also correlated with:

Q.1. Thinking the number of *gairaigo* had increased in the last 10 years (ρ = 0.127, p< 0.001, V= 0.120). The largest subgroup (237) thought *gairaigo* had increased 'a lot' and there was a 'tendency' for *gairaigo* to confuse Japanese. Even amongst those who thought it had increased 'a lot', 44.9% tended to disagree that *gairaigo* confused Japanese and only 9.3% strongly agreed.

Q.3. Thinking the way *gairaigo* are used is not good (ρ = -0.334, p< 0.001, V= 0.257). This tends to support the converse of hypothesis 4.2f, but the largest subgroup (232) thought there was a 'tendency' for *gairaigo* to cause confusion but 'could not say' whether the use of *gairaigo* was good or not.

Q.5. Thinking a future increase in *gairaigo* is not good (ρ = -0.372, p< 0.001, V= 0.268). This tends to support hypothesis 4.2b, but the largest subgroup (211) thought it 'tended' to cause confusion but 'could not say' whether a future increase in *gairaigo* was good or not.

Q.9. Frequency of encounter with *gairaigo* that were not understood (ρ = 0.135, p< 0.001, V= 0.117). The largest subgroup (283) thought there was a 'tendency' and 'sometimes' encountered *gairaigo* they did not understand. Of those who agreed that *gairaigo* confused Japanese, 33.3% 'frequently' encountered *gairaigo* they did not understand, compared with 12.8% of those who disagreed. This supports the converse of hypothesis 4.2a.

Q.12. Not starting to use new *gairaigo* (ρ = -0.096, p= 0.003, V= 0.118). This supports the converse of hypothesis 4.2e. The largest subgroup (179) thought there was a 'tendency' and 'didn't start using new *gairaigo* much'. However, of those who strongly

agreed that *gairaigo* confused Japanese, 42.2% still said they used new *gairaigo* 'often' or 'sometimes', and only 9.4% said they would not use them. Therefore, thinking that *gairaigo* confused Japanese did not necessarily lead to a refusal to adopt new *gairaigo.* In comparison, of those who thought *gairaigo* 'enriched' Japanese, 65.2% used new *gairaigo* 'often' or 'sometimes'.

Discussion

The strongest relationships were with opinion on a future increase in *gairaigo* and the way *gairaigo* are currently used. This pointed towards a belief that confusion may well result if current trends continue and *gairaigo* increase into the future. In addition, perception of a large increase in *gairaigo*, and encounter with new *gairaigo* that are not understood were related to thinking *gairaigo* caused confusion. Nevertheless, the majority saw only a tendency for *gairaigo* to cause confusion and did not express a strong view. Considering the number of times respondents are likely to have heard *gairaigo* linked with language confusion in the media, it would seem likely that many people would concede there was this tendency, even though they did not hold a particular opinion on the subject.

Another factor that may have biased people towards the mild negative response is the aspect of the question 'and will eventually ruin it'. It is evident from the comments that at least some people read this as causing the extinction of Japanese. For some of the people who agreed that *gairaigo* cause confusion, the notion that extinction would also be the result may have seemed too extreme, with the result that they chose the milder negative view. As would be expected, the people who expressed strongly positive viewpoints on *gairaigo* were more likely to use new *gairaigo*. However, even those who took a negative view tended not to resist using new *gairaigo* they had learned.

Comparisons with other surveys

Despite discussions linking *gairaigo* and confusion in the media and popular press, only one of the surveys examined included a question on this topic (see table 7.4). The same question was included in the present survey but the range of options was extended from three to five.

Table 7.4: Results of survey questions on *gairaigo* as a cause of confusion in Japanese

NHK 1989.2 (same as Q.7)

that's exactly right	it's not as bad as that	that's not correct
16%	38%	46%

The 23.6% of clear disagreement in the present survey is considerably less than that of NHK 1989.2, as is the choice by 27.1% of the 'it's not as bad as that' option. This suggests that the present sample disagrees less with the proposition, but this is juxtaposed with the much lower level of agreement. While there are likely to be real differences between the samples, another reason for the level of difference in the results lies in the options. When offered the mild option 'there is a tendency', many respondents took it.

Effects of *gairaigo* on Japanese

Gairaigo have not only been seen as a source of confusion but of modernisation and enrichment. Question 16 aimed to gauge a number of these viewpoints in a comparable fashion (see table 7.5). Overall, more disagreed than agreed with each viewpoint. Disagreement was strongest for *gairaigo* accelerating internationalisation. Agreement was strongest for *gairaigo* introducing confusion in communication, followed by enriching the Japanese vocabulary.

Table 7.5: Q.16. Please give your opinion on the following statements about the effects *gairaigo* have had on the Japanese language (n).

Q.16 effects	agree	can't say	disagree
a. enrich the Japanese vocabulary	26.2% (240)	38.1% (349)	35.7% (327)
b. confuse the Japanese language	23.8% (218)	35.8% (328)	40.4% (370)
c. accelerate the internationalisation of Japanese	21.8% (199)	31.6% (288)	46.6% (425)
d. modernise the Japanese language	22.0% (200)	33.5% (305)	44.6% (406)
e. introduce confusion in communication	29.4% (268)	39.3% (359)	31.3% (286)

Comments (N=6) Of the comments that were written under 'other' in question 16, the following added an additional effect:

F. 35-39: They simplify Japanese.

F. 16-19: They make (the language) incomprehensible to old people.

F. 20-24: Our feelings about Japanese and the importance of Japanese will be forgotten.

M. 60-69: We should use *gairaigo* with the correct meaning in the proper circumstances.

M. 60-69: We should exchange them for traditional words.

Again, most comments (80%) tended to be negative, but they were also quite diverse.

Demographic variables

16a: Those aged 50 years and older were the least likely to agree, but there was no correlation with age since agreement was also rather low in the youngest age-group, producing a curved effect. Agreement tended to increase with English reading level but there was no converse effect of disagreement, resulting in an overall lack of correlation.

16b: There was no correlation with age, so hypothesis 4.3g was not supported. No correlation was found with English ability, so hypothesis 4.4f was not supported.

16c: Age did not correlate so hypothesis 4.3i was not supported. The highest level of agreement was amongst non-readers (36.6%), followed by top-level readers (33.3%), so there was a curved relationship, and hypothesis 4.4g was not supported.

16d: There were no effects for age or English reading ability. Non-readers were the most likely to agree (23.8%), while top-level readers were the most likely to disagree (50.0%).

16e: Disagreement tended to increase with age (ρ = 0.073, p=0.026) (independently of gender), contrary to hypothesis 4.3f. English ability did not correlate, so hypothesis 4.4g was not supported.

Discussion

Despite the correlation in 16e, those in the top age-group (70+) were most likely to agree, followed 16-19 year-olds, so there was a curved effect. Elderly people may encounter more *gairaigo* than slightly younger people through their contact with health services. Young people may be exposed to more new *gairaigo* via the new media. English ability did not correlate but it was the non-readers who were the most likely to link *gairaigo* with internationalisation and modernisation.

Relationships between responses

In general, confusion in the Japanese language (16b) and confusion in communication (16e) represented a similar viewpoint. 16e attracted greater agreement but responses were strongly correlated (ρ = 0.429, p<0.001, V=0.348). Enriching the Japanese vocabulary (16a) was a positive viewpoint that correlated positively with modernising the language (ρ = 0.263, p<0.001, V=0.271) and accelerating internationalisation (ρ = 0.228, p<0.001, V=0.252), but negatively with introducing confusion in communication (ρ = -0.148, p<0.001, V=0.186). Notions of modernisation and internationalisation received very similar proportions of agreement and a strong correlation was found (ρ = 0.443, p<0.001, V=0.403). The above correlations show that responses to question 16 relate to three notions. These have been grouped as follows for further analysis:

1. 16a. *gairaigo* as enriching.
2. 16b & 16e. *gairaigo* as producing confusion.
3. 16c & 16d *gairaigo* as internationalising and modernising.

Relationships with other questions

Significant correlations were found with questions 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 12 (see table 7.6).

Table 7.6: Q.16 by questions 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 12 – Spearman correlations and Cramer's V

	Q.1	Q.3	Q.5.	Q.7	Q.9	Q.12
16a	not sig.	0.282, p<0.001 V=0.244	0.267, p<0.001 V=0.225	-0.285, p<0.001 V=0.245	-0.080, p=0.016 V=0.089	0.149, p<0.001 V=0.134
16b	0.149, p<0.001 V=0.112	-0.299, p<0.001 V=0.267	-0.350, p<0.001 V=0.279	0.513, p<0.001 V=0.418	0.107, p=0.001 V=0.125	-0.140, p<0.001 V=0.124
16c	not sig.	0.212, p<0.001 V=0.190	0.272, p<0.001 V=0.240	-0.088, p=0.008 V=0.102	-0.074, p=0.025 V=0.074	0.168, p<0.001 V=0.159
16d	not sig.	0.214, p<0.001 V=0.194	0.197, p<0.001 V=0.179	-0.113, p=0.001 V=0.124	-0.121, p<0.001 V=0.101	0.193, p<0.001 V=0.169
16e	0.111, p=0.001 V=0.099	-0.329, p<0.001 V=0.277	-0.359, p<0.001 V=0.291	0.335, p<0.001 V=0.268	0.163, p<0.001 V=0.126	-0.126, p<0.001 V=0.119

16a. *Gairaigo* as enriching

The strongest positive correlations were with questions 3, 5 and 12. Those who thought *gairaigo* enriched Japanese tended to think the way *gairaigo* were used was good (25.5%), and approved of a future increase in *gairaigo* (30.9%) supporting hypothesis 4.2b. However, in each case the largest subgroup was non-committal. Of those who agreed with 16a, 55.9% used new *gairaigo* they learned 'sometimes' or 'often', supporting hypothesis 4.2e. However, even amongst those who disagreed, 40.0% still used them. The strongest negative correlation was with question 7. Those who disagreed with 16a tended to think *gairaigo* confused the language (63.6%), supporting hypothesis 4.2f, but the largest sub-group only thought there was a tendency. Somewhat surprisingly, of those who agreed with 16a, 35.5% (85) still thought *gairaigo* confused Japanese.

16b & 16e *Gairaigo* as producing confusion

Questions 7 and 16b were similar and the strong positive correlation showed most respondents answered in a consistent fashion. There were, however, some differences. In 16b, 23.8% agreed that an effect of *gairaigo* was to confuse the Japanese language and 40.4% disagreed, whereas in question 7, 49.3% tended to agree. When offered only three options in question 16b, 46.0% of those who chose option 2 in question 7 chose 'can't say' in 16b. So it seems that those who did not have a strong opinion were willing to accept there being a 'tendency' in question 7, but this did not really represent

agreement with the proposition. Also, 55.2% of those who chose option 3 in question 7 chose 'disagree' in 16b. Therefore, the options offered, and perhaps the phrasing of question 7, easily led to an overestimation of the proportion of people who thought *gairaigo* were confusing the language. Similarly, question 7 correlated with 16e, although not as strongly (V=0.268). Of those who strongly agreed that *gairaigo* confuse Japanese, 72.3% agreed that *gairaigo* confuse communication, whereas 84.6% agreed for 16b. Conversely, of those who agreed with 16e, 17.6% strongly agreed with question 7, compared with 25.3% of those who agreed with 16b. Therefore, causing confusion in communication was a milder viewpoint than causing confusion in the language and some people made this distinction. Strong negative correlations were found with questions 3 and 5, indicating that thinking *gairaigo* produced confusion was associated with a negative view of both the way *gairaigo* were used and any future increase, confirming hypothesis 4.2f.

16c & 16d *Gairaigo* as internationalising and modernising

The pattern of results was very similar for 16c and 16d. The strongest positive correlation was between 16c and question 5, indicating that those who thought *gairaigo* had an internationalising influence were most positive about a future increase in *gairaigo*. Of all the groups, those who thought *gairaigo* had a modernising influence were most likely to start using new *gairaigo*, with 58.5% using new *gairaigo* they learned 'sometimes' or 'often', followed by those who thought it accelerated internationalisation, thereby confirming hypothesis 4.2g.

Summary of the strongest relationships

Q.1. Perception of a greater increase in *gairaigo* was associated with believing they caused confusion in the language.

Q.3. A negative evaluation of the way *gairaigo* were used was associated with believing they caused confusion in communication. A positive evaluation was most associated with them enriching the language.

Q.5. A negative view of a future increase in *gairaigo* was most associated with causing confusion in communication, while a positive view was most associated with them accelerating internationalisation.

Q.7. Causing confusion naturally correlated positively with causing confusion. However the strongest negative correlation was with *gairaigo* as enriching.

Q.9. Frequent encounter with not understood *gairaigo* was most strongly associated

with thinking they caused confusion in communication.

Q.12. Those who viewed *gairaigo* as modernising were the most likely to start using new *gairaigo*, followed by those who thought them internationalising.

Overall, those who attributed negative effects to *gairaigo* had negative views of *gairaigo* in general. The converse was also evident. However, respondents were generally reluctant to commit to a strong opinion on the effects of *gairaigo* on the language. In the case of beginning to use new *gairaigo*, those who held negative views were resistant, but the strength of this resistance was not equal to their opinions and a considerable proportion still used these words at least sometimes.

Comparisons with other surveys

Gairaigo as an enriching influence has been polled in earlier surveys but there was no comparable question on their modernising or internationalising influence. Some of the items below (see table 7.7) also relate to questions 13 and 15 but have been included here to maintain the questions in context. These aspects are discussed in the relevant sections.

Table 7.7: Results of survey questions on the effects of *gairaigo*

NHK 1989.2: There is the opinion that we should welcome *gairaigo* as a nutrient that enriches Japanese. What do you think about this?

that's exactly right	it's not that good	that's not right	don't know/can't answer
24%	42%	29%	4%

Gairaigo written in *katakana* should not be used much. What are the main reasons?

a. because communication becomes difficult	55
b. because it seems to be just an attempt to be fashionable	45
c. we already have *wago* and *kango* so there is no need to use *gairaigo*	44
d. it destroys the traditional nature of Japanese language	18
e. I don't know many *gairaigo*	15
f. it makes you seem snobbish	10
g. none of the above	4

NHK 1995.3: The following are four opinions on *gairaigo*. Do you agree or not?

a. New ideas and new things are coming into Japan, so it obvious that *gairaigo* will increase.

agree	disagree	don't know/no answer
83.0%	11.3%	5.7%

b. The increase of *gairaigo* enriches the Japanese language.

31.7%	50.9%	17.4%

c. The government should take an active role in regulating the excessive use of *gairaigo*.

15.9%	68.1%	16.0%

d. The excessive use of *gairaigo* should be regulated in broadcasting.

30.0%	54.3%	15.6%

The level of agreement with *gairaigo* as enriching is similar between the present survey and NHK 1989.2, but in NHK 1995.3 agreement was higher. Nonetheless, since the

three questions are not directly comparable, so hypothesis 5.3 cannot be supported. The only conclusion that can be drawn is that more people tend to disagree than agree with this notion. In Bunkachō 2000.1 (see table 7.10), 'enriching' was not a popular option, even amongst those who approved of *gairaigo*, whereas the notion that *gairaigo* allowed the 'expression of new things' was the top option. These are basically the same concept, since anything that adds something new to the language can be considered enriching. However, it seems that the word 'enrich' (*yutaka ni suru*) turns people off. A likely reason is *gairaigo* are associated with things new, while the word *yutaka* has a more traditional connotation, so it seems inappropriate.

As with the present survey, *gairaigo* was linked with communication problems in NHK 1989.2, although the questions are not comparable with regard to proportions. In Bunkachō 2000.1, 'difficulty with understanding' was the top option with those who disapproved of *gairaigo*, and was twice as popular as 'confusing the language'. It seems that people were more willing to criticise *gairaigo* for the concrete problem of impeding communication than for the more abstract one of confusing the language.

Reasons for the incorporation of *gairaigo*

The explanation that received the greatest agreement was Japanese people have adopted *gairaigo* because they have a tendency to copy foreign things (see table 7.8). However, only 13.0% thought this was due to lack of creativity. A majority (59.2%) thought that *gairaigo* were introduced because of a lack of suitable Japanese words, but only 30.4% thought this was because it was easy to incorporate foreign words into Japanese. The idea that the introduction of *gairaigo* was a natural part of the internationalisation process received a mixed response, with 37.4% agreeing and 32.8% disagreeing.

Table 7.8: Q.15. Why do you think Japanese people incorporate *gairaigo* into the Japanese language?

Q.15 reasons	agree	can't say	disagree
a. Because Japanese people have a tendency to copy foreign things	71.5% (655)	15.8% (145)	12.7% (116)
b. Because there are no Japanese words that fit	59.2% (543)	19.3% (177)	21.6% (198)
c. Because it is a natural part of the internationalisation process	37.4% (342)	29.8% (272)	32.8% (300)
d. Because Japanese people have a high degree of enthusiasm for learning foreign languages	13.9% (127)	24.9% (228)	61.2% (561)
e. Because Japanese people lack creativity in making new words	13.9% (119)	24.4% (223)	62.6% (573)
f. Because it is easy to incorporate foreign words into the Japanese language	30.4% (278)	34.1% (312)	35.4% (324)

Comments (N=28) Comments have been grouped according to the response option they are most similar to and according to the similarity of the comments. Some people made more than one comment.

15a.

1. M. 20-24: It has been a long time habit, since the Nara era.
2. M. 20-24: It is an ethnic characteristic.

15b.

3. F. 20-24: I think we can express it better in the foreign language. Even though there is a translated word, it is better to use the foreign word as it is.
4. F. 20-24: [This] is sometimes the case but not always.

15c.

5. M. 30-34: [This phenomenon goes] along with internationalisation, it is not only happening in Japan.
6. F. 40-49: Because the number of people in your circle of friends who understand foreign languages has increased. Because the number of foreigners in Japan has increased.

15f.

7. F. 20-24: Because we have two phonological orthographies and *katakana* makes the adoption of foreign words convenient.
8. M. 30-34: Because we have *katakana*.
9. F. 25-39: Because we have *katakana* it is easy to use.
10. M. 50-59: It is difficult to incorporate foreign words into Japanese so they are used as they are.

Foreign words/languages are fashionable

11. F. 35-39: Foreign words sound stylish. You can give the impression that you are at the head of the trend.
12. F. 40-49: Because people admire Europe and America, they think English is fashionable.
13. F. 40-49: People think it is fashionable to say it in English.
14. F. 20-24: Because there are many who think that using [*gairaigo*] makes them look fashionable and intelligent.
15. F. 20-24: Because they think it is fashionable.
16. F. 20-24: People think foreign languages are fashionable.
17. F. 20-24: Everyone is enjoying the feeling of becoming an international person by using foreign language words.

Sense of inferiority of Japan / Lack of appreciation of Japanese culture

18. F. 20-24: Because [Japanese people] have an inferiority complex with regard to the West.
19. M. 60-69: Sometimes people have an inferiority complex about the Japanese language,

for no reason.

20. M. 20-24: Because people are not confident of the richness of Japanese culture and the level of academic achievement, when compared to foreign countries.

21. M. 40-49: People are not aware of the originality of Japanese culture.

22. M. 16-19: It is because [Japanese people] do not have much interest in their own language.

Other cultural reasons

23. M. 60-69: There is a cultural tendency to appreciate words that have unclear meanings.

24. M. 16-19: It is because Japanese culture is a mixed culture.

25. M. 35-39: Because Japan is an island nation.

Attractiveness of *katakana*

26. M. 40-49: Because [the use of *katakana*] makes documents and instructions look neat and stylish.

27. M. 60-69: People like *katakana* words.

Other

28. M. 40-49: People are easily influenced by TV and mass communications.

29. M. 30-34: It depends on the type of 'Japanese person' (young age-group, older age-group).

30. M. 40-49: Intelligent people, who have good Japanese language ability, do not need *gairaigo* in order to converse with Japanese people in Japan!

31. F. 35-39: Because Japanese is difficult.

The most common reasons given in the comments were cultural. These ranged from historical habit to a sense of the inferiority of Japanese culture. The next most common theme was the importance of fashion, even though this was an issue that had received little support in Q.13. Following this was the nature of the writing system and the role of *katakana*. Only three comments were related to internationalisation.

Demographic variables

15a. Agreement was highest in the 16-19 year group (77.0%) and tended to decrease with age (ρ = 0.098, p=0.003).

15b. The better English speakers were more likely to agree (ρ = 0.100, p=0.003). While there was no significant effect for English reading overall, the same trend was evident and it was significant when the females were considered separately. This tended to support hypothesis 4.4h.

15c. The age-group least likely to agree was 16-19 years (30.4%) and agreement tended to increase with age (ρ = -0.082, p=0.013). This was counter to hypotheses 4.3i, but the

trend was uneven. The effect for English ability was unclear. The top-level readers were the most likely to agree (52.9%) and agreement declined with reading level to a low of 35.7% in the non-readers, but the level of disagreement was fairly constant across reading levels. So, hypotheses 4.4g was not supported, even though there was a trend.

15d. For females, the better readers of English were less likely to agree and more likely to disagree (ρ = -0.107, p=0.013). This tended to support hypothesis 4.4h.

15e. In males, agreement tended to decline with age (ρ = 0.125, p=0.016).

15f. Those aged 50 years and over tended to disagree but there was no clear pattern with regard to the other age-groups.

Options 15a, 15d and 15e related to cultural traits, while 15b and 15f related to features of the language. Although there were few significant correlations, it seems that the cultural explanations were less popular as both age and English ability increased.

Relationships between reasons in question 15

15a and 15e correlated (ρ = 0.109, p=0.001) but the largest subgroup (394) agreed with 15a and disagreed with 15e. So, although there was a tendency for a significant proportion to link copying with lack of creativity, this was not the dominant view. As one comment noted, copying foreign words has a long history in Japan. It seems most people accepted this as a national trait and, of these, many did not regard it as negative. Correlations were found between 15c, 15d and 15f. However, each of these viewpoints could also be independent. Consequently, it was not appropriate to group these reasons for further analysis.

Relationship to other questions

Correlations with questions 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 12 are presented in Table 7.9.

<u>15a. Tendency to copy</u> Agreeing was associated with:

- greater than average estimation of the level of *gairaigo* increase,
- more frequent encounter with *gairaigo* that are not understood,
- greater dislike of the way *gairaigo* are used, and of a future *gairaigo* increase, and
- increased tendency to think that *gairaigo* confused the language.

However, this constellation of experiences and attitudes tended to be mild and did not produce any significant resistance to using a new *gairaigo* that had been learned. It was also evident that many of those who had a positive view of *gairaigo* also agreed that Japanese people tended to copy, so copying was not necessarily regarded as a negative characteristic.

Table 7.9: Spearman correlations and Cramer's V for question 15

Option	Q.1.	Q.3.	Q.5.	Q.7.	Q.9.	Q.12.
15a	0.113, p=0.001 V=0.128	-0.149, p<0.001 V=0.129	-0.122, p<0.001 V=0.103	0.163, p<0.001 V=0.136	0.100, p=0.003 V=0.092	not sig.
15b	not sig.	0.157, p<0.001 V=0.142	0.079, p=0.017 V=0.084	-0.162, p<0.001 V=0.152	not sig.	0.120, p<0.001 V=0.112
15c	not sig.	0.259, p<0.001 V=0.224	0.318, p<0.001 V=0.255	-0.177, p<0.001 V=0.151	not sig.	0.196, p<0.001 V=0.166
15d	not sig.	0.163, p<0.001 V=0.125	0.177, p<0.001 V=0.150	not sig.	not sig.	not sig.
15e	not sig.	not sig.	not sig.	0.132, p<0.001 V=0.135	not sig.	not sig.
15f	not sig.	0.172, p<0.001 V=0.172	0.121, p<0.001 V=0.137	-0.142, p<0.001 V=0.136	not sig.	0.168, p<0.001 V=0.139

<u>15b. No Japanese words fit</u> Those who agreed:

- did not differ from average with regard to experience of the level of change of *gairaigo* or encounter with *gairaigo* they did not understand,
- were somewhat more positive in their view of the way *gairaigo* were used and in their attitude to a future *gairaigo* increase,
- were less likely to regard *gairaigo* as a source of confusion, but many still thought there was this tendency, and
- were slightly more likely than average to use new *gairaigo* they had learned.

Nevertheless, many of those who held negative views of *gairaigo* also agreed that they were adopted since no Japanese words fit.

<u>15c. Natural part of internationalisation</u> Those who agreed:

- did not differ from average with regard to perception of the level in increase in *gairaigo* or encounter with *gairaigo* that were not understood,
- held a more positive view of the way *gairaigo* were used and of a future increase in *gairaigo* (these had the strongest two associations),
- were less likely to view *gairaigo* as causing confusion in Japanese but a substantial proportion still thought there was a tendency for this to happen, and
- were more likely to use new *gairaigo* they had learned at least sometimes.

<u>15d. Enthusiasm for learning foreign languages</u>

Agreement was low but it was associated with:

- a more positive view of the way *gairaigo* are used and of a future increase.

15e. Japanese people lack creativity

Agreement was low but it was associated with:

- more likely to view *gairaigo* as causing confusion in Japanese.

15f. Easy to incorporate foreign words Agreeing was associated with:

- a more positive view of the way *gairaigo* were used and of a future increase,
- a reduced tendency to think *gairaigo* confuse the language, and
- a greater tendency to start using new *gairaigo* that have been learned.

Of the above views, 15a and 15e tended to be negative towards *gairaigo.* The most positive was 15c, followed by 15f, since these both correlated strongly with questions 3, 5 and 12, then 15b and 15d.

Discussion of the relationships between question 15 and general questions

Agreement with 15a was more evident in those who viewed *gairaigo* negatively, but it was also common amongst those who approved of *gairaigo*. Along with 15e, it was associated with thinking *gairaigo* confused the language (Q.7). It was also associated with increased encounters with not understood *gairaigo* (Q.9), thereby supporting the converse of hypothesis 4.2a.

15b received considerable support, particularly from those who took a positive view of *gairaigo,* but many of those who held negative views also accepted this explanation. Those who agreed were less likely to link *gairaigo* with language confusion and were more likely to use new *gairaigo,* thereby supporting hypothesis 4.2e. They were also more likely to think, in Q.16a, that *gairaigo* 'enriched Japanese' ($\rho = 0.222$, $p<0.001$). One comment even noted that foreign words could be more expressive than the Japanese translation. 15f was also associated with a positive view of *gairaigo* and with use of new *gairaigo,* again supporting hypothesis 4.2e. The comments indicated this ease was associated with *katakana*.

Agreement with 15c was the most strongly associated with greater use of new *gairaigo,* thereby supporting hypotheses 4.2e and 4.2g. One comment noted that word borrowing was a worldwide phenomenon. Most people disagreed with 15d, but the small proportion who agreed was positive about *gairaigo*. There was, however, no correlation with question 12, probably due the low level of agreement. Nonetheless, a comment linked *gairaigo* adoption to increasing foreign language knowledge and use in Japan.

Not included in question 15, but evident from the comments, was the issue of fashion. Seven women made comments on how fashionable *gairaigo* were.

Comparisons with other surveys

Directly comparable questions were not found in other surveys, but some questions did address links between *gairaigo* and internationalisation, the need for new words, habit of borrowing, and fashion (see tables 7.10 below and 7.7 above).

Table 7.10. Results of survey questions relating to reasons for *gairaigo* introduction

Yomiuri 1989.11: If you agree with any of the following opinions about *gairaigo*, please circle them.

The internationalisation of our country is remarkable, so the increase in *gairaigo* reflects the vigour of the current era	48.6%
There are new ideas and feelings that cannot be expressed without *gairaigo* or *gaikokugo*	38.2%
In the case of terms used in technology and fashion, Japanese translations do not seem right	32.6%
The inherent beauty of the Japanese language will be lost and there is a risk that traditional Japanese will be distorted	28.8%
Sentences containing *gairaigo* or *gaikokugo* are hard to understand	33.1%
It seems that *gairaigo* or *gaikokugo* are used to sound good and show off	25.1%

Bunkachō 2000.1: Subsequent to a general question on like or dislike of *gairaigo* (see table 6.2) Respondents who were positive about *gairaigo* (N=293) were asked to choose reason(s) why.

There are things that cannot be expressed without *gairaigo* or *gaikokugo*	68.3%
Gairaigo and *gaikokugo* are easier to understand	39.6%
Because it enriches Japanese language and culture	18.8%
Because the Japanese language has been adopting foreign words for a long time	13.7%
Gairaigo and *gaikokugo* are fashionable	11.9%

Those who had a negative view of *gairaigo* (N=779) chose the following reasons.

