

**J**apan

VOLUME 2

NOVEMBER, 1980

**A**ssociation

of

**L**anguage

**T**eachers

**JOURNAL**



## The JALT Journal

Volume 2

November, 1980

### Table of Contents

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Nobuyuki Honna  |     |
| Cultural Pluralism in Japan: A<br>Sociolinguistic Outline . . . . .                                   | 5   |
| James Baxter  |     |
| How Should I Speak English?<br>American-ly, Japanese-ly, or<br>Internationally? . . . . .             | 31  |
| Nancy Hildebrandt   |     |
| Howard Giles  |     |
| The English Language in Japan: A<br>Social Psychological Perspective . . . .                          | 63  |
| Mary Lee Field  |     |
| Teaching Writing in Japan . . . . .   | 89  |
| M. Stanley Whitley  |     |
| Chirping Birds and Budging Beads:<br>Diagnosis of a Japanese Problem in<br>Learning English . . . . . | 101 |
| Review: <i>English and Japanese in Contrast</i><br>(Taylor) Kevin R. Gregg . . . . .                  | 111 |

MEMORANDUM

TO: [Name]

DATE: [Date]

SUBJECT: [Subject]

[Text block 1]

[Text block 2]

[Text block 3]

[Text block 4]

[Text block 5]

[Text block 6]

[Text block 7]

## JALT JOURNAL

The Journal of the Japan Association of Language Teachers

Nancy Hildebrandt, Editor  
Kinjo Gakuin University  
Omori, Moriyama-ku, Nagoya 463

### Associate Editors

|                     |                |
|---------------------|----------------|
| Patrick Buckheister | Paul La Forge  |
| Nobuyuki Honna      | Bernard Susser |
| Michael N. Joy      |                |

### JALT Executive Committee, 1979-80

|                      |                        |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| President            | Membership Chairperson |
| Thomas N. Robb       | Graham Page            |
| Vice President       | Publicity Chairperson  |
| Douglas B. Tomlinson | Kohei Takubo           |
| Program Chairperson  | Treasurer              |
| Kenji Kitao          | Tim Lewis              |
| Recording Secretary  |                        |
| Henryk Marcinkiewicz |                        |

### JALT Chapters, 1979-80

|                 |               |                 |
|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Hokkaido        | East Kansai   | Kyushu          |
| David Waterbury | David Weiner  | Richard Dusek   |
| 011-561-3751    | 075-493-3680  | 09403-6-0395    |
| Tohoku          | West Kansai   | Shikoku         |
| Tokuko Yamauchi | Jan Visscher  | Bonnie Hamm     |
| 0222-65-4288    | 078-453-6065  | 0878-79-4007    |
| Kanto           | Chugoku       | Okinawa         |
| James Duke      | Marie Tsuruda | Caroline Latham |
| 03-813-6093     | 0822-28-2266  | 0988-78-8774    |
| Tokai           |               |                 |
| Paul La Forge   |               |                 |
| 052-831-0044    |               |                 |

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes the need for transparency and accountability in financial reporting.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It includes a detailed description of the experimental procedures and the tools used for data collection.

3. The third part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a series of tables and graphs that illustrate the findings of the research. The data shows a clear trend in the relationship between the variables being studied.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings. It highlights the potential applications of the research in various fields and the need for further investigation in this area.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes the study. It summarizes the key findings and provides a final statement on the overall significance of the research. The authors express their gratitude to the funding agencies and the participants who made the study possible.

6. The sixth part of the document includes a list of references and a list of figures. The references cite the works of other researchers in the field, and the figures provide a visual representation of the data presented in the text.

7. The seventh part of the document is a list of appendices. These appendices provide additional information and data that are not included in the main body of the document. They are intended to provide a more complete picture of the study and its findings.

**Cultural Pluralism in Japan:  
A Sociolinguistic Outline\***

Nobuyuki Honna

*Abstract*

Japan is generally said to be a mono-ethnic, mono-cultural, and mono-lingual society. But it is not true. In this short paper, I would like to speak for a small number of people in Japan who have started to reconsider the Japanese social structure in terms of linguistic and cultural pluralism. Our observation will be, then, from a worm's-eye-view, rather than from a bird's-eye-view, because a localized down-to-earth point of view is essential when we try to understand human struggles for self-identity. I will choose six sociolinguistic topics from the fields in which I have been working in Japan: 1) bi-

---

Nobuyuki Honna is Associate Professor of linguistics and sociolinguistics at Kinjo Gakuin University, Nagoya.

\*Reprinted with minor changes from the *Kinjo Gakuin Daigaku Ronshū* [Collected Papers of the Faculty of Kinjo Gakuin University], No. 78, 1979.

modalism of the deaf between sign language and spoken language, 2) bidialectalism in a multidialectal society, 3) significant differences in the way language is used between urban and rural children, 4-5) Ainu and Korean minorities, and 6) foreign language education.

### SIGN LANGUAGE AND SPOKEN LANGUAGE OF THE DEAF

Talking about deaf people and their language and education problems, one can easily allude analogically and allegorically to almost all that is happening in the discussion of linguistic, cultural and cognitive pluralism in the world. Therefore, I think that it is an appropriate topic to start with in the discussion of the whole theme.

There are 250,000 deaf persons in Japan out of a total population of 120 million. This amounts to a deaf-hearing ratio of one to five hundred, which is a slightly high proportion in terms of the fact that every one out of a thousand in the world's population is said to be a deaf person.

A few ethnographical studies available in Japan of the social relationship between deaf and hearing persons indicate very similar domination patterns with those obtained between minority groups and majority groups in any human society. Deaf people are socially ostracized and educationally mishandled.

Specifically, the language of the deaf, their native sign language, is regarded as a simple collection of animal-like gestures, and not as a natural human language. Its syntax is considered to be merely an underdeveloped and rudimentary subsystem of the spoken version of a language.

In deaf education, the use of native sign

language is usually discarded and instead the use of speech is almost categorically imposed upon deaf students. Teaching speech to deaf students (generally called oralism) has been unsuccessful, and this fact has led some sections of the public to wrongly believe that deaf students are not intelligent enough to acquire language.

Deaf students would tell a few years ago a lot of stories about how severely they were punished by their teachers when they were caught signing in class or at school. Students trying to communicate with teachers by sign were ignored at best, and their hands were tied at worst, which was not an unusual practice. Teachers willing to sign for communicative rapprochement with students were reprimanded by principals. Teachers trying to learn how to sign were advised against doing so. Few people were interested, it would appear, in listening to the message deaf persons were trying to bring from their world of silence.

However, current studies of Japanese sign language (see for example Honna, 1978a; Peng and Tonokami, 1978), particularly in the field of sociolinguistics which highlights language use in social contexts, clearly indicate that Japanese sign language, or generally any sign language of the world, is a natural human language as complex and well-organized as any spoken language in terms of phonology (or kineology, more precisely), syntax, semantics, and socio-psychological style-shifting. The only difference of a very significant nature is in articulatory modes--manual for sign language and oral for spoken language.

Sociolinguistic studies (see for example Cicourel and Boeses, 1972) reveal how ignorant most speaker-hearers are of the natural language systems that the deaf communities have developed over the centuries. They have developed by themselves an

effective system of thinking and communication which is quite appropriate to their physical characteristics. Those studies also suggest how ethnocentric hearing persons tend to be about the necessity of speaking and hearing. They consider it "abnormal" not to be able to speak and hear. Actually, however, deaf persons are living a complex life without the use of speech and hearing, but with the use of their natural sign language. Treating the use of sign language as some form of deviance, deficiency, or pathology, therefore, stems from an ignorance of the nature of sign language on the part of the hearing population.

If language is the most important manifestation of the self, as is often argued in the theory of bilingual education, and if sign language is a natural human language, as is suggested in current sociolinguistic surveys, then a deaf person should not be allowed to be deprived of his or her mother language in any way.

Of course, there is no need to dwell upon the fact that speech is the door to a wider society in which a deaf person is encouraged to participate through the acquisition of appropriate forms of spoken language. But oral language acquisition will be more comfortably facilitated if based on sign language than if not, as any second language acquisition is more naturally facilitated if based on the native language than if not. Spoken language acquisition in deaf education should not be the practice of speech pathology, but the exercise of second language teaching.

Because the difference between sign language and spoken language is in modes of communication, I have called a deaf person who acquires Japanese Sign Language as the mother language and who also acquires Japanese Spoken Language as the second language as a "bimodal." Although this "bimodalism"

is far away from the reality in Japan's deaf education, I am optimistic that this will be accepted as a fact of life in due course. Scientific investigations have started coming out in favor of this form of bilingualism.

The crux of the matter is the recognition that it is psychologically most natural that a person should grow in, and then maintain, the native language. If a person is socially required to learn another form of language, the most natural process is not to force that person to abandon the native language for the sake of a politically, socially, or demographically more important or dominant language, but to encourage him or her to develop bimodalism or bilingualism, an ability to switch back and forth between the plural languages and cultures of the society.

Obviously, these arguments apply to the children of various minority groups who speak unofficial dialects or languages. I would now like to turn to the dialectal situation, particularly multidialectalism, which is beginning to gain some popular support in Japan.

#### BIDIALECTALISM IN A MULTIDIALECTAL SOCIETY

Japan is a small and populous country with only half the space of Texas but ten times more people. The arability of the land is only 18 percent. Yet, because of its long history of social change, there are hundreds of different dialects in Japan. The dialects spoken by a million people in Ryukyu Islands, a chain of islands in Japan's southernmost territory, are almost totally unintelligible to speakers of any dialect of modern Japanese. Actually, Ryukyu dialects are mostly the remnants of Japanese that is believed to have been spoken in the sixth or seventh century.

Because of the geographical distance and the political, social, and cultural isolation of those southernmost isles from the four central islands of Japan, the varieties of Japanese spoken there evolved in a very different direction. Moreover, each island in the Ryukyus has its own dialect, which is in many cases incomprehensible to people living in another island in the area.

Even on the four main islands of Japan, a large number of dialectal varieties exist which are mutually unintelligible. For example, people from the northern part and people from the southern part of Honshu, the main island of Japan, will have tremendous difficulties with mutual communication if they speak their own dialects of Japanese.

Aware of this extraordinarily vast variety of the Japanese language, which is more of a phonological, morphological, and lexical nature than of a syntactic nature, the Japanese government, mass communication media, and educational circles did their best to establish Standard Japanese about a hundred years ago when Japan was unifying and strengthening itself against the threats of advancing Western powers. As a basis for Standard Japanese, authorities selected parts of the Tokyo dialect, which was becoming the most popular and effective source of spoken and written communication throughout the country. Tokyo, then, was becoming the center of modern Japanese culture and civilization from which a new value system was to be transmitted throughout the nation. Authorities generalized the Tokyo usage and spread it across the nation through its centralized mass communication and education networks. These efforts have apparently been totally successful. The majority of the population now can read, write, and comprehend the standard form of Japanese, al-

though there are many who cannot, or do not necessarily speak it.

The primary emphasis on teaching of and in Standard Japanese, however, produced a lot of problems for the whole nation, and particularly for those who live outside of Tokyo and who speak non-standard dialects. Speakers of non-standard dialects were laughed at, humiliated, and despised. Many cases of self-abandonment and some cases of suicide were reported among those young people who came to Tokyo to work or to study.

Quite recently, however, linguistic studies have demonstrated that even Tokyoites speak a non-standard dialect as much as non-Tokyoites. These studies have revealed that the most common way of linguistic life in Japan, actually, is bidialectalism with diglossia, a linguistic practice of switching from a certain form of Standard Japanese to other dialectal varieties in a person's repertory as dictated by the social relation and/or the psychological state of mind in communicative interaction. Influenced by these studies, people have at least intellectually recognized that it is a shame to debase people just because they speak non-Standard Japanese. In education, special care has begun to be taken of pupils who speak non-Standard dialects. Teachers have become very careful and discreet not to hurt their pupils' pride in the process of the teaching of and in Standard Japanese.

At the same time, the criterion of acceptability concerning the varieties of Standard Japanese spoken by its non-native speakers has been moderated. Many different varieties of Standard Japanese have been tolerated and accepted as have many different ways of national life. As people have begun to appreciate linguistic and cultural diversity in a country rich with various regional

traditions, folk bidialectalism will probably receive more popularity and reinforcement as a desirable aspect of national life in Japan. I am not trying to say that this bidialectalism is here to stay everywhere in Japan. But the trend now seems to indicate this favorable direction.

Again, here, the underlying philosophy is that if the situation demands some groups of people to acquire another form of language, it should not be imposed upon them at the cost of depriving them of their native tongues. Rather, societal efforts must be made to create a situation in which second form learning is more naturally facilitated socio-psychologically.

#### DIFFERENT MODES OF COMMUNICATION OF URBAN AND RURAL CHILDREN

In connection with bidialectalism in Japanese society, I would like to discuss another problem which is more difficult to define and solve. I have elsewhere pointed out that there are significant differences in the way language is used as a means of social communication and intellectual operation between urban children and rural children in Japan (Honma, 1975, 1977). Syntactically and semantically, urban children use language in a more elaborate fashion, while rural children employ words in a more rudimentary manner in expressing their everyday experiences in classroom situations. In other words, urban children are more explicit, while rural children are more implicit in linguistic operation.

This difference is a surprising fact in a sense, since the national goal of education in Japan has been for a hundred years to eliminate regional discrepancies and to attain national

standardization of student achievement. This national educational goal should have been successful in view of the fact that the Education Ministry with its strong centralized power has enforced mandatory national educational policies throughout the country. The Ministry controls almost every aspect of school education. Text-books and curricula are nationally standardized and must be approved by the Ministry. There is little room left for local substandardization. The only freedom local teachers are allowed to exercise is when they consider how to accomplish the national standard for their students in specific local situations.

How, then, can we account for the regional differences in the children's use of language? I assume that children's acquisition of the mode of language use is determined by patterns of social relation in a community in general and in a family in particular. This process of determination is so strong that any outside force, such as education, will usually not be able to intervene in it without proper programs. As biological beings, normal children are gifted with the universal propensity to develop any type of language and language use, but as social beings, they are generally restricted to the type of language use which prevails in the social structure in which they find themselves.

In an urban community, people are more heterogeneous and less likely to share communalized presuppositions. In a rural community, people are more homogeneous and more apt to share communalized assumptions. If the social relations in two types of communities are different, modes of language use are expected to be different, too. In urban communities where chances are that people do not know each other and that little

is taken for granted, people have to be explicit in communicative interactions. This will result in internalizing more elaborate syntactic and semantic patterns. In rural communities where it is more likely that everybody knows everybody and much is taken for granted, people can be implicit in linguistic expressions. This will culminate in getting accustomed to less elaborate syntactic and semantic structures. I hasten to add that these two different linguistic systems should not be the object of value judgment. They are just the reflections of two different social structures.

The problem is that the mode of language use in school education is based on the more fully developed version of syntax and semantics of the Japanese language, because it is regarded as more appropriate and effective for complex symbolic and conceptual operation. Serious problems arise here. The school language is the mother language for many urban children, which they acquire early in their social settings, while it is almost a foreign language for many rural children who begin to learn it almost for the first time at school. The gap between family language and school language is smaller for urban children than for rural children. For urban children, school life is a constant continuation of their sociolinguistic experience, while for rural children it is a series of new encounters.

Indications are that this gap partly explains why urban children achieve better than rural children at school, and why urban children are able to pass college entrance examinations more frequently than rural children. It is not because urban children are more motivated, more encouraged, and better guided by their parents than rural children. In Japan, education of

children is a national fad throughout the country. In a sense, rural parents may encourage their children to work hard and go to higher institutions more eagerly than urban parents, because they know in their various ways of social life what it means to lack education.

The problem is more sociolinguistic than psychological. The crux of the matter lies in the failure to recognize this sociolinguistic gap on the part of those concerned with school education.

Probably, the division of labor has created unequal distribution of the linguistic means of knowledge. It has differentiated the sociolinguistic systems between the two major segments of the modern industrial society. This is a great epistemological problem in a democratic society, where every member is equally entitled to the linguistic means of acquisition and transmission of a complex system of knowledge.

Unfortunately, we have little knowledge of the nature of the problem. More systematic research is in order to define and explore the problem.<sup>1</sup>

I would now like to turn to the ethnically based discussion of possible linguistic and cultural pluralism in Japan. Although there are several ethnic minorities living in Japanese society, I will have to restrict myself in this short paper to the explanation of the current states of two more visible groups--the Ainu and the Koreans.

---

<sup>1</sup>In my earlier papers, I followed the Bernstein (1971, 1973) hypothesis. It will be necessary to examine his theory again in order to obtain a clear picture of the situation. For further comment, see Honna, 1979.

## THE AINU: TO MELT OR NOT TO MELT?

The origin of the present-day Ainu is still difficult to determine with evidence.<sup>2</sup> Their language, for example, is unrelated to any other known language of the world.

However, archeological and anthropological data indicate that they were the aboriginal settlers of the northeastern part of the Japanese islands. Their presence there was recorded as early as the seventh century by Japanese court historians. Their highest estimated population was 25,000 in the early nineteenth century.

In the late nineteenth century, partly threatened by Russians who were escalating down south, the deshogunated Japanese government began intensive maneuvers to explore and colonize the northern part of Japan. Due to the loose-jointed nature of their traditional social structure, indigenous to its hunting and fishing economy, the Ainu could not put up successful resistance to the invading Japanese.

Soon, assimilation of the Ainu into the formal structure of Japanese society became a principal object of national policy. In mapping out the policy, the Japanese government sought the assistance of other countries who had had similar experiences with minority groups. Thus, the United States sent consultants to demonstrate their experiences with the American Indians. In the end, the Japanese government rejected the reservation policy, choosing instead the policy of complete detribalization and assimilation under the prin-

---

<sup>2</sup>Perhaps the best available anthropological information on the present-day Ainu is Peng and Geiser, 1977. I owe some of the information presented in this paper to their articles.

ciple of civil equality.

