เปรมวดี ณ นครพนม
บัณฑิตวิทยาลัย มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏสวนสุนันทา

การรับรู้คำยืมภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาญี่ปุ่น

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยนี้ เป็นการศึกษาความเข้าใจและรูปแบบข้อผิดพลาดเกี่ยวกับคำยืมภาษาอังกฤษในการเรียนคำศัพท์ภาษาญี่ปุ่นของนักศึกษาปี 3 ที่เรียนภาษาญี่ปุ่นเป็นวิชาเอก จำนวน 106 คน จากมหาวิทยาลัยไทย 4 แห่ง โดยแบ่งนักศึกษาเป็นกลุ่มเก่ง 21 คน และกลุ่มอ่อน 85 คน ตามผลสอบวัดระดับความรู้ภาษาญี่ปุ่น ใช้แบบทดสอบความเข้าใจคำยืมภาษาอังกฤษ 3 ชุด จำแนกตามประเภทคำยืม คือ 1) แปลคำศัพท์ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นคำยืม 20 คำ 2) แปลคำยืมเป็นคำศัพท์เดิมในภาษาอังกฤษ 20 คำ 3) แปลคำยืม 6 คำเป็นคำศัพท์เดิมในภาษาอังกฤษ โดยเป็นคำที่ญี่ปุ่นสร้างขึ้น 5 คำ และคำยืมที่มาจากภาษาอื่น 1 คำ ใช้สถิติเชิงพรรณาและเชิงอนุมานวิเคราะห์ข้อมูล และวิเคราะห์ข้อผิดพลาดในการแปลคำยืมในเชิงคุณภาพ ผลวิจัยพบว่า ความถูกต้องหรือความสามารถเข้าใจได้ในการแปลคำศัพท์ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นคำยืมของนักศึกษาทั้งสองกลุ่ม มีค่าเฉลี่ยสูงกว่าการแปลคำศัพท์ในอีก 2 ชุด (กลุ่มเก่ง 2.55, 2.48, 1.87 กลุ่มอ่อน 2.18, 2.16, 1.59 ตามลำดับ) และพบปัญหาการแปลคำศัพท์ภาษาอังกฤษที่มีพยางค์ท้ายคำที่อยู่ในตำแหน่งไม่ออกเสียง รูปแบบข้อผิดพลาดในการแปลคำศัพท์ทั้ง 3 ชุด สัมพันธ์กับประเภทของคำยืม และสัมพันธ์กับการออกเสียงคำศัพท์ของนักศึกษา

คำสำคัญ

การรับรู้, คำยืม, ภาษาญี่ปุ่น, การวิเคราะห์ข้อผิดพลาด

Premvadee Na Nakornpanom
Graduate School of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University,
Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University

Recognition of English Loan Words by Thai Students of Japanese

Abstract

This research examined the comprehension and error patterns related to loan words in the Japanese vocabulary learning of 106 third-year students majoring in Japanese from 4 universities in Thailand. The students were divided into good and poor groups (21:85) according to their Japanese Language Proficiency Test (JLPT) results. They were asked to translate 1) 20 English words with their equivalent loan words; 2) 20 loan words with the original English words; and 3) 6 loan words: 5 Japanese innovative forms and 1 other European origins with the original English words. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analysis the data. Qualitative analysis was applied to describe the types of errors that the students made. It was revealed that the translation correctness or comprehensibility of English words to loan words was higher than the two other two types of loan words in both groups of students (good group: $\bar{x}$= 2.55, 2.48, 1.87; poor group $\bar{x}$= 2.18, 2.16, 1.59). The students faced problems in the translation of English words ending with the schwa sounds. The error patterns in identifying the loan words of the students were related to the types of loan words. They were also related to the students' pronunciation of the English words and the loan words.

Key words

recognition, loan words, Japanese, error analysis

1. Introduction

Many foreign words were borrowed into Japanese over the centuries. Loan words (mostly from English) were frequently used even though there are Japanese equivalents, this phenomenon shows the Japanese need for new linguistic materials to continually enrich their own language and semantic nuances. A massive rise of loan word in Japanese was noticeable with a drastic increase of loan words entries in Japanese dictionaries, from 1,500 entries in 1912 to 30,500 entries in the 1990 (Tomoda, 1999; Scherling, 2015). Sanseido's Concise Dictionary of Foreign Words in 2010 edition contained 48,100 entries of loan words. However, the numbers of dictionary entries cannot illustrate the true extent of the number of loan words actually in use. Various media - White Papers, Public Information Bulletins, magazines, television and newspapers showed the most frequently used loan words. The field of tourism also shows extravagant use of English loan words and other European words (Moeran, 1989), and one of these is travel the brochure.

A lot of loan words, English sounding words in Japanese, are actually created to fit the Japanese phonology system. Therefore at the first hearing them, it may lead to a bit of confusion. In addition, the meaning of some loan words has changed. Thus, the loan words made it more difficult and complicated to comprehend, not only for Japanese students of foreign languages, but also for students of Japanese. The issue aroused arguments among researchers (Arabski, 2006; Igarashi, 2007; Daulton, 2008) about the advantages and disadvantages of loan words, not only in English learning among Japanese students, but also among learners of Japanese. However, little research has been directed to the topic of how Thai university students studying Japanese as a major recognize loan words and their tendency to make errors related to these words in learning Japanese.

