

Est.
1841

YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY

Danjo, Chisato and Moreh, Chris (2020) Complementary schools in the global age: A multi-level critical analysis of discourses and practices at Japanese Hoshuko in the UK. *Linguistics and Education*, 60.

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/4701/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2020.100870>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repositories Policy Statement](#)

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at
ray@yorks.ac.uk

Danjo, Chisato & Moreh, Chris (2020) Complementary Schools in the Global Age: A multi-level critical analysis of discourses and practices at Japanese *Hoshuko* in the UK

Linguistics and Education, Volume 60

[This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced PDF of the chapter]

Please do not cite this version but the published version at
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2020.100870>

If you have any questions, please contact the authors:

Chisato Danjo at c.danjo@yorksj.ac.uk

Chris Moreh at c.moreh@yorksj.ac.uk

Complementary Schools in the Global Age: A multi-level critical analysis of discourses and practices at Japanese *Hoshuko* in the UK

Chisato Danjo

York St John University

Lord Mayor's Walk, York, UK

Email: c.danjo@yorks.ac.uk

Chris Moreh

York St John University

Lord Mayor's Walk, York, UK

Email: c.moreh@yorks.ac.uk

Abstract

Hoshuko are Japanese government approved complementary schools operating in many countries outside Japan and providing Japanese-medium education. Although originally established for children of temporary professional expatriates, increasing emigration has diversified the family backgrounds and educational needs of the pupils. This article explores how the Japanese government, *hoshuko*, as well as the teachers and parents accommodate to the challenges and opportunities of diversification, looking specifically at the context of the United Kingdom. It combines discourse-analytic conceptual tools and ethnographic methods to explore discursive practices at the *macro-level* of governmental policy, the *meso-level* of institutional policies of nine UK *hoshuko*, and the *micro-level* of situated practices at one UK school. We demonstrate how governmental discourses pursue specific coercive aims using discursive strategies, and how these are recontextualised in institutional and individual practices. At each level, we also identify mechanisms through which the official dominant discourse is negotiated. Based on the findings, we argue that a more purposeful policy realignment acknowledging local diversity would benefit the overseas communities involved in *hoshuko*.

Keywords: Complementary school, *Hoshuko*, Critical Discourse Analysis, Ethnography, Globalisation, Policy Analysis

Introduction

Complementary schools – sometimes called heritage language schools, community schools, ethnic schools, or Saturday schools – are generally non-statutory educational institutions where linguistic, cultural or religious practices are taught particularly through the language of a specific ethnic minority community in parallel to mainstream education (Blackledge and Creese, 2010). Despite the great variation in the socio-political and historical contexts in which they were founded (Li, 2006), complementary schools share a common concern over ethnicity, religion, language and culture, and aim to provide access to these resources for their target ethnic and minority communities.

Japanese *hoshuko* in the United Kingdom – the empirical focus of this article – are a specific type of complementary school. Unlike the majority of non-statutory institutions, *hoshuko* are officially approved and financially supported by the Japanese government. This is due to the specific nature of the Japanese communities which *hoshuko* had first emerged to cater for; these communities consisted mostly of professional expatriates working temporarily at local branches of Japanese transnational corporations. Their residence plans in the UK were short-to-mid-term, and therefore they needed educational institutions that could support their children in keeping up with the Japanese curriculum until their return to Japan. It was, consequently, in the common interest of the Japanese government and businesses to support the establishment and maintenance of such educational opportunities for their citizens and employees respectively (Sato, 1997).

Recent demographic trends, however, raise important questions regarding the sustainability of the traditional operating model of *hoshuko*. The family backgrounds of children accessing *hoshuko* have become significantly more diverse over the past decades, with children of intermarriage couples¹ and globally mobile professionals present in increasing numbers (MOFA, 2018). This article argues that the diversification has opened a chasm between official policy discourses and actual localised practices and aims to assess how emerging contradictions are negotiated by stakeholders at different operational levels.

Combining the analytical framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) with that of ethnography (see Johnson, 2011), the article compares discursive practices at three levels: the *macro-level* of prescriptive Japanese governmental policies; the *meso-level* of institutional *hoshuko* policy where governmental discourses are appropriated and recontextualised; and the *micro-level* of situated practices where these official discourses are reproduced and undermined at the same time. The analysis is based on three data sources: ministerial policy documents, institutional policy documents – or official purpose statements – of the nine *hoshuko* operating in the UK, and ethnographic data collected at one of the *hoshuko* which has experienced significant diversification in students' backgrounds in recent years. By distinguishing these three levels of analysis, the article helps identify the mechanisms which mediate interactions between them, making not only a significant contribution to scholarly understanding but also highlighting the areas where policy realignment is desirable and feasible.

¹ While the authors are aware of the diversity in backgrounds among parents too, for the purpose of this article we use the term 'intermarriage couple' to describe the union between a Japanese citizen and a non-Japanese citizen.

Before detailing the methodology and analytical strategy of the research, the next sections provide some contextual information on *hoshuko* and on previous research on the topic.

Hoshuko: the institutional context

The main governmental department in charge of education policy in Japan is the *Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology* (MEXT). This ministry has oversight of the country's overall education, including the 'Course of Study', the prescriptive national curriculum for primary-school and lower/upper secondary-school levels. It was in this role that MEXT became engaged in supporting the educational demands of families of professional expatriates during the 1950s (MEXT, n.d.-a; Sato, 1997).

The first schools providing compulsory-level Japanese instruction overseas originated in this historical context. Given the international nature of these establishments, alongside MEXT the *Ministry of Foreign Affairs* (MOFA) has played an active role in designing and promoting the policy framework in which this form of *overseas education* was to operate. Responding to the aforementioned specific needs of professional expatriates with temporary overseas residency plans, *overseas education* policies aimed to regulate the equivalence of standards between overseas curricula and the domestic Course of Study. This was achieved in two forms: the establishment of so-called 'Japanese schools' (*nihonjin gakko*) that provide full-time instruction strictly following all elements of the Course of Study based on government-approved textbooks; and 'complementary schools' (*hoshuko*) operating on a part-time basis mostly on weekends to complement the instruction received at local mainstream schools with certain essential aspects of Japan's domestic Course of Study: primarily *kokugo* (Japanese 'national language')² but sometimes also mathematics, science and social studies. Both types of schools are expected to provide Japanese-medium instruction.

By 2015 there were 89 *nihonjin gakko* and 205 *hoshuko* operating worldwide (88 in North America, 64 in Europe, 21 in Asia, 12 in Oceania, 9 in Central and South America, 6 in Africa, and 5 in the Middle East), instructing 19,894 students (MEXT, 2016). Most schools were originally established by local Japanese communities, gaining official *hoshuko* status following the approval of the Japanese government. The type of support provided to *hoshuko* by the government varies by school, but can include qualified teachers dispatched from Japan, free government-approved textbooks and teacher training, and financial assistance for facilities and local teacher recruitment (MEXT, 2016).

As noted earlier, the Japanese government's *overseas education* policy has been closely aligned with the interests of overseas and domestic Japanese business communities from their inception. An example at hand is *Kaigai-shijo Kyoiku Zaidan* (Japanese Overseas Educational Services, JOES, n.d.-a), a Public Interest Incorporated Foundation under Japanese law established in 1971, which operates with financial support from Japanese transnational companies to provide services for professional expatriate families in close alignment with the *overseas education* framework of MEXT and MOFA. The flagship projects of JOES included financing the establishment of nursery classes at various *nihonjin gakko* and *hoshuko* across

² *Kokugo* is a somewhat controversial term among scholars. The more neutral and common expression is *nihongo* (literally: 'Japanese language'). By contrast, *kokugo* emphasises the 'national' dimension and is closely linked to the history of nation-building, emperor worship and colonial expansion (see Lee, 1996).

the world between 2008–2012 (JOES, n.d.-b), and the distribution of textbooks to those overseas institutions (Doerr & Lee, 2013).

As we shall argue later, the expansion of *overseas education* to nursery-level is a symptom of the demographic transition and diversification which has taken place in overseas Japanese communities both globally and in the United Kingdom. According to the latest official statistics, the number of Japanese nationals living abroad has doubled over the past two and a half decades, increasing from 679,379 in 1992 to 1,351,970 in 2017 (MOFA, 2018: 13). Among those residing in the UK, professional expatriates employed by transnational companies now only account for 28% of the entire Japanese migrant population of 62,887 (MOFA, 2018: 86-87). This means, consequently, that almost three out of four *hoshuko* pupils in the UK are children whose Japanese parents are most likely to be settled residents with no clear intention of going back to Japan before the children complete their compulsory-level education.

