DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 113 FL 019 082

AUTHOR Biro, Jan E.
TITLE Literacy to Aurality/Orality in an Adult Japanese ESL Student: A Case Study.
PUB DATE 10 Jan 91
NOTE 35p.; Master's research paper, Georgetown University, Washington, DC.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Students; Case Studies; Classroom Techniques; College Students; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Group Membership; Higher Education; Japanese; Language Planning; *Language Variation; Learning Processes; *Listening Comprehension; *Pronunciation; Secondary Education; Second Language Instruction; *Sociocultural Patterns; Uncommonly Taught Languages; Written Language
IDENTIFIERS *Japan

ABSTRACT

A study examined the factors shaping English language education within the Japanese public education system and the attitudes of Japanese learners toward the pronunciation of English, first in an overview and then within the context of a case study of an adult Japanese student. The first section discusses the status and instruction of English in Japan, including characteristics of "Japanized English," which is based on the use of English loanwords spoken by Japanese people among themselves, the effect of learning four Japanese writing systems before English orthography is encountered, classroom practices, and norms for English usage within social groups. It is concluded that listening and speaking skills are governed by Japanized English within the Japanese system of syntax, with type and frequency of use governed by group norms. The subject of the case study was a middle-aged Japanese professor of linguistics on sabbatical in the United States attending undergraduate lecture courses in linguistics. His use of English language skills, learning strategies, and pronunciation patterns were investigated and the effect of Japanized English on comprehension of academic lectures was analyzed. Background information on the subject and a 21-item bibliography are appended. (MSE)

LITERACY TO AURALITY/ORALITY IN AN ADULT JAPANESE ESL STUDENT: A CASE STUDY

A Master's Research Paper
submitted for LING 358 EFL MATERIALS PREPARATION
to Professor Lowenberg
of the Graduate School of Georgetown University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Thirty-six Credit M.A.T. degree

by

Jan E. Biro, M.A.

Washington, D.C.
January 10, 1991

I. Introduction

Overview

In designing a learner-centered curriculum (Nunan 1988) for the study of English as a second language, it is important to have some notion of what previous experience, emotional attitudes, and strategies the learner has already developed regarding English or second language learning when he or she first enters a particular classroom. Some teachers try to get at this information by engaging students in classroom discussion the first few sessions, by preliminary interviews or by having students fill out questionnaires. Yet it is still up to the teacher to interpret the information in a way that will give an accurate portrait of the learner's needs and aspirations.

It is the goal of this paper to look in greater detail at the factors shaping English language education within the Japanese educational system as well as attitudes toward the pronunciation of English, first in a general overview and then within the context of a case study of an adult Japanese ESL student. It is hoped that such background information would be useful to teachers when they are trying to interpret the information they receive from adult Japanese students entering an ESL/EFL classroom. Since the focus of this paper will be only on the publicly funded Japanese educational system, it cannot account for all possible cases of an adult Japanese student's experience, and exceptions to that typical educational process can be extremely important in the initial assessment. In addition, a case study necessarily only looks at one individual's background influences

and idiosyncratic cognitive style and strategies and thus cannot be generalized to the population as a whole. A final danger of this approach is that the researcher's bias will be supported by conscious or unconscious exclusion of contradictory evidence. Thus it is the hope of this researcher that the information presented will stir comment and criticism with the goal of greater genuine understanding of the needs of the adult Japanese ESL/EFL student.

English in Japan

Japanized English

Stanlaw (1987) distinguishes between "two kinds of English extant in Japan today...these are `Japanized English,' based on the use of English loanwords spoken by Japanese among themselves, and `the Japanese variety of English, spoken as a second language with foreigners" (p. 93). The former is part of the linguistic repertoire of every Japanese native speaker, whereas the Japanese variety of English is something that must be learned (p. 106). This section will focus primarily on some of the factors involved in acquisition of Japanized English by the Japanese student.

Today's average Japanese six-year-old child entering an elementary school in Tokyo will have been unknowingly exposed to hundreds of English words in daily conversation (Stanlaw 1987:106) and through television. In 1973, Higa estimated that "approximately eight percent of the total Japanese vocabulary is derived from English" (cited in Stanlaw 1982:173) and there is no reason to think that

today's figure has in any way diminished but rather has increased. However, it is extremely important to note that the majority of English used in conversation and the written media is made up of such individual loanwords or short phrases rather than any borrowing at the syntactic level. More importantly, the English loanwords have undergone Japanese nativization so that they are phonologically assimilated (Morrow 1987: 51) and the distinguishing features between pronounced Japanese and pronounced English loanwords have been lost.