To reveal the responses of the students addressed above, two purposes of this study were investigated:

1) To what extent Thai university students of Japanese major: good and poor group, comprehend English loan words in Japanese;

2) What errors occurred in their transliteration of English words to loan words equivalents, and loan words to the original word in English?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Loan Words in Japanese: Historical

European loan words were first imported into Japanese during the mid-16th to the mid-17th century with the coming of Portuguese Jesuits, followed by Spanish missionaries. Many loan words in the fields of foodstuffs, cloth and clothing, drugs and medicinal goods, a small group of tools and appliances, and place names came into Japanese. These loan words played a role as a lexical gap filler in Japanese (Irwin, 2011), for instance, pan パン (bread), botan ボタン (button) and meriyasu メリヤス (knitting). Due to the popularity of Dutch Studies

during Japan's long period of isolation (from 1640 to 1853), Western scientific knowledge and technology were transmitted to Japan through the Dutch language. The loan words played a role as a medium to absorb advanced Western knowledge (Irwin, 2011), as well as a lexical gap filler in Japanese. Loan words such as kobaruto コバルト(cobalt), koohii コーヒー (coffee) and garasuガラス (glass) were borrowed into Japanese. Due to the end of the country's isolation in 1853, Japan underwent rapid modernization. Therefore, Western technology, Western customs and life styles were preferred among the elite classes. As a result, many loan words from English, French, German, Italian and Russian were introduced into Japanese. The loan words, for example, saizuサイズ (size), zubon ズボン (trousers) and ankeeto アンケート(questionnaire) came to be used in Japanese. Loan words related to thinking, patterns of behavior and worldview were also imported.

After World War II, Japan's import of Western values and culture was mostly directly from the U.S. Overseas travelling and English language learning were promoted and gained greater popularity with the public. These caused a great amount of English to be continually added to Japanese. Olah (2007) noticed that many English loan words play a role giving a semantic void that existed in Japanese, or fill a lexical gap, and to express a sense of progress and modernization. In many cases, the loan word form might not be recognizable to a native English speaker.

2.2 Japanese Writing System

The writing of Japanese text is done today by using a mixture of three different scripts: kanji (漢字), hiragana (ひらがな) and katakana (カタカナ), and each of these scripts has definite functions. In addition, the Latin alphabet (romaji) and Arabic numbers are also used.

Kanji, Chinese characters or ideograms, are not used for phonetic purposes. Hiragana and katakana are syllabic, and they are purely phonetic symbols. Hiragana is mainly used in grammatical elements while katakana is mainly used for the transcription of foreign loan words borrowed into Japanese (other than Chinese).

The influx of loan words brought an expansion of the Japanese sound inventory or re-order in terms of phonetics. The government's initiative to assign a special syllabary to loan words, and to continuously improve and elaborate on it, allowing better phonetic transcriptions. The revision and guidelines for transcribing loan words in katakana was done two times, in 1954 and 1991. As a result, multiple forms for the same words arose (Igarashi 2007). It corresponds to personal preference. For examples: the word "romantic" can be written in the new form as romantikku (ロマンティック) or in an old form as romanchikku (ロマンチック).The different forms of this loan word is based on using different Japanese phonological rules to transcribe it. This variation of loan words writing may confuse learners of Japanese since both types of writing are accepted to use in written text. Students may face difficulties in recognizing the subset

of English loan words. Recognizing similarity in form is typically the key to lexical transfer (Daulton, 2008). This can imply that a word in its original form could be better understood or predicted than a word with variations in the process of word recognition. Normaly, Japanese people romanize English loan words according to their perception of English sounds (Kitanaka, 2007). Problems in transcription may occur since Japanese has fewer consonant and vowel sounds than English. In addition, Romanization is a transcription of Japanese sounds, not English sounds; therefore, it might lead to misspelling the words.

2.3 Linguistic Changes of Loanwords

Once English words were incorporated into Japanese, they were changed to variations in Japanese linguistics (Daulton, 2008; Stanlaw, 2004 and Kay, 1995). Orthographic change: Instead of using the original form of the word in the Roman alphabet, loan words are written in katakana.

Phonological change: The Japanese language is based on syllables rather than a phonetic system, and the 5 vowel sounds can occur with a number of consonants (Thompson, 1990).

According to Tsujimura (1996), Japanese lacks four typical sounds /f/, /v/, /θ/, and /ð/ and has only /ɾ/ instead of /r/ and /l/, and these facts are primary concerns when an English word is borrowed into Japanese. Therefore, the four missing sounds /f/, /v/, /θ/, and /ð/ are substituted by /ɸ/, /b/, /s/ and /z/, respectively. Since tense, lax and schwa vowels do not exist in Japanese, the closet sounds existing in Japanese are substituted when English loan words are transcribed. In addition, consonant clusters in English are separated with vowels (except those beginning with 'n'), as in スケジュールsukejuuru (schedule), トラベルtoraberu (travel). And when English loan words ending in a consonant other than 'n' must add a vowel after them, as in ウェルカムwerukamu (welcome), ゲストgesuto (guest).

Morphological change: Morphological change can involve two aspects: those with grammatical functions and those without grammatical functions. The most typical change of English loan words in Japanese is clipping, or shortening of the original word, which does not affect parts of speech such as ビルbiru (building).

Semantic change: Three main processes: semantic restriction, semantic shift and semantic extension (Scherling (2015) are involved in semantic change of loan words. Semantic restriction, or semantic narrowing, is commonly found in loan words in Japanese. For examples: ドライヤーdoraiyaa (only mean hair dryer in Japanese). Semantic shift referring to the meaning of the loan words is slightly shifted from the meaning of the original English such as スマートsumaato (smart) refers to slim, slender (Loveday, 1996). Sometimes the meaning of a loan word is an extension or has a different meaning (Scherling, 2015) such asサービスsaabisu (service) referring to a complementary gift given by a business establishment or a restaurant to a customer.

Syntactic change: Syntactic change occurs due to morphological change and it makes loan words have their parts of speech changed. This makes loan words morphological indistinguishable from native Japanese words. Key (1995) categorized this process as morphological change.