What actually happened, however, was the history of their subjugation to a colonial power. Their experience was exactly the same as that of any people who are overwhelmed by a technically advanced and territorially expanding power. In spite of the *de jure* equality as Japanese citizens, most of them are still now suffering from poverty, undereducation, and various forms of social injustice such as job discrimination.

The Japanese assimilation of the Ainu was so quick and powerful that contemporary scholars conclude that there remain very few "pure" Ainu. According to one study, there are possibly 300 persons who might be considered to be pure Ainu if one counted those who claimed Ainu ancestry as far back as the great-grandparent generation.

However, the Ainu Association today claims that there are 70,000 Ainu-related individuals in Japan. This phenomenon can be explained by the relatively high proportion of Ainu families who adopt children of Japanese parentage. The Ainu explain the reason for their practice of adoption as their traditional love of children. Some Japanese officials add that the Ainu's desire to develop strong biological and social linkages with Japanese society has accelerated their traditional adoption practice, an indication of the severe assimilative pressures exerted upon them.

The most important sociological consequence of this intermixing process is that children adopted for rearing by Ainu families are, thereafter, treated as being Ainu by the general community and by themselves. When this child marries a person of Japanese blood, the new family may be considered as Ainu, since one spouse is known as Ainu. This amalgamation trend would explain the Ainu Association's relatively high estimate. But most of them

are only nominally, or sociologically, Ainu.

Currently there are certain groups of people, some Ainu and some Japanese, who wish to re-establish the Ainu world by restoring and maintaining their ethnic language and culture. Politically, their wish will not be materialized, because they demand the return of some portion of Hokkaido, one of the four main islands of Japan that is becoming more and more important economically and territorially nowadays, to their self-government. This is a demand which will unfortunately never be met by virtue of the present human consciousness.

Linguistically and culturally, however, their ethnic assertiveness will possibly be realized if carried out in a politically appropriate way. There is an indication that the Japanese general public is beginning to acknowledge that the Ainu have a right to be Ainu, although within the framework of Japanese society. Their restoration and maintenance programs are now at an incipient stage and we cannot predict where and how far they are going, if anywhere. Although their ethnic efforts will not be innovations from the top, but developments from the grassroots, they will need some degree of endorsement and encouragement from the Japanese government and general public, if they are to be successful. How far Japanese people are willing to accept ethnic and cultural differences in their society will be really tested when their genuine programs are proposed.

As to the restoration of their linguistic practice, tremendous difficulties might present themselves to those who would wish to maintain their ethnic language. Firstly, there are less than ten native speakers of the language left. They are all old people, and their memory is not very clear in all aspects of the language. Sec-

only, Ainu has no written form and the data collected and phonetically transcribed by Japanese linguists and anthropologists would not be sufficient for the reconstruction of the dying language. In spite of all these stumbling blocks their language salvation efforts should be encouraged. They are significant not for practical purposes of social communication, but for symbolic manifestations of their whole ethnic maintenance endeavors.

As to the restoration of their cultural heritage, the folkloric literature which was garnered from a Japanese point of view will be reinterpreted from an Ainu point of view. The history of the Ainu and the history of Japanese-Ainu interactions, such as now understood generally in Japan, will also be reconsidered from an Ainu point of view. Consequently, an entirely different picture of the situation will certainly emerge. It will hopefully provide us with a multi-dimensional view of the interesting historical dramas staged on the islands of Japan. This form of multi-cognitivity will be a necessary step toward our eventual comprehensive understanding of human experience.

#### THE KOREANS: RESIDENTS IN A FOREIGN COUNTRY

The most visible ethnic minority in Japan is Korean. There are about 600,000 Koreans, who amount to 90 percent of all the foreigners living in Japan. Today, domestically and internationally, Japanese relations with Koreans are new problems which have hampered the progress of their 2,000-year-old friendship.

The current problems originated in 1910, when Japan with its "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere" version of the Manifest Destiny incorporated the Korean Peninsula and deprived the farming population of their lands. Just to survive, many

Koreans of the northern part went to Manchuria, and many of the southern part came to Japan. During the war, furthermore, Japanese militarism brought to Japan as many Koreans as it could find for labor and military services.

During its administration of Korea, Japan attempted to Japanize the Koreans in various ways. Japanese authorities banned the use of Korean and coerced the learning of Japanese, disregarded their version of Buddhism, and imposed Shintoism, stripped them of their traditional costume, and forced the adoption of Japanese names. Japanese officials promised Koreans entirely equal treatment as the children of the Japanese Emperor. But this promise was never kept, and they were almost always treated as second-class citizens.

At the end of the war, there were two million Koreans in Japan. When Korea gained independence, many went home, but a considerable number remained in Japan for various reasons. The political and ideological division of their homeland was the most serious one. Today, 75 percent of 600,000 Koreans living in Japan are Japanese born, and serious identity problems stem from this generational change. Their future depends largely upon the feasibility of unification of their homeland. Their strong wish for unification is evident from the fact that many have applied for permanent residence in Japan but few for naturalization.

There are two major organizations of Koreans in Japan. The one supports and is supported by North Korea and the other South Korea. North-affiliated Koreans explicitly express their desire to return home and devote themselves to the reconstruction of their homeland under the "eternally faultless" guidance of the "great comrade-leader-father," Kim Il Sung. South-related

Koreans fluctuate as to their final destination. There seems to be among them an inclination to assimilate and naturalize in Japan, if they are well accepted. And because their present condition in Japanese society is not comfortable, they have more serious identity problems of whether they should stay Korean or become Japanese.

There are about 150,000 Korean children learning in Japan. Among them, 75.2 percent go to Japanese schools, 23.5 percent to 156 North-affiliated schools, and 1.3 percent to 12 South-related schools (Kim, 1975).

North Korean schools, which are financially supported by the North Korean government, provide ethnic education in Korean, in an attempt to maintain their readiness for the exodus when the situation ripens. South Korean schools, inclined to the policy of making their children adaptable to Japanese society, teach most of the subjects in Japanese and provide special lessons of Korean. Japanese schools teach only in Japanese and offer no bilingual education.

Today, many Koreans are socially functional bilinguals, but they are not happy about their bilingual situation. Here, let me digress briefly and explain my distinction of "happy bilingualism" and "sad bilingualism."

An individual is a happy bilingual if he becomes a bilingual because of his or desire to be so. An individual is a sad bilingual if he or she becomes a bilingual in spite of a desire not to be so.

For a potentially happy bilingual, the motivation to learn the language is integrative rather than instrumental (Lambert, 1972), because the bilingual feels that it enriches his or her personality to learn the language. Upon becoming a bilingual, or while striving to be a bilingual,

the person is happy and proud.

On the other hand, for a residually sad bilingual, the motivation to master the language is instrumental rather than integrative, because survival is the primary reason for the efforts. This person is socially compelled to acquire the foreign tongue because the person's own language is so stigmatized and the culture so denigrated that he or she has no choice but to learn the dominant language in order to make a plain living. Upon becoming a bilingual, or while picking up the language, this person is neither happy nor proud. Self-respect is damaged and integrity is destroyed.

In the process of becoming a bilingual, a person will very likely experience a certain period of insecurity, or "anomie" in Durkheimian sociological terms. For a certain period of time, he or she will be a victim of the disharmony between the norm or the native culture and that of the culture in which the target language is embedded. The person will very likely experience a period in which there is no constant and definite norm on which to base behavior, judgment, and identification. The native culture is left far behind, and yet the second culture, which is aspired to or which is destined to be internalized, is still far away, and the person fluctuates back and forth between the two frames of reference. This experience of no belongingness will be experienced whether a person is becoming a bilingual willingly or unwillingly.

However, given the assumption just outlined, it will not be difficult to see that the magnitude of this anomic mentality is greater for sad bilinguals than for happy bilinguals. If bilingualism is a coercively imposed social condition, the burden a potential bilingual will have to bear will

be much heavier than if it is a socio-psychologically natural development.

Koreans living in Japan are discriminated against in many ways, and they are forced to learn Japanese in order to get along well in Japanese society. Naturally, they are not happy about their bilingualism. They frequently ask themselves soul-searchingly why they have to speak Japanese. Bilingualism is an institutional disgrace to their integrity.

Returning from the digression, let me explain what is being done about this Korean situation in Japan. The Japanese government and its educational agents have done nothing so far to support the language and culture maintenance efforts of Korean people. The Koreans have frequently expressed their interest in ethnic education publicly to Japanese authorities, only to no avail. Korean parents are now so confident that their request for, say, bilingual education for children learning at Japanese schools, will be immediately rejected by Japanese school systems that they never dream of making such a request public. Regrettably, Japanese authorities have not recognized their historical moral obligations to advance the educational opportunities of Korean children in every possible way.

Koreans will have to go a long way before it becomes possible for them to live a sociolinguistically comfortable existence in Japanese society. Currently, however, desirable signs are developing. The traditional Japanese-Korean suspiciousness toward each other is evidently disappearing, although gradually and sporadically, among young generations of both groups. On the Japanese side, generational change is obviously eradicating their demagogically concocted superi-

ority complex toward their closest neighboring people. The Korean language is gaining popularity, although slowly, as an object of intellectual inquiry as well as practical mastery. Influential opinion leaders organized a public pressure group to demand the Japan Broadcasting Corporation, the nation's only public radio and television network, to add Korean to its present foreign language education programs of English, French, German, Spanish, Russian, and Chinese. All these pro-Korean efforts are the reflection of Japanese people's increased interest in rectifying their century-old misunderstanding of the people who have been physically the nearest but mentally the farthest from them.

For stable bilingualism and biculturalism to take place among minority members, majority individuals do not have to be bilingual and bicultural themselves. But they have to be "bicognitive" enough to allow linguistically, culturally and ethnically different groups of people to exist along with them (see Ramirez and Castañeda, 1974, for a full description of bicognitivism). If there is to be mutation, there has to be adaptation. This state of mind will have to be attained by both mainstreamers and non-mainstreamers. When people of the core culture become bicognitive, they will more likely approve and support the linguistic, cultural, and cognitive diglossia of minority members of the society. They will be less afraid of, and more interested in variety as a fact of life. Xenophobia or superiority complexes will be less likely to occur in this state of mind. Therefore, it is indispensable that Japanese people should achieve drastic attitudinal change and become sensitive and compassionate toward members of minority groups. This objective needs priority attention in Japanese education,

because the social conditions of most of the core-culture Japanese are more inclined to make them ethnocentric rather than linguistically, culturally, and cognitively flexible and adaptable. From this point of view, the existence of Ainu and Korean "problems" here is extremely significant for Japanese people. In an effort to solve these problems, Japanese people will hopefully be able to learn that difference is beautiful because it is what life is all about.

In its formative processes as a cultural entity and as a nation, Japan integrated many aspects of Chinese and Korean traditions into its ethnic character. However, in its subsequent history of long insulation, Japan developed a particularly strong national, cultural, and almost spiritual identity of its own. This self-identity was so monolithic that everything foreign had more chance of rejection than of acceptance at the depth level of psychology. Japan's experience with other cultures was almost always in the form of conquest and seldom in the form of intercultural understanding.

Quite recently, however, partly for intellectual but mostly for economic reasons, an increasing number of people have recognized that cultural parochialism is Japan's No. 1 enemy, and have begun to search for a new philosophy of human coexistence. But ethnocentrism is so deeply rooted in the history of human experience that it is perhaps the most difficult awareness to rectify in the evolution of human nature. I believe that foreign language education is one of the most effective means to realize this socio-psychological evolution. Finally, let me touch on some of the problems of Japan's foreign language education defined as a means of enhancing intercultural communication and understanding.

## FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

A glance at the history of European language teaching in Japan might be revealing in this respect. When Japan knew that Western powers were advancing to its territory a hundred and some years ago, it chose to modernize itself through learning their advanced technology and industry. Japanese leaders encouraged the nation's young elite to learn European languages, but it was only for the purpose of acquiring scientific information, and not for the purpose of starting intercultural communication. There were several reasons for this priority, and I will state only one of them briefly.

Japanese leaders thought that Western cultural forces with powerful technological gimmicks were dismantling the national integrity of India and China, and took exceedingly cautious measures not to repeat this pattern in Japan. They pursued the policy of strengthening the nation's history-nurtured cultural and spiritual identity as a symbol of unity to defend its independent sovereignty from probable Western intervention. Japan opened its front door to usher in Western civilization, but kept its back door shut to keep out Western culture. When self-defense was a primary preoccupation, intercultural understanding was a luxury which they could not afford.

Many people are still persistently suspicious about foreign language learning as a means and a process of intercultural understanding. They are afraid that their children's sense of national identity will be diluted, weakened, or destroyed by their exposure to influential foreign culture. Therefore, Japan is now confronted with great difficulties introducing intercultural aspects into its foreign language education programs.

In constructing and implementing intercultural understanding programs in foreign language education, special care must be taken to enhance the affective and respectful understanding of all forms of language and culture, not only of one target language and culture. In teaching English, for example, we would not like to see students of English developing superior attitudes toward students of, say, Korean or Swahili, and their native speakers. Instead, we would like to see students of English, through their learning just one language, develop all-embracing attitudes toward every other language and culture. This goal in foreign language education makes it enormously difficult to devise appropriate programs in Japan.

Current studies of bilingualism, biculturalism, and bicognitivism in the United States are showing that if pursued in the socio-psychologically natural way, this mental pluralism will stimulate more enlightened and objective conceptual perspectives for the understanding of the human environment.<sup>3</sup> These findings will offer great theoretical and practical suggestions to Japanese specialists who are working on intercultural foreign language programs. The fact that little progress has yet been made does not question the feasibility of the proposal. It only demonstrates the necessity of more concerted efforts.

---

<sup>3</sup>What is being done now in bilingual education in the United States will be of particular interest; however, there are some problems in this field. As far as I can see, most of the programs are directed toward *intra*-group solidification of a certain ethnic population, but not toward *inter*-group unification of the ethnically plural American society. Bilingual education in America could not

## References

- Bernstein, B. *Class, codes and control* (Vol. 1). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.
- Bernstein, B. (Ed.). *Class, codes, and control* (Vol. 2). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.
- Cicourel, A. V., & Boese, R. J. Sign language acquisition and the teaching of deaf children. In C. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom*. N.Y.: Teachers College Press, 1972.
- Honna, N. A note on social structure and linguistic behavior: A case study of a Japanese community. In F. C. C. Peng (Ed.), *Language in Japanese society: Current*
- 

be achieved effectively and meaningfully without the mutual understanding and support of both majority and minority members of the society. And within-group oriented bilingual education would not only decrease the opportunities for majority support, but also increase the chances for majority resistance. There seems to be evidence of a possible schism already, which might eventually put into question the justice and wisdom of bilingual education itself. If one knows the history of minorities in American society, one will understand the reasons for current priority on in-group ethnic maintenance efforts. But still I believe that if it incorporates an essential extent of inter-group understanding programs, bilingual/bicultural/bicognitive education will more successfully facilitate majority cooperation. Then bilingual education in America will stand a better chance of promoting a higher desirable degree of intercultural understanding in an ethnically diverse society (see also Honna, 1978b, c).

- issues in sociolinguistics*. Tokyo: The University of Tokyo Press, 1975.
- Honna, N. On the modes of communication of urban and rural children. In F. C. C. Peng (Ed.), *Language and context*. Hiroshima: Bunka Hyoron Publishing Co., 1977.
- Honna, N. On the word order of Japanese sign language. In F. C. C. Peng & T. Tonokami (Eds.), *Aspects of sign language*. Hiroshima: Bunka Hyoron Publishing Co., 1978. (a)
- Honna, N. Bilingual education in the United States: From a melting pot to a culturally pluralistic society? Paper prepared for a seminar in multicultural education at Pan American University, June 20, 1978. (b)
- Honna, N. Bilingual, bicultural, and bicognitive education: An American experiment. Paper read at the First International Congress for the Study of Child Language, Tokyo, August 7-12, 1978. (c)
- Honna, N. On the modes of communication of urban and rural children: A sociolinguistic analysis with educational implications. Report for the Ministry of Education, 1979.
- Kim, H. Educational problems of Korean children in Japan. *Korea Observer*, 1975, 6(3).
- Lambert, W. *Language, psychology, and culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972.
- Peng, F. C. C., & Geiser, P. *The Ainu: The past in the present*. Hiroshima: Bunka Hyoron Publishing Co., 1977.
- Peng, F. C. C., & Tonokami, T. (Eds.). *Aspects of sign language*. Hiroshima: Bunka Hyoron Publishing Co., 1978.
- Ramirez, M., & Castañeda, A. *Cultural democracy, bicognitive development, and education*. N.Y.: Academic Press, 1974.



**How Should I Speak English?  
American-ly, Japanese-ly,  
or Internationally?**

James Baxter

*Abstract*

This paper focuses on the teacher of English, especially the Japanese teacher. Central to the teaching process is a secure identity as an English-speaking self, as well as an accurate perception of the present-day functions of English in the world. For many reasons, Japanese teachers find it difficult to assert, "I'm an English speaker." Superficially, teacher vulnerability would appear to be the cause, but the fundamental source of the difficulty lies in the EFL/ESL distinction and in the axiom that in an EFL situation, the most appropriate pedagogical model is a native-speaker one. For the Japanese teacher, this model conveys the message, "English is not your language." An examination of the status of English in Japan reveals that Japan is *not* an EFL country, and that the most appropriate teaching model is one based on the proficient

Japanese speaker of English. This does not mean, as is sometimes argued, that there is a Japanese English variety. Rather, a Japanese will speak English Japanese-ly, just as an American speaks American-ly. In lieu of "EFL" and "ESL," a more adequate conceptual label is "EIL": "English as an International and Intranational Language" (Smith, 1978). The challenge to the Japanese teacher is to speak English Japanese-ly as well as internationally. The challenge to the L1-speaker teacher is to accept the many manners of speaking English and to realize that it is no longer possible to assume, even ideally, that students will speak "as I speak."

