Native-speaker behavior in Australian-Japanese business communication

HELEN E. MARRIOTT

Introduction

As the internationalization of Japan proceeds and interaction between the Japanese and foreigners intensifies, the need for in-depth studies of the communicative and interactional patterns of participants increases. Of all the elaborate interactive encounters involving Japanese and non-Japanese, those which occur in the business domain can be considered as being of major importance. Although the settings are frequently located in Japan, especially Tokyo, business contact also occurs in many other countries.

Australia is one of those overseas countries where the presence of the Japanese is well established, reflecting the fact that in recent decades rising numbers of Japanese businessmen have been sent abroad to establish Japanese companies for the purpose of facilitating business activities on an international scale. Currently, there are over 400 representative offices or companies with substantial Japanese investment — commonly known as 'Japanese companies' — employing a workforce of approximately 72,000 individuals, a small fraction of whom are Japanese (Australia-Japan Economic Institute 1989). At the corporate level, these Japanese companies have extensive contact with other Australian or multinational companies, and this in turn necessitates contact between individuals and groups of individuals. Australian businessmen thus come into contact with those Japanese who are temporarily resident in Australia, as well as with Japanese businessmen who travel to Australia on short-term business assignments.

When interacting business personnel belong to different cultural systems, as is the case in Australian-Japanese contact, we face a large number of interesting features of the communication process. Since spoken and written English predominates in most Australian-Japanese contact situations, Australian English is generally thought to provide the 'base' norm (Neustupný 1985b: 163), and accordingly, Australians can be classified

as the native participants in these situations. The Japanese represent the foreign or non-native participants. To date, most theoretical treatments have assumed that both parties in a contact situation apply the base norm, or in the case of the non-native participant, *aim* to apply these target norms. In other words, the foreign participant was seen as moving in the direction of the base communicative system. However, empirical research has shown that the attainment of target norms is often difficult for foreign participants, especially in the case of Australian and Japanese contact where the norms are extremely distant (Neustupný 1982, 1985a, 1985b, 1986; Marriott 1988a, 1988b, 1989).

While much of the research on intercultural contact in general over the past decades has focused upon the behavior of non-native speakers, there has been insufficient systematic treatment of native speakers in reference to their interactive participation in contact situations. An exception are studies which have dealt with the problem of native speakers in contact situations under the broad framework of 'foreigner talk' (Clyne 1981; Ferguson 1981). Some specific treatment has also been given to the communicative behavior of native speakers in Japanese and Australian contact situations (Neustupný 1982, 1985b; Marriott 1988b), but even so more rigorous analysis is required. The aim of the present paper is to examine the behavior of the native speaker in contact situations and to consider the appropriateness of the notion of base norm when used in reference to one of the communicative systems represented in these intercultural situations.

Theoretical background

Considerable progress in research on communication in contact situations, especially between Australian and Japanese participants, has been achieved by Neustupný (1982, 1985a, 1985b, 1986, 1987) through his development of the concept of 'contact situation'. Unlike the original paradigm of language contact established by Weinreich (1952) and Haugen (1956), Neustupný concentrates on processes of contact rather than on their results. In contrast to intracultural, also called internal or 'native' situations, intercultural or 'foreign' situations are those in which 'contact' takes place (Neustupný 1985a: 44). Of critical importance is Neustupný's observation that participants in Australian-Japanese contact situations frequently deviate from the base norm, which may be either Australian English or Japanese, and that furthermore, the deviations assume a range of forms (Neustupný 1985a, 1985b). Various empirical analyses have confirmed that in these contact situations massive norm

deviation does in fact occur (Murie 1976; Ozaki 1985; Asaoka 1987; Marriott 1988b). For both native and non-native participants these deviations indicate the presence of at least three main processes: transference, interlanguage/interculture, and pidginization. Where Australian English is the base system, the three main processes can be broadly defined as follows (Neustupný 1973, 1985a, 1985b; Marriott 1988b):

1. Transference: the application of a nonbase norm, in this case, a Japanese norm. The term 'interference' is avoided here since it carries negative connotations which are not always applicable. As Australians may also apply Japanese norms, the term 'borrowing' is used synonymously with transference to account for the behavior of the native English speaker.

2. Interlanguage/interculture: the application of adapted norms. Here, the individual adopts a rule which moves toward the base system but which does not really reach it. As an extension of the earlier concept of interlanguage, I employ the concept of 'interculture' to cover more broadly participants' sociolinguistic and sociocultural, as well as linguistic, rule systems (see Marriott 1988b). My own work diverges from most other studies on interlanguage by delineating two original sources for the adapted norms: the base system, or, alternatively, the nonbase system (Marriott 1988b). That is to say, the interculture forms may be adapted from Australian English norms, especially by Japanese participants, but, as will be argued in this paper, interculture forms may also originate from the Japanese cultural system which, on occasions, becomes the target for the Australian participant. In addition, the possibility for Australians to adapt their own native norms exists.

3. Pidginization: a process involving neither the adoption of nor movement toward the target system. Pidginization is characterized by such behavior as loss of control and perhaps movement toward 'natural' rules. The process is applicable to members of the nonbase system as well as to those of the base system who may reduce either their native norms or those other norms which they seek to borrow or adapt.

Apart from explicating norm deviation in terms of the above processes, use will be made in this paper of Neustupný's model of correction to account for deviations from the base norm (Neustupný 1985a: 45). Neustupný's model proposes that for either one or both parties, deviation from the base norm may remain covert; in other words, there is no noting of any deviation. If noted, the deviation may remain without negative evaluation and be disregarded, or else be evaluated negatively, in which case it becomes an 'inadequacy'. The next stage involves the selection of

a suitable action program, most typically 'corrective adjustment' which generally, though not invariably, is then implemented. The following examination of native speaker behavior in contact situations utilizes the concepts of transference, interculture, and pidginization and also draws upon Neustupny's model of correction, which allows all communication problems in contact situations to be related to various stages of the correction process.

Background data

Data for this paper have been drawn from a study of etiquette in a variety of Australian-Japanese business situations — a courtesy call, a management meeting, two negotiations, two business luncheons, and four other business meetings — all of which were recorded on videotape, supplemented by interviews with a much wider sample of subjects (Marriott 1985, 1988a, 1988b, 1989). Of importance is the fact that all video recordings were of naturally occurring situations in the business domain. Nine of the ten situations were of intercompany interaction; only the management meeting in encounter 8 was an intracompany situation. In total, the encounters involved 22 Australian (20 male and two female) and 19 Japanese (male) participants.[1] Dyadic interaction occurred in three cases (encounters 1, 2, and 10), four participants with two personnel on each side were involved in another two contexts (encounters 3 and 6), and the remaining situations consisted of configurations of unequal representation. Apart from the Japanese businessman in encounter 9, all the Japanese were temporarily resident in Australia, covering periods which ranged from one and a half months for the businessman in encounter 6 to nearly ten years for another. For the Australians, the length and intensity of their contact with Japanese businessmen varied. Generally, though, three broad groups were distinguishable: those with extensive contact, those with some contact, and others with negligible or no previous contact. None of the Australians possessed extensive competence in Japanese; only the Australian in encounter 6 had acquired minimal competence. Table 1 summarizes these background details on contact. Even though Australia currently has the highest rate of students studying Japanese relative to its population (Coulmas 1989: 128), most Australian business personnel continue to possess only monolingual competence in Australian English.

