

Foreign Women Living in Japan: a Survey

Part 2

Language and Communication

Cyndee Seton

要 約

日本に居住する外国人女性についての調査——その2—— 言語とコミュニケーション

Cyndee Seton

今回の調査の目的は、日本に居住する外国人女性を回答者として、彼女たちの日本語の言語能力とコミュニケーション能力を調査することにある。回答者の年齢、教育背景、結婚歴、職業、日本に来た動機、目的、日本での居住地、日本に存住している年数、日本にどのくらい在住する予定か、日本へ来る前にあるいは現在日本で、日本語のレッスンを受けているかどうかなど9つの場合を考慮して、彼女たちの言語能力の調査結果を考察する。次に、日本語の達者な回答者数名と日本語を話せない回答者数名のプロフィールを比較する。又、上記9つの状況における回答者たちのコミュニケーション能力の自己評価の結果も検討する。

Part 2 : Language and Communication

Introduction

To live or work successfully in a foreign country may require skills in the language of the country, depending on the country and the job. Learning a foreign language is never easy; it requires much effort. Communicating in a foreign language also requires effort. People may learn a new language in the formal context of a classroom or in the informal context in the country in which the language is used.

Much research has been done in the field of language acquisition. Researchers have made hypotheses and theories, constructed models and investigated numerous factors predicting success in learning and gaining proficiency in a foreign or second language. These involve a broad range of factors including societal, cultural, psychological and interpersonal issues which influence attitudes towards languages and their users, as well as motivation to learn languages.

Aims

The aims of this part of the survey are to investigate the Japanese language and communication ability of the respondents who are foreign women living in Japan. I will view their reported language ability in relation to the respondents' age, educational background, marital status, work status, purpose in coming to Japan, place they live in Japan, length of time living in Japan, length of time they expect to stay in Japan, language lessons taken prior to and in Japan. I will compare a profile of the fluent Japanese speakers with that of non-speakers and will also see if there is any relationship between their proficiency or non-proficiency and their image of Japanese people.

Method

The Survey. The questionnaire was in English. It was divided into the following eight parts: Japanese language, Characteristics of the Japanese, Discrimination, Sexual harassment, Changes in behavior, Life-style differences, Other time spent overseas, and Personal Information.

Population. The population chosen for the survey was subject to the availability of various registers of names. I used registers of teachers in the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) program, of parents and teachers at a large international school in Kobe, of members of a social club for foreign residents in Kobe, of some members of Foreign Executive Women's Club of Osaka (FEW), and sent some questionnaires to personal friends who teach at universities in the Kansai area of western Japan.

A total of 1,250 questionnaires were mailed between April and June, 1994. By October of the same year, 584, or 46.7% of the questionnaires had been returned.

In the section entitled "Japanese Language", respondents were asked to check the appropriate boxes in response to questions. There were three types of questions: the

first asked about knowledge of Japanese prior to coming to Japan and lessons taken in Japan, the second asked them to rate their Japanese language abilities in speaking, understanding, reading and writing, the third asked them to indicate how often they could communicate enough for their needs in nine different situations. There were five levels of language ability: fluently or very well, well, so-so, a little, not at all. There were 4 frequencies for communicating their needs: always, usually, sometimes, seldom. (See Appendix A)

On their job applications, international and some national companies and schools often have a language section on which prospective employees are asked to list the languages they speak, understand, read, and write. Some ask for more detailed information on the level of ability in each section. Language ability might come up in conversation in such examples as: "Oh, you live in Japan. How well do you speak Japanese?" or "You've lived in Japan for five years, you must be fluent in Japanese." or asked by a newcomer, "You speak the lingo?" or a comment by a Japanese taxi driver, "You speak Japanese well." These companies and people making comments are not giving a person a test in the spoken or written language; they only want an overall picture of one's ability. They might be referring to language ability or communicative ability in a certain context.

The nine situations for communicating needs included using public transportation, going shopping, eating out, staying at a hotel, taking a non-language class, going to a health professional, doing business at a bank or post office, taking a message on the telephone and doing their job.

