

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University  
Microfilms  
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



8302437

Easton, Barbara Jo

BLENDING BEGINNINGS: CONNECTIONS AND THE EFFECTS OF  
EDITING IN A CASE OF ACADEMIC "JAPANESE ENGLISH"

*University of Hawaii*

PH.D. 1982

University  
Microfilms  
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1982

by

Easton, Barbara Jo

All Rights Reserved



PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy.  
Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs or pages \_\_\_\_\_
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print \_\_\_\_\_
3. Photographs with dark background \_\_\_\_\_
4. Illustrations are poor copy \_\_\_\_\_
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy \_\_\_\_\_
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page \_\_\_\_\_
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓
8. Print exceeds margin requirements \_\_\_\_\_
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine \_\_\_\_\_
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print \_\_\_\_\_
11. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered \_\_\_\_\_. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages \_\_\_\_\_
15. Other \_\_\_\_\_

University  
Microfilms  
International



BLENDING BEGINNINGS: CONNECTIONS AND THE EFFECTS OF  
EDITING IN A CASE OF ACADEMIC  
"JAPANESE ENGLISH"

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
IN LINGUISTICS  
AUGUST 1982

By

Barbara Jo Easton

Dissertation Committee:

Michael L. Forman, Chairman  
George W. Grace  
Howard P. McKaughan  
Lawrence A. Reid  
Richard W. Schmidt

© Copyright by Barbara Jo Easton 1982  
All Rights Reserved



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want first of all to thank Yumiko and her professors for providing me with the basic data for this study; also my fellow students, particularly Shanta Danaraj, Fumiko Fukuta Earns, Eiko Uehara, and Suwanna Wongwaisayawan, who helped with language problems and who offered encouragement along the way; and the East-West Center, Culture Learning Institute, which provided financial support through a Joint Doctoral Research Internship (1981-1982) administered in conjunction with the University of Hawaii at Manoa.

In addition, I want to express appreciation to the members of my dissertation committee, Michael L. Forman, George W. Grace, Howard P. McKaughan, Lawrence A. Reid, and Richard W. Schmidt, and to Björn Jernudd of the East-West Culture Learning Institute, for their encouragement throughout the development of this study. I have absorbed some of their ideas to the point where I no longer can distinguish mine from theirs although I have tried to keep records. I wish especially to acknowledge my debt to Michael Forman, my committee chairman, for his dedication to teaching and to the pursuit of excellence in scholarship. His inspiration has been so pervasive that I cannot give him proper credit at all points. To all of those people from whom I have learned, thanks and no blame.

## ABSTRACT

This case study of the effects of editing in communication where participants did not fully share linguistic expectations calls the attention of readers and writers to some characteristic differences in forms of academic English used by Japanese and Americans. These differences are usually masked from the participants by what seems to each individual to be the same language. The study is primarily based on analysis of written communication between Yumiko, a graduate student from Japan at a university in Hawaii in 1980, and her American professors. Blending between English and Japanese discourse strategies occurs in Yumiko's use of particular patterns of connections in overall organization (especially of introductions) and in her use of initial connectives (the conjunctions and transitional adverbial expressions occurring at the beginnings of sentences). These uses create an indirect approach to a subject under discussion. Yumiko's patterns of use of connections and initial connectives--particularly Because, Though, and While--create constructions that are generally not regarded as correct standard academic English. The meanings of particular English words or constructions in discourse are modified by analogy with Japanese. Modifications here represent differences in linguistic codes (i.e., parts of sets of mutually intelligible resources of language--Hymes 1974).

As may be seen from their editing, Yumiko's professors tended to have difficulties at all levels of discourse structure in reading her first paper with comprehension. The difficulties, however, may serve us as resources for developing insights about language.

Blended beginnings characterize a variety of "Japanese English," which is not simply "imperfect English." Comprehension difficulties tend to originate where the patterns of connections and the reasons for use of initial connectives are not clear to readers who do not share linguistic expectations. This seems to be the case even though editing readers do not consciously focus corrective attention in those places. Japanese tend to rely on initial connectives to provide coherence. Yumiko's professors, in contrast, seem not to realize this function of connectives in writing by Japanese. They seem rather to expect that coherence will be evident in the structuring of information without depending on so many initial connectives and elaborate introductions.

The process of language editing can lead to language learning, and learning of a second language is possibly a basis for linguistic change. Convergent change at the level of individuals is likely to show the same processes as change in the language of a larger speech community, since language change occurs in individuals. My analysis focuses on Yumiko's short-term diachronic linguistic development. Primarily four major texts (about 33,000 words) by Yumiko are compared and related to comments of the professors who edited them. The comments come from the margins of the papers and from my interviews. Supplementary evidence from Yumiko in English and in Japanese and evaluative comments by other readers, including some native Japanese, are also analyzed. I examine my conclusions in terms of fundamental factors that contribute to linguistic change in a situation of language contact (see Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog 1968 and Slobin 1977).

This study concerns in part what the participants say about the use of their language. Yumiko labels some of her language "Japanese English," emphasizing the legitimacy of maintaining distinctive nonnative English characteristics as long as these do not seriously hinder communication. Yumiko's "Japanese English" may represent an Asian linguistic code (i.e., one displaying certain East Asian linguistic areal features) although it is not currently institutionalized to the extent of certain other Asian codes.

Linguistic codes include different ways of communicating which are similar, though not identical, for writing and speaking in particular language communities. Literacy is the principal means of both learning and use of English for scholarly communication for many nonnative speakers of English. Problems involving nonnative English may differ from those of native English in important ways. Code blending occurs in the linguistic repertoires of some Japanese individuals who write in English. Such blending differs from code switching. Consideration of "Japanese English" code blending leads to questions about linguistic boundaries, systematicity, and acceptability or appropriateness.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iv
ABSTRACT . . . . .	v
LIST OF FIGURES . . . . .	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS . . . . .	xii
PREFACE . . . . .	xiii
CHAPTER I. BEGINNINGS: INITIAL PROBLEMS FOR YUMIKO AND HER READERS . . . . .	1
1.1 Introduction . . . . .	1
1.2 Background Information about Participants . . . . .	5
1.3 Issues for Linguistics . . . . .	8
1.4 Systematicity and Linguistic Codes . . . . .	12
1.4.1 Systematicity of Language . . . . .	12
1.4.2 Linguistic Codes and Interethnic Communication . . . . .	14
1.5 Linguistics and Boundaries of "English" . . . . .	16
1.5.1 Yumiko's Writing and "Englishes" . . . . .	16
1.5.2 Linguistic Issues: Functional Relativity and Code Blending . . . . .	22
1.5.3 Reading, Writing, and Editing by Yumiko and Her Professors . . . . .	25
1.6 Plan of Discussion in This Dissertation . . . . .	26
Notes . . . . .	28
CHAPTER II. INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF THEORY AND DATA . . . . .	33
2.1 Description of Data . . . . .	33
2.2 Theory and the Determination of Data . . . . .	36
2.3 Presentation of Data . . . . .	37
Notes . . . . .	40
CHAPTER III. COHERENCE AND INITIAL CONNECTIVES: REVIEW OF LITERATURE, WITH EXAMPLES FROM YUMIKO'S DRAFTS. . . . .	41
3.1 Coherence . . . . .	42
3.2 Initial Connectives in Yumiko's "Japanese English" . . . . .	45
3.2.1 Toward a Definition of <u>Initial Connectives</u> in English . . . . .	46
3.2.2 Syntactic Conjunction(s), Coordination, and Subordination . . . . .	50
3.2.2.1 Definitions . . . . .	50
3.2.2.2 Discussion of Examples from Yumiko's Drafts . . . . .	52

3.2.3 Semantic Conjunction . . . . .	57
3.2.3.1 Definitions . . . . .	57
3.2.3.2 Discussion of Examples from Yumiko's Drafts . . .	59
3.2.3.2.1 Additive Relations . . . . .	59
3.2.3.2.2 Adversative Relations . . . . .	60
3.2.3.2.3 Causal Relations . . . . .	61
3.2.3.2.4 Temporal Relations . . . . .	62
3.2.3.2.5 Other Transitional Phrases . . . . .	63
3.3 Review of Yumiko's Use of Initial Connectives . . . . .	66
Notes . . . . .	67
CHAPTER IV. PATTERNS OF CONNECTIONS IN THE OVERALL ORGANIZATION OF YUMIKO'S DRAFTS . . . . .	68
4.1 Overall Organization in Yumiko's Drafts . . . . .	68
4.1.1 Professors' Evaluations: A Linguistic Issue . . . . .	69
4.1.2 Titles and Organizational Changes . . . . .	71
4.1.3 Outlines and Abstracts . . . . .	75
4.2 Yumiko's First Draft and Japanese Patterns of Connections . . . . .	75
4.2.1 <u>Ki</u> . . . . .	77
4.2.2 <u>Shoo</u> . . . . .	81
4.2.3 <u>Ten</u> . . . . .	83
4.2.4 <u>Ketsu</u> . . . . .	84
4.2.5 Comment . . . . .	86
4.3 Yumiko's Second Draft and English Patterns of Connections . . . . .	87
4.4 A Comparison of the Major Parts of Yumiko's Drafts . . . .	90
4.5 Concluding Comment . . . . .	96
Notes . . . . .	97
CHAPTER V. EDITING, CONNECTIONS, AND CONNECTIVES . . . . .	99
5.1 Negotiation and Connections . . . . .	99
5.2 Structuring of Information and "Themes": Review of Literature . . . . .	100
Notes . . . . .	107
CHAPTER VI. INITIAL CONNECTIVES AND STRUCTURING OF INFORMATION WITHIN SECTIONS OF YUMIKO'S DRAFTS . . . . .	108
6.1 Comments by Yumiko and Her Professors on Their Editing . .	108
6.2 Editing, Initial Connectives, and Development within Sections . . . . .	109
6.2.1 General Comments . . . . .	111
6.2.2 Introductory and Concluding Sections of Yumiko's Drafts . . . . .	114
6.2.3 Middle Sections of Yumiko's Drafts . . . . .	119
6.2.3.1 Reordering and Substitution . . . . .	120
6.2.3.2 Addition and Deletion . . . . .	126

6.3 Ethnolinguistic Perspective . . . . .	140
Notes . . . . .	147
CHAPTER VII. READING, WRITING, AND EDITING: IMPLICATIONS OF A STUDY OF YUMIKO'S "JAPANESE ENGLISH" FOR LINGUISTICS . . . . .	
	148
7.1 Reading, Writing, and Editing: General Background . . . .	148
7.2 Instrumental Writing and Editing . . . . .	155
7.2.1 Writing and Language . . . . .	155
7.2.2 Models of Writing and Studies of Students . . . . .	158
7.2.3 Planning in Editing . . . . .	159
7.3 Genre and Rhetoric . . . . .	162
7.4 Linguistic Norms and Coding . . . . .	165
7.5 "Japanese English" and the Nature of Language . . . . .	170
7.6 Extension of Findings to a Broader Data Base . . . . .	176
7.7 Implications for Linguistics . . . . .	178
Notes . . . . .	183
APPENDICES . . . . .	185
APPENDIX A: Draft PS1 . . . . .	186
APPENDIX B: Introductions . . . . .	206
APPENDIX C: Conclusions . . . . .	220
REFERENCES . . . . .	228

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Extract from a Crucial Portion of Yumiko's First Draft (PS1) . . . . .	9
2	Selected Characteristics of Yumiko's Drafts . . . . .	34
3	An Overall Comparison of Yumiko's Drafts . . . . .	74



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

<u>Example</u>	<u>Interpretation</u>
PS2:V(.1):8-45:354-391	Draft:Section(Subsection):Section lines:Draft lines
PS2:II::74-120	Section lines are omitted
MA2:I::17-18	(For section I, draft and section lines are identical)
n.4	Yumiko's footnote
*	My footnote to Yumiko's text
E	Example extracted from a draft that Yumiko submitted to her professors
E8i . . . E8ii	Comparable passages from successive drafts
E9iia . . . E9iib	Closely related passages within a draft
E1'	Translation of passage (E1)

(These conventions are discussed in 2.2 and 2.3.)

## PREFACE

Some people wonder how a study of writing is properly a part of the academic discipline of linguistics. Writing is commonly associated with specific academic departments of languages such as English in the United States, and many linguists have sought autonomy from these for their academic discipline. Nevertheless, even while it is distinct from speaking, writing is an aspect of language. The effects of literacy are pervasive in our contemporary world, as scholars are coming to recognize (e.g., Ong 1967, 1977; Goody 1968, 1977; Olson 1977a, b; Ferguson 1978; Scollon and Scollon 1980, 1981, to appear; Stubbs 1980). Ferguson summarizes the state of affairs with regard to studies of literacy patterns in multilingual situations. His summary involves an application of linguistics to problems beyond the confines of universities.

Some large issues concerning the nature of written language, particularly as it is produced in English as a second language, relate to some interesting theoretic<sup>1</sup> questions for linguistics. George Grace (1978) has pointed out a writing paradox, and Hymes (1974), Slobin (1977), and Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog (1968) have suggested various questions concerning speech that I will consider in relation to writing. Bloomfield (1964, 1970b) raised questions about the relationship of writing to broader sociocultural issues of attitudes toward literacy. This aspect of his linguistic work has been overlooked by most linguists. They have been slow in following up on Bloomfield's questions. Neglect of such questions within the discipline of theoretical linguistics is perhaps partly due to the

fact that Bloomfield's Language made a deeper impression on most linguists than did his contributions to more applied linguistics.

Linguists studying distributional relations have used judgments as to difference and sameness to determine whether variations in forms occurring in data are meaningful. Editing, or correction, whether initiated internally or externally in relation to a writer, raises questions as to what is the "same" or "different," and from whose perspective, and why. The answers vary depending on the assortment of forms and functions that are important in a particular sociocultural matrix. Certain incongruities may arise if participants in situations that involve interlanguage (Selinker 1969, 1972) and interethnic communication have different linguistic expectations. Mutual adjustments are likely to occur, however, if efforts to communicate continue.

Frequently in the world beyond the university, one justification for the usefulness of linguistic studies seems to be the presumed applicability of linguistics to concerns of education or language departments. Academic disciplines, perhaps naturally, tend to direct attention inward rather than outward to interdisciplinary concerns. I hope to show that study of second-language development outside departments that focus primarily on language can contribute something to the advancement of the field of linguistics even if the contribution lies primarily in raising questions from an interdisciplinary perspective.

Although this is an exploratory study, I believe that the conclusions could be generalized through further investigations of different sociocultural groups.

## CHAPTER I

### BEGINNINGS: INITIAL PROBLEMS FOR YUMIKO AND HER READERS

I gave the- my first draft of this paper, he didn't want to read because of my English [embarrassed laugh], but uh, then he corrected some of my English on the paper. (Yumiko, speaking of Professor B)<sup>1</sup>

#### 1.1 Introduction

Patterned differences occur, I argue, 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 terms of patterns of overall organization, or connections, and the use of initial connectives: conjunctions and adverbial phrases that occur at the beginnings of sentences. The "Japanese English" patterns represent linguistic code blending.<sup>2</sup> A linguistic code is part of a set of mutually intelligible resources of language: e.g., Japanese or English (Hymes 1974). Blending represents the last-  
ing creation of new forms (or new uses of forms) by analogy with two different sources (see, e.g., Hockett 1958, 1967; Fromkin 1973). Patterns in the structuring of information depend on the ethno-linguistic backgrounds of the participants in a communication situation. Code blending has ethnolinguistic implications in terms of form-meaning covariation and sequencing. Through investigation of editing,<sup>3</sup> which I use as a technical term, I analyze the differences in patterns in terms of the participants'

own frames of reference. Theory and the collection and analysis of data interact to determine what is significant to focus upon in any linguistic study.

As a result of the editing of a series of drafts where participants did not fully share linguistic expectations, some of the differences in the structuring of information have tended to converge. Such convergence in an American academic setting inclines toward patterns of standard academic English.<sup>4</sup>

The analysis that is presented in this study cannot clearly establish a linguistic system for "Japanese English" as separate from some other system of English, because English has indistinct boundaries. Still Yumiko and I believe that her "Japanese English" is not purely idiosyncratic. As Yumiko became aware of blending in her use of language, she made changes to the extent that they seemed necessary to her for interethnic communication. Such changes are brought about by language editing that is performed by individuals. This kind of convergent change at the level of individuals is distinct from language changes in whole speech communities as such changes are traditionally considered by linguists. Nevertheless, language change occurs in individuals in both cases, so the types of change are quite probably related. It is indeed likely that the same processes are at work whether in a microcosm or on a grander scale. There is convergence between Japanese and some standard English norms in the blended linguistic code "Japanese English." More studies of Japanese speech communities that use forms of English are necessary across time if linguists are to learn about historical

developments within "Japanese English" as a dialect. In this case study, I am more immediately concerned with the language of an individual writer of "Japanese English" as it shifts toward an American academic standard in some ways. Language editing can lead to language learning, and learning of a second language is possibly a basis for linguistic change.

There are conflicting pressures that work against a great degree of change in Yumiko's language. These pressures derive from linguistic customs, at both a cultural and a personal level, and from beliefs in the legitimacy of retaining a linguistic code that reflects an individual's own cultural background and personality. In this way, questions of constraints, transition mechanisms, sociolinguistic embedding, evaluation, and actuation interact in relation to change in language (Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog 1968). For communication to be effective, it must be relatively clear, processible, quick and easy, and semantically and rhetorically expressive (Slobin 1977). Yet there are factors that conflict here in terms of production and comprehension. What is quick and easy and expressive for a writer may not be so for a reader. This is especially the case when there are differences due to blending in their linguistic codes, for such differences tend to escape direct notice.

Translation between Japanese and English is often difficult. This fact seems rather obvious. Yet the difficulty is one of the reasons leading to my focus on connective problems. Connectives generally are fundamental grammatical morphemes or adverbial phrases serving as cohesion devices for the structuring of information.

That is, connectives normally signal relationships among data or ideas. These basic structural words are likely to be influenced by, or even translated from, the native language of writers who write in a nonnative language. The meanings and specific uses of connectives are often little understood (cf. Lakoff 1973).

In editing Yumiko's writing, when problems concerning simple grammaticality or factual accuracy do not intervene, her readers comment primarily on content where difficulties involve initial connectives and connections. While the readers perceive difficulties in communication, they do not necessarily see the cause of the problems. The use of numerous initial connectives without apparent reasons makes it hard for the readers to know what is important to the writer. This is because such connectives fill a prominent role in discourse by initiating sentences while also tending to mask assertions. When the "same" linguistic forms occur in other positions in Yumiko's sentences, they are more often seen as being suitably in accord with standard academic English.

To facilitate communication a writer must usually learn to take readers' expectations into account. The ideal result of editing is greater similarity in linguistic encoding of connections than in the participants' earlier communication, while maintaining distinctive personal cultural identities.

This study is based on a longitudinal examination, in some detail, of work by an individual writer. Linguistic field work has frequently been based on data gathered from a single source. Such work tends to emphasize coverage of a wide range of topics in order to describe a

language, and the results naturally tend to lack much depth of coverage. The current study, comparing developments involving patterns of connections in a series of papers composed by one writer, aims for greater depth in one topic rather than breadth of topics. Since no linguistic description represents a language completely, any linguistic description should be evaluated in terms of its purpose (see Grace 1981a for a discussion of this point). Scollon and Scollon emphasize the importance of attending to assumptions thus:

To a large extent the object of linguistic description may be a product of the assumptions about the nature of language made by linguists. To the extent that this is true, we see the investigation of those assumptions about the nature of language as the problem of central importance to current linguistic theory. (1979:259)

I strongly agree with these statements. It is hoped that the findings in the present study can be taken as representative of writers with linguistic backgrounds similar to Yumiko's.

