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By Nari Koga
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Abstract

This study was conducted to understand student identities of five Japanese children (the second through sixth grade) and the processes of identity negotiation within their sojourning experiences between Japan and the United States. An increasing number of Japanese elementary students internationally sojourn in today’s globalized societies, and consequently shape their identities in multiple school contexts. Previous research has suggested the reciprocal relations between linguistic minority learners’ identities and their diverse school experiences, and reported a wide variation of bilinguals’ self-perceptions. However, few studies have focused on elementary sojourners to holistically theorize the internal and external processes of their identity negotiation.

In this interpretive multiple case study, children’s own perspectives were inductively gathered by following the constructivist grounded theory guidelines. Data collection methods included child in-depth interviews enhanced with drawing activities, classroom observations, and teacher and parent interviews. The cross-case analysis was facilitated by interpretive focus group interview with Japanese former sojourners.

The results indicated that the children across varied stages of sojourning integrated their consistent self-relevant attributes (ordinary student status and familiar
personal traits) and their changing attributes (oral English proficiency) together as the fuel for pursuing their identity standard—their own interpretation of positive student identities—which fundamentally represented their social adaptive and socioemotional competences. Their experiences with Japanese language and culture, bilingual/bicultural competences, and international transitions, appeared potentially influential for their student identities. Through the multi-layered complex negotiation processes, they successfully verified, improved, balanced, and imagined their self-relevant attributes salient for their identity standard.

By proposing a competence-based identity negotiation model, this study recommends all educators to support their sojourning students by attending to two types of school competences: (a) the Identity-Relevant Competence which contributes to identity standard and (b) the Identity-Negotiation Competence to practice the holistic processes of identity negotiation for sustaining the identity standard. The findings add a new theoretical scope to the evolving field of child identity research, and suggest further interdisciplinary explorations of sojourners’ student identities.
Acknowledgement

This work has gone forward with the support of a great number of people. My sincere appreciation goes first to the chair of my dissertation committee, Dr. María Estela Brisk, and to the members of the committee, Dr. Sharlene Hesse-Biber and Dr. Mariela Páez. Their scholarship, professionalism, mentorship, and, most especially, care for students made a tremendous impact on my scholarly endeavor of completing this dissertation as well as growing as a researcher. Dr. Brisk provided me on-going supports for all these years by reading numerous versions of my drafts and giving me invaluable comments and feedback throughout. Because of the high expectations that she always held for me, I was able to challenge myself to continuously study and work hard. Her guidance and lessons were always clear and nurturing, and helped me improve my analyses and writing. Having her as my dissertation chair as well as my academic advisor for the entire doctoral program has become a true asset for my learning and scholarly spirit. It also has been my irreplaceable life-experience, which I cannot appreciate enough.

Dr. Hesse-Biber taught me about various research perspectives and potentialities of incorporating multiple methods into a research inquiry. She opened my eyes to the fluidity and dynamic nature inherited in the research in social science and helped me grow my sensitivities towards situatedness, positionalities, and life-experiences that each individual brings to the research arena. The research design of this study would not be possible if I did not receive her countless supports through individual meetings, her research method course, and the writing seminar which she so dedicatedly offered her students outside the course.
Dr. Páez not only shared her academic expertise with me but also provided me her moral supports consistently throughout the dissertation processes. By giving me constructive feedback and pointing out the positive aspects of my preliminary works, she always encouraged me to keep my chin up and to remind myself that writing a dissertation is indeed an exciting task that one can experience. Because of her presence and support, I was able to maintain my positive attitudes even when the processes seemed endless. I also truly appreciate her comments and feedback on my final draft, which allowed me to further revise my assertions, logics, formats, and language usages.

As I was going through the exciting yet challenging processes of research and writing, I often felt that the supports given by all of my committee members were like the streams of light shedding on a long path journey. They all showed me that there would never be an undefeatable mountain to climb, and that I would eventually complete my mission as long as I continue to work my way through the processes steadily and sincerely. I am thankful for their generousities to always keep their doors open for my needs. They also have been my great role models as scholars, as educators, and as women. I am, therefore, deeply thank Boston College for giving me the fortunate opportunities to interact with and learn from my committee members. With my experiences of learning from these brilliant and dedicated educators, I hope more strongly than before that I will someday make meaningful contributions to the lives of others, especially the next generation of social scientists.

Next, I am profoundly grateful to all of my participants who so generously provided their time, energy, and insights to the study. A Japanese proverb, “一期一会”
(Ichi-go Ichi-e, Treasure every encounter, for it will never recur.),” remind me that sharing a time with each one of them through this research was indeed miraculous and once in a lifetime opportunity for me. I truly treasure the moments that I shared with them, and wish the best of luck on their educational and personal fulfillment in the future ahead. The five children’s smiles still shine in my memories.

My appreciation is then extended to my friends and family members. I first want to show my appreciation to Noriko Sugimori, who is soon to be Dr. Sugimori, and Dr. Masako Kikuchi. I was fortunate to form a dissertation support group with these two dedicated scholars and caring friends. We were from different schools and studied in different disciplines, yet built such a strong bond with each other through sharing the same mother tongue, culture, and most importantly love for knowledge. I am also thankful to Dr. Deborah Horan and Xiaoxia Chen who gave me invaluable advice for my proposal and final draft. My deep appreciation equally goes to Hong Zhu, Afra Hersi, Teruko Shirahama, Akiko Kawai, Tamotsu Nagano, Yuriko Ikeda, Toshiko Fell, Mindy Paulo, Koremi Kinoshita, and Nobuko Kodama for their supports in varied phases of my dissertation journey. Then, I am truly thankful to Barbara LaPotin, Treva Krantz, Yoko Nakatani, Yi-Chien Lee, Maite Sánchez, and Swati Mehta for their warm friendship that encouraged me to keep going.

Next, I am thankful to my parents, Hiroshi and Makiko Koga, who supported me with their unconditional love and care. While I worked on my research in Japan, I stayed with them and enjoyed their company. I am confident to state that my mother’s nutritious meal everyday was the primary source for my energy to get through the challenging times.
After I was back to the States, their voices that I occasionally heard in our phone conversations across two different continents always reminded me of the high expectations and warm encouragement that they had given me since my childhood.

Last, but not least, I am thankful to my husband, William Wong, for his love, friendship, patience, a great sense of humor, and truly kind heart. Having looked at me getting overwhelmed with the demands of writing, he once told me with a smile, “Just take it one day at a time.” With his words, I realized that each day I devoted for my dissertation was indeed precious moments of my life which I should enjoy and cherish. He open-heartedly accepted all tears, laughter, and identity negotiation I experienced throughout my work.

Once again, I express my gracious and sincere appreciation to above mentioned people with “Arigatou-gozaimasu,” a phrase which best resonates with my heart and soul.
# Table of Contents

Acknowledgement...........................................................................................................i  
Table of Contents........................................................................................................vii  
Glossary.....................................................................................................................x  
List of Tables...........................................................................................................xi  
List of Figures...........................................................................................................xii  
List of Appendices....................................................................................................xiii  

**Chapter 1  INTRODUCTION ......................................................................................1**  
My Standpoint on Japanese Sojourners........................................................................2  
Scarcity of Identity Research on Elementary Sojourners..........................................3  
Identity Negotiation and Language Learning...............................................................5  
The Context of English Language Learning: Japan and the United States...............7  
Focus of the Study and Research Questions..............................................................11  
Definition of Terms..................................................................................................14  
Organization of the Dissertation..............................................................................17  

**Chapter 2  LITERATURE REVIEW..........................................................................19**  
Linguistic Minority Learners’ Identity Negotiation and Learning Experiences....19  
*Reciprocal Relations between Identities and Learning Experiences*.................20  
*Identity and school competences*.........................................................................20  
*Socioemotional consequences of identity negotiation*.......................................23  
*Processes of Identity Negotiation*.......................................................................28  
Research Approach Used in Existing Identity Research........................................31  
*Interdisciplinary Approach of Identity Research*................................................31  
*Research Focus on the Multiple Aspects of Identity*..........................................33  
*Research Perspectives and Designs Commonly Used*......................................34  
*Research Approach Recommended*..................................................................37  
Summary...................................................................................................................39  

**Chapter 3  ECOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION OF IDENTITY AS THE SYMBOLIC SELF: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK........................................................................41**  
Adaptive Functions of the Symbolic Self and Its Multiplicities..............................42  
The Roles of Language in the Symbolic Self...............................................................47  
Self-Evaluation Motives and Learning....................................................................51  
Stabilities and Changes of the Symbolic Self.............................................................55  
Summary...................................................................................................................59
Chapter 4  METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

| Research Perspectives: Co-interpretation of Multiple Meanings | 62 |
| Cross-National Research Contexts | 66 |
| Participants and Sampling | 68 |
| Data Collection Methods and Procedures | 74 |
| **Primary Data Collection Methods** | 77 |
| Child in-depth interviews with drawing activities | 77 |
| Classroom observations | 81 |
| **Supplemental Data Collection Methods** | 82 |
| Background information questionnaire (BIQ) and parent BIQ interview | 82 |
| Informant interviews: U.S. classroom teacher and parent | 83 |
| Collecting school artifacts | 84 |
| Interpretive focus group interviews | 84 |
| Data Analysis Methods and Procedures | 86 |
| Analyzing the Primary Data | 87 |
| Analyzing the Supplemental Data | 92 |
| Developing Categories | 93 |
| Validity and Reliability of the Study | 94 |
| Summary | 95 |

Chapter 5  CASE STUDIES OF SOJOURNING: THE PERSPECTIVES OF NEWCOMERS

| Haruya | 97 |
| Wataru | 115 |

Chapter 6  CASE STUDIES OF SOJOURNING: THE PERSPECTIVES OF RETURNING STUDENTS

| Misaki | 133 |
| Tsubasa | 150 |
| Yayoi | 167 |

Chapter 7  A CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS OF STUDENT IDENTITIES: SALIENT ATTRIBUTES AND NEGOTIATION PROCESSES WITHIN SOJOURNING EXPERIENCES

<p>| Ordinary and Familiar Student Identities | 191 |
| Consistently Expressed Self-Relevant Attributes and Processes of Identity Negotiation | 191 |
| In Relation to Affirmative School Inclusion: Consistent Attributes | 198 |
| Socioemotional Consequences: Consistent Attributes | 201 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Translation/Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>daijoubu</td>
<td>feeling secure/all right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eiken</td>
<td>A prominent English proficiency examination administered by the Society for Testing English Proficiency (STEP), Japan’s largest testing organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>futuu(-no)</td>
<td>ordinary/regular/common/normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ganbaru</td>
<td>to make (one’s own) best effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honshin</td>
<td>one’s true heart/mind/intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juku</td>
<td>cram school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaigaishijo</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanji</td>
<td>Chinese ideographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kikokushijo</td>
<td>Japanese returnee student(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kokugo</td>
<td>Japanese language arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumon</td>
<td>private educational institution that implements its own math and language learning systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minna</td>
<td>everyone/all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samishii</td>
<td>sad/lonely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sekkyokuteki</td>
<td>active/positive/constructive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoukyokuteki</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>shouganai</td>
<td>cannot help it/cannot do anything about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taiken nyugaku</td>
<td>experiential enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanoshii (tanoshimu)</td>
<td>enjoyable/pleasant (to enjoy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tennen</td>
<td>natural/spontaneous personal character</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

International migration has been widespread in today’s globalized societies, projecting approximately 175 million people living outside their home countries in 2000 as compared to 35 million in 1910 (Benhabib, 2004 cited in Banks, 2008). The notion of globalization has brought political, economical, and cultural changes to the lives of the millions (Luke, Luke, & Graham, 2007; Spring, 2008) and consequently raised pivotal questions regarding citizenship, human rights, democracy, and education (Banks, 2008). In schools worldwide, globalization has diversified the student population. Especially the students, who are directly involved in transcending national boundaries, have identified themselves according to varied combinations of “racial, cultural, ethnic, religious, and linguistic group” (Banks, 2008, p. 132).

Among those diverse students are an increasing number of Japanese students, so called kaigaishijo, who involuntarily study abroad while accompanying their expatriate parents overseas (Langager, 2001; Nishida, 2008). According to the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) (2004), the total number of kaigaishijo has been steadily increasing in the past decades from 8,662 in 1971 to 54,148 in 2004. Among the total population, 41,368 are elementary students (in kindergarten through the sixth grade) and almost 20,000 reside in the United States alone.

This dissertation research studies five elementary age kaigaishijo, who temporarily sojourn between Japan and the United States, and interpretively examines the
salient components of their student identities and the processes by which their student identities are shaped and negotiated across different stages of sojourning. Before unfolding the entire study, this introductory chapter presents the study’s rationale and background as well as the focus and research questions. The chapter also defines the key terms and outlines the organization of the subsequent chapters.

My Standpoint on Japanese Sojourners

Focusing on identity issues in school and also selecting Japanese sojourning children for this study have been driven by my personal background as a Japanese woman, who sojourns and studies in the United States, and my professional background as a former bilingual teacher in a U.S. public elementary school. Having lived in Japan all my life until college graduation, my U.S. sojourning as a graduate student still gives me pressure to develop linguistic, cultural, academic, and social competences in order to survive my daily life and to simply get along with others. As I have been gradually developing those competences required in the United States, I began to view myself more adapted to the country and recognized ever-changing aspects of my identities. However, despite my stay in the United States over ten years, I also continue to view myself as a person attached to Japanese linguistic and cultural heritage after all. In my mind, Japan has been my home where I would eventually return. At the same time, being married to an American makes my view of the United States neither a mere foreign country nor a second home. There are definitely conflicting aspects in my self-perceptions as a person who lives outside her home country. In a more fundamental level, I find peace in mind when I can appreciate my international experiences whole heartedly by viewing myself as
a global citizen. Thus, the phenomenon of identity negotiation has been so deeply
embedded in my everyday life and, therefore, I was naturally drawn to the topic.

In addition, when I worked as a bilingual teacher, I had opportunities to meet
over a hundred Japanese sojourning students in kindergarten through eighth grade and to be part of their international transitions. While supporting their overall school adjustment, academic learning, and English acquisition, I was often impressed with their courage to jump into their new U.S. mainstream classrooms and grow as a learner and as a person over time. I witnessed and became involved in the processes by which they shaped their student identities along the way. Their identities seemed to reflect their inner worlds (e.g., feeling, engagement) as well as their actual learning practices (e.g., developing and demonstrating varied school competences). Therefore, my former students’ identities were multiple and complex, displaying their success and struggle, changes and consistency, aspiration and modesty, and much more. Also, knowing their self-perceptions in different stages of sojourning seemed critical for me as their teacher to monitor their progress and to provide appropriate support. Thus, I began to hope for improving teaching practices through understanding students identities, and decided to conduct this identity research on elementary age Japanese sojourning students.

Scarcity of Identity Research on Elementary Sojourners

This study involves five Japanese sojourning children in grade 2 through grade 6 since there has been clear need of more extensive empirical identity research on elementary sojourners. Educational research on identity negotiation of elementary students, especially those who experienced international migration and linguistic and
cultural adaptation, is still developing. An increasing number of educational researchers have studied linguistic minority students’ identities in varied fields (e.g., multicultural education and second language acquisition) from several interdisciplinary perspectives (e.g., sociolinguistic, sociocultural, and social psychological perspectives). While their efforts have contributed to the exploration of research approach and theoretical framework, most of them focused on the individuals in adolescence through adulthood (e.g., Benet-Martinez, Leu, & Morris, 2002; Choi, 2002; Duff, 2002; Kanno, 2003; Miller, 2004; Morita, 2004; Norton Peirce, 1995; Pavlenko, 2006; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Sarroub, 2001). There are some notable ethnographic longitudinal studies that have specifically illuminated linguistic minority children’s identities negotiated in school (e.g., Day, 2002; Hawkins, 2005; Toohey, 2000); however, their participants were commonly young elementary children in kindergarten through the second grade. Other relevant studies involved a large number of linguistic minorities widely ranging from elementary through secondary students (e.g., Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Only few studies have primarily focused on elementary language learners (e.g., Soto, 2002, with the participants in ages ranging from 7 to 13).

In addition, most of the existing studies have concerned language learners who were categorized under the umbrella terms, such as immigrants, English language learners (ELLs), limited English proficient (LEP) students, and minority students, rather than those who were sojourners of specific ethnic groups. Kanno (2003) has pointed out the inappropriateness of overgeneralizing immigrants’ experiences in identity research since bilingual sojourners’ awareness of their temporal stay, perceptions of time, as well
as senses of belonging to a home country may uniquely influence their overall learning experiences in a host country.

Moreover, there have been a small number of dissertation research conducted specifically on *kaigaishijo* in U.S. elementary schools (e.g., Harkins, 1998; Ishikawa, 1998; Minoura, 1979; Nagao, 1998; Podolsky, 1994). These studies, however, commonly used acculturation and socialization frameworks and mainly captured the cultural aspects of identities rather than overall student identities encompassing the participants’ varied school practices. This study, therefore, captures multiple aspects of Japanese sojourners’ student identities, and explores potential theoretical framework, methodology, and research design in order to more holistically conceptualize what types of school competences, not limited to their cultural competences, attribute to their student identities.

Identity Negotiation and Language Learning

The interplays between the learners’ identities and their language learning experiences have been widely acknowledged across diverse disciplinary fields. As the next chapter (Chapter 2) will present more extensively, a growing number of empirical research has found that English language learners (ELLs) in varied ages inevitably negotiated their identities while their language learning experiences shaped and altered their perspectives, linguistic competence, actual school engagement, and integration into learning environments (e.g., Choi, 2002; Day, 2002; Duff, 2002; Hawkins, 2005; Kanno, 2003; Macpherson, 2005; Mora, 2000; Morita, 2004; Norton, 2000; Sarroub, 2001; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Toohey, 2000; Yeh, 2003; Yihong, Ying, Yuan, & Yan, 2005). Also, as the theoretical framework of the study will clarify in more details
(Chapter 3), previous researchers across disciplines have theorized the inter-relations between identities, language learning experiences, and the contexts of learning (e.g., Bracher, 2002; Cummins, 2000; Gee, 2001; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Tajfel, 1982).

Also, identities of bilingual individuals have been described in multifaceted ways, both negatively and positively. The negative connotations have been historically given the misconceptions of “bilingualism as linguistic schizophrenia” (Pavlenko, 2006, p. 3). The metaphors, such as “tongue snatching, border crossing, borrowing, bigamy, betrayal, bifurcation, fragmentation, multiplicity, split, gap, alienation, dislocation, and double vision” (Pavlenko, 2006, p. 5), were used to describe bilingual individuals. Such divided self-perceptions were assumed to bring negative socioemotional consequences, such as:

Guilt over linguistic and ethnic disloyalties, insecurity over the legitimacy of a newly learned language, anxiety about the lack of wholesome oneness, angst over the inability to bring together one’s incommensurable worlds, and sadness and confusion caused by seeing oneself as divided, a self-in-between, a self in need of translation. (Pavlenko, 2006, p. 5)

In previous studies, ELLs’ negative socioemotional experiences associated with their self-perceptions included: facing uncertainties for future due to the clash between the U.S. political values and their own sociocultural practices (Sarroub, 2001); being caught between two worlds and feeling marginalized in ESL contexts (Kanno, 2003; Mora, 2000); feeling powerless and alienated (Morita, 2004); and deteriorating mental health (Yeh, 2003).

In contrast, previous research has also given the positive connotations to identities associated with language learning, and reported that ELLs transcended their immediate conflicts and developed more flexible forms of identities, such as bilingual
and bicultural identities (Kanno, 2003), translingual identities (Kellman, 2000), and transcultural identities (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). When the identities of bilingual individuals depart from the monolingual norms, multiple self-relevant attributes constructed through language learning are not disengaged pieces but rather coherent representations of the hybrid self. As Grosjean (1997) asserted, a bilingual person is not two combined monolinguals but an unified being who is cable of using different language modes depending on the contexts and interlocutors. In this sense, bilingual individual’s identities are not regarded as mere sources of difficulties but rather seen as the “creative enrichment … stemming from the ever-present relativity of one’s stance and perspective” (Pavlenko, 2006, p. 5).

Thus, wide variations exist when it comes to understanding the learners’ identities associated with their language learning experiences. The variations suggest that sojourning students, who experience international transitions, most likely negotiate their identities in relation to their acquisition of the languages required in their home and host country. They also suggest the need of solid empirical evidence and new theoretical scope to clarify what internal and external processes make language learners’ identities positive or negative.

The Context of English Language Learning: Japan and the United States

Language learners’ identities are also influenced by the historical and sociopolitical contexts of learning (Brisk, Burgos, & Hamerla, 2004). For the Japanese children, who sojourn between Japan and the United States, the contexts of English language learning are especially important to their identity formation since their English
proficiency distinguishes them from others or integrate them into the mainstream throughout their sojourning periods.\(^1\) Their English language skills are necessary for their survival in U.S. schools and also for their fulfillment of academic requirement in Japanese schools before and after their U.S. sojourning. Importantly, these two countries implement English language education differently (Jenkins, 2006), giving the contextually unique “meaning, purpose, and necessity” (Driscoll, 2000, p. 79) of English language learning in school. More specifically, Japan offers the context of English as a foreign language (EFL), English as an international language (EIL), and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) while the United States is considered as the context of English as a second language (ESL) and World Standard (Spoken) English (WSSE) (Jenkins, 2006).

Although English has strong sociopolitical, economical, and professional vitalities in the existing hierarchical global linguistic order (Maurais, 2003; Phillipson, 1992), different linguistic ideologies exist in each context. In Japan, similar to many other Asia-Pacific regions, English language learning has been positively viewed and U.S. sojourning has been regarded as a privilege. The notion of EIL has clearly impacted on Japanese educational policies and practices (Nunan, 2003): In 2000, the government report, Plan for the 21st Century Japan, proposed English to be a potential second official language (Hashimoto, 2002) and, in the following year, public elementary schools began

\(^1\) The contextual differences, which Japanese children experience in two countries, are not limited to their English learning experiences, but include numerous experiences (e.g., Japanese language learning, cultural experiences, etc.). However, for the children in this study, their English language learning experiences appeared significant and influential to their overall school lives. In addition, I take a stance that language and the affiliated culture are inseparable components interwoven into human experiences. Choi (2002) stated that “[l]anguage learning is not only about acquiring the systematic rules of the language. Rather, it involves more about learning new cultural ways of interacting with others while using the new language and new interpersonal skills” (p. 36).
to implement Period of Integrated Study which incorporated optional English language lessons for all students above third grade (MEXT, 2001; Otsu, 2004). According to Hashimoto (2002), incorporating English language education in the national curriculum stands on conflicting ideologies—hope for promoting additive bilingualism among Japanese citizens and fear against the potential crisis in national and cultural identities due to their divided levels of English proficiency and the Western globalization.

In addition, the notion of “linguistic Anglo-Americanization” (Modiano, 2004, p. 215) has been pervasive in Japan. For instance, most public schools have overly and overtly chosen to teach American Standard English over other foreign languages for the Period of Integrated Study despite the fact that the policy promotes students’ international understanding through their early encounter to any foreign languages (Parmenter, 2004; Tomita, 2004). Moreover, many U.S. sojourning parents expect their children to receive maximum exposure to American Standard English and its affiliated culture and, therefore, select genchikou (regular schools of the host country) for their children. The recent statistics showed that more than 95 percent of U.S. kaigaishijo receive education in genchikou and only less than five percent go to nihonjin gakkou (full time Japanese schools) (MEXT, 2004). In contrast, the kaigaishijo in non-English speaking countries, such as Asian, Middle Eastern, and South American countries, are enrolled in more nihonjin gakkou than genchikou (MEXT, 2004).

In the United States, Japanese sojourning children are often expected to acquire English proficiency at the risk of losing their first language proficiency. The U.S. language education policies between the 1980’s and the present time were influenced by
series of campaigns, which overly promoted the use of English and negated the use of students’ first languages in classrooms (e.g., U.S. English, English Only, English First, and Ron Unz’s initiatives for the Proposition 227) (Ovando, 2003). English immersion movements also promoted the implementation of one-size-fit-all programs and the abolishment of bilingual education in public schools (Del Valle, 2003; The Harvard Law Association, 2003). Current U.S. public educational policies under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act have imposed aligned standards, curricula, instructional strategies, and assessments on all students, including linguistic minority students broadly categorized as LEP (U.S. Department of Education, 2002a, 2002b).

Previous researchers have argued that such educational policies denigrated language and cultural capitals of linguistic minority learners (Nieto, 2004) and promoted “monoculturalization that accompanies English language learning” (Modiano, 2004, p. 215). Various underlying ideologies have also been discussed, including: language parochialism, language elitism, and language restrictionism (Lessow-Hurley, 2005); “[i]nwardness, protectionism and xenophobia” (Diaz, Massialas, & Xanthopoulos, 1999); political, social, and historical intolerance towards minority language and culture due to hegemony of English (Macedo et al., 2003); and so forth. Under these controversial ideologies, linguistic minority students in the United States often struggle to practice desirable social recognitions for an affirmative sense of self (Bracher, 2002; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Developing “cosmopolitan identity” (Hargreaves, 2003, p. 46) and global awareness (Diaz et al., 1999; Noddings, 2005), therefore, has been beyond their reach.
Thus, U.S. kaigaishijo’s experiences of varied English language learning contexts are unique to their international transitions, and influence their English acquisition and identities formation. Taking the contextual influences into account therefore, is necessary for adding new empirical and theoretical knowledge to the developing body of child identity research.

Focus of the Study and Research Questions

The major purpose of this study is to understand Japanese elementary children’s student identities shaped and negotiated within their sojourning experiences. My particular interest is in the emergence, formation, and growth of their student identities over the typical course of sojourning starting from the presojourning stage in Japan through the adjustment periods in the United States and the readjustment periods back in Japan. This study was conducted to answer the following research questions:

How do Japanese elementary students perceive themselves in school as they sojourn between Japan and the United States? More specifically:

How do they form their identities in relation to overall school experiences across two countries? (e.g., What kinds of self-relevant attributes do they use to describe their student identities? What types of school experiences do they perceive as most influential to those attributes?)

What are the processes by which their student identities are shaped across different stages of sojourning? (e.g., What aspects of their student identities do they need to maintain or change? To what extent do their student identities change or remain stable? What are the internal processes to shape their student identities? What are the external influences on their negotiation of student identities?)

Informed by Charmaz’s (2006) grounded theory principles, these research questions are raised to elicit the “social processes” relevant to the children’s particular learning contexts as well as the “social psychological processes” (p. 20) relevant to their
perceptions within the contexts. The specific questions also clarify “varied emergent analytic goals and foci” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 180, italics in original) of the study.

The answers to the research questions derive from case studies of five Japanese children in age 8 (Gr.2) through 12 (Gr.6). At the onset of the study, two of them were in the stage of leaving Japan to the United States (cross-section one) and the rest were in the stage of returning from the United States to Japan (cross-section two). As Chapter 4 will explain in more details, this study employed the interpretive multiple case study approach (e.g., Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2002, 2003) and followed the constructivist grounded theory guidelines (Charmaz, 2006). Multiple methods, such as child in-depth interviews, classroom observations, and informants (teacher and parent) interviews were employed to reveal the children’s experiences and perspectives. The analysis was also facilitated by interpretive focus group (IFG) interviews with Japanese adolescents and young adults with previous U.S. sojourning backgrounds.

The major premise of this study is to bring children’s perceptions, voices, and own agenda to the core of interpretation. Rather than merely describing the social realities in which they live, by “importing [the researcher’s] preconceived assumptions” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 181), this study focuses on the co-interpretation of meanings embedded in children’s perspectives. This means that the major findings of the study capture the specific school competences and experiences, which the children themselves actually verified as the salient components of their positive student identities, while the supplemental findings include the competences and experiences which I assumed to be salient to their student identities based on my understanding of their learning contexts.
The cross-case analysis juxtaposes these focused and unfocused attributes, and raises further questions of how and why they perceive themselves based on some attributes while leaving out the others. The processes of identity negotiation, therefore, are described according to the children’s focused attributes as well as their unfocused yet potentially salient attributes. Importantly, the co-interpreted meanings of the children’s realities are the guiding force for my discussion on the theoretical and empirical findings as well as the competence-based identity negotiation model.

The strengths and potential scholarly contributions of the study include:

1. Its selection of the research participants who are an increasing yet seldom studied population of elementary age U.S. kaigaishijo. This can provoke further comparisons and theory building in research on diverse language learners’ student identities.

2. Its emphasis on inductively capturing the unique circumstances, voices, and “vantage points” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 17) of the child participants who are “the least powerful stakeholders in the educational hierarchy” (Kanno, 2003, p. viii).

3. Its interdisciplinary orientation towards conceptualizing identities as a holistic phenomenon that consists of both internal and social processes. The contribution of the study then includes the theoretical framework and the conceptual model of identity negotiation, which both can speak to the audience in diverse disciplines.

4. Its cross-national research design reflecting my international perspectives. This increases the versatility of the study so that the findings and implications speak to a variety of audience in Japan and the United States and to become applicable to varied educational contexts.

5. Its craft of exploratory research methods (e.g., cross-sectional sampling, drawing activities during in-depth interviews, and interpretive focus group interviews).

Simultaneously, this study has several potential limitations. First, although this study captured the longitudinal processes of identity negotiation by drawing on the
perspectives of two cross-sections of child participants, the actual duration of the data collection was four to six months for each child. Due to this limited timeframe, some may argue that the child’s shared stories are limited to reveal the snapshots of his or her identity craft. Second, albeit the efforts were made to obtain multiple sources of evidence, the co-interpretation of meanings was simply a challenge because it relied on my reflexivity as a researcher and also on all participants’ perceptions which are dynamic, fluid, and complex. Third, all children were elite bilinguals with well educated and socioeconomically privileged parents. Though this was a way to control variability, their comparatively uniform backgrounds might be considered as a limitation since all of them received similar contextual influences from their learning environments.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and concepts are selected for definitions and clarification in order to promote uniformity and clear understanding within the context of this study. It is important to note here that the particular meanings of some terms emerged from literature review (Chapter 2) and theoretical framework (Chapter 3).

Identity is the intangible, abstract, and complex self-concept that a person (or a group of people) experience(s) in multifaceted ways (e.g., form, shape, construct, develop, express, perceive, alter, maintain, negotiate, recognize, etc.). Identity is not an innate spiritual construct detached from living environments but a holistic entity representing both intrapersonal and interpersonal processes. In this sense, being part of social communities, including schools and classrooms, reciprocally influences the individual’s identities. This suggests the ecological interplays between identity and social practices
In addition, this study interchangeably uses various terms assigned to the idea of identity, such as self-perception, self-recognition, self-representation, self-image, self-concept, a sense of self, the self, and individuality. Although these terms hold discrete and sometimes incompatible meanings depending on the discipline, this study aims to preserve elusive boundaries between these terms by promoting identity as an umbrella construct. This broad approach allows me to make sense of the holistic and ecological aspects of identity and to further explore the essential characteristics and potentialities of child identity. The plural form, identities, represents the multiple aspects of self-perception that a person can experience (e.g., academic identity, linguistic identity, cultural identity, etc.). Student identity (or identities) means an individual learner’s identity (or identities) negotiated particularly within his/her school context.

Self-relevant attribute (or attributes) are the information/descriptions of an individual and typically serve as the components of his/her identities. The terms, identity components and “self-relevant information” (Sedikides & Skowronska, 2000, p. 93) are then used interchangeably with this term.

Processes of identity negotiation are defined as the multiple trajectories through which individual learners gain their self-relevant attributes and holistically form their identities during both intrapersonal and interpersonal experiences. While I use the terms, such as identity formation, identity craft, and shaping identities, to broadly mean that the learners express their identities based on some self-relevant attributes, I use the term, identity negotiation, to particularly convey a nuance that individual identities are “an interactional accomplishment, produced and negotiated in discourse” (Pavlenko &
Blackledge, 2004, p. 13). In specific, identity negotiation reflects varied human interactions in relation to given social contexts and, therefore, is practiced in multiple ways (e.g., reconstruct, maintain, inform, recognize, expand, imagine, etc.).

**School competences** are the skills and abilities required for school participation. They are not limited to academic competence but also include the competences in non-academic activities, social interactions, emotional engagement, language learning, and cultural compatibility. These varied human competences resonate with Gardner’s (2006) multiple intelligences of the learners, which overarch a wide spectrum of human capacities in language, logical mathematics, music, kinesthesia, spatiality, and interpersonal and intrapersonal interactions. Varied combinations of school competences are necessary for students to function, survive, and succeed in school learning, and influence their perspectives on school experiences and identities.

**Interdisciplinary research approach** is defined as the researcher’s reference to diverse disciplinary fields or “multiple and overlapping communities of practice” (Preissle, 2006, p. 692) for the purpose of understanding the studied phenomenon.

**Categories** are the key ideas and common themes generated from the data which reveal the “recurring pattern” (Merriam, 1998, p. 179). The major categories found in this study are used to structure the cross-case analysis and to further suggest the conceptual model grounded in the empirical data.

**Sojourner** is the term used to describe a person who temporarily resides outside his/her home country. In this study, the child participants are mostly referred to Japanese sojourning children/students. However, I also use different descriptors which emphasize
certain experiential characteristics, including: “U.S. kaigaishijo (Japanese children studying in the United States)” to emphasize the host country of sojourning; “linguistic minority children/students/learners” to show their statuses within U.S. contexts; “English language learners (ELLs)” to highlight their language learning experiences; kikokushijo (returnee student) to indicate their statuses after returning to Japan.

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation consists of eight chapters, including this introduction. Chapter 2 presents a review of relevant empirical studies which informs identity negotiation of linguistic minority learners and describes the interdisciplinary orientations and the research design used in those previous studies. Chapter 3 introduces the study’s theoretical framework that “emerges from [my] analysis” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 169) and also “locates the specific argument that [I] make” (p. 169). Previous identity theories across disciplines are integrated into the theoretical framework in order to inform readers “how [my] grounded theory refines, extends, challenges or supercedes extant concepts” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 169, italics in original). In Chapter 4, the overall research design is outlined by describing my specific research perspectives, research contexts, participants and sampling, the multiple methods used for data collection and analysis. Then, the next two chapters will unfold the findings of the study as the case studies of two children in cross-section one (Chapter 5) and three children in cross-section two (Chapter 6). Since this study emphasized each child’s own perceptions, voices, and own agenda, the case studies serve as the foundation of the following analysis and discussion. Subsequently, Chapter 7 will present a cross-case analysis and the categories derived from the case
studies. Finally, Chapter 8 will discuss the key theoretical and empirical findings in order to provide answers to the research questions and to propose a process model of Japanese sojourning children’s identity negotiation. The final chapter will also indicate: limitations of the study; implications for educational practices, policies, and further research; and a conclusion.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

To begin the inquiry into Japanese elementary students’ identity negotiation associated with their international sojourning, this chapter presents the review of the relevant empirical literature across disciplines. The purposes of this chapter are threefold: (a) to identify the significant ideas and findings in the literature; (b) to reveal gaps in the previously posed knowledge and theoretical orientation; and (c) to build a foundation for my theoretical framework which will be presented in the next chapter. This chapter first presents the literature review which informs identity negotiation of linguistic minority learners in varied developmental levels and backgrounds. Specifically, the review illuminates the ways in which the learners’ identities can be interrelated to the learning contexts as well as to their overall learning experiences, including English language learning experiences. The chapter then describes the research approaches commonly used in the existing identity research.

Linguistic Minority Learners’ Identity Negotiation and Learning Experiences

Identity negotiation of elementary students, especially those who experience international sojourning, has been seldom studied before in educational research; therefore, this section presents the review of previous literature that has reported identity negotiation among linguistically and culturally minority learners who varies in age (kindergartner through adults), immigration status (sojourners and permanent immigrants), and learning circumstances (e.g., ESL contexts, EFL contexts, school, and
learning center). These studies inform: (a) the reciprocal relations between the learners’ identities and overall learning experiences, including the development of varied school competences and socioemotional consequences of second language learning and (b) the processes of identity negotiation.

Reciprocal Relations between Identities and Learning Experiences

Identities and school competences.

Previous research found that language learners’ identities were constructed, practiced, and revealed in a strong association with their school competences developed in particular learning contexts. Toohey’s (2000) three-year longitudinal ethnography of English language learners (ELLs) in a Canadian elementary mainstream classroom (K-grade 2), for instance, reported that the ELLs’ identities were “the product” (p. 125) of specific school participation, resource distributions, and social integration which together resulted in the development of their school competences in language, academics, behavior, social relations, and physical presentation. Those ELLs also perceived their English language proficiency and academic competence in accordance with: their positioning in discursive practices (e.g., access to English language learning); their socialization into the norms, values, and behaviors of the classroom community; and their subsequently endowed social identities. Thus, the reciprocal relations were evident among identity, specific school participation, and the attainment of associated school competences.

Linguistic minority students’ cognitive, behavioral, and relational engagement was also found congruent to their self-images formed through social interactions (Suárez-
Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco, & Doucet, 2004). As a part of the Harvard Immigration Project, Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco (2001) conducted a large scale ethnography to explore the themes in the lives of “children of immigration” who were U.S.-born and foreign-born school age individuals. By studying the nature of their journeys to the United States and the transformation of their self-perceptions in school, the researchers conceptualized the phenomenon of “social mirroring” (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001, p. 96) through which students’ identities reflect back from the mirrored images given by others who live in the same environment (e.g., family members, caretakers, teachers, peers, media, etc.). The researchers argued that children constructed their student identities, either worthwhile or non-worthwhile, according to the socially mirrored self images.

Among a variety of competences required in school, English language competence played a crucial role in ELLs’ identity negotiation. The reciprocal relations between identity and the development of second language (L2) proficiency was described in Day’s (2002) one year ethnographic case study of a Punjabi-speaking ELL named Hari in a Canadian mainstream kindergarten classroom. Discursive analysis of the social and political dimensions of Hari’s classroom community revealed that his “language learning, language choice, social interaction, and identity [were] inextricably interwoven” (Day, 2002, p. 54). Hari’s linguistic identity shifted over time along with: his developing L2 competences; the related images projected by his teacher (e.g., a new member to the class); and varying social experiences (e.g., helping a newly arrived classmate). From poststructural perspectives, Day (2002), like Toohey (2000), argued that ELLs’
negotiation of multiple identities depended on their situatedness in specific social network within classrooms as well as the types and qualities of L2 practices in which they engaged for the improvement of English proficiency.

Clearly, language competence was fundamental to other school-related competences that ELLs acquired in school, such as the competence in academics and social interactions. Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco, and Doucet (2004) found the close tie between Latino adolescents’ social identities and their academic engagement and learning. As the Latino youths became socially adapted to the United States, the factors affecting their learning opportunities, such as their educational backgrounds, poverty levels, neighborhoods and schools, undocumented status, and migration situations, were all taken into the process of social mirroring and influenced the levels of their academic engagement and the formation of their academic identities. The researchers found that the high levels of academic engagement were achieved when the participants were able to experience positive psychological involvement, such as positive affiliative motivations.

Hawkins’ (2005) ethnography of two ELLs, Anton and William, in a mainstream kindergarten classroom similarly showed the importance of academic engagement to learners’ identities by comparing these children’s social practices in academic discourse. Anton, who utilized the strategies closely aligned to academic discourse, gained his positive academic identity that represented his actual academic performance, whereas William, whose social strategies reflected his non-academic social status as a popular child, merely self-claimed his positive academic identity based on the expectation given by his parents not on his actual academic practices. Considering that Anton was a
socioeconomically disadvantaged Spanish-speaking newcomer and William was from a middle class Korean-speaking family, the researcher asserted that ELLs’ academic identities primarily depended on their academic engagement in real practices not on their socioeconomic and sociocultural backgrounds.

Moreover, Morita’s (2004) multiple case study of six Japanese female graduate students in Canada, also described their identities negotiated through academic socialization during open-ended class discussions. As the participants experienced “changing sense of competence as a member of a given classroom community” (p. 583), they demonstrated a wide variety of individual positionalities in the L2 community. Their individually unique ways of negotiating identities, such as remaining silent and challenging their own English language competence by actively speaking out, were “locally constructed” (p. 597) in the particular classroom contexts rather than socially or instructionally defined.

*Socioemotional consequences of identity negotiation.*

Previous research have also suggested the interdependency among: ELLs’ feelings and emotions; identities; and varied school practices in L2 acquisition, academic learning, and cultural adaptation (Choi, 2002; Day, 2002; Duff, 2002; Goldstein, 1995; Norton Peirce, 1995; Sarroub, 2001; Soto, 2002). Day (2002), for instance, pointed out that her case study participant’s affective engagement during social interactions consciously and unconsciously influenced his classroom participation and access to English language practice, and subsequently shaped his language and academic identities. Soto (2002) similarly found that Spanish-speaking elementary students’ identities and
sociolinguistic competence as biliterate individuals were strongly driven by their hope to create and maintain the compassionate, loving, and altruistic relationships with their families and others who shared their heritage languages and culture in the same ethnic communities.

In poststructural views, the contexts of English language learning are inseparable from inequitable power relations and linguistic hegemony and, therefore, create varied types of challenge, struggle, and difficulty for ELLs’ identity formation. In the large scale study on the self-perceptions of over one thousand multilingual adult participants, Pavlenko (2006) found that the ones, who lived in monolingual countries, experienced “different selves” (p. 27) more sharply when using more than two languages than those who lived in multilingual contexts did. Similarly, some researchers reported that the English-dominant contexts mediated the interrelations among ELLs’ socioemotional competence, identities, the outcomes of their English language acquisition (Choi, 2002; Norton Peirce, 1995; Soto, 2002).

Norton Peirce’s (1995) ethnographic investigation of English language learning experiences of immigrant women in Canada clearly depicted the negative consequences of the inequitable power relations not only on the amount of their social interactions with native speakers but also on their judgment of rights to speak English. Due to the discrepancies between their own socioeconomic and sociopolitical status and those of the native speakers, they viewed the native speakers as the owners of English and felt inferior to them. Their negative feelings and emotions then diminished the amount of their English usage. The researcher also described that some participants practiced the
“investment” (Norton Peirce, 1995, p.17) in English because they expected a return of “cultural capital,” “an access to hitherto unattainable resources” (p. 17), and socioeconomic success. In contrast to the individually fixed affective factors widely studied in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) (e.g., motivation, individual differences), the idea of investment represented the dynamic and changing human intentions and identities in relation to social contexts.

In contrast, Goldstein’s (1995) study found that socioeconomically disadvantaged Portuguese-speaking immigrant women in Canada avoided to invest in English because they highly valued a sense of solidarity to their heritage language and community. For those women, their ethnic ties were important for surviving as minority individuals in the English-dominant contexts. As a result, they viewed English language learning as a betrayal to their ethnic group, which might alienate them from the group, and, therefore, as social and economic risks.

The elementary age kaigaishijo in Podolsky’s (1994) study similarly avoided to invest in Canadian culture and English because they did not want to risk their identities strongly associated with their ethnic heritage. Among the three patterns of cross-cultural socialization suggested by the researcher: (a) host-culture-oriented, (b) dual, and (c) Japanese-culture-oriented, the Japanese sojourning children commonly demonstrated the last two patterns and maintained their identities as sojourning students who would eventually return to Japan. Ishikawa (1998) also reported that her kaigaishijo participants connected their native language, Japanese, to a sense of existence in their everyday lives and to their identities. Thus, ELLs’ English learning took place while they experienced
varied feelings, emotions, and the varied levels of investment in English in relation to their linguistic, cultural, and ethic origins. It is also important to note here that studying the variations of social adaptation among linguistic minority learners is not new. For instance, Child (1943, cited in Brisk, 1998), over a half century ago, found that some Italian immigrants in the United States were assimilated to the dominant language and culture while others rejected “everything American” (Brisk, 1998, p. 48) and felt comfort in their sole association with the Italian community.

Previous research also described identity negotiation as the site of socioemotional struggle. Morita (2004) stated that “the co-construction of learner agency and positionality is not always a peaceful, collaborative process, but is often a struggle involving a web of power relations and competing agendas” (p. 597). Choi (2002) also found that, in the United States where English is often viewed as “the language of hegemony, imperialism, and superiority” (Choi, 2002, p. 57), her Korean-speaking adult participants consistently experienced the power relations among languages and felt forced to form language identities subordinated to English. As a result, they experienced “a sense of shame, inferiority, loss of power, subordination, and oppression” as well as “isolation and a desire not to follow the dominant discourse” (p. 57). Their negative socioemotional consequences under unequal power relations also resulted in their unsuccessful English language acquisition.

Similarly, in Soto’s (2002) study, the participants, who held the sociohistorical view of Puerto Rico as a colonized minority group in the United States, experienced “a scene of displacement, filled with contradictions and reconfigurations that [began] to
influence the construction of [their] present identities” (p. 606). In their views, being both U.S. citizens and Puerto Ricans resulted in “the struggle for identity” (p. 607). The socioemotional consequences of the dual identities were also described by Sarroub (2001) in her two year longitudinal case study on the sojourning experiences of a Yemeni female high school student named Layla. While living as a U.S. high school student, she was obligated to practice Yemeni cultural traditions and rituals, including marrying a Yemeni boy at the age of fifteen. Due to those multiple ways of “being” in her life, she became disengaged with the two worlds, home and school, and began to imagine the third space which could justify who she was. In the multiple spaces existing in her life, including the imagined third space, Layla experienced consistent tensions between two culture and negotiated her sociocultural identities. She felt that the U.S. education was liberating and, at the same time, threatening to her identities.

The contradictions and tensions in identity negotiation was also reported in Duff’s (2002) study of Chinese-speaking ELLs in a Canadian high school. As language learners, the participants consistently received expectations regarding “how they should behave and speak, and which language they should use and when, whether Mandarin, Cantonese, or English” (p. 313). Their identity negotiation, therefore, often made them feel being caught between two “unfavorable options: silence or mockery and hostility” (p. 312).

Thus, previous research has suggested that the identity negotiation of linguistic minority learners was interwoven into their dynamic social practices in school. Their socioemotional sphere of self-perceptions was also considered influential to their school learning. The reciprocal relations between identity, social practices, socioemotional
consequences, and social structure of the learning contexts have also suggested that language learners’ identity negotiation was mediated by holistically interrelated constructs that were both intrapersonal and interpersonal.

Processes of Identity Negotiation

Given the interrelations between identities, learning experiences, and the development of school competence, the processes of identity negotiation overlap with the processes of social adaptation and competence development in school. The shifts of language learners’ identities over time along with their developing school competences have been reported in the longitudinal identity research the same individuals over time (e.g., Day, 2002; Kanno, 2003; Toohey, 2000) as well as in the research that compared different negotiation patterns among the individuals in varied stages of social adaptation (Duff, 2002; Macpherson, 2005; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). In Day’s (2002) case study, her participant, Hari, shifted his identity based on his practice of English language in social interactions. For instance, when a new student joined his class, he began to perceive himself as a more experienced member of the class rather than an ELL who needed linguistic support from others. Also, Duff (2002) found varied degrees of classroom participation among Chinese-speaking adolescents who differed in the durations of stay in Canada. The newcomers freely revealed their cultural identities in the classroom whereas the more adapted students shared their multilingual expertise and cultural identities not in school but in their own ethnic communities to which they belonged locally and internationally.
Kanno’s (2003) longitudinal qualitative study also examined the ways in which four Japanese sojourning adolescents developed their “bilingual and bicultural identity” (p.6) as they were enrolled in Canadian high schools and moved back to Japan for their college education. In her study, bilingual and bicultural identities represented “where bilingual individuals position themselves between two languages and two (or more) cultures, and how they incorporate these languages and cultures into their sense of who they are” (Kanno, 2003, p. 6). The researcher illuminated the processes through which the participants became able to strike a better balance between two languages and culture and acquired skills necessary to participate in multiple communities. As they were entering their young adulthood, they became increasingly “sophisticated in negotiating their bilingual and bicultural identities with their surroundings” (Kanno, 2003, p. vii) and “moved away from the simplistic strategy of total assimilation or total rejection, and shifted to more flexible ways of negotiating bilingual bicultural identities” (p. 122). The researcher argued that these findings stood in an opposition to the oversimplified understanding of identity as insider-outsider or minority-majority because the participants displayed their acceptance of their unique identities as translingual and transcultural beings. The development of their hybrid identities also involved their realization and appreciation of the possibility to become bilingual and bicultural. Thus, Kanno (2003) depicted the process of developing the harmonized sense of self through sojourning experiences between Japan and Canada.

In the views of Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco (2001), the processes of identity negotiation consisted of individual learners’ multiple ways of “crafting
identities” (p. 101) through social mirroring. The researchers focused on the formation of ethnic and cultural identities among the children of immigration and found three levels of acculturation manifested in their identities: (a) ethnic flight that relates to identifying the self with the mainstream language and culture rather than with heritage language and culture; (b) adversarial identity that relates to the rejection of the mainstream; (c) transcultural identity that represents individuals’ bilingual and bicultural competence, affective ties to heritage language and culture, and success in coping with the mainstream language and culture. These categorizations resembled the five alternative procedural patterns of identity negotiation suggested by Macpherson (2005) in her ethnographic action research on identities of Tibetan ELL refugee women in the Indian Himalayas: (a) rejection, (b) assimilation, (c) marginality, (d) bicultural accommodation, and (e) intercultural creativity. One of the participants, Rinchen, was an enthusiastic learner in both English and Buddhism classes and formed her intercultural creativity. In the process of her identity formation, she pushed against the limit to accommodate her crosslingual and crosscultural development and showed “the additional willingness and ability to transfer knowledge, concepts, and skills between the two languages and culture” (p. 602). She also created a “third space” and “the capacity to step outside of [particular] culture and identity” (p. 602).

Thus, previous empirical studies demonstrated that the continuous changes in language learners’ varied competences and experiences inevitably fostered their identity craft. Though the previous studies illuminated the individually unique and distinct experiences of identity negotiation, particular circumstances (e.g., newly arrived or fully
adapted, monolingual or multilingual context, etc.) and particular learning experiences (e.g., helping a newcomer, sharing cultural expertise, etc.) also suggest that there are somewhat common procedural patterns in which the learners’ identities changed over the course of learning experiences.

Research Approach Used in Existing Identity Research

This section revisits the literature reviewed in the previous section, and explains varied research approaches, focuses, and designs utilized in the literature. The approaches recommended by some previous identity researchers and theorists. Also, this section shows how this study contributes to the evolving body of identity research by filling the gaps in the existing research perspectives.

Interdisciplinary Approach of Identity Research

When the abstract concept of identity is operationalized in research, the interdisciplinary approach, which may appear to be the researcher’s flexible research orientation, is not a mere preference but a necessity for holistically understanding identities as individual’s internal and external processes. The identity research, which was initially reserved to the domain of psychology, has evolved in the last few decades across a variety of social and humanistic disciplinary fields (Juzwik, 2006; Kraus, 2007; Sfard & Prusak, 2005; Suls, Tesser, & Felson, 2002), including cognitive studies, sociology, sociolinguistics, anthropology, history, political science, communication, philosophy, literacy, and education. The research participants are also no longer confined to adolescents, as typically seen in the tradition of developmental psychology, but have been diversified in terms of their developmental levels and backgrounds (Kraus, 2007).
Though it is currently limited, the interdisciplinary research on elementary children’s identities is expected to develop further in the future.

The interdisciplinary approach also includes the researchers’ frequent use of cross-disciplinary references for the purpose of using a variety of previous studies to support their theoretical underpinnings as well as their theoretical and empirical findings. This tendency was, in part, driven by the “postpositivist” (Lather, 1992, p.89) research traditions, such as poststructuralism, postmodernism, constructivism, and critical perspectives. These perspectives promote the understanding, emancipation, and deconstruction of existing values, beliefs, and techniques within scientific inquiry (Lather, 1992), and, therefore, necessitate a wider scope of theoretical and empirical resources.

For instance, poststructural identity researchers have extended the scope of inquiry over the disciplinary boarders in order to reconceptualize identities of the marginalized in connection with existing social structures. In their views, the empirical evidence and theories from previous identity research across varied social and humanistic disciplines are necessary to illuminate the social, historical, and political milieus presumably influential to individual identities. The poststructural researchers, who examined identity negotiation of linguistic minority learners, (e.g., Macpherson, 2005; Norton Peirce, 1995; Sarroub, 2001) commonly demonstrated the interdisciplinary practices. One salient example is Norton Peirce’s educational research (1995) in the field of second language acquisition, which used a cognitive and social anthropologic framework while citing abundant resources from the fields of social psychology and sociolinguistics.
Research Focus on the Multiple Aspects of Identity

The previous research on identity negotiation among linguistic minority learners has depicted a wide range of identity aspects. These aspects include school related academic identity (Hawkins, 2005; Morita, 2004; Toohey, 2000), linguistic identity as a learner of particular languages (Day, 2002; Macpherson, 2005; Soto, 2002; Yihong et al., 2005), racial and ethnic identity (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001), cultural identity (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002; Duff, 2002; Sarroub, 2001), and so forth. Some also captured the participant’s compound identities, such as: language and cultural identities (Kanno, 2003; Macpherson, 2005); academic and cultural identities (Sarroub, 2001); language and academic identities (Day, 2002; Toohey, 2000); academic, language, and cultural identities (Morita, 2004).

These multiple aspects of identity suggest the close tie between individual identities and the particular experiences focused by the researchers. This is to say that the researchers’ focus on the participants’ particular experiences and life contexts, among the countless combinations of their experiences and contexts, limits or delimits the illumination of particular aspects of identity in their studies. The focused experience(s), therefore, determine which aspect(s) of identity would become central to the study. For instance, in Hawkin’s (2005) study, the participants’ academic identities became apparent only through their development of academic literacies defined as “distinctive school-based (often discipline-specific) forms and varieties of language and communication” (p. 60). Also, Norton Peirce (1995; 2000), who focused on a broader range of life experiences (e.g., being a woman, a mother, a student, and a worker) in extending social
contexts (e.g., school, home, work, and community), consequently illuminated multiple
dimensions of the participants’ identities. Thus, the close tie between identity and human
experience is evident. This further implies that investigating the child participants’
various events and episodes specifically within their school contexts allow this study to
capture their identities as students. Simultaneously, without setting the research focus on
specific school experiences (e.g., academic, social, literacy, linguistic, cultural experience,
etc.), this study has the potential for capturing the identity aspects that are most important
to the children.

*Research Perspectives and Designs Commonly Used*

In the relevant research on language learners’ identities, the qualitative studies
have outnumbered the quantitative ones. Many qualitative identity researchers have
approached individual identities with varied combinations of postpositivist perspectives
and aimed to capture the participant’s voices as well as their actual learning experiences
and social interactions. They have commonly practiced ethnographic fieldwork and often
used in-depth open-ended interviews and classroom observations. Some researchers
added creative research methods, such as drawings and collages (Soto, 2002), diaries
(Norton, 2000) and group journals (Kanno, 2003) in order to better interpret their
participants’ perspectives.

In contrast, most quantitative studies have focused on hypothesizing and testing
the research agenda intriguing to the researchers. Mostly from the positivistic
perspectives, quantitative identity researchers have operationalized the concepts of
identity into the categories used in various measures, including questionnaires and
surveys. Yihong, Ying, Yuan, and Yan (2005), for instance, used six categories of identity; self-confidence, subtractive bilingualism, additive bilingualism, productive bilingualism, identity split, and zero change; and surveyed how these categories were viewed by a large scale of over two thousands Chinese college students who were assumed to shift their identities as a result of their English language learning. Benet-Martinez, Leu, and Morris (2002) also recruited a total of over two hundreds 45 Chinese-speaking high school students and measured the levels of their compatibilities to “bicultural identity integration” (p.493) which they predefined as the way in which bicultural individuals manage and experience multiple meaning systems attached to specific culture. Based on the results of experimental sessions, they further categorized two types of identities: compatible identity, which corresponded to the high levels of bicultural identity integration, and oppositional identity which related to the low levels.

In terms of the research perspectives, many of the notable inquiries on linguistic minority learners’ identities were based on the researchers’ postpositivist perspectives, such as poststructural, critical, constructivist perspectives. For instance, it has been clear that the poststructural emphasis on the social aspects of identities in relation to discursive practices have contributed to the exploration of identity theories and new research paradigms. For instance some of the studies reviewed in this chapter (Norton, 2000) used the framework of community of practice created by cognitive/social anthropologists (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998), and brought a particular attention to the reciprocity between ELLs’ identities and their social and linguistic participation in school. In the framework, an emphasis was placed on “a set of relations among person, activity,
and worlds, over time and in relation with other tangential and overlapping communities of practice” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 98). Moreover, Norton Peirce (1995), a poststructural critical feminist, emphasized the illumination of the contingency between identities and social contexts. While her study aimed to emancipate the socially disadvantaged population of female factory workers, it also deconstructed the existing SLA theories that only appealed to individual capacities separated from social contexts.

Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) described the poststructuralists’ and critical theorists’ efforts to reconceptualize multilingual learners’ identities by eliciting their voices, discursive practices, multiple and imagined identities, and the language ideologies and power relations embedded in the learning contexts. They argued that some previous studies based on the sociopsychological theory, such as the ethnolinguistic theory (Giles & Johnson, 1981, 1987), and the studies based on interactional sociolinguistic behaviors, such as code-switching and language choice, were limited since they oversimplified the real-life contexts of identity negotiation and to implant the discipline-based static images to the idea of identities. In the views of Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004), it has been clear that identity research needs:

Poststructuralist theory which recognized the sociohistorically shaped partiality, contestability, instability, and mutability of ways in which language ideologies and identities are linked to relations of power and political arrangements in communities and societies. (p. 10)

Also, the qualitative researchers, who studied L2 learners’ identities, took varied theoretical orientations, yet, commonly suggested the importance of examining the situational variations influencing language learning (Cargile, Giles, & Clement, 1995; Dittmar, Spolsky, & Walters, 1998; Norton Peirce, 1995). For instance, Cargile and
associates (1995) supported a constructivist framework for examining the context of both individualistic and collectivistic culture to study learners’ identities. Thus, many qualitative researchers have focused on the social practices of identity formation and negotiation.

Research Approach Recommended

There has been on-going discussion on improving the research on language learners’ identities in English-speaking contexts. In the field of SLA, Hansen and Liu (1997) asserted that longitudinal qualitative studies, which capture the complexities of historical and developmental accounts and influence the language learners’ identities, have more significant potentials to lead the field than one-time-only quantitative surveys and questionnaires. Kraus (2007), from post-modern perspectives, similarly supported the use of longitudinal approaches for identity research across disciplines since individual identities would change, shift, and evolve according to varied life experiences. In addition, Dittmar and associates (1998) recommended the identity researchers to use interdisciplinary mixed methods that target the participants from more than one learning community. In their views, it was crucial to examine the various contextual backgrounds (e.g., regional differences, class differences, roles of particular language, etc.) in order to cross-validate the participants’ individual and collective views of the self and languages.

Though many researchers have emphasized the social and political sphere of the language learners’ identity negotiation, it is also equally crucial to capture identity in a holistic manner which encompasses both the learners’ internal (e.g., intrapersonal, psychological, emotional, etc.) and external (e.g., interpersonal, social, contextual, etc.)
processes of identity negotiation. In other words, social contexts were powerful yet not
the only elements that should be focused in identity research (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2004).
As mentioned earlier, previous poststructural identity research has placed strong
emphasis on the situational contexts and the social processes of identity negotiation.
Though the results of contextual analysis have revealed the learners’ feelings, emotions,
and psychological states which were interrelated with their identities, the internal
processes have been seldom explained in details in relation to the social processes. As a
result, many poststructural identity researchers often explain individual identities with the
common descriptors, such as “dynamic,” “fluid,” “complex,” and “multiple.” Since there
are intricate links between the learners’ identities, language acquisition, socioemotional
experiences, and the context of learning, their emphasis on the complexity of identity
negotiation as an integral part of human experiences is crucial. However, previous body
of knowledge tends to leave the fuzzy gray area, or what I presumed as the gap, between
universality and idiosyncrasy in individual identities (e.g., the psychological traits of
identity formation versus the contextual uniqueness of identity negotiation). Thus, the
focus on the only external contexts of identity negotiation often failed to capture the
complex components and functions of human self-perceptions.

Also, as the next chapter will explain in details, existing identity theories inclined
towards either end of the spectrum between internal focus or external focus, depending
on the theorists’ disciplinary affiliations. For instance, Gee’s theory of Discourse identity
(2001; Gee, 2005) defined two types of identity, core identity, which refers to one’s
internal characteristics and “whatever continuous and relatively ‘fixed’ sense of self”
(Gee, 2005, p. 34), and social identity which represents an unstable, changing, and ambiguous sense of self in a given social context. Although Gee (2005) explained that the core identity “underlies our contextually shifting multiple identities” (p. 34), his primary concerns was on the utilities of social identities for better educational practices. However, when the “core” aspect of identity is understood as one’s abilities to internalize self-perception, the separation between core and social, and internal and external, seem artificial. Therefore, identity researchers face the need of integrating both psychological and contextual approaches into their interpretations of identity negotiation (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). At the same time, they need to suggest identity theories that do not dichotomize the internal mechanism of identity formation and the relations to the external social structure (Stryker & Burke, 2000).

Summary

The review of relevant empirical literature in this chapter presented the reciprocal relations between identities, social practices, school competences, socioemotional experiences, and contextual differences. Surveying the research approaches commonly used by previous researchers revealed the interdisciplinary orientation and the multiple aspects of identity studied. It also showed that identity negotiation has been increasingly interpreted as a social phenomenon within postpositivist frameworks. However, the literature review also depicted individual learners’ internal processes to cope with psychological and emotional sphere of self-perceptions and also the processes of identity negotiation, which can be both individually unique and universally developmental. It was, then, reasonable to assume that crafting identities is not exclusively internal or external,
universal or unique, and psychological or social, but rather holistic with the mixture of those seemingly polarized interpretations.

In this study, I take the challenge of filling the gap between individual and social dimensions of language learners’ identities and call attention to the holistic interpretations of identity as well as to the ecological interplays between identities and social contexts. In order to do so, this study draws on previous conceptual literature and identity theories from diverse disciplines, which clarify the underlying theoretical framework, and employed the exploratory research approach and design. The theoretical framework, methodology, and research design of the study will be explained in details in subsequent chapters.
CHAPTER 3

ECOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION OF IDENTITY AS THE SYMBOLIC SELF:
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter presents the theoretical framework of this qualitative inquiry into Japanese elementary sojourners’ identity negotiation in school. The primary purpose of this chapter is to bring conceptual coherence to the entire study. More specifically, the theoretical framework serves to engage the analysis and theorization of the findings and to highlight the significance of emerging theories. As the review of empirical literature has suggested (Chapter 2), the research on linguistic minority learners’ identities needs to conceptualize identity more holistically and create a synergy between seemingly dichotomized constructs (e.g., internal and external, abstract and concrete, symbolic and real, universal and unique, etc.). Therefore, the theoretical framework also represents my conceptual logic to explain the ecological relations between individual learners’ symbolic representations of the self and external learning environments.

This theoretical framework is built primarily upon the evolutionary social psychological theory of the symbolic self (Sedikides & Skowronski, 1997, 2000; Skowronski & Sedikides, 1999), especially its selected key concepts: (a) adaptive functions of the symbolic self and its multiplicities, (b) language-based representations, (c) self-evaluation motives, and (d) stabilities and changes within the developmental processes. It also incorporates conceptual literature and other identity theories with diverse theoretical and disciplinary backgrounds, including sociology, sociolinguistics,
psychoanalysis, and educational philosophy (e.g., Bracher, 2002; Cummins, 2000; Gee, 2001; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004; Stryker & Burke, 2000). According to Preissle (2006), many qualitative educational researchers belong to “multiple and overlapping communities of practice” (p. 692). This creates the pressure for them to find a stable theoretical ground among the “interdisciplinarities in academic” (Preissle, 2006, p. 685) and to build their own community of practice that transcend the boundaries among the varied research paradigms, such as positivism, interpretivism, postpositivism, critical scholarship, feminism, postcolonialism, postmodernism, and poststructuralism. Therefore, the incorporation of the identity theories with varied paradigmatic and disciplinary backgrounds into the study’s theoretical framework shows my intention to explore the ways to improve interdisciplinary identity research in education.

Adaptive Functions of the Symbolic Self and Its Multiplicities

In this study, individual identity is primarily conceptualized with the idea of the symbolic self, which refers to “a flexible and multifaceted cognitive representation of an organism’s own attributes” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 1997, p. 80), including individual’s “personality and characteristics in the memory system” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000, p. 92) as well as “demographic, physical trait, or behavioral attributes” (p. 92). According to Sedikides and Skowronski (1997), the symbolic self differs from the mere “objectified self” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 1997, p. 82), which requires the capability to bring one’s own attention to the self as an object, and also differs from the “subjective self-
awareness” (p. 82), which is his or her capability to differentiate the self from the physical and social environment.