Gairaigo and *gaikokugo* are difficult to understand	64.2%
The good characteristics of Japanese will be lost	49.9%
Japanese language will get confused and Japanese culture will become corrupt	30.2%
It seems like the shallow pursuit of fashion	28.6%
Because I dislike *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo*	7.6%

In the above surveys and the present survey, large proportions of respondents agreed that *gairaigo* were needed to express new things for which Japanese words were lacking or inadequate. Internationalisation rated highest in *Yomiuri* 1989.11, but this may have been due to there being two options relating to the use of new *gairaigo* to express new meanings with a resultant dilution effect on the proportions. Due to the differences in the questions, however, longitudinal comparisons were not appropriate. The top-ranking option in Bunkachō 2000.1 was similar to 15b. Others were similar to questions 16a, 16b and 16e. Also included, were some of the reasons found in the comments, such as the historical tendency to borrow and the role of fashion, but, as in Q.13, fashion was not rated highly as a reason.

Opinions on how *gairaigo* should be treated

Neither the strongly restrictive (14a) nor the totally open (14d) approaches received much support. So while most people thought *gairaigo* were necessary, since the Japanese vocabulary was inadequate, they did not want them brought in freely. Care in the choice of words (14g) was the most popular statement, followed by selective use of *gairaigo* when a Japanese expression was unavailable (14c).

Table 7.11: Q.14. What do you think about the use of *gairaigo*?

Q.14 statements	agree	can't say	disagree
a. The Japanese language has enough vocabulary, so *gairaigo* should not be used.	5.5% (50)	30.6% (280)	63.9% (585)
b. To avoid the incorrect use of *gairaigo* they shouldn't be used much.	28.0% (256)	34.1% (312)	37.9% (347)
c. They should only be used for things that cannot be expressed in Japanese.	66.5% (607)	18.2% (166)	15.3% (140)
d. They should be brought in freely.	10.2% (93)	37.7% (343)	52.1% (475)
e. Only words relating to current topics should be introduced.	38.6% (354)	33.3% (305)	28.1% (257)
f. The use should be limited to words which ordinary people can understand.	28.2% (257)	35.6% (324)	36.2% (330)
g. We should carefully choose the words to use.	69.7% (637)	17.2% (157)	13.1% (120)
h. It does not matter how much we use them as long as we understand the meaning.	17.4% (159)	34.4% (314)	48.2% (440)

Comments (N=24) Comments were called for. Examples have been grouped as follows:

Should be used accurately, appropriately or carefully

1. M. 30-34: *Gairaigo* should not be used with a meaning different from the original.
2. M. 40-49: It is a problem when *gairaigo* are used (in Japanese) with a meaning different from that in the foreign language.
3. F. 20-24: We should only use *(gairaigo)* in appropriate expressions.
4. F. 40-49: It is necessary to have sufficient ability in using Japanese well to be able to use *gairaigo* in a balanced way.
5. F. 40-49: In the case of opinion g, in material written for the general public I agree, but I don't agree in the case of personal writing and speech.

Mutual comprehension is necessary

6. M. 20-24: The requirement is that the other person can understand (what is said).
7. F. 20-24: People should not intentionally use *gairaigo* which are hard to understand and unnatural.
8. M. 16-19: It is OK as long as they are not used in an artificial way.

Should be limits or conditions

9. M. 40-49: The media, newspapers and TV should limit *(gairaigo)* to words that are

difficult to say in Japanese.

10. F. 16-19: They should be used or not used depending on whom we are talking to.

Japanese words/translations should be used

11. F. 50-59: I want us to make an effort to say it in Japanese rather than simply use *gairaigo.*
12. M. 40-49: We should continue to make an effort to translate into Japanese / *kango.*
13. M. 40-49: I mainly want to continue to enjoy the depth and power of expression of Japanese language.
14. M. 20-24: When the use of unclear language becomes more widespread, the language in which culture can be expressed becomes less meaningful, I think this is a problem.
15. F. 20-24: In some cases the Japanese meaning should be added in brackets.
16. F. 20-24: When it is written in Japanese it is easy to get the meaning at a glance.

Other

17. M. 16-19: I think that words that don't have much meaning will be forgotten soon anyway. I think they are a sort of fad word.
18. M. 60-69: We should distinguish *(gairaigo)* from fad words. They are mixed up.
19. M. 20-24: Sometimes I can get the image just from the sound.
20. M. 40-49: They are used a lot because there is no Japanese translation / equivalent.
21. F. 20-24: At the same time, a modern-style of Japanese language education should be implemented.
22. F. 20-24: I don't pay attention to *gairaigo* in everyday life so I don't have any opinion.

About six (25%) of the comments were concerned with limiting *gairaigo* or using Japanese instead, five focused on the appropriate use of *gairaigo* with the proper meaning, and four were concerned not being able to understand *gairaigo*.

Demographic variables

14a. Those aged 50 years and over were more likely to agree than those in other age-groups, but there was no correlation. For English reading there was a curvilinear relationship with good readers (1) and non-readers (6) being more likely to agree (11.8% & 11.4%) than middle (3) and rudimentary level (4) readers (5.2% & 3.9%).

14b. No correlation was found for English level but agreement was highest amongst the level 1 readers (41.2%) and lowest amongst the non-readers (18.2%). There was no effect for age, although agreement was highest in the 16-19 (33.6%) and 50 plus (32.8%) age-groups.

14c. The best readers were the most likely to agree (72.2%) and the non-readers the least likely (52.3%) (ρ = 0.085, p=0.010).

14d. No significant effects

14e. For the females, agreement tended to increase with age (ρ = -0.099, p=0.020).

14f. There was no correlation with English level, but the top-level readers were the most likely to agree (39.9%), while the non-readers were the least likely (25.0%).

14g. The top-level readers were more likely to agree (77.8%) than non-readers (40.9%) (ρ = 0.141, p<0.001).

14h. The top-level readers were less likely to agree (16.7%), while non-readers were the most likely (29.5%), but the least likely were the level 3 readers (13.4%) (ρ = -0.078, p=0.019).

Age-group did not appear to have an effect on these opinions. The correlation for 14e indicated that older females were more likely to agree with a restrictive view, but this was not sufficient to support hypothesis 4.3j. For English level, the clearest correlation was for 14g, followed by 14c. These statements tended to reflect a conservative or cautious viewpoint on *gairaigo* and gained greater support amongst high-level readers. 14h expressed the opposite attitude and the converse effect was found, with higher level readers being less likely to agree. So, non-readers of English were more liberal in their views on *gairaigo* than were good readers. Even though there were no significant correlations in 14b and 14f, the proportions found in these questions were also consistent with this interpretation. In 14a (perhaps the most conservative view) level 1 and level 6 readers had a similar pattern of response. This would appear to run counter to the above interpretation, but this is probably due to agreement with 14a being very low. Overall, these results tend not to support hypothesis 4.4i.

Relationships between responses in question 14

A fairly consistent pattern of correlations was found between the opinions given in question 14 (see table 7.12). Positive correlations were found between 14a, the least supportive of *gairaigo* use, and 14b, 14c, 14f and 14g. This indicates that respondents who agreed with 14a would also tend to agree with the other four opinions and vice versa. Of the above four correlations, the strongest was between 14a and 14b, with the largest subgroup (291) disagreeing with both. The next largest subgroup (165) disagreed with 14a but couldn't say for 14b, and only 40 agreed with both. 14b and 14f also correlated strongly and also showed a consistent response pattern. The largest subgroup (194) disagreed with both, the next largest subgroup (150) couldn’t say for both, and the third largest subgroup (128) agreed with both. Agreement with 14a represented the most strongly anti-*gairaigo* position, with 14b and 14f representing similar, but more

moderate, opinions. However, none of these three gained majority support.

In the case of 14c and 14g, positive correlations were found with 14a and 14b, and there was majority support. 14c and 14g also correlated strongly. By far the largest subgroup (475) agreed with both, followed by those who agreed with 14g but couldn't say for 14c (89), and those who agreed with 14c but couldn't say for 14g (82).

The opinion most supportive of further introduction of *gairaigo* was 14d, but the level of support was low. As would be expected, 14d correlated negatively with 14a and 14b, but negative correlations were also found with 14c and 14g, suggesting that those who supported these two popular opinions tended not to be supportive of the free introduction of *gairaigo*.

14d correlated positively with 14e, but the largest subgroup (192) disagreed with both. 14d also correlated positively with 14h, but again the largest subgroup (161) disagreed with both. These three represented opinions supportive of *gairaigo* introduction, with 14e being the most popular, but also the most ambivalent, since it also correlated positively with 14f.

Table 7.12: Responses to Q.14 – Spearman Correlations and Cramer's V

	14a no, Jap. has enough vocab.	14b to avoid incorrect use, should not use	14c only for cannot express in Jap.	14d yes, bring in freely	14e limited to current topics only	14f limited to ordinary people can understand	14g should choose carefully
14b	0.321, p<0.001 V= 0.290						
14c	0.176, p<0.001 V= 0.143	0.321, p<0.001 V= 0.248					
14d	-0.146, p<0.001 V= 0.143	-0.296, p<0.001 V= 0.235	-0.302, p<0.001 V= 0.265				
14e	not sig.	-0.119, p<0.001 V= 0.123	not sig.	0.253, p<0.001 V= 0.230			
14f	0.264, p<0.001 V= 0.219	0.360, p<0.001 V= 0.291	0.279, p<0.001 V= 0.264	-0.135, p<0.001 V= 0.157	not sig.		
14g	0.121, p<0.001 V= 0.153	0.278, p<0.001 V= 0.223	0.282, p<0.001 V= 0.231	-0.203, p<0.001 V= 0.195	not sig.	0.269, p<0.001 V= 0.262	
14h as long as can understand	-0.100, p=0.003 V= 0.134	-0.207, p<0.001 V= 0.185	not sig.	0.341, p<0.001 V= 0.279	0.168, p<0.001 V= 0.185	-0.136, p<0.001 V= 0.158	-0.257, p<0.001 V= 0.224

From these results we can construct a hierarchy of opinions ranging from anti-*gairaigo* to supportive of its ongoing introduction. Negative and positive symbols were attributed,

with three symbols marking the extremes and others allocated according to the pattern of correlations. The relative popularity of the opinion is indicated by asterisks according to level of agreement (see table 7.13).

Table 7.13: Opinions in Q.14 arranged according to negativity or positivity towards *gairaigo*

Neg/pos	Opinion in Q.14	popularity
- - -	a. The Japanese language has enough vocabulary, so *gairaigo* should not be used.	*
- -	b. To avoid the incorrect use of *gairaigo* they shouldn't be used much.	****
- -	f. They should be limited to words ordinary people can understand.	*****
-	g. We should carefully choose the words to use.	********
-	c. They should only be used for things that cannot be expressed in Japanese.	*******
+ -	e. Only words relating to current topics should be introduced.	******
++	h. It does not matter how much we use them as long as we understand the meaning.	***
+++	d. They should be brought in freely.	**

Majority support was only evident for the two mildly negative viewpoints 14g and 14c. The mixed opinion, 14e, was supported by more people than opposed it. The medium negative viewpoints, 14b and 14f, were opposed by more than supported them.

Relationships between question 14 and other questions

Correlations between question 14 other questions are presented in table 7.14.

Table 7.14: Q.14 Spearman Correlations and Cramer's V

	Q.1	Q.3	Q.5	Q.7	Q.9	Q.12
14a	not sig.	-0.192, p<0.001 V=0.203	-0.268, p<0.001 V=0.258	0.251, p<0.001 V=0.235	0.085, p=0.011 V=0.125	-0.160, p<0.001 V=0.196
14b	0.065, p=0.050 V=0.063	-0.334, p<0.001 V=0.273	-0.370, p<0.001 V=0.291	0.323, p<0.001 V=0.248	0.138, p<0.001 V=0.110	-0.225, p<0.001 V=0.181
14c	not sig.	-0.221, p<0.001 V=0.186	-0.284, p<0.001 V=0.221	0.166, p<0.001 V=0.122	0.125, p<0.001 V=0.101	-0.185, p<0.001 V=0.139
14d	not sig.	0.368, p<0.001 V=0.313	0.430, p<0.001 V=0.377	-0.257, p<0.001 V=0.204	-0.082, p=0.013 V=0.102	0.267, p<0.001 V=0.234
14e	0.077, p=0.021 V=0.092	0.160, p<0.001 V=0.151	0.163, p<0.001 V=0.175	not sig.	not sig.	0.191, p<0.001 V=0.150
14f	0.072, p=0.030 V=0.066	-0.183, p<0.001 V=0.152	-0.235, p<0.001 V=0.186	0.198, p<0.001 V=0.174	0.112, p=0.001 V=0.104	-0.142, p<0.001 V=0.135
14g	0.066, p=0.046 V=0.107	-0.260, p<0.001 V=0.215	-0.234, p<0.001 V=0.197	0.228, p<0.001 V=0.184	0.119, p<0.001 V=0.089	-0.134, p<0.001 V=0.134
14h	not sig.	0.282, p<0.001 V=0.224	0.291, p<0.001 V=0.244	-0.210, p<0.001 V=0.165	-0.123, p<0.001 V=0.114	0.178, p<0.001 V=0.147

The correlations between the opinions in question 14 and responses to a selection of other questions can be summarised as follows:

14a. Japanese has enough vocabulary so *gairaigo* should not be used

Agreement was a small minority position associated with:

- a more negative view of the way *gairaigo* are used and of any future increase,
- thinking the use of many *gairaigo* confuses Japanese,
- an increased incidence of encounters with not understood *gairaigo*, and
- a decreased tendency to use new *gairaigo* that have been learned.

14b. To avoid incorrect use, they shouldn't be used much

Agreement was a minority position associated with:

- an increased estimation of the increase in *gairaigo*,
- a more negative view of the way *gairaigo* are used and of any future increase,
- thinking the use of many *gairaigo* confuses Japanese,
- an increased incidence of encounters with not understood *gairaigo*, and
- a decreased tendency to use new *gairaigo* that have been learned.

14c. Should only be used for things that cannot be expressed in Japanese

Agreement was a majority position associated with:

- thinking the way *gairaigo* is used is not good,
- a negative evaluation of any future increase in *gairaigo*,
- the use of a lot of *gairaigo* tended to confuse the language,
- more frequent encounters with not understood *gairaigo*, and
- a reduced tendency to use new *gairaigo* that have been learned.

14d. *Gairaigo* should be brought in freely

Those who agreed took a minority position and were:

- more likely to think the way *gairaigo* are used is good,
- more likely to approve of a future increase in *gairaigo*,
- less likely to agree that many *gairaigo* tended to confuse the language,
- less likely to encounter *gairaigo* they did not understand, and
- more likely to use new *gairaigo* they had learned.

14e. Only words relating to current topics should be introduced

More agreed than disagreed. They were:

- more likely to think the way *gairaigo* are used is good,
- more likely to approve of a future increase in *gairaigo*,

- more likely to use new *gairaigo* they had learned.

14f. Should be limited to words that ordinary people can understand

Agreement was a minority position associated with:

- a greater estimate of the level of increase in *gairaigo*,
- an increased tendency to think the way *gairaigo* is used is not good,
- thinking a future increase in *gairaigo* was not good,
- thinking *gairaigo* tended to confuse Japanese,
- a tendency to encounter not understood *gairaigo* more often, and
- less frequent use of new *gairaigo* that had been learned.

14g. Should carefully choose the words to use

Agreement was a clear majority position associated with:

- an increased estimation of the level of *gairaigo* increase,
- thinking the way *gairaigo* is used is not good,
- a negative evaluation of a future increase in *gairaigo*,
- greater tendency to think many *gairaigo* confused Japanese,
- increased incidence of encounters with not understood *gairaigo*, and
- a reduced tendency to use new *gairaigo* that had been learned.

14h. It doesn't matter how much we use *gairaigo*, as long as we understand the meaning

Agreement was a minority position associated with:

- thinking the way *gairaigo* is used is good,
- a positive evaluation of a future increase in *gairaigo*,
- a tendency to think many *gairaigo* do not confuse Japanese,
- decreased incidence of encounters with not understood *gairaigo*, and
- a greater tendency to use new *gairaigo* that had been learned.

Question 5 showed the strongest pattern of correlations overall. Negative correlations with 14b, 14a, 14c, 14f and 14g indicated a lack of support for a future increase in *gairaigo*, and positive correlations with 14d, 14h and 14e indicated support. This confirmed the classification in table 7.13 and indicated that 14e was more supportive of *gairaigo* than against. This same pattern of results was also found in Question 3.

As would be expected, there was strong correlation between negative views of *gairaigo* and Question 7, indicating these people tended to think *gairaigo* cause confusion. 14e did not correlate, indicating the somewhat mixed nature of this opinion. Question 9

showed a similar pattern of results, thereby confirming hypothesis 4.2a and its converse.

Question 12 is perhaps the most interesting, since it relates to behavior rather than experience or opinion. As would be expected, 14a was most strongly against using new *gairaigo* and 14d was most strongly in support. 14e also showed support, again suggesting it represented a more positive than negative opinion.

In order to determine how closely opinion was linked to behaviour for those who agreed with each opinion, the proportions who used new *gairaigo* often or sometimes was calculated and compared with those who used them seldom or would not use them (see table 7.15).

Table 7.15: Opinions ranked in descending negativity by response to question 12

Opinion (ranked – to +)	often / sometimes use (n)	seldom / will not use (n)
14a	32.0% (16)	22.0% (11)
14b	32.8% (84)	18.7% (48)
14f	37.8% (97)	16.7% (43)
14c	39.9% (242)	14.0% (85)
14g	41.6% (265)	12.7% (81)
14e	54.5% (193)	7.9% (28)
14h	56.6% (90)	6.3% (10)
14d	74.2% (69)	2.2% (2)

The percentages confirm the ranking of the opinions and demonstrate that respondents' behaviour was consistent in both their adoption of *gairaigo* and in resistance to *gairaigo* thereby supporting hypothesis 4.2e. In addition, it shows that even when the opinion of *gairaigo* was negative, over 30% still adopted new *gairaigo* and this was greater than the resistance rate.

Comparisons with other surveys

Questions similar to 14f and 14h have been asked in other surveys (see table 7.16).

In NHK 1988.2, the level of support for introducing *gairaigo* on the basis of their being understandable, was much higher than in 14h of the present survey. This seems to suggest that support for *gairaigo* has fallen. However, Bunkachō 2000.1 also appeared much more supportive of *gairaigo* than 14f, but this may have been because the context was limited to the names of events.

Bunkachō 1995.4 contained a similar question to 14d but received a much larger level of support, but again the context was different.

Table 7.16. Results of questions in other surveys relating to how *gairaigo* should be treated

NHK 1988.2: Do you agree with the following? It doesn't matter how much we use *gairaigo*, as long as we understand the meaning.

agree	don't agree	hard to say which	don't know/no answer
53.5%	35.2%	10.4%	0.9%

Bunkachō 1995.4: What do you think of the following opinions?

a. It is necessary for the government to work to maintain the correctness and beauty of Japanese language.

I think so	I don't think so	can't say which	don't know
71.5%	19.8%	6.0%	2.6%

b. It is necessary for the government to provide broad guidelines for language usage.

46.5%	40.2%	8.4%	4.9%

c. A language changes with the times, so it is better to let nature run its course.

38.7%	48.6%	10.7%	2.1%

Bunkachō 2000.1: What do you think of the use of *gairaigo* in the names of public facilities and events? Choose one from the following.

a. it is all right to use *gairaigo* but they should be limited to those that the general public understands.	48.3%
b. I don't think there is any particular problem with names in *gairaigo*.	24.5%
c. Japanese names should be used, without using *gairaigo*.	12.6%
d. I think it is good to use *gairaigo* actively to invent a good name.	10.1%
e. other	0.7%
f. don't know	3.9%

Overall, both the NHK and Bunkachō surveys displayed tolerant attitudes to *gairaigo* despite being 18 years apart, however, due to the great differences between the various surveys, no longitudinal comparisons can be drawn.

Summary of findings

Regarding language confusion, in Q.17 a majority thought the language had a tendency to be confused, and while the proportion that was certain of this was small, it was larger than those who clearly disagreed. A similar pattern of results was evident in Q.7, except that the majority tended to disagree, and the proportion that clearly disagreed was considerably larger than those who clearly agreed. Therefore, while most people thought Japanese was somewhat confused, most did not attribute this to *gairaigo*. Nonetheless, there was a link between the two viewpoints, as shown by the correlation. The comments revealed that besides *gairaigo* there were other aspects to language confusion such as *keigo*, accent, and the use of 'proper Japanese'. Also, the view proposed in Q.7 was an extreme one that could be read as *gairaigo* eventually causing the extinction of Japanese, and this could have lead to a lower level of support than if it had been a more moderate statement. This concern was evident in the comments, a

number of which refuted the notion of *gairaigo* leading to the 'ruin' of Japanese.

Age was a clear factor in Q.17, with support for the notion growing with age, but in Q.7 there was no correlation with age. This suggests that as age increased people became more convinced that the language was confused, but not that *gairaigo* were the source of this confusion. Probably they were concerned over a range of issues. English level did not seem to have an effect on responses to either question. The pattern of correlations with questions 1, 3, 5, 9 and 12 were very similar for questions 17 and 7, with no discernible differences. Comparisons with other studies showed that the level of agreement with Q.17 was in line with that found in earlier studies. There was, however, no clear evidence that belief in language confusion had changed over the 1980s and 1990s. In the case of Q.7, there were insufficient surveys for comparison.

Of the options given for the effects of *gairaigo* on the language, all received only minority support. Introducing confusion in communication received the largest level of agreement, followed by enriching the Japanese vocabulary. These were quite different viewpoints, as shown by the negative correlation between them and the correlations with other questions. Internationalising and modernising the language both received low levels of support with internationalising receiving the highest level of disagreement. The correlations showed that these represented positive views of *gairaigo,* and those who associated *gairaigo* with modernising the language were the most likely to start using new *gairaigo*. Neither age nor English level had a clear relationship with responses to this question. An earlier survey also found that people linked *gairaigo* with communication problems but the survey results were not comparable with regard to degree.

Of the reasons given for the incorporation of *gairaigo* into Japanese, a majority selected the tendency to copy, and some of the comments noted that this was a 'long term habit' and an ethnic characteristic. This reason correlated with a mildly negative view of *gairaigo* in general. It also tended to decline with age. A smaller majority chose the reason 'there are no Japanese words that fit'. This correlated with a mildly positive view of *gairaigo*. There was no age effect. The notion that *gairaigo* were a consequence of internationalisation received support from a minority of a little over one third. The correlations showed this was associated with a positive view of *gairaigo*. Although not included in the options, the comments suggested that fashion played a role in the

adoption of *gairaigo*. In other surveys, both the lexical gap and internationalisation explanations received considerable support, with fashion receiving relatively little support.

A laissez-faire approach to how *gairaigo* should be treated (i.e. 14.d & 14.h) received fairly low levels of support, but respondents were even less enthusiastic about the strongly restrictive approach (14a). The approaches that received strong majority support were those that implied restraint in *gairaigo* use (i.e. 14.c & 14.g). These views were associated with a mildly negative view of *gairaigo*. Age did not correlate with these opinions but the effects found for English reading pointed to a greater tendency amongst the top-level readers to take a restrictive or cautionary approach to *gairaigo*.

Lack of support for a restrictive approach was also evident in NHK 1995.3 (see table 7.7), but in Bunkachō 1995.4, the majority seemed to support government action. The questions were, however, very differently phrased. In Bunkachō 1995.4, the implication in option a. was that government would take care of its own language use, in a similar manner to 14g, while in option b., the guidelines would be loose ones, not restrictions. People were quite willing to take care in language use, and wanted the media and government to take care also, but there was very little enthusiasm for restrictive measures.

The next chapter returns to the issue of language planning and the approaches taken by various LP bodies to the issue of *gairaigo*.

CHAPTER 8

GAIRAIGO AND LANGUAGE PLANNING IN CONTEMPORARY JAPAN

This chapter focuses on LP for *gairaigo* from the late 1980s through to the early 2000s. Part 1 examines the viewpoints of unofficial and semi-official bodies on *gairaigo* and their level of influence on policy. Part 2 examines the interrelationships between LP bodies with a focus on the makeup of official LP bodies. Part 3 details NLC policy discussions in the 1990s, the activities of FLC and the outcomes of the measures taken.

PART 1. RESPONSES OF LP BODIES TO *GAIRAIGO*

The policy positions adopted by LP bodies aim to achieve particular ends, but these may be multiple and are not always clearly stated. Since the thrust of LP activity was concerned with issues other than *gairaigo,* the viewpoint taken on *gairaigo* may only manifiest in relation to other issues.

Unofficial bodies

The background to these bodies was discussed in Chapter 3.

Nihon-Rōmajikai

Rōmajikai does not appear to have an established policy on *gairaigo,* but their current president Umesao Tadao, an anthropologist, favours words that are comprehensible to the ear and advocates the use of a simple style of writing based on the spoken language that uses *rōmaji* and *wago,* rather than *kanji* and *kango*. He is not a supporter of increased *gairaigo* use (Mogami, 1997). Rōmajikai was once very infuential on LP. Toki Zenmaro, a member, was president of the first five NLC and a board member of NLRI. Executive members of Rōmajikai also held positions on some early Councils, but by the 1990s the society's influence had waned considerably and romanisation had ceased to be a major issue for deliberation by official LP bodies.

Kanamojikai

Kanamojikai views *kanji* as an impediment to education, intellectual development and efficiency. They also favour the use of *wago* rather than *kango*. However, they recognize that it is impractical to immediately cease using *kanji,* so in the interim they support limitations on *kanji* and recommend the use of the 881 Kyōikukanji in conjunction with *katakana* (Kanamojikai, 1971). While they have no specific policy on *gairaigo,* a number of articles have appeared in their journal *Kana-no-hikari* and on

their homepage, expressing the views of members. In response to the debate on the influx of *gairaigo* causing confusion in the language, Tamaki (1991) argued that greater confusion was due to *kango* and made the point that *kango* is a kind of *gairaigo* anyway. Kawai (1993; 1996) argued that *katakanago* can be easier to understand than *kango* and said that critics should be more concerned over the use of difficult *kango* and *kango* homophones, whose meanings are difficult to comprehend when heard. Momose (1987) pointed out that *katakana* were not only used for *gairaigo.* In the contemporary press many words were written in *katakana* rather than *kanji,* since *katakana* are easier to read and stand out. So there is a gradual increase in those who use *katakana* in place of *kanji*. Kikuchi, a frequent contributer to their journal, responded to an article by Ōno in *Yomiuri* (Mizutani & Ōno, 1995) that claimed the influx of *katakanago* was due to the postwar limitations on *kanji* having made *kanji* less productive. He argued against Ōno's view, saying the popularity of *katakanago* was due to other reasons and while *kanji* could still be productive, there was little enthusiasm for using *kango* as translations for new words. He said that *kanji* had damaged Japanese much more than *katakanago* (Kikuchi, 1996). Since, Kanamojikai's primary aims are limiting *kanji* and promoting *katakana*, it seems consistent for them to support direct borrowing as a means of corpus modernisation. Even so, they appear reluctant to take a firm position on this.

In the immediate postwar period, prominent members of Kanamojikai held positions on the first five NLC, but from the sixth onwards their influence declined. Shibata held a position on Councils 8, 9 and 10, but not in his capacity as a club member (Monbushō, 1952-1966; NLRI, 1968-2000; Watanabe, 2003). In the 1990s, further limits on *kanji* were off the agenda and the influence of Kanamojikai on NLC was minimal.

Language Issues Discussion Society (LIDS)

On the society's website is a document which states that language is not a tool and that the focus on phonology is mistaken. Language policy in the postwar period has been based on these misconceptions and it is the role of the society to rectify this (LIDS, 1959). Although LIDS does not appear to have an official view on *gairaigo*, the anti-*gairaigo* views of some of its prominent members, such as Ōno and Tsuchiya, were outlined in Chapter 4. *Gairaigo* are conspicuously absent on the website, suggesting a policy of deliberate avoidance.

Japan Newspapers Association (JNA)

There has been an active and ongoing dialogue between JNA and NLC with regard to the specifics of LP, particularly in reference to script. Articles on LP issues frequently appear in the press. Newspaper representatives are included on NLC and are considered influential. Consequently, there has been general accord between the policies put out by NLC and those of the newspapers (Kindaichi et al, 1988). There are, however, some differences. While newspapers adopt the Jōyōkanji list in principle, NTC specified 11 *kanji* that were not to be used in newspapers and also permited some *kanji* that were not on the list (*Asahi*, 1990).