Foreign language, second language and communication

Foreign language teaching curricula are often designed with various goals in mind. There is the old distinction between foreign language and second language. A foreign language is one which is not used in the country of instruction for everyday interaction. It is often taught in an isolated classroom, with emphasis on grammar, and reading the literature in that language is one of the goals. The grammar-translation method was often used for this sort of teaching. The civilization of the country where the language is spoken may be covered in respect to learning about the history, geography, art, famous writers, in short, the "high culture" of the country. Students might be able to read poetry in the foreign language, but not be able to order a meal in a restaurant in that country. A second language is one which students need to use everyday, either because they are living in a country which uses that language (immigrants, people working overseas) or in their own country to communicate with other ethnic and language groups (Singapore). The emphasis is often on using the language in everyday activities, to get the things one needs, to get things done. The students are surrounded by the language outside the classroom or soon will be, in the case of preparing people to go overseas. Speaking is more important than reading or writing. The audio-lingual method was often used for this sort of teaching. The everyday culture, or "low culture", dominates the topics in class. Nowadays, more communicative teaching has become the norm and so the

boundaries between these two types have become somewhat blurred.

However, there is still a distinction to be made between foreign language learning and second language acquisition. Preston writes that Krashen's monitor model (1981) "states that a language is acquired (by use, in natural settings, unconsciously) and learned (in classrooms, through the study of grammar, consciously)." (241) Much of the research on foreign language learning was concerned with language learning aptitude and investigated various other factors which might predict success in the learning and mastery of a foreign language. These studies were often done in a tightly-controlled laboratory or classroom setting. Since it takes some time to master a foreign language, sustained effort is important so many motivation studies were done.

Lambert (1963) used the labels integrative and instrumental motivation connected to language learning. Integrative motivation lies at a deeper level and includes "a general interest in language study, attitude towards the teacher, attitudes toward the native culture and the foreign culture" while instrumental motivation includes using the foreign language to deal with everyday life in a foreign country, transact routine business in the language, or for professional reasons such as reading a paper in one's field in a foreign language. (Stevick 48)

Later, Gardner and Lambert (1972) developed their social-psychological model which focuses on the affective factors of attitude and motivation in language learning. They wrote:

A social psychologist would expect that success in mastering a foreign language would depend not only on intellectual capacity and language ability but also on the learner's perceptions of the other ethnolinguistic group involved, his attitudes towards representatives of that group, and his willingness to identify enough to adopt distinctive aspects of behavior, linguistic and nonlinguistic, that characterize that other group. (132)

Gardner did much statistical work which suggested that integrative motivation highly influenced one's success in a foreign language. Many other researchers used these terms in writing about language learning. The terms have been used in slightly different ways so it is sometimes difficult to decide if a motivation is instrumental or integrative.

Gardner (1985) stated that "motivation to learn a second language is influenced by group related and context related attitudes, integrativeness and attitudes towards the learning situation, respectively." (168) Attitude is linked to a person's values and beliefs and encourages or discourages choices made in all spheres of activity, academic and informal. Attitude influences motivation. Motivation is the combination of desire and effort made to achieve a goal. (168) In their article, "An Instrumental Motivation—who says it isn't effective?" Gardner and MacIntyre (1991) suggest that for adults in a second language situation (i. e. not a classroom) instrumental motivation can be strong. In the same article, they also made the distinction between orientations, which refer to reasons for studying a second language, and motivation, which refers to the "directed reinforcing effort to learn the language". (Brown and Gonzo 207) This distinction does not seem very clear to me.

Lalonde (1982) commenting on Gardner's model said that motivation was "found to

be an indirect cause of achievement. Motivation affected self-confidence, with self-confidence directly affecting achievement." (in Baker, 41)

Other researchers have suggested that the type of motivation does not make much difference; Spolsky says there are many possible bases for motivation. He wrote, "A language may be learned for any one or a collection of practical reasons. The importance of these reasons to the learner will determine what degree of effort he or she will make, what cost he or she will pay for the learning." (1989: 160) Oller, Hudson, and Liu have said that there was only 5% variance found in achievement due to integrative motivation. (1977: 35) Gardner and Lambert also wondered "if part of the favorable attitude might only be a tendency to appear democratic and fair toward minority groups." (1972: 139) Baker thinks that "integrative motivation may be directed at friendships, sociability or gregariousness" without being focused on language learning. (1992: 34) Gardner et al. (1976) wrote that motivational variables "determine whether or not the student avails himself of... informal language contexts." (200) Even if the "right" kind of motivation is present, learners may not take advantage of interacting with members of the target language group or, if they do, may use their native language and focus on friendship or other aspects, rather than language.

