On research on contact situations

Jiří V. Neustupný
(translated by Patrick Heinrich and Roman Schorr)[1]

Abstract (Patrick Heinrich)

This paper is divided into two parts. First, it introduces the concept of contact situation, indicating the necessity of including it in research on Japanese as Foreign Language (JFL). The concept of contact situation is defined and its specific features for foreign language learners and native speakers are discussed. It is concluded that advanced learners of Japanese must make conscious efforts to move away from contact situations. The second part of the paper introduces research methods for studying contact situations. The method of problem analysis is suggested to be the approach best suited for expanding existing research methods, such as error analysis or foreigner talk. Language learning strategies can be explored along the lines of problem analysis. It is argued that research on JFL should not stay restricted to the classroom, but should also study imbalances in language learning processes, consider ways of dealing with such imbalances, reconsider the role of the native speaker as model speaker for foreign learners, and address language ideological notions on the part of language teachers.

1. Research on contact situations as the basis of JFL

If the objective of Japanese as Foreign Language (JFL) is to make foreign speakers use Japanese, it should certainly be of great value to study how foreign speakers actually use the language. This should probably be the starting point of JFL, and, moreover, also its goal. In other words, if we start by researching the situations in which foreigners use Japanese and what communication problems occur, then we might, for the first time, be able to establish effective measures to deal with these situations. However, until recently, no systematic research into the ways foreigners actually use the target language has been conducted, neither in general language education nor in JFL.

[1] This paper was originally published as chapter 8 titled *Sesshoku bamen no kenkyū ni tsuite* [On research on contact situations] of the following monograph: Jiří V. Neustupný (1995): *Atarashii nihongo no tame ni* [Towards New Perspectives in Japanese Language Teaching]. Tokyo: Taishūkan shoten.

The contributions by Monash University scholars Ozaki, Skoutarides, Yoshimitsu, Kubota and Masumi in the special edition of *Nihongo kyōiku* [Journal of Japanese Language Teaching] 45 (1981) provide for some kind of new perspective, in that they share the feature of attempting *on the basis of data to systematically look into the conditions in which Japanese is actually used* by foreigners (Kubota 1981; Masumi 1981; Ozaki 1981; Skoutarides 1981; Yoshimitsu 1981). In spite of the fact that these attempts did not produce entirely satisfactory results, as the research was pioneering and, therefore, still fragmentary, I nonetheless believe that, from now on, similar approaches to those in this special issue must be developed in the field of JFL. In the present paper, I will first introduce several new concepts necessary for research on foreigners' communication, and then briefly report on the aims of the five papers published in the special edition of the *Nihongo kyōiku* 45.[2]

2. On the concept of "contact situation"

To start with, I would like to emphasize that, more often than not, situations in which foreign speakers participate are specific linguistic situations. It goes without saying that there is no distinctive boundary between Japanese and foreigners, but we might nevertheless define "foreigners" here as "people with limited Japanese communication skills". As a rule, the first contact that foreigners have with the Japanese language is in the classroom, which is one type of "contact situation" (which we could also call "foreigner situation"), and foreigners' participation is usually limited to contact situations for several more years. As long as foreigners are not perceived by native speakers as "native level speakers", the situations they participate in will inevitably be contact situations. These contact situations and "native language situations" (where all speakers are native speakers) differ substantially with regard to a number of distinct features. Since language teaching has, until today, exclusively aimed at native language situations, it must be said to have been unrealistic in its attitude. Along these lines of thought, three points relevant to current JFL ought to be added to its research agenda.

(1) Clarifying the characteristics of contact situations and teaching them to foreign language learners.
(2) Making learners utilize the characteristics of contact situations.
(3) Teaching learners ways to move away from contact situations.

[2] This paper has benefited much from suggestions made by Hata Hiromi and Ozaki Akito. I would like to express my gratitude to them.

