PROBLEMS IN AUSTRALIAN-JAPANESE CONTACT SITUATIONS

J. V. Neustupný

The framework

The theoretical framework for the study of intercultural communication presented in this paper* relates to what can be called the "generative-corrective" paradigm. It is based on the claim that generative rules of language are only one part of our overall communicative competence. Since they inadvertently produce "deviant" and "inadequate" communicative acts, they must be supplemented by the second largest set of communication rules we possess, the rules of corrective competence (cf. Neustupný 1973, 1976, 1977, 1982, 1973a, Jernudd 1982, 1983, Jernudd-Thuan 1983, Rubin 1978-79, forthcoming).

The new framework differs not merely from the numerous "loanword" examinations of the past but also from the rigorous models of "language contact" studies, developed first by Weinreich (1952) and Haugen (1956), which have successfully supported empirical investigations of linguistic phenomena in intercultural communication over the last two decades. It can be characterized through emphasis it lays on four basic terms: contact situation, correction, discourse, and non-grammatical competence.

Contact situation

Each linguistic act occurs in a particular communicative situation (Hymes 1972, p.56). A situation can be taken as a conveniently wide and relatively closed unit of discourse, characterized by a stable configuration of personnel, a particular setting (time and space), a set of functions and other factors of communication.

Situations can be classified from various points of view. However, one basic division is into intracultural and intercultural situations. We can also call the former "native" or "internal" and the latter "foreign" ' or "contact" situations. The division is basic. When one or more of the constituent factors of a situation is foreign to the cultural system in question, communication in the situation differs substantially from communication in "native" situations. Even more importantly, it cannot be understood on the basis of experience and knowledge of the two cultures considered in isolation. The world of "contact" situations is specific.

As a result of the presence of "foreign" factors, a typical contact situation is packed with communication problems and attempts are constantly made for their removal. Problems do, of course, occur in native situations as well, but their frequency and pattern are quite different. Apart from borrowing, interference in

44

general and switching, contact situations display phenomena such as pidginization, interlanguage, learning and acquisition, foreigner talk and many others.

Moreover, we realize today that contact situations are not a rare phenomenon by any standards. Most if not all situations of "foreign" language acquisition and "foreign" language use are contact situations. Within the context of internationalization of contemporary society (which includes the phenomena of international migration), contact situations are gaining even more prominence than in the past.

To speak of contact situations rather than of "languages in contact" is not a mere terminological nicety. The dualism of internal (native) and contact (foreign) situations emphasizes the necessity to develop their study on an equal footing. Furthermore, an opportunity is created here to take into account the whole range of problems which occur in contact situations, not merely the narrowly linguistic ones. Also, we are reminded that apart from the necessity to examine the *end product* language, we are equally — or perhaps primarily — interested in processes which develop in linguistic discourse.

Correction

The widest possible framework for "contact linguistics" is available in the theory of linguistic correction.

What differentiates contact situations from native ones is the amount and type of "deviations" from what is accepted as the base norm for the encounter, and the type of processes that ensue. First, some of the deviations remain covert; others are noted (not necessarily consciously noted) by one or more participants, and these noted deviations can be called "violations". Second, the attitude of the speaker towards a violation is considered: a violation can be disregarded, or it can be evaluated, often in a negative way. When such a negative evaluation takes place, we speak of "inadequacies".[2] Third, participants in the situation select a suitable action program. The most important of such programs is the application of "corrective adjustment" (or simply "correction"[3]) strategies. However, as studies of correction processes indicate (cf. Ozaki, forthcoming), adjustment through correction is not always successful and the deviation from norm which results serves as a starting point for new correction processes.

I believe that all communication problems in contact situations can be related to various stages of the correction process. One of the communication systems present in the situation serves as the "base norm", and there are deviations from the norm, violations, decoded inadequacies and corrective adjustments. These processes include phenomena such as borrowing, interference, integration, switching, or foreigner talk.

It is important to realize that correction processes in contact discourse are connected in various ways with more complex and organized systems of correction, which aim at corrective adjustment of inadequacies. The most typical of these systems are foreign language teaching and the policies of language maintenance and language shift (Fishman 1972). This parallel development of correction processes in discourse and metalinguistic correction systems is a general feature of language correction (cf. Neustupný 1973).

45

Discourse

The classical theory of "languages in contact" concentrated on the system of language and the effects corrective adjustments had on the system. One asked how language changed when it appeared in contact with another language: what happened to the native tongue of an immigrant, how did he acquire English, what was the English in which he was addressed. These issues undoubtedly are of importance and should not be neglected.

However, this approach would necessarily lead to an unwanted narrowing of the scope of investigation. Already phenomena such as Clyne's "triggering" (Clyne 1967), in which a "foreign" element in one segment of an utterance switches on a transfer in another segment, showed that along with adaptations in language systems changes in discourse must also be considered. Contact discourse contains a large number of processes, such as post-correction (cf. Neustupný 1973) of an unsuitable lexical choice, which are likely to escape the attention of the classical model. Besides, there is a whole inventory of phenomena in discourse which are never clearly reflected in surface sentences: the evaluation of speech which accompanies all speech activity, pre-corrections such as avoidance of speech, and many others. All these must be accounted for in the linguistics of contact situations.

The orientation towards the study of discourse processes requires a reappraisal of the research techniques used. The recording of contact situations remains a necessary starting point but cannot satisfy on its own. A recording only preserves surface sentences, which are the result of the whole complicated process of discourse. The process itself is lost and one of the important tasks for linguistics — and not only contact linguistics — is to find ways for its preservation. A useful technique is a systematic "follow-up interview" (Neustupný 1981) in which at least the components of discourse of which the participants became conscious can be tapped. Another technique for the study of discourse processes has been developed by Clyne (1975). Clyne showed a group of subjects a video-recording of a conversation and recorded their non-verbal reactions to the conversation. These reaction could be linked with evaluations. More initiative for the development of further discourse research techniques is needed.

Non-grammatical communicative competence

Apart from concentrating on the systemic effects of language contact, the classical theory also neglected the close relationship between grammatical and non-grammatical features of contact situations. Such situations consist of
(1) Sociocultural interaction
(2) Communicative interaction (e.g. the establishment of communication networks, selection of content, use of non-verbal channels, etc. cf. Hymes 1974), and
(3) Grammatical linguistic interaction (i.e. the formation of sentences on the basis of grammar/lexicon/pronunciation/writing competece.