2.4 Word Formation of Loan words in Japanese

In the present study, loan words were categorized into five types as follows.

2.4.1 Original form

Borrowed English words have been phonologically changed to incorporate with native Japanese phonology. However, the original form of loan words is usually used. In a present study, the original form was separated and listed as one type of loan words as Kitanaka (2007) suggested in order to clearly categorize them from the others. Loan words in this category are e.g. パーティーpaatii (party), ホテルhoteru (hotel), ゴルフgorufu (golf) andゴールデンgooruden (golden).

2.4.2 Clipping/Abbreviation

Clipping/Abbreviation is a process of forming a new word by dropping one or more moras of loan words in order to abbreviate a long word. The more moras a loan word contains, the more likely it is to have mora clipping (Irwin, 2011). Loan words in Japanese can undergo three processes of clipping including fore-clipping, mid-clipping, or back-clipping (Shibatani,1990). Fore-clipping is removing the first part of the loan word and the later moras are retained such as アルバイトarubaito > バイトbaito (part-time job). Mid-clipping is removing the beginning and end of a loan word's moras to form a new word, such as エンターテインメントentaatinmento >エンタメentame (entertainment). In back-clipping, the latter part of a loan word is omitted and only the first, two, three, four, or occasionally five moras are retained, such as ビルディングbirudingu >ビルbiru (building).

2.4.3 Compounding and Compound clipping

Compounding plays a major role in Japanese word formation, and it may be any combination of free words. There are "imported and "assembled" English loan word compounds (Kageyama and Kishimoto, 2016). Imported compounds are those that have been borrowed directly from English, for example, "life" and "jacket" are combined to construct a compound loan word asライフジャケット> raifu jaketto (life jacket). Whereas assembled compounds are those which have been produced from two independently borrowed non-compound English words, for example, "internet" and "access", are constructed as a new word, as inインターネットアクセスintaanetto akusesu (internet access) in Japanese.

Compound clipping is rather different from mora-clipping, and should not be confused. In mora-clipping, the syllable plays a major role (J.Ito,1990; Ito and Mester,1992;Labrune,2002 as cited in Kageyama and Kishimoto,2016), whereas in compound clipping, the syllable plays only

a bit part (Kageyama and Kishimoto, 2016). For instance: computer + software > コンピュータソフトkompyuuta sofuto (computer software).

2.4.4 Word order inversion

The order of some English compound words is inverted when they come into Japanese. Kageyama and Kishimoto (2016) explained that imported compounds are a small number whose elements have been switched during the borrowing process. For instance: toaster oven > オーブントースターoobun toosutaa (toaster oven).

2.4.5 Loan words of other European origins

Japanese has borrowed many words of other European origins, though mostly are English. “アンケート”ankeeto is derived from French “enquête, which means “questionnaire” in English.

There are other forms of loan word formation but they were not used in the present study. Through these various processes of word formation, loan words are simplified and become easier to pronounce for native Japanese, but it might lead to a bit of confusion for Japanese English speakers or learners of Japanese.

2.5 Differences between Japanese and English

2.5.1 Phonology

Japanese has a rather limited phonetic inventory, both in number of sounds and in their distribution, and is based on syllables rather than a phonetic system (Thomson, 1990). There are five vowels and 17 consonant phonemes in Japanese compared with the English language total of 20 vowels and 24 consonants. The number of vowels and the tense / lax distinction is the greatest significant difference between the vowels systems of both languages (Ohata, 2004). The non-existent vowels in Japanese could cause difficulties in perceiving the target language.

2.5.2 Vowels

Japanese syllable structure is very simple, and there are few consonant clusters. Thus Japanese learners find the more complex distinctions and sound combinations of English very difficult to produce. Vowels being the most noticeable problem for Japanese learners, as discussed in Thomson’ study (1987), are /ɔ:/, /əʊ/, /æ/, /ʌ/, /ɜ:/, /ə/, /l/, /ʊ/ and /u:/.

2.5.3 Consonants

The most characteristic difference between Japanese and English consonantal systems is in the unique distribution pattern of consonants of both languages. Case (2012) pointed out that the main distinctions between how the Japanese pronounce words that are derived from English in their own language and how the British or the American pronounce those words, are based on Japanese’s syllabic language system. Japanese’s lack of consonant clusters thus consonants apart from a final n, must be followed by a vowel in Japanese, such as /booto/ for boat. Thomson (1987) described the most noticeable errors made by Japanese learners when pronouncing /l/, /r/, /h/, /f/, / θ /,

/ð/, /v/, /g/, /n/, /t/, /d/, /s/ and /z/.The difficulty of great grammatical, lexical and phonetic disparity in both languages cause problems for learners of the target language.

3. Previous related studies

Kimura (1989) conducted a test consisting of 34 English loan words, presented in a form of a multiple-choice test with Japanese EFL and ESL students at the college level. The students were appointed to match the English words to three definitions offered for base-words and non-base-words. The result revealed that both groups scored 5% better for base-words over non-base-words.

Daulton (1998) tested 27 Japanese first year junior college English major to find whether their recall and recognition of lexical items with loan words correlations was better than for those without. The test consisted of 60 words: base-words and non-based words. The words were ranked by the difficulty into three groups of five words: junior level, high school level and university level respectively. The participants were given a fill-in the blanks test which provided the first and last letter of each item. The result revealed that spelling of both base-words and nonbase-words performed well at the junior high school level.

Van Benthuysen (2007) tested Japanese L1 ESL learners' ability to distinguish between English words which have been adopted into Japanese and words which have not been adopted, including testing their ability to provide the Japanese words for the English words that have been adopted. The test items were taken from words in the 1001-2000 frequency range of the GSL; participants were able to correctly identify, on average, 70% of the tested words.

