〈公募論文〉

Attitudes toward Bilingual and Multicultural Aspects of Japanese-Language Policy and Teaching to Non-Native Children in Japan

NOYAMA Hiroshi*

This study reports on attitudes toward bilingual/multicultural aspects of Japanese-language policy and teaching to non-native children in Japan in terms of Australian language policy, which is based on multiculturalism. The data was gathered by questionnaire and a follow-up interview after I observed language classes. The questionnaire method of gathering data was used and involved eighteen foreign students who need to learn Japanese as a second language from years 1 and 9 at Ōmiya city and twenty-six teachers who work at the following three teaching places: elementary or junior-high school at Ōmiya city in Saitama, Kokusai Kyūen Sentā at Shinagawa in Tokyo, and Chūgoku Kikoku Koji Teichaku Sokushin Sentā at Tokorozawa in Saitama.

The results of analysis show that parents of most students feel that they would like to have their children become bilingual. Moreover, most teachers welcomed the opportunity to offer a JSL (Japanese as a Second Language) class that is based on bilingualism or multiculturalism for non-native children. Most of the teachers strongly agreed with the idea of maintaining or facilitating contact with people of different nationalities even though there is an adequate language policy within the educational system to enable non-native children to live in an environment that is conducive to acquiring sociolinguistic and cultural competence.

In addition, I will examine this kind of survey of both language learners and teachers using questionnaires and follow-up interviews, which play a significant role in identifying intercultural problems that happen among non-native children. Furthermore, the results of this survey strongly support developing a Japanese language policy based on bilingualism and multiculturalism.

In the discussion and recommendation section, recommendations are made for changing the language education policy, which includes supporting economic budgets and fostering progress in non-native children's Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) as soon as possible.

---

* 野山　広：　Graduate Student, Department of Japanese Studies, Monash University, Australia.

> In the conclusion section, it is recommended that it would be desirable for
> some further study to be undertaken on other elements of the language life of
> non-native children and the significance of such a study is highlighted.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the trend of education in Japan is moving toward treating the
intercultural experience of students who are being educated in a foreign country as
positive rather than something negative that must be removed to avoid tearing away
their experience (Ozawa, 1989).

If the aim of communication for children who have a different culture is to sustain
the equality of the relationship between children, while, at the same time, accepting
the difference among one another, we should maintain more cooperative education
for the different cultures (a kind of multicultural education) of foreign/immigrant
children rather than assimilation (Ebuchi and Kobayashi, 1985).

What, then, is the situation of language education for non-native children in Ja-
pan? In this report, I would like to discuss points of view of multiculturalism,
especially focusing on the Teaching of Japanese Language to non-native children
who attend elementary or junior high schools.

This research focuses on the aspects of bilingualism in teaching Japanese to non-
native children in Japan. This means that there is no consideration of Korean-
Japanese children or Chinese-Japanese in this report, because their needs in lan-
guage education are very different from those who came from China, Brazil, Viet-
nam (non-native children) and so on in this decade.

I would like to try to clarify whether or not language education for non-native
children is based on the principle of bilingualism. This includes the following two
aspects:

1. Mother tongue maintenance and cultural identity.
2. Assimilation into Japanese Society.

In order to do this, first, I would like to briefly overview the theories of bilingual-
ism that support a language policy based on bilingualism and multiculturalism. In
addition, with reference to this overview, I would like to claim that now is the time
to develop a Japanese-language policy based on bilingualism focusing on the actual
conditions of admitting and teaching non-native children who need to study Japa-
nese language in Japan.

Second, I would like to define the following key words: multiculturalism, bilin-
gualism, CALP, semilingual.

Third, I would like to cite a specific example: the actual conditions of Japanese-
language teaching to non-native children in Ōmiya city, and then analyze it.

Finally, I would like to recommend the kind of language education that is most
appropriate for non-native children in Japan in the future, based on theories of
bilingualism.

Background to This Study

There are a large number of language policies based on various theories in the world. I would like to focus mainly on the language policies in Australia, which are among the most developed policies based on bilingualism/multiculturalism, and also on Cummins's (1984: 143) theories, which support bilingual programs such as Heritage Language Education in Canada.

According to research papers and books concerning Language Policy in Australia (e.g., Lo Bianco, 1987; White paper, 1991; Clyne, 1991; Ozolins, 1993), it seems that in implementing the contemporary NPL (National Policy on Languages)'s main focus has been on realizing its four principles, which reflect those of all the major policy documents of l980s:

1. English for all. It includes E.S.L. (English as a Second Language);
2. Support for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island languages;
3. A Language Other Than English (LOTE) for all; and
4. Equitable and widespread language services.

These can be especially useful models for Japan (Japanese for all. It includes J.S.L. = Japanese as a Second Language, Support for the Ainu language, A Language Other Than Japanese = LOTJ, and Language services). Japan must be prepared to maintain a Japanese Language Policy (JLP) supported by multiculturalism like that of Australia.

Even though the four areas are similar, their implementation in Australia is not a very useful model for contemporary Japan, which has just introduced Japanese as a Second Language (JSL) in elementary and junior high schools. Therefore, among these four issues, this report will especially focus on J.S.L. including Community Languages (CL) in primary schools. In providing second-language education including CL supported by multiculturalism, it is essential to keep one's own cultural expression.

It is estimated that, as a result of the economic expansion of the 1960s and 1970s, there are a lot of children of migrant workers attending schools in developed countries including Australia. According to OMA (1989: vii), Multiculturalism — "maintaining cultural diversity, peacefully within a single country" — is a difficult proposition. In Australia, however, it is essential to foster an environment or to extend an adaptability for difficult and complex cultural problems. In addition, a group's cultural identity — "the right/ability to express and share their individual cultural heritage, including language and religion" — is one of the three important dimensions of multicultural policy identified by the Commonwealth Government of Australia, even though core values of their culture are different for each ethnic group (Smolicz, 1981; Smolicz and Secombe, 1989).

Unfortunately, even though the above-mentioned are valid reasons that a Community (Heritage) Language education supported by multiculturalism is required in developed countries, there have been few examples of this being implemented.

Fortunately, in the 1980s, an important fundamental theory to support a bilingual (Community/Heritage language) education was developed by Cummins in Canada.

According to Cummins (1983: 51), minority students enrolled in heritage-language bilingual programs possess academic skill equivalent to students enrolled in regular school programs. This finding is vitally important, because it counters the misunderstood view of some educators and ethnic parents that such programs would interfere with the development of English (target or main-language) academic skills. Furthermore, it gives minority children a better chance to study their native language than had previously been the case. As a result, this program has affected the language policy of many developed countries, including Australia, which is facing a similar situation. Cummins's (1983: 84) theories support bilingual programs in Canada and have been responsible for the development of the current language program there,[1] even though there is criticism (Edelsky et al., 1983; Rivera, 1984; Martin-Jones and Romaine, 1986; and Frederickson and Cline, 1990).