The majority of bilingualism and contact studies are still limited to investigations of (3), even though (2) has already received pioneering attention in the work of Hasselmo and Clyne in the 1970's (Hasselmo 1970, 1972, Clyne 1972).

Hasselmo and Clyne studied interference in routines, the use of quotations, irony, greetings and other cases of the application of non-grammatical rules of communication.

As far as (1) is concerned, much work has been done with regard to factors which affect language maintenance and shift (J. Fishman and others); less effort has been spent on the study of the relationship between sociocultural behaviour, communication and language at the discourse level. Murie's survey of Japanese and Australian businessmen (Murie 1976) suggests that deviations from communicative and linguistic norms of Australian English found in the behaviour of Japanese businessmen in Melbourne are not negatively evaluated by their Australian interlocutors if the accompanying economic interaction is successful. This means that sociocultural considerations enter at the very beginning of the correction process as some of the most powerful factors. Masumi-So (1983) showed in her study of lexical interference in Japanese speakers in Melbourne that avoidance (correction) of loanwords is connected with the social status of the addressee: when he/she is superior, systematic correction takes place; failing this the influx of loanwords can remain unrestricted.

To summarize the main features of the framework used in this paper we can say that:
(1) The non-linguistic factor of foreignness is responsible for the division of communicative situations into two large groups: the internal and contact situations.
(2) Contact situations are characterized by very extensive and specific correction processes, required to deal with deviations from the norms of internal communication. This characteristic places "intercultural" or "contact" linguistics within the scope of "corrective" linguistics.
(3) Various stages of the correction process can be distinguished:
   (a) deviance,
   (b) violation,
   (c) inadequacy, and
   (d) corrective adjustment (correction in the narrow sense of the word).
The process can stop at any of these stages. Phenomena which occur in contact situations can be explained in terms of various stages of the correction process.
(4) Corrective adjustment can be effected through discourse correction or through the application of more complicated systems such as language teaching or language planning.

Australian-Japanese contact situations

Compared with the large immigrant groups in Australia (Clyne 1982), the number of the Japanese is very small. Moreover, the few thousand people, mostly concentrated in Sydney and Melbourne[4], are in the majority temporary residents who return to their home country after a few years overseas. Yet, the Japanese presence in Australia is clearly felt and there should be no doubt that the issue of Australian-Japanese intercultural communication is of considerable importance. In the first place, there is the economic significance of the relationship. This should not be overlooked. However, what makes the Japanese case a most

important one for a researcher is the sheer amount of communication problems involved.

At the present stage of our knowledge it would be premature to attempt a clearly quantified comparative statement. However, it seems fair to say that the Japanese are among the least successful communicators in contact situations with native speakers of English. Few ethnic groups active on the international scene have experienced problems as grave as the Japanese in acquiring competence in communicating through the medium of the English language[5].

In the context of both the Japanese economic power and the role Japan is inevitably going to play in the world society of the future, the problem of a "common language" to be shared with the Japanese is challenging and vitally important.

In this paper I shall exemplify the model outlined above by pointing to some problems of the "common language" as they appear in the light of empirical studies conducted over the last decade mostly at Monash University in Melbourne. The paper does not make a claim on systemacity or exhaustiveness. The focus will be on the Japanese in Australia, both when they communicate in English, and when they use Japanese among themselves.

The foreignness factor

As already indicated, the principal determinant of deviation from norms of the base system in contact situations is the presence of foreign factors in the situation. These foreign factors provide content which is difficult to convey, present participants with various problems in performing communicative acts and thus significantly constrain their generative-corrective competence.

It would be incorrect to make the assumption, which was usual in the classical models of language contact, that the presence of a foreign variety of language is the foreign factor par excellence. The use of a foreign language does represent a major source of deviation, but is not the only one.

For instance, various foreign features of the communicating personnel can contribute to the general instability of a contact situation and lead to deviations. It has been reported by Japanese as well as non-Japanese speakers that extreme foreign features of participants (blue eyes, blond hair, height, etc.) can easily increase performance problems of Japanese speakers. When the base language is Japanese, the factor can assume a high prominence, with a strong version of foreigner talk being applied by Japanese participants irrespective of the competence of the foreign speaker in Japanese.

Native speakers of Japanese who live overseas but retain full competence in their native language, report that on their visit to Japan a number of speakers address them with an unusually high amount of English words used within Japanese sentences. It can be assumed here that the speakers are labelled as "overseas residents" and that this feature switches on a kind of "native foreigner talk". In other words, the situation becomes a weak contact situation, even if no foreign language is used.

In general, it seems that many Japanese are strongly sensitive to foreign cultural features in interactive situations. If this is true, the characteristic should be considered, together with the distance of the Japanese and Western communication systems, as one of the major causes of problems in the acquisition and use of foreign languages.

Deviations, violations and inadequacies

As indicated above, in the correction model proposed in this paper, the foreign factors present in contact situations lead to deviations from norms applicable in internal (native) situations. Noted deviations are violations and violations which are negatively evaluated become inadequacies. Inadequacies then provide the starting point for corrective adjustment. The languages-in-contact framework covers only a fraction of these phonomena. In particular the complicated processes of noting (or not noting) deviations, and of marking (or not marking) violations as inadequacies has not been given proper attention.

It has already been mentioned that the corrective process does not necessarily pass through all the stages. Uncontrolled lexical transfers represent deviations which frequently remain covert in many languages. They do of course appear in Australian-Japanese contact situations. In her study of English transfers in Japanese used by native speakers resident in Melbourne, Masumi-So (1983) pointed to her subject E1 who had a high occurrence of transfers, was unaware of them, and showed no traces of their correction. Although some of these transfers may not have been classifiable as clear uncontrolled transfers (instances of "mixing"), some of them probably were. For E1 they represented the stage of covert, unnoted deviance.

However, transfers are frequently noted, and become thus violations. Only those cases of violations which are negatively evaluated become inadequacies, and many of these are corrected. The correction process can stop at the violation or inadequacy stage without proceeding further. Techniques for identifying violations and inadequacies (unless speakers become aware of them) are underdeveloped and researchers have frequently failed to recognize them. However, when corrective adjustment is identified, it signals not simply that the last stage of the correction process took place, but also furnishes a testimony about the existence of the preceding stages of the correction process. In this paper I do not propose to discuss the processes of "noting" and "evaluation" in detail. The occurence of correction will be taken as a sufficient proof that they had taken place.