Previous research on *Hoshuko* and research questions

Along with the diversification of students' backgrounds, *hoshuko* are increasingly valued by parents less as institutions imparting Course-of-Study-equivalent accredited knowledge, and more as sources of instruction in what is commonly referred to as 'heritage language education' (Kataoka, 2008; Doerr & Lee, 2009). While such diversification is rather recent in the UK context, it is a more established trend in North America, and several US-focused studies have picked up on the difficulties this poses for the sustainability of traditional ways of thinking about the purposes and operating models of *hoshuko*. Kataoka and Shibata (2011), for instance, find that a majority of pupils in the four *hoshuko* on the West Coast of the US covered by their research were in fact learners of *Japanese as Heritage Language* (JHL) rather than children of temporary residents planning a return to Japan. Aware of this reality, some *hoshuko* in the US operate parallel programmes of study based on two different curricular routes for *Japanese as Heritage Language* and *Kokugo* (Doerr & Lee, 2009, 2012). It is often the case, however, that schools are ill-equipped with suitable pedagogical approaches for delivering JHL teaching, particularly where the *Kokugo* is prioritised (Chinen et al., 2013; Doerr & Lee, 2009).

Against this background of internationalisation, the bulk of US-based research has focused on aspects of curriculum development and pedagogical practice that would improve the quality of JHL education at *hoshuko* (e.g. Chinen et al., 2013; Douglas, 2005), while questions concerning the tension between centralised government policies and local realities have largely remained unaddressed. One important exception in this respect are the ethnographic studies carried out by Doerr and Lee (2009, 2012, 2013; Lee & Doerr, 2015). Examining specifically the tensions between locally employed administrators and several government-dispatched principals at one *hoshuko*, they argue that the observed conflicts originated in the discrepancy between the centralised government policy narratives and the needs dictated by local realities (Lee and Doerr, 2015). Although these general insights are likely to describe tensions that exist at many other *hoshuko* – including those in the UK – the specific institutional context of Lee and Doerr's study limits the transferability of their findings to many other *hoshuko* settings outside the US. In particular, the fact that their *hoshuko* is a sizeable institution able to maintain separate curricular routes for *JHL* and *Kokugo* learners and benefits from government-dispatched senior managers – a privilege of schools with at least 100 enrolled students (MEXT, n.d.-b) – sets it apart from the overwhelming majority of

other schools in respect to the administrative challenges they face and the options they have available for resolving tensions.³

Despite a fair amount of research conducted in the US, no comparable research has been identified in the European context, the second largest geographical unit in the global distribution of *hoshuko*. Existing studies on Japanese heritage language maintenance and practices (e.g. Okita, 2002; Mulvey, 2017) do not specifically focus on *hoshuko* settings, while the contexts of various studies exploring non-Japanese ‘heritage language schools (complementary schools)’ (e.g. Blackledge and Creese, 2010; Creese and Blackledge 2011; Lytra, Martin, Barac, and Bhatt, 2010) lack the structuring influence of the governmental patronage characteristic of the Japanese example.

By focusing on situated practices in a small-scale non-statutory locally operated *hoshuko* in the UK against the background or official policy discourses, this article fills both an important empirical gap and a conceptual one. As will be shown in the analysis, contextual characteristics also shape the counter-discursive practices observed at the micro-institutional level. Notwithstanding, the studies reviewed above have helped delimit the main research questions that need to be addressed:

- 1) What discourses dominate Japanese governmental policies towards *hoshuko* (macro level)?
- 2) How are the governmental policy discourses recontextualised and appropriated in *hoshuko* institutional policies (meso level)?
- 3) How are the governmental and institutional discourses reproduced, interpreted, and/or challenged by individual stakeholders’ situated practices at *hoshuko* (micro level)?

Methodology

Analytic framework

Johnson (2011) has identified the combination of critical discourse analysis (CDA) and ethnography as the most rewarding approach to exploring ‘multiple levels of policy creation, interpretation, and appropriation’ (Johnson, 2011: 277). He emphasises that combining the two methods is particularly useful when analysing the behaviour of ‘language policy agents’, be it institutional or individual, and that such work essentially involves also combining ‘the macro, meso, and micro’ perspectives in order to provide ‘a balance between policy power and interpretative agency’ (2011: 269). This is precisely our aim and focus in this article, and we therefore employ an ethnographically situated analytic framework that involves the flexible adaptation of certain critical-discursive conceptual frames that aid a deeper understanding of phenomena by identifying covert meanings and power dynamics behind discourses, narratives and behaviours.

The space available here does not allow a detailed description of critical-discourse-analytic principles; we can only briefly highlight some essential definitions and the core analytical concepts that will explicitly frame the presented analysis. First, following Gee (2008, 2011) we define *discourse* as the production, reproduction and circulation of a specific set of values and knowledge (e.g. about what is ‘good’ or ‘appropriate’) through written, spoken or

³ Around 80% of *Hoshuko* worldwide have fewer than 100 students and are thus managed by residents (MEXT, n.d.-b).

social-interactive *texts*. A holistic *analysis* of discourse, therefore, considers ‘the production of public representations (texts)’ as well as ‘the construction of mental metarepresentations by text-consumers in response to texts’ (Hart, 2010: 183). The latter can themselves be analysed textually as transcribed interview narratives or detailed accounts of observed behaviour. However, to perceive the ‘response’ mechanism that links ‘mental metarepresentations’ – or ideologies – to the discourse-generative texts, the analyst must often rely on linguistic cues such as those denoting *intertextuality* (explicit/implicit references to other texts, topics, actors and events, past and present), *interdiscursivity* (the hybridity and interrelation between different discourses) or *recontextualisation* (the context-specific adaptation of discourses to fit particular goal-oriented strategies) (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001; Fairclough, 2010).

The more specific analytical concepts that drive our analysis originate primarily in studies focusing on ‘discriminatory’ language (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001; Hart, 2010). The general line of argument here is that such use of language aims at ‘linguistic coercion’ through various discursive strategies. The critical-discursive conceptual frame adopted in this article relies primarily on the work of Hart (2010: 63), who defines coercion as ‘an intention to affect the beliefs, emotions and behaviours of others’. Accordingly, ‘text-producers may act coercively in discourse by presenting information in particular ways, thus *influencing the representations of reality* that text-consumers hold, at least for the purpose of local understanding during the discourse event, *and their responses to those representations*’ (2010: 63, italics added). The basic method for such information manipulation is a *referential* strategy, which differentiates *in-groups* – to which the communicator and most often the addressee belong – from *out-groups* – to which they do not (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001). *Predicational* strategies then assign positive and negative attributes and symbolic values to these referential categories (2001: 46). A further possible strategy is *proximisation* (see Cap, 2013), which activates perceptions of threat by alerting text-consumers to the proximity or imminence of phenomena affecting the in-group. Last but not least, Hart (2010) reminds us, ‘referential, predication and proximisation strategies can only achieve coercion when the representations realising these strategies are accepted by text-consumers as true. Text-producers use *legitimising* strategies for precisely this end’ (2010: 89, italics added).

The article explores the operation of these discursive strategies in macro-level official governmental discourses and meso-level institutional policy texts by applying the discourse-analytic conceptual tools outlined above. Then, it traces the appropriation of these discursive features by micro-level actors using ethnographic methods (Johnson, 2011).

Multi-level data

Macro-level discourses are analysed based on publicly available texts issued by MEXT and MOFA, the two Japanese governmental departments involved in the drafting and implementation of *overseas education* policies. A table listing the government documents analysed is available in Appendix A.

The meso-level of analysis centres on institutional discourses carried in texts made available online by the nine *hoshuko* in the UK. These are user-facing documents setting out the schools’ mission statements, institutional policies, structure and organisation. Table 1 below lists some specific characteristics that may impact on policy discourses. All nine UK *hoshuko* operate on Saturdays, yet those whose curriculum extends beyond Japanese provide full-day rather than half-day teaching. Only two have received dispatched teachers from

Japan due to enrolling more than 100 pupils, the rest being operated and managed entirely by local residents.