Schumann views second language acquisition as an acculturation process. Second language acquisition "is just one aspect of acculturation and the degree to which a learner acculturates to the TL (target language) group will control the degree to which he acquires a second language." (1978: 34) He says that language acquisition may be blocked at the level of the individual learner and at the level of the two speech communities. The first or second language community may block learning in various ways: the second language community may offer or have no reasonable assimilation opportunities, may be so bounded in group membership requirements that access seems impossible, or may have strong negative attitudes towards the other community. On the individual level, culture shock may impede language acquisition. (80)

Schumann thinks that peer group influences are the principal input of language behavior. Although one usually associates peer group pressure with adolescents, Chambers and Trudgill remind us:

Adults are not freed from the sorts of socially conservative factors which restrain adolescents. They trade in their peer group oriented behavior for the standard language, and they are no less threatened by failure in the work place, in social and economic advancement, and in presentation of self.... In short, both groups have a solid front to put up against new or different language behavior. (59)

Today many of the methods and curricula for second language learning focus on the learner. The term second language acquisition was used to mean learning a language in an immersion context or in a second language context, informally in the country where the language is used. There are domains for language use and roles that speakers play when they use language. These are important when designing a language teaching program for second language use. Two types of curricula take second language context into consideration: programs preparing people to work or travel overseas (Peace Corps or

U. S. Foreign Service Institute programs preparing diplomats) and English for Special Purposes (as in the hotel industry, aviation industry for air controllers). These programs place emphasis on communicative skills (speech). The goal, according to Krashen, is to make "the meaning clear but not necessarily to be accurate in all details of grammar. They need not know every word in a particular semantic domain." (1983: 71) J. van Ek gives a specification of "the minimal 'general' communicative ability which will allow learners to maintain themselves in most everyday situations including situations for which they have not been specifically trained." (Trim: in Stevens, 108)

In these programs, there are varying levels of competence: survival, basic, general, advanced and professional, as in Wilkins' notional-functional approach to syllabus design. (Szmanski 75) Maslow's needs hierarchy, pyramid style, starts with a wide bottom and proceeds to a point at the top. These needs are physiological necessities (air, food, water), security (shelter, stability, protection, freedom from fear and chaos), belonging (sense of identity in a group), esteem (from self, from others, a feeling of strength), a realization of one's own unique capabilities (to achieve goals related to purposes, to see life making sense and to be satisfying) and finally self-actualization. (Stevick 49) He suggests basic needs must be accomplished before one can go on to a higher level.

In *The Natural Approach*, Krashen gives a list of situations, functions, and topics in which learners need to develop basic personal communication skills. These will most likely be useful to beginning students of a second language. The situations he gives are the following:

- I. Greetings, classroom commands
- II. Playing games, sports
- III. Introductions, meeting people
- IV. Talking on the job
- V. Looking for a place to live, moving
- VI. Friends, recounting experiences
- VII. Visits to doctors, hospitals, health interviews
- VIII. Ordering a meal in a restaurant, shopping in a supermarket
- IX. Buying tickets, making reservations, exchanging money, obtaining lodging
- X. Selling and buying, shopping
- XI. Finding locations, making an appointment
- XII. Discussing a recent movie, etc. (67-70)

What then is proficiency or success in a second language, used in an informal environment? In "The pleasure hypothesis", Krashen states:

... studies in second language acquisition in the informal environment show that the longer length of residence in the country where the target language is spoken results in more proficiency as long as the acquirer is competent enough in the language to understand some of the input and has a chance to get input, e. g. to interact with speakers of the language. (1994: 299)