Let me add, however, that other studies of data from Australian-Japanese contact situations also point out to speakers reaching different stages of the correction process. A survey of Australian-Japanese contact situations conducted by Murie (1976) showed that a number of deviations occurred in communication acts of Japanese businessmen in Australia: for instance, when greeting their Australian contacts they bowed. The occurrence of this deviation[6], denied by the Japanese subjects, was reported by the Australian participants. For the Japanese the process seems to have been concluded at the stage of covert deviation, while the Australians proceeded to evaluate the violation either positively or negatively. At a party, described by Asaoka (forthcoming) some Japanese participants showed lack of adherence to Australian rules of table etiquette (offering butter or bread to

others before using them themselves). This deviation seemed to remain covert for them but was noted and negatively evaluated, in other words, reached the inadequacy stage for the Australian participants. However, the Australian speakers did not attempt to correct this behaviour.

Propositional deviance

Several types of deviance, deriving from the presence of the foreignness factor, can be distinguished. In the classical languages-in-contact theory some of them are discussed under the heading "factors causing interference".

The most obvious case of deviance is the inability to formulate or comprehend a proposition[7]. In other words, what was to be said was not said (in whole or in part) and what was to be understood remained uncomprehended. Let us call this type propositional deviance. Propositional deviance is often noted, evaluated and corrected. Unless successfully corrected it may result in various degrees of miscomprehension, including a total communication breakdown (cf. Clyne 1977).

This type of deviance is of course common in Japanese-Australian contact situations, especially when grammatical competence of the foreign participants is low. At the party, studied by Asaoka, five Australian participants reported that their English messages seemed to be poorly understood by the Japanese participants (Asaoka, forthcoming). Table 1 shows that none of the Japanese was rated as "always" understanding, and even the subject J4 who had spent almost 5 years in Australia, in her own assessment had good English, and who reported fewer problems than the others, was only rated as "almost always" understanding, the implication being that problems in understanding did occur. Marriott's data also include many instances of unsuccessful production and reception of messages (Marriott 1984). Some of them led to breakdown, but since the conversations recorded were not linked with any significant substantive behaviour, such breakdown had little practical effect.

Table 1

Comprehension of Australian English by Japanese Listeners

	Listener J1	2	3	4	5
Speaker A1	∓	−	−	∓	∓
2	−	−	−	∓	∓
3	∓	∓	−	∓	∓
4	∓	∓	−	∓	∓
5	∓	−	−	∓	∓

+ always understood
∓ almost always understood
− very rarely understood

Presentational deviance

However, contrary to the popular belief that propositional deviance constitutes the mainstream of language problems in contact situations, it appears that other types of deviance, violations and inadequacies are equally if not even more important. The major type is the inability to send or receive information other than the bare proposition: to communicate about the speaker's attitudes, intention, or personality. This information is of particular importance for the development of personal relationships. In follow-up interviews subjects frequently comment on their inability to "remain themselves", the resulting feeling of despair, or difficulties in assessing their interlocutors; when an assessment is formulated, it is frequently wrong. This type of deviance can be called presentational deviance.

In Asaoka's study the Japanese participants estimated that in 17 out of the 25 individual relationships at the party the Australian participants appeared not to enjoy conversing with them. Although the Japanese were not aware of all their deviations from the Australian rules of communication, they did notice many of them and evaluated them negatively, feeling that the image they were creating of themselves was not a true picture of their attitudes and intentions. On the other hand the Australians clearly noticed and negatively evaluated a number of features of the behaviour of the Japanese participants. One of the Australian subjects, commenting on the apparent lack of enthusiasm for conversation of the Japanese, stated that they seemed to him to have come for the meal. Others reported, with obvious disapproval, a too businesslike attitude. On a three point scale of formality (formal, informal, very informal) the Australians almost without exception rated the Japanese as formal (average mark 1.2). Since they conceived of the party as a basically informal gathering, this conclusion was a negative one.

The picture which English speakers develop of the Japanese (and other foreigners for that matter) is more than frequently distorted because of the inability of the foreign speaker to communicate. In view of difficulties in controlling laughter (Neustupný 1983b), some Japanese are often assessed as optimistic, lighthearted or on the contrary as too serious and lacking a sense of humour. Deviations from the English speaker's norm tend to be interpreted in terms of personal qualities and intentions of the speaker, rather than as a result of the inability of the foreign participant to communicate. A negative evaluation (the inadequacy marking) follows as a matter of course.

Performance deviance

Another type of deviance due to the presence of foreign factors in contact situations can be called performance deviance. In this case the problems can be located in the inability of speakers and/or hearers to perform a message according to norms prevalent in internal (native) situations. Even if the message itself is not deviant at all, the speaker may expend too much energy on performing it; the hearer may become weary or irritated because of the slowness of the speaker's performance or other problems. This sub-type can be referred to as the "extra-effort" deviance. Another sub-type, the occurrence of which has been confirmed for Australian-Japanese contact situations is "mixing" deviance, the inability of speakers to keep Japanese and English competence apart.

In the data available from Australian-Japanese contact situations "extra-effort" deviance is well represented. Japanese participants complain about the amount of effort needed to communicate in English; in many cases the avoidance of communication in English seems to be primarily motivated by this inadequacy. On the

other hand, Marriott (1984) shows how the slow tempo of speech of Japanese speakers is unconsciously labelled as inadequate and becomes the basis for correction (prompting etc.) by English native speakers. More attention should be paid to this area of inadequacy marking.

Mixing deviance is present in Masumi-So's interview conducted in Japanese speakers in Melbourne. In

> Eee, uenzu-, suiyoobi no yo-, yoru go-ji kara shichi-ji made, ee, tsuu-kooto kari-kitte . . . "Yeh, on Wednes-, Wednesdays ni-, night from five to seven, we book two courts . . ." (Masumi-So 1983, p.124),

there are two ad hoc loans: uenzu- (unfinished uenzudee "Wednesday") and tsuu "two" in tsuu-kooto (note that kooto "court" is a well established lexical item in Japanese). The inability of the speaker to keep his Japanese and English lexical inventories apart is obvious, though the process seems to be influenced by other circumstances as well. What I mean is that the transfers may also have been influenced by a trend to refer to "Australian" items in English, and by a more or less established practice in doing so. The processes of interference, triggering and switching possess a complicated structure. I shall return to this issue later.