School names referred to in this paper	Taught Curriculum	Level	Established	Pupils
A-hoshuko	Japanese [<i>Kokugo</i> and JHL]	Primary Lower-secondary Upper-secondary	1960s	1000+
B-hoshuko	Japanese [<i>kokugo</i>] Mathematics	Primary Lower-secondary	1980s	NA
C-hoshuko	Japanese [<i>kokugo</i>]	Nursery Primary Lower-secondary	1980s	50–100
D-hoshuko	Japanese [<i>kokugo</i>]	Nursery Primary Lower-secondary	1980s	N/A
E-hoshuko	Japanese [<i>kokugo</i>] Mathematics	Nursery Primary Lower-secondary	1980s	50–100
F-hoshuko	Japanese [<i>kokugo</i>] Mathematics	Primary Lower-secondary	1980s	50–100
G-hoshuko	Japanese [<i>nihongo</i>]	Nursery Primary Lower-secondary	1990s	50–100
H-hoshuko	Japanese [<i>kokugo</i>] Mathematics	Primary Lower-secondary Upper-secondary	1990s	100–150
I-hoshuko	Japanese [<i>nihongo</i>]	Nursery Primary Lower secondary	2000s	N/A

Table 1: Characteristics of the nine UK *hoshuko*

Source: Authors, based on information available on schools' websites (accessed 10 September 2019, to preserve a level of anonymity, the websites links are omitted)

The micro-level of analysis is focused on ethnographic data collected by the main author at one of the UK *hoshuko* during a 16-month fieldwork conducted between April 2012 and July 2013 as part of a research project investigating language practices among Japanese multilingual families in the UK (Danjo, 2015). To preserve a level of anonymity, we will be referring to this school as UKJH, and is one of the *hoshuko* that provides instruction including at nursery level. The fieldwork at UKJH comprised 36 participant-observational school visits as a volunteer assistant nursery teacher following approval of the research project by the school administration. The position taken on by the ethnographer in this project was that of partial insider: of Japanese nationality and with work experience as a primary school teacher in Japan, she assumed her role as assistant teacher as a participant observer; at the same time, not having children of her own placed her in an out-group position compared to parent participants and most of the permanent teaching staff (for more information on the fieldwork and considerations of researcher positionality, see Danjo 2017). The ethnographic data used for the analysis in this paper are fieldwork diary notes, audio-recorded and transcribed formal

interviews with teachers and parents, and informal ethnographic interviews recorded in the fieldnotes.

Analytic technicalities

The primary aim of this article is to examine interactions between these three analytic levels in order to highlight how socio-cultural diversification raises challenges to established discourses. This requires co-temporality between texts at different levels, so the initial analysis was undertaken on versions of policy texts effective during the fieldwork period (2012–2013). An additional analysis was carried out on the most recent – up to 2020 – versions of the documents in order to identify any significant changes. In some cases, we observe textual alterations that further support our interpretation of the multi-level interactional processes described.

The critical analysis of macro- and meso-level discourses was carried out on the text of the governmental documents listed in Appendix A, and the institutional policy declarations available on the websites of all the nine UK *hoshuko* listed in Table 1. However, unlike in studies whose primary aim is to expose coercive discourse strategies by documenting their pervasive exploitation by text-producers (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001; Hart, 2010), our multi-method framework is aimed at tracing the operation of certain strategies through the different analytic levels to their interpretation and appropriation by actors in an ethnographic context (Johnson, 2011). This, combined with space constraints, requires some special considerations in terms of the presentation of findings. We will support our arguments in the main text by citing specific instances of macro- and meso-level discourse in the form of selected quotations. Longer excerpts in the original language are provided in Appendix B. This approach allows for data obtained through the two different methodological approaches to be presented in a more uniform format.

The analysis was performed on the Japanese original version of policy texts and interview transcripts, while the excerpts presented in the paper are the author's translation. Where necessary, clarification notes are added in brackets. Some expressions were kept in the original Japanese in romanised form, italicised and with translations given in square brackets upon first appearance (e.g. *hoshuko* and *kokugo* above).

Macro-level discourse: the normative frame of *overseas education* policies

Governmental self-legitimation

A major limitation faced by MEXT in respect to *overseas education* has been the fact that its ministerial legislative powers are inherently domestic. It is in explicit acknowledgement of this limitation that MEXT describes its role in providing *overseas education* as such:

In order to make it easier for the children of Japanese people to receive education that is appropriate [ふさわしい: *fusawashi*] adequate, suitable] for a Japanese citizen (while living) in a foreign country where the sovereignty our country [我が国: *waga kuni*] does not reach, MEXT and MOFA adopt several measures [施策: *shisaku*: policy, measure] to promote *overseas education* in the spirit of equal

opportunity and free compulsory education stipulated [定める: *sadameru*: decide, establish, prescribe] in the Constitution. (MEXT, n.d.-a; EX_1)⁴

This technical limitation, however, is employed in the excerpt as part of a legitimising strategy. According to Chilton (2004) political discourse invariably aims to satisfy coercive purposes, and Hart (2010) has argued that legitimising strategies facilitate linguistic coercion indirectly by first establishing a ‘right to be believed’ so that ‘the propositions they communicate are accepted as true and accurate representations of reality’ (2010: 65, 10). Above, MEXT legitimizes itself through several means: first, it ties its name to MOFA, a ministry whose international orientation can give an impression of international authority; second, invoking the spirit of the ‘Constitution’ (specifically Article 26) creates the impression that ‘overseas’ education is constitutionally prescribed; third, the rhetoric of ‘equal opportunity and free compulsory education’ also contains interdiscursive references to international human rights law (see United Nations, 1948, Art. 26; 1989, Art. 28). Legitimation is thus rhetorically derived from the authoritative power of universal human rights and constitutional law which the ministry purports to carry.

Manufacturing its ‘right to be believed’, however, is not the final aim of the MEXT discourse. Hart (2010) has shown that legitimisation is often employed simultaneously with other discursive strategies to ‘achieve macro-strategies like coercion’ (2010: 65). In the excerpt, the possessive determiner in ‘*our* country’ – the opening phrase of the paragraph in the original Japanese script – constructs an in-group inclusive of both the text-producer and the addressee, while the juxtaposition of ‘*Japanese* children/national ... in a *foreign* country’ acts as a referential strategy by presenting the national in-group in ‘de-spatialised’ contrast to the ‘dissimilar’ foreign out-group (cf. Hart, 2010: 57–59). On the scaffold of this dichotomy, demanding education that is ‘*appropriate* for a Japanese national’ is a predication which implicitly assigns a positive quality to the Japanese in-group.

Furthermore, the very emphasis placed on the government’s limited powers in overseas matters of utmost constitutional and universal importance seems to add a sense of threat and urgency to the situation described, serving thus as a proximation strategy (cf. Hart, 2010: 83–87); at stake is *our* appropriate educational development and *our* constitutional and human rights and principles – is the covert message communicated to the text-consumer. The ‘coercive’ purpose is then achieved by pointing out the solution to this urgent matter: the policy measures of MEXT and MOFA. The ensuing paragraph – not quoted above but available in Appendix B (EX_2) – outlines these measures, with direct financial assistance falling under the remit of MOFA and reserving for MEXT the domains of human and material resource management, including the ‘reception of returnee pupils’ [帰国児童生徒 | *kikoku jido seito* | returnee pupils (of compulsory-education age)] (EX_2).

In its own narrative of the purposes of overseas education, MOFA acknowledges in almost identical words the government’s limitations, then proceeds to emphasise the importance to ‘provide at least compulsory education similar to domestic compulsory education’ (EX_3) and to specify its own role using language reminiscent of international economic development discourses:

Overseas education is (an issue) of greatest concerns of Japanese residents abroad [在留邦人 | *zairyu-hojin*]— recognising its essential importance [不可欠

⁴ Excerpts in Japanese original script are available in Appendix B. They are listed in order of their citation in the text (e.g. EX_1).

[*fukaketsu*] indispensable, essential] in improving the environment of overseas development [環境整備 *kankyo seibi*] environmental improvement] of our country's citizens, (MOFA) have taken budgetary measures (to support *overseas education*) (MOFA, 2015; EX_3).

Here, the linguistic coercive aims are pursued through a combined referential-proximation strategy by establishing a nationally inclusive in-group ('our country's citizens') as the supposed beneficiaries of the 'budgetary' measures, even though the 'great concern' about overseas education is felt by the Japanese residents abroad' (*zairyu-hojin*).

Discursive construction of the implicit out-group: the kaigai-shijo as kikoku-shijo

It appears from the previous analysis that the two ministries pursue a similar coercive aim: to establish a representation of overseas education as equally and freely available to, and serving the developmental enrichment of all those from the *national* in-group. What is missing in the referential strategies highlighted above is the absence of an explicitly stated or a logically deducible out-group. We would argue, however, that the true coercive aim of the governmental discourse is in fact the creation of a 'mental metarepresentation' of an implicit out-group (Hart, 2010: 183).

