Is Cohesive Writing Coherent?

A Case Study of Japanese English*

Barbara Jo Easton

This longitudinal case study of Japanese English discourse raises questions about the nature of "English" and argues for blending as an explanation for characteristic Japanese English patterns of organization. The primary data come from a series of four major papers written by a multilingual Japanese informant, Yumiko, interacting "in English" with American university professors in Hawaii. What seems to be characteristic Japanese indirectness and emphasis on cohesion occurs both in the patterning of overall organization (with four basic parts rather than Wee), especially in the first draft, and in the use of initial connectives (i.e. conjunctions and adverbial phrases at the beginnings of sentences). The American readers have difficulty viewing writing as being coherent when it is based on cultural expectations that differ from theirs.

*I wish particularly to thank Yumiko and her professors for providing the basic data for my dissertation (Easton 1992) on which this paper is based. I am also grateful to the East-West Center, Culture Learning Institute, for support in the form of a Joint Doctoral Research Internship (1981-1982) administered in conjunction with the University of Hawaii at Manoa, Department of Linguistics.
Initial Problem

The problems to be considered start with Yumiko and her professors. Yumiko was a graduate student at a university in Hawaii in 1980 when she wrote the series of four drafts (about 33,000 words, submitted to departments other than those of English) that form the basis for this study. She is a native of Japan, with Japanese as her first language, but she speaks English quite understandably. She has an undergraduate degree in American literature from a Christian university in Japan, where some of her teachers were Americans. She has studied outside of Japan for about two and one-half years, including a year in the Philippines and the remainder of that time in Hawaii. She is married to an Indonesian. Her ability to approximate a standard English at a reasonably advanced level, at least in conversation, seems fairly stable.

Besides Yumiko, two groups of readers served as checks in this investigation. One includes five professors from various social science departments. The other includes two graduate students from departments other than Yumiko's. Four of the professors do not share Yumiko's linguistic background. English is their primary language, and they also know some Southeast Asian languages. The fifth, although a native of Japan, completed his education in the United States and generally prefers to speak English rather than Japanese now. One of the students speaks Japanese as a first language, and the other speaks English primarily. The Japanese student is essentially fluent in standard English. Her orientation toward the value of adopting American English ways of speaking is stronger than is Yumiko's.
became involved as an editor primarily with Yumiko's pre-final draft (MAl),
by which time Yumiko had basically established matters of
content and form in her drafts. My primary language is English, but I
also know Japanese and have taught English courses, including
composition, in Japan and the United States.

Yumiko did not expect to have academic difficulties based on
language. She submitted the first draft in this series to Professor A
with fairly satisfactory results. Professor A's basic acceptance of the
paper contrasted strongly with Professor B's unwillingness to read
beyond a couple of pages of it due to its nonstandard language. Figure
1 presents a fairly extended extract to show what these readers faced.²
The contrast raised a series of questions as to why the reactions were
so different. Here I will discuss some points concerning the nature of
English: (1) What are the basic characteristics of organization (i.e.
of labeled sections of papers) and of the use of initial connectives
(i.e. conjunctions and adverbial phrases that occur at the beginnings
of sentences as cohesion devices—cf. Halliday) and their contribution
to coherence³ in writing, in this case of Japanese English? (2) May
differences that distinguish Yumiko's writing from standard academic
writing be systematic within English? Yumiko's oral fluency helps mask
the fact that both her writing and speaking tend to deviate from
standard English in similar ways. The differences attract greater
attention in writing than in speech. Section headings such as "Intro-
duction" and "Conclusion" and initial connectives seem to be invariable
forms for the most part. On the other hand, they my actually mask
differences between the functions that readers of standard English
II. Historical Overview of the Javanese Villages' Development.

Rural settlement in Java conforms a nucleated residential unit surrounded by the lands cultivated by the residents, forming a community with political, economic and religious dimensions. In lowland villages units have expanded for beyond within most of the daily patterns of mutual interest and aid to take place. (2) (Jay; 1956 p.215).