2.1. Specific features of contact situations – the case of foreign speakers

Let us consider how the concept of contact situation can actually be defined. The mere participation of a foreigner in a given situation does not inevitably create a contact situation. In order to become a contact situation, the communication must include particular features which do not occur in native language situations. When looking at concrete contact situations, two types of specific features in communication can be observed. Firstly, features *on the part of the foreign speaker*, and, secondly, features *on the part of the native language speaker* in the same situation. Generally speaking, as the communication proficiencies of foreign speakers are limited, they can only communicate inadequately, and they themselves have a clear awareness of these limitations. Native speakers, on the other hand, are aware of the limited proficiencies of foreign speakers, which make them adjust their own communication accordingly. In more precise terms, the following three types of specific features of contact situations can be identified on the part of foreign speakers:

(1) Features related to the foreign speakers' expectations and plans prior to the realization of an utterance.
(2) Features related to the problems foreign speakers face after an utterance has started, and the treatment of these problems.
(3) Features related to the foreign speakers' awareness after the realization of an utterance (for instance, the evaluation of the effects of their communication).

2.1.1. Expectations of problems

Foreign speakers' expectations, intentions and so on concerning communication processes differ clearly from those of native speakers. One typical problem is that foreign speakers anticipate that they may not be able to communicate successfully, and therefore, from the very start, refrain from communication about certain issues. A further example, on the level of the lexicon, is the avoidance of using a particular word in ongoing communication, because the word is too difficult for the speaker to pronounce properly. In my data collection, I have a concrete example of a foreign language learner who failed several times to distinguish between *ojisan* [uncle] and *ojīsan* [grandfather] and therefore completely avoided these words in an interview. While we can assume that such phenomena, consciously or unconsciously, frequently occur in contact situations, there is still hardly any research about them.

Let us call cases in which speakers take definite measures in order to protect themselves from problems they expect to arise in the course of communication (such as inappropriateness) "pre-corrections". Pre-cor-

rections can also be observed in native language situations, but their frequency and quality differ from those in contact situations. In the case of communication amongst native language speakers, there are many pre-corrections concerning issues such as whether the standard language should be used, the style to choose or how to express something in polite language. However, in contrast to foreign speakers, self-monitoring of basic grammatical rules cannot be observed in native language situations. Consequently, at least a certain part of the various measures for pre-corrections in contact situations would not be understood in native language situations. For instance, the procedure of checking the correctness of one's own speech as it occurred in Ozaki's data collection would in all likelihood lead to misunderstandings in native speaker situations.

2.1.2. When problems have emerged

Above, I have considered specific features of contact situations before utterances are realized. In the following discussion, I will consider features of contact situations after an utterance has been completed. Foreign speakers are confronted with numerous language problems as soon as speech acts have been initiated. While it can be observed that foreign speakers are using the rules of Japanese, this does not imply that they have acquired all the rules. Consequently, in cases where foreign learners cannot deduce rules appropriate for the given situation from the rules they have already acquired, they select means such as the following to manage language problems.

(1) Applying rules of their native language just as they are (this issue has been emphasized in contrastive analysis).
(2) Creating new rules which differ both from Japanese and the respective native language (this process has been noted by scholars studying inter-language).
(3) Communicating without cultural, that is, linguistic, constraints by using as few grammatical rules as possible. For example, one instance is the case of simply lining up words in complete absence of any grammatical rules (this phenomenon is the focus of scholars claiming pidginization by foreign speakers).

Some of these means may lead, by chance, to correct expressions in Japanese. However, in most cases, foreign speakers communicate that they themselves expect such utterances to be incorrect, or they simply communicate the incorrect use as such. In situations like this, a correction process frequently sets in and in-corrections or post-corrections occur.

In-corrections do not involve mistakes on the surface level, because speakers notice some inappropriateness in their intended utterance and

implement a correction themselves. However, fillers frequently occur, and phenomena such as pauses and gaps can be noted. Post-corrections, by contrast, are corrections of mistakes which have actually materialized on the surface level. The most common instance is the correction of an unsuitable word. In the same way as pre-corrections, in- and post-corrections are not features restricted to contact situations. Native speakers, too, are frequently confronted with problems of expression, and thus self-correction or other-correction is implemented. Nevertheless, there are also features of correction processes that are restricted to contact situations. For example, the rather unnatural utterance "could you say it once more" (*mō ichido itte kudasai*) is exclusive to contact situations. How "could you say it once more" can be replaced by a more natural-sounding expression is a rather difficult issue. One of the reasons is that, in native language situations, instances of such utterances directed to one's superiors are rare. Furthermore, in a number of contact situations that end up in a communicative deadlock, for instance, in the classroom, silence is used as an indicator of such deadlock. In contact situations, silence serves as a request for help from the participating native speaker. However, this function is absent in native language situations, because silence carries different meanings there.