Kitanaka (2007) examined Japanese adult English learners' perceptions and attitudes towards English loan words (5 homemakers and 5 ESL students). Comprehension and error patterns related to loan words in English vocabulary learning were also investigated. It revealed that their error patterns were related to the types of loan words.

4. Research Method

4.1 Participants

The participants totaled 106, of which 31 came from Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, 31 were from the University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce, 15 were enrolled in Srinakharinwirot University and 29 came from Rajamangala University of Technology Rattanakosin Borpit Pimuk Chakrawad Campus. All students were the third year and took Japanese as a major subject for their degree. They have an English education background (66% for more than 10 years, 26% for 9-10 years) as a foreign language, and they could participate in the study on a voluntary basis; therefore they served the purpose of the study. The participants were grouped into a "good" group (N=21) and "poor" group (N=85) according to their level in the Japanese Language Proficiency Test (JLPT) results. Students who passed the JLPT level

N2 - N4 were put into the “good” group, and the rest (N5 and no JLPT results) were put into the “poor” group. There were 3 reasons to divide the students into 2 groups like this. 1) The present study aimed to examine loan words without text, and no grammatical competence required. 2) The linguistic competence of the student who passed N4 is understanding familiar daily topics while the student with N5 is understanding typical expressions therefore their experience of exposure to loan words was different 3) The students with poor Japanese ability had not taken the JLPT yet or did not pass the test regarding to mini-interview with the heads of Japanese program/Japanese section of the 4 universities.

4.2 Data Collection

A demographic questionnaire was use to investigate students’ characteristics: age, gender, educational background of English and Japanese, JLPT results and self-evaluate of English vocabulary size. Comprehension Test was employed to examine to what extent students could identify 20 English words (List A) with their equivalent loan words, 20 English loan words (List B) with the original English words, and 6 loan words of Japanese innovation and other European origin (List C) with the original English words. To prepare the test items, firstly, two sources of materials: Japanese textbooks which have been used for Japanese major students in Thai universities, and Japanese travel brochures were examined. From 9 textbooks (6 Beginning and 3 Intermediate), finally, Minna no Nihongo 1, 2 (みんなの日本語 1, 2) and Manabou Nihongo1, 2 (学ぼう！ にほんご1, 2) were chosen since both books were designed for beginners at the N5-N4 level of the Japanese Language Proficiency Test (JLPT) and the number of lessons in the books is roughly closed (50:40 lessons). The textbooks were written in Japanese using 3 scripts; hiragana, katakana and kanji.

For travel brochures, HIS SMILE and CIAO HIS, travel brochures from two travel agencies in Japan were selected since they were printed in three Japanese scripts, and they provided tour packages to Thailand from March to September 2015. H.I.S. SMILE consists of 109 pages while CIAO H.I.S. had 47 pages, thus a wide range of loan words could be collected.

Secondly, all katakana words in the textbooks and the travel brochures were extracted totalling 19,196 words (including single words and compound words but katakana words which were used for onomatopoeia, special emphasis, or words generally written in kanji or hiragana were ignored). The method of β units counting was adopted to analyze the number of katakana words since loan words cannot be broken down into semantic constituents. With the β units counting method (Igarashi, 2007; Saiga, 1955), a sentence is divided into morphemes, offering a better way for counting words as morphological units. A total of 24,629 words (repeated words were counted) were typed into a computer database.

Thirdly, the obtained loan words were analyzed using the AntConc Software Program to find the rank and frequency of the words. Fourthly, 40 words were randomly selected after a consult the obtained loan words from the AntConc with The English - Japanese Loanwords

which appear in the 2000 most common words in English which were introduced by Daulton (1999). The selected words were in the original forms, clipping, geminate, and the words of noticeable errors made by Japanese learners when pronouncing as stated in 2.5.3. As a result, 20 words were put into List A (English), the rest, 20 words were grouped into List B (katakana script). Since the loan words in the types of compounding and compound clipping, word order inversion, and loan words of other European origins did not find in the fourth step of the word selection, 6 loan words which were adapted from Kitanaka (2007) were used in List C (katakana script). These 3 Word Lists could illustrate to what extent the students of Japanese major: good and poor group, comprehend loan words both based-words and non-based-words, and types of errors which the students made in the translation of loan words into English and vice versa. The words used in a present study were those in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3.

Table 1. Words in List A

English words	Japanese transliteration	Romaji	English words	Japanese transliteration	Romaji
1. area	エリア	eria	11. image	イメージ	imeeji
2. arrange	アレンジ	arenji	12. oil	オイル	oiru
3. body	ボディー	bodii	13. out	アウト	outo
4. building	ビル	biru	14. party	パーティー	paatii
5. course	コース	koosu	15. present	プレゼント	purezento
6. check	チェック	chekku	16. report	レポート	repooto
7. flight	フライト	furaito	17. restaurant	レストラン	resutoran
8. group	グループ	guruupu	18. service	サービス	saabisu
9. golf	ゴルフ	gorufu	19. shopping	ショッピング	shoppingu
10. hotel	ホテル	hoteru	20. staff	スタッフ	sutaffu

Table 2. Words in List B

Loan words	English Words	Romaji	Loan words	English Words	Romaji
1. アトラクション	attraction	atorakushon	11. パッケージ	package	pakkeeji
2. クラシック	classic	kurashikku	12. リクェスト	request	rikuesuto
3. クラウン	crown	kuraun	13. ラッシュ	rush	rasshu
4. ダイエット	diet	daietto	14. スケジュール	schedule	sukejuuru
5. フラワー	flower	furawaa	15. スムーズ	smooth	sumuuzu
6. フルーツ	fruit	furuutsu	16. ストレス	stress	sutoresu
7. ゴールデン	golden	gooruden	17. ストライキ	strike	sutoraiki
8. ゲスト	guest	gesuto	18. トラベル	travel	toraberu
9. ランチ	lunch	ranchi	19. ウェルカム	welcome	werukamu
10. ミルキー	milky	mirukii	20. プライベート	private	puraibeeto