    The focus of this paper is upon etiquette, including linguistic etiquette, and the analysis is illustrated with examples of linguistic, sociolinguistic, and sociocultural norms. In all the ten video-recorded business situations,

Table 1. *Length of contact of the Australians with Japanese businessmen*

	Long contact	Moderate contact	A little contact	None/negligible contact
Encounter 1	1A[a]			
Encounter 2		2A		
Encounter 3			3A1[b], 3A2	
Encounter 4		4A1, 4A2, 4A3		
Encounter 5		5A1, 5A2	5A3, 5A4	
Encounter 6	6A1, 6A2			
Encounter 7	7A			
Encounter 8	8A1, 8A2, 8A3, 8A4, 8A5			
Encounter 9			9A1	9A2
Encounter 10				10A
Subtotal	9	6	5	2

a. The coding indicates the number of the encounter and the nationality of the subject.
b. The final number differentiates individuals in the encounter when there is more than one interactant of a particular nationality.

Australian English was employed as the linguistic code, and in accordance with the objective stated above, the principal concern is with the native English speaker, that is, the Australian businessman. The term 'business-man' is used in this paper in a generic sense. The discussion to follow covers address and personal reference forms in the first part and the preparation and presentation of business cards in the latter section.

Address and reference

The universal centrality of address and reference forms as indicators of politeness in a culture's communicative system has been widely recognized (for example, Goffman 1967; Neustupný 1968; Friedrich 1972; Geertz 1972; Brown and Levinson 1978; Braun 1988). When the base norm is Australian English, it would be expected that Australians would apply native norms for address and reference in contact situations. Some of the Australians in the ten video-recorded business situations followed Australian English norms of address and reference, using first names and surnames.

First names and surnames

In the data, instances of actual Japanese first names occurred in the discourse of the two Australians in the third encounter; the actual Japan-

ese first name for the younger of the two Japanese addressees was used once by one of the Australians and nine times by the other. Thus, in this case, the two Australians who had experienced little contact with Japanese businessmen up to that stage (see Table 1) maintained the Australian norm of first name usage in relation to one Japanese interactant. This, however, was the only example of its kind in the data. By comparison, there were more occurrences of Australians using anglicized first names for Japanese referents. Not uncommonly, Japanese businessmen who are resident in Australia select anglicized names for themselves, such as Alan, Mike, Tim, and Roger, for use by Australians. In three encounters, for instance, all Australian speakers used only anglicized names for their Japanese addressees, even when the addressee had been newly introduced.

In Australian English, it is not uncommon in an initial or subsequent encounter to switch from surname to first-name usage. Such a pattern was observed in the tenth encounter, where the Australian visited the company of a Japanese businessman for the first time. Upon entry, the Australian appropriately used a title and surname, 'Mr Okamoto?', to check the identity of the Japanese in the office, prior to the greeting of 'How do you do' by the former. However, in the closing sequence the Australian switched to the anglicized name for this businessman, 'Tom', having been granted dispensation earlier in the discourse, when, during the business-card exchange, the Japanese had announced his anglicized name: 'Oh please call me yeh Tom'. In most cases, the selection of an anglicized name occurs at the initiative of the Japanese, but apparently in some cases it is proffered by the Australians themselves. Anglicization of Japanese names only occurs with the first name: it is never applied to surnames. In any case, the anglicization of Japanese first names and subsequent use may represent a case of interculture, as it is an attempt to approximate the Australian system of first-name use. From the perspective of the Australian speaker, though, use of an anglicized name for Japanese business personnel facilitates the maintenance of a native norm of first-name use.

The other recurring pattern which appears consistent with Australian norms concerns the use of English title and surname. In the data this pattern was used in address by five Australian speakers, as well as in reference to Japanese individuals who were not present. However, some qualification is necessary, for the frequency and contextual use of title and surname exhibited deviations from the regular Australian norm. A selection of examples of first name and surname use taken from the discourse of the Australian participant at the business meeting recorded in the first encounter is as follows:

(1) a. Come in. Grab a seat Alan (reference to his Japanese addressee).
     b. Now what about old friends? What about somebody like eh, Mr. Miura um I'd rather like to invite Mr. Miura to the dinner that we host (reference to a Japanese businessman in Japan).
     c. I may decide I want Lorenz to meet with eh with Mr. Takasaki ... (reference to an Australian colleague and to a Japanese businessman in Japan).
     d. Is Ken going back to Japan? (reference to a Japanese business-man in Melbourne).
     e. Shinzawa's no problem, we know him (reference to a senior Japanese businessman in Sydney).
     f. Russ has been to Kyoto before hasn't he. Russ Fellows came to Kyoto with us when we had the last meeting (reference to an Australian colleague).
     g. So Dick and Gerry will be the two who will be negotiating for ... (reference to Australian colleagues).
     h. And the reason for that is that Richard James and I have a meeting um probably for next week (reference to an Australian belonging to another corporation).

Although the Australian businessman used an anglicized first name for his Japanese addressee (see [1a] above), throughout the encounter he utilized the English title and surname variant for eight of the 11 instances of reference to nonpresent Japanese (see [1b] and [1c] above). The remaining cases of reference to Japanese individuals consisted of surname and the Japanese title of 'san' (Mr.) for one Japanese businessman whom the Australian had known for a long time, an anglicized first name for a Japanese temporarily resident in Melbourne (see [1d] above), and surname only for the Japanese managing director (see [1e] above) of his addressee's company.

In contrast to the Australian's regular use of English title and surname in reference to Japanese personnel, he maintained native norms for Australian referents: first name (see [1f] and [1g] above), surname only (see [1c] above), or full name, consisting of first name and surname (see [1f] or [1h] above). It is important to note that the Australian businessman makes reference to his company's personnel, including seniors, using first name or surname only. The full name is sometimes used in a correction frame as well as for other individuals belonging to a different corporate organization. These uses are summarized in Table 2.

Without doubt, far greater use of surnames by Australians occurs in the business encounters than is the norm in Australian English. As in the first encounter, many examples are found in the sixth encounter. Some illustrations from the encounter are given in extract (2):

Table 2.   *Forms of personal reference in encounter 1*

	Mr. & SN	SN & 'san'	SN[a]	Eng FN[b]	Eng FN & 'san'	Anglicized FN	Anglicized FN & 'san'	Full name (FN & SN)	Mr. & full name
Australian speaker									
to Japanese addressee									
for Japanese referents	8	1	1			4			
for Australian referents			1	2		1		2	
Subtotal	8	1	2	2		5		2	
Japanese speaker									
to Australian addressee	1	1		1	1				
for Japanese referents	15	1					1		
for Australian referents	1								1
Subtotal	17	2		1	1		1		1

a. SN denotes surname.
b. FN denotes first name.

(2) a. Initially he was going to come in for Mr. Fujita's farewell (reference by Australian speaker to a Japanese businessman).

     b. That was the year Mr. Hashimoto came (reference by Australian to a Japanese businessman).

     c. When's Mr. Kimura coming? Any fixed date yet Dick? (Australian speaker addressing another Australian; reference to a Japanese businessman).

     d. Mr. Kogawa was the Deputy General Manager I think of ... Melbourne office (reference by Japanese speaker to a Japanese businessman).

     e. I said to Mr. Shimada that you know Mr. James will not be available (reference by Japanese speaker to Japanese and Australian businessmen).

     f. I think Don Keatey and Geoff Dickson will be the only two in between Christmas and the New Year (reference by Australian speaker to two Australian colleagues).