Krashen in 1991 also suggested that language acquisition in the informal environment follows an S-shaped curve, with little progress at the beginning and a flattening out

of growth at advanced levels. (1994: 299)

Because motivations for learning may be diverse, such as the learner wanting to assume the role of tourist, or some other role, Krashen wonders if “success in fulfilling these roles should suggest the standards for determining a learner’s success.” (in Patten and Lee, 11)

In order to measure respondents’ communication ability in my survey, I asked them to chose frequencies such as always, usually, sometimes and seldom in various situations. These situations were similar to Krashen’s list, Maslow’s hierarchy, and most curricula for survival in basic language courses. If the respondents could fulfill their needs in these situations, with relatively little stress or frustration, I feel they have communicated enough. If they feel they can go to a restaurant and usually get a meal to their liking, then I think they will feel satisfied. If, on the other hand, they can seldom get what they want, then this will lead to frustration and may block them from going out, learning the language, or having contact with Japanese. It will also add to the stresses already experienced by living in a foreign environment.

Results

Below are the results in terms of percentages of the responses about Japanese language ability in four areas, with the mean on the right. Fluently=5, well=4, so-so=3, a little=2, not at all=1.

Table 1
Japanese language ability

	<u>fluently</u>	<u>well</u>	<u>so-so</u>	<u>a little</u>	<u>not at all</u>	<u>mean</u> (top=5)
speak	3%	18%	36%	41%	2%	2.7
understand	5	26	41	27	1	3.0
read	0.6	8	25	52	14.4	2.2
write	0.3	6.7	24	49	20	2.1

Speaking and understanding skills are usually easier than reading and writing skills in a language. Japanese presents more difficulty with its three writing systems. What exactly did respondents think when they saw the English word write? Did they think kanji or hiragana and katakana? What did they mean when they checked a certain reading or writing skill? I do not know. I did not specify which writing system they knew. In real life, the job application forms do not break down reading and writing for a specific language, such as Japanese.

Respondents reported themselves better at speaking and understanding than at reading and writing. Most people understand more than they can say in a foreign language. The charts bear this out, too.

There are very low percentages at the fluent and not-at-all stage with regards to speaking and understanding. The not-at-all writers are much higher. It must be a strange feeling for a university educated person to be illiterate in daily life in Japan.

Tables 2–21 come in pairs. In the tables on the left are the percentages of responses within a certain grouping. In the tables on the right are the means for the four skills broken down according to the same grouping. This is an attempt to see what differences may appear connecting the respondents' reported language ability and other factors.

Table 2
Age

20–29	76%
30–39	12
40–49	9
50–59	3
60+	0

Table 3
Age and language

	<u>speak</u>	<u>understand</u>	<u>read</u>	<u>write</u>
20's	2.8	3.1	2.3	2.2
30's	2.7	2.8	2.1	2.1
40+	2.3	2.3	1.9	1.7

Age may be a factor influencing language learning; the very young learn at incredible speeds; however, these respondents were adults. People in their twenties seem to do better than those in their forties but the percentage of people over forty is small.

Table 4
Educational Background

high school	2%
university	87
graduate school	11

Table 5
Educational background and language

	<u>speak</u>	<u>understand</u>	<u>read</u>	<u>write</u>
high school	2.5	2.6	1.7	1.9
university	2.8	3.7	2.3	2.2
grad. school	2.8	3.0	2.2	2.0

University graduates reported themselves much better at understanding than high school graduates, but again there were few high school graduates who responded to the survey. People who finished university and graduate school did slightly better at speaking.

Table 6
Marital status

single	75.0%
divorced	0.5
married	24.5

Table 7
Marital status and language

	<u>speak</u>	<u>understand</u>	<u>read</u>	<u>write</u>
single/ divorced	2.8	3.1	2.3	2.2
married	2.6	2.8	2.0	1.9

There were so few divorced respondents that I put them together with the single ones. Married women did very slightly worse in the four skills.