## 1.2 Background Information about Participants

Yumiko is the writer who provided the principal data to be discussed here. She was a graduate student at a university in Hawaii at the time (1980) when she wrote the series of four drafts (about 33,000 words) that form the basis for this study. She is a native of Japan, and Japanese represents her primary language of socialization and education, i.e., her native language. She has an undergraduate degree in American literature from a Christian university in Japan, where some of her teachers were native speakers of American English. She has studied outside Japan for approximately 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 variety of English at a reasonably advanced level, at least in conversation, seems fairly stable. She speaks English quite understandably. She is no longer actively studying the language nor incorporating a large amount of new grammatical information that must be assimilated into a linguistic system.

Yumiko became involved in this investigation because she was experiencing linguistically based academic difficulties that she did not expect. That is, her oral and written language production evoked differing evaluations from professors concerning her ability to communicate in English. This contrast is of interest in relation to the paradox that George Grace (1978) has pointed out: namely, while written and oral language have generally been thought to be the same except for the medium of presentation; and while differences in proficiency in writing, even among native speakers of a language, have generally been recognized; individual differences in language "competence" in a broad sense are largely overlooked.<sup>5</sup> 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.

In addition to Yumiko, there are two groups of readers whose responses are relevant as checks in relation to this investigation. One includes five professors (A, B, C, D, and E) from various departments with some academic interest in Yumiko's topics. The other includes two graduate students (F and G) from departments other than hers.

The professors, as native speakers of English (except for D, who was primarily a discussant rather than a reader), are outsiders relative to Yumiko's linguistic codes. Although Professor D is a native speaker of Japanese, he has lived in the United States since his teens and generally seems to prefer to speak English rather than Japanese now. Each of the other professors knows at least one Southeast Asian language. In the academic setting in Hawaii where the writing was done, it is difficult to find monolingual speakers who have no experience with other languages.

As for the students, F's native language is English, while G's is Japanese. In addition to being fluent in her native language, G is essentially fluent in English as a second language although she sometimes uses forms that are not completely idiomatic in a standard English. Her orientation toward the value of adopting American English ways of speaking is stronger than is Yumiko's. It was not possible at the time of this study to find any readers locally who both closely resembled Yumiko and also could afford the time to become involved in a comparative linguistic project involving lengthy written drafts (averaging more than twenty pages each).

As an editor, I became involved primarily with Yumiko's pre-final draft (MAli).<sup>6</sup> By the time she had written that draft, Yumiko had basically established matters of content and form in her drafts. My native language is English, but I also know Japanese and have taught English courses, including composition, in Japan and the United States.

### 1.3 Issues for Linguistics

When I first met Yumiko, she had recently encountered a crucial reader (Professor B) who would not read beyond a couple of pages of Yumiko's first draft (PS1:I-II::1-47--see Figure 1, on p. 9, and Appendix A) because of the nonstandard nature of the written language involved. Yumiko had submitted this draft to Professor A with fairly satisfactory results. To give an impression of what these readers had to face, I am presenting a fairly extended example at this point (see Figure 1).

Professor A's basic acceptance of the paper contrasted strongly with Professor B's unwillingness on account of linguistic problems to continue reading the paper. This contrast raised a series of questions as to the reasons behind such different reactions:

On what grounds do American English-speaking professors find fault with the English of writers such as Yumiko?

In reading, what draws attention away from content and onto form?

Are there possible linguistic bases for the noted differences between the reactions of Professors A and B?

What might they be?

Is there a linguistic basis for drawing acceptability lines?

How are language-based evaluations embedded in the socio-cultural matrix that supports a language?

What is the relationship between writing and "language"?

Do differences that distinguish Yumiko's writing from standard academic writing represent systematicity within "English"?

Javanese Rural Elite: PROTECTOR OF THE PEASANT MASS OR EXPLOITER

Yumiko

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 far beyond within most of the daily patterns of mutual interest and aid 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)

Figure 1

What is "English"?

Specifically with regard to initial connectives and their contribution to coherence in writing, what are the basic characteristics in this particular case of academic "Japanese English"?

The thesis I am arguing is that there is patterned linguistic blending involving connections and connectives in "Japanese English" discourse. Features that indicate overall organization in English include, for example, particular types of section headings such as Introduction and Conclusion. Initial connectives include syntactic conjunctions such as Because, (Even) Though, and While<sup>7</sup> (see 3.2.2.2) and also the transitional expressions that are presented under 3.2.3.2. While headings and connective forms seem to be invariable in communicative function, they may actually mask differences between the functions English readers assume that they have and what Yumiko assumes. A writer such as Yumiko and readers more generally are not fully aware of the differences in the characteristics of the linguistic patterns of organization that they normally expect. (Issues of rhetorical style that are relevant to linguistics are discussed by Gray 1977, Slobin 1977, Richards 1979, and Pike 1981.)

Consideration of the nature of same and different relations is fundamental to any comparative analysis, in linguistics or elsewhere. Same and different are not absolute, unchanging relations. Instead there are degrees of similarity and difference, and judgments concerning them depend on the arena of evaluation. Comprehensible discourse that deviates from the grammatical rules of standard academic English

cannot be accounted for except in terms of a description which is separate from that of the standard language. (See 1.5.1 and the discussion of semigrammaticality in Gleitman and Gleitman 1970.)

Hockett comments:

Close similarity implies mutual intelligibility, but a fair degree of difference need not imply mutual unintelligibility. People manage to understand each other even though they signal by different codes. (1955:18)

Lack of recognition of specific differences in expectations concerning the use of English makes editing especially difficult. There is substantial overlap in the competences of Yumiko and her readers. For example, Yumiko uses a wide range of connectives in her writing. The range distinguishes her work from that of some American students who have writing problems. (See the discussions under 3.2.2 and 3.2.3; also 7.2.) The overlap in competences tends to disguise the fact that writer and reader may be interpreting the "same" thing differently, until some particular incongruity appears sharply.<sup>8</sup> Then it may turn out that the element in question, or the context that gives it meaning, is not really the "same" as that which a reader expected after all.

In this case study, where the process of language editing or correction involves communicative interaction between a student writer and her professors as readers, I will argue that editing produces some specific kinds of structural changes in the organization of Yumiko's discourse where there are differences in understanding. Namely, there is a shift from a four-part Japanese pattern of overall organization to the three-part pattern of standard academic English

(see 4.4). There is also a shift in Yumiko's use of initial connectives so that their occurrence seems more reasonable to her professors.

#### 1.4 Systematicity and Linguistic Codes

##### 1.4.1 Systematicity of Language

People generally agree that languages are systematic means of communication at least. Since systematicity enters into definitions of codes, let us first compare some discussions of systems in linguistics before we focus on codes.

Labov provides a fairly standard definition of a system as "a set of elements which are so tightly organized that one cannot change the position of one without changing the position of the others" (1971:447). He goes on to say that important and significant linguistic behavior can be nonsystematic, not predictable, and without norms. This statement is in line with his definition of system. Although Labov was discussing systems in relation to Creole studies, his points also have relevance for studies of bilingualism. Does the use of a nonnative language in addition to a native language reflect a single variable system, or does it reflect co-existent systems within an individual language learner? Existence of code blending in Yumiko's writing suggests systematic interdependence.

With regard to emphasis on "system," Gray seems closer to Labov than to Halliday (to be discussed next) in claiming:

Every language is systematic, but none constitutes a system--a consistent, coherent, and unchanging body of rules for making or recognizing utterances. . . . Linguists have tended to

think that it must be possible to isolate at a given moment in space and time the system of rules that is responsible for a given language. (Gray 1977:xiii)

Gray goes on to observe: "No grammar can be more consistent than the language it analyzes" (1977:76). This statement is especially likely to be true for descriptions of nonnative language phenomena such as those in Yumiko's writing, where variation tends to be great.

Halliday argues:

In the interpretation of language, the organizing concept that we need is not structure but system. . . . With the notion of system we can represent language as a resource, in terms of the choices that are available, the interconnection of these choices, and the conditions affecting their access. (1978:192)

Structural arrangement is a surface level phenomenon. We need to understand the deeper patterning both between paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships and also within them. The set of options in a system provides a frame for determining sames and differentials. Acceptability depends on the potential range of occurrences of options. Halliday claims "the nature of the linguistic system is such that it has to be explained in functional terms"<sup>9</sup> (1978:47)

Hymes (1974) also argues for the need to pay attention to shifts in levels within a grammar when trying to understand the meaning, or function, of particular elements. Certain assumptions about the placing of linguistic boundaries, ranging from those of lexical items to those of languages, may lead to misconceptions. Sapir, of course, told us quite a few years ago that grammars leak.

Language in general, and a code like "Japanese English" in particular, is not a closed system. Rather it represents an open system that is manifested in patterned interactions.



#### 1.4.2 Linguistic Codes and Interethnic Communication

With the preceding discussion of systematicity to serve as background, let us focus next on the matter of codes in linguistics. There are several possible definitions here. The current discussion focuses on statements by Hymes, Halliday, and Bernstein which seem most relevant.

Hymes contrasts codes with other forms of speech: namely languages and dialects; varieties; and registers.<sup>10</sup>

Forms of Speech  
languages and dialects  
codes  
varieties  
registers

Where mutual intelligibility is in question, whether due to different provenance or to derivation by addition, deletion, substitution, permutation from a common set of resources, the term code is most appropriate; it suggests decoding and intelligibility. (Hymes 1974:59)

Since the provenance of "Japanese English" such as Yumiko's and of standard academic English differ, it seems appropriate to discuss the resultant problems of mutual intelligibility in terms of code. "Japanese English" is, of course, closer to academic English in most ways than it is to academic Japanese. Nevertheless, analysis of Yumiko's writing provides clear evidence of code blending in her "Japanese English" discourse strategies.

Halliday defines a code as "a systematic pattern of tendencies in the selection of meanings to be exchanged under specified conditions" (1978:181). The most typical form of representation of

any text<sup>11</sup> is that which is most highly coded, or systematically patterned in the language of the text. This form expresses a "congruence relation."

Certain types of social context typically engender text in which the coding process, and the congruence relation, tend to be foregrounded and brought under attention. An example is the language of young children (and of others interacting with them), since children are simultaneously both interacting and constructing the system that underlies the text. (Halliday 1978:180)

The language of people developing any code (particularly a second language), and the language of people who interact with them, constitutes another example of what Halliday is talking about here. This is the type of situation that I have been investigating with regard to the editing of English written by Yumiko in interaction with her American professors.

Bernstein discusses codes as follows:

The code which the linguist invents to explain the formal properties of the grammar is capable of generating any number of speech codes. . . . Language is a set of rules to which all speech codes must comply, but which speech codes are realized is a function of the culture acting through social relationships in specific contexts. (1971:230)

Thus there are sociocultural boundary-maintaining principles. Meanings are more explicit and less contextually bound in elaborated codes than in restricted codes. Formal academic settings tend to favor elaborated linguistic usage, at least for writing, although elaboration is not always necessarily the most effective communication.

Schank and Abelson claim that "when people have a clue of what to forget they do better at remembering" (1975:163). In discussing interethnic oral communication, Scollon and Scollon (in press, p. 197) suggest that "communication goes wrong more often when speakers can

determine what was said but not why." Meta-messages are often implicit, and they are even less apparent in most writing than in speaking, since they are primarily based on prosodic or paralinguistic conventions.

Cross-language communication such as that involving English used by most Japanese is ordinarily interethnic. There is a common erroneous belief, particularly erroneous in interethnic communication, that a message which has been sent (e.g., written) is equivalent to the one that is received (e.g., read). (Cf. Reddy 1979 and the discussion of the conduit metaphor in my 1.5.) This belief may lead to stereotypical reactions by a reader, especially where he has more social power than a student writer. It is generally necessary to integrate inferences and situational context with overt linguistic expressions to arrive at the communicative intent of a speaker or writer. Yet frequently differences in un verbalized inferences that are characteristic of speech communities<sup>12</sup> remain unrecognized. Speech communities (e.g., groups of writers), as social network groups, normally share conventions that facilitate contextualization in communication (see Gumperz 1978; Gumperz and Tannen 1979). Contextualization conventions govern expectations and preferences concerning what co-occurs in language. Problems arise when a Japanese writer of English is not integrated into a homogeneous group which could assist development of standard academic English norms shared with readers.

## 1.5 Linguistics and Boundaries of "English"

### 1.5.1 Yumiko's Writing and "Englishes"

The findings that are presented in chapters 4 and 6 suggest that there are some major differences between Yumiko's problems with

"Japanese English" and the problems of writers whose native language is English (see Sommers 1980 and Jacobs 1979). The differences raise questions about the boundaries of "English" in various contexts. These questions concern linguistics because they interact with assumptions about the nature of language. The problems considered here relative to Yumiko's writings are attributed by some people to the common lot found in English departments in the United States. Whatever differences there are, however, are not likely to be brought to consciousness by lumping writing problems together.

College English teachers have said:

The differences between neighboring dialects are not sufficiently wide to prevent full mutual comprehension among speakers of those dialects. That is to say, when speakers of a dialect of American English claim not to understand speakers of another dialect of the same language, the impediments are likely to be attitudinal. ([National Council of Teachers of English] College Composition Committee Conference, n.d.:4)

Neighboring dialects are thus seen as basically representing a single linguistic code. Nevertheless, evaluative responses based on sociolinguistic or personal factors may lead to problems of mutual intelligibility which result in separate codes. In what sense might we say that standard academic English and the English written by Japanese represent "neighboring dialects"? If English as a first language and English as a second language are not fully mutually intelligible, as a result of systematic differences in patterning, they differ from "neighboring dialects." Then comprehension difficulties are likely to be more than just attitudinal, although attitudes are involved in adaptability to semigrammaticality. In

characterizing semigrammaticality, Gleitman and Gleitman say that a linguistic theory "must assume that comprehensible deviant sentences are systematic deformations of well-formed sentences" (1970:160-161). Whether the emphasis here, when comprehension occurs, is on deformation or on systematicity depends on whether one takes a prescriptive or descriptive view of English.

Before discussing these views concerning the English language, and in order to consider the College Composition Committee Conference's (CCCC) statement more adequately, let us first compare "Japanese English" and interlanguage in regard to a speaker whose first language is Japanese and whose second language is some form of English. By interlanguage I mean a set of systematic intermediate stages through which learners develop mastery of a linguistic code during the period between initial meaningful exposure to a target language and the potential attainment of nativelike proficiency in it. (Cf. Selinker 1969, 1972.)<sup>13</sup> "Japanese English," as the term is used in this study, represents an interlanguage that is legitimized both personally and on the basis of shared linguistic expectations within a community of language users. Yumiko sometimes uses this label in contrasting the language of her drafts in this study and standard academic English. She does not see "Japanese English" as an intermediate linguistic stage on the way to her becoming proficient in English. Rather "Japanese English" depends on a set of shared linguistic expectations which differs from that of many other speakers and writers of English. Yumiko does not seem to be very concerned about her English except at the stage of her final master's paper. She

does not intend to make major adjustments beyond those necessary for the kinds of communication in which she chooses, or expects, to participate. This attitude may represent "tacit fossilization," but that is not a permanent condition (see Strevens 1982). Fossilization seems to be an unhappy metaphor in relation to living languages. Yumiko does indeed make some adjustments in her language to succeed in the university, but not until she sees their necessity. She clearly recognizes a need for some minimum level of standardization of English such that people can communicate with one another on this basis. It is also clear that such standardization does not need to be American or British for her. She accepts her nonnative English as an adequate basis for both speaking and writing.<sup>14</sup> In line with the methodological approach of the ethnography of speaking (see 7.1), it seems reasonable to consider the data in this study descriptively as "Japanese English."

The CCCC statement continues, questionably:

Since differences among dialects of a language are confined to surface features, it follows that every speaker with competence in one dialect of a language also has virtually total competence in all other dialects of that language, even though that competence may never be activated in performance.  
(n.d.:9)

Even if standard academic English and "Japanese English" are not "neighboring dialects," both are generally seen as forms of "English" with a source that is partially shared. As some sort of a dialect of English, "Japanese English" might then be assumed not to involve special linguistic problems. Nevertheless, there is often an implicit assumption that "Japanese English" is really "imperfect English." From the perspective of most native speakers

of English this assumption appears reasonable. Nobody says that Yumiko's writing in this study is in Japanese (or Indonesian, despite the occurrence of a few lexical items that are taken from Indonesian because of the subject matter). At the same time, Yumiko's American readers view her writing as deviant from the norms that they accept. Yumiko's use of language, however, seems to involve patterned code blending, at least at some levels, as we shall examine in detail later. Scollon and Scollon (1979) describe somewhat similarly patterned mixture in Chipewyan narrative structures. In Yumiko's case, the "system of systems" which constitutes a language (Hymes 1974:152, attributed to Jakobson) shows less congruence with the systems of native speakers of English than in the situation anticipated by most English teachers and by many linguists.

Many student writers for whom the basic language of socialization and education is not English do not seem to respond in the same way as do native speakers of English to instruction in college courses dealing with writing.<sup>15</sup> The differences are one principal reason for having separate courses which are supposedly designed to deal with the specific problems of speakers and writers of "English as a second language."

A question remains as to whether Yumiko's "English" is the same as that of another Japanese who uses English. There are surely individual differences, but certain common features are also likely to occur. (See 7.6 for discussion of specific comparisons. I cannot find other studies like the current one.) If users of a particular language are intelligible only to each other, it seems that they have

a distinctly separate code from the codes in the repertoires of other language communities. However, usually there is some mutual intelligibility with members of other natural language groups. Then the determination as to which linguistic phenomena belong to the same language must be made on sociolinguistic grounds, preferably from the points of view of the participants in communication.

The conduit metaphor expounded by Reddy (1979) fits here nicely. Metalinguistically, at least English speakers tend to try to "put content into words" or "extract meaning from sentences." If readers of "English" find it difficult to "get the message from" a writer who lacks nativelike command of English, they may question the extent to which the writing is actually "in English." Reddy suggests that the conduit metaphor seriously affects our thinking about language, discouraging us from reconstructive communication.

Schooled people have considered it a duty, at least since the Renaissance period, to cultivate national languages. (Cf. Grace 1981b:35-45.)<sup>16</sup> In contacts between people from different speech communities, however, prescriptive attitudes concerning national languages may not necessarily enhance interethnic communication. "English" is no longer simply a national language. Instead it is increasingly being used and accepted as an international, or world, language. (See Smith 1981 and Kachru 1982.) Regional variations that represent indigenization (Richards 1979) are becoming institutionalized in various parts of the world--e.g., in India (Kachru 1978), the Philippines (Llamzon 1969), and Singapore (Platt 1975, Crewe 1977, Richards 1979, and Platt and Weber 1981)--although



this is not at present the case in Japan to the same extent. Institutionalization of regional Englishes seems to be connected with broader questions concerning the role of English repertoires<sup>17</sup> in particular situations, especially as literacy is involved. In disregard of external standards, to avoid loss of cultural values or identity (see S. Scollon 1982), or to avoid contributing to cultural imperialism, users of English in the so-called Third World are allowing new norms of acceptability and correctness to develop with relatively little protest. Also many American professors seem to be more concerned with upholding academic standards in general than with particular standards of English, although some minimal thresholds of acceptability are necessary for comprehension. These thresholds vary with individuals.

#### 1.5.2 Linguistic Issues: Functional Relativity and Code Blending

Since the nature of the problem here under investigation goes beyond the framework provided by most academic departments and has not received much attention in linguistics, the problem tends to fall between disciplines and remains neglected (see Hymes 1977 and Grace 1979). Aside from this remark, what else can be said about the problem in relation to broader interests in linguistics? Socio-linguistic issues of functional relativity (Hymes 1966, 1974; also Gumperz, Jupp, and Roberts 1979) and code blending are relevant here.

First, let us consider functional relativity. As a result of differences in the patterns of overall organization in discourse that readers such as Yumiko's professors expect and that writers

such as Yumiko provide, 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. The relations of same and different are in some ways culturally bound (emic) and hence cross-culturally variable, while in other ways they are universal (etic), or cross-culturally invariable. Despite Hymes (1966), this type of functional relativity remains little recognized, both by communicators who are relatively naive linguistically and by more sophisticated linguists. (For discussions of this point see R. Scollon 1980b and S. Scollon 1982; also Forman, personal communication.) To the extent that functional relativity 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.