In the above discourse both Australian and Japanese speakers refer to Japanese referents who are not present using title and surname (see [2a]–[2e] above). Although such usage is not negatively evaluated in Australian English, reference to absent personnel by an Australian speaker routinely takes the form of a full name consisting of first name and surname, rather than use of a title plus surname. Reference to other Australian personnel by the two Australians did in fact consistently involve the former pattern (see [2f] above). First names or surnames only are other variants which occur, as seen in the examples from encounter 1 (extract [1]) above.

Although in formal Australian English, surname with title is used as an expression of politeness, it is not normally employed in informal contexts or in semiformal contexts such as the ones reported here. Reference to very senior individuals may be an exception to this claim, though if they are not present, full name rather than surname is likely to be the norm. Generally, however, it is full name or even first name. In contrast to the Australian practice, Japanese speakers tend to use the English title and surname for nonpresent referents irrespective of whether they are Australian or Japanese (see [2e] above), superior or inferior. The excessive use of English title and surname in my data seems to be derived from the Japanese system; it is transferred by the Japanese participants to their communication in English and is applied to both Japanese and Australian referents. Australians employ it as a result of their acquisition of the Japanese norm, but only as a form of reference to Japanese personnel.

The discourse of the Australian chairman at the management meeting in encounter 8 provided clear illustration of the variation between first

names and surnames. Extract (3) below contains various examples of personal reference in the opening and closing segments and in the turns where the speakership role passes to other Japanese and Australian participants:

(3) a. The eh theme this morning is forecasting 1985 and eh Mr. Kurobe before I say any more would you like to say a few words (reference by Australian chairman to his copresent Japanese superordinate).

 b. Thank you Kurobe 'san' eh I had just distributed some notes on that economic seminar which Mr. Kurobe referred to.

 c. So I think that's the scene in the overview as we see it so if we can now go round the table and ask your views from your individual business area how you see things. Mr. Shimada happens to be sitting on the end and might go first.

 d. We have to understand the nature of the political animal that we're dealing with, I say that kindly, a political burden. Will.

 e. Thanks Bill. (pause) Neil. We're allowing ourselves about five minutes each gentlemen.

 f. We might have to leave it there in a moment gentlemen, thank you. I think Mr. Morris, Mr. Pulvers pinched two minutes of your time, Rod.

 g. Thank you Rod. Hagura 'san'.

 h. Right, thank you. Sakuma 'san'.

 i. Thank you. Nola.

 j. Thank you Nola. (pause) Ken.

 k. We can always talk to Hagura 'san' and Osawa 'san' and we should ...

 l. Mr. Kurobe, any closing remarks for us?

In the above discourse, the Australian chairman employed the surname with the English or Japanese title for four of the copresent Japanese referents: Mr. Kurobe/Kurobe 'san', Mr. Shimada, Hagura 'san', and Sakuma 'san' (see [3a], [3b], [3c], [3g], [3h], [3k], [3j], and [3l] above). By contrast, he used the English first name or its abbreviated variant for the four Australians in attendance: Will/Bill, Neil, Rod, and Nola (see [3d], [3e], [3f], [3g], and [3i] above). In addition, the chairman employed an anglicized first name, 'Ken', for one of the younger Japanese but also alternated with the latter's Japanese surname (Osawa) and 'san' (see [3j] and [3k] above).

Clearly, then, the principal variation between first name and surname is based upon cultural membership. At this meeting a switch to the

Australian's surname for two copresent participants is only used by the chairman in a marked context (see [3f] above). Similar to the discourse of the chairman, another Australian at the same meeting used an English title and surname for all Japanese referents, although in reference to Australians he used first names in three instances. The same Australian also used a full name once and, on two occasions, the English title plus full name for Australian referents who were not in attendance. In summary, the alternation of reference forms depending upon the cultural membership of the referent emerges from the data. Australian speakers apply the Japanese norm of surname for Japanese referents but, in the same situation, maintain native norms of reference for non-Japanese.

Use of the Japanese title 'san'

Conspicuous deviation from the English norm was evidenced in the discourse of some Australian speakers, who attached the Japanese suffix of 'san' (Mr.) to the surname of present or non-present Japanese referents. Apart from the examples observed in encounter 8 and illustrated in extract (3) above (see [3b], [3g], [3h], and [3k]), this pattern occurred in various contexts in five other business situations (encounters 1, 2, 4, 7, and 9). Use of the suffix 'san' clearly represents transference from the Japanese linguistic code.

Employment of the English title 'Mr.' together with a surname is a distancing device in Australian English, so, to minimize this effect, Australians may encode the Japanese referent's surname, thus adhering to a Japanese norm, but reduce distance through the use of the foreign title, 'san'. For instance, in the second encounter, which consisted of a courtesy call made by an Australian banker to a newly arrived Japanese banking representative, the Australian actually greeted his Japanese addressee using the Japanese title: 'Good to see you again Sakamoto san', and throughout the duration of the encounter he referred to four Japanese business contacts utilizing the same pattern. His Japanese interactant, conversely, avoided any nominal reference form for his Australian addressee; he employed an English title and surname in reference to the Australian treasurer and alternated this with surname only on one occasion. The linguistic behavior of the two individuals in encounter 2 is summarized in Table 3.

The placement of an inadequacy marking by the Japanese interactant upon the Australian's use of the Japanese suffix 'san' can be seen in the following extract (4) from encounter 2:

Table 3. *Forms of address and reference in encounter two*

	Mr. & SN[a]	SN & 'san'	SN	Eng FN[b]	Full name (FN & SN)	Avoidance
Australian speaker						
to Japanese addressee		1				
for Japanese referents		4				
for Australian referents	1			1	1	
Subtotal	1	5		1	1	
Japanese speaker						
to Australian addressee						X
for Japanese referents	1					
for Australian referents	1		1			
Subtotal	2		1			

a. SN denotes surname.
b. FN denotes first name.

(4) a. 2A: Mr. Hodges said that er a former ... man joined the
    b.   Commonwealth Bank.
    c. 2J: Oh yes.
    d. 2A: Katoo san.
    e. 2J: Mr. Katoo.
    f. 2A: I, I really fell off my chair. I thought you said your
    g.   predecessor was Katoo san.
    h. 2J: No, no, no, no.

Although the Australian's selection of the Japanese title 'san' (line d) was corrected by the Japanese speaker to the English title (line e), the Australian was unaware that correction was being effected and he continued to employ the deviant form here (line g) and in subsequent turns.

Clearly the Australian in this situation did not employ Australian norms of address and reference. Here, as in one of the other situations (encounter 7), all participants were new acqaintances: the Australian and Japanese businessmen met for the first time in encounter 7, while in encounter 2 it was only the second occasion for the participants to meet. In the case of encounter 7, although the Australian used the Australian English norm of English title and surname in the opening sequence when he was introduced to the Japanese, toward the end of the meeting he employed the Japanese suffix of 'san' twice for his Japanese addressee.

My data clearly show that in contact situations Japanese speakers strongly hesitite to reciprocate this pattern or use it for third-person reference. This is particularly so when the interactants are new acquaint-

ances. However, Australians who borrow the Japanese title frequently do not apply it according to the Japanese norm but rather adapt it and use it rigidly, without appropriate variation; consequently, their manner of application can be said to represent an instance of interculture.

