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 "EIIL": "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*[1] 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

---

[1]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.[2]

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

---

[2]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" (Strevens, 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 repetoire, 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." Ther perception of self as an English speaker counteracts many of the native-speaker biases found in language taeching. 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 that 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 "EIIL." "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.[3] 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.

---

[3]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 EIIL 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.[4] In addition, there are all the skills of cross-cultural interaction (see Hoopes et al., 1977, vols. 1-3).

---

[4]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 "EIIL"--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 labelling 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 moddel 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 EIIL 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.