Second, blending has received little attention from linguists in the study of discourse (cf. Hockett 1961, Topping 1962, Forman 1972). Blending differs from code switching as the latter is described by Gumperz and others in the fact that code switching serves sociolinguistic purposes directly.<sup>18</sup> Blending, on the other hand, is generally closer to the notion of linguistic interference, as described by Weinreich, Mackey, Rozencvejk, and others.<sup>19</sup> Blending is likely to occur relatively uniformly across texts, while code switching, and style shifting, are concerned with variation in texts.

Oke (1975:279-280) discusses "code-mixing" by a Yoruba-English speaker and emphasizes that "while his linguistic hybrid has rules as do other linguistic systems, it is not an autonomous system and may never be one." This raises some interesting linguistic questions for him, including whether "the code-mixing bilingual has now developed a sort of 'upper case LANGUAGE'." The situation that Oke refers to involves lexical code switching, but Yumiko's writing cannot accurately be described as lexical code switching. So the two cases differ at least in that regard. Yet a similar type of cover category that will allow for systematic blending is desirable for the present discussion. (Cf. also the discussion of "diasystems" in Weinreich 1954 and Nagara 1972.) Code switching and blending may also occur within languages as well as between them.

People who are bilingual to only a slight extent in Japanese and English often combine the languages at various levels. Their combinations constitute simplified linguistic codes like those that are labeled "Japlish" (Morito 1978), "Janglish," or "Bamboo English" (Goodman 1967). Yumiko's blended English is complex rather than simplified like such combinations, which are not the focus of the current investigation. Yet interlanguage phenomena are difficult to sort out analytically, and the existence of "Japanese English" is at least partly a matter of the attitudes of its users. Patterned blending in discourse represents a basic linguistic phenomenon that deserves attention in its various manifestations.

The patterned blending of Japanese English is likely to go unnoticed when the lexical items are English and when the sentences

are generally decipherable by readers of English who do not know Japanese. Yet the main points being communicated may differ between writer and reader.

The use of connective expressions in written English is typically more elaborated than in spoken English. However, a writer such as Yumiko may have little opportunity to develop a sense of natural, idiomatic use of connectives in English. As a result, she tends to depend on her native sense of how to use connectives, translating subconsciously between Japanese and English systems.

#### 1.5.2 Reading, Writing, and Editing by Yumiko and Her Professors

When Yumiko's professors interpret a text in English that Yumiko has written, their interpretations are likely to differ from hers. Characteristic responses to patterns in the structuring of information are based on, or influenced by, an individual's native language patterns. They can be investigated by means of paraphrase or translation. Through negotiation in the communicative interaction that goes with the editing process in an academic setting (or elsewhere), generally consensus can be reached where interpretations differ from each other.

"Overt correction or editing" (Hockett 1967:917) tends to be more obvious in speech than in most academic writing that is seen by people other than the writer. This is because slips of the tongue cannot be erased (except from recordings). Nevertheless, editing may be of greater concern in written communication, at least with regard to final versions of papers. This is because of the writer's lack of opportunity to provide immediate interpretations or corrections

in direct response to readers' reactions. In reading and writing, the expectations of participants in a communicative situation constitute a factor of central importance in understanding the relationship between language editing and communication.

#### 1.6 Plan of Discussion in This Dissertation

Chapter 1 has introduced the problems, especially the linguistic ones, to be discussed in this dissertation, with some background for perspective.

Chapter 2 describes the types of data in this study and discusses interrelationships of theory and data as they affect the presentation of extracts from Yumiko's writing.

Chapter 3 presents terminology, theory, and a review of literature relevant to coherence<sup>20</sup> and initial connectives. This chapter includes examples of the range of connectives found in the data.

Chapter 4 presents a comparative outlining of the section headings of Yumiko's various drafts to show how her plan of overall organization shifts in relation to comments made by her readers.

Chapter 5 reviews literature dealing with structuring of information and "themes," with particular attention to Halliday (1967).

Chapter 6 deals with analyses of connectives within sections and paragraphs, from both synchronic and narrow diachronic perspectives, in relation to comments by editing readers. Diachronic comparison of parallel passages from various drafts shows how initial connectives occur in the different contexts of successive stages of developments.

Chapter 7 discusses the implications of the findings. In addition to pulling together some insights derived from the analytical

discussion of forms and their functions, I will consider some of the more general theoretical issues which this investigation raises. These include the question of whether some English may in a sense be an Asian language when it is written by some Japanese. That is, might there be certain East Asian linguistic areal features in languages such as Japanese, Korean, Philippine languages, and Thai that also occur in some forms of English used by the speakers of these languages? Also included are questions concerning the interrelationship of theory and data, in addition to other questions already raised in this introduction.

The appendices contain a complete copy of Yumiko's draft PS1<sup>21</sup> and the introductory and concluding sections from her later drafts.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>See 1.2 for descriptive identification of the participants.

<sup>2</sup>Credit for stimulating this line of thinking belongs to Michael Forman (personal communication). Forman suggests that "we require a theory which makes provision for the building of a language by blending" (1972:237). Forman (1973) raises some related questions concerning systems and boundaries.

<sup>3</sup>If we compare editing with correction, the former term is more general and relatively nonprescriptive. It seems more appropriately descriptive than the latter for the approaches of some of Yumiko's readers and of Yumiko herself as a writer, although prescriptive correction characterizes other readers.

<sup>4</sup>Standard variety of English is one that does not attract peculiar attention to itself when it is used. A "standard English" is not actually a single homogeneous linguistic system for speech nor for written language (Stubbs 1980, Hudson 1981). For purposes of comparison involving the "Japanese English" in this discussion, we are concerned with some standard academic variety of American English as a first language. One's first language, or native language, is the language of one's primary socialization and schooling (cf. Coulmas 1981).

Since synchronic descriptions are essentially abstractions based on data gathered in the course of time, albeit brief, the possibility of encountering variation and developmental change in synchronic material is very great.

<sup>5</sup>Consideration of Hudson's (1981) list of "some issues on which linguists can agree" suggests that this paradox may not be an issue

so much in linguistics as it is outside the discipline. Yet Stubbs (1980) claims, even within linguistics, there is still no coherent theory of the relations between written and spoken language.

<sup>6</sup>See 2.1 for a descriptive discussion of Yumiko's texts.

<sup>7</sup>When syntactic conjunctions (e.g., Because, Though, and While) occur as initial connectives, they are always capitalized in this presentation in order to distinguish them from forms (e.g., because, though, while) which Yumiko uses as non-initial connectives in accordance with syntactic norms of standard academic English. Capitalization of semantic conjunctions (3.2.3), on the other hand, has no special significance.

<sup>8</sup>Disguised incongruities of comprehension and production show up in child language development experiments, too. For example, in relation to the meanings of before and after, iconic patterns such as

- (1) a. He ate before he slept.
- b. After he ate, he slept.

are easier to follow than their reverse:

- (2) a. Before he slept, he ate.
- b. He slept after he ate.

<sup>9</sup>"The 'formal/functional' dichotomy is one of those which linguistics is better rid of; it is misleading to say even that classes are functionally determined, since they are set up with reference to the form of the unit next above--the whole description is both formal and functional at the same time, and function is merely an aspect of form." (Halliday 1976a:65)

<sup>10</sup>Cf. Hymes, where he says that a community's verbal means--based on provenance, human nature, and use--are organized into



"fashions of speaking" that enter into linguistic repertoires (1974:171).

<sup>11</sup>Halliday and Hasan define "text" as "any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole. . . . a unit of language in use" (1976:1).

<sup>12</sup>Hymes defines a speech community as "a community sharing knowledge of the rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech" (1974:50). (Also see the discussion in my 7.4.)

<sup>13</sup>Current interest in IL studies developed out of the error analysis perspective of modern foreign language teachers, particularly those who found that linguistic contrastive analysis was inadequate to predict or even to explain the "errors" made by learners. Investigators have treated IL under various labels, e.g., Nemser's (1971) "approximative systems" and Sampson and Richards' (1973) "learner language systems," but Selinker's "interlanguage" has become the dominant term.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. Schmidt's discussion of a similar attitude displayed by Wes, who is another Japanese who speaks English, although he does not write. See Schmidt (to appear), especially pp. 34-35.

<sup>15</sup>See Arena 1975. Apparent differences in response seem to be largely a matter of attitudes. (Ted Plaister, personal communication.)

<sup>16</sup>Grace says: "By cultivated languages, I mean forms of language that have been shaped consciously by deliberate human intervention" (1981b:35).

<sup>17</sup>The question as to whether "Japanese English" may be an Asian language has been raised by Michael Forman (personal communication).

<sup>18</sup>Gumperz says that conversational code switching "relies on the meaningful juxtaposition of what speakers must process as strings formed according to the internal syntactic rules of two distinct systems" (1977:6). The key here is meaningful choice. There is considerable literature dealing with phenomena related to code blending. Gibbons (1979) contrasts "code-mixing or koinéising" by students at the University of Hong Kong with borrowing, interference, code switching, pidgins, creoles, and creoloids. (Cf. Platt 1975 concerning "creoloid" Singapore English.) Agheyisi (1977) describes interlarded speech of Nigerians.

<sup>19</sup>Weinreich says: "Those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact, will be referred to as INTERFERENCE phenomena" (1963:1). He considers phonological and grammatical phenomena and their impact on language norms.

Mackey (1970) associates interference with message rather than code.

Rozencveig defines interference as "the bilingual's breaking of the rules of equivalence between the languages in contact as manifested in his speech by deviations from the norm" (1976:1), but he does not discuss this in relation to discourse, nor to writing.

Language transfer is also related to linguistic interference. Selinker (1969) uses language transfer for a statistically based discussion of binary oppositions in interlanguage syntax. (See also

Gass 1979.) It seems preferable for me to use the term "blending" in this study of discourse patterns, since I am emphasizing the convergence that is evident in my data. The fact that Yumiko is not aiming for "American English" as a target language is important in determining what norms are relevant for an interlanguage analysis.

<sup>20</sup>Coherence represents the result of a systematic structuring of information. (Cf. 3.1 and 5.2.) Just as "structure" may be either a noun or a verb, "structuring" of information may be conceived of as either an action or a state resulting from the action.

<sup>21</sup>See 2.1 for a discussion of my coding of Yumiko's drafts.

## CHAPTER II

### INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF THEORY AND DATA

#### 2.1 Description of Data

Yumiko was planning a series of related papers (concerned basically with political, cultural, and historical developments in Java) to be written during a period of about eight months and to be shown to various readers as part of her M.A. program. This set of circumstances provided a good opportunity to investigate the editing process through a comparison of various intermediate drafts and papers which were officially submitted. The papers were written outside departments of English of any kind,<sup>1</sup> and they were directed more or less successfully toward eventual publication.

This investigation focuses on initial connectives and overall patterns of organization in written academic "Japanese English." The primary data derive from two sets of interrelated drafts (listed below in Figure 2, p. 34), and related outlines, culminating in a master's paper.<sup>2</sup> I have encoded the sets as PS, standing for political science, and MA, signifying the final paper required for the master of arts degree in Yumiko's curriculum. 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 also contrasts the most obviously with standard written academic American English.

<u>Draft</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Pages</u>	<u>Typeface</u>	<u>Comments</u>
PS1	May 8	20	elite	
PSli	Sept.			partial intermediate, handwritten drafts that Yumiko did not submit to professors
PSlii				
PSliii				
PS2	Oct. 29	26	elite	
MA1*	Dec. 5	37	elite	
Mali				intermediate, handwritten drafts that Yumiko did not submit to professors
MAlii		100		
MA2	Dec. 29	55	pica	

\*Yumiko submitted slightly different versions of draft MA1 to me and to her professors, as I indicate where it is relevant in later discussion.

#### Selected Characteristics of Yumiko's Drafts

Figure 2

The primary corpus of written data consists of about 33,000 words produced by Yumiko in her nonnative English over an eight-month period. Yumiko also kindly provided access to the comments written by professors on her various drafts. These comments indicated some of the focal areas of concern among various knowledgeable readers and served as an important component of the interaction between readers and writer which is crucial for editing.

I elicited a Japanese outline from Yumiko for comparison with her English outline for draft PS2, because she reported her tendency at the beginning of this period of investigation to think in Japanese. She also translated selected passages from various drafts into Japanese at my request. A discussion (for about forty-five minutes) of the major points of her intended message in the original paper (PS1) was conducted in Japanese and tape-recorded. Besides Yumiko and me, the discussion group included a professor (D) in Yumiko's field of specialization whose native language is Japanese, and another Japanese graduate student, who has no particular knowledge of the topic under consideration. I conducted additional discussions in English with Yumiko to elicit possible paraphrases of some of the written sentences. This was done for sentences which deviated markedly from any standard academic English sentence that seemed to me to say what Yumiko probably meant. After she had completed her final paper, I taped another discussion with her dealing with general issues centering around her writing.

## 2.2 Theory and the Determination of Data

A rudimentary theory, at least, is an important prerequisite for determining what constitutes data to be investigated. There is a need for longitudinal studies of individuals in research concerning developmental language use (see, e.g., Corder 1978 and Taronc 1979; also Klein 1981 and Huebner 1982). Longitudinal studies of individual differences are also needed in order to deal with Grace's (1978) writing paradox (see my 1.2; cf. Gleitman and Gleitman 1979; also Bloomfield 1964 [1927] and Hymes 1973, who take note of individual differences in language proficiency, whether written or oral). To understand linguistic differences among individuals, we must first know something about the language of individuals. Recently interest has focused somewhat more than formerly on individual differences even among adults speaking their native language (see Fillmore et al. 1979).

A human language cannot exist meaningfully apart from specific people, who produce and/or interpret it. A writer such as Yumiko, like any other producer of discourse, must make editing decisions in writing. Central among these is treatment of the question of how to connect ideas to communicate successfully with expected readers, who correct, overtly or covertly and to a greater or lesser extent, depending on personal factors and other circumstances. It is important to consider audience in relation to any communication, especially where there is a series of interactions which may lead to linguistic shifts in the structuring of information in comparable messages. Because of the importance of audience, the reactions of Yumiko's readers provide relevant data for trying to understand

the nature of communication written "in English" by Japanese. The extent of convergence of readers' reactions can serve as one indication as to how effectively a writer is communicating.

### 2.3 Presentation of Data

For copies of written communication not to misrepresent the original production, the format of reproduction must be as close to the format of the original as possible. In presenting textual material for publication, however, changes are often necessary. The implications of such changes should be consciously considered.

The original documents cannot be reproduced here exactly, partly on account of the private nature of various intermediate drafts and comments and partly because of the fact that some of the versions are too faint to be copied directly. Yumiko declared that she was not much concerned with the format of her drafts preceding the final paper.<sup>3</sup> The results are apparent in her own copying of drafts, and they do not seem to make an appreciable difference to most readers. Nevertheless it seems important in studying connections to try to preserve relative spacing of the text insofar as this is practical, with particular attention to line turns,<sup>4</sup> paragraphing, and punctuation marks,<sup>5</sup> because the physical presentation of constituents as units for the eye can influence readers in their interpretation of a written message. But since Yumiko generally typed long lines with narrow margins, it is impractical to preserve most of her line turns here where margins must be wider. I have made this modification arbitrarily since the matter did not seem significant to her or her professors. Yet wherever it seems to me that a phrase that is used



in one of the examples may have been critically interrupted by the end of a line in Yumiko's versions, I point the problem out in the discussion.

Otherwise all of the citations that are given here from Yumiko's English writing have been copied exactly from her drafts in my possession, and all of the citations from her speech are transcribed as accurately as possible. Consequently any deviations from standard English grammatical usage, wording, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, or spacing between words represent the original data and not the results of typing the current presentation.

To facilitate comparisons, citations from the drafts are encoded in terms of lines within a section (or subsection) and lines within a draft as a whole, since Yumiko reordered some sections in the process of revising. For example, to indicate lines 8-45 in the fifth section of Yumiko's second political science draft, we have the following code--PS2:V(.1):8-45:354-391--where the last set of numbers (354-391) represents lines in the draft as a whole. Citations are sometimes abbreviated by the use of :: followed by the draft lines without the section lines. I have not numbered Yumiko's footnotes with line numbers because she changes her style of presentation from draft to draft, sometimes putting notes at the foot of a page and sometimes at the end of the draft. Where citation of a note is relevant to the discussion here, I refer to it in the following manner: e.g., n.4. When I add notes to Yumiko's texts, these are indicated by \*.

For ease of reference within each chapter, I have numbered all of the citations from the drafts that Yumiko submitted to her professors. These numbers are preceded by E for extract. Comparable passages from successive drafts are further distinguished by small Roman numerals. Closely related passages within a draft are identified by lower case letters: e.g., in E9iia. Translations of passages are signalled by a prime mark following the original extract number: e.g., E1'. In singling out sentences of a long citation, I have used the abbreviation S (plural, Ss.).

Transcriptions of oral discussions and readings are further complicated by features of oral production such as pauses and intonation contours, and by various interruptions. There is no simple way to correlate these directly with written forms. But if writing is seen as a representation of language in its own right (see 7.2) rather than as a basically direct representation of speech, the significance of oral transcription problems here becomes secondary relative to the main focus of this investigation. Theory and the identification of data remain mutually dependent.

Notes

<sup>1</sup>The requirement that Yumiko take English courses was waived by her academic adviser, in part for personal reasons. The belief, shared by Yumiko and her adviser, that Yumiko would gain little of practical value from taking courses which neither saw as being relevant to Yumiko's linguistic needs was also a factor in the situation at the time.

<sup>2</sup>The format of a "master's paper" is less rigidly prescribed than that of a "master's thesis."

<sup>3</sup>She had it (in the form of draft MAli) closely edited by me prior to having it professionally typed by someone else.

<sup>4</sup>This matter is of concern in ethnopoetic studies because of the need to represent oral texts in some written form that captures as much of the prosodic information structuring as possible. In the current investigation of Yumiko's texts, we started from written data. Yumiko, however, began with language in her mind, which she then represented to some extent on paper. I have no experimental basis for a discussion of the significance of line turns at present, but the issue is one of psycholinguistic interest.

<sup>5</sup>Where Yumiko's punctuation practices differ from those of standard academic English, sometimes problems arise as to how to represent the data accurately and yet follow standard norms for this presentation. Specific problems will be noted at appropriate places in the discussion.

CHAPTER III  
COHERENCE AND INITIAL CONNECTIVES: REVIEW OF LITERATURE,  
WITH EXAMPLES FROM YUMIKO'S DRAFTS

In this chapter, before considering definitions of connectives, I will compare coherence and cohesion, which appear in linguistic literature with a confusing intersection of meanings. Then I will define initial connectives for the purpose of this study, contrasting this use of connectives with other uses of this and related terms in literature pertaining to language. Specifically, I will consider syntactic conjunctions (both subordinate and coordinate) and transitional adverbial phrases. Although there are similar forms elsewhere within sentences, I am not focusing on them here because they do not share the introductory function.

Coherence, connection, and conjunction have much in common. These terms, and other derivationally related ones, come from Latin forms meaning "to cling/tie/join together", respectively (American Heritage Dictionary 1975). An appropriate use of connectives results in coherent connections.

Furthermore, coordination and syntax are fundamentally related linguistic concepts, and these terms also are etymologically similar. Both come to us from Late Latin through French; but coordination derives from the Late Latin form meaning 'arrangement in the same order', while syntax derives from Greek forms meaning 'to put together, to arrange in order' (ibid.). Syntax is usually thought

of in terms of intrasentential arrangements. On the other hand, coordination, as well as other types of connection, can involve interclausal or intersentential relations. Seeking to understand these relationships is a basic reason for working on a discourse analysis, rather than a simpler grammar, of connection and connectives in the present investigation.

### 3.1 Coherence

Intelligibility or interpretability of messages, as we have seen (in 1.5), depends on the existence of some degree of shared perceptions of linguistic patterns, providing a basis for predictability in communication.