Rather, the construction and maintenance of the symbolic self involves more sophisticated human practices of the “adaptive function” which Sedikides and Skowronski (1997) described as “the regulation of cognitive, affective, motivational, and behavioral processes in a variety of intrapersonal and interpersonal domains” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 1997, p. 84). This means that the symbolic self evolved from the primitive humans’ ecological and social adaptations in a living environment (e.g., food procurement, hunting, etc.), and has been continuously practiced by all humans who engage in social and linguistic communication (Sedikides & Skowronski, 1997, 2000). Therefore, the symbolic self include both the attributes universal to human history and the attributes unique to individuals’ life experiences within particular social system.

This evolutionary psychological perspective on the adaptive function call our attention not only to individuals’ idiosyncratic affects but also to contextual influences, what other theorists may call the “universe of discourse” (Mead, 1956, cited in McCallister, 2004) or Discourse (Gee, 2005).² Conceptualizing identity in relation to the external contexts is important to this study on the identities of the Japanese sojourning children who experience migration and linguistic and cultural adaptation across two countries. By portraying their individually unique experiences as case studies, this study generates more fundamental analysis and theory that were assumed to originate, in part, in universal adaptation functions and also in their external life contexts.

² In Gee’s (2005) views, Discourse involve various “social practices and mental entities, as well as material realities” (p. 32) across various people, social communities, and time.
Some researchers similarly suggested that the seemingly dichotomized properties of identity, such as the internal and external (i.e., intrapersonal and interpersonal, psychological and ecological mechanisms), are holistically integrated during identity negotiation (McCallister, 2004; Stryker & Burke, 2000; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2004). For instance, Eriksonian identity theory has suggested that identity formation follows “a process located in the core of the individual and yet also in the core of his communal culture” (Erikson, 1968, p. 22, cited in Kraus, 2007, p. 25). This idea resonates with Wenger’s (1998, cited in Wallace, 2004) conceptualization of identity as “the mutuality of the individual and community, not as mere social residue within the individual” (p. 199). McCallister (2004) also discussed the interrelations between individual identities and collective human experiences, and between “contemplation and social interaction” (p. 431). Similarly, the identity theory suggested by Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco (2001) concerned both “the inner and interpersonal worlds” (p. 13).

Moreover, Stryker and Burke (2000), from the symbolic interactionist perspectives, asserted that the identities formed through two different processes—internal “cognitive identity process” (p. 288), such as “self-verification” (p. 287), and external processes related to social structure, such as “identity salience” (p. 286)—were “linked to [one’s] roles and to behavior through meanings” (p. 289). In their views, the roles created through individuals’ cognitive activities to make sense of the social contexts reflected upon their identity-relevant behaviors and the meanings of the contexts. In other words, there were reciprocal relations between their identities formed through their cognitive
schema and those formed externally in relation to social structures. Stryker and Burk (2000) stated, “social structure is made up of interconnecting positions and associated roles, each linked through the activities, resources, and meanings that are controlled mutually or sequentially” (p. 289).

It is important to acknowledge here that the idea of social identity suggested by an increasing number of poststructural scholars have brought attention to the ecological relationship between individual identities and the surrounding environments (Gee, 2001, 2005; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Norton Peirce, 1995; Sfard & Prusak, 2005; Slavkin, 2001). These scholars asserted that identity is not an entity that individuals possess or are fixated with, but rather, a multiple, dynamic, and fluid social phenomenon. According to Gee (2005), social identities are “different ways of participating in different sorts of social groups, cultures, and institutions” (p. 1) and are composed of four interrelated strands: (a) nature-identity that refers to an uncontrollable natural state, such as gender, (b) institutional-identity that refers to a position authorized by social institutions, (c) Discourse identity that refers to individual traits developed through both incidental and intentional social processes, including language learning, and (d) affinity-identity that refers to the experiences shared with certain affinity groups, such as nations and cultures. In Gee’s (2005) views, identity formed within multiple Discourses can also be multiple, fluid in time, multi-scaled, potentially hybrid, and emergent. In the similar line of thoughts, Sfard and Prusak (2005) stated that “identifying is to be understood as the activity in which one uses common resources to create a unique, individually tailored combination” (p. 15, italics in original). Furthermore, some social theories, such as the
community of practice framework (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998), have conceptualized identity as social participation in group practices.

The degrees of access to Discourses and social practices were considered to allow or disallow individuals to recognize themselves in comparison to others in the same social group. The idea of socially recognizing the self has been widely discussed among many researchers across disciplines (Gee, 2005; Mead, 1956; Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco, 2001). For instance, Mead (1956, cited in McCallister, 2004) argued that “one’s sense of self emerges as a person internalizes how he or she is perceived by others across a range of social contexts” (p. 431). Such phenomenon was also understood as social mirroring (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001) and as social recognition (Gee, 2005). Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) conceptualized three types of socially negotiated identities: (a) imposed (non-negotiable) identities that cannot be contested by individuals in given contexts; (b) assumed (non-negotiated) identities that are legitimized by the dominant discourses and not contested by individuals; and (c) negotiable identities that can be contested by individuals or groups.

In addition, Slavkin (2001) described individual identities in relation to problem solving behaviors by adopting the human ecological theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1972, 1979, cited in Slavkin, 2001) which systematically conceptualized the inseparable relations between physical environments and four psychological environments, including “microsystem,” “mesosystem,” “exosystem,” and “macrosystem” (p. 242). The researcher asserted that posing the questions based on these multi-systems illuminates the identity pertaining to particular human experiences. Gee (2001) similarly supported the
use of macro-level questions (e.g., asking how institutions ensure certain types of
identities among students) and micro-level questions (e.g., asking how certain types of
identities are negotiated in social interactions) in his work of operationalizing the concept
of identity for educational research.

Thus, although previous researchers, especially the poststructuralists, placed a
stronger emphasis on the social contexts of identity formation than on the internal
mechanisms, their conceptualizations of identity certainly have suggested one critical
interpretation of multiple identities intricately related to the surrounding environments.
The key idea is that identity researches have not viewed individuals situated within the
environments like the objects but understood them ecologically relating to the social
contexts. Sedikides and Skowronski (2000) regarded such ecological interrelations as the
essence of human adaptation and stated the following:

The capacity to form and use a symbolic self added malleability, flexibility, and
purpose to the individual’s cognitive armamentarium and, by doing this, enhanced
the adaptive fit between individuals and their environment. (p. 99)

The Roles of Language in the Symbolic Self

Sedikides and Skowronski (2000) explained that the cognitive capabilities
required for the symbolic self are, in large parts, language-based since the human
adaptation involved the pressure not only from the surrounding physical environments
but also from varied social relationships. In their views, the “environmental pressure” can
enhance individuals’ “symbolic reasoning” (e.g., planning, decision making, and
imagination) while the “social pressure” (p. 96) can improve their “social intelligence”
social strategies based on role differentiation, and “communication capabilities” (p. 99). Especially in the social communities with flexible role differentiation, individuals develop “a symbolic self that could better keep up with rapidly changing situations, subgroups, and interactions” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000).

In this study, the identity associated with language practices is particularly important to the sojourning children who become members of their school communities in more than one linguistic context. Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) stated that language learners’ identity options include their “linguistic competence and ability to claim a ‘voice’ in a second language” (p. 22). Bialystok and Hakuta (1994) also stated that “language determines not only how we are judged by others but how we judge ourselves and define a critical aspect of our identity: who we are is partially shaped by what language we speak” (p. 31).

Some poststructural theorists have argued that the underlying ideologies and power relations within human discourse impact on learners’ language learning experiences and their identities (Bourdieu, 1991; Fairclough, 2001; Foucault, 1984). In Bourdieu’s (1991) view, language is not a mere mean of communication but a medium of power through which individuals pursue their own interests and display their practical competence. Their linguistic utterances are, then, products of the relations between a linguistic market and its linguistic habitus—the schemes of disposition, perception, thought, and action. In other words, when individuals use a language in particular ways, they organize their linguistic resources and implicitly accommodate the demands of particular social market. In this sense, every linguistic interaction holds the traces of the
social structure that contributes to the social reproduction of particular ideologies and linguistic order. This view of language resonates with the idea of “heteroglossia” (Bakhtin, 1981, cited in Pagnucci, 2004, p. 3) that refers to “the fluid, ever changing, chaotic nature of language, the way all words are infused with social, political, and cultural baggage, with ideological intention, with the stories of each speaker’s life” (p.3).

This idea suggests that, though individuals’ utterances seem to display their original intentions and purposes, they, after all, represent “a specific ideological-belief system, a way of seeing the world” (Morris, 1994, p. 73) and “traces and echoes of other texts and utterances” (Bakhtin, 1981, cited in Pavlenko, 2006, p. 8). Sfard and Prusak (2005) also stated that “identities are products of discursive diffusion—of our proclivity to recycle strips of things said by others even if we are unaware of these texts’ origins” (p. 18).

Given the connections between language and socially embedded ideologies, identity has been theorized particularly in relation to second language acquisition (SLA) in three major disciplinary areas, sociology/social theory, linguistic/sociolinguistic, and social psychology (Dittmar et al., 1998). Some sociolinguistic theorists, for instance, have suggested that language learners’ identities impact on the levels and nature of their SLA (Giles & Johnson, 1981, 1987; Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In the social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), identities are characterized with the learners’ psycholinguistic strategies, such as code-switching and accentuating ethnic dialects. The ethnolinguistic identity theory (Giles & Johnson, 1981; 1987) further suggested that the learners’ success in SLA was affected by their perceptions of their own ethnic language vitality, ethnic group boundaries, and their memberships in multiple
social groups. Moreover, Ochs (1993) described learners’ language usages during the process of language socialization as the displays of their group memberships and identities. In Corson’s (2001) view, discursive practices allow individuals to interpret social realities, experience visible and invisible social recognitions, and expand self-consciousness.

The language-based representations of the self were also conceptualized by the researchers whose primary interests were the identities manifested through stories, narratives, and voices (Miller, 2004; Pagnucci, 2004; Sfard & Prusak, 2005). It is important to restate here that, in this study, case studies serve as analytical presentations of children’s individual stories and unique agenda which are all expressed in their lively voices. In the following quotation, Miller (2004) described the “literal yet highly symbolic sense” (p. 293) of individual voices:

Speaking is itself a critical tool of representation, a way of representing the self and others. It is the means through which identity is constituted, and agency or self-advocacy is made manifest. In other words, we represent and negotiate identity, and construct that of others, through speaking and hearing. (p. 293)

Miller (2004) also explained that “being audible to others, and being heard and acknowledged as a speaker of English” (p. 294) determines the learners’ participation in schools and societies. In her view, school is the site of self-representation for linguistic minority learners who receive “different opportunities, constraints, and conditions to speak” (Miller, 2004, p. 295).

Sfard and Prusak (2005) also suggested that identity serves as an analytical tool for investigating learning when it is operationalized as narratives or the “stories about persons” (p. 14). They viewed individual identities as “reifying, endorsable, and
significant” (p. 16, italics in original) stories that are “human-made and not God-given” (p. 17). In their views, identities reflect “the activity of communication, conceived broadly as including self-dialogue—that is, thinking” (p. 16). Identities as stories or narratives, then, serve as the “discursive counterparts of one’s lived experiences” (Sfard & Prusak, 2005, p. 17, italics in original) and also as “the missing link” (p. 15) between learning and sociocultural context.

Though the interchangeable use of stories and narratives is not always well accepted (Juzwik, 2006), Sfard and Prusak’s (2005) conceptualization of individual identities as their linguistically shared voices has echoed with Pagnucci’s (2004) idea of narrative identities. In his view, narratives in individuals’ own languages reveal their “continual reinterpretation” (Pagnucci, 2004, p. 53) of own experiences and, therefore, are considered as the expressions of their identities. Moreover, Pagnucci (2004) indicated that expressing identities through storytelling has a potential to be an empowering process for individuals since their narrative identities allow them to engage in “learning to take pleasure in unruly answers” (p. 53).

Self-Evaluation Motives and Learning

Sedikides and Skowronski (2000) explained that the symbolic self involves individuals’ “perceptions of the self to vary across the situations” (p. 93). This means that individuals not only receptively perceive the self but also actively engage in seeking information about the self, “making choices, coping with feedback, and experiencing the emotional consequences of outcomes” (p. 93). This “self-motivated information-seeking

---

3 Juzwik (2006) further defined narrative as “a unit of discourse” within one’s life story, which is “a broader unit constituted by narratives, as well as by other forms of discourse” (p. 17).
process” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000, p. 101) was theorized by Sedikides and Skowronski (2000) with three types of goal-oriented self-evaluation motives, “valuation motives, learning motives, and homeostatic motives” (p. 101, italics in original).

To be specific, the valuation motives are characterized with the individuals’ desire for self-protection to filter out the unfavorable information and for self-enhancement to filter in favorable information. These motives allow the individuals to select “an optimum combination of challenge and success probability” (p. 103), which maximizes the benefit for the symbolic self, and to maintain and enhance self-esteem. Next, the learning motives represent individuals’ desire for self-assessment to gain accurate knowledge of the self and also for self-improvement to increase a sense of progress. These motives bring clarity and enrichment to the symbolic self and promote “positive feelings of personal adjustment” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000, p. 105).

Lastly, the homeostatic motives are for self-verification of pursuing the control and consistency of the symbolic self. The homeostatic motives stabilize the symbolic self and cultivate “a sense of efficacy” (p. 105). Individuals are also able to solicit self-confirming information, feedback, and behaviors, and often make biased interpretation, inference, and recall regarding ambiguous information. Such processes of self-verification allow individuals to “resist unwarranted changes in self-knowledge, thus maintaining the integrity of the self concept” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000, p. 108). Moreover, the homeostatic motives are regarded as the most powerful motives among all when an individual is certain about the possession of some previously established attributes. Similar to their views, Stryker and Burke (2000) stated that self-verification
brings “situationally perceived self-relevant meanings into agreement with identity standard” (p. 286).

These self-evaluation motives, in the views of Sedikides and Skowronski (2000), complementarily promote “the adaptive values of the symbolic self” (p. 101) since they are activated and prioritized by available information in the environment as well as by their goal-oriented actions congruent to the information. The information include “the generation, refinement, and testing of hypotheses concerning the quality of the person-environment fit” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000, p. 107) while the actions refer to “opportunistic responses to existing conditions or to the strategic creation of new conditions that could yield beneficial outcomes or bypass harmful ones” (p. 107).

When these motives based on information and actions are carried out effectively, they eventually improve individuals’ “standing in the group” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000, P. 101) and positively affect their cognitive, affective, and behavioral functions. For instance, they may experience high self-esteem and satisfaction, positive emotions, and effective connections between feedback and motives. Sedikides and Skowronski (2000) stated that “the emotion of happiness would be produced when the organism fit environmental requirements and was also challenged adequately” (p. 107).

For sojourning children who receive different contextual information from two countries, the self-evaluation motives and their enactment of the motives become crucial for their social and emotional experiences and overall language and academic learning in school. According to Sfard and Prusak (2005), learning occurs when the learner shifts his or her “actual identity” to the “designated identity” (p. 18). In a framework of
collaborative empowerment, Cummins (1996; 2000) also suggested that the contextual information and linguistic minority students’ classroom interactions influence their identities and learning practices. In his view, transformative and intercultural interactions in classroom promote the learners’ positive identities, successful learning, and eventual empowerment whereas the coercive interactions create their negative identities and unsuccessful learning. This idea is supported by Deweyan philosophy of democratic communication in classroom. Dewey (1916) asserted that students’ active and critical classroom participation provide the opportunities to invent their own forms of freedom and individualities in an open-ended manner. In his view, educational contexts are seemingly unpredictable but flow into the particular directions like the river water. Thus, if positive forms of communication are promoted in classrooms, students’ identities have the potential to serve as a directing force for learning and educational change.

From a social psychologist’s point of view, Steele (1997) also asserted that minority students’ performance declined on various academic tasks when they experienced the threats on their identities. Similarly, Bracher (2002) suggested, from a psychoanalytic perspective, that the threats to “a secure identity” (p. 94) not only “prevent learning and development, but actually trigger resistance and regression (p. 175). In his view, students and teachers all have the very fundamental desire for a secure sense of self and usually engage in the process of self verification to achieve “identity-supporting recognition” (p. 97). Bracher (2002) suggested three types of fundamental desire which have the potential to become their identity components: (a) Symbolic register—the desire to be recognized with certain signifiers, such as “intelligent” and “an
excellent student,” (b) Imaginary register—the desire to be recognized with our bodily appearance and effectivity, (c) Real register—the desire to be recognized with positive characteristics, such as charm, charisma, and sex appeal, and to experience positive emotions. According to Bracher (2002), educators must understand their students’ “multiple and conflicting identity components and desires in which education occurs” (p. 23) in order to support their learning and positive identities. Thus, varied desires and motives are contextually determined while strongly influencing identity negotiation and learning in classroom.

Stabilities and Changes of the Symbolic Self

The concept of the symbolic self explains the possible influences of human development in the processes of identity negotiation. Sedikides and Skowronski (1997) stated that “the structure of the symbolic self is relatively stable, persists across time, and is transformed predictably as a function of development” (p. 84). This idea is supported by Damon and Hart (1986; 1988) who conceptualized a developmental model of self-understanding. Based on the three-year study on self-understanding of the children and adolescents (age 4-18), Damon and Hart (1986) found that the participants’ self-perceptions, which were represented as the physical, active, social, and psychological attributes, took “regular and predictable” (p. 102) path for transformations, and that the changes of identities in childhood through adolescence were stable and consistent in four strands, including continuity, distinctness, volition, and self-reflection. For instance, the children in the middle and late childhood, like the participants of this study, understood their psychological self based on “activity-related emotional status” (Damon & Hart,
1986, p. 110) as compared to the children in early childhood, who referred to “momentary moods,” and early adolescents, who referred to “social sensitivity” (p. 110). While the learners in childhood experience their self-reflection through “the awareness of body features, typical activities, and action capabilities” (Damon & Hart, 1986, p. 110), the adolescents’ self-reflection is based on their “recognition of conscious and unconscious psychological processes” (p. 110). These are just some examples of the development progression of identity formation, but suggest predictable changes of identities across ages.

It has been widely acknowledged that identity formation is a continuous and cumulative process over individual’s life span (Kraus, 2007; Marcia, 2007). According to Kagan (1984, cited in McCallister, 2004), the order of developing identity components proceeds from children’s “stable and unchanging [identity] based on fixed characteristics of being” (McCallister, 2004, p. 430) to “malleable and changing [identity] based on social affiliations and evolving standards” (p. 430). This progression emphasizes individuals’ internal processing of personal traits that are also “a reflection of the nature of the society” (McCallister, 2004, p. 430). The societal influences on identity were also emphasized by Marcia (2007) who asserted that the process of identity formation involves both psychological and social stages. According to the researcher, these stages are “marked by a somatic-societal mutuality” which means that “what an individual can do meshes with what a society requires; and what the individual needs corresponds to what a society provides” (Marcia, 2007, p. 2, italics in original). In Tomasello’s (1999, cited in McCallister, 2004) theory, humans are “biologically endowed with the capacity
to think socially” (p. 431), and, therefore, a process of identity formation becomes “a pivotal mechanism” (p. 430) as children develop their capabilities for social functioning. It is also important to indicate that the stabilities and changes of the symbolic self rely on individuals’ cognitive capacities to store their “self-relevant information” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000, p. 93) in “the essential library of [their] past and present and the repository for [their] goals and aspirations for the future” (p. 94). The self-relevant information is equal to the “temporally organized semantic, episodic, and perceptual representations of an individual’s personal history” (p. 92), including:

1. Knowledge about goals, values, and feelings.
2. Imagined, desired, or feared information in future or hypothetical contexts.
3. Information about possessions, social roles, and social relations, and beliefs about how others might perceive one’s personality and characteristics.

Sedikides and Skowronski (2000) stated that “the self that one is experiencing at any given moment (the phenomenal self-concept) may simply be a reflection of the self-representation that is temporarily activated in working memory” (p. 93). This idea resonates with the notion that identity is three-dimensional in time, comprising identities in the past, present, and future (Kanno & Norton, 2003).

Furthermore, Sedikides and Skowronski (2000) asserted that the shifts of the symbolic self across time and situations are, in part, caused by the activation or deactivation of the above described self-information. In the processes of activating or deactivating different aspects of identities, individuals often “develop and store bodies of self-relevant information that are inconsistent with each other” (p. 93). Diverse self-representations stored in memory are not always well integrated and, therefore, may
cause “the notorious malleability of the self-concept” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000, p. 93). This idea explains the contradictions and hybridities of identity frequently reported in previous identity research (e.g., Kanno, 2003; Pagnucci, 2004).

The inconsistent self knowledge in memory can be also interpreted positively as the flexibility and reflexive potentials of identities which allow individuals to build upon their life history and use their imagination. In other words, the representations of the self from the past, present and future are in a synergic relation when forming the symbolic self. This is apparent in the studies of linguistic and cultural minority learners who envisioned so called a third space where their hybrid identities were believed to be legitimatized (e.g., Giampapa, 2004; Kanno, 2003; Sarroub, 2001). Giampapa (2004) stated that previous identity researchers have used various spatial metaphors to conceptualize identity, including “position, location, inside-out, global-local, third space” (p. 193), and that these metaphors were “not only geographical, but also imagined, drawing on transnational connections that function in a unifying way through difference” (p. 193). Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) stated that the notion of hybrid identities as a third space reveal “new and alternative identity options” (p. 17) that transcend existing linguistic, cultural, and national boundaries.

The overlap between space and identity resonates with Dewyean philosophy of self-realizations, potentialities, and “temporal seriality” (Dewey, 1998, p. 102) which were viewed dependent on particular time and place. In Deweyan pragmatics, identity negotiation involves unpredictable social interactions and self-realizations of own “moral, intellectual, and physical improvement” (Martinez Aleman, 2001, p. 385). This idea
corresponds to the notion that certain identities become available to students as they develop varied competences within classroom environments (e.g., Day, 2002; Toohey, 2000). In addition, the freedom of self-realization and the hope for the imagined and unpredictable growth of identities are essential in Deweyan utopian views of individuality and potentiality (Martinez Aleman, 2001; Rorty, 1999). This view echoes with an implication of identity suggested by Suárez-Orozco and associates (2004) which was to “envision their future and mobilize toward that realization” (p. 427). The Deweyan pragmatic ethics and flexible conceptualization of identity in terms of time and space have suggested all students’ continuous growths of individualities.

Summary

In this chapter, I outlined this study’s theoretical framework based on the theory of the symbolic self (Sedikides & Skowronski, 1997, 2000; Skowronski & Sedikides, 1999) as well as varied previous identity theories across disciplines. By doing so, I set a clear conceptual foundation to regard identity as adaptive, holistic, language-based, developmental, procedural, and flexible human experiences. The ecological interplays between internal and external constructs were emphasized based on poststructural interpretations of identity as a social phenomenon. Most importantly, previous identity theories across disciplines suggested that linguistic minority learners, such as Japanese sojourning children in this study, form and negotiate their identities in relation to their learning environments while experiencing emotional consequences, learning outcomes, and stabilities and changes of the self.
In the next chapter, the theoretical framework presented in this chapter will be tied into my general research perspectives and my selection of research methods. The theoretical framework will also logically support the organization and content of the remaining chapters which present five Japanese children’s individually unique stories as multiple case studies and extend the findings into a more universal theorization of elementary sojourners’ identity negotiation.
CHAPTER 4
METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

The identities of five Japanese elementary sojourners in this study holistically encompass their symbolic representations of the self, social practices, membership in school communities, perceptions of time, varied school-related actions, beliefs, and imagination. Understanding their identity negotiation, therefore, is a task inseparable from the ambiguities of human experiences and required multiple research strategies to unfold individual stories of sojourning, the trajectories of the negotiation, and theoretical possibilities of the findings. The purpose of this chapter is to present the methodology and specific research design for executing this study. The major research question of the study concerned the ways in which these children, in the second through sixth grade, perceive themselves in school while sojourning between Japan and the United States. More specifically, this study asked what self-relevant attributes are salient to their student identities and by what processes they internally and externally shape and negotiate their student identities.

The answers to the posed research questions were generated with the inductive methods which placed co-interpretation of meanings as the heart of the study. Multiple data collection strategies were employed during four to six months study periods for each child, beginning with collecting his or her background information and subsequently

---

4 The term, “methodology,” refers to the interpretive framework or “paradigm” that guides a particular research study (Lather, 1992). It includes but is not limited to “method” which stands for the technique for gathering and analyzing empirical evidence.
involving in-depth interviews, classroom observations, informant (teacher and parent) interviews, and collecting school artifacts. The data collection took place simultaneously with the data analysis.

The overall research design is exploratory and unique in the following aspects:

1. Involving two cross-sections of child participants in order to capture the processes of identity negotiation over time: the section one with the children who were to move to the United States and the section two with the ones who were to return to Japan.

2. Conducting child in-depth interviews cross-nationally in Japan and the United States since I assumed that each child’s U.S. sojourning was integrated into a natural continuum of his or her life experiences across two countries rather than beginning or ending abruptly upon the physical relocations to and from the United States.

3. Incorporating drawing activities into the child interview sessions in order to facilitate the conversation.

4. Employing indirect member-checking through interpretive focus group (IFG) interviews with Japanese adolescents and young adults as part of the data analysis procedure.

This chapter first presents my specific research perspectives from which this study was designed and conducted in connection to the theoretical framework described in Chapter 3. Followed are the detailed explanations of research contexts, participants and sampling, the multiple methods used for data collection and analysis, and the validity and reliability of the study. The chapter concludes with a summary and also a roadmap for reporting and discussing the findings in the remaining chapters.

Research Perspectives: Co-interpretation of Multiple Meanings

In the previous chapter, I presented the theoretical framework of this study and stated the following main conceptual foundation:
1. Identities are the holistic entities encompassing varied ways of individuals’ ecological engagement in intrapersonal and interpersonal experiences, including their practices of cognitive, linguistic, psychological, emotional, and social capacities.

2. Interdisciplinary approaches need to be explored in order to illuminate the holistic identities.

These ideas are based on my epistemological beliefs that the human phenomena, such as identity formation and negotiation, have multiple possible meanings, and that the knowledge of the focused phenomenon in particular social contexts can be constructed through understanding the meanings.

The interpretive research approach (Creswell, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006; Merriam, 1998; Neuman, 2000) is, therefore, the major research perspective taken in this study. Interpretive researchers are interested in understanding the multiple layers of meanings constructed by people regarding social realities (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Merriam, 1998; Neuman, 2003), and assume that the processes of making the social meanings are value-laden, involving co-interpretations practiced by the researcher and the participant(s) (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006). Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2006) described interpretive research as the following:

Reflexive and process driven, ultimately producing culturally situated and theory-enmeshed knowledge through an ongoing interplay between theory and methods, research and researched. (p. 5, italics in original)

In this study, I perceive all participants and myself as the ecological organisms whose

---

5 Interpretive research is often used as an umbrella term to describe the characteristics of qualitative research paradigm in general (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006) ranging from the traditional perspectives, such as positivism, through the non-traditional perspectives, such as postmodernism.
mental schema coexisted in a seemingly complex matrix of the focused phenomenon.

For the purpose of co-interpretation as well as “knowledge-producing conversation” (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006, p. 128, italics in original), it was absolutely essential for me to work towards building a rapport with all participants and to practice the researcher’s “reflexivity: the ongoing questioning of one’s place and power relations within the research process” (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2005, p. 38). Viewing myself as the “primary instrument” (Merriam, 1998, p.20) of the study, I practiced the followings:

1. Allowing the participants to claim their expertise by presenting myself as a learner not an authoritative figure (i.e., to ask the participants to teach me how to interpret their shared stories, to avoid making any judgmental comments on their actions and viewpoints, and to use “watashi [I]” to refer to myself even when they knew my teaching background and called me, “sensei [teacher]” 6)

2. Interacting with all participants with respect. (i.e., to be an active and empathetic listener and to keep an unobtrusive manner during classrooms observations)

3. Acknowledging the potential biases and benefits from my own linguistic, cultural, personal, and professional backgrounds

This study also followed the basic procedural guidelines suggested by the constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 1995; 2006). The suggested strategies, such as the three-stage in-depth interview and constant comparative analysis allowed this study to inductively generate the interpretations legitimate to the views of all participants and the researcher as well as to the previous identity theories. They also enhanced the depths of interpretations by capturing “how—and sometimes why—participants construct meanings and actions in specific situation” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 130, italics in original). Furthermore,

---

6 In Japanese conversations, many teachers call themselves “sensei (teacher)” when speaking to their students.
the constructivist grounded theory approach, when regarded as “a set of principles and practices, not as prescriptions or packages” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 9), revealed the interdisciplinary orientations embedded in the findings and extended their potential theoretical implications. This was also one of the strengths of interpretive research approach which Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2006) described as “an exciting interdisciplinary landscape rich with perspectives on knowledge construction” (p. 5).

In addition, the multiple case study approach (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 2005; Yin, 2002, 2003) was an integral part of overall interpretive research processes and bestowed several advantages on the study. First, the systematic case organization of each Japanese child as the unit of analysis was necessary to set the effective flows of “logical persuasion” (Merriam, 1998, p. 41) that extended the focus on the “particularistic” (Merriam, 1998, p. 29) and “experiential knowledge” (Stake, 2005, p. 12, italics in original) of the studied phenomenon into the collective interpretations. Reflecting its “iterative nature of explanation building” (Yin, 2002), the case organization also allowed this study to create “multiple sources of evidence” (Yin, 2003), which could be triangulated for “the discovery of new meanings” (Merriam, 1998, p. 30), and refine emerging categories through the “cross-case synthesis” (Yin, 2002, p. 133).

Second, the multiple case study approach was useful for illuminating “contextual conditions” (Yin, 2002, p. 13) within each of the “embedded cases” (p. 6) as well as across cases and for capturing the “rich, ‘thick’ description[s] of the phenomenon under study” (Merriam, 1998, p. 29). The case study researchers assume that “the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 2002, p. 13). This
assumption was consistent with my afore-described conceptual assumption that negotiating individual identities is inseparable from their ever-changing contexts of realities. Third, this approach was considered “the adventure full of promise for discovery” (Merriam, 1998, p. 21) and, therefore, promoted the openness and flexibilities toward the necessary shifts of perspectives and research practices throughout the study. Such “exploratory” (Yin, 2002, p. 3) research conduct was critical to this study since studying the unpredictable social phenomenon, such as identity negotiation, is the processes of discovery. Charmaz (2006) stated:

The path [of the interpretive research] may present inevitable ambiguities that hurl you into the existential dislocation of bewilderment. Still, when you bring passion, curiosity, openness, and care to your work, novel experiences will ensue and your ideas will emerge. (p. 185)

The harmonious integrations of interpretive perspectives, constructivist grounded theory approach, and multiple case study approach promoted the exploration of the ambiguities embedded in the interpretations of realities unique to the Japanese sojourning children’s worldviews and standpoints. Thus, the systematic yet iterative research perspectives added the depths and breadths to the co-interpretation.

Cross-National Research Contexts

The data collection took place in Japan and the United States from October 2006 through November 2007. For all child participants, one of the child in-depth interviews took place in Japan either before or after their U.S. sojourning and, therefore, I visited Japan twice in December 2006 and May 2007. The sites for the interviews in Japan included the child’s home, public library, and café, based on parents’ preference as well as on the criteria: (a) convenient for the participants’ access (b) quiet for recording, and (c)
comfortable for seating and drawing. During my second visit to Japan, two IFG
interviews also took place in Tokyo and Osaka, respectively. The research site for each
interview was a quiet meeting room arranged by a participant’s father in his workplace.

The research sites in the United States were the Spring Lake School and the
Oakfield School, the public elementary schools (K-8) in which my child participants
were enrolled.7 Both schools belonged to a sub-suburban school district near Boston.
With high reputation for educational excellence, the district offered various enrichment
and support programs for its diverse student population. For the English language
learners (ELLs), the ELL programs offered sheltered English instruction and the language
support programs provided bilingual instruction in six different languages, including
Japanese.8 These were one-year programs but extendable upon request. Spring Lake and
Oakfield both housed the Japanese language support program, or what is known as the
JELL program. Many of their Japanese-speaking students were the children of medical
researchers since there were numerous medical research institutes near the district.

The Spring Lake School had consistently a large number of Japanese students in
the past few decades. About 100 out of approximately 500 students were Japanese. The
school valued its Japanese community and promoted cultural exchange through various
events (i.e., the Japanese craft bazaar and an annual study trip for the selected teachers to
visit Japan). Many of the veteran teachers were familiar with Japanese culture and the

---

7 Pseudonyms were used to protect confidentiality.
8 Other languages included Korean, Hebrew, Russian, Chinese, and Spanish. After 2002 when the English
immersion movement abolished bilingual education in all Massachusetts public schools, the district re-
named English as Second Language (ESL) program to ELL program and Transitional Bilingual Education
(TBE) program to the language support program. This change placed the support given in students’ native
languages as supplemental to the instructions in English.
Japanese educational systems due to their participation in the trip in the past. There were three JELL teachers, who provided in-class support, while the ELL program offered pull-out lessons. The child in-depth interviews and parent interviews took place in a small conference room and the teacher interviews were in each teacher’s classroom.

The Oakfield School had approximately 20 Japanese students among a total of approximately 400 students. The JELL and ELL programs provided the pull-out support for Japanese students. There was only one Japanese-speaking JELL teacher who worked two days a week. I conducted the child and parent interviews either in the school library or at a quiet seating area in the hallway, and the teacher interviews in the classrooms.

Both schools seemed to provide positive learning environments in which diverse learners, including Japanese sojourning students, were adequately challenged and supported to maximize their potentialities for learning. All classrooms that I observed similarly had an abundant amount of educational resources, the walls filled with artful displays of students’ works and educational posters. Both school buildings were newly renovated and created a bright and airy atmosphere throughout. Each classroom featured large sun-filled windows, built-in book shelves, window seats, and high ceilings. All teachers were very open and cooperative to an outside researcher, like myself, and I always felt welcome to visit their classrooms.

Participants and Sampling

The primary participants were five Japanese children in two cross-sections; the section one with two boys, Haruya and Wataru, who were in the stage of leaving Japan and becoming newcomers in their U.S. schools, and section two with one boy, Tsubasa,
and two girls, Misaki and Yayoi, who were in the stage of concluding their U.S. school lives and returning to Japan. This cross-sectional design allowed me to view these children’s overall sojourning experiences through their multiple lenses.

As Table 4.1 shows, the ages of children ranged from 8 (the second grade) through 12 (the sixth grade). Though section one had only boys, section two represented male and female. More than one child in each group and more than one gender across groups created heterogeneous representations of the participants. Regardless of the birth place, all children had some educational experiences in Japan and had never lived in the United States prior to their sojourning. Their families had high socioeconomic status due to parents’ elite occupations (i.e., medical researcher, banker, and professional sports agent). All children were either the only or the oldest child in the family. In addition, Wataru was enrolled in Oakfield while the other four children went to Spring Lake.

Table 4.1 Personal and Family Information of Child Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-section</th>
<th>Name (Gender)</th>
<th>Age/Grade in US (DOB)</th>
<th>Birth Place</th>
<th>Parent Info. (f: father, m: mother)</th>
<th>Sibling (Age/Grade in US)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section One</strong></td>
<td>Haruya (M)</td>
<td>9/Gr. 3 (7/10/97)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Medical researchers (f &amp; m)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wataru (M)</td>
<td>8/Gr. 2 (3/23/99)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Sports agent (f)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section Two</strong></td>
<td>Misaki (F)</td>
<td>10/Gr. 4 (9/22/96)</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>Banker (f)</td>
<td>Sister (5/K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tsubasa (M)</td>
<td>9/Gr. 4 (7/15/97)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Medical researcher (f)</td>
<td>Sister (4/K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yayoi (F)</td>
<td>12/Gr. 6 (5/15/94)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Medical researcher (f)</td>
<td>Sister (9/Gr.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Pseudonyms are used for all participants.
The next table (Table 4.2) presents the durations of each child’s U.S. sojourning as well as the timeframe of their research participation starting from my initial contact.

**Table 4.2 Durations of U.S. Schooling and Research Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-section</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Duration of Stay in U.S.</th>
<th>Duration Diagrams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section One</strong></td>
<td>Haruya</td>
<td>3 yrs. (planned)</td>
<td>Feb. 07 – Mar. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 06 – June 07 (6 mos.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wataru</td>
<td>5 yrs. (planned)</td>
<td>June 07 – June 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May – Nov. 07 (6 mos.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section Two</strong></td>
<td>Tsubasa</td>
<td>4 yrs.</td>
<td>Apr. 03 – Mar. 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misaki</td>
<td>2 yrs. &amp; 8 mos.</td>
<td>Aug. 04 – Mar. 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yayoi</td>
<td>11 mos.</td>
<td>May 06 – Mar. 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. – May 07 (4 mos.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. – May 07 (4 mos.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The planned durations of U.S. sojourning for the section one children were for either 3 or 5 years while the completed durations for the section two children varied between eleven months and 4 years. The duration diagrams in the table visually display the different stages of sojourning covered by each cross-section: The section one children participated...
in the study for about 6 months during the early stages of their sojourning while the
section two did for about 4 months during the late stages.

The purposive snowball sampling technique was used to recruit all children based
on the following four sampling criteria:

1. Hold Japanese nationality
2. Enrolled in elementary grades, preferably the middle through upper grades
3. Temporarily sojourn/plan to sojourn in the United States for one to four years
4. Having no history of disabilities

The sampling sources were the individuals, who were likely to know about incoming and
outgoing Japanese families in Spring Lake or Oakfield, and included JELL teachers,
Japanese families, and an ELL coordinator of the school district. Although I immediately
recruited Haruya in November 2006 with the Oakfield JELL teacher’s referral, I faced the
difficulty to find another participant for the section one and needed to contact additional
sources, such as Japan Oversea Educational Services; international schools in Japan, a
returnee support group; and Japanese online communities.\(^{10}\) Six months later in May,
2007, I finally recruited Wataru with the ELL coordinator’s referral.\(^{11}\) Finding the section
two participants in January 2007 was comparatively easy with the help from Spring
Lake’s JELL teachers since many Japanese families traditionally returned to Japan in the

\(^{10}\) The Japan Oversea Educational Services (\textit{Kaigaishijo-kyouiku-shinkou-zaidan}) is a non-profit
organization which offers \textit{kaigaishijos}, \textit{kikokushijos}, and their families various supports (e.g., language
learning/maintenance in Japanese and English, online and face-to-face counseling services, etc.).

\(^{11}\) For the section one, it was simply challenging to identify and recruit the children before their actual
move to the United States for three major reasons: First, incoming Japanese families did not necessarily
have to contact the U.S. school prior to their moves. They rather chose to contact the ELL coordinator after
their arrival. Second, the timings of their moves could shift due to U.S. immigration visa process and,
therefore, many families chose not to immediately announce their U.S. sojourned. Third, there was an
issue of locality: While I was focusing on the children who would be coming to the two particular U.S.
elementary schools, their places of origin could be anywhere in Japan.
end of March before the new school year begins in April. All parents agreed on their children’s research participation and signed the informed consent documents. All children also signed the assent document. Since the study involved elementary students representing the vulnerable population in social hierarchies, ethical consideration was taken seriously and the voluntary nature of their participation was emphasized.

This study was also informed by secondary participants, including the children’s parents (mother or father), their U.S. mainstream classroom teachers, and Japanese former sojourners. Upon identifying the child participants, their parents were asked to serve as the informants about the children. All mothers and Haruya’s father agreed to participate and signed the informed consent documents for their participation when they gave their permissions to their children’s participation. All fathers worked full time in the United States while all mothers, except for Haruya’s mother who was a medical researcher, stayed home. Tsubasa’s mother was a medical doctor in Japan, but chose not to work in the United States. All parents had positive expectations towards their children’s language development in English and Japanese as well as experiences of both Japanese and American culture.

The U.S. classroom teachers also served as the informants of the children. The teachers of the cross-section one children were asked to participate when the children’s classroom placements were confirmed. The teachers of the section two children were recruited when the children first agreed upon their participation. All teachers agreed to

---

12 See Appendix 1 for the parent informed consent document for each cross-sectional group.
13 See Appendix 2 for the assent document written with kanji in either the second/third grade level or the fourth grade level.
14 All were the children’s U.S. mainstream classroom teachers, except for Wataru’s summer champ teacher.
participate and signed the informed consent documents. All teachers were monolingual English-speaking Americans, except for Tsubasa’s teacher who was bilingual in English and Spanish. Their years of teaching ranged from less than five years to over fifteen years. All teachers had some experiences of teaching Japanese sojourning students in the past and were familiar with Japanese culture. Two teachers, Misaki’s and Yayoi’s, have been to Japan as part of the Spring Lake’s annual study trip, and knew about the Japanese educational systems. All teachers, except for Misaki’s, were female.

In addition, twelve Japanese individuals were also recruited to take parts in the interpretive focus group (IFG) interviews and to share their perspectives on my preliminary analyses of the data obtained from the first two child interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Site &amp; School Affiliation</th>
<th>Name (Gender)</th>
<th>Age (DOB)</th>
<th>Duration. Timing of U.S. schooling (Grade)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo Spring Lake</td>
<td>Aya (F)</td>
<td>14 (8/11/92)</td>
<td>2 yrs. Sep. 1998 (K) - Sep. 2000 (Gr.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mai (F)</td>
<td>18 (8/30/88)</td>
<td>2 yrs &amp; 5 mos. March 1998 (Gr.4)-Aug 2000 (Gr.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanae (F)</td>
<td>14 (3/8/93)</td>
<td>2 yrs &amp; 9 mos. Dec. 1999 (Gr.1) - Sep. 2002 (Gr.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kazuya (M)</td>
<td>15 (6/10/91)</td>
<td>2 yrs &amp; 9 mos. Dec. 1999 (Gr.2) - Sep. 2002 (Gr.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osaka Oakfield</td>
<td>Toshi (M)</td>
<td>17 (12/4/89)</td>
<td>1yr. July 1998 (Gr.5) - June 1999 (Gr.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masa (M)</td>
<td>22 (11/17/84)</td>
<td>1yr. April. 1998 (Gr.7) - March 1999 (Gr.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yuta (M)</td>
<td>18 (12/28/88)</td>
<td>1 yr &amp; 2 mos. April, 1997 (Gr.2)- June, 1998(Gr.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satoru (M)</td>
<td>21 (5/13/86)</td>
<td>1 yr &amp; 2 mos. April, 1997 (Gr.4)-June, 1998(Gr.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fumi (F)</td>
<td>18 (10/13/88)</td>
<td>1 yr &amp; 9 mos. July, 1998 (Gr.3) - April, 2000 (Gr.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hinako (F)</td>
<td>14 (10/22/92)</td>
<td>2yrs. Sep. 1997 (Pre-K) - Aug. 1999 (K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruriko (F)</td>
<td>16 (12/30/90)</td>
<td>2yrs. Sep. 1997 (Gr.1) - Aug. 1999 (Gr.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atsushi (M)</td>
<td>21 (10/23/85)</td>
<td>2yrs. Sep. 1997 (Gr.5) - Aug. 1999 (Gr.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4.3 shows, the IFG participants included six males and six females aged

---

15 See Appendix 3 for the teacher informed consent document.
between 14 and 22. The group in Tokyo consisted of four former Spring Lake students introduced by the JELL teacher, while the group in Osaka had eight former Oakfield students referred by one of the IFG participants. The lengths of their U.S. sojourning ranged from one year through two years and nine months, in between 1997 and 2002. Their grades in the U.S. schools varied from kindergarten through the eighth grade. All of them returned their signed informed consent documents before the interviews took place. Because of their ages and developmental maturity, they were able to well articulate their insights regarding their childhood sojourning experiences.

Data Collection Methods and Procedures

The primary data collection methods included child in-depth interviews, which were enhanced with drawing activities, and classroom observations. The supplemental methods included background information questionnaires (BIQ) and parent BIQ interviews, informant (teachers and parents) interviews, gathering school artifacts, and interpretive focus group (IFG) interviews. These multiple methods were designed to obtain “detailed, focused, and full” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 14) data which “reveal participants’ views, feelings, intentions, and actions as well as the contexts and structures of their lives” (p. 14). Before the following sub-sections present the purposes and the procedures of the primary and supplemental data collection methods in details, the next two tables show the systematic flow of conducting these methods for each cross-section. The systematic cross-sectional research design was an integral part of the iterative and non-linear interpretive research endeavor.

16 See Appendix 4 for the IFG informed consent document.
Table 4.4 Data Collection Procedures for Section One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Context</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Convenient place</td>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>2-3 mos. before moving</td>
<td>1-2 mos. before moving</td>
<td>1-2 mos. after moving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Methods</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child In-depth Interview 1 (Drawing)</td>
<td>Child In-depth Interview 2 (Drawing)</td>
<td>Child In-depth Interview 3 (Drawing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observation 1</td>
<td>Classroom Observation 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplemental Methods</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIQ</td>
<td>Teacher Interview 1</td>
<td>Teacher Interview 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent BIQ Interview</td>
<td>IFG</td>
<td>Parent Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Collecting School Artifacts)

Table 4.5 Data Collection Procedures for Section Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Context</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Convenient place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>2-3 mos. before returning</td>
<td>1-2 wks. before returning</td>
<td>1 &amp; 1/2 mos. after returning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Methods</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child In-depth Interview 1 (Drawing)</td>
<td>Child In-depth Interview 2 (Drawing)</td>
<td>Child In-depth Interview 3 (Drawing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observation 1</td>
<td>Classroom Observation 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplemental Methods</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIQ</td>
<td>Teacher Interview 1</td>
<td>Teacher Interview 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent BIQ Interview</td>
<td>IFG</td>
<td>Parent Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Collecting School Artifacts)
Importantly, the data collection and analysis occurred simultaneously as I continued to evaluate and create “the fit between [my] initial research interests and [the] emerging data” (Charmaz, 2004, p. 17). In addition, Table 4.6 provides a brief overview of the methods in terms of the types of data obtained and the purposes of using them.

Table 4.6 Overview of Data Collection Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Obtained Data</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Methods &amp; Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Child in-depth interview       | ▪ Conversation recorded and transcribed             | ▪ To understand children’s perspectives on the essential aspects of their overall sojourning experiences  
                                        |                                                    | ▪ To capture their self perceptions negotiated within the given educational contexts |
| Drawing activities             | ▪ Drawing                                          |                                                                         |
| Classroom observation          | ▪ Fieldnotes                                       | ▪ To gain multiple views of children’s overall school experiences  
                                        | ▪ Conversation recorded and transcribed             | ▪ To understand the ways in which their identities described during the in-depth interviews were negotiated and enacted in actual learning contexts |
| **Supplemental Methods & Data**|                                                    |                                                                         |
| BIQ                            | ▪ Completed BIQ                                    | ▪ To portray a wide range of children’s backgrounds  
                                        |                                                    | ▪ To prepare for co-interpretation  
                                        |                                                    | ▪ To clarify and confirm emerging categories |
| Parent BIQ interview           | ▪ Notes                                            |                                                                         |
| (Teacher)                      | ▪ Email communication                              |                                                                         |
| Informant Interview (Teacher)  | ▪ Conversation recorded and transcribed            | ▪ To portray children’s U.S. school experiences from the teachers’ perspectives  
                                        |                                                    | ▪ To elicit additional information  
                                        |                                                    | ▪ To clarify and confirm emerging categories |
| (Parent)                       | ▪ Conversation recorded and transcribed            | ▪ To portray the dimensions of children’s sojourning experiences, which could be revealed only in their home contexts |
| Collecting school artifacts    | ▪ Copies of artifacts                              | ▪ To capture more holistic views of children’s school experiences    |
| IFG interview                  | ▪ Conversation recorded and transcribed            | ▪ To illuminate a wide range of perspectives on sojourning experiences and suggest the models of transitions across two countries  
                                        |                                                    | ▪ To inform subsequent child in-depth interviews and to enrich interpretations |
| Participant info. sheet        | ▪ Completed info. sheet                            |                                                                         |
Primary Data Collection Methods

Child in-depth interviews with drawing activities.

Each child participated in at least three in-depth interviews on different points of their sojourning.\textsuperscript{17} For the section one children, their first interviews took place in Japan one to two months before their migrations to the United States, their second and third interviews in the United States one to two months after their moves and five months after their moves respectively. For the section two children, their first and second interviews took place in the United States two to three months before their returns to Japan and one to two weeks before their returns respectively. Then, their last interviews were in Japan about one and a half months after their returns. This semi-longitudinal design allowed me to capture the changes of the children’s perspectives over time. All children chose to speak in Japanese and the conversation was digitally recorded.\textsuperscript{18} In order to protect their “conversational prerogatives” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 27), I avoided abstract language (e.g., identity) and promoted their own language usages regardless of the unconventionality.

For all interviews, I used a guide created based on the three-tier questioning technique for grounded theorists (Charmaz, 2006).\textsuperscript{19} The three types of questions were: (a) initial open-ended questions, (b) intermediate semi-structured questions, and (c) ending questions. In the initial phase, I asked open-ended and “non-judgmental”

\textsuperscript{17} A supplemental interview was conducted for Haruya between his first and second interview in order to capture his views on the first two days of U.S. schooling as a newcomer. This reflected the non-linear nature of the interpretive inquiry. Over the course of research, I developed a positive relationship with his parents through helping the family settle in a new country. The strong rapport naturally increased a sense of their research involvement and allowed this additional interview. Also, since this interview was conducted during the winter break, the research site was Haruya’s home instead of his school.

\textsuperscript{18} When I interviewed the section two participants who were fluent in both languages, I initiated a code-switching in a casual manner so that they could naturally be in their bilingual mode (Grosjean, 1997). However, all children chose to speak only in Japanese throughout.

\textsuperscript{19} See Appendix 5 for the interview guide.
(Charmaz, 2006, p. 26) questions, such as below, in order to capture children’s own agenda regarding their sojourning experiences:

1. Can you tell me about your current life?

2. If someone asked you to tell or write a story of your school life, what would you choose to talk or write about?

3. What would first come to your mind when you think of your current life situation?

Since all children tended to respond very briefly, I used two techniques to probe into the emerging topics in their responses. One was to use some extra wait time of ten to twenty seconds after they stopped talking. This created the atmosphere in which the children would continue to talk and elaborate their points with more details without feeling rushed. The other strategy was to ask extending questions for eliciting more details, such as “Can you tell me more about __?” and “Why did you think it was __?”

At the same time, children were invited to engage in more focused conversation around my research interests in identity negotiation. The intermediate semi-structured questions elicited the children’s self perceptions associated with the social, educational, and cultural aspects of their learning experiences in the past, present, and future. The questions also allowed me to discover the shifts of children’s self-perceptions over the three interviews. Those questions accentuated the relevance between their own agenda and my research focus and allowed me to take more direct control over the data construction (Charmaz, 2006). It is, however, important to note that, these precomposed semi-structured questions were used only when they were appropriate in the flow of the conversation. Therefore, the order and the contents of questions varied as I was
“constantly reflexive about the nature of [the] questions and whether they work for the specific participants and the nascent grounded theory” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 32). To conclude each interview, I asked some ending questions to see if the children would like to talk more about their present sojourning experiences or ask me any questions. For analysis purposes, I also conducted member-checking at the end of each interview by asking the children to make comments on the legitimacy of the analytic categories emerging from their own data (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003) as well as from other participants (Charmaz, 2006).

The flow of conversation corresponded to the characteristics of in-depth interviews and the grounded theory approach which are both “open-ended yet directed, shaped yet emergent, and paced yet unrestricted” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 28). The major purpose of the interviews was to generate rich data with the “thick description” (Geertz, 1973, cited in Charmaz, 2006, p. 14) of children’s own perspectives on their overall sojourning experiences and identities negotiated in school. Neuman (2000) explained that in-depth interviews in general are useful for capturing the seldom emphasized perceptions of the subjugated groups of people in social stratification, including children, and for increasing the study’s authenticity by “giving a fair, honest, and balanced account of social life from the viewpoint of someone who lives it everyday” (p. 185).

In addition, children were asked to draw a picture related to his or her school life. Before each interview began, I suggested three different timings to draw: (a) before the conversation so that the drawing could guide storytelling, (b) anytime after sharing some stories so that the drawing could help the child articulate, recapture, and extend his or her
perspectives, and (c) after the whole conversation in order to supplement the stories already shared. Art supplies, including an 8”×11” sketchbook, drawing pencils, erasers, and a set of fifty colored pencils, were accessible for children throughout the interviews. All of them chose to draw in the middle of the interviews. Their drawings were about either the stories already shared or the ones that they intended to tell after drawing. Incorporating drawing activities into in-depth interviews gave them an alternative way to express their views and to extend the ideas shared in their storytelling.20

Previous researchers found several advantages of using artistic activities in research. Igoa (1998), for instance, viewed drawing as “a vibrant second language” (p. 73) for children to “communicate in more expressive and expansive ways” and to “stay in touch with their feelings” (p. 73). Similarly, the child participants in Soto’s (2002) study used drawings and collages to freely express their emotions towards their educational lives. Most importantly, drawings have been considered as artistic expressions of the participants’ worlds and self-conceptions (Clark-Keefe, 2002; Pagnucci, 2004). When art-based research is understood as an “artistry” (Eisner, 1995, p. 1) itself and an “imaginative extrapolation” (Eisner, 1995, p. 5), drawings become the “material[s] through which new perspectives are made available, facts are made meaningful, and coherence is made possible” (p. 5). Drawings then illuminate: the classroom ecology (Gulek, 1999); students’ actions and learning engagement in their classrooms (Haney, Russell, Gulek, & Fierros, 1998); their identities shaped in “the dynamic, emergent,

20 According to the BIQ, all children had neutral attitudes towards drawing. They were neither liked nor disliked drawing pictures.
culturally bound and embodied ways” (Clark-Keefe, 2002, p. 6); and their changing academic identities and aspirations (Clark-Keefe, 2005).

Overall, in-depth interviews allowed children to share their self-perceptions in relation to their unique sojourning experiences and became heart of the co-interpretation processes. The interview procedures were emergent, controlled, and exploratory with the uses of open-ended and semi-structured questioning techniques and drawing activities.

Classroom observations.

A total of two observations took place in each child’s U.S. classroom on the same weeks when the in-depth interviews were conducted. In all observations, I unobtrusively shadowed the child and wrote fieldnotes in varied school contexts, including mainstream classroom, ELL class, gym, music, art, and recess, for the entire school day from 8am through 2pm. The purposes of classroom observation were to gain multiple views of children’s overall school experiences and to examine the ways in which their identities described during the in-depth interviews were negotiated and enacted in actual learning practices. The fieldnotes complemented interview data by delineating the followings:

1. “[T]he context, scenes, and situations of action” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 21), including the contents of varied learning activities and the physical characteristics of learning environments
2. Children’s social interactions with their teachers, peers, and friends
3. Their non-verbal behaviors
4. Their language choice and the contexts of their language use

Fieldnotes also included children’s direct quotations uttered during their interactions with others, which I digitally recorded whenever possible. I also wrote “observer’s comments”
(Merriam, 1998, p. 106) during and after the observations in order to record: my impressions and feelings towards observed events; my self-reflection as a researcher; symbolic meanings of observed behaviors; ideas to generate analytical understandings; and unobservable events as negative evidence. Overall, classroom observations allowed me to understand the classroom ecology represented in the academic and non-academic, physical and social, and individual and collective aspects of the learning context.

Supplemental Data Collection Methods

Background information questionnaire (BIQ) and parent BIQ interview.

All parents filled out a questionnaire in Japanese regarding their children’s educational, family, personal, and language backgrounds prior to the child interviews. Parents received the BIQ by mail or in person two to three months prior to their moves and had at least one month to complete. I also conducted an interview with each parent for about 15 minutes to clarify their answers in the BIQ and to gain additional information. Based on the parent’s request, the means of interview included phone, e-mail, or a face-to-face meeting. I hand-wrote notes during all conversations and saved all email communication. The purposes of conducting BIQ and parent BIQ interviews were to portray a wide range of children’s backgrounds as the preparation for the following co-interpretation processes. With the BIQ data, I was able to compare and contrast the backgrounds of all children and to better understand their stories shared during the interviews.

---

21 See Appendix 6 for the BIQ for each cross-sectional group.
Informant interviews: U.S. classroom teacher and parent.

In order to further clarify and confirm the emerging interpretations, supplemental data were obtained in a total of two individual interviews with each child’s U.S. classroom teacher and one individual interview with his or her parent. The focus of these interviews was on making sense of how children’s sojourning experiences had been like from the perspectives of their teachers and parents as informants, rather than on revealing the feelings and attitudes of the informants. In other words, the purpose was to portray different dimensions of children’s sojourning experiences which could be revealed only by their classroom teachers, who interact with them daily at school, and their parents, who knew them in a home environment.

The teacher interviews took place in English for about 20 to 30 minutes on the same week with child interviews and classroom observations. Parent interviews took place in Japanese for about 20 minutes right before the school dismissal time on the same week when the second teacher interviews were conducted. Because a set of data were collected on the same week for each child, I was able to concentrate on one child at a time and, then, move onto the cross-case analysis. During all informant interviews, I digitally recorded the conversation and asked the following questions:

1. What would you like to talk about (child’s name)?
2. How do you describe him/her in your classroom/at home? And, why?
3. Tell me about his/her academic learning.
4. Tell me about his/her English language learning.
5. Tell me about his/her relationships with peers and friends.
6. Are there any significant events that have occurred since he/she came to the United States?

7. Is there anything else you have noticed about him/her and would like to share?

All informants cooperatively shared various information and episodes.

Collecting school artifacts.

As additional supplemental data, I also collected copies of school artifacts from children and their informants when available. The artifacts included the children’s writing samples, art displays, journal entries, written self-introduction, and self portraits, which all were relevant to the categories emerging from the co-interpretation. Collecting those artifacts facilitated the “converging lines of inquiry” (Yin, 2002, p. 98) to tell more convincing stories of an individual child.

Interpretive focus group interviews.

Two sets of Japanese adolescents and young adults participated in the interpretive focus group (IFG) interview before I conducted the last child interviews. The IFG interviews were designed to gather a wide range of perspectives among the individuals who shared similar experiences with the primary participants and, therefore, had “expertise in the area under study” (Dodson & Schmalzbauer, 2005, p. 954). The IFG interviews also provided opportunities to co-analyze the data already gathered and fine tune the focus of emerging categories according to the participants’ “significant insight into the data” (Dodson & Schmalzbauer, 2005, p. 956).

Before the interviews, all participants filled in a participant information sheet regarding their educational, linguistic, and sojourning backgrounds. Their background information revealed the commonalities and distinctions between their sojourning
experiences and those of the child participants. The interview conversation was in Japanese and digitally recorded. In order to first survey the participants’ views on their sojourning experiences, I asked open-ended questions, such as:

1. What do you still remember about your sojourning experiences?

2. Tell me about the most significant events, which occurred before/during/after your U.S. schooling.

All participants were very cooperative and shared their insights mainly regarding the social, academic, and linguistic aspects of their school lives in both countries. They were also asked to comment on the model of my preliminary data analysis on the processes of identity negotiation in relation to several key contextual influences, including, English language acquisition, cultural assimilation/Americanization, overall learning experiences (i.e., JELL and ELL programs, academics, and extracurricular activities), and social relationships with teachers, peers, and friends in both countries as well as with their family members. The IFG participants’ comments on the model were useful in refining the emerging interpretive framework. More specifically, I was able to reflectively check my own biases and assumptions, which might have influenced the interpretation, and to assess to what extent my interpretations seemed common, varied, or isolated in comparison to their collective perspectives. I also found resonances and discrepancies between children’s perspectives and those of the IFG participants. The resonated ideas confirmed the significance while the discrepancies generated additional questions to ask in the subsequent child in-depth interviews.

22 See Appendix 7 for the IFG participant information sheet.
23 Though the participants were encouraged to freely talk among each other, they participated in the conversation more actively when they took turns for speaking.
24 See Appendix 8 for the model which was created solely for the purpose of IFG interviews.
Data Analysis Methods and Procedures

This study employed several inductive data analysis strategies informed by a combination of interpretive research inquiry (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006), constructive grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2006), and multiple case study method (Stake, 2005). The next table outlines the overall data analysis methods and procedures.

Table 4.7 Data Analysis Methods and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Methods and Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1: Data Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded conversations (Children)</td>
<td>Transcribing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing with Atlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings</td>
<td>Typing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing with Atlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes</td>
<td>Reading &amp; re-reading (viewing &amp; reviewing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SupPLEMENTAL Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIQ and Notes</td>
<td>Managing manually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded conversations (Teachers and parents)</td>
<td>Transcribing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing with Atlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded conversations (IFG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing with Atlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant info. sheets (IFG)</td>
<td>Managing manually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in the table, the specific data analysis strategies included: transcribing; coding; memo-writing; clustering, sorting, and diagramming; and conducting within-case and
cross-case comparisons. The procedures for analyzing each data set followed the four steps of analysis suggested by Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2006): (a) data preparation, (b) data exploration, (c) specification and reduction of data, and (d) interpretation. The data analysis was “a process of making sense out of data” (Merriam, 1998, p. 192) and all steps of analysis were never strictly sequential but rather iterative, occurring simultaneously with data collection. The following subsections presents how each data set was analyzed in those steps and how the overall data analysis contributed to the development of meaningful categories.

Analyzing the Primary Data

The digitally recorded conversations from child in-depth interviews and classroom observations were transcribed with software called HyperTRANSCRIBE which offers useful data control functions (e.g., pause, loop playback, etc.). The use of this software increased accuracy and efficiency of the task. Transcribing was necessary for the data preparation and also served as an entry into data analysis through recapturing children’s lively voices and discovering their silence, pauses, and non-verbal expressions. Children’s unique language usages represented the essential aspects of their experiences and, therefore, were preserved without being inadequately rephrased or distorted with the standard linguistic forms. The data originally obtained in Japanese were translated into English only for the parts used as quotes in the following chapters. Instead of automatically re-encoding the lexical items, I practiced the idea of “intersemiotic translation” (Birch, Edwards, & Edwards, 1996, p. 14) by emphasizing the “comparability, mutuality, unification of understanding” (p. 15) between two languages
and culture. While transcribing, I also wrote initial memos by quickly and spontaneously jotting down what comes to my mind about participants, contexts, and data.

The transcribed data were then organized with the Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software called Atlas ti 5.2, in order to accelerate the subsequent steps of analysis. Since the use of software might alter the relationship between the researcher and the data, and consequently influence the research outcomes (Merriam, 1998), I diversified my interactions with the data by analyzing them both electronically and manually. I also wrote research journal to freely and systematically record my on-going reflections on overall research practices. The prepared data were read and re-read for the purpose of the data exploration.

The first task for the data reduction step was to apply two-stage codes: (a) line-by-line “initial codes” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 47) and (b) segment-by-segment “focused codes” (p. 57). The initial codes were the gerunds that captured actions, processes, and empirical worlds grounded in the data. It was extremely important not to first screen the general topics in the data in order to avoid the researcher’s preconceptions and “outsider analyses” biased with “participants’ orchestrated impressions at face value” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 49). I, therefore, remained “open to exploring whatever theoretical possibilities [I could] discern in the data” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 47).

25 Birch et al. (1996) viewed the translation as the process of “cultural transfer” (p. 14) to develop “an empathy with, if not a practical knowledge of, the cultural practices and linguistic identities of the communities from whom information is sought” (p. 15). This view comprised my ethical responsibilities as the researcher for not unconsciously promoting linguistic imperialism. While my linguistic and cultural congruity with the participants might have helped capture the original nuances, authenticities, and feelings (Choi, 2002) in the children’s language uses, I was also mindful of the potential assumptions and biases.

26 My research journal, which I had kept since the planning stage of this study, allowed me to report methodologies and findings based on a clear cross-reference to data collection and analysis procedures as well as to the resulting interpretation. It was also used to “liberate [my] thoughts and feelings” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 88) associated with each process.
The focused codes were mainly the gerunds and increased the “fit and relevance” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 54) between the initial codes and the data by more incisively and theoretically categorizing the data segments. Applying the focused codes allowed me to realize children’s agenda and reduce the tensions between their perspectives and the “professionals’ meanings” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 47) that I unconsciously relied on (e.g., the tension between children’s emphasis on the non-academic experiences and my orientations towards the academic aspects of their experiences). The next table presents an example of the two-stage coding procedure with a data excerpt.