Table 8
Work status

full-time work	84.0%
part-time work	5.0
mother	7.5
homemaker	2.5
student	0.5
retired	0.5

Table 9
Work status and language

	<u>speak</u>	<u>understand</u>	<u>read</u>	<u>write</u>
working	2.8	3.1	2.3	2.2
not working	2.4	2.6	1.9	1.8

Most of the people were working part or full time. By mother, I mean a non-working woman with children in Japan under eighteen years of age. A homemaker is a non-working woman whose children are older than eighteen or not in Japan, or someone without children. Working women did slightly better than non-working women perhaps because they have more contact with Japanese through their jobs.

Table 10
Purpose in coming to Japan

work	73%
with husband	13
culture	12
language	11
experience	6
money	2
adventure	1

Table 11
Purpose in coming to Japan and language

	<u>speak</u>	<u>understand</u>	<u>read</u>	<u>write</u>
language	3.2	3.6	2.8	2.7
culture	2.8	3.1	2.3	2.1
work	2.8	3.1	2.3	2.2
experience	2.7	2.9	2.4	2.2
adventure	3.1	2.6	2.0	1.8
money	2.5	2.6	1.7	1.7
husband	2.4	2.5	1.8	1.7

The percentages on Table 10 add up to 118% because some respondents wrote in more than one purpose.

At the heart of this is the question of integrative and instrumental motivation. It is very difficult to make a neat dichotomy. Coming to Japan seems to be integrative but coming to Japan for work, money, or to accompany one's husband is also instrumental. Some did write several purposes such as work and culture or work and language. This supports earlier statements about multiple motivations.

Those who came for language reasons (to practice it, use it, learn it better) did better than those who came for other reasons. The lowest were those who came for money or to accompany their husbands. Culture and work are about equal. The ones who came for adventure are a very small percentage of the whole and either happened to be good at language learning or the same spirit that moves them towards this sort of adventure, and not sky-diving for example, would also move them to communicate with people and learn their language.

Table 12
Place they live

city	57.5%
town	28.0
country	14.5

Table 13
Place they live and language

	<u>speak</u>	<u>understand</u>	<u>read</u>	<u>write</u>
city	2.8	3.0	2.2	2.1
town	2.7	3.0	2.3	2.2
country	2.7	3.0	2.2	2.1

Whether the respondents were living in the city, a town, or in the country seems to make no difference at all to their reported language ability in Japanese. The means are remarkably similar.

Table 14
Length of time in Japan

under 6 mo.	1%
6 mo-1 yr.	42
1-2 yr.	36
3-5 yr.	12
6-10 yr.	5
11-20 yr.	2
20+ yr.	2

Table 15
Length of time in Japan and language

	<u>speak</u>	<u>understand</u>	<u>read</u>	<u>write</u>
under 6 mo.	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
6 mo.-1 yr.	2.5	2.8	2.2	2.1
1-2 yr.	2.8	3.1	2.3	2.2
3-5 yr.	3.0	3.3	2.4	2.4
6-10 yr.	2.9	3.1	2.2	2.0
11-20 yr.	3.3	3.5	2.2	2.1
20+ yr.	3.4	3.4	2.4	2.1

The percentage of respondents who have lived in Japan over five years is rather small. The results seem to bear Krashen out; the longer one lives in a second language situation, the better one seems to get. This is not necessarily true in writing, though, with regards to respondents living in Japan for longer than 5 years.

Table 16
Time expected to stay

1-2 yr.	52%
3-5 yr.	30
6-10 yr.	5
11-20 yr.	2
indefinitely	10
forever	1

Table 17
Time expected to stay and language

	<u>speak</u>	<u>understand</u>	<u>read</u>	<u>write</u>
1-2 yr.	2.6	2.9	2.2	2.1
3-5 yr.	2.8	3.1	2.3	2.2
6-10 yr.	2.8	3.1	2.2	1.9
11-20 yr.	3.4	3.7	2.7	2.5
indefinitely	3.0	3.2	2.3	2.5
forever	2.4	3.3	2.0	1.8

The percentage of respondents who will be staying in Japan forever is very, very small. Respondents who expected to stay longer seem to do slightly better. Those who are here indefinitely are higher than the overall mean. Which is it—they are prepared to stay because they know the language and are comfortable here or they learn the language because they know their sojourn is indefinite? It is circular.