Four of the important modifications that occur in the production of spoken Japanized English occur in such features of English as the consonant clusters, which are redistributed into the open syllable CVCV structure of Japanese by vowel epenthesis; the reduction of the greater inventory of vowel sounds in English to the thirteen vowel phonemes of Japanese, consisting of three diphthongs and five vowels which may be lengthened (Hanaoka 1990:53) and (Maybin 1990:12); the loss of certain English consonantal sounds such as /θ/, /ð/, and /v/ (Stanlaw 1982: 174); and substitution using Japanese consonantal sounds as in /tsu/ and /dzu/. These changes produce the distinctive sound and cadence of spoken Japanized English. As an example, the words /bath/ and /bus/ would both be rendered [basu] in Japanese because of the substitution of /s/ for /θ/ and the rendering of the schwa in /bus/ as /a/. The early acquisition of nativized English loanwords could be one of the crucial factors that influences later English language education.

Such phonological nativization of loanwords is not unique to the Japanese language and by itself would not of necessity profoundly influence the course of English usage in Japan to such an extent that it would produce a variety of English: Japanized English. It is the assertion of this paper that the methods and goals of the Japanese educational system, combined together with the nativization of English loanwords and with group peer pressure, have produced the Japanized English with which an adult Japanese student enters the ESL/EFL classroom.

Influence of Japanese Writing Systems

Further underlying influences on the development of Japanized English can been seen in the order in which literacy skills are taught in formal Japanese education. A literate Japanese adult must master four writing systems (Foorman, cited by Butler in her preface to Cheng 1987:x) and understand the sociolinguistic use of each. Beginning in the first year of elementary school, the modern child will first learn **hiragana** - a syllabary used to spell out Japanese words. The child will also be introduced to some of the characters of **katakana** - the more angular syllabary which is used to spell out loanwords (Higa 1979: 287) or give special emphasis to a Japanese word. It is at this point that the child gains the tools to detect the difference between two major classes of words (Morrow 1987:56), Japanese and loanwords, but it is important to remember that the distinction is a visual one rather than an auditory one.

The study of Chinese characters, **kanji**, is also introduced at this level together with the Japanese and Chinese-derived phonetic realizations of each character. The fourth writing system, which is introduced in the third year of elementary school, is **romaji**, the Roman alphabet used in English. However, at this level, **romaji** is used to spell out Japanese words such as /gakusei/ (student) and as such follows the rules of Japanese phonology. By the fifth year of elementary school, children may have items on vocabulary tests that reflect Japanized English such as the following items (Fukao, cited in Stanlaw 1982:182): /aidea/=(idea), /kontorasuto/=(contrast) and /nansensu/=(nonsense). One can begin to anticipate the confusion that could occur when English orthography is introduced four years later in junior high school.

English Language Education in Japan

Remarkably however, there is relatively little confusion from the first day of English language instruction in junior high school if the instructor is a Japanese teacher of English. Since both the teacher and the students are products of the centralized and regulated curriculum set up by the Ministry of Education (Kurian 1990:120), the Japanese language using Japanized English is the spoken language of the English language classroom in the typical Japanese secondary school. (In a classic case of the chicken or the egg, what and how the future teacher is taught in turn profoundly influences how he or she will teach.) The task of the student then becomes one of

matching the familiar Japanized English sounds to the misleading orthography of written English rather than one of learning a wider range of phonetic values to represent spoken English.

The use of Japanized English as the spoken medium of instruction in the English language classroom is not a static phenomenon. Hanaoka (1990:53) traces the evolution of the notion that English is a syllable-timed language, as is Japanese, through the confusion between the colloquially used terms `long and short vowels´ in English with the actual lengthening of a vocalic sound, which changes the semantic meaning of some Japanese words. This has led to a new strategy among young adult Japanese speakers trying to make themselves understood in English by holding a `long vowel´ longer; e.g., beat=/bi:to/ rather than simply /bito/. It is evident that spoken Japanized English is an evolving language developing on an independent line from other spoken varieties of English.

Another influence on English teaching in Japan is the specter of the notorious Japanese university examinations which haunts the centralized curriculum of secondary schools. Because only English grammar and translation are included on the Japanese university examination, English as taught by the grammar-translation method is considered the most appropriate method to prepare secondary students (Reischauer 1977:397). English is just one of many subjects to be mastered and standard English is valued only in its written form with close attention to grammatical detail for the purpose of translation.

There are still relatively few native speakers of English in Japan, so there is little integrative motivation to develop a communicative form of spoken English outside the speech community of native Japanese speakers. The Japanese ESL/EFL student is the product of a culture which has decided to value written English over native-like spoken English. Is it any wonder that there is no check on the development of Japanized English if it is needed to understand and speak with other native Japanese speakers?