Coherence, for me, indicates a logical or orderly relationship (cf. syntax above) among the parts of a message. Coherence and cohesion are etymologically related, the latter deriving from the past participle of the root verb. The use of coherence and cohesion tends to be confusing in some linguistic literature. The confusion arises partly because some authors (e.g., Halliday and Hasan 1976) discuss cohesion, emphasizing semantic relationship, while others (e.g., Widdowson 1973) use cohesion in a different sense, emphasizing some syntactic condition.

Widdowson, in suggesting the following terminological distinctions to differentiate cohesion from coherence, appears to be separating normative, structural usage from characteristic functional use:

Grammarians are concerned with rules of usage which are exemplified in sentences; discourse analysts with rules of use which describe how utterances perform social acts. . . . Sentences combine to form texts and the relations between sentences are aspects of grammatical cohesion; utterances combine to form discourse and the relations between them are aspects of discourse coherence. (Cited in Coulthard 1977:9-10)

The present study of Yumiko's writing is concerned with relationships between cohesion, particularly where blending is involved, and coherence in "Japanese English," as they become evident as a result of editing by people who do not share certain basic linguistic expectations.

Halliday and Hasan, in their book entitled Cohesion in English, characterize cohesion in the sense of semantic relationship. They describe it as "a general text-forming relation, or set of such relations," where "text" refers to "any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole. . . . a unit of language in use" (1976:9, 1). Their text-forming relations include reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. Halliday and Hasan claim that these relations are independent of the structure of the text, particularly independent of structure at or below the level of the sentence. "Cohesion occurs where the INTERPRETATION of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another" (1976:4).

Along somewhat similar lines, Grimes states that "cohesion has to do with the way information mentioned in speech relates to information that is already available" (1975:272). That is, "cohesion is cumulative and linear rather than hierarchical" (1975:113).

On the other hand, Levy (1979) seems to stress the qualitative aspect of coherence, for semantic relationships, as preferable to the connotation of cohesion, at least for him, as merely syntactic. He comments that "'cohesive' suggests only structural binding, whereas 'coherent' borders on 'comprehensible' and suggests, in addition to cohesion, the mental processes whereby the discourse is understood" (1979:184).

In line with this distinction, for Kenneth and Evelyn Pike,

coherence comes, first of all, in reference to a chosen universe of discourse within which there is either syntagmatic (sequential) or network (relational) cohesion, in relating events or properties in various ways which leave parts of the whole compatible one with another. . . . Every monolog implies the coherence of a four-way relation of I-thou-here-now, as a universal of human experience tied into that interaction. (1977:377, 380)

This four-way relation corresponds, at least partially, to factors of situation and participants in the framework of the ethnography of communication.

For Crothers, coherence includes connectivity, coreferentiality, and lexical comparison or contrast. In text analysis it offers an essential criterion for selecting inferences worth including: "The more a given inferable proposition contributes to coherence, the more one should be inclined to include it" (Crothers 1979:7).

Jacobs suggests that "perhaps the most reliable indicators of coherence are descriptions of reader response" to the way information is combined (1979:3). She describes coherence as "the quality of smoothness or flow which allows the reader to follow the writer" (1979:129). She found that if writing lacked relational information (e.g., the assertion that something is an example) in any sentence,

it was "almost certainly incoherent" (1979:98). Relational information occurred in connection with personal insight. Her students reportedly did not normally use short connectives such as particularly and on the other hand, or this use was judged to be incorrect by the evaluator in her study. Yumiko's case is different, since she uses a wide range of connectives, as we shall see in the next section.

Mindful of the distinctions between coherence and cohesion discussed in this section, in considering patterns of connections we are concerned basically with coherence since this dissertation focuses on the use of written utterances in discourse.

### 3.2 Initial Connectives in Yumiko's "Japanese English"

Before the presentation of specific examples, this chapter discusses how connectives, particularly initial connectives, may be defined. Then we shall survey the basic types of initial connectives occurring in the data from Yumiko's writing. We shall see the wide range of initial connectives that Yumiko employs throughout her various drafts.

Some of these words will occur at the beginning of a sentence by virtue of their inherent nature as syntactic elements. This is true of the coordinating conjunctions: e.g., And, But, Or.

More problematic are the subordinators (subordinate conjunctions) such as Because, Though, and While. Capitalization<sup>1</sup> signifies the beginning of a written syntactic unit, specifically a sentence. In oral language, where sentence boundaries are less clearly indicated, Yumiko's use of these subordinators is less noteworthy. This, we may



assume, is because hearers react to pauses in speech differently from the way readers react to periods (and other punctuation) in written messages. Yet in both speaking and writing, it seems that Yumiko does not always distinguish between connectives which are coordinators and those which are subordinators in the way that native speakers of English expect.

Semantic conjunction can also be accomplished by adverbial phrases, particularly when these are initial and therefore indicative of some reasoned choice in the arrangement of a message. Yumiko uses such initial connectives more extensively than expected by most of her readers, particularly professors. Problems of interpretation arise when readers and writers do not perceive the differences in patterns of linguistic expectations behind the use of initial connectives. The connectives in such cases fail to function effectively; instead they disrupt a reader's train of thought.

### 3.2.1 Toward a Definition of Initial Connectives in English

The term initial connectives in this study basically refers to words and phrases that precede the subject phrase of a sentence (specifically in the first independent clause) and influence coherence between units of discourse ranging from sentences to paragraphs and beyond. We might expect more variability among pre-subject linguistic expressions for a Japanese writer of English than in standard academic English since Japanese has relatively free word order and marked topicalization (but cf. Talmy 1978). When coordinate conjunctions, subordinate conjunctions and the clauses they introduce, sentence adverbials, and other transitional phrases occur at the beginning

of a sentence, I consider these forms to be basic initial connectives in English. I will describe each of these classes more specifically after presenting an overview of the use of the term connective and related terms in literature representing various perspectives in the investigation of language.

Linguistic communication requires some meaningful arrangement of symbols. Good rhetorical style, according to Aristotle, is founded first of all on "the proper use of connecting words, and the arrangement of them in the natural sequence which some of them require" (1954:1407). Yet "the proper use" is a restricted use, as he implies in saying that "it is a general rule that a written composition should be easy to read and therefore easy to deliver. This cannot be so where there are many connecting words or clauses, or where punctuation is hard . . ." (ibid.). The use of connecting words tends to be impressive, uniting statements, but not necessarily concise. The omission of conjunctions makes each separate statement more important.

The term connective(s) is used in different ways by various people who are describing languages. Related terms include nexus (cf. Jespersen 1924, 1940), conjunct, coordinate, subordinate, and other forms that are derivative.

For Boas, in Tsimshian, connectives are suffixes that "connect two words that are syntactically related" (1911:350), while conjunctions (introductory, subordinating forms) are basically separate temporal particles and a negative. The conjunction meaning 'and' has special "connective" forms. Cf. Dunn, who says that

speakers of Tsimshian "never continue a sentence (after a pause) by starting with a connective" (1979:131). This is a distinctive difference from the use of English connectives. Boas and Swanton describe connectives in Teton as being "so closely related to adverbs as to be at times indistinguishable" (1911:949). They also describe coordinating conjunctions and subordinating conjunctions for Teton. The latter are correlated with postpositions and possibly related to the definite articles and an adverbial particle. Conjunctions meaning 'and then' and 'so' are most often used to introduce sentences.

Jespersen distinguishes "coordinating connectives" from "subordinating connectives" in English (1924:89-90). The latter include prepositions and the conjunctions that he labels "sentence prepositions." These latter differ from other prepositions only with regard to the type of complement with which they co-occur. Jespersen denies that there is any reason to establish two word-classes for these connectives.

In addition, note the following modern examples from other descriptions of grammars. Dubois says in his discussion of conjunctions and temporal expressions in narratives in Sarangani Manobo (a Philippine language), "The purpose of connectives is to provide reference points to keep the hearer properly oriented within the discourse. Even asyndeton, or absence of a connective, is significant, . . ." (1973:20). Some connectives may be inferred.<sup>2</sup> Koontz and Anderson (1977) describe connectives in Teribe (a language of northwestern Panama) as demonstratives, conjunctions, spatio-temporals, and "verbal expressions." R. Scollon (1977, 1979)

discusses the role of 'eku' and related clause-initial forms as Chipewyan discourse markers.

For Japanese, Martin states:

Certain adverbs and adverbial phrases apply to the sentence as a whole; among these we find a number of connectors that show some logical relationship between two sentences. Typically the CONJUNCTION, as we can call such phrases, serves to introduce the second sentence. The first sentence may be stated as a separate complete sentence or it may be reduced or conjoined to form a complex sentence, with the conjunction serving to remind us of its origin. . . . The conjunction is a kind of interpolation, like an interjection, and is like a minor sentence in itself. . . . Conjunctions might be treated as TRANSITIONAL THEMES with respect to the immediately following sentence. The use of conjunctions is apparently more common in modern written Japanese than in the older texts. (1975:817)

Bloch (1970) stated earlier that when connective adverbs occur in Japanese, they always begin a clause. Lehmann and Faust in A Grammar of Formal Written Japanese describe the function of conjunctions thus:

They are used to join nouns, or they introduce new clauses and provide a continuity of thought between two clauses. Unlike postpositions, they are not bound to the preceding clause; they follow the indefinite or conclusive form [of a verb] rather than the attributive. . . . 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 sentence connectives such as de wa, tokoro ga, sore kara, so site. Similar words are used in the written language; like some of the postpositions, these often have a functional meaning. For example, nao 'furthermore'. . . . (1951:96-98)

Conjunctions constitute a group of particles connecting "the following words to those preceding" (1951:68). Shinzato (1981) explores the nature of conjunctive particles as sentence conjunctions in her study of Japanese adverbial clauses. Some of the conjunctive

particles have alternate sentence-initial forms. (Cf. Talmy 1978, to be discussed in the next section.)

### 3.2.2 Syntactic Conjunction(s), Coordination, and Subordination

This section offers a quick historical perspective of the differentiation of connectives, followed by a discussion of examples from Yumiko's drafts.

#### 3.2.2.1 Definitions

Aristotle maintained Plato's distinction between nominal and verbal components of sentences<sup>3</sup> and added "the syndesmoi, . . . a class covering what were later to be distinguished as conjunctions (and probably prepositions . . .), the article, and pronouns" (Robins 1967:26). The minor parts of speech "did not signify anything of themselves, but merely contributed to the total meaning of sentences by imposing upon them a certain 'form', or organization" (Lyons 1968:273). Next the Stoics separated the inflected from the uninflected members of this group and among the latter split adverbs off from the later prepositions and conjunctions. Dionysius Thrax separated prepositions and conjunctions. The latter represent "a part of speech binding together the discourse and filling gaps in its interpretation" (Robins 1967:33). According to Priscian's grammar, "the property of conjunctions is to join syntactically two or more members of any other word class, indicating a relationship between them" (1967:57). No distinction between subordinate and coordinate conjunctions appears at this time in the classification of Latin conjunctions, although the relation of subordination was recognized elsewhere in the grammar.

In modern times, Chomsky (1957) defines conjunction as it relates to coordination within sentences. Transformational grammarians, and most others, have been more concerned with phrasal and clausal conjunction than with connections between surface sentences. They have relatively little to offer as a result to a discourse analysis of initial connectives. Talmy (1978) suggests that Japanese lacks true clausal coordinating conjunctions. His analysis may be accurate in a strict sense at the intrasentential level. The native speakers of Japanese with whom I have discussed the issue, however, believe that Japanese really has words that function as clausal coordinating conjunctions, even though the examples they give might be analyzed in terms of intersentential coordination involving initial sentence connectors. This discrepancy in views highlights the need (cf. Fillmore 1973) to consider language from an emic (i.e., insider's) perspective as it really occurs, especially as a basis for understanding editing decisions.

A coordination is defined by Dik as "a construction consisting of two or more members which are equivalent as to grammatical function, and bound together at some level of structural hierarchy by means of a linking device" (1968:25).

Conjunction is exemplified with and, that, when, and although by Quirk et al. (1972:45). For them, three conjunctions are coordinators: and, or, but.

And and or are central coordinators. . . . For, indeed, is often classed as a coordinator. Nor is not a pure coordinator since it can be preceded by another coordinator . . . and it contains a negative feature. . . . Both,

either, and neither are not themselves coordinators, since, like nor, they can be preceded by another coordinator. (1972:552)

Clause coordinators are restricted to initial position, and the order of coordinated clauses is set in relation to circumstances.

### 3.2.2.2 Discussion of Examples from Yumiko's Drafts

In Yumiko's English writing, at least, coordinating conjunctions are rarely initial in sentences. When Yumiko occasionally begins a sentence with And, it seems to intensify the general connections between two statements. It is frequently followed by another word that contributes to the relationship of coherence: besides, this, the other. But, in contrast to And, occurs a little more frequently at the beginning of a sentence. Or is the least common initial coordinating conjunction in Yumiko's writing.

Initial "subordinators" in the data include Because, Since, Though, Even, Although, As, If, After, When, Whereas, and While. Yumiko does not always use these in standard academic English fashion, however. (Cf. the discussion of several specific initial connectives in extended contexts in 6.2.) Several of these forms, of course, also occur with other functions in sentences. Individual "subordinators" will be discussed next in turn.

When Yumiko uses Because at the beginning of a sentence, there is generally no co-occurring independent clause within the same written sentence on which the subordinated clause can depend. For example,<sup>4</sup>

- E1.        Because village social organizations . . . are centered around lurah and his officials. (PS1:IV:5-6:141-142)
- E1'.       Nazenara, mura no shakoo kikoo wa, sonchoo to yakunin o chuushin to shite naritatte iru kara desu. (Translated by student G)
- E2.        The power of the leader is very crucial. Because the moral norms urge them to protect the masses and discourage to enforce their power aggressively. (MA1:III:37-38:222-223)

(My Japanese readers say they would translate Because in [E2] in the same way as in [E1']: i.e., Nazenara, . . . kara.)

This is more than just a problem of sentence 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; rather it corresponds to a complete subordinate clause in itself (deriving historically from forms meaning 'why' + copula + conditional ['if']). So nazenara co-occurs with a separate clause which further contains kara, a subordinative form indicating reason (source), followed by a form of the copula (desu) at the end of the sentence (cf. E1'). Nazenara and kara occur in complementary distribution.

Sentences like (E1) would become grammatical in standard academic English if something like "It is" or "This is" were inserted at the beginning. "It is" may represent a grammatical requirement in this kind of reason-sentence in English, but the phrase does not have much cognitive content. The main clause in Japanese may lack an overt subject, although the existence of a subject is implied by the use of the copula. Standard academic English, on the other hand, usually requires an overt grammatical subject for



completeness in a main clause. There is no need for a linking verb when the English subject is omitted.

Deviations from standard academic English in the writing of some Japanese may result in part from pedagogical interference. Some high school English textbooks in Japan, according to Yumiko, have apparently presented the pattern involving initial Because as grammatically acceptable for written English. I have not been able to locate any examples of such materials so far, and other Japanese tell me they have not either. Yumiko has learned a pattern, however, that she believes was taught, and she is by no means alone in using it. This is a point where the language of Japanese writers of English may be changing currently. Certainly variation exists among such writers.

There is also the possibility of code blending where two Japanese forms (nazenara and kara) correspond to what American readers such as Yumiko's professors see as one English form (because). The apparent unity of form here in English may be false, however, as differences in capitalization, based on syntactic position in a written sentence, relate to prosodic features of speech. Cultivated standard written language patterns are not often compared with spoken patterns. Yet the norms may differ--e.g., (E1) is basically acceptable in spoken English--and such differences need to be taken into consideration for a full understanding of the blending that occurs.

When because introduces a clause after an independent clause in a sentence, Yumiko's usage is more typically English except when because of occasionally replaces the simple form because:

- E3. This becomes possible because of village officials are not elected. . . . (PS1:IV:29-30:165-166)

An editor could delete the unnecessary "of" here or insert "the fact that," which is often a semantically weak phrase after "because of." The insertion is basically automatic like that of "This is" preceding Because.

Since occurs as a causative subordinator in Yumiko's writing basically as in standard academic English (cf. the discussion in 6.2.1).

Though, like Because, at the beginning of a sentence often introduces a single clause which has no co-occurring independent clause on which to depend grammatically.

- E4. 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:V:67-69:413-415)
- E5. Though the economic basis of Javanese villages had already started to widen the gap between the rich and the poor in the 1950s. I think that the rural democracy, popular participation and consensus-building in decision-making, was still practiced to some extent. (MA2:V:104-109:960-965)

This last example clearly involves a typographical error, judging from the fact that there is a comma in draft MA1ii after "1950s" instead of a period. Yumiko and her typist, as the proofreaders,<sup>5</sup> however, did not perceive the difference before the paper was submitted. This indicates, I think, the lack of significance of the subordinative character of Though for Yumiko, at least, although she sometimes follows standard academic English patterns in using though.

Compare, furthermore, the use of Even though and Even.

- E6. The politics and social relations are of course not democratic in Western sense. Even though, during the period when a leader had to seek for the basis of his power within the community, social relationship was important to maintain his power, then a sort of democracy was practiced. (PS2:I::18-21)
- E7. Even the rapat desa is held, it is only for the formality. (MA1:VII:38-39:759-760)

The use of Even here represents 'even if' (cf. MA2:VI:56-57:1144-1145).

Yumiko uses Although, As, If, and After as standard academic English subordinators, and When rarely causes problems for her.

- E8. On the other hand, in a case when patron does not carry out his obligation to clients, the clients can cancel the relationship. However, the case can happen only when the needs between the two groups are relatively balanced. In another words when clients still have bargaining power in this unequal relationship. (PS2:IV:20-24:222-226; underlining added)

Whereas and While, on the other hand, cause more difficulties.

- E9. Polarization of landholding seems to have been occurring gradually since the colonial period when population growth and political power, especiall that of lurah started to affect economic conditions.<sup>4</sup> Whereas the bengkok land has not changed the size since the colonial period. (MA1:V:80-84:479-483)
- E10. While to write this paper, villages in my mind were fairly densely populated, and where most of the population engage in agriculture only, land is very scarce resources, communist party was active then depoliticization was strongly implemented to wipe out PKI remnant and rather near to urban centers. (PS2:n.4)

Yumiko uses all of these lexical forms (except perhaps whereas, which did not occur as a non-initial connective in the data) in accordance with standard academic English patterns at times. This is to be expected since she is striving to communicate in English. Nevertheless, there is patterning where her usage diverges from the norms of

standard academic English, and this patterning is shared with some other Japanese writers of English.

### 3.2.3 Semantic Conjunction

#### 3.2.3.1 Definitions

While syntactic conjunction has its bases in intrasentential structures, semantic conjunction goes beyond these structural limits. Halliday and Hasan (1976), Longacre (1976), and Jones (1977) offer frameworks for categorization of semantic conjunctions. Although any of these frameworks could be applied to Yumiko's data, none completely coincides with the set of initial connectives on which I am focusing. The frameworks include some of the sentence adverbials that appear in the next subsection, but neglect most of the other transitional phrases.

Halliday and Hasan summarize conjunctive relations in terms of four basic semantic categories: additive 'and', adversative 'yet', causal 'so', and temporal 'then'. These represent nonstructural cohesive relations, distinct from intrasentential structural coordination.

Halliday and Hasan's basic semantic categories overlap Longacre's deep notional, or logical, categories. According to Longacre, the categories of

conjoining, alternation, temporal, and implication are assumed to be more basic to the structure of discourse, while paraphrase, illustration, deixis (as defined here), and attribution (speech and awareness) are considered to be essentially embellishments, i.e. rhetorical devices. (1976:100)

Deixis here refers to "any sort of identificational-contrastive pointing" (1976:144). Deixis and attribution fall outside the basic categories of conjunctive relations defined by Halliday and Hasan although relating to other kinds of coherence.

Frequently adverbial expressions rather than conjunctions are used as initial connectives. These sentence adverbials can function as transitional phrases between more or less explicit assertions.