Administratively this cluster of villages units is under control of a headman called lurah, and it forms the lowest unit of the hierarchical local administration. In this paper the definition of village refers to this collection of villages (which so-called dukuh according to some writer), desa in Indonesian term, so village headman refers to lurah.

Javanese villages are traditionally not isolated. There was continuous relationship between towns which are the center of the kingdom and villages. As a part of larger political unit the relationship between the ruling elite and peasants was reciprocal and superordinate on one side and the subordinate on the other. However, by and large, peasants were only marginal participants in the traditional political process, at least at the level of the state. Supravillage levels of authority were also by no means the main focus of village attachments; loyalty to kin and locality took priority over any allegiances to the wider political system. Though by no reckoning isolated from the larger society, local peasant communities stubbornly retained their identity which was bound up with attachment to the soil and to age-old village cults. (3)( pp. 83-86 of Kartodirdjo, and pp. 83-85 of In Search of Southeast Asia).

Extract from a Crucial Portion of Yumiko's First Draft (PS1)
assume for them and what Yumiko assumes. Overlapping competence tends to disguise the fact that writer and reader may interpret the "same" thing differently, until some particular incongruity appears sharply.

My analysis is based predominantly on Yumiko's earlier drafts, especially as PS1 and PS2 show the greatest contrasts to each other in overall organization. Draft PS1 contrasts the most obviously with standard written academic American English. Supplementary materials include Yumiko's outlines, some translations into Japanese, the comments that three professors wrote in the margins of Yumiko's papers, and taped discussions of Yumiko's writing (one in Japanese and two in English).

I have examined literature dealing with various aspects of the nature of language in considering organization and connectives in Japanese English. I have not found any studies that are closely comparable to this one, which tries to illuminate the data from the perspectives of the discussion of cohesion, extended discourse analysis, regional forms of English, Japanese discourse patterns, interlanguage, blending, language differences among individuals, interethnic communication, writing, literacy, editing, language attitudes, and language change. (See Easton 1982 for specific references.)

It is not possible to draw firm conclusions on the basis of a case study. My aim is rather to raise questions for further investigation, both descriptive and comparative. I provide a sane comparative empirical basis for discussing Japanese English discourse characteristics that occur in academic writing.

Patterned differences occur in the structuring of the presentation
of information between the English of a Japanese writer such as Yumiko
and that normally expected by American readers such as "her professors.
The differences are particularly evident in patterns of overall organi-
zation and the use of initial connectives. The Japanese English pat-
terns represent blending of language resources at a level beyond that
of single sentences. Blending creates lasting new forms, or uses, "by
analogy with two different sources—in this case Japanese and English.
We do not yet have a theory of blending in language, particularly at
the level of discourse. My dissertation works toward one in presenting
extended examples in a specific context as a basis for theoretical
development. Blending differs from code switching in that the latter
serves sociolinguistic purposes directly, while the former does not.
Blending is likely to occur relatively uniformly across texts, while
code switching is concerned with variation within texts. In contrast
with language transfer, blending emphasizes convergent development and
seems to allow for more complex relations in discourse. In a case
where Japanese English is not targeted on a specific Western form of
English, nouns cannot be taken for granted. Blending can help explain
why Japanese English is distinctive and why readers who "know English"
but do not knew Japanese linguistic expectations have difficulty with
Japanese English.

Yumiko's readers comment primarily on content where difficulties
involve organization and initial connectives, when problems of simple
grammaticality or of factual accuracy do not intervene. Difficulties
involve problems of acceptability and interpretability. While the
readers see difficulties in communication, they do not necessarily see
the cause of the problems. The prominent use of initial connectives, when they seem to occur without clear discourse reasons, makes it hard for readers to know what is important to a writer. When the same forms occur in other positions in Yumiko's sentences, they are more often seen as suitable. A writer must learn to take readers' expectations into account to facilitate communication. As a result of language editing by her professors, Yumiko gradually became aware of blending to some extent in her use of language. She then made changes in her discourse patterns to the extent that they seemed necessary to her for communication with her American audience. Linguistic customs, both cultural and personal, however, work against great change, as Yumiko believes in the legitimacy of maintaining a form of communication that reflects her background.