Table 3. Words in List C

Loan words	English Words	Romaji
1. ライフジャケット	raifujaketto	life jacket
2. インターネットアクセス	intaanetto akusesu	internet access
3. ドライヤー	doraiyaa	hair dryer
4. オーブントースター	oobun toosutaa	toaster oven
5. コンピューターソフト	konpuutaa sofuto	computer software
6. アンケート	ankeeto	questionnaire

4.3 Reliability and Discriminant validity of Instruments

To ensure the reliability of instrument (List A and B), the quality of the measurement procedure was tested. It showed that an internal consistency reliability of the test in List A are .954, and List B are .901 using Cronbach's Alpha. The discriminant validity of List A, it was found to be .82, with a range of .37 to 1.00. In List B, it was found to be .55, with a range of .32 to .77. This showed the reliability and the discriminant validity of the test instruments. For List C, adapting from the pre-existing questionnaire which was designed by Kitanaka (2007), it was also considered as good and acceptable.

The test took place from 21 April to 16 May 2015 in 4 universities which the participants were studying. It used 45 minutes for each participant to finish the test and the questionnaire.

5. Data Analysis

Descriptive and Inferential Statistics were used to describe the basic features of the data. In addition, the t-test assesses whether the means of two groups of students (good and poor) were statistically different from each other in their translation of the words List A, B and C. Evaluation of correctness or comprehensibility and error analysis were used to analyze data of comprehension test for List A, B and C.

To evaluate their correctness/ comprehensibility, the responses were categorized into 4 groups: correctness, misspelling, fault and no response. A correct answer was awarded a mark of 3, misspellings a mark of 2, faults a mark of 1 and 0 marks for no response. In addition, the t-test tested for discriminant validity for each item between the good group and poor group of students.

All words in 3 sets of vocabulary comprehension test were classified based on the differences between Japanese and English phonology, and linguistic change of loan words. They were presented with their loan words equivalents and their original English equivalents.

6. Research Findings

The responses of 3 sets of vocabulary comprehension test by the good group and poor group of students showed as follows:

Table 4. Comparison of Means between Good and Poor Groups of Students in Word Translation

Word Lists	Good Group (N=21)			Poor Group (N=85)		
	Mean	Std.	Std. Error	Mean	Std.	Std. Error
A	2.55	0.6164	0.1637	2.18	0.6779	0.1601
B	2.48	0.7721	0.1686	2.16	0.9593	0.1041
C	1.87	0.8486	0.1850	1.59	0.8475	0.0918

Table 4 revealed that the good group performed better than the poor group in translation of all Word lists (2.55, 2.48, 1.87: 2.18, 2.16, 1.59 respectively). Both groups could identify Words List A (English words to loan words equivalents) higher than Word List B (loan words to the original English words) and Word List C (Loan words of Japanese Innovation and other European origins to the original English words). The finding indicated that translation of English words into loan words was easier than translation of loan words into the original English words. It was difficult for both groups of students to identify the loan words of Japanese innovation and other European origins to their original English words.

6.1 Responses to words in List A

As shown in Table 5, in general, the good group performed better than the poor group in identifying English words with their equivalent loan words (M=2.55: M=2.18). Five out of twenty words, arrange, out, present, staff and flight could be identified correctly by the good group at a lower scores than the rest of the words (2.19, 2.33, 2.38, 2.38, 2.43, respectively). The poor group could translate arrange, flight, present, body and out at a lower score than the rest of the words (2.04, 2.06, 2.06, 2.07, 2.12, respectively). The word "arrange" got the lowest mean in both groups (2.19, 2.04 respectively).

Table 5. Comparison of Means between Good and Poor Groups in Identifying Words in List A

English Words	Good Group (N=21)			Poor Group (N=85)		
	Mean	Std.	Std. Error	Mean	Std.	Std. Error
1. area	2.48	.814	.147	2.27	.543	.187
2. arrange	2.19	.928	.203	2.04	.808	.221
3. body	2.52	.750	.133	2.07	.483	.172
4. building	2.62	.669	.172	2.15	.716	.165
5. course	2.62	.740	.196	2.26	.819	.184
6. check	2.62	.498	.161	2.32	.694	.132
7. flight	2.43	.746	.221	2.06	.943	.192
8. group	2.57	.507	.135	2.45	.567	.127
9. golf	2.57	.676	.195	2.28	.825	.173
10. hotel	2.90	.301	.104	2.76	.454	.082
11. image	2.67	.658	.163	2.25	.671	.161
12. oil	2.52	.680	.180	2.25	.754	.169

English Words	Good Group (N=21)			Poor Group (N=85)		
	Mean	Std.	Std. Error	Mean	Std.	Std. Error
13. out	2.33	1.017	.218	2.12	.865	.241
14. party	2.52	.512	.143	2.58	.605	.130
15. present	2.38	.669	.172	2.06	.713	.165
16. report	2.62	.669	.153	2.38	.617	.161
17. restaurant	2.86	.359	.108	2.84	.459	.093
18. service	2.76	.539	.179	2.26	.774	.144
19. shopping	2.43	.676	.146	2.21	.579	.160
20. staff	2.38	.590	.145	2.38	.597	.144
Average	2.55	0.616	0.164	2.18	0.678	0.160

As for party, the good group was evaluated at 2.52 points while the poor group got 2.58 points. It showed that the poor group could translate this word better than the good group. However, no significant differences were seen between the two groups in identifying party. Independent t-tests were carried out with the alpha level set at .05. An independent t-test revealed that the good group (M=2.52, SD=.512, t=-.367) and the poor group (M=2.58, SD=.605, t=-.407) were not different. The p-value is .687, and therefore, the difference between the two means is not statistically significantly different.