Arapoff lists three criteria for identifying what she labels "sentence connectors" (e.g., therefore, in contrast, to be sure, as a matter of fact):

1. The expression, whether a word or a phrase, must be capable of occurring at the end of a simple sentence or independent clause (some, of course, occur at the beginning or in the middle of a sentence).
2. The expression must occur within the second of the two sentences it connects.
3. The expression must connect the two sentences semantically in such a way that a coherent logical relationship is revealed. (1968:244)

Some initial connectives, however, may not reveal logical relationships that are normally expected in standard academic English.

Discussing adverbs as clause elements, Quirk et al. differentiate among conjuncts, disjuncts, and adjuncts on the basis of their functions. "CONJUNCTS . . . indicate the connections between what is being said and what is said before": e.g., yet, anyway (1972:270). "Semantically, DISJUNCTS express an evaluation of what is being said, either with respect to the form of the communication or to its context": e.g., briefly, probably (1972:269). ADJUNCTS (e.g., now, outside) are at least partially integrated structurally within a

clause, as opposed to conjuncts and disjuncts. Words such as yet and briefly may function as adjuncts if they are structurally integrated appropriately (1972:268).

Jones (1977) found in her investigation that experimental conjoining sometimes decreased success in relation to theme identification but at other times facilitated it. The results depended on the specific nature of particular "conjunctions." The "conjunctions" which she identifies as having "seemingly neutral effects on Theme-Identification (e.g. perhaps, probably)" (1977:246) basically seem to be disjunctive adverbs according to the classification of connectives in the current study.

In Japanese the neutral order of adjuncts, according to Martin (1975), begins with time and place preceding the subject.

### 3.2.3.2 Discussion of Examples from Yumiko's Drafts

Various transitional forms, both single words and phrases, occur in addition to the commonly recognized conjunctions in the data from Yumiko's drafts. Some of these expressions represent the basic conjunctive relations of Halliday and Hasan (1976) and the equivalent deep notional categories of Longacre (1976), discussed above (3.2.3.1).

#### 3.2.3.2.1 Additive Relations.

The first set of expressions here to be discussed represents various additive relations. Besides normally occurs in Yumiko's writing in a phrase by itself, set off by a comma, sentence-initially, or it precedes a noun phrase as in (E11).

- E11. Besides civil service KORAMIL (the commander of military district) oppress the popular participation. (PS2:V:51-52:397-398)

Furthermore and moreover occur in phrases by themselves, as does namely. In (an)other words is another independent introductory additive phrase, although it is not always punctuated as such. For example (and such as in footnotes) sometimes introduces an independent phrase without directly accompanying predication:

- E12. Other change was to place a set of officials for the whole village. For example, one irrigation officer for the whole village, rather than for each hamlets. (PS2:V:62-64:408-410)

3.2.3.2.2 Adversative Relations. The next set of expressions represents adversative relations. However usually occurs sentence-initially in the data rather than in other positions. It is not always set off clearly as an independent unit.

- E13. However generally it can be concluded that the common villagers are tended to be excluded from the decisionmaking processes. (MA1:VII:35-37:756-758)

Nevertheless, yet, and in spite of this also occur in initial position. On the other hand, too, may stand as an independent phrase at the beginning of a sentence, or it may occur correlatively after on one hand. Rather is used to clarify meaning through rephrasing:

- E14. Thus, the penetration of political parties had no character to reconstruct village social structure. Rather it was used by the village elite to secure or maintain their power within the village. (PS1:VI:23-26:281-284)

In any case, which occurs as an independent phrase sentence-initially, dismisses any opposition.

3.2.3.2.3 Causal Relations. The principal initial connectives representing causal relations are thus, therefore, hence, as a consequence with/of, and consequently. Thus almost always occurs sentence-initially instead of elsewhere in the data, sometimes set off by a comma and sometimes not:

- E15. Everyone is endowed with the freedom to act and think at variance with other individuals provided he pays attention to certain restrictions defined by Javanese culture and does not disturb total harmonious relationship. Thus opposition to the leaders is very difficult for Javanese. (MAL:III:26-30:211-215)

Therefore, too, occurs at the beginning of sentences, with or without a comma:

- E16. Although bengkok land is communal land, actual control is almost same with the privately owned land. Therefore it is not a communal land strictly. (MAL:III:11-13:196-198)

Hence begins sentences as an independent phrase. As a consequence with/of begins a longer unpunctuated introductory phrase:

- E17i. As a consequence with lacking institutional intra-village relationship. . . . (PS1:III:29:122)
- E17ii. As a consequence of lacks of institutional intra-village relationship. . . . (PS2:V:41-42:387-388)

Consequently usually seems to function in the data as in standard academic English, but a logical reason for its use is not always clear:

- E18. In 1950s, nationa political parties became very popular in rural Indonesian villages. Consequently political parties did not change the rural society, but rather the collapse of them in rural aras and emergence of militaries played a great role for transision in democracy. (PS2:V:72-75:418-421)



In this situation, a connective such as subsequently seems more reasonable to some readers.

Otherwise establishes a reversed conditional relation.

E19.        Otherwise, the rapat desa loses the function. (MA2:III:105-106:494-495)

Contrast her usage in (E19) with that in (E20) which persisted more or less unchanged until the final revision, where she adopted a semicolon after "government."

E20.        For the sake of governments' security policy, the military cast control over the command of the lurah. Because of this, the lurah is forced to accept the instruction of the government otherwise more direct oppression such as disapproval of the lurah's position or relief of the position are performed. (PS1:VII:6-10:313-317)

Respective relations are represented in the data by in this regards and in this sense.

3.2.3.2.4 Temporal Relations. Most temporal expressions in the data are ad hoc. Today sometimes occurs as an initial connective, but now almost never does so. Then can occur in a generalized sense:

E21.        When this society needs stronger leadership . . . consensus becomes important. Then the second type of society emerges. (MA2:II:192-196:354-358)

Then occurs more often, however, in the middle of a sentence, marking a causal relationship:

E22.        Thus about 84% of peasants are landless or near-landless (see: Table 1 above), then have to depend on other farmers' land. (PS1:IV:47-48:183-184)

In short occurs at the beginning of particular paragraphs to summarize the main idea of the preceding paragraph.

Other initial temporal expressions also occur in Yumiko's writing with some connective function. The following examples relate to the structure of the discourse as it is situated in an external context more than they relate to content within the texts.

- E23. Before to start discussion, I would like to define democracy. . . . (PS2:II:2:75)
- E24. Before starting discussion on conditions of landholding, let us examine. . . . (MA1:V:16-17:415-416)

3.2.3.2.5 Other Transitional Phrases. Quasi-conventionalized narrative expressions of place occur in Yumiko's writing also, connecting an utterance to a larger context.

- E25. In case where the village headman refused to collaborate, the party would devote considerable efforts to get him replaced by somebody else more sympathetic to the party's cause. (PS1:VI:12-14:270-272; underlining added)

There are in addition some initial locative references to the paper being written: e.g., "In this paper. . . ."

Initial prepositional phrases and related expressions can introduce background information, but the connections are not always clear or unambiguous. The difficulty in (E26) is a matter of punctuation:

- E26. In rural Java democracy in village politics has been practiced through participation in the process of decision-making. (MA1:VII:2-3:723-724)

In the following examples, I have underlined the introductory words that are relevant to the point.

- E27. According to Geertz's research in 1953 in Modjokuto had only 15% of the village land which is called communal land in a strict sense. (MA1:III:7-9:192-194)

- E28. According to the Javanese view lurah is a wise man to rule the villagers' everyday life. . . . (PS1:V:11-12:220-221)
- E29. According to circumstances surrounding rural society these people take the position of lurah. (PS1:IV:9-10:145-146)
- E30. By the depoliticizing policy after the 1965 abortive coup there were practically no alternative channels of communication. . . . (PS1:III:25-26:118-119; PS2:V:38-40:384-386)
- E31. By 1900, the social group who only owned house lots also might have been consulted in village affairs. . . . (PS2:IV:37-38:239-240; MA1:V:49-50:448-449)

This last example, (E31), appears clear enough out of context. In the final version, however, "by 1900" is replaced with "before 1900" (MA2:IV:90:213). It is then evident that there has been confusion between Yumiko and Professor A over the use of by with dates.<sup>6</sup>

Initial participial and infinitive phrases may serve connective functions in discourse as in the following examples, of which none is completely clear or idiomatic in standard academic English. Dangling modification causes some lack of coherence in the sentences of the first set of examples here.

- E32i. Compared with the average size of land holding in Java which is 0.7 hectare, table 2 shows far greater land is allotted to the village officials. (PS1:IV:35-36:171-172)
- E32ii. However, compared with the average size of landholding in Java which was said to be 0.7 hectares<sub>25</sub> Table 2 shows far greater land is allotted to this elite group. (PS2:IV:48-50:250-251)
- E33. Considering his role, the autonomy of villages are highly relying on his standpoint. . . . (PS1:II:53-54:77-78)
- E34. Considering the Javanese villages, the societies have been moving from the second pattern to the third type. (MA1:IV:83-84:166-167)

In the next pair of sentences, the infinitive phrases attract attention.

E35. To examine the first reason, land holding is the most important factor in Java since Java is one of the most densely populated area in the world. . . . (PS1:IV:35-36:171-172)

E36. To make success of these projects direct pressure was applied to the headman. (PS1:II:51-52:75-76)

Some disjunctive adverbs such as obviously and probably are used as transitional phrases, primarily at the beginning of sentences, to show the writer's attitude toward, or assessment of, content.

E37. The degree of social changes is various depending on regions. Obviously four important factors have to be taken into account to tackle the theme; . . . (PS2:I::51-52)

E38. Probably before the colonial period such democracy was practiced. (MA2:I::17-18)

The idiom by and large might also fit here.

Theoretically might be an adjunct, but it appears in the data as a disjunct:

E39. Under these circumstances, theoretically, a person without influence . . . could be elected. . . . (PS1:V:45-46:252-253)

Especially (cf. toku ni in Japanese), somewhat similarly, tends to occur at the beginning of a sentence or clause:

E40. Especiall the tendency became obvious after the 1960s. . . . (MA1:VI:101-102:665-666)

E41. Hierarchical order of local administration diminished village autonomy especially military oppression deprived the channel to reflect villagers wishes in various program imposed on them by the central government. (PS1:IX:33-35:443-445)

Initial adjuncts in the data include adverbs such as internally, externally, outwardly, administratively, officially, potentially, morally, socially, structurally, systematically, traditionally, usually, and virtually.

### 3.3 Review of Yumiko's Use of Initial Connectives

Yumiko uses a wide variety of initial connectives as cohesive devices in her writing. While some of these contribute to coherence, others have a negative influence on her professors' comprehension. Among syntactic conjunctions, coordinate conjunctions do not create special problems, but subordinate conjunctions do. Yumiko did not treat syntactic conjunctions such as Because, Though, and While as subordinators at the beginning of sentences, although she did so in other syntactic positions. A theory of linguistic code blending could help us understand this phenomenon in "Japanese English."

Semantic conjunctions include additive, adversative, causal, and temporal conjunctions, as well as other transitional phrases: particularly phrases referring to time and place, prepositional phrases and related expressions, participial and infinitive phrases, and disjunctive and adjunctive adverbs. These forms often do not create difficulties within sentences, but they may interfere with intersentential connections by distracting attention from the main line of Yumiko's argument. This point will be considered further in chapter 6 in relation to editing.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>See chapter 1, n. 7.

<sup>2</sup>I do not know the details for Sarangani Manobo. In discussing inferred English connectives, however, Crothers says, "A few are strong causal connectives that replace weak surface conjunctions, for example SINCE/HENCE replacing now" (1979:86).

<sup>3</sup>Robins writes concerning rheme:

Plato and Aristotle make scattered references to grammar, but do not deal with it consecutively or as a specific topic. Plato, however, is said to have been the first to take the subject seriously, as in his dialogues we encounter a fundamental division of the Greek sentence into a nominal and a verbal component, ónoma and rhéma, . . . which remained the primary grammatical distinction underlying syntactic analysis and word classification in all future linguistic description. (1967:26)

<sup>4</sup>Recall that E is the prefix for examples cited from the drafts that Yumiko submitted to her professors. Also recall the rest of the discussion in 2.3 concerning the presentation of examples. In this case, to focus on the point concerning Because, I have deleted the portion of the sentence marked by ellipsis, but cf. Appendix A for the full sentence. A lurah is a Javanese "village headman."

<sup>5</sup>Proofreaders constitute a special type of editing reader since they attend primarily to form rather than to content.

<sup>6</sup>Professor A wrote about this passage from draft PS2, "You're saying, therefore, the circle of consultation widened (by 1900) then narrowed again?" Yumiko in her next draft showed no response to this comment, but in the final version she substituted "before" for "by." (Compare the use of made 'until' and made ni 'by' in Japanese.)

CHAPTER IV  
PATTERNS OF CONNECTIONS IN THE OVERALL ORGANIZATION  
OF YUMIKO'S DRAFTS

4.1 Overall Organization in Yumiko's Drafts

Both Yumiko and the readers of her first two drafts (PS1 and PS2) recognize that readers whose native language is English can understand the revised version more easily than the first one. It is evident from a broad perspective that the text changes markedly between the drafts, but a more detailed analysis can point out many close similarities between them as well. These are discussed in 4.4. Skillful readers tend to react to content, overlooking many details of form except when the latter attract particular attention. Readers may consequently not realize how their language shifts through interaction with writers such as Yumiko. The writers, in contrast, tend to be more directly confronted with the need to take their readers into account as they develop their language abilities.

A writer's chief purpose in exposition is to communicate information about a subject. She does this by presenting a subject of some kind, preferably with an explicit thesis statement, and adducing support for the position she takes concerning it. In the process of editing, she is likely to refine her statements concerning topic and thesis in response to her perception of the needs of readers. The presentation must be advanced enough to hold the

interest of voluntary readers, yet introductory enough to avoid creating difficulties in following the main point(s) of the argument.

#### 4.1.1 Professors' Evaluations: A Linguistic Issue

Draft PS1--"Javanese Rural Elite:PROTECTOR OF THE PEASANT MASS OR EXPLOITER"<sup>1</sup>--was originally submitted by Yumiko to Professor A, who termed it "inadequate" in basic organization. Professor A, like many other teachers, does not ask for outlines of student papers. This is because past experience with student outlines has not "satisfied" him, and his own outlines reportedly tend to be informal clusters of ideas. Although Professor A commented to Yumiko that the ideas in the draft are excellent and can be supported, he declared in writing: "I had a hard time figuring out what was being said. . . . I had to re-read, struggle with your paragraphs."

Professor A's evaluation is not unique: i.e., it is shared by other readers of Yumiko's writing, and these readers make similar statements concerning papers of some other writers, particularly those whose native language is not English. Questions concerning linguistic evaluation as it affects cross-cultural editing (i.e., editing done by people who do not share certain basic linguistic expectations) are thus of both theoretical and practical interest. The questions are of theoretical concern because they may bring us to a deeper understanding of the interrelationships of language and culture and of what components of language must be developed for satisfactory communication to occur. The questions are also of practical concern because language is embedded in a social reality



that may be dysfunctional if matters of discrepancies in communication and their repair are not understood.

Why did Yumiko's professors have such a hard time interpreting her writing? Readers, like writers, display individual differences. Some of their reactions to what they read may stem from idiosyncracies that are personal but nevertheless relatively constant representations of sociocultural features. Other reactions may depend on immediate circumstances of a nonlinguistic nature that exist at the time of reading. Aside from these kinds of factors, however, there remains an analytical question as to what linguistic factors might account for the evaluation which Professor A assigned to Yumiko's writing.

Issues of cross-cultural editing are still basically unexplored in relation to writing; but in the area of oral communication, work such as that of Gumperz, Jupp, and Roberts (1979) and Gumperz and Tannen (1979) is instructive. This work suggests that differences in shared linguistic expectations may strongly influence the ways in which participants in cross-cultural communication interpret what they perceive as the "same" language: viz. English.

Professor A's evaluation of Yumiko's writing is grounded in his expectations concerning what constitutes acceptable writing in a specific academic situation. The linguistic norms which govern the characteristic development of particular genres may differ between speech communities. There is thus some linguistic basis for differences in the expectations of Yumiko and her professors in regard to their perception of rhetorical patterns of overall organization.

We may expect nonnative language behavior to be influenced by characteristics of a person's primary language. As linguists such as Fillmore (1973) and Hymes (1974) have commented in explaining why grammarians look to sociolinguistics, these characteristics are not limited to the domains of vocabulary and the syntax of sentences. Even understanding of elements within sentences often depends on recognition of contexts that go beyond individual sentences. This is especially the case in studies of sentence connectives. To understand the difficulties in communication between Yumiko and her readers, we need to know more about systematic differences that distinguish their English at the level of discourse. Yumiko's English writing is not completely nativelike in regard to lexicon and grammar within sentences; yet this is not the only source of the difficulty which she faced in writing to be understood. Her native patterns of overall organization lead to code blending which easily remains unrecognized because her writing is "in English." In chapter 1, I discussed the nature of codes such as the one that Yumiko uses for communication in English. The discussion in the present chapter focuses on examples of code blending as it affects connections in overall organization rather than lexical items per se.

#### 4.1.2 Titles and Organizational Changes

The title of a paper is the initial point of contact between writer and reader in written communication. As such, it offers the best starting point for a reader in considering a prospective topic. The title is likely to change with any major revision of a paper.

For example, Yumiko gave her successive drafts the following titles:

PS1: Javanese Rural Elite:PROTECTOR OF THE PEASANT MASS OR EXPLOITER

PS2: DEMOCRACY AND FUNCTION OF LURAH IN RURAL JAVA

MA1: TRENDS IN "DEMOCRACY": THE CASES OF JAVANESE VILLAGES

(in the period between the 1960s to the mid-1970s)

MA2: TRENDS IN "DEMOCRACY": THE CASES OF JAVANESE VILLAGES

Of these, the second title is most specific concerning the particular elite group being discussed. Nevertheless, recognition of this fact requires some knowledge of Javanese political terminology, i.e., that LURAH represents the village headman. The second title also focuses more explicitly on political issues than the first, which is at least equally open to economic interpretations. Actually outlines of section headings treat economic matters more explicitly in draft PS2, too, than in draft PS1, but that is not obvious from the title: FUNCTION is a general word and occurring with DEMOCRACY it is likely to be interpreted in the title in connection with a discussion of politics. The third title focuses more precisely on the fact that the meaning or use of the term "DEMOCRACY" in the rural Javanese situation is at issue. The title implies, in addition, that the issue will be clarified by means of examples taken from studies of particular villages. The subtitle is a further attempt to narrow the specific scope of the topic. Yet it is omitted in the end as being too restrictive, since background information from earlier periods is also presented in the paper.

Each draft has section headings, beginning with an "Introduction" and ending with a "Conclusion."<sup>2</sup> As we shall see, Yumiko's patterns of overall organization shifted from a four-part, basically Japanese, orientation in draft PS1 to a three-part, more typically English, arrangement in draft PS2. How great were the changes in terms of a more detailed analysis of the structures of these drafts?

An overall comparison of these drafts appears as Figure 3. (Cf. Figure 2, in 2.1.)

Major organizational changes occur in the explicit structuring between drafts PS1 and PS2, particularly in the first half of the drafts. The number of primary headings drops from nine to six. Then in draft MA1 there is some expansion and reorganization of "chapters" (seven in all at this point), as the overall length of the draft increases by nearly fifty percent. Historical aspects are played down and recast in terms of cultural norms, as the discussion of decision-making mechanisms is illustrated with data concerning specific modern villages.

In contrast to the earlier changes, Yumiko sees the modifications introduced in draft MA2 as "making minor changes," "not revising." This difference in approach to the editing task is illustrated by the fact that the section headings remain basically the same as those of draft MA1. The single exception involves one two-page chapter (MA1:III::186-232) which in the final version is incorporated into the preceding section (MA2:II:15-95:177-257). Yumiko said she did not want to go back and look over earlier drafts again.