Overall Organization in Yumiko's Drafts

What seem to be characteristic Japanese indirectness and emphasis on cohesion occurs both in patterns of overall organization, especially in Yumiko's first draft, and in her use of initial connectives. Her American readers have difficulty finding such writing coherent.

Yumiko makes major organizational changes in explicit structuring between the first two drafts (PS1 and PS?). (See Figure 2.) The third draft (MU) shows some expansion and reorganization of "chapters," as the overall length of the draft increases by nearly fifty per cent. Yumiko sees the modifications introduced in the fourth draft (MA2) as "making minor changes, not revising," although MA1:III gets
I. Introduction

II. Historical Overview of the Javanese Villages' Development

III. Position of village in local government administration

IV. Power structure in the village

V. Sources of Lurah's authority

VI. Influence of the political parties

VII. Influence of the military

VIII. The Green Revolution and village elite

IX. Conclusion

Draft PSI—463 lines*

[ki]

[shoo]

[ten]

[katsu]

Draft PS2—562 lines

[introduction]

I. Introduction

II. Concept of Democracy

III. Historical Overview of Lurah

IV. Economic Function of Lurah

V. Political Function of Lurah

VI. Conclusion

Draft MA1—770 lines*

I. Introduction

II. Concept of Democracy and Consensus

III. Cultural norms and Leadership in democracy

IV. Decision-making mechanisms in the period of the 1960s to the mid-1970s

V. Socio-Economic transition

VI. Trends in the leadership of the Lurah

VII. Conclusion

Draft MA2—1160 lines*

I. Introduction

II. The Concept of Democracy and the Function of Consensus Building

III. Decision-making Mechanisms in the Period from the 1960s to the Mid-1970s

IV. Socio-Economic Transition

V. Trends in the Leadership of the Lurah

VI. Conclusion

*Drafts PS1, PS2, and MA1 are in elite type. Draft MA2 is in pica type.

Figure 2. An Overall Comparison of Yumiko's Drafts
incorporated into MA2:II. Yumiko was not taught to outline in English classes, she says, and little practical instruction is given concerning organization and style for long papers in either Japanese or English, particularly as an international language.

Yumiko reported that she wrote the first draft directly "in English," but she said later: 'My first one is still following the Japanese way.'

A basic Japanese pattern of overall organization consists of four fundamental parts: ki-shoo-ten-ketsu. The function of the introductory ki is the "awakening" of the reader's interest, to quote Yumiko. Shoo represents an "explanation" of the writing of the preceding part, or some motivation for it. Then ten introduces a "different aspect" of the subject, often with an unexpected twist. Finally ketsu concludes the presentation; but rather than summarizing the discussion, it may introduce a highlight or even the main point of the discussion.

Standard academic English, on the other hand, normally demands progress from a clear statement of the subject in an introduction, through a basically linear development of main points, to a concluding summary. Coning abruptly to the heart of a matter, however, is considered impolite in various East Asian cultures, as Japanese, Indonesians, Koreans, and Thais have pointed out. Japanese generally try to establish an initial atmosphere that will lead to a favorable reception for their message; they prefer to avoid blunt repetition.

The introductory part (ki) of the first draft—"Javanese Rural Elite: PROTECTOR OF TOE PEASANT MASS OR EXPLOITER"—consists of two sections that present a general overview of the background of the sub-
ject, without highlighting specific points. Yuniko phrases her objectives in a way that is meaningful primarily to specialists. The opening sentences exemplify the difficulties which a reader must confront.

"Indonesian villages in general have in certain ways come into contact with outside influence, whether they are purposely directed to the village or brought there accidently. Especially in the post a few decade rural societies suffered drastic changes caused by national politic and economic development policy of the Central Government."

There is more cohesion than coherence. Yuniko's reported tendency to think in Japanese leads to some particular choices in the use of English connectives: e.g. "Especially. . . ." These choices, which represent blending, depend on her selecting lexical items and syntactic positions for them that seem to her to be equivalent in Japanese and English.