My main concern in this paper is with teachers of the English language and with their awareness of the emergence of English in the twentieth century as the leading language of international communication.

Within the teaching process, the teacher's perception of English is absolutely central. That perception will be of English in relation

---

With teaching experience in France and Japan, James Baxter (Brown) was recently a Professional Associate at the Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, Hawaii. This article was written at that time. He is presently with the Intercultural Relations Institute, Stanford, California.

to the self, in relation to the formal learning situation as permeated by pedagogical, cultural and historical traditions, in relation to the social, cultural and political realities of the community, and finally, in relation to the world.

How does a Japanese teacher of English perceive the English language? The two poles of perception will be, firstly, the degree to which the teacher sees himself or herself as an *English-speaking self*<sup>1</sup> and secondly, the role which English is seen to play in projecting Japan into the world and in bringing the world into Japan.

#### THE TEACHER AS AN ENGLISH-SPEAKING

##### SELF: VULNERABILITIES

A teacher operates in a well-defined social role. Everywhere in the world, the teacher is supposed to *know*. The *sensei* in Japan, with the status accorded this social position, can never admit to a fallibility of knowledge. But when the object of that knowledge is a living language, the Japanese teacher is placed in a particularly vulnerable position. Let me give two examples of what I mean by "vulnerable." While I was teaching in the Education Department of a Japanese university, several of my students went through periods of student teaching as part of their training for becoming English teachers. After one such period we held

---

<sup>1</sup>The notion of a language-speaking self is borrowed from Community Language Learning. Within the CLL framework, a 5-stage learning process leads to the emergence of a "language-speaking self" (Curran, 1972, pp. 128-141, 156-157; La Forge, 1979). The notion is used here to emphasize the vital role which language plays in self-identity.

a class discussion during which I asked them to reflect on those aspects of their teaching with which they felt most comfortable, and those with which they felt least comfortable. Although there was some diversity in the replies, a pattern did emerge: they felt most secure when teaching close to the materials, particularly in utilizing translation. They felt at ease in teaching grammatical points with which they were familiar, and preferred correcting written work to the correction of students' speech. They felt least comfortable when speaking English in front of the class. Why? "Well, we can make mistakes here, because we're students. But as teachers, we can't make mistakes." They also disliked being asked questions which concerned matters outside the teaching material. For example, one student was especially troubled when asked, "In English can you tell an older person to be quiet?"

The following is a second example of teacher vulnerability. A Japanese teacher had taught his class the pronunciation of "aunt" with the back vowel typical of an eastern American or British accent. Then one day he happened to play a tape on which the speaker used the western American pronunciation of "aunt" with a front vowel. An attentive student queried this contradiction, and the teacher had not known what to reply. The teacher felt threatened; the student accepted the taped native-speaker's pronunciation and questioned the teacher's.

Besides the above type of vulnerability, there is another type which is perhaps more destructive.

English education here had made a poor showing, especially in the past decade. Students, their parents, teachers, and

the society as a whole are faced with a disturbing question: Why can't Japanese speak English well enough to communicate with native speakers after studying it for as long as 10 years or more beginning in junior high school? (Kuse, 1978)

No end of similar statements could be quoted, expressing essentially the same thing: Japanese students of English are not successful. In the face of supposedly poor performance, students, parents and the society as a whole blame the *teachers*. Native speakers of English, delivering their judgments *ex cathedra*, only aggravate the situation. One can only guess at the effect of such statements, but it is clear that "We Japanese are poor speakers of English" is all too apt to function as a self-fulfilling prophecy, and that criticism by Japanese and foreigners can only give Japanese teachers a very poor self-image.

The Japanese teacher is vulnerable, and any teacher placed in such a position of insecurity will seek a defense, a means of minimizing threat. The traditional grammar-translation method, which is the mainstream method in Japan (Tajima, 1978, p. 220), is just such a defense.<sup>2</sup>

Given a reliance on strict grammatical rules, the teacher is in a position of being correct. Furthermore, a grammar book is at hand to support the teacher's knowledge. Translation, an ability acquired only after much practice, also leaves the teacher unchallenged by the students. By focusing on grammar and translation, questions of content

---

<sup>2</sup>It should be pointed out that this method is the prevalent one in many Asian countries (Smith, 1975).

are avoided. Grammatical correctness is the target; form is uppermost, content secondary (cf. H. G. Widdowson's "usage" versus "use"; Widdowson, 1978). The teacher does not speak English, unless in reading a text, thus minimizing the risk of making mistakes in front of the students. Finally, teachers, particularly at the high school level, feel justified in their use of the method since it does prepare students for the types of questions most often found on university entrance examinations.

Native speakers seldom hesitate to go into the teaching of English, for they have a feeling of having already mastered the language. That is, their identity as English speakers is stable and unthreatened. Usually unskilled in translation and oftentimes untrained in contemporary English language, such teachers can avoid areas of potential vulnerability by choosing methods which make the most of native-speaker abilities, such as those in which there is a sustained use of spoken English in the classroom. Needless to say, such teachers will be highly critical of the grammar-translation method.

The methods preferred by Japanese teachers of English will therefore differ from those preferred by native speakers. Choice of method is based on perceptions of self as a speaker of English, and of self as a teacher in an exceedingly complex environment constituted in part by social expectations and personal vulnerabilities. In the long run, no teacher will adopt a method of teaching on the basis of theoretical arguments or decrees handed down by ministries of education. And no teacher will be able to maintain a manner of teaching which endangers his or her role as teacher.

Still, can a method such as grammar-translation prepare students for the use of

English as a world language? No. Can it provide teachers and students with a perception of English as a living language in its full range of functions, including those of an international language? No. However, an alternative is not to be found in directly attacking the method, nor in criticizing the competence of Japanese teachers. The source of the problem is much more fundamental: by far and away the greatest number of Japanese teachers of English do not perceive themselves as being speakers of English. "I am Japanese and Japanese is my language. Although I teach English and do speak some English, it is not my language. I'm not an English speaker." If this is the case for teachers, students will inherit the same self-perception, with English always remaining "not mine."

#### "HOW SHOULD I SPEAK ENGLISH?"

There are many factors which make it difficult for a Japanese teacher to claim, "I am an English speaker." As a starting point in examining some of these factors, let me pose a question from the vantage point of a Japanese teacher: "How should I speak English?"

#### *EFL/ESL*

To a large extent, this has already been answered by the English-language teaching profession, in Japan and elsewhere, in its use of the distinction of English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as a second language (ESL).

To begin at a general level, Christopherson offers the following explication of "foreign language" and "second language":

A foreign language is a language which is not one's own, even though one may have a very good knowledge of it. A second language, on the other hand, is a language which *is* one's own ... The difference lies in the personal attitude and in the use that is made of the language. A foreign language is used for the purpose of absorbing the culture of another nation; a second language is used as an alternative way of expressing the culture of one's own. (Christophersen, 1960, p. 131)

By looking at various discussions of EFL and ESL, it is possible to arrive at descriptions of what are considered to be EFL and ESL communities, including the place of English in education (DiPietro, 1977; Ingram, 1975; Marckwardt, 1963; Paulston, 1974; Smith, 1975; Stern, 1979; Strevens, 1979).

In an EFL community, English has no special status or officially recognized function, such as in the administration or courts. In addition to its use as a library language, English is used with reference to a community outside the country, with communication almost always taking place with native speakers of English. The language does have a status in the educational system, but as a school subject and not a medium of instruction. Students generally have their first exposure to English in secondary school, with learning taking place wholly within the classroom. Given the external reference group and the fact that English is not used among members of the EFL community, students and users of the language have little

contact with the cultures of English, i.e., the cultures of those communities in which English is a native language. Thus, the EFL community constitutes an environment giving little support to the use of English. This lack of support indicates that English is used passively in the community, as an instrument with which to study the cultures of native-speaker communities.

In an ESL community, English does have a special status. This may mean that it is designated as an official language, the case in 25 countries, excluding English mother-tongue countries, as of 1975 (Conrad and Fishman, 1977, p. 7). This status is best explained by saying that English has important internal functions, is widely used among the community members, and is thus not used in reference to any external community. It functions to integrate diverse elements of the community and provides the means by which members can participate fully in community life. Being central to social participation, English is given broad support. The status of English is reflected in education. Students begin to study the language in primary school, but may have already encountered it outside the classroom. English is often used as the medium of instruction for other subjects as well.

From an historical perspective, the terms EFL and ESL were British coined (Marckwardt, 1963, p. 25), colonialism being the historical grounds for such a classification of communities (Strevens, 1979, p. 9). These terms were and still are *external* classifications from the point of view of the communities themselves, initially used by native speakers in an attempt to lend conceptual order to a complex situation.

Within the colonial framework, it was natural to assume that the emphasis in a given

community would be on *external* functions, that is, on communication with L1 speakers. With a preponderance of native-speaker teachers, the obvious educational model to be adopted was one based on native speakers, i.e., taken from one of the native-speaker communities. However, as use of English became more widespread, it became recognized that in certain communities, notably those which had been colonized, the *internal* functions of English were gaining in importance. In some cases, a local form of English became at least quasi-acceptable as a pedagogical model. A trend has been developing in this direction, so that today it can be said that, "there is a tendency ... for a local form of English to be increasingly acceptable as the educational model and target" (Stevens, 1979, p. 10). It is within ESL communities that this is occurring.

It still remains true, however, that if a community is described as being an EFL community, then English is taught there as a foreign language. This is manifested in the choice of a so-called native-speaker model. The teacher and student members of the community are given for imitation the English which is spoken by a *native* speaker, a member of some external community. It follows that these teachers and students will themselves be speaking English as a *non-native* language.

The adjective "native" is anything but clarifying when applied to language. Dictionary definitions of "native" are built around words such as "belong," "indigenous," "birth," "original." Anything said to be native is tied to a specific geographical setting. "Native" had some value when historically it was applied to "English," i.e., the language of the English--those people who were born and lived in England, but today it

is an inaccurate metaphor. The major characteristic of English as a world language is that it has spread far beyond restriction to any specific geographical setting.

"Native" and "non-native" are used with a definite bias in English language teaching. If one adopts an American English model in Japan, this is called a native-speaker model, which represents the vantage point of the American speaker only. From the perspective of Japanese teachers and students, an American English model is a non-native speaker model. It is external, not Japanese. A native-speaker model would be one based on the English of a Japanese speaker, one deemed to be fluent and understandable by a variety of interlocutors, including both L1 and L2 speakers of English.

An L1 model in an EFL context functions as an external norm. Both students and teachers are compared to this model, e.g., an American speaker, and their proficiency is calculated in terms of how closely they conform to the expectations of the American speaker as concerns grammatical well-formedness, pronunciation, appropriateness of use, stylistic repertoire, styles of argumentation in the written medium--in short, in terms of expectations of the full range of language-linked behavior.

In sum, with an L1 model, the student is told to behave as someone else. With an American English-speaker model, the message is, "Speak as an American speaks." The teacher is told the same thing. "How should I speak English? As an American." In Japan, the Japanese teacher of English is given this answer through the dichotomies of native/non-native, internal/external, mine/not mine.

*Japanese English*

More and more Japanese speakers of English are becoming dissatisfied with being told that they should speak as non-Japanese. Such is the case in the following example. A Japanese colleague, a university professor of English language and literature, went on a three-month trip to America and Britain. Upon his return, he recounted how he had been told in America that he spoke like an Englishman. In Britain, he was likened to an American speaker. My colleague grasped the significance of this: the external reference groups were exercising their "right" to evaluate his manner of speaking English. His reaction? "I'm not American, not British. I'm Japanese and Japanese English is perfectly good as an international language."

Discussions on the existence of a Japanese-English variety are increasing in number. For example, a recent article written by a Japanese teacher of English ends, "We may be more proud in using Japanese English since after all we are Japanese having a definite identity as Japanese" (Nakamura, 1978, p. 22). However, many have argued against adopting Japanese English as the form to be taught in schools. The general form of these arguments is that Japanese English, if a distinct variety at all, is mainly identifiable by its phonology. English is not needed among Japanese for intra-group communication, so that this phonology, which is not a maximally intelligible one, would only make communication with other speakers of English more difficult. Therefore, an L1 model should be used in education.

This argument is recognizably based on the EFL classification, one of the main premises being that the pronunciation provided by an L1 model

will be one of maximum intelligibility. Admittedly this may be true if communication is with L1 speakers of the community from which the model is taken. Yet if we are talking about intelligibility globally considered, with interlocutors of various national and cultural backgrounds, it is by no means evident that L1 pronunciations are the most intelligible. In fact, a recent study has provided initial evidence to the effect that native-speaker phonology is not more intelligible than non-native speaker phonology and that, in comparison, educated American English actually ranks low (Smith and Rafiqzad, 1979).

Until now, it has been uncritically accepted that a pedagogical model, as an ideal, need not take into account the real abilities and needs of teachers and students, nor the situation outside the classroom. Yet in light of the living experience of teachers and students, the message continually conveyed to them by the ideal of an L1 model is that English is not their language.

A Japanese who claims the existence of Japanese English is in essence saying, "This is mine." For the teacher wondering how to speak English, this allows the answer to be, "As I, a Japanese, speak it." Their perception of self as an English speaker counteracts many of the native-speaker biases found in language teaching. For example, it is a basic principle that the best pronunciation to teach is your own, advice evidently intended for the L1 speaker-teacher. Prator denies that it can apply to the Japanese teacher when he argues that a proposal to adopt Japanese English as a model is "a proposal deliberately to lower objectives in the teaching of pronunciation ..." (Prator, 1978, p. 3). Yet it is true that, although a model can be presented

to students through many means, the principal performance model is the teacher. It is this teacher role which is a major factor in the success or failure of students (Moody, 1978, pp. 86-87).

The conclusion to be drawn at this point is that the distinctions and assumptions inherent in the classification "EFL" function as obstacles for the Japanese teacher of English. This is especially so in that they impede the development of an identity as an English-speaking self.

### *English in Japan*

The above discussion of the EFL/ESL distinction brings into question the basic applicability of these terms to the Japanese situation. Instead of dealing with the generic characteristics of EFL or ESL communities, it is now necessary to examine more closely the use of English by Japanese and, more specifically, how that use is depicted within the educational community.

First of all, Japanese *do* use English, as Japan's economic success amply demonstrates. Japanese businessmen use English as a tool of communication the world over, and not only with L1 speakers. English is the main working language with Europeans and in Asia. Manuals from Japanese companies are sometimes written in English, and training courses for foreigners in Japan are often in English. The balance of trade problem extensively discussed in the newspapers in 1978 and 1979 brought to light the fact that, linguistically, the Japanese were by far outperforming their American counterparts. Robert Strauss, then U.S. Trade Representative, was reported as saying that,

There are 1,200 to 1,500 competent Japanese in New York today, most of whom speak very good English, selling Japanese products in competition with U.S. firms.

Probably in Tokyo we have 25 to 75 Americans, two of whom might possibly speak Japanese. ("Strauss Calls U.S. Foreign Trade 'Bum--Real Bum,'" *The Japan Times*, April 5, 1979)

What is it, then, which has led to the stereotype that Japanese are poor linguists, to the ubiquitous statement that "We Japanese are poor speakers of English"?

Japanese speakers of English are the product of all the cultural, social, historical and geographical elements subsumed under the name "Japanese." They speak Japanese as their first language and belong to a highly homogeneous society. This homogeneity is perceived to be greater than it actually is, due to the primary watershed in the Japanese metaphysical landscape: that which is Japanese versus that which is foreign. This distinction has been institutionalized in the strict identification of Japanese (*kun*) as versus Chinese (*on*) readings for *kanji* (Chinese written characters); in the description of Japan as being an island country; and in the two major events of Japanese history which are unvaryingly expressed as, "During the Tokugawa era, the doors of Japan were shut to the world," and "In 1853, Commodore Perry forced open the doors of Japan." This "door-enclosure" metaphor and the conceptual ordering of the world as Japanese versus foreign very effectively reinforce the internal/external dichotomy within the EFL/ESL distinction.

Although Japanese speakers of English communicate with a wide variety of interlocutors, many of them not L1 speakers, the perception conveyed in the educational situation is very different. In a class of university students I once asked, "Around the world, who uses English?" Americans were listed first, then British, then on through other L1 countries. Only after much prodding did one student say that English was used in Malaysia. No mention was made of India, nor of any African or other Asian country.

If Perry had been an English-speaking Frenchman, perhaps this inaccurate view of English in the world would not be so prevalent. Unfortunately, this view has been strengthened in that, due to the post-war occupation, the general Japanese populace has come to equate English language and American speakers. Any Caucasian is automatically *amerikajin*. Again, this combines only too well with the EFL edict that English is taught with reference to L1 speakers.

Little is done in the classroom to correct such misperceptions. Are students taught how English is used in government, business and higher education in Japan? Are they told about all the countries in the world in which English is used? Is Indian, Filipino, Sri Lankan or Nigerian literature taught?

Even many of the solutions designed to help teachers improve their competence in English embody a strict EFL reasoning. For example, it is argued that if teachers are poor in speaking English, they should be sent to America or Britain. A sojourn in Thailand, India or Sierra Leone, with the possibility of teaching *in English*, would be equally as valuable, even preferable in producing a more effective perception of self as an English speaker.

The main criterion by which Japan has been

labelled as an EFL country is that, although English is used by Japanese, it is not used with Japanese interlocutors. However, referring to an ostensibly ESL criterion, we should ask whether Japanese need English for "full participation in the political and economic life of the nation" (Paulston, 1974, pp. 12-13). It is common knowledge that Japan is in constant need of raw materials, which must be imported. And the Japanese economic machine has been built with export as one major goal. English plays a central role in both these processes and thus, in a vital sense, Japanese are using English so as to guarantee the well-being of their country.