Japanized English and Group Membership

This last point, use of Japanized English in communication between Japanese, ties in with the notion that Japanese society and culture are strongly based on defining the self through membership in the group. It is perhaps the most significant factor influencing the adult Japanese student of English. Stanlaw (1987:100) notes that as far back as the late nineteenth century, it was fashionable among Japanese university students to "add English spice to their conversation diet by using a plethora of transparent and esoteric loanwords." Loveday (1986), Morrow (1987) and Stanlaw (1987) among others note the positive attitude Japanese native speakers have toward the use of loanwords and that such use enriches the linguistic repertoire of the Japanese language as well as adding more sociolinguistic features to the negotiation of communicative acts in Japanese.

The sociolinguistic features basically center around the norms for pronunciation, contrasting native speaker pronunciation of English

with Japanized English, and the frequency with which loanwords are used in conversation. There are Japanese group norms for usage of English whether it is a native speaker variety or Japanized English.

While a number of writers, including Lebra (1976), Reischauer (1977), Loveday (1986), and White (1987), have described in detail the influence of the group on the Japanese individual, more specific research has been done on language use in relation to membership in the group. Stanlaw (1982:180) recorded that even within the use of Japanized English, a relative newcomer to a group who sprinkles his or her conversation with too many loanwords may be considered a somewhat "affected" individual and may be denied inclusion in the group. Therefore, a speaker of Japanized English must be attuned to the particular group norms governing the type and quantity of loanwords permissible in a given group.

In reference to the use of native-like pronunciation of English or Japanized English, Reischauer (1977) noted a pejorative term, "eigo-zukai", which he translated as meaning "English users" (p. 398). This term is used by Japanese to describe a Japanese who "knows English well and gains some advantage from the skill". While it may be motivated from jealousy, still the interpretation is worth noting that such "English users" are "suspected of being superficial in other matters....[and] likely to be people who had achieved this special facility largely outside the standard Japanese education system and therefore probably regarded as semi-outsiders." This re-

mark reflects both the group norm and the extraordinary influence that the educational system plays in shaping the expectations of the group even after the school years are long over. To be cast as an outsider from the group is extremely serious in Japanese society, and social ostracism is used as an effective tool for shaping behavior in the home, school, neighborhood, and workplace.

Another example of norms governing use of native-like pronunciation of English in the group is cited by Loveday (1986) who describes the plight of "nihonjin-kikoku-shijo" (returning youngsters) as a particular example of social ostracism toward Japanese who can use a second language (p.30). These students "encounter educational and social difficulties on termination of their period abroad which has led often to a bilingual and bicultural condition." As Loveday explains further (in endnote 89), "these are social problems of integration: they are often rejected and ridiculed by classmates." The Japanese who can use English more natively than his or her fellows would be wise to hide or underplay this ability in order to gain and maintain membership in the group if that group does not share the second language ability. Thus potential role model opportunities for more native-like pronunciation of English among peers are lost.

Language Planning and Japanized English

There is also some concern among members of the Japanese speech community that the ever-increasing importation of foreign loanwords into the Japanese linguistic repertoire will compromise the purity of

the Japanese language (Loveday 1986:21, Morrow 1987:184, Stanlaw 1987: 184, and Reischauer 1988:392). At present, publications issuing from the government bureaucracies attempt to avoid use of loanwords as much as possible (Reischauer 1988). It is uncertain whether this can be considered a deliberate attempt at language planning at the centralized level and whether Japanized English has been encouraged and developed as a compromise measure in the minds of the purists. Certainly the recent hue and cry over the lamentable condition of English language teaching in Japan (Reischauer 1977: 399) has led to some rather tepid innovations at the centralized level. In particular, the JET program, which brings young native-English-speaking college graduates to Japan to teach for a year (Information Bulletin 3/30/87), sidesteps the entire question of the powerful role model of Japanese teachers of English who are able only to use Japanized English in conversation and the fact that there is no overwhelming motivation to develop native-like pronunciation of English because it is not required on the Japanese university examination.[1]

Summary and Impact on the ESL/EFL Classroom

If the experience of English for the Japanese student is summarized, it can be seen that listening and speaking skills are governed by Japanized English within the syntax of the Japanese language and the type and frequency of use are governed by group norms. Reading and writing skills are governed by the standard forms found in British or American schools although the references used by the Japanese are

outdated at times. Japanese students are motivated by the need to be able to translate in order to be considered educated adults (using the form of the Japanese university examination of English as the standard). In brief, it could be said that the typical Japanese adult is literate in standard English but lacks any aural/oral skills in standard English, or that literacy precedes orality in the acquisition of native-like English as a foreign language for the typical Japanese.

Returning to the original question of what an adult Japanese learner of English brings into the ESL/EFL classroom, a further distinction must be made between the monocultural student body and the multicultural student body.