Willing to give an aspiring writer a fair chance to communicate, a reader such as Professor B proceeds beyond the generalities of section I despite whatever misgivings he may feel. By the middle of section II, however, if not sooner, he feels discouraged about continuing to read Yuniko's paper. He would probably go further if the form were more standard, but section II does not seem to be developing the main points of the "Introduction" (section I) in a way that Yuniko's professors normally expect in a graduate level paper. A reader may not go very far beyond the section that is labeled "Introduction" if he does not know what to anticipate: i.e. that the structure of Yuniko's intro-
ductory part (ki) corresponds to the combination of sections T and TI.

Yet it is clear that Yumiko has put considerable effort into the production of this draft. Indeed if the reader chooses to stop before the end of section II, he misses its points. Yumiko's first attempt to give a direct answer to the question implicit in her title occurs on her pp. 3-4.

Yumiko is ready by the end of shoo (in section V) to focus on the "concept of the elite and his role in Javanese culture." This seems to be an appropriate placement of emphasis in Japanese patterns of overall organization in communication, where the final position often has the greatest importance, without necessarily being definitive. American readers, however, expect main points to occur at the beginning of units of expositions unless deviations are signalled through clearly reasonable use of connectives or sequencing.

Sections VI-VIII (ten) form a unit Chat contrasts with the preceding part. Yumiko returns to the focal points of her "Introduction" for a more detailed examination. She comes to a reasonably concise statement of her conclusion about her title subject by the end of section VIII.

There are two principal sources of difficulties in Yumiko's first "Conclusion." One is lack of parallelism between its organization and that of the paper as a whole. The other involves grammatical usages that readers such as Yumiko's professors consider deviant from academic English norms. Blending contributes to both of these problems.

Yumiko's second draft—"DEMOCRACY AND FUNCTION OF LURAH IN RURAL JAVANESE SOCIETY"—is "much clearer, better organized," according to
Professor A. The later drafts also came to satisfy Yumiko's other professors. Improvements in Yumiko's research and grammar, as perceived by her professors, undoubtedly played a role in the ultimate successful reception of the final paper. Patterns of overall organization also seem important for the outcome. Yumiko said: "I think these two are following a different way of writing." She sees the revised "Introduction" as a separate part, unlike the first one. She commented that she still tended to write "something new in the conclusion that's not discussed before— that's very Japanese way," but this was not a major problem. She has become aware of her responsibility as a writer to achieve satisfactory communication in dealing with her readers' patterns of responses.

Initial Connectives

Connectives generally are basic structural words. Yumiko uses a wide range of them in writing. They are likely to be influenced by, or even translated from, one's primary language when one writes in a second language. Their meanings and specific uses are often not well understood.

Bloch (1946) states that when connective adverbs occur in Japanese they always begin a clause. Lehmann and Faust say:

"Abrupt breaks between sentences are avoided in Japanese; one does not come to a 'full stop' until one has said all there is to say. This is evidenced in the spoken language by the constant use of sentences connectives such as de  wa, tokoro ga, sore kara, so site. Similar words are used in the written language. . . ."
Martin describes initial adverbial phrases that apply to whole Japanese sentences as being like minor sentences in themselves. These serve as "TRANSITIONAL THEMES with respect to the immediately following sentence" (1975:817).

Yumiko rarely begins written English sentences with coordinating conjunctions. On the other hand, she uses various other syntactic conjunctions, including Because, Since, Though, Even, Although, As, If, After, When, Whereas, and While, but she does not always use than (except for Although, As, If, and After) as standard academic English subordinating conjunctions, particularly at the beginning of sentences. Consider, for example:

"The power of the leader is very crucial. Because the moral norms urge than to protect the masses and discourage to enforce their power aggressively." (MAL)

