

模範解答

1. Describe the official language policy of a country you are familiar with.

The United Kingdom does not have a single codified official language at the level of the state, yet English functions as the dominant de facto national language across government, law, education, and public administration. At the same time, the UK presents a more complex linguistic landscape due to the recognition of minority and regional languages, particularly in devolved administrations. Welsh has achieved the most extensive legal recognition, and Welsh enjoys institutional support in education, broadcasting, and administration, and its revitalization is often cited as a relatively successful example of language policy in Europe.

Scottish Gaelic and Irish also receive official recognition, though to a more limited extent. The Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act 2005 aims to secure the status of Gaelic as an official language of Scotland with “equal respect” to English, although in practice its use remains geographically and socially restricted. Irish holds official status in Northern Ireland in more contested political circumstances, reflecting its association with identity and historical conflict. Beyond these indigenous languages, the UK has become increasingly multilingual due to migration, with significant communities using languages such as Polish, Punjabi, Urdu, and Arabic. However, these languages are not formally incorporated into national language policy, and support for them is largely uneven and localized.

Overall, the UK’s language policy can be characterized as asymmetrical and multi-layered. While English dominates as a de facto national language, minority languages receive varying degrees of recognition tied to regional governance and identity politics. This results in a system that combines strong linguistic centralization with selective institutional pluralism.

3. What is receptive multilingualism?

Receptive multilingualism refers to communicative situations in which speakers use different languages while relying on their ability to understand, rather than produce, the language of their interlocutor. This form of interaction is particularly common among speakers of closely

related languages and challenges the assumption that communication requires full productive competence in a shared code.

As discussed by Rehbein, ten Thije, and Zeevaert (2007), receptive multilingualism operates through strategies such as inference, accommodation, and the exploitation of linguistic similarity. It is especially visible in the Scandinavian context, where speakers of Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish often communicate by each using their own language. Braunmüller (2007) demonstrates that mutual intelligibility in such contexts is supported not only by structural similarity but also by exposure and pragmatic flexibility.

The concept has broader implications for multilingual societies and language policy. It offers an alternative to the dominance of lingua francas such as English by allowing speakers to maintain their linguistic identity while still achieving mutual understanding. It also has pedagogical relevance, as developing receptive skills across related languages can lower the threshold for multilingual communication. In this sense, receptive multilingualism represents a more flexible and realistic model of communication in linguistically diverse environments, emphasizing comprehension and interaction over formal proficiency.

6. Briefly discuss the nature of multilingualism in a country you are familiar with.

Multilingualism in Japan is often characterized as limited in comparison to many other societies, yet this perception obscures a more complex linguistic reality. While Japanese dominates public and institutional domains, multiple forms of multilingualism exist at different social levels. Historically, Japan has contained significant internal linguistic diversity, including regional dialects and distinct language varieties such as the Ryukyuan languages. However, processes of modernization and nation-building, particularly from the Meiji period onwards, promoted the standardization of Japanese and contributed to the marginalization of these varieties. As a result, multilingualism within Japan has often been suppressed or rendered invisible.

In contemporary contexts, new forms of multilingualism have emerged through migration and globalization. Increasing numbers of foreign residents have introduced languages such as Chinese, Vietnamese, Portuguese, and Tagalog into everyday life, particularly in urban and industrial areas. At the same time, English plays a prominent role as a global language, although functional proficiency remains uneven.

Following Blommaert's (2010) perspective, multilingualism in Japan can be understood as

stratified and unevenly distributed, with different linguistic resources carrying different social values. While official discourse often emphasizes homogeneity, actual language practices reveal a more layered and dynamic situation. Multilingualism in Japan is therefore best understood not as absent, but as structured by historical processes, institutional norms, and global flows.

[3]-1 In what sense can your proposed research be considered geolinguistic ethnography?

My proposed research can be considered what is referred to here as geolinguistic ethnography insofar as it investigates language use as a socially embedded practice situated within specific spatial, cultural, and institutional contexts. Although the term itself is not standard within the field, it can be understood in relation to developments in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology that foreground the relationship between language, place, and mobility.

The research examines translated media as a form of discourse that circulates globally while remaining embedded in specific sites of production and reception. Subtitles produced for streaming platforms, for example, are shaped not only by linguistic considerations but also by technological constraints, institutional norms, and assumptions about geographically dispersed audiences. By combining close textual analysis with attention to these contextual factors, the project adopts an ethnographic sensitivity to situated practice while engaging with geolinguistic concerns about scale and circulation. In this sense, the research does not treat language as an abstract system but as a set of practices embedded in spatially organized social life. It therefore fits productively within an expanded understanding of geolinguistic ethnography.

[3]-2 Describe possible applications of receptive multilingualism

Receptive multilingualism refers to communicative situations in which interlocutors use different languages while relying primarily on receptive competence for mutual understanding. As explored in the work of Rehbein, ten Thije, and Zeevaert (2007), this mode of communication challenges the assumption that effective interaction requires full productive mastery of a shared language.

One well-documented application can be found in the Scandinavian context, where speakers of Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish often communicate by each using their own language. Research by Braunmüller (2007) demonstrates that mutual intelligibility, combined with exposure and pragmatic accommodation strategies, allows for effective communication without language switching. This model has attracted interest within European policy

discussions as a potential means of maintaining linguistic diversity while reducing reliance on English as a lingua franca, although its practical implementation remains uneven.

Receptive multilingualism also has implications for migration contexts, where individuals must navigate linguistically complex environments. The ability to understand a dominant language without full productive competence can support social participation and access to information, especially in the early stages of integration. In this sense, receptive multilingualism offers a pragmatic and inclusive model of communication that reflects the realities of linguistic diversity.

[3]-3 What relationships can language and culture have with each other?

The relationship between language and culture is best understood as one of mutual constitution rather than simple causality. While early formulations such as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis emphasized the extent to which language shapes thought, subsequent work in linguistic anthropology has demonstrated that language both reflects and actively constructs cultural meaning within specific social contexts.

From an anthropological perspective, culture can be understood, following Geertz, as a system of meanings embodied in symbolic forms, among which language plays a central role. However, more linguistically grounded approaches, such as those developed by Silverstein (1979) and Duranti (1997), emphasize that language operates not only as a symbolic system but also as a form of social action embedded in practices, ideologies, and power relations. In this respect, Bourdieu's concept of linguistic capital further highlights how language use is linked to social hierarchy and the distribution of symbolic power.

The relationship between language and culture becomes particularly visible in translation, where culturally specific meanings must be mediated across linguistic boundaries. As Venuti has argued, translation strategies can either foreground or obscure cultural difference, thereby shaping how cultures are represented and understood. This process is not neutral, but involves choices that reflect broader ideological and institutional pressures. At the same time, globalization has intensified the interaction between language and culture by facilitating the circulation of linguistic forms across cultural contexts. This has led to the emergence of hybrid forms, as described by Bhabha, in which cultural meanings are negotiated rather than fixed. Language in such contexts becomes a site of ongoing cultural production.

In sum, language and culture are dynamically interconnected. Language both encodes and

shapes cultural meaning, while culture provides the conditions under which language is used and interpreted. Any adequate analysis must therefore account for their reciprocal and context-dependent relationship.