Draft PS1--463 lines*		Draft PS2--562 lines	
	lines		lines
[ki]		[introduction]	
I. <u>Introduction.</u>	24	I. Introduction	73
II. <u>Historical Overview of the Javanese Villages' Development.</u>	69	[body]	
[shoo]		II. Concept of Democracy	47
III. <u>Position of village in local government administration.</u>	43	III. Historical Overview	82
IV. <u>Power structure in the village.</u>	71	IV. Economic Function of <u>Lurah</u>	144
V. <u>Sources of Lurah's authority.</u>	57	V. <u>Political Function of Lurah</u>	7
[ten]		1. administrative change	63
VI. <u>Influence of the political parties.</u>	49	2. Influence of the political parties	51
VII. <u>Influence of the military.</u>	50	3. Influence of the militaries	58
VIII. <u>The Green Revolution and village elite.</u>	53	[conclusion]	
[ketsu]		VI. <u>Conclusion</u>	37
IX. <u>Conclusion.</u>	53		
Draft MA1--770 lines		Draft MA2--1160 lines*	
	lines		lines
I. <u>Introduction</u>	83	I. Introduction	162
II. <u>Concept of Democracy and Consensus</u>	102	II. The Concept of Democracy and the Function of Consensus Building	227
III. <u>Cultural norms and leadership in democracy</u>	47	III. Decision-making Mechanisms in the Period from the 1960s to the Mid-1970s	71
IV. <u>Decision-making mechanisms in the period of the 1960s to the mid-1970s</u>	60	1. Socio-economic Conditions and Leadership	77
<u>Socio-economic conditions and leadership</u>	50	2. Decision-making Processes in Specific Cases	86
<u>Decision-making processes</u>	57	IV. Socio-Economic Transition	233
V. <u>Socio-Economic transition</u>	165	V. Trends in the Leadership of the <u>Lurah</u>	14
VI. <u>Trends in the leadership of the lurah</u>	6	1. Administrative Change	111
<u>Administrative change</u>	68	2. Influence of Outsiders	107
<u>Influence of outsiders</u>	83	VI. Conclusion	72
VII. <u>Conclusion</u>	49		

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

Figure 3. An Overall Comparison of Yumiko's Drafts

#### 4.1.3 Outlines and Abstracts

An outline for writing is a schematic plan, frequently preliminary. An abstract is a condensed statement of important points of a text.

Japanese students are taught in intermediate schools to use outlines for various purposes. (See Ishimori 1974 and Morioka 1968.) It is common practice for teachers to write an outline of the main points of a lecture on the blackboard for students to copy a set of notes accurately. Composition teachers also encourage students to create outlines to achieve balance in their writing. Various patterns for the construction of compositions are presented in such a context (see Ookuma 1967). Perhaps the most common is that of ki-shoo-ten-ketsu, which I discuss in the next section in relation to Yumiko's draft PS1. Besides outlining their own writing, Japanese students must also outline some of what they read.

On the other hand, Yumiko was not taught to outline in English classes, she says, and little instruction is given concerning organization for writing long papers in any language. Yumiko tends to use informal, rather than formal, outlines and to include abstracts in parts of them. Japanese generally do not distinguish between outlines and abstracts (Miho Steinberg,<sup>3</sup> personal communication).

#### 4.2 Yumiko's First Draft and Japanese Patterns of Connections

Yumiko outlined her first draft (PS1--dated May 8, 1980) at my request in June 1980 on the basis of its nine sectional divisions (see Figure 3). Yumiko confirmed that she wrote draft PS1 directly "in English," i.e., without actively translating it from Japanese, but she reported that she tended to think in Japanese at the

beginning. In discussing differences between her outlines of her first two drafts, she said (in our final taped interview): "My first one is still following the Japanese way." A basic Japanese pattern of overall organization consists of four fundamental identifiable parts. How well might we, as readers, interpret her structuring of information if we were to proceed as her professors had to?

In discussion, Yumiko labels the parts of draft PSl in terms of ki, shoo, ten, and ketsu.<sup>4</sup> The function of the introductory ki is the "awakening" of the reader's interest.<sup>5</sup> Shoo presents 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.

This four-part pattern of organization does not correspond nicely to the normal three-part patterns of organization in standard academic English discourses. Yumiko now accepts the latter pattern as consisting of introduction, body, and conclusion. Standard academic English demands progress in a basically linear fashion from a clear statement of the subject in the introduction, through development of main points, to a summary. Yumiko, on the other hand, focuses more indirectly on the main point that she wishes to communicate. Coming abruptly to the heart of a matter is considered impolite in various Asian cultures, as she and other people from Japan, Indonesia, Korea, and Thailand have pointed out. Japanese generally try initially

to establish an atmosphere that will lead to a favorable reception for their message; they prefer to avoid blunt repetition. In keeping with this prominent East Asian cultural value, Yumiko's approach to the focus of the first of her drafts was indirect. This indirectness is exemplified in 4.2.1 in the discussion of her introductory paragraph.

#### 4.2.1 Ki

Ki corresponds only partially to a typical English introduction. Each of these parts represents a beginning, but an introduction usually states a thesis clearly, while the primary function of ki is arousal of interest relative to a given subject.

In draft PS1, Yumiko links the first two sections as ki: "I. Introduction." and "II. Historical Overview of the Javanese Villages' Development." Functioning together, they present a general overview of the background of the subject. That is, they place "Javanese Rural Elite . . ." in a broad context without actually highlighting specifics of the subject itself.

Yumiko begins the draft with a statement of the objectives of her study (see "I. Introduction." in Appendix A). She phrases this in a restricted code, however, which is meaningful primarily to specialists such as her professors who are already familiar with the subject. The disadvantages of her presentation become increasingly apparent when the group of readers expands to include nonspecialists, albeit highly educated ones.

The opening sentences exemplify the difficulties which a reader must confront.



- El. 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 accidentally. Especially in the post a few decade rural societies suffered drastic changes caused by national politic and economic development policy of the Central Government. (PS1:I::1-5)

The initial focus seems very broad. There is more cohesion than coherence. The reader is likely to wonder how Yumiko intends to relate "Indonesian villages in general" to the subject that has been suggested by the title "Javanese Rural Elite. . . ." The subsequent phrase "in certain ways" does not contribute anything to the specification of the subject. Indeed, Yumiko's Japanese translation of this phrase, aru imi de 'in a certain sense', seems even less specific. Compare (El) with Yumiko's translation of this passage as a whole (El') (accompanied by my English equivalents for lexical phrases).

- El'. Ippanteki ni Indonesia no nooson wa,  
Generally Indonesian farm villages
- aru imi de tsune ni gaibu no eikyoo o  
in a certain sense usually outside influences
- uketsuzukete kita. Sorera no eikyoo ga, koi ni  
have continued to receive Those influences deliberately
- aruiwa, guzen ni motarasareta  
or accidentally were brought
- ka no chigai wa aru no da ga, toku ni kono 2-30nenkan  
Q differs but especially these 20-30 years
- noosonshakai wa chuuoseifu ni okeru seijiteki henka to  
rural society in central government political changes and
- keizai kaihatsu to ni yotte hijoo ni okiku  
economic development according to extremely greatly
- henka shite kita.  
has changed

Note that Yumiko translates "in general" here as Ippanteki ni 'generally', at the beginning of the first sentence. Yumiko's reported tendency to think in Japanese leads to some particular choices in the use of English connectives. These choices, which represent code blending, differ from those expected in standard academic English. Yumiko's choices depend on her selecting lexical items and syntactic positions for them that seem to her to be equivalent in Japanese and English.

Turning to Yumiko's outline of the "Introduction," we find that she focuses on "objectives of study." She begins with "social changes among the elites." Next she lists "transition of the elite-mass relationship, the role of the elites in rural society." This is her title issue, which appears in the third paragraph on her first page as "(3) . . . (b) function of rural elites in the local community." (PS1:I:22-24). Yumiko continues her outline with "influences of national integration, movement of political parties, military rule, economic development over the rural social stratification." This last set of factors is also enumerated in the final paragraph of her "Introduction" (PS1:I:19-24). Yumiko concludes the first section of her outline as follows: "The elite-mass relation which was used to be based on traditional reciprocal values is collapsing. The Indonesian villages are becoming less autonomous."

In standard academic English writing, these factors that Yumiko listed would seem to be the main points of the paper. Yet, Yumiko has outlined section II as a "general description of pre-independence, traditional society." The focus has narrowed to Java from Indonesian

villages generally, but the background information on villages includes a confusing use of key terms, centering around unit(s), village(s), cluster, and collection. The lack of clarity seemed so extensive to Professor B that he stopped overtly correcting Yumiko's draft in the third paragraph of this section (PS1:II:15-40:39-64) and soon gave up trying to read it altogether.

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 Yumiko'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 Yumiko'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 Yumiko's introductory part (ki) corresponds to the combination of sections I and II. The difference between English and Japanese structuring is especially troublesome, when Yumiko, in her code blending, attaches English section labels to Japanese patterns of overall organization.

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 point. Yumiko's first attempt to give a direct answer to the question implicit in her title occurs on her pp. 3-4 (PS1:II:53-69:77-93). There, concerning

the village headman, the second sentence of the last paragraph in section II states:

E2. When the village has to accept the government order without actual participation in decision-making in the name of national development, he changes his nature from traditional authority to protect his people as a 'father' to more sophisticated collaborator. (PS1:II:54-58:78-82)

Nevertheless, Yumiko's professors do not expect to have to wait several pages--i.e., until the end of ki, section II--for the essential statement of a paper.

At the beginning of section II, Yumiko continues to introduce dimensions such as the religious one, without establishing ties to her "Introduction." She is still trying to "awaken" the reader. In this same section, on the other hand, she goes on to discuss the origins of the patron-client relationship and constraints on it, and the changing relationship involving national integration and the role of the village headman, which are related to her central concerns. Thus, she is gradually approaching the central portion of her discourse, where she presents evidence relevant to the issue that is raised in her title.

#### 4.2.2 Shoo

The function of shoo is to provide a motive for, or explain, the writing of ki, the "awakening." Sections III-V of draft PS1 constitute shoo according to Yumiko. They discuss closely related aspects of the more general topic of the bases of the post-independence local government power structure. Yumiko outlines the main points of this part as follows:

Because of administrative changes in national level, village administration became oriented towards supra-village level. This fact caused the village political elites to be more directly attached to the central authority and weakened the elite-mass bond in indigenous rural society.

(Compare this passage with the last sentence of section III in Appendix A.) By the end of this part (section V), Yumiko is ready 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.

In contrast to many Japanese, readers who have been basically socialized and schooled in American English have generally been taught to expect main points to occur at the beginning of units of exposition. When main points occur elsewhere, such deviations from the communicative norm need to be signalled through reasonable use of connectives or sequencing. Communication is hindered if main points are not immediately evident in the pattern of organization.

A reader whose native language is English might expect section III to deal with the "depoliticization of villages by militaries" (PSI:I::21-22) since this is the second focal point that is given in the "Introduction" and since the first point, concerning national integration, has some relevance to the preceding section (II). Yet this second point does not appear at all in Yumiko's outline of section III. In fact, only one brief mention of this aspect of the topic appears in any way in section III (39-40:132-133), and that is buried in the final paragraph. Instead of discussing such depoliticization,

this section provides additional general explanatory background as Yumiko approaches her main point gradually. There are meaningful chains of relationships among the various sections in this part, but they do not necessarily correspond to readers' expectations.

Sections IV and V develop the last point that Yumiko introduced in the "Introduction." That is, they deal with present economic development in some sense as it relates to governance. They also shed some light on the religious aspect of Javanese communities, in the context of indigenous values. This aspect was introduced by Yumiko in section II without adequate explanation.

#### 4.2.3 Ten

Ten represents a turning point in an exposition. Sections VI-VIII form a unit that contrasts with the preceding part. Here Yumiko deals with various external influences that have been "purposely directed to the village." This part involves a closer approach than Yumiko's earlier ones to developing the paper's initial statement. Yumiko returns to the focal points of her "Introduction" for a more detailed examination in outlining the (minimal) "influence of the political parties on the patron-client relationship," "the military's interference with the traditional village authority," and the "influence of transition in agriculture." By the end of section VIII, Yumiko has come to a reasonably concise statement of her conclusion with regard to the subject of her title. She abstracts it in her outline thus:

The changes caused the destruction of reciprocal relationship represented by the patron-client relation. The elite became to depend more on the supra-village authority and to widen the gap between the elites and masses.

#### 4.2.4 Ketsu

Ketsu is commonly translated as conclusion, but the meanings of the two terms do not correspond exactly. The English word conclusion is used in this discussion of writing to refer to (1) the final part of a paper (vs. the end of a section) and also to (2) any of the main points which are based on the arguments of the paper. Yumiko labels the concluding parts of her drafts as "Conclusion," which she underlined in drafts PS1 and PS2 but not in later drafts. In draft PS1, she views section IX ("Conclusion.") as ketsu. Unlike the concluding part in a standard academic English exposition, ketsu does not need to summarize what has been presented in a paper. It must, however, emphasize the writer's main point and may even introduce it. For draft PS1, Yumiko outlines her conclusion as follows:

Rural mass-elite relationship is basically unequal. Because of it the elite can easily strengthen their power, connecting themselves with the urban based political elites. The rural society became less autonomous and it is greatly because of unequal mass-elite relationship.

The function of the concluding part of a paper is, I think, to answer satisfactorily the question(s) that the title and introduction of a paper raise in readers' minds. The conclusion is not normally the place, however, in standard academic English to introduce a main point. Readers whose native language is English seem generally to expect some sort of coherent summary overview of the development of the subject of a paper in an acceptable "Conclusion."

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 standard academic English norms. Code blending contributes to both of these problems.

Yumiko begins her "Conclusion" with material that relates primarily to sections III-V (shoo). Next she offers her evaluation of the "Javanese Rural Elite" in the second paragraph:

E3.           I think the Javanese traditional leader worked as long as the rural society remained very traditional. To some extent he was a protector of the mass, providing enough assistance to guarantee the peasant's life. Even though under the face of protector, he was an exploiter.  
(PS1:IX:16-19:426-430)

This passage does not convey Yumiko's meaning clearly and easily to her professors, however, particularly because of the use of the connective phrase "Even though under the face of protector" in the last sentence. (See 4.4 for further discussion of this example in a comparative context.) Although this seems to be a key sentence for Yumiko, it brings uncertainty and incompleteness to the end of the paragraph. These feelings are reinforced by the relatively weak beginning of the next paragraph with the coordinating conjunction "But" set off as an independent phrase by a comma.

Next Yumiko offers her conclusions concerning sections VIII-VI (ten), culminating in the penultimate paragraph of the draft, beginning:



E4.<sup>6</sup>

Hence, it is the traditional relationship between the elite and the mass that hinder the restructure of rural social strata. (PS1:IX:42-43:452-453)

This seems to leave the issue of protection versus exploitation rather more open than did the second paragraph, cited as (E3). The final paragraph of draft PS1 ends with an unimpressive parenthetical note concerning village democracy. The note is incorporated in the last full sentence, which starts with the weakest coordinating conjunction, And. The importance of democracy in Yumiko's thinking, which becomes evident in later drafts, is disguised by this form of presentation. As a result, this finale does not leave many readers with a strong ultimate impression of the main point of the paper.

#### 4.2.5 Comment

Draft PS1 is primarily intelligible to those who already know something about the subject that Yumiko is presenting or to those who know Japanese well, as various readers (including Yumiko now) agree. They can, by perseverance, find the main points even in patterns of organization that are not typical of standard academic English. Nonetheless, the readers who have been primarily socialized and schooled in English tend to be dissatisfied with the "vagueness" of the presentation.

Yumiko, in trying to deal with readers' expectations, gradually became more aware of differences in patterns of connections. She consequently determined to improve her knowledge of acceptable English patterns of overall organization before revising her paper. As a result of her efforts at self-education, the first revision that she submitted for her professors' attention (draft PS2) shows striking reorganization

in the patterns of structuring of information. Yumiko subsequently characterized even her Japanese outline of the revision as corresponding to a three-part English model. (This outline was elicited for the sake of comparison with Yumiko's English outlines, as discussed in 2.1.) There was also some improvement in the grammaticality of her writing of standard academic English with reference to other points not within the scope of this study.

#### 4.3 Yumiko's Second Draft and English Patterns of Connections

About six months after submitting draft PS1, Yumiko submitted her second draft (PS2)--"DEMOCRACY AND FUNCTION OF LURAH IN RURAL JAVA."--to Professor A, for whom she had written the first draft. Professor A's comments on the revision include "much clearer, better organized," as well as "research better." Yumiko's later drafts on the same subject also came to satisfy her other professors. Improvements in Yumiko's research and grammar, as perceived by her professors, undoubtedly played a role in the ultimate successful reception of her final paper. Nevertheless, patterns of overall organization governing the structuring of information also seem important for the outcome.

Talking of differences she sees between draft PS1 and PS2, Yumiko said (in a taped interview):

I think these two are following a different way of writing, and . . . in this- the second part [i.e., section II] of the- my first draft, I'm still explaining something that I started in the introduction, and this [revised] one, between the [sections] one and two there's no similarity. . . . [I.e., between "I. Introduction" and "II. Concept of Democracy"--see Figure 3.]

Yumiko goes on to say of section I, "I'm trying to point out what I have to write in the other part also. . . ." She agrees with my

perception that the revised "Introduction" stands as a functional part by itself in a way that her original "Introduction" did not. Sections II-V then function together as the "body" of the discourse. As for the "Conclusion," Yumiko continues: "I think I got the point from the former part," going back as far as the "Introduction." This is in contrast to her "Conclusion" in draft PS1, which had no need to return to the opening part.

In draft PS2, Yumiko begins in the first paragraph to discuss the politics of Javanese villages and the function of lurah. (Contrast sections I-II of draft PS1 and the beginning of draft PS2 in Appendices A and B.) In her outline of the "Introduction," Yumiko focuses on the "concept of democracy" and the "purpose of the study." She highlights the former by making it the heading of the opening section of the "body" of the discourse. Her outline then goes on to "II. Historical overview of village democracy and structural changes of village institutions," which she discusses in section III along with "III. Social, cultural norms of lurah (what kind of role is expected to lurah)." After this point, her outline corresponds closely to her section headings.

In the early sections of draft PS2 there seems to be some conflict between Yumiko's traditional Japanese patterns of overall organization and her intended three-part organization. That is, Yumiko still tends to offer some explanatory background for the introductory part. Her focus, however, remains more steadily on the various functions or roles of the lurah in Javanese villages than it did in draft PS1.

Yumiko still tends also to write "something new in the conclusion that's not discussed before--that's very Japanese way,"<sup>7</sup> as she commented in a taped discussion regarding her first draft. This is not a major problem in draft PS2; there are other difficulties, however, with the revised "Conclusion."

E5.            Economic and political scenes in Javanese villages are under influence of new systems 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:VI:33-37:558-562)

Yumiko's final paragraph does not mention the lurah at all, although FUNCTION OF LURAH is part of the title of draft PS2. On the other hand, democracy receives attention in the final sentence of this draft:

E6.            The failure to establish new social order results in decline of "democracy". (PS2:VI:36-37:561-562)

This sentence seems to be a recasting of the first sentence of the penultimate paragraph of draft PS1 (cited above and repeated here):

E4.            Hence, it is the traditional relationship between the elite and the mass that hinder the restructure of rural social strata.

In conclusion, draft PS2 more nearly satisfies the expectations of Yumiko's professors concerning patterns of overall organization in standard academic English than does draft PS1. These readers seem to comprehend the revised version as a whole more easily than the first draft.

#### 4.4 A Comparison of the Major Parts of Yumiko's Drafts

This section focuses primarily on a comparison of patterns of overall organization in drafts PS1 and PS2 because these two drafts display the most obvious differences in broad connections.