To uncover the mechanism at play, let us examine more closely the usage of the word 'children' in the various policy documents relating to *overseas education* (MEXT, n.d.-a; MEXT, n.d.-c; MEXT, n.d.-d; MOFA, 2015). These texts contain several compound nouns and prepositional phrases referring to the children who are the beneficiaries of overseas education provision: *nihonjin-no-kodomo* (children of Japanese person/people); *zairyu-hojin-no-kodomo* (children of Japanese residents abroad); *kaigai-shijo* (overseas children/sons and daughters); or *kikoku-shijo* (returnee children/sons and daughters). In these expressions, children are referred to either separately or in dependency to their parents. In the latter case, we find that the parents are described either simply as 'Japanese' (*nihonjin*) or as 'Japanese residents abroad' (*zairyu-hojin*). No clear definition of these categories is given, but intertextually we can deduce that *zairyu-hojin* refers to only those who have Japanese citizenship; for instance, the *Annual Report of Statistics on Japanese Nationals Overseas* published by MOFA adopts this definition (MOFA 2018: 6-7).

Kodomo is the common word for 'child' in Japanese, while *shijo* is a rather obsolete phrase referring to 'sons and daughters'.⁵ It is also extremely rare in contemporary Japanese for *shijo* to be used on its own; one notable place where it appears, nevertheless, is Article 26 of the Japanese Constitution to which the previously analysed MEXT excerpt alluded.⁶ The term today is most commonly used in the compound *kikoku-shijo*, denoting returnee 'sons and daughters' from abroad. However, the version *kaigai-shijo* (overseas 'sons and daughters') appears infrequently and almost exclusively in governmental documents (for results of an analysis on this issue, see Danjo, 2015: 91–94). It is safe to assume that this latter term is a linguistic invention of governmental discourse.

⁵ While *shijo* translates more literally as 'children and daughters', 子 (children) is commonly taken to refer to male offspring as the dominant gender, somewhat similarly to the use of 'man' in English.

⁶ In the official English translation of the Constitution (1947) the phrase appears as 'all boys and girls under [one's] protection' [italics added] (https://japan.kantei.go.jp/constitution_and_government_of_japan/constitution_e.html)

Our analysis has also revealed that in the overseas education policy texts *kaigai-shijo* always appears alongside *kikoku-shijo*, thus deriving its discursively constructed meaning from this more common phrase in a way that the adjectives ‘overseas’ and ‘returnee’ appear to describe one and the same group. It is a powerful referential strategy, which constructs a new representation (the ‘overseas’ children as assumed future ‘returnees’) by connecting two distinct concepts with the help of a noun whose antiquated formality can serve both as cognitive and emotive glue (cf. Hart, 2010: 65). The coercive aim is to specify a narrower in-group than the explicitly constructed universalistic and constitutionally grounded ‘sons and daughters’ of the Japanese nation. Overseas education is, rather, the privilege of those expected to ‘return’ to the country. Those in the implicit out-group are, accordingly, those who may remain abroad indefinitely or those who do not intend to return to Japan.

The suppressed challenge of diversification

It is the in-group of expected ‘returnees’ that the ‘policy measures’ and ‘budgetary provisions’ of MEXT and MOFA are directed at. We could say that the coercive aims of the governmental discourse are realised not through an explicit discrimination of a ‘non-returnee’ out-group but via the overemphasis of educational support and expectations of a very particular kind.

MEXT clearly states that the prescriptions of the domestic *School Education Act* (Act 26 of 1947) must be followed in overseas education too, and their help with distributing government-approved textbooks, dispatching ‘competent’ teachers or facilitating the training of local teachers in order to ‘increase educational standards’ is towards this aim (MEXT, n.d.-c). The government believe that these ‘standards’ would ensure pupils’ seamless reintegration into the Japanese domestic education system after return, and for this reason *overseas education* entails following the formal requirements and pedagogical style of the ‘national language’ (*kokugo*) curriculum, as opposed to teaching ‘Japanese’ (*nihongo*). Although it is impossible to expand here on the intricacies of *kokugo* pedagogy, it undoubtedly retains aspects of the imperial-era way of ‘thinking that clearly discriminated between “Japanese (*nihongo*) for foreigners” and “*kokugo* for the homeland”’ (Lee, 1996: 202, emphases in original; see also 244; footnote 20).

There was only one instance in the overseas education policies where a group falling outside the implicit in-group was mentioned. The relevant section from a 2010 MEXT document describes how:

With the recent trend of internationalization [国際化: *kokusai-ka*], however, (schools) have actively engaged with the local contexts, including the study of local language, history and geography, as well as cooperating with local schools to actively promote interactions with local children. Some schools are also running ‘international classes’ [国際学級: *kokusai gakkyu*] that accept children of foreigners [外国人の子ども: *gaikokujin no kodomo*] (MEXT 2010: 4, emphasis in original; EX_4).

This acknowledgement, nevertheless, merely restates the distinction between the ‘domestic standards’ and the ‘international classes’. It is unclear whether the ‘children of foreigners’ who are now accepted to ‘international classes’ also includes, for instance, children of intermarriage families or children with active Japanese heritage whose parents are technically not Japanese ‘citizens’. Tellingly, the text appeared in a section describing *nihonjin gakko* – those full-time ‘Japanese schools’ that do not ‘complement’ but ‘substitute’ local mainstream

education, of which there were a total of 89 worldwide in 2015 (MEXT, 2016) – but there was no mention of ‘internationalisation’ in relation to *hoshuko*. One possible reason could be, in fact, that *hoshuko* are precisely the places where diversification and ‘internationalisation’ in family backgrounds are more likely to emerge and threaten the purity of the national curriculum.

Furthermore, the message falls squarely within the national policy debates around the ‘internationalisation of education’ dating back over thirty years (Ehara, 1992). It is in fact more puzzling that in revised annual editions of the text – since 2014 – the quoted paragraph no longer mentions ‘internationalisation’ or the existence of ‘international classes’ (see EX_5). There is no textual evidence to support that this change reflects a realisation that either the category ‘foreign children’ or ‘internationalisation’ as a whole poses difficulties; however, the analysis of meso-level *hoshuko* institutional policy documents, to which we turn in the next section, would favour such an interpretation. Regardless of the reasons behind this textual alteration, we can interpret it – expanding on Van Leeuwen’s (1996) concept – as an ‘intertextual suppression’, which effectively obliterates the presence of an out-group that had been previously acknowledged in an earlier iteration of the same text. We have found, at the same time, no trace of ‘intertextual backgrounding’ in the latest editions of the relevant policy documents, which would have allowed the continued presence of the out-group to be inferred and suppressed from a related text.

Meso-level discourse: *Hoshuko* institutional policies

The recontextualisation of explicit out-groups

In the previous analysis, we have shown how the Japanese government legitimises the overseas education policy framework, establishes the in-group of legitimate beneficiaries, and suppresses the existence of out-group participants through concealed discursive mechanism, which become discernible through critical analysis. In the meso-level of institutional texts discursive representations and categorisations are much more direct, while at the same time more openly conflicting with the realities of ‘internationalisation’. One typical institutional self-representation is the following:

The purpose of providing complementary education is that the children of professional expatriates etc. deployed from Japan to the C region of England can adapt easily to the Japanese school education after returning to Japan, by fostering Japanese language skills, which is the foundation of all learning, and by allowing students to experience (Japanese) school life. (C-*hoshuko*, EX_6)

Similarly to the excerpt above, six out of the nine UK *hoshuko* stated explicitly that their services are aimed at ‘expected returnees’. Describing their activity as providing an ‘experience’ of Japan’s domestic education is also common. In the excerpt above, the clarification that Japanese language ‘is the foundation of all learning’ is just another rhetorical tool to emphasise that the real purpose of their teaching is not language for language’s sake, but as a basis for other subjects (which most schools do not provide). What also stands out above is the specification of ‘professional expatriates’ [*chuzai-in*]. Most *hoshuko* had been established by the families of temporary employees dispatched to local branches of Japanese companies, and such historical developments have a strong structuring effect on institutional

discourse even when a sizeable proportion of their pupils are no longer children of ‘professional expatriates’.