Table 18
Prior knowledge of Japanese

yes	41%
no	59

Table 19
Prior knowledge of Japanese and language

	<u>speak</u>	<u>understand</u>	<u>read</u>	<u>write</u>
yes	3.2	3.5	2.7	2.6
no	2.4	2.7	1.9	1.8

Respondents who responded that they had prior knowledge of Japanese, even if only a few words, rated themselves rather higher in all the skills. This may show integrative motivation.

Table 20
Lessons taken in Japan

yes	73%
no	27

Table 21
Lessons taken in Japan and language

	<u>speak</u>	<u>understand</u>	<u>read</u>	<u>write</u>
yes	2.8	3.1	2.3	2.2
no	2.6	2.9	2.1	2.0

A fairly large percentage of respondents have taken language lessons of one sort or another and yet there is not much difference between the two groups.

There were only 19 respondents who reported that they were fluent speakers and only 12 who reported themselves as speaking Japanese not at all. I was curious about these two groups. Table 22 is a profile of these fluent (F) speakers and non-speakers (N).

Table 22
Profile of fluent speakers (F) and non-speakers (N)

	<u>F</u>	<u>N</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>N</u>
<u>age</u>			<u>length of time in Japan</u>		
20's	18	4	6 mo-1 yr.	5	3
30's	1	2	1-2 yr.	8	2
40+	0	6	3-5 yr.	4	4
<u>education</u>			6-10 yr.	1	2
high school	1	1	11-20 yr.	1	1
university	15	9	<u>expected length of stay</u>		
graduate school	3	2	1-2 yr.	6	2
<u>marital status</u>			3-5 yr.	7	3
single	19	3	6-10 yr.	1	2
married	0	9	11-20 yr.	1	1
<u>work status</u>			indefinitely	4	4
full-time	18	6	<u>prior Japanese</u>		
part-time	0	3	yes	18	0
mother	0	3	no	1	12
student	1	0	<u>lessons in Japan</u>		
<u>purpose in coming</u>			yes	16	3
work	16	5	no	3	9
language	5	0			
culture	2	0			
money	1	0			
husband	0	6			
no reason given	0	1			

What can be said about these extremely small groups from looking at Table 22? The fluent speakers are younger in age, being mostly in their twenties. Might this reflect more interest in Japan than twenty years ago, or more easily available Japanese classes overseas today? The fluent speakers are all single. All but one of the fluent speakers work full-time and the other is a student, giving them more daily contact with a variety of people. Three mothers said not at all. Thirteen of the fluent speakers gave work as their only purpose in coming to Japan while three of them said work and something else.

One of the fluent speakers said money. None of the non-speakers came for language or cultural reasons. They came to work or to accompany their husbands who work in Japan. Might work be a euphemism for money? The fluent speakers had prior knowledge of Japanese before they came to Japan and continued to take lessons in Japan. The non-speakers had no lessons prior to Japan and only three had taken any lessons in Japan.

There were no big differences in educational background, length of time spent in Japan, nor length of time they expected to stay in Japan. Both groups were spread out in these categories.

I was also curious about the characteristics of the Japanese people that both these groups checked. I wondered how they differed from the whole group and also how they differed from each other. Because both groups were miniscule, one or two people could make a large difference in the percentage of the group and it would not do to compare a group of 584 with ones of 19 and 12. Actually, the group of fluent speakers was reduced to 15 because four of the respondents refused to fill in the section of the questionnaire, Characteristics of the Japanese, saying they did not want to stereotype anyone. Still I wanted to see if there were any wide discrepancies between the two groups. (See Appendix B) There were a few. There was a 59% difference for humble, a 33% difference for diligent, a 30% difference for shy, a 26% difference for busy and a 18% difference for kind with the percentage of fluent speakers higher. 50% more of the non-speakers checked insecure, 22% checked arrogant, and 17% checked suspicious more often than the fluent speakers. The adjectives checked by a higher percentage of the fluent speakers are generally more complimentary while those checked by a higher percentage of the non-speakers are generally less complimentary. The large difference for humble may be accounted for by the fact that the fluent speakers can understand more Japanese and have more opportunity to hear and identify Japanese speakers' various uses and types of keigo or polite forms of language.