If the Japanese student is entering a multicultural English language classroom outside of Japan, he or she will probably try to conform to the norms of the heterogenous group, which will not include Japanized English as the medium of communication. The need to communicate and alternative role models will act together to diminish the use of Japanized English and a phonological interlanguage (Lovins 1975) develops. This does not mean that Japanized English is lost, but that parallel systems develop that are used depending on the speech situation.

If the Japanese student enters a multicultural classroom and stays with the other Japanese speakers, not only is there a loss of opportunity from not being forced to communicate with non-Japanese speakers and loss of close contact with role models, but also the powerful

psychological forces behind the use of Japanized English as part of group membership are left intact, tending to reinforce the in-group/ out-group dichotomy central to Japanese culture and perhaps inhibiting the development of a phonological interlanguage aimed at more native-like pronunciation of English.

If the Japanese student enters a monocultural English language classroom in Japan, the situation is compounded. Not only will the norms of Japanized English prevail within the classroom unless explicitly addressed, but attempts to use more native-like English pronunciation outside the classroom could be met with with varying degrees of derision, ridicule, or ostracism by the Japanese speech community.

Ball and Giles (cited in Preston 1989:80) noted five features in an intergroup model of second language acquisition in minority groups which apparently contributed to "an individual's inability to maintain self-concept in the face of the second language task." Four of the propositions seem to characterize the monocultural language situation just described in the previous paragraph. The group members (1) "see themselves as members of a group with language an important dimension of its identity," (2) "perceive their ingroup's ethnolinguistic vitality as high," (3) "perceive their intergroup boundaries as hard," and (4) "identify with few other social groups and ones which offer unfavorable social comparisons."

The context of these three scenarios - the multicultural classroom

and the two choices a Japanese student can make (to immerse or retain solidarity with other Japanese students) and the monocultural classroom in Japan - is an essential feature the English language teacher must consider in developing a learner-centered curriculum with adult Japanese students in mind. Generally these students are relatively literate in standard written English but use Japanized English in place of native-like pronunciation of English. It cannot be said that such a student has a fossilized or interlanguage form of spoken English if he or she comes directly from a Japanese-speaking community because the student competently speaks and understands the only form of aural/oral English to which he or she has been repeatedly exposed.

The task of the teacher becomes more one of building on the standard skills in English that the student already possesses, reading and grammar, and developing associations from the written form to a parallel form of more native-like aural/oral skills English rather than trying to eradicate so-called "bad English." The fact is, Japanized English is an essential part of Japanese group membership and it is a moot point whether it is standard or non-standard.

It would be to the advantage of the teacher, in fact, to utilize the strong group orientation to create norms within the classroom for the development of more native-like pronunciation of English that would be reinforced by the group, as suggested by La Forge (1975) in his description of using Community Language Learning in the Japanese EFL classroom. In that case, the group learned to set the norms for

English usage in the classroom and monitored themselves and their classmates in conformance to the norm. This makes maximum use of culturally-based behavior to counter culturally reinforced Japanized English.

II. Case Study

Purpose

The rationale for gathering information for curriculum development through a case study is based on Schmidt's case study (1981) in which she cites three advantages for this method: (1) "possibility of an in-depth study over a period of time", (2) "opportunity to appeal to the student's intuitions about his or her difficulties and needs in more detail", and (3) "occasion for the curriculum developer to do direct observation of the student in the classroom and study situation to gain insight into the student's own methods of learning" (p. 201).

The focus of my case study was to gather information on how an adult Japanese ESL student with a typical educational background in English (that is to say, having achieved literacy but not necessarily orality in native-like English) would function in an American university lecture course. In particular, the degree to which Japanized English influenced listening comprehension and oral production was to be noted. Although this was not an ESL classroom, it was predicted that the extent to which the subject immersed himself in the environment of spoken native English would influence his development of a phonological interlanguage away from Japanized English and towards

native-like pronunciation of English.

Subject

The subject, Professor M, was a middle-aged Japanese professor of linguistics on sabbatical for one year in the United States (see Appendix A for background information). He was a gregarious person with a wide circle of acquaintances of many different nationalities. At the time of the experiment, he had been in the United States for approximately six months. He was living in an off-campus apartment with his wife who neither spoke nor understood English.

He read college textbooks with relative ease and was able to write competently in academic English. He had well-developed study skills and studied hard on a daily basis. At the time of the study, he was auditing two undergraduate lecture courses offered by the linguistics department: one taught by a native speaker of English and the other taught by a nonnative speaker. He also attended a night class in English composition and grammar.

He understood native English speakers with some difficulty, and was not afraid to ask for clarifications. His spoken English was strongly accented showing features of Japanized English at times, and at other times a phonological interlanguage depending on the speech situation and interlocutors. Native English speakers tended to use modified foreigner talk in conversing with him (slower rate of speech, clearer articulation, reduced use of idiomatic expressions, and frequent clarification or restatements).