On the other hand, in the 1990s, it may be the case that there are not many children of migrant or foreign workers attending schools in Japan, compared with those in developed countries.[2] However, Tables I and II are indicative of the number of children from multicultural backgrounds, who have to learn Japanese as a second language. Unfortunately, it could be considered that there is officially no chance for non-native children to take any kind of heritage-language education in or out of school.[3] This fact suggests that some non-native children may in the future become semilingual (see Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981: 53). Japan must formulate a lan-

---

[1] The summary of Cummins's (1984) theories that support bilingual programs in Canada are as follows:

Cummins distinguished between BICS (Basic Inter Communicative Skills), which are essential aspects of concrete language activity (e.g., daily conversation in the class room or community) and CALP (Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency), which is an essential aspect of abstract language ability (complemented cognitive activity) in the class. Furthermore, he mentioned that CALP develops more slowly than BICS.

The L1 and L2 language abilities of bilingual people are supported by crosslingual dimensions not independent. They are interdependent with, especially, the language ability (e.g., reading ability) or implemented cognitive/academic ability. Therefore, it can be considered that if the CALP of L1 is strong, the ability can be transferred to the language ability of L2.

It requires the development of their mother tongue (L1) for the children of a minority language to progress higher in both languages. If the children's CALP has not developed enough in L1, it means that they don't have any fundamentals to develop CALP in L2. As a result (according to this hypothesis), in order to get an effective influence of bilingual education, it is vital that their mother/father make an effort to advance their L1 ability.

[2] For example, according to the White Paper (1991: 50), there were 179,640 students who needed to be provided with English-language assistance in 1989 in Australia.

On the other hand, according to Table I, there were only 5,463 students who needed to be provided with Japanese-language assistance in 1991 in Japan.

[3] According to March & Yatsushiro (1991: 191–97), it seems that there are a few private teaching centers maintaining mother tongue and culture supported by volunteers since 1988. They are as follows: →

Table I

School	Elementary School		Junior High School		Total	
Classification by Prefecture	The number of Schools	The number of Children	The number of Schools	The number of Students	The number of Schools	The number of C or S
Hokkai-dō	6	19	4	5	10	24
Aomori	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iwate	1	1	0	0	1	1
Miyagi	7	11	3	5	10	16
Akita	6	11	1	2	7	13
Yamagata	2	3	3	5	5	8
Fukushima	3	9	2	4	5	13
Ibaraki	56	204	18	31	74	235
Tochigi	18	91	8	16	26	107
Gunma	65	221	24	71	89	292
Saitama	33	112	13	32	46	144
Chiba	52	134	18	50	70	184
Tōkyō-to	253	586	97	273	350	859
Kanagawa	184	535	77	200	261	735
Niigata	2	10	1	1	3	11
Toyama	8	10	1	2	9	12
Ishikawa	6	8	1	1	7	9
Fukui	9	15	0	0	9	15
Yamanashi	19	36	2	3	21	39
Nagano	40	106	20	31	60	137
Gifu	41	81	11	17	52	98
Shizuoka	117	423	41	61	158	484
Aichi	215	526	56	91	271	617
Mie	23	89	10	27	33	116
Shiga	17	56	3	3	20	59
Kyōto-fu	8	30	7	17	15	47
Ōsaka-fu	84	195	50	310	134	505
Hyōgo	34	161	11	50	45	211
Nara	15	19	4	16	19	35
Wakayama	2	3	0	0	2	3
Tottori	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shimane	1	1	0	0	1	1
Okayama	12	25	2	2	14	27
Hiroshima	37	98	17	89	54	187

→	Language	Main-supporter or Main Group	Place
	Cambodian	The Society of Cambodian in Japan and supporting Group for refugees	Tōkyō
	Laotian	The Society of Lao in Japan	Ayase City in Kanagawa Ken Ōmiya City in Saitama Ken
	Vietnamese	The Volunteer group of Vietnamese	Fujisawa City in Kanagawa Ken and some places in Japan

Table I Continued

School	Elementary School		Junior High School		Total	
Classification by Prefecture	The number of Schools	The number of Children	The number of Schools	The number of Students	The number of Schools	The number of C or S
Yamaguchi	2	3	1	2	3	5
Tokushima	2	2	0	0	2	2
Kagawa	5	13	3	4	8	17
Ehime	1	3	0	0	1	3
Kōchi	10	17	3	5	13	22
Fukuoka	10	27	6	8	16	35
Saga	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nagasaki	3	5	3	5	6	10
Kumamoto	6	16	3	5	9	21
Ōita	0	0	1	1	1	1
Miyazaki	3	6	1	1	4	7
Kagoshima	2	4	2	2	4	6
Okinawa	17	53	8	37	25	90
TOTAL	1,437	3,978	536	1,485	1,937	5,463

Source: The Ministry of Education, 1992, "Nihongo kyōiku ga hitsuyōna gaikokujin jidō seito no ukeire shidō no jōkyo ni tsuite," Tokyo, Japan.
According to the classification by to (Greater Tōkyō), dō (Prefecture), fu (Metropolitan Prefecture), ken (Prefecture): The number of a foreign/immigrant students who need Japanese as a Second Language.
Note: The following four prefectures: Hokkai-dō; Tōkyō-to; Kyōto-fu; and Ōsaka-fu are exceptions to the name of prefecture. Others are called — ken.

guage policy that integrates multiculturalism.

With regard to the examination results of the heritage program discussed by Cummins (1983), in the United States, Britain, the Netherlands, and Sweden, evaluations from these countries show that the use of a minority language (community language) as a medium of instruction for all or part of the school day entails no long-term loss in the development of academic skills in the majority language.

Furthermore, in the language policy of Australia, it can be seen that the ability to use two languages will contribute to individual and social development (White Paper, 1991: 1). The Australian government maintains cultural diversity by supporting four goals to develop:
1. English Literacy that is appropriate for a range of contexts;
2. LOTE to reinforce educational outcomes and communication within both the Australian and intercultural community;
3. Aboriginal languages for the benefit of descendants of their speakers and for the nation's heritage;
4. Language services through interpreting and translating, printing and electronic media and libraries (White Paper, xiii).

These goals indicates that the Australian Language Policy (ALP) is prepared to spend a lot of money every year to carry out those policy goals (Table III). While

Table II

L Sc	P	C	S	K	V	E	F	O	Total
Elementary	1,665	999	451	139	170	118	94	342	3,978 N
School	41.9	25.1	11.3	3.5	4.3	3.0	2.4	8.6	100%
Junior High	267	625	145	187	93	37	27	104	1,485 N
School	18.0	42.1	9.8	12.6	6.3	2.5	1.8	7.0	100%
Total	1,932	1,624	596	326	263	155	121	446	5,463 N
	35.4	29.7	10.9	6.0	4.8	2.8	2.2	8.2	100%

Source: The Ministry of Education, 1992, "Nihongo kyōiku ga hitsuyona gaikokujin jidō seito no ukeire shidō no jōkyō ni tsuite," Tokyo, Japan.