Table 4.8 Example of Two-Stage Coding: Initial Codes and Focused Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Excerpt</th>
<th>Initial Codes (Line-by-Line)</th>
<th>Focused Codes (Segment-by-Segment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Misaki: I don’t eat lunch with the group of Japanese people but eat with American people (...) But, the Japanese people always get together and sit at a table together. American people might be thinking that it was noisy because those Japanese people were speaking in a different language. The Americans actually said so before. So, I thought it was better to stop speaking too much Japanese. (...) I don’t know but the Americans said something like, “It’s so noisy over there, isn’t it?” So, I feel that it was better to mix in English as much as possible and speak, because I think it would sound noisy, after all, if someone was speaking a different language. (...) Because it’s a different language. After all, when Japanese people hear Chinese and don’t understand the meanings, they’ll think it’s noisy, won’t they? So, I think it’s the same thing. | ▪ Not eating lunch with Japanese peers  
▪ Eating lunch with American peers  
▪ Viewing the situation from the Americans’ points of view  
▪ Thinking that it is noisy to hear a different language spoken  
▪ Trying to speak less Japanese and more English  
▪ Hearing American peers complaining about Japanese speaking  
▪ Feeling the need to “mix in English” (in vivo code)  
▪ Agreeing that it is noisy to hear a different language when not understanding the meanings  
▪ Justifying American peers’ complaint | ▪ Making a fair judgment of an ethnic group based on an actual situation  
▪ Viewing English oral communication necessary for fitting in the mainstream community  
▪ Perceiving a linguistic conflict among peers from a multilingual/multicultural perspective |
This example shows that applying these codes first required me to conduct the “processual analyses” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 136) of the children’s actions and then to construct the “categories that crystallize participants’ experience” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 54). The process of coding was never mechanical but both practical and conceptual (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996): While I practically sorted, separated, and retrieved the data, I tried to grasp an “analytic handle to develop abstract ideas for interpreting each segment of data” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 45). In addition, both types of code included “in vivo codes” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 55) which referred to the participants’ “innovative terms” and “insider shorthand terms” (p. 55). Overall, the codes forged “a bridge between described data and [my] emerging analysis” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 69) by: identifying themes, regularities, paradoxes, and patterns in the data; recontextualizing and reassembling the data segments; and “expand[ing] the conceptual frameworks and dimensions for analysis” (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 30).

Writing memos, or “informal analytic notes” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 72), was also an important part of data reduction and an entry into interpretation. While coding or reading the coded data, I wrote two types of memos about participants, contexts, data, codes, and emerging categories: (a) “early memos” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 80) for identifying some codes that “subsume condensed meanings” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 83) and characterize the properties of emerging categories and (b) “advance memos” (p. 81) for developing categories and understanding the relations among them. Memo-writing enabled me to “become actively engaged in [my] materials, to develop [my] ideas, and to fine-tune [my] subsequent data-gathering” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 72).
The coded data were further reduced by sorting and clustering the emerging categories in diagrams created either manually or electronically with software named Inspiration. The purpose of using these techniques was to visually display “the best possible balance between the studied experience, [the] categories, and [my] theoretical statements about them” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 117). For instance, the lines and arrows in the diagrams indicated the specific relational ideas, such as “is associated with,” “is part of,” “is cause of,” and “contradicts,” and revealed “the relative power, scope, and direction of the categories” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 118).

For children’s drawings, I first scanned and organized them with Atlas ti 5.2 along with the conversation data. I then applied codes and wrote analytical memos. The codes applied to the drawings overlapped with those used for the conversation data since the contents of drawings were verbally explained by the children during the interviews. The emerging ideas were embedded into the clustering process of analyzing the conversation data. I also tabulated the frequency in which verbal and non-verbal interactions appeared in the drawings.27

The fieldnotes from classroom observations were typed and stored with Atlas ti 5.2. I explored the data by reading, re-reading, and writing initial memos. The data were then reduced only with the focused codes since those notes were already the descriptions of children’s actions and processes. Then I followed the same memo-writing and clustering procedures as described for the conversation data.

---

27 The table is presented in Chapter 7 (Table 7.2 Verbal and Non-Verbal Interactions in Drawings).
The interpretation step for all primary data utilized “constant comparative methods” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, cited by Charmaz, 2006, p. 54, italics in original) which involved on-going multi-level comparisons among data, codes, categories, individuals, and cross-sections. I first conducted the “within-case analysis” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 194) to reveal “the local dynamics” (p. 195) in terms of children’s actions, processes, and self-perceptions, and then the “cross-case analysis” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 194; Stake, 2005, p. 39) to move “beyond individual situation and immediate interactions” (p. 129) and to construct categories based on the “implicit, unstated, and condensed meanings” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 83). The matrix template adopted from Stake (2005) helped me create a list of tentative categories, determine their utilities in each case, and make category-based assertions.28 Memo-writing and clustering also set the stage for “exploration and discovery” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 81) necessary for the constant comparisons. In addition, “theoretical sampling” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 96), including member-checking and follow-up conversations, facilitated the “analytic depth and precision” (Charmaz, 2006, p.106) of the category and informed the timing to stop data collection due to “theoretical saturation” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 113).29

Analyzing the Supplemental Data

The completed background information questionnaire (BIQ) and the notes from parent BIQ interviews were manually managed and frequently reviewed throughout the

---

28 See Appendix 9 for the matrix template.
29 According to Charmaz (2006), theoretical saturation is when “gathering fresh data no longer sparks new theoretical insights, nor reveals new properties of [the] core theoretical categories” (p. 113). Upon completing data collection for each child, I tried not to abruptly become distant from the child and his or her parent(s). I remained in touch with the newly arrived families if they needed support for settling down in the United States. For the returnee’s families, I announced the progress and the completion of the study via email. The natural flow of communication was crucial to the ethical research conduct.
interpretation process. I started to write initial memos while reading them and wrote more memos as the data analysis developed further. The digitally recorded conversation from informant interviews were transcribed with HyperTRANSCRIBE and organized with Atlas ti 5.2. I used the same coding, memo-writing, and clustering techniques used for the child interview data. My understanding of each child’s background and the informants’ perspectives on the child’s sojourning experience mainly informed and enriched the within case analyses.

The participant information sheets from the IFG participants were manually saved for my reference. The recorded conversation from the IFG interviews was transcribed and managed using Atlas ti 5.2. The codes applied to the IFG data overlapped with the ones used for the primary data. Writing memos and organizing emerging ideas in diagrams were also integrated mainly into the cross-case analyses. Overall, the IFG data informed the interpretation process by enabling me to tell more convincing stories (Dodson & Schmalzbauer, 2005).

**Developing Categories**

The primary purpose of the above-explained data analysis was to develop meaningful categories. The multiple methods of data analysis allowed me to gain the “plausibility” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 246) of the categories emerging from the co-interpretation among myself as the researcher, all participants, and sources outside the study, such as literature (Merriam, 1998). Before, during, and after my data collection and analyses, reading the relevant literature across various disciplinary areas helped me analytically redefine my theoretical framework and compare my theoretical assertions to
existing theories (Charmaz, 2006). Through the interpretation process, I continued to refine my categories in a way that they would follow the criteria suggested by Merriam (1998): (a) exhaustive to have all significant data fit into a category, (b) mutually exclusive to have a particular data set fit into only one category, (c) sensitizing to capture the meaning of the focused phenomenon, and (d) conceptually congruent to keep the same level of abstraction among all categories. Overall, the refined categories allowed me to fulfill the research purpose, answer the posed research questions, and suggest the theories grounded in the data.

Validity and Reliability of the Study

In this study, I viewed validity of the study as “a process whereby the researcher earns the confidence of the reader that she or he has ‘gotten it right’” (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006, p. 66, italics in original). In order to increase the validity, I generated the holistic understanding of the studied phenomenon by obtaining multiple data sources and conducting the data triangulation. Member-checking as well as IFG interviews also increased my confidence to tell convincing stories. In addition, I remained reflective and critical about my own biases and theoretical assumptions. I also acknowledged the need of exploratory research practices in the topic of children’s identity negotiation and kept open-mindedness for on-going discussion among the wide community of researchers.

I viewed reliability of the study as the “dependability” and “consistency” (Neuman, 2003, p. 184). The dependability of the study increased as I incorporated multiple data collection methods into the study in order to illuminate diverse dimensions of the focused phenomenon. The internal consistency between the date and the results
increased by the “chain of evidence” (Yin, 2002, p. 105) obtained through multiple data collection methods. The external consistency, or generalizability, of the study increased through collecting rich data and extracting thick descriptions of “typicality or modal categories” (Merriam, 1998, p. 211). It was important to explicitly present my compelling categories and to demonstrate the “credibility, originality, resonance, and usefulness” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 182) of my emerging grounded theories.

Summary

This chapter described the methodologies employed to study Japanese elementary sojourners’ identity negotiation in school. The overall research design reflected my stance as a qualitative identity researcher who is committed to explore interdisciplinary perspectives and potential research methods. I chose to incorporate the approaches of interpretive research, constructivist grounded theory, and multiple case study into the research design. The central premises of this study included: an inductive approach to the topic with the use of multiple methods; co-interpretation of meanings with all research participants; and a construction of the theories grounded in the co-interpreted categories.

The primary participants were two cross-sections of five Japanese children in either the beginning or the ending stage of sojourning while the secondary participants included their informants (i.e., U.S. classroom teachers and parents) and two sets of Japanese former sojourners who had grown up to adolescents and young adults. Multiple methods for the data collection included in-depth interviews enhanced with drawing activities, classroom observations, background information questionnaire, informant interviews, and collecting school artifacts. The obtained data were analyzed, more
specifically, prepared, explored, reduced and interpreted, with the combinations of methods, such as, transcribing, reading and re-reading, memo-writing, coding, clustering and diagramming, within-case and cross-case analysis, and the interpretive focus group (IFG) interview.

Importantly, the research design was unique not only because the semi-longitudinal data collection for each child revealed the changes of his or her self-perceptions over time but also because the perspectives shared by the two cross-sections of children suggested the processes of identity negotiation associated with their overall sojourning experiences. In addition, this study uniquely explored the use of drawings to facilitate the knowledge generation with children. The incorporation of the IFG interviews also added more diversified insights to data analysis. The overall research design with my exploratory research orientation was helpful and necessary for telling convincing stories and building meaningful theories based on dependable research conducts, consistent interpretation, and useful implications to improve education for elementary age linguistic minority sojourners.

The next three chapters will unfold the findings of the study based on the lively voices shared by all participants: The first two chapters (Chapter 5 & 6) present the idiosyncratic experiences and perspectives of each child as case studies while the following chapter (Chapter 7) ties the individual accounts into a cross-case analysis which presents the major categories generated in the study. Then, in the last chapter (Chapter 8), the categories will be discussed in order to suggest a conceptual model grounded in the data and implications of the study.
CHAPTER 5
CASE STUDY OF SOJOURNING: THE PERSPECTIVES OF NEWCOMERS

This chapter and the next chapter together present individual child case studies of sojourning experiences and identity negotiation. The purposes of the case studies are: (a) to chronologically capture the Japanese elementary children’s lived moments of sojourning; (b) to illuminate the episodes which were essential to their identity formation and negotiation in school; and (c) to reveal multiple sources of evidence (e.g., in-depth interview data and the supplemental data triangulated) as well as the co-interpreted meanings of their experiences. The case studies are the foundational resources for the subsequent chapters since they provide the mixture of each child’s stories, narratives, and voices, which served as the essential part of co-interpretation and cross-case analyses. This chapter consists of two case studies of Haruya and Wataru who shared their perspectives as they were leaving Japan and becoming newcomers in U.S. schools.

Haruya

One warm winter Saturday in December 2006, I met Haruya for the first time in Tokyo. Since it was also the very first interview for this study, I was high-spirited to head to the interview site which was a public library near his apartment in one of the most upscale wards. In the library, his mother greeted me with a warm smile. Then, he appeared

---

30 The structure of each case study follows a chronological order. This, however, does not mean to rigidly interpret the children’s lived experiences from left to right like a timeline. The backbone of each case, in fact, is each child’s own unique perspectives co-interpreted by multiple human perspectives of the child, his/her informants (teachers and parents), the interpretive focus group (IFG) participants, and the researcher. In order to show that each case study stands on the irregular intersections of human perceptions across time and situations, each quote cited in this chapter indicate which interview was the source of the quote (e.g., “ci.1” to mean the first child interview, “ti.2” to mean the second teacher interview, etc.).
from behind her and discreetly said with a slight bow, “Konnichiwa (Hello).” Born in Japan on July 1997, he was a nine-year-old third grader enrolled in a public elementary school. Well-trimmed short hair, clean and conservative outfit, and a slim physical figure with a seemingly adequate height for his age, instantly gave me an impression of a nice Japanese school boy. His communication style was mature, pleasant, sensitive, and respectful with the use of keigo (the honorifics). There was no doubt that he was “a careful, meticulous, and strong-willed yet reserved child” (BIQ) as his parents described. Despite a glimmer of nervousness hidden under his politeness, he remained cooperative and engaging during all interviews. Although I did not see myself always asking right questions or probing appropriately due to my novice research skills, his communication style made me forget my own nervousness and helped me create a comfortable atmosphere for conversation and co-interpretation.

“I don’t really want to go” (ci.1) was Haruya’s first response to his parents’ announcement about his upcoming U.S. sojourning. He knew that his parents, who

---

31 Keigo is a form of expression, which shows varied levels of respect, humbleness, and politeness. According to Shibatani (1990), “contextual factors such as the means of communication (writing or speaking), the formality of the setting, and the sex and the social status of the speech-act participants as well as of the person being talked about” (p. 93) affect one’s use of keigo. In all interviews, Haruya used a type of keigo called “teinei-go ‘polite language’” (Shibatani, 1990, p. 375), such as verbal endings of -desu and –masu and a response with hai (yes). The best example of his keigo use was when I showed him the art supplies for his drawing. As he looked at the supplies, he politely said in an adult-like manner, “Domo goteineini arigatougozaimasu (Thank you very much for your courteous treatments)” (ci.1).

32 BIQ=background information questionnaire

33 Kanno (1996) reported her own limitations as a researcher, such as her own “lack of story listening skills” (p. 94) and her “norm inspired fear” to conduct a research study in a second language that has been “a less reliable tool for [her]” (p. 82). I respect this ethical approach and believe that such honest display of limitations would make the researcher’s identity come alive, foster reader’s comprehensions of the research results, and subsequently increase the validity of the study.
medical researchers with graduate degrees, had applied for research positions in Boston. However, he still felt “bikkuri (astonished)” to know that the plan was to become a reality and thought, “It was just strange to go to another country” (ci.1). His hesitance was also largely due to his oral English proficiency which he did not think was good enough to survive in his future U.S. school. In his view, bi-weekly English classes at school and weekly Kumon lessons after school never prepared him to speak English with an ease.35 Despite his English literacy skills assessed above his grade level at Kumon, his primary concern was his linguistic competence of being either “shabereru (able to speak)” or “shaberenai (unable to speak)” (ci.1) English.

In his Japanese school, Haruya viewed himself as a “futuu-no (ordinary/regular)” student who was average overall but did better in the subjects of his interest (i.e., Japanese language arts, social studies, gym, and arts). I kept questioning myself if he was being too modest since his intelligence manifested in our conversation and the BIQ made me think that he was more than just an average student. According to his parents, he loved reading and showed strong interests in academics as well as varied non-academic topics, such as animals, world geography, and classic music.36

To my surprise, Haruya also perceived himself as a student who liked to make “warufuzake (practical jokes)” and go into “itazura (mischief)” (ci.1). He explained that many of his successful itazura happened during school lunch. One time, he secretly

34 The first child interview (ci.1) was on 12/09/06, the second interview (ci.2) 2/12/06, and the third interview (ci.3) on 4/3/07, and the last interview (ci.4) on 6/5/06.
35 Kumon is a worldwide educational institution that provides math and language learning system created by a former high school math teacher, Toru Kumon (Kumon Institute of Education, 2007). Haruya started his Kumon in the beginning of the second grade.
36 He was especially a huge book lover. When I thanked him for using his library time for the interview, he responded; “It’s okay because I always read way too many books anyway” (ci.1).
scotch-taped his friend’s milk carton onto the tray and watched what would happen when
the friend tried to drink his milk. It was humorous to him when the friend lifted the whole
tray up in the air and cried out, “Oh, my obon (tray)!” (ci.1) It was more humorous when
the tricked friend chased after him in the hallway, screaming, “Waaaait!” (ci.1) In order
to avoid his teacher’s reprehension, he even came up with a clever tip to use a small piece
of tape and attach it very softly. Unfortunately, his former second grade teacher
negatively viewed his playfulness and “utterly irrationally” (ci.4) stigmatized him as a
troublesome student. Because of the teacher, he described his second grade days as
“really terrible” (ci.4).37 On the contrary, his third grade teacher understood him well and
he built a good relationship with her. He thought that she was a “very enthusiastic” (ci.4)
teacher because, when she found out about his move to the United States, she took him to
all of the third grade classrooms to make a formal announcement. In Japan, he always
had good relationships with his peers. However, his father noticed that he kept a certain
distance from others even during play and never made best friends to whom he could
completely open up himself.

As his U.S. sojourning was becoming a reality, he developed some mixed feelings
of “kinchou (nervousness) and ikitai (desire to go)” (ci.2). The idea of learning all
subjects in English made him nervous. At the same time, he felt “waku-waku (eagerly
anticipated)” to become one of the U.S. kaigaishijo who he thought were “ganbatteru
(holding out)” and, therefore, looked “kakkoii (cool)” (ci.1). Projecting the positive image

---

37 This teacher often wrongfully accused him for making trouble at school (e.g., teasing other students,
breaking the bathroom compartment door) when he was only a “bystander” (ci.4). One time, his father
wrote a letter to complain about the teacher’s unfair judgment. Haruya was still upset and commented, “I
said, ‘I didn’t do it.’ But the teacher one-sidedly said, ‘You did it!’” (ci.4)
of kaigaishijo onto himself, he felt like saying, “Ganbaruzou! (I’ll make my best effort!)” (ci.1).³⁸ His positive projection of the future was also reinforced by his belief in “tanoshimu (to enjoy)” (ci.1) as the key for successful learning. With the real-life purpose of learning English, he started to enjoy learning English conversation in class.

Feeling motivated to ganbaru (make best effort) and tanoshimu (enjoy) even before his actual U.S. schooling, he expected that his future U.S. education would allow him to “become able to speak another language that is different from Japanese,” “make various friends,” and to “gain more confidence” (ci.1). When his parents received their job offers, the family visited Boston for about a week. Referring to his memories from this visit, he looked forward to “walking in the city once again and learning more about it” (ci.1). He also planned on playing basketball in the United States.

Within one month prior to his move, Haruya spent extremely hectic days due to packing, cleaning, moving, and visiting people. He later could not even remember how exactly he spent this stressful preparation phase, but knew that he survived because of the on-going support that he received from his parents as their only child. Receiving the information regarding the positive sides of U.S. school life from his parents was especially helpful since it reduced his anxieties against the unknown future. He particularly liked that he would have extracurricular activities and longer vacation days in the United States since his life in Japan had been regularly busy with Kumon, piano lessons, club activities, and library visit. He also felt better when his parents informed

³⁸ Spirit of ganbaru (to make best effort) is deeply rooted in Japanese cultural virtue of endurance. Many Japanese elementary schools, in fact, propose the development of ganbaru attitudes (e.g., making efforts and working hard), rather than academic achievement, as the educational goals for their students (Lewis, 1995).
him that his future school, the Spring Lake School, would have many Japanese students. Based on the information he obtained from his parents and his previous visit to Boston, he expected that his U.S. school life would be relaxing and “more fun than [he] had thought of” (ci.1). His parents also reassured that he would “eventually go back to the same Japanese elementary school and always have his home country to return” (pi).39

Despite all the excitement and positive expectations towards U.S. sojourning, he still would have chosen to remain in Japan if he had a choice. At the same time, he knew that, regardless of his feelings, moving to the United States was necessary for his parents’ careers. He stated, “I had to accept [the fact] that I would be going to America” (ci.4).

Haruya and his parents moved to Boston in February, 2007, a few weeks later than their original plan due to the delayed U.S. immigration process. In the typical severe cold winter of New England, Haruya, whose previous visit was in the summer, felt sort of tricked to see the totally different face of the city. On school registration day, I happened to be at the Spring Lake School and saw him and his father in the JELL office. While his father was talking with the JELL teacher, Mrs. Morita, Haruya sat in the corner of the room, looking very tense and nervous.40 When I asked him how he was doing, he said in a very soft voice that he was fine. His father emphasized to Mrs. Morita about Haruya’s reserved personalities and strongly requested that he would be placed with other Japanese

---

39 The parent interview (pi) was on 6/5/07.
40 See Chapter 4 (p. 66) for the explanation regarding JELL and ELL programs of the schools. Also, whenever I collected my data in Spring Lake, Mrs. Morita was very welcoming and allowed me to stay in her office freely. I often ate lunch with her and other Japanese faculty members. The conversation with them was beneficial for me to learn about the overall school culture, the Japanese community, and important events that occurred in my participants’ lives, including this school registration.
peers, especially at least one Japanese boy. After receiving the required immunization shots, he started his U.S. school life in a third grade class with about twenty other peers, including two Japanese students.41

Two days later, there was a week-long winter break. This was when I met him for the second interview at his apartment located a few blocks away from his school. At his home, I was welcomed by his grandparents who were visiting from Japan to help out the family’s transition and to look after him in the daytime when his parents were at work. Haruya looked relaxed and greeted me with a pleasant smile like he did in Tokyo. We sat in the dining area overlooking the living room/play area that had a small fold-up Japanese table covered with many colorful origami (Japanese traditional paper craft) figures. He loved kousaku (handicraft) and spent most of his vacation to create origami animals.42

His first day of school was a huge milestone since he overcame the initial fear and began to build positive feelings towards his new school. According to his parents, he cried in tears the night before because of elevated anxieties. When he stepped into the classroom for the first time, his classroom teacher, Ms. Thomas, saw “his nervous and scared look” (ti.1).43 However, he developed a positive view of the school very quickly: “Before [going to school], I felt nervous, but soon I wasn’t nervous any more. I can say

41 After Haruya settled in his classroom, Mrs. Morita told me, “He did just fine in his new class. I don’t think he is shy at all. His parents shouldn’t be worried about him so much.” Listening to his father’s concerns about his timid personality, she anticipated that he would have more difficulties in adjusting. Her comments did not surprise me much because I knew that he was not just a quiet, reserved, and serious child, but a child who had positive views for the future and who could sometimes be mischievous.
42 One thing I noticed at his home was the physical setting of the room. Although the rooms seemed rather empty due to their recent move, the few pieces of existing furniture and interior items were set up in a typical Japanese way. For instance, there was no sofa or coffee table in the living room. Instead, there was a rug in the middle for people to sit on the floor. The play area had a small bookcase with many Japanese books, including chapter books and encyclopedias. According to his father, it was the “parental strategy” (pi) to reduce his stress level by recreating the room settings similar to what the family had in Japan.
43 The first teacher interview (ti.1) was on 4/5/07 and the second (ti.2) on 6/5/07.
that my first day was fun. I felt like I went to a fun elementary school and spent a very fun time” (ci.2). He looked totally relieved after he came back from school and no longer cried at home. This smooth adjustment on the very first day surprised his parents who expected that he might resist harder and cry for many weeks.

His immediate positive impression of his school, in part, came from the welcoming atmosphere of his class and the various supports he began to receive from his teachers and classmates. Ms. Thomas never forced him to take on difficult tasks but, instead, allowed him to first observe all lessons. Mrs. Morita also occasionally stopped by his class to provide one-on-one translation of the content area lessons. His Japanese classmates, Ken and Kyoko, were both very helpful, giving a school tour and teaching him things that he was unclear about. His seat was arranged next to Ken’s so that he could receive support whenever necessary.

He positively viewed his U.S. school as “omoshiroi (fun)” also because the school was “full of play rather than study” (ci.2). His conception of “study” reflected the Japanese traditional classroom practices which tended to be teacher-centered, academic-oriented, and discipline-focused. Although Spring Lake offered various academic subjects, the class was student-centered and entertaining. For instance, students were allowed to use markers and a whiteboard instead of pencils and notebooks and to walk around the classroom during some classroom activities. Students also did not need to bring their own stationary and hardly used notebooks and textbooks in classes. In addition, Ms. Thomas, unlike his teachers in Japan, did not spend much time for scolding students. The school day was full of relaxing moments, such as snack time, silent reading,
and recess or what he called “asobi jikan (play time)” (ci.2). On the first day of school, he particularly enjoyed playing with geometric blocks with Ken during the indoor recess and sledding on the snow hill in the school’s front yard on his way back home. All these fun things were not what he was accustomed to do in his Japanese school.44

For the first two days of the school, he faced difficulties with English as he expected. By listening to Ms. Thomas’ fast speaking, he kept on wondering, “Oh my… What is my sensei (teacher) saying?” (ci.2) He realized that learning English in Japan was different from the situations he faced in his U.S. classroom: “My English teacher in Japan spoke with only the words that everyone knew, but [Ms. Thomas] used many words that I did not know” (ci.2). Though he felt motivated to improve his English, he knew that this initial difficulties were “atarimae (natural)” for the time being and tried not to pressure himself too much to learn English: “Learning English is difficult for now, and, uh, I think it’s okay not to be good at it because I don’t particularly have any reason why I ought to learn English so desperately now” (ci.2). He was just hoping to become “a futuu-no student” (ci.2) in his class. Similarly, his parents did not pressure him to totally master English. Instead, they hoped that he would simply enjoy his school life in the United States and acquire minimal communication skills to avoid negative feelings.

44 When Haruya was telling me that he liked the Spring Lake School because there was not much study, he lowered his voice and glanced at the room where his grandparents were, in order to make sure that they were not listening. Like we all do more or less, he revealed or unrevealed his perspectives according to the contextual appropriateness. One time when I told his father about his positive attitude towards learning English, his father commented that Haruya was probably giving me his “yosoyuki no kotae (an answer to respond to outside people, like a formal dress worn to impress outside people with pretense propriety and prinness)” because, at home, he only showed an attitude of living only for the pleasure of each moment. It was clear that the aspirations and positive expectations that he shared with me were not shared in the same way with his parents. Similarly, he had been mainly sharing with me the positive sides of his experiences not his vulnerable side (e.g., crying, being worried, etc.) which he openly expressed at home. I found that his perspectives shared with his parents and his “yosoyuki no kotae” shared with me represented the diverse contextual dialogues which were both legitimate for holistically illuminating his identities.
As a newcomer, Haruya also observed American people being “ozappa (careless/rough/thoughtless)” (ci.2) by, for instance, going indoor with their shoes on, “ignoring when they drop something” (ci.3), and not thoroughly cleaning up their own mess. He sensed, “In America, it’s not really a big deal to make a mess anywhere” (ci.2). This surprised him because he was always asked to immediately clean up his own mess in Japan. Though he still liked the Japanese ways better, he could see himself being influenced by the American way and behaving ozappa by the time when he finishes his U.S. schooling.

Thus, the first two days at Spring Lake allowed Haruya to become familiar with the school culture and to develop positive impressions of the school. He even told me that he liked his new school better than his Japanese school if he did not have to think about the demands of English language learning. He told his parents that it would be ideal if he could go to Spring Lake in Japan. After the vacation, he was looking forward to having “some fun again” (ci.2) at school and doing things that he had not yet tried, such as art class, outdoor recess, and pizza and tomato soup for lunch. He forecasted his future school life to continue to be positive, “When I get used to my school more, I will enjoy more and feel that America is more fun” (ci.2).

When I met with Haruya after a month and a half since the first day of school, he was in his polite way as usual and seemed very comfortable conversing with me in the school setting to which he was already accustomed. After the winter vacation, he quickly learned his classroom routines and became able to follow his teachers’ simple directions
in English. However, as a newcomer, he struggled with his English most of the time at school. During some classroom activities, such as the sharing time, he could not “understand anything at all” and, therefore, felt “hima (bored)” and “not interested” (ci.3).

When he was not understanding the class, he usually kept himself busy by either “thinking of something else” (ci.3), looking around the classroom, touching his shoe laces, or impulsively swinging his legs. Since he often found himself being the only one who was quiet in the class, he perceived himself as “a student who [could] not speak English” and who was in an “otonashi (quiet) mode” (ci.3).45 This was something new to him and he thought that his old friends in Japan would be surprised to see him being so quiet if they had a chance to see him in his American classroom. Because of his quietness, he speculated that his classmates and Ms. Thomas did not know his “honshin (true heart/intention)” and probably saw him as “an otonashii (quiet) student” who was “always just alone” (ci.3).46 Ms. Thomas, was actually aware of his quietness and observed his tendency to “stay at the edge and sort of absorb” and to turn away or show a sign of “avoidance” when working with her and his English-speaking peers. She also thought that “he held himself inward a little and held back what he was really feeling because he was so new” (ti.1).

He knew that he needed to improve his English and “tried very hard in [his] ELL class” (ci.3). He felt more comfortable practicing English in his ELL class than in his

45 He explained that the otonashi (quiet) mode became activated when he could not listen and respond in English even though he understood the partial meanings of the conversations. He also clarified that his otonashi mode would last until he would be able to speak English fluently. Interestingly, his mode was not affected by his accent or unconventional grammar.

46 The Japanese word, honshin, contains two characters, 本 (hon) to mean “true” and 心 (shin) to mean “mind, heart, and spirit.”
mainstream classroom. In the ELL class, he was particularly motivated to learn new
English words and had already completed four vocabulary workbooks in the past month.
He had mastered simple vocabulary words (e.g., ball, mole, and bat) and was eager to
acquire more complex ones. For instance, when his ELL teacher wrote a word,
“octagon,” on the chalkboard during the word game, he independently jotted it down on a
piece of paper and tried using it in the class.

He continuously received varied supports from his teachers and classmates. He
was particularly impressed with Ms. Thomas’ great effort to communicate with him with
the use of visual clues: “My sensei (teacher) is ganbatteru (holding out). Not like being
kind, but [she] is trying very hard to teach me. Sensei can’t speak Japanese, so [she] used
pictures to let me understand” (ci.3). Some of his American classmates also took an
initiative to communicate with him by, for instance, complimenting his art work. In
addition, his Japanese classmate, Ken, offered help without being asked whenever
Haruya looked confused. Haruya was selective about when and what to ask questions to
Ken. For instance, he felt most comfortable asking questions in the ELL classroom which
tended to be always noisy. Even in his ELL class, he asked questions only when his
teacher was doing something else so that he did not interrupt the lesson. In his
mainstream classroom, he asked questions to Ken only when he needed to complete
important academic tasks. Although he did not push himself too hard, he usually tried his
best on completing his academic work, in order to avoid feeling “iya (dislike)” (ci.3).
Ken was still his closest friend and there was not anyone particular whom he wanted to
be close. Ms. Thomas thought that it would be sort of difficult for him to expand his
friendship outside the Japanese community since “the friendship [had] been already established” (ti.1) among his other classmates at that time of the school year.

Haruya also received on-going support from his parents and grandfather especially for translating his homework. With their help, he could complete most of his homework. His father frankly admitted that Haruya had been overprotected. His parents’ priority was to create a warm and nurturing home environment so that he would fulfill his pleasant childhood with a minimal amount of stress. His father explained that we all would eventually have some negative experiences as we become an adult, and that Haruya, as a young boy, should be just enjoying his childhood.

Learning in the supportive environments, he continued to enjoy some school activities, such as art class and recess. Art class was the most important part of his school life and the art room was the most comfortable place to stay because he could simply enjoy the time there without worrying about English or academics. Also, he explained, “Art is similar to play, and I always liked art since I was in Japan. I think everyone feels the same way, too” (ci.3). He hated to skip his favorite art class because of the ELL pull-out. During the recess, he often played tag in the playground with his Japanese friends and ELL peers. He managed to interact with his non-Japanese peers by using a minimal amount of English (e.g., tag, it). Simply engaging in play was another great time at school. In his view, “Play is the same in all parts of the world if we don’t think of speaking

---

47 His grandfather stayed in Boston till the end of May and supported his transition by taking him to school everyday, helping his homework, going to field trips, and even participating in parent meetings. Because Haruya and his grandfather were always together in the ELL library after school to borrow Japanese books, both of them were well known by the JELL teachers as big book lovers.
English” (ci.3). While playing, there was no difference between his friends in Japan and his new friends in the United States.

Looking into the future, he was sure that he would not stay in his *otonashi* (quiet) mode for good. He expected that it would take about one year from his arrival to be fluent in English and to “feel more interested” (ci.3) in all school activities. The speculation was based on the fact that his Japanese classmates, who had been in the United States for about a year, seemed already fluent in English. He expected that his mode would then shift to a “*genki* (fine/cheerful) mode” which was also described as his “*futuu* (ordinary/regular) mode” (ci.3) representing who he really was. In the present time, he could be in his *genki* mode only in Japanese-speaking environments where he felt being set free from his anxieties of speaking English. He viewed Japanese-speaking as a source of his *genki* feeling and commented, “If I could speak more Japanese in school, I would have felt like becoming a little more *genki*” (ci.3). He continuously inclined to his Japanese ways of thinking and behaving and read many Japanese books. To my surprise, he was reading about 200 pages in Japanese everyday. As he planned on acquiring English skills in the future, he knew that he would start feeling *futuu* (ordinary/regular) not only in Japanese-speaking but also in English-speaking environments. He stated with high hope, “Compared to when I was in Japan, I think that [I have been] a little quieter in America, but soon I will totally go back to my *hyoujun* (standard) mode that I am used to” (ci.3).

. . . . .

After about four months in the United States, Haruya finally declared, “My *otonashi* (quiet) mode is over!” (ci.4) However, his *genki* (fine/cheerful) mode, which he
expected to follow next, did not take over so easily. Instead, he unexpectedly went into his “kinchou (nervous) mode” (ci.4). Since he was increasingly encouraged to participate in regular classroom activities, he often had to feel nervous of speaking English in front of others. He commented, “I don’t get much nervous in Japanese, but I sure do in English” (ci.4). In his view, nervousness meant “anxiety” or the “feeling of not knowing if [he was] doing well” (ci.4). He thought, “It’s better not to get nervous, if possible. [Because] it’s not so fun if one gets nervous and has only negative thought” (ci.4).

The event that made him extremely nervous was the parent breakfast share in which all students in his class had to give a small group oral presentation of the results of animal research project. For the project, Haruya engaged in a variety of thematic activities (e.g., online research, expository writing, art project) to learn about an animal of his choice. When the presentation event was announced in the class, Haruya as well as his parents and Ms. Thomas knew that speaking English in front of others would be quite a challenge for him. As they expected, the presentation became a nerve-wrecking event. Since his group had no Japanese student who could translate for him, he had to handle the situation on his own: “I responded to [the audience] with only ‘I don’t know’ because I didn’t understand them at all” (ci.4). He also noticed, “Some people knew that I couldn’t speak English, so, after a while, they stopped asking me questions” (ci.4).

He did not tell his feelings to others because he thought, “It was pointless to convey my nervousness to others. Rather, it was convenient, or I felt lucky, that they did not know about it” (ci.4). This animal research presentation actually became a breakthrough for him because, after the event, he began to feel less nervous about orally
presenting to others. Experiencing the real-life pressure helped him overcome his fear. He commented, “I probably wouldn’t get [nervous] again because I experienced it already. It’s *daijoubu* (all right) after I did it once” (ci.4). His *kinchou* (nervous) mode shifted to his “*kinchou-gimi* (slightly nervous) mode” and then progressed into “the midst of *kinchou* mode and *futuu* (ordinary/regular) mode” (ci.4).

He was motivated to further develop his English skills and was also aware of his own progress. Though he still struggled to listen to native speakers’ pronunciation, he was able to comprehend the meanings “*bochi-bochi* (little by little)” (ci.4), especially the directions given in math class. For speaking, he was developing “sort of nerve to try more than one time to tell what he need[ed] to tell” (ti.2) and recently completed the task of reading aloud the morning message to the class. Though his voice was soft and he needed Ms. Thomas’ help to pronounce some words, he read very nicely and his peers seemed to pay respect to his effort. He also started to show his *genki* (fine/cheerful) mode and *honshin* (true heart/intention) to his classmates and teachers although they were still unaware of his positive changes. They still saw him as “a student who tends to get nervous” (ci.4), “a little guarded,” and “sort of hiding a little” (ti.2). Ms. Thomas also wondered if he was “quiet by nature” and still had a hard time figuring out “how he was feeling” (ti.2) in school.

Haruya’s motivation to improve English oral communication skills became very strong and he stated, “I want to communicate and play with American people. [It is] not that good [to be with] only Japanese people all the time” (ci.4). Especially when he could not find anyone to play with or could not join the soccer games during the recess due to
his limited English skills, he wished he could say in English, “Hairashite! (Let me join!)” (ci.4) He expected that he would gradually acquire more English proficiency and become able to approach American peers by the following spring. His parents noticed that he started to talk more about American students at the dinner table.

Art class was still his favorite subject and his face brightened up every time when he talked about it in interviews. He enjoyed engaging in the non-linguistic-oriented activities and compared the Japanese perspectives to the American’s as he sat at the same table with his American peers and listened to his art teacher’s directions. One day in his art class, he was making a clay figure of a bat for his animal research. When one of the spread wings broke off, he knew that it was not a big deal since, in the previous class, his art teacher looked at someone’s panda bear split into halves and said, “This is ok because I have seen a figure broken into fifty pieces” (ci.4). Compared to those figures, his case seemed trivial.

Figure 5.1 Haruya’s Drawing: Art Time

This incident confirmed him that the Americans tend to “think as positive as possible” (ci.4) for their convenience. He admired such American optimism and thought that it may
benefit the Japanese who “tend to think as negative as possible” (ci.4). At the same time, he knew that he would not be able to fully follow the American ways: “Even if I try to think positive, I wouldn’t be able to think to that extent” (ci.4).

He was very much inclined towards the Japanese ways of thinking and behaving and had not found any part of himself being influenced by the American ways. For instance, he explained, “The Japanese people are kichoumen (meticulous). I think [I am] a Japanese person who likes kichoumen better than ozappa (careless/rough/thoughtless)” (ci.4). He saw himself, who “could not be separated from the Japanese life after all” (ci.2) and always felt like returning to Japan no matter how long he would reside in the United States. His parents also had not noticed any major changes occurring to him and did not expect that he would change much in the future. Haruya was well aware that he would be strongly connected to his Japanese origin because, in three years, he would be returning to the same Japanese school, reuniting with the same friends, and living in the same apartment.\(^48\) His parents hoped that he would maintain his Japanese skills and academic competence at his Japanese grade level. Therefore, he spent his Saturdays studying academic subjects in Japanese, using the Kumon’s correspondence courses.

The long summer vacation was coming up and his parents already registered him for two summer camps, the multi-sports camp and the international ELL camp. Although he was worried about the sports camp which was not particularly designed for ELL students, he also showed me his optimistic attitude and commented, “I’m sure it’ll be

---

\(^48\) His father called this effort of not changing his environment upon his return as another form of “parental strategies” (pi).
fun” (ci.4). He had no anxieties towards the ELL camp since he knew that other Japanese newcomers would be there. He was confident that the camp would help him become “a student who can do well in English” (ci.4). At the same time, he expected to be in his “kinishinai (carefree) mode” (ci.4) during the summer because he would not be overly concerned with his English unlike he was in the regular school year. In addition, he and his father planned on visiting Japan for two weeks in the late summer. He was looking forward to seeing his grandparents and visiting his apartment in Tokyo. When the new school year begins and he becomes the forth grader in the fall, he hoped to finally move onto his futuu mode, feel genki (fine/cheerful), and show his honshin (true heart/intention) to others.

Wataru

I have to thank the booming baseball popularity and the influx of Japanese players to the Major League Baseball teams for giving me an opportunity to meet Wataru. He and his parents planned to sojourn in the United States for five years because of his father’s business in professional sports. Wataru was born in Tokyo in March 1999 and had lived in Kanto (the eastern area of Japan) all his life. He went to a public elementary school in Saitama prefecture and completed his second grade in March 2007. Both of his parents were college graduates and had lived in Los Angeles for about a year and a half before Wataru was born.

\[49\] I had a chance to talk to his mother on the phone a few days after he started the sports camp. She said that, a night before the camp, he again cried because of overwhelming anxieties and fear towards the first day of the camp. However, he seemed to have overcome his nervousness by jumping into a new situation because his attitude changed dramatically after spending a whole day at the camp. He came home after the first day and told his parents that he found a few Japanese students and had a great time with them. She thought each of his new experiences was like “climbing over one wall at a time.”
In April 2007, Wataru and his mother, Yuki, were in the process of obtaining U.S. immigration visa. Instead of entering the third grade in Japan, he visited Boston with Yuki for a few weeks to spend time with his father who had already started to work there. In May, the family went back to Japan to complete the visa process. That was when my first interview with Wataru took place. On a beautiful sunny day typical to the month of May in Japan, I met up with Wataru and Yuki at a Japan Railways station in Saitama. His sporty look with a crisp navy blue baseball cap helped me spot him right away in a crowd. As we all sat in the café, he seemed very relaxed and happily ordered a drink. Upon his request, Yuki sat next to him and read her book for the entire interview session. At first, I wondered if this was due to his anxieties towards participating in the study and if he would be comfortable to share his honest feelings and thoughts in his mother’s presence. However, I soon realized that they were closely bonded to each other, and that he simply wanted her to stay within a close proximity. The interaction styles between them were very open, frank, and nurturing. It seemed that he was accustomed to stay close to her all the time. He neither behaved hesitant nor checked Yuki’s reactions when sharing his school experiences. His openness and friendly manner was consistent throughout and I totally became used to having Yuki sitting with us in all three interviews.

---

50 A pseudonym is given to his mother because she served an important part in co-interpretation. Not only she was always present during the interviews but also she provided me with invaluable information regarding his sojourning experiences. One time, she shared with me her hand-written journal in which she recorded what she had noticed about him at home. She was very generous to provide her honest thoughts and examples of child bearing. Over the course of the study, I developed a great rapport with her.

51 Later in a casual conversation with Yuki, I found out that her husband often traveled for his business. In his absence, she was in charge of taking care of Wataru. Knowing that the United States is not a crime free country, her priority was assuring her son’s safety and, therefore, her physical proximity to him, was very important.
Growing up in the sports-oriented family, Wataru started to play baseball in age three and had loved playing any type of sports ever since. One of his favorite family video footage captured that he was swinging his leg hard but could not kick a soccer ball into a goal post because he was too young. In Japan, he independently practiced baseball with his father, who was knowledgeable of athletic training, but did not join a little league baseball team because his father did not like the way the coach trained the players. Wataru explained, “If the coach is not very good, you will not be good [at baseball] and the team will be weak” (ci.1).

Not surprisingly, he enjoyed all sorts of athletic activities and events in school, such as gym and undoukai (the annual sports festival), as well as the playtimes during recess and after school. His fondest memory in his Japanese school was being selected to run a relay for his class in the undoukai. He commented, “Minna (everyone/all) knows that I’m athletic because most of them have played sports, ran, or played tag with me before” (ci.1). By playing various sports, such as softball, soccer, and dodge ball, during the playtime, he expanded his social network even to become friends with the sixth graders who were “almost 168 centimeters in height” (ci.3). He joyously described how serious he and his friends could be when playing dodge ball games: “When the sixth graders threw their balls, they growled in a funny voice, like ‘Urhhhhhh…’ I’m good at playing dodge ball, so I can catch their balls, but my stomach hurts after catching them!” (ci.3) As a “very social” (BIQ) child, he proudly stated, “When I entered my first grade, I made over one hundred friends in my school. I became friends with minna (everyone/all)
In the first grade through the sixth grade” (ci.3). In his class, he also built great relationships with his teachers and classmates. He often volunteered to help out his teachers in class and developed a sense of mutual trust. Many of his classmates also depended on him and sometimes called him home to ask questions about homework.

In academics, Wataru was always motivated, “very curious,” and “full of inquiry mind” (BIQ). Although he perceived himself as “a futuu-no (ordinary/regular) student,” he was aware that his teachers and classmates viewed him with more positive images, such as “a great listener,” “the best or the second best student in the class” (ci.1), and “the smartest of all” (ci.3). He, in fact, did very well in all subjects and especially liked kokugo (Japanese language arts). He loved: reading a variety of books (e.g., comic books, chapter book stories, encyclopedia); writing fun stories and letters; reciting Japanese proverbs; and playing kotoba-asobi (word games/word play), such as shiritori (capping verses). Even in math which was his least favorite subject, he enjoyed solving the word problems since they were similar to literacy activities. He also enjoyed having conversation with others and used adult-level expressions and vocabulary. His parents valued Japanese language and culture, and hoped that he would maintain his Japanese.

When Wataru found out about his upcoming move, he first announced it to his best friends. Soon after, “the rumors had spread” (ci.1) and all of his friends found out about it. They all did not want him to leave and pleaded, “Don’t go! Do not go!” (ci.1)

---

52 The idea of making one hundred friends in the first grade is part of Japanese culture because of a very famous children’s song titled, When I Become a First Grader. The song expresses the wishful thoughts of a kindergartener to make many friends upon entering an elementary school. The first line of the relics goes, “When I become a first grader, when I become a first grader, I wonder if I make one hundred friends.”

53 His mother, Yuki, thought that Japanese expressions reflect the richness of Japanese culture originated in the “delicate” (BIQ, p. 3) aspects of four seasons, geographic features, and climates.
Some of them told him, “If you leave, I will cry!” (ci.1) Then they really began to cry tears. The hardest thing for him to do was to say good-bye to a boy who was his neighbor: “I played with him everyday, so I felt samishii (sad/lonely)” (ci.1). His class hosted a farewell party for him and played one last dodge ball game together. When the party was over, he and his classmates “cried really hard” (ci.1).

In order to prepare for U.S. schooling, he started to go to a private English conversation school weekly and learned how to exchange simple greeting words and to follow simple directions. He found that learning English through physical movements (i.e., games and play) was more enjoyable than learning it at desk. He also received weekly thirty minutes lessons from his father’s American friend and enjoyed being read aloud a variety of books, such as Dr. Sues series and the Frog and Toad books. In his free time, he also independently read English comic books, such as PokeMon.54 He did not know how to write in English and could only spell his name in upper case letters. He also was not yet confident to converse with English-speaking people. Being in the process of acquiring English, he perceived himself as “a student who does not do well in English” (ci.1). He commented, “I think I’ll be able to speak English in the future, but I can’t now. I can’t speak at all, can’t read at all, and can’t write at all” (ci.1).

During his previous short visit to Boston in April, he joined the local little league baseball team. He excitedly stated, “The coach was great, so my dad said I could join!” (ci.1) He enjoyed playing baseball so much that he always counted down the days to the next practice. He liked trying different defense positions in the trial games and,

---

54 Although Wataru liked reading PokeMon in English, he also thought, “It is easier to read it in Japanese because it is after all a Japanese cartoon” (ci.1).
simultaneously, he focused on practicing basic skills: “Well, I want to hit more homers in games and try my best, so I want to practice harder” (ci.1). In the beginning, communicating with his teammates in English was still a challenge, so he carefully observed what was going on and tried acting appropriately in each circumstance. He explained, “Minna (everyone/all) started talking to me in English but I didn’t understand, so I wanted to be better in speaking English” (ci.1). Towards the end of his stay, he became more used to the English-speaking environment and sometimes successfully communicated with his teammates. For instance, he once reported to Yuki, “Today, I talked to minna in my team!” (BIQ) and “I can’t say the exact words, but I knew that my teammate was saying to other teammates, ‘Follow Wataru!’” (BIQ) His parents hoped that baseball would be one way for him to acquire not only athletic skills but also language skills.55

In May when Wataru and his parents returned to Japan, they stayed at Yuki’s parents’ house in Saitama. Because they planned to move to the United States as soon as they obtain the visa, Wataru did not go back to his Japanese school and stayed home. He spent most of his free time outside in the park and enjoyed practicing baseball with his father and grandfather. He sometimes missed his teammates in Boston: “There are not many baseball kids here and I feel like wanting to play baseball so badly with my teammates when I think of how they may be practicing now. I don’t like to think that I’m not doing much, so I try practicing a lot on my own” (ci.1). Besides baseball, he enjoyed

55 Although his parents provided him with abundant opportunities to play baseball, they did not pressure him to become a professional baseball player. Yuki knew that limiting his future options was not a good idea and wanted him to explore varied career opportunities.
catching insects and small animals. He loved “almost all living things” (ci.1) and knowledgeable about many small animals, such as lizards, cicadas, stag beetles, sparrows, shell parakeets, great spotted woodpeckers, white eyes, and starlings. He sounded like an expert when he said, “The predators of lizards are white eyes. The predators of sparrows are cats” (ci.1) and also when he explained how to catch sparrow chicks: “Sparrows make their nests in the rain gutter between houses, so it’s difficult to aim. I don’t aim at the chicks in the nest because the mother bird is usually guarding it” (ci.1). When he had to stay indoor, he usually read comic books and just simply “abareru (went wild)” (ci.1) with his cousins.

While he was waiting for his visa and his move, he was getting excited about many things in his upcoming U.S. life. His excitement was “utterly bigger than sadness [to leaving Japan]” (ci.1). He looked forward to: playing outside everyday; enjoying the spacious atmosphere in American parks, houses, and supermarkets; and making many friends who “would treat [him] kindly” (ci.1). He especially hoped to make American friends “because [he would] be living in America” (ci.1). He already started to think about leaving the United States in the future and stated, “When I come back to Japan, I think I will miss my friends that I make in America” (ci.1).

His main goal for his upcoming U.S. sojourning was to “make efforts and become strong” (ci.1) in baseball and English. For baseball, he stated, “It is still way ahead of time, but I really want to be strong by my fourth grade” (ci.1). He hoped to have enough free time to practice baseball in the United States although the school would begin right away. For English, he was determined to “do [his] best in English language arts” and to
acquire oral proficiency which he currently considered as “mah-mah (so so)” (ci.1). He “like[ed] American people very much” and wanted to “chat with them a lot” (ci.1). Especially, it was very important for him to be able to communicate with the people in his baseball team (e.g., understand the directions given by the baseball coach, cheer for the team, and respond his teammates when they speak to him). More broadly, he knew that his English oral communication skills would allow him “to meet with people from various countries” and “to get to visit various places” (ci.1) in the future. His parents also expected that his English skills would broaden his perspectives and life choices. Wataru roughly estimated that it would take one year for him to be able to speak English. He was not sure how he would learn all subjects in English in the United States (e.g., how to do math calculation in English), but kept his attitudes always motivated, up-beat, and “cheerful” (BIQ).

The U.S. immigration process did not go smooth as his parents expected. The visa interviews for Wataru and Yuki were postponed without a further notification.56 His father did not want them to just wait out in Japan, so they visited Boston once again in the mid-June with their tourist visas. During the summer, Wataru was enrolled in an ESL summer camp which offered daily English lessons (e.g., reading and writing, grammar, drama, etc.) as well as fun activities (e.g., free choice, snack time, field trips to local stores and the fire station, etc.). Each class had less than ten students in similar English

56 Initially, Wataru planned to start at the Oakfield School in the end of May so that he could experience the U.S. school for a few weeks before the summer. However, the plan did not work due to the visa problem.
proficiency levels and Wataru was placed in a class with seven other newcomers with minimal English skills.

In the beginning of the camp, he experienced difficulties in adjusting to his class and often got too upset to stay for the entire school hours. All camp instructors, therefore, recognized him as “the student who always left school at noon” (ti.1). His teacher sometimes saw him sobbing at his desk. One of the reasons for the difficulty was because his class did not have other Japanese student besides him. He was so disappointed to find out that all other Asian classmates were Korean: “I couldn’t tell that they were all Korean and thought that they were Japanese, so I asked, ‘Are you Japanese?’ Then, they said, ‘Korean.’ I didn’t like it at all” (ci.2). He began to wonder if he would be daijoubu (all right)” and “if he could learn English well” (ci.2) in such a classroom environment.

Yuki and his teacher speculated that he was also very frustrated in the class when he was unsuccessful to say something in English, and that he saw himself as the only one who was lagging behind. When he was very upset and cried, his teacher had to explain that he was not the only one in the class who did not understand English. In Yuki’s view, because he had been always a good student in Japan, he had a hard time adjusting to his new status as a student who was behind others in English. While he struggled with his English in the beginning, Yuki always told him that he should be proud of his mother tongue “that not everyone knows” and should keep an attitude of “Hey, I can speak Japanese!” (ci.2) Since he moved to the United States, he increasingly became conscious of his Japanese background.

---

57 The first teacher interview (ti.1) with his summer camp teacher was on 7/26/07 and the second interview (ti.2) with his classroom teacher, Ms. Lewis, was on 11/7/07.
While experiencing the difficult adjustment, his goal was “to definitely become friends with minna (everyone/all)” (ci.2). To achieve his goal, he knew that he just needed to “play together once” (ci.2). He soon became popular among Korean boys and often found himself in the center of their attention. He and the boys so joyously chased each other outside and playing board games together inside. When Korean boys sometimes asked him to teach how to speak simple Japanese greeting words, such as *ohayou* (good morning) and *oyasumi* (good night), he got motivated and felt like saying, “Yes, I’ll do it!” (ci.2) Among all classmates, he particularly became close to a Korean boy named Martin who he described as “a naughty boy, just like me” (ci.2). They enjoyed fooling around together by, for instance, sitting on the same chair, poking each others’ back, and grabbing a cap from each other’s head. Knowing about their growing friendship, the teacher also paired them up during classroom activities. He then had his next goal “to just keep on playing with [his] new friends” (ci.2).

As his social network expanded, his English skills were steadily improving. He stated, “Before, I did not know anything but ABCDEFG. But, now I know so much English” (ci.2). There was one incident that became the breakthrough for his English speaking: When he could not find words to express himself to his classmate, he asked Yuki what to say and repeated her sentence. After he successfully had himself understood, he “started to feel calm” (ci.2). In class, his teacher noticed that he became more confident in raising his hands to speak out and also became more able to complete tasks in English, such as note-taking. While learning grammar (i.e., be-verbs and progressive forms) was easy to him, some words were difficult for him to spell (e.g., swimming,
squirrel, etc.) or to listen to the American pronunciation (e.g., going, water, etc.). He particularly wanted to improve his pronunciation so that others could comprehend his utterances better. Some classroom activities (i.e., drama and morning meeting) also became more enjoyable. He enjoyed filling in the blanks in morning messages with the keywords (e.g., weather descriptors and class agenda), as he recited each sentence together with his teacher and classmates. It was fun because the activity was “like playing a puzzle game” (ci.2). In addition, he started to enjoy the typical learning atmosphere of summer school which was “more relaxing than the regular school year” (ti.1) and started to take advantage of it by, for instance, freely walking around the classroom, chatting with others, and lying on the rug during a free choice time. He commented, “I first thought that we were going to study English, but we are actually playing with English. So, I like it a lot” (ci.2).

Throughout the summer, he continued to perceive himself as a “futuu-no” student but, at the same time, as a student “who speaks English but not yet in the American way” (ci.2). His overall summer camp experiences were “mah-mah (so so)” (ci.2) because things did not happen exactly how he imagined and because he knew that it would take longer for him to feel fully adjusted. He did not want to stay in the camp any longer though he “[might] start liking the camp if stayed longer” (ci.2). At the same time, he acknowledged his own effort for learning English and stated, “It’s great of me to learn English so hard” (ci.2). He felt that he learned much more English than he initially expected.
Towards the end of the camp, his teacher started to notice his positive attributes and described him as a “polite, respectful, active, considerate, and friendly” (ti.1) student. She thought that the “basic needs” of English, which he acquired in the camp, would ensure his smooth transition in September. Most importantly, she expected that his experiences of being only one Japanese student in the class and of overcoming his initial adjustment would be a source of confidence and a milestone to remember for the rest of his sojourning. Wataru similarly thought that his “English skills would be useful” for his school adjustment in the next school year: “Because I know more English, I feel it’s *daijoubu* (all right) to start my new school” (ci.2).

Besides attending the summer camp, he spent his summer time practicing baseball and catching cicadas in the park. His love for the living things was still the same. He sometimes thought about his insects that he left behind in Japan, and phoned his relatives to see how those insects were doing. Thinking of the upcoming school year, he felt “worried which school [he would] be going” (ci.2).  

He also had many questions in mind regarding his new school: “Are there any Japanese students?” “Will I find anyone to play with?” “Is there a place like a basketball court where kids can freely run around?” (ci.2) and so forth. He thought that he would like his new school as long as he would “make some friends,” and particularly wanted “to get familiar with American people” and “learn English naturally” (ci.2) by talking with them.

58 The family moved to the town where the Spring Lake School and the Oakfield School were located. However, since the address was not in their school districts, they had to wait to know to which school the ELL coordinator would assign him. His parents were hoping to send him to Oakfield because they were afraid if the large number of Japanese students in Spring Lake would hinder his English acquisition.
In the end of August, Wataru’s parents were informed that he would be going to the Oakfield School and completed his school registration. Then, Wataru and Yuki immediately went back to Japan to settle the visa process. Again, they stayed at Yuki’s parents’ house and Wataru spent a familiar routine of playing outdoor and indoor. He also independently studied academic subjects in Japanese for about thirty minutes everyday. In the mid October after a month and a half of waiting, he finally moved to the United States and started at Oakfield.

A night before the first day of school, Wataru felt “kowai (scared)” (ci.3) and thought, “I don’t want to go because I don’t know how the school is like and my heart is racing so fast” (ci.3). In the morning, he went to school with his parents and met with his third grade classroom teacher, Ms. Lewis in the lobby. According to her, he seemed fine until he came to the classroom entrance. However, as soon as he saw some students inside, he started to look overwhelmed with tears and his feet completely stopped. After she gently encouraged, he finally stepped in the room. A few hours later, he went down to the nurse’s office due to his stomach aches. In half an hour, he came back and seemed fine afterwards.

On the first day, Yuki noticed that he did not finish all of his lunch but ate only one rice ball, and imagined how nervous he had been in school. He described to her that the school was “fun, especially the recess time” (ci.3), but, at the same time, shared his concerns about the days when his part time JELL teacher would not be in school.59 Yuki informed him that a Japanese-speaking aide was in the school building everyday, and

59 Unlike in the Spring Lake School, the JELL teacher worked part-time only two days a week in Oakfield.
then he seemed relieved. During the first few days of school, he was upset and randomly spoke out complaints about the school, teachers, and classmates at home. When Yuki patiently listened to him with an accepting attitude, he calmed down and started to play cheerfully as usual.

Before long, he overcame his initial anxiety and “jump[ed] right in” (ti.2) his new class. After one week, he was like a “brand new kid” who was “energetic, pleasant, up-beat, happy, and confident in self” (ti.2). When he joined the class, it was in the season of the World Series baseball event and he made a great impression to his classmates that he had “really taken on more of the American culture because of baseball” (ti.2). Ms. Lewis explained, “It’s almost like, he does not have culture. It’s more baseball. ‘I’m Wataru and I am baseball’” (ti.2). He also really tried hard to “put himself out there so that he [could] connect with [his classmates]” (ti.2). In a poetry class, for instance, Ms. Lewis told him that he could pass his turn to recite a poem to the class. However, he wasn’t “even entertained by the idea of passing” (ti.2) and read a short English poem to the class with her help. Ms. Lewis commented, “If you ask the kids how long he has been [in my class], very few of them would have said a week” (ti.2).

About ten days since he joined his new class, I met him for the last interview. When I greeted him, “Gakko wa dou? (How’s school?),” he answered with his usual friendly smile, “Sugoku-ii (Greatly wonderful)!” (ci.3) He explained, “[My classroom] is lively, minna (everyone/all) is kind, I don’t have to study much, there are so much times for playing and talking, so it’s fun” (ci.3). His quick adjustment was a surprise to Yuki because he cried at least for a week in the past when he entered both his kindergarten and
his elementary school. He explained the reason for his easier adjustment this time, “I went through the same situation in my summer camp. I was scared in the beginning and then began to enjoy more and more later on” (ci.3). As he developed a sense of comfort in school, Yuki noticed that he started to finish all of his lunch.

He particularly liked the “asobippoi (play-like)” (ci.3) atmosphere of his classroom. For instance, one day Ms. Lewis told the class, “Let’s do our math lesson outside because it’s raining hard!” and then, some students said, “No kidding!” while others said, “Let’s really go outside!” Everyone in the class, including Wataru, laughed together. He had never experienced such fun classroom interactions during academic lessons: “In Japan, you get scolded by your teacher if you tell jokes in class. The teachers are urusai (importunate) in telling us, ‘Please be quiet!’ and ‘Keep your good posture!’” (ci.3) He liked his U.S. classroom better and thought, “It’s better to have fun when learning because it helps students remember things better for any subjects” (ci.3).

The extensive support from his teachers and his Japanese classmates, Tetsu and Chika, also contributed to his smooth adjustment. Though Tetsu, who had been in the United States over one year, was “serious child” (ti.2) unlike him, they instantly became connected with each other and Tetsu became his “biggest friend” (ci.3) in no time. It was comfortable for him to ask questions to Tetsu who also voluntarily offered help. Wataru also worked closely with Chika who was a newcomer like him. They were both “smiley up-beat people” (ti.2) and they seemed to enjoy each others’ company.

Because of his “good nature” (ti.2), he soon became positively connected to most of his classmates. His American classmates were very kind to him and he felt
comfortable asking them questions. He was eager to make “not one hundred friends but one thousand friends” (ci.3), including both American and Japanese friends. Ms. Lewis called him, “a trickster” (ti.2) because he seemed to like doing some non-verbal tricks, for example, tapping his classmate’s shoulder and moving to the other side like nothing happened. At home, he started to talk about his new American friends. One day when Yuki was going to take him to his classroom in the morning, he found his classmate in the hallway and told her, “I can go with him” (pi).60

As a newcomer, he still had the English language barrier. In his class, he saw himself as a student who “does average in English and studies” and who “was not saikoukyu (best top ranking)” (ci.3). Ms. Lewis noticed that he tended to get frustrated in retrieving English words to express himself, and often told him, “It’s okay that you can’t think of the words for now, honey. It’s okay and not a problem” (ti.2). Despite his struggles in English, he remained “enthusiastic, very committed, and dedicated” (ti.2) to acquire English and positively viewed his own progress: “Until a few days ago, I kept myself silent and just smiling when I was with minna (everyone/all). But, now, I can have fun talking and playing with them. I began to do much better with my English and I began to have more fun” (ci.3). He thought that he understood English better than Chika did. At home, he also taught his father some English words that he learned in school.

In addition to his previous English lessons in Japan and in the summer camp, his careful observations of others were important for his English acquisition. During a gym class, for instance, he first had no idea what his teacher was saying to his classmate.

60 The parent interview took place on 11/7/07.
However, he started to comprehend the conversation when he thought about “the situation really hard” (ci.3) and observed the classmate’s action and reaction. When he knew that the teacher was saying, “Wait for a second!”, he felt like praising himself, “Good job!” (ci.3). He also felt thankful to *minna* for giving him the unconscious opportunities for learning English.

Since he was immersed into English-speaking environment for most of the school hours, he could practice his oral English through interacting with American students. Especially when he invented a game called “leaf fight” (ci.3) during the recess, American boys began to join him and became his friends. In the game, children simply threw a handful of fallen leaves at each other. He commented, “Before, I did not have any friends. So, I played by myself or with Chika at the monkey bar. But I started to do the ‘leaf fight’ and *minna* (everyone/all) came up to me and we decided to play it together. After that, I got better with my English” (ci.3).

Figure 5.2 Wataru’s Drawing: Leaf Fight
In school, Wataru chose to use English as much as he could even in his JELL class. Ms. Lewis always wanted him to write in Japanese in class so that he could first “think of the big picture and lots of ideas, and worry about English second” (ti.2). However, he usually did not prefer writing in Japanese. This was because of his strong motivation towards mastering English and did not mean that he was rejecting his Japanese background. In fact, when he conversed with his Japanese classmates, he perceived himself as “after all a Japanese person” (ci.3). He did not go to a supplemental Japanese language school, but he continued to speak only Japanese to his parents and independently studied kokugo (Japanese language arts) at home. Yuki also read aloud Japanese books to him every night, hoping that he would maintain “proper” Japanese skills which allow him to “express his humane side” (pi.2).

Wataru tried his best on fitting in his U.S school because he loved his U.S. life so much. He knew that he would return to Japan when he enters a junior high school in five years. However, he tried not to think about the return yet and commented, “I want to stay here longer, so it’s good for nothing if I think about [my future return]. I’ll think about it right before I go back” (ci.3). When he sometimes saw Tetsu being so Americanized and not knowing Japanese ways (e.g., check marks on the worksheet means the incorrect answers in Japan), he wondered if he would be similarly Americanized in the future.
This chapter presents case studies of three Japanese children, Misaki, Tsubasa, and Yayoi, who lived the stages of concluding their U.S. schooling and returning to Japan.