Explicit positive acknowledgement of diversity in the student body is extremely rare. In most cases the presence of out-group members is indicated through predications that highlight certain negative qualities or behaviours that deviate from the assumed ‘returnee’ in-group. *B-hoshuko*, for example, state on the Admission Information page of their website, under the heading ‘First of all’, that:

Hoshuko is not a Japanese language school. Please understand the operative purposes of the school. *Hoshuko* conduct the classes ‘according to the curriculum issued by MEXT in Japan.’ As instruction is in Japanese language, it is very difficult for children who do not understand the Japanese language spoken by the teacher to understand the classes. (*B-hoshuko*, EX_7; emphasis in original)

The existence of those with a limited understanding of spoken Japanese is then stated directly in the following subsection outlining the ‘minimum measures of preparation’ required to attend the *hoshuko*; the first measure requires the addressee to ‘create a Japanese-language life environment’ [*Nihongo de seikatsu-suru kankyo wo totonoeru*]:

There are some children who feel that speaking Japanese is something special [特別: *tokubetsu*] (...) (We ask parents to) use Japanese as the standard language for conversation in the family home. (EX_7)

While in the first quoted section, diversity appears merely as a deficiency in language skills, we can infer from the second section that the reference is very likely to those with diverse family backgrounds – such as children of intermarriage families and second generation Japanese migrants – who do not use Japanese as their main form of communication at home (including those who communicate multilingually).

The statements can also be read as pursuing a more radical coercive goal. The emphatic rejection of the *hoshuko* being a ‘Japanese language school’; the adherence to MEXT regulations emphasised with quotation marks; the plea to ‘understand’ the school’s objectives; highlighting the ‘extreme’ difficulty [非常に: *hijoni*: very, extremely, exceedingly] of keeping up with the classes; in conjunction, these admonitions can effectively discourage the enrolment of students from multilingual family backgrounds.

Such strategies of emotive coercion are often coupled with practical policies to discriminate between applicants by using separate sets of entry criteria and expectations. *A-hoshuko*, for instance, declares its openness to both those who will ‘return to Japan’ and those ‘whose return is undecided [未定: *mitei*: not yet fixed, undefined]’ (EX_8), but the latter must be:

motivated to study Japanese and have school-year-appropriate competence of Japanese language (interviews and other examinations may be conducted as necessary). (EX_8)

What the school does not problematise is the ‘motivation’ and ‘competence’ of the ‘expected returnees’. As often in predicational strategies, assumed positive traits are what give definition to the in-group, whereas negative evaluations delimitate the out-group as irregular

or misplaced. Argumentative devices such as the ‘topos of definition’ described by Reisigl and Wodak (2001: 76) do just that. Through essentially reconfiguring the meaning of ‘returnee’ to ‘will-have-returned’ – what we might call a ‘future-perfecting’ strategy – the group is discursively relocated within the safe physical bounds of the domestic linguistic community.

The observation that additional entry exams may be conducted *if* or *as* necessary recontextualises the ambiguity that we have seen in the macro-discursive reference to ‘children of foreigners’ and trickles it down into the micro-sphere of social practice. Ultimately, it will be at the discretion of school principals or chairs to assess whether a family has ‘decided’ return plans or not, and thus whether entry examinations are in order. Given that initial interactions during the admissions process take place between parents and administrators, the first criteria to shape their assessment will relate more to family background than to children’s actual language abilities.

Meso-level suppressions and transgressions

The more explicitly discriminatory nature of institutional policy discourses is due to a combination of factors. On the one hand, benefiting from governmental provisions and financial assistance depends on the ‘correct’ interpretation and implementation of the required educational ‘standards’. On the other hand, *hoshuko* have always been established to serve the specific requirements of local Japanese communities abroad, and ‘overseas education is primarily conducted through the self-supporting endeavour of Japanese [local] residents’ (MOFA, 2015). Some *hoshuko* actually emphasise this principle of ‘self-organisation’ to the effect that it enacts further barriers for access by out-group members; they often require a level of parental involvement that is unattainable if both parents are in full-time employment, a rarer case in ‘professional expatriate’ families than in others. However, the local characteristics and requirements driving self-organisation are various and changeable. It is this dynamic variability which sets the tone for the local institutional recontextualisation of macro-level discourses, and what gives rise to counter-discursive practices in meso and micro-level contexts.

Two institutions were identified to ‘transgress’ the dominant discourses. In one case, they made explicit neutral reference to the presence of potential non-returnees such as children of ‘intermarriage families’, or whose parents are ‘international academic scholars’ (*G-hoshuko*). The other institution went as far as to construct a full-fledged counter-discourse framed around openness and interculturality. It described its activities as providing:

opportunities for children to be exposed to Japanese language and to learn and develop their reading and writing skills. Moreover, (our activities) are not limited to Japanese language learning but include communicating Japanese culture to a wide variety of people; we aim to be a group in which anyone can feel free to participate in, and to be a community bridge between Britain and Japan. (*I-hoshuko*; EX_9)

We can see the stark contrast between the experience of ‘Japanese school life’ promised to the ‘children of professional expatriates’ by *C-hoshuko* in an earlier quote and the experience of ‘Japanese language’ offered here to ‘children’ unqualified by family background. The social context in which such a strikingly different self-representation has emerged would be worth exploring in detail ethnographically in the future. Here we can only point out how both ‘transgressive’ schools are recent, *I-hoshuko* having only been established in 2007. A plausible

working hypothesis is that the original circumstances in which individual *hoshuko* were established does indeed have a long-lasting structuring effect, as mentioned earlier.

One common structuring effect is the general overrepresentation of ‘professional expatriates’ on school executive management boards, while those in student-facing teaching and administration roles are themselves more reflective of local social diversification, as we discuss below. Structural realignment with the social realities in such contexts is likely to be slow and less manifest than in the case of new institutions. Our analysis has identified one instance of such inconspicuous but discourse-analytically traceable structural shift, where a school has omitted from the most recent version of its organisational policy the sentence requiring that school Chairs be chosen from among local ‘professional expatriate’ parents. Although this ‘intertextual suppression’ only becomes apparent when we closely compare policy texts across different versions in time, its actual effect may have significant consequences for the realignment between centralised policy discourses and local realities.

Micro-level discourse: situated practices at UKJH

Recontextualised categorisations: chuzai-ji and kokusai-ji

In the previous section we have identified how ‘local policy activities relate to macro-level policy texts and discourses’ through a critical discourse analytic approach (Johnson, 2011: 270). In this section, we shift our focus to the micro-level context of situated practices at one UK *hoshuko* (UKJH) This also requires a shift in method and data, as such situated practices are best explored through ethnographic methods (Johnson, 2011).

UKJH is one of the *hoshuko* established by ‘professional expatriates’ and maintains a close relationship with the local Japanese corporate network. Although its pupil numbers had once afforded it the privilege of dispatched teachers from Japan, by the time of the fieldwork during the 2012 and 2013 it had long ceased to benefit from such support. Its teachers are recruited locally, and some parents with pedagogical training – exclusively mothers of intermarriage families in our case – also double as teachers. Its management, by contrast, is composed of ‘professional expatriate’ parents – usually fathers, to be precise – who administer the communications and contractual relationship with Japanese government representatives (adapted from fieldnotes).

The gendered aspects and repercussions of UKJH’s self-organisation are a topic to be explored separately elsewhere; here we focus on how the macro- and meso-level discourse structures parents’ and teachers’ everyday representations of the school’s pupils and pedagogic aims. In line with the institutional discourses we examined earlier, the recontextualised referential labels assigned to pupils contrast *chuzai-ji* [children of professional expatriates] and *kokusai-ji* [international children], referring to the children of intermarriage families⁷. We employ these categories for simplicity, despite challenging their validity.

According to the available school statistics, in the late 2000s *chuzai-ji* were still the dominant group, outnumbering the *kokusai-ji* by a rate of three to one. This changed by 2012, and at the time of the fieldwork, the *kokusai-ji* were numerically dominant. This reality, however, was not represented in any of the school’s official mission statement and policy

⁷ *Kokusai-ji*, literally means ‘international child’, and has been widely used in the government documents and scholarly literature when referring to the children of international marriage families (Lee and Doerr 2015).

documents. The collected ethnographic data also show that the official representations of *chuzai-ji* as the dominant group and the rightful beneficiaries of *hoshuko* education is also highly internalised by parents of *kokusai-ji*; statements such as ‘they kindly let our children study at *hoshuko*, so we need to encourage our children to keep up with their level’ (Sachiko, parent, fieldnote) were oft-uttered reminders of how effective the *topoi of definition* and *burdening* employed in official discourses really are (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001: 76–78).