In the final part of this paper, I wish to look at the responses to the frequencies in the different communication situations. Always=4, usually=3, sometimes=2, seldom=1.

Table 23
Communication situations

	<u>always</u>	<u>usually</u>	<u>sometimes</u>	<u>seldom</u>	<u>mean</u> (top=4)
transportation	40%	53%	7%	0%	3.3
shopping	34	54	12	0	3.2
eating out	35	53	12	0	3.2
hotel	30	52	14	4	3.0
class	11	50	30	9	2.6
doctor	6	40	38	16	2.3
post office	18	60	20	2	2.9
phone message	6	43	34	17	2.3
job	19	62	17	2	2.9

What can be seen here is that most of the respondents feel they can communicate enough to get what they need in the situations. They can use public transportation, go shopping for food and household items, eat out in restaurants, stay at a hotel, transact business at a bank or a post office and do their job. Some added that their job was teaching English so they did not need Japanese for that. The areas where they are less likely to feel confident is at the doctor's, dentist's, or at a hospital and when taking telephone messages. Basically, they do feel they can communicate enough to usually satisfy their basic needs.

In conclusion, I have looked at the self-reported Japanese language ability and communication ability of the respondents. I have checked the four skills of speaking, understanding the spoken language, reading and writing in relation to the factors of age, educational background, marital status, work status, purpose in coming to Japan, place they live, length of time in Japan, the length of time they expect to stay in Japan, knowledge of any Japanese language prior to their coming to Japan, and language lessons taken in Japan. I have found that length of time in Japan and prior knowledge of Japanese seem to influence the respondents' reported abilities in Japanese.

I have also done a profile of the very few fluent speakers and non-speakers in the survey and tried to see if there were any big differences in their choice of adjectives to describe the Japanese in another section of the survey. It is difficult to make any judgments because the numbers were so very small.

In looking at the ability to communicate enough to fulfill their most basic needs, I might say that the respondents seem to feel they can usually communicate enough to satisfy their basic needs. This, in turn, will increase their self-confidence and perhaps aid motivation and will also help reduce the stresses connected with living in a culture that is not their own.

Appendix A

Questionnaire

Japanese Language

1. Did you know any Japanese before you arrived? Yes () No ()
2. Have you ever taken Japanese language lessons in Japan? Yes () No ()
3. Do you speak Japanese. . .
fluently () well () so-so () a little () not at all ()
4. Do you understand spoken Japanese. . .
very well () well () so-so () a little () not at all ()
5. Do you read Japanese. . .
very well () well () so-so () a little () not at all ()
6. Do you write Japanese. . .
very well () well () so-so () a little () not at all ()
7. Can you communicate enough for your needs when. . .
 - a. taking public transportation (trains, buses, subways)
always () usually () sometimes () seldom ()
 - b. going shopping (food, clothes, household goods)
always () usually () sometimes () seldom ()
 - c. eating out
always () usually () sometimes () seldom ()
 - d. staying at a hotel or an inn
always () usually () sometimes () seldom ()
 - e. taking a class (not a language class, but art, aerobics, etc.)
always () usually () sometimes () seldom ()
 - f. going to a doctor, dentist, or a hospital
always () usually () sometimes () seldom ()
 - g. doing business at a post office or a bank
always () usually () sometimes () seldom ()
 - h. taking messages on the telephone
always () usually () sometimes () seldom ()
 - i. doing your job, if you work
always () usually () sometimes () seldom ()

Appendix B

Characteristics of the Japanese according to all the respondents (A), the fluent speakers (F) and non-speakers (N) in percentages of each group