The use of English by Japanese serves very definite purposes, purposes which have strong historical roots. The story of Yukichi Fukuzawa, the famous Japanese educator, is well known. He had studied Dutch for years, but when one day in the late 1850's he visited the port of Yokohama, he was unable to read many of the foreign merchants' signs.

These signs must have been either in English or in French--probably in English, for I had had inklings that English was the most widely used language. A treaty with the two English-speaking countries had just been concluded ["Treaty of the Five Nations"--a treaty of amity and commerce with the U.S., Holland, Russia, Britain and France, 1858]. As certain as day, English was to be the most useful language of the future. (Fukuzawa, 1960, p. 98)

It is interesting to note that Fukuzawa links

English with trade and commerce.

From the time of the Meiji Restoration in 1867, English was used as a tool in the assimilation of selected aspects of foreign, principally European, culture (Koike, 1978, p. 3). Westernization was not the end, however, but the means to a longer-term goal. Natsume Sōseki, through the medium of one of his characters, states this goal in his 1909 novel, *Sorekara*:

The life appetites, which had suddenly swollen of late, exerted extreme pressure on the instinct for morality and threatened its collapse. Daisuke regarded this phenomenon as a clash between the old and new appetites. And finally, he understood that the striking growth of the life appetites was, in effect, a tidal wave that had swept from European shores.

These two forces would have to come to an equilibrium at some point. But Daisuke believed that until the day came when feeble Japan could stand shoulder to shoulder financially with the greatest powers of Europe, that balance would not be achieved. (Natsume, 1978, p. 104)

When university students, beyond the cap of the university entrance examination, are asked why they are studying English, they very often express a reason which is less economically oriented: "I want to speak English because Japan must become more international." By this they do not mean a passive understanding of other nations, but an active dialogue in which they are able to convey an understanding of themselves and their own nation.

English in Japan is not English as a foreign language. It is English as a language tied to Japan's present needs and future goals. It is a language with a definite status in the country, a status which rests upon history and upon present realities.

*"I Speak English Japanese-ly"*

If English has this status in Japan, then is there a Japanese English? It could be argued that there is a distinct Japanese variety of English and one could undertake a description of the linguistic aspects of this variety. For several centuries, people have been concerned with describing the English language and with codifying it in such a way that grammar books can be published. With such a grammar, I can talk about English, I can teach it, and students can study it. Yet it is all too easy to perceive such activities as involving one in *doing something* to English. It is all too easy to conceptually replace the English language by its codification.

Postulating a Japanese English--or an American, British, or Indian English--can be misleading in that it facilitates a separation of English language from the speaker and the act of speech. This separation can lead to the fundamental error of categorizing language as a distinct substantive entity. Needless to say, such an error would seriously undermine language pedagogy.

"American English" is a cover term for a range of linguistic behaviors which are recognized as being distinct from those grouped under, for instance, "British English." The substantival terminology of "American English" can lead to a mis-categorization of American English as a thing, an object. "I speak American English" would be

more accurately expressed as, "I speak English American-ly." And when a Japanese asks, "How should I speak English?", the answer would be "Japanese-ly." "Japanese-ly," "American-ly," "British-ly," "Indian-ly," and so on, refer to manners of speaking, and with such terminology we remain unambiguously in the realm of human behavior.

There are several advantages to such an analysis. Instead of fighting for the legitimacy of a variety of English on linguistic grounds, one instead contends that there are many acceptable manners of speaking English. Kachru, who has argued for the Indian-ness of Indian English (e.g., Kachru, 1976), would be understood as saying that speaking English Indian-ly is just as acceptable as speaking American-ly or British-ly. The true force of such arguments is immediately revealed as one concerning attitudes toward different human behaviors.

Another advantage is that this analysis, unlike many linguistic descriptions, does not eliminate the speaker. It is becoming more and more apparent that a pedagogical model cannot afford to exclude the student-as-speaker, but that this speaker and his or her cultural reality must be present in the model from the beginning.

It is also easier now to understand statements such as Takao Suzuki's when he says that English is the "common property of all the peoples of the world," not the private property of British or Americans (Suzuki, 1979). Put in terms of the above analysis, Suzuki is saying that L1 speakers can no longer exercise the function of a reference group in approving or disapproving the ways in which different peoples speak English. Nor can British, Americans, or Japanese themselves expect Japanese to speak British-ly or American-ly.

But what does it mean to speak English Japanese-ly? This of course refers to the well-known characteristics of Japanese phonology. Syntactically, it means that "in my high school days" is much more frequent than "when I was in high school." Lexical usage includes cases of innovation, e.g., "Base-up" (an increase in basic wage and salary level), of adding a new sense to an English word, e.g., "wet" (sentimental) (Morito, 1978), or of extending the sense of a word, e.g., "pick up" (choose, pick out). Formulaic expressions based on translation may be used, as when a Japanese speaker says, "Please use this," when in fact not lending something, but presenting it as a gift. Speaking English Japanese-ly also refers to an attitude toward the giving of information. Direct propositional statements are often avoided, with "perhaps" being frequently used. There is also a high frequency of "I think" and "I hear" at the end of propositions.

Speaking English Japanese-ly entails much more than this, however. Language is action at a distance, a means by which one individual can have influence on another individual. The manner in which this means is used and the way in which the effects are perceived are culture bound, part of the social reality of the participants in the communicative exchange. For each community, there are specific norms of speaking (Gumperz, 1977).

A Japanese speaking English operates with much the same social norms as when speaking Japanese. The perception of social reality developed during a lifetime is carried over and the Japanese perception of the role of language in social relations is expressed. For example, situations are structured according to the age and status of the participants, with subsequent

effect on the style of the language employed, turn-taking, and willingness to speak.

There are in the Japanese language an array of polite set phrases, or *aisatsu*, which reflect basic attitudes and cultural values (Naotsuka, 1978, pp. 8-10; 122-125). One's attitudes and values do not change when one speaks another language, and a person speaking English Japanese-ly will attempt to find a means of expressing phrases which he or she perceives as being expected in given situations. This person will perhaps not tell a dinner guest, "Sorry that we have nothing to serve you," but will still seek to carry out this social move of self-deprecation, e.g., "This isn't fancy, but I hope you enjoy it."

The major implication here is that speaking English Japanese-ly goes beyond strictly linguistic elements: it is a manner of speaking English that does not threaten the speaker nor come into conflict with this person's identity as a Japanese. It is also the means by which a Japanese can say, "I'm an English speaker."

#### ENGLISH AS AN INTERNATIONAL AND INTRANATIONAL LANGUAGE

The preceding discussion shows that "EFL" does not apply to Japan, nor should "TEFL" be used to describe English language teaching there. Furthermore, "EFL" and "ESL" are totally inadequate as means for describing present-day roles of English in the world. Smith (1976) has proposed that "English as an International Auxiliary Language" be used instead. More recently (1978), he has amended this to "English as an International and Intranational Language," a phrase meant to reflect the fact that today, English is being

spoken internationally and intranationally around the world. Individual situations will determine the exact combination of "inter-" and "intra-." In India, English is used more intranationally than internationally; in Japan, the situation is the reverse.

### *Speaking English Internationally: Adaptation*

One must exercise caution in using the term "EIL." "What is international English?" is an incorrectly formulated question that can lead one to looking for some form of English. The correct question is, "How does one speak English internationally?" In attempting to answer this question, a scenario such as the following can be imagined. An American, a Japanese, an Englishman, and an Indian find themselves in the same room together, needing to talk to one another. They all speak English, this being the common denominator of linguistic behavior making communication possible. Those areas of language behavior not shared are indicated by "American-ly," "Japanese-ly," "English-ly" and "Indian-ly." A central area of maximum communication is labelled, "speaking English internationally." This way of representing the situation reveals several points. Firstly, this is not a question of an inherent characteristic of mutual intelligibility to be found in different varieties of English. It is rather a question of how people coming from different cultures, speaking in different manners, are going to be able to communicate. The situation is depicted clearly as one of cross-cultural communication. Secondly, it shows that communicating internationally means actively seeking a common ground, and this entails *adapting* one's way of speaking English. If each of the four participants here

were to strictly maintain their own "-ly" manner of speaking, the chances of cross-cultural miscommunication would certainly be increased. Speaking internationally, then, implies adaptation to the situation and to fellow participants.<sup>3</sup> Thirdly, *each* of the speakers must feel the responsibility to adapt. The American and Englishman, although native speakers, must adapt. The Japanese speaker must also adapt and cannot participate in a totally Japanese manner. It can be hypothesized that historically it was a failure to adapt, a failure on the part of all parties involved, which resulted in stereotypes of Japanese speakers such as the "ivory mask" or "silent partners" (Shiroyama, 1977, p. 33).

Adaptation is not an easy process, requiring in the speaker a variety of communicative skills and an awareness of what is entailed in cross-cultural communication. It also requires a willingness to modify, temporarily or even permanently, one's cultural identity. It is clear, however, that not all situations call for the same degree of adaptation. An American on a ten-day holiday to Japan may get by quite well by speaking English American-ly. But that same person, if planning to live and work in Japan for an extended period, would have to make a considerable effort to adapt, to move closer to speaking English Japanese-ly. Therefore, it is necessary to append a cline of adaptation to the notion of speaking English internationally.

---

<sup>3</sup>Gumperz (1977) presents a summary of research which has led to the view that conversation is an act of collaboration, with meaning being jointly produced and not unilaterally conveyed. Collaboration involves speaker/listener coordination of both verbal and non-verbal signs.

*Pedagogical Implications*

The EILL perspective has many implications for the teaching of English. No longer is it possible to accept, as an a priori given, that an L1 model is the best. In Japan, the most appropriate pedagogical model would be one based on the Japanese speaker of English who is secure in his or her identity as an English speaker, and who is also flexible enough to speak English internationally. In the case of L1-speaker teachers, it is no longer possible to assume that, even ideally, students should speak "as I speak." Teaching materials should be drawn from all the various English-using communities, not only L1 communities, so as to introduce students to the different manners of speaking English and to build an attitudinal base of acceptance.

For *all* individuals who plan to have extensive contact with English speakers from various cultures, there should be specific training in adaptation, in how to speak internationally. Means of enhancing cooperation between speakers, so as to permit negotiation for clearer meaning, should be taught.<sup>4</sup> In addition, there are all the skills of cross-cultural interaction (see Hoopes et al., 1977, vols. 1-3).

---

<sup>4</sup>Gumperz and Roberts (1978) is an account of a course piloted at a London firm in 1977. The managers were British, with many employees being speakers of Indian English. Course participants were taught to perceive that inter-ethnic communication problems do exist, to accept that they can grow out of systematic linguistic differences, and to repair communication breakdown.

## CONCLUSION

This article began with the assertion that the teacher's perception of English is central to the teaching process. The foundation of that perception is, "I speak English." The Japanese teacher faces several obstacles in developing this identity, many of which can be traced to the EFL/ESL distinction. The EFL concept, with its corollary that an L1 pedagogical model is the only appropriate one, is a serious obstacle.

Japan is not an EFL country and the most productive pedagogical model is not an L1 model. Acceptance by Japanese teachers of the EFL classification has led to a situation in which the classroom conveys an inadequate perception of the present-day reality of English both in Japan and in the world.

Improvement of the situation does not lie in arguing for a Japanese English variety. An analysis was proposed in which English is removed from a misleading substantive realm and placed firmly in the domain of human behavior: an American speaks American-ly; a Japanese, Japanese-ly.

In lieu of "EFL" and "ESL," the term "EILL"--especially if understood as "speaking English internationally and intranationally"--allows a more accurate description of the ways in which individuals, the world over, are using English today. Very importantly, this conceptual labeling permits the perception of an underlying image: people of many national and cultural backgrounds, speaking together through English, adapting to one another and in so doing creating a new social reality. Major participants in this process are English language teachers.

"How should I speak English" As a Japanese

speaker, the Japanese teacher will speak Japanese-ly. Through an informed perception of the role of English in the world, the Japanese teacher will also speak internationally. This is possible only through an arduous effort of adaptation, an effort in which all speakers of English, including L1 speakers, cooperate to create an atmosphere of mutual acceptance.

This is a difficult challenge for Japanese teachers. It is a challenge presented not from a position of criticism, but of praise for the more than 60,000 Japanese teachers of English (Koike et al., 1978, p. iv). It is a challenge presented in the hope that, in the very near future, the following situation will no longer hold true:

The attitude of the teacher is, therefore, quite native speaker oriented. The non-native speaker English teacher is teaching *their* language.... [Non-native speaker teachers] are always making futile efforts to reach the goal of native speaker standards. Since this goal is usually unattainable for most of non-native teachers, they have great frustration or inferiority complex relative to the language they are teaching, and, therefore, are severely demoralized. (Nakamura, 1978, p. 14)

#### REFERENCES

- Christophersen, P. Towards a standard of international English. *English Language Teaching*, 1960, 14(3), 127-138.

- Conrad, A. W., & Fishman, J. A. English as a world language: The evidence. In J. A. Fishman, R. L. Cooper, & A. W. Conrad (Eds.), *The Spread of English*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, 1977.
- Curran, C. A. *Counseling learning: A whole-person model for education*. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1972.
- DiPietro, R. J. The function of language in cross-cultural interactions. In D. S. Hoopes, P. B. Pedersen, & G. W. Renwick (Eds.), *Overview of intercultural education, training, and research* (Vol. 1). Georgetown University, Washington D.C.: Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research, 1977.
- Fukuzawa, Y. *The autobiography of Fukuzawa Yukichi* (E. Kiyooka, trans.). Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, new trans. 1960.
- Gumperz, J. J. Sociocultural knowledge in conversational inference. In *28th annual round table monograph series on languages and linguistics*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University, 1977.
- Gumperz, J. J., & Roberts, C. *Developing awareness skills for inter-ethnic communication*. Southall, England: National Centre for Industrial Language Training, 1978. [Available from NCILT, Recreation Road, Southall, Middlesex UB2 5PF, England]
- Hoopes, D. S., Pedersen, P. B., & Renwick, G. W. (Eds.). *Overview of intercultural education, training and research: Vol. 1, theory; Vol. 2, training and education; Vol. 3, special research areas*. Georgetown University, Washington D.C.: Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research, 1977. [Available from Intercultural

- Network, Inc., 906 North Spring Ave.,  
LaGrange Park, IL 60525, U.S.A.]
- Ingram, E. Psychology and language learning. In  
J. P. B. Allen and S. P. Corder (Eds.),  
*The Edinburgh course in applied linguistics:  
Volume 2, papers in applied linguistics.*  
London: Oxford University Press, 1975,  
218-290.
- Kachru, B. B. Models of English for the third  
world: White man's burden or language  
pragmatics? *TESOL Quarterly*, 1976, 10(2),  
221-239.
- Koike, I. English language teaching policies in  
Japan: Past, present, and future. In  
I. Koike, M. Matsuyama, Y. Igarashi, & K.  
Suzuki (Eds.), *The teaching of English in  
Japan.* Tokyo: Eichosha Publishing Co.,  
Ltd., 1978.
- Koike, I., Matsuyama, M., Igarashi, Y., & Suzuki,  
K. (Eds.). *The teaching of English in Japan.*  
Tokyo: Eichosha Publishing Co., Ltd., 1978.
- Kuse, A. Learning new ways to teach. *Mainichi  
Daily News*. Reprinted in *JALT Newsletter*,  
1978, 2(2), 1-5.
- LaForge, P. The epigenetic principle in community  
language learning. *JALT Journal*, 1979, 1,  
7-21.
- Marckwardt, A. H. English as a second language  
and English as a foreign language. *PMLA*,  
May 1963, 25-28.
- Moody, H. L. B. Conditions for effective language  
learning. In C. H. Blatchford and J.  
Schachter (Eds.), *On TESOL '78.* Washington  
D.C.: TESOL, 1978.
- Morito, Y. Japanese English: The use of English  
by the Japanese today. In I. Koike, M.  
Matsuyama, Y. Igarashi, & K. Suzuki (Eds.),  
*The teaching of English in Japan.* Tokyo:  
Eichosha Publishing Co., Ltd., 1978.

- Nakamura, J. EIAL--a new trend in English language teaching. *Michi*, 1978, 1(2), 12-23. [Published by Yamaguchi-Shoten, Kyoto]
- Nakayama, Y. Intercultural communication and no common language: A brief survey of attitudes on non-native speakers' use of English--from a Japanese perspective. Unpublished paper, 1979.
- Naotsuka, R. *Mutual understanding of different cultures*. Osaka: Educational Science Institute of Osaka Prefecture, 1978. [Available from Reiko Naotsuka, Educational Science Institute of Osaka Prefecture, 4-51 Karitacho, Sumiyoshi-ku, Osaka 558, Japan]
- Natsume, S. *And then [Sorekara]* (M. Field, trans.). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1978.
- Paulston, C. B. Implications of language learning theory for language planning: Concerns in bilingual education. *Papers in applied linguistics: Bilingual education series 1*. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974.
- Prator, C. H. The pronunciation of English as an international auxiliary language in Japan. *JACET Bulletin*, 1978, 9, 1-4.
- Shiroyama, S. War criminal: The life and death of Hirota Koki (John Bester, trans.). Tokyo: Kodansha International Ltd., 1977.
- Smith, L. E. Teaching English in Asia--An overview. *Topics in Culture Learning*, 1975, 3, 133-136. [Published by the East-West Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S.A.]
- Smith, L. E. English as an international auxiliary language. *RELC Journal*, 1976, 7(2), 38-53.
- Smith, L. E. Some distinctive features of EIAL vs. ESOL in English language education.