Other evidence is available to support this claim. As noted above, abundant switching between use of English and Japanese titles was observed in the discourse of the Australian chairman of the management meeting (encounter 9) for the superordinate Japanese who was actually the company's managing director: the Australian employed 'Mr. Kurobe' five times and 'Kurobe "san"' on three occasions (see [3a], [3b], and [3l] above). Parenthetically, the Australian speaker exhibited consistent phonological deviation involving 'bi' instead of 'be' in the final syllable of the Japanese surname. It was also reported above that the same Australian used the suffix 'san' for two of the other three Japanese businessmen present at the business meeting, as well as an anglicized first name for a junior Japanese interactant. However, on one occasion, surname and 'san' was used for the latter participant. The data thus show that for this Australian speaker there was regular alternation between the English and Japanese suffixes for one superior referent, while for other referents, the junior participant excepted, selection of one of the two forms was standard practice. As already argued, Australians fairly commonly borrow the Japanese title 'san'. However, as suggested above (see extract [4]), its use in certain contact situations represents norm violation when evaluated by Japanese interactants. According to the Japanese internal norm, use toward superiors is generally restricted and frequently, though not necessarily, the slot is filled by an occupational title or by avoidance. It can be seen from my data that Japanese speakers transfer this restriction to the English contact situation and, in addition, restrict the use of the Japanese title between new acquaintances in business situations because such usage signals informality to them. The Australians who adopt the Japanese title may use it appropriately in some contexts, but in others overgeneralization occurs and results in adaptation rather than adoption of a Japanese pattern. What is not transferred from the Japanese system are the restrictions upon its use.

It should be pointed out that transference of the Japanese suffix 'san' is occasionally observable in the conduct of some Japanese participants, suggesting that use by Australians could at least be partly accounted for as cooperative behavior in contact situations (see Grice 1975). The Japanese superordinate at the management meeting in encounter 8, for instance, twice employed surname and 'san' when addressing one of the other Japanese participants, as in 'Eh what is your opinion Shimada "san" do you think that Australian wheat producer will be able to maintain its

competitive position ...?'. Similarly, the Japanese speaker in encounter 1 occasionally employed 'san', even in frames which represented a deviation from the Japanese norm. For instance, he used 'san' after his Australian addressee's first name and after the anglicized first name of a Japanese referent. The Japanese speaker seemed to use this pattern to mark the distinct superiority of the Australian, but it must be acknowledged that there was a fairly high degree of personal intimacy between the two individuals. Apart from another case of surname and 'san' for a nonpresent Japanese, all other Japanese referents received the form Mr. and surname (see Table 2 above). The problem is that Australians frequently borrow the pattern of 'san' and apply it rigidly (Neustupny 1985b: 165). That is to say, a norm is applied consistently without any, or insufficient, contextual variation which is necessary if it is to be equivalent to nativelike application.

In any explanation of norm deviation, mention must be made of the concept of 'fossilization'. Australians, like Japanese, who move toward the other culture, often fossilize their verbal and nonverbal conduct at some intermediate stage and as a result do not reach the target norms. As explained in an earlier section, it is this stage which is signaled by the concept of interculture. Once patterns are fossilized, their correction is extremely difficult. Self-correction does not occur, as the individual does not diagnose his own behavior as inadequate. Neither is other-correction easily implemented because adults, at least in both the Australian and Japanese cultural communities, display extreme reluctance to correct the inadequacies of other adults (Neustupný 1982: 84; Marriott 1988b: 329). This observation parallels Brown and Levinson's (1978: 109) finding that polite behavior requires an interactant to ignore the deviant behavior of another participant in the situation. The concept of fossilization implies nontransitoriness, and while to date it has been applied only to the nonnative speaker in a situation, it is clear that it also is applicable in accounting for the conduct of native speakers. There was little evidence in my data to indicate that Japanese speakers correct the Australians' use of 'san'. In the one sequence where correction was observed (see extract [4] above), it did not remove the inadequacy as the deviation remained covert to the Australian. Consequently, use of 'san' becomes fossilized in the discourse of Australian speakers, and, without their realization, the usage is evaluated negatively in certain contexts by Japanese interactants.

In summary, then, adaption by Australians of the Japanese norm, as in the deviant employment of 'san', can be seen as exemplifying the process of interculture. Here, the target for the Australian participant in the contact situation is the acquisition of a Japanese norm. However, the

norm is overgeneralized and hence is adapted rather than adopted. It is thus obvious that the concept of interculture must be extended to encompass not only movement toward target English norms by Japanese speakers but also movement toward Japanese, which has traditionally been seen as the nonbase norm for Australian interactants when the linguistic code in the contact situation is Australian English.

Avoidance of reference

Deviation from the English norm can further be seen in the use of avoidance strategies whereby some Australian speakers use zero reference for their Japanese addressees. At the business luncheon in the third encounter, for example, the two English speakers applied the Australian norm of first name use to the younger Japanese interactant, as mentioned above, but during the two-hour encounter almost totally avoided any address or reference form apart from the pronominal 'you' for the superordinate Japanese. Only once did an Australian refer to the Japanese superordinate using English title and surname, 'Mr. Kamada'. Instead, they employed a variety of nonverbal strategies, such as gaze, to accompany their discourse. In many contexts in Australian English, reference forms other than pronouns are not obligatory on the grammatical level but often perform the function of communicating politeness or intimacy. As all interactants in encounter 6 knew each other, the omission by the Australians to use an appropriate name during the long luncheon period suggests that their behavior was due to the process of pidginization; in other words, they failed to apply their native norms.

More severe instances of pidginized behavior involving avoidance of reference occurred elsewhere in the data. A Japanese businessman who was on a short business assignment from Japan visited an Australian company for the first time in encounter 9. In the opening sequence of the business meeting an Australian manager (9A1) introduced the Japanese visitor to the Australian (9A2) who was to assume the role of pivot interactant and present a briefing on a pre-prepared topic. The Australian superior performed this introduction by merely naming the other member of his network. The discourse was as follows:

(5) a. 9A1: Steven Simons (upward swing of arm
     b.   in the direction of 9A2).
     c. 9A2: Hello, how are you.
     d. 9J: Pleased to meet you.
     e.   (Overlapping speech and handshake.)
     f. 9A1: Well sit down. And eh.

The avoidance of any reference form for the Japanese businessman by the Australians was very conspicuous in the above sequence. Further-more, neither Australian speaker used any reference form other than pronominalization throughout the whole encounter. There was no evi-dence, in fact, to indicate that the Australians knew and could pronounce the name of the Japanese participant. In conversation with myself prior to the commencement of the meeting, the main Australian speaker (9A2) employed a paraphrasing strategy, referring to the Japanese visitor as 'the guy from Japan'. The choice of this referential lexical string is indicative of the speaker's nonattempt or failed attempt to acquire the personal name of his prospective interactant. Perhaps in this encounter, the omission of a reference form by both Australian speakers was moti-vated by knowledge of the temporary and short-term nature of their interaction. I have suggested elsewhere that the communicative compe-tence of these Australian speakers includes a rule which specifies that under certain conditions the acquisition of a personal name is not obliga-tory (Marriott 1985: 8). Notably, this encounter represented the first time for 9A2 to meet a Japanese businessman; contact with the Japanese had not been extensive for 9A1 either.