M was considerably older than the usual adult Japanese ESL student, but his extensive educational background had produced a very marked disparity between his English literacy and orality skills. This made it somewhat easier to narrow the focus of the study to the influence of Japanized English on native-like English aural/oral skills without the handicap of impaired literacy.

Lecture Course

The lecture class was an undergraduate introductory survey course in linguistics held twice a week with one discussion session run by teaching assistants held on Fridays. The course was taught by a native English speaker. It was held in a large classroom with approximately seventy students. The professor delivered his lecture from a podium at the center of the front of the classroom and would make occasional brief notes on the blackboard behind him to emphasize particular points. M sat to the extreme right near the back of the classroom next to an American friend who was relatively fluent in Japanese.

M took notes on the lecture in English, but did not participate in discussion within the lectures nor did he take any of the examinations. At the time of the observations, the morphology and syntax section of the course had been finished (an area in which M was quite well-versed). The next topic was sociolingistics, which was a new topic for him.

M, when given the choice between which classes the researcher would observe, chose this course because he had the most difficulty

following it of the three he was currently attending. He described the chief problem as being unable to fully understand the lectures because the professor spoke so quickly. M's choice coincided nicely with that of the researcher's because M's extensive background knowledge in linguistics and experience teaching a survey course in linguistics (see Appendix A) removed the factor of totally unfamiliar material.

Procedure

The researcher observed M four times in a one-month period. Three classes were lectures and one class was devoted to showing a movie on American regional dialects, American Tongues. The researcher sat one row behind and to the right of M, so that the subject was in the line of sight between the researcher and the lecturing professor.

The researcher took process notes on the professor's lecture such as raising or lowering the voice, gestures, reading or extemporaneous explanation. These process notes were matched with M's response or lack thereof to the different actions. This approach was used to get a sense of how M responded to extralinguistic factors which might have contributed to his difficulty in listening comprehension. Content notes were taken as an additional measure to see if there was a connection between which parts of the lecture M failed to follow and the extralinguistic factors.

The researcher met with M after each lecture for a study session

to process what had been covered. Initially these sessions had the character of a tutorial, but gradually the quality of a discussion session between two colleagues developed. M shifted back and forth between Japanese and English using both to clarify his points. When using Japanese, M used Japanized English for English loanwords. When speaking in English, he used a variable interlanguage with elements of Japanized English and more native-like pronunciation. Occasionally he also would write on the blackboard in both Japanese and English to illustrate a point under discussion. Although the researcher understood some of the Japanese spoken, she did not respond in spoken or written Japanese to any extent in the study sessions. M was neither encouraged nor discouraged from code-mixing.

Data

#1: Lecture - Study Session

The topic of this lecture was speech acts. The professor had assigned reading homework of which M had done about half with careful notes in his textbook for new vocabulary items. The professor gave a handout of the outline for the day's lecture at the beginning of the class. The process notes reveal that M tended to miss the extra-linguistic cues indicating how the professor was focusing on the material. For example, the professor used a slightly faster rate of speech and somewhat of a monotone when reading a definition verbatim from the handout, but M was often watching the professor read rather than reading along. On the other hand, when the professor would ex-

pand what he had just read, his voice would rise and his speech would become more conversational. Often during this time, M would be focused on the handout.

After the class, the researcher left the room together with M and his American friend. Although M said, in English, that the lecture had been too fast for him to follow, he immediately launched into a rather thorough analysis of speech acts together with examples, but all spoken in Japanese.

In the study session, M's questions focused mostly on vocabulary items such as <u>hereby</u> which he noted down as <u>hearby</u>. This was used by the professor in his dramatic demonstration of a declarative speech act. The professor left the podium, stood in front of a male and female student, and said, "I HEREBY pronounce you man and wife " This of course amused the students and brought a laugh. The professor repeated it again, this time at the podium. In each case, his voice rose on <u>hereby</u>. M somehow was convinced that <u>hereby</u> was some new linguistic term with which he unfamiliar.

In other cases, M understood the term being discussed but could not understand the cultural references used in the examples. In a brief aside about language variation, the professor took a quick poll on how many students said "roll through a stop sign" versus "drift through a stop sign". M, a non-driver, was able to follow the activity of poll-taking but was mystified as to the meaning of the variations. He had come to the conclusion that they somehow involved

flattening a stop sign.

After going over the notes, the researcher gave a detailed analysis of the professor's lecture style in terms of a predictable series of speech moves that M could anticipate. In particular, the recommendation was made that M read the handout as the professor read it aloud since M's reading skill (supported by having read the homework) could support his weaker listening skill, and help him stay oriented during the lecture.