This is more than just a problem of punctuation. The Japanese usage of initial Because to highlight a reason parallels the usage of Nazenara. The latter, however, does not function as a subordinator. It corresponds instead to a complete subordinate clause in itself. It co-occurs with a clause containing kara, a subordinate form indicating reason (source). Deviations from standard English may result partly from pedagogical interference, as Yumiko believes she was taught this patterns. There is also the possibility of blending where two Japanese forms correspond to what Yumiko's professors see as one English form. The seeming unity of form here in English may be false, however, as differences in syntactic position relate to prosodic features of speech.
Semantic conjunction includes additive, adversative, causal, and temporal relations. While syntactic conjunction has its bases in intra-sentential structures, semantic conjunction goes beyond these structural limits (see Halliday and Hasan 1976; cf. Longacre 1976). Yumiko indicates additive, relations by means of besides, furthermore, moreover, namely, for example, such as, and in (an)other words. She shows adversative relations by however, nevertheless, yet, in spite of this, on the other hand, rather, and in any case. She marks causal relations by - us, therefore, hence, consequently, and as a consequence with/of. Related connectives include otherwise, in this regards, and in this sense. Most temporal expressions in the dab are ad he. We find now, then, today; in short and before to start discussion; and various specific time phrases.

Some of the more interesting semantic conjunctions are other transitional phrases which do not fit into the four basic relational classes above. These phrases include quasi-conventionalized narrative expressions of place (e.g. in case where) and locative references to the - e itself (e.g. in this paper); initial prepositional phrases and related expressions (e.g. according to ...; by ...); initial participial and infinitive phrases (e.g. compared with ...; considering ...; to examine the first reason; to make success of these projects); disjunctive adverbs (especially, obviously, probably, theoretically; by and large) and other adverbs such as administratively, internally, morally, potentially, usually, virtually, and so on.

To sum up, coordinating conjunctions do not create special problems in Yumiko's writing, but many subordinating conjunctions do.
Semantic conjunctions often do not create difficulties within sentences, but they may interfere with coherence between sentences by distracting attention from the main line of Yumiko's argument.

Let us look at some contextualized examples centering around Though and While, respectively.

"The village democracy in the past was supported by the distribution of power among village officers. Though, lurah was still most powerful, as can be seen in the distribution of bengkok land." (PS2)

"Economic and political scenes in Javanese villages are under influence of new system which do not originate in indigenous society. While social relationship which is in fact in transition to adjust to the new circumstances is still characterized as 'traditional'. The failure to establish new social order results in decline of 'democracy'." (PS2)

Readers label the sentences that begin here with English subordinators as grammatically incomplete because the readers do not see independent clauses to accompany the conjunctions. The problems is often seen as one of sentence punctuation. It is not that simple, though, because when these conjunctions occur elsewhere in Yumiko's sentences, they conform to standard English patterns. The Japanese equivalents of these connectives provide a key to the blended uses of these forms as initial connectives. Though corresponds to keredomo; While to ippo; and Because corresponds to Nezenara, as shown above. Keredomo, meaning however (not a subordinator), may occur in various positions in a sentence, but Though is not equivalent to however in initial position.
in standard English. *Ippo 'one side' signals that the following clause presents a background statement that contrasts with the preceding statement.* Again this initial connective is not a subordinator.

**Editing and the Ethnography of speaking**

Yumiko's professors do not focus consciously on connectives when discussing characteristic types of errors that foreign students make in writing English. On the other hand, Professor A commented that by rearranging particular nonstandard sentences in his head, he can generally see them as meaningful. Knowing the subject matter in advance helps, of course. Understanding is based on prediction, which in turn is based on knowledge of connections, and hence connectives. Meanings need to be negotiated, but negotiation is difficult where linguistic expectations differ and where feedback is limited.

Yumiko reports that she thinks in the "logic of Japanese" although she was "taught to think in English" by American teachers in Japan. She says she finds it "automatic" to "write in English," while she remains aware of her need to attend to English grammar. The interaction between her conscious efforts to write in grammatical English and her deeper sense of natural connections in language leads to Japanese English blending.

A dialogic approach to discourse analysis suggests a means of trying to deal with the linguistic problem of connections. If the writer can imagine questions that a reader might reasonably ask, she can then proceed to deal with them. First, however, the purpose of
writing must be clear. Yumiko is not satisfied with "explanation," which she sees in this context as description; her aim is rather to do analysis, preferably based on her own field research.