- Culture Learning Institute Report*, 1978, 5(3), 5-11. [Published by the East-West Culture Learning Institute, East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S.A.]
- Smith, L. E. (Ed.). *English for cross-cultural communication*. London: The Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1979.
- Smith, L. E., & Rafiqzad, K. English for cross-cultural communication: The question of intelligibility. *TESOL Quarterly*, 1979, 13(3), 371-380.
- Stern, H. H. Unity and diversity in L2 teaching: English in non-native settings from a Canadian perspective. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), *English for cross-cultural communication*. London: The Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1979.
- Strevens, P. Forms of English: An analysis of the variables. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), *English for cross-cultural communication*. London: The Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1979.
- Suzuki, T. Native speakers don't "own" English language. *Japan Times*, June 24, 1979.
- Tajima, K. The grammar-translation method: Its historical and social background. In I. Koike, M. Matsuyama, Y. Igarashi, & K. Suzuki (Eds.), *The teaching of English in Japan*. Tokyo: Eichosha Publishing Co., Ltd., 1978.
- Widdowson, H. G. *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

The first part of the book is devoted to a general history of the United States, from the discovery of the continent to the present time. The author traces the progress of the colonies from their first settlement to their independence, and then follows the course of the American Revolution, the formation of the Constitution, and the subsequent history of the Union. The second part of the book is a history of the United States from the year 1789 to the present time, and is divided into three volumes. The first volume contains the history of the United States from 1789 to 1800, the second from 1800 to 1825, and the third from 1825 to the present time. The author's style is clear and concise, and his treatment of the subject is impartial and accurate. The book is a valuable work for the student of American history, and is one of the best of its kind that has ever been published.

The author's style is clear and concise, and his treatment of the subject is impartial and accurate. The book is a valuable work for the student of American history, and is one of the best of its kind that has ever been published. The author's style is clear and concise, and his treatment of the subject is impartial and accurate. The book is a valuable work for the student of American history, and is one of the best of its kind that has ever been published.

**The English Language in Japan:  
A Social Psychological Perspective<sup>1</sup>**

Nancy Hildebrandt

Howard Giles

*Abstract*

This paper attempts to extend theories from the social psychology of language to the case of a monolingual community speaking English as a foreign language. Two theoretical frameworks are presented and then integrated: Giles's theory of speech accommodation, which attempts to account for the conditions under which speech convergence and divergence occur, and Gardner's model of second language acquisition, which illustrates the strong effect of the social milieu and type of motivation on second language learning. Implications for English language education and planning in Japan are discussed.

---

Nancy Hildebrandt is a Visiting Lecturer in English at Kinjo Gakuin University, Nagoya. Howard Giles is a Reader in the Department of Psychology, University of Bristol, England.

<sup>1</sup>The authors would like to thank Nobuyuki Honna for his comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript.

Most of us can recount instances during the day when our style of speaking has changed. Speech becomes grammatically less complex for children, slower for nonnative speakers, or enunciated more clearly to superiors. While these and other speech shifts have been studied for monolingual and bilingual communities and even for speech addressed to nonnative speakers, they have not so far been considered for the case of those speaking or studying a foreign language.

This paper will present a framework which helps to explain observed changes in foreign language speech from the viewpoint of the social psychology of language (see Giles & St. Clair, 1979; Giles, Robinson, & Smith, 1980, for an introduction to this paradigm). First, an overview of two specific theoretical frameworks in the social psychology of language will be presented: Giles's theory of speech accommodation, which attempts to account for the conditions under which speech convergence and divergence occur, and Gardner's model of second language acquisition, which illustrates the strong effect of the social milieu and type of motivation on second language learning. There will then be a synthesis of these two areas and an application to the situation in Japan.

#### INTERPERSONAL ACCOMMODATION THROUGH SPEECH CONVERGENCE

When two people meet there is a tendency for them to become more alike in their languages, accents, speech rates, pause and utterance lengths and so forth (Giles & Powesland, 1975). Such speech *convergences* can be considered "upward" when directed towards speakers possessing more

prestigious linguistic features or "downwards" when directed towards speakers possessing less prestigious varieties. According to Giles's theory (Giles, 1977a, 1980; Giles & Powesland, 1975), the more people desire another's approval, the more they will converge (usually non-consciously) their speech towards the other, to an optimal level (Giles & Smith, 1979). The theory makes use of four social psychological processes (similarity attraction, social exchange, causal attribution, and social identification) to explain the motivations and social consequences which underlie interpersonal shifts in speech style.

Similarity attraction theory in its simplest form proposes that the more similar our attitudes, beliefs and valued characteristics are to those of other individuals, the more likely it is that we will be attracted to them (Byrne, 1969). If one accepts the notion that people find approval from others satisfying, it would not seem unreasonable to suppose that people would attempt to reduce linguistic dissimilarities in order to gain the listener's social approval, since increasing similarity between people along such an important dimension as communication is likely to increase attraction as well as intelligibility (Triandis, 1960) and predictability (Berger, 1979). In support of this prediction, Natalé (1975) found that speakers with high needs for approval converge more to another's vocal intensity and pause length than those with low such needs.

Many factors could affect the intensity of a need for social approval, including the probability of future interactions with another, recollections of previous convergences from that person, and his or her social power over you.

Of these, the power dimension is perhaps the most crucial, and thus it is not surprising to learn that in New York City, Puerto Ricans assimilate the language of blacks (who consensually hold more power and prestige) than vice-versa (Wolfram, 1973). The power dimension also explains why most countries are using English, the language of the economically dominant countries, as a *lingua franca* in international dealings.

However, it is likely that there are costs as well as rewards for converging. Social exchange theory, again in its simplest form, states that prior to acting, we attempt to assess the rewards and costs of alternate modes of behavior (Homans, 1961) and then choose that which maximizes the chance of positive outcomes and minimizes the possibility of unpleasant ones. Potential "rewards" for speech convergence could include a gain in listener's approval as already mentioned, while "costs" might include excessive effort expended in convergence and/or the loss of perceived integrity and personal/group identity. Thus, one could predict that in a job interview where the applicant has a less prestigious accent than the interviewer, the applicant will shift his or her accent more in the direction of the interviewer than vice-versa because of their relative needs for each other's approval.

Causal attribution theory (Heider, 1958; Jones & Davis, 1965; Kelly, 1973) suggests that we interpret other people's behavior, and evaluate the persons themselves, in terms of the motives and intentions that we attribute as the cause of their actions. For example, we do not label a person giving money to charity as kind and generous if we attribute a motive of personal gain for the act. Such processes can operate in

relation to speech convergences as well. Simard, Taylor, and Giles (1976) found that French Canadian listeners favorably viewed an English Canadian's convergence to French when they felt it was due to a desire to break down cultural barriers, but far less favorably viewed it when they attributed it to external pressures in the situation demanding the use of that language.

Of course speech is not the only dimension along which convergence takes place. Hall (1976, p. 73) has spoken of the synchronization of not only syllables but also eye blinks and even brain waves by two speakers with a similar cultural background. A variety of behavior expressions (e.g., speaking distance, direction of breath, gestures) also convey meaning, although in cross-cultural encounters they are often misinterpreted (Hall, 1966; Jaspars & Hewstone, in press), and hence it is often essential that mutual convergence on nonverbal visual levels occur as well.

#### INTERGROUP RELATIONS AND SPEECH DIVERGENCE

People do not always react to each other as individuals; there are occasions when they react, and are seen to react, to each other as representative members of different social or cultural groups. In this vein, Tajfel and Turner (1979) conceived of an interindividual-intergroup continuum where at one extreme (the interindividual pole) would be found an encounter between two or more people which was *fully* determined by their interpersonal relationships and individual characteristics, whereas at the other extreme (the intergroup pole) would be found an encounter between two or more people which was fully determined by their respective memberships of various social groups or categories. The more participants

in an encounter view the situation as towards the intergroup end of the continuum "the more they will tend to treat members of the outgroup as undifferentiated items in a unified social category rather than in terms of their individual characteristics" (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, p. 36). (This intergroup process applies to any social categories in contact, including of course ethnic collectivities.)

The fourth social psychological process in speech accommodation theory, Tajfel's social identity theory, helps provide an explanation for why divergence (rather than convergence) usually occurs in an intergroup encounter. This theory (Tajfel, 1974, 1978) describes a sequence of processes simply described as follows. Social categorization of the world involves knowledge of our memberships in certain groups; the values associated with these group memberships (defined as our social identity) have meaning only through social comparison with other groups and form part of the self-concept. Since we seem to derive great satisfaction from possessing a positive social identity, we perceive and act in such a way as to make (or keep) our own social group favorably distinct from other groups, a process termed "psychological distinctiveness." This means that when a particular group affiliation is important to individuals and interaction with a member (or members) of a relevant outgroup occurs, the former will attempt to differentiate themselves from the latter on dimensions they value.

Once again, we would argue that language in its broadest sense would be an extremely important dimension along which speakers may wish to differentiate from each other in an intergroup context. In other words, individuals are likely to want to accentuate any linguistic differences between themselves and outgroup members, that is, *diverge*.

Moreover speech divergence between two speakers who define their encounter in intergroup terms may be based more on the linguistic attributes *thought* to be characteristic of their *group* memberships than their actual idiosyncratic *personal* speech characteristics (cf. Giles, Hewstone, & St. Clair, in press; Thakerar, Giles, & Cheshire, in press).

Numerous studies have shown the importance of language in ethnic relations (Giles, 1977b; Giles & Saint-Jacques, 1979). Language can be: (i) a criterial attribute for ethnic group membership (you are not considered one of the group unless you speak in a particular manner); (ii) a cue for inter-ethnic categorization (you are identified by the language variety you speak); (iii) an important dimension of ethnic identity (the language expresses the "heart" of the people of the group); and (iv) a means by which intragroup cohesion is facilitated (shared elements can be transmitted without outgroup interference through the language variety). Because of the emotional significance of language for ethnic and cultural groups, it is not surprising to find language issues often at the focal point of interethnic encounters (see for example Trudgill, 1974). Some of the speech variables used to seek a positively-valued distinctiveness and signal ingroup membership are the use (or accentuation) of ingroup language, dialect, slang, content (disparaging and humorous), and certain lexical items (see Giles, 1979, and Giles & Johnson, in press, for a review of such features and strategies of so-called "psycholinguistic distinctiveness").

A study by Bourhis and Giles (1977) demonstrates change in accent as a tactic of speech divergence. The setting was a language laboratory in Wales where Welshmen, who valued their nationality and the Welsh language very highly,

were asked to help in a survey concerned with second language learning techniques. The survey questions were presented on tape to the individual booths and the voice on tape was a speaker using the English prestige accent called "Received Pronunciation" (as might be heard by a BBC news-caster). At one point, the speaker arrogantly challenged their reasons for studying a "dying language with a dismal future." As might be expected, a torrent of divergence ensued in that participants significantly broadened their Welsh accents to him in their replies. Some also introduced Welsh words and phrases, while others used a very aggressive tone of voice. One woman did not reply for a while and then was heard conjugating Welsh verbs softly into the microphone. Another illustration is the case of English and French Canadians in Quebec, who after a while start introducing ingroup phonological markers in the second language (i.e., French and English respectively) they are learning (Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Taylor, Meynard, & Rheault, 1977). Indeed, those who converge or assimilate "too much" with (or even "pass" into) the outgroup are often viewed as "cultural traitors" by their own ingroup (cf. Khleif, 1979).

Although convergence and divergence have been viewed here as mutually exclusive categories, it is possible to converge on some linguistic dimensions while diverging on others simultaneously. For example, a speaker might converge by using the language of the outgroup but maintain pronunciation features of the ingroup language as an expression of ingroup solidarity (e.g., Japanese-flavored English). It should also be reemphasized that speech accommodation and interpersonal/intergroup relations are often non-conscious processes; similarly, the cause of divergence is not neces-

sarily a personal dislike of an outgroup speaker per se, but rather, as Tajfel argues, a need to maintain a positive group identity.

#### JAPANESE ETHNICITY AND ITS LANGUAGE

"Ethnicity" in its popular meaning is not usually a term that comes to mind in reference to the Japanese. There are disagreements as to the definition of the word ethnicity; however, the term could be thought of as "an aspect of a collectivity's self-recognition in the eyes of outsiders" (Fishman, 1977, p. 16). Thus, if the Japanese are viewed as an ethnic group rather than simply a nationality, it becomes apparent why, for example, descendants of Japanese who emigrated from Japan (to, for example, California and Brazil) perhaps 100 years ago are still considered Japanese, and why it is extremely difficult for foreign residents, even those born and raised in Japan, to become Japanese citizens.

While the Japanese language is not a criterial attribute for being Japanese, it is indeed an important dimension of cultural identity. One example of the process of intergroup distinctiveness reflected in the Japanese language is the frequent mention of the "unique character of our native language" (Letter to Editor, *Japan Times*, September 1979), and the popularly-held belief that Japanese is one of the most difficult languages in the world. One of the arguments commonly given in the media for not accepting Vietnamese refugees during the 1979 boat exodus was that "the refugees would find it hard to make a living here and learn the language and adapt to the customs" (Editorial, *Mainichi Daily News*, July 21, 1979). As Shibata (1979) says, "the Japanese like to believe that their mother tongue

is very difficult and they won't be satisfied unless they are told so ... if you really do speak Japanese well, they will push you away." Here then we have a classic example of the desire for a positive cultural distinctiveness (cf. Lambert, 1979). Another illustration of the connection between language and cultural identity is the popular concern over the large number of loan words (mostly English) recently entering the language. This condition is all the more noticeable because of the special alphabet (*katakana*) that is used to write foreign words. Mention of the "corruption" of the Japanese language by the proliferation of loan words can be found regularly in the media (as indeed it can in the French media).

#### SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING: MOTIVATION AND THE SOCIAL MILIEU

In an attempt to understand why some students are successful at learning a second language and others are not, extensive research has emanated from Canadian universities over the last two decades or so. One of the significant findings to emerge from the studies, which have been conducted in various countries, is that there are two independent factors associated with achievement in a second language, namely language aptitude and an attitudinal/motivational factor (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). The attitudinal motive was further divided into two basic types: (a) an *integrative* orientation which implies a willingness to be like those of the "other" language community or a goal to interact with or learn more about the other ethnolinguistic community, and (b) an *instrumental* orientation which

is characterized by a desire to gain social or economic rewards through knowledge of a second language such as "becoming cultured" or gaining a competency useful for occupational advancement. It was proposed that the integrative motive (although admittedly sometimes allied with an instrumental orientation) was most related to success in second language learning.

Gardner's (1979) social psychological model of second language acquisition suggests that the social milieu in which the target language is learned has a great influence on other factors involved in successful language acquisition. More specifically, social attitudes affect the relative importance in second language acquisition of various individual difference variables (including intelligence, language aptitude, motivation, and situational anxiety); they *also* tend to determine individual attitudes, which in turn support the effort and desire put into learning the second language (i.e., motivation). In other words, "since attitudes are formed through interaction with one's social environment, they make a direct link between the cultural milieu and the motivation to acquire a second language, and ultimately proficiency in that language" (Gardner, 1979, pp. 205-206). Thus, for a society which views a foreign language as necessary for instrumental purposes, one could predict that individual orientation would also tend to be instrumental and thus affect the entire matrix of factors and their salience involved in the situation (cf. Clément, 1980).

#### ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN JAPAN

While English is not used as a medium of communication among the Japanese themselves,

Japan's position as a world trader has created a wide range of positions where English ability is necessary or desired. Many companies include an English component in their entrance examinations and will increase an employee's salary if he or she becomes proficient in English to a certain certified level (there is a national proficiency examination which tests proficiency at four levels). English is also a subject which is tested on all university entrance examinations, and to this end English is taught to everyone throughout six years of middle and high school.

While it is true that there is a certain degree of integrative orientation in the society--there is often a desire to be able to speak English well enough to be able to talk to someone from an English-speaking country--the overwhelming social attitudinal orientation is instrumental. An example of the strength of instrumental goals is an incident related by one of the few native speakers of English allowed to teach at the high school level in Japan. The teacher tried to achieve a more communicatively-based class than the usual grammar-translation lecture and was told by the students that they preferred to be taught specifically what would help them pass the future university entrance examinations.

Indeed, the students had little choice. As Yoshima and Sasatani (1980) state, parents feel that English is a "passport" to success and a secure future in "Japan, Inc.," and therefore "a good teacher is a teacher who is able to mold his students into successful candidates for prestigious universities" (p. 11). Conversely, many parents also "are afraid that their children's sense of national identity will be diluted, weakened, or destroyed by their exposure to influential foreign culture" (Honna, this volume). It

is not difficult to see why grammar-translation-based teaching (and testing) persists, in spite of its readily admitted failure to produce speakers of the language. It can be taught as a regular school subject; fulfills parents' expectations, and is not threatening to either students' or teachers' social identity.

An instrumental orientation seems to be stressed at the expense of an integrative orientation outside of the classroom as well. Those who are perceived to have a certain amount of proficiency in spoken English are accorded social prestige and social (instrumental) rewards, but those who speak the language "as a native" and adopt the cultural mannerisms of an English-speaking milieu while doing so are perceived negatively by other Japanese (Honna, 1979). Indeed, such negative consequences for reducing ingroup distinctiveness under certain circumstances are predicted by social identity theory. Thus, it seems likely that when more than one Japanese participates in a conversation with a native English speaker there will be strong pressure to treat the conversation as an intergroup encounter and diverge at least to some extent on some linguistic dimensions as a means of signalling ingroup membership and cultural distinctiveness. (Obviously, the more that speakers define such encounters in interindividual terms rather than on intergroup lines, the less likely that psycholinguistic differentiations will occur.)

To be sure, the speaker's repertoire in the language (or languages) of the interaction determines the maximum convergence or divergence possible, but it is argued here that speech accommodation can exist even at the most basic levels of foreign language proficiency to the extent of a speaker's ability to express a certain function.

A personal experience with students in a university English-conversation class illustrates divergence in a situation requiring little language proficiency. The teacher was a native speaker of English and had never used Japanese in the class. After one class midway through the course, the teacher left through the front door, passed a group of students who had exited by the rear door, said "Goodbye," and heard in reply "*Sayonara*." Clearly this is not a case of the students not knowing what to say in the foreign language; rather it seems that divergence helped to maintain a valued identity.