However, it can also be argued that avoidance of Japanese personal names by Australians may be used as a strategy to protect the face of both speaker and addressee (Marriott 1985: 8). Avoidance enables a speaker to protect his own face through nonverbalization or mispronunci-ation of his interactant's name, whereby he would present a self-portrait of a person incapable of mastering a short string of phonetic sounds. Such restraint also shields the face of the addressee, who could feel threatened upon hearing his name pronounced deviantly (see Goffman 1967). Phonological deviations for reference were indeed found in the data. Apart from the example of the Australian chairman's deviant employment of the surname of his Japanese superordinate in encounter 8, mentioned above, the Australian in the tenth encounter expressed two surnames for nonpresent referents so deviantly that his Japanese ad-dressee was unable to decode them. The inadequacy was resolved only when the Japanese interactant checked the written form in a letter which the Australian subsequently produced.

Other use of pidginized reference in discourse

An examination of the discourse revealed that pidginization was also noticeable in other aspects of the conversational turns of the Australian speakers. The business luncheon recorded in encounter 6 commenced

with an introduction to two Australians of a newly arrived Japanese (6J2). This introduction was effected by a Japanese colleague who was temporarily resident in Melbourne (6J1). Both Australians waited in the private room of the restaurant where the luncheon encounter was to be located. Following the arrival of the Japanese, 6J1 and 6A1 greeted each other and shook hands. Then, the other Japanese who had entered the room behind 6J1 moved forward to greet the Australians. The dialogue is given in extract (6) below:

(6) a. 6J2: I, I'm pleased to meet you.
    b. 6A1: Pleased to meet you.
    c.   (As they shake hands, 6J1 raises his left hand with his
    d.   palm facing upward in the direction of 6J2.)
    e. 6J1: Mike Asai.
    f. 6A1: Mike Asai, Mike.
    g.   (The other Australian moves forward and the Japanese
    h.   similarly advances toward him.)
    i. 6J2: Asai's my name.
    j. 6A2: Nice to make your acquaintance.
    k.   (They shake hands.)

In the above sequence, the Japanese intermediary did not name the Australian but simply stated the name of the new Japanese participant. The Australian then undertook a move which constituted a deviation from an Australian English etiquette norm: he produced the Japanese speaker's full name and then repeated his first name (line f). In this interchange, the Australian's behavior is characterized by a reduction of his own norms: in a position where it would have been appropriate to announce his own name (especially since this had been omitted by 6J1), he pronounced his addressee's name instead (Marriott 1988b: 99). Omission of naming oneself is, of course, a regular feature of an introduction according to Australian English norms, but such omission would only occur if one's name had been enunciated by the participant who conducted the introduction. Since this was not the case in this context, the Australian's speech indicated the presence of the process of pidginization.

Following the above introduction, the new Japanese participant proceeded to exchange his business card with the two Australians. During the first presentation by the Japanese of his card to 6A1, he reverbalized his anglicized first name, 'Mike'. Use of a first name only in this position constitutes a deviation from both Australian English and Japanese norms. Further, he switched to Japanese for this frame. The interchange is reproduced below in extract (7):

(7) a.   (6J2 presents his card directly into 6A1's
    b.   left hand. Both bow slightly.)
    c.   6J2:   Mike desu. Konnichiwa.
    d.   (With a rhythmical arm movement, the Japanese takes
    e.   hold of the card which 6A1 offers in reciprocation.)
    f.   6A1:   Mike, OK. I'm Tom. Thank you.
    g.   (The Australian touches his chest with his right hand.)

To match the same level of personal reference, the Australian introduced himself with his first name only and touched his chest in a gesture which supplemented his verbal message (lines f and g). Introduction of the first name only is contrary to normal Australian English communication, particularly in business situations where routinely the full name, or occasionally surname only, are verbalized. Similarly, repetition of the other interactant's name by the Australian, as in line f, is not a feature of an introduction sequence in the English communicative system in Australia.

To conclude this section, then, much evidence has been provided to show that in their use of address and reference forms in contact situations, Australians deviate considerably from the Australian English norm. Influence from the Japanese system is strong, particularly with regard to frequent use of surnames and use of the Japanese title 'san'. Cases were also shown where use of the Japanese title by Australians constituted interculture; though their aim was to apply a Japanese norm, their usage represented an overgeneralization. Further, it was shown that Australians engaged in pidginized behavior in the form of avoidance of reference forms, overuse of first names, and the failure to appropriately perform first- or third-person introductions.

Business-card usage

Presentation of business cards

The second main section of this paper deals more fully with the presentation of business cards, a highly recurrent act in Australian-Japanese contact situations in the business domain. Of the ten video-recorded encounters, six contained an introduction sequence where individuals came into contact for the first or second time. In all these instances the presentation of a business card featured (encounters 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10), and on five occasions, the presentation was expanded into an exchange. The presentation of a business card in the initial, opening segment of an

introduction is an obligatory act in Japanese internal business situations, and it is evident from my data that the same act is also mandatory for participants of Australian-Japanese contact situations (Marriott 1985: 13). The exchange of cards is vital for two reasons: the act communicates politeness, and furthermore, it performs an important substantive function by conveying not only each participant's name but also his corporate affiliation and status title.

All the Australian informants in my study confirmed that the use of business cards is increasing in the internal Australian business domain but reported that rules for presentation vary from the Japanese pattern, especially with regard to the timing of the presentation, the need for reciprocity, and the type of attention required. My data contained instances in encounters 5, 9, and 10 where the Australian participants continued to draw upon their native Australian rules pertaining to business-card usage (Marriott 1985). Of the large number of Japanese informants who were questioned upon this matter, all reported that some of the rules pertaining to business-card use in the Australian system of interaction are inadequate in a contact situation. In other words, Japanese participants invariably regard adjustment to certain rules which originate in their own native system, such as possession of a card by all business interactants and immediate presentation, as obligatory for non-Japanese interactants. Following the Australian norm, reciprocity is not obligatory and hence the failure of one of the Australians in encounter 5 to exchange a card is not inconsistent with conduct in the Australian system, where business cards are still used less extensively. In fact, none of the four Australian personnel who participated in the meeting which was recorded in encounter 5 was carrying business cards on that occasion. The fact that all other presentations of business cards in the data were converted into exchanges may be due to an application of a Japanese norm. Even though exchanges are not incompatible with Australian norms, the obligatory nature which an exchange assumes in contact situations is probably due to influence from the Japanese cultural system.

The cultural difference in timing rules was vividly illustrated in encounter 9, where the Japanese visitor undertook drastic remedial action to correct the omission of the Australian to allow an exchange of business cards in the opening segment. Following the short introductory sequence, quoted in extract (5) above, and some interchange on the seating position of individuals, one Australian participant opened the main segment of the business encounter by describing the preplanned content of the meeting. Since this sequence contains many points of interest it is reproduced in full in extract (8):

(8) a. 9A1: Good.
     b.   (pause)
     c.   Steven is our project manager looking after retail systems
     d.   so he's going to take the session on, excuse me I'll have
     e.   a look, to recall it (he looks at his notes), point of
     f.   sales terminals, credit–debit cards, retail outlet, net,
     g.   on-line networks and all that sort of thing.
     h. 9J: Yes, oh by the way this is my card.
     i.   (The Japanese stands to present his business card and
     j.   bows. 9A2 accepts the card in his right hand while
     k.   remaining seated.)
     l. 9A2:   Oh thanks very much. I've
     m.   got a card too. Where is it? (laughter) I should have it
     n.   somewhere. (He has a long search for his business card.
     o.   First, he taps his chest with both hands then reaches
     p.   with his right hand to the hippocket of his
     q.   trousers. Next, he opens and searches his folder, which
     r.   is open on the table in front. The Japanese resits.)
     s. 9J: We should have done it in the beginning.
     t.   (9J glances at 9A1 to whom he directs his comment.
     u.   9A2 locates his card in a folder on the desk. He removes
     v.   a card and flips it on to the table in front of the
     w.   Japanese, who slides the card toward himself and with
     x.   both hands raises it about 6 centimetres off the table.)
     y. 9A2:   Thanks very much.
     z. 9J: Oh thank you very much.