The recent diversification of family backgrounds, nevertheless, was raising practical challenges to the official discourse and the dichotomising categorisations. One telling example is the outcome of an administrative exercise that asked each teacher to complete a report containing a section listing the number of *kokusai-ji* and *chuzai-ji* in their class with the aim of identifying the pupils’ language levels and needs. Almost all reports contained a significant number of annotations highlighting the difficulty of placing some of their students in either of the two categories. Some noted how many *chuzai-ji* had moved between countries all their lives, without ever having lived in Japan; other *chuzai-ji* had parents who held permanent residence in the UK and no clear plan to return to Japan. Similarly, some *kokusai-ji* had been raised in Japan and only recently moved to the UK, while others had never been to Japan. The exercise not only challenged its original underlying assumption of equivalence between ‘out-group’ membership and language deficiency but was one of the rare moments when internalised and unchallenged perceptions became problematised by social actors (adapted from fieldnotes).

Families of such diverse backgrounds must see the role of *hoshuko* in their lives and their children’s development from very different perspectives. Institutional policies and pedagogies, however, were strictly structured around the *Kokugo* curriculum, based on government-approved monolingual textbooks and demanding Japanese-only communication during school hours. Although the general attitude among parents and teachers was that ‘this is *hoshuko*, so we cannot say much about what to teach, how to be taught’ (Emiko, parent, field note), the observational material has highlighted the pervasiveness of everyday practices that elude these discursively reproduced normative frames.

It was particularly the ‘monolingual’ expectations that could least be maintained, but not for a lack of determination to police one’s and others’ speech. Since all the teachers were bilingual and many were themselves parents familiar with the local mainstream educational environment, syncretic practices crept through the discursive veil whenever practical considerations came into play. Several such instances were recorded in the ethnographic material. For instance, in a nursery class attended by children aged 3 and 4, the teacher had to use English several times to make herself understood while reading a story, despite following a Japanese-only policy in her class (EX_14). As highlighted in the appended excerpt from audio-recorded material, the children’s silence forced the teacher to clarify in English the meaning of a picture depicting a ‘star festival’ (EX_14, lines 2-5). Her English rendition of ‘Milky Way’ comes more swiftly in the next sentence (EX_14, lines 7-8), while in the following sentence she utters ‘prince’ and ‘princess’ in English pronunciation without first waiting for any puzzled facial expressions from the children (EX_14, line 11), and she does the same with several other words in the rest of the recording. The excerpt highlights vividly how seamlessly teachers react and adapt to students’ language abilities when it comes to choosing the best approach to enhance understanding. Nonetheless, when asked about her multilingual support in an informal ethnographic interview immediately following the teaching session, the teacher emphasised how aware she was that it is wrong to use English in class instead of Japanese, and that had she ‘had any other option at the time’ she would have avoided it

because ‘using English in the classroom was against her teaching philosophy’ (Teacher A, field note; EX_10). Similarly, another teacher confessed to ‘sometimes using English’ herself yet disapproving of pupils doing so because ‘English should not be encouraged in a government-approved *hoshuko*’ (teacher B, email exchange; EX_11).

Multilingual exchanges at *hoshuko*, however, can also enhance learning for pupils of all backgrounds. A lively example of a mutually beneficial interaction recorded in the fieldwork diary was when a child brought up in the UK learnt the American-English loan-word *uinna* (wiener) from a classmate who had recently arrived to the UK, and taught the other child how in British-English what he was referring to is actually called ‘sausage’ (Tomoko, parent interview_EX_12). Similarly, one teacher described how using English in her class can bring learning benefits to students of different backgrounds. She gave as example a textbook Japanese story about ‘soya beans’. According to her, when she teaches this story to students, she tells them how the Japanese word ‘bean’ [豆] describes both ‘beans’ and ‘peas’ in English. This instructive distinction would be difficult to make using only Japanese, and according to the teacher, through her brief use of English words the *kokusai-ji* can learn the new concept of 豆, while the *chuzai-ji* can learn about the distinction between ‘beans’ and ‘peas’ in English (teacher B, ethnographic interview). Such opportunities for unstructured learning emerge precisely from the multilingual resources available in the *hoshuko* community.

Among the children, it was often the *chuzai-ji* who have benefited from bilingual interactions at *hoshuko*. As one teacher noted, ‘for *chuzai-ji*, *hoshuko* may be a buffer zone. By coming to *hoshuko*, interestingly, they can also develop English vocabulary’ (teacher B, interview). Similarly, for some *chuzai-ji* parents, *hoshuko* was the only place where they could gather information on various aspects of local life in the UK, serving effectively as a community support centre. The *hoshuko* thus often acts as a bridge for sociocultural adaptation to life in the UK, rather than a safe space of sociocultural seclusion. Furthermore, it can also provide an entry-point to a more international education in Japan. Indeed, one *chuzai-ji* mother confessed just before her family’s return to Japan that they were thinking to send their children to an international school rather than a government approved school, as their son had enjoyed learning English so much while staying in the UK, and they wanted to enhance his English skills (Yukari, parent, field note). Such plans may not be uncommon, as the prestige of international schools and the cosmopolitan careers they can provide has been increasing in Japan. For others, seclusion was precisely the aim, albeit their support for monolingual policies stemmed mostly from reasons very different to the official narrative. For instance, some *kokusai-ji* parents explained how they were becoming less and less able to maintain Japanese-language conversations at home; for them, *hoshuko* provided a setting where they could re-enact the role they had played at home when they managed to impose on their younger children a strict one-parent-one-language policy by pretending not to understand English (Danjo, 2015).

Micro-level appropriations

The various acts of negotiation that we have described above are, nonetheless, part of the *modus vivendi* rather than subversive acts meant to drive a radical reconfiguring of power relations and policy structures. They correspond somewhat to the slow and inconspicuous form of change we identified in respect to meso-level discursive shifts. We also noted there how more open structural challenges might be dependent on the circumstances under which those structures emerged in the first place.

The fieldwork at UKJH was able to identify one avenue for institutions with long-established structural constraints to openly challenge the normative frame of the governmental discourse. As mentioned earlier, *overseas education* policies prescribe the provision of 'equal' and 'free' education at the nationally compulsory primary- and lower-secondary levels. However, many *hoshuko* around the world – including seven of the nine UK schools – have expanded their teaching to nursery and upper-secondary levels too. We have already noted the role played by the JOES Foundation in financially supporting the establishment of nursery-level instruction. As the Foundation explains, their reasons for the initiative are to respond to an increasing number of pre-school-age 'professional expatriate' children, and to ensure that the number of pupils remains high enough to enable the proper functioning of the schools (JOES, n.d.-b).

Of the two somewhat conflicting reasons, the second is closer to the realities at UKJH, where discussions around establishing a nursery class emerged in the late 2000s, and classes officially started in 2010. As one teacher recognised, 'for large schools that have enough financial resources without *kokusai-ji*, it might not be a problem; but schools like ours, with a small number of students, cannot survive' without diversifying (teacher B, interview; EX_13). Nursery classes can provide a solution where rigid policy structures — such as restrictive entry requirements and discourses similar to those discussed in the previous section — set impediments to diversification.

Compulsory-school-level entry requirements were set rather high at UKJH. They required students to possess good age-appropriate Japanese proficiency (in comparison to Japanese children living in Japan), to have Japanese language communication available at home, for parents to actively participate in administration tasks, as well as for children to have Japanese nationality. They also required that *kokusai-ji* pass an entry examination to prove their language ability. Since the same admission policy documents were used as the basis for drafting the nursery-level admission requirements, it is noteworthy that only the nationality and the examination requirements were omitted from the latter. This effectively opens the path for legitimate participation in the *hoshuko* for a wide variety of potential new pupils.

As the administrator in charge of nursery-level administration at the time of the fieldwork explained, nursery classes were both structurally and financially independent from the main *hoshuko* section, allowing more freedom in pedagogical practices and managerial decision-making (Noriko, nursery administrator, field notes). As they are not part of 'compulsory education,' classes do not have to follow Japanese government-approved textbooks or the national curriculum. This makes *hoshuko* more widely available and can be an effective preparation course for progression to primary-school level for children whose parents are settled in the UK. Conversely, it may also cater for parents who, under the influence of popular bilingualism discourses, are interested in achieving 'child bilingualism' by exposing their children to the Japanese language for only a limited period at a very young age (King and Fogle, 2006; Piller, 2005). How this development will affect the broader *hoshuko* structures, policies and discourses remains to be explored in future research.