	A	F	N		A	F	N
reserved	78%	87%	92%	strict	20%	33%	17%
proper, formal	74	73	58	arrogant	17	20	42
conservative	66	67	58	insincere	12	7	0
polite	66	67	67	rational	12	7	8
punctual	65	60	58	matter-of-fact	12	13	0
narrow	58	67	67	suspicious	10	0	17
shy	58	80	50	idealistic	8	20	8
kind	53	60	42	intuitive	6	13	0
diligent	52	67	34	unfriendly	5	0	8
friendly	49	40	34	impatient	5	13	8
harmonious	48	33	25	jealous	5	13	8
busy	45	60	34	rich	5	0	0
persevering	44	33	34	unsociable	5	7	0
quiet	40	40	34	cunning	4	0	0
thin	36	27	17	negative	3	7	8
nervous	36	40	50	cruel	3	0	8
humble	33	67	8	original	3	0	0
imitative	33	20	17	open	3	0	0
short	32	27	42	earthy	3	0	0
insecure	32	27	67	free	1	0	0
cheerful	29	20	8	stingy	1	0	0
intelligent	21	13	8	vengeful	1	0	0
calm	21	33	17				

A = 584, F = 15, N = 12

Works Cited

- Ager, Dennis, George Muskens & Sue Wright, eds. *Language Education for Intercultural Communication*. Clevedon, Eng.: Multilingual Matters, 1993.
- Alatis, James E., ed. *Educational Linguistics, Crosscultural Communication, and Global Interdependence*. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown UP, 1994.
- Baker, Colin. *Attitudes and Language*. Clevedon, Eng.: Multilingual Matters, 1992.
- Brown, H. Douglas and Susan Gonzo, eds. *Readings on Second Language Acquisition*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents, 1995.
- Chambers, J. K. and P. Trudgill. *Dialectology*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980.
- Diller, Karl C., ed. *Individual Differences & Universals in Language Learning Aptitude*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1981.
- Gardner, R. C. *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold, 1985.
- Gardner, R. C. and W. E. Lambert. *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1972.
- Gardner, R. C., P. Symthe, R. Clement, and L. Glikzman. "Second language learning: a social-psychological perspective." *Canadian Modern Language Review* 32, 1976, 198-213.
- James, Charles J., ed. *Practical Applications of Research in Foreign Language Teaching*. Lincolnwood, ILL: National Textbook, 1983.
- Kinsella, Valerie, ed. *Language Teaching and Linguistics: Surveys*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1978.
- Krashen, S. D. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1981.
- Krashen, Stephen. "The pleasure hypothesis." James E. Alatis, ed. *Educational Linguistics, Crosscultural Communication, and Global Interdependence*. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown UP, 1994, 299-322.
- Krashen, Stephen D. and Tracy D. Terrell. *The Natural Approach*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1983.
- Lalonde, R. N. *Second language acquisition: a causal analysis*. Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Western Ontario, 1982.
- Lambert, Wallace E. *Language, Psychology, and Culture*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1972.
- Lambert, W, R. C. Gardner, H. C. Barik, and K. Tunstall. "Attitudinal and cognitive aspects of intensive study of a second language." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 66, 1963, 358-368.
- McKay, Sandra Lee and Nancy H. Hornberger, eds. *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Oller, J., P. Hudson and P. Liu. "Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: A sociolinguistic study of native speakers of Chinese in the United States." *Language Learning*. 27, 1977, 1-27.
- Osgood, Charles E. and Thomas A. Sebeok, eds. *Psycholinguistics*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana UP, 1965.
- Preston, Dennis R. *Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- Schumann, J. H. "The acculturation model for second-language acquisition." R. C. Gringras, ed. *Second-Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978, 27-50.
- Shuy, Roger W. and Ralph W. Fasold, eds. *Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects*. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown UP, 1973.
- Spolsky, B. *Conditions for Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.

- Stevick, Earl W. *Memory Meaning & Method: some psychological perspectives on language learning*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1976.
- Stevens, Peter. *New Orientations in the Teaching of English*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1977.
- Szymanski, Jeannette R. "Curricular trends in modern language communication." Charles J. James, ed. *Practical Applications of Research in Foreign Language Teaching*. Lincolnwood, ILL : National Textbook, 1983, 67-90.
- Van Patten, Bill and James F. Lee, eds. *Second Language Acquisition & Foreign Language Learning*. Clevedon, Eng.: Multilingual Matters, 1990.

I would like to thank the Research Institute of Kobe College for the grant to help make this project possible.

(Received December 13, 1996)