2.1.3. After the conclusion of communication

Foreign speakers' language awareness after communication, for example, the evaluation of their own language use, also has a close relation to JFL. Material examining foreign speakers' language awareness after the conclusion of discourse in which they have participated has elucidated how influential and detailed such awareness is. This is not to say that awareness of one's own language does not exist in native language situations, but it is so slight there that it cannot be compared to contact situations. Foreign speakers' expectation of errors; errors as such; pre-, in- and post-corrections; and relative lack of reflection on communication processes as a whole are distinctive features of contact situations. Among these issues, research in JFL has only taken up errors as a research topic. It has hardly paid any attention to the issues of structures of language awareness and correction processes.

2.2. Specific features of contact situations – the case of native speakers

Linguists and language educators have not paid sufficient attention to the fact that native language speakers often adjust their speech in situations in which foreigners participate. However, research on foreigner talk,

begun by Ferguson (1971), has confirmed that such adjustments are a universal feature. The concept of foreigner talk has been derived from the model of baby talk, but while baby talk is used by adults and infants alike, foreigner talk is usually confined to the language that native speakers use when addressing foreigners. In an unpublished paper in 1976, I hypothesized that Japanese foreigner talk had the following characteristics.

(1) A particular use of pronouns (for instance excessive use of *watakushi* [I] and *anata* [you] etc.).
(2) Restricted use of polite language (for instance, substantial simplification of polite language).
(3) Use of children's vocabulary (frequent use of vocabulary used in children's talk or of language used in language textbooks in the lower grades of elementary school).
(4) Use of loan words (for instance, *burikku* [brick] instead of *renga* [brick]).
(5) Use of foreign language (native speaker switch to English or another foreign language without using Japanese).
(6) Use of gestures (for instance, gestures indicating the size and shape of objects).
(7) Restrictions with regard to conversation topics (for instance, avoiding abstract topics or jokes).
(8) Networks formed with a third person as mediator (addressing utterances to a Japanese third party without addressing the foreign speaker directly).

If the existence of foreigner talk in Japanese is confirmed on the basis of empirical data, then foreigner talk inevitably becomes an important characteristic of contact situations. As stated above, all situations in which foreign language learners have contact with the Japanese language are contact situations (or classroom situations as a variant thereof). Thus, Japanese language use by Japanese in such situations is of great significance for research in JFL. While the concept of foreigner talk is certainly a very useful research tool, it is clearly inadequate when it comes to capturing all features of native speakers' language use in contact situations. The reason is that native speakers usually take at least the following three points into consideration.

(1) They expect problems in communication with foreign speakers of Japanese and may therefore implement pre-corrections on a larger scale than research on foreigner talk has revealed so far.
(2) They implement in- and post-corrections on a large scale, because they monitor their own and foreign speakers' language use after the start of an utterance (until now, only some kinds of post-corrections have been the object of research in foreigner talk studies).

(3) After completion of an utterance, native language speakers' critical awareness of the contact situation frequently differs from that of speakers in native language situations.

While using the concept of foreigner talk exhaustively, I believe that it is also vital to study impartially the specific features of native language speakers in contact situations more comprehensively.