6.2 Responses to words in List B

Responses to words in List B (loan words with the original English words) were presented in Table 6. In general, the good group could perform better than the poor group (m=2.48:m=2.16). It found that 5 out of 20 words, クラウン, パッケージ, スケジュール, プライベートand ゲスト got lower point than the rest of the words in being identified by the good group (1.48, 2.05, 2.05, 2.05, 2.10 respectively). A lower score of correctness in identifying 7 out of 20 words in List B by the poor group were shown as follows: クラウン, スケジュール, プライベート, ストライキ, ゲスト, アトラクション and パッケージ (1.16, 1.38, 1.38, 1.75, 1.88, 1.88, 1.92, respectively). As for クラウン, both groups were evaluated with the lowest mean than the rest of the words (1.48, 1.16, respectively).

Table 6. Comparison of Mean Scores between Good and Poor Groups in Identifying Words in List B

Loan Words	Good Group (N=21)			Poor Group (N=85)		
	Mean	Std.	Std. Error	Mean	Std.	Std. Error
1. アトラクション	2.24	1.091	.238	1.88	1.096	.119
2. クラシック	2.71	.902	.197	2.27	1.179	.128
3. クラウン	1.48	1.167	.255	1.16	1.132	.123
4. ダイエット	2.95	.218	.048	2.76	.666	.072
5. フラワー	2.95	.218	.048	2.88	.448	.049
6. フルーツ	2.95	.218	.048	2.59	.806	.087
7. ゴールデン	2.86	.478	.104	2.33	1.005	.109
8. ゲスト	2.10	1.044	.228	1.88	.993	.108
9. ランチ	2.24	.995	.217	2.49	.908	.098
10. ミルキー	2.62	.921	.201	2.61	.832	.090
11. パッケージ	2.05	1.117	.244	1.92	1.093	.119
12. リクエスト	3.00	.000	.000	2.60	.743	.081
13. ラッシュ	2.57	1.076	.235	2.04	1.200	.130
14. スケジュール	2.05	.973	.212	1.38	1.046	.113
15. スムーズ	2.76	.539	.118	2.64	.769	.083
16. ストレス	2.71	.561	.122	2.51	.881	.096
17. ストライキ	2.14	1.315	.287	1.75	1.204	.131
18. トラベル	2.29	.956	.209	1.80	1.183	.128
19. ウェルカム	2.81	.680	.148	2.41	.955	.104
20. プライベート	2.05	.973	.212	1.38	1.046	.113
Average	2.48	0.772	.169	2.16	0.959	.1041

Considering each word's mean score, all words, except ランチ ranchi (lunch) which the good group got mean score lower than the poor group (2.24: 2.49). However, no significant differences were revealed between the two groups of students in identifying this word. Independent t-tests were performed with the alpha level set at .05. An independent t-test revealed that good group (M=2.24, SD=.995, t=-1.135) and poor group (M=2.49, SD=.908, t=-1.074) were not different. The p-value is .292 therefor the difference between the two means is not statistically significantly different.

6.3 Responses to words in List C

Responses to words in List C (loan words of Japanese innovations and other European origins) were presented in Table 7. The good group got an average mean score higher the than poor group in the translation of words in List C (1.87, 1.59, respectively). アンケートankeeto (questionnaire) got the lowest mean score, followed by オーブントースター oobuntoosutaa (toaster oven) and ドライヤーdoraiyaa (hair dryer) in both groups (1.14,1.14,1.62:.89,1.09,1.40, respectively). コンピューターソフトkonpyuutaasofuto (computer software) got lower points than ライフジャケットraifujaketto (life jacket) in the good group (2.29:2.33). In contrast, it got higher points than the other in the poor group (2.27:1.55).

Table 7. Comparison of Means Scores between Good and Poor Groups in Identifying Words in List C

Loan Words of Japanese Innovations and other European origins	Good Group (N=21)			Poor Group (N=85)		
	Mean	Std.	Std. Error	Mean	Std.	Std. Error
1. ライフジャケット	2.33	1.197	.261	1.55	1.160	.126
2. インターネットアクセス	2.67	.483	.105	2.34	.665	.072
3. ドライヤー	1.62	.669	.146	1.40	.805	.087
4. オーブントースター	1.14	.964	.210	1.09	.895	.097
5. コンピューターソフト	2.29	.717	.156	2.27	.447	.048
6. アンケート	1.14	1.062	.232	.89	1.113	.121
Average	1.87	0.849	0.185	1.59	0.848	0.092

No significant differences were found between the good and the poor group in identifying words in List C. An independent t-test revealed that the good group (M=1.87, SD=0.849, t=1.21) and the poor group (M=1.59, SD=0.848, t=1.29) were not different. The p-value is .397 and, therefore, the difference between the two means is not statistically significantly different.

6.4 Errors Translation

Although there is no standard for transcribing a word into katakana, generally it attempts to preserve the pronunciation of English, not the spelling. The error responses in List A were classified into 5 categories: misspelling, misapplication of Japanese phonology, misapplication of Japanese morphology, fault, and nonresponse.

6.4.1 Misspelling including misapplication of Japanese phonology occurred due to the following reasons.

1) Mis-substitution of Consonant Phonemes

Students made broad errors in mis-substitution of consonant phonemes in translating English words into loan words, for example, /ʃ/ for /tʃ/ and /b/ for /h/.