M engaged in frequent code-mixing between Japanese and English with English loanwords clearly pronounced according to the rules of Japanized English when he was speaking in Japanese. When using English, there was relatively little influence of Japanized English such as vowel insertion to make a CVCV structure, but frequent substitution of /s/ for /θ/, /tsu/ for /tu/, etc. He understood the researcher with difficulty, and made frequent requests for clarification. He would also try to write down some of the researcher's utterances verbatim in two different types of situations: when he wanted to preserve the researcher's summary of a point, and when he was intrigued by a particular turn of phrase.

Between the first and second sessions, the researcher lent the subject a talking thesaurus. This handheld electronic dictionary could voice a large vocabulary of words in a reasonably clear fashion. It also had the advantage of accepting rough phonemic spellings and translating them into correct spelling. M initially seemed fascinated

by it, but became somewhat disillusioned with it when he used it while watching election returns on TV. He typed in words he heard, such as precinct, but these were beyond the capacity of the machine lexicon. This was a strong indication that when M's study was self-directed, he was capable of much more than might be anticipated in an ESL classroom at his supposed level of aural skills.

#2: Movie - Study Session

The movie, American Tongues, was on phonological, lexical, and syntactic variation in the United States. The style was entertaining yet informative with a good deal of tongue-in-cheek humor. The professor passed out an outline of the major points in the movie so that extensive note-taking was unnecessary. M remained attentive throughout the movie, taking some notes and making occasional use of the handout.

M understood the main points as indicated on the handout, but missed many of the numerous cultural references. He was particularly eager to know what everyone had been laughing at, and had made notes of the points about which to ask for clarification in the study session.

His oral production remained similar to the first session, but the researcher noted that he was unable to reproduce accurately some words he had heard in the lecture which were obviously familiar to him from reading. One example was the word barrier which he clearly understood and had heard spoken in the lecture, but reproduced with the

accent on the second syllable and rhyming with the word rear.

#3: Lecture - Study Session

This lecture again focused on language variation with special attention to phonological variation. As usual, an outline handout was passed out to accompany the lecture. M was very successful in staying on cue with what the professor was doing at any given time. He also whispered to his American friend on several occasions, apparently to confirm points. It is not known whether he whispered in English or Japanese.

There was a definite shift in this study session from tutorial to a discussion of the material. M's notes were more complete and the implications of the material were discussed rather than points simply being clarified.

M's oral production remained about the same as noted in the first two sessions, but there was less attention to word-by-word understanding of the researcher's utterances.

#4: Lecture - Study Session

This lecture focused somewhat on phonological variation but more on lexical variation using the handout from the previous class. M was not aware that he should have been using the previous handout, and his immediate neighbors were not paying much attention, so he didn't get any hints from their behavior. He clearly picked up the cues that something was being read from, so he rather desperately paged through the textbook. Still, he managed to take a more complete set of notes

than the researcher.

In this study session, it was clear that M had followed a great deal of the lecture, including a rather involved example of an obscure West Virginian word, spider, for a footed, cast-iron frying pan. He was particularly interested in `r-insertion´ in American dialects as the professor had used, as an example, a local dialect which produces /War i t n/ for Washington. M was familiar with `r-insertion´ from a book on English pronunciation written by a Japanese linguist. Recalling an example from that book, take care of..., he understood that the /r/ was inserted in care. During the lecture, he couldn´t read the example hastily written on the board, and he was unable to generalize from his schemata how `r-insertion´ operated in Washington. Although he had heard the professor say /War i t n/, he knew it was not normally spelled with an r, so he couldn´t determine where to insert it. He was quite intrigued with the explanation that the book example must have been illustrating a relatively r-less dialect, probably British Received Pronunciation. He was a bit chagrined that he had been teaching this point in his own classes without putting it in the context of a particular variety of English.

In an unrelated personal discussion, M said something quite remarkable. He was rather agitatedly asking questions about the driving test (pursuant of getting a driver´s license) which he planned to take the next day. He was code-mixing, as usual, and while speaking in English about rules for parallel parking, he clearly said /k+rb/ for

curb and then corrected himself to /ka:bu/, which represented the Japanized English version.

Analysis and Discussion

Schmidt (1981) outlined two types of lectures in her case study analysis: **prose type** - "uses the verbal message as its principle means of conveying information" which cannot be easily represented by concise graphs or schemata, and **mathematical-model type** - can be represented in a concise, visual, relatively non-verbal format (p. 202). The lectures in this case study seemed to fall somewhere in the middle of these two types. On the one hand, they certainly relied strongly on the verbal medium, but on the other hand, the outline handouts served to show relationships between main ideas and subordinate ideas which Schmidt's subject, **Y**, found so problematic (1981: 203). The handouts were a real boon to **M**, because they allowed him to bring his stronger skill, reading, in support of his weaker skill, listening.