Misaki

“A beautiful smile” (ti.1) is the first image that comes to my mind when I think of Misaki.\textsuperscript{61} When we first met at the Spring Lake School in January 2007, she was a ten-year-old fourth grader who called herself an “oshaberi-san (Miss. Chatter)” (ci.1). In our conversation, her confident manner of speech was softened by her gentle smile and spiced up with playful expressions that reflected her great sense of humor.\textsuperscript{62} Unlike my other participants, she was born abroad in London in the United Kingdom due to her father’s banking business.\textsuperscript{63} While living there for five years, she went to an English nursery school and acquired her age-level English skills.

In 2001, she and her family moved to an outskirt city of Tokyo. After going to a kindergarten for a year, she entered an elementary school affiliated to a Japanese national university. She felt “lucky” (ci.1) to be admitted to this extremely popular school which used a lottery system to select the prospective students. In school, she enjoyed art class and kanji learning though she did not see herself strong in kokugo (Japanese language

---

\textsuperscript{61} The first teacher interview (ti.1) was on 1/25/07 and the second interview (ti.2) was on 3/10/07.
\textsuperscript{62} The first child interview (ci.1) was on 1/24/07, the second (ci.2) 3/20/07, and the third (ci.3) 5/07/07.
\textsuperscript{63} Her parents’ international sojourning had begun long before her birth: They had spent three years in Hong Kong and an additional three years in London before she was born in September 1996.
arts). Her relationships with her teachers and classmates were always positive, and she made two best friends whom she kept in touch throughout her sojourning.

After living in Japan for three years, she had to prepare for the next sojourning due to her father’s new business assignment. She was already accustomed to the Japanese environment and forgot almost all English. Therefore, she joined an after school program to learn the basic English. While her parents were hopeful that U.S. education would benefit her life, she was reluctant to leave her best friends behind. When she announced one of them about her move, the friend was shocked and exclaimed, “Misaki is moving! Oh, my god!” (ci.3)

In August 2004 after completing the first trimester of her second grade in Japan, Misaki moved to Boston and joined a second grade classroom in the Spring Lake School. Due to the supports immediately provided by the school, she thought, “The teachers were great!” (ci.3) When she just started off, she was often “excused from regular classroom lessons” and asked to read Japanese books or to just watch what her classmates were doing. This made her perceive herself as “an outsider” (ci.3). Even when she participated in classroom activities, her learning experiences were not always positive due to her limited English skills. She, for instance, struggled with listening and stated:

I found the classes so boring because I did not understand the meanings. My teacher was speaking some henna (strange) words and I was like, ‘I wonder what she is speaking about.’ I understood nothing at all. When my teacher read aloud a book, I just felt distant and wondered, ‘What is she saying?’ (ci.3)

---

64 Japanese public schools, in general, have the trimester system. The first term runs from April through July, followed by the second term from September through December and the third term from January through March.
She also struggled with speaking English and commented:

I was doing everything quietly in the beginning and I couldn’t speak at all. One time, I was advised by my teacher to speak more. It was like, I wanted to have communication but couldn’t because I couldn’t speak English. (ci.3)

She thought that her teachers and classmates could not understand her because of her “bad pronunciation” (ci.1), and that they viewed her as “a quiet and strange student, who can’t speak English” (ci.3). In her views, writing in English was easier than speaking because she did not have to see others’ negative reactions, such as “What is she saying on the earth?” (ci.3) As a newcomer, she found the supports from the JELL and ELL programs crucial to her school life. She learned survival vocabulary in her ELL class and benefited immensely from her JELL teacher’s one-on-one instruction and translation.

Despite her struggles, Misaki optimistically accepted these seemingly unpleasant situations as “shouganai (can’t help it/can’t do anything about it)” (ci.3) because, after all, she indeed could not speak English yet. She simply knew that English acquisition would take some time, possibly one year to develop her oral English proficiency if she would “keep on trying” (ci.3). This idea came from her parents and teachers who told her, “In one more year, you’ll be able to speak at least a little” (ci.3). According to her mother, as Misaki sojourned across three countries, England, Japan, and the United States, she maintained her positive attitude towards learning and always tried her best on keeping up with her peers. She was also always a type of person who played by ear with an optimistic attitude. She had seen some Japanese students with an attitude, “It’s okay [not to speak English] because I am going back soon anyway”, but her attitude was opposite
from theirs. During her U.S. sojourning, she “always wanted to be better able to speak English” (ci.1).

As she expected, she improved her English skills “little by little” (ci.1) yet steadily during her first year in the United States. When she became able to keep up with the grade level studies, she stopped receiving the JELL support. She continued to receive the ELL support throughout her U.S. sojourning, but started to “dislike” (ci.3) it as a burden because of the extra homework. In addition to those school supports, she initially took weekly English lessons from a private tutor but eventually stopped this as well. In her third grade, she was no longer exempted from the regular classroom activities and completed all academic works at her grade level.

Throughout her U.S. sojourning, there were always several Japanese girls in the same grade who “gather[ed] up naturally” (ci.2). They influenced Misaki’s English acquisition to some extent. For instance, when a Japanese girl, who always translated for her, suddenly became unwilling to offer help, she needed to find alternative ways to keep up in English, such as actively asking different Japanese classmates for help and doing “a team work” (ci.1) with other newcomers. Her experience with the Japanese girl was surely not pleasant; however, it seemed understandable to Misaki that the girl did not like translating because she did it “for really a long time” (ci.1) since kindergarten.

Also, in the first year of sojourning when another Japanese girl named Mayumi mistreated her, she became motivated to “play with minna (everyone/all)” rather than just with Japanese peers and “ganbatta (made her own best effort)” (ci.2) on learning English. She described Mayumi as “a very unyielding girl,” “my unfavorable type,” and “a sticky
type of person who I don’t like” (ci.2). One day in the school cafeteria, Misaki tried sitting at a table of Japanese girls, including Mayumi. However, Mayumi told her, “You don’t understand English so you should sit over there” (ci.3), pointing at a table of American girls. Misaki was shocked at first and said, “What?” (ci.3) Then, she walked away from the table by saying, “Ok, I understand” (ci.3). She again optimistically viewed this obviously negative episode by reasoning that she is “after all, a kinishinai (carefree) type” (ci.3). Also, compared to the bossy and violent bullies who she witnessed in her former Japanese school, this incident was not even a big deal to her.

In addition, Misaki engaged in various extracurricular activities throughout sojourning, including her weekly piano lesson and figure ice-skating practice. In her free time at home, she loved to make crafts like origami and sometimes invited her Japanese and American friends over to make some crafts and fun games together.

After more than two and a half years in the United States, Misaki was “still developing” as “a classic ELL” (ti.1). She, for instance, “did a little slower with the word problems” in math, had “her greatest challenge” (ti.1) in writing, and struggled with “memorizing science terminologies” (ci.1). She often felt the need of “keeping up a little better with the classes” (ci.1). Despite these challenging aspects typical to ELL students, she was known as “a bright kid” with “really good grasp of English language” and “a wonderful attitude” (ti.1). In most parts, she could do the tasks in the level of “fourth grade age appropriate” (ti.1). Her classroom teacher, Mr. Wilmore, thought that she could “understand everything that [he said] and everything she [was] learning” (ti.1).
Even when her returning date was approaching within three months, she “stayed motivated, learned as much as she could, and never discouraged” (ti.1). In her classroom, I observed her actively engaging in various content area lessons for the entire school hours, completing her tasks like her English-speaking classmates, frequently raising her hand to speak out her ideas. She was able to “speak so much more than before” (ci.1), and had no problem with daily conversations in English. Her mother noticed that she started to speak English to her five-year-old sister, Kumi, at home. In school, she began to be chatty with others and to show her “true self” (ti.1). In one parent conference, Mr. Wilmore even had to tell her mother that she was “a child who talks a lot and sometimes needs to be quieter” (ci.3).

She also frequently translated for Japanese newcomers in her class, who sat next to her, because she knew that helping them was a shared responsibility among all Japanese-speaking students in the class. Mr. Wilmore praised her being “very good at working with other kids” (ti.1), including both her Japanese and American classmates. As she interacted with the newcomers, she thought that coming to the United States in an older age, unlike herself, would make their school experiences much harder because “studies would get difficult more and more” (ci.1) in higher grades. She also thought that everyone must have English oral communication skills in order to avoid unnecessary misunderstanding and unfair scolding. One time, she witnessed that a Japanese boy was

---

65 Mr. Wilmore distributed the responsibilities to help newcomers among Japanese-speaking students (e.g., changing the seating arrangement every month). By doing so, he hoped to give all students more chances to speak English. He had been encouraging ELLs to practice speaking English in his classroom. He thought that there was “no better place than here in the classroom to be immersed into total English” (ti.1). Although he did not stop his Japanese students to speak Japanese with each other, he believed that “to be a better English speaker, they need to speak [English] as much as possible” (ti.1).
scolded by his teacher because he could not explain in English that he had to be away from his classroom to attend his ELL class.

Despite the clear improvement, she was not totally confident in her English oral communication and still viewed speaking English more difficult than reading and writing in English. It was still challenging to comprehend what others were saying and to have herself understood by others. In the drawing below, she depicted herself conversing with her American friends without understanding what they were talking about.

Figure 6.1 Misaki’s Drawing: Talking with American Friends

Verbally interacting with more than one friend at a time was challenging and she explained:

My American friends are chatting something and sometimes I don’t keep up with them… When I’m with only one friend, I understand almost everything, but when I play with more than one, there are times when I just can’t keep up. (ci.1)

In such situations, she usually asked her Chinese-American friend, Emma, to repeat the content of the conversation and clarify the meaning of unknown expressions. She felt close to Emma who always helped her “so kindly” (ci.1). In the meantime, she was not

---

66 Misaki is to the right of the drawing.
yet comfortable to ask other English-speaking girls to help her since she was afraid of not understanding their answers to her questions.

Throughout her sojourning, Misaki learned the differences between Japanese and American students. When she was in Japan, she imagined that all American people would be “really up right, cheerful, gentle, and kind” (ci.1). However, she noticed that her U.S. peers were “bara-bara (inconsistent/heterogeneous)” (ci.1) to the greater extent than the students in Japan in terms of their learning levels, physical figures, behaviors, and personalities. She criticized that most of her American peers, except for her Asian-American peers, were “random and rough” (BIQ), and that some were even “strong-tempered yet a crybaby” (ci.1). In her view, the non-Asian Americans also “exposed secrets to all” and tended to “say bad things about people so openly, like it was okay to be wrong” (ci.1). She was also advised by her Japanese friend that “it’s better not to lend money to the Americans because they won’t give it back” (ci.1). She immediately felt “ki-ga-au (getting along well)” (ci.1) with her Asian American peers who were more sincere and trustworthy.67

She also critically viewed Japanese students. She particularly did not like two Japanese girls who were “always together” (ci.2) and who behaved very exclusive against other classmates by consistently speaking Japanese. One day during lunch, she saw some American students complaining about those girls speaking in Japanese, “It’s so noisy over there, isn’t it?” (ci.2). She was supportive for the perspectives of those American students

---

67 The word in this phrase, 気 (ki), literally means mind, heart, and feeling. The phrase, 気が合う (ki-ga-au), then describes the situation in which people find those aspects of their souls are bonding in a way that they naturally achieve mutual understanding.
students and thought it was understandable that they were annoyed by listening to a
different language that they did not understand the meanings.

She did not necessarily like or dislike either ethnic group. In her view, “the
Americans are, after all, different from the Japanese,” yet both groups were “dotchi-mo-
dotchi (about the same)” (ci.1). She either praised or criticized people in both culture
based on the particular events and episodes in which she was involved. Mr. Wilmore
thought that she was different from a typical Japanese student who “tended to gravitate
towards one another” (ti.1). Her relationships with her friends seemed “interchangeable”
and she had “her friends all over” (ti.1). She also commented, “The kids, who I play with,
are always different” (ci.1). Especially during the last few months in the United States,
she expanded her social network and began to “play with minna (everyone/all) in [her]
class” (ci.2). She also increasingly talked about her American friends at home.

Though her social relationship transcended the ethnic boundaries, she was always
strongly connected to Japanese language and culture. The Japanese-speaking
environment available at Spring Lake reduced her anxieties towards school:

Before getting on the bus every morning, I feel nervous and wonder, ‘Will there
be anything difficult happening today?’ But, once I come to school and start
yakking away with my Japanese friends, I gradually stop feeling that way. (ci.1)

Every Saturday, she went to the supplemental Japanese language school and learned her
grade-level math and language arts in Japanese. Her parents hoped that she would
maintain and further develop her Japanese skills since Japanese language is “beautiful
and special” (BIQ) with the sophisticated writing system and multifaceted expressions of
modesty and respect to others. She read Japanese books at her grade level although she
sometimes struggled expressing herself in writing. At home, she had been speaking Japanese to her family members and enjoyed watching Japanese cable television which she thought was “sugoi omoshiroi (so much fun)” (ci.1). She joyously told me that she had been watching a manga series, *Meitantei Conan* (Case Closed/Detective Conan), and that she sometimes borrowed the DVDs from her Japanese friends to keep up with the episodes. She looked amused when I told her that I watched the drama version of the manga, too. Unlike her sister, Kumi, she hardly watched American TV programs except for forecasts, news, and some children’s programs. Misaki thought that her sense of humor was different from the Americans, and commented:

> A timing to laugh is different. Like when I go to a sleepover, we watch TV and there are scenes to laugh… The times when [my American friends were] laughing, I thought it wasn’t very funny. And then, when I thought it was funny, everyone else was not laughing. (ci.1)

When the returning date approached less than a week ahead, Misaki developed mixed feelings: “I am looking forward to it, but there are some sad things, too” (ci.2). Mr. Wilmore commented, “She is kind of bitter sweet thing, you know, she is happy but she is not” (ti.2). She was “samishii (lonely)” partially because she “[wouldn’t] be able to see [her] American friends” (ci.2) and largely because she would miss out the events that she always enjoyed in Boston (i.e., the Red Sox games and the annual school festival). Her mother was also “a little disappointed as a parent,” because she thought that, if Misaki could stay a little longer, she would definitely be able to “play with her English-speaking friends without boundaries” (pi). In contrary to the sadness, Misaki was surely excited to go back to Japan where she would be enjoying favorite Japanese TV programs, great

---

68 The parent interview (pi) took place on 3/20/07.
food, and the reunion with her best friends. Her attachment to her friends in Japan
seemed to surpass her newly developing friendship in the United States. When she found
out that one of her American friends was going to have a family trip to Japan and stop by
at her place in the summer, she stated, “I feel neither happy nor glad about it because I
have my own friends over there” (ci.2). Her best friends in Japan sometimes emailed her
to tell that they were waiting for her return and planning to throw a welcome-back party.
In the meantime, Misaki enjoyed selecting souvenirs for them.

Throughout sojourning, staying in touch with her best friends in Japan reminded
her of her eventual return and made her imagine a Japanese school life. One of her best
friends, who had visited her in Boston once, told her that it was “very hard to be a student
in Japan because of the busy schedule with juku (cram school)” (ci.1). This made her
want to immediately return to Japan because she “did not want to be behind in studies”
(ci.3). She planned to “ganbaru (make best effort) on keeping [her] English skills” (ci.3)
in Japan because she expected that, by having her strong English skills, she would not
feel too bad about other subjects which she might be behind her peers in Japan. She also
anticipated that, unlike a typical U.S. school life, the busy school life in Japan would not
allow her to “play outside everyday on [her] way back home” (ci.1).

Despite the obvious need of readjustment, she remained optimistic about her
return. Compared to her relocation from Japan to the United States, her upcoming return
did not seem too terrible. She simply knew that she would “manage somehow” (ci.1) and
commented, “I’m not as lonely or sad as when I came here from Japan, because I know I
have my friends over there” (ci.2). Her mother attributed her optimistic attitude to her
“frank disposition” (pi) and “cheerful and positive minded” (BIQ) characters. Her parents intended not to pressure her to prepare for her future school life in Japan and only provided her with the information about some “kikoku-gumi (a group of returnee students)” (pi). She was not studying even for the academic placement test which she would take only three days after her arrival in Japan. Her mother thought, “It’s too late for Misaki to do anything at this point. She has been learning the basics in her Japanese Language School. So, if we push her too hard now to place her in a higher grade, she’ll have a hard time later in her class” (pi).

Until the last day of school, she also kept her enthusiastic attitudes toward her U.S. school life. She seemed happy in school, skipping in the hallway with a big smile as usual. When she had to take a three-hour-long writing assessment as part of MCAS, the state-wide standardized examination, only a few days before her last day of school, she positively viewed her experience and sated, “If I didn’t take it, I couldn’t stay with my classroom, and then, I would’ve played all day, which I didn’t like. So, I rather wanted to take it” (ci.2). She also told her mother, “It’s better taking it than being tokubetuatsukai (treated as special)” (pi). After the exam, she was glad not to be one of the last students to complete it like she was in the previous year. She was looking forward to receiving the test results in order to determine her own “ichiduke (level/position)” (pi).

69 When I talked with her mother, I noticed that she often modestly described herself and Misaki, “konna seikaku (personalities like this),” to mean that both of them were very optimistic and carefree.
70 The test was in math (i.e., basic calculation skills) and in Japanese language arts (i.e., kanji and overall literacy skills). Based on the results, she was going to be placed in either fourth or fifth grade.
71 All students in public schools in Massachusetts, including ELLs, are required to take the MCAS (the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System) which fulfill the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Law. Only the ELLs who are in their first year of enrollment in U.S. schools are exempted (Massachusetts Department of Education, 2007).
Her last day at Spring Lake was approaching in a few days and her class started to be filled with a farewell mood for Misaki and two other Japanese students who were leaving in the end of March. Her parents and Mr. Wilmore both thought that she would be just fine, if not “fantastic” (ti.2), in Japan. Even though she may encounter “extra pressure” due to Japanese culture, Mr. Wilmore believed that “anyone [like Misaki] who developed relationship in one place” (ti.2) would do well in another place. With great excitement and a trace of sadness in mind, her transition was to become a reality. She knew that Japan is truly a far away country to return from the United States. Unlike her sister, Kumi, who was looking forward to taking an airplane, the idea of traveling from one continent to another was heavy on her shoulders: “I’m excited to take a plane, but I’m not sure about taking it for thirteen hours!” (ci.2)

. . . . .

Newly cut short hair, a tanned face, and a sporty red t-shirt—Misaki looked somewhat boyish and very lively when I reunited with her at a public library in Tokyo about a month and a half since her return. Because her father was still working in Boston, the rest of her family moved first and was staying at her maternal grandparents’ house. Their decision of an early return was for Misaki to re-enroll in her old school. According to the school’s academic placement test, she was qualified to enter the fifth grade class that happened to be taught by her former teacher in the primary grades. Because she started the new school year from shigyoushiki (the opening ceremony) in

---

72 Mr. Wilmore had been to Japan in the past and was familiar with the Japanese education systems and high academic demands.
73 The school could save Misaki’s enrollment only for three years from April 2004 through March 2007.
April and because everyone in the class was going through the transition of *kurasu-gae* (class change), she could mingle in the crowd of students without standing out as a returnee student.

As Misaki expected, the typical school life in Japan was quite hectic with extracurricular activities, abundant homework, daily *kanji* practice, and various school events. She described the way in which most of her classmates spent their after school hours as the following:

They go to *juku* (cram school) until ten at night. They quickly go there after school with a packed dinner. And, after coming home, they brush their teeth. Some people quickly finish their homework at the same night and other people do their homework in the morning before they go to school. (ci.3)

It seemed that they did not have enough time to play and to engage in sports activities for fun. Misaki was not yet enrolled in *juku* because her mother wanted her to first get used to her school with a minimal amount of stress and then to start extracurricular learning activities. However, she could easily imagine her busy life in the future with *juku*, *soroban* (abacus), and swimming which she planned to begin soon.

Despite the hectic school life in Japan, her readjustment went very smoothly. She enjoyed the long school hours that allowed her to “be close to [her] friends” (ci.3). As a part of *Aozora Katsudo* (the Blue Sky Activities) which was a year long curriculum to foster students’ interests in the nature, all fifth graders were soon participating in *rinkan gattko* (overnight outdoor camp) at the Kuruma mountains in Nagano. This one-week camp would be the longest time that Misaki would be away from her family and stay with her friends. She was “looking forward to everything” (ci.3) in the camp and had been busy packing her luggage which the school would deliver to the destination in advance.
The *Aozora Katsudo* also included various nature activities, such as an experiment to dye fabric with natural organic materials (i.e., vegetable, fruits, and flowers) and the *taue* (rice planting) event. Misaki thought the *taue* was unique in Japan because, in the United States, her class “did not do so many things that make students dirty” (ci.3). When planting the crops, she felt “pretty disgusted digging a hole in the ground” (ci.3) but had great fun observing her mischievous male classmates who were running around wet in the mud pool. One of them, who got all his clothes soaking wet, took off the clothes and ran fast in his underwear to keep himself dry. Some students yelled out at him, “Stop! Stop! You’ll be caught by the police!” (ci.3) “Minna (everyone/all)” laughed at the scene and said, “Cut it out!” (ci.3) As she described this memorable episode of *taue*, she repeatedly used the term, *minna* to refer to her classmates as a whole. She felt “tanoshii (fun/enjoyable)” (ci.3) to collaboratively work with *minna* in various school activities.

In class, she found her Japanese skills a little behind her peers. Although she was keeping up all academic tasks at her grade level, she saw herself “a little no good” (ci.3) in *kanji* learning. In Japanese conversation, she also experienced the “times when words do not come out” and “[her] head goes crazy” (ci.3). However, these difficulties in Japanese were less than a concern to her since she had already experienced a more difficult task of learning English in the United States.

Soon after her return, she was “not using much English anymore” (ci.3). She stopped reading in English and no longer spoke English to Kumi at home. In fact, she did

---

74 Many Japanese public elementary schools have a shallow pool for students’ agriculture activities. Students experience the process of rice harvesting practiced by the farmers—preparing the plant bed, placing young rice plants in late spring, monitoring the growth, and harvest the crops in the autumn.
not bring her collection of English books, which she enjoyed reading in the United States, because her mother expected that Japanese reading would be her main focus in Japan. Though her parents did not impose any pressure on her to maintain English for the time being, they wanted her to eventually begin learning English in Japan. They believed that English was the world’s common language which could benefit her future life. Misaki also knew that her English skills would be useful for taking the junior high entrance exam and also for “going abroad and getting a job in the future” (ci.1).

At the present time, however, she used English only during an hour-long weekly English class at school. The class was “not fun” (ci.3) since the level of English taught was too low for Misaki. She thought that it was “shouganai (can’t help it/can’t do anything about it)” (ci.3) since most students could not comprehend English at all and kept on speaking Japanese in class even when the teacher told them, “Please use more English, everyone!” (ci.3) She knew that learning English is difficult for anyone and said, “I was like that in the beginning” (ci.3).

During the English classes, she did not want to reveal her English skills to others because, in her view, “By being special, you cannot help being like bragging” (ci.3). In her class, there was another returnee male student who frequently spoke in English to the teacher and interrupted the lessons. Other students were “very angry at him” (ci.3) and she tried not to behave like this boy. Instead, she tried to be “the same as minna (everyone/all),” because she knew that the students, who are bragging, being special, and being too active, “could be hated” and “naturally become apart from others” (ci.3). Since she was not really showing her English skills, she was not sure if her classmates viewed
her as a *kikokushijo* (returnee). The only times when she revealed her U.S. sojourning background was when her teacher asked her, in front of the whole class, if the world map used in her U.S. classroom really display American continents in the center of the map, and when her friends asked her to speak some English words so that they could listen to her pronunciation. She assumed that “all of the girls [knew]” (ci.3) about her background, though she did not emphasize it at all.

She did not think that her U.S. schooling and English language acquisition had changed her at all, but her friends sometimes mentioned that she became more “*ki-ga-tsuyoi* (aggressive/strong minded)” (ci.3) when compared to before. In her view, her Japanese peers were the ones who were strong, serious, competitive, and even “*kowai* (scary)” (ci.3) when it comes to their test scores. One of her classmates, who did not receive perfect score on his *kanji* test, got very angry and loudly complained about it in the classroom. It was not only this boy but most of her classmates were discussing their test results and grading. She never saw such seriousness among students when she was in the United States.

She also noticed that the Japanese adults, *obasan* (women) and *ojisan* (men), who she encountered on her way walking to school, were so different from American adults. She often felt “*mukatsuita* (disgusted)” and “*iyada* (unpleasant)” with their rudeness.\(^{75}\)

---

\(^{75}\) The terms, *obasan*, and *ojisan*, refer to the people who passed their middle age. One of the connotations attached to the term, *obasan*, is a somewhat comical stereotype of old women misbehaving in public places without a sense of shame. Besides school contexts, Misaki experienced so many incidents in which *obasan* and *ojisan* were troublesome. In a bargain sale at a supermarket, she saw an *obasan*, who was pushing other customers, said, “Excuse me! Move out of my way!” (ci.3) She also saw an *obasan* grabbed the last cart in the store without a hesitation and disappeared in the crowd with a big attitude. Unlike American adults, who kindly open the door for each other, *ojisan* usually sneakied through the door that someone opened and *obasan* pushed to open the door just for themselves and make a quick entry.
One time, an obasan in bicycle so closely passed by Misaki and her friends on a narrow road and caught the string of her train pass holder hanging around her neck. After having dragged her on the road, the woman never apologized, but, instead, angrily said, “It was your fault walking in a spread” (ci.3). Another time, when Misaki was about to take a seat in a train to school, an ojisan suddenly appeared from somewhere and quickly stole the seat. She thought that their “obasan power” and “ojisan power” were shamelessly “sugoi (extreme)” (ci.3). As she told these incidents, she laughed and said that there was nothing she could do with their behaviors.

Misaki’s readjustment to Japan thus involved varied social and academic experiences as well as cultural exposure. She was always attentive to the people around her, including her friends, peers, teachers, and even the strangers who she encountered outside the school. Still wearing her Red Sox t-shirt, she kept her fond memories of Boston. At the same time, she was becoming immersed back into the mainstream in her Japanese school. She imagined her future school life with her optimism and her usual smile, “I think I will get used to it” (ci.3).

Tsubasa

For most people who I interact with, I heavily rely on my first impression to remember them. However, when I think of Tsubasa, my very last impression is most powerful to engrave his images in my consciousness. He unveiled his sincerity, which had been hidden during all interviews in the United States, when I was leaving his house in Tsukuba after the last interview.76 Though he could easily go inside without seeing me

---

76 The first interview took place on 2/1/07 (ci.1), the second on 3/15/07 (ci.2), and the third on 5/5/07 (ci.3).
off, he chose to stand next to the entrance door without a word or waving but with his eyes so kindly following me walking away. I waved at him one last time before turning the corner and disappearing from his sight. His calm and caring gaze in a distance was my last impression of him that I vividly remember.

Interacting with Tsubasa was a challenge but certainly gave me a chance to reflect on my own research practice (i.e., building a rapport and co-constructing dialogues with the participant). In the interviews, Tsubasa looked comfortable, occasionally smiled at me, and happily ate some chocolate chip cookies that I prepared for him. However, he was not willing to verbally express himself and his answers to my questions were often limited to “I don’t know,” “I’m not sure about that,” or “I would not know about that yet” (ci.1, 2, &3). In one interview, he most rigidly concealed his thoughts, refused to draw a picture, and requested to shorten the session. Since he seemed active and happy as usual, his uncooperative attitudes puzzled me. As a researcher still in the infantile stage, I felt like being abandoned all by myself in the unknown schema of his thoughts. I desperately needed his help for constructing legitimate interpretations of his world and experiences. Simultaneously, I realized how much I had been taking for granted of the collaboration from my other participants who so willingly spoke and elaborated their ideas to make me feel warmly invited into their worlds. I could not help speculating the possible reasons for Tsubasa’s responses (e.g., the content of conversation, his personalities in general, his possible mood of the day, the issue of age and gender, his role as an older brother in the family, the preferred use of language, etc.). Not surprisingly, my direct questions to him about these presumptions only received his usual answer, “I don’t know” (ci.2).
However, I soon realized that I was imposing self-centered expectations on Tsubasa for being as cooperative and communicative as other child participants. I needed to quit complaining about his interaction style and to learn how to accept his distinct ways of using silence as an expression. What he did not verbally share with me could possibly illuminate his views when intersecting it with the supplemental data. The missing piece, or what he chose not to share, seemed to hold invaluable meanings. Then I could admit that it was totally all right for him to talk about the only things that he wished to share in a way that best suited his own ways of expressing himself. I accepted whatever he could offer, and then, noticed that not only his voices but also his silence had meanings so clear and strong.

Born on July 15, 1997 in Ibaraki, Japan, Tsubasa was nine-year-old when he participated in this study in January, 2007. His hometown was a newly developed region called Tsukuba Science City which was located within an hour distance from Tokyo and which was home to the national testing and research facilities encompassing such research fields as medicine, agriculture, and environment. Both of his parents were medical researchers who worked in one of those facilities. Tsubasa lived in Ibaraki all his life until he moved to Boston in April 2003 due to his father’s postdoctoral research.

In Japan, Tsubasa went to a private Catholic kindergarten which offered abundant resources and small-size classes to its students. Although he did not remember much of his presojourning days in Japan, his mother described him “always curious and interested” (BIQ). She also explained that he was always motivated to engage in various
classroom activities and got along with his teachers and his classmates regardless of their genders. He often played with a few good male friends in the playground and at each other’s home. Two months before moving to the United States, he and his younger brother began to go to a private English conversation school weekly to learn the very basics of English, such as alphabet. His parents hoped that the early exposure to English would reduce their children’s fear against the new language.

In May 2003, Tsubasa and his family arrived in Boston. His father started to work full time and his mother stayed at home to take care of her children. His parents optimistically thought that the real life multicultural experiences in the United States would bring no harm but only benefits to their children. When Tsubasa entered his kindergarten class in the Spring Lake School, it was already three weeks before the end of school year. As a newcomer, he struggled with his English language learning and often cried in class. One day when his mother came to pick him up, she saw him in tears at his desk, facing a piece of paper without knowing what he was supposed to do with it.

Because of his limited English skills, he was also teased by a Japanese bully in his class. One time, in the courtyard of his apartment, he and his Japanese peers, including the bully, were playing a “dengon (message) game” (pi). In the game, each child needed to take turn whispering one English word to the next person so that the word would be passed onto the last person correctly. When Tsubasa did not know the word,

---

77 Tsubasa’s mother, who I found was intelligent, articulated, caring, and frank, always cooperatively provided information about his school experiences. Every time when we set up an interview date through email, she voluntarily wrote a few paragraphs regarding what she noticed about his current school life.

78 His mother noticed that Japanese students in Spring Lake tended to pick on newcomer’s limited English skills. It seemed to her that children’s English proficiency played a big role when it comes to bullying, teasing, and harassing within the Japanese community.

79 The parent interview (pi) took place on 3/15/07.
“nest” to tell the next person, the bully started to tease him very harshly and made him cry. He cried so loud that the security guard had to come to check on them. Bullying continued after this incident and Tsubasa became afraid of his Japanese peers. Though the bullying persisted, his sociable personality allowed him to make other Japanese friends before long. He soon started to enjoy playing a game called “circle soccer” with his friends and grew his interests in sports.

At the end of his kindergarten, the school offered his parents an option of having him either repeat the same grade or advance to the first grade. After consulting with his classroom teacher, his parents decided to send him to the first grade. The biggest reason was because he had already made some friends in his class and it would not be fair for him to start over again. In addition, his parents never doubted that he would do well in school, knowing of his high motivation towards learning and his active disposition. When this decision was made, his parents started to provide as much support as possible for his English language learning at home. His mother bought him many workbooks that he could use to practice phonics and alphabet during the summer. At his bedtime, she also started to read aloud simple picture books in English, such as Thomas the Train.

His first summer in the United States was very fruitful in terms of making friends and learning English. At a child care center in which he was enrolled only in the summer, he and an American boy started to play together while waiting for their mothers. At first, he cried and told his mother that he had no idea what the boy was saying to him. His mother, then, encouraged him, “You’ll be able to understand and speak English soon” (BIQ). Like she said, he gradually became able to communicate with this new American
friend in English. They became so close to each other that Tsubasa chose to play with him rather than with his Japanese friends. The boy’s mother was also kind to his mother and taught her various things about American culture. This made her feel lucky to have met such a wonderful American family who reached out and provided tremendous support for Tsubasa’s adjustment.

He also improved his English dramatically in the summer by continuing his study at home and attending an international ESL summer camp. He was first afraid of other Japanese students, but soon found out that none of them was like the bully in his school. After completing the camp, he felt “daijoubu (all right)” (ci.1) to use English. His mother attributed his positive learning experiences to his summer camp teacher’s excellence in teaching ELLs. In every summer throughout his sojourning, he participated in various summer camps, such as public recreation camps and private sports camps.

When he entered the first grade, he was again bullied by a different Japanese classmate. However, as he further improved his English skills in a rapid pace, the teasing stopped eventually. His mother thought, “If the child is confident in English, he or she will be able to overcome any issues” (pi). He acknowledged his classroom teacher’s support for his English acquisition and commented, “It was very hard [to learn English] when I just started my [first grade] class, but my sensei (teacher) was the one who could teach really well. So, I could understand English” (ci.1). The greatest thing about his teacher was that, while she taught him “so many different things in various ways” (ci.2), she did not treat him in any special ways. He was not the only one, who benefited from her enthusiastic teaching, but “minna (everyone/all) learned in the same way” (ci.1).
In the second grade, he continued to study English very hard at home and school. At home, he mainly learned literacy with his mother. His familiar routine was to first independently finish questions in workbooks and then to show the answers to his mother for feedback. Around this time of sojourning, he started to read more English books and watch more children’s TV shows in English. At school, he no longer needed to go to ELL class and focused on studies in his mainstream classroom. His mother noticed that a few of his best friends had been always American boys since his second grade.

In the third grade, he could “understand everything in English” and “speak English so much more” (ci.1) with his teachers and classmates. As a result, the number of English-speaking friends increased dramatically. He also started to speak only English to his siblings at home. He also became totally comfortable to use English for literacy tasks, which consequently decreased the levels of pressure and learning demands: “When my English was not good, I could be in trouble if I didn’t study hard. But, when I began to do better in English, I did not need to study hard any more” (ci.1). In the meantime, he stayed connected to Japan and the Japanese culture. Using the winter school vacation, he traveled to Japan for two weeks and experienced a one day enrollment in a Japanese public elementary school. He was most surprised to see the Japanese students commuting to school by themselves.

In February 2007 when I met with him for the first interview, he was a well respected member of his fourth grade class. I could sense sort of his dignified presence as a fully adjusted child who had been sojourning in the United States for over four years. In
his class he perceived himself as a “futuu-no (ordinary/regular) student” (ci.1) as he always did in Japan and in the United States. He defined futuu as “neither so great nor too bad in studies” (ci.1). He had never wondered how others might perceive him in class. To him, thinking of others’ views about him was not very meaningful, if not useless, since he would never find out their views without directly asking them. He, therefore, just assumed that his self-perception would not be too different from how they saw him. However, as I talked with his mother and his classroom teacher, Miss Garcia, it was clear that others saw him more than just regular or average because of his excellence in academics and English language learning.

In terms of his academic achievement, Miss Garcia described him as being “pretty much where he should be with his classmates” (ti.1). In all subjects, he was “very focused, studious, really smart, confident, and pretty consistent throughout” (ti.1). In his strongest subject, math, he was able to do “a lot of higher level thinking” (ti.1) and was selected to attend the Math Extension Program and receive advanced math instruction.

In terms of English language learning, he was a very enthusiastic learner as well, and Miss Garcia thought that he was “at his grade-level with his skills” and “on the right track” (ti.1). He did very well in his language arts class, read a great amount of books about adventures and sports, and hardly made grammatical mistakes in his writing. During one of my classroom observations, Miss Garcia came up to me to show his writing sample because it was one of the best works in the entire class. In his narrative writing, he described the ways in which he actively played a soccer game with his team.

---

80 The first teacher interview (ti.1) was on 1/31/07 and the second one (ti.2) was on 3/14/07.
mates. Having developed high fluency in oral communication, he not only understood Miss Garcia’s instructions but also enjoyed her fast-paced speech. He was even able to correct her misuse of words in speaking (e.g., mistake of saying “South Africa” instead of “South America”). He also did “lots of translation” (ti.1) for Japanese newcomers. At home, he started to read the English newspaper in addition to his books, and enjoyed writing fun stories with his friends on their play dates. He continued to speak only English to his siblings and talked with his English-speaking friends on the phone for over thirty minutes everyday. He listened to sports broadcastings on the radio and accurately translated what was going on in the game to his mother. His successful English acquisition was also manifested in the results of Eiken (an English proficiency exam administered by a Japanese organization) that he went to New Jersey to take a few times during his U.S. sojourning. He first passed the Grade Pre-2 with ease and then passed the Grade 2 as well.81 His parents were happy to know that his hard work for English acquisition made the fruitful results.

His enthusiastic learning attitudes also gave others an impression that he was competitive. His mother and Miss Garcia noticed that, because he had a tendency of pushing himself very hard in given academic and athletic tasks, he easily got upset when he could not do well on those tasks. Miss Garcia often saw him getting “angry,” “mean,” and “kind of aggressive” (ti.1) to others in competitive situations. He could be a very

81 Eiken is a leading English language assessment administered by Japan’s largest testing organization, the Society for Testing English Proficiency (STEP). The Grade Pre-2 is roughly equivalent to the total score of 400 in TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language), the Grade 2 to 450, and the Grade Pre-1 to 530 (The Society for Testing English Proficiency, 2007). The results of this exam are regarded as important and reliable indicators of individuals’ English proficiency. The highest Grade obtained is often stated in their varied forms of background information, including a resume.
motivated student on one hand and an extremely competitive student on the other hand. In several occasions, he pushed and hit his classmates. When she told him about her concerns on his behavior, he looked “very sad” (ti.1).

Despite his competitive character, he was “very well-liked” and “look[ed] up” (ti.1) by his classmates. His mother described him as “a type of person who [was] very social and willing to relate to others and enjoy things together” (pi). He made many friends “without alienating anyone” (pi) and played with both American and Japanese friends extensively. Miss Garcia noticed that he chose who to play with “based on what he wants to do on that day” (ti.1) and did not care much about his friends’ cultural and ethnic backgrounds. His mother sensed that, due to his experiences with the Japanese bullies, he did not exclusively hang around with only Japanese friends.

In addition, his love for sports had been an important part of his school life since kindergarten. He was a big fan of Boston’s baseball and ice hockey teams as well as Japanese Major League Baseball players. He had seen the actual professional games many times and learned the players’ names and stats through the newspaper, TV, and sports cards. At home, he displayed a poster of Ichiro Suzuki at his desk. Known as “very athletic” (ti.1) in class, he played soccer with his friends “almost every day” (ci.1) in recess and after school.\footnote{During the interview when he described the details and sequences of soccer games, it was actually a true pleasure for me to see him turning into a talkative boy. As he told the fun aspects of playing sports, his facial expressions were cheered up and his voice sounded so excited. His mother said that, at home, he always joyously told her what he did during recess.} The following drawing depicts Tsubasa running fast and dribbling a soccer ball to the goal post in his school’s backyard after school:
As extracurricular activities, he played soccer and baseball for the town’s sports teams in the summer and also played ice hockey in the winter. In addition to the athletic activities, he had been taking piano and violin lessons.

When his parents reminded him of his upcoming return to Japan, he “did not like it so much” (ci.1). However, he did not share his “honshin (true heart/intention)” (pi) with his family members. His mother speculated that he concealed his feelings inside and quietly accepted the reality because his younger brother was openly expressing his sad feelings and he needed to act like “chounan (the oldest son)” (pi).

One day in the middle of February, he announced his close friends about his return. They all looked “bikkuri (surprised)” (ci.2) and asked him the exact date for his last day. On that night, he asked his mother, “When are we leaving?” She noticed that he “looked so sad,” and told him, “It’ll be the 23rd, but we shall visit Boston again in the future, shall we not?” (pi) He again just nodded without expressing his feelings. She did

---

83 His mother was hesitant to have him play both soccer and baseball at first. However, he had strong desire to try both and she allowed him to do so with one condition: If he cannot keep a good balance of both, he will quit soccer and just play baseball. After all, he did very well on practicing both. His mother felt no regret, as a parent, on providing him with the opportunities of trying out the sports of his interest.
not ask how he was feeling because she knew that the family’s plan for returning would not change regardless of his feelings. In March when Miss Garcia made a formal announcement to the class about his return, he just felt “mah-mah (so so)” (ci.2). Some boys exclaimed, “I can’t believe you are leaving!” and he simply responded, “I know” (ti.2). Miss Garcia thought that the reasons for not wanting to leave the United States were different between Tsubasa and other typical Japanese students: In her view, Japanese students usually did not want to leave because they wanted more time to make English-speaking friends. In contrast, it would be hard for Tsubasa to leave because he made so many friends who he did not want to be separated from. Since the announcement about his upcoming return, he did not change his behavior or attitude in school and seemed “neither sad about it nor excited” (ti.2). At home, his mother noticed that he looked less anxious after everyone knew about his return. After all, he realized that he had no control over his family’s plan: “I’ll go back because I know I have to” (ci.3).

When I met with him a few days prior to his return, he joyously told me that he had been “having lots of play dates and sleepovers” (ci.1) with his close friends almost once every other week. He wanted to maximize his limited time left in the United States and, therefore, chose to play with a few friends at a time rather than just one friend. In addition to athletic activities, he and his friends played Nintendo DS games, such as PokeMon and Kabi, and also did their homework together.

Thinking of his future school life in Japan, his only concern was on his Japanese

---

84 His mother actually thought that it was a good timing for him to return to Japan and become readjusted to the Japanese school since he was already in the fourth grade. In her view, it was all right for him to get “pampered” (pi) in the U.S. school in his childhood but not in his adolescent. She also thought that he was lucky to return to his home country unlike other students who had to move to another foreign country.
language skills. After four years in the United States without going to the supplemental Japanese language school, he saw himself stronger in English than in Japanese.  

He thought he was “not so good at Japanese, especially writing” (ci.2). Because he sometimes made mistakes on writing some *hiragana* letters, his parents suspected that he could be behind his peers in Japan. They also knew that he would need to practice *kanji* before he enters his Japanese school in April. At home, therefore, he had been independently learning Japanese, using his grade level Japanese language arts textbooks. His mother noticed that he got very nervous and angry when he encountered challenging Japanese tasks. He sometimes crunched up his hands into fists and told her, “See, Mother! I can’t do it after all” (pi). Despite his anxiety towards his lack of Japanese skills, he had not shown any negative feelings toward Japanese language itself. Therefore, his parents expected him to eventually develop more confidence and grade-level literacy skills in Japanese. Though it was not much of their concern unlike his Japanese skills, his knowledge of Japanese culture was also limited to only some Japanese tradition (e.g., *tatami* mats, *origami*, Japanese bath, the custom of taking off shoes inside, etc.) and Japanese popular culture (e.g., sports players, computer games, etc.). His parents, who highly valued Japanese culture, hoped that he would gain more cultural knowledge and enjoy the comfort of living in Japan.

---

85 After he mentioned this, I code-switched to English a few times in order to see if he would like to speak English instead of Japanese. However, he strictly chose to speak only Japanese.

86 Among the three different writing systems in Japanese (i.e., *hiragana*, *katakana*, and *kanji*), *hiragana* is the simplest characters. All Japanese students are expected to master writing all *hiragana* letters at least by the end of the first grade.

87 His parents thought that the Japanese culture represents the unity of a whole rather than individuals. In their views, Japanese culture makes people feel pressured but also feel more delicate. They always felt fascinated by the clean and calm aspects of Japanese culture.
Tsubasa had not thought about how his sojourning experiences would influence his future school life in Japan. He also did not have any particular objectives besides his Japanese learning. Or, at least, he was not sharing all of his thoughts with others. His parents thought that his “nervous temperament yet ozappa (carefree) disposition” might cause him stress in the beginning, however that he would be fully adjusted soon. In order to prepare Tsubasa for his return and to facilitate his aspiration for a future schooling, they provided the information regarding his new Japanese public elementary school. His father, who had a business trip to Japan, visited the vice principal to learn about various academic and non-academic programs offered by the school. Tsubasa seemed relieved to know that he would be able to receive Japanese as a Second Language support if necessary. He was also glad to find out that the school had its soccer and baseball teams because he had been worried if he would get to play any sports in Japan. Though he would still miss the large playground and various recreation facilities in the United States, he was excited about playing sports in Japan and started to think, “It seems nice to go back”.

Tsubasa and his family returned to Tsukuba in the end of March 2007. In Japan, his father continued his medical research and his mother chose to stay home while her children were adjusting to their new school. Describing Tsukuba as “a solitary island in land” (pi), his parents thought that the school offered an ideal environment for their

---

88 It was probably adults’ agenda to think of the impact of U.S. sojourning and the preparation for the future.
89 Being located in the Tsukuba Science City, the school served a large number of returnee and foreign students, many of them the children of researchers, and provided Japanese language support for them.
children’s education.\footnote{When I got off the Tsukuba Express to visit him for the last interview, the first thing I noticed was the city’s distinct atmosphere. With no high-rise building, I could see the far away mountains surrounding the great plain where the city was situated. Wide roads were spreading across the city along with the promenades and tree lines. The newly developed urban architecture and landscaping were well-harmonized with the natural resources preserved since the ancient times. As I was walking towards his house in a such environment, I felt like visiting a different country.} Adjacent to the school was a large park with a shallow pond where the students could receive outdoor lessons in science class and play in the nature during recess. The school culture was comparatively liberal and there was no standardized uniform for students. Every morning, his mother saw him so cheerfully going to school with the neighbor’s children.

It was a little more than a month after his return when I visited his house in Tsukuba. One warm sunny afternoon, we sat for the interview in his father’s study where we could listen to birds chirping in the nearby forests and feel a fresh clear breeze coming in through an open window. Tsubasa looked just the same as before when we met in Boston: He seemed relaxed and calm yet neither overly excited nor talkative. His mother served us some Japanese cake which definitely helped creating an enjoyable atmosphere for conversation. He told me that he had been enjoying food in Japan while he did not miss American food at all. He comically described the vivid green frosting that he saw on his younger brother’s birthday cake in the United States. Having the European inspired artistic Japanese cake in front of us, Tsubasa and I agreed that we were so lucky to be in Japan and smiled at each other.

In his new fifth grade class, he was in the process of adjusting to the new learning environment. On one hand, he felt comfortable to perceive himself as “a futuu-no (ordinary/regular) student” who was “quite similar to minna (everyone/all)” (ci.3). He
emphasized that, since the beginning of school year in April, he did not have to receive any Japanese as a Second Language support and his classroom teacher treated him in the exact same way as she did to the other students. He also felt that his character and attitude (e.g., athletic, social, and very eager to learn new things) had not changed at all since his Boston days or even since his presojourning days in Japan. With his unchanged love for sports, he joined the school’s soccer team and enjoyed practicing it every Saturday. He also made many friends through playing baseball together after school in an empty lot behind a nearby supermarket.91 He did not feel that his new friends in Japan were different from his friends in the United States.

On the other hand, he did not see himself totally adjusted to his new school “right at this time” (ci.3) and knew that it would take more time for a full adjustment. One possible obstacle was learning kokugo (Japanese language arts). In fact, the first thing that he stated in the interview was, “Kokugo is difficult” (ci.3). Especially, reading and writing kanji had been challenging. While newly introduced kanji hardly caused a problem, he struggled with the ones introduced in the former grades since mastering kanji requires the character knowledge accumulated over many years of schooling.92 He also had to spend thirty to forty minutes every day after school just to complete his daily kanji homework and to prepare for the weekly kanji tests. In every test, students were required

91 His mother noticed that being a baseball fan in Japan made him happy because the media and many Japanese people were talking about Boston in connection to the Red Sox. In the summer, his family was planning to visit Boston again to watch Daisuke Matsuzaka pitch for the team.
92 In general, a certain set of kanji characters are introduced in each grade in the Japanese school. The characters introduced in the primary grades are the base characters which can be the foundation to learn more complex characters introduced in the following grades.
to repeat the test until they have all correct answers. Though he had to work hard, he proudly told me, “I have never repeated my test before” (ci.3).

In his class, Tsubasa did not care much about his sojourning background but all his classmates knew that he was a returnee from the United States. He sensed that they saw him as “a student who knew English well” (ci.3) because they sometimes asked him, “Can you speak some English?” (ci.3) To the request, he usually responded, “I don’t want to” (ci.3). One time during the social studies class, his teacher asked him to pronounce the English words related to garbage incinerating facilities (i.e., reduce, renewal, and recycle). When he complied with the request, some classmates praised his excellence in English. Though he knew that many people admired returnees’ high English proficiency, he felt “neither good nor bad” (ci.3) about how others viewed him.

While adjusting to his new learning environment, he was making cultural comparisons between his former U.S. school and his Japanese school. For instance, the class size in Japan (about 32 students in one class) was much larger than what he was accustomed to in his U.S. classroom (about 20 students in one class); however, he noticed that the large class size was not a problem to Japanese teachers because they seemed just fine to handle all of their students. He also noticed that, unlike in the United States, he had to own a textbook for each subject. Because of the small lockers in his Japanese school, he had to carry so many textbooks everyday. In addition, as he had imagined in the United States, there was much more homework in Japan and the soccer field in Japan was smaller. What he did not expect in Japan was that the math concepts he learned in his U.S. class were more advanced than what he was currently learning in his Japanese class.
Tsubasa saw himself being “still pretty good at English” (ci.3) and planned to take the Grade Pre-1 level of the *Eiken* in the future. However, he also knew that “not forgetting English [would] be a little difficult” (ci.3). His school offered no English class and he did not have any English-speaking friends in Japan. The only time that he enjoyed using English was when he emailed his American friends in Boston. In order for him to maintain English, his parents had him participate in a returnee support group, a private English learning center, and also violin lessons taught by an American teacher who spoke only English. Although those lessons made his after school hours busy, he enjoyed them very much. His parents believed that it would be ideal for him to continue English language learning when he was still young, and hoped that he would treasure the memories of many warm-hearted people and interesting events that he encountered over the course of his U.S. sojournning.

Yayoi

The oldest child participant, Yayoi, was born in May 1994 in Japan and twelve-year-old when I first met her in January 2007. Her cooperative attitude, confident and clear manner of speech, and polite yet very friendly interaction style made every second that I spent with her enjoyable and satisfying. As she revealed various qualities typical to a good student in our conversation, it made a perfect sense to me that she was once nominated for the *seitokaichou* (the president of the student council) election and that her future dream was to become an elementary school teacher.

She grew up and went to a local public elementary school in Matsumoto in Nagano prefecture, a popular tourist destination that offers beautiful mountains, natural
hot springs, and traditional culture. When I visited there for the last interview, I could not help wondering how it would feel like growing up in such a beautiful city and what qualities could a person be endowed by the great nature. I was definitely overlapping her serene clear gaze to what I saw in the wide endless sky of her hometown.  

Yayoi first could not celebrate the idea of sojourning abroad because she simply wanted to complete the last year of her elementary education in Japan and to share the important transitional phase of her life with her friends and teachers. She knew that it would be only about a year to live in the United States, however she had no idea if it would be “like an instant or for a long time” (ci.1). Knowing that the U.S. sojourning was necessary for her father’s career as a medical doctor, she tried to positively view her future in the United States: “Going to an American elementary school may be an opportunity that happens to my life only once, if not none. It is also true that the probability of not having such opportunity is so much higher that the probability of having it” (ci.3). Her parents, who had never lived in a foreign country, expected that living abroad would be an invaluable experience for Yayoi and her three younger siblings.

In school, she always did well in all subjects, tackled everything with strong interests, and enjoyed being a part of classroom community. Since her third grade, she had been a member of the school’s brass band orchestra and practiced her trumpet every

---

93 The sceneries surrounding her house were just breath-taking. From her house located on the hill, I could overlook the lines of magnificent mountains gleaming under the gentle sunshine. The soothing sights of deep green forests and the luxury of unpolluted air made me feel so fortunate to stand in the midst of such beautiful part of the country.

94 The first interview (ci.1) was on 2/7/07, the second (ci.2) on 3/22/07, and the third (ci.3) on 5/19/07.
after school. She was never shy to relate with people and built excellent relationships with her teachers and classmates. Her favorite time at school was always lunch time when all classmates socialized and ate lunch together in the same classroom. Her mother attributed Yayoi’s sociable character to her innate personality since she and her siblings behaved very differently in the same circumstances. Unlike her siblings, Yayoi always enjoyed interacting with others and nicely fit in any social settings.

She described her own character as “tennen (natural/spontaneous)” which she defined as “a little off, like remembering the meanings of words differently from others” (ci.2). According to her, tennen people would make cute mistakes in their language usages. Although they are not weak in academics, they display their dispositions of being “donkan (insensitive)” with “slow perception” (ci.2) in a positive way. For instance, when something is very obvious, she would ask, “Oh, really? Are we doing that?” (ci.2) It also meant that she is “a mood maker” who can be “very noisy” and “occasionally the center of attention” (ci.1). She humorously told me that, if everyone in the same group were tennen, “the conversation goes nowhere” (ci.2). In the fifth grade, her classroom teacher and classmates were often entertained by her exaggerated gestures, physical movements, and varied facial expressions. They commented that she was “omoshiroi (funny/interesting)” (ci.1), “tennen-like,” and “aikyo-ga-aru (charming/attractive)” (ci.2).

When Yayoi was nominated to run for seitokaichou (the president of the school council) in the end of the fifth grade, she knew that the most important quality required for the nomination was “popularity” (ci.2) rather than academic excellence. The qualities

---

95 Tennen is a common term to describe some people in Japanese culture. Though there is no official definition to the term, Yayoi’s interpretations pretty much explain the central nuance given to the idea.
suggested by the school also included the abilities “to follow the school’s requests, speak in a loud voice, and demonstrate a cheerful personality” (ci.2). Due to her upcoming sojourning, she had to decline this nomination. That did not disturb her much because she knew that the seitokaichou would be required to write up many reports and often get scolded by teachers. Later she found out that her father once ran for the same position when he was at her age. She found this commonality fascinating and stated, “That must be in our blood!” (ci.2)

In Japan, she had learned English for many years as an extracurricular activity. For seven years from age two to eight, she went to a private English conversation school and familiarized herself with American culture while enjoying games and songs in English. At the age of eight, she began to take English conversation classes taught by a Filipino teacher. She also independently studied English for Eiken (English proficiency exam). When she saw her father reading the medical research articles in English, she knew how important it is to be able to read in English for some careers. Her parents hoped that she would acquire as much English skills as possible through her U.S. sojourning because the skills would make her life more “promising” and “enjoyable” (BIQ). There was nothing special that Yayoi was doing to prepare for her sojourning besides continuing the English lessons and receiving some information about U.S. schools from friends with sojourning backgrounds.

When Yayoi joined the fifth grade class in the Spring Lake School, it was only ten days before the summer vacation. In her class, she could hardly understand the content of
lessons. This made her think that her English skills acquired in Japan might be helping her somehow but not allowing her to fully function in the new English-speaking environment. Without enough English skills, Yayoi naturally got drawn into the group of Japanese girls. Having the Japanese classmates was “kokoroduyoi (reassuring/encouraging)” (ci.1) in the very beginning.

While gradually getting accustomed to her school, she keenly observed her peers. She admired the friendliness of American students while criticizing their immoral behaviors (e.g., easily wasting and throwing out food, sitting on the desk, eating and reading at the same time, leaving a mess without cleaning, etc.). She was first shocked to see those behaviors in her class since they all could be a total taboo in Japan. Also, she discovered the differences between Japanese teachers and American teachers and stated:

In Japan, some teachers exploded and yelled while other teachers became totally silent without a word for about one hour. But American teachers don’t waste time like that and their scolding tends to end soon. Once you experienced the scolding by Japanese teachers, any American teachers don’t sound scary at all. (ci.2)

She thought, in American ways, students might ignore their teacher and repeat their mischief again. The effectiveness of discipline in two countries, after all, seemed “dotchi-mo-dotchi (about the same)” (ci.2).

In the summer, she went to the private ESL summer camp.96 Her first impression of the school was not quite pleasant due to the “gloomy” (ci.1) classrooms and the morning routines of repeating after her teacher to read morning message without understanding the meanings. However, she started to enjoy the camp towards the end and commented, “It was probably the place where I learned English and American culture the

---

96 This is the same summer school in which Wataru enrolled when he just came to the United States.
most” (ci.1). Without having any problem fitting in her class, she enthusiastically
engaged in learning activities and rapidly improved her overall English skills. In her free
time at home, she usually read books, wrote letters to friends in Japan, watched movies
and Japanese TV drama, played piano, and surfed on the Internet.

In September, Yayoi started off the new school year as a sixth grader with her
positive learning attitudes as usual. Her classroom teacher, Mrs. Hughes, was “an
omoshiroi sensei (a funny/interesting teacher)” (ci.1) who deeply understood Japanese
students.97 Among all teachers, Yayoi liked her science teacher who was very strict to his
students when it comes to conveying his academic expectations.

In class, she immediately noticed that she could understand academic lessons in
English much better than before the summer. She viewed her school as “a fun place”
(ci.1) due to her smooth adjustment to her new classroom, and commented:

I feel fun when I can understand what my teacher is saying, even though that
might be a trivial thing. (…) I feel happy in school when I can communicate with
minna (everyone/all) in English, when I can read books in English, and when I
can come in contact with American culture. I’m glad that I came to America
because it is the most suitable place to learn English. (ci.1)

Since Mrs. Hughes enforced the English-only rule, Yayoi could use Japanese only for the
translation purposes.98 She was also intentionally separated from her Japanese classmates
in order to take an initiative to interact with English-speaking peers. She actually liked

97 Mrs. Hughes, who had worked at Spring Lake over ten years, believed that she “had some strong
connections to the Japanese community” (ti.1). As part of the school’s teacher exchange program, she was
invited to travel in Japan to study Japanese educational systems and culture. She also once visited the
supplemental Japanese language school to learn about the educational options for Japanese sojourners.
98 Mrs. Hughes thought, “It was polite and respectful [for Japanese students] to speak the language of the
majority so that their English-speaking friends will not feel excluded” (ti.2). However, having taught many
Japanese students in the past, she also understood that her Japanese students liked to “congregate” (ti.2) and
speak Japanese with each other. She smiled about the fact that, even though she encouraged them to speak
English, they spoke Japanese to each other anyways during lunch, recess, and breaks. Sometimes when she
directly told them to speak English, they had “a good humor about it” and “roll[ed] their eyes” (ti.2).
this class rule and stated, “Here is America after all. If I spoke Japanese, nothing would be different from my school in Japan” (ci.2). For the first several months, her JELL teacher occasionally translated the lesson content in her class. The ELL program also provided modified lessons in social studies and language arts throughout her sojourn.

In school, she saw herself as “a type of person who liked to work *kotsu-kotsu* (acidulously/diligently/steadily)” (ci.1). Similarly her mother described her learning attitude as “*cho-totsu-mou-shin* (going headlong/rush recklessly)” (pi). She never gave up, quit, or took breaks from difficult and unpleasant tasks. Her diligent work ethics as well as her “*makezugirai* (unyielding/stubborn)” (pi) personality had been consistent throughout her life and her mother attributed them to her innate character. Mrs. Hughes once stated in the conference report that she was “conscientious” and “always very willing to take on extra work and extra challenge” (ti.2).

On regular weekday nights, Yayoi and her siblings spent a few hours at a dinning table or what her mother called “the family’s meeting place” (pi) to work on homework. She often stayed up till mid-night to finish her work. She also went to the after school homework club a few times a week to receive extra support. She repeatedly complained to her mother how hard it was to complete her homework everyday; however, she knew that it was “something really necessary for improving [her] English skills”

---

99 The Japanese four-letter idiom, *猪突猛進* (*cho-totsu-mou-shin*), literally means a boar rushing straight forward. The idiom also has the connotation that a stubborn person recklessly carries out things like an energetic boar running intensely. The parent interview (pi) took place on 3/22/07.

100 Yayoi’s mother thought that her children received stimulation from each other by doing homework together. Yayoi, who was developing her English skills rapidly, sometimes tried to help her fourth grade sister by pointing out her mistakes. Her sister, who did not have a smooth school adjustment, often got annoyed by the interference and said to her, “Don’t look!” Her mother thought that Yayoi sometimes pushed her sister too hard and gave her unnecessary pressure.
for “doing things like minna (everyone/all)” (ci.3), and for being part of her class. Mrs. Hughes could tell that she “put a lot of attention into her work” (e.g., math drill, book report, writing, science worksheet, etc.) because all of her work was “always nicely done” (ti.2). Yayoi thought that Mrs. Hughes viewed her as “a student who may or may not know English, but completes homework anyway” (ci.2). As her English literacy skills improved, she started to feel that “homework was not too much work” (ci.1).

While she spent all weekdays to study English, she usually devoted her weekends for her Japanese learning. Due to her relatively short duration of stay, her parents did not enroll her in the supplemental Japanese language school. Therefore, she needed to independently study academic subjects in Japanese, using her sixth grade Japanese textbooks and the correspondence course materials that she subscribed from Japan. Her parents wanted her to properly acquire Japanese since she would most likely live in Japan for the rest of her life. Because of her studies on weekends, she thought on every Monday morning, “Oh! I did not take a break at all on my weekend!” (ci.1).

In her class, there were two Japanese students who had lived in the United States since they were young. Yayoi was occasionally paired up with one of them, Yoko, to receive translation. However, Yoko, who had “bad reputation” (ci.2), sometimes harassed her in class and homework club by, for instance, writing scribbles on her name tag, stealing her possessions (e.g., stationary and the stylus of her electric dictionary), and telling lies. One time, Yoko told her that homework was due next day. When Yayoi was about to go home and tackle her homework, Yoko came up to her and said, “That was just a lie. The real due is next week” (pi). Another time, Yoko lied to female classmates
that Yayoi liked one of the boys in the class. Though Yayoi shared her concern regarding those incidents with her mother, she neither confronted Yoko nor reported to her teacher.  

101 She explained, “I want [Yoko] to stop, but I’ve been receiving her help, so I can’t really tell her so” (ci.2). Her mother also thought that it was not wise to turn Yoko into Yayoi’s enemy since she still needed someone to translate for her. Fortunately, Yayoi viewed Yoko’s harassment as “not a big deal” and “something [she] could endure easily” (ci.2). It was also “nothing new” because “there were kids like that in Japan, too” (ci.2). Though Yoko did not stop harassing her throughout her U.S. sojourning, she was able to “deal with the situation skillfully” (pi). She also became motivated to make more English-speaking friends because of Yoko. When her mother asked her, “Your American life has not been fun at all because of the teasing, has it?” she responded, “Well, that’s just one of the smallest things among many other things that I carry within myself” (pi).

. . . . .

After more than a half year in the United States, Yayoi was steadily developing yet seemed “still not sure about” (ti.2) her English.  

102 Oral communication was the greatest challenge in both academic and non-academic settings. In class, she had trouble understanding “lots of directions given all at once” by her classroom teacher, and had not yet developed the “comfort level of speaking aloud in front of other people” (ti.2). Even when she knew an answer to the question being asked, she hardly raised her hands to

---

101 Yayoi’s mother thought that too many Japanese students in a school could cause problems, such as *ijime* (bullying/teasing/harassment) and fighting. In her view, the Japanese students in the United States, unlike in Japan, have the limited choices of selecting their Japanese friends. Because they automatically form a group with anyone who speak Japanese, they can easily relate with the ones whose personalities are different from theirs, and, therefore, experience the conflicts.

102 The first teacher interview (ti.1) was on 2/13/07 and the second (ti.2) was on 3/22/07.
speak out and usually waited until being called upon by her teacher. Participating in a group conversation was also very difficult: There was not enough time for her to merely ask questions “when minna (everyone/all) in the group are riding on the wave of conversation” and when their English was “kowareteru (broken) as they acted frolic” (ci.1). It was much easier for her to understood conversation in one-on-one settings: Even though her interlocutor first did not understand her and showed a sign of puzzlement, she could repeat herself patiently until being understood. When communicating with others in English, Yayoi saw herself neither “shoukyokuteki (passive)” nor “sekkyokuteki (active)” (ci.2). Her JELL teacher similarly viewed her neither shy nor imprudent. Despite her struggles with English oral communication, her actual progress exceeded her original expectations. In Japan before moving to the United States, she never imagined herself being able to interact with English-speaking peers in such a short amount of time.