2.3. Utilizing the specific features of contact situations and moving away from contact situations

The specific features of contact situations offer, in various senses, precious material for JFL. On one hand, some of the features of contact situations with foreign language learners at beginning or intermediate levels play a negative role in constituting models of unnatural language, for example, through the excessive use of personal pronouns. On the other hand, there are also features which fulfil positive roles in language acquisition. For example, constantly monitoring their own language and implementing pre-, in- and post-corrections will, in effect, result in foreign language speakers' improvement of their own language proficiency. However, in present day JFL, exercises, drills and general instruction focusing on how one's own language can be monitored and how incorrect utterances can be corrected are inadequate. I believe that it is valuable to teach systematically to beginning and intermediate level students the specific features of contact situations. In case of concern about possible misunderstandings, it is also necessary to provide instruction to foreign learners, so that, for example, they can make native language speakers more aware of contact situations and hence encourage them to simplify their language. In other words, it is favourable for foreign language speakers to know the extent to which they evoke their own foreignness to native language speakers, without being too gauche towards them.

However, when moving from advanced level to native-like level language proficiency, the specific features of contact situations become a particularly heavy burden. At this stage, it becomes necessary to move away from contact situations. This is because it is tiresome for participants to constantly monitor their language and to be unable to focus on the content of communication itself. Secondly, there is the problem that, as long as native speakers continue to use foreigner talk, foreign language learners cannot take this language as a model of regular Japanese. Thirdly, there is also the problem of Japanese speakers attaching the label "foreign language speaker" to foreign participants if they vigorously communicate their foreignness through unnatural language use. Foreign-

ers speaking Japanese frequently complain about not being treated on a par by Japanese speakers. However, at least one reason for such unequal treatment, that is, being treated *as a foreigner*, is caused by the specific features of contact situations. If the foreign language participants had the skills to reduce the "impression of contact situation", which arise through their participation, we might assume that such inequalities would also decrease.

3. Research methods for contact situations

As a method of studying the essence of contact situations one might first think of tests. While tests such as acquisition or proficiency tests can indeed be used to some extent, the role of the native speaker in test situations is usually limited, even in cases of contact situations. Furthermore, because these language situations have distinctive features, one cannot simply infer from a test to the essence of a normal communication situation. A further method that comes to mind is that of error analysis. Error analysis is, without doubt, a powerful tool and therefore beneficial. In issue 45 of *Nihongo kyōiku* [Journal of Japanese Language Teaching], both Yoshimitsu and Kubota used this method. However, numerous shortcomings can be pointed out in standard error analysis. First of all, in most cases of error analysis, only language system errors (including syntax, lexis, phonology and orthography) are taken up as the object of analysis, while the *communicative elements* that are the object of study in sociolinguistics are not sufficiently considered. The problems that foreign speakers encounter are, however, not limited to grammar problems. Who communicates what, where, to whom, how, via which channel, and so on are important issues. The reasons for attaching the label "foreign speakers" are not merely the result of errors of the language system. Rather, "foreigners" are people who address others, who do not expect to be addressed, who say unexpected things, who do not say things one would expect, who laugh, talk and are silent in inappropriate ways. If the objective of JFL was simply to educate "strange foreigners" (*hen na gaikokujin*) who do not produce ungrammatical language, then it might be appropriate that research on contact situations would also be focused on the correction of grammatical errors. If, however, JFL aims at enabling foreigners to communicate as regular speakers on an equal footing with Japanese, then research into contact situations must also include communicative rules as a significant topic of research. Ozaki's paper in the special edition of *Nihongo kyōiku* is very thought-provoking in this respect.

Another shortcoming of standard error analysis lies in the fact that it tends to be restricted to only *the part of the problem which appears on the language surface*. It is, however, not the case that all functional obstacles encountered by foreign speakers are manifested as errors on the surface. As mentioned above, speakers expect specific communicative obstacles in advance, which quite often prevent them from making errors. There are, furthermore, instances of sentences that are unobjectionable on the surface level but that do not communicate the content intended by the speaker. In my video data, there is an example of a foreign speaker suddenly moving his legs during his utterance. At this point of his utterance, no linguistic problem could be detected. In a follow-up interview, he explained that he moved his legs at this particular point because he noted that he had communicated something which ran completely counter to his initial intentions and that he was indecisive as to whether he should correct this at this point. This constitutes a case of an obstacle (problem) of language use which does not appear on the surface of the utterance.