Correction deviance and discord deviance

Undoubtedly, more types of deviance can be found in contact situations. At this stage of our knowledge it would be too early to attempt a full listing. However, two additional types immediately come to mind: one is the inability to correct, the other one the feeling of discord between features of the situation (speaker's self, the addressee's features, content etc.) and the communication means.

When native speakers identify an inadequacy in their speech and decide to adjust it, they apply various "corrective adjustment" rules in order to remove the inadequacy. For instance, they use phrases such as "or rather . . .", rephrase a whole sentence, apologize etc. Plenty of evidence exists in our Australian-Japanese data that this family faculty is impaired in foreign speakers. Whether their inability to correctly adjust (correct) is a result of interlanguage (such as excessive use of "sorry") or reduction[8] (as when the speaker simply stops in the middle of a sentence), in each case it is frequently noted and labelled as an inadequacy by the speaker.

Under discord deviance I mean cases in which participants feel that a foreign feature of the situation does not match with a native means of communicating about it or vice-versa. The study of this type of deviance in discourse has been neglected and I shall not be able to elaborate on the issue here. At a more systematic level of correction discord deviance becomes one of the starting points of corrective processes such as language maintenance movements.

Some corrective adjustments

As briefly mentioned above, some inadequacies result in emotive behaviour only; however some become the source of corrective adjustment (correction) processes. Types of corrective adjustments most commonly discussed in literature about "language contact" are interference, switching, integration, language shift, maintenance, and language teaching. In this section of my paper I propose to show

that the phenomenon of corrective adjustment in contact situations is not limited to this set.

Interference and switching

The transfer of the word "milk bar" into Melbourne Japanese can serve as an example of a corrective adjustment of propositional inadequacy. However, since a complete transfer would be identified by native speakers of Japanese as an intentional communication of foreignness (presentational violation or inadequacy) another adjustment process, the phonetic integration process takes place and the pronunciation of the item is changed into "mirukubaa". In this form the loan is not further evaluated by Melbourne residents, but there still remains a possibility of a negative evaluation by casual Japanese visitors who may not understand the word (identify it as propositionally inadequate) and initiate another type of adjustment process through a "request for clarification" (cf. Ozaki, forthcoming). It must be added, that the first two corrective processes soon become automatized and the usage of mirukubaa loses thus its initial corrective character. It assumes the character of a generation process, a mutation common to most correction processes (cf. Neustupný 1973).

However, the technique of interference (or transference, cf. Clyne 1967) is not necessarily a means of corrective adjustment. As I briefly mentioned above, interference may also be a simple result of the inability of the speaker to keep English and Japanese apart. This is probably the case in most instances of triggering (Clyne 1967). Hence, at least two forces leading to transference can be distinguished:

(1) corrective adjustment of an inadequacy occurring in a contact situation, and
(2) mixing, as a result of a performance deviance.

I assume that both forces, rather than one of them, are present in many instances of transfer. For instance, in the sentence

> (Long pause) te, sonoo, rookaru kontentsu, desu ne, kokusansha hogo dee, teatsui hogo o morattari . . .
> "Well, err, local contents, you know, protection of locally made cars, they are getting a lot of protection . . ." (Masumi-So 1983, p.136)

the speaker hesitates, looking for an adequate expression for the "Australian" idea of "local contents" but relaxes, before finding a purely Japanese solution, his anti-mixing attitude and the expression rookaru kontentsu "local contents" is uttered.

Of course, another force which can work towards transference, not merely in contact situations, is a word-formation strategy. In Japanese, even in native situations, new things and concepts are sometimes given English names, in particular when it is desirable to convey a foreign connection or when a term without emotional or other overtones is needed. It is interesting to note that these word-formation strategies also occur in contact situations, perhaps reinforced by the other transference strategies. Masumi-So (1983) reports the use of the neutral asuma "asthma" for the more emotionally loaded Japanese zensoku "asthma". Of a similar character is the employment of a lexical transfer in order to vary expression (e.g. bijitaa "visitor" immediately after having used a Japanese expression with the same meaning; cf. Masumi-So 1983, p. 1978).

A great wealth of knowledge has been accumulated in transference studies and it is not possible to enter into its detailed discussion in this paper. The only claim I wish to make here is that conceiving of transference as basically a correction process may contribute to a further clarification of the issues involved.

Avoidance of communication

Interference or switching are admittedly important corrective processes. However, other adjustment processes take place in contact situations. In this paper I shall only mention a few, for which examples from Australian-Japanese contact studies can be given. Avoidance of communication is one of these adjustment processes.

Evidence is available that Japanese speakers using English avoid speech in contact situations, particularly when they anticipate problems in constructing messages (propositional inadequacy) and/or problems in the ease of message production (performance inadequacy). Avoidance, needless to say, is a corrective process which removes the possibility of inadequacies occurring in speech (cf. Neustupný 1983c). In the case of avoidance of communication in general, we can say that it results in the violation of Grice's "cooperative principle" which implies that participants in communicative encounters are firmly committed to cooperate in the production of communicative acts (Grice 1975). Asaoka reported that Japanese participants in the party she studied (Asaoka, forthcoming) were considered by Australian participants as uncooperative in general. All Japanese participants reported conscious avoidance of speech due to either problems in "English" or to their inability to identify suitable content for communication.

The matter is of considerable importance because the heading 'avoidance' applies to behaviour more varied than the cases of complete withdrawal from communication. For instance, lack of elaboration is another case of avoidance. Short answers containing little more than "yes" or "no" are typical results of avoidance strategies. Marriott's data (Marriott 1984) also shows another case of partial avoidance which is negatively evaluated: the failure of Japanese speakers of English to furnish conversation topics, as expected, and to develop topics suggested by native speakers.

If we consider such cases of partial speech avoidance, it is not difficult to see that avoidance is one of the most typical adjustment strategies used by foreign speakers in contact situations. Although it solves temporarily some inadequacies, it normally produces many others and becomes an important factor in the overall negative assessment of foreign speakers in contact situations.

Avoidance is sometimes a conscious process. Note however that speakers may be completely unaware of avoiding speech. Even if they notice the result of avoidance, the lack of speech activity, they often do not understand their own behaviour which appears to them to be at variance with their own personality. Responses from English native speakers suggest that for them, too, it is difficult to relate speech avoidance of their Japanese interlocutor to problems in language competence. The usual interpretation is either by personality features ("she is very shy", "he is an introvert") or by imputing an intentional lack of cooperation ("it seems he came here to eat").