A Japanese writer such as Yumiko, whether using Japanese or English, tends to rely on explicit connective markers to give the feeling that sentences in a text flow smoothly together. This emphasis on cohesion, however, may interfere with coherence or logical organization of ideas in particular texts. The weakness may be hidden by the use of "too many conjunctions," as one reader put it. Many Japanese seem to believe that Americans write too directly, in comparison with Japanese normative behavior which encourages careful introduction of a subject and also restraint in expression of personal views in most formal presentations.

Yumiko summed up her own views with regard to the use of "proper" English thus:

"To some extent we need to speak English properly as a means to communicate each other but, but I don't think it's fair to require the foreign student as- to write a good English, as good as the good native speaker."

When I asked her to explain why it is not "fair," she continued:

"Well, uh, the way of thinking is different. The cultural background is different. And, since- I think it's different for the foreign student who are majoring (in) English, but if not English, it's not our purpose to study English here."

In comparing her study at a university in the Philippines with that in Hawaii, Yumiko said of the Filipino teachers:
"I don't think they thought our language commun- English performance is so important, uh, because wen for the Filipino student* since English is not the native-, is not their native tongue, and some of the student can speak good English, but not all of the students, student, so they don't require so much."

Yumiko went on to discuss the role of English as an international language for regional conferences, where social power relationship may not dictate that all participants should use one particular form of English. Institutionalization of regional Englishes seems to be connected with broader questions about the role of English repertoires in particular situations, especially as the accomplished use of sophisticated written language is involved.

Regional forms of English, including Japanese English are not necessarily simply "imperfect English," which would represent a prescriptive judgment made from the perspective of most native speakers of English. We can reasonably expect to find certain characteristics in Yumiko's writing that also occur in the writing of other people who share the same linguistic expectations. English as a first language and English as a second language, however, are sometimes not fully mutually intelligible as a result of systematic differences in patterning. These forms of English thus differ from those that people typically consider as "neighboring dialects."

The degree of tolerance of deviance from standard linguistic forms depends a great deal on the personalities of the participants in a communication situation and on their past experiences. Some people have quite rigid expectations about the need to conform to rules of an
approved grammar in order for certain kinds of academic communication to occur. Other people seem less preoccupied with forms. The types of editing done by various readers consequently differ. Yumiko's professors generally resist the notion of double standards and argue that the "same learning," in same sense, should be required of all students. At the same time, they admit that it is not possible to treat all students alike in terms of language, or at least of grammar. It is also impossible to separate linguistic form and the organized presentation of content neatly since they necessarily interact.

Bilingual editors are needed to assist with final versions of major papers on campus that are serious about having international students. Professors express less concern about regular class papers since students tend to write carefully in a language that is not their primary one. There may still be cause for concern about editing, however, even when a draft has been carefully thought out, if the normative patterns of discourse are noticeably different for writer and reader. The factors that are most important in evaluation of writing seem to be comprehensibility, interpretability, acceptability, appropriateness—rather than simple grammaticality. These factors may vary widely, depending on "how well a reader knows a writer's background, subject, and perspective from the start."

What both writer and reader see as the "same" organizational form (e.g. Introduction) may serve different functions for Japanese writers and American readers. Likewise, what the American readers see as "different" lexicogrammatical forms (e.g. Though and However) could be seen from the Japanese perspective as functioning alike. To the extent that
linguistic functional relativity (Hymes 1966) goes unrecognized, we have little chance of dealing successfully in any principled way with the misunderstandings and attempts at correction that result from communication between people who have different primary languages.

What possible changes may we reasonably expect to observe in the linguistic data of academic Japanese English, and under what conditions are such changes likely to occur?