With regard to *gairaigo* usage, newspapers seldom take explicit policy positions but their internal policies are occasionally expressed. The common terminology booklet used by all newspapers stated: '*gairaigo* should not be used indiscriminately', and in response to a letter to the editor in 1980 complaining about excessive *gairaigo* use, *Yomiuri* said they: 'do not use difficult *gairaigo* for fun – there are occasions when it is necessary. We are always trying to reduce the number of *gairaigo*. We wish to make newspapers easy to read by using Japanese as much as possible and when *gairaigo* are unavoidable, explanatory notes are added' (Ishino, 1983, pp.234,236). It has also been reported that the internal policy position of the newspapers with relation to *gairaigo* is equivalent to that of NHK, that is, in order to facilitate understanding Japanese should be used wherever possible and *gairaigo* avoided (*Yomiuri*, 2003, October 29b).

Individual newspapers issue their own handbooks on language usage that include how to spell various *gairaigo*. According to Katayama (1983), of the *Asahi* terminology committee, the view of newspapers is that *gairaigo* is Japanese, so it should be spelt according to the Japanese phonological system. Sounds such as 'v' do not exist in Japanese, so spelling words using such non-existent sounds is meaningless and should not be permitted. Consequently, these handbooks avoid novel *katakana* combinations (e.g. there is no 'va') (*Asahi*, 1990; *Yomiuri*, 2002).

Some guidance on appropriate use is provided by *Asahi*: 'be careful not to overuse *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo*. New ideas that do not have a suitable replacement term and specialised terms that are not easily understood need to be treated carefully. They should be accompanied by a short explanation, either in brackets following the word, or as a note at the end of the article' (*Asahi*, 1990, p.397). Despite such guidelines,

complaints are frequent and *Yomiuri* (2002) has even produced its own dictionary of *katakana* words used in newspapers, in response to letters from readers complaining they cannot understand *katakana* words. Even so, the dictionary does not express any policy position regarding appropriate *gairaigo* usage.

Overall, the major newspapers have taken a cautious position on novel *katakana* and, it would seem, on *gairaigo* usage. However, their position is very general and not actively advocated.

Semi-official bodies

Japan Broadcasting Corporation (NHK)

NHK states that its 'broadcast language must be easy to understand, correct, aesthetically pleasing, and have a rich variety of expression' (Carroll, 2001, p.48). It is consciously aware of its role in improving the language and fashioning a new spoken language appropriate to the 21st century (Carroll, 1995; NHK, 2001). Although NHK does not issue policy directives, it has internal policies and provides detailed guidance to the public on language usage via its handbooks for announcers, pronunciation and accent dictionaries and other publications (Carroll, 1995; NHK, 2001).

In the immediate postwar period, the influx of *gairaigo* led NHK to develop a policy position. About 3,000 *gairaigo* were selected for discussion and in 1953 a compendium of these words (called *Gairaigoshū*) was developed for internal use. It divided these words into three categories as follows:

1. appropriate for use in broadcasting;
2. should be avoided except when used as a specialist term;
3. should be avoided in broadcasting wherever possible.

In subsequent years *gairaigo* remained a topic for discussion and, although there have been adjustments in the categorisation of some words, the system continued to be used within NHK (Asai, 1987). According to Ogawa (in Iijima, Momose & Ogawa, 1956), NHK took a conservative position on *gairaigo* usage, since it broadcast to all regions of Japan and intended its language to be understood by all and regarded as the standard. Kindaichi (1966) commented that in the postwar period NHK's carefully constructed word lists were considered authoritative and were adopted by commercial broadcasters.

With regard to explicit policies on current *gairaigo* use, the 2000 edition of *NHK*

Handbook of Japanese Language only contains rules for the spelling of *gairaigo* and foreign names. These rules state that when there is an established *katakana* spelling in Japan that is different from the pronunciation in the foreign language, the established version is adopted, but when there is no clearly established spelling, a spelling that is as close to the source language as possible should be used. In news programs the focus should be on the ease of understanding for viewers, and the spelling should be the same as in newspapers and other media, where possible. Pronunciation should accord with the spelling, except for sounds such as 'v' that do not occur in Japanese. Following on from these general rules are numerous examples of how to spell foreign words (NHKBCRI, 2000, pp.203-4). In these guidelines NHK encourages, in some instances, the use of modern *katakana* spelling, while respecting established usage. As Carroll (1995) has noted, NHK has to keep up with language change, but cannot be too innovative, since either position could alienate the public who look to it as the representative of good spoken Japanese.

Although spelling is a legitimate issue for a broadcaster of television programs that use subtitles and other forms of text, it does seem surprising that a broadcaster would focus on spelling. The 1987 edition of the handbook did, however, include a brief policy on usage as follows:

1. When it is possible to express an idea using existing Japanese words, these should be used without resorting to *gairaigo*.
2. When there is no equivalent word, and when a difficult technical term is used, the *gairaigo* should be used with explanation.
3. Verbs that combine a *gairaigo* plus *suru* (to do), for example 'camouflage *suru*', should be avoided, unless they are already in common usage.

This section was deleted from the 1992 and subsequent edition, but the question and answer section said that NHK recognised that *gairaigo* can be difficult to understand, so 'in such cases an explanation is always added, and *gairaigo* should not be used when existing Japanese words are available. These are the unspoken rules.' Regarding the use of *gairaigo* in program titles, NHK said that even though *gairaigo* can help program titles to stand out, when these are used a lot the effect is lost. Just because they are in a title, does not mean that incomprehensible words can be used (NHKBCRI, 2000, p.335; Harada, 2001). These comments show that the policy of limiting *gairaigo* use expressed in 1987 remains, but the fact that it has been relegated to a less conspicuous location in the handbook suggests a decline in the active implementation of this policy.

While NHK does not have an official role in LP, it has had close links with both NLC and NLRI. Prominent members of NHK were always included on NLC and members of NLC and NLRI were included on NHKBLC. NHKBCRI and NLRI have overlapping research interests and have cooperated on projects. Therefore NHK has numerous avenues of influence on official policy.

Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute (GISPRI)

In February 1993, GISPRI released 'A Proposal on the Establishment of a Japanese Language Policy in the Global Age' which was presented to the Prime Minister. The report made six proposals:

1. Establish a section of government to deal with the full scope of language policy issues, funded from the national budget.

   The main aim should be to develop skills in clear, logical communication that can be understood in the international arena and the establishment of Japanese an official language in the United Nations.

2. Introduce education in 'language arts' aimed at developing the use of clear, expressive language for international communication.

   The report argued that Japanese styles of communication, that express things indirectly, were not effective in international society and led to miscommunication and suspicion. Children in Europe and America were taught at school to clearly distinguish between fact and opinion, and communicate these effectively. Japanese children should also be taught in this way. This did not mean that Japanese communication styles should be abandoned, but that new forms were needed for international communication. This kind of education needed to be developed and introduced as soon as possible.

3. Financial support for Japanese language education for foreigners.
4. Reform foreign language education to suit the era of globalisation.

   The focus of foreign language education in Japan should shift to a communication-centered focus. There should be more emphasis on learning the languages of neighbouring countries and the training of interpreters and translators in these languages.

5. Promotion of language sciences and the systematic development of language processing technology.
6. Promote language investment in a borderless trade system (GISPRI, 1993, pp.2-6).

GISPRI proposed a form of LP that was wholly focused on globally strategic purposes, rather than internal cultural concerns or historical and ideological disputes. The timing of the Committee and its proposals were also significant since they coincided with the change in direction of NLC. The Committee was chaired by the physicist Kinoshita Koreo (a regular conributor to *Kotoba-shirīzu*) and included Suzuki Takao, Mizutani Osamu (NLC 18-22), Nishio Keiko (NLC 19-22) and Oshio Makoto (NLC 22), giving it both broad and high-level influence.

Official LP bodies

Although NLC was the main official LP body to issue policy recommendations, other official bodies were also involved in LP with regard to *gairaigo*.

Terminology Rectification Committee (TRC)

In 1989 Koizumi Junichirō, then Minister for Health and Welfare, set up a committee of executive officers within the Ministry (Kōseishō) to revise the use of *katakanago* in documents issued by Kōseishō. This TRC issued a directive regarding the use of *katakanago* in 1989. When he returned to Kōseishō in 1996, he reestablished TRC and in 1998 another directive was issued (NLRI, 2000, pp.87-93).

Koizumi said that something needed to be done about the flood of *katakanago* terminology. The terms that he targeted were: *tāminarukea* ターミナルケア (terminal care), *deisābisu* (day-service), *shōtosutei* ショートステイ (short-stay), *nōmaraizēshon* ノーマライゼーション (normalisation), *keahausu* ケアハウス (care-house), *werueijingukomyunitī* ウェルエイジングコミュニティー (well-aging-community) etc. There was also discussion about reviewing the use of words such as *nīzu* ニーズ (needs) and *konseputo* コンセプト (concept) in parliamentary debates (Suzuki T., 1991, p.211). According to *Yomiuri* (2002, November 21):

> ‘When Koizumi first set up his Committee it was in the middle of the bubble economy and all ministries and other government agencies were competing with each other for funds for projects, which used numerous *katakana* words in their titles to make them seem new and attractive. He was annoyed by project names such as Well-Ageing-Community-Kōsō which were aimed at elderly people but used words that elderly people would not understand. So he had all these *katakana* words changed to more suitable words in the so-called “*katakana* hunt”.’

TRC's guidelines were issued in September 1997 by the Minister's office and distributed to section heads throughout Kōseishō. These proposed four principles of language use in order to make materials issued by Kōseishō to the public easier to understand, by using Japanese as much as possible:

1. The main principle is to avoid *katakanago* and replace these words with Japanese equivalents. A list of 23 *katakanago* with appropriate replacements was given. For example, *keapuran* ケアプラン (care-plan) was replaced by *kaigosābisukeikaku* 介護サービス計画 and *donā* ドナー (donor) was replaced by *zōkiteikyōsha* 臓器提供者.
2. In the case of new ideas or things which did not exist in Japan, or in cases where the use of specialist terms was unavoidable, then *katakanago* use was considered acceptable. However, in such cases the Japanese explanation should come first, followed by the *katakanago* in brackets. When the same word is used again, only the *katakanago* could be given. In the case of acronyms, the Japanese explanation should come first followed by the full term and the acronym in brackets. The sixteen examples included: *mushōheki* 無障壁 (*bariafurī* バリアフリー i.e. barrier-free); *haishi to shinsetsu* 廃止と新設 (*sukurappuandobirudo* i.e. scrap and build); *nichijōseikatsu no dōsanōryoku* 日常生活の動作能力 (Abilities of Daily Life, ADL).
3. *Gairaigo* that are already used in everyday life should be used as they are. For example, *sābisu* サービス (service), *pettobotoru* ペットボトル (PET bottle).
4. When Japanese translations are used for *katakanago*, an effort should be made to insure that these translations are easy to understand (NLRI, 2000).

In July 1998, an additional list of 64 *katakanago* with replacement words categoried by area was issued (NLRI, 2000).

Suzuki T. (1991, p.211) commented: 'this minister's campaign to purge *katakana* terms has resonated with elderly people who have written numerous letters to the editor expressing their agreement and encouraging his efforts. Despite such a response, there are others who wonder how successful this will be.' He went on to say: 'What interests me most about this is that the person who was fed up with the excessive use of *katakana* terms by bureaucrats and took action was not the Minister of Education or NLC, whose only role is to deal with language issues, but the Minister of Health!'

A *Yomiuri* reporter interviewed a number of elderly Japanese people to find out whether they understood the problematic *katakanago* used in aged care. Some people had no

idea what the terms meant but those who were using the services tended to know them. One old lady in a wheelchair said that she actually preferred 'barrier-free' to the alternative term, but generally, people wanted Japanese to be used when talking about aged care (*Yomiuri*, 2002, November 25).

Although short-lived and limited in scope, TRC was the first LP body to be wholly concerned with *gairaigo* usage. While it is difficult to measure the extent to which this committee and Koizumi's personal interest in *gairaigo* affected LP after he became Prime Minister, according to Mizutani (2003, p.6): 'It seems that Koizumi's concerns over the excessive use of difficult-to-understand *gairaigo* provided the trigger for the establishment of Gairaigo-iinkai.' As will be seen below, there are similarities between the approach taken by TRC and those of both NLC and FLC.

National Language Council (NLC)

During the 1990s there were five Councils (18 to 22). Their composition, activities and policies are discussed in Parts 2 and 3 below.

National Language Committee (Kokugobunkakai)

The successor of NLC, this committee continues to deliberate on LP issues but these do not include *gairaigo* (MEXT, 2002). Therefore further discussion is unwarrented.

Foreign Loan Words Committee (FLC)

Established in August 2002 under NLRI, it comprised: the head and ex-head of NLRI, 3 other institute members, plus 15 external members including people from the mass media, scientists and writers (NLRI, nd; Tanaka, 2003). The activities of FLC are discussed in Part 3 below.

PART 2: RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN LP BODIES

Although there are a considerable number of distinct bodies involved directly or indirectly in LP, there is overlap in membership between these bodies. This is examined using published membership lists, where possible, and references to affiliation in other publications.

Membership structure of NLC

NLC was both the most influential and largest LP body. It usually consisted of 45 members plus a number of officials from Bunkachō and Kokugoka who provided

support. When there were retirements or deaths during the course of a Council, new members were appointed, so the number of people involved in a particular Council was usually greater than 45. Table 8.1 shows the types of people who made up NLC based on their primary affiliation.

Over the last three decades the general membership structure was fairly constant, with academics occupying the majority of positions. The next largest grouping was newspapers, with one representative from JNA, plus members from other papers. Broadcasting was less well represented numerically, but NHK, besides always having at least one member, also held the chair seven times. In addition, Kanno Ken (19-20) was listed as an academic, but he was also ex-NHK. A number of members were from research institutes, but these formed a diverse group comprising both government, private and consumer groups. Schools were generally represented by the principals of individual public schools.

NLRI always had at least one representative, but the figures tend to understate its influence, since there was considerable overlap in the roles of some members, particularly in the case of academics. For example, Nomoto Kikuo was listed as an academic on Councils 19-20 but at this time he was the ex-director of NLRI. Four other academics were also ex-NLRI – Shibata Takeshi (8-10), Ishiwata Toshio (17-20), Tokugawa Munemasa (21-22) and Saiga Hideo (16-20). The influence of writers and critics is also somewhat understated by the figures, since some academics were also writers e.g. Etō Jun (17-21) was an executive member of JWA.

From 1966 to 2000, the main changes in the composition of NLC were a decline in the number of academic appointments, a strengthening of newspapers, publishing and printing, and a broadening of the kinds of appointments. People from the entertainment industry were included in the mid 1970s. The number of business members, who were always from large corporations such as Toyota, Shiseidō and Fujitsū, increased in the 1990s and the Association for Japanese Language Teaching (AJALT) gained a representative.

Table 8.1. Membership structure of National Language Councils 8-22 (1966-2000)

Councils (8th to 22nd) and dates (year.month)

	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
Category	66.6 - 68.5	68.6 - 70.6	70.7 - 74.11	72.11 - 77.1	75.1 - 77.1	77.4 - 79.3	79.6 - 81.5	82.3 - 84.3	84.4 - 86.4	86.12 - 88.12	89.2 - 91.2	91.11 - 93.8	93.11 - 95.11	96.7 - 98.7	98.12 - 00.12
Academics	26v	29v	28v	26v	22v	23v	20v	15	17	20	20	14v	15v	16c	18c
NHK	1c	1c	1c	1	1	1	1	1	1	2c	2c	3c	3c	2	1
Other broadcasting	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	1
Sōrifu	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2
Entertainment industry	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	2	2
Business	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	3
NLRI	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	1	2
JNA	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Other newspapers	6	6	8	7c	6c	8c	8c	8	8	8v	8v	8	7	9	8
Publishing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2
Printing	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Research institutes	2	1	1	2	3	3	3	4	3	2	2	2	2	0	0
School education	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	4	4	2	3	3	3	3	2
Writers	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	2	3v	2
Critics	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arts/Culture	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3cv	2cv	0	0	0	0	0	0
AJALT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1v
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	46	50	49	46	47	48	46	48	48	45	46	47	48	46	46

c = Chair person, v = Vice-chair

Compiled from NLC membership lists: Monbushō (1952-1966); NLRI (1968-2000)

Links between LP organisations

As noted above, official bodies such as NLRI, Sōrifu and NHK all had permanent positions on NLC. While NHK's voting position appears relatively weak, its representative held the Chair in seven of the last 15 Councils and there is cross membership with Council members also sitting on NHKBLC. For example, on the 21st Council there were three such members. Of the unofficial bodies, only JNA maintained a permanent representative. All the major newpapers belong to this association, so it seems that this position would be a particularly influential one, providing a conduit between NTC and NLC. Nevertheless, the newpaper representatives tended not to be people who had expressed views on LP, and since the internal workings of NLC remain opaque, it is difficult to determine how much influence they actually brought to bear on policy. GISPRI, on the other hand, had indirect but strong representation via three members between 1990 and 2001. Mizutani was on Councils 18 to 22, Nishio on 19 to 22, and Oshio on 22. Moreover, on the final Council, both the Chair (Mizutani) and Vice-chair (Nishio) were occupied by GISPRI members.

Of the 20 members of FLC, six had been on NLC. Four were current members of NLRI, 10 were academics (two were ex-NLRI), two were newpaper editors (*Asahi*, *Yomiuri*), one was from NHK, and there was one writer, one translator and one publisher. The Committee Head, Kai Mutsurō, was also head of NLRI and the Vice-chair, Mizutani Osamu, was ex-head of NLRI and a member of NHKBLC.

Unlike in the 1950s and 1960s, the level of influence of unofficial LP bodies in the 1990s was low. Rōmajikai, Kanamojikai and LETS had no representation on NLC or FLC. Some members did contribute to the influential *Kotoba-shirīzu*, however, and may also have gained influence via other writings. Overall, both NLC and FLC were dominated by people from official and semi-official LP bodies, academics and newspaper representatives, partially confirming hypotheses 2.2. Key positions on NLC tended to be held by members of NLRI, NHK and, in the late 1990s GISPRI. This supports hypotheses 2.1.

PART 3. NLC REPORTS 1993 TO 2000 AND THE ACTIVITIES OF FLC

Councils 19 to 22 deliberated on a much broader scope of issues than previous Councils. This indicated a fundamental shift in the thinking of planners away from the focus on script, and in particular on *kanji*, that had dominated the postwar Councils to date. Four

reports were issued: 1993, 1995, 1998 and 2000. These are discussed below with reference to *gairaigo* and associated issues. FLC released three reports between 2003 and 2004. Full translations are provided for key sections of these reports, with other parts being paraphrased, in order to preserve a sense of the structure of each report and place issues relating to *gairaigo* in context.

The 1993 NLC report

The final report of the 19th Council 'Regarding the problems affecting contemporary Japanese' (*Gendai no kokugo o meguru shomondai nitsuite*) presented discussions on issues intended for further deliberation by subsequent Councils. The style was indirect and tentative (i.e. used *de arō*). Its basic viewpoint was stated as follows:

> 'The National Language is an important entity formed through an eternity of history. It is closely linked with the creation and transmission of culture, therefore, by according a high regard to tradition and considering future development, it is extremely important to actively implement each policy in cooperation with other ministries. So far, language policy has been primarily concerned with formulating and implementing measures with regard to the writing system. However, from now on, NLC will not only concern itself with the writing system but with issues of language use such as everyday speech, *keigo*, standard language and dialects. Moreover, in order to respond to the information age and internationalisation, it is necessary to consider the totality of *kokugo* issues including education and research.' (Bunkachō, 1994, p.86).

These statements of intent were followed by an assurance that the recommendations of NLC were intended to apply to language for public consumption, such as laws, public documents, newspapers, magazines and broadcasting, but not to science, the arts and specialist fields, or to personal writing (Bunkachō, 1994).

As noted by Ujihara (1994), in this report NLC took up the proposals made in 1972 and used similar wording. The identification of the language with culture, rather than viewing it as a tool for communication, was a key feature of the LDP Sub-committee's 1968 report, as well as NLC's 1972 proposal. This suggested that the focus of discussion would not be reformist but conservative in nature.

For the first time a statement on *gairaigo* that dealt with issues other than *katakana* spelling was included. In the section on social change and language it stated:

> 'With regard to language and human interaction, the topics that are often discussed are so-called language confusion and *keigo* issues. The rapid changes in modern life have

> brought a flood of new terms, slang or fad words (*ryūkōgo*), *gairaigo*, *gaikokugo* and specialist terminology that has broadened the gap in language use between the generations. Of course we recognise that the development of new culture is actively progressing in the young generation. If people recognise the difference between formal and informal situations and use language appropriately no difficulties should arise. However, when such distinctions are lacking or forgotten, the basic function of language, that of communication, can be impeded and this can lead to problems in human relations. The arrival of the aged society is a certainty and we think this will also have an effect on language problems.' (Bunkachō, 1994, p.85).

Here NLC seems to imply that *gairaigo* are also a form of 'confusion' and inter-generational communication is identified as a key issue. This was, however, not a new issue, having been discussed by Suzuki T. (1985a).

Later in the same section, following on from comments on the need to support Japanese language education for foreigners, the following statement was made:

> 'Voices have been raised to the effect that some sort of brake on the excessive use of *gaikokugo* in Japanese is necessary. This could be a good opportunity for us to consider the state of the national language in relation to international society.' (Bunkachō, 1994, p.84).

Although the voices were not specified, Suzuki T. (1985b) had called for a brake on *gairaigo* and it was also likely that this was a reference to the actions of Koizumi. The notion that the *gairaigo* issue presented a good opportunity to consider the state of the language was expressed by Horiuchi (1990).

This section suggests that NLC regarded the overuse of new *gairaigo* to be a factor in the breakdown in communication between older and younger generations. It could also be inferred that the increase in new *gairaigo* presented difficulties for learners of Japanese. These issues, together with calls for limits on the use of new *gairaigo*, meant that it was time to reconsider the broader issue of how Japanese was responding to internationalisation.

With regard to internationalisation, Suzuki T. has argued that the learning of Japanese should be promoted and Japanese should become a language of international communication. However, *gairaigo* present both a problem for learners of Japanese and a barrier to the wider use of Japanese in the international arena (Suzuki T., 1988; 1992a).

The passage continued:

> ‘These changes in social conditions have various effects on the language, people’s language life, and people’s attitudes to language. The language is the most important thing that forms a common bond between people’s life and thinking, at the same time it is very important as a means to make Japan and the Japanese people understood internationally and deepen international friendship. Developing the spirit of loving and protecting the language, and aiming at a plain, accurate, beautiful and rich language has never been hoped for as much as it is now. For this reason we consider the greater promotion of education in the national language, encouragement of more interest in the language amongst the people, and broadening opportunities for discussion of the language in everyday life are important.’ (Bunkachō, 1994, p.84).

The intention of the above passage is rather difficult to fathom but reference to the 1972 proposal is clearly evident. It seems to imply that social change is affecting the language and, since the language is so important for both internal and international communication, it is necessary to instill in people a sense of wanting to protect and improve the language so as to make it clear, beautiful and rich. To do this, there needs to be more education, more public interest and more discussion about the language.

Five areas requiring further investigation were identified and briefly discussed:

1. language usage
2. responding to the shift to an information age
3. responding to an international society
4. Japanese language (*kokugo*) education and research
5. the writing system.

Gairaigo were included under the section on international society. The report began by using Suzuki T.’s (1992a) phrase ‘Japanese is not just for Japanese people any more’ and then went on to state: ‘issues relating to the increase in *gairaigo* and the overuse of *gaikokugo* need to be examined’. More specifically, in regard to the use of novel *katakana* words by government offices, the report advised: ‘While it is acknowledged that there are occasions when the use of *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* are unavoidable, considering the public nature of government, an effort should be made to use plain, accurate Japanese and caution should be exercised in the use of novel *katakana* words’ (Bunkachō, 1994, pp.83-2). Again the report made reference to the need for controls on *gairaigo* usage, at least in the field of government.

In response to this report, the Minister for Education, Akamatsu Ryōko, instructed the 20th Council to begin an inquiry into an 'ideal language policy to suit the new era' (Bunkachō, 1994, p.80). Subsequently, NLC began deliberation on each of the five issues identified by the 19th Council. This sequence of events was interesting, since the Minister appeared to give new instructions to the 20th NLC, but these related to an agenda already set by the 19th NLC, so she was actually instructing NLC to continue with its plans. Moreover, the issues raised by the 19th NLC included some that were being developed at the same time by GISPRI, which included NLC members, in consultation with government. Therefore, the change of direction seen in the early 1990s was not simply the result of a top-down process, but was a more complex interaction of governmental and semi-govermental bodies, together with influential individuals.

The 1995 NLC report

An interim report titled 'Ideal language policy to suit the new era: Progress report' (*Atarashiijidai niōjiita kokugoshisaku nitsuite: Shingikeikahōkoku*) was released in November 1995. In the introduction, the report noted that this was the first time NLC had received instruction from the Minister to address issues of usage (Bunkachō, 1997a). Part 1 duscussed issues of language usage under the section headings of:

1. General viewpoint,
2. The importance of the language environment,
3. *Keigo* issues, and
4. Other (vocabulary, usage, pronunciation, accent).

Issues related to *gairaigo* appeared under headings 1 and 4 (Bunkachō, 1997a, p.87).

NLC began by restated that their orientation was towards 'plain, accurate, beautiful and rich language'. The report continued:

> 'It is evident that the characteristics of modern society are the diversification of people's sense of values, the shift towards an information age, and increasing internationalisation. These changes in social conditions have an effect on the language and on human relations. Regarding language change and vocabulary change, the main issue is the increase of: *shingo*, *ryūkōgo*, *gairaigo*, *gaikokugo* and *senmonyōgo* (specialist terms). This, together with changes in language use, has resulted in a widening gap between the language used by the different generations. In order for language to function fully as a means of communication it must be appropriate to the recipient and the situation. When it is not

appropriate it acts as a barrier not only to communication but to human relationships as well. In fact, it has been pointed out that amongst the younger generations in particular, the ability to establish and maintain human relationships using the proper language is becoming weaker, and consequently there is a tendency for them to lose sight of the essence of the language.' (Bunkachō, 1997a, p.86).

The above passage essentially restated points made in the 1993 report, but in a stronger tone, since the aspects of vocabulary change cited were identified as main issues and intergenerational communication problems were identified as being due to the younger generation not using proper language.

The report continued:

'Amongst the general public, many people view the current condition of the Japanese language as "confusion in the language" (*kotoba no midare*). According to the results of opinion polls [i.e. Sōrifu 1992.6, Bunkachō 1995.4], the proportion of people who think "contemporary Japanese is confused" exceeds 70%. The notion "confusion in the language" is associated with a subjective view of the language. Each person has their own pre-conceived notion of how the language should be and, when this is contrasted to the current state of the language, [many people] take a straightforward attitude and regard any discrepancy as "confusion". This kind of attitude seems to stem from a high level of interest in the language' (Bunkachō, 1997a, pp.86-5).

'As the National Language Council we take an objective view of language change. In situations where there is a recently-emerged variant word form that coexists with a conventional form, we take the view that this is *kotoba no yure* (language variation)' (Bunkachō, 1997a, p.85).

A footnote on *kotoba no yure* was added. It defined this term as referring to the coexistence of alternative forms such as *atatakai* and *attakai*, *mirareru* and *mireru*, *kanzuru* and *kanjiru*. It said that in many cases *yure* begins as an incorrect usage, and most people regard it as incorrect, but when the number of users of the new usage reaches a certain point, it becomes an alternative form (*yure*). When people consider the older conventional form to be correct, they view the existence of the alternative form as an example of confusion (*midare*). The note made the point that the term *midare* reflects a value judgment, while *yure* reflects an objective perception of this phenomenon of language change (Bunkachō, 1997a, p.85).

In the above passage, NLC sidestepped the issue of language confusion and used Kindaichi's (1966) explanation for people's concern over this issue. Rather than deal

with the typical complaints raised by those who regard the language as confused, i.e. *kanji* limits, *keigo* abuse by young people, *gairaigo*, *gaikokugo* etc, NLC redefined the term as language variation and argued for an objective viewpoint. The examples of *yure* cited were, however, confined to the less controversial question of alternative forms of Japanese words.

The report continued:

> 'These days, it is becoming more important than ever to foster a spirit of loving and protecting the language. "Loving and protecting the language" means nothing other than that each citizen has an interest in the language, takes care with everyday language usage, and strives to have a rich and fulfilling language life. In the case of NLC, it is important [for us] to have a good grasp of the diverse states of the language in modern society, to discuss our perceptions of language use, and present our viewpoints' (Bunkachō, 1997a, p.85).