According to a mother tongue: The number of foreign/immigrant students who need Japanese as a second language.

Note: L = Language, Sc = School, P = Portuguese, C = Chinese, S = Spanish, K = Korean, V = Vietnamese, E = British, F = Filipino, O = Others, N = Number.

Table III   This Table Summarizes Level of Funding in Each Area for the ALLP from 1991–92 to 1993–94

Total Funding: ALLP Package

(Deet Programs and Dilgea's Adult Migrant English Program Only)

	1990–91 $ m	1991–92 $ m	1992–93 $ m	1993–94 $ m
Children's literacy	2.68	6.76	7.87	5.10
Adult literacy	18.02	39.39	51.12	52.63
Children's ESL	92.95	97.96	107.07	117.76
Adult ESL	94.40	106.42	118.46	120.35
Children's languages other than English (LOTE)	16.90	14.29	17.59	17.45
Adult LOTE	5.29	6.25	6.33	5.35
Aboriginal literacy and languages	1.00	1.75	5.63	8.25
Advisory councils/research/other	2.11	5.64	6.44	6.44
TOTAL	233.35	278.46	320.51	333.33

All costs for 1991–92 and subsequent years contained in the Policy Information Paper and companion volume are in Budget 1991–92 prices.

Source: Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET), 1991, *Australia's language* ("White Paper"). Canberra: AGPS.

funding is necessary, it is of little use unless people are made aware of cultural diversity, which can best be addressed through the implementing of the following language policies supported by multiculturalism: full access to E.S.L.; Aboriginal-language programs; and LOTE and language services.

Above all, it is very important for migrant or foreign children to have the freedom to choose whether they will take first (minority)-language lessons in school or after school based on the principle of "living place first" rather than "nationality first" (Asakura, 1990, 1993). Additionally, even if they can receive lessons in their first

language (e.g., Heritage program, Community Language program), there may be problems unless the program can provide enough time to develop that proficiency. For example, if people grow up with insufficient language tuition, they may become semilingual rather than bilingual (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981: 51; Noyama, 1988). Therefore, the ALP is required to maintain good cooperation between E.S.L. and LOTE including CL and to provide enough funding to carry it out. Furthermore, ALP has to consider the issue of inequality, discrimination, etc. in implementing the goals associated with point 4.

According to DEET (White Paper, 1991), it seems that the ALP has been making efforts to avoid these problems. Even though the ALP states that Australia is trying hard to implement programs, nevertheless, the financial aid to maintain good cooperation between E.S.L. and LOTE is not yet satisfactory (Green Paper, 1990: 70–72). It is an undeniable fact that a Language Policy is usually affected by the national economy. However, according to Clyne (1983: 35), even now, it is vital for Australia to try out as many programs as possible to ascertain which is appropriate for which situation. Therefore, although it is acknowledged that it is considerably difficult to obtain sufficient funds, it is essential that the issues of equity and sensible handling of communication and language issues including E.S.L. and LOTE will cannot be allowed to disappear even in the worst economic situation (Ozolins, 1993: 256–57).

Although there are many bilingual program models in the world, if Japan does not acknowledge the statements of Clyne (1983: 35) when trying out models, JLP might become a house built on sand. In order to prevent this from happening, it is essential for Japan to carefully monitor the implementation of ALP.

While a program began for the teaching of Japanese as a Second Language (T.J.S.L.) in 1991, there is still a long way to go. As mentioned above, it is vital and possible for non-native children to maintain JLP supported by multiculturalism. The first step in implementing JLP is to introduce J.S.L. and LOTJ (including CL) to non-native children with progressing CALP, which is treated as one of the most fundamental elements of education. In other words, the role of J.S.L. must be to provide children with a firm roots (identity), which can offer them an additive rather than subtractive bilingualism (Harley, 1990: 140).

Therefore, in this report, I will mainly focus on JSL. There are a number of schools in which a kind of JSL class for non-native children is being implemented.[4] This research focuses on the actual conditions of Japanese-language teaching to non-native children in elementary and junior high school in Ōmiya city, and the attitudes of teachers who are teaching Japanese to them, by means of a questionnaire and follow-up interview. These research methods are based on Kawakami (1991) and the view of the principles of multiculturalism and bilingualism supported by Cummins's theories.

---

[4] According to the Ministry of Education (1992), there are 413 elementary schools and 144 junior-high schools that are implementing a kind of TJSL class for non-native children who need to study JSL in Japan.

Definition and Function

In this study, firstly, I would like to define multiculturalism as follows: "It allows a situation in which an individual or group has more than one set of cultural beliefs, values, and attitudes with support from appropriate language education, which provides a chance to take L1 (or mother-language) education, especially for immigrant/ foreign children."

It is considered that this concept also includes 'bilingualism.' This means, in this study, that I use the concept of 'multiculturalism' to be almost the same as that of 'bilingualism.'

Therefore, in this study, the meaning of 'Language Policy based on bilingualism or multiculturalism' is:

> A policy for implementing both Japanese as a Second Language and Community Language/Heritage Language for non-native children in order not to make them semilingual in the future. In order to do this, the teaching of JSL must encourage cultural pluralism. In other words, it must support their Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) in order to help them acquire their own identity (firm roots) in at least one language.

Referring to Richards (1992), Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) can be defined as:

> A hypothesis proposed by Cummins (1980) that describes the special kind of second-language proficiency that students need in order to perform learning tasks in school. Cummins suggests that many classroom tasks are cognitively demanding and often have to be solved independently by the learner without support from the context. The ability to carry out such tasks in a second language is known as CALP. Cummins contrasts this kind of language proficiency with Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS). This refers to the language proficiency needed to perform other kinds of tasks which are not directly related to learning academic content, such as interpersonal communication. Interpersonal and social communication is relatively undemanding cognitively and relies on context to clarify meaning. According to Cummins, different kinds of tests are needed to measure CALP and BICS, and a learner's skill in BICS does not predict performance on CALP (Richards, 1992: 59).

Richards (1992) defines semilingual as "a term sometimes used for people who have acquired several languages at different periods of their lives, but who have not developed a native-speaker level of proficiency in any of them (Richards, 1992: 329).

For the purpose of this study, I use the concept of 'Teaching Japanese' to be almost the same as that of 'Teaching Japanese with taking care of the progress of non-native children's CALP.'

Finally, according to Smolicz (1981: 85), cultural identity is defined as 'A phenomenon which is experienced by both groups and individuals: the group phenom-

enon is in fact acknowledged by its members, who are often conscious that their particular attitude is shared with other members and is a reflection of the group's value systems.'