Conclusion

This article has combined ethnography and CDA to explore the meaning of policies and practices related to *overseas education* in the context of Japanese government-approved

complementary schools (*hoshuko*) using textual and ethnographic data pertaining to three different levels of analysis. This combination of data and methods is particularly suitable for multi-level analysis. As Johnson (2011) has already demonstrated, 'CDA reveals how local policy activities relate to macro-level policy texts and discourses, while ethnography shows how the meaning of a particular language policy in a community emerges across a trajectory of interpretation and appropriation unique to that context' (2011: 270).

We have shown how the two governmental departments responsible for *overseas education* provision legitimise their role and pursue specific coercive aims whose meaning is concealed by various discursive strategies. We argued that these macro-level policy discourses serve to specify a more restrictive target group for the policy measures than what is overtly acknowledged, and that they effectively suppress the challenges posed by the sociocultural diversification of the family backgrounds of many overseas pupils. We have traced the recontextualisation and appropriation of these macro-policy discourses in the meso-level context of the institutional policies of the nine Japanese *hoshuko* operating in the UK, and in the micro-level context of practices at one of these schools. At each level, we have also identified mechanisms through which the official dominant discourse is challenged either openly or in more subtle forms which only emerge through careful intertextual critical analysis.

The analysis we have presented allows us to draw several important conclusions. First, that the discursive normative frame of *overseas education* policy is unable to capture linguistic and social realities in the local contexts that they affect. However, the top-down effect of mental representations created by the policy discourse is increasingly complemented by the bottom-up effect of practices immersed in the localised realities. Nevertheless, a more purposeful policy realignment acknowledging local diversity would benefit the overseas communities involved in *hoshuko*. As we have demonstrated, the restrictive categorisations inherited from the institutional discourses not only mask the existence of diversity, but also hinder effective linguistic and cultural development.

Secondly, we have shown how the discourse-analytic conceptual apparatus developed to help decipher discourses of 'discrimination' particularly against racial, ethnic and migrant minority groups (e.g. Reisigl & Wodak, 2001; Hart, 2010) can be usefully applied in a variety of contexts where the discursive discrimination between in-groups and out-groups can enhance the text-producers' 'coercive' aims. As Hart (2010: 49) has noted 'in-group versus out-group distinctions are not coded in cognition a priori', rather the 'construction of in-groups and out-groups is triggered by cultural inputs (texts) and where the boundary lies between them is imparted through cultural transmission (discourse)'.

Some of the analytical contributions that we make – such as the identification of 'intertextual' forms of suppression and backgrounding, or the operation of 'future-perfecting' argumentative devices – are likely to find applications in a variety of other research contexts. Considering the diverse contexts in which *hoshuko* operate around the world, our analysis of the institutional policy materials and ethnographic data is limited to the specific case of the UK and that of UKJH particular at the time of the investigation.

References

- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum International.
- Cap, P. (2013). *Proximization: The pragmatics of symbolic distance crossing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge
- Chinen, K., Douglas M.O., & Kataoka, H. C. (2013). *Japanese Heritage Language Schools in the United States*. Heritage Briefs Collection. Online available at <http://www.cal.org/heritage/pdfs/briefs/japanese-heritage-language-schools-in-the-united-states.pdf> (Accessed on 10 September, 2019).
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1196-1208, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.006>
- Danjo, C. (2015). *A Critical Ethnographic Inquiry into the Negotiation of Language Practices among Japanese Multilingual Families in the United Kingdom: Discourse, Language Use and Perceptions in the Hoshuko and the Family Home*. PhD Thesis, Northumbria University at Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Danjo, C. (2017). Reflecting on My Positionality as a Multilingual Researcher. In Conteh, J. (Ed.), *Researching Education for Social Justice in Multilingual Settings* (pp. 105–119). London: Bloomsbury.
- Doerr, N.M., & Lee, K. (2009). Contesting heritage: language, legitimacy, and schooling at a weekend Japanese-language school in the United States. *Language and Education*, 23:5, 425-441, DOI: 10.1080/09500780802651706
- Doerr, N.M., & Lee, K. (2012). 'Drop-outs' or 'heritage learners'? Competing mentalities of governmentality and invested meanings at a weekend Japanese language school in the USA. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 23:5, 1-13, DOI: 10.1080/09500780802651706
- Doerr, N.M., & Lee, K. (2013). *Constructing the Heritage Language Learner: Knowledge, Power and New Subjectivities*. Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Douglas, M.O. (2005). Pedagogical Theories and Approaches to Teach Young Learners of Japanese as a Heritage Language. *Heritage Language Journal*, 3(1), 60-82
- Ehara, T. (1992). "The internationalization of education." In D. H. Glenn & M. A. Weiner (Eds.), *The Internationalization of Japan* (pp. 269-283). London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2008). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (3rd ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.

Hart, C. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

JOES. (n.d.-a). Kaigai-Shijo Kyoiku Shinko Zaidan Gaiyo [Introduction to Japan Overseas Educational Services]. Retrieved 29 May 2014, from Japan Overseas Educational Services <http://www.joes.or.jp/gaiyo/index.html> (originally in Japanese); The English translation is also available at <http://www.joes.or.jp/info/introduction.html>

JOES. (n.d.-b). Yochibu Kaisetsu Shien [Support for establishing nursery]. Retrieved 02 Oct 2014, from Japan Overseas Educational Services <http://www.joes.or.jp/yochibu/index.html>

Johnson, D. C. (2011). Critical discourse analysis and the ethnography of language policy. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 8(4), 267-279.

Kataoka, H. (2008). *Amerika ni iru nihon no kodomotachi* [Japanese children in the U.S.]. In G. Sato & H. Kataoka (Eds.), *Amerika de sodatsu nihon no kodomotachi* (pp. 49-67). Tokyo, Japan: Akashi Shoten.

Kataoka, H., & Shibata, S. (2011). Japanese language proficiency and home language use among children of international marriages: Breaking free from common assumptions. *JHL Journal*, 4, 1-40.

King, K & Fogle, L. (2006). Bilingual Parenting as Good Parenting: Parents' Perspectives on Family Language Policy for Additive Bilingualism, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(6), 695-712.

Lee K. & Doerr N.M. (2015). Homeland Education in a New Home. In S. Horiguchi, Y. Imoto, & G.S. Poole (Eds.), *Foreign Language Education in Japan. Critical New Literacies: The Praxis of English Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 19-34). Sense Publishers, Rotterdam

Lee, Y. (1996). *The ideology of kokugo: nationalizing language in modern Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press

Li, W. (2006). Complementary Schools, Past, Present and Future. *Language and Education*, 20(1), 76-83.

Lytra, V., Martin, P., Baraç, T., & Bhatt, A. (2010). Investigating the intersection of multilingualism and multimodality in Turkish Gujarati literacy classes. In P. Martin, & V. Lytra (Eds.), *Sites of multilingualism: complementary schools in Britain today* (pp. 19-31). Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

MEXT. (n.d.-a). Kaigaishijo-kyoiku no gaiyo [overview of education for children abroad] International Education Division, Elementary and Secondary Education Bureau, MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology). Online available at http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/clarinet/002/001.htm (Accessed on 10 September, 2019).

MEXT. (n.d.-b). Kaigaishijo-kyoiku no genjo ni tsuite [Current state of overseas education] International Education Division, Elementary and Secondary Education Bureau, MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology). Online available at http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/shotou/026/shiryuu/04111901/004.htm (Accessed on 10 September, 2019).

MEXT. (n.d.-c). Shisaku no gaiyo [overview of educational institutions] International Education Division, Elementary and Secondary Education Bureau, MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology). Online available at http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/clarinet/002/003.htm (Accessed on 10 September, 2019).

MEXT. (n.d.-d). Zaigai kyoiku shisetsu no gaiyo [overview of educational institutions for residents abroad] International Education Division, Elementary and Secondary Education Bureau, MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology). Online available at http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/clarinet/002/002.htm (Accessed on 10 September, 2019).

MEXT. (2010). Kaigai de manabu nihon no kodomotachi: Waga kuni no kaigaishijo-kyoiku no genjo [Japanese children learning abroad: Our country's present situation of education for children abroad] International Education Division, Elementary and Secondary Education Bureau, MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology).

MEXT. (2016). Kaigai de manabu nihon no kodomotachi: Waga kuni no kaigaishijo-kyoiku no genjo [Japanese children learning abroad: Our country's present situation of education for children abroad] International Education Division, Elementary and Secondary Education Bureau, MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology).

MOFA. (2015). Kaigai kyoiku [education abroad] MOFA (Ministry of Foreign Affairs). Online available at <https://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/toko/kaigai/kyoiku/index.html> (Accessed on 10 September, 2019).