In general, **M** seemed to favor visual learning strategies over oral strategies. He read the homework assignments prior to the lectures, referred frequently to the handouts in class, read the material again after class, chose to write down important points in the study sessions, and sometimes illustrated his own points to the researcher using the blackboard. It is uncertain whether this was true throughout all aspects of his life. He certainly had a great deal of difficulty retaining the native pronunciation of words even if he knew them well from his reading and had heard them used by the professor

and the researcher. It is possible that this reliance on visual strategies was confined to English language study, influenced by his educational experience which emphasized reading English to the exclusion of understanding native pronunciation of English.

M's apparent improvement in listening comprehension of the lectures seemed to have less to do with any particular intervention or strategy suggested by the researcher than with having the opportunity to discuss the material with a colleague. He made several comments to the effect that prior to the study, he just listened in a general way to the lectures and would go home and read the text to understand the ideas. M obviously learned to look forward to and plan questions for discussion in the study sessions. His motivation to listen for comprehension of ideas sharpened, and he became less interested in understanding utterances word-for-word. Although he expressed regret for the loss of opportunities for discussion after the conclusion of the study, later he went on to engage in after-class discussions with the other visiting professor (Polish) who was also auditing the class.

M's pronunciation remained essentially unchanged throughout the study. He frequently code-mixed between Japanese with Japanized English and a Japanese phonological interlanguage variety of English. These did appear to be separate but parallel systems with boundaries governed by the dominant language in use at any given time. The only instance of boundary violation between the parallel systems, correcting from /kɨrb/ to /ka:bu/ (in the fourth session), occurred when he

was rather agitated and may be analogous to the data from danger-of-death narrations. It suggests that perhaps at an emotional level, Japanized English retains a psychological meaning and comfort for M.

It is also possible that no change in oral expression was observed because M has able to code-mix Japanese and English with the researcher. Had the researcher had absolutely no comprehension of Japanese, M probably would have reduced his code-mixing dramatically. Being able to code-mix represented a situation which could have evoked the feeling of Japanese group membership through use of Japanized English. The question is whether M's pronunciation would have improved if he had done less code-mixing and tried solely to express himself in English. Also the time constraints of the study, one month, may not have allowed sufficient time to see a change in pronunciation regardless of whether he used code-mixing or not.

Conclusions

After six months in the United States, Japanized English did not seem to interfere with aural comprehension of academic lectures when the material was relatively familiar to the subject. The relevant factor seemed to be the motivation for attending the lectures. When the goal was simply general listening comprehension, the subject tended to miss quite a bit, focusing on more word-by-word comprehension for listening practice rather than for overall comprehension of ideas. When the subject began to focus on listening in order to later discuss the material, his comprehension and note taking rose drama-

tically even though his tested listening comprehension was in the intermediate range at best.

It is clear that the subject successfully used his stronger skill in reading to support his weaker skill in listening. He was less successful in supporting his oral skills through reading. While the speaking thesaurus offered momentary novelty, it was ultimately too limited in its lexicon for the subject's use. However, it did prompt the subject to investigate a closed-caption signal receiver for his television. It may be that the subject will eventually find a way to link his reading strength to his oral weakness.

The data are inconclusive with regard to the hypothesis that use of Japanized English interferes with development of a phonological interlanguage. Because the subject spoke both Japanese and English with the researcher, the constraints of Japanese group membership may have been operating even though the researcher is not Japanese. An alternative explanation is that some cultural identity issues were involved in which use of Japanized English identified the subject with Japanese people as a whole rather than with a specific group. Although the atmosphere of the study seemed to be quite amiable to the researcher, this explanation cannot be discounted. A third explanation is that the subject simply found improvement in his pronunciation too difficult to achieve and was not motivated to try. The subject has undertaken prodigious efforts to improve his English, including interrupting a flourishing career in order to study abroad. It is

uncertain that he simply found pronunciation too difficult to master in the face of all his efforts.

III. Implications

The results support Schmidt's (1981) assertion that case studies can contribute to needs assessment for curriculum development. It is clear that students can be inventive in devising ways to bridge from their strengths to their weaknesses and any learner-centered curriculum must address this. It is also clear that strong motivation to use information interactively with others can overcome considerable language weaknesses. The results could be used in support of further research on content-based ESL/EFL classes even at the lower levels of proficiency.

Looking at the adult Japanese ESL student in particular, this study indicates that the effect of Japanized English on listening comprehension of academic lectures is greatly reduced after six months of in-country residence in at least one case. It is unknown what the effect would be in an EFL class conducted in Japan. It would most likely depend on the methodology of the teacher and the English-related activity the student engaged in outside of class.

The effect of Japanized English on oral production is unclear and bears further investigation in both ESL and EFL classrooms. Through further research, it may become evident that two parallel forms of spoken English are necessary for the adult Japanese native speaker who wishes to converse with other Japanese and also English speakers.