Adjustment of non-grammatical inadequacies

Problems of communication in contact situations are frequently viewed as an issue of "language" i.e. "grammatical competence". In fact, it appears that the failure of speakers to improve their linguistic competence is caused by their inability to handle and adjust non-grammatical rules of communication.

One of the basic problems is the establishment of networks. Without prior establishment of networks there is no speech and no further language acquisition. Japanese speakers in Australia keenly perceive the lack of their participation in Australian networks, both for substantive and communicative reasons. Contrary to a popular belief that they seek the formation of closed Japanese-only networks, informal data seem to indicate that most of them arrive in Australia with a genuine wish to enter into Australian networks and actively participate in them. In passing, I would like to note that the creation of closed networks by minorities is very often a process which does not simply result from a decision by that group not to mix with the mainstream population. Since the behaviour of the minority is normally deviant, it is not surprising that the mainstream is less than enthusiastic in accepting such members when vacancies in networks are available. One interesting result of Bolitho's study of the networks of Japanese women in Melbourne was that immigrants were over-represented in the networks established by her subjects in Australia. While it was difficult to be accepted in purely Australian groups, such an acceptance was easier in the case of other immigrants, who also had vacancies in their networks (Bolitho 1976).

Bolitho's and Marriott's research have shown in what ways some Japanese residents in Australia try to adjust inadequacies resulting from their lack of membership in Australian networks. Links are developed on the basis of physical proximity (neighbours) or are made to overlap with networks established for other (substantive) purposes (husband's secretary, parents of children's friends, English teachers, people met at ikebana or tennis classes, etc.). It is interesting to note that in some cases, such as intensive links with neighbours or husband's staff, these adjustment strategies seem to disagree with native Australian norms, and are thus capable of creating new inadequacies. This fact has already been noted by Bolitho.

Of course, network formation is not necessarily a corrective adjustment process. In any prolonged social interaction networks are established, maintained and abandoned according to generative rules of network formation. For instance, when an adult enters into a new employment relationship, he normally establishes new networks. In other words, network formation can only be designated as corrective (an adjustment process) if called forth by an inadequacy in discourse. This happens, for instance, when a need for information is not being satisfied (propositional inadequacy) or when lack of communication partners threatens to affect the emotional stability of a speaker.

In the case of Japanese speakers in Melbourne, it was particularly the use of "connectors" (Bolitho 1975, p.27, 1976, p.110) that was clearly of corrective nature. Because of problems of a practical nature, Bolitho's subjects were using a mediator to solve communication problems they encountered in Australian networks. The 'connector' was frequently the subject's husband, husband's contact

or a neighbour, and his/her role was to advise (pre-correct), act as an interpreter, or assist in any other way.

Non-grammatical rules of communication which are the object of correction are not restricted to network rules. There are others: rules of setting, content, message form, channels of communication and others (cf. Hymes 1974, Neustupný 1982, pp.40-54). Deviations from Australian norms in the communication of Japanese speakers in Australia have been reported for many of these categories (e.g. Murie 1976) but only with regard to communicative content have the correction processes been given more detailed attention. Marriott (1978, 1984) has, for instance, noted the fact of "simplification of content" in the case of her subjects.

Adjustment of secondary inadequacies

Inadequacies which result directly from the foreignness factors present in contact situations can be called primary. However, I have already pointed to the fact that corrective adjustments applied in the course of the correction process do, in their turn, produce new inadequacies. Their adjustment, which can be called "secondary adjustment", is an important characteristic of contact situations.

Masumi-So (1983) has shown how Japanese speakers using Japanese in Australia adjust the amount of interference from English in their speech. Since interference of this kind is normally a primary corrective adjustment, a process which aims at its removal is a typical "secondary adjustment". A loan word can be marked as inadequate in anticipation (pre-correction), in the course of producing a sentence, but before actually uttering the loan word (in-correction) or after it has been uttered (post-correction)[9]. Pre-corrective strategies were applied systematically and consciously in the speech of a number of subjects. These subjects stated in the follow-up interviews that they consciously avoided loan words because they considered them inadequate. However, sometimes a loan word does not enter until the planning stage of a sentence and will then be in-corrected. Masumi-So established that the process of in-correction was normally accompanied by hesitation and consciousness of the adjustment process: the subjects could report in follow-up interviews the particular loan word they were avoiding. Sometimes the beginning of the loan word was actually uttered. Masumi-So's data also contained various types of secondary post-corrections, using a variety of frames to introduce the Japanese word after the loan word was used, e.g.

> buusutaa-tte shooatsuki 'booster, as it is called, shooatsuki'
> ruudo na, sono busahoo 'rude, that, busahoo'

A special type of post correction occurred in sentences with *which* retained the loan word in the sentence plan, but added elements which "justified" its presence, or apologized for it, e.g.

> Eego de yuu to, tannaru seerusu ripurezentatibu "in English one would say, just a sales representative".

Masumi-So noted that intonation can be used to "soften" the impact of a loan word usage and thus partly remove the inadequacy created by its use.

Research such as Masumi-So's clearly shows that the study of secondary adjustments of interference in contact situations is a necessary component of their

investigation, a component without which it is difficult to fully account for the behaviour of participants.

Amount of corrective adjustment

One interesting feature of contact situations which warrants the attention of future research is the amount of correction a speaker is able to carry out. Limitations on the execution of corrective adjustment seems to be closely connected with the amount of interference as well as reduction (pidginization) in contact situations.

Masumi-So noticed in her data that different subjects selected different secondary inadequacies for correction. E3 was strongly pre-correcting lexical transfers. This was clear from the low frequency of such transfers in her speech (0.57 per cent), the analysis of hesitation in her speech, and was confirmed by the follow-up interview. However, she had a high occurrence of uncorrected grammatical/phraseological deviations. On the other hand subject J6 showed a very high figure for transfers (1.52 per cent) and almost no attempts to adjust them. She also had a high frequency of grammatical/phraseological deviations, but unlike in the case of E3, one half of these were corrected. Masumi-So concluded that if a subject consumes too much 'correction capacity' on one particular aspect of speech, he/she seems to be unable to correct other deviations (Masumi-So 1983, p.94).

We must realize that the amount of corrective adjustment needed in contact situations, especially in the case of low competence foreign speakers, is considerable. Are primary corrections through interference, which remove referential inadequacies, given precedence over other corrections? What are the conditions which decide about secondary corrections? Many questions wait for clarification through future research.