Furthermore, error analysis has until now one-sidedly focused only on the foreign speaker. It is thus no exaggeration to state that it has almost completely ignored the role of the native speaker in contact situations. As discussed above, however, it is usual that native speakers implement pre-, in- and post-corrections and that they apply the technique of foreigner talk. These issues should certainly also be considered along with problems on the part of the foreign speaker. Consequently, a broader method than that of error analysis ought to be used when analysing the various problems occurring in contact situations. There already exists the approach of *problem analysis* as a suitable method. The main characteristics of problem analysis are the following

(1) It includes all participants in communicative acts and all communicative rules as objects of study.
(2) It collects instances in which participants depart from rules of native situations and analyses them.
(3) It documents identifications of "inappropriateness" by participants.
(4) It elucidates how participants treat "inappropriateness" (whether they merely note inappropriateness or whether they implement some kind of correction).
(5) It examines how participants mutually interact in the process of identifying and dealing with deviations or inappropriateness.
(6) In the case of a correction process, it examines what correction rules have been applied. It studies, for example, whether self-correction or other-correction has occurred; pre-, in- or post-correction; whether the correction refers to one part of an utterance only, to the language

system as a whole, or whether the correction process has led to a particular language system (for instance, foreigner talk).

(7) It examines the result of the correction process.

Needless to say, the approach of problem analysis is not limited to contact situations. Its application range is exceptionally broad. It is a suitable method for native language situations, for language problems in general, and also for contact situations. It is therefore important to develop it into a powerful method for understanding contact situations. The follow-up interview is an indispensable technique for problem analysis. This technique is already partly used in error analysis. However, in the data collection for error analysis no consideration has been given to examining the awareness of all the participants in detail over the whole period of time. Without this examination of participants' awareness, in other words, without follow-up interviews, it is impossible to elucidate many problems that occur in contact situations.

4. Research on contact situations of the Japanese language

Certainly, not every paper in the special issue of *Nihongo Kyōiku* 45 treats "contact situations" and "problem analysis" in the form depicted above. If, however, one conceives the contributions in this special issue as one entity, the following features which unify the method of analysing contact situations can be recognized.

(1) Problems of both foreign speakers and native speakers are considered (albeit with a focus on the former).

(2) Both grammatical and non-grammatical problems were considered (the latter are, however, limited to Ozaki's paper).

(3) Data have been collected from regular conversations in contact situations, and, in the case of Masumi's paper, from actual classroom situations (in the case of Kubota only, the data are somewhat close to a test).

(4) Either error analysis (Yoshimitsu, Kubota) or problem analysis (Ozaki, Skoutarides) has been applied.

Ozaki's paper departs from the almost exclusive focus of traditional JFL on the grammatical proficiency framework. It examines how problems (obstacles) can be treated without sounding "un-Japanese" when speakers are confronted with problems expressing themselves. It can be assumed that such proficiency is an important issue for advanced language learners progressing from contact situations to native level language situations. In present day JFL, the rules of steering conversations are not an issue that has been much reflected upon. However, I believe that in JFL

in future, the extent to which advanced language learners can acquire this sort of proficiency by themselves, or whether it is necessary for language teachers to teach this constructively in the classroom, will become an important consideration.

In his paper, Skoutarides shifts the viewpoint towards native speakers in contact situations. As a first attempt to study Japanese foreigner talk, this article is bound to draw much attention. On the premise that the characteristics of Japanese foreigner talk which appear in Skoutarides's data turn out to be general in nature, these data have the potential to demonstrate that the Japanese used by native speakers in contact situations (including the Japanese of language teachers in the classroom) cannot easily be used as a model for foreign language learners. This issue is so significant that it would fundamentally unsettle – both from a practical and a theoretical point of view – current ideas about the role of the native speaker in Japanese language education.