It may also be divergence that is being observed in some cases where English is spoken with a Japanese-like pronunciation, although the speaker may have previously demonstrated the ability to produce the sounds correctly. In some cases certain aspects of this Japanese-like pronunciation may even be accentuated, for example attaching a final vowel (as in Japanese) to all consonant-final English words and then accenting the final sound: "I would[o] like [ú]/ to take[ú]/ your class[ú]." Marked changes in pronunciation can sometimes be noticed when a particular person is speaking in the presence of other Japanese as opposed to speaking in a situation where no other Japanese is present.

Speech divergence in a *second* language along phonetic dimensions has been found in other cultures, as mentioned earlier. Gatbonton (1975) found that French Canadian students preferred their group representatives to display a distinctive French Canadian accent rather than an anglicized version when negotiating with English Canadian students in certain situations. In the same cultural context, Segalowitz and Gatbonton (1977) found that certain linguistic

features (certain consonant sounds in this case) may carry the symbolic load of signalling ethnic identification more heavily than do others.

Attitudinal orientation and social identity suggest another area of conflict in the language class and especially a required class where grades are used as measures of achievement. When the "costs" of perceived loss of identity become greater than the "rewards" of pleasing the teacher or getting high marks, it can be predicted that students will diverge. This could be the process operating when students, asked to produce a sound which exists in the foreign language (English) but not in their own, at first produce nearly acceptable pronunciations following the teacher's model, but gradually, looking more and more embarrassed, begin to "retreat" toward pronunciations closer to sounds existing in their native language (Japanese). Occasionally, a student goes beyond this point and refuses to produce any sound at all while looking extremely distressed.

Once again, divergent speech shifts, as well as the definition of a conversation in intergroup terms, are not necessarily conscious or deliberate tactics; rather they might be considered automatic mechanisms. Thus, since participants do not typically have an explicit awareness of all processes in all contexts (Berger, 1980), misunderstandings occur when a particular encounter is not treated in the same way by the two speakers, and the wrong motive is often attributed (cf. Blakar, in press). For example, a teacher hearing a student using highly exaggerated Japanese-English pronunciation just after finishing a pronunciation lesson may attribute the shift to impudence or stubborn resistance, rather than to a need to signal or maintain a

positively-valued group or individual identity.

Other factors related to poor communication in English (besides the obvious reason of simple lack of proficiency in the language itself) have also been suggested in the literature. Some are cultural, such as the "shy" character of the Japanese, or the allegedly reduced importance of language in communication activities in Japan compared to Western cultures (Matsumoto, reported in Bycina, 1979); others are linguistic or educational, such as the extreme linguistic contrasts between Japanese and English production skills (Imamura, 1978). From a psychological viewpoint it has been argued that task overload (in this case the demands of a communicative situation) can cause a reversion to previous habits (Japanese-like pronunciation) (Nord, 1975). It seems likely that in any situation a complex interaction of factors produces the observed behavior. For example, the prevailing attitudes toward speaking English in Japan would tend to discourage confidence and encourage the feeling of "shyness" professed by many Japanese in foreign language interactions. This lack of confidence would further enhance the need for differentiation from the outgroup to increase a positive cultural identity. In any case, the extent and nature of these interactions will remain speculation until examined by empirical research.

#### IMPLICATIONS FOR LANGUAGE EDUCATION

The failure of the majority of the Japanese to approach an acceptable level of English-speaking ability is the subject of almost constant discussion and some scholars have become aware of the cultural threat of learning English.

For example, Suzuki (1979) argues that not only do Japanese feel inferior about speaking English, but also Americans and Englishmen communicate the feeling to Japanese people that English really belongs to Anglophones. However, since English is currently serving as an international language, Suzuki says, English "as neutral as possible, devoid of the cultural tint of the original English" should be taught and accepted by other cultures, allowing Japanese-English pronunciation and certain cultural styles of expression (for example, use of the word "yes" to actually mean "no"). In this way, Suzuki argues, Japanese will feel confidence in speaking English that is "their own" and in our terminology, this will allow them to redefine their previously "poor" or "inadequate" English performance more positively and thereby maintain a favorable cultural and linguistic identity (cf. strategies of redefinition, Tajfel, 1974; Giles, 1979). Hence the speaking (and learning) of "Japlish" would be an "additive" experience (Lambert, 1974); that is, it would contribute to, rather than subtract from, the learner's identity.

Such a process, as outlined by Suzuki, is a natural ally of language evolution and can be observed currently in many Anglophone contexts including Puerto Rico and Singapore, as exemplified in the varieties of Engañol (or Spanglish) and Singlish respectively (Nash, 1976; Platt, 1975). It will undoubtedly be a long-term project and may in part have to be legitimized by Anglophones generally; that is, English-speaking foreigners in Japan may expect to be confronted by Japlish, have at least a passive comprehension of it, and even perhaps be encouraged to function in it orally themselves. The use of English outside Japan would be a different matter and second

language training would have to be geared, almost in a trilingual sense, to equip Japanese to negotiate a more international variety in geographically foreign contexts.

Honna (1979 and this volume) proposes another solution, which stresses teaching foreign *cultures* through the teaching of foreign languages, offering a variety of language in schools besides just English, and encouraging the development of appreciation of differences, beginning with minority groups already in Japan (Koreans, Chinese, Ainu, etc.). In this way, the learning of standard English (or any other language) could also become additive to their experiences, in that the promotion of cultural pluralism would aid the development of a more integrative motivation, which is so essential for adequate second language proficiency, and which would not threaten any sense of cultural identity (cf. however Drake, 1979). Furthermore, the injection of a sociolinguistics and a social psychology of language component into language education can only increase students' (and teachers') understanding of the complex, *non-linguistic* dynamics involved, thereby facilitating second language acquisition.

This paper does not suggest that the entire reason for problems in speaking English is due to social identity processes and the attitudes of society. Nevertheless, the framework presented here does show that even the best efforts at providing quality English education may meet with failure if the attitudes of the society as a whole are not considered as an important intervening variable and if the language education situation is conceived in an intergroup vacuum. Interestingly, Gardner's (1979) dynamic model is encouraging in this respect: social attitudes

support motivation, which influence achievement, but achievement again influences attitudes. Thus, even in the absence of more radical reforms, it is possible that improved English education could create slightly more positive linguistic outcomes, which could change both specific and general attitudes gradually over a period of time.

In conclusion, it should be emphasized as has been implicit in our discussion that Japanese problems with learning a majority group or international language are in no sense a local, cultural peculiarity. The situation appears, on the contrary, to reflect a universal phenomenon as might be expected when social psychological processes of loss of group distinctiveness, threats of cultural assimilation, and ethnic subtractiveness are involved. Hence, we need to examine other cultures with similar patterns and problems (e.g., Puerto Rico) and thereby consider a wider range of possible solutions and their probable results (which is unfortunately beyond the scope of this paper). The value of adopting a social psychological perspective, as only briefly outlined herein, to analyze the Japan English-language situation is that it has broader explanatory power than any model hitherto presented. At this moment, the approach cannot readily offer a panacea for the problems encountered--this can only be achieved when empirical research in Japan attends to the relationships between languages and identities, ingroup identifications, motivations and attitudes towards Anglophone culture and language varieties. Yet by discovering the dynamics of these phenomena and processes which have been largely unexplored we will be in a much better position to propose important implications for foreign language education planning.

## References

- Berger, C. R. Beyond initial interaction: Uncertainty, understanding and the development of interpersonal relationships. In H. Giles & R. St. Clair (Eds.), *Language and social psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1979.
- Berger, C. R. Self-consciousness and the study of interpersonal interaction: Approaches and issues. In H. Giles, W. P. Robinson, & P. M. Smith (Eds.), *Language: Social psychological perspectives*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1980.
- Blakar, R. Towards a theory of communication in terms of preconditions. In H. Giles & R. St. Clair (Eds.), *The social psychological significance of communication*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, in press.
- Bourhis, R. Y., & Giles, H. The language of intergroup distinctiveness. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press, 1977.
- Bycina, D. Haragei. *JALT Newsletter*, 1979, 3(3), 17-18.
- Byrne, D. Attitudes and attraction. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 1969, 4, 35-89.
- Clément, R. Ethnicity, contact and communicative competence in a 2nd language. In H. Giles, W. P. Robinson, & P. M. Smith (Eds.), *Language: Social psychological perspectives*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1980.
- Drake, G. Ethnicity, values and language policy in the United States. In H. Giles & B. Saint-Jacques (Eds.), *Language and ethnic relations*. Oxford, Pergamon, 1979.

- Ferguson, C. A. Towards a characterization of English "foreigner talk." *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1975, 17, 1-14.
- Fishman, J. A. Language and ethnicity. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press, 1977.
- Gardner, R. C. Social psychological aspects of second language acquisition. In H. Giles & R. St. Clair (Eds.), *Language and social psychology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1972.
- Gathonton, E. *Systematic variations in second language speech: A sociolinguistic study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, McGill University, 1975.
- Giles, H. Social psychology and applied linguistics: Towards an integrative approach. *I T L: Review of Applied Linguistics*, 1977, 35, 27-42. (a)
- Giles, H. (Ed.). *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*. London, Academic Press, 1977. (b)
- Giles, H. Ethnicity markers in speech. In K. R. Scherer & H. Giles (Eds.), *Social markers in speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Giles, H. New directions in accommodation theory. In S. De Silva (Ed.), *Aspects of linguistic behavior*. York: University of York Press, 1980.
- Giles, H., Hewstone, M., & St. Clair, R. Cognitive structures and a social psychology of language: New integrative models and an introductory overview. In H. Giles & R.

- St. Clair (Eds.), *The social psychological significance of communication*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, in press.
- Giles, H., & Johnson, P. *Language of ethnicity*. In J. C. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behavior*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, in press.
- Giles, H., & Powesland, P. F. *Speech style and social evaluation*. London: Academic Press, 1975.
- Giles, H., Robinson, W. P., & Smith, P. M. (Eds.). *Language: Social psychological perspectives*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1980.
- Giles, H., & Smith, P. M. Accommodation theory: Optimal levels of convergence. In H. Giles & R. St. Clair (Eds.), *Language and social psychology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979.
- Giles, H., & St. Clair, R. (Eds.). *Language and social psychology*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1979.
- Giles, H., & Saint-Jacques, B. (Eds.). *Language and ethnic relations*. Oxford, Pergamon, 1979.
- Hall, E. T. *The hidden dimension*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1966.
- Hall, E. T. *Beyond culture*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, & Co., 1976.
- Heider, F. *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. N.Y.: Wiley, 1958.
- Homans, G. C. *Social behavior*. N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961.
- Honna, N. Cultural pluralism in Japan: A sociolinguistic outline. *JALT Journal*, 1980, 2, 5 - 29. (Reprinted from *Kinjo Gakuin Daigaku Ronshū*, No. 78, 1979.)
- Honna, N. Cultural pluralism in Japan. Paper presented at a meeting of the Japan Associa-

- tion of Language Teachers, Tokai Chapter, Nagoya, Japan, April 1979.
- Imamura, S. Critical views on TEFL: Criticism on TEFL in Japan. In I. Koike, M. Matsuyama, Y. Igarashi, & K. Suzuki (Eds.), *The teaching of English in Japan*. Tokyo: Eichosha, 1978.
- Jaspars, J., & Hewstone, M. Cross-cultural interaction, social attribution and intergroup relations. In S. Bochner (Ed.), *Cultures in contact: Studies in cross-cultural interaction*. Oxford: Pergamon, in press.
- Jones, E. E., & Davis, K. E. From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in social psychology, II*. N.Y. & London: Academic Press, 1965.
- Kelly, H. H. The process of causal attribution. *American Psychologist*, 1973, 28, 107-128.
- Khleif, B. Insiders, outsiders and renegades: Towards a classification of ethnolinguistic labels. In H. Giles & B. Saint-Jacques (Eds.), *Language and ethnic relations*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1979.
- Lambert, W. E. Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In F. E. Aboud & R. D. Meade (Eds.), *Cultural factors in learning and education*. Bellingham: Western Washington College Press, 1974.
- Lambert, W. E. Language as a factor in intergroup relations. In H. Giles & R. St. Clair (Eds.), *Language and social psychology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979.
- Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G. R. *Bilingual education of children*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1972.

- Nash, R. Phantom cognates and other curiosities in Puerto Rican Engañol. *La Monda Lingvo-Problemo*, 1976, 5, 157-167.
- Natalé, M. Convergence of mean vocal intensity in dyadic communication as a function of social desirability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1975, 40, 827-830.
- Nord, J. R. The importance of listening. *The English Teacher's Magazine*, 1975, 34-39.
- Otani, Y. College and university: What are the barriers to efficient English teaching? In I. Koike, M. Matsuyama, Y. Igarashi, & K. Suzuki (Eds.), *The teaching of English in Japan*. Tokyo: Eichosha, 1978.
- Platt, J. T. The Singapore English speech continuum and its basilect "Singlish" as a "creoloid." *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1975, 17, 363-374.
- Segalowitz, N., & Gatbonton, E. Studies of the non-fluent bilingual. In P. Hornby (Ed.), *Bilingualism: Psychological and social implications*. N.Y.: Academic Press, 1977.
- Shibata, T. Conversations: Takeshi Shibata. *The Mainichi Daily News*, June 1, 1979, p. 9.
- Simard, L., Taylor, D. M., & Giles, H. Attribution processes and interpersonal accommodation in a bilingual setting. *Language and Speech*, 1976, 19, 374-387.
- Suzuki, T. Native speakers don't "own" English language. *Japan Times*, June 24, 1979, p. 12.
- Tajfel, H. Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Sciences Information*, 1974, 13, 65-93.
- Tajfel, H. (Ed.). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in intergroup behavior*. London: Academic Press, 1978.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. An integrative theory

- of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup conflict*. Monterey: Brooks/Cole, 1979.
- Taylor, D. M., Meynard, R., & Rheault, E. Threat to ethnic identity and second language learning. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press, 1977.
- Thakerar, J. N., Giles, H., & Cheshire, J. Linguistic and psychological parameters of speech accommodation. In C. Fraser & K. R. Scherer (Eds.), *Social psychological approaches to language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, in press.
- Triandis, H. C. Cognitive similarity and communication in a dyad. *Human Relations*, 1960, 13, 175-183.
- Trudgill, P. *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1974.
- Wolfram, W. *Sociolinguistic aspects of assimilation: Puerto Rican English in East Harlem*. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1973.
- Yoshima, T., & Sasatani, T. The teaching of English in the upper secondary schools in Miyazaki prefecture: A study by questionnaire. *Memoirs of the Faculty of Education*, Miyazaki University, 47, 1980.

# Mathematical Analysis of the Economic Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic has had a profound impact on the global economy, leading to a sharp decline in GDP and a rise in unemployment. This paper aims to analyze the economic impact of the pandemic using mathematical models and data analysis.

The first part of the paper discusses the impact of the pandemic on the labor market. The labor market is modeled as a system of differential equations, where the number of employed and unemployed individuals is tracked over time. The model shows that the pandemic has led to a significant increase in unemployment, particularly in the short term.

The second part of the paper discusses the impact of the pandemic on the financial markets. The financial markets are modeled as a system of differential equations, where the price of stocks and bonds is tracked over time. The model shows that the pandemic has led to a significant decline in stock prices and a rise in bond prices.

The third part of the paper discusses the impact of the pandemic on the government's fiscal policy. The government's fiscal policy is modeled as a system of differential equations, where the government's revenue and expenditure is tracked over time. The model shows that the pandemic has led to a significant increase in government expenditure and a decrease in government revenue.

The fourth part of the paper discusses the impact of the pandemic on the overall economy. The overall economy is modeled as a system of differential equations, where the GDP and unemployment rate is tracked over time. The model shows that the pandemic has led to a significant decline in GDP and a rise in unemployment.

The fifth part of the paper discusses the impact of the pandemic on the distribution of income. The distribution of income is modeled as a system of differential equations, where the income of different groups of people is tracked over time. The model shows that the pandemic has led to a significant increase in income inequality.

The sixth part of the paper discusses the impact of the pandemic on the environment. The environment is modeled as a system of differential equations, where the level of pollution and the number of trees is tracked over time. The model shows that the pandemic has led to a significant decrease in pollution and an increase in the number of trees.

The seventh part of the paper discusses the impact of the pandemic on the health care system. The health care system is modeled as a system of differential equations, where the number of patients and the number of health care workers is tracked over time. The model shows that the pandemic has led to a significant increase in the number of patients and a decrease in the number of health care workers.

The eighth part of the paper discusses the impact of the pandemic on the social system. The social system is modeled as a system of differential equations, where the level of social inequality and the number of social services is tracked over time. The model shows that the pandemic has led to a significant increase in social inequality and a decrease in the number of social services.

## Teaching Writing in Japan

Mary Lee Field

### *Abstract*

Based on the author's experiences teaching composition to Japanese university students in 1977-78, "Teaching Writing in Japan" identifies some of the cultural assumptions which Western teachers are likely to bring with them into the classroom and traces the author's attempts to recognize and to overcome those assumptions. The most important principle which the article illustrates is that the patterns for composition which Japanese students unconsciously imitate, even when writing in English, are patterns shaped by their own cultures; likewise, the patterns for English composition have been shaped by a long rhetorical tradition. The article outlines a pedagogy for teaching English composition to Japanese students, one based on the student's and the teacher's mutual respect and understanding of each other's culturally shaped expectations.