/ʃ/ for /tʃ/: check チェック chekku ➞ sheck シェックshekku

/b/ for /h/: hotel ホテル hoteru ➞ botel ボテル boteru

2) Mis-substitution of Vowel Phonemes

Students used wrong vowel phonemes to translate English words into loan words, for example, /ɔ:/ for /aʊ/ and /a/ for /ɪ/.

/ɔ:/ for /aʊ/: out アウトauto ➞ aut アオトaoto

/a/ for /ɪ/: image イメージ imeeji ➞ amage アマジamaji

3) Mis-application of English Final Silent (e)

The final “e” does not need to be applied in transliteration of English words into loan words. This different feature between English and loan words is hardly comprehended by students, for example, arrangeアレンジ arenji ➞ アレンゲarenge

4) Mis-application of Japanese Consonant Gemination

Generally, gemination of fricative consonants are not allowed in loan words but less restriction is exercised if an extra consonant is added to the beginning of the word. Thus consonant /f/ in stuff can be geminated.

check チェックchekku➞チェクcheku, shoppingショッピングshoppingu➞ショピングshopingu , staffスタッフstuffu➞スターフsutaafu

5) Mis-application of Japanese Syllables

Confusion in selecting basic Japanese syllables were commonly made by students, such as “reレ” with “ raラ”, “ri リ” with “reレ”, “boボ” with “baバ”, “ruル” with “roロ”, “suス” with “saサ”, for example, area エリアeria ➞アレアarea, bodyボディーbodii ➞バディーbadii, golfゴルフgorufu ➞ ゴロフgorofu and staffスタッフ➞ サタッフ.

6.4.2 Misapplication of Japanese morphology

Misapplication of Japanese morphology in regard to students not applying back clipping to form equivalent loan words. This error occurred in the word “building”ビルbiru.

Various forms were presented, for instance, ビルジングbirujingu, ビリディングbiridingu (other types of errors also occurred).

6.4.3 Fault

These five words: flight, arrange, course, out and golf, were transliterated with wrong words with a higher percentage than the rest, for example, flightフライトfuraito ➞ファイトfaito (fight), arrangeアレンジ arenji➞オレンジ orenji (orange), courseコースkoosu ➞カラスkarasu (crow), out アウトauto➞アオトaoto (auto) and golfゴルフgorufu ➞グループ guruupu (group).

6.4.4 Nonresponse

Nonresponse was counted as one type of error. Five words "out, flight, arrange, service, staff and building" were not translated by students with a higher percentage than the rest.

For words in List B, the errors were classified into five groups: misapplication of Japanese phonology, misapplication of Japanese lexicon, misspelling, fault, and non response.

1) Misapplication of Japanese phonology

The errors were counted as misapplication of Japanese phonology in regard to students applying Japanese phonology into English. They made errors with the following 6 loan words. アトラクションatorakkushion (attraction) ➞atorakution, クラシックkurashikku (classic) ➞krashikku, ダイエットdaietto (diet) ➞daiet, パッケージpakkeeji (package) ➞ pakenji, packetchi , スケジュールsukejuuru (schedule)➞sukejuru andストライキsutoraiki (strike) ➞ storayky and straiky.

2) Misapplication of Japanese lexicon

When the students applied Japanese phonology into English, they also applied the Japanese lexicon to the word. The same words as described in 1) above fell into this type of errors.

3) Misspelling

An incorrect spelling of a word was also counted as an error. All loan words were misspelled, in which the following words were at a high frequency of misspelling.

スケジュールsukejuuru (schedule) ➞ schedul, scheldle,プライベートpuraibeeto (private) ➞ pribat, praibate, パッケージ pakkeeji (package) ➞ packgage, packgate, アトラクション atorakushon (attraction) ➞ actacktion, attracktion, ウェルカムwerukamu (welcome) ➞ welcom and wellcome.

4) Fault

Students used the wrong English words to translate nineteen loan words, for example, ゲストgesuto (guest) ➞ guess, gate, クラウンkuraun (crown) ➞ cloud, crow, トラベルtoraberu (travel)➞terrible, trouble, スケジュールsukejuuru (schedule)➞ suggest, sketch, アトラクション atorakushon (attraction) ➞ action and after shock.

5) Nonresponse

When students gave no answer at all, it was considered as a nonresponse, and it was counted as one type of error. Nineteen loan words were not translated, for instance, クラウンkuraun (crown), スケジュールsukejuuru (schedule), ストライキsutoraiki (strike), パッケージ pakkeeji (package), クラシックkurashikku (classic).

For words in List C, the errors were classified into seven groups: misapplication

of Japanese phonology, misapplication of Japanese lexicon, misspelling, word order, clipping, fault and nonresponse.

1) Misapplication of Japanese phonology

Fifteen out of a hundred and six students (11.15%) fell into this type of error. They made errors to the following 4 loan words. ライフジャケットraifu jaketto (life jacket)→raifushaketto, ドライヤー doraiyaa (dryer) → doraiya, オーブントースターoobuntoosutaa (toaster oven) → oobuntooster, oobunntoosutaa, アンケートankeeto (questionnaire) → angate and ankate.

2) Misapplication of Japanese lexicon

Students misapplied the Japanese lexicon into the same English word as described in 1) above.

3) Misspelling

Students wrote the original form of English words with incorrect spelling. There were three loan words which the students spelled incorrectly with a higher ratio than the rest, respectively. コンピューターソフトkonpuutaa sofuto (computer software) → computer solfwear, computer solfwere, ドライヤー doraiyaa (hair dryer) → drier, driyer, インターネットアクセスintaanetto akusesu (internet access) → internet acess and internet acced, for instance.

4) Wrong word order

The word order of two original English words was reversed by students.

オーブントースターoobuntoosutaa (oven toaster)→コンピューターソフトkonpuutaa sofuto (computer software)→software computer.