In the meantime, her English literacy skills were “progressing along really quickly” (ti.1). When she happened to look at the notebook she used in the summer camp, she was surprised to know that now she could understand everything written in it. With her strong literacy skills, she was reading many adventure novels, which were usually thick chapter books, and working hard in her ELL class to learn vocabulary, grammar, and writing. Mrs. Hughes thought that she was “really resourceful” (ti.2), always trying to clarify unknown meanings with her classmates and teachers as well as with her electronic bilingual dictionary. In class, she felt like being “in trouble” (ci.1) without her dictionary. When she encountered a new vocabulary word in reading, she felt “uzu-uzu (itching/inpatient)” (ci.1) to know the meaning of the word and could not read forward
until she looked it up in her dictionary. She also relied on her dictionary to translate her Japanese sentences into English for her writing tasks and also to understand new academic concepts in two languages. Among all subjects, math was her strongest subject since she could understand the concepts “without completely knowing English” (ci.1). Most of math tasks (e.g., to calculate the area of a trapezoid with a formula) were “extremely easy” and she often felt “bored” (ci.2) during math lessons. In contrast, science was the most difficult subject since she had to memorize various technical vocabulary in English.

Her motivation for learning English overlapped with her hope for school inclusion. She stated, “I’ll ganbaru (make my best effort) on learning English because it is for getting along with minna (everyone/all)” (ci.1). According to Mrs. Hughes, her classmates saw her as a “quiet, friendly and cooperative” student as well as “someone who [they] would want to work with and to spend time with” (ti.2). She was quiet, but her friendly smile showed her classmates her willingness to be part of the class. She was successfully expanding her social network and was sometimes seen relaxing with non-Japanese girls in her class.

Her closest friend was a Taiwanese newcomer, Lily, who went to the ELL class together everyday. During lunch time, she usually ate with a few English-speaking girls, Lily, and her Japanese friend from another class. Since she still struggled with English oral communication, her drawing in next page shows an imaginary situation in which she is freely conversing with her American friends at a the lunch table.\(^{103}\)

---

\(^{103}\) Yayoi is the center of the drawing. Lily to her right and her American friend to her left.
Feeling “much more at home and much more comfortable” (ti.2) in her classroom, her goal for the rest of her U.S. sojourning was to “be more sekkyokuteki (active), do best in studies, enjoy communicating with minna (everyone/all), and having a fun school life” (ci.1). She believed that it would be “daijoubu (all right) if [she] stayed positive and did not hate learning English” (ci.1). She explained: “If you start hating, you can’t do anything. If you can’t have fun, you won’t even want to come to school” (ci.1).

Only a few days before the last day of school, Yayoi was making her best effort on all academic tasks as usual. She especially spent many hours writing an essay about her favorite historical figure, Gracia Hosokawa. Everyday she went to bed after eleven at night and woke up at six in the morning to complete her draft. Her efforts to catch up with her peers looked too desperate and unnecessary to her mother’s eyes. When her mother told her that she probably did not have to use so much time and energy on the
essay because she would be leaving the United States soon, she responded, “I’m not treated any special at Spring Lake, so I’ll be in trouble if I go school without my homework done” (pi). By looking at Yayoi’s serious attitudes and hard work, her mother started to feel that leaving the United States in such a short time would be “mottainai (too bad/wasteful)” (pi).

Yayoi often heard her teachers praising her, “Your English is getting so much better” (ci.2). However, she still could not see herself as “an insider” (ci.2) in English conversation and did not find “a stage” (ci.1) to show her true character, such as tennen. Instead, she saw herself as “an outsider” and felt “not being in the center of attention” (ci.2). In her view, no one could be an insider “without speaking out” (ci.2). Therefore, it was more difficult for her to be an insider in a group than in one-on-one setting. In group settings, her peers paid attention to her only when she shared “something that they did not know” and “something related to the differences between American and Japanese culture” (ci.2). Her insider status, however, “usually end[ed] in a moment” (ci.2) and, in most times, she felt like turning into “just a serious type” (ci.3). This did not bother her too much because she knew that “one’s character and ways of thinking change when environments change” (ci.3). It was especially obvious to her that the idea of tennen (natural/spontaneous) character was not common among the Americans.

She expanded her social network “just a little bit” (ci.2) and began to mention more names of American friends at home. One science experiment was particularly memorable because she enjoyed interacting and collaboratively working with her American female friend. In the experiment, they together designed and created a small
paper boat to see how many pennies it could hold. Among all school routines, she enjoyed the recess time the most because she felt being “set free” (ci.2) by playing with her friends. During the recess, she joined “a drawing club” (ci.2) which was formed by a group of fourth grade girls. The girls enjoyed drawing together and made a book with their own drawings to pass around among each other.

Her closest friend was still Lily. Though Lily was “extremely sekkyokuteki (active)” and different from her, they got along pretty well and they enjoyed each other’s company. They sometimes “fooled around together” and talked about “the differences between Taiwan, America, and Japan” (ci.2). One time, she had a chance to have a play date at Lily’s house. This made her very excited because she “didn’t even imagined to play at someone’s home, speaking English” (ci.3). Also, she hardly played with her friends after school because of her homework and after school programs. She also could not invite her friends over to her home which was not the environment suitable for playing because her mother was still nursing her infant brother.

Facing her upcoming return, she described her complex feelings as the following:

My feelings are sort of han-han (half and half). When I think of minna in Japan who are waiting for me, I want to go back. But I made my friends here, so I also have feelings of not willing to go back. The rest of my feelings are, like, “the entrusted umei (fate/destiny). I’ll stay here if my father says he’ll stay, and [I’ll] go back if he says he’ll go back. (ci.1)

She, after all, thought that returning to Japan in March to start her junior high school was probably a good idea because “studies [would] get harder in Japanese junior high” (ci.1).

---

104 Her family members displayed different feelings toward the return. Her younger sister in the fourth grade told her, “I want to stay longer” while her younger brother in kindergarten said, “I want to go back” (ci.2). In the meanwhile, her mother wanted to stay longer in the United States so that she could learn more English.
Considering the rigorous curriculum in Japanese schools, she and her parents hoped that she would not be behind her peers. Although she was learning Japanese on her own, she had forgotten how to write some kanji characters because she was not using them often.

Mrs. Hughes, sensed that, unlike some long-term sojourners, Yayoi was not very resistant to leaving the United States because she had not been fully adapted to American culture and also because she still had her roots deep in her home country. In fact, she kept a close contact with her former teachers and friends in Japan through letters and emails. Her Japanese teacher, who knew that Yayoi would not be able to attend the graduation ceremony, sent her a graduation project so that she could feel like completing her elementary education in Japan with their former classmates. Her Japanese friends also provided her with the information of Japanese school lives. This made her “envious about everything in Japanese school” (ci.1). In return, she shared with her friends how the U.S. school was like. They were envious that students in the United States have a long summer vacation and a snack time. Although her school life in the United States was enjoyable and she wanted to visit Spring Lake again in the future, she was certainly looking forward to returning to Japan, reuniting with “the same members as before” (ci.2), and going back to who she used to be with her original character. She would choose to return to Japan even if she had a choice of staying in the United States.

In the last few days at Spring Lake, she did two things to make her U.S. school life more memorable. One was to give a small farewell gift to everyone in her class. Mrs. Hughes and her classmates, who were accustomed to Japanese culture, thought that the gift giving was “very charming and very sweet” (ti.2). The other was to take digital photo
of “the scenery of her usual school life” (pi) (e.g., school buildings, classroom atmosphere, scenes in the cafeteria, smiles of friends and classmates, etc.). Her teachers allowed her to take pictures during the breaks, lunch, recess, and even during lessons since they knew that the pictures would be “her memories to take back to Japan” (ti.2).

While spending busy days prior to moving by packing and cleaning, she looked back upon the past year and felt that her U.S. sojourning was a long time. She was sure that her knowledge of the United States and English would be advantageous in her future English class in Japan. Her parents hoped that she would maintain her English skills as much as possible in Japan since learning English had not been an easy task for her. In Yayoi’s views, it took about three months for her to become able to listen to English and five to six months to write in English smoothly. She knew that it would take even longer to develop speaking skills and commented, “I finally became able to speak English just a little after ten months. To be able to speak English, you need to stay over one year” (ci.3).

Her U.S. sojourning also allowed her to learn and appreciate the positive sides of Japan (i.e., history, food, and culture) and to develop international perspectives. She became more able to “see things in a comparison to the world” and to “understand what minna (everyone/all) are doing in the world, just like what people are doing in Japan and what people are doing in America” (ci.1).

Yayoi returned to Matsumoto in the end of March 2007 during the spring vacation for Japanese schools. When she visited her old elementary school to pick up her diploma, she happily reunited with her former classmates who came out to throw a welcome-back
party for her. She also had a chance to say a good-bye to her former teacher who kept in contact with her throughout her U.S. sojourning. Her teacher playfully asked her, “Can you try speaking English? What about konnichiwa (hello)?” (ci.3). She responded with a good laugh, “Even a Japanese person living in Japan can say that in English!” (ci.3)

In April 2007, she entered a public junior high school and joined the class of about thirty students who were mostly from her former elementary school. She liked her classroom teacher who always “tells great stories” (ci.3). Her main focus in school was to spend “a futuu-no seikatu (regular life)” (ci.3) like everyone else. In Japan, the typical school life was “very busy compared to an American school life” (ci.3). She realized that she simply had “too many things to do within such a limited time” (ci.3), including her bukatsu (club activities), extracurricular activities, and homework. Especially, her brass band practice for bukatsu took up many hours daily. On a regular school day, she spent two hours in the morning and another two hours after school to practice her Fluegel horn. She also practiced for a half day on every Saturday and Sunday. Her bukatsu was demanding, but she enjoyed playing her instrument with the band members and interacting with the charismatic instructor who was nicknamed “Jaiko” (ci.3).105

In-between the bukatsu hours, she did her studies “choko-choko (little by little)” (ci.3). Completing her daily homework (e.g., writing compositions, English workbook, and math drill) was hard because of her hectic schedule. After she came home from her bukatsu, she ate dinner, took a bath, and wrote bukatsu journal, and, then, usually had no

---

105 Jaiko is a famous Japanese cartoon character. The images of the character are usually over-weight, loud, and bully-like. Yayoi humorously told me that the band instructor had been called by her students this way for over five years but had not noticed that yet.
time for anything else. So, she had to wake up early in the morning to do her homework. There was also no time for her to relax even during the breaks and recess at school because all students used the extra time for transitioning to another classroom, changing into gym cloths, and studying for exams. When the exams were coming up, she and her friends complained, “There is no time for that!”

In fact, there was not even enough time for her “to just simply chat with [her] friends” (ci.3). Since students were not allowed to exchange letters and memos during school hours, chatting was the only and precious way to have fun communication with friends. In order to have few moments to chat, she and her friends had to rush each other to gather up quickly, “Hurry, hurry!” (ci.3) When they got lucky enough to make some moments to chat, they usually talked about their most and least favorite teachers and about “ikemen (handsome/good looking)” boys in their school. In addition, her life was busy with “so much work” (ci.3) that she had to do as the vice representative of her class and as the executive committee member for an upcoming school camp. Being selected for those positions, she felt obligated to act as a good role model for other students and to always “straighten her posture” (ci.3).

She sometimes recalled that, in the United States, she could play and relax outside during the recess and enjoy writing letters and play piano after school. In Japan, she had not yet found time to write to Lily who gave her fond memories of the United States and who built precious friendship together. As she thought of her days at Spring Lake, the most memorable thing was her daily routine of “walking with Lily to the ELL class with an electronic dictionary in [her] hand” (ci.3).
In most times at school, her returnee status seemed “not relevant at all” (ci.3). However, she sometimes felt that her classmates and teachers saw her as kikokushijo (a returnee) and envied her knowledge of English and American culture. Some classmates, for instance, asked her, “You’ve lived in America, haven’t you?” (ci.3) and requested her to speak some English words. Her English teacher also asked her to read aloud some English sentences on the blackboard. When she was called upon, she thought, “Why me? Please don’t call on me!” (ci.3) Because her class had another returnee student who was more fluent in English than her, she also thought that her classmates might think, “She is not much different from us” (ci.3). She did not want others to see her as a returnee and to give her excessive expectations towards her English skills. She explained, “If I made mistakes in my English tests, I would have to feel badly” (ci.3).

In terms of learning English, her school offered a grammar class daily and a conversation lesson bi-weekly. While grammar learning was challenging, the conversation lessons were way too easy for her because the teachers introduced only simple greetings (e.g., “Nice to meet you.”) and simple sentence structures (e.g., “I am _.” and “You are from _.”) and translated everything into Japanese. Yayoi often felt bored and sat “blankly” (ci.3) in her class. She also hated to see that her classmates did not have a chance to “understand English by their own exertions” (ci.3). Besides those classes, she received English homework which required one page free writing everyday. Depending on her schedule, she either took her time to write a journal entry or simply practiced new vocabulary words. In addition, she met with her private tutor weekly to learn English grammar. Though she sometimes felt “mendokusai (tired of)” (ci.3) going
to the tutor’s house, she enjoyed the lesson and knew that her grammar knowledge was necessary for *Eiken*, which she planned to take the Grade 2 level in the fall. At home, she also independently learned English grammar, using a radio program and the corresponding textbooks. She could find the time to listen to the radio lesson only at five o’clock in the morning only when she had already done her homework. Though she understood most of the contents on the radio without translation, she found some grammar (e.g., perfect tense) difficult to understand.

She knew that all these efforts were necessary for her to maintain her English skills and stated, “If I stop learning English now, I will not be able to do anything [in English] after one year” (ci.3). Only during the first two weeks in her new school, she unconsciously code-switched some words which she had been familiar with in the United States (e.g., “positive” and “negative” in math). A boy in her class jokingly said to her, “You are still speaking with an accent” (ci.3). She responded to him with her non-bothered attitude, “Oh, really?” (ci.3) The frequency of her code-switching had decreased and she had been readjusting to the Japanese-speaking environment very quickly. She had no problem with learning Japanese, including *kanji*.

Since her return, she had been making cultural comparisons between her former U.S. school and her Japanese school in terms of class-size, school culture, and students’ behaviors and attitudes. Her U.S. classroom had only 20 students and her teacher could “look around [the classroom] in one go” (ci.3) whereas her Japanese classroom consisted of over 30 students and her teacher had to turn her neck from right to left in order to look at all students. Because it is hard for her Japanese teacher to always pay attention to all
students, the teacher managed the class by “glaring at a few target students all the time” (ci.3). As a result, other non-targeted students, including Yayoi, were “like nobanashi (loose/pasturing)” (ci.3) in the class, being not always in the teacher’s sight and attention. She thought, “It is ‘a free environment, if you put it that way, but there is not always someone who would scold them. So, that’s why Japanese students are more responsible [than American students]” (ci.3) on their own behaviors. In her view, Japanese students took their responsibilities in taking care of themselves and school environment (e.g., serving their own lunch, carrying their textbooks, cleaning the school building, etc.). They even cleaned up the school bathrooms. Unlike the messy bathrooms of the Spring Lake School with running liquid soap and ripped paper towels on the floor, all bathrooms in her Japanese school were kept spotless. She thought that, in Japan, the bathrooms would be closed down if students ever used them in the American way. Though she valued this cleaning responsibility, she knew that such custom would be hard for the Americans to adopt.

She also noticed the extreme uniformity and strict discipline in her Japanese school. All students, for instance, used the required uniforms, gym clothes, socks, hats, shoes, and bags. Wearing the uniform all the time was not so bad because it save her time to change and to think what to wear every morning. However, she knew that this custom would look strange to the Americans and thought:

If American students visit Japan, they may think that Japanese students are ayashii gundan (strange corps). They probably can’t recognize who’s who because minna (everyone/all) has black hair and same clothes. They may even think that minna has the same face! (ci.3)
Also, Japanese students were more severely disciplined by teachers for manners (e.g., arranging their shoes neatly at the entrance). She wondered if the Americans might view such strict discipline as resembling to “bringing up an army” (ci.3). She also found that Japanese students liked to “uchikomu (devote oneself)” to studies and bukatsu with their “teki-paki (prompt/efficient)” attitudes, whereas American students like to tanoshimu (enjoy) everything and “do things on their own pace” with their “dara-dara (slow/inefficient)” pace (ci.3).

Although her friends commented that her basic character did not change and that she was “tennen (natural/spontaneous) even more,” they also informed that she had turned into “a my-pace person” and “a little more sekkyokuteki (active) than before” (ci.3). She then realized that she was unconsciously influenced by American ways of keeping her own pace and speaking out opinions. Being always one of the last students to finish school tasks (e.g., painting and cleaning up the painting supplies in art class), she felt the need of speeding up her pace. She also knew that being very active was not well-accepted in Japan and tried not to be loud in her class. Her returnee classmate always actively stated his opinions, and she knew that her classmates viewed him as “loud and awful” (ci.3). Her classmates also wondered “how his parents’ faces look like” (ci.3). In her view, the Japanese might benefit from the Americans’ sekkyokuteki (active) behaviors whereas the Americans might benefit from the Japanese’ teki-paki (prompt/efficient) behaviors. However, she knew that “kottchi wa kottchi (here is here), attchi wa attchi

---

106 A Japanese saying, “oya-no-kao-ga-mitemitai,” literary means “I want to see how his/her parents’ faces look like.” It is translated into English as “the son is known by his father.” The phrase is often used with a negative connotation in a situation where one encounters someone’s socially inappropriate behaviors.
(over there is over there)” (ci.3). Each environment seemed to require different attitudes so that it was natural for her to unconsciously change who she was during her sojourning.

Despite the very hectic school life, she felt more “yutori (peace/extra room in mind)” (ci.3) in Japan than in the United States. She explained, “There is not much English here. Though studies are hard, I’m doing everything in Japanese. So it’s easy. It’s just a matter of time” (ci.3). She also “felt good” (ci.3) to have more chance to stay physically active in Japan. While she moved her body only during the easy gym and relaxing recess in the United States, her Japanese school life was full of physical exercises for the serious gym class and school commute. She often woke up late and started off her day by running fast to school. By listening to her story of the busy morning, I could picture her in a blue school uniform running down the green hill and cutting through the clear air of an early morning.

After all, the time constrains and the work loads did not matter for Yayoi to have a peaceful mind. What she needed was the comfort of mother tongue and the healthy school environment blended into the warmth of her hometown. In Japan, her smile was even brighter like a flower that grows strong in its habitat. When I asked her if she ever wanted to go back to the United States, she answered:

I sometimes want to go back, but I really enjoy living here. So, if my parents tell me that we are moving again, I think I will go. But, if they don’t tell me, then I will just stay here. (ci.3)

Her U.S. sojourning was becoming her long-ago memory. When she viewed many pictures taken at the Spring Lake School, she said to herself, “Oh, I was really in America!” (ci.3).
CHAPTER 7

A CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS OF STUDENT IDENTITIES: SALIENT ATTRIBUTES AND NEGOTIATION PROCESSES WITHIN SOJOURNING EXPERIENCES

This chapter presents three essential categories found in a cross-case analysis of five Japanese sojourning children’s identity formation and negotiation in school. Because I used “student identity” as a lens to analyze their school experiences in Japan and the United States, the first two major categories are presented as the specific aspects of identity which they described were central to their school lives. Each of those identity aspects is described with clarification of: (a) what kind of self-relevant attributes were considered by the children as the most salient ones; (b) how their use of those self-relevant attributes shifted or remained consistent during their sojourning; and (c) how those salient self-relevant attributes were interrelated with their perspectives on school adjustment and inclusion as well as socioemotional experiences in school. The last category is about the children’s school experiences, which appeared to be potentially critical to their identity formation during their sojourning, however, which were either considered irrelevant or de-emphasized as to become their salient identity attributes. This chapter incorporates direct quotations from not only the children and their informants (i.e., U.S. classroom teachers and parents) but also the interpretive focus group (IFG) participants in order to present those key categories in a more convincing manner. In the end of this chapter, I briefly explain the contributions of the IFG data to the co-interpretation processes as well as to the overall analyses of the study.
Ordinary and Familiar Student Identities

A cross-case analysis indicated that the most salient self-relevant attributes, which the Japanese sojourning children used to describe their student identities, were: (a) their ordinary social and academic statuses as students and (b) their familiar personal traits that they demonstrate in school. This section presents that, throughout their sojourning, their student identities reflecting these attributes, what I call the ordinary and familiar student identities, remained as the fundamental part of who they were, and were interrelated with the ways in which they became part of their learning communities and experienced various feelings and emotions within their school lives.

Consistently Expressed Self-Relevant Attributes and Processes of Identity Negotiation

The children in any stage of sojourning consistently expressed their identities as ordinary students with previously developed personal traits. More specifically, one attribute that they most frequently and repeatedly used was “a futuu-no (ordinary/regular) student.” They defined this abstract attribute by referring to their social status in their classrooms (e.g., just the same as minna [everyone/all] in the class, not being treated in any special ways) and to their self-claimed academic standing (e.g., not being particularly good at anything, being neither so great nor too bad in studies, and average overall). At the same time, their student identities were consistently connected to the attributes representing their unique personal traits that they had been familiar with since their presojourning days in Japan, mainly including, their personal and behavioral characters and dispositions (e.g., talkative, tennen [natural/spontaneous], mischievous, makezugirai [unyielding], and optimistic); their learning behaviors and attitudes and work ethics (e.g.,...
a student who likes to *uchikomu* [devote oneself] in academics and a child who tries *ganbaru* [to make best effort]); and their personal interests and the characters developed through engaging in the activities of their interests (e.g. a huge sports fan, athletic, into music, and a student who likes *kousaku* [handicraft]).

All these self-relevant attributes represented the children’s perspectives on their actual school practices in both academic and non-academic school contexts, and became salient components of their student identities. In other words, their ordinary and familiar student identities were commonly and consistently manifested in their varied academic, social, personal, and linguistic school experiences in two countries. Some of the attributes appeared to be influenced by Japanese cultural virtue of hard work and uniformity among individuals; however, the children in this study did not necessarily emphasize their Japanese backgrounds when describing their student identities. The possible reason for this is indicated later in this chapter. Also, like the children, most of the IFG participants maintained their ordinary and familiar student identities during their sojournning.

The most important point here is that the children maintained their ordinary and familiar student identities as a result of carrying over these salient self-relevant attributes consistently across two countries as they moved to the United States and as they moved back to Japan. This was, in part, because their learning contexts in both countries allowed them to continuously engage, or expect to eventually engage, in school activities relevant to their ordinary and familiar self-perceptions. In other words, the children’s ordinary and familiar student identities were negotiated through the very stable process only when they were given the opportunities to actually practice the salient self-relevant attributes.
However, it is also important to note that the contextual influences did not allow all of those salient self-relevant attributes to be easily tied into the children’s stable student identities. While some of their salient self-relevant attributes, such as the ones pertaining to their learning attitudes and personal interests, seemed easy for them to demonstrate regardless of the stage, timing, and context of sojourning, other attributes particularly pertaining to their futuu-no status and some personal characters were not so easy to demonstrate when they just moved from one country to another.

For instance, Yayoi’s attributes representing her studious learning behavior and attitude (i.e., a student who works kotsu-kotsu [acidulously/diligently/steadily] and a student who always completes all of her homework) remained crucial to her student identities throughout her sojourning because she was able to consistently demonstrate these attributes in her actual school practices in both Japan and the United States. In Japan before sojourning, her school provided a positive learning environment where she could receive ample opportunities to grow her learning motivation (e.g., being nominated for the school representative election, building an excellent relationships with teachers and peers, etc.). After moving to the United States, her strong learning motivation continued because she was given an abundant amount of homework everyday and received adequate school support in her mainstream class, JELL and ELL classes, and after school homework club. She was, therefore, able to continuously perceive herself an assiduous learner who does her best on all of the given tasks. Then, after returning to Japan, she was immediately immersed back into the rigorous Japanese school routines and spent her weekdays and weekends, from the morning to night, to fulfill varied school
obligations. As a result, she maintained her identity as a hard worker. Thus, the learning contexts of both countries clearly supported her to enact her identities reflecting her positive learning attitudes.

In the cases of Wataru and Tsubasa, they were most enthusiastic about maintaining their personal interests in non-academic activities, such as sports and play. Wataru’s passion towards baseball and his identity as a baseball fan has been strongly established in Japan due to the influence from his father and the supportive environment in which he could practice baseball in a daily basis. Therefore, when he joined his U.S. classroom, his familiar student identities associated with his interests in baseball most saliently symbolized who he was and became recognized by his teacher and classmates. Especially, since baseball was one of the most popular sports in the United States, he could immediately present his familiar student identity as a baseball fan/player. In the views of his teachers and classmates, the image of Wataru, therefore, equaled to baseball. Also, his familiar student identity seemed to persist throughout his U.S. sojourning because he had already started to play baseball in the United States (i.e., joined the little league baseball team and independently practiced in the park) and planned to continuously play in the future as well. Similarly, Tsubasa carried his identities as an athletic child across two countries. He was an active child who liked to play with friends outside in Japan before his U.S. sojourning. After coming to the United States, his interests in athletic activities never changed and he spent most of his breaks, recess, and free time to play sports. After returning to Japan, he continued to play sports and never altered his familiar student identities representing this strong interest. During the U.S.
sojourning and in Japan after his return, he was always given the opportunities to practice and grow his interests (e.g., participating in sports summer camps, joining the school’s sports teams, etc.), and maintained his familiar student identities accordingly. These are just a few examples of the very stable process in which Japanese sojourning children quite smoothly maintained their familiar student identities across two countries.

Unlike these examples, other salient self-relevant attributes particularly related to their ordinary student status and some personal characters were not easily demonstrated because of the dramatic changes of learning contexts that their international transitions brought upon them. In other words, as a result of some difficulties and disadvantageous school experiences associated with the initial adjustment in the United States and the initial readjustment in Japan, the children could not immediately practice their self-relevant attributes salient for their ordinary and familiar student identities. For the children in this study, some attributes, such as being talkative, tennen (natural/spontaneous), and also simply being futuu in mainstream classroom, were especially difficult to manifest as newcomers in their U.S. schools. This was partially because these attributes required their proficiency in the contextually required linguistic skills: Their identities as futuu-no (ordinary/regular) students required them to have sufficient English language skills to participate in school activities in the same ways as their classmates while some of their familiar student identities similarly required their sociolinguistic competence to engage in oral communication and social interactions in English. In addition, the children in this study did not encounter the same difficulties to practice their ordinary and familiar student identities due to their Japanese skills when they moved
back to Japan. However, Aya (IFG), who returned to Japan as a totally “an Americanized kid” with a sense of more comfort in English language, could not perceive herself as futuu until she developed enough Japanese language and cultural knowledge to fully function in school. This makes me speculate that the children in this study were more able to demonstrate their ordinary and familiar student identities in Japan because they did not have tremendous difficulties in their Japanese sociolinguistic practices.

When the children faced the difficulties to immediately claim their ordinary and familiar student identities, they perceived themselves based on the attributes that they optimistically anticipated to develop in the future. For instance, even in their initial adjustment stage when they were not actually participating in school activities in the same ways as other non-sojourning students, Haruya and Wataru showed their clear expectations for eventually perceiving themselves as ordinary students and full participants in school. Misaki, Tsubasa, and Yayoi, who had completed their U.S. sojourning, did not articulate about their experiences of imagining their identities as futuu-no (ordinary/regular) students when they were newcomers in the United States, but clearly maintained their ordinary student identities throughout their U.S. sojourning and even after they returned to Japan. The following quote by Mai (IFG), who looked back at her childhood sojourning, supports the process through which the children’s ordinary student identities were maintained throughout their sojourning:

I was a futuu-no student, acting cheerful futuu-ni (in a regular way), studying futuu-ni, and speaking out futuu-ni. (…) As I retrieve my memories now, I did not change much when I was in Japan at first, when I was in America next, and then, when I came back to Japan.

The names of interpretive focus group participants are indicated with (IFG).
This suggests that, despite the commonly expressed difficulties in their international transitions (e.g., initial adjustment and readjustment, language learning, building social relationships, etc.), all of them somehow continuously maintained their ordinary student identities across countries. It is then reasonable to speculate that they used their imagination to envision the continuity of their ordinary student identities like Haruya and Wataru did. In fact, although Tsubasa, Misaki, and Yayoi did not articulate their imagined ordinary student identities, all of them positively imagined their future school lives as they were leaving the United States and readjusting to their Japanese schools.

In addition, the children could not demonstrate some of their salient personal characters, during the initial adjustment periods in the United States, because those characters overlapped with their orally presented self-images. Misaki’s “talkative” character is an obvious one that could only be demonstrated in Japanese-speaking environment until she developed enough oral English proficiency. Yayoi’s tennens (natural/spontaneous) character is another good example. Due to the difficulties with English oral communication skills, her social interactions with others did not allow her to behave and act like a tennens person—a charming individual who makes cute mistakes in conversations and occasionally becomes a mood maker and the center of attention in the social groups. Instead, she remained as a seemingly serious person while she was in a U.S. context. In her case, she did not imagine herself revealing her tennens character while she was in the United States because she knew that her relatively short term sojourning of about one year would not be long enough for her to acquire all necessary sociolinguistic competence to show her true character to others. When her imagination for the familiar
student identities was restricted by her learning contexts, she reasoned herself and understood her sojourning circumstances as *shouganai* (can’t help it/can’t do anything about it). Using her knowledge of contextual differences between the United States and Japan, she explained that *tennen* character was bound to Japanese culture not American. In the meantime, she imagined herself regaining all aspects of her familiar student identities after returning to Japan. This was because she had her strong sociolinguistic competence in Japanese which allowed her to imagine the consistency of her personal and social capitals and the associated student identities within Japanese school contexts. In fact, her friends acknowledged that her *tennen* character was unchanged or even became stronger after she readjusted to her Japanese school where she could freely express herself in Japanese and enjoy interacting with others without struggle.

Thus, Japanese sojourning children most consistently perceived themselves as “a *futuu-no* student” with their own familiar personal traits. While some self-relevant attributes for their ordinary and familiar student identities were easy for them to demonstrate in any stage of sojourning, other attributes were more difficult to demonstrate and required of their imagination for the continuous self-relevance or their contextual knowledge for self-reasoning when their learning environment and sojourning circumstances did not permit them to imagine the continuity.

*In Relation to Affirmative School Inclusion: Consistent Attributes*

As the children negotiated their ordinary and familiar student identities, their primary concern was to “fit in” their mainstream classrooms and to “keep up with others” without “lagging behind.” A sense of affirmative school adjustment and inclusion was
their foremost important agenda when negotiating their student identities. As stated earlier, in any stage of sojourning, they commonly perceived themselves as students who were included, or would eventually be included, in varied academic and non-academic activities and social interactions in the same way as their non-sojourning classmates.

For instance, the children’s assiduous and serious learning attitudes allowed them to feel included in the mainstream classroom activities in both Japan and the United States. Some children viewed even the state-wide standardized examination in the United States as an opportunity to feel being part of their mainstream classroom community. When Misaki needed to take the exam only a few days before her last day of U.S. schooling, she was willing to comply with this seemingly unreasonable requirement and never complained about it. In her view, the exam would inform her “ichiduke (level/position)” in comparison to others and, foremost importantly, allow her to stay with her classmates and perceive herself as an ordinary student. Similarly, Yayoi, who was exempted from the same exam due to the short length of U.S. schooling, wished to take it so that she did not have to be separated from her class for the entire days of testing. Also, taking Eiken (English language proficiency exam) affected the children’s sense of inclusion in the dominant discourse in Japan. After returning to Japan, Yayoi and Misaki planned to voluntarily take Eiken because it was a common practice among most Japanese students. In Tsubasa’s case, he started to take Eiken while he was in the United States and continued to challenge himself on passing the higher levels after his return.

Also, during the interviews, no child spontaneously chose to talk about the special school support, which they received as sojourners, unless being asked to share. Instead,
their emphasis tended to be on how well they could fit in their learning communities as “a futuu-no student.” For instance, when Tsubasa was already a fully adjusted member in his U.S. classroom, he emphasized that his enrollment in the ELL program in the past was for a short term. When he joined his Japanese school after returning, he also explained that he was learning only in his mainstream classroom and never needed to receive the Japanese as a Second Language support. In both countries, he described his abilities to complete some challenging tasks without receiving any support. An important point was that he shared all these episodes not for the purpose of revealing his extraordinary talents and skills to surpass others in the same learning contexts, but rather for the purpose of emphasizing his successful school inclusion as an ordinary student. Misaki also stated that the JELL and ELL support provided in the United States became less necessary and less helpful as she became more adjusted in her mainstream classroom. She even began to see the pull-out support as a burden to fully participate in mainstream classroom activities. Many IFG participants similarly viewed the pull-out programs negatively as they strived for their full memberships in their mainstream classrooms.

Similarly, when children expressed their identities with the self-relevant attributes representing their unique personal traits, those attributes were not meant to be the factors which make them stand out or be superior to others. Rather, they described the attributes as to become an advantage for finding a connection to others and for mingling with them. For instance, although Wataru was aware of his advanced athletic skills in comparison to his classmates in both Japan and the United States, his intention for integrating his athletic skills into his familiar student identities was to be a well-accepted and well-liked
member of given social communities (i.e., baseball team and mainstream classroom) rather than to claim an extraordinary status that might isolate him from others. Likewise, Haruya’s mischievous nature, Misaki’s chatty personality, and Yayoi’s *tennen* character were all tied into their familiar student identities to show their social connections to others. Thus, the children’s ordinary and familiar student identities were fundamentally supported by their commitment to fit in their given learning environment.

*Socioemotional Consequences: Consistent Attributes*

This study found both positive and negative socioemotional consequences that the Japanese sojourning children experienced as they revealed their ordinary and familiar student identities and worked towards claiming their legitimate memberships in learning communities. Especially, it was foremost important for all of them to positively perceive themselves as the students who were able “*tanoshimu* (to enjoy)” their school lives. Their case studies, therefore, showed numerous episodes of seeking joyous moments in school in two countries. Yayoi, who worked very hard to become part of her U.S. mainstream classroom, explained that feeling fun in school motivated her to go to school everyday. Ken (IFG) similarly noticed the importance of school enjoyment and stated, “When I was in my elementary school, everything seemed fine if I enjoyed each situation.”

One of the key sources for children’s school enjoyment was their participation in various non-academic activities with their friends and peers (e.g., Circle soccer, triad baseball, leaf fight, tag, sledding, reading, drawing, Nintendo DS, simply chatting, etc.). The opportunities to engage in those non-academic activities made their school lives more enjoyable and allowed them to display their child-like and playful characters, social
standings, and fundamental personalities to others. When all children were newcomers to the United States, play became an important activity to be part of given social community, to make friends, especially English-speaking friends, and to improve their English skills. In Tsubasa’s case, play was also a natural part of his life and helped him readjust to the Japanese community after his return. However, it is important to note that the children enjoyed play for its own sake not for the advantages that play might bring to them, (i.e., making friends and improving English skills). Although Haruya, Wataru, and Yayoi, as U.S. newcomers, initially expected those advantages of play, they began to simply enjoy engaging in various play activities and experienced positive feelings, such as “joyous,” “comfortable,” and “set free.” Haruya, Wataru, and Tsubasa, stated that play was “the world’s universal activity” which transcends countries, nationalities, and languages. Kazuya (IFG) similarly explained that his mindset as a child always followed the idea, “The purpose of play is only to play.”

Moreover, the fun aspects of academic discourse also helped newcomers shift their negative anxieties towards their U.S. school lives into their positive feelings and impressions. For instance, Haruya and Wataru experienced strong anxieties a day before they first joined their U.S. classrooms. However, both of them went through smooth initial adjustments because they found in their new classrooms that not only the non-academic activities but also the academic activities were “asobippoi (play-like).” Less structured classroom environment, lessons without using standard textbooks, casual conversations between teachers and students were something that they had never experienced during academic lessons in their former Japanese schools.
It is also important to state that, because the children’s participation in non-academic activities, such as play, was closely related to their school inclusion and identity formation, the failure to join in those activities caused them some negative feelings and emotions. For instance, Haruya and Wataru strongly felt “*iya* (disliking)” when they were not able to participate in play during their adjustment in the United States. When Haruya could not find someone to play with during the recess, he ended up with just running around the playground all by himself. He shared this incident with his parents with a sign of deep disappointment. Also, Wataru, who was a very sociable child in his former Japanese school, was dissatisfied with his participation in play right after he started his summer camp in the United States. Even though he was cheerfully running around outside with his new classmates for more than half of the recess time, he regarded himself mostly playing by himself because he experienced an occasional disconnection to his peers and did not participate in the play for the entire time. In Yayoi’s case, one of her only few complaints about Japanese school life after returning was not having enough time to play, or even to just chat, with her friends.

Moreover, the children also tried avoiding negative feelings by demonstrating their familiar student identities with serious learning attitudes in academic activities. For instance, Haruya tried to fill in all the blanks in his English worksheet, despite his English barrier, because he knew that he would have negative emotional consequences if he did not complete his work. The afore-mentioned learning engagement of Misaki (i.e., positive attitude towards MCAS) and Yayoi (i.e., working assiduously on academic tasks) were also, in part, for them to maintain their familiar student identities and to
experience positive feelings and emotions in school. In this sense, the consistency of self-relevant attributes, affirmative school inclusion, and positive socioemotional experiences in school were mutually influential phenomena within the children’s identity negotiation.

Student Identities Associated with English Language Learning

Another important category found in this study concerned the children’s student identities reflecting the changes of their English language proficiency over the course of sojourning. As the next table presents, the children engaged in various English language learning opportunities and experienced varied difficulties, progress, and expectations for their English acquisition across different stages of sojourning.

Table 7.1 Outline of Children’s English Language Learning Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of Sojourning</th>
<th>In Japan Before moving to the U.S.</th>
<th>In the United States</th>
<th>In Japan After returning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning the basic Eng. in/from:</td>
<td>Receiving support from:</td>
<td>Showing Eng. lang. skills to others by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- school</td>
<td>- J/Ell programs</td>
<td>- translating Japanese words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- after school learning center</td>
<td>- peers and teachers on</td>
<td>- pronouncing Eng. words/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- private conversation school</td>
<td>- family</td>
<td>sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- private tutor</td>
<td>Making effort for</td>
<td>Learning Eng. as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasizing Eng. oral proficiency</td>
<td>acquiring Eng. by:</td>
<td>- school subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>through:</td>
<td>- studying at home</td>
<td>- extracurricular activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- expecting it to be important in</td>
<td>- studying at ELL class</td>
<td>Planning to take Eiken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the U.S.</td>
<td>- doing best on</td>
<td>Motivated to maintain Eng. skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- noticing own inability to speak</td>
<td>homework</td>
<td>Viewing grammar learning as a challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>- using dictionaries</td>
<td>Viewing Eng. conversation lesson too easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facing difficulties</td>
<td>Learning outside school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- listening &amp; speaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- oral communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling bored in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expecting the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>progress in Eng.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquiring Eng. oral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proficiency through:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- social interactions with Eng.-speaking peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- departing from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expressing preference and sense of comfort in:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- varied group settings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- academic subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- pull-out support program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staying motivated to learn Eng.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Making progress in Eng. acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helping Japanese newcomers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Showing behavioral and attitudinal changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- being more out-spoken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- working in own slow pace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before moving to the United States, all children learned the basic English skills through school, after school learning center, private English conversation school, and/or private tutor. As they imagined their future U.S. school lives, they were most concerned with their oral English proficiency which they expected to be the most important skills to survive in U.S. schools and which they did not fully develop in Japan.

As they became the newcomers to the United States, they also received JELL and ELL support, translation helps from peers and teachers, and family support on homework. They also studied English independently at home, tried their best completing given academic tasks in English, and used electric dictionaries to facilitate their English learning. In the newcomers’ period in the United States, they encountered numerous difficulties in listening, speaking, and interacting in English. They often could not understand the lesson content and teachers’ fast speech, and felt bored in the class. In the meantime, they held clear expectations for making progress in their English acquisition and some of them estimated the length of time which might take for them to acquire English skills.

While they were enrolled in U.S. schools, they also acquired English through engaging in non-academic activities with their English-speaking friends and through departing from the Japanese peer groups. They paid close attention to the social dynamics embedded in English learning contexts and expressed their preference and a sense of comfort in varied learning settings (e.g., group size, academic subjects, presentation requirement, ELL pull-out support, etc.). They stayed highly motivated to acquire English and made continuous progress in English learning until the last day of school in
the United States. Those who had developed strong English proficiency helped Japanese newcomers in the same class.

Then, after returning to Japan, they were sometimes asked to show others their English language knowledge (e.g., translating Japanese words to English, pronouncing English sentences in class, etc.). In Japan, they continued to learn English as a school subject and as an extracurricular learning activity. They were also motivated to take *Eiken* (English proficiency exam) and hoped to maintain their English language skills for which they had devoted so much effort to acquire in the United States. While English grammar learning was challenging in Japan, they found English conversation lessons in their Japanese schools too easy. They also noticed the changes of their behaviors and attitudes due to their sojourning experiences in the English-speaking country.

Among these varied experiences that influenced not only their English acquisition but also their school lives, all children considered their proficiency in English oral communication as the most salient self-relevant attributes for their student identities. This section describes these attributes in details and examines the processes of negotiating specifically their linguistic identities as English language learners (ELLs), or what I call the *ELL identities*. This section also indicates that their ELL identities were based on their hopeful imagination and expectations towards participating in verbal interactions, building meaningful social relationships, and experiencing positive feelings and emotions.

*Changing Self-Relevant Attributes and Processes of Identity Negotiation*

All children most strongly associated their student identities with the attributes pertaining to their English oral communication skills especially during the first transition...
when they envisioned their future U.S. school lives in the presojourning stage in Japan and also when they were being immersed into their U.S. classrooms. Their strong emphasis on their oral English proficiency, in the presojourning stage through the entire U.S. sojourning stages, was manifested not only in their verbally shared episodes but also in their drawings. As the following table indicates, 10 out of a total of 15 drawings depicted the episodes verbally interacting with others and 8 of them were in English-speaking contexts:

Table 7.2 Verbal and Non-Verbal Interactions in Drawings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Haruya</th>
<th>Wataru</th>
<th>Tsubasa</th>
<th>Misaki</th>
<th>Yayoi</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Verbal Interaction</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the meantime, during the second transition, when they were preparing for their return to Japan and also when they were readjusting to their Japanese schools, they did not describe their student identities in connection to their specific English skills, which they were most concerned about then (i.e., English literacy and grammar skills), nor their broad English language learning experiences (i.e., their oral language proficiency, which was more advanced than their Japanese peers, and their unconsciously changed behaviors and attitudes due to English language learning). It seemed that all children and IFG participants in this study no longer needed to claim their ELL identities in Japan since they had more than enough English skills to fit in the Japanese mainstream (e.g., for English class and exam, for *Eiken*, etc.). It is also reasonable to assume that focusing on
their English language experiences as the salient self-relevant attributes in Japan would make them stand out in the peer group, and interfere with their intentions to fit-in.

The children’s salient self-relevant attributes associated with their English oral communication skills represented: (a) their linguistic competence actually demonstrated during verbal interactions; (b) their perceptions of their own linguistic competence in comparison to others; and (c) their expectations for acquiring oral English proficiency. First, all children predominantly perceived themselves as the students who were either “shabereru (able to speak)” or “shaberenai (unable to speak)” English. This was based on their real-life experiences of being able or unable to engage in actual oral communication, and often reflected their keen observations of the frequency, lengths, and quality of their own oral participation in both academic and non-academic discourses.

Second, their actual practices of oral language competence in English were also tied into the ways in which they perceived themselves in comparison to others in the same academic and non-academic contexts. For instance, when experiencing the situation in which they were shaberenai (unable to speak) English, they immediately perceived themselves as “a student who does not do well in English” “a student who cannot speak English in a great way like the Americans can,” “otonashii (quiet) student,” “quiet and strange student,” “one who needs help with English,” “an outsider,” and so forth. These self-relevant attributes suggest that their ELL identities would not become apparent without the children situating themselves in social relations with others.

It was then not surprising that the children also assumed how their teachers and classmates might view them in the learning contexts. In some cases, their assumptions
reasonably corresponded to others’ views. For instance, when Haruya assumed that his
teacher saw him as a quiet student, the teacher was actually speculating if he was “quiet
by nature.” However, others’ perceptions did not become the salient self-relevant
attributes for their ELL identities unless they were actually practiced and recognized by
the children. All children heavily relied on their own perceptions of English oral language
skills and actual practices to form their identities. Tsubasa explained that speculating
others’ views was not meaningful and stated, “You’ll never know [how others perceive
you] unless you ask them.”

Lastly, children perceived themselves based on their expectations towards
acquiring oral English proficiency. For instance, when Wataru expected to develop his
oral English proficiency in his U.S. classroom, he not only imagined himself claiming the
identity as “a student who can speak English” in the future but also started to perceive
himself as “an English speaker.” He explained, “When I’m studying [in English], I do my
work pretending that I am an American. If I work on my English in that way, it’s
somehow fun and I can work better.” The children’s ELL identities thus reflected not
only their practice of actual English oral language skills but also their perceptions of
those skills within their given academic and non-academic contexts as well as their
imagination of future progress. Importantly, their oral English proficiency was practiced
and imagined in varied learning settings, including academic and academic social settings
(e.g., speaking out in class, giving oral presentations in a breakfast share, socially
interacting with peers in group activities, etc.) as well as non-academic social settings
(e.g., playing with friends during the recess).
These varied expressions of salient self-relevant attributes relevant to children’s oral English proficiency explain the processes by which the children negotiated their ELL identities. This means that the children’s ELL identities associated particularly with their oral English proficiency shifted from one representation to another as they keenly recognized their successful or unsuccessful acquisition in varied academic and non-academic settings. For instance, their growing oral English proficiency and the increased frequency of verbal interactions affected the shift of their ELL identities in varied ways (e.g., from a student, who is “shaberenai [unable to speak]” English to a student who is “shabereru [able to speak]” English; from mostly an outsider to occasionally an insider; from a student, who needs JELL and ELL support, to a student, who no longer needs any language support; and from a student, who needs translation from Japanese classmates, to a student who helps Japanese newcomers). The most dramatic shift was seen in Misaki’s ELL identities which shifted from “a quiet and strange student” when she was new to the United States to “a talkative student” by the time when she was returning to Japan. Similarly, Kazuya’s (IFG) self-perceptions changed from “a shy student” to “an urusai [noisy] student” as he became more able to participate in English oral communication.

Haruya used the term, “mode,” to describe the shift of the salient self-relevant attributes representing the development of his oral English proficiency in the United States. When he was exempted from most of the classroom activities that required English verbal interactions (e.g., sharing time, oral presentation, speaking out in class, etc.) and remained silent in his new U.S. mainstream classroom, he perceived himself as being in “an otonashi (quiet) mode.” His mode shifted to “a kinchou (nervous) mode”
when he was gradually required to participate in those classroom activities. Once he experienced speaking out in front of people, his mode again shifted to “a *kinchou-gimi* (slightly nervous) mode.” At the same time, he expected his mode to continuously shift in the future as he would further develop his oral English proficiency. He predicted that he would perceive himself being in the “*kinishinai* (carefree) mode” during the summer because he would feel increasingly less worried about speaking English. Then, the following mode was expected to be his “*genki* (fine/cheerful) mode” that would represent his “*hyoujun* (standard)” state of mind. The below figure shows his shifting modes in different timings within the newcomer’s stage:

Figure 7.1 The Shift of Mode Described by Haruya

In addition, these shifting modes were described by Haruya in May and differed from the shift described in February. When he was in the midst of his *otonashi* (quiet) mode in February, he first thought that his *genki* (fine/cheerful) mode would follow next. However, he unexpectedly experienced the extreme nervousness by being required to give an oral presentation in English for his animal research, and formed his *kinchou*
(nervous) mode accordingly. By experiencing the gradual shift of the unexpected modes, he thought that another phase, *kinishinai* [carefree] mode, would come before he would gain his positive feeling of *genki* as an ELL. In his view, the initial self-relevant attributes, which represented his comparatively negative modes before achieving the *genki* mode, were understandable and appropriate for the time being because his true self, or what he called *honshin* (true heart/intention), had not been fully revealed due to his minimal English skills, frequent silence, and negative socioemotional experiences.

As seen in Haruya’s example, children’s ELL identities continuously changed according to not only their actual development of English language competence but also their English language learning expectations. In other words, all children in this study expected their future selves making continuous progress in English acquisition and imagined that their identities would shift in correspondence to their progress. For instance, Haruya’s ELL identities started to change when he was first announced about his family’s plan of U.S. sojourning. As he imagined his future U.S. school life and gained the real-life purpose for learning English, he began to form his identities as a child who would balance the attitude of *tanoshimu* (to enjoy) and *ganbaru* (to make best effort) in learning English. In presojourning days in Japan, Yayoi had already begun imagining the future processes through which she would perceive herself as an adult who would use her English skills to see things from an international perspectives.

Especially when newcomers faced difficulties in English oral communication due to the transitions to the United States (e.g., being unable to communicate, being misunderstood by others, secretly ignoring others speaking to them in English, losing the
chance to join athletic activities during recess, etc.), they displayed their hopeful expectations for acquiring the listening and speaking skills necessary for English communication, and imagined more desirable ELL identities for the future. In their views, their ELL identities reflecting their linguistic difficulties were temporal. Also, the language learning expectations held by Haruya, Wataru, and Yayoi were very concrete. For instance, they estimated that spending one year in their U.S. school would be a critical turning point for acquiring English oral communication skills. Even after the children became adjusted to their U.S. schools, oral English proficiency continued to be their concern. This phenomenon was manifested in interview conversation as well as in their drawings.

Moreover, when some behaviors and attitudes associated with English language learning developed unconsciously, children became conscious of the changes after others in the same learning environment (i.e., teachers, peers, friends, and parents) informed them of the changes. For instance, the children’s behavioral and attitudinal changes associated with English oral communication (e.g., sekkyokuteki [active], the ki-ga-tsuyoi [strong minded/aggressive], my-pace type, etc.) unconsciously occurred during their U.S. schooling, they began to think of the changes when they entered the Japanese learning context where the changes were accentuated and noticed by their friends. Upon confirming the friends’ views in their actual school practices, the children agreed that they had really changed their attitudes and behaviors.

However, at the same time, the children were also aware that Japanese school contexts did not warmly accept their unconsciously developed attitudes and behaviors.
which were naturally practiced in the U.S. classrooms for their successful communication with English-speaking peers. For instance, Misaki and Yayoi observed their out-spoken returnee peers negatively viewed by other classmates, and immediately sensed the extent to which students’ activeness, strong mind, and individual pace were accepted in the Japanese school discourse. Misaki knew that being strong minded was connected to an idea of aggression and, therefore, would make her stand out in Japanese classrooms in a negative sense. Yayoi also knew that keeping her own pace in social interactions and school activities would slow her down when following the very structured class schedules in Japan. Mai (IFG), who had similar experiences with the children, explained that her “sekkyokuteki attitude was considered to be sugoi (extreme) in Japan though it was totally normal in the United States.” Since the children intended to continuously fit in the mainstream classroom in Japan, they did not regard these unconsciously developed behaviors and attitudes as their new salient self-relevant attributes. Rather, they de-emphasized those changes and considered them to be temporal. Thus, the children in this study articulated the shift of ELL identities which occurred mainly due to their practice and imagination of English oral communication skills within U.S. school contexts.

In Relation to Affirmative School Inclusion: Changing Attributes

Children’s ELL identities were inseparable from their strong commitment to fit in their learning communities, particularly in the United States, and to earn a sense of affirmative school inclusion. This idea is best exemplified in the children’s use of the terms, “an insider” and “an outsider” to express their ELL identities. In other words, they were aware that the frequency of their successful participation in English oral
communication often determined their social status as an insider or an outsider of the English-speaking community. Misaki, for instance, explained that, when her oral participation occurred “only sometimes” or “for a moment,” she experienced a “bimyo-na [subtle]” sense of self as an insider. Her insider identity lasted for more prolonged time as the frequency of her oral interaction increased.

The children’s insider and outsider status also randomly appeared depending on the varied combinations of their intentions, the nature of activities, and social dynamics of the group. In some cases, children made their conscious efforts for earning memberships in the group by verbally sharing their academic knowledge and cultural expertise. For instance, during a small group math activity, Yayoi was not able to play a central role in explaining the rules of a math game that she and her partner, Lily, collaboratively created. As Lily dominantly spoke to the group with a confident attitude, Yayoi remained silent and sat at the end of the table for most of the class time. However, she occasionally earned an insider status in the group when she was the only one who could point out the mistakes that some group members made. As she verbally displayed her solid knowledge of academic content and her righteousness, her existence was revealed to others and then she received their attention and respect.

In addition, Haruya, Misaki, and Yayoi thought that their “sekkyokuteki (active)” attitudes were important for them to courageously jump in English oral communication and to become part of the mainstream communities. Similar to their views, Atsushi (IFG) valued the sekkyokuteki attitude and stated, “Even when I wasn’t able to speak English, trying my best to communicate, rather than remaining silent, was the best shortcut for
being able to speak English and to be part of my class.” He also commented that his activeness became part of his life-long competence and identity, and that he could not have developed his sekkyokuteki attitude if his devoted fifth grade teacher did not make tremendous efforts to understand and communicate with him.

In contrast to such positive attitude towards English language learning, Misaki and Yayoi noticed that some of their Japanese peers were not motivated to be part of English-speaking communities due to their notions of upcoming return. Some of the IFG participants were, in fact, like those unmotivated peers. Masa (IFG), for instance, stated, “I knew that I would be going back, so I wasn’t able to jump in the group of English-speaking kids. My Japanese was the main and English was like the language for the time being.” Satoru (IFG) similarly stated, “It’s just fine not being able to speak [English] because I’m going back anyway.” Masa (IFG) later felt regret about being “shoukyokuteki (passive)” when he was learning English in the United States and commented, “I had an attitude that ‘I am not going to speak English because I can’t,’ But, I’ve come to think now that it might have been better if I tried speaking anyway no matter how little I knew the language.” Toshi (IFG) also regretfully stated, “I wonder if my world expanded if I spoke to people more actively.”

In some occasions, the decision on acting as an insider or an outsider in English oral communication was not made by the children but by others who allowed or disallowed their participation in social interactions. For instance, when I observed Yayoi in a small group during an art class, her English-speaking peers at the same small table did not talk to, or almost ignored, her when they were chatting with each other. However,
the same peers invited her to join them when they started to play a non-verbal game using their fingers. In the same group context, her status of an insider or an outsider shifted instantly and fluidly based on her English-speaking peers’ judgment on what she could do and could not do with her limited oral English proficiency.

Similarly, teachers determined their sojourning students’ participation in academic discourse by modifying the content and route of learning. The below excerpt of an one-on-one conversation between Yayoi and a student teacher in the ELL program shows that their verbal interaction changed the purpose of the literacy lesson from a creative task of building a sentence with key vocabulary to a task of mere dictation.

Student Teacher: “An excellence as an artist …” (reading a sentence off the workbook) Now, you can complete the sentence.

Student Teacher: What? (making a slight frown on her face)

Yayoi: (thinking for a few seconds and says something inaudible)

Student Teacher: “is known in a whole country.” (not waiting for Yayoi to repeat)

Yayoi: (writing down what teacher said)

Thus, others’ views influenced children’s language learning practices and ELL identities as an insider or an outsider of specific social interactions and academic discourse.

In addition, it is also important to note that the linguistic demands of academic activities also influenced children’s perceptions on their possible participation in academic discourse. In other words, all children were very reflective about how different academic subjects allowed or disallowed them to experience a sense of achievement and social inclusion with their currently acquired English language proficiency. All children commonly viewed that math was their strongest subject in U.S. classrooms because it did not demand them to memorize technical vocabulary unlike other subjects. Although there
were some language-oriented math tasks, such as word problems, there were also numerous less language-oriented tasks, including calculations and drawing diagrams. It was important for the children to do well at least on those tasks like other non-sojourning classmates and to build a sense of confidence. Their views were confirmed by Toshi (IFG) who stated, “Math was the only one subject that I could do well with my limited English skills.” Having one strong academic subject fostered their ELL identities as the students who managed to participate in the academic discourse and to fit in their learning communities with their developing English language skills.

_Socioemotional Consequences: Changing Attributes_

Children experienced various feelings and emotions as they negotiated their ELL identities by developing their English language proficiency in varied social and academic interactions. In social contexts, they were able to build positive relationships with peers and friends, for instance, by actively communicating with English-speaking peers, keeping distance from Japanese bullies, and not being chastised by their American peers about speaking Japanese. Then, the positive social relations allowed them to purely enjoy interacting with others and to feel “_tanoshii_ (pleasant)” about their school lives. Such positive social and emotional experience also facilitated their English acquisition as Haruya explained, “When you think it’s _tanoshii_, you can study English easily.”

All children were also sensitive about the negative feelings caused by social exclusion due to their limited English skills. Haruya, Misaki and Yayoi clearly stated that they felt “_iya_ (unpleasant/dislike)” about being isolated in any verbal social interactions in English. In Misaki’s view, speaking in English was the most challenging skill to
acquire and more difficult than writing in English because the ineffective speaking with “bad pronunciation” would force her to directly witness an obvious puzzlement in the interlocutor’s face and cause her negative feelings. Interestingly, the children’s limited oral English proficiency in the United States also caused social isolation even among Japanese-speaking peers, who were better English speakers than them, because their weakness in English easily became a target of bullying. The negative experiences with Japanese bullies often became the central topic of the stories shared by Misaki, Tsubasa, and Yayoi. It is important to note that their negative experiences with those bullies encouraged them to expand their social network to English-speaking communities and, as a result, helped them improve their English skills.

In academic contexts, the children knew that their sufficient oral English proficiency would increase enjoyment in academic learning while insufficient proficiency would result in negative feelings (e.g., nervous, feeling lagging behind, etc.). For instance, Haruya felt extremely nervous about orally presenting in English when he was enrolled in his U.S. school for less than three months. Without understanding English spoken by others, Haruya, Wataru, Yayoi, and Misaki, as newcomers, also could not help being “bored,” “unfocused” and “reckless” during lessons. Haruya and Yayoi often felt “zannen (disappointed)” about missing out learning opportunities. Haruya thought, “I could have understood interesting things a little more, if I could speak more English.” Thus, like the consistent self-relevant attributes presented in the previous section, the changing self-relevant attributes are inseparable from and are intricately interwoven into the children’s experiences of school adaptation and socioemotional consequences.
Potentially Critical School Experiences for Children’s Student Identities

The five Japanese sojourning children went through varied academic, social, linguistic, and cultural school experiences during their sojourning. When they described their student identities in this study, they focused on some specific school experiences to be treated as the salient self-relevant attributes (i.e., ordinary student status, familiar personal traits, development of oral English proficiency) while not focusing on other school experiences that could potentially become critical to their identity formation. Those potentially critical school experiences include: (a) the children’s experiences with Japanese language and culture; (b) their practice of bilingual and bicultural competences; and (c) their overall international sojourning experiences as kaigaishijo (Japanese students oversea) and kikokushijo (Japanese returnee students). This section describes those experiences in details and indicates the possible reasons why those experiences could be the potential salient self-relevant attributes for the sojourning children and why the children did not emphasized the connections between those experiences and their student identities. While the previous two sections placed the children’s articulated expressions of their student identities in the core of analysis, the content of this section is supported by the analysis of the varied events, episodes, and contexts depicted in each case study as well as the experiences of IFG participants.

Experiences with Japanese Language and Culture

Children’s experiences of Japanese language learning and their Japanese cultural backgrounds were not clearly stated as the attributes to their student identities, but significantly affected many aspects of their school lives in two countries. The table below
outlines their Japanese linguistic and cultural experiences across different stages of sojourning.

Table 7.3 Outline of Children’s Experiences with Japanese Language and Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Japan Before moving to the U.S.</th>
<th>In the United States</th>
<th>In Japan After returning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer’s Stage</td>
<td>After the newcomers’ stage</td>
<td>Learning kanji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fully immersed in Japanese school</td>
<td>• Continue to learn Japanese through:</td>
<td>• Adjusted to Japanese school culture and school life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acquiring strong Japanese language proficiency</td>
<td>- supplementary Japanese language school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the correspondent course materials</td>
<td>- weekly test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the assignments from the former teacher in Japan</td>
<td>- daily homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- independent study at home (w/ parents)</td>
<td>- Adjusted to Japanese school culture and school life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being part of the Japanese group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bullied by Japanese peers</td>
<td>• Staying connected to Japanese language &amp; culture by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Using Japanese to support school learning:</td>
<td>- speaking Japanese at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- JELL program</td>
<td>- keeping in touch with old friends &amp; teachers in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Japanese classmates</td>
<td>- enjoying Japanese popular culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- some academic tasks &amp; homework</td>
<td>- maintaining interests in Japanese athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focusing on kanji learning</td>
<td>• Learning kanji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- forgetting some kanji characters</td>
<td>- weekly test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- preparing for Japanese schooling</td>
<td>- daily homework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the presojourning period, all children were fully immersed into their Japanese learning context and, therefore, had developed strong Japanese language skills and a sense of comfort in the language and culture. In the initial adjustment periods in their U.S. schools, they had the strong linguistic foundation in Japanese and received JELL support as well as translation help from their Japanese classmates. They were also allowed to use Japanese to work on some academic tasks (e.g., writing, homework, quiet reading in a free choice time, etc.). With the minimal English skills, their social interactions initially
took place within the group of Japanese peers. However, their relationships with the Japanese peers were not always positive because of bullying and teasing.

Throughout U.S. sojourning, their parents provided some Japanese learning opportunities as preparation for their eventual returns. For instance, they attended the supplemental Japanese language school on weekend, subscribed the correspondent course materials from Japan, received the assignments from the former teacher in Japan, and studied at home independently or with their parents. Even after developing the grade-level English proficiency, they were always connected to Japanese language and culture by: speaking Japanese to family members, keeping in touch with old friends and teachers in Japan, enjoying Japanese popular culture (e.g., drama, movies, comic books, computer games, etc.), and maintaining their interests in Japanese professional sports players.

Before returning to Japan, some children realized that they forgot some simple kanji characters and practiced more seriously in order to catch up with their peers in Japan. After returning, they continued to learn kanji hard since they had to receive weekly test and daily homework to prepare for the test. Despite the hectic schedules, all returning children in this study nicely readjusted to the Japanese school culture and their school lives in Japan.

The above outlined experiences with Japanese language and culture could be potentially reflected upon the children’s student identities for a few reasons. First, Japanese language and culture deeply influenced their feelings, emotions, and attitudes towards school learning. For instance, it was extremely important for newcomers to have Japanese-speaking peers in the same learning environment in order to feel comfortable in
school. By just knowing about the Japanese student population in the Spring Lake School, Haruya, in the presojourning period, felt less anxious about his future in the United States. Also, he felt hesitant to join his sports summer camp when he found out that there might be no other Japanese students. To Wataru, being the only one Japanese student in his class during his very first summer camp in the United States was extremely difficult and caused him tears and negative feelings. When he was struggling with the initial adjustment in the United States, he took his mother’s advice and tried not to lose his confidence by reminding himself that he was able to communicate in Japanese which not all students in his U.S. class could speak. Toshi (IFG) also explained that, when he was a newcomer, the existence of his Japanese-speaking peers made him “not feeling isolated.”

Moreover, the Japanese-speaking environment in U.S. schools gave a sense of comfort and security to not only newcomers but also the students who had been well-adjusted to the United States. Even for Misaki who had spent almost three years in the United States, Japanese-speaking was almost therapeutic since chatting with her friends in Japanese every morning made her relaxed and less worried about the upcoming school day in her mainstream classroom. Also, Japanese popular culture continued to provide children with a sense of joy across countries.

As the children were to return to Japan, their Japanese language skills, especially kanji skills, became a source of their concern because they were afraid if they might feel behind their peers in kokugo (Japanese language arts). After returning to Japan, their Japanese language skills continued to influence their feelings and emotions. Tsubasa pointed out that the only negative feeling he had towards his new Japanese school was
about the difficult *kokugo*. In contrast, Yayoi, who returned from her one year U.S.
sojourning with her well-maintained Japanese language skills, felt “*yutori* (peace in
mind)” in Japan where she could learn all school subjects in Japanese. These examples
across different stages of sojourning indicate that, as the children engaged in Japanese
linguistic and cultural discourse, they experienced varied feelings, emotions, and attitudes,
which seemed to be related to their student identities—who they were and who they were
supposed to be as students.