Yoshimitsu and Kubota's analysis of data on how pitch accent and the stroke order of Chinese characters are acquired is pioneering. Admittedly, pitch accent and stroke order play only a restricted role among the means to transmit meaning in communication, but in contact situations they are quite crucial elements. This is the case because pitch accent errors mean that the label "foreign speaker" is attached to foreign speakers. In the case of stroke order, the problem might be less pressing at beginner and intermediate levels. However, at the stage where foreign speakers start writing characters in running style, mistakes with regard to balance and connection of the strokes play a role similar to that of pitch accent errors. If no solid data are collected on the extent to which advanced Japanese language learners acquire correct pitch accent and stroke order, measures for improvement cannot be established. There is, however, an additional problem with regard to pitch accent as well as to stroke order. Exceptions aside, pitch accent and stroke order are only taught at the beginner level in present-day JFL. However, the rules of pitch accent and stroke order acquisition are rather complex issues governed by general strategies, standard rules and individual rules. Consider the following examples.

(1) For instance, general strategies are (a) the pitch accent nucleus is attached to the second last morpheme (for example: *nihon dai*ˀ*gaku*, *uchi de*ˀ*wa*). (b) Writing from left to right (for example 川).

(2) With regard to standard rules, (a) words including *ken*, *gun*, *shi*, *machi* (prefecture, county, city, town) have the accent attached in accordance with the strategy of "second-last morpheme" (for instance: *Akita*ˀ*shi*) and (b) the stroke order for 皮 is in accordance with the strategy "from left to right".

(3) With regard to individual rules, (a) the pitch accent of words including *mura* (village) is flat (for example *Kodachimura*) and (b) in the case of 方 the right stroke is written first with regard to the last two strokes.

It goes without saying that, in many cases, these three categories cannot be clearly divided and one has to conceive them as a continuous scale rather than as three independent categories. Being on a continuous scale, the question of in what combinations language learners acquire general strategies, standard rules and individual rules is crucial. This is a significant theoretical issue which calls for empirical research with concrete data from contact situations. While Yoshimitsu and Kubota do not provide for solutions to the extent that they describe combination patterns, they nonetheless present conclusions relating to separate detailed acquisition, and, at the same time, provide a contribution towards this end.

In Masumi's contribution, the object of research has been the classroom situation as one particular category of contact situation. The behaviour of foreign language learners in classroom situations, that is, behaviour in accordance with fixed teaching methods, can basically be considered as one type of correction behaviour. In other words, language teaching can be regarded as *correction rules* that systematically provide speakers who do not know the language with methods of managing communication problems.

So what exactly are the correction behaviours which *in fact* occur in the classroom? While various kinds of correction processes can be distinguished within language teaching theory, for example, in accordance with the grammar-translation method or the audio-lingual method, it is unclear what the main reason for choosing such a variety of a correction process is. The question of which teaching method should be applied in the classroom is of course the ultimate issue. Nonetheless, I would argue that it is at times important to leave aside the viewpoint "how it should be" and to look descriptively at "how it is". In this context, Masumi's paper is instructive.

The concept of "contact situation" and its significance for various concrete research tasks has been described above. Although this concept is not merely for the purpose of language teaching, it has been pointed out that it is an indispensable tool for language teaching. Without doubt, the more the various problems in contact situations are studied, the more JFL will profit thereby.

5. Analysis of contact situations and JFL

To conclude, let us attempt to draw some general conclusions from the five papers in the special issue of *Nihongo kyōiku* 45.

(1) The acquisition of Japanese is not merely a result of classroom education.

As the data collected by Ozaki and Kubota make clear, foreign language learners acquire to a considerable extent rules of Japanese not taught or emphasized in the classroom. Since, however, the acquisition of rules is deficient in some of these cases, some kind of countermeasure in the process of Japanese language education might be desirable. Furthermore, the issue of which elements of Japanese are omitted from the language courses, and under what circumstances, is one that can only be resolved by analysing a large amount of data from contact situations.

(2) Rule acquisition is unbalanced, except for a few learners; some acquire more general strategies, while others learn more standard or individual rules.

As evidenced by the research results of Ozaki, Yoshimitsu and Kubota, Japanese language learners acquire many language rules. Nevertheless, they acquire only parts of individual rules (the accent pattern of individual words, stroke order of Chinese characters), standard rules and general strategies. Therefore, I believe, it is essential to compensate imbalances in the process of language education.