According to Australian norms of behavior, some of the acts of the
Australian in the above sequence can be described as impolite. Not only
was he unprepared to make a presentation of his card (lines l-n), but his
prolonged searching (lines n-r) and then presentation which involved
flipping it onto the table (lines u-v) was indecorous, involving violations
of native demeanor rules. In this case such behavior on the part of the
Australian constituted pidginization of his own native norms. As the
Australian had never previously interacted with any Japanese business-
man, it is not surprising that the meeting contained no evidence of
transference of Japanese norms with regard to presentation rules for
business cards.

In terms of prior contact with the Japanese, the Australian businessman
in encounter 10 was similar to the main participant of encounter 9: only
once before had he experienced any direct contact with Japanese interac-

tants. At the business meeting recorded in the tenth encounter, the Australian undertook an extremely informal presentation of his card. As rules on the timing and the actual handing-over act are less restrictive in the Australian system, the Australian's style of presentation would probably not have represented an inadequacy according to his own native norms. He removed a card from his suit pocket while engaged in talk and, some conversational turns later, stretched out his arm to drop the card gently on the low table, slightly to the left of his Japanese addressee. The Japanese recipient responded almost simultaneously by transferring his own business-card wallet, which was placed on the table on his left, to a position on his right. It is possible that this nonverbal move signaled a noting by the Japanese of violation, according to Japanese norms, which was committed by the Australian (see Clyne 1975; Neustupný 1985b: 167). In the follow-up interview which took place between myself and the Japanese businessman immediately at the conclusion of the business meeting, parts of the video recording were shown to the Japanese for comment. At the segment where the business card was produced, I asked whether the manner of presentation was consistent with Japanese norms:

(9) a.   Interviewer: Did you notice the way he handed his card. He
      b.   gets out his name card and instead of handing it to you
      c.   he just puts it on the table. Is that the same as the
      d.   Japanese custom?
      e. J: No, no.
      f.   (He looks extremely surprised to view this segment.)
      g.   In our, yeh in Japan we hand to him, yeh hand-in-hand
                yeh.

In the above interchange the Japanese businessman thus confirmed a distinct difference in the style of presentation, indicating that hand-to-hand presentation is obligatory in the Japanese system. The fact that Japanese evaluate the conduct of Australian participants at business meetings as inadequate if the latter fail to exchange business cards employing this style of presentation was also reported at many other interviews with Japanese informants. Likewise, the Japanese informants tended to evaluate negatively the failure of Australians to observe timing rules similar to those of the Japanese system and to present the card in the initial opening sequence. The Japanese businessman in encounter 10 subsequently evaluated as inadequate the introduction sequence which had opened the encounter. The original opening was as follows (extract [10]):

(10) a.   (The Australian enters the main office and moves
      b.   toward the inner office where the Japanese sits. He
      c.   knocks on the door.)
      d. 10J: Ah
      e. 10A: Mr. Okamoto?
      f. 10J: Ah hi. Nice to meet you.
      g. 10A: How do you do.
      h.   (They shake hands and then the Japanese directs the
      i.   Australian toward the guest area.)

When questioned on his own omission of initiating an exchange of business cards in this opening sequence, the Japanese businessman claimed to have lost the opportunity since the Australian immediately initiated a handshake, arguing that the exchange of business cards precedes a handshake, a sequential order which actually was not confirmed by other informants. Obviously, in this contact situation, the Japanese reduced his own behavior by failing to present his business card, yet the Australian's conduct was quite consistent with his own native norms in the execution of a greeting and a self-introduction. What we can deduce from this sequence is a difference in timing rules: for Japanese an exchange of business cards takes place in an opening sequence, whereas for Australians the timing restraint is looser. Not surprisingly, the Australian with virtually no prior participation in Australian-Japanese situations applied his own native norm.

Extent of transference and other processes

In contrast to those with little prior experience in business interaction with the Japanese, some Australians with extensive prior experience in Australian-Japanese business situations apply, or endeavor to apply, Japanese norms in the presentation of their business card. This claim can be made for both Australians in encounter 6 and for the Australian in encounter 7. Applying Neustupny's correction model, we can state that such Australians appear to evaluate their own native norms negatively in these contexts and proceed to adjust their inadequate conduct by borrowing Japanese rules. Encounter 6 contained an elaborate sequence where the two Australian participants exhibited acquisition of a relatively large number of rules which pertain to the presentation act in the Japanese system. Since storage on a video recording has made fine observation and analysis of the interaction possible, a number of interesting details will be reported in this paper. First, both Australian businessmen were

carrying cards even though the situation was a business luncheon. Second, one Australian stored his card in a special business-card wallet, and although the other used his pocket for storage, both locations are regularly utilized by Japanese themselves.

A brief description of the exchange between the Japanese and one Australian participant has already been quoted above in extract (7). When the Japanese businessman was only halfway through the act of withdrawing his own card from his pocket, the superordinate Australian (6A1) also began preparation. In the meantime, the second Australian (6A2) waited his turn to make a presentation, awarding priority of presentation to his senior. Both businessmen engaged in very ritualistic, hand-to-hand presentations of their cards to the Japanese and when doing so employed a slight bow of their upper torso and head. Following receipt, the Australians specifically inspected the newly received card, and in the case of 6A1, he opened discussion on the contents of the card. Finally, after sitting down, 6A1 temporarily deposited the new card on the table and only stored it away at a later stage. On the other hand, the second Australian participant soon placed the Japanese card in his suit pocket, an act which is more in accordance with Australian norms with regard to timing. Clearly, then, both exhibited extensive borrowing of Japanese norms, but if a comparison is made of the conduct of the two Australians, it was the superordinate who had borrowed the more extensive set of rules, including, for instance, storage and removal from a business-card wallet, display of verbal attention to the card's content, and temporary deposit on the table prior to removal and storage in his jacket. Nonetheless, the conduct of the other Australian had also been highly adjusted to a pattern which derives from the Japanese system.

Even though it has been argued that there was extensive transference of Japanese norms in terms of the total presentation act itself as well as of constituent parts, the same sequence in encounter 6 contained evidence of the existence of other processes. In particular, 6A1 maintained a native norm which requires an appreciation routine to be verbalized upon receipt of an article. In fact, of the seven instances in the total data when Australians received a business card from a Japanese participant, six speakers produced a verbal routine, typically 'thank you'. By contrast, most Japanese did not use this routine; one of the exceptional cases was reproduced in extract (8) above. The difference in the frequency of use of verbal expressions of appreciation can be attributed to norm discrepancies between the two cultures: a verbal appreciation routine represents an obligatory display of politeness in the Australian system; in the Japanese culture appropriate appreciation is expressed through an explicit perusal of the contents of the card, omission of which constitutes a breach

of politeness. This instance thus shows that in a contact situation extensive transference will not cancel the maintenance of strong native norms, especially those which communicate politeness.