Looking first at the introductory sections of drafts PS1 and PS2, we can observe the following correspondences. The introductory part (ki) of the first draft includes two sections (PS1:I-II::1-93). These correspond basically to the synthesis in the revised "Introduction" (PS2:I:1-73); Yumiko includes additional material in the revision, however, and moves part of the original historical section to a separate "Historical Overview" (PS2:III::121-202) which begins the "body" of the revised draft. Preceding the latter historical section there is a new section (PS2:II::74-120) to define the "Concept of Democracy," which has become a more central issue than in the first draft. The final paragraph of draft PS1:II (53-69: 77-93), which deals with the role of the lurah, has no direct counterpart in later drafts. We can thus see some shifting of material in the organization of the introduction and the first half of the "body" of draft PS2 as the result of Yumiko's revision.

The second part (i.e., the "body") of draft PS2 deals with material from two parts (shoo and ten) of draft PS1. The changes in the part labeled shoo are more obvious than those in ten. This is because the labels and order of arrangement differ more between the drafts for the earlier sections than they do for the later ones. The principal change involving ten is the incorporation of "The Green Revolution and village elite" (PS1:VIII::358-410) into "Economic

Function of Lurah" (PS2:IV::203-346). In contrast, the material from the original discussion (in shoo) of the "Position of village in local government administration." (PS1:III::94-136--cf. PS2:V(.1)::354-416) has been transposed to follow that from the discussion of "Power structure in the village" (PS1:IV::137-207--cf. PS2:IV::203-346). This seems to be because the power structure (PS1:IV) is largely economically based whereas the administrative position (PS1:III) is more closely related to the subsequent discussion of political matters (PS2:V::412-525--cf. PS1:VI-VII::259-357). The separate section dealing with traditional "Sources of Lurah's authority" (PS1:V::208-258) drops out as Yumiko plays down the historical aspects of the discussion in subsequent versions. Then the disparity here among comparable sections of various drafts is basically eliminated.

As a result of the changes in overall organization, we find that the "body" of draft PS2 consists of four main sections: (1) a definition of democracy, (2) an historical overview, and (3) a discussion of economic bases relevant to (4) the "Political Function of Lurah." Yumiko brings these together to form a single unit at the center of her exposition.

This contrasts with her original orientation, which was to shed light on the introductory part (ki) in shoo and then to develop the exposition further in a somewhat different direction in ten. Yumiko originally attempted in Japanese fashion to elucidate her subject (PS1:III-V) and then to present a discussion of changes (PS1:VI-VIII) related to the three focal points of her "Introduction" (PS1:I:19-24) --i.e., "national integration," "economic development," in terms of

the "foundation of rural authority, and . . . function of rural elites," and "depoliticization of villages by militaries." This approach was not particularly successful with her professors, who tended to judge her presentation in draft PS1 as vague and disorganized.

The "Conclusions" (PS1:IX::411-463; PS2:VI::526-562), as whole sections or parts, correspond to each other directly, but the details of content vary. This is because the focuses of the drafts and their basic patterns of organization differ. Although Yumiko did not submit any abstracts with these drafts for professors, the main points of her message should be evident in the sections labeled "Conclusion" (see Appendices A and C).

In draft PS1, paragraph two of the final section (discussed above as [E3] in 4.2.4 and repeated here) refers specifically to the issue raised in the title of the original paper:

E3.           I think the Javanese traditional leader worked as long as the rural society remained very traditional. To some extent he was a protector of the mass, providing enough assistance to guarantee the peasant's life. Even though under the face of protector, he was an exploiter.

The particular wording of this supposedly major conclusion of the original study does not reappear in later drafts, although the idea behind it runs as an undercurrent throughout the series of drafts. Yumiko changed the wording of (E3) presumably because, as she herself commented when asked for a paraphrase interpretation of this passage, "That isn't clear." Compare this passage, (E3), with one in paragraph five of the "Conclusion" of draft PS2:

E7.           Actually economic resources were not equally distributed, but social norms have prevented great polarization in spite of unequal social order. Paternalistic traditional

role of lurah to avoid excessive interference by the higher level authorities and maintain independence of village societies. When these elements started to be destroyed, democracy in the village also did to decline.  
(PS2:VI:23-28:548-553)

(Cf. MA1:VII:22-26:743-747, where the infinitives in the second sentence are replaced by past finite verb forms.)

Yumiko's translation of (E3)<sup>8</sup> suggests that her conclusion is clearer to her, at least with the benefit of hindsight, than to most of her readers. Here is a reasonably direct equivalent in English (mine) for the last sentence of Yumiko's translation: "But, at the same time that he is a protector, in a real sense, it is not a mistake that he is an exploiter also." Yumiko's use of words such as "face" and "worked" in this paragraph interferes with clarity and with the quick and easy processing of meaning, too, for some readers. Yumiko does not translate "face" directly in her Japanese version of this paragraph, and she elaborates "worked" into the equivalent of "exists and performs his role."

The "Conclusion" of draft PS1 begins with a review of the lurah's authority. The later drafts, in contrast, begin their conclusions from the more general perspective of rural village democracy. The "Conclusion" of draft PS2 is basically identical to that of draft MA1 except for the final paragraph (PS2:VI:33-37:558-562; MA1:VII:33-49:754-770; see Appendix C; draft MA2:VI:48-72:1136-1162, discussed below, introduces a few other modifications). In the first "Conclusion," rural mass participation appears to some extent in the third through fifth sentences of paragraph one (PS1:IX:6-12:416-422). The



presentation runs into difficulties again, however, on account of the use of "Even though. . . ."

- E8.           Even though systematically all the decision-making and election of their leaders were in the hand of village meeting which was attended by village members and open to the rural democracy. (PS1:IX:8-10:418-420)

The first two sentences of this initial paragraph are recast as the opening of paragraph three in the later drafts. The statements concerning Javanese ideology are later played down, as the section heading dealing with "Cultural norms and leadership in democracy" is finally deleted. Yumiko felt that the material that was presented there belonged more appropriately in the preceding section, "The Concept of Democracy and Function of Consensus Building." Most of the content of paragraphs three and four of draft PS1 (IX:20-38:430-448) is concisely summed up in the single sentence of paragraph six of drafts PS2 and MA1, which became paragraph five of draft MA2.

- E9.           Main events which account for the changes are firstly transition in village economy which started in colonial period and has been reinforced by the agricultural development programs, secondly political transition particularly just before 1965 and military oppression after that. (PS2:VI:29-32:554-557)

This reduction is offset by the expanded treatment of economic and political factors in later versions, particularly in the final one. This expansion is more in keeping with the "democratic" theme, culminating in paragraph five of drafts PS2 and MA1, cited above as (E7) (cf. MA2:VI:33-37:1121-1125).

Draft MA1 concludes with a more elaborate consideration of the issue of the existence of "democracy" in rural Java, in keeping with its title: "TRENDS IN 'DEMOCRACY': THE CASES OF JAVANESE VILLAGES."

By this time, Yumiko had a clearer idea of the patterns of responses of her immediate readers. She was also aware of her responsibility as a writer to achieve satisfactory communication in dealing with them. The most striking innovation in this "Conclusion" is the introduction of a direct question in the middle of the final paragraph. Although Yumiko had written questions in outlines previously, she had worded the drafts themselves almost exclusively in terms of statements. She regards the question as a device to attract attention to a main point. The impact of this particular question, however, is to minimize the importance of what she has been trying to say about changing trends, for she asks:

E10.        But is this greatly different from traditional way?  
               (MA1:VII:39-40:760-761)

The following sentences imply a negative answer since she points out the traditional high valuation of leadership. The rest of the conclusion seems somewhat anticlimactic, as Professor B commented to her in asking, "What's the point then?" Consequently, in drafts MA1 and MA2, Yumiko deleted the direct question and began a new paragraph there to deal with the question "So what?" regarding the point of the paper. The final paragraph in draft MA1, which Yumiko split anew in draft MA2, moves from the statement concerning traditional norms, through a reworking of the second and third sentences, to the final point concerning village democracy. This completes her treatment of the topic introduced in her last title.

#### 4.5 Concluding Comment

Yumiko, like many other student writers, was not taught to write long papers in English, and emphasis in her advanced English courses was on content rather than style. It has therefore been necessary to a great extent for her to develop her linguistic patterns by herself for writing long papers. Most schooled native English speakers, on the other hand, are taught more than Yumiko about writing standard academic English in the course of their formal education. She was taught something about style, of course, in Japanese language courses. She further came to recognize some distinctive differences between Japanese and (American) English styles through her reading as a student of American literature. She was also taught to translate between English and Japanese, primarily in grammar classes, but passages were short and the focus was at the level of sentences rather than on discourse. She has done some translation of Indonesian stories into Japanese, since learning Indonesian (mainly in Hawaii), so she is aware of differences in style there as well. She further says that she sees distinctions between her own written English and that of her husband, which she believes shows the influence of his native Indonesian language.

The relationship between shifts in the linguistic structuring of information within sections in Yumiko's drafts and specific instances of editing will be examined in chapter 6.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>All of the citations from Yumiko's drafts are accurate representations of the original data, apart from line turns. See 2.3 for a discussion of the manner of presentation here.

<sup>2</sup>Yumiko sometimes underlines her title, and she ends each heading in the first draft with a period (see Figure 3). When Yumiko puts a period after a title, with or without underlining the whole, it complicates the matter of citing her forms accurately while following standard American academic English punctuation practices. Norms call for placing all periods and commas, whether they originate in a quotation or not, inside quotation marks when these forms of punctuation co-occur. Yet periods and commas should not usually co-occur adjacently: e.g., "Introduction.," . . . I will generally follow standard American academic English patterns in discussing titles, since I am not focusing closely on punctuation in this discussion.

<sup>3</sup>Miho Steinberg, born in Canada of Japanese parents, has studied and taught English in both Japan and America. She is currently director of the English Language Institute at the University of Hawaii.

<sup>4</sup>See Ookuma (1967) for a presentation of common rhetorical patterns that are taught in Japanese secondary schools; also Yamaguchi (1967) and Hinds (1979, 1980). Hinds (1980) focuses on contrastive rhetoric at the level of paragraph development, while I am concerned with larger units in this chapter. I am using the term "part," in contrast with "section," to distinguish the purely analytical ki, shoo, ten, ketsu of Japanese (and the introduction, body, and

conclusion of English) from the numbered divisions of Yumiko's drafts.

"Introduction" and "Conclusion" also appear in the latter type of organization.

<sup>5</sup>The quoted words in this paragraph are Yumiko's translations.

<sup>6</sup>Yumiko translates this sentence thus: "Kono yoo ni, nooson shakai koosoo no saikoosei o habanda mono wa, masa ni eriito to taishuu no aida no dentooteiki na kankei de atta."

<sup>7</sup>For example, Yumiko introduces the "principle of musyawarah literally meaning collective deliberations to achieve unanimity" (PS2:VI:3-4:528-529) in the opening sentence of the "Conclusion." This evokes Professor A's written comment that "this should have been introduced and described earlier--in the section on democracy."

<sup>8</sup>Yumiko translates this passage from her "Conclusion" as follows:

E3'. "Nooson shakai ga dentoo o mochitsuzukeru kagiri Jawa no dentooteiki na riidaa mo mata sonzai shi sono yakuwari o hatashite iru to watashi wa kangaeru. Aru teido made kare wa noomin no seikatsu o hoshoo suru hitsuyoo na enjo o hodokasu taishuu no sakusha de atta. Shikashi sakusha de aru to dooji ni hontoo no imi de wa kare wa sakushusha de aru koto mo machigai nai."

## CHAPTER V

### EDITING, CONNECTIONS, AND CONNECTIVES

#### 5.1 Negotiation and Connections

Schank and Abelson (1977) emphasize that understanding is based on prediction, and prediction is based on knowledge of connections (and hence connectives). If language such as Yumiko's is not predictable, there will be problems in understanding it. On the other hand, most of Yumiko's language seems to be understandable, at least for some people. Knowledge about characteristic linguistic expectations for the use of connectives is of fundamental importance here.

Meanings need to be negotiated (see Goffman 1976; Gray 1977; Reddy 1979; Scollon and Scollon 1980, to appear; Grace 1981b: chapter 10). The Scollons discuss communication in terms of whether situations are "focused." They define a focused situation as "any communicative situation in which there are strong limitations on negotiation between participants" (Scollon and Scollon, to appear). Focusing factors include time constraints, participant crowding, and distance, either social or on account of the medium of communication. That is, interaction is focused where feedback and repair work are limited, as in writing.

On one hand, Japanese sociocultural norms tend to favor indirectness in communication until some sort of consensus can be agreed upon. Academic constraints, on the other hand, tend to produce focusing in

favor of powerful readers, professors, the ones who can make their own sense "stick" if anyone can. As a result of the combination of indirectness and focusing, professors may not always be able to make sense unilaterally in reading the English of a Japanese student.

The Scollons continue:

Readers typically make changes in the texts they read. . . . These changes, however, are usually compensated with other changes which bring the read utterances into grammatically correct form without changing the meaning of the text.  
(Ibid.)

Changes are essential in some texts that Japanese writers of English compose. Nevertheless, due to the overall differences in idiomaticity (Grace 1981a) between what is actually written and what is expected, professors may not be able to compensate for some changes.

Negotiation is especially important in cross-cultural situations where participants do not fully share any code for communication (cf. 1.3 and 1.5). Yet such situations are the ones where negotiation is most likely to break down or be lacking in general. Just such a situation produced the data for this investigation.

## 5.2 Structuring of Information and "Themes": Review of Literature

The broad patterns of connections in overall organization of discourse and narrower patterns in the structuring of information are emic, or language-specific, in nature. Neither particular discourse genres nor particular patterns in the structuring of information are necessarily universal. Information (either knowledge or ideas) is normally organized for presentation, or communication, in terms of connected propositions or message components. Although the simplest form of connection is mere juxtaposition, often coherence in discourse

is increased by appropriate use of explicit lexical connective markers. Recognition of appropriateness here must be relative to ethnolinguistic normative patterns. That is, a reader uses the norms of his own language to interpret the connections that the writer has tried to indicate. Conventionalized means of connection often signal interpropositional relations (Crothers 1979) and larger expository relations (Jones 1977:145-150). Among these means are initial connectives--cf. Halliday's (1967) discussion of marked themes.

Information must be structured in some comprehensible way if communication is to be coherent (cf. 3.1). Halliday and Hasan characterize the structuring of information as "the ordering of the text, independently of its construction in terms of sentences, clauses, and the like, into units of information on the basis of the distinction into GIVEN and NEW" (i.e., that which is recoverable and nonrecoverable to the hearer) (1976:27).<sup>1</sup> When Halliday talks about "information structure," he is basically concerned with its spoken realization through intonation. In writing, on the other hand,

Any interpretation of the information structure of a written text depends on the 'implication of utterance' which is a feature of written language. There are two aspects to this: (i) the interpretation of the paragraphological signals that the written language employs, such as punctuation, underlining and other forms of emphasis; (ii) the assumption of the 'good reason' principle, namely that the mapping of the information structure onto other structures will take the unmarked form except where there is good reason for it to do otherwise. (1978:133)

We will consider various aspects concerning theme before taking a brief look at punctuation. For Halliday, "'theme' means 'what I am talking about'" (1976b:180). He contrasts this with "given," i.e., "what you were talking about." Themes provide texture, organizing



a discourse as relevant to a particular situation. Initial connectives indicate foregrounding. The theme and information systems, with the identification system (i.e., what is known), constitute the structural resources of the "textual" component, which is part of Halliday's semantic system. Cohesive relations, according to Halliday and Hasan, are semantic rather than structural because these relations are realized apart from any necessary structural configurations. (See 3.2.3.1.)

To compensate for its lack of direct prosodic information,<sup>2</sup> the written mode has "alternative" characteristic devices. One of these is thematic variation, involving marked and unmarked themes.<sup>3</sup> This variation suggests some particular information structure which theme helps to determine. The association typically has the form "theme within given, new within rheme"<sup>4</sup> (Halliday 1978:148).

Scollon and Scollon "use 'information structure' to encompass prosodic, grammatical, and morphological systems of marking givenness, contrastiveness, perspectives, grounding, definiteness, and topicality" (in press, p. 198). Chafe (1976) discusses these marked factors in terms of "packaging" statuses. For him, "theme" is unnecessary, or at best an alternative for "topic" (or subject?)<sup>5</sup> in English. Generally, "the so-called topic is simply a focus of contrast that has for some reason been placed in an unusual position at the beginning of the sentence" (1976:49). He distinguishes this from the Chinese-style topic which represents "the frame within which the sentence holds" (1976:51). Although his discussion focuses on nouns, Chafe mentions initial English adverbial expressions of time and place in

connection with the English type of topic. Topics in Japanese also seem to represent the framing of domains, and they appear at the beginning of sentences when they occur.

Keenan and Schieffelin (1976:345) extend the definition of topic to that of discourse, saying that a discourse topic is the primary presupposition of a question of immediate concern. When there is a change involving such a question, this change is normally indicated in some way:

If an adult (in this society) is attending to a discourse topic that is not tied to the prior discourse topic and/or claim (introducing topic, re-introducing topic) then he is expected to mark this break in some overt manner, e.g., through expressive particles, . . . explicit topic-switching expressions, or explicit questions of immediate concern. (1976:374)

Grimes offers another view of theme. He sees it as a point of departure for the staging of discourse, i.e., for the perspective of presentation (1975:324). For him, "theme" contrasts with "topic," which he regards as a constituent in the grammar. Sentence-initial subordinating conjunctions are "semithematic" for Grimes, but coordinating conjunctions and ordinal numbers are seen as "athematic" (1975:328).

Halliday, too, does not consider subordinators to be strictly thematic in clauses since subordinators occur in clause-initial position obligatorily and since definition of his themes depends on sets of options. Nevertheless he labels subordinators as "structural themes" since they have "a slight thematic flavour. . . . as if one aspect of the theme of a dependent clause was the fact and nature of

the dependence" (1967:220). As a sentence adjunct, an initial subordinating clause is thematic in relation to a sentence as a whole.

Halliday considers two classes of connectives as intermediate between conjunctions and adjuncts of time, place, manner, and so on. (See 3.2 for discussion of these.) He labels the classes as discourse adjuncts and modal adjuncts. Discourse adjuncts include forms such as however, nevertheless, in that case, and therefore; and modal adjuncts include perhaps, probably, frankly, and apparently. The latter relate to speech functions. These classes of intermediate forms are like conjunctions in lack of predicability and in favoring initial position; they can also be followed by other themes.

For Japanese, Martin says that if there is a theme in a sentence, it ordinarily comes first, but a conjunctional theme may precede some other kind of theme. In contrast with Halliday's discussion of theme in English, Martin asserts, "But surely we do not want to say that whatever comes first in the sentence is a theme. . . . not unless we insist on finding a theme for EVERY sentence that contains more than predicate alone" (1975:225). Themes are marked by major junctures. These may be represented by a comma in writing although Martin goes on to state that "comma-insertion is highly idiosyncratic and often unconnected with either grammar or prosody" (1975:227). He distinguishes thematization from focus (cf. the discussion of Chafe above). Thematization represents "the source and expression of a 'topic' for a sentence" (Martin 1975:29). Its function is "to relate the sentence to the larger discourse (specifically to the preceding sentences)" (1975:232).

English and Japanese are not identical in their treatment of theme, topic, and subject. For this reason the treatment of these functions in a "Japanese English" must involve interesting questions in regard to whether "Japanese English" is simply a dialect of English (see 1.3). Initial connectives, which enter into patterns of the structuring of information, are thematic. In this discussion, I am focusing on a relationship between such patterns and cross-cultural editing. Fuller discussion of the theoretical interrelationships of theme, topic, and subject will consequently not be attempted here. Both topic and unmarked subject in English may be viewed as related to syntactic position, which is what Halliday's "theme" gets at. Hence Halliday's concept of theme appears to be useful for my discussion of the structuring of information. On the other hand, the variety of meanings with which the term is used in literature pertaining to language can be confusing (e.g., cf. Jones 1977; Schank and Abelson 1977). I have therefore chosen to use the term initial connectives rather than marked theme.