ENDNOTES

1. An interesting development occurred in 1989 with the start of an Japanese-English bilingual radio station. This is a commercial station with bilingual male and female disc jockeys. In the course of the programs, there is rapid and frequent code-mixing by the disc jockeys between Japanese and native English. More importantly, when the disc jockeys use an English word while speaking Japanese (code-switching), they preserve the native English pronunciation. This popular radio station is providing new role models for pronunciation of English within the Japanese language. It is interesting to note that this is a commercial venture rather than one sponsored by the government. It is too early to tell whether this will have a lasting impact on the use of Japanized English and the development of a Japanese variety of English.

APPENDIX A

Background Information on Professor M

M began elementary school in the southern island of Kyushu, Japan, six months before the end of World War II. He recalled that teachers, returning to the area after the military was disbanded, spoke rather poor English. He suggested as an explanation that if a teacher had spoken a standard form of English, he would have been suspected of having collaborated with the enemy. As American military bases were set up throughout Japan, this attitude began to change; however, there was no base near his hometown so he did not benefit from this change.

His education followed the typical pattern outlined in the introduction of this paper with two exceptions. One, he was taught **katakana** before **hiragana** because **katakana** was considered easier to learn in those days due to its more angular characters. Second, he attended an elite public high school which had native speakers of English as teachers. He reported that those teachers tried to teach pronunciation during the reading lessons, but their efforts were ignored as irrelevant to the university examination by the students including the subject himself.

M majored in Japanese linguisitics at a university in Tokyo and later earned a graduate degree in English linguistics which included the coursework leading to a Ph.D. but without the dissertation. He began his teaching career and at present is on the faculty of a prestigious women's junior college in Tokyo. He teaches three courses:

an introduction to language, classical Japanese composition, and beginning English grammar. He has collaborated on and also written some English-Japanese dictionary-style reference works.

M had visited the United States four times as a chaperone for month-long programs for the junior college women prior to his sabbatical. After he arrived in May 1990, he enrolled in an ESL intensive summer course in order to "observe the teaching methods of native speaker teachers" as well as study English. On his placement test, he scored at the advanced level in reading, grammar, and writing but at a lower level for listening and speaking.

REFERENCES

Cheng, Li-Rong Lilly. 1987. Assessing Asian language performance: guidelines for evaluating limited-English-proficient students. Rockville: Aspen.

Foorman, B.R. and A.W. Siegel (Eds.). 1986. Acquisition of reading skills: cultural constraints and cognitive universals. Hillsdale: Erlbaum Assoc.

Fukao, Tokiko. 1979. Katakana Kotoba. [Words in Katakana]. Tokyo: Saimaru Shuppankai.

Hanaoka, Barbara. 1990. The long vowels of Japanese English. The Language Teacher. 14(10): 53-55.

Higa, Masanori. 1973. Sociolinguistic aspects of word-borrowing. Topics in Culture Learning I. Reprinted in W.K. Mackey and J. Ornstein (Eds.). 1979. Sociolinguistic studies in language contact. New York: Mouton.

"Japan takes further steps to promote international exchanges in education." 1987. Information Bulletin (Public Information Ministry of Foreign Affairs). 17(1): 220-221.

Kurian, George. 1990. Facts on file national profiles: Japan. New York: Facts on File, Inc.

La Forge, Paul. 1975. Community Language Learning: The Japanese case. In Fred C.C. Peng (Ed.), Language in Japanese society. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Lebra, Takie Sugiyama. 1976. Japanese patterns of behavior. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Loveday, Leo. 1986. Explorations in Japanese sociolinguistics. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lovins, Julie B. 1975. Loanwords and the phonological structure of Japanese. Bloomington: Indiana Univeristy Linguistics Club.

Maybin, Donald. 1990. Pronunciation work in a team-teaching context. The Language Teacher. 14(10): 11-15.

Morrow, Phillip. 1987. The users and uses of English in Japan. World Englishes. 6(1):46-62.

Nunan, David. 1988. The Learner-centred curriculum. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Preston, Dennis R. 1989. Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Reischauer, Edwin O. 1977. The Japanese. Cambridge: Belknap Press.

Reischauer, Edwin O. 1988. The Japanese today: change and continuity. Cambridge: Belknap Press.

Schmidt, Maxine F. 1981. Needs assessment in English for specific purposes: the case study. In L. Selinker, E. Tarone & V. Hanzeli (Eds.), English for academic and technical purposes. Rowley: Newbury House.

Stanlaw, James. 1982. English in Japanese communicative strategies. In B. Kachru (Ed.), The Other Tongue: English across cultures. Elmsford: Pergamon Press.

Stanlaw, James. 1987. Japanese and English: borrowing and contact. World Englishes. 6(2):93-109.

White, Merry. 1987. The Japanese educational challenge. New York: Free Press.