It is the Australians with intense or moderate contact with Japan who frequently attempt to approximate the Japanese norm in relation to the production of their business cards. This is achieved by adding to the back of their English card a translation of the message in Japanese: corporation name, personal name, status title, and address (Marriott 1988b: 106). The cards of the Australians in encounter 6 and the chairman of the management meeting of encounter 8 are examples of this pattern. Although Australians consider such action to be an application of the Japanese norm, it is most often an example of interculture. The full translation of an Australian address, including the street name and number, into Japanese represents a case of overgeneralization of the business cards used by Japanese businessmen in contact situations in Japan. Whereas the use of romanized equivalents is reasonable for a Japanese setting, the employment of a Japanese translation for an Australian address serves little functional purpose. This act no doubt illustrates the desire of Australian businessmen who have intensive contact with Japan to adopt norms of that culture. Interestingly, however, in interviews Japanese businessmen frequently indicate that they consider the use of such Japanese translations to be inadequate. The fact that the business cards of the Japanese residing temporarily in Melbourne do not replicate those of the Australians with translated addresses also lends support to this claim.

Further evidence of the Australians' attempt to apply a Japanese norm is observable in the manner in which they handle their business card, often placing the Japanese side of their card upward when making a presentation. This act could be observed in encounter 6, where the two Australians presented their cards to the Japanese (see extract [7] above). The deviancy of their presentation could be inferred from the reaction of the Japanese interactant who smiled upon receipt of the first card and flipped it over before returning it to the side presented to him. Just as it was argued above that some Australians use the Japanese pattern of 'san' rigidly, their attempt to utilize the Japanese written script is also characterized by rigidity. The overgeneralization which results thus means that the act is another case of interculture rather than the appropriate application of a Japanese norm. All Australians and Japanese in my interviews reported that Australians with cards containing English and Japanese sides regularly, though not invariably, present the Japanese side. While most Japanese informants evaluated this action neutrally, a minority mark it as inadequate since, to them, this may imply an evaluation by the Australian of deficiency in the English competence of the Japanese

recipient. The illustration thus shows that some attempts by Australian participants to apply a non-native norm in the contact situation can give rise to negative evaluations on the part of participants belonging to the other cultural system.

The means by which appreciation for a newly received card is expressed in the Japanese communication system is through a visible display of attention to the card, that is, the focusing of one's eyes upon the card and subsequent reading of its contents. Discussion of some features of the content is an optional feature. This stage of attention display, which has no equivalent in the Australian native system of politeness, had been acquired by both Australians in the sixth encounter, as reported above. It can be observed in the extended presentation sequence that, upon receipt of the card, 6A2 duly read the contents. This action is reported in extract (11):

(11) a. (6A2 moves slightly back along the table maintaining his
      b. gaze upon 6J2's card);

And,

      c. (6A2 glances again at 6J2's card, lowers it to a position
      d. under the table where his gaze is maintained for a few
      e. seconds. He then stores it in the outside lower left
      f. pocket of his suit.)

On the other hand, 6A1 engaged in such an elaborate display of attention that it was equivalent to overgeneralization of the Japanese rule (extract [12]):

(12) a. 6A1: This would be a new position?
      b.   (He points his finger at 6J2's card, tapping it twice
      c.   with his right finger, then again twice with his left
      d.   finger.)

And,

      e. 6A1: Huh huh. I notice here the marketing manager is an
      f.   Australian term.
      g.   (6A1 again points to 6J2's card, running his finger
      h.   horizontally back and forth along the card twice.)

The above data show that excessiveness in the conduct of the Australian occurs on two levels. First, the use of his finger to point to and tap the card four times (lines b-d) and then to run his finger horizontally along the card twice (lines g-h) is not in accordance with either Australian English or Japanese norms. Additionally, his reference to the status title

(lines a and e-f) may also be a deviation. This fact was verified by the Japanese informants with whom I undertook extensive analysis on the content and use of business cards. All reported that discussion of status title is generally avoided in order not to cause any potential offense. Although the Australian attempted to apply a Japanese norm pertaining to the use of business cards, his conduct was clearly excessive and thus exhibited the process of pidginization as well as interculture, for in his own interstage rules, extensive discussion of the status title occurred.

One interesting feature became apparent upon repeated reviews of the video recording of the business card exchange in encounter 6. In spite of the preliminary movements leading up to the presentation of the card being in accordance with Japanese rules, the actual hand-to-hand transfer, which was briefly reported in extract (7) above, was not executed by either Australian participant. Rather, each of them prepared to present his card, then held it, waiting motionlessly, so that, in both instances, the Japanese recipient actually removed the cards from their hands (lines d-e and s-t below). This is shown in extract (13):

(13)   a.   (6J2 presents his card directly to 6A1's left hand. Both
       b.   bow slightly.)
       c.   6J2:   Mike desu. Konnichi wa.
       d.   6J2:   (Then with a rhythmical arm movement, 6J2 takes hold
       e.   of the card which the Australian offers in reciprocation

And,

       f.   6J2:   (6J2 enters into a new presentation pose as 6A1, who has
       g.   6J2:   already transferred 6J2's card to his right hand,
       h.   6J2:   retreats slightly, 6A2, holding his card in his right
       i.   6J2:   hand, advances with his arm outstretched. Since the
       j.   6J2:   spatial distance between the two presenters is slightly
       k.   6J2:   greater than in the previous case, 6J2's posture is
       l.   6J2:   fully inclined forward, rather than in a bowing pose
       m.   6J2:   from the waist, as previously observed. 6A2's head and
       n.   6J2:   upper torso are slightly inclined. After a distinctive
       o.   6J2:   downward arm motion performed by 6A2, the inter-
       p.   change is ready to proceed.)
       q.   6J2:   My name card.
       r.   6J2:   (Again, at the crucial transference phase, 6J2 places
       s.   6J2:   his card into 6A2's left hand and removes the one held
       t.   6J2:   out for reciprocation from 6A2's right hand.)

The failure of the Australian to actually hand his own card to his Japanese interactant thus appears to be another case of pidgnization. Here, the

presenter loses control of one important step in the presentation act which originates in the Japanese system and, in doing so, fails to apply a most important component of the sequence. Both Australians behaved in an identical manner.

In a follow-up interview, 6A1 claimed that he had acquired the Japanese business-card-presentation act. My findings, however, show that while some rules were indeed borrowed from the Japanese system and were appropriate in the contact situation, behavior which was caused by other processses also existed. Very commonly Australian businessmen believe that they have acquired a Japanese pattern of behavior, when, in fact, their own performance is strongly indicative of interculture which originates from the Japanese system, or of pidginization, which, similarly, could be of a borrowed Japanese norm.