While following studies of 'Teaching Japanese,' it becomes necessary for this report to examine the significance of studying the attitude that regulates bilingualism, which is one of the most important elements affecting language policy in Japan in the future.

As mentioned in the introduction, non-native children (even elementary-school students) usually have their own right to choose taking the language teaching class in their own mother tongue, which regulates their own identities.

In this study, I attempt to survey language behavior of non-native children including attitudes of parents and attitudes of teachers in order to understand whether children, their parents and their teachers really want to be provided with language policy based on bilingualism/multiculturalism or not.

Method

Kawakami (1991) investigated the language life and education of Vietnamese children by using a questionnaire consisting of two categories: children's background and their language behavior, which consists of the following three items: Code Switching according to Listener, Code Switching according to Situation, and Language Adaptation based on sociolinguistics.

In this study, I surveyed the language behavior of students (years 1 to 9) at Saturday Supplementary School by using a questionnaire that I modified for JSL students consisting of the above 3 items with one original item (No. 4), which is included in the category of attitude of parents and a follow-up interview. In addition, I surveyed the attitudes to language education based on bilingualism/ multiculturalism of Japanese-language teachers at the following three teaching places: elementary or junior-high schools at Ōmiya city in Saitama, Kokusai Kyūen Sentā (The International Refugee Assistance Centre) at Shinagawa in Tokyo, and Chūgoku Kikoku Koji Teichaku Sokushin Sentā (Adaptive Education Centre for Japanese Returnees from China) at Tokorozawa in Saitama.

Before analyzing the results of this survey at Ōmiya, I conducted the following simple survey of the background of the students and a follow-up interview with the Japanese teacher in order to know the Japanese class situation in more detail.

The Japanese program at Saturday Supplementary School has just two levels of Japanese classes; Form 1 and 2 (equivalent to elementary and junior-high school level). Non-native children are not required to attend the course. The students of Form 1 were usually taught using the original textbook developed by a Japanese teacher with the curriculum based on the instruction and concept of the teacher's plan. In addition, the students of Form 2 were taught using a Japanese textbook for native children with a sub-text of grammar for native children. Surprisingly, the

Japanese teacher of Form 2 was not conscious of any teaching methodology in either syllabus or course design as a second language, and even said: "I've never taught Japanese as a second language for non-native children or been trained in teaching methods of Japanese for non-native children," in the follow-up interview. This suggests that it is difficult to offer enough Japanese-language education for non-native children, because this kind of teaching has just started. Furthermore, it also suggests that it is very natural that the concept of TJSL or Bilingualism is not yet well understood by teachers.

The questionnaire was answered not only by the students of Forms 1 and 2 (years 1 to 9) but also the other non-native children who need to study Japanese as a second language at the following elementary or junior high schools in Ōmiya city:

Elementary Schools: Ōmiya Minami, Nanasato, Ōsato Higashi, Higashi Miyashita, Nisshin Kita

Junior-High School: Miyahara

The numbers of students in elementary and junior-high level were eleven, and seven respectively. There were 11 male students, and 7 female students. The ages ranged from 7 to 18. Details are shown in Tables 3 and 4 (See Appendix 1).

Subjects

Eighteen (18) students participated in this study. Their background: mother tongue sex, age, level, the age at arrival and length of stay in Japan are shown in Tables 1 to 6 (See Appendix 1). In addition, 26 teachers participated in this study. Their affiliation and numbers are shown in Table 7.

Procedure

This questionnaire in Japanese was conducted directly by the researcher during class time or indirectly in December 1991, and follow-up interviews in Japanese were undertaken from December 1991 to January 1992. The researcher and teachers in charge explained each question for the students' convenience. Students were permitted to write their feelings in their mother tongues if they felt any difficulty in expressing an appropriate answer.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was in two parts: one for children and one for teachers. The questionnaire for children contained 12 questions covering four categories: code switching according to listener (items 1,2), code switching according to situation (item 3), language adaptation (item 4), and attitudes of parents (items 5,6).

Secondly, the questionnaire for teachers contained 7 questions covering two categories: evaluation of the Japanese ability of non-native children in Ōmiya city, and attitudes to language education based on bilingualism or multiculturalism. Most questions were multiple-choice (the original questionnaires are shown in Appendixes 2 and 3).

Analysis

Since the purpose of this survey was to grasp an overview of language behavior of non-native children who need to study Japanese at Ōmiya city, it is intended to be taken as a pilot study. In addition, this was to grasp an overview of the attitudes of Japanese-language teachers for Teaching Japanese as a Second Language (TJSL) based on bilingualism/multiculturalism. Consequently, the number of subjects is small, and no statistical analysis has been conducted. Instead, rough tendencies and possibilities are presented.

Results

Language Behavior of Non-native Children and Attitudes of Teachers
This section will discuss the responses of non-native children of JSL classes and teachers of the three locations. The 18 students represented relatively multicultural backgrounds typical of students in Japanese as a Second Language (JSL) programs at elementary and junior-high school levels, especially in the Kantō area in Japan.

There were 11 males and 7 females. Their countries of origin are listed in Table 1. Responses to the questionnaire could have been broken-down by sex, country of origin, or other demographic variables; however, such an analysis will not be reported here because of the small size of students representing each group.

There were no clear-cut right and wrong answers to the questionnaires. It is not the purpose of this questionnaire to identify "incorrect" student opinions; rather, it seeks to describe specific language behaviors and discuss the potential impact of these behaviors on language education and policies.

There were 26 teachers. Their responses to this questionnaire describe specific attitudes and provide discussion of the potential impact of such attitudes on developing language policies based on bilingualism in Japan.

Although one or two items on the questionnaire were not answered, it is uncertain whether the subjects involved did not understand the questions or they chose not to answer. Therefore, these results were also included in the analysis.

In addition, the questionnaire included a few unsatisfactory questions. Therefore, only the parts yielding interesting data are reported in this paper. The results of the raw data are as follows (from Tables 8 to 13: See Appendix 1):

1. Language Behavior of Non-Native Children

1–1. Code Switching according to Listener
The answers to Code Switching according to Listener are shown in Tables 8 and 9 (see Appendix 1). Table 8 covered code switching at home. Table 9 shows code switching out of home.

According to the results of Table 8, these children overwhelmingly speak to their parents using their mother tongue. Half of them speak to elder brothers/sisters using the mother tongue. Seven-tenths (70%) of them speak to younger brothers/sisters using the mother tongue. In addition, three-tenths (30%) of them speak to both elder

and younger brothers/sisters using both languages. In regard to the environment of their language life, according to these results, even in the home, there is code switching. In other words, their language life is not always simply distinguished by the domain (place between school and home). Furthermore, there are only two children who always speak to their father in Japanese and to their mother in both languages. In their case, the follow-up interview showed that they are brothers and their father is Japanese and mother is Filipino. The father's language is dominant.