Foreigner talk

Foreigner talk (cf. Ferguson 1981) is another correction process which occurs in contact situations. Expected or actually faced comprehension inadequacies in foreign speakers are pre-corrected by native speakers through adaptations made to their own speech. These adaptations are usually simplifications, but as Skoutarides (1981) has pointed out, complication also sometimes takes place. Her Japanese data contain sentences in which more information was encoded and in a more formal manner than in native Japanese talk.

Little systematic attention has so far been given to the use of foreigner talk in contact situations towards Japanese speakers. Since Asaoka did not record conversations at her party, her data do not provide any direct evidence that foreigner talk was used. There are, however, indications of the existence of the opposite trend. Although the Australian participants did realize, as said above, that their Japanese interlocutors had comprehension problems, they did not seem to change their speech and use foreigner talk. The Japanese participants complained in follow-up interviews that the Australians spoke 'too fast'. At least one Australian participant admitted that this may have been the case. The hesitation of the Australian speakers to use foreigner talk may have been connected with the fact that almost all personnel at the party were tertiary-educated middle-class adults.

Studies of foreigner talk conducted so far concentrated on the *use* of foreigner talk. However, if the whole of the phenomenon of contact situations is to be accounted for, we must pay equal attention to the conditions and practice of *avoidance* of foreigner talk by native speakers. Since foreigner talk is a primary correction adjustment, the avoidance of foreigner talk obviously belongs to what has been described above as "secondary adjustment".

In Marriott's data (1984) clear evidence of foreigner talk does exist at a number of levels. The Australian interviewer was using special emphatic pronunciation, was simplifying the content, encouraging and praising the Japanese interlocutor, and accepted overall responsibility for providing topics of conversation.

It should be noted in this context that various features of foreigner talk can also be subject to a negative evaluation (inadequacy marking) by the addressees of foreigner talk. For instance, they can feel offended by being talked to "like children", or frustrated when they are not given sufficient opportunity to develop their own content as they might wish. Does this happen in the case of Australian-Japanese contact situations? None of the studies conducted so far can give an answer to this question.

Should the concept of foreign talk be extended to cover non-grammatical features of communication, we would have to take account of reports by the Australian participants at Asaoka's party that they intentionally refrained from introducing "heavy topics" which they thought were beyond the linguistic competence of the Japanese participants. It will be of interest to note that this correction strategy used by the Australians may actually have been counter-productive. Informal observations suggest that Japanese speakers may perform better on "heavy" topics (e.g., discussion of social problems, comparison of Japanese and overseas institutions) which require less competence in typically conversational language, such as is needed for "light" small talk topics.

In this connection a note may be in place concerning the role of "foreigner talk" in contact studies in general. The concept has certainly been an extremely useful tool. However, if we proceed step by step, broadening it to include correction processes other than simplification and behaviour other than language in the narrow sense of the word, does it not simply become a synonym for "correction by native speakers in contact situations"? My own feeling is that a broader category than foreigner talk is needed in order to widen the scope of contact studies and systematize it.

Private correction

With regard to the participation of the Japanese in contact situations we know very little about more conscious forms of what could be called "private correction" (Neustupný 1976) — the conscious attitudes and policies an average speaker holds vis-à-vis language. This is regrettable because the area is relatively easy to investigate.

From informal observations and discussions it would appear that individual members of the Japanese community in Melbourne are not unduly concerned about their Japanese or English. It is true that some of Masumi-So's subjects were aware of changes in their Japanese and applied conscious anti-transference corrective strategies. Businessmen in her sample seemed to develop an ability to switch between their "Overseas Japanese Pattern" in which anti-transference constraints were relaxed, and an "Authentic Japanese Pattern" which was used in communication with senior visitors from Japan, telephone calls to Japan, and in writing. However, it appears that this development was not accompanied by conscious attitudes or policies (Masumi-So 1983, p.70).

The area needs more attention in future research. If it can be proved that different languages mark and correct to a different extent, then Japanese might well be considered a relatively weakly marking and weakly correcting language. The relative lack of concern — in comparison, for instance, with Central European attitudes — for correction in overseas Japanese situations, might then be explained as a reflection of this basis attitude.

Children with both Japanese parents resident in Australia are known to quickly lose their competence in Japanese. This happens even though almost all their parents are highly educated middle class speakers. The process is certainly quite complicated, but I would like to point to the lack of language correction in family networks as one of the possible factors. With no effective correction pattern on the side of the parents, the language of the children is quickly flooded with transfers from English and the next stage of abandoning Japanese in favour of English seems to be an inevitable conclusion.

The study of English

It seems that the study of English, which is an important adjustment process, grows rather directly from the decoding of discourse inadequacies by the Japanese speakers than from separately held attitudes or policies. Marriott's survey (Marriott 1978) confirmed that the belief of automatic improvement in English through living in Australia is widespread. As previously suggested by Murie (1976), Japanese businessmen did not take English courses at all. Some of the wives of the businessmen investigated by Marriott, did take English lessons early during their stay in Australia, but mostly they turned to English teaching as a remedy for communication problems in their second or third year. Marriott (1978) hypothesized that her subjects passed through three different phases of communicative development —

(1) The first 12-18 months were the period of basic "communicative" (I would prefer "interactive") adaptation — getting used to situations of everyday life, establishing friendship links with other Japanese residents etc.

(2) The second period follows the first when the decoding of their own communicative inadequacies mounts up and it becomes clear that the "automatic acquisition of English" theory fails. It is in this period that taking English lessons typically commences.

(3) The third period provides an opportunity for a selection between two different outcomes: satisfaction or disillusionment. Subjects in the former category reported a relatively high degree of successful entry into Australian networks which was combined with personal satisfaction. However, most women in the survey belonged to the latter type. Despite their efforts they continued experiencing serious communication problems. They abandoned their attempts at

communicative adaptation and retracted almost fully to their Japanese networks (Marriott 1978, pp.79-83).

The English teaching programmes available to the subjects were either private tuition programmes or courses at a low or medium level of rigorousness. However, it may be questioned whether more rigorous programmes would have brought better results.

Kehoe (1979) investigated in depth the process of acquisition of English in the case of several Japanese speakers in Australia. She suggested that the failure of her subjects to profit from formal instruction was frequently due to pre-established "traditional" strategies of correction (acquisition) through language study. For instance, the subjects were too much concerned with explicit grammar, emphasized the acquisition of inventories over the acquisition of competence, relied too heavily on the written language etc. Obviously, these strategies derived from experience gained in English classes taught in Japan.