Protecting the language against corrupting influences, such as *gairaigo*, is a notion that is associated with the NLC disputes of the 1960s (see chapter 3). In the above passage, however, loving and protecting the language is reframed to remove any nationalist connotations and make it an issue of individual usage. It is not specified why this is becoming more important, however. Presumably this is due to the issues mentioned earlier.

The report continued:

> 'The aspects of language use that NLC should deliberate upon are: spoken language, written language, standard language, and dialects etc. It is important to consider the phonology, lexicon, usage and other features of these, together with issues of expression and communication.'
>
> 'With regard to language usage, the general approach is to consider issues in spoken language usage. However, there is considerable overlap between spoken and written language in the selection of usage, style and vocabulary, so we should focus on the areas of overlap and aim at a common idea for the ideal form of modern Japanese. NLC has decided to discuss language usage in general according to the above viewpoint' (Bunkachō, 1997a, p.85).

These statements of intent outlined a very broad agenda in the first paragraph, but in the second paragraph this was narrowed to areas where spoken and written language overlap. In effect, this limited the focus to written language usage.

The above statement led on to section 2 of Part 1 'The importance of the language environment' which was divided into two sub-headings. The first, 'Maintenance of the language environment' picked up from the 1972 proposal and discussed the roles of school, family, regional community, the mass media, government, and language research with a focus on the need to actively maintain plain, accurate, beautiful and rich language usage (Bunkachō, 1997a, pp.83-1). The second, 'Respect for regional dialects', said that dialects were included in the notion of rich, beautiful language, so it was desirable that dialects be maintained and coexist with standard language (Bunkachō, 1997a, pp.83-1). This inclusion of dialects was a significant departure from earlier policy which had focused wholly on on standard Japanese. The third section dealt with issues relating to *keigo* (Bunkachō, 1997a, pp.81-77).

The fourth section, simply titled 'Other', discussed a number of kinds of variation (*yure*) under the sub-headings of 'vocabulary and usage' and 'pronunciation and accent' (Bunkachō, 1997a, pp.77-4). Within the first of these was a short discussion of '*gairaigo, gaikokugo, waseieigo, shōryakugo* (i.e. abbreviated words)' which echoed the 1993 report saying:

> 'There are occasions when the use of *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* is unavoidable, however, novel *katakana* words, *waseieigo* and abbreviated words, such as *apo* (appointment) and *toraburu* (trouble), should not be used lightly. In particular, considering the public nature of government, an effort should be made by government offices to use plain, accurate Japanese and caution should be exercised in the use of novel *katakana* words' (Bunkachō, 1997a, p.75).

Although this section also covered young people's language, this was wholly devoted to issues of grammar and made no mention of *gairaigo*. Therefore it seemed that despite earlier comments, questions of *gairaigo* use were being directed towards government rather than to the general population.

Part 2 of the report was concerned with 'Responding to the shift to an information age' but *gairaigo* did not get mentioned. The focus was on IT technology and the ideal Japanese language policy for the future, and issues relating to *kanji* forms for word-processors (Bunkachō, 1997a).

Part 3 was titled 'Responding to an international society' and was divided into sections as follows:

1. General viewpoint
2. The ideal state of Japanese people's communicative ability
3. Responding to the internationalisation of the Japanese language
4. Other

Gairaigo were discussed in sections 3 and 4 but some of the points made in the earlier sections are worthy of note. In Section 1, under the heading 'Internationalisation and language issues', the points made were: respect should be accorded to languages and cultures, the need for cross-cultural communication is international, and a balanced view of internationalisation is needed. The view offered was that a spirit of love for the Japanese language should be maintained and from this standpoint, keeping other languages in sight, the issues should be discussed and a holistic language policy developed (Bunkachō, 1997a, p.65). The need for an international perspective and holistic language policy were points made by GISPRI (1993) but in this passage NLC managed to include 'love for the language' – a phrase used by neither GSPRI nor Suzuki T.

Section 2 began with a statement referring to the 1972 proposal, which said the present NLC took the same view of *kokugo* as the foundation for its discussions. After discussing aspects of Japanese communication styles (echoing Kinoshita, 1986), it went on to say that, in order to deal with international society, Japanese people needed to improve their language ability in both their own language and in foreign languages. The report stressed that the basis for the acquisition of a foreign language was a sound knowledge of the native language. There needs to be good educational planning as well as research into this area, it said (Bunkachō, 1997a). This section seems to be saying that a good knowledge of Japanese is the basis for internationalisation, so it seems likely this is an oblique critical reference to the contemporary calls for improving English language education as a means to internationalisation.

In Section 3, under the heading 'How to view a response to the internationalisation of the Japanese language', the main point was that the number of Japanese language learners has been increasing overseas. This should be supported, taking into consideration the wants and needs of the particular countries. It said that this internationalisation phenomenon had three aspects:

1. It is an extremely limited phenomenon but Japanese is in the process of becoming an international language.

2. Changes such as the influx of *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* into Japanese and the establishment of sounds from foreign languages are undoubtedly progressing.
3. The number of Japanese words being adopted into other languages is increasing (Bunkachō, 1997a, p.63).

The report went on to say that the overseas expansion of Japanese language would assist in communication with other countries and Japanese ways of thinking and customs would become better understood. It also noted that there were many foreigners in Japan, for whom Japanese was needed for general communication, and that the background of these people should be taken into consideration. The section concluded by proposing plans for supporting the internationalisation of Japanese, including ways of supporting and researching Japanese language learning and promoting the use of Japanese as an official language in international meetings and the United Nations (Bunkachō, 1997a). This section mainly sumarised views that had been expressed earlier by Suzuki T. (1985c; 1992a), Kinoshita (1992), GISPRI (1993) and others, but it also directly associated the influx of *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* with the internationalisation of Japanese.

In Section 4, under the heading 'Issues relating to the increase of *gairaigo* and excessive use of *gaikokugo* in the Japanese language', the report said that, along with the internationalisation of society, there had been an increase in *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo*. According to a poll conducted by Bunkachō in 1995, those who were not particularly concerned over some increase in *gairaigo* in the future amounted to 44.8%, so there were many people who did not have much resistance to an increase in *gairaigo*. It then went on to say:

> 'However, the opinion has also been expressed that some kind of brake on the excessive use of *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* is needed for the following reasons:
>
> 1. They undermine the status of the Japanese language and destroy tradition;
> 2. They tend to be used a lot by young people and this can lead to a communication problem between generations;
> 3. The use of *gairaigo* with a meaning different from that in the source language and the excessive use of *waseieigo* should be avoided, since this not only confuses the language but acts as an impediment to Japanese people's foreign language learning.
>
> Along with the progress of internationalisation and the development of new technologies, situations arise in which the use of *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* to express new ideas or nuances is unavoidable. Also, there are occasions where the *gairaigo*/

gaikokugo are more easily understood than the Japanese translations. These situations aside, in general it is necessary to give due consideration and exercise judgment as to whether *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* should be used or not, taking into consideration the respondent and the purpose [of the communication]. It is often the case that unless [the recipient] has a basic knowledge of the [source] language it is not possible to achieve communication using *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo*. For this reason, government offices, newspapers, broadcasters etc, which deal with the general public, should not lightly use *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* that can be converted into Japanese or uncommon *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo*. When there is no alternative, consideration needs to be shown and explanatory notes added.' (Bunkachō, 1997a, pp.60-1).

After general statements about the importance of the language in tradition and the transmission of culture, in the above passage NLC eventually linked these notions with *gairaigo*. Also, the link between *gairaigo*, young people and inter-generational communication problems was clearly stated. Moreover, *gairaigo* and *waseieigo* were identified as sources of confusion. NLC was, however, careful over ownership of these views, since it says that these are opinions that have been expressed and the reader is left unsure whether NLC actually subscribes to them. In the explanation, NLC avoids clarifying these opinions and focuses on comprehension difficulties, particularly for those who do not know the source language (presumably English).

The 21st Council continued the investigations and set up additional committees – one for *keigo* and one for issues relating to the forms of script used in information technology. Consequently, the interim report released in 1998 covered only these two areas (Monbukagakushō, 2001; Asamatsu, 2001).

The 2000 NLC report

The remaining issue 'responding to an international society' was the focus of the deliberation of the 22nd Council. In December 2000 NLC released three final reports. Discussions on *gairaigo* were mainly included in 'Optimum response of the Japanese language to the global society (*Kokusaishakai ni taiōsuru nihongo no arikata*)'.

In Part 1, the position of the Japanese language in international society and the spread of Japanese were discussed. The main points made can be paraphrased as follows:

There are many languages in the world, each reflecting a culture and way of thinking, and these comprise an important aspect of world heritage. English is currently being

> spread as a language of international communication, but one language cannot express the diversity of world cultures. So, it is important to promote the diversity of language and culture in the world. Also, as the number of people with multilingual skills increases, so should understanding of the diversity that exists in ways of thinking.
>
> Japanese language is the foundation that has supported Japanese people's sensibility and way of thinking since ancient times. It has produced a considerable amount of literature and philosophy, led Japan to become a modern nation and supports modern science and technology. Japan has a history of active absorption of overseas culture, particularly via translation. So, not only is there much information written in Japanese, there are also many translations from other languages, especially those of other Asian cultures. This resource is one that ranks amongst the top in the world and should be regarded as a great asset and part of world cultural heritige. When foreigners learn to read Japanese they can not only access writings from Japan but can also use all the works translated into Japanese.
>
> We should cherish the Japanese language and develop it. At the same time, viewing it as a cultural heritage, we should more actively promote its role in world society and spread its use and learning. We should continue to develop the tradition of using beautiful and rich Japanese, as well as use plain, accurate language suitable for communication, and always pursue both these goals.
>
> Information transmission in Japanese, in a broad sense, means transmitting Japanese culture and ways of thinking. It is an important part of deepening international understanding of Japan and Japanese people. In order for the international spread of Japanese language to progress, it is a prerequisite that Japan be seen as attractive and that Japanese people be proud of their language. Therefore, we all should make an effort to be more attractive to the outside world as a people and a culture. (NLC, 2001, pp.101-2)

In this part NLC expressed very similar views to those of Suzuki T. (1985c; 1988; 1991), Kinoshita (1986; 1992) and outlined in the GISPRI proposal. One addition was the mention of 'beautiful, rich' language. In the other writings, the focus was on 'plain, accurate' language and effective communication. These were, however, mainly concerned with modern and international issues. In the above passage 'beautiful and rich' seems linked with traditional usage. In 1965, NHK conducted a survey of intellectuals on the topic of what words were 'beautiful'. The majority chose *wago,* but there was a minority who considered *kango* to be more beautiful due to the clear, sharp meaning they produced (Kanno, 1990). It is also likely that the writers had *keigo* in mind. It was the topic of a separate report, and is a kind of language that would be

considered both beautiful and rich.

In Part 2, three specific policies were proposed:

1. Send out information to the world about Japan and the Japanese language in both Japanese and foreign languages;
2. Support the promotion of Japanese language study;
3. Improve Japanese people's communication ability in dealing with international communication, improve training in interpretation and translation (NLC, 2001).

Again, these were the same as the points made by Kinoshita (1992) and GISPRI.

The first section of Part 3 began with comments on the weighty responsibility of the government and media with regard to language use and the need for government offices and the press, in conjunction with individual Japanese language users, to make an effort to improve the communicative effectiveness and attractiveness of the Japanese language. It then listed the functions of *gairaigo* and moved on to focus on current problems relating to the increase in *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo*. Five problems were identified:

1. Communication in Japanese is impeded by the use of *gairaigo* that not everyone can understand, and there is the risk of inequalities in access to information [required in everyday life].
2. Communication problems between generations, due to older people not being able to understand new *gairaigo*.
3. Expression in Japanese becomes vague, since when *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* whose meaning is not clear [unlike the use of *kanji*] are used, the meaning of the whole sentence becomes unclear.
4. The understanding of Japanese by foreigners is impeded, since *katakanago* is difficult to understand.
5. The learning of foreign languages by Japanese is impeded, because the meaning of *gairaigo* and *waseieigo* as used in Japanese is different from the source language, and is not understood in the foreign language context. (NLC, 2001, pp.110-11).

This sub-section concluded with a statement to the effect that, while *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* have their own functions and attractions, and are used in various fields, their rapid increase and excessive level of use impedes social communication. There is the risk that this will weaken the communicative function and spoil the value of the Japanese language (NLC, 2001, pp.110-11).

The next sub-section discussed the general attitude of NLC towards the increase in

gairaigo/*gaikokugo*. It stated:

> 'The position of NLC is to recognise that the Japanese that is suitable in the era of internationalisation needs to be even more equipped with a plain, accurate communicative function, and at the same time realise its communicative function within society more appropriately. In view of this, we believe that the use of *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* without consideration of the comprehension of the readers or listeners, and the use of *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* that makes expression unnecessarily vague, is not desirable. Moreover, from the viewpoint of producing, for the Japanese people and the people of the world, an attractive and valuable Japanese language that can create high-level, rich scholarship and culture, we believe that it is not desirable to use a large amount of words that have vague meanings.
>
> The decision whether to use *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* or not is a matter for individual judgment, also there is no need to proscribe the effective use of *gairaigo* for its image. However, in the case of government offices, newspapers and broadcasting, considering the importance of the broad dissemination of information and the effect on people's language life, *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* that have not been stabilised in the language should not be used lightly. Careful judgment should be employed regarding the use of such words and when it is necessary to use them, consideration, such as the use of explanatory notes, should be taken.
>
> It is desirable that ordinary people, who are the recipients of printed materials aimed at the general public, should take an active attitude in demanding consideration from the various organisations or specialists, who are the senders, with regard to the use of *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* in such materials. The Japanese language exists for all its users. We think that when all the users take an active interest in the state of the language, this will lead to the creation of the ideal language' (NLC, 2001, p.111).

In this passage the focus is the use of language that all receivers can comprehend. The problem with *gairaigo* is they can be vague and unclear. Such language use does not show consideration to the receiver. This is particularly a problem when the receiver is the general public and the intention is conveying important information.

The next sub-section addressed the treatment of *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* by government offices and the press. It said:

> 'With regard to *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* that are used by government offices and the press and aimed at the general public, we think they can be categorised according to the level of familiarity and difficulty. In the table [8.2] we present what we consider typical examples in each category at this point in time, to serve as a reference for government

offices and the press. The language used and the target group will vary with the organisation, and we assume that new problematic words will appear in the future, so each organisation needs to make their own judgment about the use of *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* in their publications. Moreover, judgment needs to be exercised in the treatment of the words in the table, according to the point in time, and these examples should not be regarded as fixed, because the level of naturalisation of each word will change year by year.

In addition, with regard to the names of policies, public facilities or events, sufficient consideration should be given to the ease of comprehension of the meaning amongst the general public. When *gairaigo* are used, special care is needed when a number of words are combined to coin a new term since the meaning tends to become difficult to understand' (NLC, 2001, pp.111-12).

Table 8.2: Viewpoint regarding the use of *gairaigo*/*gaikokugo* by government offices and the press in materials aimed at the general public

Category	Treatment	Examples
1. Words that have wide usage and whose usage is established within the general population	Use as is	*sutoresu* (stress) *supōtsu* (sports) *boranthia* (volunteer) *risaikuru* (recycle) PTA (Parents Teachers Association)
2. Words that are not sufficiently naturalised that are easier to understand when rephrased into Japanese	Rephrase	*akauntabirithī* (accountability) → *setsumei sekinin* etc *inobeeshon* (innovation) → *kakushin* etc *insenthibu* (incentive) → *yūin, shigeki, hōshōkin* etc *sukiimu* (scheme) → *keikaku, zushiki* etc *purezensu* (presence) → *sonzai, shusseki* etc *potensharu* (potential) → *senzaitekina chikara* etc
3. Words that are not sufficiently naturalised that do not have an easily understandable Japanese equivalent	Depending on the situation, take steps to make them easy to understand by providing notes	*aidenthithī* (identity) *apurikēshon* (application) *deribathibu* (deliberative) *nōmaraizēshon* (normalisation) *hādoweā* (hardware) *bariafurī* (barrier-free)
Alphabetical acronyms that fall into categories 2 and 3 above	At least when they appear the first time, the Japanese translation should be included	ASEAN (*Tōnan-ajiashokoku-rengō*) GDP (*Kokunai-sōseisan*) NPO (*Minkan-hieiri-soshiki*) PL 法 (*Seizōbutsu-sekininhō*) WTO (*Sekai-bōeki-kikan*)

(NLC, 2001, p.113)

The report on *keigo* began by taking a broad view of *keigo* as the use of language that

shows respect and consideration to others, rather than limiting *keigo* to specific stylistic and grammatical forms. As such, it is an important element in ensuring smooth communication. It made the point that language which is appropriate for use within a group is not necessarily appropriate when used to outsiders, particularly when words or expressions are used that the outsider may not understand. This includes the use of specialist terms in fields such as medicine, welfare, science and technology that employ *gairaigo*, *gaikokugo* or alphabetical acronyms. The use of such terms should be avoided in communication with the general public and be rephrased to make them easy to understand (NLC, 2000).

Discussion of NLC reports 1993-2000

The reports of 1993, 1995 and 2000 all expressed some common views on *gairaigo*. They are viewed as part of the internationalisation process but they can cause problems, particularly with regard to comprehension, and can therefore impede communication, so their use requires restraint. This essentially instrumental argument is a constant over the three reports, but the first two reports also discuss cultural issues and language confusion. In the 2000 report, puristic statements about loving and protecting the language, the danger to tradition and loss of cultural heritage are not to be found, and statements about beautiful, rich language are less prominent. Instead, the argument centres on effective communication. To some extent, this is a product of the report's focus on internationalisation, but there is a distinct change in the tone in which the problems of *gairaigo* are discussed. In 1995, there is comment on *gairaigo* destroying tradition and causing intergenerational problems, whereas in 2000, the problems all relate to comprehension, access to information, clarity in expression and effective learning. Also, there was no attribution of blame to young people. Instead the problem was viewed as one of communication that could be remedied by appropriate usage. Even in the *keigo* report, the rationale for avoiding *gairaigo* was the receiver might not understand, and this would constitute inconsiderate usage, out of keeping with the aims of *keigo*.

This shift in the view of *gairaigo* was accompanied by a greater focus on how Japan can improve its communicative ability to deal with the outside world in a proactive manner. The exact reasons for this shift were not given, but the numerous similarities between the GISPRI proposal and the 2000 report, the similarities between sections of earlier

reports and the writings of Suzuki T. and Kinoshita, plus the increasing level of influence of GISPRI committee members, all point to GISPRI gaining steadily more control of NLC policy with regard to issues relating to internationalisation. NHKBLC is also likely to have had an influence, since the division of *gairaigo* into three categories was similar to the approach used by NHK.

Internationalisation was a buzz-word of the 1980s and the era of trade friction with the United States. It was associated with Japan opening up to the world both economically, by buying foreign goods, and culturally, by allowing in more foreigners and improving English skills, and politically, by being more active in international bodies. From this perspective, *gairaigo* could be considered another import and a natural consequence of internationalisation or even a sign of active Japanese participation in an English-dominated world culture. The view taken by the NLC was, however, quite different. Simply stated, since internationalisation is a process that involves clear cross-cultural communication, anything that impedes this is counter to internationalisation. *Gairaigo* tend to be vague and unclear, and also tend to impede foreign language learning, therefore their replacement by clear, precise language will benefit internationalisation. So, in the 2000 report, the need for internationalisation became an argument against importing *gairaigo*.

Foreign Loan Words Committee (FLC)

The establishment of FLC in August 2002 was welcomed by Prime Minister Koizumi. He had previously requested Bunkachō and other Ministries to deal with the overuse of *gairaigo* and he encouraged the new Committee to exert themselves as much as they could to address this issue (*Nikkei*, 2002, June 25).

The aims of FLC were to: 'investigate whether difficult-to-understand *gairaigo* are being used in, firstly, government white papers, then newspapers and magazines. If such words are used, FLC will examine what alternative words or expressions are available. Each *gairaigo* will be categorised to determine which should be used and alternatives provided for those that should be avoided. FLC will produce guidelines for the use of *gairaigo* and tables of *gairaigo* and their replacements' (FLC, 2003c, p.1; Tanaka, 2003). Surveys on the recognition and comprehension of 269 *gairaigo*, collected from white papers, were conducted in 2002 in cooperation with Bunkachō. FLC examined the research data and categorised the words according to the system established in the

NLC final report. It called for public opinion on *gairaigo* and suggestions for replacement terms for selected *gairaigo* via the NLRI website (Tanaka, 2003).

In May 2002, letters were sent by Bunkachō to the public relations sections of each ministry and other agencies, requesting care be taken in the use of *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* and the replacement of these terms be considered (Bunkachō, 2002c; Wada, 2003). At a meeting of deputy ministers in June 2003, agreement was secured for the replacment of difficult *gairaigo* with plain Japanese (Bunkachō, 2002c). In justification for this approach, FLC said: *gairaigo* and *katakanago* are used a lot in government white papers and newsletters as well as on television. In the areas of aged care and welfare, it is most important that the words used take elderly readers into consideration. It is also important to avoid the overuse of unfamiliar specialist terms in newspapers and broadcasting. At present, it appears that priority is given to the convenience of writers rather than to the readers' comprehension. *Gairaigo* can be used to express things that didn't previously exist in Japanese and to enrich the language. However, their excessive use can prevent communication, so it is important that government and the media use replacement terms or add sufficient explanations (FLC, 2003c, p.1).

The rationale used by FLC, was similar to that in the 2000 NLC report. It focused on instrumental arguments about clear communication and avoided issues such a language protection. *Gairaigo* are presented as a problem that affects the elderly but no blame is accorded to the young. FLC argues that it aims to assist ordinary people, particularly the the elderly, by improving their access to the information provided by government and the media.

Between April 2003 and October 2004 FLC released three reports. These provided measures of the comprehension level of 141 *gairaigo* in the general population, and in those aged 60 years and over, on a four-point scale. Suggestions for replacement terms, explanations of meanings, usage examples and recommendations on the use or non-use of the *gairaigo* were also included (FLC, 2003a; 2003b; 2004). The word lists were published in newspapers and on the NLRI website.

According to newspaper reports, FLC found it difficult to find appropriate replacement terms, was running behind schedule, and fewer words were being included in the reports than planned (Matsui, 2003; *Nikkei*, 2003, November 14). Some words, such as 'online', 'database' and 'forum' proved so difficult that FLC gave up trying to find replacements

(*Yomiuri*, 2004, June 30). There was also concern expressed by some Committee members about whether any impact could be made on the estimated 500 new *gairaigo* that were entering the language annually (Matsui, 2003).

Yomiuri responded by making internal guidelines, that aimed to replace *katakanago* with Japanese words as much as possible, and in other cases to add explanations, in an effort to put a brake on the *gairaigo* influx. This was, however, not a new policy, since the paper had previously been careful to limit *gairaigo* use. Using long *gairaigo* was not in the paper's interest, since such long words limited the amount of information that could be packed into a space (Kanetake, 2004). Local and regional governments also reviewed their use of *katakanago*. For example, Suginamiku and Saitamaken announced they would replace many of the *katakana* terms in their publications in response to criticism from residents (*Tōkyō*, 2003, April 29; *Yomiuri*, 2003, June 4).

A common response to the lists was criticism of the replacement words. A *Yomiuri* article (2002, December 26) quoted the editor of the dictionary *Kankōchō no katakanagojiten* as saying that FLC had just replaced hard-to-understand *katakanago* with hard-to-understand Japanese. In an article in *Sankei*, another dictionary editor, Kurashima Nagamasa (2003), was very critical of the translations, saying it was similar to the government's replacement of English-derived baseball terms during the war. His preference was for the *katakanago*.

After the first report, the word that received the most complaints was 'informed consent'. Amongst these, some people from hospitals said they were already very busy and were concerned about expressions that raised patients' awareness of their rights (Matsui, 2003). Such a response, however, suggests FLC was on the right track and the *gairaigo* was indeed used for obfuscation. In other cases, the concerns were from special interest groups. The Japan Virtual Reality Society said the replacement for 'virtual' missed the correct meaning (*Yomiuri*, 2003b, November 14). When it was reported that FLC intended to replace *mesena* メセナ (*mécénat* Fr.), a protest society was organised to resist its replacement, since this word had been promoted by the Kigyō-mesena-kyōgikai, an arts organization. As a result, FLC dropped *mesena* from their list. Somewhat surprisingly, Maruya was a member of the protest group (*Yomiuri*, 2003b, November 14).

In *Nikkei* (2003 April 25), an article said that many of the replacement words seemed

odd, so it was difficult to determine which would survive, the *gairaigo* or the replacements. A contrary view was expressed in *Yomiuri* (2003, August 7). It supported the activities of FLC saying that it was the users of new *katakanago* who were strange, not those older people who could not understand them. Sakamoto of NHKBCRI expressed doubt about whether the efforts of FLC could be effective, since they did not address the need for people to show off their foreign language knowledge, nor could they find suitable Japanese replacements (*Yomiuri*, 2004, June 30).

The main aim of the proposals was, however, to influence government. In this regard the impact has been mixed. Sekine (2003) made the following observation of the attitude of Bunkachō officials in January 2003, when a project called 'Cutural Heritage Information Digital Archive' was announced. He said he contacted Bunkachō about the words 'digital archive', which were in *katakana*, since they were words for which alternative suggestions had been made by FLC, and *Yomiuri* was concerned about the use of these *katakanago*. The Bunkachō representative told him they had decided to use that name and would not change it. Sekine commented that Bunkachō was ignoring the results of their own surveys and the suggestions of FLC, while at the same time instructing other departments not to use *gairaigo*. Similarly, a meeting organised by government to discuss privatising the postal system, a pet project of Koizumi, used *konfarensu* (conference) in its title, rather than the replacement (*Yomiuri*, 2005, January 26). According to *Yomiuri* (2003a, November 14), NLRI compared white papers from five ministries and found *katakango* usage had declined and the addition of notes had increased, but there was considerable variation between ministries, with Monbushō showing the greatest change. In contrast, the Ministries of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and Business and Industry showed little change.

Discussion of FLC's proposals

Since the aim of FLC was to replace difficult-to-understand *gairaigo*, it could be expected that the replacements would be easy-to-understand Japanese words. As seen in the comments above, this was not always the case.

One thing that stands out about the word lists is the preponderance of *kango* (see FLC, 2003a; 2003b; 2004). For the 141 *gairaigo* examined, 164 alternatives were proposed. Almost 90% of these were *kango* and 47% were *kango* comprising four or more *kanji*. A few terms were composites which included *wago* or *gairaigo* aspects, for example

mudansabasu 無段差バス and *higaerikaigo* 日帰り介護. Only 14 (8.5%) were pure *wago*, none of which were new words.

In the case of the *kango*, some were words already in use, but a number were novel combinations. These words evidenced a range of the issues raised by *kango* critics regarding the use of *kango* for the formation of new words. Firstly, a number of terms were calques for the *gairaigo*. In such cases, the *kanji* may themselves be readable but the overall meaning is not transparent without explanation – precisely the criticism levelled at the original *gairaigo*. For example, *hōreisonshu* 法令尊守 is given for 'compliance' but the *sonshu* section is not a word that can be found in the Kōjien dictionary, so it is itself unclear. Other words evidence similar difficulties: *jikkōkeikaku* 実行計画 for 'action program', *tōkōjugyō* 登校授業 for 'schooling' and *hekimenkōtai* 壁面後退 for 'set back'.

Secondly, the problem of homophony is evident. Terms such as *kasō* 仮想 (for 'virtual') could be 仮装 or 下層, and *kigyōshien* 起業支援 (used to replace 'incubation') sounds like a combination of *kigyō* 企業 and *shien* 支援. So, unless these terms are seen in print, there is a likelihood of confusion. Thirdly, the phonological form of a number of the *kango* provides no indication of the meaning, so the word is only effective when written. This poses a problem for broadcasting. For example, *kyoshiteki* 巨視的 and *sasshin* 刷新 (alternatives for 'macro' and 'renewal') do not produce clear meanings when heard. Fourthly, there is a tendency to nominalise active concepts using long *kango* terms. For example, *jūminsankaku* 住民参画 (for 'public involvement'), *nōryokukaika* 能力開化 (for 'empowerment') and *setsumeisekinin* 説明責任 (for 'accountability'). Nominalisation is a problem with *gairaigo* but is not solved by substituting a *kango*. The resultant increase in nouns for terms which actually refer to activities makes expression less flexible, and can hardly be considered a contribution to the beauty or clarity of the language.