Table 9 shows that the meaning of speech companion to the subjects includes both Japanese and people of the same ethnic group. According to this result and the follow-up interview, the code switching of two children who have been in Japan more than two years depends on their companion. One child was nine years old when he arrived in Japan and has been in Japan for five years. The other was ten years old when he arrived and has been in Japan for two years. It can be observed that their BICS level must be considered abilingual, according to their following comment to me: "It is usual for us to speak Japanese to Japanese and Vietnamese to Vietnamese."

Applying Cummins's Linguistic Interdependence hypothesis (1984: 143) to these children, it could be said that if their language ability in both BICS and CALP is high, they definitely have the potential to acquire high speaking and reading ability. According to Cummins and Nakajima (1985: 161), there are two dimensions in the case of language maintenance of Japanese children who live in Canada. First, there is the dimension of BICS, and it seems that the critical period for it is around the age of six years. Second, in the dimension of CALP, it seems that the critical period is around the age of ten years.

If I focused on the language maintenance of non-native children based on this hypothesis, there could be big problems for the following two types of children, because it could be considered that their dimension of BICS and CALP is not always high because they are still developing:

1) Those who arrived in Japan when they were less than six years old.
2) Those who arrived in Japan when they were less than ten years old.

For example, depending on when they arrived in Japan, some of them forget their mother tongues (L1) and the Japanese language replaces it. This implies the possibility of latent semilingualism. Therefore, it is vital to prepare an appropriate environment with the family's and community's cooperation in order not to discourage the development of semilingualism. However, the following steps which would do this are difficult to enforce:

* To drive home the benefits of parents using the mother tongue with their children at home.
* To use video tape or cassette tape materials for language maintenance.

Cooperation in these consists of the following complex of elements: decision-making of parents, parents' actions, economic power, children's own self-learning ability, strong motivation of children and parents for keeping the mother tongue, cooperation of the community.

1–2. Code Switching according to Situation

Table 10 shows their code switching in the different situations (see Appendix 1). This questionnaire asked what language they use when playing in the following different situations:

* Among only native people.
* With Japanese people.

When they are playing among native children, the number of children who speak Japanese is much larger than the number of those who speak their mother tongue. This suggests that the children will forget their mother language gradually. On the other hand, there is one child who speaks his mother tongue when playing with Japanese people. This child has been in Japan for two years and his mother tongue is English. This highlights the strength and status of English, as an international language in the world.

According to the above result, the following two points arise:

1) non-native children switch languages according to their companion, moving between school life in which they usually speak Japanese and home or community life in which they mainly speak their mother tongues.

2) Except with parents, the extent of use of the mother tongue in their usual life is not very high.

1–3. Language Adaptation

This question asked what language they use in the following different situations in their usual life: (1) in dreams, (2) counting, (3) crying, (4) quarreling.

Table 11 shows the language adopted in different situations (see Appendix 1).

According to the results, these children overwhelmingly use either Japanese or both languages in every situation. Very few use the mother tongue only.

1–4. Attitudes of Parents

These questionnaires first asked what their parents think about their future in regard to the place of living by requiring them to choose from the following three categories: (1) Your country is better, (2) Japan is better, (3) Both of them are OK.

Second, in regard to attitudes toward language maintenance, the questionnaire asked about their parents' aim by requiring them to choose from the following three categories: (1) to be bilingual, (2) to be a monolingual in Japanese, (3) to acquire Japanese and learn about the culture of the first/mother language without learning about the language.

Tables 12 and 13 show the attitudes of parents who have bilingual children (see Appendix 1).

According to these results, no parents feel that their country offered the best option for living in. This indicates that their decision to live in Japan forever is very strong.

According to this result, most of their parents want their children to become bilingual or to acquire Japanese and learn their own culture. There was just one parent who wanted her child to become monolingual. In this family's case, it was

seen in the follow-up interview that this mother's attitude is definitely affected by the fact that the father is Japanese.

1–5.   Language Ability in School Situation

Table 14 shows the state of language ability (a kind of academic ability) of non-native children in the school situation (see Appendix 1). The content of this question is based on the report of Ministry of Education (1992). The questionnaire asked teachers in Ōmiya city about the level of language ability of non-native children (see Appendix 3).[5]

According to the results, it was found that progress in listening and speaking develop earlier than in reading and writing, which supports the results of the Ministry of Education. In addition, in this question, it was found that the ability of five students in all skills was "fairly good." All of them have been in Japan for more than two years.

According to Minoura (1984), in the case of Japanese children who went to the United States before the age of 13, good 'listening' in English general life took more than 1 year, and 'listening' in the school situation took more than two and a half years. Furthermore, it seems that it takes more than three years to become truly bilingual with BICS and CALP.

In regard to reading ability, according to Nakajima (1983), in order to achieve the standard reading level of native children, it takes more than five or six years for Japanese students whose are at elementary-school levels 1, 2, and 3. In addition, it takes more than 4 or 5 years for those whose levels are 4, 5, and 6.

According to above mentioned results and studies, it takes a long time to become bilingual with BICS and CALP. In order to do this, it is vital for children to keep strong motivation, for which, it is essential for children to acquire a self-learning ability (Hatano, 1980; Dickinson, 1987). In other words, it is very important for teachers to introduce 'learning-how-to-learn' to children (Vale, 1991: 33–39). In fact, it is considered that this kind of ability is one of the most important strategies in long term study.[6]

---

[5] These four skills are the same as those of the questionnaire of the Ministry of Education. According to the report of the Ministry of Education (1992), in both elementary and junior-high school, it seems that the progress of the language ability of reading and writing is slower than that of listening and speaking.

   In the regard to the procedure of acquisition, 'Listening' takes more than one year and 'Speaking' takes more than two years. In addition, 'Reading and Writing' take more than five years for more than 50 percent of children in the elementary-school situation. On the other hand, in the junior-high school situation, 'Listening' takes more than one year, however, 'Speaking' takes more than three years. Furthermore, even though they have attended school more than five years, the rate of students who "fairly" manage 'Reading' is 32%, and for 'Writing,' it is 26%.

[6] For example, in order to carry out proper language class management, as in the Australian Language Levels Guidelines (ALL: 1991), the following five goals of language learning are vital for both teachers and children: 1. Communication. 2. Sociocultural. 3. Learning-how-to-learn. ↗

2. The Attitudes of Teachers

In regard to the attitudes of teachers, I would like to analyze the data in Tables 15 to 19 (see Appendix 1).

2–1.　Attitudes to Multiculturalism

This question was asked: "Do you agree or disagree with multiculturalism?" Table 15 shows the results (see Appendix 1).

According to the results, there is no teacher who disagrees with multiculturalism. This suggests that most Japanese-language teachers are already prepared to implement a language policy based on multiculturalism.