Second, some of the salient self-relevant attributes explained in previous sections
seemed to relate to their Japanese cultural backgrounds and Japanese language learning
experiences. As mentioned earlier, their emphases on being “*futuu* (ordinary/regular)”
and on demonstrating their familiar learning attitudes and work ethics (e.g., a student who
completes homework, a student who *uchikomu* [to devote oneself] in academic tasks,
etc.) might reflect Japanese cultural virtue of hard work and not standing out in groups. In
addition, the children’s Japanese language skills and cultural knowledge helped them
maintain some salient attributes for their familiar student identities (e.g., sports fan,
“*genki* [fine/cheerful]”). For instance, Tsubasa’s personal interests in playing sports was
consistently expressed as crucial part of his student identities while his love of sports was
inseparable from his admiration for Japanese professional athletes. Also, when Haruya
could not show his *honshin* (true heart/intention) in English-speaking contexts, speaking
Japanese allowed him to demonstrate his *genki* character, which always remained as a
salient self-relevant attribute to his familiar student identities.
The children’s ELL identities also seemed to be indirectly impacted by their Japanese language experiences. This is because the progress they made in their English language acquisition was, in part, supported by their Japanese language skills. More specifically, all newcomers viewed the support given in their first language (i.e., JELL and translation support from Japanese classmates and parents) valuable and helpful to be part of their mainstream classroom and to acquire English. Mai (IFG) also explained that her relationships with her Japanese friends helped her build a wider social network with English-speaking peers, and stated, “Some of my Japanese friends had been in the United States for a long time, some were actually born in the United States, and so I became closer to American children through them.”

In other cases, children began to socially interact with American peers in order to avoid Japanese bullies. As mentioned earlier, since bullying and teasing often targeted on newcomers’ minimal English language skills, the victimized children became motivated to depart from the Japanese community by improving their English. Two of the IFG participants, Aya and Mai, similarly experienced being teased or “haburareta (ignored)” by their Japanese classmates, and, as a result, expanded their social network to English-speaking peers. In addition, as children developed more English proficiency, their roles in the Japanese-speaking community changed from a newcomer, who needs help from Japanese classmates, to a resource person for other Japanese classmates who newly joined the class. Thus, the Japanese-speaking community in school deeply, sometimes indirectly, influenced the social relationships with English-speaking peers and their social status in mainstream classrooms, which were both important for their ELL identities.
Lastly, unlike the children in this study, some IFG participants clearly stated that they perceived themselves as “a Japanese-speaking student” and “a Japanese person.” For instance, Toshi (IFG) began to realize his Japanese identity after he came to the United States where he encountered the different linguistic and cultural contexts for the first time in his life. His consciousness of Japanese identity was “activated” in the United States and never disappeared even after his return to Japan. Satoru (IFG) similarly stated that he became more conscious of his Japanese identity by sojourning in the United States. He further explained that his awareness of his Japanese identity persisted after his return to Japan, and he “became more able to view [his] own identity from others’ perspectives.” Thus, the experiences of IFG participants supported the idea that the children’s experiences with Japanese language and culture could be influential to their formation of student identities.

It is then meaningful to consider the reasons why this study did not find the children’s Japanese linguistic and cultural experiences as their salient self-relevant attributes to their student identities. The possible reasons may vary across two countries and across the stages of sojourning. In Japan before sojourning, the children probably did not need to emphasize their Japanese-related backgrounds as self-relevant attributes since their backgrounds were never contested in comparison to others.

In the United States, children’s primary focus was on acquiring English not on maintaining Japanese. Therefore, it is reasonable to speculate that they did not intend to accentuate their Japanese backgrounds as part of their student identities. Some children also thought that their language acquisition occurred in a zero-sum manner between
English and Japanese. Yayoi and Wataru, for instance, viewed that excessive Japanese speaking made their school lives less “America-like.” Toshi (IFG) also explained, “I started to hate having many Japanese students in my school when I got used to the school. (…) I spoke too much Japanese, after all, and didn’t speak English.” Moreover, Japanese became an obstacle for not only their English acquisition but also their social relations with American peers. When Misaki witnessed that American girls negatively viewed a group of Japanese-speaking girls during lunch, she refrained herself from speaking Japanese in the cafeteria, and more actively joined the American group. Since gaining a sense of school inclusion through English oral communication was crucial in the United States, it makes sense that children did not necessarily viewed themselves as a person with their minority linguistic and cultural backgrounds which might separate them from the dominant peer group.

In Japan after their return, some children immediately became readjusted to their Japanese schools and kept up with all academic works in Japanese. For those children, it was not necessary to emphasize their Japanese backgrounds in connection to their student identities since they had enough Japanese proficiency to maintain their ordinary student identities without struggle. Tsubasa was an only child who felt that his difficulties in kokugo (Japanese language arts) were delaying his full adjustment to his Japanese school. However, he, like other children, did not view himself based on his Japanese linguistic competence. It seemed that pointing out his weakness in Japanese would differentiate himself from others and would become a disadvantage for his school inclusion. Unlike in the United States where newcomers openly shared their identities based on their inability
to speak English, perceiving the self based on the linguistic skills, which were not equal to the majority’s (e.g., limited kanji knowledge, advanced English language skill), might have been more disadvantageous in Japanese contexts where harmonious social relations are highly valued.

Experiences with Bilingual and Bicultural Competences

The children’s selected attributes also did not include their unique competences as bilingual and bicultural individuals (e.g., skills to simultaneously engage in multiple linguistic and cultural discourses, skills to naturally transcend the linguistic and cultural boundaries and determine their own positionalities in each given social context, abilities to translate between Japanese and English, etc.). Their bilingual and bicultural competences seem potentially salient to their student identities because these unique competences were clearly demonstrated in their everyday school practices and affected their participation in multiple social discourses. In this study, Tsubasa and Misaki were the ones who had gone through U.S. education for a prolonged time and who demonstrated their bilingual and bicultural competences. In my classroom observations, I was often amazed by Tsubasa’s abilities to not only use different variations of English but also demonstrate culturally appropriate ways of social interaction. For instance, in a small group activity, he engaged in three different types of linguistic and cultural discourses at the same time: He spoke the academic-oriented Standard English to English-speaking Caucasian girls while chatting in casual buddy-like English with an English-speaking Asian American boy, who was one of his close friends, and translating in Japanese for a Japanese-speaking newcomer with minimal English skills. His
classroom teachers described him as being good at working with both English-speaking and Japanese-speaking classmates, keeping “a good balance,” and “going back and forth very easily” between two languages and culture. However, his unique competence in two languages and culture was not emphasized when he articulated his student identities.

As seen in Tsubasa’s example, children’s language competence required their cultural awareness. While learning English, all children made on-going cultural comparisons in varied aspects, such as physical environments (e.g., large playground in the United States, small lockers in Japanese school, etc.), learning attitudes (e.g., The Japanese students’ attitudes of uchikomu [devoting oneself] in comparison to the American students’ attitudes of tanoshimu [enjoying oneself]), and behaviors (e.g., describing the Americans as ozappa [careless/thoughtless] as compare to describing the Japanese as kichoumen [meticulous]). They also placed themselves on the spectrum of cultural distance and stated their positionalities (e.g., resonating themselves with Japanese ways of thinking and behaving, preferring Japanese popular culture, etc.). In Misaki’s case, she demonstrated her bicultural competence to take her fluid positionalities depending on her critical yet fair judgment of the linguistic and cultural practices in each situation. This means that she did not claim a membership to one culture but rather transcended the mono-cultural standpoint while criticizing and/or supporting particular aspects of either Japanese or American culture. For instance, while she was in the United States, she was critical about the Japanese girls always congregating and speaking only Japanese to each other and supported the American girls’ complaints about them. At the same time, she continued to enjoy interacting with her Japanese peers and to
love Japanese pop cultures while criticizing the immoral and immature behaviors she saw in some American peers. After returning to Japan, she also kept some positive views of American mannerism and criticized the Japanese adults misbehaving in public. At the same time, she truly cherished her Japanese school life. Thus, she demonstrated her deep understanding of both culture and her seemingly unbiased cultural positionalities in each given situation.

Another reason for the potential salience of children’s bilingual and bicultural competences is based on the view shared by IFG participants. For instance, Fumi (IFG) thought that her bilingual and bicultural competence was fundamental to her identity as “a person who could enjoy living in both countries.” In her view, her unique linguistic and cultural competence allowed her to understand social interactions appropriate for each culture while keeping her own hybrid stance as a translingual and transcultural person without being biased by her Japanese origin. Unlike Fumi, no child in this study explicitly described their bilingual and bicultural/translingual and transcultural identities.

This might be because, in the United States, the learning contexts did not provide children with the chance to value their bilingual and bicultural competences since their use of Japanese skills was limited for the purpose of supporting their English acquisition. Also, in Japan after returning, the children did not have a strong purpose for claiming their bilingual and bicultural competences, except for some occasions in which they did a favor for their teachers and friends (e.g., translating Japanese words to English, pronouncing English sentences/words, sharing what they learned in the United States, etc.). In addition, as mentioned earlier, they attentively noticed that standing out with
extraordinary English skills in the class would result in being excluded from the Japanese peer group.

*International Sojourning Experiences as Kaigaishijo and Kikokushijo*

The children’s sojourning experiences associated with their unique status as *kaigaishijo* (Japanese students oversea) in the United States and as *kikokushijo* (Japanese returnee students) in Japan were also not utilized as self-relevant attributes when they described their student identities. Their sojourning statuses seemed potentially salient to their student identities since every child was required to experience the international transitions at least twice, going to the United States and returning to Japan, and experienced varied events and episodes unique to only sojourning individuals in each transition. Those events and episodes include: making an announcement of their move to friends, peers, and teachers; preparing for moving; making memories by taking pictures and giving gifts; keeping in touch with friends long distance; learning and maintaining two language in both countries; etc.). Importantly, those experiences during transitions affected the children’s feelings and emotions, and created the situations in which they sort of gave up and accepted their sojourning experiences as an involuntary family obligation.

More specifically, the transitions from one country to another required the children to leave the learning environment where they had developed their social network and student identities, and, subsequently, to become a part of a new learning environment where they would need to build new relationships with others and to reconstruct, maintain, and change their student identities. For all children, each transition was
accompanied with some mixed feelings. When they perceived the transition as a dislocation, they experienced some negative feelings, such as “samishii (sad/lonely)” and “iya (unpleasant/dislike).” Mai (IFG), like the children, experienced a separation distress when she sojourned between two countries. She explained, “It was simply difficult to enter another circumstance that was different from the one in which I was already feeling comfortable.” In addition, the children’s negative feelings coexisted with their positive feelings, such as “excited” and “waku-waku (eagerly anticipated),” when they viewed the transition as an opportunity to expand their social network internationally or to reunite with their old friends. It seemed that they made conscious attempts to envision their enjoyable school lives for the future because experiencing the international transitions twice was something that they could not control, or what Yayoi called her “entrusted unmei (fate/destiny).”

Thus, experiencing the international transitions was a necessary and significant life event for all sojourning children. Misaki, for instance, viewed the international transitions that Japanese sojourning students had to go through as a big deal and reprimanded her classmate who did not even know that one of the Japanese students in the same grade left the school a few days ago. She simply could not dismiss his ignorance and exclaimed, “Don’t just say that you don’t know!”

All children and IFG participants were also aware of the terms, kaigaishijo and kikokushijo, and had their own interpretation of what kind of social connotations were attached to these terms. For instance, Haruya thought that kaigaishijo were “kakkoii (cool)” because they appeared “ganbaru (to make best effort)” on learning in a foreign
country. All children in this study received strong parental expectations towards their English language acquisition throughout their U.S. sojourning. The children, who returned to Japan, as well as all IFG participants also received the continuous parental expectations for their English maintenance in Japan. Many of them were aware of the social and parental expectations for U.S. kaigaishijo’s and kikokushijo’s high English language proficiency. Tsubasa and Yayoi knew that, after returning to Japan, some of their peers viewed kikokushijo’s knowledge of English and American culture with envy.

Despite the children’s awareness of their unique experiences as sojourners and their socially given labels in the Japanese community, it seemed that they avoided connecting their student identities to any special connotations which would make them distinct from other non-sojourning students and which also might prevent them from keeping the consistency of their ordinary student identities. Moreover, in the United States, the children were probably not concerned with their self-images as kaigaishijo since there was not many audience to reveal their special status. The only time when they gained the audience was when they phoned or emailed their friends in Japan and shared how their U.S. school lives were like. In Japan, although they were aware that some of their peers viewed them as kikokushijo, they probably de-emphasized their extraordinary status so that they could fit in the dominant classroom community. This was similar to the tendency of not perceiving themselves with their unique bilingual and bicultural competences and their advanced English language skills. Again, Aya (IFG), who returned to Japan with limited Japanese skills and cultural knowledge, was the only one who viewed herself as kikokushijo after her return. Her readjustment was difficult and she was
often teased by her classmates. In her case, she had no choice but noticing the obvious differences between herself and the majority of Japanese peers and, therefore, she most likely had to view her as a returnee. It is expected that she did not use her sojourning background as the salient self-relevant attribute if she was able to smoothly fit in the Japanese classroom like the children in this study.

Contributions of Interpretive Focus Group Data to Analysis

This study employed interpretive focus group (IFG) interviews with twelve Japanese adolescents and young adults, who had their temporal sojourning experiences in the same U.S. elementary schools where the five children in this study were enrolled. The data from the IFG interviews were collected solely for analysis purposes and showed that there are diverse experiences existing even within one particular ethnic, linguistic, and cultural group of students who share similar socioeconomic backgrounds and similar characteristics of sojourning experiences (e.g., relatively short term stay in the U.S., enrollment in the same U.S. public schools, etc.). In specific, there are mainly three different ways in which the IFG data contributed to the data analysis of this study: (a) to confirm and support the children’s perspectives by providing similarities and better articulated explanations; (b) to expand the interpretation of the children’s perspectives by depicting differences and apparent contradictions; and (c) to determine the focus of emerging categories by suggesting additional perspectives not articulated by the children.

First, the IFG participants confirmed the salience of particular self-relevant attributes expressed by the children, as well as the relevance of some school experiences to the children’s identity formation. For instance, some IFG participants, like the children
in this study, commonly identified themselves as *futuu-no* (ordinary/regular) students, or imagined to claim their ordinary student status, in any academic and non-academic settings throughout sojourning. They also similarly revealed their familiar personal traits while engaging in non-academic activities, such as play and sports, and considered play as a world universal activity that transcends linguistic and cultural boundaries. In addition, the IFG participants and the children all emphasized their oral English proficiency to serve as the salient self-relevant attribute for their ELL identities. While commonly describing the struggles and difficulties with oral English as U.S. newcomers, they all shared the similar experiences of: receiving invaluable supports from their parents, teachers, and peers; feeling a sense comfort from Japanese speaking environment in school while developing oral English proficiency; improving English skills significantly in their ESL summer camps; negatively viewing the school’s ELL pull-out system as an interruption to their participation in mainstream classroom activities; doing well on the non-language oriented tasks in math; and receiving high expectations for their successful English acquisition as *kaigaishijo* (Japanese students oversea) and *kikokushijo* (Japanese returnees). After returning to Japan, the children and the IFG participants also commonly experienced being too active and too out-going in their Japanese classroom discourses. These are only several examples to show that many of the events and experiences described in child case studies and a cross-case analysis were confirmed and supported by the IFG participants.

The IFG participants also supported children’s perspectives by providing more articulated explanations about the experiences that they shared with the children. In other
words, when children could not utter long sentences to elaborate their experiences critical to their identity negotiation, the IFG participants’ articulation, which was largely due to their mature ages, illuminated the essence of the focused experience. One example is the ways in which Misaki and Tsubasa shared their experiences of expanding their social network to English-speaking groups as a result of being teased and bullied by their Japanese peers, in comparison to the ways in which Mai (IFG) talked about her similar experience. After telling me a story of being rejected to sit at the same table with her Japanese peers during lunch, Misaki simply stated, “I, then, *ganbatta* (made my own best effort) in learning English.” In Tsubasa’s case, he did not want to talk about the incidents of being bullied and reaching out to his American peers, and all information came from his mother during parent interview. In contrast, Mai (IFG) clearly explained, “I felt really bad about [being bullied], but because of that, I became more able to get along with my American classmates.” Her explanation echoed with the children’s voices or intentional silence, and, at the same time, further clarified my interpretations of their particular school experiences of improving their English skills due to their dissonant relationships with their Japanese peers.

It is important to note that, after finding that some of my interpretations of the children’s experiences were supported by the IFG participants, I also had chances to confirm the emerging interpretations with the children again in their last interviews. For instance, I could share some of the IFG participants’ well-articulated explanations, such as Mai’s (IFG), with the children and ask them if those explanations really resonated with their views and made sense to them. The use of IFG data were, then, never hidden from
other research participants or never regarded as the absolutely reasonable ways to interpret the focused phenomenon. Rather, they were contested for the legitimacy, explored for the relevance, and, importantly, integrated in the on-going processes of co-interpretation.

Second, some of the IFG participants did not confirm the children’s perspectives on particular school experiences, but rather provided different perspectives which suggested an alternative way to understand the same phenomenon and also which often contradicted against the children’s. This was, in part, because the IFG participants involved a larger number of individuals than the child participants, and, therefore, naturally represented a wider range of life circumstances, linguistic and cultural competences, and perspectives. For instance, the children in this study experienced the silent periods when they were newcomers to the U.S. and struggled with English oral communication. In their cases, their silence was unavoidable due to their nervousness and developing language skills, and, as a result, they had to unfavorably perceive themselves as outsiders in the mainstream social groups. On the contrary, Satoru (IFG) explained that remaining as an outsider was his deliberate choice of protecting his “perfectionist” character. Rather than communicating with others in an improper way by “putting some words together,” he chose to remain silent and stay marginalized in his class. Thus, the IFG’s different perspectives, such as Satoru’s, provided varied interpretations of the school experiences relevant to sojourning children’s identity negotiation.

One crucial example of different experiences shared by the IFG participants is Aya’s (IFG) difficulty to manifest her “futuu-no (ordinary/regular)” student status after
her return to Japan. This was different from all children in this study who experienced difficulties to claim their ordinary student status only when they were the newcomers in their U.S. schools. This discrepancy created an opportunity for contextual comparisons and speculations of possible reasons why the children could claim their ordinary student status more easily in Japan after returning than when they newly arrived in the United States. For instance, the most noticeable differences between Aya’s circumstances and those of all children as well as the IFG participants were their linguistic, social, and personal capitals that they had already developed in their former Japanese school experiences. More specifically, Aya, who started her U.S. sojourning as a kindergartener, had less previous school experiences in Japan than other participants, and, therefore, she was totally Americanized as a returnee and did not have enough Japanese language competence or cultural and social competence to perceive herself as ordinary in her Japanese classroom. Thus, IFG data showed relevant yet diverse school experiences among different sojourning individuals, depending on their life circumstances.

Another example of the apparent contradiction was seen between the children’s learning attitudes towards their English language acquisition in the United States and those of the IFG participants. As described in the previous sections, all children in this study demonstrated positive attitudes and high motivation towards English language acquisition to fit in the mainstream learning communities and to enjoy their school lives. As a result, their identities as ELLs changed over the course of their U.S. sojourning according to the difficulties and progress they experienced with their English language acquisition. In contrast, some IFG participants, Satoru, Masa, and Toshi, showed their
reluctance to learn English in the United States because they knew that they would eventually return to Japan. These unmotivated IFG participants did not improve their English skills. Consequently, their ELL identities reflected not their progress but only their struggles with especially speaking English. Thus, IFG data showed the different experiences of individuals who shared the similar sojourning circumstances and yet did not act like the children.

In addition, because IFG participants’ perspectives were retrospective, I was also able to learn how they, as more grown-up adolescents and young adults, currently felt about their either highly motivated or reluctant attitudes towards English language acquisition in the past. Some of them expressed a sense of regret for not fully challenging themselves to actively speaking out English while they were part of their U.S. classrooms whereas others were glad that they had made their best efforts to jump in English-speaking communities and acquired English language skills that they found useful to succeed in Japanese school even after their returns. Thus, IFG data further suggested potential long-term consequences of diverse school experiences in childhood sojourning.

It is also important to note that IFG data clarified the contradictions that the children found between their own school experiences and their Japanese peers’ experiences in the same learning contexts. The children differentiated themselves from their Japanese classmates who displayed unmotivated attitudes towards English language acquisition. These unmotivated peers provided a good contrast to the children, and, at the same time suggested diverse ways to engage in the similar school experiences. The IFG data then further confirmed the diversities existing within the sojourning children’s
school experiences. Overall, presenting the different experiences and apparent contradictions stated by the IFG participants, especially those who did not act like the children, helped expand the interpretation of the children’s perspectives and increase the trustworthiness of the study.

Third, IFG data provided additional information and perspectives which were not articulated by the children as the topics relevant to their identity negotiation. Some additional information was about the experiences which were closely relevant to the school lives of the children and the IFG participants but considered as the salient self-relevant attributes for student identities only by the IFG participants. To simply state, the children and the IFG participants all engaged in similar school experiences yet the IFG participants expressed their student identities based on a wider range of school experiences than the children did. As a result, this study found that the shared school experiences, such as their experiences with Japanese language and culture, bilingual and bicultural competences, and international sojourning as *kaigaishijo* (Japanese students oversea) and *kikokushijo* (Japanese returnee students), were clearly expressed as the IFG participants’ salient self-relevant attributes, and that these experiences were considered potentially critical for the children’s student identities as well. Such additional information promoted further contextual analysis for each case to find the potential importance of those school experiences to the child’s student identities and also to speculate the possible reasons why the experiences were not emphasized by the child within his or her particular school contexts. Most importantly, I was able to refine the focus of emerging categories in a way that children’s perspectives and self-relevant
attributes are brought to the center of the findings. This means that, the missing pieces found in the contrasts between the self-relevant attributes expressed by the children and those shared by the IFG participants accentuated what the children were able to articulate and what they intended to convey as their key agenda.

The other additional information from the IFG was not clearly relevant to the children’s school experiences depicted in this study, and provided unnamed experiences which shed light on additional themes and topics that should be examined in future identity research. For instance, some IFG participants emphasized their personal experiences outside their schools, such as family trips during U.S. school vacations, and their relationships particularly with their mothers and siblings, as they expressed their student identities as sojourners. This study placed a large emphasis on the children’s experiences and perspectives, and, therefore, did not focus on those additional themes from the IFG which were not relevant to the children’s school experiences. However, the information shared by the IFG participants, which went beyond the scope of the research focus of this study, offered some opportunities to widely survey the varied events and thoughts concerning the phenomenon of sojourning children’s identity negotiation. This contributed not only the interpretation process of this study but also to the process of envisioning the potential topics for future identity research.

Overall, the IFG data provided a wide range of perspectives which supported, contradicted to, and supplemented the children experiences and perspectives. With the similarities, differences, contradictions, and additional information and theme provided by the IFG, I was able to analyze the learning contexts of each child more carefully, to
emphasize the children’s voices as the heart of the study, and to situate this study in a wider spectrum of IFG participants’ mental schema representing varied time perceptions and contexts.

Summary

This cross-case analysis indicated that the five Japanese sojourning children primarily described their student identities based on their ordinary school status, their familiar personal traits, and the development of their oral language proficiency in English. In other words, their ordinary and familiar identities as well as their ELL identities were the most focused aspects of their student identities. The formation of these aspects of student identities were closely related to their strong desire to achieve affirmative school inclusion and, therefore, caused the children varied feelings and emotions. The familiar and ordinary student identities were maintained by the children throughout their sojourning periods with the help of their imagination for the consistency. When their ELL identities changed according to the progress of English language acquisition in the United States, their changing identities reflected and were negotiated through: their actual practice of English language skills; their perceptions of their linguistic competence in comparison to others; and their expectations and imagination for future progress.

In addition, this chapter juxtaposed the salient self-relevant attributes, which children articulated to describe their student identities, with the potentially critical school experiences on which they placed less emphasis. Based on the analysis of the children’s contexts of learning and the experiences of IFG participants, this study found that the children’s Japanese linguistic and cultural experience, their practice of bilingual and
bicultural competences, and their international sojourning experiences as *kaigaishijo* and *kikokushijo* were potentially influential to their student identities. The reasons why the children did not connect these experiences to their salient self-relevant attributes may vary across the learning contexts; however, it seems that their strong commitment to fit in their mainstream learning communities in each country either made them consider these experiences irrelevant to their affirmative school inclusion or made them de-emphasize the extraordinary connotations that these experiences bring to their student identities. Moreover, this chapter briefly indicated how IFG data contributed to the data analysis and interpretation by providing a wide range of perspectives that could resonate, contradict, and supplement the children’s perspectives.

All key findings of the study become the foundation to the next chapter in which I will answer the research questions and discuss the theoretical possibilities and the potential implications of the overall research findings.
CHAPTER 8

JAPANESE SOJOURNING CHILDREN’S IDENTITY NEGOTIATION:
THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

This dissertation study was conducted to better understand how sojourning students, in today’s increasingly diverse elementary classrooms worldwide, perceive themselves in school and negotiate the sense of who they are as students. Specifically, this study examined: (a) what kind of self-relevant attributes were used by five Japanese sojourning children in the second through sixth grade to express their student identities over the different stages of their international sojourning between Japan and the United States and (b) by what processes their student identities changed or remained stable across varied learning contexts. This chapter first presents a summary of key findings to answer these research questions, and then provides a further discussion on the empirical and theoretical findings to propose a conceptual model of the sojourning students’ identity negotiation processes. Subsequently, the implications of the study as well as the utilities of the process model are suggested for educational practices, policies, and future research. This chapter also indicates the limitations of this exploratory identity research and draws a conclusion to reflect on the key assertions and to emphasize the importance of new identity theories that help sojourning students succeed in school to their own best.

Summary of Key Findings

There are five key findings generated from this study. First, when children were asked to describe how they viewed themselves in school in different sojourning stages,
they commonly answered that they were the students with futuu-no (ordinary/regular) status in academics and social relations with others and also the students with the personal traits that they had been familiar with since their presojourning days in Japan (e.g., personal character, interest, learning attitude and ethics, etc.). In other words, their social and academic school competences to display their ordinary student status and their personal competence to reveal their familiar personal traits represented the most salient self-relevant attributes for their student identities. Importantly, they continuously preserved their ordinary and familiar student identities throughout their sojourning periods (i.e., presojourning period in Japan, newcomer’s stage in the United States, throughout U.S. sojourning, and after returning to Japan).

Second, the children also described their student identities based on the difficulties and progress that they experienced with English oral communication in both academic and non-academic settings (e.g., a student who is shabereru [able to speak] English or who is shaberenai [unable to speak], an insider or an outsider, etc.). The acquisition of their oral English proficiency was, thus, another salient self-relevant attribute for their student identities. Their identities associated with this particular linguistic competence were expressed in the presojourning period in Japan where they envisioned their future U.S. school lives and also throughout their sojourning in the United States as they were actually immersed into the English-speaking contexts. Although the children continuously acquired varied types of English skills throughout their sojourning (i.e., literacy skills, vocabulary, grammar knowledge), the oral English
proficiency was the only English linguistic competence which they clearly articulated as the self-relevant attribute salient for their student identities.

Third, all of these salient self-relevant attributes were expressed by the children in connection to their strong aspiration for fully participating in their learning communities with a sense of joy for their school lives. In other words, as they perceived themselves with the above stated specific self-relevant attributes, they were most concerned with their affirmative school inclusion (i.e., to fit-in and to engage in the same learning activities with their classmates) and their emotional fulfillment in school (e.g., tanoshimu [to enjoy], to feel confident, to avoid feeling iya [unpleasant/dislike], etc.).

Fourth, this study also illuminated varied school experiences which could potentially influence children’s student identities, including: (a) their experiences with Japanese language and culture in two countries (e.g., Japanese language maintenance in the United States, kanji learning in Japan, preference of Japanese popular culture for the entire sojourning period, etc.); (b) their practice of bilingual and bicultural competences (e.g., participating in multiple linguistic and cultural discourses in the United States, translating between English and Japanese, making on-going cultural comparisons in Japan, etc.); and (c) their experiences of international transitions as kaigaishijo (Japanese students oversea) and kikokushijo (Japanese returnee students) (e.g., having mixed feelings, receiving parental expectations towards English acquisition, etc.). I found these experiences potentially critical to the children’s student identities for three reasons. First, some interpretive focus group (IFG) participants integrated these experiences into their identity negotiation. Second, these experiences affected the children’s feelings and
emotions. Third, these experiences were related to the children’s salient self-relevant attributes (i.e., ordinary student status, familiar personal traits, and oral English proficiency). For instance, some of their personal traits, such as a hardworker and an assiduous learner, seemed to reflect their Japanese cultural values while their bilingual competence as well as their Japanese language skills were both relevant to their acquisition of oral English skills. However, the children did not express their student identities in connection to these experiences, and seemed to regard them irrelevant to or interfering with their school adaptation.

The last key finding was that the processes of Japanese elementary sojourners’ identity negotiation were the multiple paths and trajectories through which they internalized their salient self-relevant attributes in relation to their school contexts. For instance, with the strong commitment to achieve their affirmative school inclusion and positive socioemotional experiences, the children in any stage of sojourning consistently expressed their ordinary and familiar student identities, which they had developed in the past, while expressing the changes of their ELL identities, which were contextually required. Also, during the newcomer’s stage in the United States, the children imagined that they would continuously have their ordinary and familiar identities and would improve their contextually required linguistic competences in the future. Thus, in the processes of identity negotiation, the children integrated their previously developed school competences, personal capital, and their developing linguistic competences required in the learning contexts into their self-perceptions.
Discussions on the Theoretical and Empirical Findings

The phenomenon of identity negotiation depicted in this study suggested the multi-layered and complex processes in which Japanese elementary students connected their own specific self-relevant attributes to their student identities in varied stages and contexts of sojourning. The processes appeared to be multi-layered, in part, due to the complexities embedded in the followings:

1. the learning contexts of two countries in which the children had to adapt (e.g., linguistic and cultural contexts)
2. varied school experiences relevant to their student identities (e.g., academic, social, linguistic, cultural, and socioemotional experience)
3. varied school competences that they prioritized to pursue, maintain, and improve in relation to their student identities (e.g., their primary concern on social adaptive competence to fit-in their mainstream classroom across countries and their subordinate focus on the linguistic competence required in home and host countries)
4. the integration of the internal process (e.g., understanding who they are, experiencing the feelings and emotions attached to their sense of self, etc.) as well as the external process (e.g., working towards affirmative school adaptation, detecting the contextual demands on language skills, etc.)

In this chapter, I argue that such complex processes of Japanese sojourning children’s identity negotiation is best understood in relation to their strong aspiration for positively perceiving themselves as students who fit in and enjoy their schools. In other words, the central argument of this study is that the children negotiated their student identities for the purpose of achieving who they wanted to be and how they wanted to perceive themselves in school, or what Stryker and Burke (2000) called “identity standard” (p. 287). The next subsection elaborates this idea.
Understanding Identity Negotiation as the Pursuit of Identity Standard

International sojourning placed the five Japanese children in the situations where they had to experience the changes of learning contexts across two different countries and also to claim their roles and memberships in new learning communities of each country. As the children expressed their student identities with varied self-relevant attributes, they also gave me a strong message regarding their own student identities that they were committed to maintain and achieve in school. In other words, they commonly displayed their own form of “identity standard” (Stryker & Burke, 2000, p. 287) that is “a set of (culturally prescribed) meanings held by the individual which define his or her role identity in a situation” (p. 287). Therefore, their negotiation of student identities was always led by their aspiration for achieving their identity standard.

Drawing on the study’s theoretical and empirical findings and the existing identity theories across disciplines, I discuss: (a) what identity standard was commonly essential for the sojourning children in this study, and what kind of school competences and contextual influences contributed to their identity standard; (b) how they actually negotiated their student identities and achieved their identity standard, and also what ways of pursuing their identity standard were found unique to their sojourning experiences and international transitions; and (c) what makes the processes of identity negotiation appear to be an ecological human phenomenon. By presenting these, I intend to provide all readers across disciplines, especially educators in the United States and in Japan, a more complete theoretical understanding of how those five Japanese elementary students perceived themselves in school within their sojourning experiences.
Children’s identity standard and necessary school competences

The children’s identity standard, which was commonly displayed in any stage of sojourning, reflected their commitment to demonstrate two types of interrelated school competences: (a) social adaptive competence to nicely fit in the mainstream classroom communities like other non-sojourning peers and (b) socioemotional competence to have emotional fulfillment in school, especially *tanoshimu* (to enjoy) social interactions during varied academic and non-academic activities. The importance of those two school competences to the children’s identity standard is evident because, as stated earlier as one of the key findings, all of their salient self-relevant attributes were expressed in connection to these competences.

For instance, when the children as well as the IFG participants commonly used the attribute, “a *futuu-no* (ordinary/regular) student,” to identify themselves in school, they repeatedly commented how important for them to fit in and keep up with others in their classrooms. Similarly, their identities reflecting their unique personal traits (e.g., love for sports, *tennen* [natural/spontaneous] character, chatty personality, etc.) showed their positive social connections with others. A sense of enjoyment in school was also inseparable from a sense of belonging to social groups in non-academic school settings, such as play. While their participation in play allowed them to exhibit their ordinary and familiar student identities across countries, they experienced negative feelings when they could not participate in play due to their adjustment in the United States and also due to the busy schedule in Japanese schools upon their return. Moreover, their student identities associated with oral English proficiency were based upon how well and how frequently
they could be part of social conversation during the academic and non-academic discourse in U.S. schools. Their feelings, emotions, and attitudes were influenced by this particular language competence that could alter their participation in social interactions and academic learning.

In this sense, their identity standard, was not the subject for direct negotiation but rather became a source of learning aspiration and a purpose of schooling throughout sojourning. In other words, their social adaptive and socioemotional competences were most fundamental in their identity discourse. Other school competences, which were attributed to their verbally expressed student identities (e.g., social competence of not behaving too active in group, academic competence to practice assiduous learning attitudes; and linguistic competence to acquire oral English proficiency, etc.) were all relevant, yet subordinate, to their more fundamental school competences to fit in and enjoy their schools. The salient self-relevant attributes expressed by the children were, in this sense, the supporting components of their identity standard.

It was then clear that the children prioritized their various school competences and treated their social adaptive and socioemotional competences as most important for their identity standard. For instance, they chose to describe their student identities with the term, futuu (ordinary/regular), which rather modestly indicated their academic and social competences demonstrated in school. This indicates that they were more concerned about fitting in their classrooms without being specially labeled than claiming their strong academic and social competences which could make them look outstanding. For the same desire for their social adaptive competence to fit in, they did not focus on their linguistic
and cultural competences that might make them unique in their given learning context (e.g., bilingual and bicultural competence in the United States and Japan, overall English proficiency in Japan, Japanese language and cultural competence in the United States, etc.) unless they determined that the improvement of the linguistic competence would benefit their identity standard (e.g., oral English proficiency).

Another example is related to how they engaged in their English language learning with their attitudes of *tanoshimu* (to enjoy) and *ganbaru* (to make best effort). All children in this study made their consistent effort to acquire oral English proficiency and to keep up with academic demands. In more fundamental level, however, they knew that enjoyment in school was more important. For instance, Haruya and Yayoi viewed that, without enjoying school, learning and school participation are meaningless. Although they knew that making efforts would allow them to demonstrate their familiar learning attitudes as well as academic competence, they placed more emphasis on their socioemotional competence of being able to positively view their learning experiences. Also, Haruya and Wataru, as newcomers, would not have practiced their *ganbaru* attitudes in actual school activities if they did not find their schools as a fun place with full of play-like activities, casual interactions between teachers and students, and relaxing learning atmosphere. Thus, the children both consciously and unconsciously prioritized their social adaptive and socioemotional competences as the most important aspects of their identity standard.

The following figure shows that the children’s pursuit of their identity standard—to achieve and demonstrate their social adaptive and socioemotional competences—was
the central purpose of their identity negotiation throughout their sojourning experiences across two countries. It also shows that their identity standard was fundamental to their salient self-relevant attributes representing their ordinary student status and familiar personal traits, which were consistently expressed throughout the sojourning periods, as well as their salient self-relevant attributes representing their changing oral English proficiency in the presojourning period in Japan and during the U.S. sojourning period.

Figure 8.1 Identity Standard and Salient Self-Relevant Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japan Transition</th>
<th>U.S. Transition</th>
<th>Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Self-Relevant Attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futuu-no (ordinary/regular) Student Status &amp; Familiar Personal Traits (character, attitudes, interest)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDENTITY STANDARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adaptive Competence to Fit in &amp; Socioemotional Competence to Enjoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Self-Relevant Attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral English Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to state that the identity standard of the children in this study revealed their own interpretation of what would be their positive student identities. This is supported by Bracher’s (2002) idea that all students bring their own “desire for a secure identity” (p. 94) which allows them to keep their positive and legitimatized self-perceptions to pursue in their classrooms. It is then reasonable to speculate that, with their identity standard representing their social adaptive and socioemotional competences, the children in this study could cope with international transitions and unavoidable uncertainties of identity formation.
In addition, their identity standard representing their positive student identities was most likely coincided with what was valued by others in school. In other words, it is highly likely that the majority of people in their learning contexts (i.e., teachers, classmates, and parents) positively viewed their identity standard associated with affirmative school inclusion and positive socioemotional experiences, because such identity standard seemed to correspond to the educational goals and standards valued by the school and perhaps by the society. This is to say that the successful development of social adaptive and socioemotional competences would most likely be the qualities necessary for what others perceive as good students in school. This also means that the sojourning students in different circumstances may possibly have the identity standard that conflicts with what others believe to be valuable in the learning context. In any case, one’s identity standard is positive in his/her view; however, this does not mean that the educational consensus in a given school context would agree with the view. The uniqueness of sojourning experiences is that, as the students move from one country to another, they inevitably encounter varied educational expectations from each learning context which either resonate or contradict their identity standard. In this sense, the fact that the identity standard of the children in this study seemed to overlap with what was valued in their learning environment in both home and host countries should be considered as an advantage for their identity negotiation.

Moreover, even when students express their identity standard based on the same type of school competence, they may have different interpretations of the values attached to the competence. For instance, the children in this study intended to pursue their
identity standard and their social adaptive competence, like many other linguistic minority learners in previous studies, especially the studies that used the community of practice framework (Day, 2002; Lave & Wenger, 1991) to capture the participants’ identities representing their positionalities and legitimate peripheral participation in given learning communities (e.g., Day, 2002; Kanno, 2003; Norton, 2000; Toohey, 2000). However, the children’s pursuits of their identity standard was neither to transform themselves into the dominant by fitting in the learning communities nor to invest in the language and culture with a high sociopolitical status like previous studies have found (e.g., Macedo, Dendrinos, & Gounari, 2003; Norton Peirce, 1995; Phillipson, 1992). The children’s intention was to continuously perceive themselves as the students with no extraordinary status in any learning contexts across countries. This might be because the children in this study were the temporal sojourners, not permanent immigrants, and because they knew that they would continue to have a strong linguistic and cultural foundation in their mother tongue regardless of their English language acquisition. Although some children, as a result of sojourning, absorbed the dominant culture and incorporated cultural influences into their attitudes and behaviors (e.g., becoming ki-ga-tsuyoi [strong minded] and sekkyokuteki [active] after the U.S. education), this appeared to be a mere byproduct of pursuing their identity standard. Most of their Americanized attitudes and behaviors, for instance, developed unconsciously while they were in the United States and were expected to be temporal in Japan because they knew that being too out-spoken and too active would be inappropriate in their Japanese classrooms.

The above discussion further suggests the importance of identifying what
contextual influences contributed to the children’s identity standard. The most important contextual influence seems to be the children’s previous educational experiences in Japan which allowed them to learn the values of social adaptive and socioemotional school competences and to integrate these competences into their identity standard. All children in this study had been immersed in relatively nurturing learning environment in Japan where they could build their academic, social, personal, and linguistic capitals (e.g., positive relationships with teachers and classmates, parental support, desirable academic standing, opportunities to expand personal interests, etc.). They then carried over their own views of positive student identities and necessary school competences to the United States. Also, the school contexts in the United States continuously provided them with the opportunities to maintain and grow some self-relevant attributes essential to their identity standard, including the opportunities to: demonstrate futuu-no status; display familiar personal traits; and practice English oral communication. In other words, they were placed in the school environments where they were able to transfer some of their academic, social, and personal capitals and also to develop their new linguistic capital in English. As a result, they were able to sustain and reinforce their identity standard. After returning to Japan, their identity standard still represented their aspirations for fitting in and enjoying their schools, in part, because they were back to the familiar nurturing learning environment of their Japanese schools where they could reclaim their varied school relevant capitals.

In my view, all children in this study were truly fortunate to receive those supportive contextual influences which allowed their identity standard to remain
transferable across countries. It is reasonable to assume that sojourners’ international transitions can be a big risk to the sustainability of their previously established identity standard if they would not be in such supportive school contexts in both home and host countries. The sojourning children’s identity standard remained fundamental to their identity negotiation as they could continue to maintain and acquire their school competences most meaningful to their identity standard.

Processes of pursuing identity standard

The research findings clearly suggested four different yet interrelated processes of pursuing identity standard. The first two processes, self-verification and self-improvement, resonated with previous identity theories and became critical to the children’s active engagement in their identity negotiation throughout sojourning. The other two processes, self-balance and self-imagination, became particularly important to the sojourning children as they experienced their initial adjustment and readjustment periods in two countries.

Self-verification and self-improvement.

The ways in which the children negotiated their student identities and pursued their identity standard most strongly resonated with two negotiation processes suggested by previous identity theorists. The first is the process of self-verification (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000; Stryker & Burke, 2000) through which individuals “[bring] situationally perceived self-relevant meanings into agreement with the identity standard” (Stryker & Burke, 2000, p. 288). The second is the process of “self-improvement” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000, p. 105) through which individuals use their self-
knowledge, demonstrate their learning motivation, and gain a sense of progress.

To elaborate the former, it was clear that the children practiced self-verification as they found and selected their salient self-relevant attributes that could best support their identity standard as well as the relevant school competences. More specifically, they chose to use their ordinary school status, familiar personal traits, and oral English proficiency as the self-relevant attributes to describe their student identities because these attributes most strongly facilitated their social adaptive and socioemotional competences needed for their identity standard. In this sense, the process of self-verification allowed them to control and stabilize the integrity of the selected self-relevant attributes so that they could cope with the potential threats to their self-knowledge (Sedikides & Skowronska, 2000). The following figure shows the on-going process of verifying the agreement between their varied self-relevant attributes and their identity standard.

Figure 8.2 Process of Identity Negotiation: Self-Verification
The process of self-verification explains the close ties between the salient self-relevant attributes selected by the children and their identity standard. For instance, by perceiving themselves as *futuu-no* (ordinary/regular) students, they were able to maintain their aspiration for always being part of their mainstream learning communities without being treated in any extraordinary ways. Also, by perceiving themselves with, for instance, their limited oral English proficiency that restricted them from participating in social interactions (e.g., a student who is *shaberenai* [unable to speak]), they revealed that they were working hard towards achieving the language skills so that they would eventually be part of their learning communities and make their school lives more enjoyable.

The latter process, self-improvement, is clearly practiced by the children when they described their student identities with the attributes representing their developing skills in English oral communication. Their identities associated with oral English proficiency reflected their attention towards their own linguistic practices in U.S. classrooms and their informal self-assessment of the progress they made over the course of sojourning. Based on the sense of progress gained through developing their oral English proficiency in presojourning periods in Japan and during U.S. sojourning, the children were able to clarify and enrich the cognitive representation of their symbolic self (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000) and also to ensure their identity standard. The following figure shows that the children’s self-improvement was mainly actualized through experiencing positive changes in their oral English proficiency and also was integrated into their pursuit of identity standard.
For instance, when Misaki shifted her identities from an *otonashii* [quiet] student to an *oshaberi-san* [chatty person] in English-speaking contexts over the three years of her sojournning, she was aware that her shifted identities represented not only her linguistic competence to communicate with others but also her social adaptive competence to reveal who she was to others and to achieve more favorable social standings in her peer groups. Similarly, when Tsubasa first viewed himself as a student who was *shaberenai* (unable to speak) English as a newcomer and later changed his self-perception as a student who is *shabereru* (able to speak) English after four years of sojourning, his identities represented his well-adapted academic and social status in his mainstream classroom and his competence to have enjoyable moments in school, especially during play. Also, when Haruya’s identities shifted from an *otonashii* [quiet] student to a nervous student within the first three months of his U.S. schooling, he was signaling his struggles to participate in the same learning activities as everyone else, and yet, had been monitoring the changes in his oral English proficiency so that he would
eventually claim his membership in his class. These are just a few examples of the
children’s practice of self-improvement for achieving their identity standard; however,
they clearly show that all children gained a sense of progress especially by improving
their oral language skills in English while they were most concerned about claiming their
memberships and gaining positive feelings in their schools.

Overall, these two types of process, the self-verification and the self-improvement,
suggest that children’s identity negotiation is a “self-motivated information-seeking
process” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000, p. 101) through which they flexibly found and
utilized their self-relevant attributes, or “self-relevant information” (Sedikides and
Skowronski, 2000, p. 93), to form their identity standard. In order to achieve their
identity standard in school, the children engaged in these two types of processes
simultaneously: They identified themselves with the self-qualities most relevant to their
identity standard, such as their ordinary student status, while attending to their English
language learning experiences to assure the necessary self-improvement.

Furthermore, these processes of self-verification and self-improvement explain
possible reasons why the children’s student identities were not composed of the attributes
associated with particular school experiences which some of the IFG participants
considered were crucial to their school identities. These unfocused yet potentially critical
school experiences included their experiences with: Japanese language and culture;
bilingual and bicultural competences; and international transitions as kaigaishijo
(Japanese student oversea) and as kikokushijo (Japanese returnee student). The following
figure shows that these experiences, which were recorded in varied timeframes of
sojourning (e.g., the experiences with bilingual and bicultural competences after they developed sufficient English language skills in the United States and the experiences with Japanese language and culture throughout sojourning) could potentially generate the sojourning children’s ever changing self-relevant attributes which are then verified and improved for pursuing their identity standard.

Figure 8.4 Potentially Critical School Experiences for Self-Verification and Self-Improvement

Unlike the IFG participants, all children in this study did not focus on these experiences as they described their student identities. Rather, they seemed to
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Unlike the IFG participants, all children in this study did not focus on these experiences as they described their student identities. Rather, they seemed to
deemphasize some of these experiences because verifying and improving the linguistic, cultural, and social competences within these experiences were considered irrelevant to or interfering with their pursuit of identity standard.

For instance, although some children in this study clearly exhibited their bilingual and bicultural competences to manage multilingual and multicultural classroom discourses without a struggle, they did not internalize their experiences with those unique linguistic and cultural competences into their self-perceptions. One possible reason for this phenomenon is because they did not verify an agreement between their practices of bilingual and bicultural competences and their identity standard in their given learning context. In other words, if they chose to use only the self-relevant attributes that agreed with their identity standard in the process of self-verification, it is reasonable to speculate that the unfocused school experiences were most likely regarded by them as insignificant to support their identity standard. This further implies that, in their classroom communities in the United States and Japan, their linguistic and cultural capitals in a hybrid form were not treated as the resource for claiming a sense of successful school adaptation. When learners determine the self-relevant attributes for their student identities, the salience of the attributes also needs to be supported by their learning contexts.

The same reasons can explain why the children also placed less emphasis on their Japanese language and cultural experiences. Their Japanese language learning and Japanese cultural backgrounds remained important parts of their school lives throughout sojourning. For instance, in the U.S. contexts, their competences in Japanese language and culture sometimes helped them to learn English (e.g., receiving JELL support and
translation helps, expanding social network through Japanese friends, etc.). However, they seldom articulated their Japanese linguistic and cultural competences as the advantageous factors to actualize their affirmative school inclusion. This was probably because emphasizing their extraordinary linguistic and cultural backgrounds (i.e., Japanese language skills and cultural knowledge, bilingual and bicultural competences) would distinguish themselves from most of their non-sojourning classmates and result in interfering with the competences necessary for their identity standard and their social adaptive and socioemotional competences. Then, it is reasonable to speculate that the learning environments in home and host countries led them to deemphasize their unique linguistic and cultural experiences rather than supported them to extract their salient self-relevant attributes out of those experiences. Their less emphasis on their experiences of international transitions as kaigaishijo (Japanese student oversea) and as kikokushijo (Japanese returnee student) can also be explained by the same reason.

Thus, the children might have chosen to focus on the only school experiences, which could generate the supportive self-relevant attributes for their identity standard, and considered other school experiences as irrelevant or interfering. This idea is supported by the concept of “self-protection motive” (Sedikides and Skowronski, 2000, p. 101) to “filter out, negate, or discredit information that is unfavorable to the self” and also the idea of “self-enhancement motive” to “filter in, accept, and magnify information that is favorable to the self” (p. 101).

In addition, even when the children were concerned about their development of Japanese language skills, they did not connect their concerns to their student identities
like when they did for their acquisition of English oral language skills. For instance, when they moved to the United States, they commonly viewed themselves as the one who was not able to speak English and who was quiet. However, none of them told that they viewed themselves as the one who could not write kanji or the one who could not do well in kokugo upon returning, even though Japanese language learning was their primary concern about their school lives in Japan. One possible reason for this is because, with their comparatively smooth readjustment to Japanese schools, they did not need to practice the process of self-improvement in Japanese language in order to achieve their identity standard and to fit in and enjoy their schools. Misaki and Tsubasa showed that they encountered more difficulties when they moved to the United States and acquired their English skills than when they started to learn all subjects in Japanese upon their return. This is to say that the children in this study were not in the positions where they had to improve their Japanese language skills to claim their affirmative school inclusion and positive feelings and emotions in school.

In contrast, an IFG participant, Aya, struggled tremendously upon returning to Japan because of the lack in Japanese language skills. She then needed to reflect her improvement in Japanese language skills, which were strongly required for her readjustment to a Japanese school, onto her student identities so that she could achieve her identity standard. This suggests that the sojourning children in different circumstances may verify and improve their self-relevant attributes differently depending on associated with their diverse school experiences. Therefore, it is reasonable to consider those unfocused school experiences with Japanese language and culture,
bilingual and bicultural competences, and *kaigaishijo* and *kikokushijo* status as potentially critical to sojourning children’s school identities. Overall, throughout sojourning, the children verified and improved their own salient self-relevant attributes that best supported their identity standard while dismissing the irrelevant school experiences and ruling out the interfering ones.

*Self-balance and self-imagination.*

There are some negotiation processes which particularly impacted on the children’s student identities during their transitions from one country to another, or one learning environment to another (e.g., Wataru’s transition from his summer school to U.S. public elementary school within U.S. context). These processes can be applied to their identity negotiation in any stage of sojourning, but appeared to be the most important during their international transitions typical to their sojourners lives: (a) keeping a balance between the consistent identities (i.e., ordinary and familiar student identities) and the changing identities (i.e., ELL identities) while receiving varied contextual influences and (b) using imagination to maintain the consistency and to envision positive changes of those aspects of student identities.

First, the process of pursuing identity standard required the children to keep a good balance between the consistency and the changes of their student identities. More specifically, they needed to balance the consistency of the self-relevant attributes, which they assumed to be universally applicable across countries (i.e., ordinary social status and familiar personal traits), and the changes of other self-relevant attributes, which they assumed to be uniquely accepted in each country (i.e., oral English proficiency). The
former attributes had already been developed through their educational experiences in presojourning days, whereas the latter attributes were newly developed in new learning environment particularly in the United States. In the process of self-balance, with their aspiration for their affirmative school inclusion and positive social and emotional experience, the children integrated their previously established stable self-images (i.e., ordinary and familiar student identities) and their continuously improving sociolinguistic self-images (i.e., ELL identities) into their identity craft. The next figure shows that, throughout sojourning, the children balanced their two types of self-relevant attributes, the consistent attributes, which were considered to be contextually universal, and the changing attributes, which were considered to be contextually unique.

Figure 8.5 Process of Identity Negotiation: Self-Balance
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The figure also shows that these salient self-relevant attributes are balanced while sharing the common ground which is the children’s pursuit of their identity standard. In other words, the children’s negotiation of student identities through balancing those salient self-relevant attributes was, after all, for the purpose of achieving their identity standard, as I have argued repeatedly in this chapter.

Several points also become clear when we conceptualize the process of self-balance. The most important point is that, through expressing their consistent and changing salient self-relevant attributes for the pursuit of identity standard, the children balanced not only their psychological states but also the contextual influences that they received in their learning contexts. The ideas of negotiation processes presented in this chapter reflect universal dynamics of identity negotiation that all migrating children most likely go through. However, there are some unique contextual influences that the five children in this study commonly experienced as the sojourners who shared comparatively similar educational, family, socioeconomic, linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In both home and host countries, the most critical contextual influences, or external factors, affecting their identity negotiation were the support and resources that they received from their parents, schools, and classroom communities (i.e., their teachers and classmates).

First, children’s parents provided continuous support for their academic and language learning, non-academic extracurricular activities, and also transitions from one country to another. For instance, their familiar personal traits remained consistent in their student identities, in part, because the social, personal, and financial resources from their parents (e.g., father’s expertise in playing baseball; time and money spent on varied
extracurricular activities in sports, music, and arts; etc.), were always available and promoted various opportunities for them to grow their personal interests.

The children were also able to continuously experience positive changes in their oral English proficiency because of their parents’ high expectations and continuous support outside school. In Japan before sojourning, all parents gave them some opportunities to start learning English as extracurricular activities, including private tutoring and conversation lessons. Though the children did not fully master English oral communication in the presojourning periods, they certainly became prepared for the upcoming school experiences in English-speaking contexts. Throughout their U.S. sojourning, parents also supported the children’s acquisition of oral English by, for instance, giving them chances to participate in summer camps, especially the one specifically designed for ELLs, and to have a play date and a sleep over with English-speaking peers. In the nurturing home environment, children could also grow and practice not only their oral English proficiency (e.g., speaking English with siblings) but also their overall English skills necessary for surviving in their U.S. mainstream classrooms. For instance, parents provided translation support for their daily homework and helped them cope with academic demands. After returning to Japan, the children continued, or planned to continue, their English language learning outside school because their parents believed that English language maintenance in Japan would benefit their future lives.

Moreover, parents also made children’s international transitions less disruptive to their educational lives by, for instance, visiting the host country prior to an actual sojourning and providing varied information of new schools. Together with the
opportunities to engage in the activities of their personal interests and to acquire English, the opportunities to be familiar with the school contexts of both countries were necessary for the children to balance the consistency and the changes of their self-relevant attributes.

Next, the school contexts also played crucial roles in the process of self-balance. In order for the children to simultaneously claim the consistency and the positive changes of student identities, they needed to receive structural, social, linguistic, and cultural support from their school environments. For instance, the children’s U.S. public elementary schools traditionally housed many ELL students with diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and had a relatively large population of Japanese students for decades. The schools, therefore, offered JELL and ELL programs to support the children’s successful school adaptation and English language acquisition. Though Japanese language acquisition and maintenance was not the schools’ agenda for their students, the school environments did not denigrate their Japanese linguistic and cultural heritage (e.g., allowing them to use their first language to facilitate their English language acquisition, providing school-wide Japanese cultural events, etc.). Such school contexts encouraged them to consistently claim their ordinary student status and to experience the improvement of oral English proficiency.

In addition, the children’s classroom communities, including their teachers and classmates, also well accepted some of their familiar personal traits (e.g., assiduous learning attitudes, passion for baseball, etc.) and supported their overall English language acquisition (e.g., abundant resource in classroom library, effective seating arrangement to create support systems, promoting translation support, etc.). Especially, this study found
that the U.S. classroom teachers’ enthusiastic supports motivated the sojourning children to more actively engage in English communication and to become part of their classrooms. Furthermore, the U.S. teachers’ previous experiences of teaching Japanese sojourning students seemed critical to the ways in which the children claimed their ordinary and familiar student identities and acquired their oral English proficiency in classroom. For instance, Yayoi’s teacher, who was a very experienced teacher with profound knowledge of Japanese sojourning students in general, positively acknowledged Yayoi’s assiduous learning attitudes and understood her silence in classroom as the typical initial adjustment stage for Japanese newcomers.

Without above-mentioned supports and resources from parents, schools, and classroom communities, the process of self-balance would not be possible. This is to say that the children balanced varied salient self-relevant attributes to achieve their identity standard while attending to how these attributes were required, accepted, and supported in their school contexts. This also suggests that the contextual resources, which were not available for the children in their school contexts (e.g., lack of focus on bilingualism/biculturalism in school, etc.), could impact on the children’s selections of their salient self-relevant attributes.

Another point suggested by the idea of self-balance is that there are somewhat contradicting and paradoxical situations within the process of balancing the consistent and changing self-relevant attributes. For instance, while their self-relevant attributes associated with their oral English proficiency clearly reflected the contextual appropriateness and demands that they accepted and absorbed in the United States, they
took an independent stance from the very same learning context and sustained their ordinary and familiar attributes across countries. In other words, in order to pursue their identity standard, they were protective about the contextually universal/consistent attributes, and yet they were not particularly resistant to the changes of attributes resulting from their oral language acquisition in English. They, therefore, experienced a paradoxical situation: the stronger they sought for the stabilities of their ordinary and familiar student identities based on the contextually universal attributes, the more changes they experienced in their ELL identities based on their contextually unique attributes.

The last point is that the children had to retrieve and activate their self-relevant information stored in their working memory (Sedikides & Skowrons, 2000). For instance, their past educational experiences influenced their aspiration for consistently perceiving themselves with ordinary school status. In the meantime, their present educational context informed them of the linguistic demands, and, subsequently, motivated them to improve their oral English proficiency for the future. Reliance on human perceptions of time to understand identity negotiation suggests that the children’s identity standard was not permanently set in stone but rather reflected their self-knowledge in memories which were activated temporarily at the time when they participated in the study. This is to say that their identity standard, which they revealed as if they were the purpose of schooling for the time being, can be subject to change in the future. Moreover, the paradoxical situations seen in the process of balancing the consistent self-relevant attributes and the changing self-relevant attributes are also
understandable since their stored student identities, which encompass the past, present, and future, are not always consistent with each other (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000).

The second unique way to negotiate identities as sojourners is to use their imagination. During the transitions from one country to another, pursuing their identity standard and developing the relevant school competences were not always easy tasks. Due to their non-established statuses in classrooms in the initial adjustment and the initial readjustment, their ordinary and familiar student identities were temporarily hard to be manifested to others. Also, due to their limited English skills in the United States, newcomers’ ELL identities were often described negatively in the beginning (e.g., a student who cannot speak English and who is shy and quiet, a linguistically and culturally minority student, an outsider, etc.). However, in such seemingly problematic circumstances, they demonstrated their internal strengths to regard the contextual difficulties and the less desirable self-relevant attributes as temporal by imagining the consistency of their established student identities as well as the continuous progress of their linguistic identities for the future. Their imagination was always tied into their views that they were competent enough to be eventually integrated in the mainstream learning communities and to have positive feelings towards school. In this sense, their imagination allowed them to transcend the negative influences from immediate learning contexts and motivated them to further pursue their identity standard.

The following figure shows that the process of self-imagination help sojourning students overcome their international transitions and pursue their identity standard. Though the children in this study emphasized their imagined self-perceptions especially
during the initial adjustment periods in the United States, the IFG data showed that self-imagination was also used to acquire school competences necessary to survive in Japanese schools after returning (e.g., Japanese language skills).

Figure 8.6 Process of Identity Negotiation: Self-Imagination

The process of self-imagination was evident when the newcomers not only described themselves based on their limited English proficiency for the time being but also stated how they would envision themselves for the future after they become more fluent in English. Haruya, Wataru, and Yayoi, all held hopeful views toward their future acquisition of oral English proficiency, and stated that their social interactions, feelings towards learning, and perspectives would change when they were able to view themselves more positively in the future. Also, after returning to Japan, some IFG
participants, who struggled with the readjustment, imagined the positive shift of identities for the future. Thus, imagining future student identities became especially important when the children were new to the learning contexts after an international transitioning.

The positive imagination demonstrated by the children and the IFG participants in this study resonated with previous research findings that linguistic minority students’ hope, aspiration, and achievement in school were promoted through the process of positive social mirroring (Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Like the supportive contextual influences from parents, schools, and classroom communities were crucial to the process of self-balance, the process of self-imagination would not be possible if the children did not live in the environment where they could continuously envision the consistency and changes of their self-relevant attributes for the future. Moreover, the children in this study were different from the ELLs in previous studies, whose positive student identities became deteriorated due to social and political injustice and negative social mirroring they faced in North American educational contexts (Cummins, 2000; Nieto, 2000; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). The noticeable difference is that most of those ELL participants in previous studies were permanent immigrants while the children in this study were temporal sojourners. At least in the five cases of temporal sojourning depicted in this study, the children’s identity negotiation during their initial adjustment in the United States and initial readjustment in Japan was most strongly driven by their hopeful imagination of positive student identities, or what Dewey (1998) called individualities and potentialities, rather than by their immediate social practices, non-established social status, and limited classroom participation.
It is also important to note that the children’s imagined identities did not come from others’ views or make-believe. This means that they imagined about only the self-relevant attributes which they could, or eventually would be able to, demonstrate, practice, and enact in school (e.g., English skills, personal interests in particular activities, etc.). Although their self-relevant information was often naturally communicated to their teachers, peers, and friends in the same learning environment (i.e., being revealed to them and being informed by them), the only information confirmed in practice guided their imagination. For instance, upon returning to Japan, some children were told by their teachers and friends that they had unconsciously developed some behavioral and attitudinal attributes in the United States (e.g., sekkyokuteki [active] attitude, working in a slow pace, etc.). Then, they needed to confirm if those attributes were indeed practiced in actual situations and to determine if those changes were worth carrying over to the particular learning context in the future. Thus, enacting, communicating, and imagining were intricately overlapped with each other and activated concurrently as the children expressed their student identities across different stages of sojourning. Also, the process of self-imagination, as well as other processes described in this chapter (i.e., self-verification, self-improvement, and self-balance), were the overlapping conceptual layers necessary to be explained when we attempt to understand the children’s identity negotiation as their pursuit of identity standard.

*Holistic understanding of children’s identity negotiation*

So far I have argued that sojourning children negotiated their student identities so that they could be one step closer to their identity standard which represented the self-
perceptions that they believed they should pursue in school. In the cases of the five Japanese children in this study, they were most concerned with their social adaptive and socioemotional competences for their identity standard, and engaged in the processes to verify, improve, balance, and imagine varied self-relevant attributes. They expressed some contextually universal self-relevant attributes consistently throughout sojourning and other contextually unique self-relevant attributes only during the changes of the attributes were important for their school inclusion. These processes illustrated so far in this chapter support the ecological interpretation of identity negotiation explained in the study’s theoretical framework (Chapter 3). More specifically, these processes resonated with the previous assertions that research on students’ identities requires both psychological and contextual approaches (Suárez Orozco & Suárez Orozco, 2001), and that the theories regarding the internal mechanism of identity formation and the theories regarding the external mechanism in relation to social structure should not be discrete, but, instead, should complement each other (Stryker & Burke, 2000).

I found that the identity negotiation processes certainly have internal aspects, mainly because of the children’s focus on their socioemotional sphere of their school experiences. As they engaged in varied negotiation processes, they nicely dealt with their varied feelings and emotions associated with the processes. For instance, when they tuned to their oral English proficiency to describe their student identities, newcomers could not describe themselves positively and had to face their struggles in verbal interactions with English-speakers. While facing negative feelings and emotions, they were also committed to shift the negativity to positiveness along with their improved oral English proficiency.
Also, all negotiation processes discussed in this chapter require them to cognitively understand their own school competences and experiences across time, and affectively connect their understanding to their own desirable and satisfactory sense of self.

The processes also appeared external mainly because the children showed their keen awareness of the demands from their learning contexts and always hoped to be included in their learning communities in any circumstances. More specifically, they perceived themselves with ordinary school status and familiar personal traits because they found that it was important for them to fit in and to be well-accepted in their learning contexts. Also, it was necessary for them to select oral English proficiency as the salient identity component because it was the linguistic competence required in their U.S. mainstream classrooms where they received inescapable “social pressure” (Sedikides & Skowronski, 2000, p. 96) for their school inclusion. They were well aware that the progress they made in English oral communication would affect their identities in various ways. They stated that their English proficiency allowed them to keep up with academic demands. Also, by verbally sharing their academic knowledge in groups, they could claim a sense of insider which, in return, fostered their English proficiency. My analysis of their learning experiences indeed revealed that their English proficiency, academic competence, and student identities developed simultaneously within the given social discourses and, therefore they were mutually influential. Moreover, they selectively avoided perceiving themselves with the self-relevant attributes that could interfere with their affirmative school inclusion. It is also important to reemphasize that the children were in the situations where they could receive continuous contextual supports for their
identity negotiation from their parents, schools, and classroom communities. Thus, the children’s decisions of selecting specific self-relevant attributes depended on their abilities to obtain the contextual demands, to integrate contextual supports, and to attend to the outcomes of developing some school competences in their given learning contexts.