Fifthly, there is the question of nuance. To be an effective substitute, a new term needs to carry similar connotations to the *gairaigo*, but a number of the new terms fail in this. For example, *baisekisha* 陪席者 has the courtroom connotation of 'judge', whereas 'observer' suggests a watcher with a more neutral role. Finally, many of these *kango* fail to produce a sense of newness or attraction, so it seems unlikely they can compete with the *gairaigo*. For example, *iyokushigeki* 意欲刺激 is a very unattractive substitute

for ‘incentive’; *seisakukenkyūkikan* 政策研究機関 does not have the impact of ‘think-tank’; and it seems unlikely that public relations departments would wish to refer to their brochures by the down-market term *chirashi* ちらし.

This focus on *kango* was also evident in the words issued by TRC and those presented in the last NLC report (see table 8.2), so it appears that FLC has continued in much the same mould. There are, however, some differences. TRC tended to provide a greater list of alternatives, many being phrases, whereas FLC followed NLC more closely in proposing single words.

As an exercise in puristic LP, FLC’s efforts can be classified as xenophobic and archaising, since they follow the method of *kango* calquing that has dominated since Meiji. In degree, the proposals are mildly puristic since they are tolerant of established *gairaigo* (some are incorporated in the new words), and are primarily concerned with questions of comprehension. They are also limited in scope, since they do not apply to the general public, and even in the domains to which they are aimed (i.e. government and the media), their status is only that of a guideline.

Athough FLC made an effort to canvass public input, as noted above, responses in the press tended to be negative. So it seems FLC may have misread the public mood. *Tōkyō* (2003, August 12) said that, looking at the membership of FLC, it was evident that there was no one on the Committee to convey the perceptions and feelings of ordinary people. Therefore it was impossible to expect an outcome that expressed the sensibility of the common people. As Fishmann (1983) observed, corpus planners tend to homogenity in age, training and background, thereby running the risk of being out of touch with the general population.

Cooper (1989) stressed that, while planners may occupy elite positions and be able make pronouncements on the language, it is the public who will accept or reject their reforms, so it is important how the planners convey their message. FLC, it seems, did little to prepare the public or market the lists. The only justification for why particular words were selected was their lower than average familiarity and comprehension level. By these same criteria, a considerable number of the replacements would rate even more poorly than the *gairaigo*. So, while these were useful criteria for FLC, they cannot carry the same force with the public. What FLC needed to do was show how these replacement terms enhanced comprehension and improved the language.

CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Part 1 begins by discussing hypotheses on *gairaigo* and LP issues and then evaluates the data on public opinion derived from the surveys. In part 2, an account of LP in relation to *gairaigo* based on Cooper's framework is presented, then specific hypotheses are discussed. Part 3 provides recommendations, both of a general nature and specific to LP bodies. Finally, directions for further research are suggested.

PART 1

Hypotheses relating to language issues

It was expected that:

1.1. The issues discussed with regard to *gairaigo* in Japan would include those identified by Fishman (1996): efficiency and accuracy, development and modernisation, internationalisation and globalisation, nation and ethnicity, tradition and culture, richness, purity and beauty.

1.2. Puristic, nationalistic and xenophobic viewpoints would be evident.

The adoption of words from English was generally regarded as an expedient way of filling lexical gaps but the efficiency of this method was questioned by critics. *Gairaigo* were regarded as too long when written and hard to understand due to the lack of semantic clues. In this regard they were compared unfavourably with *kango* by some scholars. Nakajima (1993) lamented that Meiji people were wise and made *kango* calques but modern people are too shallow and lazy to do this. *Kango* proponents also argued that *gairaigo* are inaccurate and vague. While many people tended to agree that *gairaigo* have shortcomings, the problems of *kango* (e.g. homophony, difficult *kanji*) also received comment and enthusiasm for *kango* calques seemed low.

There seemed to be widespread acceptance that technological and social change generates a need for new words and the speed of change makes borrowing the most practical option. There was, however, some hesitation in calling this 'modernisation', probably because the Japanese term *kindaika* now seems rather old fashioned. Internationalisation (*kokusaika*) was, however, frequently associated with *gairaigo* by commentators and many questionnaire respondents associated knowledge of new *gairaigo* with being up-to-date. Some saw them as an inevitable by-product of internationalisation while others viewed them as assisting the process. While there

seemed to be hesitation in describing *gairaigo* as 'enriching', the notion that *gairaigo* introduce new concepts and add nuances to existing ones was widespread. Some also said *gairaigo* can assist with learning English and making contact with foreigners.

Even *gairaigo* critics tended to support internationalisation but linked the overuse of *gairaigo* to the less desirable process of Euro-Americanisation (*ōbeika*). In this view, the indiscriminate adoption of English words is not true internationalisation but a reflection of a Japanese inferiority complex in relation to the West and in particular to America. Critics deplored the use of *waseieigo* and pointed to disparaging comments made by foreigners about Japlish. Although most commentators did not subscribe to the inferiority complex argument, there was general agreement that more and more *gairaigo* are being used and the positive images that surround words from America and Europe are a key factor in the ongoing popularity of English-derived *gairaigo*.

Some *gairaigo* opponents viewed the influx as a source of confusion and a threat to Japanese and exhorted people to protect the language. This argument echoed the disputes over the post-war language reforms. Then, the key issues were *kanji* and *kana* usage. Anti-reformist groups claimed that the reforms not only disordered the language but the culture and the nation. They wished to maintain a clear, accurate, beautiful, rich language and regarded both the writing reforms and the overuse of *gairaigo* as threats to this. As both Thomas (1991) and Fishman (1996) have noted, arguments for preserving the traditional form of the language that link language and culture can be found throughout the world and they frequently employ the concepts of richness, purity and beauty. In the 1980s and 1990s, although the anti-*gairaigo* rhetoric was less overtly purist than that of the anti-reformist groups of the 1960s and 1970s, it still stressed the need to preserve the richness and beauty of Japanese and identified *gairaigo* as a threat. Within Thomas' framework of purism these viewpoints are characterised as archaising and xenophobic. Concrete proposals for purifying the language are, however, generally absent, although replacement of certain *gairaigo* is advocated. This marks the degree of purism as mild.

Overtly nationalistic sentiments are seldom expressed in postwar Japan, but the argument that *gairaigo* are a form of cultural colonisation has this flavour. The relationship between English language education and *gairaigo* has been similarly interpreted and some scholars have called for an end to universal English education on

the grounds that it is not necessary and just increases *gairaigo*. Successive governments have, however, seen English learning as a key aspect of their policy of internationalisation so, if anything, the focus on English seems to be increasing.

Although those who view *gairaigo* as a serious threat to Japanese seem few, the comments on the questionnaire do indicate that some respondents believe there to be a link between borrowing and language decay. Even so, the general view seems to be that Japan has a long history of copying and borrowing from other cultures but these items are successfully incorporated into Japanese culture. There seems to be confidence that the current wave of *gairaigo* will be the same.

While each of the above issues was evident, the most pervasive issue was comprehension difficulty. This appeared in academic writings, newspaper articles and letters, survey data, and in the comments on the questionnaire. The main complaint was that ordinary people had trouble keeping up with the number of new *gairaigo*. Secondary to this was the misuse of *gairaigo*. This could be intentional, as in use by government for obfuscation, or due to carelessness. With regard to the second aspect, a number of people took the somewhat purist view that the meaning in the source language was the measure of accuracy. They were consequently critical of any deviation from this and were particularly averse to local coinages (e.g. *waseieigo*, *shingo*).

An argument against *gairaigo* that was not culturally based was the plain speech argument. It contends that the use of incomprehensible *gairaigo*, especially by the government and media, runs counter to democracy and creates social division between those who understand English, and are privy to the jargon, and ordinary people. Therefore, proper Japanese should be used and borrowed or coined words avoided.

Overall, most of the themes identified by Fishman were found in discussions of *gairaigo* issues. Development and modernisation were too out-of-date to receive much comment but internationalisation, globalisation and technical change were key issues. Notions of nation, ethnicity and language purity were perhaps too close to prewar militarist ideology to be widely voiced, but numerous commentators were concerned with protecting tradition and culture and preserving the richness and beauty of the language. While xenophobic purist views were evident, there were few calls for radical purification of the language or drastic measures to halt the *gairaigo* influx. Also, much of the criticism of *gairaigo* was concerned with non-purist issues, such as inaccurate or

unclear usage and the comprehension problems resulting from the scale of the influx.

Hypotheses tested by the questionnaire

The following tables indicate which questions (given as numbers) confirmed, rejected or produced an unclear result for each hypothesis.

Table 9.1 presents hypotheses associated with experiences of *gairaigo*, and general opinion of *gairaigo*. In question 1 over 90% of respondents reported that *gairaigo* had increased a 'fair amount' over the previous ten years and over 55% reported that they had increased 'a lot'. Question 3 found that the areas of greatest increase were advertisements and posters, magazines, then television and radio programs. On the other hand, the level of increase in newspapers was much lower than had been expected. The areas of least change were the workplace and school classes with just over 50% reporting no change. This suggests that the *gairaigo* increase noted in the media was not a reflection of an increase in everyday usage.

Table 9.1: Tests of hypotheses relating to experiences and general opinion

No.	Hypothesis	Confirmed	Rejected	Unclear
	General			
4.1a	Respondents would report that the level of *gairaigo* use had increased.	1		
4.1b	The language domains of greatest increase would relate to the mass media.	3		
4.1c	Most respondents would have encountered *gairaigo* they could not understand.	9		
4.1d	Such *gairaigo* would be mainly encountered in the mass media.	10		
4.1e	Most people would have a negative view of *gairaigo*.		2	3,5

In question 9 almost 85% of respondents said they encountered *gairaigo* they could not understand at least sometimes in their everyday life and question 10 found that such *gairaigo* were most often encountered in television and radio programs, advertisements and posters, followed by magazines. Newspapers were again considerably lower than the other media so it seems that their claims of care in *gairaigo* use (see Chapter 4) were well founded.

Negative opinion of *gairaigo* was lower than expected. In question 2, only 12.4% said they were used 'too much'. In question 3, the majority (59.6%) could not decide whether the way *gairaigo* were used was good or not but more took a negative view than a positive and there was a similar result in question 5 regarding a future increase.

As Table 9.2 shows, a positive viewpoint on *gairaigo* was closely linked with comprehension, acceptance of a future increase and an increased tendency to use new *gairaigo*. The converse also tended to be true. The preponderance of comprehension-related comments suggested this was a key issue.

Table 9.2: Tests of hypotheses relating to viewpoint

No.	Hypothesis	Confirmed	Rejected	Unclear
	It was expected that:			
4.2a	Comprehension of *gairaigo* would be linked to a positive view of *gairaigo*.	3,5,6,7,11.9, 14,15ae		
4.2b	A positive view of *gairaigo* would be linked to acceptance of a future increase in *gairaigo*.	5,6,7,14,16a		
4.2c	*Gairaigo* would be linked to notions of fashion, newness and modernity.	13.4	16d,13.3	
4.2d	The increase in *gairaigo* would be linked to internationalisation.	13.10,15c		16c
4.2e	A positive view of *gairaigo* would be linked to a tendency to use new *gairaigo*.	7,11.9,12,13, 14,15bcf,16a		
4.2f.	Belief that the language was confused would be linked to a negative view of *gairaigo*.	7,16ab,17		
4.2g	Believing that *gairaigo* had an internationalising effect would be linked to using new *gairaigo*.	13.10,15c, 16c		

Gairaigo were linked to 'giving a sense of newness' in question 13 – this being the second most popular positive view, after 'can express subtle nuance'. However, in question 16 the idea that *gairaigo* modernise Japanese received only 22% support. In question 13 the notion that *gairaigo* users seemed fashionable was the lowest of 14 options but those few who selected it were much more likely to use new *gairaigo* often. Fashion also received a fairly low rating in Bunkachō 2000.1. So it may be that people are generally hesitant about choosing this option, perhaps because it seems a shallow reason. Even so, there were numerous associations between fashion and *gairaigo* in the comments.

Although *gairaigo* are frequently linked with internationalisation in the literature, in question 13 this ranked only third of the positive attributes. Those who chose 13.10 tended to think *gairaigo* had increased a lot, their use was good, and would use new *gairaigo*. In question 16, the notion that *gairaigo* accelerate the internationalisation of Japanese received only 21.8% agreement. While there was no link with *gairaigo* increase (Q.1), it was a positive viewpoint and those who agreed were more likely to use new *gairaigo*. Although only 37.4% agreed that *gairaigo* were a natural part of internationalisation (Q.15c), more agreed than disagreed and those who agreed tended

to use new *gairaigo*. Somewhat surprisingly, the tendency to copy was by far the most popular explanation for *gairaigo* adoption, followed by the lack of suitable Japanese words.

As would be expected, those who liked *gairaigo* took a more positive view of their future increase. In addition, these people were more likely to use new *gairaigo*. The converse hypothesis was not as clear, however, since most people had a tendency to use some new *gairaigo*. Those who thought Japanese was confused tended to think the way *gairaigo* were used was not good. Although a significant proportion of these saw *gairaigo* as a cause of confusion, other respondents did not link *gairaigo* with language confusion.

Table 9.3 shows that older people tended to think the increase in *gairaigo* was larger, had a more negative opinion of *gairaigo* use and were more likely to encounter *gairaigo* they did not understand. In question 5 there was a slight increase in disapproval with age but it was not significant. As it turned out, however, question 5 was very effective in sorting out opinions on *gairaigo* (see question 14) and these opinions tended to spread across an age-group, so there were positive, negative and more neutral views in all age-groups, thereby inhibiting correlation. In question 14d there was no age effect for the opinion that *gairaigo* should be brought in freely but this may have been due to the low numbers who chose this option overall. In question 12, age did not correlate with starting to use new *gairaigo*. This seems to be because both the oldest age-group and the youngest were the most negative about starting to use them and because there was a spread of positive and negative responses within age-groups.

Table 9.3: Tests of hypotheses relating to age

No.	Hypothesis	Confirmed	Rejected	Unclear
	Older people would be:			
4.3a	more likely to perceive a large increase in *gairaigo*.	1,4		
4.3b	less approving of the way *gairaigo* were used.	2,3,6		
4.3c	more likely to encounter *gairaigo* they did not understand.	9		
4.3d	less approving of increases in *gairaigo*.			5,14d
4.3e	less likely to adopt and use new *gairaigo*.			12
4.3f	more likely to think Japanese is confused.	17		
4.3g	more likely to link *gairaigo* with confusion.		16e	7,16b
4.3h	less likely to link *gairaigo* with modernisation, fashion and newness.			13.3, 13.4,16d
4.3i	less likely to link *gairaigo* with internationalisation.		15c	13.10,16c
4.3j	more likely to approve of restrictions on *gairaigo*.		14e	14abf

As age increased, agreement with the notion that Japanese is confused increased steadily. In question 16e, as age rose, people tended to disagree that *gairaigo* confused communication but the top age-group strongly agreed. In question 7, there was no correlation with age, but those aged 50 years and over were considerably more likely to strongly agree that *gairaigo* caused confusion in Japanese. It seems that the general notion of confusion in Japanese is one that becomes progressively more popular as age rises, but when *gairaigo* are considered a cause, opinion is more divided in the various age-groups. In question 13, tendency to link *gairaigo* with newness or think *gairaigo* users fashionable was not associated with age, nor was thinking *gairaigo* modernised Japanese (16d). There was no link between age-group and internationalisation in questions 13 or 16 but in these questions there were few age-related correlations overall. In 15c, agreement tended to increase with age, so hypothesis 4.3i is rejected. This seems contradictory since thinking the adoption of *gairaigo* was a natural part of the internationalisation process tended to be associated with a positive view of *gairaigo*. However, it was only a mildly positive association in which many were undecided, so it is probable that some people saw the link between internationalisation and *gairaigo* increase without approving of it and this proportion increased with age. In general, increasing age was not associated with a more restrictive view on how *gairaigo* should be treated. There was, however, a tendency for older females to think that only words relating to current topics should be introduced (14e) – an option that tended to a positive view of *gairaigo*. Overall, while older people were less approving of the way *gairaigo* were used, this did not translate into thinking they were the cause of language confusion, refusal to use them, or a wish to restrict them.

It was expected that those with a higher English ability would be more positive about *gairaigo* but, as table 9.4 shows, hypotheses 4.4a and 4.4b were not confirmed. In questions 2 and 3 approval tended to increase as reading level fell, but disapproval was highest in the top-level readers and the non-readers with the medium level readers being less disapproving. In question 6, the top-level readers were much more disturbed about a lot of *gairaigo* being used than any other group of readers.

Greater English ability did improve comprehension of *gairaigo* and increased adoption of new *gairaigo* but it was the mid-level readers who were most enthusiastic. In question 15c the top-level readers were the most likely to agree that *gairaigo* were a natural part of internationalisation but no correlations were found. Those with better

English were, however, more likely to agree with the lexical gap explanation for borrowing (15b), and, amongst the females, less likely to attribute borrowing to enthusiasm for foreign languages (15d). There was, however, no effect with regard to the principal cultural reason, the tendency to copy (15a). Contrary to expectation, the better readers tended to take a mildly restrictive attitude to *gairaigo*.

Table 9.4: Tests of hypotheses relating to English ability

No.	Hypothesis	Confirmed	Rejected	Unclear
	People with a higher English ability would:			
4.4a	have a more positive view of *gairaigo.*			2,3,6
4.4b	be more approving of increases in *gairaigo.*			5
4.4c	be less likely to encounter *gairaigo* they did not understand.	9,10		
4.4d	be more likely to adopt and use new *gairaigo*	12		
4.4e	be less likely to think Japanese is confused.			17
4.4f.	be less likely to link *gairaigo* with confusion.			7,16be
4.4g	be more likely to link *gairaigo* with internationalisation.			15c,16c, 13.10
4.4h	be less likely to attribute *gairaigo* increase to cultural reasons.	15bd		15acef
4.4i	be less likely to approve of restrictions on *gairaigo*.		14cgh	14abf

Although most people thought *gairaigo* had increased, when the various surveys were compared there was no support for any acceleration in the rate of increase (see Table 9.5). There was, however, some evidence for an increase in problems with comprehension. Nevertheless, neither belief in language confusion nor negative views of *gairaigo* appear to have increased. If anything, people seem to have become more tolerant of *gairaigo*.

Table 9.5: Tests of hypotheses relating to longitudinal change

No.	Hypothesis	Confirmed	Rejected	Unclear
	Over the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s:			
5.1.	the rate of increase in *gairaigo* would have accelerated.			1,2,8
5.2.	problems with understanding *gairaigo* would have increased.	10		
5.3.	negative views of *gairaigo* would have increased.		6	2,3,5,13, 16
5.4.	belief in language confusion would have increased.			17

Conclusions on public opinion

The majority of respondents, in all age-groups, perceived an increase in *gairaigo* over the previous ten years and this proportion increased with age. Most people also encountered *gairaigo* they did not understand. This proportion rose with age but

declined as English ability rose. It also seems to have been increasing over time. The areas of greatest perceived increase and encounter with not understood *gairaigo* were advertisements and posters, magazines, and television and radio programs. These results demonstrated that the *gairaigo* increase was a phenomenon noticed by almost everyone but more so by older people and those who understood less English. It was also most evident in the mass media and much less so in interpersonal domains, thereby confirming the notion that the media are a major conduit for *gairaigo*.

Most respondents neither approved nor disapproved of the way *gairaigo* were used but more disapproved than approved, and disapproval rose with age. Similarly, more people were negative about using new *gairaigo* than were positive but most took a mild view – using new *gairaigo* 'not much' or 'sometimes'. On neither of these measures were there large numbers who strongly approved or disapproved of *gairaigo*. So, while people were concerned over *gairaigo*, and this concern increased with age, there was no evidence of strong intolerance amongst the majority, nor was *gairaigo* an issue of great concern. Despite expressing negative viewpoints, people were still willing to adopt and use new *gairaigo*.

Concern over not knowing the meaning proved to be by far the most common reaction to encountering a not-understood *gairaigo*. The next most common response was worry at being behind the times. This seemed to suggest a linkage between *gairaigo* and fashion but in question 13 only a small minority thought the *gairaigo* user seemed fashionable. Even so, a substantial proportion associated *gairaigo* with newness. The most popular options, however, both related to issues of meaning. Becoming hard to understand was the main negative effect and expressing subtle nuances the main positive one. The strongly negative 'destroys the traditional order of Japanese' received very little support. Also, while thinking *gairaigo* were hard to understand correlated with a negative view of *gairaigo*, about one third of respondents still said they used new *gairaigo* sometimes or often.

While a majority thought there was a tendency for Japanese to be confused, only a small minority strongly agreed and this was even smaller when *gairaigo* were considered a cause. Regarding general confusion, belief that this was true increased with age but there was no clear age effect for *gairaigo* as a cause. This suggests that the notion that the language was confused was one that most people were willing to concede but few

held strong views about. Support for *gairaigo* as a cause of confusion in the language was relatively weak. People were, however, more ready to agree that they confused communication.

Regarding the effects of *gairaigo* on the language, internationalising and modernising received only minority support with more disagreeing than agreeing. As to the reasons for adopting *gairaigo*, more people agreed that it was part of internationalisation than disagreed, but this view was exceeded by the lack of suitable Japanese words and even more so by the notion that Japanese people have a tendency to copy. Like internationalisation, the notion that Japanese lacked suitable words was linked to a more positive view of *gairaigo*.

Respondents' views on how *gairaigo* should be treated tended to be mildly negative. Very few took the strong view that *gairaigo* should not be used but a majority thought that it should only be used for things that could not be expressed in Japanese. Even amongst those with strongly negative views, about a third used new *gairaigo* sometimes or often, and for those with strongly positive views, this was around three quarters.

Overall, while respondents tended to be critical of *gairaigo* and their users, they were also quite willing to become users themselves. The main issue for most people was not cultural but concern over not knowing new *gairaigo* and *gairaigo* misuse. Increasing age was associated with more negative views of *gairaigo* but again these tended to be centred on issues of comprehension.

English competence reduced the comprehension difficulties but did not translate into an increased enthusiasm for using more *gairaigo*. Where an effect for English ability was apparent, it seemed that the best readers took a more puristic view of language and were less, rather than more tolerant of *gairaigo*. The middle level readers, however, tended to be the more enthusiastic adopters while the non-readers tended to be split between those with positive and negative views. This suggests that when people know no English they encounter more difficulties and this can make them either reject *gairaigo* or become interested in learning them. Those with more English ability still encounter difficulties but, presumably due to their English skills, find that they can learn these words and tend to adopt them. This pattern tends to fit with the arguments of Suzuki.T. and Honna that the *gairaigo* increase is associated with English learning. However, once a person's English is good, they can become more critical of *gairaigo* and more averse to their use.

It also suggests that when Japanese people become good at English they tend to lose their taste for *gairaigo*. So improvements in English education may eventually lead to a slow down in *gairaigo* adoption.

PART 2

Descriptive framework

Having examined the LP activities with regard to *gairaigo* since the late 1980s, a number of the features of Cooper's framework can be filled in.

> 'What actors attempt to influence what behaviours of which people for what ends under what conditions by what means through what decision-making processes and with what effect' (Cooper, 1989, p.98).

The actors in the LP process

As expected, the principal actors included both LP bodies and influential individuals. In the case of the LP bodies the locus of policy making with regard to *gairaigo* usage shifted over time. NHK and the newspapers had developed policies on *gairaigo* usage in the 1950s which were maintained through subsequent decades. It was NHK's three tiered classification system based on level of naturalisation and comprehension that formed the model for that proposed by NLC and subsequently adopted by FLC. NHK was also influential in that it stimulated the emergence of *gairaigo* as an LP issue via its surveys of public opinion and comprehension of *gairaigo* that were ongoing since the early 1970s. When Bunkachō began surveys in the early 1990s, in response to the needs of NLC, similar survey questions were included.

Although the focus of NHK was on *gairaigo* use and the media, research carried out by the NHKBCRI in the 1980s into the use of *gairaigo* by government was instrumental in the emergence of this aspect as an LP issue. In the case of NHKBLC, however, there was no clear evidence of activism during the 1980s or of any strengthening of NHK's policies regarding *gairaigo* – if anything, NHK became more tolerant. So while NHK provided data and a model for regulating *gairaigo* use, it cannot be considered a driver of the LP processes that led to FLC.

Even though it was short-lived, TRC was particularly influential in the 1980s. Unlike NLC, which could spend a decade (e.g. the 1980s) debating issues and writing reports that included few specific measures, TRC moved quickly to propose specific measures and implement them. Its actions demonstrated that positive measures were not only

possible but were well-received amongst certain sections of the public. Although there were no direct links between TRC and NHK, the emergence of *gairaigo* use in government as an issue, which resulted from NHKBCRI research, set the preconditions for the TRC's activities. It seems unlikely that, had *gairaigo* use remained a media issue, government would have taken any action, but once the problem was placed within the bureaucracy, official action was more feasible. TRC also provided the model for the FLC. Unlike NLC, which deliberated on a wide range of issues and had broad representation, both TLC and FLC were small groups specifically appointed to consider a single issue and come up with measures that could be implemented.

As the principal LP organisation, NLC was central to the official LP processes in relation to *gairaigo* during the 1990s but its activities were subject to Ministerial direction and external influence. Whereas in the disputes over *kanji* and *kana* reforms, unofficial groups such as Kanamojikai, Rōmajikai, LIDS and JWA had played prominent roles, none of these were found to have had any significant influence on NLC deliberations on *gairaigo*. GISPRI, a relatively new grouping with business and government backing, did, however, play a key role in the shift of focus that occurred in NLC in the early 1990s. Although the thrust of GISPRI's agenda was not to introduce *gairaigo* limitation as an issue, but to broaden the scope of LP and restructure the workings of LP bodies, by putting responses to globalisation on the agenda along with questions of usage, *gairaigo* became an issue that had to be addressed. Without the shift away from orthographic concerns to questions of usage, NLC probably would have continued to limit its deliberations on *gairaigo* to issues of spelling.

Evaluating the level and manner of influence of individuals on LP was more problematic, since documentary evidence from LP bodies is not generally sourced to particular individuals. It was possible to find out who was involved in a particular LP body or process, what they wrote in the public domain, and who was associated with whom. This information could not, however, provide an absolute index of influence. Moreover, it seems unlikely that such an index could be constructed even if transcripts of meetings were available, since influence is itself such a nebulous form of power. Some inferences can, however be attempted. Of the numerous influential individuals, Suzuki T. stands out as a long-term and vocal critic of *gairaigo* use in both the media and government who was well known to the general public. Although not a member of official LP bodies during the 1980s and 1990s, he appears to have had an active hand in

producing the GISPRI report and his writings seem to have influenced aspects of the NLC reports. In terms of direct influence on LP bodies, Mizutani was particularly prominent with positions on NLC, NLRI, NHKBLC, GISPRI and FLC. As Head of the NLC committee deliberating 'Responding to an international society', it would appear that he played a key role in developing the framework for responding to *gairaigo*. He is also likely to have been instrumental in the dissolution of the NLC and setting up FLC. Since he was not identified as a hard-liner and had voiced relatively mild criticisms of *gairaigo* use, it is likely that he was at least partially responsible for the moderate viewpoint taken in the 2000 NLC report.

Vocal critics of *gairaigo* within NLC during the 1990s included Kai. He subsequently headed FLC, where he was joined by another *gairaigo* critic Jinnouchi. Compared to NLC, NHKBLC and NHKBLRI seem to have been better provided with *gairaigo* critics. Of these, Mogami was perhaps most prominent, due to his writings on *gairaigo* use by government. Other strong critics included Toyama, Morimoto and Ishino. The more mild critics were Mizutani and Kindaichi. Overt supporters of *gairaigo* use were few. On NHKBLC were the moderates Inoue and Shibata. Inoue was also on NLC but not after 1998. Another NLC moderate, Ishiwata, did not last the 1990s either.

The actors were, however, not limited to members of LP bodies and social commentators – for official LP measures to be adopted there also needed to be political support. The change in direction of NLC was directed by Akamatsu but she was not known for any anti-*gairaigo* views. So it seems more likely that she was influenced by GISPRI's proposals for a more holistic approach to LP or by political colleagues. Within LDP, Koizumi had not only publicly voiced his concerns over *gairaigo* usage but had taken action by setting up TRC. Subsequently, on becoming Prime Minister, he was able to lend support to FLC. It seems unlikely that without such support a group such as FLC would have been established.

The behaviours to be modified

The behaviour in question was the use of *gairaigo* but policy discussions tended to focus on particular kinds of *gairaigo* and certain language domains. In general, *gairaigo* that were considered not naturalised were the focus. These were often characterised as *gaikokugo* to emphasise their foreignness even though a considerable number were more properly classifiable as *waseieigo*.