A contrastive analysis of the behavior of Australians who possess little or negligible participatory experience in contact situations and businessmen possessing extensive experience shows that the latter modify their behavior in a variety of ways. First, there is transference: the Australians carry their business cards at all times, follow the Japanese timing rules of presentation in the opening sequence, and utilize a hand-to-hand style of presentation which is often accompanied by a slight bow. Also, it is possible that the notion of reciprocity is strengthened as a result of influence from the Japanese communicative system. However, in addition to transference there is also the evidence of adapted norms in the form of interculture: Australians overuse the Japanese script on their business cards and often present the Japanese side of their card even though the spoken language is English. Nonetheless, these adaptations appear on the surface as a result of the Australians attempting to apply a Japanese norm. Third, pidginized behavior occurs in connection with borrowing from the Japanese system. In this regard, an excessive display of attention was observed in one context, and furthermore, the failure of two Australians to actually hand over their cards was visible following repeated viewing of one of the video recordings. Here, it can be claimed that fossilization of the behavior of the Australians was apparent: the excessive attention paid to newly received business cards by the superordinate Australian and the failure of both Australians to actually hand over their cards seems indicative of pidginized behavior which has probably fossilized. Finally, one interesting finding concerns the maintenance of certain native norms alongside those which originate in the other cultural system. Strong evidence was advanced to show that within a sequence involving the presentation of a business card where a variety of Japanese rules are applied, Australian businessmen produce an English appreciation routine,

even though such routines are not regularly a constituent of the Japanese internal pattern.

Conclusion

This paper has focused upon the behavior of native speakers in Australian-Japanese contact situations and, in particular, has investigated the speech patterns pertaining to address and reference and the utilization of business cards. It has been argued that Japanese norms of address and reference are transferred extensively by Australians: there is greater use of surnames than is customary in the Australian society, and, furthermore, direct borrowing of the Japanese title 'san' is not uncommon. However, evidence was also advanced to show the presence of interculture in the linguistic behavior of participants, with the Japanese title 'san' being used rigidly and inappropriately. The existence of pidginization was also noted in the discourse: the Australians minimized their use of surnames and instead overused first names in frames where the use of surnames actually accords with the Australian English norm. Surprisingly, the Australians even failed to apply appropriate native norms for reference forms in such significant sequences as introductions. It was interesting to note that variations of the English norm were observed in the behavior of Australian businessmen irrespective of the amount of their prior participation in contact situations with the Japanese. In other words, forms of address and reference become an early target for modification by native speakers of Australian English.

Data have been presented to show the extent to which Japanese norms pertaining to business-card production and presentation are adopted and adapted by Australians. Indeed, some Australians rigorously applied the presentation act and at least some of the constituent norms of the Japanese system. Evidence pointed to the strong expectation of Japanese interactants that some of the principal rules relating to the business-card presentation be adopted by non-Japanese. Transference of Japanese norms involved a greater importance being attached to the act, its initiation in introduction sequences, hand-to-hand presentation of the card, and the employment of a nonverbal display of appreciation, among other rules. Nonetheless, the Australians sometimes adapted the borrowed rules whereby, for instance, they overused the Japanese written code, both in the production of the card and in the presentation of the Japanese side. The contrasting conduct of those Australians who had borrowed and adapted a set of norms from the Japanese system with those who maintained native norms was conspicuous and indicates the extent to which

native speakers come to modify their verbal and nonverbal behavior as a result of participatory experience in contact situations.

The concept of base norm is of much significance in any explication of the behavior of participants in contact situations. However, the evidence presented here makes it necessary to qualify the role of the base norm in contact situations. On the linguistic level, Australian English was undoubtedly the base system in all the business situations reported here. However, in terms of norms pertaining to sociolinguistic and sociocultural behavior, the nonbase, that is, the Japanese system, assumed a prominent position in various contexts even in the case of Australian participants. Clearly, the principal norms originate from the two cultural systems, both of which are highly visible in the contact situation. This has been seen through an examination of the verbal and nonverbal performance of Australians themselves and by brief reference to the ways in which Japanese interactants evaluate some of the conduct of their Australian partners. The existence of the three processes discussed in this paper — transference, interculture, and pidgnization — in the behavior of the Australians as well as the Japanese supports the significance of the Japanese cultural system in the contact situation. Convincing evidence was provided to show that Australians borrowed Japanese norms, and while some of these were not attained, resulting in interculture or pidginization, the original source was Japanese. In many microanalyses the appropriateness of simply referring to one set of norms in the contact situation as base norms while others are designated as nonbase norms is therefore questionable.

Monash University

Note

1. Reference is made throughout the paper to the ten video-recorded encounters and to the participants in them. The coding system denotes the number of the encounter and the nationality of the participant. Another number is used when there is more than one individual of a particular nationality in an encounter (for example, 6A1 refers to one of the two Australians in encounter 6; 1J denotes the single Japanese businessman in the first encounter).

References

Asaoka, Takako (1987). *Communication Problems Between Japanese and Australians at a Dinner Party.* Working Papers of the Japanese Studies Centre 3. Melbourne: Japanese Studies Centre.

Australia-Japan Economic Institute (1989). *A Survey of Japanese Business Activity in Australia*. Sydney: Australia-Japan Economic Institute.

Braun, Friederike (1988). *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, Penelope, and Levinson, Stephen C. (1978). Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In *Questions and Politeness*. E.N. Goody (ed.), 56–289. (Revised and reissued 1987 as *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.)

Clyne, Michael G. (1975). A non-verbal check on acceptability of transference among bilinguals. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics* 30, 55–64.

—(1981). 'Second generation' foreigner talk in Australia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 28, 69–80.

Coulmas, Florian (1989). The surge of Japanese. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 80, 115–131.

Ferguson, Charles A. (1981). 'Foreigner talk' as the name of a simplified register. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 28, 9–18.

Friedrich, P. (1972). Social context and semantic feature: the Russian pronominal usage. In *Directions in Sociolinguistics.*, J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), 270–300. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Geertz, C. (1972). Linguistic etiquette. In *Sociolinguistics*, J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.), 167–179. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Goffman, Erving (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour*. New York: Anchor.

Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, P. Cole and J.L. Morgan (eds.), 41–58. New York: Academic Press.

Haugen, Einar (1956). *Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide*. Alabama: American Dialect Society.

Marriott, Helen E. (1985). *Introductions in Australian-Japanese Contact Situations*. Working Papers of the Japanese Studies Centre 4. Melbourne: Japanese Studies Centre.

—(1988a). *Japanese Business and Social Etiquette*. Working Papers of the Japanese Studies Centre 13. Melbourne: Japanese Studies Centre.

—(1988b). Etiquette in Australian-Japanese business interaction: a study of a meal situation. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Monash University.

—(1990). Intercultural business negotiations: the problem of norm discrepancy. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* Series S, 7, 33–65.

Murie, Alice (1976). Communication problems in Australia-Japan business relations. Unpublished honours dissertation. Monash University.

Neustupný, J.V. (1968). Politeness patterns in the system of communication. *Science Council of Japan Proceedings* 3, 412–419.

—(1973). Sociolinguistics and the language teacher. In *Language Teaching: Problems and Solutions*, M. Rado (ed.), 31–66. Bundoora: La Trobe University.

—(1982). *Gaikokujin to no komyunikeishon* [Communicating with foreigners]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

—(1985a). Problems in Australian-Japanese contact situations. In *Cross-Cultural Encounters: Communication and Mis-Communication*, J.B. Pride (ed.), 44–64. Melbourne: River Seine.

—(1985b). Language norms in Australian-Japanese contact situations. In *Australia, Meeting Place of Languages*, M.G. Clyne (ed.), 161–170. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

—(1986). *Foreigners and the Japanese*. Tokyo: Hokuseidoo.

—(1987). *Communicating with the Japanese*. Tokyo: Japan Times.
Ozaki, Akito (1985). *Requests for Clarification: A Study of Correction Strategies*. Working Paper of the Japanese Studies Centre 2. Melbourne: Japanese Studies Centre.
Weinreich, U. (1952). *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.