5) Morphological error

Clipping is the process of forming a new word by dropping one or more syllables from a polysyllabic word. Students did not know the following word is a shortened form of long words. コンピューターソフトkonpuutaa sofuto (computer software) → computer soft.

The meaning of the following loan word is narrower than the original word, but students did not understand it. ドライヤー doraiyaa (hair dryer) → dryer.

6) Fault

This type of error occurred due to students choosing wrong English word to translate the loan word, for instance, アンケートankeeto (questionnaire) → survey, ice skate, ドライヤー doraiyaa (hair dryer) → drive, diamond, オーブントースターoobuntoosutaa (toaster oven) → open star and office center.

7) Nonresponse

Three out of six loan words were not translated by students at a high ratio.

アンケートankeeto (questionnaire), コンピューターソフトkonpuutaa sofuto (computer software), ドライヤー doraiyaa (hair dryer).

7. Conclusion and Suggestions

Based-words and words related to loan words where sounds were similar to English words could be easily recognized with not much difficulty and translated correctly by students. The findings supported the earlier study stated earlier (Kimura, 1989; Daulton, 1998; Van Benthuysen, 2007) though the present study was conducted with Thai university students majoring in Japanese. Students' error patterns in translation of given words were related to the types of loan words as Kitanaka (2007)

stated. The loan words of Japanese innovation and the loan words from other origins were difficult to identify by the students. Students' problems in English pronunciation could affect the correctness of loan word translation. The English loan words ending with schwa sounds were difficult to translate into their counterparts. It could conclude that there were 5 main influences on comprehensibility and correctness of loan word translation by students: orthography, the knowledge of Romanization, students' English pronunciation, the types of loan words, and high-frequency English words that correspond to commonly-known Japanese loan words. The students could take advantage of loan words in learning Japanese vocabulary and reduced errors related identifying the loan words by learning through their mistakes.

In this study the loan words were examined without the text therefore it is interesting to test students both with and without the text to see whether the results are different.

References

[1] Arabski, J. (2006). *Language Transfer in Language Learning and Language Contact*. In Arabski, J.(ed) Cross-linguistic Influences in the Second Language Lexicon. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

[2] Daulton, F. E. (1998). *Japanese Loanword Cognates and the Acquisition of English Vocabulary.* The Language Teacher, 20(1), 17-25.

[3] _____ (1999). *List of High-Frequency Baseword Vocabulary for Japanese EFL Students.* The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. V. No. 11.<http://iteslj.org/lists/Daulton-Baseword Vocabulary. html>

[4] _____ (2001). *Book Reviews: A Dictionary of Loanword Usage; Tuttle New Dictionary of Loanwords in Japanese.* JALT Journal, 23(2), 274-276.

[5] _____ (2008). *Japan's Built-in Lexicon of English-based Loanwords*. Clevedon & Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

[6] Habein, Y.S. (1984). *The history of the Japanese written language*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

[7] Igarashi, Y. (2007). *The Changing Role of Katakana in the Japanese Writing System: Processing and Pedagogical Dimensions for Native Speakers and Foreign Learners.* A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Linguistics. University of Victoria.

[8] Irwin, M. (2011). *Loanwords in Japanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[9] Kageyama, T. & Kishimoto, H. (2016). *Handbook of Japanese Lexicon and Word Formation.* Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

[10] Kay, G. (1995). *English loanwords in Japanese*. World Englishes, 14 (1), 67-76.doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.1995.tb00340.x

[11] Kimura, M. (1989). *The effect of 5 Japanese loanwords on the acquisition of the correct range of meanings of English words*. Master's Thesis, Brigham Young University, Department of Linguistics.

[12] Kitanaka, K. (2007). *Vocabulary Recognition, English Loan Words and English Learners*. A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies. California State University, Long Beach.

[13] Labrune, L. (2002). *The prosodic structure of simple abbreviated loanwords in Japanese: A constraint-based account.* Onsei Kenkyu [Journal of the Phonetic Society of Japan] 6(1): 98–120.

[14] Loveday, L. J. (1996). *Language contact in Japan: A sociolinguistic history*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

[15] Moeran, B. (1989). *Language and Popular Culture in Japan*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.

[16] Olah, B. (2007). English loanwords in Japanese: Effects, attitudes and usage as a means of improving spoken English ability, Bunkyo Gakuin Daigaku Ningen-gakubu Kenkyuu Kiyo 9(1), 177-188.

[17] Saiga, H. (1955). *Sougou zasshi no katakanago [Katakana words in general magazines]*. Gengo Seikatsu [Language Life], 46, 37-45.

[18] Scherling, J. (2015). *Japanizing English: Anglicisms and their impact on Japanese.* BoD – Books on Demand.

[19] Shibatani, M. (1990). *The Language of Japan.* Cambridge University Press.

[20] Stanlaw, J. (2004). *Japanese English: Language and Culture Contact.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

[21] Thompson, I. (1990). Japanese Speakers, In Michael Swan and Bernard Smith (Eds.), Learner English: *A teacher's guide to interference and other problems.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[22] Tomoda, T. (1999). *The Impact of Loan-Words on Modern Japanese.* Japan Forum, 11(1), 231-253.

[23] Tsujimura N. (1996). *An Introduction to Japanese Linguistics*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

[24] Van Benthuysen, R. V. (2010). Japanese ESL Learners' Acquisition of English Loanword Cognates: Difficulties Due to Semantic, Phonological, and Orthographic Factors. *Bunkyo Gakuin Daigaku Gaikokugo Gakubu Bunkyo Gakuin Tankidaigaku Kiyo*, 10 (2010).

หน่วยงานผู้แต่ง: บัณฑิตวิทยาลัย มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏสวนสุนันทา

Affiliation: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University

Corresponding email: premvadee.na@ssru.ac.th