The main domains considered were the print and broadcast media, publications by government departments, and the spoken language of young people. Within the media, the focus was on news and other aspects of the media's role as an information provider. Areas such as advertising, entertainment, culture, sports and technical terminologies were specifically excluded in policy statements. In government, *gairaigo* use in high-profile areas such a project names came in for early criticism, but the first specific action taken by TRC was in relation to health care information aimed at older people. In the case of FLC, it was concerned with the *gairaigo* used in documents issued by the central government, in particular white papers. Within this domain the focus was on the use of *gairaigo* that had low levels of recognition and comprehension amongst the public, particularly those aged 60 years and over.

Young people's language received some comment in earlier NLC discussions, but over the course of the 1990s the focus narrowed to concentrate more on government. As this happened the issue of young people's language shifted, to become, in the 2000 report, the more general issue of problems in communication between the generations. FLC did not concern itself with young people's spoken language at all.

The people whose behaviour was targeted

The principal target group of TLC, NLC and FLC was government officials, particularly those involved in producing print materials aimed at the public. In the case of the media, the main targets were news editors and news broadcasters but since FLC did not have jurisdiction over the media this could only take the form of an advice. Regulation was left up to the media organisations themselves.

Although LP documents put out by NLC specifically stated that their guidelines were not intended to apply to the Japanese population as a whole, there were sections that admonished people to take care with their own language use. One group that received special mention in this regard was young people. In the 1995 NLC report, young people were characterised as not using proper language and their overuse of *gairaigo* was identified as a source of intergenerational communication problems. As mentioned above, this view was dropped in the 2000 report and young people ceased to be a target.

The ends to which the LP is aimed

Identifying the ends to which the various proposals regarding *gairaigo* were aimed is

complex, since some ends were stated by LP bodies but there were also ends that could be inferred from their actions or inaction. Moreover, LP processes involved the interaction of numerous individuals and groups, the aims and motivations of whom could vary considerably. Therefore, this section of Cooper's framework was expanded to encompass stated aim, rationale, and motivation. Of these, the first two can be found in policy documents but the third is more difficult to determine with the same level of clarity. Motivation may concur with the stated aim but it may also be considerably broader or even covert.

The principal stated aims of NLC's policy deliberations during the 1990s were the achievement of an ideal language policy for the new era and a form of Japanese that was plain, accurate, beautiful and rich. The exact features of such a Japanese language were not specified by NLC, but some aspects could be inferred from the reports. *Gairaigo*, *gaikokugo* and *waseieigo*, it seems, did not satisfy some or all of the criteria 'plain, accurate, beautiful and rich', since they were targeted for criticism. With regard to government, NLC said language should be 'plain and accurate' and caution should be exercised in the use of *katakanago* (Bunkachō, 1997a, p.75). Therefore it seems that plainness and accuracy were the key criteria for proper *gairaigo* use. By 'plainness' NLC was apparently referring to the ease of comprehension by ordinary people, since government offices, newspapers, and broadcasters were admonished to avoid uncommon *gairaigo* (Bunkachō, 1997a, p.61). Also, the table in the final report placed words with well established usage in category 1 and advised that their use was permissible. Moreover, the FLC used comprehension by ordinary people as a key criterion in compiling its lists. The principal rationale given for targeting *gairaigo* use was that the unfamiliarity of some of these terms led to poor comprehension of the information government wished to convey, thereby leading to inequality in access to information. Based on the above statements, the primary end of this exercise in LP was language use in government publications and in the media that enabled them to be easily understood by members of the public, including the aged.

The meaning of 'accuracy' in the context of the NLC reports appeared to refer to the degree to which the *gairaigo* reflected the meaning of the word(s) in the source language. The 1995 report stated that *gairaigo* with a meaning different from that in the source language should be avoided. It also stated that the excessive use of *waseieigo* should be avoided – presumably for the same reason. Moreover, such usage confused

the language and impeded people's foreign language learning (Bunkachō, 1997a, pp.60-1). Although this was not explicitly stated, it appears that the rationale for targeting such *gairaigo* was that a lack of verity with the source language could lead to miscommunication and confusion. Compared with plainness, the achievement of this kind of accuracy appeared to have been a secondary end. There was no category for such words in the table in the final report, nor was this given as a selection criterion for the FLC lists. This may, however, have been due to the difficulty in deriving a measure of semantic veracity.

From these rationales it can be inferred that it is appropriate to use *gairaigo* that are well-known and comprehensible to most people and also true to the meaning in the source language. Such *gairaigo* could be expected not to impede communication or lead to confusion.

The ideal language was, however, not just plain and accurate but also 'beautiful and rich'. With regard to these attributes and *gairaigo,* NLC was mute. In the 2000 report, when *gairaigo* were being discussed the only attributes listed were plain and accurate, so it can inferred that *gairaigo* were not conceived of as beautiful or rich (NLC, 2001, p.111). Therefore, the dichotomy between the beautiful and rich traditional words and the new words, which, at best, could be plain and accurate but were frequently confusing, persisted throughout the NLC discussions – albeit in a much more indirect form in the final report.

Besides the above, an additional reason was given in the 1995 report. It said that the excessive use of *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo* 'undermines the status of the Japanese language and destroys tradition' (Bunkachō, 1997a, p.60). The 1993 report had linked the language with the creation and transmission of culture but this was not explicitly associated with *gairaigo*. In neither of these reports was any rationale given for the above statement, but it could be inferred that limits on *gairaigo* would contribute to the maintenance of the status of the language and protect tradition. The presence of such passages suggests that NLC was not only motivated by the vision of a more plain and comprehensible Japanese. There was also a desire to protect the language from outside influences. In the 2000 report, similar statements were conspicuously absent from the list of problems caused by *gairaigo*, so it seems that there was a shift in aims during the final Council.

As Cooper mentioned, LP can be viewed as an instrument for the achievement and maintenance of power. NLC did not benefit from the changes of the 1990s, since it was dissolved, but it is possible that those members who were transferred to the new bodies gained an advantage. NLRI benefited in that it received a new committee, FLC, even though it was a comparatively small one. The central government would have gained some savings by downsizing the NLC and consolidating it within the new Bunka-shingikai. In its old form NLC must have been an expensive enterprise, particularly when viewed in terms of producing practical policy outcomes. On the political side, no doubt Koizumi was pleased to see the initiatives he took as a health minister be applied to all ministries. It is also likely that the attention given to the problem of *gairaigo* made the LDP government more popular amongst its constituency, which tends to be conservative and older.

Social and political conditions

Discussion on the desirability or otherwise of *gairaigo* usage has been ongoing throughout the postwar period but it was not until the late 1980s that any positive LP action was taken. Identifying all the social and political conditions that contributed to this development was beyond the scope of this thesis but a number of these can be elucidated.

NHK surveys on *gairaigo* had provided data suggesting public concern over *gairaigo* since the 1970s. Articles on the increase in *gairaigo* and their incomprehensibility and inappropriate use in the media and government appeared from time to time and received comment in the press. Discussions of confusion in Japanese had been popular since the mid-1970s and, while these were not necessarily concerned with *gairaigo*, they were identified as one source of confusion. These all provided evidence that *gairaigo* were a problem and that a considerable proportion of the population also thought so.

Within the ruling LDP, since the 1960s there had been groups opposed to the postwar language reforms and to other aspects of language change, such as the *gairaigo* influx. As a party, the LDP was culturally conservative but it had long pursued a policy of promoting international trade. The collapse of the bubble economy had placed economic issues at the centre of governmental and corporate thinking. In particular, the question of how to respond to the wave of globalisation was being considered by think tanks such as GISPRI. The need to restructure the Japanese economy, policy and bureaucracy

to deal with the dual challenges of economic decline and global competition were being given serious consideration. The need to improve English language learning was also an issue that had been smoldering through the 1970s and 1980s but had become more urgent following the economic collapse. Other issues that received increasing attention in the latter decades of the twentieth century were the aging of the Japanese population and the implications for health and welfare, as well as worries about youth culture and their lack of traditional values.

When Koizumi first took over the Health and Welfare portfolio, it is likely that he was aware of the issues surrounding *gairaigo* use in government and of the association between age and comprehension of *gairaigo*. It also seems that he had a personal interest in these issues. His action in setting up TRC was apparently well received by the public and by commentators. So, even though the public was not generally well disposed to the government intervening in their language use, action directed at bureaucrats in support of the aged was a political success.

As an exercise in LP, Koizumi's first TRC was both modest and narrowly focused. Other groups, such as GISPRI, saw a need for a more holistic approach to LP to be taken by the central government and for this to be a kind of LP that took globalisation into account. For this to occur, action was needed at the level of NLC.

In NLC, although the orthographical disputes that had occupied the postwar period had not been resolved, by the late 1980s a point of stalemate had been reached. It was impractical to scrap the postwar reforms, as some critics wished, but the critics had been at least partially appeased by the removal of their official status. This meant that NLC was free to take on other issues and presented an opportunity for a new agenda to be set.

When considered together, all these factors indicate that the late 1980s and early 1990s was an opportune time for *gairaigo* usage to become a subject for LP. It was already established as an issue in the media, was associated with economic needs and globalisation, there was an LP body free to consider it, a limited trial had proven popular with a key constituency (i.e. those over 60 years) and there were influential figures in the political and economic establishment, as well as in LP bodies, willing to take on the issue.

The means by which LP is implemented

Broadly speaking, LP in the postwar period was applied differentially to the media, government and the public. NHKBLC, with research support from NHKBCRI, developed and implemented LP for *gairaigo* in broadcasting. Also, *gairaigo* usage in newspapers was discussed and regulated by JNA with reference to NHK policy. This was essentially a self-regulatory form of LP done by and for media organisations in order to facilitate their functioning. That it was not driven by the central government is demonstrated by the long time-lag before NLC took on the issue and the way some of the NLC approaches were modelled on those of NHK. Nevertheless, the policies and practices of NHK and JNA were to some extent emulated in the broader realms of publishing and government, even though they had no legal force.

The overarching LP framework was provided by NLC and its supporting agencies NLRI and NLS. Subsequent to the dissolution of NLC, LP relating to *gairaigo* became the preserve of FLC and NLRI. Although national in name, these agencies only had jurisdiction over areas of language usage controlled by government and took pains to point this out. Within the bureaucracy, the implementation of LP was at the level of the ministry and department. Health and Welfare was particularly proactive via TRC but this was an exception. Other ministries appear to have only acted in response to directives. Moreover, the level of compliance with directives was variable and there seems to be no means of enforcing compliance.

With regard to the general population, official LP decisions could not be enforced. The approach taken was to disseminate policy positions via government publications and the media and call for public cooperation.

The decision-making processes

Although the actual policy deliberations were not open to public scrutiny, the decision making procedures of NLC were a matter of public record and required majority acceptance of a policy. The procedures used in NHKBLC and JNA were not published but it can be assumed that a form of majority vote was used. Decision making processes were, however, likely to have been considerably more complex than the voting procedures suggest – particularly given the committee structure of NLC. Unfortunately, neither the reports of the LP bodies nor articles written by members provided much insight into this level of decision making.

The degree to which decisions taken by NLC and FLC affected other LP bodies was also difficult to determine. Considering the high level of cross-representation between NLC and NHKBLC, it could be expected that decisions taken in one body would affect others. The similarity in policy approaches would tend to support this, but the level of conformity was only partial. Therefore, decisions taken by official LP bodies did not have an automatic flow-on to the unofficial bodies with which they had links. So, despite an official policy line being taken by government, NHK, broadcasters and newspapers remained free to continue with their own LP. This was, perhaps, to be expected since it was the media bodies which had taken the first action with regard to *gairaigo* LP. Even so, the media bodies appear to have taken some notice of FLC.

The processes by which decisions were made at the political level also proved difficult to determine. It was evident that the change in direction of NLC in the early 1990s was politically driven and GISPRI was also involved but processes remain unclear. Koizumi may have had a hand in the shift but no links between him and Akamatsu could be found. Her background was as a bureaucrat, not an LDP politician. The decision that led to the disbanding of NLC and the setting up of FLC must have been made at Cabinet level, so Koizumi was likely to have been involved, but the actual processes remain opaque.

The effects of the LP

At the time of writing it was still too soon after FLC's lists were issued for any objective evaluation of the success or otherwise of the replacement words. It seems likely that some will be widely used instead of the *gairaigo* while others will be rejected. The initial reception the lists received was mixed but criticism of the words was to be expected. The test will be the level of uptake amongst the bureaucracy and the media over time.

In the short term, these corpus planning activities have served to bring the issue of the use of *gairaigo* and other *katakana* words to public attention and have highlighted the problems older people encounter with the comprehension of new terms. It seems likely that this has stimulated government agencies and perhaps private companies to consider their language use when providing information to the public. More generally, the focus on comprehension in the LP discussions brought attention to the need for plain, clear language to be used and, when difficult terms are unavoidable, for explanation to be

provided. Although the context was *gairaigo*, this principle could be applied to all information aimed at the public.

Another effect, most probably unintended, of the word lists was that they highlighted the difficulty of finding equivalent Japanese terms to replace *gairaigo*. Each of the lists FLC issued fell short of their initial targets due to difficulty in finding replacements. Words that proved too hard for FLC included database データベース, online オンライン, ubiquitous ユビキタス and forum フォーラム (Matsui, 2003, June 24). It also became evident that a committee such as FLC could not hope to produce a sufficient number of alternative words to keep up with the number of *gairaigo* entering the language.

By choosing the *kango* route for word formation FLC also highlighted, again unintentionally, the problems of *kango.* Of the effects of the word lists, this is likely to be the most detrimental to the cause of *gairaigo* replacement. When compared with the *kango* alternatives, many of the *gairaigo* no longer seemed so bad.

Hypotheses relating to LP bodies

2.1: Decision-making processes would be controlled by government or other elite groups.

2.2: There would be close linkages between LP bodies.

Both hypotheses were confirmed. In the 1990s and early 2000s, LP was principally controlled by NLC and FLC, both of which were appointed by the Minister and whose policy deliberation could be directed by the Minister. Semi-official and industry-based LP bodies had no direct role in decision-making, although there were a number of avenues for some of them to influence policy formation. A history of close linkages between official, semi-official and unofficial LP bodies was found but this had changed greatly over the postwar period as unofficial LP bodies lost their influence, with the exception of JNA; although there might be a case for their influence waning compared to the 1950s. In their place, GISPRI managed to establish close links with official LP bodies and profoundly influenced policy.

Hypotheses relating to planners

In the arguments and pronouncements of planners and planning bodies it was expected that:

3.1. Proposed changes would be presented as improvements.

3.2. Instrumental arguments would dominate policy documents.

3.3. Policy documents would reflect the views of influential individuals and groups.

3.4. Puristic aims and rationales would be evident.

As discussed above and in Chapter 8, many of the statements, arguments, views and policy positions discussed in NLC reports can be traced to individuals and other LP bodies.

When this research commenced, NLC had not concluded its policy deliberations. It was expected that NLC and FLC would discuss the various cultural, social and linguistic problems caused by *gairaigo* and present LP solutions to each, together with arguments for how these improved Japanese and made it clearer, more accurate, more beautiful and richer. As it turned out, in the 2000 report NLC dropped the concerns with cultural and social issues that were evident in the 1993 and 1995 reports, to concentrate on *gairaigo* as an impediment to communication. By taking this point of view, the issues were reduced to clarity and accuracy. Although not explicitly stated, *gairaigo* were categorised by their comprehensibility and utility. Naturalised *gairaigo* that were known to all and had clear meanings were acceptable. Vague, unclear *gairaigo* and *gairaigo* that few people knew were considered unacceptable since they led to communication problems. However, new *gairaigo* that served a purpose for which there was no suitable Japanese word were acceptable, provided they were clearly explained. Presumably, if these *gairaigo* continue to be useful, they will become naturalised and explanations will no longer be needed.

This argument is an instrumental one that seems to avoid the charge of purism. Although not explicitly stated, this approach could be expected to alleviate the communication problems posed by some *gairaigo*, while allowing borrowing to continue. Since it only aims to replace those *gairaigo* that are marginal, problematic and unnecessary, it could be expected to enhance the clarity of the language. The policy was also presented as addressing the problem of inequality in access to information on the part of those who do not know English or the new *gairaigo*, and the problem of intergenerational communication. Moreover, it enhances internationalisation, since it removes impediments to foreign language learning both on the part of Japanese and foreigners. In the case of NHK policy, although the approach to *gairaigo* was cautious, purist statements were not evident.

As discussed in Chapter 8, purist arguments that can be classed as archaising and xenophobic were evident in the 1993 and 1995 NLC reports. Also the approach taken by FLC could be seen in the same light, since, although not explicitly stated as a policy, the main way of replacing *gairaigo* was with *kango* calques. Since this was the outcome of planning undertaken by NLC, the overall character of this LP sequence was mildly archaising and xenophobic.

PART 3

Recommendations and suggestions

General

Support for strong measures to limit *gairaigo* appears to be lacking amongst the general public. Therefore, government should not attempt to implement and enforce restrictions. It is sufficient that restraint by government agencies be urged. Restrictions such as those implemented in France (Hausmann, 1986; Thody, 1995) would be likely to be politically unpopular and could be regarded as akin to the activities of the ultra-nationalists. Since government policy is generally supportive of internationalisation, such measures could be seen as contradictory and interpreted as supporting cultural insularity instead. The proscribing of English *gairaigo* would also sit uncomfortably with efforts to improve English education, particularly in the spoken domain. The costs of revision of print materials would also alienate publishing houses and the print media. On top of this, such measures could be seen as a violation of free speech and individual freedom.

The issuing of word lists by a committee such as FLC is unlikely to have a significant long term effect on *gairaigo* use. Such a committee can only attempt to replace *gairaigo* that are already in use and it is unlikely to be able to keep up with the number of new *gairaigo* and other *katakanago* that are coming into use. Such a reactive approach can have little effect at the point where the new word is adopted. For example, when a company has to develop instructions for a product in English, Japanese and other languages that employ a range of technical terms, the most expedient approach is to use the same English terms throughout. This is especially so when these terms are of recent coinage and derived from English. The manufacturer cannot wait on the adjudication of an external committee on the language used in their Japanese instruction manual prior to releasing it. Therefore, if government is serious about limiting new *gairaigo*, effort is

required to find ways in which the creators of text in both government and industry can obtain timely advice on language usage.

An alternative to a committee would be access to translation services skilled in the selection of appropriate words and the creation of new terms. Services could be developed with government support, as suggested by Kai (2001), and made available firstly to government departments and then to the media and industry. Such a service could also advise on plain language use. The improvement in translation and interpretation that such support would bring would not only assist in dealing with issues relating to *gairaigo* but also improve Japan's ability to deal with the broader challenges of globalisation.

To LP bodies

There has been a broadening of representation on LP bodies over time but this remains too narrow. While it is important that experts be involved in these bodies, it is also important that there be more input from ordinary people, in order that the planners do not lose touch with the mood of the populace. Since it is both expensive and unwieldy to have a very large committee, a two-tiered structure may be more effective. A fairly small committee comprised mainly of experts could be charged with evaluating research and developing policy detail in conjunction with a larger and more diverse reference group, with whom the committee could periodically discuss issues and proposals. Also, prior to issuing a policy such as a word list, the LP body should have the words properly evaluated by ordinary people. Asking for comment via the NLRI website was a step in this direction but this could only provide limited input.

Effective LP requires good data. Public opinion polls on LP should aim at consistency from poll to poll in the questions asked to enable valid longitudinal comparison. Leading questions should be avoided and the full range of opinions needs to be sampled. Opinion poll data should be analysed and interpreted prior to being released. Summary data is easy to misinterpret and can lead to overgeneralisation. Policy should not be made on the basis of such data. Raw data should also be made available to researchers so that a broader range of interpretations might be available to policy makers.

Care needs to be taken to avoid stereotyping. Statements linking young people with *gairaigo* and causing language confusion, as in the 1993 NLC report, are counterproductive and should not be included in policy discussions. LP should aim to

be inclusive and not exclude some groups. Such statements may appeal to the elderly but they could alienate younger people.

Since the promotion of English learning and the spread of loanwords appear to be linked phenomena, policies on loanwords should take English language education policy into consideration. Policy positions that have the effect of promoting negativity towards the loanword influx could translate into a reaction against English. The economic imperative for the promotion of English seems clear, so rather than continue with the current reactive policy response to *gairaigo*, proactive measures that educate students about loanwords and language change, combined with measures directed at the public to reduce the difficulties produced by new loanwords, could be adopted.

A broader approach to word formation should be considered. While the creation of *kango* calques should remain a valid approach, this is not the only approach. Another option is to use the resources of *wago*. Such a path has been suggested by Kindaichi. In the past *wago* was more productive in producing new compounds but there has been a tendency to replace *wago* compounds with *kango*. From a practical point of view, *wago* compounds would seem to have a number of advantages over *kango*, since they rely less on *kanji*, and by using *kun* readings can produce longer words with less risk of homophony. Also, they usually employ *hiragana* which assist readers with pronunciation. However, in order to become a means for creating new technical vocabulary, the image of *wago* would need to be revised. Currently *wago* are associated with tradition, rusticity, the home and common speech, so technical terms using *wago* may not be able to produce the image of newness that *katakana gairaigo* can confer or the image of scholarliness that is associated with difficult *kango*. Nevertheless, *wago* do have a friendlier image than *kango*, and in this respect resemble *katakana gairaigo*. Therefore, it may be possible to modify public opinion in favour of *wago*.

Another possibility is to take an innovative approach to word coining by employing *hiragana*, *katakana* and *kanji* to create new hybrid words that use aspects of *wago*, *kango*, and *gairaigo*. Already, Japanese fad words, slang and *waseieigo* use these approaches, for example *merutomo* (mail+*tomo* [friend]) and *imadoko-sābisu* (*ima* [now] + *doko*[where] + service), so this is already an established approach to word creation. Such new words would need to satisfy a series of desirable conditions. For example, they would:

- avoid homophony that could need to confusion;
- employ *kanji* on existing lists (or other salient *kanji*);
- be concise; and,
- contain within their pronunciation some hint as to their meaning.

Such an approach would not be popular with purists but it could make corpus planning more accessible to younger people and harness their creativity.

The above list of approaches may not be exhaustive, but it covers the main approaches to word creation, other than direct borrowing, that are currently used in Japanese. The first two are somewhat purist in nature, one with a bias to *kanji* and *kango*, and the other with a bias towards *kana* and *wago*. However, purism could be avoided if a combination of the above approaches were used. In addition, direct borrowing, with or without modification, should be added as an acceptable strategy. If such a combined approach were adopted, the options for developing new words could be expanded considerably.

Since it is unlikely that all recipients would be satisfied with a single option for a neologism, an approach that planners could trial is the production of a series of alternatives using differing word formation approaches. For a single foreign word there could be options employing *kango*, *wago* and various hybrids that could include *gairaigo* and *waseieigo*.

Further research

Since the success of modernising corpus planning ultimately depends on whether the neologisms planners produce are accepted by the population, there is a need for research into the kinds of new words the Japanese population is receptive to. Public opinion surveys have tended to concentrate on people's opinions on *gairaigo* and *gaikokugo*. When comprehension problems were found, and a majority expressed a negative viewpoint, this was interpreted as indicating a need to replace these words. However, only one dimension of a more complex issue was being investigated. Firstly, people's views on whether *gairaigo* should be replaced, and if so, which *gairaigo*, were not canvassed. Secondly, what kind of neologisms people found attractive was not examined. When provided with alternatives, such as replacing *gairaigo* with *kango* or *wago*, people's opinions may change. Thirdly, people experience comprehension problems with various kinds of words – not just *gairaigo*. Research is needed to determine whether, when a person encounters a word new to them, they find *gairaigo*

more difficult than new *kango*, or whether factors other than word class are involved.

Since there is a need for new words, research should be conducted to determine the optimal methods of word formation from the perspectives of efficiency and cultural acceptability. What are the parameters of a good neologism? Do these vary with the context in which the word will be used? There is also need for research into the best approaches to creating neologisms. Language academies and committees do not seem to have had a good record of success. In addition, committees find it difficult to produce sufficient numbers of words in a timely manner. Therefore there is a need to evaluate other ways of generating new terms.

Public acceptance of the products of planners also needs more research. It seems likely that this will vary not only with the form of the word, but according to the manner in which new words are presented and disseminated. Planners need to know what people find attractive in a new word, in order to produce attractive new words. It is apparent that newly coined *kango* are not highly attractive, but public response to other forms of neologisms also needs to be evaluated. Strategies for promoting new words also need evaluation. The issue of word lists by a committee may not be the most effective way of marketing these new words.

In conclusion, the *gairaigo* influx is a significant event in Japanese language change. It is also an issue of concern for a large proportion of the Japanese population and consequently government needs to take an LP approach. It is, however, a phenomenon that is not peculiar to Japanese. Also, it is unlikely that corpus planning could halt the inflow of new *gairaigo*. The government appeared to be aware of this and took a cautious and mildly purist approach. It did not attempt to purge established *gairaigo*, only targeted its own language use and did not introduce legal sanctions. As it turned out, this caution was warranted since the word lists were not as well received as would have been hoped for. As Fishmann (1983) observed, the life of a corpus planner is not an easy one.

REFERENCES

Alisjahbana, S.T. (1974). Language policy, language engineering and literacy in Indonesia and Malaysia. In J.A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in language planning*. (pp. 391-416). The Hague: Mouton.

Amanuma, Y. & Ukita, S. (1961). *Kokugokokuji-mondai-shōshi*. Tokyo: Ritsumeisha.

American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication manual, fifth edition.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Arakawa, S. (1943). *Gairaigo-gaisetsu.* Tokyo: Sanseidō.

—— (1980). *Gairaigo ni manabu.* Tokyo: Shinsensha.

Araki, T. (2001, December 28). Waseieigo no tsuihō o. *Mainichi*, p.3.

Asahi. (1975, September 23). Katakana yame nihongo tsukaō. *Asahi*, p.5.

—— (1988, May 13). Katakanago-hanran kanawan. *Asahi*, p.29.

—— (1990). *Asahishinbun no yōgo no tebiki.* Tokyo: Asahi-shinbunsha.

—— (1994). *Japan almanac 1995.* Tokyo: Asahi-shinbunsha.

—— (1999, June 4). 'Ribenji' wakarimasuka. *Asahi*, p.4.

—— (1999, June 9). 'Ribenji' wa shinkankaku no kotoba. *Asahi*, p.5.

Asai, M. (1987). *Hōsōyōgo no chōsakenkyū no keifu*. Tokyo: NHKBCRI.

Asamatsu, A. (1994). Kotobazukai, jōhōka, kokusaishakai. *Nihongogaku 13(8),* 128-133.

—— (1995). 'Kokugo nikansuru yoronchōsa' gaiyō. *Nihongogaku 14(9),* 106-112.

—— (2001). Kokugo-shingikai no saigo no 20nen. *Nihongogaku 20(11),* 72-80.

Asami, N. (1998, January 20). Saihengo no shōmei. *Yomiuri,* p.5.

Becker, C.C. (1990). Higher education in Japan: Facts and implications. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 14,* 425-447.

Bunkachō. (1969). *Kokugo-shingikai-hōkokusho 8.* Tokyo: Ōkurashō-insatsukyoku.

—— (1991). *Keigo (kotoba-shirīzu 1).* Tokyo: Ōkurashō-insatsukyoku.

—— (1994). *Kotoba nikansuru mondōshū: Keigohen (Shinkotoba-shirīzu 2).* Tokyo: Ōkurashō-insatsukyoku.

—— (1995a). *Kotoba nikansuru mondōshū: Keigohen 2 (Shinkotoba-shirīzu 4).* Tokyo:

Ōkurashō-insatsukyoku.

—— (1995b). *Kotoba nikansuru mondōshū: Sōshūhen.* Tokyo: Ōkurashō-insatsukyoku.

—— (1997a). *Kotoba nikansuru mondōshū: Gairaigohen (Shinkotoba-shirīzu 6).* Tokyo: Ōkurashō-insatsukyoku.

—— (1997b). *Kokugo nikansuru yoronchōsa.* Tokyo: Ōkurashō-insatsukyoku.

—— (1998). *Kokugo nikansuru yoronchōsa.* Tokyo: Ōkurashō-insatsukyoku.

—— (1999). *Kokugo nikansuru yoronchōsa.* Tokyo: Ōkurashō-insatsukyoku.

—— (2000). *Kokugo nikansuru yoronchōsa.* Tokyo: Ōkurashō-insatsukyoku.

—— (2001). *Kokugo nikansuru yoronchōsa.* Tokyo: Zaimushō-insatsukyoku.