Teachers of English as a second language are armed with a variety of methods, techniques and practices. However, in some situations, especially when the cultural differences between student and teacher are very great, that methodology is not enough to insure good results because both the students and the teachers carry with them a vast body of cultural assumptions. Both have difficulty recognizing the parts of human experience which are universal and those which are shaped by their own cultural training. They are, as Edward Hall described in *Beyond Culture*, in the "grip of unconscious culture" (1977, p. 240). Effective teachers must free themselves from that grip and must lead their students to do the same. In doing so, they do not become *cultureless*--but more aware of the universal and the culture-specific aspects of their behavior. They come to understand what those hidden, unconscious sets of expectations are which have been instilled into them by their own cultures. The students in this situation were Japanese university students, all English majors, all between 19 and 23 years old. Still, the underlying principles expressed here, the need for teachers and students to free themselves from the "grip of unconscious culture," apply in a wide variety of cross-cultural teaching situations.

---

Dr. Field was Visiting Foreign Professor of American Literature at Shimane University in Matsue, Japan in 1977-78. She is presently Assistant Professor of Humanities at the Weekend College Program of Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan. She misses Japan and hopes, someday, to return.

Not all teachers of English, and especially teachers of English composition, face such serious problems. The students who have been raised in Western cultures, students who have, albeit unconsciously, modeled their thinking and their methods of argumentation on the examples of Plato, Aristotle and other Western thinkers, do not have the same trouble learning the rhetoric and style of English composition that students from Eastern or other non-Western cultures may have. Even the "natural act of thinking," Edward Hall argues, "is greatly modified by culture" (1977, p. 9). But teachers of English as a second language who fail to understand those modifications often expect students to write compositions that reflect the teachers' own Western patterns of thinking.

When I began teaching English composition to Japanese students, I started with checks on grammar, sentence structure, use of articles and other details which I thought would reveal keys to writing problems. But the students were quite proficient. Confidently, I moved on to a study of the paragraph. The students dutifully wrote paragraphs, tried to follow my instructions, worked hard; but the results were disappointing. The paragraphs lacked details, they usually ended with vaguely emotional or sentimental statements, they never included strong arguments or clear evidence to support an issue. The students simply couldn't conceive of the style and form which I was asking them to produce; I couldn't believe that they didn't understand such (to me) basic points. After a period of considerable frustration, a story from a colleague, combined with my own reading, began to break this stalemate.

My colleague had been asked to translate from Japanese into English an article by a well-established Japanese critic. He remembered the article as solid, useful criticism. During the course of the translation, however, he came to another conclusion. In English the article was poorly organized, vague, confusing, trivial and uninteresting. At this point, he could not decide whether to submit the English translation without comment, mention that he was not responsible for the quality of the original, or simply refuse to submit the translation at all. His dilemma was serious; he was a Japanese scholar who had lived and studied in the United States, and he was able to see the differences between the original and the translation, yet he found no readily apparent way to resolve those differences. Indeed, perhaps there is none.

Soon after, in a sociolinguistic study of Japanese which I was reading, I found a similar comment by Roy Andrew Miller, who concludes that translation into English is virtually impossible.

Translation from Japanese for any end--literary, cultural, scientific, political--cannot provide effective communication in isolation from the sociolinguistic approach of the society toward its own language. In Japanese life and culture, translation alone will never provide full communication between Japan and the rest of the world ... Translation without the assistance of commentary can be worse than no translation at all, because it can be the source of positive misunderstanding. (1977, p. 99)

Westerners who have learned French, German, Italian, even Greek, know that translation is a difficult--often unsatisfactory--process. But the differences between Japanese and English create an even wider gap.

An important study of this matter, Robert Kaplan's "Cultural Thought Patterns in Inter-Cultural Education" (1966), gives the teacher some help. But Kaplan sees the English paragraph as the norm, as the straight line, and he draws visual models of paragraphs in other cultures which are circular, digressive or otherwise variants from the straight line. The crucial point which Kaplan makes in his article is that "the teacher must be himself aware of these differences, and he must make these differences overtly apparent to his students. In short, contrastive rhetoric must be taught in the same sense that contrastive grammar is presently taught" (1966, p. 256). On the other hand, making those rhetorical matters "overtly apparent" to students is not an easy task.

Since I could not investigate the differences between Japanese and English rhetoric on my own, I tried to make the students become aware of different patterns by having them do the investigating. First, I worked with some students to find English and Japanese newspaper articles that had the same topic and would reflect the same structure; but we were unsuccessful. Next, I asked some students to translate a paragraph from a newspaper editorial into English. The students were dismayed. They said the paragraph was not a "good" one. They were reluctant to finish or to show their translations to me. The editorial had none of the elements I had been naming in composition class--no topic sentence, no clear details, no direct statements, no

conclusion. The vocabulary I had given them for analysis was useless when applied to the writing of another culture.

Our cultural assumptions--both mine and the students'--were becoming evident. I learned how they valued personal statements, discussion of feelings, more delicate and vague phrasing and the use of emotive terms. They had absorbed these values through years of reading and imitating Japanese writing. They did not judge a sentence as bad because it was vague; on the contrary, they found vague sentences often good ones which gave the reader a pleasant feeling. Yet, articulating these assumptions is difficult; it takes conscious efforts not to reject other cultural modes. And even when Japanese students learn to imitate Western argumentative style, they will feel uncomfortable attacking other positions, giving evidence, and making points of view explicit.

Roy Andrew Miller, in his study of Japanese attitudes toward their own language, discusses their attitudes concerning prose style. Miller concludes that Japanese prose,

particularly scholarly prose ... is so dense that in many cases even specialists in the field in question are hard put to answer direct inquiries about just what the text is trying to say about what. It is writing that, since it does not communicate to the reader anything at all about what the author is trying to say, violates the most elementary functional definition of language as a medium of social inter-relationship. Yet, writing of this variety is not only prized by many Japanese scholars

and intellectuals but the techniques for its generation are carefully cultivated. (1977, p. 38)

These students whose language prizes the mysterious and the vague don't shift immediately into a Western teacher's pattern of rhetorically argued expository prose. Indeed, to do so is to become rude and vulgar, to become un-Japanese. But once the teacher recognizes the problem, he or she may help the students to see that Japanese and English writing styles are only two ways of writing, ones which can be learned and imitated, ones which are shaped by culture and not by universal law.

In another attempt to make the differences in style more overtly apparent, I constructed a set of three paragraphs, all on the same topic. The first was as close as I could come to a rather Japanese style. It included several generalizations, avoided precise details, concluded with a rather personal, emotional observation. The other two paragraphs were increasingly argumentative with more clearly defined topic sentences, stronger adjectives and very obvious organizational devices (Field, 1978). This exercise did make the different patterns more clear.

As the year progressed, I devised a number of other techniques which helped students understand the basic cultural differences which were causing them problems with writing in English. At one point, I collected the final sentences from a set of student argumentative paragraphs and duplicated them all on one long page. Students had to guess the topic of the paragraph from those last sentences, a difficult feat when the sentences were in the more typically Japanese pattern of delicate or vague personal feelings. Then, as a class exercise, they revised those

sentences to make them more forceful, conclusive and argumentative. The students completed this exercise by working in groups of two or three, and as I went from group to group, they would talk about the difference between Japanese and English writing styles with me.

Group work, in fact, proved to be a useful technique with these students. Small groups would study sample paragraphs to learn to recognize topic sentences, enumerate details and illustrations and distinguish between comparison, descriptive, analytical, process and persuasion paragraphs. They would argue and discuss freely in their groups, and they would call me over to ask questions; however, they still hesitated to discuss their findings or opinions with the whole class at the end of the period.

Individual conferences were also helpful, despite the students' initial shyness in meeting me personally. My verbal critiques of their paragraphs and papers were much more meaningful than my written comments, and they were eager to rewrite and correct their errors. Students were encouraged to write everything in English, because to write first in Japanese led to the same problems in translation that I described above. In addition, students enjoyed reading and criticizing other students' paragraphs that had been retyped and duplicated without the authors' names. The vocabulary and syntax of student papers were within the reading ability of all the students, and they could immediately devote themselves to the writing's organization rather than exhausting themselves in the translation of it.

Perhaps the most helpful exercise which the composition students practiced was journal writing. They were assigned the task of writing a minimum of four sentences per day for five days

each week. These sentences were to be recorded in notebooks which I collected and returned weekly. They could write about any topic; the assignment was a rigid requirement for the course but received no letter grade. That journal provided an excellent opportunity for students to comment on cultural differences, and I frequently responded to their journals by making explicit some differences which would help them understand the cross-cultural process which we were going through.

Through the journal, the individual conferences and the group work in class--all attempts to make overt the cultural patterns which inhibit communication--student and teacher gained trust for each other and developed some cross-cultural awareness.

A final consideration in developing teaching strategies is that teachers of English as a second language must recognize the impact of what they are teaching. Teaching English composition so thoroughly that students learn to use the forms with ease will change the students. There is some resistance to learning English really well among the Japanese. Edwin O. Reischauer has remarked on that hesitance, and he comments that there is a "fear--largely unspoken--that, if many Japanese learned a foreign language too well, this might impair their command of the Japanese language or at least some of their identity as Japanese" (1977, p. 398). To work through this resistance takes flexibility and ample time for students to adjust.

Teachers of English as a second language must always watch for ways in which they may still be held in the "grip of unconscious culture." In my own experience, there was an unconscious or unexamined assumption which held me back from

understanding the situation for many months. I could objectively state cultural differences and could explain to my students some of the obvious cultural expectations which we were struggling against. But I could not recognize my own deep-seated belief that once they learned more "logical" or Western ways of presenting material in their papers, they would be convinced that the Western way was better, clearer, more useful to them. Only during my second semester of teaching composition in Japan did I realize my own prejudice, and it was difficult for me to acknowledge that the Western way was not necessarily better. Students need to learn to use Western patterns in order to be able to master the complexities of the language and syntax and composition, but those patterns are not better, just different. Thus, effective teaching strategies for teaching Japanese students must begin with a recognition of our culturally shaped assumptions about English writing. Teaching English composition is, ultimately, a kind of "brainwashing," a process of acculturation to Western ways for Japanese students. The results of that process, for all who are involved, may last forever.

#### References

- Field, M. L. Teaching paragraph development. *Modern English Teaching* [*Gendai Eigo Kyōiku*], September, 1978, 15(6), 26-28.
- Hall, E. *Beyond culture*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1977.
- Kaplan, R. Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, 1966, 16, 1-20.

Miller, R. A. *The Japanese language in contemporary Japan*. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1977.

Reischauer, E. *The Japanese*. Tokyo: Charles Tuttle, 1977.



**Chirping Birds and Budging Beads:  
Diagnosis of a Japanese Problem  
in Learning English**

M. Stanley Whitley

*Abstract*

In this article it is suggested that the analysis of phonological problems encountered by students cannot proceed just from comparisons of source and target language phonemes. In the specific case of Japanese students learning English, it is shown that several resources fail to predict a certain area of difficulty, perhaps because they give more attention to phonemes and phonemic contrasts than to phonetic details. The latter, far from being negligible, can serve as clues for discovering underlying rules which are carried over from language to the next.

---

M. Stanley Whitley received his PhD in linguistics from Cornell University in 1974. He currently teaches Spanish, general linguistics, and English for Japanese students at West Virginia University. Publications include articles in dialectology, Spanish language, language change, and a workbook in phonology.

It can be a great advantage to FL and ESL teachers to know the linguistic systems of both target and source language. Teachers with such information are able to rank the various units, categories, rules, and constructions of the target language according to the degree that they differ from those of the source language, and concentrate on the ones which may cause the most trouble. Unfortunately, the teacher does not always have a personal command of the students' native language. As a partial remedy, linguistics and applied linguistics have made available numerous resources for reference. In lieu of a native command of, say, Japanese, the English teacher can consult a linguistic description of the language, and use a text whose author approaches English from the standpoint of a careful, point-by-point contrast with Japanese.

But a caveat is in order before linguistic resources can be used in this way. Linguists, when carrying out an analysis, do not paint the complete picture, but bring out the basic, distinctive features of the linguistic system; they may not explicitly state those phonetic details which are found to be "redundant" or nondistinctive. Redundancies are resolutely factored out of the description because they do not contribute to the sets of contrasts which are held to characterize the system.

For example, an English phonologist, if asked to talk about English /r/, may observe its contrast with /l/ and cite minimal pairs such as *reap/leap* for illustration; he or she may even go on to offer a phonotactic description (e.g., /r/ can occur in initial clusters), an account of morphophonemic alternations (e.g., *er ~ r* as in *cylinder ~ cylindrical*), and possibly some notes on dialectal variations (e.g., "r-dropping").

Is this all the ESL teacher and students need to know about Eng. /r/? No, not unless the students use a similar /r/ in their native language(s), which is seldom the case. Beyond the phonological properties of /r/ mentioned above are certain phonetic ones factored out by the analysis. /r/ (in most of the U.S.<sup>1</sup>) is a vowel-like sound pronounced with the tongue curled back, typically quite rounded before stressed vowels (*rock*, *around*, but not *car*, *card*), and devoiced after voiceless consonants (*pray*, but not *bray*). More technically, Eng. /r/ is [ɹ], [ɹ<sup>w</sup>], [ɹ̥] -- a retroflex approximant often rounded and/or devoiced. Of course, the English phonologist could supply this information, but often does not; it is ignored, for example, in that elaborate study of English phonology, Chomsky and Halle (1968). As a result, the phonetic details of /r/ might not filter down into ESL pedagogy, where the student must acquire a retroflex approximant, instead of the uvular trill, alveolar flap, or whatever, of his or her native language, if a strong "accent" is to be avoided.

Similar cases could be cited from any other language treated phonologically. Spanish *b d g* are phonemicized /b d g/, which makes excellent sense phonemically although phonetically they are more often fricatives than stops. Russian *o* is /o/, although phonetically it resembles Eng. /ɔ/ more than Eng. /o/; and French *r* is often a uvular fricative, but is symbolized /r/, like Eng. /r/. Phonemic symbols of course represent abstract units of a particular phonological system, not actual pronunciations, and ordinarily one

<sup>1</sup>In some dialects it is produced instead by a medial contraction of the tongue towards the alveopalatal area, but this yields an acoustically similar sound.

takes this into account in contrastive analysis. Nevertheless, it is occasionally concluded that, because language A has an /X/ and language B has an /X/, there will be less difficulty with /X/ when their speakers study each other's language than with a /Y/ that one has and the other does not have.

As an illustration, let us examine a recent text by Harriette Gordon Grate (1974), *English Pronunciation Exercises for Japanese Students*. This book is pedagogically sound in many ways; it uses a diagnostic test (with each entry cross-referenced to the relevant lesson), and, despite a rather thorough account of English phonology, it presupposes little prior linguistic training. It accurately pinpoints most problems Japanese students have, taking up phonemes lacking in Japanese, sounds contrasting as separate phonemes in English but not in Japanese, phonological rules applied in English but not in Japanese, phonotactics, and intonation patterns.

One of the problems Grate takes up is the Eng. /z/ vs. /dz/ (=ʒ/) contrast. Any analysis of Japanese will show that the language lacks such a contrast, and that /z/ vs. /dz/ should pose a problem. In fact, my Japanese students have had a good deal of trouble with it, consistently rendering /z/ as [dz] and confusing *version* with *virgin*, *lesion* with *legion*, etc. Grate carefully describes the articulation of the two sounds and demonstrates their contrast with minimal pairs.

But just as Japanese students pronounce /z/ as [dz], they further render Eng. /z/ as [dz], /ð/ as [dð], and /v/ as [bv], as shown in the following transcriptions of actual pronunciations:

|         |        |                  |        |
|---------|--------|------------------|--------|
| [dzu]   | zoo    | [ædz]            | as     |
| [badza] | buzzer | [ridzan]         | reason |
| [dðɛn]  | then   | [idða]           | either |
| [bvɛst] | vest   | [flɛbva, frɛbva] | flavor |

These last three substitutions are not attended to in Grate's text, nor are they predicted by many phonological descriptions of Japanese. Like [dʒ] for /ʒ/, they can cause an audible accent and are thus comparable to English speakers' aspiration of /p t k/ or diphthongization of /e o/ in Japanese--that is, not grave errors, but impediments nevertheless to native-like command. The teacher can improvise with phonetic descriptions, articulatory diagrams, and minimal contrasts (*size/sides*), but is bound to wonder what the source of difficulty is and why it has been missed in an otherwise fine contrastive study, and indeed in other resources available to ESL.

The answer lies in a factored-out detail of the sort mentioned earlier. Consider the following chart of obstruent (stop and fricative) phonemes of Japanese, which synthesizes various linguistic descriptions and underlies Grates' phonemic-contrast approach to English.

|     |     |              |                 |
|-----|-----|--------------|-----------------|
| /p/ | /t/ | /k/          |                 |
| /b/ | /d/ | /g/ = [g, ŋ] |                 |
|     | /s/ |              | /h/ = [h, ɸ, ç] |
|     | /z/ |              |                 |

By a rule called Palatalization, the alveolars in this system become alveopalatals before the vowel

/i/ or the glide /j/<sup>2</sup>:

|        |   |                  |
|--------|---|------------------|
| t → tʃ | } | / <u>  </u> i, j |
| d → dʒ |   |                  |
| s → ʃ  |   |                  |
| z → dʒ |   |                  |

Note that Japanese, like English, has a /z/ phoneme; apparently, no more attention would be needed for Eng. /z/ than for /b/, /k/, or any other phoneme shared by the two languages. But here we are merely comparing phonemic symbols. What is analyzed as /z/ in Japanese is actually (phonetically) an affricate, [dz]. Instead of producing continuous friction, as in English, the Japanese speaker briefly stops the airflow at the alveolar ridge before articulating friction there. Still, as the voiced equivalent of /s/, the sound is rightly phonemicized as /z/, written *z* in Romanization, and treated as voiced *s* in the Japanese syllabary, just as Eng. [ɹ] is phonemicized as /r/ and written *r*. The slightly plosive start of Jap. /z/ is an insignificant detail, like the rounding and retroflexion of Eng. /r/; it is voiced sibilance which contrasts it with other phonemes in the system, and that is its distinctive property. Consequently, its affrication is passed over in phonological analysis and in

<sup>2</sup>Alveopalatals are thus allophones of the alveolar phonemes; this is the analysis reflected in the Japanese syllabary and implicitly in Grate's approach. But Bloch (1950), using an argument (biuniqueness) no longer accepted in phonology, phonemicizes the alveopalatals.

pedagogical resources,<sup>3</sup> and Grate follows suit.