However, one of Kehoe's subjects, a boy of 17, was an unsuccessful learner despite the fact that he had hardly any experience of English teaching in Japan. Kehoe attributed his lack of success to his early development of a set of communicative "survival strategies" such as avoidance of English speaking networks, the mastery of some basic routines ("yes sir", "no sir" etc.), which made further acquisition of English superfluous. It is interesting to note that he assessed his own English as second from the top on a five point scale — an extremely unrealistic proposition seen from the point of view of his family as well as teachers who were concerned about his case. It seems that the "survival strategies" worked in his case to remove the common feeling of inadequacy in English, which would be in place at his level of competence.

Since language teaching is an important adjustment process, more indepth investigation into English learning by Japanese speakers is necessary. The great distance between the Japanese and the English communication systems admittedly acts as a negative factor. However, the strategies and rules of learning in formal (directed) settings play an important role. In the case of most Japanese speakers it is not only particular English grammar rules but correction strategies as well that seem to be fossilized. How to get them to move again is one of the basic questions for future research in Australian-Japanese contact communication.

Language treatment and language planning for Australian-Japanese contact situations

The term "language treatment" refers broadly to all organized forms of societal attention to language problems (Neustupný 1973). Correction through language treatment can be pursued at various levels: governmental committees, the level of national agencies (national language associations, special commissions or academies), language associations, special committees established by political parties, business or mass media organizations or, indeed, any group of concerned people whose primary aim is to consider or implement communicative correction acts.

No detailed survey of language treatment activities in Japanese organizations in Australia has been conducted but casual observation seems to strongly suggest that very few correction acts have been considered or carried out. The organizations which could act as carriers of language treatment are, for instance, the Japanese Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (or its branches in Australia: the Embassy or consular offices), the Japanese Society of each capital city, or other societies formed by Japanese residents.

The only existing corrective policy with regard to the maintenance of Japanese by Japanese residents in Australia seems to be the establishment of Japanese schools (full-time in Sydney, part-time in Melbourne, Brisbane, Canberra and Perth), primarily for the use by children of short-term residents. Although the overall aim of these institutions is corrective (i.e. language maintenance), the programmes pursued closely follow the teaching curricula of Japanese schools, and only minimal consideration is being given to the special problems caused by the fact that the children involved live in Australian-Japanese contact situations. For instance, there is no particular policy to counter the influx of English loanwords into the language of the children, to help them acquire adolescent and adult vocabulary needed for more elaborate communication, or to acquire the normal range of honorific expressions.

Similarly, there is no corrective policy with regard to the acquisition of English, at least among members of the Japanese community. Special English courses are offered to Japanese speakers at the Swinburne Institute of Technology in Melbourne, but this programme has never reached large enrolments (approximately 20 students per term, 70 percent of them female) and has been introduced on the initiative of teaching staff of the Institute, not of the Japanese community. As mentioned before, the fact that a considerable amount of Japanese women in Melbourne seem to study some English at a certain point of their stay in Australia, does not result from conscious correction policies that could be classified as language treatment.

Language planning is a special type of language treatment. It is a corrective system which is informed by a language planning theory and is clearly future-oriented (cf. Jernudd 1982). Of course, no language planning exists with regard to Australian-Japanese contact situations. However, the facts mentioned in this paper indicate a need for language planning in this area: a planning which would include language teaching, without being limited to it. There is a need for teaching about problems occurring in Australian-Japanese contact situations both to the Japanese and to the Australians. The aim of the course should be to dramatically increase the degree of understanding of what happens and what, therefore, should be attended to. There is also a need to teach participants in the contact situations how to correct inadequacies at all levels of interaction (language, communication, sociocultural behaviour) without the creation of new inadequacies. Such planning, when instituted, will realistically accept that not all inadequacies can so be corrected, and will establish a hierarchy of preferences for correction.

Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to outline a theory of contact situations which would provide a framework broader than the classical languages-in-contact theory, and which could be integrated in contemporary linguistics. At the same time I have

tried to apply the theory to the particular case of Australian-Japanese contact situations and introduce the reader to some more recent research conducted in the area. There is no doubt in my mind that the paper represents only an introduction to what we hope to know and understand within the next few years.

FOOTNOTES

* I wish to thank Helen Marriott and Akito Ozaki for providing helpful suggestions for the improvement of this paper. I am also greatly indebted to Michael Clyne for his comments on the theoretical framework presented here. Needless to say, all possible errors or defects are solely my own responsibility.

1. In Neustupný 1974 these situations were called "foreign user situations" and in Neustupný 1981 they were referred to as "foreigner situations" (gaikokujin bamen).

2. Note that an "inadequacy" refers to the act of evaluation in a speech act, not to any assumed or real inherent insufficiencies of language.

3. The term "correction" will be used in two ways: to refer to the whole process, from deviation to the corrective adjustment, and in a narrow sense, to denote the corrective adjustment stage alone. The full form "corrective adjustment" will be used wherever necessary.

4. According to the 1981 census there were 1752 persons born in Japan in the State of Victoria. 782 of these were male and 970 females.

5. While saying this I should hasten to add that the rate of success has not been much better in the case of Westerners communicating in Japanese. Although a few may have learned how to construct simple sentences, the number of such people still remains curiously small, and those who can communicate in the proper sense of the word are still fewer.

6. Deviation here means deviation from norms of the "base system" of the situation, which in this case was close to the Australian system of communication. The issue of the "base system" will not be discussed in this paper.

7. For the discussion of the concept of proposition in Japanese communication see Minami 1974.

8. The issue of interlanguage and reduction (pidginization), cf. Neustupný 1982, p.62, will not be discussed in detail in this paper.

9. For these terms see Neustupný 1973.

REFERENCES

Asaoka, T., forthcoming. Communication problems between Japanese and Australians at a dinner party. (*Working Papers of the Japanese Studies Centre* 3).

Bolitho, M. A. 1975 "Communicative networks of Japanese women in Melbourne." *Linguistics Communications* 15 (Papers in Japanese Linguistics 3), 1-94.

Bolitho, M. A. 1976 "Communicative networks of Japanese women in Melbourne." In *Australia Talks*, ed. by M. Clyne, 103-115. (Pacific Linguistics, Series D-No.23).