Importantly, these internal and external aspects are inseparable and are holistically and ecologically integrated into the processes of identity negotiation. This is to say that, when children expressed their multiple self-relevant attributes across time and situations, they firmly situated themselves in their learning contexts and, at the same time, internalized the contextual clues necessary for maintaining and/or developing their identity standard. Their identity standard represented their ideal forms of social adaptation in school and, therefore, required them not only to attend to the contextual influences but also to activate their own cognitive, affective, motivational and behavioral competences into identity negotiation (Sedikides & Skowronski, 1997, 2000). The specific negotiation process discussed in this chapter (i.e., self-verification, self-improvement, self-balance, and self-imagination) all required the children to use internal mechanisms and also to be attentive to the external surroundings.

Overall, understanding the process of identity negotiation as the children’s pursuit of identity standard teaches us that, when they perceived themselves in certain ways in school, their selections of self-relevant attributes reflected their relations to the learning contexts as well as their perceptions and feelings that they processed within themselves. This study thus suggests a more holistic way to understand identity negotiation as the ecological integration of internal and external processes. The complexity found in the

At the same time, this study revealed the five children’s very successful cases of demonstrating such complex negotiation processes. Not only they knew their own possible student identities and maintained their identity standard across two countries, but also they nicely plugged some of their pre-established academic, social, and personal competences as well as their newly developing linguistic competence into their identity standard. This also makes me believe that identity negotiation requires students to have varied school competences to work toward achieving their identity standard. Therefore, it is understandable that some sojourning students, in different circumstances, may not be able to engage in the negotiation processes as smooth as the children in this study. Some student may be, for instance, unable to verify their school competences and their identity standard, unable to receive contextual support to improve the school competence necessary for their positive student identities, unable to balance the consistent and changing aspects of their student identities, and unable to imagine their future stability and growth of student identities. In this sense, a sojourning experience can be a risk of forcing students to experience unsuccessful and unfavorable student identities. At the same time, it can be an opportunity to practice their varied internal and external competences to pursue their identity standard.

A wide range of procedural patterns for identity negotiation have been suggested in previous identity research (Macpherson, 2005; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Although those previously suggested patterns revealed individuals’ identities
primarily in relation to their cultural experiences (e.g., positive cultural identities, such as transcultural identities and intercultural creativity, and negative cultural identities, such as rejection and ethnic flight), the differences seen in their identity negotiation might also have been due to diverse ways of utilizing their school competences to pursue their identity standard. In other words, if we understand student’s identity negotiation processes more holistically with focus on both internal and external mechanisms, the descriptions of negotiation patterns could be more elaborated. For instance, in addition to understanding individual identities in relation to their cultural distances and socialization practices, the researchers can also explain what specific school competences were difficult to be practiced and internalized. This means that understanding students’ identity negotiation processes as their pursuit of identity standard would allow us to find and assess what kind of advantages or stumbling blocks the students experience when they engage in their internal and external craft of self-perceptions.

**Competence-Based Identity Negotiation Model**

By understanding the Japanese sojourning children’s identity negotiation as their pursuit of identity standard and the relevant school competences, I propose the following ideas:

Elementary sojourners need, in large, the following two types of school competences to form their student identities during their international sojourning:

1. The *Identity-Relevant Competence* (IRC)—the school competence(s) that contribute to their identity standard.

2. The *Identity-Negotiation Competence* (INC)—the school competence(s) to practice the four processes of identity negotiation (i.e., self-verification, self-improvement, self-balance, and self-imagination) across time and learning contexts in order to sustain their commitment towards identity standard.
I use the term, competence, in order to be faithful to the children’s agenda shared in this study. In all interviews, the children’s conversations regarding their student identities were constructed around their perceptions of their own skills and abilities which they were able or unable to demonstrate in their immediate learning contexts and which they imagined to be able to demonstrate in the future. Not only their articulated self-relevant attributes but also the contexts described in each case study were associated with their varied school competences.

More specifically, children expressed their social adaptive and socioemotional competences as the foremost important IRC and showed their strong aspiration for being part of their academic and social communities and for feeling joy in school. They also expressed varied school competences (e.g., academic, social, personal, behavioral competence) as their IRC, and showed that they were ordinary learners who would nicely fit in the mainstream with likable personalities, characters, and interests. Their linguistic competence in oral English was another IRC that showed their progress in and effort for achieving their identity standard. This study also suggested that other school competences, including bilingual and bicultural competences, Japanese linguistic and cultural competences, and social competences to tackle with a sojourner’s status could potentially become their IRC. Although the children did not necessarily talk about the second type of competence, the INC, they clearly demonstrated it in their school practices as they engaged in the four processes of identity negotiation described in this chapter. This suggests that the children’s identity standard as well as all of their salient self-relevant attributes represented their perceptions and actual practices of school competences.
The following model brings together all of the four processes of identity negotiation and visually presents how Japanese sojourning children’s IRC and INC were integrated into the negotiation processes across two countries.

Figure 8.7 Competence-Based Identity Negotiation Model
Since this process model is two-dimensional and follows a chronological order of the children’s sojourning experiences, the presentation of the ideas is simplified in a way that only the key ideas are highlighted. Though this may cause a limited view of the complex processes of identity negotiation, the purpose of presenting the intricate ideas of IRC and INC in a simple form of visual representation is only to capture the essential ideas found in this study. It is also important to note here that the ideas of identity competences, the IRC and the INC, are, in large, suggested as the “interpretive theory” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 126) that fosters “the imaginative understanding of the studied phenomenon” (p. 126) and, in specific, as the “constructivist grounded theory” (p. 130) that substantively captures how and why multiple meanings were constructed. The theory emerging from this study adds a new body of information to the existing identity theories because no previous educational theorist has conceptualized elementary sojourners’ identity negotiation in relation to their school competences.

In the model, the IRC, which are indicated as boxes, consists of varied school competences which the children were committed to develop throughout sojourning, and suggests that their student identities, identity standard, and those school competences were mutually influential. The children’s practice of their INC is symbolized with the arrows in the model to promote the idea that their identity negotiation took place by multiple processes throughout their sojourning. Although the arrows are placed only in certain stage of sojourning (e.g., the arrows indicating “self-verification” are placed in the U.S. contexts and the arrows indicating “self-balance” are placed in the Japanese contexts), this does not mean that the children’s practice of the INC was limited to the
time periods. All types of INC were practiced throughout all sojourning periods. However, it is important to note again that the processes of self-balance and self-imagination seemed most significant especially during their international transitions. The idea of INC helps us conceptualize the phenomenon of identity negotiation as a new domain of school competence uniquely practiced by sojourning students.

In addition, this process model should also emphasize that the children demonstrated their IRC and INC so that they could achieve their identity standard, which served as the central purpose for their identity negotiation throughout sojourning and also the aspirations for coping with their temporal school lives in the United States and necessary international transitions. Some of their IRC (i.e., competences to reveal ordinary student status and familiar personal traits) had been developed in their previous school experiences and were regarded as applicable for their pursuit of identity standard. Other IRC (i.e., sociolinguistic competence in English) needed to be continuously improved in new learning contexts so that they could stay focused on their identity standard. Also, their INC would not have been possibly demonstrated if they were not able to determine and pursue their IRC. In this sense, it is important to take into account that both types of identity competences vary depending on individual learners’ unique backgrounds and life contexts in terms of their previous educational experiences, heritage language and culture, and the duration of sojourning, contextual supports, and so forth.

Moreover, the idea of INC suggests that students, who have acquired their INC, would most likely be able to apply it to another situation in which they become immersed in a new learning context and renegotiate their identities. For instance, after experiencing
the adjustment and identity negotiation in his first summer school, Wataru found his second transition to his U.S. public school easier than before. Misaki and Tsubasa similarly had a smooth transition back to Japan because they remembered that their initial adjustment in the United States and their negotiation of ELL identities were much harder than their readjustment and their re-negotiation of identities in Japan. This implies that the five children’s successful negotiation of their student identities during their sojourning this time would benefit their future identity negotiation especially if they will have to transit between different learning contexts. The key point is that the improvement of identity negotiation practices of the children in this study proceeded along with their social adaptations since their affirmative school inclusion was the key to their identity standard. Further more, this model suggests that varied school contexts in two countries filtered through the processes of identity negotiation. As the model indicates, the influential school contexts included: academic and non-academic contexts; linguistic and cultural contexts; social pressure from the contexts; contextual demands for specific school competences needed in the contexts; and varied supports from parents, schools, and classroom communities.

Lastly, this process model shows some successful cases of elementary sojourners’ school adaptation, and, at the same time, suggests that there are most likely other students who live in diverse circumstances and cannot represent successful identity negotiation and school adaptation. In this sense, the model works as a protocol which predicts what may happen to the sojourning children when they come to the United States and return to Japan. It also sets a guideline of not only what the sojourning children bring to the table
but also what their parents, teachers, and schools bring to the table as the external factors or contextual influences affecting the children’s identity negotiation. Therefore, the model is what social scientists would call a heuristic device which sets out “the defining characteristics of a social phenomenon, so that its salient features might be stated clearly and explicitly as possible” (Marshal, 1998). This model then should speak to a variety of individuals across disciplines (e.g., sociolinguistics, social psychology, sociology, educational counseling, psychoanalysis, etc.). Although my attempt to suggest the conceptual understanding of sojourning children’s identity negotiation is exploratory and shows my novice background as a child identity researcher and theorist, I hope that this interdisciplinary model would be useful for varied audience, foremost importantly, educators for sojourning students.

Implications of the Study

This section presents the implications of the study, including the utilities of the suggested model of competence-based identity negotiation, for educational practices, policies, and future research. Though a single study cannot provide the comprehensive basis for entire educational and research issues, below recommendations are expected to foster on-going discussions on the ways to better educate an increasing population of sojourning students in today’s diverse elementary classrooms.

For Educational Practices

This study suggests that all educational practitioners in the home and host country, who take part in sojourning students’ education, should support the holistic growth of the students’ identity standard and necessary school competences. Two major
recommendations include: (a) to learn about students’ perspectives on their identity standard and Identity-Relevant Competence (IRC) and (b) to help them maintain and grow their IRC by fostering their Identity Negotiation Competence (INC).

First, all teachers across countries need to find out how individual students hope to perceive themselves in school and also which of their school competences are regarded by them as necessary for their identity standard. Teachers then need to learn about not only the students’ backgrounds (e.g., linguistic, cultural, family, and educational backgrounds) but also their experiences of developing their student identities across time. In other words, teachers’ knowledge of the students should not be limited to the factorial information, but rather, should be extended to the information regarding the internal and external processes through which they have developed their identities in the past, continue to form their identities through the present school practices, and imagine their identities for the future. All teachers, thus, should learn about individual students in an ecological relation to ever-changing social realities of the classroom.

In practical levels, all teachers should take advantage of daily classroom interactions in both academic and non-academic contexts in order to facilitate the identity discourse among all participants in the same learning community. The key is to create a learning environment in which all participants feel secure to openly share their views on various educational experiences, life history, identity standard, and the IRC. In any classroom conversation, teachers can provide clear and yet nurturing feedback to the students’ school practices, including both progress and challenge, so that the students can become more aware of the varied self-relevant attributes to integrate into their identity
standard. Moreover, creating the positive identity discourse in classroom allows all participants to learn about themselves and each other. For instance, while engaging in the social interactions to promote mutual understanding in class, teachers can also reflect upon their own experiences of identity negotiation as learners, and deepen their understanding of students’ identity negotiation. In more specific, previous researchers have suggested some effective literacy activities, which can help teachers elicit students’ identities and create the identity discourse in classroom communities. Those literacy activities include writing activities (Bourne, 2002), literature club (Vyas, 2004), and online discussion (Nguyen & Kellogg, 2005). All these activities have been found effective in English-speaking contexts, yet seem appropriate to be implemented in any linguistic contexts. Thus, all teachers across countries should carefully design lessons by adopting the effective activities suggested in previous literature while further exploring the possibilities across various content areas.

Second, it is also important for teachers to create a learning environment in which all students not only talk about their identity standard and IRC but also feel supported to demonstrate their INC to actualize the IRC. In order to do so, general curriculum and instruction need to be designed, and modified whenever possible, according to the needs of individual students. For instance, if students’ foremost important IRC include their social adaptive and socioemotional competences as found in this study, it is critical for teachers and schools to assure the legitimate social participation, a sense of belonging, and joy of learning for every student in all school activities. Such inclusive learning environments are expected to positively impact the students’ language learning, academic
engagement, and social psychological development like many previous studies have suggested (e.g., Kanno, 2003; Morita, 2004; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). It is also important to note that the children in this study firmly developed their identity standard through their positive school engagement in the past. Therefore, all teachers should know that students’ identity standard can reflect their previously established beliefs, values, and strengths as students. When students’ identity standard is positive and overlaps with the educational goals valued by the school, teachers should make sure to help them maintain it. Teachers should know that students’ identity standard carried over from the former learning context can be an asset for supporting them in the current learning context. In the meantime, when students’ identity standard and their focused IRC do not correspond to what the current educational goals and standard require, teachers need to find common ground to bridge between them, or guide the students to broaden their perspectives to add new standard to their identities by providing them optimal educational opportunities with clear expectations.

This study also suggests that the sojourning students will highly likely regard several different school competences as their IRC necessary for their affirmative school inclusion and emotional fulfillment in school. In the cases of the five Japanese children, they wanted to be able to remain as the students who do not stand out in school, and who continue to have their own unique personal traits (e.g., character, personality, interest, etc.). In order to help sojourning students maintain their ordinary school status and positive personal traits, teachers in Japan and the United States should provide them a plenty of opportunities to fully participate in all classroom activities and to show others...
who they are, especially during the initial adjustment and readjustment periods. For instance, a sense of inclusion as ordinary students may increase when U.S. teachers make lessons more comprehensible for them by using more hands-on activities and visual clues and by allowing them to use their bilingual dictionaries. U.S. teachers can also connect newcomers to their classmates by giving them a chance to show their expertise and talents based on their unique personal traits. If students are going to return to the same Japanese school, they can be placed with their former classmates so that they feel more comfortable to readjust and reveal their identities that have been consistent since their presojourning days.

Parents can also help children maintain the consistency of identities by making the international transitions less obtrusive to the flow of their school experiences, like the parents in this study have successfully done. For instance, parents can provide children with the information of their new schools before their actual transitions and enrollment. If time and financial situations allow, it is helpful for sojourning children to be exposed to the learning contexts of the country to which they plan to move. Visiting the United States before the actual U.S. sojourning was helpful for Haruya and Wataru to prepare themselves for their transitions and to begin imagining their future school lives. While staying in the United States, sojourning children can also use their school vacations to periodically experience *taiken nyugaku* (a visiting enrollment) in Japanese schools.

Previous researchers found that the bilingual and bicultural children in the United States could maintain and appreciate their heritage language and culture through *taiken nyugaku* (Caldas, 2006; Sugimori, 2006). By experiencing it, Tsubasa could become familiar with
the routines and curriculum of a Japanese school and prepare himself for his eventual return. The opportunity for taiken nyugaku will also depend on parents’ resources (e.g., financial situation, time restriction, etc.); however, teachers can certainly make suggestions for parents when appropriate. Parents can also provide opportunities for the same kind of extracurricular activities in both countries so that children can continue to grow and reveal their familiar student identities based on the same personal interests regardless of the changes of learning contexts.

The children in this study also considered their oral English proficiency as their IRC to develop their changing aspects of student identities, especially in the U.S. contexts. There are several recommendations for teachers in Japan and the United States to help sojourning students acquire oral English proficiency and experience a sense of improvement for the purpose of their identity negotiation. First, teachers in Japan should know that some students may view themselves unprepared to move to the United States because of their minimal oral English proficiency. English education in Japan, therefore, should place more emphasis on teaching oral communication. Due to the implementation of Period of Integrated Study since 2001, many public elementary schools started to provide English language lessons which are often co-taught by a set of a Japanese teacher and an English native speaking teacher (MEXT, 2001). For the students who plan to sojourn in an English-speaking country, those teachers should collaboratively provide supplemental opportunities to practice English oral communication.

Second, U.S. teachers should similarly provide their sojourning students with abundant opportunities to practice their English oral communication. Whenever possible,
the explicit instructions on English pronunciation, presentation skills, and communication strategies should be incorporated into all content area lessons in mainstream classrooms as well as ELL program. The U.S. mainstream classroom teachers and ELL teachers should know that English oral communication skills can be perceived as the foremost important skills by not only newcomers but also the sojourning students who have developed their grade-level English skills to participate in their mainstream classrooms. The children in this study engaged in the process of self-improvement by acquiring their English oral language skills, in part, because it helped them: participate in non-academic social activities that they truly enjoyed; overcome bullying among Japanese peers; and avoid being chastised by American peers during lunch.

All U.S. teachers are, therefore, recommended to explore varied teaching strategies to foster sojourning students’ oral interactions in English. In specific, the teaching strategies should promote students’ active practices of oral English and foster a sense of an insider to the social group. One example is to arrange an appropriate group size when designing learning activities. The children in this study preferred a small group setting to a whole class setting, like Brock (2007) suggested in her case study of an ELL elementary student. In a small group setting, they were able to comprehend language and to ask questions to “genuinely seek new information” (Gibbons, 2002, p. 18). At the same time, the children preferred a one-on-one setting to a small group setting because they could not always view themselves as an insider in the group. Sojourning student, therefore, may benefit from the activities to work with an English-speaking partner and also from one-on-one support/buddy systems. In addition, English-speaking teachers
need to be patient when conversing with sojourning students, especially newcomers. Teachers need to give enough wait time, listen to the students’ utterances carefully, and respond in a clear and nurturing manner. Rather than watering down the content and route of lessons due to the student’s limited oral proficiency in English, U.S. teachers should enhance lessons with more props, visual clues, and modified curriculum in order to provide all students with appropriate learning opportunities. Again, teachers should know that oral English language proficiency is essential to sojourning students’ school inclusion and socioemotional experiences.

Though the children in this study did not emphasize, their acquisition of overall English skills, including literacy skills, vocabulary, and grammar knowledge, was also essential to their learning experiences, and appeared to be influential to their identities throughout sojourning even after they returned to Japan. In U.S. contexts, one concern that all children shared regarding their English language learning was the pullout system used by the ELL program. Though the ELL class helped them learn basic survival English and supported their initial adjustment, the pullout support became an obstacle for their full school inclusion after they developed sufficient English proficiency. One recommendation for ELL teachers is to be strategic to schedule the lesson hours for each student. In order to do so, they need to communicate and coordinate well with their students’ mainstream classroom teachers and to exchange information of schedule change and ongoing/upcoming events. This can be done through face-to-face conversation as well as through email communication. It is crucial for ELL teachers to prevent students from missing out some portions of lessons in either mainstream or ELL class due to
unorganized schedules. Students certainly would not want to return from their ELL class to their mainstream classroom in the middle of lessons due to unexpected schedule changes. It is equally important for all teachers to identify the subject hours in which the students definitely need to stay in the mainstream classrooms in order to avoid making them feel excluded and marginalized. For older students, it may be a good idea to allow them to take more initiatives on creating their own schedules and to participate in the scheduling procedure with their ELL and classroom teachers. Less standardized scheduling is the key to meeting sojourning students’ individual needs.

Also, in the U.S. context, teachers should know that the attitudes towards English language learning vary among sojourning students even when they have similar backgrounds. All children in this study kept positive attitudes, whereas some of their Japanese sojourning classmates and some of the IFG participants expressed their reluctance to learn English because of their temporal status in their U.S. classrooms. If teachers have previously taught the motivated learners, there may be a chance that they overgeneralize their views onto other students who are less motivated. It is, therefore, important for teachers to assess their students’ individual needs and circumstances before categorizing them as a group of Japanese sojourning students.

English language learning and maintenance, especially grammar learning for school exams and Eiken (English proficiency exam), were also important experiences for sojourning students after their returns. In Japanese school, English grammar knowledge is extremely important for all students to succeed. U.S. teachers, therefore, should start teaching English grammar more explicitly when sojourning students start preparing for
their returns. Also, teachers in Japan should know that returnee students’ fluency in
English is not equal to their abilities to explain the syntactic rules. The returnee students
are often aware of the high expectations given by others for kikokushijo’s English
language proficiency. While an appropriate level of expectations, which facilitate their
English language learning, should be promoted, excessive expectations, which give them
unnecessary pressure, should be avoided. In addition, Japanese public schools in general
offer rigorous English grammar and literacy instructions, yet hardly support their returnee
students’ English maintenance. Therefore, the returnee children in this study went, or
planned to go, to private learning center after school (e.g., juku, a conversation school,
etc.) in order to maintain their English skills. Classroom teachers in Japan should use
their creativity to incorporate some English language maintenance opportunities into the
existing school curriculum. For instance, they can ask their native English-speaking
colleagues for a help for having their returnee students complete some of the Japanese
writing homework in English.

It is also recommended for teachers in Japan to give higher expectations towards
all students’ English language acquisition in elementary level. Even though many
Japanese public elementary schools implement English lessons, returnee students would
not benefit from the lessons which are too easy. They also would not want to show their
advanced English skills if the majority of their classmates do not understand English.
Teachers in Japan, therefore, need to work towards raising all students’ English
proficiency, or teaching them to value high English proficiency, so that the returnee
students can freely display and practice their English skills.
Moreover, over the course of sojourning between Japan and the United States, sojourning children, as well as their parents and teachers, may continue to hold and express their own views of language acquisition and maintenance which are not always supported by the scholarly knowledge of language acquisition. For instance, the children in this study developed an idea of acquiring their English speaking skills in one year because they observed their Japanese classmates who were already fluent after spending a year in their U.S. classrooms. This idea of one-year-acquisition motivated the children to further improve their English and to imagine their future proficiency. However, English language learners should not feel discouraged when their English acquisition does not occur like the people around them because the length of language acquisition can vary among individual learners. Moreover, all parents in this study expected children’s English language maintenance in Japan, yet some parents did not consistently require the children to use English in order to avoid giving them excessive pressure. Parental support for the children’s language acquisition and that for their psychological well being should not be understood in a zero-sum manner, rather, should be provided simultaneously. Thus, all agents, who take parts in sojourning students’ education, should have more opportunities to be familiar with up-to-date theories of second language acquisition.

In addition, sojourning students’ Japanese linguistic and cultural backgrounds were always essential to their sojourning experiences. With the comparatively large population of Japanese students and the existence of JELL program in their U.S. schools, the students were able to participate in social interactions in Japanese, to utilize their Japanese skills to support their English learning; and to relate to the Japanese
communities as the base to expand their social network. Especially newcomers benefited from having Japanese-speaking classmates and the translation support when they could not comprehend the lessons in their mainstream classrooms. Also, having Japanese classmates with similar backgrounds as theirs allowed them to have role models of sojourning and to imagine their future school lives as sojourners.

While teachers in the United States should regard the students’ Japanese backgrounds as the resource to support their school adjustment and learning, they should also be aware that the same ethnic, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds do not automatically guarantee a harmonious relationship among all Japanese students. Before automatically grouping or pairing up the Japanese students together for mutual support (e.g., changing seating arrangement to have them sit next to each other, having them work as partners in a group activity, etc.), U.S. classroom teachers should consider each student’s personal backgrounds and the social dynamics within their ethnic community. Upon noticing the dissonant relationships among Japanese students, teachers should investigate if there are any negative consequences, such as bullying and teasing. If so, teachers must mediate the conflicts promptly. The common cause of bullying found in this study was the victimized child’s limited English skills. One possible way to solve the conflict is to support the students’ English language acquisition so that their social network will not be limited to the Japanese peer group. However, it is critical to state again that teachers need to view the students’ Japanese linguistic and cultural background as an asset not an obstacle for their learning, and to pay close attention to individually unique personalities that each student brings to the learning community.
Moreover, Japanese language skills, especially *kanji* skills, can become a concern for sojourning students when they are to return to Japan and after they actually return. While living in the United States, they less likely focus on their Japanese language maintenance due to their efforts to fit in the mainstream learning communities, and, therefore, need to practice *kanji* on their own. Teachers and parents should know that it is very important for the students to practice *kanji* consistently throughout their U.S. sojourn. In Japanese schools after returning, teachers should know that *kanji* can be a stumbling block for many returnees. Though they may seem to keep up the *kanji* introduced in the current grade, it does not mean that they mastered the ones introduced in previous grades. *Kanji* learning is an accumulating process that takes many years, if not a lifetime, for the mastery. Japanese teachers should assess the returnee students’ *kanji* skills comprehensively and provide adequate support so that the students can feel more included in their learning communities and feel joy in learning.

Overall, sojourning students need to engage in meaningful school activities in which they can freely reveal their perspectives on identity standard and develop the school competences necessary for the standard. Designing effective lessons, in this sense, means to ensure the learning environment where the students’ IRC and INC, which are relevant to their linguistic, academic, behavioral, social, emotional, and personal experiences, are valued and promoted for their learning. This requires teachers to acknowledge and respect the students’ identities representing varied school competences of which they seek for the consistency and improvement. The students’ aspiration for acquiring those competences and their imagination for potential self-perceptions need to
be regarded as assets for education. As some of the children and the IFG participants stated in this study, sojourning students are attentive to their teachers’ hard work to create optimal learning environments for identity discourse, and will highly likely store a sense of appreciation towards their teachers’ work in their life-long memories of childhood sojourning. I hope this encourages many educators across countries to attend to their sojourning students’ identity negotiation.

For Educational Policies

The well-balanced growth of identity competences does not occur without adequate educational policies and supportive school curriculum. In any educational contexts, the curriculum should not over-emphasize only the partial aspects of child development but, instead, should foster the overall growth of a whole child who is capable of pursuing his or her identity standard and the necessary school competences. This broad educational goal requires the creation of an affirmative learning community which fosters mutual understanding among students, educational practitioners, and policy makers. This study provides four recommendations: (a) to reframe the educational changes based upon identity discourses, (b) to reconcile the meanings of bilingualism and biculturalism in school, (c) to hire more teachers with linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds, and (d) to establish collaborative relations among schools in both home and host country.

First, it is crucial for policy makers to improve the framework of educational change by attending to the on-going identity discourses in today’s diverse classrooms and also by drawing on the emerging identity theories from empirical research. Since
learners’ identities serve as the lens to capture educational discursive practices and curriculum discourses (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2004), new educational policies need to reflect the perspectives of all participants in the same learning community, including linguistic minority students. The standards for educational discourses have been evolving due to the movement of global education in numerous worldwide institutions (Spring, 2008). Therefore, today’s school curriculum faces the need of “designing ecologies” (Hawkins, 2005, p. 79) and reconceptualizing existing standards in the learning communities.

Second, any learning community should encourage the sojourning students to view their bilingual and bicultural competences as the IRC to be integrated into their identity standard, rather than giving them unspoken messages that those unique competences may interfere with their affirmative school inclusion. Multilingualism and multiculturalism are human rights and, at the same time, the common ground for multicultural education and global education (Diaz et al., 1999). In many U.S. schools, maintaining bilingual and bicultural capitals has not been an option for all students. Creating multilingual learning communities in the United States has been still an imagination not a reality due to “de facto monolingual policies” (Shohamy, 2006) perpetuated by various ideologies, myths, propaganda, and language use in public. The existing social mechanisms promote “de-legitimacy and suppression of other languages” (Shohamy, 2006, p. 183). Therefore, new educational policies face a desperate need of multilingual and multicultural standards. More specifically, the state legislation, which mandates only one year English immersion program in public schools, should be revised
since most ELLs need a longer time period to acquire sufficient English skills to feel fully adapted to their U.S. classrooms. In this study, Misaki was still on the process of acquiring her English literacy skills after two and a half year of U.S. sojourning. Tsubasa, who came to the United States in the end of kindergarten, finally felt fully comfortable with his English in his third grade. It is important to restate here that these children were elite bilinguals who received abundant parental and contextual supports for their English language learning. It is not hard to speculate that the length of English language acquisition will differ if the participants are the learners who live under socially and economically disadvantageous circumstances.

Also, in Japan, it was difficult for the sojourning children to value own bilingualism and biculturalism because they hardly received opportunities to use their English skills in school as they quickly became immersed into the mainstream. Due to the influx of recent immigrants, the linguistic uniformity in Japan has been considered as a myth (Noguchi, 2001). The Japanese public school policies need to set a stage for diverse students to maintain and grow their linguistic and cultural capitals within school, rather than leaving the second language maintenance as the responsibility for private institutions.

Third, it is recommended to hire educational practitioners with multilingual and multicultural perspectives. In linguistically and culturally heterogeneous classrooms, these teachers can better support minority students (Garcia, Skutnabb-Kangas, & Torres-Guzman, 2006) and bring new materials to “multicultural-global knowledge base” (Diaz et al., 1999, p. 9). They are expected to revise existing norms and to build classroom communities in which all students feel secure to share their identities and to grow their
IRC and INC. Educational policies, then, need to not only promote diversities among educators but also provide sufficient professional development opportunities for all educators, including monolingual and monocultural individuals, to broaden their linguistic and cultural potentialities.

Lastly, the educational institutions in home and host countries should collaboratively implement effective support systems particularly designed for sojourning students. U.S. _kaigaishijo_ can better prepare themselves for the transitions and develop necessary identity competences, if public and private educational institutions in the United States and in Japan (e.g., schools, supplemental heritage language schools, International Schools, after school learning centers, support organizations, etc.) cross-nationally share the responsibilities of educating them. For instance, the institutions in Japan can prepare the students’ move to the United States by providing abundant information of the U.S. educational system and, if possible, by simulating the learning atmosphere and curriculum. The U.S. institutions can similarly support the students’ returns by providing information of Japanese school systems. In addition, the collaborative network among teachers in both countries should be established so that the teachers can exchange information about their sojourning students and keep in touch with the students abroad if necessary. Especially when the students are going back to the same Japanese school upon returning, their close contact with the teachers in Japan would facilitate their readjustment. Overall, educational policies should systematically and strategically create the learning communities which go beyond national, linguistic, and
cultural boundaries and which bring sojourning students’ development of identity competences from the margin to the center of educational agenda.

For Future Research

Several issues need to be further explored and clarified by future researchers in order to deepen understanding of sojourning children’s identities and to further theorize the competence-based identity negotiation. These issues include: (a) studying the detailed mechanisms of forming student identities; (b) broadening the scope to examine students’ identity competences; (c) including more diverse research participants and contexts; and (d) continuously exploring the research perspectives and methods.

First, future studies need to further examine the mechanisms through which sojourning students select particular school competences as if they were the indicators of who they should be while excluding other school competences. The children in this study formed their identity standard primarily based upon their social adaptive and socioemotional competences which also overlapped with and supported by other school competences, including their social and academic competences to claim their ordinary student status, their personal (e.g., attitudinal, behavioral, affective, etc.) competence to maintain familiar personal traits, and their linguistic competence in English oral communication. In addition, their Japanese linguistic and cultural competences, bilingual and bicultural competences, their social competence as kaigaishijo and kikokushijo seemed important to their identity formation, yet were not clearly articulated as their IRC. Although the IFG participant’s experiences supported the salience of those experiences, their participation was only for the interpretive purposes and their views were used only
to illuminate what was missing in the children’s views. The future research needs to clarify the reasons behind the students’ decisions on selecting and prioritizing their IRC. Furthermore, the shift of identity standard over the course of sojourning was not evident in the children nor in the IFG participants in this study, however, seemed possible since children’s identity negotiation was also the fluid process of recognizing the self-relevant attributes which were stable and changing, consciously and unconsciously developed, and actualized and imagined. Future research, therefore, should investigate this topic.

Second, this study provided the theoretical discussion on children’s identities in relation to their varied school competences; however the emerging theory was based upon the children’s recognition of school competence not the actual levels measured with assessment or scales. Though the supplemental data (e.g., background information and informant interview data) showed some coherence between the children’s views of their own competences and others’ views, it was unknown if there were any discrepancies between the perceived and actual levels of their competences and if the processes of identity negotiation would be different for the students who face such discrepancies. Future studies, therefore, need to capture the development of students’ IRC from varied angles and broaden the scope of competence-based identity theory. At the same time, the researchers should actively evaluate the effectiveness of the innovative teaching practices and strategies designed based on the premises of new theories.

Third, the above-suggested extensions of research topics would not be possible without the future research with more diverse populations of learners and varied learning contexts. I have emphasized several times in this dissertation that all of the child
participants were so called elite bilinguals who were privileged to receive abundant resources and substantial parental supports for their academic learning, linguistic development, and personal fulfillment. Their school experiences prior to U.S. sojourning were commonly positive in terms of their adaptive and socioemotional states. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that the phenomenon of identity negotiation would be depicted differently depending on the students’ diverse backgrounds. (e.g., nationality, gender, socioeconomic status, school experiences, linguistic and cultural experience, special needs, durations of sojourning, and perceptions of time, space, sequence, and memory). For instance, the students with the history of unsatisfactory school participation may not consider their adaptive competence as the IRC and may show the different path to form their identity standard in a new country. Also, the permanent immigrants in the United States may negotiate their identities based on the attributes different from those of the temporary sojourners since their needs, experiences, and perceptions are different (Kanno, 2003). Moreover, the comparisons of the findings from the students in varied ages are necessary to shed light to the developmental issues of identity negotiation, which are considered to be crucial and yet have not been the focus of discussion in this study.

In addition, it is also crucial to incorporate contextual diversities for extending the potentials of future studies. In the U.S. context, this study focused on the children’s identities negotiated only within their public elementary schools which were somewhat unique and particular because of the school traditions of strongly supporting the Japanese students and their families. The research results are expected to be different if the schools are diverse in terms of school culture, language education policy, and linguistic and
cultural contexts (e.g., ESL, EFL, foreign language learning, etc.). Moreover, future study should be conducted to capture sojourning students’ identities negotiated in their home environment as well as in the communities outside school. Future identity research thus should continuously compare the similarities and differences between the ways in which diverse students negotiate their identities while receiving varied contextual influences.

Lastly, the research perspectives and methods should be continuously explored by future identity researchers in order to add the depth and breadth to the interpretation of child identities and their identity competences. I found the interpretive research approach, the constructivist grounded theory approach, and the associated multiple research methods useful for studying children’s inner universe and socially constructed self perceptions. It is, therefore, highly recommended to replicate the interpretive research orientation; however, at the same time, all researchers should be open to the alternative research methodology and continue to evaluate its effectiveness and legitimacy.

In specific, future research should also refine and explore the supplemental data collection methods. For instance, the drawing activities in in-depth interviews can incorporate more structured visual props like the diagram of a layered circle used by Fujiu’s (2004).¹⁰⁸ A creative use of supplemental methods may further facilitate the interview conversations with the child interviewee, like Tsubasa, who is resistant to elaborate feelings and thoughts. The collection of school artifacts can also include more visual data, such as the pictures of the children’s learning contexts taken by them and/or

---

¹⁰⁸ Fujiu (2004) asked her child participants to fill in each layer of the circle with the ideas relevant to their identities. The center of the circle represented “self” and children determined how distant each idea should be placed from the center.
their informants. Viewing the numerous pictures taken by Yayoi at the Spring Lake School was helpful to co-interpret her perceptions. Also, the perspectives shared by the IFG participants were intriguing yet only used for the data analysis. Their stories can certainly become the major focus of future research and illuminate the long term impact of childhood sojourning on individual identities.

Future research also should explore varied methods of data analysis, such as: the Critical Discourse Analysis (Gee, 2004, 2005) to describe the findings in relation to poststructural social understandings; narrative analysis to understand children’s worlds and identities while reconceptualizing “one’s whole approach to knowledge” (Pagnucci, 2004, p. 47); and statistical analysis to shed light to unveiled aspects. Since the foci of these methods can be oppositional (e.g., the local contexts focused in the narrative analysis and the social contexts focused in critical discourse analysis) (de Fina, Schiffrin, & Bamberg, 2006), hybrid methods seem to have great potential.

Overall, the educational research on sojourning children’s identity negotiation has not yet well-established and, therefore, necessitates continuous efforts to explore methodology, research design, and salient topics relevant to emerging identity theories. As the new research trends and theories continue to evolve, the primary tenet of identity research should remain as to create better educational contexts for an increasing population of sojourning children worldwide.

Limitations of the Study

The explorative research design employed in this identity research suggested the potentiality of co-interpretation, however, at the same time, shed the light to several
limitations: (a) limited timeframe to study individual identities, (b) comparatively uniform background of child participants, and (c) difficulties of co-interpretation. First, some may argue that a total of approximately one year was relatively a short period for examining the processes of identity negotiation. Although I attempted to cover the children’s entire sojourning experiences as a collective account by sampling two cross-sections of children, the same critiques may still prefer the studies which followed the same individual participants for a prolonged period of time (e.g., Kanno, 2003; McCallister, 2004). In my view, however, whether it is longitudinal or cross-sectional, any identity inquiries would provide only the snapshots of identity negotiation across one’s life span unless the researcher follows the participant from birth to death. At least in my opinion, to do so is beyond the researcher’s human capacity. I also assumed that the stories shared by the cross-sections of children worked somewhat like puzzle pieces. In other words, I assumed that the perspectives shared by the individual children in varied stages of sojourning could locate the important agenda within a wide spectrum of entire U.S. sojourning experiences. Therefore, the cross-sectional design was a solution to the comparatively limited timeframe of the study and also a creative way to organize sporadic snapshots into a more cohesive picture.

Second, some may also consider the comparatively uniform backgrounds of the child participants as a limitation. As stated earlier, all children were elite bilinguals with privileged educational and family backgrounds. In order to ease this limitation, the case study of each child included detailed descriptions of his or her learning experiences so that the findings would not stand on mere assumptions or stereotypes. The findings with
this specific group of participants in this study are expected to be compared with the findings from the students with different backgrounds in future studies. It is also important to note that including the participants with more diverse backgrounds would have added too many variability that make the analysis unfocused.

Lastly, it is important to indicate some difficulties that I experienced in the co-interpretation process. For instance, co-interpretation, which primarily relied on flexible human perceptions, was partial rather than exhaustive. This means that it only allowed the study to highlight the agenda, which came under the consciousness of the participants and the researcher, and, therefore, might have left other potentially crucial issues invisible and unrevealed. Also, the main focus of this study was children’s own agenda not the researcher’s. As a result, the study emphasized the micro system rather than the macro system (e.g., the political and historical aspects of sojourning) within the structure of human ecology (Bronfenbrenner, 1972, cited in Slavkin, 2001). This study also did not focus on the children’s cultural experiences because the idea of culture and biculturalism were not articulated by them as their salient self-relevant attributes. Though the analysis of their experiences of sojourning and learning contexts suggested the importance of their cultural competences in their school lives, the major focus of co-interpretation was still placed on the children’s own agenda.

In addition, the partialness of co-interpretation may have been increased by the chronological presentation of essential episodes in each case study. Mishler (2006) argued that a story of individual identities does not represent a causal chain of time leading towards the present but rather contains the plots selected at each point of time. In
in this sense, the chronological presentation may have been artificial and limited the scope of co-interpretation. Similarly, the categories in the cross-case analysis were also organized by the level of importance found in the children’s perspectives and, therefore, may have artificially separated the interconnectivities existing in co-interpretations. My argument is that partial focus and selective mind, after all, have only a shade of difference. The systematic presentations of the findings were the necessary analytical tactics to depart from individual child’s distinctive world and to achieve the more holistic understanding of their experiences which any sojourning children in similar situations might encounter.

Furthermore, the co-interpretation process demanded me to reflect upon my own compatibilities to understand and analyze children’s views. Knowing that my assumptions and preconceptions should not influence my interpretation without “earn[ing] its way into [my] analysis” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 68, italics in original), it was crucial to practice my patience when listening to children’s responses, explanations, and stories. Especially when speaking with Tsubasa who was most reluctant to speak out thoughts and feelings, I learned that Japanese sojourning children with similar backgrounds can have very different communication styles. While speculating possible reasons for his reluctance (e.g., gender, age, birth order in family, personality, etc.), I learned the importance of practicing my patience to listen and to regard his silence as invaluable inputs.

It was also important to reflect my own multiple identities unconsciously permeating my standpoint. Among the multiple layers of my identities, I also needed to
awaken “a child inside me” so that I could manage the occasional dissonance between unexpected perspectives share by children and my own intuition. An effective way to cope with uncertain feelings during co-interpretation was to place myself in the learning environments where the children actually negotiated their identities. Observing the learning environment benefited the co-interpretation since it allowed me to capture the realities not directly told by children but rather sensed with my intuitive analytical mind.

Conclusion

Ending this study suggests many beginnings of the subsequent studies on sojourning children’s identity negotiation. There are more children whose voices deserve to be heard and more educational contexts which need further investigations. What this study unveiled was indeed a partial picture, yet it should leave a vivid impression of Japanese elementary students who so bravely jump into new school lives in countries, involuntarily accept their given learning environments, and work hard to maintain and pursue their potential identities and school competences. It should also leave an impression that identity research on elementary sojourners and an attempt of theorizing their identity negotiation processes require a great amount of efforts to explore interdisciplinary perspectives and multiple methods, to explain the layers of human perceptions and experiences, and to find the significant representations of complex ideas to make practical suggestions.

This study confirmed my belief that separating identity issues from educational purposes is artificial and impossible. One reason is because sojourning students’ multiple representations of the self and their identity standard highly likely become the source of
their aspiration for acquiring the school competences fundamental to learning. Another reason is because student identities and learning contexts are so intricately interrelated, activating both internal and external human mechanisms. This was a complex idea to unveil and explain, but was also very significant idea to understand the phenomenon of identity negotiation more holistically.

What I described as “ecological processes” of identity negotiation in this study represents the circulation of interpretations, or the exchange of messages, among the sojourning students, their learning contexts across countries, and their audiences who were involved in their education: Education given to students during sojourning is unavoidably accompanied with varied environmental changes (e.g., changes of linguistic and cultural contexts) as well as the changes in their school competences and student identities. Therefore, what identity research can capture seems to be a glimpse of the messages which students receive from their educational contexts and which they interpret and voice in their own ways. While receiving various messages from the environments, students consistently give messages to audiences in the same contexts, including teachers, peers, and parents. Thus, the circulation of interpretations is evident in any identity discourse. This further implies that, in our increasingly globalizing societies, an inquiry into the sojourning students’ identities equals to the researcher’s ecological response to the societal and educational needs.

Overall, by realizing the connections between identity and education, I argue that schools across countries need to foster students’ actual practices of well-balanced school competences, on-going communication about the competences, and imagination of
potentialities. This research taught me that, in order for students to perceive themselves positively in school by their own definitions, they have to acquire so many different school competences. I also learned that identity discourse for sojourning children requires us to attend to the most fundamental purpose of education, which is to understand the self, language, learning, and joy for life.

Invaluable lessons were also learned by exploring methodology and research design. The interpretive approach inspired by constructivist grounded theory reflected my on-going efforts to make sense of children’s worlds and “tolerate the ambiguity” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 105). As a researcher in social science, I learned the values of children’s self-expressions in conversations and drawings, for the co-interpretation purposes. The research processes also consistently challenged my reflexivity and necessitated mutual respects with all participants. Overall, this study empirically showed that identity researchers should be open to interdisciplinary perspectives and creatively design multiple methods.

Although I am satisfied with the fact that this study provided one way to interpret elementary sojourning children’s identity negotiation by carefully listening to their voices seldom heard before in previous studies, I believe that full satisfaction will produce no progress. Greene (1988) stated:

To recognize the role of perspective and vantage point, to recognize at the same time that there are always multiple perspectives and multiple vantage points, is to recognize that no accounting, disciplinary or otherwise, can ever be finished or complete. There is always more. There is always possibility. (p. 128)

This study ends by emphasizing once again the temporal conclusion of one child identity research and the numerous possible onsets of future innovative studies.
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研究参加同意書

はじめに
この場をお借りして、私が現在取り組んでいる、海外子女の英語学習とアイデンティティー形成についての研究へのお子さんのご参加の許可のお願い、また、保護者の皆様のご参加のお誘いをさせて頂きたく思います。この研究は、博士号過程の卒業論文のためのもので、仮の題名は、「アメリカ公立小学校普通学級で学ぶ海外子女の英語学習と言語学習者としてのアイデンティティー交渉についての理解」です。皆様に研究参加をお願いする理由は、皆様のお子さんたちが、近々、アメリカの公立小学校において、海外子女として学習される予定だからです。この研究にご参加して頂ける場合、皆様の他に、計４人の日本人の保護者、皆さんのお子さんの他に、計４人の日本人のお子さん、それぞれのお子さんの担任教師、また、海外子女経験を小学校時代に持つ日本人高校生と大学生約１０人が研究に参加する予定です。

この研究を行うのは、私、古賀奈里のみです。私は、ボストンカレッジ教育学部の博士号候補生としてこの研究活動に取り組んでいます。同学部のマリア・ブリスク教授が論文議会の議長としてこの研究全般にガイダンスを与えるのと同時に、同学部のマリエラ・バエツ教授と社会学部のシャーリーン・ハッセバイトバー教授がともに論文の読者として参与します。なお、この研究の経費は、今後、財団や団体などが主催する卒業論文の研究のための助成金などに応募する可能性がありますが、助成金を受けることがあっても、大学側、教授、財団、または、そのほかの団体などが、この研究から利益を上げることはありません。

研究目的
この研究の目的は、小学生である海外子女が、アメリカの公立校普通学級において、どの様に自己を認識するかを理解することにあります。特に、彼らの英語
学習者としてのアイデンティティー交渉の過程と傾向を探求するとともに、彼らのアイデンティティー形成がどのように、学習、言語習得、クラスルーム活動への参加などに関連しているかの理解を深めることを目的としています。また、皆様のように、日本からアメリカへ移動されるという、海外生活初期を体験される方とともに、海外生活を終え、日本へと帰国されるという、海外生活終期の方々にも研究参加して頂くことにより、子供のアイデンティティー交渉の傾向と過程が、一時滞在の様々な段階によってどの様に相違、または、類似するのか調べる目的もあります。

研究形式と過程
もし、この研究にご参加頂ける場合は、保護者の皆様とお子さんそれぞれに次のような研究形式を取らせて頂きます。研究参加全体の期間は、2007年5月頃から2007年10月頃までの6ヶ月間です。

保護者の参加形式
第一過程
内容：お子さんのバックグラウンドについてのアンケート
時期：2007年5月頃
必要時間：個人のご都合やベースに合わせて、必要時間を定めて下さい。およそ1時間から1時間半の間で記入できるのはと思います。
形式：お子さんの教育、言語学習経験、またはご家族などについてのバックグラウンドをアンケート方式の質問にてお答え願います。例として、次のような質問が含まれます。

- お子さんの性格をどの様に描写しますか。
- 得意な教科は、何ですか。
- お子さんは、英語についてどのようなご考え、態度をお持ちですか。

第二過程
内容：お子さんのバックグラウンドについての質問
時期：2007年6月ごろ
必要時間：15分ほど（1回のみ）
形式：ご記入頂いたアンケートを基に、疑問に思ったこと、より説明を必要とする箇所などについて、お電話または直接お会いしてお聞きします。会話の全ては日本語で行われます。

第三過程
内容：お子さんのアメリカでの学校生活全般についてのインタビュー
場所：アメリカにてご都合に合う、静かでプライベートな場所
時期：2007年9月末から10月頃
必要時間：30分（1回のみ）
形式：私と保護者の二人でのインタビューとなります。お子さんが海外子供になられて以来、お子さんの学校生活全般でお気付きになられたことを、保護者の視
点から自由にお話しして下さい。私たちの質問は、下記のようなオープンエンドなもののみとなります。

○ アメリカの学校へ通い始めてから、お子さんについて何かお気付きのことはありますか。
また、会話の全ては、日本語で行われ、保護者の承諾を得て、デジタル録音させて頂きます。

第四過程
内容: 学校関連の資料、お子さんの作品などの採取
形式: 研究参加期間中に、大切だと思われる、お子さんの学校関係の資料や作品などを提示頂くかもしれません。ご承諾を得た上で、それらの資料のコピーを取らせて頂くこともあります。

お子さんの参加形式

第一過程
内容: インタビュー（会話とお絵描きを交えたセッション）
場所: 日本にてご都合に合う、静かでプライベートな場所
時期: 2007年5月
必要時間: 一時間ほど（1回）
形式: 私とお子さんの二人でのインタビューとなります。アメリカの学校を始める前に子供が考えることや自己認識などについてお話しして頂きます。私たちの質問は、下記のようなオープンエンドディッドなもののみとなります。
○ アメリカへ引っ越すことが分かった時の気持ちや考えを話して下さい。
○ アメリカの学校で英語を学び始めた時、あなたはどんな生徒になると思いますか。
会話の全ては、日本語で行われ、保護者とお子さんの承諾を得た後、デジタル録音させて頂きます。インタビューでは、会話の進み具合によって、お絵描きを交えて会話を進めていく場合もあります。

第二過程
内容: インタビュー（会話とお絵かきを交えたセッション）、教室での学習活動の観察、学校関連の資料、作品などの採取
場所: 学校
時期: 2007年6月
必要時間: インタビューは、約1時間。学習活動の観察は、1登校日。（それぞれ1回のみ）
形式: インタビューの形式は、第一回目のインタビュー形式と同じです。アメリカの学校で学び始めたばかりのお子さんが考えること、自己認識などを、下記のようなオープンエンドディッドな質問を通して、お話しして頂きます。
○ あなたは、アメリカの教室でどの様な生徒だと思いますか。日本にいた時も、同じように思っていましたか。
○ あなたにとって、英語を学ぶことは、どのような意味がありますか。
学習活動の観察は、お子さんが普段の学習活動に参加されている様子を、私が静かに教室の隅から観察し、ノートを取させて頂くことになります。授業や学習の
妨げになることはありません。ご家族、お子さん、先生の許可を得た後に、お子さんが参加した会話の内容をデジタル録音させて頂きます。インタビューの後、または、学習観察の後に、学校関連の資料、作品などを提示して頂くことがあるかもしれません。

第三過程
内容：インタビュー（会話とお絵描きを交えたセッション）、教室での学習活動の観察、学校関連の資料、作品などの採取
場所：学校 時期：2007年9月末ごろ
必要時間：インタビューは、約1時間。学習活動の観察は、1登校日。（それぞれ1回のみ）
形式：インタビュー、教室での学習活動の観察、学校関連の資料、作品などの採取の形式は、第二回過程と同様です。インタビューでは、アメリカの学校で学び始めた後である約6ヶ月経った後の、お子さんの考えや自己認識についてお聞きします。参加のクラスでの学習活動を観察するために、お子さんの公立小学校学区（ブルックライン市公立学校区）で求められる研究必要条件を満たし、研究資格を取得しています。尚、学校長ならびに担任の先生からの研究許可を取得する予定です。クラスでの学習活動の観察を基に、担任の先生をインタビューさせて頂く予定です。お子さんの研究参加が、学習の妨げになったり、成績に影響することはありません。

リスク
現在知られる限りでは、この研究への参加されることによって、日常生活で経験されるリスクよりも大きなリスクを保護者の皆様とお子様が経験されることはありません。

利益
この研究に参加することで、保護者の皆様とお子様に直接利益がもたらされることはありません。ただし、研究結果を基に、海外子女の英語学習に伴う自己形成についての理解が、保護者、お子様、先生などの、海外子女教育に携わる人々の間でより深まることを願っています。

経費
この研究に参加するために、お金を払って頂くことはありません。ただし、皆様が指定される待ち合わせ場所に来ていたら際の経費は、自己負担となります。

報酬
この研究参加に伴う報酬はありません。
研究参加の取り止め
あなたとお子さんは、いつでも研究参加から退出することができます。研究参加を取り止めることで、お子さんの成績や学習成果に影響が及ぶことはありません。

秘匿性
研究参加者の皆様には、匿名を付けさせて頂きます。集めさせて頂いたデータは、全て匿名のみで扱いますので、皆さんの個人情報が皆さんの実名と一致することはありません。実名でサインして頂くのはこの同意書のみです。なお、この同意書は、私の自宅の安全な場所で保管されます。私以外にこの同意書にアクセスのある者はいません。この同意書は、研究結果が最後に出版されてから三年後に、私が処分します。また、皆さんの教育、言語学習経験、ご家族についてのアンケート、インタビューの会話の録音データ、学習活動観察中の会話の録音データ、学校関連の資料や作品などのデータは、最後の出版より五年間自宅にて保存し、その後、私が処分します。それ以降に、皆様がご自分やご自分のお子さんに関するデータの処分を希望場合には、その希望通りにデータは処分されます。保存期間中、全てのデータにアクセスがあるのは、私のみです。皆様は、ご自分に関するデータのみにアクセスが可能です。

まれに、この同意書のような、皆様の実名に明かになる書類を他者に提示しなくてはならない場合があります。例えば、研究過程が正しく行われているかを確認するために、ボストンカレッジの機関内倫理審査委員会（IRB: Internal Review Board）の委員に提示することがあるかもしれません。また、研究助成金を受けることになった場合、皆様に関する研究記録を研究支援団体に提示することもあるかもしれません。

インタビューや学習活動観察で得られた会話の録音データは、コンピューターに保存され、分析されます。卒業論文の指導に当たる教授との集まりや学会などで、データの一部が発表されることがありますので、匿名が使われるので、皆様の個人的な情報が流出することはありません。

質問
今、何かご質問がありましたら、ご遠慮なく私にお尋ね下さい。研究参加中にご質問が発生した場合は、いつでもお問い合わせ下さい。私の Eメールアドレスは、koganb@bc.edu です。アメリカの自宅の電話番号は、617-xxx-xxxx です。また、研究参加に際しての人権や倫理問題についてご質問がある場合は、ボストンカレッジの研究参加者保護事務所までお問い合わせ下さい。電話番号は、617-552-4778 です。
証明と署名

私(保護者)は、この同意書を読み、内容を理解しました。この研究の目的を理解し、私と私の子供がこの研究参加中にすることを理解できたと信じます。ある質問を尋ねる機会を与えられ、質問した場合には、満足のいく答えを受け取ました。

いつでも、この研究参加を取り止めることができる権利があること、質問に答えることを拒否できる権利があることを理解しました。

また、インタビュー中の会話と学習活動の観察中にお子さんが参加する会話をデジタル録音することに同意します。__________________（イニシャルをお書き下さい。）

また、すべてのデータに匿名が使われ、この研究の最終リポートに個人の身元を明かす情報が記載されないことを理解しました。この同意書の本体を保管用として受け取りました。

その上で、この研究に参加することに同意します。

日付
研究参加者(保護者)の署名(サイン)

研究参加者(保護者)の氏名(プリント)

研究者の署名(サイン)

また、私の子供__________________をこの研究に参加させることに同意します。

日付
研究参加者(お子さん)の保護者の署名(サイン)

保護者の氏名とお子さんとの関係

お子さんの氏名

研究者の署名(サイン)

署名されたこのページのみは、私が保管し、後ほどコピーをお渡しします。同意書本体は、保管用としてお使い下さい。どうぞよろしくお願いいたします。

古 賀 奈 里
Introduction:

I would like to invite you to participate in the study regarding kaigaishijo’s identity negotiation associated with their English language learning and also ask you to grant permission for your child to participate in the study. This research study is for my dissertation to fulfill the requirement of my doctoral program. The tentative title of this study is “Understanding Kaigaishijos’ English Language Learning Experiences in the U.S. Public Elementary Mainstream Classrooms and their Negotiation of Language and Academic Identities”. The reason why you and your child have been asked to participate in this study is that your child will become an U.S. kaigaishijo starting from January, 2007, in the fourth through sixth grades for the period of one through three years. If you and your child decide to take part in this study, there will be three other Japanese parents besides you and three other Japanese children besides your child, and child’s mainstream classroom teachers as well as Japanese college students who share the similar kaigaishijo experiences as your child will participate in this study.

Your and your child’s participation is completely voluntary and never compulsory. Your decision whether or not to allow your child to participate will have no effect on his/her grades, academic standing, or any services he/she might receive at school. Please ask questions if there is anything you do not understand.

I, Nari Koga, will be the only person who will be doing this study. I conduct this study as a doctoral candidate in the Lynch School of Education at Boston College. This research is guided by my dissertation committee chair, Dr. María Brisk, from the education department and also by my dissertation readers, Dr. Mariela Páez from the same department and Dr. Sharlene Hesse-Biber from the sociology department. No funding has been received for this study. In the future, I may apply for funding offered by Boston college or other external foundations or organizations, which support dissertation research. Although I may receive dissertation grants in the future, the school, professors, foundations, or organizations will not make any profits or receive any money because of the results of this study. I have enclosed two copies of this informed consent document. One is for you to sign and return to my address and the other is for your personal record.

Purposes:

By doing this study, I aim to understand how kaigaishijos in fourth through sixth grade perceive themselves while learning in U.S. public elementary mainstream classrooms. Specifically, I intend to explore the patterns and processes in which they negotiate their identities and to understand how their identity development is connected to their learning, language acquisition, and classroom participation. Moreover, I hope to
learn how such patterns and processes of identity negotiation among children differ across different stages of sojourning by focusing on a group of kaigaishijos who are in the initial stage of sojourning, like your child, and a group of kaigaishijos who are in the ending stage of sojourning.

**Procedures:**

If you and your child will take part in this study, the followings are the research procedures. The total duration of your research involvement is from October, 2006, through April, 2007. Upon receiving your signed informed consent document, I will phone you so that we can decide our first meeting date, time, and place.

**Research Procedures for Parents**

**Phase One**

**Content:** Questionnaire regarding your child background (in Japanese)

**Place:** In Japan  

**Timeframe:** October, 2006

**Duration:** You will need to fill in the questionnaire at your own pace in your convenient time and place. I estimate that it will take a total of one through one and a half hour to complete the entire questionnaire.

**Procedures:** You will be filling in the questionnaire regarding your child’s educational, language learning, and family background. Examples of questions include:

- How do you describe the child’s personality or dispositions?
- What is the strongest subject for the child?
- What thoughts and attitudes does the child hold towards English?

The questionnaire will be mailed or emailed to you. You will need to return the complete questionnaire through mail or email. When mailing, please use the enclosed envelope labeled with return address and international postal order for the postage. You will need to indicate the pseudonyms of your choice for you and your child if any.

**Phase Two**

**Content:** Interview regarding child’s background

**Place:** In Japan, at a private and quiet place of parent’s choice

**Timeframe:** November, 2006, through December, 2006

**Duration:** 15 through 30 minutes (one time only)

**Procedures:** This will be a one-on-one interview. I will ask you some questions based on the questionnaire that you complete. I may also ask you to explain some contents of the questionnaire. The interview will be in Japanese. With your permission, I will digitally record the conversation.

**Phase Three**

**Content:** Interview regarding your child’s school experiences in the United States

**Place:** In the United States in a private and quiet place of your choice

**Timeframe:** Three months after moving to the United States, in March through April, 2007

**Duration:** 30 minutes (one time only)

**Procedures:** This will be one-on-one interview. I will ask you to talk about what you have noticed since your child became an U.S. kaigaishijo. My questions will be open-ended and some examples include:
Tell me what you have noticed about your child at home since he/she started U.S. schooling?"

The interview will be in Japanese and I will digitally record all conversations with your permission.

Phase Four

Content: Collecting school documents and child school artifacts
Place: In the United States, at a place of your convenience
Timeframe: 3 months after moving to the United States, in March through April, 2007
Duration: Ten minutes (one or two times)

Procedures: I will ask you to present any school documents and artifacts that you would think are important. With your permission, I may make copies of these documents.

Research Procedures for Children

Phase One

Contents: Interview enhanced with drawings
Place: In Japan, in a private and quiet place of parents’ and children’s choice
Timeframe: November through December, 2006  Duration: 1 hour (one time only)

Procedures: This will be a one-on-one interview. I will ask your child to talk about his/her thoughts and perceptions of identity. Some of the questions that I will ask will be open-ended and will include:

- Tell me about your thoughts and feelings when you learned about moving to the United States.
- What kind of person or student do you think you will become when you start learning English in your U.S. school?

This interview will be done in Japanese. With permissions, I will digitally record all conversations. I will incorporate drawings as your child becomes engaged in conversation.

Phase Two

Contents: Interview enhanced with drawings, Classroom observation, Collecting school documents and artifacts
Place: School  Timeframe: One month after moving to the United States, January through February, 2007  Duration: Interview will last about one hour. Classroom observation will be conducted for one school day. (one time only for each)

Procedures: The interview procedure is same as the first interview. I will ask your child’s thoughts and perceptions of identity as he/she started to learn in an U.S. public elementary school. I will ask open-ended questions like below:

- How do you describe yourself as a student in the U.S. classroom? Did you describe in the same way when you were in Japan?
- What does learning English mean to you?

During the classroom observation, your child will engage in his/her regular routine classroom activities and I will be silently observing and taking notes. The observations will not disturb your child’s learning or classroom lessons. With permissions from you, your child, and teacher, I will digitally record the conversations in which your child participated during the observation. After the interview and the observation, I may ask your child to share some school artifacts.
Phase Three

Contents: Interview enhanced with drawings, Classroom observation, Collecting school documents and artifacts

Place: School  Timeframe: 3 months after moving to the United States, in April 2007

Duration: Interview will last about one hour. Classroom observation will be conducted for one school day. (one time only for each)

Procedures: The procedures for interview, classroom observation, collecting school documents and artifacts are the same as the phase two. In the interview, I will ask your child their thoughts and perceptions of identities after learning in an U.S. public elementary school for three months.

Moreover, I plan to obtain the permission for my research from the Brookline public school system before beginning to collect data at your child’s school site. I will also obtain permissions from your child’s mainstream classroom teacher and school principal. I also plan to interview your child’s mainstream teacher based on my classroom observation. Your child participation in this study will have no effect on his/her grades and will not disturb his/her learning.

Risks: To the best of my knowledge, the things you and your child will be doing in this study have no more risk of harm to you than what you would experience in everyday life.

Benefits: You will not receive any direct benefit from being in this research study, but I hope that people involved in kaigaishijo education, such as teachers, parents, and children, will deepen their understanding of kaigaishijos’ identity development associated with their English language learning.

Costs: You do not have to pay to participate in this research study. However you may have to pay for the cost of getting to the place where you choose to meet with me.

Compensation: You will not be compensated for participating in this study.

Withdrawal from the study: You and your children can choose stop your participation in this study at any time. Your decision to stop your participation will have no effect on your child’s grades or academic standing.

Confidentiality: I will assign you and your child pseudonyms. I will label all data with the pseudonyms so that the personal information of you and your child will not be stored with real names. An only form that you need to show your real name is this consent form. I will store this consent form in a secure place at my home. I will be the only person who has access to the form. The informed consent documents will be destroyed by me three years after my last publication regarding the results of the study. Other data, such as child’s background information questionnaires, recorded conversations from interviews, recorded conversations during classroom observations, and school documents and artifacts, will be stored at my home and be destroyed by me five years after my last publication. If you request to destroy the data related to you or your child before that, I will destroy the data according to your request. While the data are stored, I will be the only person who has access to all data. However, you are able to access only the data that were derived from yourself.

Although it happens very rarely, I may be required to show information that identifies you. For instance, I may have to show this informed consent document to people from the Boston College Institutional Review Board in order to ensure my correct
research conduct. Since I plan to apply for research funding, your records may also be
looked at by my study sponsor if applicable.

The recorded conversations during interviews or classroom observations will
stored in my computer and analyzed. Although I will have to share some of the data in
meetings with my teachers, who support my dissertation process, or conferences, your
identities will not be revealed since a pseudonym will be used.

**Questions:** You are encouraged to ask questions now, and at anytime during the study.
You can reach me, Nari Koga, at 617-xxx-xxxx (home), or koganb@bc.edu (email). If
you have any questions about your and your child’s rights as a participant in a research
study, please contact the Boston College Office for Human Research Participant
Protection, at 617-552-4778.

**Certification and Signatures:**

I have read this informed consent document and understand the contents. I believe
that I understand the purpose of the research project and what I and my child will be
asked to do. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and they have been
answered satisfactorily.

I understand that I and my child may stop participating in this research study at
anytime and that we can refuse to answer any question(s). I agree to digitally record the
conversations during all interviews and the conversations that your child engages in
during classroom observations. _________ (initials) I also understand that all data will be
labeled with a pseudonym and I will not be identified in reports on this research. I have
received a signed copy of this informed consent document for my personal reference.

I hereby give my informed and free consent to be a participant in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Consent Signature of Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Print Name of Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person providing information and witness to consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, I hereby give my informed and free consent for my child _________
to be a participant in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Consent Signature of Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Print Name of Parent and Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printed Name of Child Participant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Person providing information and witness to consent

Please mail and return this signed permission to my home address below. Please
use an enclosed labeled return envelope and international postal order for the postage.