Yet the affrication of /z/ and also of its palatalized allophone [dʒ] is not insignificant, but leads to a fundamental principle of Japanese phonology and its possible interference in the acquisition of English: the language, either phonemically or phonetically, has no real voiced fricatives at all. Alternatively, one can state that voiced fricatives are automatically affricated in Japanese, just as voiceless stops are aspirated in English. It is now clear why the Japanese speaker says *buds* for *buzz*, *feeds* for *fees*, *ads* for *as*, *ledger* for *leisure*, *virgin* for *version*: a regular rule of Japanese is being carried over. Moreover, a concomitant transfer of Palatalization will produce a five-way merger of /z ʒ dz dʒ d/ before /i ɪ/: *zip* = *gyp* = *dip*, *buzzing* = *budging*,

<sup>3</sup>It is ignored in Vaccari (1957) and Niwa (1964), and relegated to footnotes by Jorden (1963) and Bloch (1950). For Jorden, [dz] is an "alternate" pronunciation of *z*, and just before *u*; for Bloch, it is "rare" and limited to non-standard dialects. (Neither is correct for the speakers--educated, and from Tokyo--I have heard.) Miller (1967) recognizes a *dʒ* for Middle Japanese, but not for the modern language. Kimizuka (1968), in a list of "substitutions" in Japanese-English transference, merely observes a "less fricative quality" (p. 53) for Jap. /z/; and Kimura ignores the problem. The major ESL resource of Nilsen and Nilsen (1971) includes Japanese among the languages whose speakers may have trouble with Eng. /ð/ vs. /z/ and /d/ vs. /z/, but /dz/ vs. /z/ is not mentioned, even though my students found this last distinction harder than the other two. Of all the works consulted, only Hisano (1976) correctly notes that Jap. /z/ is [dz]; and none of them predicts [dð], [bv] for /ð/, /v/.

and (because [ʌ] and [əɾ] are merged, too) *sudsing* = *surging*.

Even more interesting is the fate of English /v/ and /ð/. The Affrication Rule is so general that Japanese students apply it not only to English /z/ and /ʒ/, whose positions of articulation are familiar from Japanese, but to the voiced labiodental and interdental, whose positions of articulation are quite alien. As it turned out, students in my classes found it less difficult to master the labiodental and interdental articulations per se, because they are visible and easily modeled, than to eliminate accompanying affrication, which was subtle and unconsciously applied. That a general rule was at work, rather than mere confusion of phonemes or substitution of one sound for another, was clear from the facts that (1) [bv] and [dð] are as un-Japanese as they are un-English, and (2) /v/ and /ð/ stayed [bv] and [dð] as long as /z/ was [dz] and /ʒ/ was [dʒ].

The logical solution was to use voiceless fricatives as a point of departure, for the students never at any time affricated Eng. /s/, /ʃ/, /h/, and (once their positions of articulation were learned) /f/ and /θ/. (Likewise, in Japanese voiceless fricatives are never affected by affrication.) Therefore, the nature of voicing was discussed, and then drills such as the following were introduced:

|             |           |             |
|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| /pa/ → /ba/ |           | /sa/ → /za/ |
| /ta/ → /da/ | likewise, | /ʃa/ → /ʒa/ |
| /ka/ → /ga/ |           | /fa/ → /va/ |
|             |           | /θa/ → /ða/ |

But despite great effort from both sides, the

results remained for a long time:

/sa/ → [dza]

/ʃa/ → [dʒa]

/fa/ → [bva]

/θa/ → [dθa]

In fact, from both the linguistic and the pedagogical viewpoints, it is interesting that affrication of voiced fricatives, even of two Japanese lacks, persisted a longer time, and caused more perceptual confusion, than the infamous *r/l* distinction. When the students finally learned to control affrication, it disappeared for all four English fricatives.

In summary, then an "accented" pronunciation such as *budging beads* for *buzzing bees* turns out to be the key both to understanding the linguistic system as a whole and to tracing its interference in ESL. Not only is /z/ actually [dz] in Japanese, but all voiced fricatives will be affricated, including ones which are quite un-Japanese in place of articulation. Despite the generality and pervasiveness of this rule, its effect on English cannot be predicted in a contrastive analysis based on comparison of English and Japanese phonemes alone, which was the approach used by Grate. To detect it requires attention to what seems an insignificant phonetic detail.

#### References

- Bloch, B. Studies in colloquial Japanese IV: Phonemics. *Language*, 1950, 26, 86-125.  
Chomsky, N., & Halle, M. *The Sound Pattern of English*. N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1968.

- Grate, H. G. *English pronunciation exercises for Japanese students*. N.Y.: Regents Publishing Company, 1974.
- Hisano, K. *A handbook for teaching English to Japanese*. Osaka, 1976.
- Jorden, E. H. *Beginning Japanese*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.
- Kimizuka, S. *Teaching English to Japanese*. Los Angeles: Anchor Enterprises, 1968.
- Kimura, T. *Teaching English pronunciation to Japanese students*. Odawara: Language Institute of Japan.
- Miller, R. A. *The Japanese language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Nilsen, D., & Nilsen, A. P. *Pronunciation contrasts in English*. N.Y.: Regents Publishing Company, 1971.
- Niwa, T., & Matsuda, M. *Basic Japanese for college students*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964.
- Vaccari, O., & Vaccari, E. *Complete course of Japanese conversational grammar*. N.Y.: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company, 1957.

ENGLISH AND JAPANESE IN CONTRAST. Edited by Harvey M. Taylor. Tokyo: Regents Publishing Co., 1979. 205 pp.

On a dark day in 1974, Harvey M. Taylor, then of the University of Hawaii, told the students of his class in the "Contrastive Study of Japanese and English" to write "term papers of publishable quality" (p. v.). "To varying degrees these students struggled with their assignment" (p. v); unfortunately, the assignment won. In one sense, of course, these papers met Taylor's criterion: they were published, and hence publishable. But if by "publishable" we mean *worthy* of being published, then it is hard to see how the term can be applied to this book. From cover to cover it is badly written, badly edited, by turns uninformative, trivial, error-ridden, and incompetent, and generally useless to its intended audience of EFL and JFL teachers.

The book is divided into four parts: an incoherent introduction by Taylor, purporting to give the "Theoretical and Methodological Backgrounds" to the subject of contrastive linguistic studies; a section on "Syntax in Contrast," consisting of eight student papers; and two previously published articles, one on "Semantics in Contrast" and one on "Culture in Contrast," thrown in as a makeweight. The semantics article (Seiichi Makino, "Contrastive Semantic Analysis and Teaching Japanese") is actually about the different meanings of *naru*, "become." There is some useful information here, but hardly enough to constitute a separate chapter on "Semantics in Contrast."

The culture chapter consists of one article by Toneko Kimura, about--well, about this and that,

and nothing in particular. In the middle of her article, for instance, for no apparent reason, she gives us 25 English sentences written by Japanese students (e.g., "My house is narrow"), and points out the error in each. Makino did much the same thing with Japanese sentences (e.g., *geemu o asobimashita*). It is not clear why, if Makino's examples are of semantically based errors, Kimura's should be considered to be culture-based.

The bulk of the book is the "Syntax in Contrast" section. (There is no "Phonology in Contrast" section, oddly enough.) James Kayoda ("Japanese *rashii* Compared with English '-ly/like' and 'seems'") argues that there are two, syntactically distinct, forms of *rashii*--a dubious thesis, and one that becomes all the less convincing when one notices that Kayoda does not seem to understand such basic grammatical terms as "dominate" (p. 60) and "relative clause" (p. 68), and that his English tree diagrams include a node for postpositional phrases! But even granting his thesis, what follows? Of what value is it to point out that *-ly* and *-like* are not marked for tense, while *rashii* is? Has any Japanese student *ever* said, e.g. "He manlied even as a boy"?

Taeko Izaki Wellington ("Varied English Equivalents of Japanese Intransitive-*suru* Verbs") deals with a more important subject: the problem of intransitive *suru* verbs ("ITVJs"--e.g., *zenmetsu suru*, "to be annihilated") and their various equivalents in English. She offers a five-way classification of ITVJs based on their English equivalents (basically, whether these are transitive, intransitive, or passive); but since her sample includes only 20 words, it is hard to assess the relative importance of each class. Moreover, she makes no attempt to discover if

there is any way to predict the class membership of a given ITVJ, or for that matter to predict its intransitivity in the first place. If there isn't, then the categories are not very useful pedagogically or heuristically. After all, in order to classify an ITVJ, one must know its English equivalent; but if one knows the English equivalent, why bother classifying? Wellington also has some trouble with terminology, including, of all things, the terms "transitive" and "intransitive" (she marks "to commute to school" as transitive!) as well as "auxiliary verb" (she includes *cause*, *make*, and other causatives in this category--p. 76).

Takemasa Fujita's ambitiously titled "The Syntax of Negation in English and Japanese" touches on many aspects of negation, and analyzes none of them satisfactorily. His paragraph on interrogatives, for instance (that's right, one paragraph) overlooks the existence of WH-questions. Here again there are some surprising errors--for example, Fujita claims (p. 98) that *pretend* undergoes "NEG-transportation," which would mean that "John pretended not to hear" is synonymous with "John didn't pretend to hear." Again, he claims, incorrectly, that "double negation" is ungrammatical in standard English, and that therefore "I don't think that it won't rain" is ungrammatical (p. 99), a misconception shared by Kayoda (p. 69).

Meg Katsuragi ("Japanese *koto* and *no* Compared with English Gerunds and Infinitives"), like Wellington, attacks an important problem--nominal clauses--but her paper is vitiated by her vagueness, inaccuracy, and ignorance of English grammar. She ignores the very existence of *that*-clauses, which dooms her comparison to failure from the start. She rejects Kuno's (1970) analysis, based on speaker presupposition, as being "not quite adequate to handle the *koto/no* problem" (p. 110; two

pages later, this becomes a bit stronger: "his concept of 'presupposition' in the use of *koto/no* is generally inapplicable"), without giving any evidence of this putative inadequacy, or replacing it with her own analysis. And finally, she ignores the Kiparskys' treatment of noun clauses in English (Kiparsky & Kiparsky, 1971), which gives a convincing account based on presupposition--in other words, an account that could be profitably compared with Kuno's. This is a surprising omission, since Kuno mentions the Kiparskys in his treatment of *koto/no/to* (Kuno, 1973, p. 214); it is all the more surprising in that Taylor, whom Katsuragi credits with making a greater contribution than she to the English section of the paper (p. 120), was a co-author of an EFL text that relies heavily on the Kiparskys' account (Crymes, James, Smith, & Taylor, 1974). The upshot of all this is that what could have been a useful article turns out to have nothing to say.

Akiko Hogg ("Japanese *-te+i+ta* and the English Progressive") disappoints in the same way. Her article is so sloppily written that it cannot help *not* making a contribution to our understanding of the differences between the two forms. She seems confused as to the distinction between tense and time, and between tense and aspect. Thus, for example, "Languages which can differentiate among various times often do not require these tense [sic] differences to be marked in the verb" (p. 131). Again, she says of the two sentences, *kinoo neko ga uchi o katta* and *Moo neko ga uchi o katta*, that they "signal different times" (p. 133). Of the past progressive in English, she claims that "He was reading" indicates that the action of reading was "continuing (but completed) [sic] prior to the speaking time" (p. 139). Hogg distinguishes between "durative" and "instantaneous" verbs in

Japanese, but her analysis again is too superficial. In the following sentence: *Otoosan ga hairu to, Taroo wa neko o butte ita*, are we to understand that *butte ita* "signifies the resulting condition of the completed verbal action" (p. 137)? What condition? What completion? Something more needs to be said about Japanese verbs in the *-teita* form.

Fumiyo Yamanaka ("Overgeneralization from English V-ing to Japanese V-*te imasu*") presents an ill-designed survey of English and Japanese speakers, who were asked to translate three Japanese sentences into English and three English sentences into Japanese. Everyone did quite well, except for the sentence "He has read that book already," which most English speakers incorrectly did *not* translate as *Kare wa ano hon o moo yonde imasu*. This can hardly be considered overgeneralizing from V-ing to V-*te imasu*.

Susan H. Shinkawa, who with charming ingenuousness assures us that although she is "not a native speaker of Japanese, [she] is a Japanese language specialist" (p. 161), compares *at*, *in*, *on*, and *by* with *de*, *ni*, and *o*. She complains of the dearth of "published analyses of the location markers of English and Japanese" (p. 161); but for the purposes of her article, any standard grammar would have sufficed. In the case of the English locatives, for that matter, if she had simply thought for a few minutes, without consulting *any* published analysis, she should have been able to avoid some of the errors that she makes. She would have discovered, for instance, that contrary to what she says (p. 173), non-solid objects can occur with *on*--"floating on the water," "carried on the wind," etc. She would have realized that it is not accurate to say that a sentence like "She sat on the beach

on a box" is ungrammatical because "the smaller location which is enclosed by the larger must come first" (p. 174); both "She sat on the beach, on a box," and "On the beach, she sat on a box" are grammatical. In this paper, as elsewhere in the book, there is much unnecessary laying of groundwork that leads to no particularly useful insights into either language; e.g., the long list of ungrammatical combinations of Japanese locative particles. (It is typical of the laxness of all the writers in this volume that Shinkawa never specifically says that the constraints on these combinations apply only to simple sentences, i.e., a sentence like *Tookyoo NI tsuite, Tomodachi NI atta* or *Tookyoo NI sunde iru tomodachi wa hashi O watatta* is perfectly grammatical.)

Finally, Yohko Haniu ("Topicalization in Japanese and English") is handicapped by not knowing just what topicalization is. The result is a hodgepodge of confusing, inaccurate, and even self-contradictory statements. For instance, "When an English noun is topicalized, a coreferential pronoun replaces the noun in its original position" (p. 193). First of all, this is not Topicalization, it is Dislocation. But aside from that, Haniu no sooner says this than she illustrates the statement with an example that she herself marks as ungrammatical (p. 193: "The mountain, I saw it"). She claims that "all generic nouns in the subject position must be topicalized" in Japanese (p. 185). But this clearly is not true; if it were, then a sentence like *Raion ga niku o taberu* could never have a generic reading ("Lions eat meat"). The problem is that Haniu does not really understand the distinction between "generic" and "specific," or that between "definite" and "indefinite." Thus, for instance, she claims that "the only correct translation of

*Kodomo ga urusai desu* must be 'A child is noisy,' meaning some child that neither the speaker nor the hearer has been referring to or has otherwise indicated" (p. 185), which is of course simply not true. Indeed, it is hard to imagine a situation in which one could appropriately utter the sentence, "A child is noisy," other than generically, in which case one is certainly not referring to a child.

In general, the contributors to *English and Japanese in Contrast* illustrate Pope's admonition about the dangers of a little learning. They have taken a little sip from the Pierian spring of linguistics, and it has made them giddy. There is a general brandishing of technical terms either incorrectly or imprecisely: "transformation," "dominate," "feature," "agent," "tense," and so on, and on. Even Taylor does not seem to understand what "deep structure" means (pp. 6, 14). There is a general violating of Ockham's Razor--tree diagrams, "case frames," "features," most of which are either incorrect, or unenlightening, or both. And when all the quasi-scholarly litter is cleared away, we are left with no information that we could not have found in a standard grammar or textbook.

The contributors were students, for the most part, and most of them are not native speakers of English; one could thus reasonably expect some errors, both of style and of substance. (This doesn't mean, of course, that we should overlook the errors, or that, the errors once corrected, these articles would have been worth publishing.) But what are we to say of the editor? A responsible, conscientious editor, especially if he is editing his own students' work, surely would at least read the manuscripts. We could expect that he might spot at least some of

the more glaring errors (and there are many more not mentioned here). We could expect at least that he would spare his students and us the embarrassment of seeing printed such gaffes as the following:

It has been pointed out by Professor Harvey Taylor ... that both English and Japanese speakers can think in universal terms of present, past, and future. (p. 146)

Taylor ... has pointed out that in English there are two semantic interpretations of the '-ed' form. (p. 117)

This book, in short, should never have been published, and both Taylor and Regents should be ashamed of themselves for perpetrating it. But it *was* published, and that fact in itself is indicative of the sorry state of the TEFL profession in Japan. If this had been, say, *English and French in Contrast*, it would never have seen the light of day. But in Japan, as this book shows, you can publish anything. As long as that remains true, as long as we remain content to buy no matter what until the real thing comes along, the real thing is not going to come along. The real thing requires knowledge, skill, and work; *English and Japanese in Contrast* shows evidence of none of these.

Kevin R. Gregg

Matsuyama University

## References

- Crymes, R. James, G. Smith, L., & Taylor, H. *Developing fluency in English*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
- Kiparsky, P., & Kiparsky, C. Fact. In D. D. Steinberg & L. A. Jakobovits (Eds.), *Semantics: An interdisciplinary reader in philosophy, linguistics, and psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Kuno, S. Notes on Japanese grammar. *Mathematical Linguistics and Automatic Translation* (Harvard University Computation Laboratory), Report No. NSF-27, 1970.
- Kuno, S. *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1973.

---

JALT JOURNAL 第2卷

昭和55年11月15日 印刷  
昭和55年11月22日 発行

発行人 全国語学教師協会 (JALT) 会長  
THOMAS N. ROBB

発行所 JALT本部  
〒573 大阪府枚方市枚方元町6-27  
TEL (0720) 45-1874

印刷所 厚進社  
〒530 大阪市北区天満2丁目13-3  
TEL (06) 351-8795

---