—— (2002a). *Gairaigo gaikokugo no toriatsukai oyobi seimei no rōmajihyōki nitsuite*. Retrieved January 23, 2003, from http://www.bunka.go.jp/kokugo/main.asp?

—— (2002b). *Kokugo-shingikairei.* Retrieved February 17, 2003, from http://www.bunka.go.jp/kokugo/main.asp?

—— (2002c). *Kokugo-shisaku-nenpyō, shōwa21 onwards.* Retrieved May 6, 2005, from http://www.bunka.go.jp/kokugo/main.asp?

—— (2002d). *VI Japanese language policy.* Retrieved September 13, 2002, from http://www.bunka.go.jp/english/English2002/6/VI-1.html

—— (2002e). *Heisei13nendo: Kokugo nikansuru yoronchōsa no kekka nitsuite.* Retrieved September 3, 2002, from http://www.bunka.go.jp

—— (2003). *Kokugo nikansuru yoronchōsa.* Tokyo: Kokuritsu-insatsukyoku.

Butler, Y.G. & Iino, M. (2005). Current Japanese reforms in English language education: The 2003 'Action Plan'. *Language Policy, 4,* 25-45.

Carroll, T. (1995). NHK and Japanese language policy. *Language problems and language planning, 19(3),* 271-293.

—— (1997). From script to speech: language policy in Japan in the 1980s and 1990s. *Nissan Occasional Paper Series, 27.*

—— (2001). *Language planning and language change in Japan.* Richmond: Curzon.

Chino, T. (2000). *Kokusaikajidai no nihongo*. Tokyo: Daigakukyōikushuppan.

Christian, D. (1988). Language planning: The view from linguistics. In F.J. Newmeyer (Ed.), *Linguistics: The Cambridge survey, vol IV language – the socio-cultural context*

(pp. 193-209). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cooper, R.L. (1989). *Language planning and social change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coulmas, F. (2002). Language policy in modern Japanese education. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 203-223). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.

Daulton, F.E. (1999). English Loanwords in Japanese – The built-in lexicon. *The Internet TESL Journal, 5(1).* Retrieved March 21, 2005, from www.iteslj.org/Articles/Daulton-Loanwords.html

Department of Finance and Administration. (2002). *Style manual: For authors, editors and printers, sixth edition.* Australia: John Wiley & Sons.

De Vries, J. (1991). Towards a sociology of language planning. In D. Marshall (Ed.), *Language planning: Focusschrift in honor of Joshua A. Fishman on the occasion of his 65th birthday* (pp. 37-52). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Doi, T. (1976). *The study of language in Japan: A historical survey.* Tokyo: Shinozakishorin.

Djite, P. (1994). *From language policy to language planning: An overview of languages other than English in Australian education.* Deakin, ACT: National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia.

Ehimeken Sōmubu-gakujibunshoka. (1987). *Kotoba no tebiki dai2gō: Kenmin kara mita yakusho-kotoba*. Matsuyama: Ehimeken Sōmubu-gakujibunshoka.

Ekuni, S. (1993). Gairaigo nitsuite. In Kawadeshobō (Ed.), *Kotobadokuhon gairaigo* (pp. 125-131). Tokyo: Kawadeshobō-shinsha.

Ferguson, C.A. (1977). Sociolinguistic settings of language planning. In C.A. Ferguson (Huebner, T. Ed.)(1996), *Sociolinguistic perspectives: Papers on language and society 1959-1994* (pp. 277-294). New York: Oxford University Press.

—— (1979). National attitudes toward language planning. In C.A. Ferguson (T. Huebner, Ed.)(1996), *Sociolinguistic perspectives: Papers on language and society 1959-1994* (pp. 295-303). New York: Oxford University Press.

—— (1983). Language planning and language change. In J. Cobarrubias & J.A. Fishman (Eds.), *Progress in language planning: International perspectives* (pp. 29-40). Berlin: Mouton Publishers.

Fishman, J.A. (1974). Language modernization and planning in comparison with other types of national modernization and planning. In J.A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in language planning* (pp. 79-102). The Hague: Mouton.

—— (1983). Modeling rationales in corpus planning. In J. Cobarrubias & J.A. Fishman

(Eds.), *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives* (pp. 107-118). Berlin: Mouton Publishers.

—— (1996). *In praise of the beloved language: A comparative view of positive ethnolinguistic consciousness.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyer.

FLC. (2003a). *Gairaigo-iikae-teian 1*. Retrieved November 17, 2003, from http://www.kokken.go.jp/public/gairaigo/Teian 1.html

—— (2003b). *Gairaigo-iikae-teian 2*. Retrieved November 17, 2003, from http://www.kokken.go.jp/public/gairaigo/Teian 2.html

—— (2003c). *Kokuritsu-kokugo-kenkyūjo gairaigo-iinkai-shuisho*. Retrieved November 17, 2003, from http://www.kokken.go.jp/public/gairaigo/syuisyo.html

—— (2004). *Gairaigo-iikae-teian 3*. Retrieved March 9, 2005, from http://www.kokken.go.jp/public/gairaigo/Teian 3.html

Frude, N. (1993). *A guide to SPSS/PC+, second edition.* London: Macmillan.

Fukakusa, K. (1999). Gairaigo wa tsutawatteiruka. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, August,* 54-61.

—— & Sakamoto M. (1997). Sūjitugo wa nannichigo? *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, April,* 42-53.

Fukuda, T. (1962). Kokugo-mondai-ronsōshi. Tokyo: Shinchōsha.

—— (1967). Kotoba no kinō nitsuite. In S. Ōno (Ed.), *Nihongo o kangaeru* (pp. 181-231). Tokyo: Yomiuri-shinbunsha.

GISPRI. (1993). *'Chikyūjidai no nihongo o kangaeru' kenkyū-iinkai-hōkokusho.* Tokyo: GISPRI.

——— (2000). *Overview of Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute* (GISPRI). Retrieved January 12, 2003 from: www.gispri.or.jp/english/overview

Glinert, L. (1991). The 'back to the future' syndrome in language planning: the case of modern Hebrew. In D. Marshall (Ed.), *Language planning: Focusschrift in honor of J.A. Fishman on the occasion of his 65th birthday* (pp. 215-243). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Gotō, K. (1983). NHK. In *Kodansha encyclopedia of Japan, vol. 5* (p. 374). Tokyo: Kōdansha.

Gottlieb, N. (1993). Written Japanese and the word processor. *Japan Forum, 5(1),* 115-132.

—— (1994). Language and politics: The reversal of postwar script reform policy in Japan. *The Journal of Asian Studies, 53(4),* 1175-1198.

—— (1995a). *Kanji politics: Language policy and Japanese script.* London: Kegan Paul.

—— (1995b). Language policy and written Japanese. *The New Zealand Journal of East Asian Studies, 3(2),* 27-40.

Haarmann, H. (1984a). The role of ethnocultural stereotypes and foreign languages in Japanese commercials. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 50,* 101-121.

—— (1984b). The role of German in modern Japanese mass media: Aspects of ethnocultural stereotypes and prestige functions of language in Japanese society. *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies, April,* 31-41.

—— (1986). Verbal strategies in Japanese fashion magazines - a study in impersonal bilingualism and ethnosymbolism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 58,* 107-121.

—— (1989). *Symbolic values of foreign language use: From the Japanese case to a general sociolinguistic perspective.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

—— (1990). Language as a seisomograph of acculturation: Sociolinguistic parameters of language contacts in the Asian context. *Journal of Asia Pacific Communication, 1(1),* 71-85.

Habein, Y.S. (1984). *The history of the Japanese written language.* Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Hansen, A.S. (1996). Leaders in change: The way to official language reform. In I. Neary (Ed.), *Leaders and leadership in Japan* (pp. 89-102). Richmond: Japan Library/Curzon Press.

Hara, Y. & Hattori, H. (1995). Gogaku eno kanshin to hōsōriyō-gakushū, *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, June,* 34-41.

Harada, K. (2001). Hōsō to gairaigo. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, July,* 112-115.

Hashimoto, G. (2002). Kotoba no midare to Tanaka Makiko genshō. *Gengo, 31(9),* 24-26.

Hashimoto, K. (1997). *Power and control: Cultural assumptions in Japanese policies on the teaching of English.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, La Trobe University, Australia.

Hashimoto, S. & Takahashi, K. (1994). Nihonjin no ishiki no 20nen (1). *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, May,* 2-69.

Hattori, Y. (1980). *Patterns of lexical adoption in Japanese.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Texas at Austin.

Hausmann, F.J. (1986). The influence of the English language on French. In W. Viereck & W. Bald (Eds.), *English in Contact with Other Languages* (pp. 79-105). Budapest: Akademiai Kiado.

Hayashi, H. (2004, April 4). Waseieigo no heigai. *Yomiuri*, p.30.

Hayashi, O., Miyajima, T., Nomura, M., Egawa, K., Nakano, H., Sanada, S. & Satake, H. (Eds.). (1982). *Zusetsu-nihongo.* Tokyo: Kadokawa.

Hayashi, T. and Hayashi, R. (1995). A cognitive study of loanwords in Japanese discourse. *World Englishes, 14(1),* 55-66.

Hayes, C. (1979). Language contact in Japan. In W.F. Mackey & J. Ornstein (Eds.), *Sociolinguistic studies in language contact: Methods and cases* (pp. 363-376). The Hague: Mouton.

Hida, Y. (Ed.). (1981). *Eibeigairaigo no sekai*. Tokyo: Nan'undō.

—— (1998). Gairaigo no toriirekata no henka. *Nihongogaku 17 (7),* 29-38.

Higa, M. (1975). The use of loanwords in Hawaiian Japanese. In F.C.C. Peng (Ed.), *Language in Japanese society: Current issues in sociolinguistics* (pp. 71-89). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

—— (1979). Sociolinguistic aspects of word borrowing. In W.F. Mackey & J. Ornstein (Eds.), *Sociolinguistic studies in language contact* (pp. 277-294). The Hague: Mouton.

Hino, N. (1988). Nationalism and English as an international language: The history of English textbooks in Japan. *World Englishes, 7(3),* 309-314.

Hirota, E. (1964). Sengo kokugo-shingikai-shi. *Gengoseikatsu, 149,* 63-67.

Hoffer, B. (1990). English loanwords in Japanese: Some cultural implications. *Language Sciences, 12(1),* 1-21.

—— (1996). Language borrowing. In H. Goebl, P. Nelde, S. Zdenek & W. Wölck (Eds.), *Contact linguistics: An international handbook of contemporary research* (pp. 541-549). New York: Walter de Gruyter.

—— (2002). The impact of English on the Japanese Language. In R.T. Donahue (Ed.), *Exploring Japaneseness on Japanese enactments of culture and consciousness* (pp. 263-273). CT: Ablex.

—— & Honna, N. (1988). The influx of English into the Japanese language. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics, 8(2),* 15-33.

Honna, N. (1995). English within Japanese society: Language within language. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development, 16(1&2),* 45-62.

——, Tajima, H. & Minamoto, K. (2000). Japan. In H.W. Kam & R. Wong (Eds.),

Language policies and language education: The impact in East Asian countries in the next decade (pp. 139-172). Singapore: Times Academic Press.

Hood, C.P. (2001). *Japanese educational reform: Nakasone's legacy*. London: Routledge.

Horiuchi, K. (1990). Nihongo niokeru gairaigo no yakuwari. *Shinbunkenkyū, 467*, 15-19.

Hoshiyama, S. (1978). A general survey of TEFL in postwar Japan. In I. Koike, M. Matsuyama & K. Suzuki. (Eds.), *The teaching of English in Japan* (pp. 104-114). Tokyo: Eichōsha.

Hōsōkenkyūbu. (1994). Shiryō: Hōsōyōgo-iinnkai no 60nen no ayumi. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, January*, 14-17.

Howell, D.C. (1987). *Statistical methods for psychology, second edition.* Boston: PWS-Kent.

Ichikawa, S. (1931). Foreign influences in the Japanese language. In I. Nitobe (Ed.), *Western Influences in Modern Japan* (pp. 141-214). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ide, S. (1973). Eigo-shidō to gairaigo. *The English Teacher's Magazine, September*, 16-18.

Iijima, K., Momose, C., & Ogawa, K. (1956). Gairaigoron. *Gengoseikatsu, 57*, 2-15.

Ike, M. (1995). A historical review of English in Japan (1600-1880). *World Englishes, 14(1)*, 3-11.

IMIDAS. (1999). Tokyo: Shūeisha.

—— (2001). Tokyo: Shūeisha.

Inagaki, F. & Ishino, H. (1984). Sedai to gengoishiki. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, April*, 14-40.

Inagaki, Y. (Chair) (1986). Kokusaikajidai no nihongo: Zadankai. *Gengo, 15(3)*, 42-63.

Inoguchi, T. (1999). Japan's failing grade in English. *Japan Echo, 26(5)*, 8-11.

Inoue, F. (1997). Market value of languages in Japan. *Japanese Linguistics, 2*, 40-61.

—— (2001). *Nihongo wa ikinokoreruka*. Tokyo: PHPkenkyūjo.

Ishii, S. (1998). Nihonjin to eigo no kankei. In Y. Tsuda (Ed.), *Nihonjin to eigo* (pp. 37-44). Kyoto: Kokusai-nihonbunka-kenkyūsentā.

Ishino, H. (1974a). Masumedia de tsukawareta gairaigo. *Bunkengeppō, January*, 25-33.

—— (1974b). Gairaigo wa doredake rikaisareteiruka. *Bunkengeppō, February*, 1-10.

—— (1974c). Hōsōyōgo toshite no gairaigo. *Bunkengeppō, June*, 24-38.

—— (1980). Kotoba no midare: Sono ishiki to jittai. *NHK Hōsōbunkakenkyū-nenpō, 25*, 175-189.

—— (1982). Gairaigo no genjō. *Bunkengeppō, September*, 31-40.

—— (1983). *Gendai-gairaigokō.* Tokyo: Taishūkan.

——, Hidaka, K., Tsutsumi, T. & Aida, T. (1980). Gendaijin no hanashikotoba. *Bunkengeppō, February*, 1-15.

——, & Inagaki, F. (1986). Nihongo wa yahari midareteiruka. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, July*, 2-16.

——, Maruta, M., Kisa, T. & Yasuhira, M. (1992). Kawariyuku nihongo. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, April*, 2-17.

——, Maruta, M. & Tsuchiya, T. (1988). Gairaigo wa dō ukeirareteiruka. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, July*, 24-39.

——, Maruta, M. & Tsuchiya, T. (1989). Kotoba no tadashisa, utsukushisa. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, August*, 2-16.

—— (1990). Kotobaishiki no shosō. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, July*, 2-12.

—— & Yasuhira, M. (1991). Kokusaikajidai no nihongo 1. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, August*, 2-11.

Ishiwata, T. (1960). Zasshi no nakano gairaigo. *Gengoseikatsu, 103*, 33-39.

—— (1985). *Nihongo no nakano gaikokugo.* Tokyo: Iwanamishinsho.

—— (1986). English borrowings in Japanese. In W. Viereck & W. Bald (Eds.), *English in contact with other languages* (pp. 457-471). Budapest: Akademiai Kiado.

—— (1989). Loanwords in historical perspective. *Japan Echo, 16*, 17-21.

Iwabuchi, E. (1993). Gairaigo. In Kawadeshobō (Ed.), *Kotobadokuhon gairaigo* (pp. 7-15). Tokyo: Kawadeshobō-shinsha.

Izumi, A. (1999, June 19). Izumi Asato no shūmatsu ryūkōgo-taishō ‘ribenji’. *Asahi*, p.5.

Japan Foundation. (nd). *Background and aims.* Retrieved March 11, 2005, from http://www.jpf.go. jp/e/about/bground.html

Jinnouchi, M. (1997). Yakusho-kotoba no honyakusho. *Gekkan-Nihongo, 11*, 34-35.

—— (2003). Gairaigo no kadai to shōraizō. *Nihongogaku, 22(7)*, 12-18.

Johnston, E. (2005, February). Editor's note. *The Foreign Correspondents' Club of Japan*. Retrieved March 21, 2005, from www.fccj.or.jp/modules/wfsection/article.php?articleid=509&category=2

Kabashima, T. (1972). Korekara no kokugo-kaikaku *Gengoseikatsu, 255*, 16-24.

—— (1981). *Nihongo wa dō kawaruka*. Tokyo: Iwanamishoten.

——, Mizutani, O., Keen, D., Mikuni, I., & Nishimura, H. (1983). *Nihongo no 21seiki*. Tokyo: Shōgakkan.

Kai, M. (2001). Gaikokugo to kokugo-shisaku. *Science of Humanity, Bensei, 33,* 50-54.

Kajiki, M. (1996a). Nihongo no midareishiki wa tomaranai. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, September,* 52-69.

—— (1996b). Kotoba-chōsa no kongo no kadai. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, December,* 17-21.

Kajima, S. (1994). *Katakana-eigo no hanashi*. Tokyo: Nan'undō.

Kagakukōgyō-nippō. (2003, June 16). Gairaigo. *Kagakukōgyō-nippō.* Retrieved April 6 2005 from Factiva, Dow Jones Reuters Business Interactive.

Kanamojikai. (1971). *Kanamojiron*. Tokyo: Kanamojikai.

Kaneda, T. (1967). Kokugo-seisaku nitsuite. In S. Ōno (Ed.), *Nihongo o kangaeru* (pp. 233-303). Tokyo: Yomiuri-shinbunsha.

Kanetake, N. (2004). *Shinbun to gendainihongo.* Tokyo: Bungeishunjū.

Kanno, K. (1986). Gairaigo to masucomyunikēshon. In Bunkachō, *Kotoba-shirīzu 4: Gairaigo.* (pp. 54-64). Tokyo: Okurashō-insatsukyoku.

—— (1990). Hōsō to wago, kango. *Kotoba-shirīzu 8: Wago kango* (pp. 61-72). Tokyo: Okurashō-insatsukyoku.

Katayama, Tomoo. (1983). *Yureugoku kotoba to shinbun*. Tokyo: Nan'undō.

Kawai, H. (1993). Katakanagaki no gaikokugo. *Kana-no-hikari, Jan,* 110-111.

—— (1996). Katakanago dakara warui towa kimaranai. *Kana-no-hikari, Oct,* 10.

Kay, G. (1995). English loanwords in Japanese. *World Englishes, 14(1),* 67-76.

Kidder, E. (1977). *Ancient Japan.* Oxford: Elsevier Phaidon.

Kikuchi, K. (1996). Katakanago ga habikorunowa kanjiseigen no seika. *Kana-no-hikari, July.* Retrieved January 3, 2003, from www1.ocn.ne.jp/~ kanamozi/hikari880-0703

Kindaichi, H. (1966). *Shinnihongoron.* Tokyo: Chikumashobō.

—— (1986). Atogaki – korekara no nihongo o kangaeru. In NHK (Ed.), Korekara no nihongo (pp. 205-214). Tokyo: Nipponhōsō-shuppankyōkai.

—— (1988). *Nihongo, vols 1 & 2.* Tokyo: Iwanamishoten.

—— (1994). Nihongo no henka to hōsō. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, January,* 12-14.

——, Hayashi, O., & Shibata, T. (1988). *An encyclopaedia of the Japanese language.* Tokyo: Taishūkan.

Kinoshita, K. (1986). Language habits of the Japanese. *Japan Echo, 13(4),* 79-84.

—— (1992). Imakoso gengo-seisaku no kakuritsu o. *Chūōkōron, 9,* 150-164.

Kobayashi, T. (1999). *Katakanago no shōtai*. Tokyo: Maruzen.

Koike, I. (1978). English language teaching policies in Japan: Past, present and future. In I. Koike, M. Matsuyama & K. Suzuki (Eds.), *The teaching of English in Japan* (pp. 3-14). Tokyo: Eichōsha.

—— & Tanaka, H. (1995). English in foreign language education policy in Japan: toward the twenty-first century. *World Englishes, 14(1),* 13-25.

Koizumi, T. (1989). Linguistic revolutionaries of modern Japan. *Japan Echo, 16,* 26-30.

Konomi, J. (1993, October 11-17). Rising tide of English in Japan is drowning out logic. *Japan Times Weekly International Edition,* p.8.

Kurashima, N. (2003, October 18). Katakanago no iikae wa kanōka. *Sankei*. Retrieved April 6 2005, from Factiva, Dow Jones Reuters Business Interactive.

Larsen, S. (1995). *Japlish.* San Francisco: Pomegranate Artbooks.

LDP-Seimuchōsakai. (1968). *Tokushū: Kokugo no shomondai.* Tokyo: LDP.

LIDS. (1959). *Sengen.* Retrieved January 12, 2003, from http://www5b.biglobe.ne.jp /~sengen/list.htm

—— (2001). *Yakuin-meibo.* Retrieved January 12, 2003, from http://www5b. biglobe.ne.jp/~kokugoky /list.htm

Lo Bianco, J., Bryant, P. & Baldauf, R.B. (1997). *Language and literacy: Australia's fundamental resource.* Canberra: Language Australia and The National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia.

Loveday, L. (1986). *Explorations in Japanese sociolingustics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

—— (1996). *Language contact in Japan.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mainichi (1998, September 22). Katakana-hanran ni konwaku, watashi mo [Letter to the editor]. *Mainichi,* p.4.

—— (1999, June 25). Ikkini hiromatta 'ribenji' [Letter to the editor]. *Mainichi,* p.5.

—— (1999, December 2). Okashina kotoba jochōsuru masukomi [Letter to the editor]. *Mainichi,* p.4.

McCreary, D.R. (1990). Loan words in Japanese. *Journal of Asia Pacific Communication, 1(1),* 61-69.

Maruya, S. (1978). *Nihongo no tameni*. Tokyo: Shinchōsha.

—— (1983). *Nihongo no sekai 16.* Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha.

—— (1989). The folly of language reform. *Japan Echo, 16,* 31-34.

Masui, H. (1999). Katakanakotoba. In H. Inoue, (Ed.), *Nihongoyo doko e yuku* (pp. 111-127). Tokyo: Iwanamishoten.

Matsuda, Y. (1985). Cross-over languages: Japanese and English (1). *Kwansei Gakuin University Annual Studies, 34(12),* 41-93.

—— (1986). Cross-over languages: Japanese and English (2). *Kwansei Gakuin University Annual Studies, 35(12),* 47-80.

Matsui, T. (2003, June 24). Gairaigo-iinkai 62go-teian. *Nikkei*, p.5.

Matsui, Y. (1992). *Gaikokujin kara mita nihongo*. Tokyo: Nihonkyōbunsha.

MEXT (1994). *Japanese government policies in education, science and culture 1994.* Retrieved September 13, 2002, from www.mext.go.jp/eky1994/index-1

—— (2003). *Regarding the establishment of an Action Plan to Cultivate 'Japanese with English Abilities'.* Retrieved March 9, 2005, from www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/

—— (2002). *Bunka-shingikai nitsuite.* Retrieved September 13, 2002, from www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/bunka/gaiyou

—— (n.d.1). *The Agency for Cultural Affairs.* Retrieved January 4, 2002, from http://www.mext.go.jp/english/bunka/index.htm

—— (n.d.2). *Improvement and dissemination of the Japanese language*. Retrieved January 12, 2003 from MEXT: www.mext.go.jp/english/org/culture/09e.htm

Miller, R.A. (1967). *The Japanese language.* Tokyo: Tuttle.

—— (1977). *The Japanese language in contemporary Japan: Some sociolinguistic observations.* Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

—— (1980). *Origins of the Japanese language: Lectures in Japan during the academic year 1977-78.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

—— (1982). *Japan's modern myth: The language and beyond.* New York: Weatherhill.

Milward, P. (1980). *Oddities in modern Japan.* Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press.

Miyajima, T. (1977). Gengo-seisaku no rekishi. In Y. Suzuki (Ed.), *Kokugokokuji-mondai no riron* (pp. 7-19). Tokyo: Mugishobō.

—— (1989). Changes in the language of a magazine. In S. Mizutani (Ed.), *Japanese quantitative linguistics* (pp. 31-49). Bochum: Studienverlag Dr. Brockmeyer.

Mizutani, O. (1994a). Nihon no kokusaika: Nihongo no kokusaika. *Nihongogaku, 13(12),* 4-10.

—— (1994b). Kokusaikajidai no hōsō to kotoba. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, January,* 4-5.

—— (1995). Nihongo no kokusaika. In *Shinkotoba-shirīzu 1: Kokusaika to nihongo.* (pp. 34-47). Tokyo: Bunkachō.

—— (2003). Nihongo no kokusaika to gairaigo. *Nihongogaku, 22(7),* 4-8.

—— & Ōno, S. (1995, November 28). Tairitsu-tōron: Ra-nuki to katakanago. *Yomiuri,* pp. 14-15.

Mogami, K. (1984). Oyakusho wa katakanago ga osuki?. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, August,* 20-38.

—— (1986). Kanchō-katakanago no hanran. *Gengo,* 15(1), 60-69.

—— (1989). Ima gairaigo wa dō uketomerareteiruka. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, July,* 26-49.

—— (1991). Hakusho no nakano gairaigo. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, June,* 34-45.

—— (1997). Nihongo no shōrai. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, October,* 12-21.

—— & Yamashita, Y. (2000). Hōsō wa nihongo ni dōiu eikyō o ataetaka. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, March,* 24-43.

Momose, C. (1987). Katakanago o dondon tsukaimashō. *Kana-no-hikari, May,* 3-6.

Monbukagakushō (2001). *Japanese government policies in education, science, sports and culture 2000.* Tokyo: Printing Bureau, Ministry of Finance.

Monbushō. (1952-1966). *Kokugo-shingikai-hōkokusho, vols.1-7.* Tokyo: Shūeishuppan.

Morito, Y. (1978). Japanese English: The use of English by the Japanese today. In I. Koike, M. Matsuyama & K. Suzuki (Eds.), *The teaching of English in Japan* (pp. 597-613). Tokyo: Eichōsha.

Morrow, P.R. (1987). The users and uses of English in Japan. *World Englishes, 6(1),* 49-62.

Motwani, P. (1991). Nihongokyōiku no nekku - gairaigo. *Nihongokyōiku, 74,* 28-33.

—— (1993). *A Dictionary of Abbreviations and Truncations*. Tokyo: Maruzen.

Nagai, K. (1988, March 17). Sekai no nakano nihongaku. *Asahi*, p. 7.

Nagano, M. (1972). Kokugo-shingikai-tōshin o kikaini. *Gengoseikatsu, 252,* 23-28.

Nakagawa, A. (1996). *English loanwords in the 1990's in Japan.* Unpublished paper, Eastern Washington University [Microfiche].

Nakajima, Y. (1993). Eigokonpurekkusu o saguru. In Y. Tsuda (Ed.), *Eigoshihai eno iron* (pp.235-288). Tokyo: Daisanshokan.

Nakayama, E. (2003). Kōyōbun no katakanakotoba, *Nihongogaku, 22(7),* 20-28.

Neustupny, J.V. (1974). Basic types of treatment of language problems. In J.A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in language planning* (pp. 481-492). The Hague: Mouton.

—— (1978). *Post-structural approaches to language: Language theory in a Japanese context.* Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

—— (1983). Japanese language reforms. In *Kodansha encyclopedia of Japan, vol. 4* (pp. 29-30). Tokyo: Kōdansha.

NHK. (Ed.). (1985) *Korekara no nihongo*. Tokyo: NHKshuppan.

—— (2001). *Broadcasting Culture Research Institute.* Retrieved February 3, 2001, from NHK: www.nhk.or.jp/bunken

NHKBCRI. (2000). *NHK kotoba no handobukku*. Tokyo: Nipponhōsō-shuppankyōkai.

—— (2004, June). *Oshirase: Kindaichi Haruhikosan seikyo*. Retrieved April 3, 2005, from NHK: www.nhk.or.jp/bunken/new

Nichigai Associates. (2002). *Contemporary who's who in Japan, vols 1-4.* Tokyo: Nichigai Associates.

Nikkei. (1988, March 27). Shingo·chingo, katakanabūmu. *Nikkei*, p. 11.

—— (2002, June 25 evening). Gairaigotayō yori utsukushii nihongo o [Letter to the editor]. *Nikkei*, p. 19.

—— (2003, April 25). Kokuritsukokugoken, gairaigo-iikae 'ketteiban'. *Nikkei*, p. 18.

—— (2003, November 14). Gairaigo-iikae, kokugoken, dai2dan saishūhappyō. *Nikkei*, p. 42.

Nihon-Rōmajikai. (2001). *Nihon-Rōmajikai-teikan.* Retrieved December 1, 2003, from: www.roomazi.org/docs/teikan.html

Nirasawa, H. (1995). Kokugo-seisaku no atarashii tenkai. *Nihongogaku, 14(4),* 103-109.