MOFA. (2018). Kaigai zairyu hojinsu chosa tokei: Heisei 30 nen yoyaku-ban [Annual report of statistics on Japanese nationals overseas: Abridged edition of 2017] Consular Policy Division, Consular Affairs Bureau, MOFA (Ministry of Foreign Affairs). Online available at <https://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/files/000368753.pdf> (Accessed on 10 September, 2019).

Mulvey, N. (2017). Translanguaging, a different pedagogy for language education at a Japanese as a Heritage Language (JHL) School in England. In K.C., Şahan, M. Melsen, A. Tawell, K. Newell, K. Wortmann, & N. Mukhi (Eds.), *Doing Education Differently: Proceedings of the 2017 STORIES Conference* (pp. 85-92). Oxford: University of Oxford

Okita, T. (2002). *Invisible Work: Bilingualism, Language Choice, and Childrearing in Intermarried Families*. Amsterdam: Benjamins Publishing.

Piller, I. (2005). Review of Language strategies for bilingual families: The one-parent-one-language approach. By Suzanne Barron-Hauwaert. *International Journal of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*, 8(6), 614-617.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. London: Routledge.

Sato, G. (1997). *Kaigai kikokushijo no kyoiku no saikoshiku* [reconstruction of education of overseas/returnee children: from the perspective of cross-cultural education]. Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.

United Nations. (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. United Nations. Retrieved from http://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/eng.pdf.

United Nations. (1989). United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. Geneva: United Nations. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org.uk/Documents/Publication-pdfs/UNCRC_PRESS200910web.pdf.

Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard, & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 32-70). London: Routledge.

Appendices

Appendix A

Analysed Policy Documents of the Japanese Government

Name of the Policy Documents [translation]	Issued Ministry, and References
海外教育 [Overseas Education] https://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/toko/kaigai/kyoiku/index.html	(MOFA, 2015)
海外子女教育の概要 [Overview of Education for Children Abroad] http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/clarinet/002/001.htm	Mext, n.d.-a
海外子女教育の現状について http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/shotou/026/shiryou/04111901/004.htm	Mext, n.d.- b
施策の概要 [Overview of Educational Institutions] http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/clarinet/002/003.htm	Mext, n.d.-c
在外教育施設の概要 [Overview of Educational Institutions for Residents Abroad] http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/clarinet/002/002.htm	Mext, n.d.-d
海外で学ぶ日本人の子供たち：我が国の海外教育の現状 [Japanese Children Learning Abroad: Our Country's Present Situation of Education for Children Abroad]	(MEXT, 2010, 2016)

Appendix B

EX_1

我が国の主権の及ばない外国において、日本人の子どもが、日本国民にふさわしい教育を受けやすくするために、文部科学省と外務省では、憲法の定める教育の機会均等及び義務教育無償の精神に沿って、海外子女教育の振興のために様々な施策を講じています。

EX_2

具体的には、文部科学省が在外教育施設への教員の派遣、教材整備補助及び帰国児童生徒の受入に係る支援などを行っており、外務省では、在外教育施設の校舎借料及び現地採用教員謝金援助などを行っています。

EX_3

また教育は、各国の主権に属する事柄と一般に理解されており、海外教育で、我が国の主権の及ばない外国において行われるものであることから、政府は直接的には行い得ず、当然日本国内と同様の義務教育を行うことは困難です。しかしながら、政府としては、少なくとも義務教育に関しては国内の義務教育に近い教育が受けられるよう最大限の支援を行うべきであるとの考え方に基つき外務・文部科学両省において諸般の施策を進めています。

外務省としても上記の基本的立場を踏まえつつ、特に海外教育は在留邦人の最大の関心事の一つであり、その充実強化は我が国国民の海外発展のための環境整備の一環として不可欠であるとの認識のもとに予算措置を講じており、次のような援助を行っています。

EX_4

最近の国際化の風潮により、ただ、日本の勉強をするだけでなく、現地の言葉や歴史、地理などの現地事情に関わる指導を取り入れたり、現地校と協力することにより、現地の子どもたちとの交流を積極的に進めるようになっていきます。また、「国際学級」を設け、外国人の子どもを受け入れている学校もあります。

EX_5

現在、多くの在外教育施設においては、現地の文化や歴史、地理など現地事情に関わる学習や現地校等との交流を積極的に進めており、ネイティブの講師による英会話あるいは現地語の学習も行われています。

EX_6

日本から X 地区へ派遣されている駐在員等の子供達が、将来、日本へ帰国し、日本の学校教育を受ける場合に円滑に学校生活に適應できるよう、学校生活を経験させ、全ての学習の基礎となる国語力を身につけさせるための、補習教育を行なわせることを目的とする。

EX_7

日本人補習授業校は、日本語学校ではありません。補習校の運営目的を理解ください。補習校は「日本の文部科学省のカリキュラムに沿った授業」を行います。日本語で学習しますので、先生の話される日本語が理解できない児童は、授業を理解することが非常に困難です。…日本語で話すことが特別なことに感じている児童が見受けられます。…家庭内での会話は日本語を基本としてください。

* 日本語で生活する環境を整える 日本語で話すことが特別なことに感じている児童が見受けられます。何を問いかけても、第一声が「できない、わからない」になる児童がいます。⇒ 家庭内での会話は日本語を基本としてください。

EX_8

小・中学部・高等部希望者は、帰国後の学校生活への適応を目的としている者および帰国は未定であるが、国語学習への意欲があり、一定の日本語力と学年相応の国語力があると認められる者（必要に応じて、面談その他の審査を行う場合あり）。

EX_9

I 補習校は子供たちに日本語に触れる機会を与え、学び、読み書きの力をつけるための活動を行っております。更には語学としての日本語学習にとどまらず、広くいろいろな方に日本の文化を伝え、どなたでも気軽に参加できるグループとして活動することにより、イギリスと日本とのコミュニティー的な架け橋となることを目指しております。

EX_10

... after the class, this teacher explained to me that **using English in the classroom is against her teaching philosophy**, and that she just had to do it as she did not have any other option at that time. Maintaining a contrite voice, she added that she had always felt that she might be doing something wrong by using English, as she was not supposed to. This perception of this teacher could indicate her strong awareness of *Hoshuko's* monolingual policy. Her self-reflection also shows that this was an issue of great concern to her, and she seemed to struggle with reconciling the reality of the students' diverse backgrounds and demands with the *Hoshuko's* discourses (a teacher, interview: July 2012).

EX_11

... after the interview and she added her notes, saying that she does not mean that she encourages her students to use English in her class. She explained that **English should not be encouraged in a government-approved *hoshuko*** (a teacher, email exchange: January 2013).

EX_12

We call a sausage ‘uinna’ in Japan, especially the small ones often in lunch boxes. I recognise those (the English loan words which is not used in the UK), so I have never used ‘uinna’ to him intentionally. But his friends at *hoshuko* have shown him a sausage which is cut into an octopus shape, and called it ‘octopus uinna.’ Then he learnt from them, and asked me one day “mum, could you make an octopus uinna?” At Hoshuko, when a *chuzai-ji* called it “octopus uinna” it is followed by *kokusai-ji* replying “no it is a sausage”: in this way, they also learn “ah, so this is not called as ‘uinna’ here” (Tomoko, parent, interview: October 2012).

EX_13

For large schools that have enough financial resources without *kokusai-ji*, it might not be a problem; but schools like ours, with a small number of students cannot survive in this way (without diversifying). Therefore, these schools have tried to accept as many students as possible (a teacher, interview: October 2012).

EX_14

- 1 < showing children a cover page of the book >
- 2 T: お星さまのお祭りが 있습니다。 [there is a star festival]
- 3 Ss: <pause about 2 seconds>
- 4 T: Star festival.
- 5 S1: Ah! Star festival!
- 6 T: どうしてそんなお話かって本をよんであげるね。 [I’ll read the story telling you] why star festival is [celebrated].]
- 7 T: < pointing at a picture > これは天の川。 [this is a milky way]
- 8 T: お空の milky way って知ってる? [Do you know *milky way* in the sky?]
- 9 T: お星さまがいっぱいあるところね。 [the place where there are a lot of stars]
- 10 Ss: < Nodding and looking at the picture in the book >
- 11 T: で、こっちにお姫様、Princes。こっちをみると王子様、Prince ね。 [so, this is a princess, *princess*, and here we see, prince, *prince*.]...

[Transcription symbols]

T teacher

S(s) student(s)

< > researcher’s additional description based on field notes

日本語[translation] speeches in Japanese [English translation]