When editors and other people who institutionalize language do not understand same of the fundamental linguistic characteristics of organization that contribute to difficulties in comprehension, the writer is left to try to work matters out for "herself. If editors and teachers are aware of functional diversity in connection with quite invariant forms or positions in sentences, they may be able to encourage more effective communication. It seems easier to rearrange outlines than to change one's approach, to sentence cohesion, at least for someone starting from a broad perspective of a subject, particularly when problems of cohesion are not clearly recognized. It is not clear to what extent Yumiko has really made fundamental changes in her use of initial connectives except for subordinators. The pattern of use of initial connectives in introductory parts certainly shifts in the direction of her professors' expectations, "but the patterns in the middle parts are less clear. Yumiko continues to introduce initial connectives into new passages even in the final version of "her paper. At that stage, on the other hand, some reason for most of the connectives is readily interpretable by her readers, even if the interpretations might not match hers exactly. Such connections occur more frequently
in descriptive passages, such as Yumiko's discussion of the case studies of specific villages, than in passages concerned more directly with explanation or even with argumentation. Yumiko has come to focus more on what seems obvious to her. The connections between sentences have greater implicit coherence than and do not rely on as many explicit connectives to provide cohesion. Yumiko has come to recognize, by her own report, that her newly modified Japanese English expresses her meanings more accurately in communicating with an American group than did her previous stages of language. Nevertheless she does not aim to adopt the use of a completely "standard" English that is foreign to the language community with which she identifies herself culturally. Readers inevitably start to make adjustments when they must try to interpret papers.

Implications of This Study for Students of Language

The linguistic knowledge of an individual cannot all be classified in terms of separate, or separable, languages. When blending occurs, there can be patterned differences within an overall system of language. Speakers make subjective identifications concerning languages. Proper speakers (Grace 1981:20) produce the language data which people recognize as the basis for a normal linguistic description. Yumiko uses the label "Japanese English" to indicate the English of Japanese people when it shares characteristics which occur in Japanese but which do not strike her as distinctive characteristics in the English of non-Japanese. "Japanese English," as the term is used in this study, represents an interlanguage that is legitimized both
personally and culturally on the basis of shared linguistic expectations within a community of language users. Yumiko accepts her non-native English as an adequate basis for both speaking and writing. She makes sane adjustments in her language to succeed in the university, but not until she sees their necessity.

We might assume that a Japanese writer of English, as a result of language instruction, would be conscious of the differences in orientations expressed in typical Japanese and English rhetorical models. Yet this assumption is not necessarily valid. Yumiko's underlying Japanese patterns of organization seem quite ingrained and resistant to change. (See also Scollon and Scollon 1979.) Moreover, most Japanese students do not seem to be taught about expository discourse formally or effectively.

Japanese English blending may be rhetorically expressive, and it may affect the ease and clarity with which sane language is processed, in terms of both production and comprehension. Is Japanese English an Asian language in a sense, reflecting the linguistic expectations of a Japanese community of language users? When Yumiko finds herself in a different community, in America, some of her expectations change. It seems difficult, however, to change basic ethnolinguistic patterns by means of ordinary academic instruction alone.

This longitudinal study aimed for depth in one topic rather than for breadth of topics. It is hoped that the findings can be taken as representative of writers with linguistic background similar to Yumiko's. Papers that students like Yumiko write outside of English departments, and the interactive editing that accompanies the process
of writing different versions of a paper, deserve comparative attention cross-culturally. They represent preparation for further motivated communication in the scholarly world at large, and they show us something about the nature of language.

Notes

1Yumiko's four main drafts are coded as PS1, PS2, MA1, and MA7, where PS stands for political science and MA signifies the final paper required for the master of arts degree in Yumiko's curriculum. MA1 is an intermediate version.

2In the extracts, any deviations from standard English grammatical usage, wording, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, or spacing between words represent the original data and the result of typing the current presentation.

3Coherence, to me, represents a logical or orderly relationship among the parts of a message.

4Hinds (1980) discusses this pattern briefly in relation to contrastive rhetoric at the level of paragraph development. I use the term part in contrast with section, to distinguish the purely analytical ki, shou, ten, ketsu of Japanese (and the introduction, body, and conclusion of English) from the numbered divisions of Yumiko's drafts.

5I capitalize these initial connectives to distinguish them from non-initial connectives, which Yumiko uses in accordance with syntactic norms of standard academic English.
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