Nishida, R. (1998, April 28). Waseieigo to zōgoryoku. *Sankei*, Retrieved June 17, 2005, from Factiva, Dow Jones Reuters Business Interactive.

NLC. (2000). *Gendaishakai niokeru keiihyōgen*. Retrieved September 17, 2001, from www.mext.go.jp

—— (2001). Kokusaishakai ni taiōsuru nihongo no arikata. *Science of Humanity, Bensei, 33,* 97-114.

NLRI. (1962). *Vocabulary and Chinese characters in ninety magazines of today, vol. 1*. Tokyo: Shūeishuppan.

—— (1964). *Vocabulary and Chinese characters in ninety magazines of today, vol. 3.* Tokyo: Shūeishuppan.

—— (Eds.). (1968-2000). *Kokugo-Nenkan*. Tokyo: Shūeishuppan.

—— (1970). *Denshikeisanki niyoru shinbun no goichōsa*. Tokyo: Shūeishuppan.

—— (1983). *Kōkōkyōkasho no goichōsa*. Tokyo: Shūeishuppan.

—— (1987). *Zasshiyōgo no hensen.* Tokyo: Shūeishuppan.

—— (1988). *An introduction to the National Language Research Institute: A sketch of its achievements.* Tokyo: NLRI.

—— (1989). *Kōkō, chūgakkō kyōkasho no goichōsa*. Tokyo: Shūeishuppan.

—— (2000). *Hakusho, kōhōshitō niokeru gairaigo no jittai, vol 1.* Unpublished internal report.

—— (2002). *History*. Retrieved January 10, 2002 from http://www.kokken.go.jp/index-e.html

Nomura, M. (1984). Goshu to zōgoryoku . *Nihongogaku, 3(9),* 40-54.

—— (1989). Japanese in the age of the word processor. *Japan Echo, 16,* 46-50.

—— & Yanase, T. (1989). Statistical structure of vocabulary in books for juveniles. In S. Mizutani (Ed.), *Japanese quantitative linguistics* (pp. 14-30). Bochum: Studienverlag Dr. Brockmeyer.

Ogaeri, Y. (1960). Kango ni kawaru katakanago. *Gengoseikatsu, 103,* 26-32.

Oguma, E. (2002). *A genealogy of Japanese self-images* (D. Askew, Trans.). Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.

Okamoto, T. (2002). From the editor. *NHK Broadcasting Studies, 1,* 3-5.

Ōmura, K. (1978). History of English teaching in Japan. In I. Koike, M. Matsuyama & K. Suzuki (Eds.), *The teaching of English in Japan* (pp. 91-103). Tokyo: Eichōsha.

Ōnishi, K. (Ed.), (1997). 21seiki ni tsutaetai utsukushii nihongo. *Hōsōkenkyū-to- Chōsa, July,* 2-23.

—— & Kajiki, M. (1995). Katakana-gairaigo 'raifurain' wa wakarimasuka. *Hōsōkenkyū- to-Chōsa, September,* 14-25.

Ōno, S. (1983). Kokugo-kaikaku no rekishi (senzen). In S. Maruya (Ed), *Nihongo no sekai 16* (pp. 5-94). Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha.

——, Morimoto, T. & Suzuki, T. (2001). *Nihon, nihongo, nihonjin.* Tokyo: Shinchōsha.

Ozawa, K. (1976). *An investigation of the influence of the English language on the Japanese language through lexical adaptation from 1955-1972.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Ohio.

Passin, H. (1977). *Japanese and the Japanese.* Tokyo: Kinseidō.

—— (1982). *Eigoka suru nihonshakai.* Tokyo: Simul Press.

Pierce, J.E. (1971). Culture, diffusion and Japlish. *Linguistics, 76,* 45-58.

Quackenbush, E.M. (1974). How Japanese borrows English words. *Linguistics - an International Review, 131,* 59-75.

Quackenbush, H.C. (1977). English loanwords in Japanese: Why are they difficult for English-speaking students? *Journal of the Association for the Teaching of Japanese, 12(2&3),* 149-173.

Roesgaard, M.H. (1998). *Moving mountains: Japanese education reform.* Aahus: Aahus University Press.

Rubin, J. (1983). Evaluating status planning: what has the past decade accomplished? In J. Cobarrubias & J.A. Fishman (Eds), *Progress in Language Planning: International*

Perspectives (pp. 330-343). Berlin: Mouton Publishers.

Sakagami, S. (2000). *Gairaigo: The semantics of Western loanwords in Japanese.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College.

Sakurai, Y. (1999). *Attitudes of Japanese adolescents toward the use of English in Japanese mass communication.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez Campus.

Sankei. (2000, August 24). Wakariyasui terebiCM o [Letter to the editor]. *Sankei*, p.11.

Schoppa, L.J. (1991). *Education reform in Japan: A case of immobilist policies.* London: Routledge.

Seaton, P. (2001). Shampoo for extra damage. *Japan Forum, 13(2)*, 233-247.

Seeley, C. (1984). The Japanese script since 1900. *Visible Language, 18(3)*, 267-301.

—— (1991). *A history of writing in Japan.* Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Seigel, S. & Castellan, N.J. (1988). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences, second edition.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Seidensticker, E.G. (1987). Nihongo no omoshirosa. In *Kotoba-shirīzu 26: Nihongo to Gaikokujin* (pp.31-42). Tokyo: Okurashō-insatsukyoku.

Sekine, K. (2003, January 7). Katakanago, dentatsujōhō o samatageru sokumen, seikatsukanren dewa hadome kentō o. *Yomiuri*, p.13.

—— (2003). Shinbunkiji no nakano katakanago, *Nihongogaku, 22(7)*, 30-39.

Shepherd, J.W. (1996). Loanwords – a pitfall for all students, *The Internet TESL Journal, 2(2).* Retrieved June 10, 2005, from www.iteslj.org/Articles/ Shepherd-Loanwords.html

Shibata, T. (1970). Gairaigo no saiseisan. *Nihongokyōiku, 15*, 2-13.

—— (1975). On some problems in Japanese sociolinguistics: Reflection and prospect. In F.C.C. Peng (Ed.), *Language in Japanese society: Current issues in Sociolinguistics* (pp. 159-173). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

—— (1985). Sociolinguistic surveys in Japan: Approaches and problems. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 55,* 79-88.

—— (1993). Gairaigo wa nihongo o midasuka. In Kawadeshobō (Ed.), *Kotobadokuhon gairaigo* (pp. 7-15). Tokyo: Kawadeshobō-shinsha.

Shibatani, M. (1990). *The languages of Japan.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shimoda, T. (1996). The role of women in Japanese television. *New Zealand Journal of*

East Asian Studies, 4 (1), 104-115.

Shiota, N. (1973). *Nihon no gengo-seisaku no kenkyū.* Tokyo: Kuroshioshuppan.

Shiraishi, D. (Ed.). (1960). *Tōyōkanji, gendaikanazukai, okurigana no tsukekata*. Tokyo: Ōkurashō-insatsukyoku.

Sonoda, K. (1983). Japanised English: A lexical aspect of English influence on Japanese. *Geolinguistics, 9,* 33-48.

Sōrifu. (1979). *Yoronchōsa-nenkan.* Tokyo: Kokuritsu-insatsukyoku.

—— (1991). *Yoronchōsa-nenkan.* Tokyo: Kokuritsu-insatsukyoku.

—— (1992). *Gekkan-yoronchōsa, November.* Tokyo: Kokuritsu-insatsukyoku.

—— (1997a). *Yoronchōsa-nenkan.* Tokyo: Kokuritsu-insatsukyoku.

—— (1997b). *Gekkan-yoronchōsa, July.* Tokyo: Ōkurashō-insatsukyoku.

Stanlaw, J. (1982). English in Japanese communicative strategies. In B.B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 168-197). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

—— (1987). Japanese and English: borrowing and contact. *World Englishes, 6(2),* 93-109.

—— (1990). Waseieigo wa bakanidekinai, *Chishiki 7,* 116-123.

—— (1996). Gengo no kōdomikishingu, pijin, shakuyō ni mirareru nihon no kokuminsei-imēji. *Nihongogaku, 15(1),* 31-38.

Sugimori, H. (1983). Kokugo-kaikaku no rekishi (sengo). In S. Maruya (Ed.), *Nihongo no sekai 16* (pp. 95-168). Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha.

Sugito, S. (1989). Lexical aspects of the modernization of Japanese. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Language adaptation* (pp. 116-126). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Suzuki, S. (1983). Gyōsei to gairaigo. *Gengoseikatsu, 379,* 29.

—— (1990). *Kanji-jōhōryoku saihakken.* Tokyo: Sōtakusha.

Suzuki, T. (1974). *Tozasareta gengo nihongo no sekai*. Tokyo: Shinchōsha.

—— (1981). *Kotoba no ningengaku.* Tokyo: Shinchōsha.

—— (1985a). Yokomojigo no hanran wa nihonbunka suitai no kizashi? *Gengo, 14(9),* 78-81.

—— (1985b). Yōgo no genjō to shōrai. *Nihongogaku, 4,* 4-17.

—— (1985c). A global role for the Japanese language. *Japan Echo, 12(3),* 79-84.

—— (1988). Ima nihongo no kokusaika o habamumono wa nanika? *Gekkan-Nihongo 3,* 48-53.

—— (1991). *Nihongo to gaikokugo*. Tokyo: Iwanamishoten.

—— (1992a). Nihongo wa nihonjindake no monoka. *Chūōkōron, 9,* 165-176.

—— (1992b). The case for spreading the Japanese language. *Japan Echo, 19(4),* 79-86.

—— (2001). *Eigo wa iranai.* Tokyo: PHP-shinsho.

Suzuki, Y. (1977a). Gengo-seisaku to kokugo-seisaku. In Y. Suzuki (Ed.), *Kokogokokuji-mondai no riron* (pp. 20-68). Tokyo: Mugishobō.

—— (1977b). Saikin no kokugo-mondai no dōkō to korekara no kokugokyōiku. In Y. Suzuki (Ed.), *Kokugokokuji-mondai no riron* (pp. 69-118). Tokyo: Mugishobō.

Takada, M. (1989). The development of Japanese society and the modernization of Japanese during the Meiji Restoration. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Language adaptation* (pp. 104-115). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Takashi, K. (1990). *A functional analysis of English borrowings in Japanese advertising: Linguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, Georgetown University, Washington DC.

—— (1991). A sociolinguistic analysis of English borrowings in Japanese advertising texts. *World Englishes, 9(3),* 327-341.

—— (1992). Language and desired identity in contemporary Japan. *Journal of Asia Pacific Communication, 3(1),* 133-144.

Takebe, Y. (1977). Kokugokokuji-mondai no yurai. In *Iwanamikōza nihongo 3* (pp. 261-308). Tokyo: Iwanamishoten.

Tamaki, H. (1991). Gairaigo to kokusaisei. *Kana-no-hikari, June,* 606-607.

Tamamura, F. (1991). Nihongo niokeru gairaiyōso to gairaigo. *Nihongokyoiku, 74,* 13-27.

Tanaka, A. (1984). Goshuron no kadai. *Nihongogaku, 3(9),* 7-17.

Tanaka, K. (2001). *Gengo kara mita minzoku to kokka*. Tokyo: Iwanamishoten.

Tanaka, M. (2003). ‘Gairaigo-iikae-teian’ nitsuite. *Nihongogaku, 22(7),* 50-60.

Tauli, V. (1974). The theory of language planning. In J.A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in language planning* (pp. 49-67). The Hague: Mouton.

Thody, P. (1995). *Le franglais – forbidden English, forbidden American: Law, politics and language in contemporary France.* Atlantic Highlands, NJ: The Athlone Press.

Thomas, G. (1991). *Linguistic purism.* London: Longman.

Toki, Z. (1960). Ryōshiki niyoru hokawanai genjitsu to shorihōhō. *Gengoseikatsu, 103,* 16-23.

Tokieda, M. (1962). *Kokugo-mondai no tameni.* Tokyo: Tōkyōdaigakushuppankai.

Tokugawa, M. (1992). The ups and downs of dialects in Japan. In T. Umesao, J.M. Unger & O. Sakiyama (Eds), *Japanese civilisation in the modern world* (pp. 123-135). Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

Tōkyō (2003, April 29). Katakanago, nihongo o torimodosō. *Tōkyō,* p. 4.

—— (2003, August 12). Katakanago, shomin no kankaku ga daiji da. *Tōkyō,* p. 5.

Tomari, J. (1985). Hanran suru katakanago. *Gengo, 14(9),* 29-33.

Tomoda, T. (1999). The impact of loan-words on modern Japanese. *Japan Forum, 11(1),* 231-253.

—— (2000). Defining the concept of loanword in Japanese: Results of a survey of 860 respondents. *Monash University Linguistics Papers, 2(2),* 3-14.

—— (2005). Change in script usage in Japanese: A longitudinal study of Japanese government white papers on labor. *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies.* Retrieved August 2, 2005, from www.japanesestudies.org.uk/articles /2005/Tomoda.html

Toyama, S. (1986). Gairaigo o ukeireru shinri. In *Kotoba-shirīzu 4,* (pp.32-40). Tokyo: Okurashō-insatsukyoku.

—— (1990). Nihongo wa midareteiruka. *Shinbunkenkyū, 467,* 10-14.

—— (1994). Gairaigo to hōsō. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, January,* 5-7.

Toyoda, K. (1972). Nihon no kokugo-seisaku no mondai. *Gengoseikatsu, 252,* 14-22.

Tsuchimochi, G.H. (1993). *Education reform in postwar Japan: The 1946 U.S. education mission.* Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Tsuchiya, T. (1991). Kokusaikajidai no nihongo. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, September,* 12-21.

Tsuchiya, M. (1992). *Nihongo-yo doko e iku.* Tokyo: Nihonkyōbunsha.

Tsunoda, R., de Barry, T. & Keene, D. (Eds.)(1964). *Sources of Japanese tradition, Vol. 1.* New York: Colombia University Press.

Tsushima, Y. (1998, April 23). Gādeningu naze niwaijiri to iwanaino. *Mainichi*. p.3.

Twine, N. (1991a). *Language and the modern state.* London: Routledge.

—— (1991b). Language and the constitution. *Japan Forum, 3(1),* 125-137.

Ujihara, K. (1994). Kotoba-shirīzu o shōkaisuru. *Nihongogaku, 13(7),* 102-109.

Umegaki, M. (1963). *Nihongairaigo no kenkyū.* Tokyo: Kenkyūsha.

—— (Ed.) (1965). *Gairaigojiten.* Tokyo: Tōkyōdō.

Umehara, M. (1982). An examination of some historical proposals for alleviating conceived difficulties in studying Japanese. *Sophia International Review, 4,* 44-50.

Umesao, T. (1989). Japanese as a vehicle for science. *Japan Echo, 16,* 43-45.

——, Kindaichi, H., Sakakura, A. & Hinohara, S. (1989). *Nihongodaijiten.* Tokyo: Kōdansha.

Unger, J.M. (1987). *The fifth generation fallacy: Why Japan is betting its future on artificial intelligence.* New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

—— (1996). *Literacy and script reform in occupation Japan: Reading between the lines.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Wada, M. (2003). *Bunshoshitsumon.* Retrieved April 11, 2005 from http://www.kitanet.ne.jp/~wadamune/0312bunsho.htm

Watanabe, Satoshi. (January 17, 2003). Personal correspondence.

Watanabe, Shōichi. (1974). *Nihongo no kokoro*. Tokyo: Kōdansha.

White, M. (1988). *The Japanese overseas: Can they go home again?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Yamada, Masamichi. (1993). English loanwords and lexical pairs in Japanese: The case of color terms. *Language Studies, 73(9),* 11-37.

Yamada, Masashige. (1995). *Amerikajin no shiranai eigo.* Tokyo: Maruzen.

Yamada, Y. & Nanba, K. (1999). Foreign language use in Japanese: An analytical study of newspaper articles 1951-1999. *Studies in the Humanities and Sciences, 40(1),* 143-181.

Yamafuji, S., Bitō, S., & Daiichiseimei (Eds.). (2004). *Heisei-sararīman-senryū kessakusen 1.* Tokyo: Kōdansha.

Yamashita, Y. (2002). Gairaigo (katakanago) no shiyōgensoku. *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, Jul,* 126-129.

—— & Katō, M. (2000). Korekarano nihongo ni eikyō o ataerumono wa? *Hōsōkenkyū-to-Chōsa, Sept,* 48-67.

Yazaki, G. (1964). *Nihon no gairaigo.* Tokyo: Iwanamishoten.

Yomiuri. (2002, November 21). Shinnihongo no genba: Dokuzenhaijo e 'katakana-gari'. *Yomiuri,* p. 18.

—— (2002, November 22). Shinnihongo no genba: Kotoba wa ikimono. *Yomiuri,* p. 22.

—— (2002, November 25). Shinnihongo no genba: Kanshin no takasa, rikaido ni chokketsu. *Yomiuri,* p. 18.

—— (2002). *Shinbun-katakanagojiten.* Tokyo: Chūōkōronshinsha.

—— (2002, December 26). Katakanago no iikae kokuminteki giron o kitai. *Yomiuri,* p. 30.

—— (2003, August 7). Katakanago no hanran. *Yomiuri*, p. 1.

—— (2003, October 29). *Shinbun niokeru gairaigo no atsukai*. Retrieved March 14, 2005, from www.osaka.yomiuri.co.jp/nie/akafude/031029b.htm

—— (2003a, November 14). Katakanago-tayō gyōseihakusho, kaizen ni ondosa. *Yomiuri,* p. 31.

—— (2003b, November 14). Katakanago-iikae giron hirogari hihan fukume kappatsu ni. *Yomiuri*, p. 38.

—— (2003, June 4). Katakana-yakusho-kotoba tsuihō. *Yomiuri,* p. 31.

—— (2004, June 30). Gairaigo sonomama. *Yomiuri*, p. 1.

—— (2005, January 26). Konfaransu, tadano 'kaigi' janai!? *Yomiuri*, p. 13.

Yoneda, T. (1982). Hōsōyōgo to gairaigo. *Gengoseikatsu, 366,* 57-62.

Yonekawa, A. (1996). Gaikokubunka no inyū to gairaigo. *Kokubungaku, 4(11),* 87-91.

Yoshida, S. (1962). Kokugo-mondai no kagenmi. *Gengoseikatsu, 125,* 50-59.

Yoshida, K. (2003). Language education policy in Japan – the problem of espoused objectives versus practice. *The Modern language Journal, 87,* 290-292.

Yoshino, K. (1992). *Cultural nationalism in contemporary Japan: A sociological enquiry*. London: Routledge.

Yoshizawa, N. (1982). Kotoba, fureai. In NHK (Ed.), *Korekarano nihongo*. (pp. 48-88). Tokyo: NHKshuppan.

APPENDIX

アンケートのお願い

このアンケートは皆さんが日ごろ見聞きする外来語に対して、どのように感じていらっしゃるかをおうかがいし、現在日本語の中で外来語がどのように受け止められているかを調査するものです。つきましては、お手数ですが、資料収集にご協力くださいますようお願いいたします。なお、これは無記名調査ですので、どうぞ率直にお答えくださいますようお願いいたします。

ニューサウスウェールズ大学　博士課程
「外来語に関する意識調査」研究　友田　多香子

次のＡ～Ｄの項目について、あてはまる答えの番号に○をつけるか、空欄に適当な語句を記入するかして、お答えください。

A. **年齢**：

1. 16 －19 才　2. 20 －24 才　3. 25 －29 才
4. 30 －34 才　5. 35 －39 才　6. 40 －49 才
7. 50 －59 才　8. 60 －69 才　9. 70 才以上

B. **性別**：　1. 男　2. 女

C. 学生の方は、１か２のいずれかを選び、２を選んだ方は専攻を記入してください。
学生以外の方は、次の質問Ｄにとんでください。

1. 高校生　2. 専門学校・短大・大学生　(専攻)＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

D. 仕事に就いていますか。

1. はい（職種）＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　2. いいえ

1 を選んだ方は、職種を(電気機器会社の海外事業部一般事務、中学校の化学の教師等のように)できるだけ詳しく、上の下線部に記入してください。

E. **外国語を話す力**：下の表の外国語について、あなたが 1～６のどの程度に当てはまるか選んで、番号を○で囲んでください。

1. 仕事など専門的な話ができる
2. 日常会話が不自由なくできる
3. 旅行会話程度ができる
4. 少し分かるが、よく話せない。
5. ほとんど意思が伝えられない
6. まったく話せない

英語	1	2	3	4	5	6	中国語	1	2	3	4	5	6
ドイツ語	1	2	3	4	5	6	韓国語	1	2	3	4	5	6
フランス語	1	2	3	4	5	6	その他＿＿＿＿語	1	2	3	4	5	6
スペイン語	1	2	3	4	5	6	その他 ＿＿＿＿語	1	2	3	4	5	6

F. **外国語を読む力：**下の表の外国語について、あなたが 1～6 のどの程度に当てはまるか選んで、番号を〇で囲んでください。

1. 新聞･雑誌･一般が楽に読める
2. 新聞･雑誌･一般がだいたい読める
3. 自分の興味のあるものならだいたい読める
4. ごく簡単な短文なら読める。
5. ほとんど読めない
6. まったく読めない

英語	1	2	3	4	5	6	中国語	1	2	3	4	5	6
ドイツ語	1	2	3	4	5	6	韓国語	1	2	3	4	5	6
フランス語	1	2	3	4	5	6	その他＿＿＿＿＿語	1	2	3	4	5	6
スペイン語	1	2	3	4	5	6	その他 ＿＿＿＿＿語	1	2	3	4	5	6

G. あなたは、どういうものを外来語とよぶと思いますか。ひとつだけ選んで、〇で囲んで下さい。

1. 外国の地名と人名だけ
2. 若者ことばなど現在はやっていて、カタカナで書かれていることば
3. 欧米からだけでなく中国からも取り入れられたことばで、漢字やカタカナで書かれることば
4. 主として欧米から日本語に取り入れられ、カタカナで書かれることばで、中国からの漢語(漢字のことば)はふくまれない。

以下の質問について、ご自分の考えとあっている答をひとつだけだけ選んで、その番号を〇で囲んでください。意見がおありでしたら、番号を選んでから余白にお書きください。

Q1 あなたは過去 10 年位の間に、日本語における外来語の数が増えたと思いますか。

1 非常にふえたと思う　2 多少ふえたと思う　3 変わらないと思う
4 多少減ったと思う　5 非常に減ったと思う

Q2 日頃見聞きしていることばの中で、外来語の使われている程度をどう思いますか。

1 多すぎると思う　2 多いと思う　3 ちょうどよいと思う
4 むしろ少ないと思う　5 少なすぎると思う

Q3 現在の日本語における外来語の使われかたを、あなたはどう思いますか。

1 大変好ましいと思う　2 好ましいと思う　3 どちらともいえない
4 あまり好ましくないと思う　5 大変好ましくないと思う

Q4 これから外来語の使用の程度は、どうなると思いますか。

1 大変ふえると思う　2 ふえると思う　3 変わらないと思う
4 今より減ると思う　5 かなり減ると思う

Q5 もし、将来外来語の使用が増えるとすると、あなたはどう思いますか。

1 大変好ましいと思う　2 好ましいと思う　3 どちらともいえない
4 あまり好ましくないと思う　5 大変好ましくないと思う
意見(　　)

Q6 日頃見聞きしていることばの中で外来語が多く使われると、あなたは気になるほうですか。

1 非常に気になる　2 多少気になる　3 別になんとも感じない
4 あまり気にならない　5 まったく気にならない

Q7「外来語の多用は日本語を乱し、ついには日本語を滅ぼす」という意見がありますが、これについてあなたはどう思いますか。

1 その通りだと思う　2 多少その傾向があると思う
3 それほどではないと思う　4 そんなことはないと思う
5 むしろ日本語を豊かにすると思う

Q8 最近、下の表の a～h の項目の中で見聞きする外来語の数について、どう思いますか。

1 以前よりかなり多くなったと思う　2 多くなったと思う
3 以前と同じ位　4 少なくなったと思う　5 かなり少なくなったと思う

の中から選んで答えて下さい。

a. テレビ･ラジオ番組	1	2	3	4	5
b. 宣伝･広告記事やポスター	1	2	3	4	5
c. 各種案内書・商品説明書	1	2	3	4	5
d. 新聞	1	2	3	4	5
e. 雑誌	1	2	3	4	5
f. 仕事場あるいは学校の授業	1	2	3	4	5
g. 知人・友人との会語	1	2	3	4	5
h. 子供や若者どうしの会話	1	2	3	4	5

Q9 日頃読んだり聞いたりすることばの中で、あなたにとって、意味のわからない外来語に気がつくことがありますか。

1 よくある　2 時々ある　3 あまりない　4 ほとんどない

Q10 あなたにとって、意味のわからない外来語をどんなところでよく見聞きしますか。よく見聞きすると思うものを下の項目から、4つまで選んで下さい。

1 テレビ・ラジオ番組　2 宣伝・広告記事やポスター
3 案内書・商品説明書　4 新聞
5 雑誌　6 仕事場あるいは学校の授業
7 知人・友人との会話　8 子供や若者どうしの会話

Q11 意味のよくわからない外来語を見聞きしたとき、あなたはどんな気持ちがしますか。次の中からあうものを**いくつでも**選んで下さい。

1 何も感じない　　2 いらいらする　　3 不愉快に思う
4 自分を恥ずかしく思う　　5 自分がおくれているのではと不安になる
6 すぐ知りたいと思う　　7 使っている人に感心する
8 無視する　　9 日本語でいうべきだと思う
10 他(　　)

Q12 あなたは、新しく意味のわかった外来語を、自分の会話の中に積極的にとり入れ始めますか。

1 よく取り入れ始める　　2 時々取り入れ始める　　3 あまり取り入れない
4 ほとんど取り入れない　　5 まったく取り入れないようにしている

Q13 外来語を使うことについて、どういう感じをお持ちですか。次の中から**いくつでも**選んで下さい。

1　その人が学のある人に見える　　2　その人がキザに見える
3　その人が格好よく見える　　4　新しい感覚が出せる
5　わざとらしい　　6　意味がわかりにくくなる
7　微妙な意味合いが表現できる　　8　日本語の伝統が破壊される
9　軽薄な感じがする　　10　国際的な感じがする
11 あいまいな意味の感じがいい　　12　違和感を感じる
13 印象が強い　　14　ものまねっぽい
15 その他 _____

Q14 外来語の使用についてどう思いますか。a～h の項目について、下の **1**, **2**, **3** のいずれかで答えて下さい。

1 そう思う　　**2** そうは思わない　　**3** どちらともいえない

a 日本語で十分足りるはずだから使うべきではない	1	2	3
b 不的確な使用を避けるため、余り使うべきでない	1	2	3
c 日本語になりにくいもののみ使えばよい	1	2	3
d どんどん取り入れればよい	1	2	3
e 話題性のあるものは取り入れるべき	1	2	3
f 一般の人がわかるものだけに制限すべき	1	2	3
g 慎重に選んで使うべき	1	2	3
h 意味さえわかれば、いくら使つてもかまわない	1	2	3
その他			

Q15 なぜ日本人は、外国語を日本語の中に取り入れるのだと思いますか。a〜f の理由について、次の 1, 2, 3 のいずれかでお答え下さい。

1 そう思う　　2 そうは思わない　　3 どちらともいえない

a 日本人は外国のものをコピーしたがる傾向があるから	1	2	3
b 日本語にちょうどあったことばがないから	1	2	3
c 国際化の過程として自然なことだから	1	2	3
d 日本人は外国語学習熱が高いから	1	2	3
e 日本人は新しいことばを作る創造力に欠けるから	1	2	3
f 日本語に外国語がうまく取り人れやすいから	1	2	3
その他			

Q16 a〜e の外来語が日本語にもたらす影響について、次の 1, 2, 3 のいずれかでお答え下さい。

1 そう思う　　2 そうは思わない　　3 どちらともいえない

a 日本語の語いを豊かにする	1	2	3
b 日本語を乱す	1	2	3
c 日本語の国際化をうながす	1	2	3
d 日本語を現代的にする	1	2	3
e コミュニケーションの混乱を招く	1	2	3
h その他			

Q17 ひとくちに言って、あなたは今、日本語が乱れていると思いますか。

1 その通りだと思う　　2 多少その傾向があると思う
3 それほどではないと思う　　4 そんなことはないと思う

Q18 日常生活の中で、漢字の使用量が将来減っていくと思いますか。

1 かなり減ると思う　　2 多少減ると思う　　3 変わらないと思う
4 多少ふえると思う　　5 かなりふえると思う

ご協力どうもありがとうございました。