Clyne, M. G. 1967 *Transference and Triggering*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Clyne, M. G. 1972 *Perspectives on Language Contact*. Melbourne. The Hawthorne Press.

Clyne, M. G. 1975 "A non-verbal check on acceptability of transference among bilinguals." *ITL* 30, 55-64.

Clyne, M. G. 1977 "Intercultural communication breakdown and communication conflict: towards a linguistic model and its exemplification." In *Deutsch im Kontakt mit anderen Sprachen*, ed. by C. Molony, H. Zobl and W. Stölting, 129-146. Kronberg: Scriptor.

Clyne, M. G. 1982 *Multilingual Australia*. Melbourne: River Seine Publications.

Ferguson, C. A. 1981 'Foreigner Talk'' as the name of a simplified register. *IJSL* 28, 9-18.

Fishman, J. A. 1972 *The Sociology of Language*. Rowley: Newbury House.

Grice, H. P. 1975 "Logic and conversation." In *Syntax and Semantix* 3: *Speech Acts*, ed. by P. Cole and J. L. Morgan, 41-58. New York: Academic Press.

Hasselmo, N. 1970 "Code-switching and modes of speaking." In *Texas Studies in Bilingualism*, ed. by G. C. Gilbert, 179-210.

Hasselmo, N. 1972 "Code-switching as ordered selection." *Studies for Einar Haugen*, 261-279. The Hague: Mouton.

Haugen, E. 1956 *Bilingualism in the Americas*. Alabama: American Dialectal Society.

Hymes, D. 1972 "Models of the interaction of language and social life." In *Directions in sociolinguistics*, ed. by J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes, 35-71. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hymes, D. 1974 *Foundations in Sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jernudd, B. H. 1982 "Language planning as a focus for language correction." *Language Planning Newsletter 8/4*, 1-3.

Jernudd, B. H. 1983 "Evaluation of language planning: what has the last decade accomplished?" In *Progress in Language Planning* ed. by J. Cobarrubias and J. A. Fishman, 345-378. Berlin: Mouton.

Jernudd, B. H. and E. Thun. 1983 "Control of language through correction in speaking?" *IJSL* 44, 71-97.

Kehoe, L. J. 1979 *Patterns of Second Language Acquisition in Japanese*. M.A. thesis, Dept. of Japanese, Monash University.

Marriott, H. 1978 *The Acquisition of English Communicative Competence by Japanese Women*. M.A. thesis, Dept. of Japanese, Monash University.

Marriott, H. 1984 *English Discourse of Japanese Women in Melbourne*. Melbourne: Japanese Studies Centre (= Papers of the Japanese Studies Centre 12).

Masumi-So, H. 1983 *Loanwords in Melbourne Japanese*. M.A. thesis Dept. of Japanese, Monash University.

Minami, Fujio 1974 *Gendai nihongo no koozoo*. (The Structure of Contemporary Japanese) Tokyo: Taishuukan.

Murie, A. 1976 *Communication Problems in Australia-Japan Business Relations*. B.A. dissertation, Dept. of Japanese, Monash University.

Neustupný, J. V. 1973 "An outline of a theory of language problems." Paper prepared for the VIIIth World Congress of Sociology, Toronto, August 16-24, 1974. Printed in Neustupný 1978, 243-257.

Neustupný, J. V. 1974 "Sociolinguistics and the language teacher." In *Language teaching. Problems and solutions*?. ed. by M. Rado, 31-66. Bundoora: La Trobe University. Also available in *Linguistics Communications* 12, 1974, 1-24, and through ERIC.

Neustupný, J. V. 1976 "Language correction in contempory Japan." *Language Planning Newsletter* 2/3, 1-5. Reprinted in Neustupný 1978, 269-278.

Neustupný, J. V. 1977 "Language planning for Australia." *Language Sciences* 45, 28-31.

Neustupný, J. V. 1978 *Post-Structural Approaches to Language*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Neustupný, J. V. 1981 "Gaikokujin bamen no kenkyuu to Nihongo kyooiku. (The study of foreigner situations and the teaching of Japanese.)" *Nihongo kyooiku* 45, 30-40.

Neustupný, J. V. 1982 *Gaikokujin to no komyunikeeshon* (Communication with foreigners). Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.

Neustupný, J. V. 1983a. "Towards a paradigm for language planning." *Language Planning Newsletter* 9, No.4, 1-4.

Neustupný, J. V. 1983b. "Communication with the Japanese." *The Wheel Extended* 13, No. 1, 28-30.

Neustupný, J. V. 1983c. "Keigo kaihi no sutoratejii ni tsuite (About strategies of honorific avoidance)." *Nihongogaku* 2, No.1, 62-67.

Ozaki, A., forthcoming. "Requests for clarification: a study of correction strategies."

Rubin, J. 1978-1979. "The approach to language planning within the United States." *Language Planning Newsletter* 4/4, 1-6 and 5/1, 1-6.

Skoutarides, A. 1981. "Nihongo ni okeru forinaa tooku (Foreigner talk in Japanese)." *Nihongo kyooiku* 45, 53-62.

Weinrich, U. 1952. *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

CROSS-CULTURAL ENCOUNTERS:

COMMUNICATION AND MIS-COMMUNICATION

Edited by J. B. Pride

CONTRIBUTORS

Richard Benton
New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington 1, New Zealand

Michael Christie
Department of Education, University of Queensland, Queensland, Australia 4067

Michael Clyne
Department of German, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia 3168

Charles Drousiotou
Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Commonwealth Centre, Melbourne, Australia 3000

Diana Eades
Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of Queensland, Queensland, Australia 4067

Stephen Harris
Professional Services Branch, Department of Education, N.T., Australia 5789

Janet Holmes
Languages and Literature Faculty, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand

Judith Kearins
Department of Psychology, University of Western Australia, Western Australia 6009

Harold Koch
Department of Linguistics, the Faculties, Australian National University, Canberra A.C.T., Australia 2600

Christopher Lane

English Language Institute, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand

J. V. Neustupný

Department of Japanese, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia 3168

John Pride

Department of English Language and Literature, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand

Terry Quinn

Horwood Language Centre, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia 3052

Terry Williams

Mount Lawley Campus, Western Australian College of Advanced Education, Western Australia 6050

Ann Zubrick

School of Behavioural Sciences, Western Australian Institute of Technology, Western Australia 6102

CONTENTS