2–2.　Attitudes to Offering Mother-Tongue Education

This question was asked "Do you agree or disagree with offering language education in the mother tongue/native language for immigrant/foreign children?"

Table 16 shows the results of this question (see Appendix 1).

According to the results, there are just two teachers who disagree with offering such language education. However, according to the follow-up interview for one of them, it was found that she didn't definitely disagree, as the following comment shows: "If non-native children will live in Japan forever, they don't need to study their mother tongue. However, I think that some kind of activity for maintaining their culture, which includes their mother tongue, is positive for keeping their mental safety."

This indicates that even though there are some teachers who disagree with offering mother-tongue education, most are very adaptable to offering a mother-tongue education.

2–3.　Attitudes to Offering JSL Class

This question was asked; "Do you agree or disagree with offering JSL classes in the future in Japan?" Table 17 shows the results of this question (see Appendix 1).

According to the results, even though there is one teacher who disagrees with offering a JSL class, most agree with it, since most of those who are neutral were unfamiliar with terms like JSL or ESL. Therefore, this suggests that most Japanese-language teachers would be willing to implement JSL classes based on multiculturalism.

↘ 4. Language and cultural awareness. 5. General knowledge.

　　Related to this function, Rubin (1987: 19) states: "To better understand how learner strategies come to be used, it is essential that we account for learner's knowledge about language and his/her beliefs about the language learning process (that is, what he/she knows) because this knowledge can form the basis for selecting and activating one strategy over anothe."

　　Therefore, based on this statement, I would like to suggest that teachers try to survey beliefs in order to better understand how elementary and junior-high school students' learner strategies come to be used.

2–4.   Attitudes to Offering Intercultural Counsellor

This question was asked; "Do you agree or disagree with offering Intercultural Counsellors for children?" Table 18 shows the attitude of the teachers (see Appendix 1).

According to the results, no teacher disagrees with offering this. In addition, according to the follow-up interviews, some teachers expected the counsellor to speak the non-native children's language. Furthermore, one teacher pointed out the following: "I think that, especially for non-native children in elementary school, it is more important to offer an intercultural counsellor than a language teacher."

This indicates that teachers feel it is more important for non-native children to have access to cultural and emotional support rather than access to a language teacher. In other words, it is vital for second-language teacher to evaluate a non-native child's mental processes properly.

2–5.   Attitudes to Offering I.E. or M.E. Class

This question was asked: "Do you agree or disagree with offering a class in intercultural education (I.E.) or multicultural education (M.E.) for children?"

In this case, according to Richards (1992: 93), the meaning of I.E. or M.E. is: "An educational programme which aims to develop cultural pluralism. For example, a programme designed to teach about different ethnic groups in a country" (Richards: 93).

Table 19 shows the results of this question (see Appendix 1). According to the results, five teachers (about 19%) disagree with offering this. In addition, according to the follow-up interviews, it seems that most of them do not understand the meaning of this kind of education. This suggests that if the language policy is based on multiculturalism in the future, it is very important to re-educate teachers, introducing the concept of this kind of education and providing teaching guidelines. This kind of preparation is vital in making a plural society in Japan.

According to above mentioned results and studies, the following aspects are summarized: The tendencies of responses of Japanese teachers are almost the same in regard to the following point: "They overwhelmingly agree with offering education supported by mother-tongue education, JSL, multicultural education, and so on."

In addition, according to the teachers' comments and follow-up interviews, the following aspects are summarized: Sufficient funds are necessary to offer adequate language education for non-native children. Otherwise, this language education must become a house built on sand, since the problem of budget is beyond teachers' ability.

Finally, in regard to teaching methodology, it seems that most teachers already integrate methodology such as TPR (Total Physical Responses) and the Communicative Approach. Furthermore, it is a good sign of the awareness of the Ministry of Education of the needs of JSL students that they did publish two kinds of textbooks for non-native children. However, according to a follow-up interview in 1993, it seems that the textbooks are not adequate for the students to be able to make sufficient progress in CALP, as the program had just begun for JSL in 1991.

Discussion and Recommendations

Discussion

1. Summaries of the Result of Analysis

From the results of the survey of non-native children and JSL teachers, the following five conclusions of their behavior and attitude can be provided:

1) The code switching of non-native children depends on whether they are outside or inside their homes. In addition, code switching is observed in their home.

2) Non-native children overwhelmingly use their mother tongue with parents; however, they use Japanese or both Japanese and their mother tongue with their brothers and sisters.

3) In dreams, counting, crying, and quarreling, non-native children overwhelmingly use Japanese or both Japanese and their mother tongue.

4) Most non-native children experience difficulty in regard to reading and writing. Therefore, even though they use Japanese in general conversation, it is not used enough for them to utter or develop their own ideas through reading and writing yet. It is estimated that CALP of some of them is not great enough to survive school life.

5) Most teachers and parents consider that language maintenance of the mother tongue is very important for non-native children. This means that teachers and parents welcome education that is useful for maintaining language and cultural identity. According to the follow-up interviews for children, it seems that they also welcome this kind of education based on multiculturalism.

From those points, the following conclusion can be drawn: "Even though current teaching of Japanese to non-native children is not based on the idea of bilingualism, it is clear that most of the people involved in elementary and junior-high school Japanese-language teaching desire JSL programs. In short, they don't hope to be offered transitional Japanese education: they do expect to be offered language education that allows progress in CALP and maintainance of cultural identity."

However, in fact, an appropriate policy including a suitable budget for TJSL is not yet in place, and Japan needs to improve its educational environment toward fostering bilingualism (Kawakami: 163–65).

2. Problems of the Result of Analysis

As seen from the summary and result of the survey, the following two problems should be noted:

1) There seems to be a gulf between the providing side and the demanding side of language policy, which includes JSL. Therefore, the shift should be changed toward a language policy based on bilingualism. There is almost no consideration for language-maintenance education, although it is desired by non-native children, parents, and teachers.

2) If this kind of policy doesn't change, most children living between two cul-

tures will have to continue to be taught just Japanese without consideration of their CALP. This could lead to a number of children becoming semilingual in the future.

Recommendations

From the content of discussion, the following five recommendations can be made:

1) To change the awareness of government policy, from transitional Japanese education toward JSL based on bilingualism/multiculturalism similar to the Australian Language Policies.

2) To offer economic and humanistic support, which includes the following two points: ⓐ Despatching experts in TJSL or intercultural counselling, and ⓑ Training or re-training the JSL teacher and intercultural counsellor. This must be done in order to implement language maintenance and cultural identity under a long-term plan.

3) To give the right to non-native children to choose whether they should try to study or not. Never force children to do this, otherwise it is very difficult for them to continue to learn their mother tongues with strong motivation in Japan. In order to do this, it is vital for them to learn independent study skills based on the view of life-long education.