Nari Koga
Address
はじめに
この場をお借りして、私が現在取り組もうとしている、海外子女の言語学習とアイデンティティー形成についての研究へのお子さんのご参加の許可のお願い、また、保護者の皆様自身のご参加のお誘いをさせて頂きたいと思います。この研究は、博士号過程の卒業論文のためのもので、仮の題名は、「アメリカ公立小学校普通学級で学ぶ海外子女の英語学習と言語学習者としてのアイデンティティー交渉についての理解」です。お子さんと皆様に研究参加をお願いする理由は、皆様のお子さんが、アメリカの公立小学校4年生から6年生のいずれかの学年で、海外子女として1から3年間学習された経験があり、2007年に日本へ帰国する予定だからです。この研究にご参加して頂ける場合、皆様の他に、計3人の日本人の保護者、皆さんのお子さんの他に、計3人の日本人のお子さん、お子さんの担任教師たち、また、海外子女経験を小学校時代に持つ日本人大学生約6人が研究に参加する予定です。
この研究参加は、ボランティアであり、決して強制ではありません。研究参加の同意、不同意によって、お子さんの学校活動や成績に影響が及ぶことはありません。何かご質問があったり、理解しにくい点などがありましたら、いつでもお聞き下さい。
この研究を行うのは、私の古賀奈里のみです。私は、ボストンカレッジ教育学部の博士号候補生としてこの研究活動に取り組んでいます。同学部のマリア・ブリスク教授が論文委員会の議長としてこの研究全般にガイダンスを与えるのと同時に、同学部のマリエラ・パエツ教授と社会学部のシャーリーン・ハッセバイヤー教授が供に論文の読者として参与します。なお、この研究の経費は、今のところ、自己サポートとなります。今後、ボストンカレッジやほかの財団や団体などが主催する卒業論文の研究のための助成金などに応募する可能性もあります。しかし、助成金を受けることがあっても、大学側、教授、財団、または、そのほかの団体などが、この研究への参与のために利益を上げることはありません。

研究目的
この研究を行うことによって、小学校4年生から6年生までの海外子女が、アメリカの公立小学校普通学級において、どの様に自己を認識するかを理解することにあります。特に、彼らの英語学習者としてのアイデンティティーの交渉の過
程と傾向を探求するとともに、彼らのアイデンティティー形成がどのように、学習、言語習得、クラスルーム活動への参加などに結びついているかの理解を深めることを目的としています。また、皆様のお子さんのように、海外生活を経て、日本へご帰国されるという、海外生活終期のお子さん方とともに、日本からアメリカへ移動されるという、海外生活初期を体験されるお子さん方にも研究参加して頂くことにより、子供のアイデンティティー交渉の傾向と過程が一時滞在の様々な段階によってどの様に相違、または、類似するのか調べる目的もあります。

研究形式と過程
もし、この研究にご参加頂ける場合は、保護者の皆様とお子さんそれぞれに次のような研究形式を取らせて頂きます。研究参加全体の期間は、2007年1月頃から2007年7月頃までの7ヶ月間です。署名された同意書を受け取り次第、こちらからお電話をさせて頂き、第一回目のインタビューの日時を中心に決めさせて頂きたいと思います。

保護者の参加形式
第一過程
内容：お子さんのバックグラウンドについてのアンケート（日本語）
場所：アメリカにて　　　時期：2007年1月
必要時間：個人のご都合やベースに合わせて、必要時間を定めて下さい。およそ1時間から1時間半の間で記入できるのではと思います。
形式：お子さんの教育、言語学習経験、またはご家族などについてのバックグラウンドをアンケート方式の質問にてお答え願います。例として、次のような質問が含まれます。
○ お子さんの性格、もしくは性質をどの様に描写しますか。
○ 得意な教科は、何ですか。
○ お子さんは、英語についてどのようなご考え、態度をお持ちですか。
書き終わったアンケートは、私のアメリカの住所まで、返信用封筒を使って返送してください。なお、希望の匿名がある場合は、アンケートに記入して下さい。

第二過程
内容：お子さんのバックグラウンドについてのインタビュー
場所：アメリカにてご都合に合う、静かでプライベートな場所
時期：2007年1月ごろ　　　必要時間：15分から30分（1回のみ）
形式：私と保護者の二人でのインタビューとなります。ご記入頂いたアンケートを基に、疑問に思ったこと、より説明を必要とする箇所などについて、私が質問させて頂きます。会話の全ては、日本語で行われます。

第三過程
内容：お子さんのアメリカでの学校生活全般についてのインタビュー
場所：アメリカにてご都合に合う、静かでプライベートな場所
時期：帰国前1ヶ月頃　　　必要時間：30分（1回のみ）
形式：私と保護者の二人でのインタビューとなります。お子さんが海外子女になられて以来、お子さんの学校生活全般でお気付きになられることを、保護者の視点から自由にお話しして頂きます。私からの質問は、下記のようなオープンエンディッドなもののみとなります。

○ アメリカの学校へ通い始めてから、お子さんについて何かお気づきのことはありますか。

また、会話の全ては、日本語で行われ、保護者の承諾を得て、デジタル録音させて頂きます。

第四過程
内容：学校関連の資料、お子さんの作品などの採取
場所：アメリカにてご都合に合う場所
時期：帰国前前1ヶ月頃 完要時間：10分ほど（1から2回）
形式：アメリカでのインタビューの際、もしくは、インタビュー後に、大切だと思われる、お子さんの学校関係の資料や作品などを、もしあれば、提示してくださ。ご承諾を得た上で、それらの資料のコピーを取らせていただくこともあります。

お子さんの参加形式
第一過程
内容：インタビュー（会話とお絵描きを交えたセッション）、教室での学習活動の観察、学校関連の資料、作品などの採取
場所：学校 時期：帰国前約3ヶ月ごろ
必要時間：インタビューは、約1時間。学習活動の観察は、一登校日。（それぞれ1回のみ）
形式：私とお子さんの二人でのインタビューとなります。海外子女としてお子さんが考えること、自己認識などをお話しして頂きます。私からの質問は、下記のようなオープンエンディッドなもののみとなります。

○ あなたは、アメリカの教室でどの様な生徒だと思いますか。日本にいた時と同じように思っていましたか。

○ あなたにとって英語を学ぶことには、どのような意味がありますか。

インタビュー中、お子さんには、英語か日本語の内、どちらか好きな言語でお話しして頂きます。保護者とお子さんの承諾を得た後、デジタル録音させて頂きます。インタビューでは、会話の進み具合によって、お絵かきを交えて会話を進めていく場合もあります。

学習活動の観察は、お子さんが普段の学習活動に参加されている様子を、私が静かに教室の隅から観察し、ノートを取させて頂くことになります。授業や学習の妨げになることはありません。ご家族、お子さん、先生の許可を得た後に、お子さんが参加した会話の内容をデジタル録音させて頂きます。インタビューの後、または、学習観察の後に、学校関連の資料、作品などを提示していただくことがあるかもしれません。
第二過程
内容：インタビュー（会話と絵を交えたセッション）、教室での学習活動の観察、学校関連の資料、作品などの採取
場所：学校 時期：帰国前約1ヶ月ごろ
必要時間：インタビューは、約1時間。学習活動の観察は、一日に1回。（それぞれ1回のみ）
形式：インタビュー、教室での学習活動の観察、学校関連の資料、作品などの採取の形式は、第一回過程と同様です。インタビューでは、日本帰国を1ヶ月あまりに控えた、お子さんの考えや自己認識についてお聞きします。

第三過程
内容：インタビュー（会話と絵を交えたセッション）
場所：日本にてご都合に合う、静かでプライベートな場所
時期：日本帰国後約3ヶ月以内
必要時間：約1時間（1回のみ）
形式：インタビューの形式は、第一回、第二回過程と同様です。インタビューでは、日本帰国後の、お子さんの考えや自己認識についてお聞きします。下記のようなオープンエンドの質問が聞かれます。
- あなたは、今、自分をどんな生徒だと思いますか。アメリカにいた時も同じように感じていますか。アメリカにいた時も同じように感じていましたか。
- アメリカでの経験を振り返って何か心に残る出来事がありましたか。
また、私は、お子さんのクラスでの学習活動を観察するために、お子さんの公立小学校学区（ブルックライン市公立学校区）で求められる、研究必要条件を満たし、研究資格を取得しました。なお、学校の校長ならびに担任の先生からの研究許可も取得します。尚、お子さんの研究参加が、学習の妨げになったり、成績に影響することはありません。

リスク
現在知られる限りでは、この研究への参加されることで日常経験されるリスクよりも大きなリスクを保護者の皆様とお子様が経験されることはありません。

利益
この研究に参加することで、保護者の皆様とお子様に直接利益がもたらされることはありません。ただし、研究結果をもとに、海外子女の英語学習に伴う自己形成についての理解が、保護者、お子様、先生、などの海外子女教育に携わる人々の間でより深まることを願っております。

経費
この研究に参加するために、お金を払っていただくことはありません。ただし、
皆様に指定していただく待ち合わせ場所に来ていただく際の経費は、自己負担となります。

報酬
この研究参加に伴う報酬はありません。

研究参加の取り止め
あなたとあなたのお子さんは、いつでも研究参加から退出することができます。研究参加を取り止めることで、お子さんの成績や学習成果に影響が及ぶことはありません。

秘匿性
研究参加者の皆様には、匿名を付けさせて頂きます。集めさせて頂いたデータは、全て匿名のみで扱うので、皆さんの個人情報が皆さんの実名と一致することはありません。実名でサインして頂くのはこの同意書のみです。なお、この同意書は、私の自宅の安全な場所で保管されます。私以外にこの同意書にアクセスのある者はいません。この同意書は、研究結果が最後に出版されてから三年後、私が処分します。また、お子さんの教育、言語学習経験、ご家族についてのアンケート、インタビューの会話の録音データ、学習活動観察中の会話の録音データ、学校関連の資料や作品などの他のデータは、最後の出版より五年間自宅にて保存し、その後、私が処分します。それ以前に、皆様がご自分やご自身のお子さんに関するデータの処分を希望場合には、その希望通りにデータは処分されます。保存期間中、全てのデータにアクセスがあるのは、私のみです。皆様は、ご自分に関するデータのみにアクセスが可能です。

まれに、この同意書のような皆様の実名が明らかになる書類を他者に提示しなくてはならない時があります。例えば、研究過程が正しく行われているかを確認するために、ボストンカレッジの期間内倫理審査委員会（IRB: Internal Review Board）の委員に提示することがあるかもしれません。また、研究助成金を受けることになった場合、皆様に関する研究記録を研究支援団体に提示することもあるかもしれません。

インタビューや学習活動観察で得られた会話の録音データは、コンピューターに保存され、分析されます。卒業論文の指導に当たる教授との集まりや学会などで、データの一部が見せられることがありますが、匿名が使われるので、皆様の個人的な情報が流出することはありません。

質問
今、何かご質問がありましたら、ご遠慮なく私にお尋ね下さい。研究参加中にご質問が発生した場合は、いつでもお問い合わせ下さい。私の電話番号は、617-xxxx-xxxx で、E メールアドレスは、koganb@bc.edu です。また、研究参加に際しての人権や倫理問題についてご質問がある場合は、ボストンカレッジの研究参加者保護事務所までお問い合わせ下さい。電話番号は、617-552-4778 です。
証明と署名

私は、この同意書を読み、内容を理解しました。この研究の目的を理解し、私と私の子供がこの研究参加中にすることを理解できたと信じます。今ある質問を
尋ねる機会を与えられ、質問した場合には、満足のいく答えを受け取りました。
いつでも、この研究参加を取り止めることができる権利があること、質問に答
えることを拒否できる権利があることを理解しました。
また、インタビュー中の会話と学習活動の観察中にお子さんが参加する会話を
デジタル録音することに同意します。__________________（保護者のイニシャ
ルをお書き下さい。）
また、すべてのデータに匿名が使われ、この研究の最終リポートに個人の身元
を明かす情報が記載されないことを理解しました。この同意書のコピーを保管用
として受け取りました。
その上で、この研究に参加することに同意します。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>日付</th>
<th>研究参加者（保護者）の署名（サイン）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>研究参加者（保護者）の氏名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>研究者の署名</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| また、私の子供_______________________をこの研究に参加させること
とに同意します。 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>日付</th>
<th>研究参加者（お子さん）の保護者の署名（サイン）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>保護者の氏名とお子さんとの関係</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>お子さんの氏名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>研究者の署名</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

署名をされた同意書の証明と署名のページのみを、下記にある私の自宅まで郵
送下さい。同意書本体は、保管用としてお使い下さい。送って下さる証明と署名
のページは、後ほどコピーをお渡しします。郵送の際には、同封しました宛名
付きの封筒をお使い下さい。
BOSTON COLLEGE
THE CAROLYN A. AND PETER LYNCH SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Introduction:
I would like to invite you to participate in the study regarding kaigaishijos’ identity negotiation associated with their English language learning and also ask you to grant permission for your child to participate in the study. This research study is for my dissertation to fulfill the requirement of my doctoral program. The tentative title of this study is “Understanding Kaigaishijos’ English Language Learning Experiences in the U.S. Public Elementary Mainstream Classrooms and their Negotiation of Language and Academic Identities”. The reason why you and your child have been asked to participate in this study is that your child will return to Japan in March 2007 after one through three years of kaigaishijo experiences in the fourth through six grades in an U.S. public elementary school. If you and your child decide to take part in this study, there will be three other Japanese parents besides you and three other Japanese children besides your child, and child’s mainstream classroom teachers as well as Japanese college students who share the similar kaigaishijo experiences as your child will participate in this study.

Your and your child’s participation is completely voluntary and never compulsory. Your decision whether or not to allow your child to participate will have no effect on his/her grades, academic standing, or any services he/she might receive at school. Please ask questions if there is anything you do not understand.

I, Nari Koga, will be the only person who will be doing this study. I conduct this study as a doctoral candidate in the Lynch School of Education at Boston College. This research is guided by my dissertation committee chair, Dr. María Brisk, from the education department and also by my dissertation readers, Dr. Mariela Páez from the same department and Dr. Sharlene Hesse-Biber from the sociology department. No funding has been received for this study. In the future, I may apply for funding offered by Boston college or other external foundations or organizations, which support dissertation research. Although I may receive dissertation grants in the future, the school, professors, foundations, or organizations will not make any profits or receive any money because of the results of this study. I have enclosed two copies of this informed consent document. One is for you to sign and return to my address and the other is for your personal record.

purposes:
By doing this study, I aim to understand how kaigaishijos in fourth through six grade perceive themselves while learning in U.S. public elementary mainstream classrooms. Specifically, I intend to explore the patterns and processes in which they negotiate their identities and to understand how their identity development is connected to their learning, language acquisition, and classroom participation. Moreover, I hope to
learn how such patterns and processes of identity negotiation among children differ across different stages of sojourning by focusing on a group of kaigaishijos, who are in the ending stage of sojourning, like your child, and a group of kaigaishijos who are in the initial stage of sojourning.

Procedures:
If you and your child will take part in this study, the followings are the research procedures. The total duration of your research involvement is from November, 2006, through May, 2007. Upon receiving your signed informed consent document, I will phone you so that we can decide our first meeting date, time, and place.

Research Procedures for Parents

Phase One
Content: Questionnaire regarding your child background (in Japanese)
Place: In the United States  Timeframe: November, 2006
Duration: You will need to fill in the questionnaire at your own pace according in your convenience time and place. I estimate that it will take a total of one through one and a half hour to complete the entire questionnaire.
Procedures: You will be filling in the questionnaire regarding your child’s educational, language learning, and family background. Examples of questions include:
- How do you describe the child’s personality or dispositions?
- What is the strongest subject for the child?
- What thoughts and attitudes does the child hold towards English?
The questionnaire will be mailed or emailed to you. You will need to return the complete questionnaire through mail or email. When mailing, I will provide an envelope labeled with return address and postages. You will need to indicate the pseudonyms of your choice for you and your child if any.

Phase Two
Content: Interview regarding child’s background
Place: In the United States, at a private and quiet place of parent’s choice
Timeframe: January, 2007  Duration: 15 through 30 minutes (one time only)
Procedures: This will be a one-on-one interview. I will ask you some questions based on the questionnaire that you complete. The interview will be in Japanese. With your permission, I will digitally record the conversation.

Phase Three
Content: Interview regarding your child’s school experiences in the United States
Place: In the United States in a private and quiet place of your choice
Timeframe: one month before returning to Japan, in March 2007
Duration: 30 minutes (one time only)
Procedures: This will be one-on-one interview. I will ask you to talk about what you have noticed since your child became an U.S. kaigaishijo. My questions will be open-ended and some examples include:
- Tell me what you have noticed about your child at home since he/she started U.S. schooling?
The interview will be in Japanese and I will digitally record all conversations with your permission.
Phase Four
Content: Collecting school documents and child school artifacts
Place: In the United States, at a place of your convenience
Timeframe: One month before returning to Japan, in March, 2007
Duration: Ten minutes (one or two times)
Procedures: I will ask you to present any school documents and artifacts that you would
think is important. With your permission, I may make copies of these documents.

Research Procedures for Children

Phase One
Contents: Interview enhanced with drawings, Classroom observation, Collecting school
documents and artifacts
Place: School  Timeframe: Three months before returning to Japan, January, 2007
Duration: Interview will last about one hour. Classroom observation will be conducted
for one school day. (one time only for each)
Procedures: This will be a one-on-one interview. I will ask your child to talk about
his/her thoughts and perceptions of identity as a kaigaishijo. Some of the questions that I
will ask will be open-ended and will include:
  o  How do you describe yourself as a student in the U.S. classroom? Did you
describe in the same way when you were in Japan?
  o  What does learning English mean to you?
Your child can speak either in Japanese or in English during the interview. Upon
receiving your and your child’s permission, I will digitally record all conversations. I will
incorporate drawings as your child engages in conversation.
  During the classroom observation, your child will engage in his/her regular
routine classroom activities and I will be silently observing and taking notes. The
observations will not disturb your child’s learning or classroom lessons. With
permissions from you, your child, and teacher, I will digitally record the conversations in
which your child participated during the observation. After the interview and the
observation, I may ask your child to share some school artifacts.

Phase Two
Contents: Interview enhanced with drawings, Classroom observation, Collecting school
documents and artifacts
Place: School  Timeframe: Three months before returning to Japan, March, 2007
Duration: Interview will last about one hour. Classroom observation will be conducted
for one school day. (one time only for each)
Procedures: The procedures for interview, classroom observation, collecting school
documents and artifacts are the same as the phase two. In the interview, I will ask your
child their thoughts and perceptions of identities when his/her return to Japan is
approaching in a month.

Phase Three
Contents: Interview enhanced with drawings
Place: In Japan, at a private and quiet place of parent’s and child’s choice
Timing: Within three months after returning to Japan, in May 2007
Duration: One hour (one time only)
Procedures: The procedures for interview are the same as the phase two. In the interview, I will ask your child their thoughts and perceptions of identities after returning to Japan.

- How do you describe yourself as a student now? Did you describe in the same way when you were in the United States?
- As you look back on your experiences in the United States, are there any other events that stand out in your mind?

Moreover, I plan to obtain the permission for my research from the Brookline public school system before beginning to collect data at your child’s school site. I will also obtain permissions from your child’s mainstream classroom teacher and school principal. I also plan to interview your child’s mainstream teacher based on my classroom observation. Your child participation in this study will have no effect on his/her grades and will not disturb his/her learning.

Risks: To the best of my knowledge, the things you and your child will be doing in this study have no more risk of harm to you than what you would experience in everyday life.

Benefits: You will not receive any direct benefit from being in this research study, but I hope that people involved in kaigaishijo education, such as teachers, parents, and children, will deepen their understanding of kaigaishijos’ identity development associated with their English language learning.

Costs: You do not have to pay to participate in this research study. However you may have to pay for the cost of getting to the place where you choose to meet with me.

Compensation: You will not be compensated for participating in this study.

Withdrawal from the study: You and your children can choose to stop your participation in this study at any time. Your decision to stop your participation will have no effect on your child’s grades or academic standing.

Confidentiality: I will assign you and your child pseudonyms. I will label all data with the pseudonyms so that the personal information of you and your child will not be stored with real names. An only form that you need to show your real name is this consent form. I will store this consent form in a secure place at my home. I will be the only person who has access to the form. The informed consent documents will be destroyed by me three years after my last publication regarding the results of the study. Other data, such as child’s background information questionnaires, recorded conversations from interviews, recorded conversations during classroom observations, and school documents and artifacts, will be stored at my home and be destroyed by me five years after my last publication. If you request to destroy the data related to you or your child before that, I will destroy the data according to your request. While the data are stored, I will be the only person who has access to all data. However, you are able to access only the data that were derived from yourself.

Although it happens very rarely, I may be required to show information that identifies you. For instance, I may have to show this informed consent document to people from the Boston College Institutional Review Board in order to ensure my correct research conduct. Since I plan to apply for research funding, your records may also be looked at by my study sponsor if applicable.
The recorded conversations during interviews or classroom observations will be stored in my computer and analyzed. Although I will have to share some of the data in meetings with my teachers, who support my dissertation process, or conferences, your identities will not be revealed since a pseudonym will be used.

**Questions:** You are encouraged to ask questions now, and at anytime during the study. You can reach me, Nari Koga, at 617-xxx-xxxx (home), or koganb@bc.edu (email). If you have any questions about your and your child’s rights as a participant in a research study, please contact the Boston College Office for Human Research Participant Protection, at 617-552-4778.

**Certification and Signatures:**

I have read this informed consent document and understand the contents. I believe that I understand the purpose of the research project and what I and my child will be asked to do. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and they have been answered satisfactorily. I understand that I and my child may stop participating in this research study at anytime and that we can refuse to answer any question(s). I agree to digitally record the conversations during all interviews and the conversations that your child engages in during classroom observations. (initials) I also understand that all data will be labeled with a pseudonym and I will not be identified in reports on this research. I have received a signed copy of this informed consent document for my personal reference.

I hereby give my informed and free consent to be a participant in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Consent Signature of Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Print Name of Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person providing information and witness to consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, I hereby give my informed and free consent for my child _________ to be a participant in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Consent Signature of Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Print Name of Parent and Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printed Name of Child Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person providing information and witness to consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please mail and return this signed permission to my home address below. Please use an enclosed labeled return envelope and international postal order for the postage.

Nari Koga
Address
研究に さんかすることについてのお手紙

このお手紙は、あなたがある研究にさんかしてみたいかを知るためのお手紙です。その研究は、アメリカの学校で英語をお勉強している、日本人の小学生がどんなふうに自分の事を見ているかを調べる研究です。あなたがこの研究にさんかしてもいいかどうか、あなたのお父さんお母さんにもおねがいしているところです。もし、この研究に参加してもいいなと思ったら、あなたの他に 4 人の日本人小学生が学校生活についてお話してくれることになっています。

わたしの名前は、こがなり（古賀奈里）です。わたしは、ボストンカレッジという大学で教育を勉強しています。この研究をするのは、わたしひとりです。

もし、この研究にさんかしたくない時は、しなくてもだいじょうぶです。したくありません、と答えて何も悪いことがおこったりはしません。もし分からないことがあったら、すぐにわたしに聞いてください。
もし、この研究に参加してくれることになったら、しずかなお部屋で、わたしといっしょに1時間くらいお話をしてもらいます。全部で3回お話をすることになります。学校生活について何でもお話して下さい。お話してくれている間に、お絵かきをしてお話をつけけてもらうかもしれません。学校の作品の中で、見せたいものを見せてもらうかもしれません。お話をやめたい時は、いつでもやめられます。それから、アメリカの教室にわたしが2回くらい来ます。教室では、あなたがどのように学校生活を送っているのかを見させて下さい。クラスの中で見たことや聞いたことを、わたしがノートに書きますが、もし書いてほしくなければ、書くのをやめます。もしよかったら、いっしょにお話したことや教室で聞いたお話ををろく音します。

あなたがお話してくれたことは、お父さんお母さん、先生たちには言いません。ただ、研究が正しくやれているかをたしかめるために、わたしの大学の事務所の人に調べたことを見せなくてはならない時があるかもしれません。それから、この研究のためにお金を出してくれる人たちに、あなたについての記録を見せなくてはならないこともあるかもしれません。この研究で分かったことを書く時に、あなたの本当のお名前は使いません。そのかわりに、ちがう名前をつけます。もしも、使ってほしい名前があったらお父さんかお母さんに伝えてください。
私とお話しをしている時に、このしつ問には答えたくありませんと言ってもだいじょうぶです。それから、もうやめたいといってもだいじょうぶです。

もしも、日本人小学生が英語をお勉強する時にどんなふうに自分の事を見ているのかを調べる、この研究にあなたがさんかしてくれならば、次のページにお名前を書いて下さい。よろしくお願いします。

じょ名

日づけ

研究にさんかする子どものじょ名(サイン)

研究にさんかする子どもの名前(プリント)

研究をする人のじょ名(サイン)
研究に 参加することについてのお手紙

このお手紙は、あなたがある研究に参加してみたいかを知るためのお手紙です。その研究は、アメリカの学校で英語をお勉強している、日本人の小学生がどんなふうに自分の事を見ているかを調べる研究です。あなたがこの研究に参加してもいいかどうか、あなたのお父さんお母さんや学校にも聞いていますところです。もし、この研究に参加してもいいなと思ったら、あなたの他にも日本人の小学生が3人くらい学校生活についてお話してくれることになっています。

わたしの名前は、こがなり（古賀奈里）です。わたしがこの研究をします。わたしは、ボストンカレッジという大学で教育を勉強しています。

もし、この研究に参加したくない時は、しなくても大丈夫です。したくありません、と答えても何も悪いことがおこったりしません。もし分からないことがあったら、すぐにわたしに聞いてください。

もし、この研究に参加してくれることになったら、しずかなお部屋で、わたしといっしょに1時間くらいお話をしてもらいます。全部で3回お話することになります。学校生活について何でもお話して下さい。お話してくれている間に、お絵かきをしてお話をつづけてもらうかもしれません。学校の作品の中で、見てみたいものを見せてもらうかもしれません。お話をやめたときは、いつでもやめられます。それから、アメリカの教室にわたしが2回くらい来ます。教室では、あなたがどのように学校生活を送っているのかを見させてください。クラスの中で見たことや聞いたことを、わたしがノートに書きますが、もし書いてほしくな
すれば、書くのをやめます。もしよかったら、一緒にお話したことや教室で聞いたお話などをろく音します。

あなたがお話をしてくれたことは、お父さんお母さん、先生たちには言いません。ただ、研究を正しくやれているかをたしかめるために、わたしの大学の事務所の人に調べたことを見せなくてはならない時があるかもしれません。それから、この研究のためにお金を出してくれる人たちに、あなたについての記録を見せなくてはならないこともあるかもしれません。この研究で分かったことを書く時に、あなたの本当のお名前は使いません。そこで、ちがう名前をつけます。もしも、使ってほしい名前があったらお父さんかお母さんに伝えてください。

私がお話をしている時に、この一つの問いには答えたくありませんと言っても大丈夫です。それから、もうやめたいといえば大丈夫です。

もしも、わたしとお話をしたり、わたしが教室へ来たり、あなたのような日本人の子供たちがアメリカの教室で英語をお勉強する時にどんなふうに自分の事を見ているのかを調べる手伝いをしてくれるならば、次のページにお名前を書いてください。

しょ名

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>日付</th>
<th>研究に参加する子どものしょ名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>研究に参加する子どもの氏名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>研究をする人のしょ名</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

This letter is to ask if you want to be part of a research study on how Japanese elementary students view themselves while learning English in American classrooms. I am asking both your parent and your school if it is all right for you to be part of this study. If it is all right for you to be part of this study, there will be three other Japanese children who will be talking about their school lives with me. I gave you an extra copy of this letter so that you can keep for your record. My name is Nari Koga and I am the one who will do the study. I am a graduate student in Education at Boston College. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. Nothing bad will happen to you when you say “no.” Please ask questions if there is something you do not understand.

If you decide to be part of the study, you will meet with me alone for about one hour in a quiet room. I will meet with you three times all together. I will ask you to talk about how your school life has been. While you talk your stories, I may ask you to draw pictures for the stories. I may also ask you to share some of your school works that you would want to show me. We can stop talking anytime when you do not feel like talking. I will also come into your American classrooms twice. I will be in your classroom and look how you spend your school day in your classroom. I will be writing down what I see and hear, but I will stop if you do not want me to write. I will be recording what we talk together and what you talk with other people in the classroom if it is all right with you.

Normally, I will not tell anyone what you tell me, not your parents and not your teachers. I may need to share your information to someone from my school only when I need to make sure that the study is done in a right way. If I start receiving research funding, your records may also be looked at by my study sponsor. When I write about what I learn from the study, I will not use your real name. Instead, I will use a different name. If you have any name that you want me to use, please tell your parent. You can tell me anytime if you do not want to answer questions or want to stop talking.

If you want to talk with me, have me come in your classroom, and help me learn how Japanese children, like you, view themselves when they learn English in American classrooms, then please write your name and the date below.

Signatures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Assent Signature of Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Print Name of Child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Person providing information and witness to consent
Appendix 3. Teacher Informed Consent Document

BOSTON COLLEGE
THE CAROLYN A. AND PETER LYNCH SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Introduction:
I would like to invite you to participate in the study regarding kaigaishijo’s (Japanese children of sojourners) identity negotiation associated with their English language learning. This research study is for my dissertation to fulfill the requirement of my doctoral program. The tentative title of this study is “Understanding Kaigaishijos’ English Language Learning Experiences in the U.S. Public Elementary Mainstream Classrooms and their Negotiation of Language and Academic Identities”. The reason why you have been asked to participate in this study is that you are the mainstream classroom teacher of a U.S. kaigaishijo child who has agreed to participate in this study. If you decide to take part in this study, this study will involve a total of five mainstream classroom teachers, including you, five kaigaishijo children, their parents (five), and eleven Japanese adolescents.

Your participation is completely voluntary and never compulsory. Your decision whether or not to participate will have no effect on your professional standing. Please ask questions if there is anything you do not understand.

I, Nari Koga, will be the only person who will be doing this study. I conduct this study as a doctoral candidate in the Lynch School of Education at Boston College. This research is guided by my dissertation committee chair, Dr. María Brisk, from the education department and also by my dissertation readers, Dr. Mariela Páez from the same department and Dr. Sharlene Hesse-Biber from the sociology department. No funding has been received for this study.

Purposes:
By doing this study, I aim to understand how kaigaishijos in fourth through six grade perceive themselves while learning in U.S. public elementary mainstream classrooms. Specifically, I intend to explore the patterns and processes in which they negotiate their identities and to understand how their identity development is connected to their learning, language acquisition, and classroom participation. Moreover, I hope to learn how such patterns and processes of identity negotiation among children differ across different stages of sojourning by focusing on a group of kaigaishijos who are in the initial stage of sojourning and a group of kaigaishijos who are in the ending stage of sojourning. I hope that you will act as an informant of your kaigaishijo student and help me to achieve the above research purposes.

Procedures:
The total duration of your research involvement is about one school day. Upon receiving your signed informed consent document, I will contact you so that we can decide the date and time for a classroom observation and an interview regarding your
kaigaishijo student’s school experiences. The observation and interview will probably
occur on the same week if not on the same day. The observation will be conducted for
one school day and the interview will last for about twenty minutes.

During the classroom observation, I will be silently observing and taking notes
about your kaigaishijo student’s involvement in regular routine classroom activities.
Although I plan to conduct my observations primarily in your classroom, I may follow
the student to other school sites if necessary. The observations will not disturb your
classroom lessons or your students’ learning. With permissions, I may digitally record the
conversations in which your kaigaishijo student participates during the observation.

The interview will be in an one-on-one setting. I will meet with you in a private
and quiet place of your choice, most likely in your classroom, and ask you to talk about
what you have noticed about your kaigaishijo student’s school experiences. I may also
ask you about particular incidents recorded during classroom observation.

During the interview, I will digitally record all conversations with your
permission. After the interview and the observation, I may ask you to share some school
artifacts or the student’s artifacts and make the copies.

Risks:
To the best of my knowledge, the things you will be doing in this study have no
more risk of harm to you than what you would experience in everyday life.

Benefits:
You will not receive any direct benefit from being in this research study, but I
hope that people involved in kaigaishijo education, including classroom teachers, parents,
children, and policy makers, will deepen their understanding of kaigaishijos’ identity
development associated with their English language learning.

Costs:
You do not have to pay to participate in this research study. However you may
have to pay for the cost of getting to the place for interviews only if you choose to meet
with me outside of your school.

Compensation:
You will not be compensated for participating in this study.

Withdrawal from the study:
You can choose to stop your participation in this study at any time. You also do
not have to answer any questions when you do not feel comfortable of answering. Your
decision to stop your participation will have no effect on your professional standings.
There will be no evaluation or judgment of your teaching or classroom activities.

Confidentiality:
I will assign you a pseudonym. I will label all data with the pseudonym so that
your personal information will not be stored with your real name. An only form that you
need to show your real name is this consent form. I will store this consent form in a
secure place at my home. I will be the only person who has access to the form. The
informed consent documents will be destroyed by me three years after my last
publication regarding the results of the study. Other data, such your background
information questionnaires and recorded conversations from interviews will be stored at
my home and be destroyed by me five years after my last publication. If you request to
destroy the data related to you before that, I will destroy the data according to your request. While the data are stored, I will be the only person who has access to all data. However, you are able to access only the data that were derived from yourself.

Although it happens very rarely, I may be required to show information that identifies you. For instance, I may have to show this informed consent document to people from the Boston College Institutional Review Board in order to ensure my correct research conduct. The recorded conversations during interviews and observations will be stored in my computer and analyzed. Although I will have to share some of the data in meetings with my teachers, who support my dissertation process, or conferences, your identity will not be revealed since a pseudonym will be used.

Questions:

You are encouraged to ask questions now, and at anytime during the study. You can reach me, Nari Koga, at 617-553-0688, or koganb@bc.edu (email). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in a research study, please contact the Boston College Office for Human Research Participant Protection, at 617-552-4778.

Certification:

I have read this informed consent document and understand the contents. I believe that I understand the purpose of the research project and what I will be asked to do. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and they have been answered satisfactorily.

I understand that I may stop participating in this research study at anytime and that we can refuse to answer any question(s).

I agree to digitally record the conversations during all interviews._

I also understand that all data will be labeled with a pseudonym and I will not be identified in reports on this research. I have received a signed copy of this informed consent document for my personal reference.

I hereby give my informed and free consent to be a participant in this study.

Signatures:

Date | Consent Signature of Participant
--- | ---

Print Name of Participant

Signature of Researcher

Please provide me with only this signed page and keep the rest of this consent form for your record. You will receive the copy of this signed page later.

Thank you.

Nari Koga
はじめに
この研究を行うことによって、小学生である海外子女が、アメリカの公立小学校普通学級において、どの様に自己を認識するかを理解することにあります。特に、彼らの英語学習者としてのアイデンティティー交渉の過程と傾向を探求する目的です。
とともに、彼らのアイデンティティ形成がどのように、学習、言語習得、クラスルーム活動への参加などに結びついているかの理解を深めることを目的としています。また、日本からアメリカへ移動するという、海外生活初期を体験する子供達と、海外生活を終え日本へ帰国するという、海外生活終期の子供達を研究対象にすることにより、各海外子女のアイデンティティ交渉の傾向と過程が、一時滞在の様々な段階によってどの様に相違、または、類似するのか調べる目的もあります。分析の段階で、皆さんにフォーカスグループへ参加して頂くことで、様々な視野からの分析を可能にし、上記した研究目的を達成することができると願っています。

研究形式と過程
研究形式は、1時間ほどのフォーカスグループインタビューとなります。場所は、東京もしくは大阪、参加者全員に都合のよい静かな場所で行います。インタビュー中は、海外子女初期と終期の子供達の経験についての初期分析結果をお見せし、それについてご意見を伺います。例えば、海外子供たちのアイデンティティ交渉の経験についてのデータを分析の際に、私が遭遇した疑問、多様な解釈の仕方について、皆さんの視点から考えつく意見を、グループの皆さんと話し合って頂けたらと思います。参加者の皆さんの承諾を得た上で、インタビュー中の会話をデジタル録音させて頂きます。その後、許可を得た方のみEメールにてご連絡し、更なるご意見をお聞かせすることもあるかもしれません。また、教育、言語学習経験、またはご家族などのバックグラウンドについてのアンケートをEメールにて送って頂きます。記入終了したアンケートをEメールにて返信して下さい。およそ1時間ほどで記入できると思われます。アンケートには、例として次のような質問が含まれます。

○ アメリカの学校で得意な教科は何でしたか。
○ アメリカの学校で、英語学習のための何か特別なサポートを受けていましたか。

リスク
現在知られる限りでは、この研究への参加されることによって、日常経験されるリスクよりも大きなリスクを皆さんが経験されることはありません。

利益
この研究に参加することで、皆さんに直接利益がもたらされることはありません。ただし、研究結果をもとに、海外子女の英語学習に伴う自己形成についての理解が、海外子女教育に携わる数多くの人々の間でより深まることを願っております。
経費
この研究に参加するためにお金を払って頂くことはありません。ただし、皆様に指定していただく待ち合わせ場所に来て頂く際の経費は、自己負担となります。

報酬
この研究参加に伴う報酬はありません。

研究参加の取り止め
あなたは、いつでも研究参加から退出することができます。研究参加を取り止めることで、あなたの成績や学習成果に影響が及ぶことはありません。

秘匿性
研究参加者の皆様には、匿名を付けさせて頂きます。集めたデータは、全て匿名のみで扱うので、皆さんの個人情報が皆さんの実名と一致することはありません。実名でサインして頂くのはこの同意書のみです。なお、この同意書は、私の自宅の安全な場所で保管されます。私以外にこの同意書にアクセスのある者はいません。この同意書は、研究結果が最後に出版されてから三年後に、私が処分します。また、教育、言語学習経験、ご家族についてのアンケート、インタビューの会話の録音データは、最後の出版より五年間自宅にて保存し、その後、私が処分します。それ以前に、皆様がご自分に関するデータの処分を希望場合には、その希望通りにデータは処分されます。保存期間中、全てのデータにアクセスがあるのは、私のみです。皆様は、ご自分に関するデータのみにアクセスが可能です。

これに、この同意書のような、皆様の実名が明らかになる書類を他者に提示しなくてはならない時があります。例えば、研究過程が正しく行われているかを確認するために、ボストンカレッジの期間内倫理審査委員会（IRB: Internal Review Board）の委員に提示することがあるかもしれませんが、また、研究助成金を受けることになった場合、皆様に関する研究記録を研究支援団体に提示することもあるかもしれません。

インタビュー会話の録音データは、コンピューターに保存され、分析されます。卒業論文の指導に当たる教授との集りや学会などで、データの一部が見せられることがありますが、匿名が使われるので、皆さんの個人的な情報が流出することはありません。

質問
何かご質問がありましたら、ご遠慮なく私にお尋ね下さい。研究参加中にご質問が発生した場合は、いつでもお問い合わせ下さい。私の自宅の電話番号は、617-xxx-xxxx で、E メールアドレスは、koganb@bc.edu です。また、研究参加に際しての倫理問題についてご質問がある場合は、ボストンカレッジの研究参加者保護事務所までお問い合わせ下さい。電話番号は、617-552-4778 です。
証明

私は、この同意書を読み、内容を理解しました。この研究の目的を理解し、私がこの研究参加中にどの様なことをするのかを理解できたと思います。今ある質問を尋ねる機会を与えられ、質問した場合には、満足のいく答えを受け取りました。

いつでも、この研究参加を取り止めることができる権利があること、質問に答えることを拒否できる権利があることを理解しました。

また、フォーカスグループインタビュー中の会話をデジタル録音することに同意します。

（イニシャルをお書き下さい。）

また、すべてのデータに匿名が使われ、この研究の最終リポートに個人の身元を明かす情報が記載されないことを理解しました。この研究者の署名付きの同意書のコピーを保管用として受け取りました。

その後で、この研究に参加することに同意します。

署名

日付 研究参加者の署名 （サイン）

研究参加者の氏名

研究者の署名 （サイン）

同意書本体は、保管用としてお使い下さい。この署名のページは、後ほどコピーをお渡しします。

古賀 奈里
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Introduction:

I would like to invite you to participate in the study regarding kaigaishijo’s identity negotiation associated with their English language learning. This research study is for my dissertation to fulfill the requirement of my doctoral program. The tentative title of this study is “Understanding Kaigaishijos’ English Language Learning Experiences in the U.S. Public Elementary Mainstream Classrooms and their Negotiation of Language and Academic Identities”. The reason why you have been asked to participate in this study is that you were enrolled in the U.S. public elementary mainstream classrooms for one through three years anytime in grade four through six. If you decide to take part in this study, there will be five other Japanese college students besides you in addition to four kaigaishijo children, their parents (four), and their mainstream classroom teachers (four). I plan to ask a group of Japanese college students, including you, to form a focus group and to state thoughts and opinions regarding my analysis of child kaigaishijos’ experiences.

Your participation is completely voluntary and never compulsory. Your decision whether or not to allow your child to participate will have no effect on your grades, academic standing, or any services you might receive at school. Please ask questions if there is anything you do not understand.

I, Nari Koga, will be the only person who will be doing this study. I conduct this study as a doctoral candidate in the Lynch School of Education at Boston College. This research is guided by my dissertation committee chair, Dr. María Brisk, from the education department and also by my dissertation readers, Dr. Mariela Páez from the same department and Dr. Sharlene Hesse-Biber from the sociology department. No funding has been received for this study. In the future, I may apply for funding offered by Boston college or other external foundations or organizations, which support dissertation research. Although I may receive dissertation grants in the future, the school, professors, foundations, or organizations will not make any profits or receive any money because of the results of this study. I have enclosed two copies of this informed consent document. One is for you to sign and return to my address and the other is for your personal record.

Purposes: By doing this study, I aim to understand how kaigaishijos in fourth through six grade perceive themselves while learning in U.S. public elementary mainstream classrooms. Specifically, I intend to explore the patterns and processes in which they negotiate their identities and to understand how their identity development is connected to their learning, language acquisition, and classroom participation. Moreover, I hope to learn how such patterns and processes of identity negotiation among children differ across different stages of sojourning by focusing on a group of kaigaishijos who are in
the initial stage of sojourning and a group of kaigaishijos who are in the ending stage of sojourning. I hope to achieve these study purposes by forming a focus group, which will enable me to analyze the data from various perspectives.

**Procedures:** The total duration of your research involvement is three months from January through March, 2007. Upon receiving your signed informed consent document, I will ask you to fill in a questionnaire regarding you educational, language learning, and family background. The questionnaire will be mail or emailed to you. You will need to return the complete questionnaire through mail or email. When mailing, I will provide an envelope labeled with return address and postages. You will need to indicate the pseudonyms of your choice for you and your child if you have any. You will fill in the questionnaire at your own pace. I estimate that it will take a total of one through one and a half hour to complete the entire questionnaire. Examples of questions include:

- What was your strongest subject in the U.S. school?
- Did you receive any special support for your English language learning in your American school?

While waiting for you to complete the questionnaire, I will phone you so that we can decide the date and time for our focus group interviews. The place for the focus group interview will be in a meeting room at a university in the greater Boston area, which I will announce to you later. The meeting room will be at a private and quiet place. The total of two focus group interviews will be conducted and each interview will last for about an hour and a half. There may be additional interviews depending on the contents of the previous interviews or the participants’ requests.

During the interview, you will be presented with my preliminary analyses of kaigaishijo experiences during the initial period of sojourning and the ending period of sojourning. For instance, I am hoping that, together with other focus group interview participants, you will share your thoughts regarding the questions and multiple interpretations that I encounter while I analyze the data of kaigaishijos’ identity negotiations. The conversations will be in either in Japanese, English, or a mix of both depending on the language preference of my participants. I will digitally record the conversations with the participants’ permissions. There will be some refreshment (soft drinks and snack) served during the sessions.

**Risks:** To the best of my knowledge, the things you and your child will be doing in this study have no more risk of harm to you than what you would experience in everyday life.

**Benefits:** You will not receive any direct benefit from being in this research study, but I hope that many people involved in kaigaishijo education will deepen their understanding of kaigaishijos’ identity development associated with their English language learning.

**Costs:** You do not have to pay to participate in this research study. However you may have to pay for the cost of getting to the place where you choose to meet with me.

**Compensation:** You will not be compensated for participating in this study.

**Withdrawal from the study:** You can choose stop your participation in this study at any time. Your decision to stop your participation will have no effect on your grades or academic standing.

**Confidentiality:** I will assign you a pseudonym. I will label all data with the pseudonym so that your personal information will not be stored with your real name. An only form
that you need to show your real name is this consent form. I will store this consent form in a secure place at my home. I will be the only person who has access to the form. The informed consent documents will be destroyed by me three years after my last publication regarding the results of the study. Other data, such your background information questionnaires and recorded conversations from interviews will be stored at my home and be destroyed by me five years after my last publication. If you request to destroy the data related to you before that, I will destroy the data according to your request. While the data are stored, I will be the only person who has access to all data. However, you are able to access only the data that were derived from yourself.

Although it happens very rarely, I may be required to show information that identifies you. For instance, I may have to show this informed consent document to people from the Boston College Institutional Review Board in order to ensure my correct research conduct. Since I plan to apply for research funding, your records may also be looked at by my study sponsor if applicable.

The recorded conversations during interviews will be stored in my computer and analyzed. Although I will have to share some of the data in meetings with my teachers, who support my dissertation process, or conferences, your identities will not be revealed since a pseudonym will be used.

**Questions:** You are encouraged to ask questions now, and at anytime during the study. You can reach me, Nari Koga, at 617-xxx-xxxx (home), or koganb@bc.edu (email). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in a research study, please contact the Boston College Office for Human Research Participant Protection, at 617-552-4778.

**Certification:**
I have read this informed consent document and understand the contents. I believe that I understand the purpose of the research project and what I will be asked to do. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and they have been answered satisfactorily. I understand that I may stop participating in this research study at anytime and that we can refuse to answer any question(s). I agree to digitally record the conversations during all focus group interviews. ___ (initials) I also understand that all data will be labeled with a pseudonym and I will not be identified in reports on this research. I have received a signed copy of this informed consent document for my personal reference.

I hereby give my informed and free consent to be a participant in this study.

**Signatures:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Consent Signature of Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print Name of Participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Person providing information and witness to consent

Please mail and return this signed permission to my home address below. Please use an enclosed labeled return envelope and postage.

Nari Koga, Address
### Appendix 5. Child In-depth Interview Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to Ask</th>
<th>Focus of the Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Open-ended Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you tell me about your current life? If someone asked you to tell or write a story of your school life, what would you choose to talk or write about? What would first come to your mind when you think of your current life/situation? Do you have anything that you would like to talk about today? Were there any changes since we talked last time? (2nd &amp; 3rd interviews only)</td>
<td>Children’s own agenda regarding their sojourning experiences A variety of educational experiences and their significance from the children’s perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you describe yourself as a student? And, what influenced your self-perceptions? Did you describe yourself in the same way before? (2nd &amp; 3rd interviews only)</td>
<td>Self-perceptions (past and present) Significant events associated with identity negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you think your teacher/peers/friends describe you as a student? And, what do you think influenced their views? Did they describe you in the same way before? (2nd &amp; 3rd interviews only)</td>
<td>Ascribed self-perceptions (past and present) Children’s social network Significant events associated with identity negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you think you will be describing yourself in the future? And, why?</td>
<td>Self-perceptions (future)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about your overall learning/language learning in English and Japanese.</td>
<td>Learning experiences and identity negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel about your relocations? Who has been most helpful to you during the transitions?</td>
<td>Contexts of transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What advice will you give to someone who is in the same situation as yours?</td>
<td>Perceptions of present experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else you think I should know to understand your experiences better?</td>
<td>Additional information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you like to ask me any questions?</td>
<td>(Conducting member-checking to obtain children’s perceptions regarding preliminary analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think about (the preliminary interpretations/emerging categories)? Do they sound right/wrong to you? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6. Background Information Questionnaire: For Section One Participants with English Translation

Questions Regarding Your Child’s Educational, Linguistic, and Family Backgrounds

お子さんの匿名 Preferred pseudonym for your child (Please leave blank if none.)
（お子さんとお話した上で、希望するものがあれば記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

保護者の匿名 Preferred pseudonym for yourself (Please leave blank if none.)
（希望するものを記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

日本でのご連絡先 (郵便番号、住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど)
Contact info. in Japan (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc.)

アメリカでのご連絡先 (住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど、もしお決まりの場合は、お知らせ下さい。) Contact info. in the United States (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc. if you already know.)

Questions Regarding Your Child’s Personal Background

お子さんの教育、言語学習経験、ご家族についてのご質問

お子さんの匿名 Preferred pseudonym for your child (Please leave blank if none.)
（お子さんとお話した上で、希望するものがあれば記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

保護者の匿名 Preferred pseudonym for yourself (Please leave blank if none.)
（希望するものを記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

日本でのご連絡先 (郵便番号、住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど)
Contact info. in Japan (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc.)

アメリカでのご連絡先 (住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど、もしお決まりの場合は、お知らせ下さい。) Contact info. in the United States (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc. if you already know.)

Questions Regarding Your Child’s Personal Background

お子さんの教育、言語学習経験、ご家族についてのご質問

お子さんの匿名 Preferred pseudonym for your child (Please leave blank if none.)
（お子さんとお話した上で、希望するものがあれば記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

保護者の匿名 Preferred pseudonym for yourself (Please leave blank if none.)
（希望するものを記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

日本でのご連絡先 (郵便番号、住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど)
Contact info. in Japan (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc.)

アメリカでのご連絡先 (住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど、もしお決まりの場合は、お知らせ下さい。) Contact info. in the United States (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc. if you already know.)

Questions Regarding Your Child’s Personal Background

お子さんの教育、言語学習経験、ご家族についてのご質問

お子さんの匿名 Preferred pseudonym for your child (Please leave blank if none.)
（お子さんとお話した上で、希望するものがあれば記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

保護者の匿名 Preferred pseudonym for yourself (Please leave blank if none.)
（希望するものを記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

日本でのご連絡先 (郵便番号、住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど)
Contact info. in Japan (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc.)

アメリカでのご連絡先 (住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど、もしお決まりの場合は、お知らせ下さい。) Contact info. in the United States (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc. if you already know.)

Questions Regarding Your Child’s Personal Background

お子さんの教育、言語学習経験、ご家族についてのご質問

お子さんの匿名 Preferred pseudonym for your child (Please leave blank if none.)
（お子さんとお話した上で、希望するものがあれば記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

保護者の匿名 Preferred pseudonym for yourself (Please leave blank if none.)
（希望するものを記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

日本でのご連絡先 (郵便番号、住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど)
Contact info. in Japan (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc.)

アメリカでのご連絡先 (住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど、もしお決まりの場合は、お知らせ下さい。) Contact info. in the United States (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc. if you already know.)

Questions Regarding Your Child’s Personal Background

お子さんの教育、言語学習経験、ご家族についてのご質問

お子さんの匿名 Preferred pseudonym for your child (Please leave blank if none.)
（お子さんとお話した上で、希望するものがあれば記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

保護者の匿名 Preferred pseudonym for yourself (Please leave blank if none.)
（希望するものを記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

日本でのご連絡先 (郵便番号、住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど)
Contact info. in Japan (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc.)

アメリカでのご連絡先 (住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど、もしお決まりの場合は、お知らせ下さい。) Contact info. in the United States (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc. if you already know.)

Questions Regarding Your Child’s Personal Background

お子さんの教育、言語学習経験、ご家族についてのご質問

お子さんの匿名 Preferred pseudonym for your child (Please leave blank if none.)
（お子さんとお話した上で、希望するものがあれば記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

保護者の匿名 Preferred pseudonym for yourself (Please leave blank if none.)
（希望するものを記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

日本でのご連絡先 (郵便番号、住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど)
Contact info. in Japan (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc.)

アメリカでのご連絡先 (住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど、もしお決まりの場合は、お知らせ下さい。) Contact info. in the United States (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc. if you already know.)

Questions Regarding Your Child’s Personal Background

お子さんの教育、言語学習経験、ご家族についてのご質問

お子さんの匿名 Preferred pseudonym for your child (Please leave blank if none.)
（お子さんとお話した上で、希望するものがあれば記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

保護者の匿名 Preferred pseudonym for yourself (Please leave blank if none.)
（希望するものを記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

日本でのご連絡先 (郵便番号、住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど)
Contact info. in Japan (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc.)

アメリカでのご連絡先 (住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど、もしお決まりの場合は、お知らせ下さい。) Contact info. in the United States (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc. if you already know.)

Questions Regarding Your Child’s Personal Background

お子さんの教育、言語学習経験、ご家族についてのご質問

お子さんの匿名 Preferred pseudonym for your child (Please leave blank if none.)
（お子さんとお話した上で、希望するものがあれば記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

保護者の匿名 Preferred pseudonym for yourself (Please leave blank if none.)
（希望するものを記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

日本でのご連絡先 (郵便番号、住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど)
Contact info. in Japan (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc.)

アメリカでのご連絡先 (住所、電話番号、Eメールアドレスなど、もしお決まりの場合は、お知らせ下さい。) Contact info. in the United States (address, zip code, telephone numbers, Email address etc. if you already know.)

Questions Regarding Your Child’s Personal Background

お子さんの教育、言語学習経験、ご家族についてのご質問

お子さんの匿名 Preferred pseudonym for your child (Please leave blank if none.)
（お子さんとお話した上で、希望するものがあれば記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のまです
アメリカ滞在予定期間はどれくらいですか。How long do you plan to stay in the United States?
アメリカ滞在の理由は、なんですか。Why do you move to the United States?
ご両親はどのような学歴をお持ちですか。Please describe parents’ educational backgrounds.
ご家族の方は、海外滞在経験をお持ちですか。あれば、いつ、どの国にどのくらいの期間滞在されたのか書いて下さい。Have any of family members lived abroad before? If so, when, how long, and in which country did s/he stay?
ご両親は、海外滞在経験についてどのようにお考えをお持ちですか。What do you think of living abroad?
現在、ご家庭の日常会話、もしくは、読み書きに用いられる言語は、何語ですか。What language(s) do you and your family use for daily conversation and literacy activities at home?
アメリカ滞在中に、ご家庭の日常会話、もしくは、読み書きに用いる予定の言語は何ですか。What language(s) do you plan to use for daily conversation and literacy activities at home while living in the United States?
以下、ご両親のお気持ち・お考えを記入願います。Please state your feelings and opinions about the following topics:
- 英語という言語について English language
- アメリカ文化について American culture
- お子さんの英語学習について Your child’s English language learning
- 日本語という言語について Japanese language
- 日本文化について Japanese culture
- お子さんの日本語学習、または日本語保持について Your child’s Japanese language learning and maintenance

お子さんの教育経験に関する質問
Questions Regarding Your Child’s Educational Experiences

- 日本で今通っている学校は、どのような学校ですか。Please describe his/her current Japanese school.
- この学校の前に通っていた学校はありますか。Was s/he enrolled in a different school prior to this school?
- 得意な教科は、何ですか。What is his/her strong subject(s)?
- 不得意な教科は、何ですか。What is his/her less strong subject(s)?
- 学校の先生との関係はどのようなものですか。How do you describe his/her relationship with teacher(s)?
- クラスメートとの関係はどのようなものですか。How do you describe his/her relationship with classmate(s)?
- お子さんの学習全般に対する意欲はどのようなものですか。How do you describe his/her motivation towards overall learning?
お子さんの言語学習経験についての質問
Questions Regarding Your Child’s Language Learning Experiences

・アメリカ滞在のために、何か特別な準備をしていますか。Has there been any special preparation for the U.S. life?

・日本で英語学習経験がありますか。あれば、どのような経験ですか。Does s/he have English language learning experiences in Japan? If so, what kind of experiences?

・以下、お子さんの言語能力について、保護者にお尋ねします。How do you describe his/her abilities in the following areas:
  ▪ 英語会話能力 English conversation
  ▪ 英語での読み書きの能力 English literacy
  ▪ 日本語会話能力 Japanese conversation
  ▪ 日本語での読み書きの能力 Japanese literacy

・以下、お子さんのお気持ち・お考えについて保護者にお尋ねします。What do you think your child feel or think about the following topics:
  ▪ 英語という言語について English language
  ▪ アメリカ文化について American culture
  ▪ 英語を学習することについて English language learning
  ▪ 日本語という言語について Japanese language
  ▪ 日本文化について Japanese culture
  ▪ 日本語維持について Japanese language maintenance
  ▪ 人と会話をすることについて Conversation in general
  ▪ 読み書きをすることについて Literacy in general
  ▪ 絵を描くことについて Drawing in general

その他 Other Comments

お子さんのバックグラウンドについて、上記の質問内容の他に何かお伝え頂けることがありましたら、下に記述お願いします。If you have anything else to share regarding your child’s background, please write below.
Background Information Questionnaire for Section Two Children with English Translation

Questions Regarding Your Child’s Educational, Linguistic, and Family Backgrounds

お子さんの匿名 Preferred pseudonym for your child (Please leave blank if none.)
（お子さんとお話しした上で、希望するものがあれば記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

保護者の匿名 Preferred pseudonym for yourself (Please leave blank if none.)
（希望するものを記入して下さい。もしなければ、空欄のままで構いません。）

アメリカのご連絡先 Contact info. in the United States (address, zip code, telephone numbers, email address etc.)

日本でのご連絡先 Contact info. in Japan (address, zip code, telephone numbers, email address etc. if you already know.)

お子さんの個人的なバックグラウンド Questions Regarding Your Child’s Personal Background

○ お誕生日はいつですか。何歳ですか。When is his/her birthday? How old is s/he?
○ 出生地はどこですか。Where is his/her birth place?
○ アメリカ到着日は、いつでしたか。When did s/he start living in the United States?
○ 日本帰国予定日は、いつですか。When do you and your return to Japan?
○ お子さんの性格、もしくは性質をどの様に描写しますか。How do you describe his/her personality?
○ お子さんは、どんなことにご興味をお持ちですか。What is s/he interested in?
○ お友達と遊ぶことがありますか。あれば、どのくらいの頻度で遊びますか。また、何をして遊ぶことが多いですか。Does s/he play with friends? If so, what does s/he like to do? Also, how often does s/he like to play?
○ お友達は、どんな国籍の子供ですか。What nationalities do his/her friends have?
○ 何かお稽古事をしていますか。Does s/he do any extracurricular activities?

ご家族のバックグラウンドについてのご質問
Question Regarding Your Child’s Family Background

○ 家族構成はどうなっていますか。Who are his/her family members?
ご兄弟、ご姉妹の年はおいくつですか。How old is his/her sibling(s)?
ご両親のお仕事は何ですか。What are parents’ occupations?
アメリカ滞在予定期間はどれくらいですか。How long will you be staying in the United States?
アメリカ滞在の理由は、なんですか。Why did you move to the United States?
ご両親はどのような学歴をお持ちですか。Please describe parents’ educational backgrounds.
ご家族の方は、海外滞在経験をお持ちですか。あれば、いつ、どこの国にどのくらいの期間滞在されたのか書いて下さい。Have any of family members lived abroad before? If so, when, how long, and in which country did s/he stay?
ご両親は、海外滞在経験についてどのようなご考えをお持ちですか。What do you think of living abroad?
ご家庭で日常会話、もしくは、読み書きに用いられる言語は、何語ですか。What language(s) do you and your family use for daily conversation and literacy activities at home?
以下、ご両親のお気持ち・お考えを記入願います。Please state your feelings and opinions about the following topics:
  - 英語という言語について English language
  - アメリカ文化について American culture
  - お子さんの英語学習について Your child’s English language learning
  - 日本語という言語について Japanese language
  - 日本文化について Japanese culture
  - お子さんのアメリカでの日本語学習、または日本語力保持について Your child’s Japanese language learning and maintenance in the United States
  - お子さんの日本での英語学習、または英語力保持について Your child’s English language learning and maintenance in Japan

お子さんの教育経験に関するご質問
Questions Regarding Your Child’s Educational Experiences

日本で以前通っていた学校は、どの様な学校ですか。Please describe his/her former Japanese school.
日本の学校で得意な教科は、何でしたか。What was his/her strong subject(s) in Japan?
日本の学校で不得意な教科は、何でしたか。What was his/her less strong subject(s) in Japan?
今の学校で得意な教科は、何ですか。What is his/her strong subject(s) in the current school?
今の学校で不得意な教科は、何ですか。What is his/her less strong subject(s) in the current school?
日本の学校で、先生との関係はどのようなものでしたか。How do you describe his/her relationship with teacher(s) in the former Japanese school?

日本の学校で、クラスメートとの関係はどのようなものでしたか。How do you describe his/her relationship with classmate(s) in the former Japanese school?

今の学校の先生との関係は、どのようなものですか。How do you describe his/her relationship with teacher(s) in the current school?

今の学校のクラスメートとの関係はどのようなものですか。How do you describe his/her relationship with classmate(s) in the current school?

日本にいた時のお子さんの学習全般に対する意欲はどの様なものでしたか。How do you describe his/her motivation towards overall learning when s/he was in Japan?

今の、お子さんの学習全般に対する意欲はどの様なものですか。How do you describe his/her motivation towards overall learning now?

日本にいるとき、アメリカ滞在のために何か特別な準備をしていましたか。Were there any special preparations for the U.S. sojourning?

今、日本帰国に備え、何か特別な準備をしていますか。Has there been any special preparation for the future life in Japan?

お子さんの言語学習経験についてのご質問

Questions Regarding Your Child’s Language Learning Experiences

日本にいる時、英語学習経験がありましたか。あれば、どのような経験でしたか。Did s/he have English language learning experiences in Japan? If so, what kind of experiences?

アメリカ滞在中に、日本語を学習する機会がありますか。あれば、どのようなものですか。Does s/he have opportunities to learn Japanese while living in the United States? If so, what kind of opportunities?

今、アメリカの学校で、英語学習のための特別なサポートを受けていますか。Does s/he receive any special support for English language learning?

以下の、お子さんの言語能力について、保護者にお尋ねします。How do you describe his/her abilities in the following areas:

- 英語会話能力 English conversation
- 英語での読み書きの能力 English literacy
- 日本語会話能力 Japanese conversation
- 日本語での読み書きの能力 Japanese literacy

以下の、お子さんのお気持ち・お考えについて保護者にお尋ねします。What do you think your child feel or think about the following topics:

- 英語という言語について English language
- アメリカ文化について American culture
- 英語を学習することについて English language learning
- 日本語という言語について Japanese language
日本文化について Japanese culture
日本語維持について Japanese language maintenance
人と会話することについて Conversation in general
読み書きをすることについて Literacy in general
絵を描くことについて Drawing in general

その他 Other Comments

お子さんのバックグラウンドについて、上記の質問内容の他に何かお伝え頂け
ることがありましたら、下に記述お願いします。If you have anything else to share
regarding your child’s background, please write below.
Appendix 7. IFG Participant Information Sheet

フォーカスグループ参加者 質問表

Questions for Focus Group Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>氏名: Name</th>
<th>生年月日・年齢: Date of birth/age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of birth/age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>年  月  日 生 (歳)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>学校名 (学部学科) 学年: Name of school and grade</th>
<th>兄弟・姉妹の年齢: Sibling(s) and age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of school and grade</td>
<td>Sibling(s) and age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>年生</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>住所: Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E メール: Email</th>
<th>電話番号: Tel#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>アメリカ滞在期間: Duration of stay in the United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>年  月 (歳)から 年  月 (歳)の 年 ヶ月間</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>帰国後、今の学校の前に通った学校: School(s) attended after the U.S. schooling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>帰国した時の日本語能力はどうでしたか? (例: 学年レベルの漢字が難しかった。問題なかった。等)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you describe your Japanese language skills when you returned to Japan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., Kanji was difficult, no problem, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>帰国後、どの様に英語学習を続けましたか? (例: 学校の英語の授業のみ。英会話学校へ通った。等)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did you continue your English language learning after your return?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., Learned only in the English classes at school, went to an English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation school, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>現在の英語能力はどの様なものですか。 (例: 学年レベルの読み書きが出来る。会話は出来るが、読み書きは不得意。テストで高得点が取れる。等)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you describe your current English language levels? (e.g., Hold grade-level literacy skills, able to converse but not strong in literacy, mark high in exams, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ご協力どうもありがとうございました。

Thank you for your cooperation.
Appendix 8. Model of Preliminary Analysis for IFG Interviews
Appendix 9. Matrix Templates for the Cross-case Analysis
Adopted from Stake (2005, p. 51 & p. 59)

Matrix 1: Generating Category-Based Assertions from Case Findings Rated Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding I</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H = high importance (e.g., For this category, the case finding is of high importance.)
M = middling importance
L = Low importance

Matrix 2: Generating Category-Based Assertions from Merged Findings Rated Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merged Findings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Which Cases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merged Finding 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merged Finding 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merged Finding 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merged Finding 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merged Finding 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H = high importance (e.g., For this category, the merged finding is of high importance.)
M = middling importance
L = Low importance