(3) A reconsideration of guidance in language learning on how diverse correction rules could render Japanese conversations more conversation-like is crucial.

Through Ozaki's research results we recognize that some advanced language learners acquired a considerable proportion of the correction rules necessary for advancing conversations smoothly. Since these are acquired incompletely, I suggest that the necessity of making corrections, in particular, the case of self-correction rules, should be a goal of JFL.

(4) It is essential to reconsider the role of native speakers as language models in contact situations.

The existence of Japanese foreigner talk has been demonstrated by Skoutarides' research. In the future, it might be necessary to further clarify the status of teacher talk by Japanese language teachers in the classroom. If the existence of foreigner talk and teacher talk is recognized, we can anticipate the emergence of various problems concerning the role of the native speaker as a language model in contact situations. Once we have insights into the factors which influence the

emergence of foreigner talk, then native speakers as well as foreign speakers can use these insights in order to advance conversations smoothly.

(5) Because the methodology of teaching Japanese is frequently based on certain attitudes acquired unconsciously by language teachers, it is not easy to change this methodology merely on the basis of language textbooks and exercise selection.

This, to sum up, is the conclusion of Masumi's paper. Speakers, even those not formally trained in language teaching, have fixed attitudes towards the practice of language teaching. This "system", which might be called "folk language teaching methods", can be altered to a certain extent through language education training at university or similar institutions. Nevertheless, if one accepts the general validity of Masumi's conclusions, an unexpectedly firm perception of teacher behaviour and basic attitudes remains, even in cases of fairly long-term (one year) and intensive training. Clarifying the origins of these "folk language teaching methods" is yet another important task of future research.

I believe that the more clearly it is recognized that problem analysis in contact situations should serve as a starting point in JFL in future, the more JFL can avoid its present state of arbitrariness and voluntarism, and the more it can be based on a rigorous empirical basis.

6. Postscript (Patrick Heinrich)

Many of the points Neustupný raised in this seminal paper have been explored in numerous papers and monographs since the original publication of this paper in 1995. Contact situation (*sesshoku bamen*) is today a well-established concept in JFL studies in Japan and in Australia, the two countries where Neustupný has mainly taught. The best overview on the impact that the concept of contact situation had in JFL is Neustupný's *Festschrift* on the occasion of his 70th birthday (Miyazaki and Marriot 2003). It includes papers on the theoretical developments and concrete applications of the concept of contact situation and explorations of the diversity of contact situations, as well as studies on language management in the classroom. The research methods introduced here are further developed in Neustupný and Miyazaki (2002). The special issue on "Language Problems of Japan" of the *Japanese Journal of Language in Society* edited by Neustupný (1999) is informative with regard to the breadth, influence and visions of Neustupný's research. Both established and young researchers draw on Neustupný's concept of contact situation

today, such as, to only name a few, Fairbrother (2000), Fan (1992, 1999, 2006), Kō (2003), Kubota (2000), Muraoka (1999, 2000, 2006) and Marriott (1993, 2000). In other words, language management in contact situations has grown into an essential field of JFL, and one that scholars such as those mentioned above continue to explore and develop.

References

Fairbrother, Lisa (2000): Analysis of Intercultural Interaction Management within a Party Situation. In: *Japanese Journal of Language in Society* 2, 2, pp. 33–42.

Fan, Sau Kuen (1992): Language Management in Contact Situations between Japanese and Chinese. Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis. Monash University.

—— (1999): Hibogo washa dōshi no nihongo kaiwa ni okeru gengo mondai [Language Problems in Conversations between Non-Native Speakers]. In: *Shakai gengo kagaku* [Japanese Journal of Language in Society] 2, 1, pp. 37–48.

—— (2006): Sesshoku bamen no taiporojī to sesshoku bamen kenkyū no kadai [A Typology of Contact Situations and Issues for the Study of Contact Situations]. In: Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyūjo [National Institute for Japanese Language] (eds.): *Nihongo kyōiku no aratana bunmyaku* [A New Context for Teaching Japanese as Foreign Language]. Tokyo: ALC, pp. 120–141.