4) To offer an appropriate education for developing children's self-learning ability, since the time spent teaching language in school is not enough even though the policy has changed. In addition, whenever someone studies something, integrating the plan (strategy) by themselves is very important. This also relates to development or progress in their own CALP.

5) To built good cooperation among children, teachers, parents, and the community toward implementing language education based on multiculturalism. This also relates to development or progress in their own BICS. Ultimately, the most important cooperation is that parents take care of maintaining their own language and cultural identity for their children. Otherwise, it is inavitable that some of those children will become semilingual.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, the language behavior of non-native children at elementary and junior-high school levels in Ōmiya city is investigated based on the idea of bilingualism supported by the theory of Cummins (1984).

Non-native children in Ōmiya city have a fairly strong motivation for becoming bilingual, even though their environment for learning their mother tongues is not appropriate. In addition, the attitudes of teachers have been established. Moreover, the actual conditions of children and teachers have been established, discussing other elements of their environment. Thus, the significance of studying non-native children's language behavior and the attitudes of teachers is highlighted and discussion about suitable ways to apply them in learning, teaching, and language policy is introduced.

However, there are some weaknesses in this paper: first, as mentioned earlier, the number of students is not large enough to fully clarify the tendency of language behavior and attitudes. Second, it is limited in terms of discussing ways to clarify bilingual and multicultural aspects of teaching Japanese to non-native children, as it only focuses on 'language behavior of non-native children' and 'Attitudes of Parents and Teachers.'

In conclusion, many other factors are not examined. For example, although many valuable opinions of the subjects were given to the researcher, a report on the opinion of each subject was not made. It would be desirable for further study to be undertaken on the various other comparisons, such as between the subjects who stay in Japan and their counterparts (e.g., Japanese overseas children in Australia), those who would like to maintain their mother tongues and their counterparts, and a study of the differences of core values of cultural identity between nationalities. These were not carried out because of the shortage of time. Moreover, to confirm the tendencies shown in this paper, more precise research, including more appropriate interviews with children, is strongly recommended. Finally, the researcher wishes to record his appreciation of the students', parents', and teachers' cooperation in this investigation.

Appendix 1

Table 1　Nationalities of Subjects (Country of Origin) (N = 18)

Chinese = 10　Vietnamese = 4　British = 1　Filipino = 2　Spanish = 1

Table 2　Sex (N = 18)

Male	11
Female	7

Table 3　The Range of Subjects' Ages (N=18)

Age	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Number	2	2	1	2	1	3	3	2	1	0	0	1

Table 4　The Range of Subjects' Levels (N = 18)

Level	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Number	1	3	1	3	2	1	4	3	0

Table 5　The age of arriving (N = 18)

Age	0~1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Number	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	3	2	2	3	1	0	0

Table 6　The length of staying in Japan (N = 18)

Years	less than 1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Number	7	4	1	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0

Table 7   The number of teachers at each teaching place (N = 26)

Ōmiya city	8
Kyūen sentā	12
Sokushin sentā	6

Table 8   Code Switching according to Listener (At Home)

	Mother Language	Japanese Language	Both
Father (N = 17)	15	2	0
Mother (N = 18)	16	0	2
Elder Brother/Sister (N = 10)	5	2	3
Younger Brother/Sister (N = 10)	7	0	3

Table 9   Code Switching according to Age (Out of Home, N = 18)

	Mother	Japanese	Both	No answer
Adult or older person	1	13	3	1
Same or Younger	0	13	3	2

Table 10   Code Switching according to Situation (N = 18)

	Mother Tongue	Japanese	Both	No answer
Among only native people	4	7	0	7
With Japanese people	0	17	1	0

Table 11   Language Adoption (N = 18)

	Mother Tongue	Japanese	Both	No answer
In dreams	3	6	7	2
Counting	1	9	5	3
Crying	0	8	7	3
Quarreling	0	8	6	4

Table 12   Attitudes of Parents: In regard to places where they live (N = 18; Plural answer is OK, if their parents attitudes are different)

① Your country	0
② Japan	11
③ Both	7
No Answer	3

Table 13　Attitudes of Parents: Towards language maintenance (N = 18; Plural answer is OK, if their parents attitudes are different)

①	Bilingual	10
②	Monolingual	1
③	Culture	4
	No answer	3

Table 14　Language Ability in the School Situation (N = 18)

	Not at all well	Not very well	Fairly well	No answer
Listening	0	6	10	2
Speaking	0	8	8	2
Reading	0	10	6	2
Writing	2	9	5	2

Table 15　Attitudes to Multiculturalism (N: Ōmiya=8, Kyūen=12, Sokushin=6)

	Agree (Positive)	Disagree (Negative)	Neutral	No answer
Ōmiya	7	0	1	0
Kyūen	11	0	1	0
Sokushin	2	0	4	0

Table 16　Attitudes to Offering Mother Tongue Education (N: As above)

	Agree (Positive)	Disagree (Negative)	Neutral	No answer
Ōmiya	7	1	0	0
Kyūen	11	1	0	0
Sokushin	5	0	1	0

Table 17　Attitudes to Offering JSL Class (N: As above)

	Agree (Positive)	Disagree (Negative)	Neutral	No answer
Ōmiya	6	0	1	1
Kyūen	7	1	4	0
Sokushin	4	0	2	0

Table 18　Attitudes to Offering Intercultural Counsellor (N: As above)

	Agree (Positive)	Disagree (Negative)	Neutral	No answer
Ōmiya	6	0	1	1
Kyūen	11	0	1	0
Sokushin	6	0	0	0

Table 19   Attitudes to Offering a Class in I.E. or M.E. (N: As above)

	Agree (Positive)	Disagree (Negative)	Neutral	No answer
Ōmiya	4	1	1	2
Kyūen	8	3	0	1
Sokushin	4	1	0	1

Note: I.E. = Intercultural Education, M.E. = Multicultural Education.

Appendix 2

(This is a translation from Japanese)

To students:

Your background
   Sex: Male   /   Female
   Year of School: Elementary   1   2   3   4   5   6   Junior High   1   2   3
   Age: 6   7   8   9   10   11   12   13   14   15   16   17
How old were you when you arrived in Japan?
                0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10   11   12   13   14   15   16   17
How long have you been in Japan?
                (   ) years (   ) months
What are your parents' mother tongues?
                Father (   ) Mother (   )

Language Behavior

Code switching according to listener:
   1. At home, what language do you speak to the following companions?
       Father (   )   Mother (   )
       Elder brother (   )   Elder sister (   )
       Younger brother (   )   Younger sister (   )
   2. Out of home, what language do you speak to the following companions?
       Adult or person older than you (   )
       Same age person (   )
       Younger age person (   )

   Code switching according to situation:
   3. When you are playing, what language do you use in the following situation?
       Among only native people (   )
       With Japanese people (   )

   Language adaptation:
   4. In the following situations, what language do you use?
       Language in dreams (   )
       Counting (   )
       Crying (   )
       Quarreling (   )

Attitudes of parents:
5. What do your parents think about your future?
    In regard of the place of living (Tick one.)
    1 Your country is better.
    2 Japan is better.   1   2   3
    3 Both of them are OK.
6. Attitudes toward language maintenance. What is your aim? (Tick one.)
    1 To be bilingual.
    2 To be monolingual in Japanese.   1   2   3
    3 To acquire Japanese and learn about the culture of first/mother language without about
      learning the language.

To Teachers:

Attitudes of Teachers:

* What do you think about co-existence in a multicultural society?
  In other words, do you agree or disagree with multiculturalism?
            Agree (Positive) / Disagree (Negative)
  Any comment? (   )

* Do you agree with offering language education in the mother tongue/native language for the immi-
  grant/foreign children?
            Agree / Disagree

* Do you agree with offering a JSL (Japanese as a second language) class in the future in Japan?
            Agree / Disagree
  In order to do this, what is essential for better education? Do you have any suggestions?
  What do you consider as essential: (   )
                                (e.g., re-training for the language teacher)
                          (e.g., Editing a new text of Japanese for children)

* Do you think that it is vital to offer an intercultural counsellor for children (both Japanese and
  immigrant/foreign children)?
            Agree / Disagree

* Do you think that it is necessary to offer a class in intercultural education or multicultural education
  for children?
  If so, why do you think so?
            Agree / Disagree
  Reasons (   )

* When you are teaching, do you consider some teaching methodology (e.g., CLL, TPR,
  Suggestopaedia, Communicative Approach, etc.)?
            Yes / No
  Examples (   )

        Thank you very much for your cooperation.
  If you don't mind, you please write your name and telephone number.

Name _____   Phone _____

Appendix 3

This questionnaire is only for teachers in Ōmiya city.

Language Ability in School Situation

   This questionnaire is based on the report of Ministry of Education (1992). The questionnaire asks teachers (you) about the level of language ability of non-native children in the following four skills. The level is distinguished according to the following three categories:

       Not at all well — Not very well — Fairly well
  ① Listening ability: Able to understand the talk of teachers and friends.
  ② Speaking ability: Able to hold a presentation in front of classmates.
  ③ Reading ability: Able to understand the content of reading materials.
  ④ Writing ability: Able to express ideas through writing.

Please indicate the ability of this child using the form below.
In_____'s Case:
Language Ability in School Situation

	Not at all well	Not very well	Fairly well
Listening			
Speaking			
Reading			
Writing			

                Thank you very much for your cooperation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Clyne, Michael. 1983.　Bilingual education as a model for community language in primary schools. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 4(2): 23–35.

――. 1991.　*Community languages: The Australian experience.* CUP.

Cummins, Jim. 1983.　Heritage Language Education. Ontario: The Minister of Education.

――. 1984.　*Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy.* Clevedon (U.K.):　Multilingual Matters.

Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET). 1990.　*The Language of Australia* ("Green Paper"). Canberra: AGPS.

――. 1991.　*Australia's Language* ("White Paper"). Canberra: AGPS.

Dickinson, L. 1987.　*Self-instruction in language learning.* CUP.

Edelsky, C. et al. 1983.　Semilingualism and language deficit. *Applied Linguistics* 4 (1): 1–22.

Frederickson, N. and Cline, T. 1990.　*Curriculum related assessment with bilingual children.*　London:　University College, London.

Harley, B. et al. 1990.　*The development of second language proficiency.* New York: CUP.

Horwitz, E.K. 1987.　Surveying student beliefs about language learning. In Wenden and Rubin (1987): 145–158.

Lo Bianco, Joseph. 1987.　*National policy on languages.* Canberra: AGPS.

Martin-Jones, M. and Romaine, S. 1986.　Semilingualism: A half-baked theory of communicative competence. *Applied Linguistics* 7(1): 26–38.

Nakajima, Kazuko. 1983.　Age Factor in Mother-Tongue Maintenance and in the Development of English Proficiency of Overseas Japanese Children. In *Theory, Technology and Public Policy in Bilingual Education.* Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA). 1989.　*National agenda for a multicultural Australia.* Canberra: AGPS.

Ozolins, Uldis. 1993.　*The Politics of language in Australia.* CUP.

Rivera, C., ed. 1984.　*Language proficiency and academic achievement.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Rubin, J. 1987.　Learner strategies: Theoritical assumptions, research history and typology. In Wenden and Rubin (1987): 15–30.

Skutnabb-Kangas. 1981.　*Bilingualism or not.* Clevedon (U.K.): Multilingual Matters.

Smolicz, J.J. 1981.　Core values and cultural identity. *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 4: 75–90.

Smolicz, J.J. and N.J. Secombe. 1989.　Types of language activation and evaluation in an ethnically plural society. In *Status and Function of Languages and Language Varieties,* ed. U. Ammon. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Vale, D., A. Scarino, and P. McKay. 1991.　Pocket ALL: Australian Language Levels Guidelines. Curriculum Corporation.

Wenden, A. and J. Rubin. 1987.　*Learner strategies in language learning.* Prentice Hall.

朝倉征夫 (1993)　「産業の革新と多文化教育――一元的文化，価値から多様な文化，価値の教育へ――」，『早稲田教育評論』第 7 巻第 1 号，早稲田大学教育総合研究室.

―― (1990)　「教育の国際化に関する考察――教育への権利と多文化教育を中心に――」，『教育学研究科紀

　　要創刊号』早稲田大学大学院教育学研究科.

江淵一公, 小林哲也編 (1985) 『多文化教育の比較研究』, 九州大学出版会.

小澤周三 (1989) 「文献紹介・多文化教育」, 『異文化間教育 3』, 138 項等参照, アカデミア出版会.

Cummins, Jim, 中島和子 (1985) 「トロント補修校小学生の二言語能力の構造」, 『バイリンガル・バイカル チュラル教育の現状と課題』, 東京学芸大学海外子女教育センター.

川上郁夫 (1991) 「在日ベトナム人子弟の言語生活と言語教育」, 『日本語教育』73 号, 日本語教育学会, 154– 166.

野山　広 (1988) 「多文化教育に関する一考察——スウェーデンにおける移民子弟への言語教育政策を事例と して——」, 早稲田大学大学院文学研究科・修士論文.

波多野誼余夫編 (1980) 『自己学習能力を育てる』, 東京大学出版会.

箕浦康子 (1984) 『子供の異文化体験』, 思索社.

文部省 (1992) 「日本語教育が必要な外国人児童・生徒の受け入れ・指導の状況について」.

八代京子, ジョン・C・マーハ (1991) 『日本のバイリンガリズム』, 研究社出版.