Ferguson, Charles (1971): Absence of Copula and the Notion of Simplicity. A Study of Normal Speech, Baby Talk, Foreigner Talk, and Pidgins. In: Dell Hymes (ed.): *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages. Proceedings of a Conference Held at the University of the West Indies. Mona, Jamaica* (April 1968). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 141–150.

Kō, Minjeong (2003): Sesshoku bamen ni okeru kategorī-ka to kenryoku [Categorization and Power in Contact Situations]. In: Satoshi Miyazaki and Helen Marriott (eds.): *Sesshoku bamen to nihongo kyōiku: Neusutopunī no inpakuto* [Contact Situations and Teaching JFL: The Impact of Neustupný]. Tokyo: Meiji shoin, pp. 59–68.

Kubota, Mariko (1981): Monashu daigakusei no hitsujun [Stroke Order among Monash University Students]. In: *Nihongo kyōiku* [Journal of Japanese Language Teaching] 45, pp. 75–88.

—— (2000): Do Students Learn Differently and Does it Matter? In: Vera Mackie, Alina Skoutarides and Alison Tokita (eds.): *Japanese Studies: Communities, Cultures, Critiques*. Vol. IV. Clayton: Monash Asia Institute.

Marriott, Helen (1993): Interlanguage/Interculture in Australian-Japanese Business Communication. In: *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese* 27, 2, pp. 33–65.

—— (2000): Japanese Students' Management Processes and their Acquisition of English Academic Competence during Study Abroad. In: *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 10, 2, pp. 270–296.

Masumi, Hiromi (1981): Nihongo kyōjuhō no jittai: Meruborun chiiki no chū-kōtōgakkō no baai [Assessment of the Teaching Methods of Japanese: the Case of Middle and High Schools in the Melbourne Area]. In: *Nihongo kyōiku* [Journal of Japanese Language Teaching] 45, pp. 89–106.

Miyazaki, Satoshi and Helen Marriott (eds.) (2003): *Sesshoku bamen to nihongo kyōiku: Neusutopunī no inpakuto* [Contact Situation and JFL: The Impact of Neustupný]. Tokyo: Meiji shoin.

Muraoka, Hidehiro (1999): *Nihongo kyōshi no hōhōron: kyōshitsu danwa no bunseki to kyōju sutoratejī* [Methodologies of Japanese Language Teachers: Classroom Conversation Analysis and Teaching Strategies]. Tokyo: Heibonsha.

—— (ed.) (2000): *Sesshoku bamen no gengo kanri* [Research on Language Management in Contact Situations]. Chiba: Chiba University.

—— (ed.) (2006): *Tabunka kyōsei shakai ni okeru gengo kanri* [Language Management in a Multicultural Society]. Chiba: Chiba University.

Neustupný, Jiří V. (1995): *Atarashii nihongo no tame ni* [Towards New Perspectives in Japanese Language Teaching]. Tokyo: Taishūkan shoten.

Neustupný, Jiří V. (ed.) (1999): *Shakai gengo kagaku* [Japanese Journal of Language in Society] 2, 1 (Tokushū: Nihon no gengo mondai [Special Issue: Language Problems of Japan]).

Neustupný, Jiří V. and Satoshi Miyazaki (eds.) (2002): *Gengo kyōiku no hōhō* [Methods of Language Education]. Tokyo: Kuroshio.

Ozaki, Akito (1981): Jōkyū nihongo gakushūsha no dentatsu nōryoku ni tsuite [On the Communicative Proficiency of Advanced Learners of Japanese]. In: *Nihongo kyōiku* [Journal of Japanese Language Teaching] 45, pp. 41–52.

Skoutarides, Alina (1981): Nihongo ni okeru forinā tōku [Foreigner Talk in Japanese]. In: *Nihongo kyōiku* [Journal of Japanese Language Teaching] 45, pp. 53–62.

Yoshimitsu, Kuniko (1981): Gaikokujin gakushūsha no akusento [Accent in Foreign Language Learners]. In: *Nihongo kyōiku* [Journal of Japanese Language Teaching] 45, pp. 63–74.