Now let us briefly return to a consideration of matters of punctuation. The relationship between spoken and written language is complex, and the relationship between punctuation and prosody--for both writer and reader--deserves further investigation.

Not only can punctuation help signify grammatical structure in writing, it also contributes prosodic signs.<sup>6</sup> Still, norms for the use of punctuation are difficult to generalize because they vary not only between standard languages but also within languages. The present study does not attempt to deal with the issues of punctuation

in any thorough manner although occasional salient examples from Yumiko's drafts are discussed where relevant to other findings in her writing.

Regarding periods in punctuation, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975:120) suggest that "sentence stops are perhaps best regarded as the supposed points of interaction in writing, and hence have a tactical element about them as well as a purely grammatical one." That is to say, the points at which a writer divides her ideas into separate sentences are the places where she seems to expect a reader to pause to assimilate what has been communicated. A similar statement would apply to larger units of discourse: e.g., paragraphs, sections. Such points offer structured opportunities for the reader to question the organized assertions that the writer is making. In this way, a writer and reader of a message approach a type of dialog, as Gray (1977) maintains.

Notes

<sup>1</sup>Chafe maintains, in contrast, that givenness depends on "the speaker's belief that the item is in the addressee's consciousness, not that it is recoverable" (1976:32).

<sup>2</sup>Robins writes of the Hellenistic age: "The description of accentual and junctural features graphically represented by word boundaries and punctuation marks, under the general heading of prosodies, . . . was part of the movement in favor of correctness, or Hellenism . . ." (1967:17).

<sup>3</sup>The unmarked theme is the subject in a declarative clause, the WH-element in a WH-interrogative and the finite verbal element in a polar interrogative. Any clause in which the element so designated does not occur initially is said to have marked theme. (Halliday 1976b:180)

<sup>4</sup>Rheme represents the fundamental verbal component of a sentence. See 3.2.2.1, n. 3.

<sup>5</sup>With regard to subject, Chafe suggests: "The best way to characterize the subject function is not very different from the ancient statement that the subject is what we are talking about. . . . It is likely that one of the main ways in which new knowledge is communicated--perhaps even the only way--is by identifying some particular as a starting point and adding to the addressee's knowledge about it. . . . Knowledge directly attached to the subject may be the most immediately accessible" (1976:43-44).

<sup>6</sup>Cf. the discussion of punctuation signs in Ballmer (1978).

CHAPTER VI  
INITIAL CONNECTIVES AND STRUCTURING OF INFORMATION  
WITHIN SECTIONS OF YUMIKO'S DRAFTS

6.1 Comments by Yumiko and Her Professors on Their Editing

This section is primarily based on comments that Yumiko and her professors expressed in interviews which I conducted concerning editing. It also includes my own views regarding cross-cultural editing and initial connectives.

Professor A comments that foreign students in American universities tend to have difficulties with the use of tenses, articles, and prepositions in standard English. Professor C comments that she does not know how to tell students where to put "a" and "the" in manuscripts. At the same time, she makes more editing suggestions with regard to form than does Professor A. Yumiko's professors do not focus consciously on connectives when discussing characteristic types of errors in writing. There is a tendency instead to overlook the importance of connectives. Nevertheless Professor A comments that by rearranging particular nonstandard sentences in his head, he can generally see them as meaningful. Connections clearly play a prominent part in the structuring of information. Standard written academic English seems to favor reliance on implicit connections for purposes of coherence. On the other hand, Japanese writers such as Yumiko tend to favor the use of a large number of explicit connectives as cohesive devices. Professor C finds Yumiko's drafts to be "in

really pretty good shape," in spite of typographical errors, omitted words, and other potential problems. However, as an expert on Yumiko's area of study, she also recognizes that she knows the arguments that Yumiko is presenting.

Talking about Professor C's editing, Yumiko commented:

She corrected my- some of my English, but that just means that she wrote down English equivalent.

Yumiko had the following to say about Professor A's comments on draft PSl:

. . . his comment was about my content but it's relating to my organization and how I wrote. . . . My first paper, he pointed out I had problems with my English, and he suggested me to accept help of native speaker, but uh, he said that can get the help but the content it's impossible. So his comment was much more on the content, not the English itself.

That is to say, Professor A suggested that a nonnative speaker could rely on assistance from a relatively unspecialized native speaker for purposes of editing the surface form of a paper but not for producing the basic content of an academic presentation.

Yumiko's statements about Professor B seem to be in contrast.

When I inquired if he talked about content, Yumiko replied:

No. Before talking about content, according to him, my English was not up to the standard [embarrassed laugh], so he didn't want to read.

We may note in passing that in her final semester at the university, Yumiko nevertheless earned an "A" in his course.

## 6.2 Editing, Initial Connectives, and Development within Sections

Comments by editing readers requesting or suggesting clarification of Yumiko's writing tend to cluster around initial connectives (see



3.2), when the comments are not directly oriented toward factual matters. The comments do not necessarily refer to connectives directly.

As discussed in 4.2.1, Yumiko's first draft (PS1) begins with an indirect approach to her main issue. In addition to the lexico-grammatical differences from standard academic English, her logic and patterns of overall organization create difficulties for some readers, both among professors and students. Student F, a native speaker of English, comments that "it's clear enough if you can figure it out. . . . I think she's going to have a tough time."

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." On the other hand, she says she must consciously apply her knowledge of English grammar since she was taught it in Japanese. What do these statements indicate? Through her early Japanese language experiences, even apart from explicit instruction, Yumiko developed a sense of idiomaticity, of "how to say things naturally," including ways of using connectives. Later in her English classes, she learned to write English symbols rather than Japanese symbols. She learned to write without consciously translating most of her messages. Nevertheless, 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.

### 6.2.1 General Comments

At least for the introductions, Yumiko's paragraphs lack much analytical unity. Jones' (1977) expository scripts, and Crothers' (1979) paragraph structure inferences, seem to require quite substantial unity in paragraphs in order to add much to understanding them. Such frameworks have been developed in relation to published writings, and so they reflect particular ideal types. They might be useful as teaching devices in helping aspiring writers develop awareness of the structuring in their own writings. Narrow categorical labels are difficult to apply at present to some of Yumiko's overt structures because so many relevant assertions in them remain implicit at best.

It seems useful in considering the editing of Yumiko's writing to look at a dialogic approach to discourse analysis like that developed by Gray (1977). In contrast with the analytical approaches of Crothers and Jones, it is more natural as a model for interaction between reader and writer. The structures of hierarchical models such as those of Crothers, or Jones, display the relative importance of particular assertions more obviously than the structure of Gray's linear model. The difference is particularly evident when the logic of a piece of writing seems weak and inexplicit. It is unlikely that readers will go to the trouble of consciously constructing hierarchies if they are led step by step along expository paths. Some hierarchical relationships will, of course, be readily apparent if the exposition is clear. On the other hand, if the structuring of information is unclear to readers, they may have to try to construct hierarchical models to come to some understanding of a message.

A dialogic approach suggests a means of trying to deal with the linguistic problem of connections. Within a frame of shared linguistic expectations, if the writer is actively directing a train of thought, most readers will probably follow along fairly quietly. If the writer can imagine questions which a reader might reasonably ask, she can then proceed to deal with them. Of course, a reader might have thought of different questions from those of the writer, especially when writer and reader do not fully share a culture.

Professor D, who himself came to Hawaii from Japan, comments<sup>1</sup> that students who come to America from Japan often have a problem with vagueness in their writing.

. . . They are philosophers, you know. They want to tackle whole society, and therefore topics are big. "What is human value?" It's very difficult to understand what they want to . . . write on such big-. . . . Japanese often write really big concept and uh--whereas in American uh--at least university professors, they want to focus on the small aspect.

As a result of a general Japanese preference for indirectness (see 6.3), the emphasis on precision that is to be found in English exposition is largely lacking in nontechnical Japanese language use. Yumiko says of her own experience that students in Japan were not taught to write "precisely," aside from scientific reports.

She says Professor D's advice to "be precise" does not sound like the advice of a Japanese reader. He has basically adapted to the ways of an American academic institution, as have Japanese student readers such as G. Yumiko has come to recognize that the organization of her first draft is "not good" from the point of view of readers such as her professors since this has been pointed out to her numerous times.

Students who are successful in American graduate schools generally learn to follow expected patterns of standard academic English communication. Otherwise, they have some rough times.

Professor D advises students like Yumiko:

First tighten organization. State the problems. . . .  
various trees in the problems and how you plan to examine  
the problems. Obviously it is not hypothesis testing.

Yumiko described the purpose of her final paper, and that of her earlier drafts to some extent, thus:

Not "explanation." I'm trying to go beyond explanation, and  
uh- want to analyze that phenomenon and social changes. . . .  
What I mean in "explanation" is that what's going on in uh-  
like if an anthropologist does ethnographic studies. . . .  
A report.

Concerning data, she said after finishing draft MA2: ". . . even now I don't think that's enough since I didn't do any research." By this she means that she had not done any field research of her own.

Yumiko frequently seems to be aiming to present arguments, or informal proofs. Reader G observes, however, that initial connectives such as therefore, thus, and Because may only suggest a vague feeling of logical relationships.<sup>2</sup> They may contribute to cohesion without contributing to coherence.

Expository writing is not generally taught as a genre in Japanese schools. American teachers in Japan who sometimes try to present exposition as a genre in composition classes tend to become frustrated as a result of the experience. Kaisetsu 'explanation' and hookoku 'report' seem like related genres, but they are not 'exposition', according to my Japanese sources (see 7.3).

After reading draft PS1, reader G concluded that the writing is so "objective" that it might be an example of kaisetsu anyway. This is not what Yumiko is aiming to produce, at least ultimately. She believes:

The writing is very important in the- for the- for those who are working in academic field. If they can't write they cannot, you know, express about what they're doing, what they're studying. . . . I prefer more writing a thesis or the longer and spend much more time.

This attitude comes from experience, however, for Yumiko also says,

When I started to write this paper, I was in my mind that I was writing for the professor or to people who have some background, so I was not writing in general, but later on I was aware. . . .

By "in general" here, Yumiko seems to mean for a general audience.

#### 6.2.2 Introductory and Concluding Sections of Yumiko's Drafts

Let us consider the introductions to Yumiko's various drafts again. The greatest similarity between section I of draft PS1 and later drafts is a correspondence between the second sentence in the first draft and the opening of paragraph four in the second.<sup>3</sup>

Eli. Especially in the past a few decades rural societies suffered drastic changes caused by national politic and economic development policy of the Central Government. (PS1:I::3-5)

Elii. For the past few decades the rural communities have been experienced drastic changes. (PS2:I::26)

The normative corrections in the revised sentence correspond to those of Professor B, although Yumiko has introduced additional changes on her own.

In paragraph two of draft PS1, the informal proof script (see Jones 1977) fails to satisfy this same professor, who comments "step left out" in relation to the second sentence, which begins with "Since."

- E2.           This paper concentrates on the adaption of the rural community to the outside influence, especially that of the rural elites. Since the scope of interest and activity of the peasants are limited to the local community, the first people to contact with it have been the village elites and only those people can cope with, adapt with and survive. In another words, the rural elites have worked as a mediator between local communities and the central government, then have developed their power by the role. (PS1:I:9-15)

In paragraph three, which is the last in the "Introduction" but not the end of ki, the final sentence attracts the editing focus.

It also begins with a connective phrase, "In this regards":

- E3.           In this regards I focuss my discussion on the :  
               (1) influence of national integration and penetration of national party activities in rural society during post independent period to Sukarno era, (2) influence of depoliticization of villages by militaries, and of (3) economic development under the present regime; on the (a) foundation of rural authority, and (b) function of rural elites in the local community. (PS1:I:18-24)

Professor B suggests the following version of this sentence:

The greater dependence of villages has resulted from the influence of (1) national integration . . . (2) depoliticization of villages by militaries, and (3) economic development under the present regime which has affected the foundation of rural authority and the function of rural elites in local communities.

This not only makes the list of points somewhat clearer; it begins without a connective. Yumiko responds to this alternative indirectly.

In draft PS2 her focus, "transition on 'democracy'" (PS2:I:46), is particularized in the following sentences:

E4. Indonesia is, however, too complex a country to allow generalization, even within Java. The degree of social changes is various depending on regions. Obviously four important factors have to be taken into account to tackle the theme; population density, types of economic activities, the social organization, distance from the urban centers or political centers. (PS2:I::50-54)

Professor A draws a vertical line in the margin next to the third sentence, which also begins with a connective, "Obviously." The line may simply be emphasizing the content. It indicates, however, that this sentence attracted attention. Yumiko reported that she rarely took such marks into account in her revising, since they have no explicit content. In draft MA1 (I::20-24), Yumiko incorporates her editors' suggestions, changing "is various" to "varies," reordering "obviously" after "factors," and adding "and" before "distance." In MA2 (I::109-115) she appends a footnote of explanation to the third factor.

The opening paragraph of draft PS2, (E5ii), corresponds most closely to the first two paragraphs of section II of draft PS1, (E5ib), although the initial mention of political autonomy in draft PS1, (E5ia), occurs prior to the listing of focal points at the end of section I, (E3). These extracts, apart from (E3), are presented below in developmental order.

E5ia. It is said that Javanese villages are traditionally an autonomous political units. (PS1:I::16-17)

E5ib. 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 take place. 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. (PS1:II:2-11:26-35)

Here Professor B questions Yumiko's use of terms, and Professor A further recommends deleting the final clause of this passage, beginning with "so." The revised version that Yumiko submitted to Professor A appears as (E5ii):

E5ii.           The wet rice cultivating Javanese villages have been politically autonomous mainly functioning as a cooperative body to engage in agriculture. The settlement pattern in general is a nucleated residential unit surrounded by the land cultivated by the residents. The several hamlets units have expanded into an administrative organization, a desa (village), which is under control of a headman called lurah. Today it forms the lowest unit of a hierarchical local administration system. (PS2:I:2-8)

In the process of revision, Yumiko somewhat clarifies the terminology concerning types of village units, by introducing "hamlets" to refer to individual lowland villages, restricting the use of "village" to reference to desa. This allows her to dispense with a formal definition of "village" in this paper. She also deletes "cluster," "collection," and "dukuh" (the Javanese term for the Indonesian desa). She decreases her use of initial connectives, thus eliminating the problems with "In lowland villages. . . ." Since this section (II) deals with historical change, "Today" is probably a more reasonable connective than "Administratively" also.

The paragraph that seems to have finally led to the initial critical breakdown in written communication between Yumiko and Professor B is paragraph three of the original section II:



E6i. 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. . . . (PS1:II:12-17:36-41)

Compare this with (E6ii), cited from paragraph five of draft PS2.

(E6ii) immediately precedes the statement introducing Yumiko's revised focus which was discussed above in relation to (E4).

E6ii. Patron-client relationship still remains. But it is practiced in limited base, only some of village population participate while pushing the increasing number of poor peasants out of it. This fact accounts for the decline of village democracy. (PS2:I::40-43)

Yumiko has again streamlined her message and eliminated her use of initial connectives. This passage also receives a marginal line from Professor A, but no further comments. It does not directly correspond to any particular passage in later drafts.

The concluding sections of Yumiko's drafts have been discussed already in 4.2.4 and 4.4. They show much greater similarity to one another than do the introductory sections, and they evoke few specific comments from editing readers. In draft PS2 the final paragraph is weakened by the use of the connective "While" in conformity with patterns in "Japanese English" but differing from standard academic English usage. These patterns are somewhat parallel to those involving Because (see 3.2.2.2). When asked for a Japanese translation of this expression, Yumiko originally said she would not use a connective here at all. Pressed further concerning the meaning of "While" in the present context, she suggested that a Japanese equivalent, ippoo,

might be used. This word would signal that the following clause presents a background statement that contrasts with the preceding statement. Yumiko's interpretation is plausible, but it is not likely to represent the immediate interpretation of a reader of English unless he is familiar with Japanese writings.

In spite of the various difficulties that readers have with Yumiko's drafts, quite a bit of communication obviously occurs, presumably with increasing ease as drafts have been revised. The question of ease, however, remains somewhat open since Yumiko continues to introduce "unrevised" changes into later drafts. The grammar and wording gradually approach those of standard academic English, but the use of initial connectives continues at the same level of frequency over all. Reasons for the use of some of them remain unclear. Yet the specific types of connectives and the concentration of them in particular sections shifts, as we shall see below.

### 6.2.3 Middle Sections of Yumiko's Drafts

The material in the middle sections shows a greater degree of direct comparability among drafts than is the case with the introductory sections. Nevertheless, in the content and in the form of its presentation, there is substantial reordering and some substitution; some deletion but more addition. These types of revision cannot be completely separated in the following discussion of the data.

### 6.2.3.1 Reordering and Substitution

Yumiko regards section III of draft PS1 as the beginning of the part she designates as shoo (see 4.2.2). This part consists of three sections that provide explanatory material to clarify or support the introductory part (sections I and II). Let us consider the following extracts, (E7) and (E8), with which she begins different, but comparable, sections of her four main drafts. Compare the changes in the framing of statements. The subheadings indicate the general topic.

First, let us examine the text from draft PS1 in some detail.

- E7i.        III. Position of village in local government administration.  
              Local government of Java forms the lowest of a series of administrative units of diminishing size. Authority is strongly centralized and chains of command carefully worked out and strictly adhered to the selection of officials for all but the bottom level of villages is by appointment of the central government. There is a critical line between the civil officers appointed by the government and village authorities elected by the villagers(8)(Jay;1956,ibid.). Though the national integration and external influences, especially those originating from the supervillage level, were usually received by the village administration in the form of instructions. Through subdistrict conferences, which are attended by the lurah, assignments were passed on from levels above the village. Since the village administration was absorbed into the centralized national administrative system which can be characterized authoritarian, the village autonomous power to deal with certain aspects of its own affairs has become vaguer than in the past.  
              (PS1:III:1-15:94-108)

In the second sentence, there are two presumably independent clauses juxtaposed without even any punctuation to set them apart.

Professor A marks this place with vertical lines in the margins. The fact that the conjunction and occurs here twice compounds the confusion. Yumiko usually uses and to conjoin phrases rather than

clauses, but see the last sentence of the first revised paragraph, (E7ii).

The next major difficulty centers on the use of "Though," in the fourth sentence. When a connective such as Though, While, or Because begins a sentence, Yumiko tends to write only a single clause. (Cf. the discussion of these connectives in 3.2.2.2.) This tendency leaves the reader wondering about the degree of independence or dependence of such clauses relative to the rest of the discourse. The fourth sentence here does not seem to be attachable to the preceding sentence, although such an attachment sometimes seems to solve a reader's problem. Nor does it depend on the following sentence, since the latter is basically a paraphrase elaboration of the one in question.

Professor A suggested the following revision:

After the national integration, external influences, especially those originating from the supervillage level, were usually received by the village administration in the form of instructions.

Alternatively, Professor E suggested:

Despite the national and external integration, influences, especially those originating from the supervillage (supra-village?) level, . . .

Either of these sentences creates an independent clause with "influences" as its subject, but it disrupts Yumiko's conjoined noun phrases "national integration and external influences." Readers tend to ask what the latter phrase means.

Her own revision in draft PS2 makes it evident that she considers "national integration" to be more significant as a subject here than "external influences." Yumiko's revised version of the sentence, which occurs at the beginning of a new paragraph, in (E7ii), replaces

"Though" with "However,"--a connective that does not imply dependency. In contrast, however, suggests that the preceding statement may be more or less disregarded for the moment at least. It is clear from the combination of a paragraph break and this connective in the revised version that there was no close connection between the sentence beginning with "Though" and the one preceding it. In other words, Though is not equivalent to Although, but the equivalence of Though to however does not extend to sentence-initial position in standard academic English. If a writer such as Yumiko does not properly understand the relevant collocational constraints on the use of particular connectives in standard academic English, we may expect nonstandard distributional patterns in their use. We can observe these in her writings involving connectives such as Though and While (indicating a contrast equivalent to that introduced by But or on the other hand). The problem of learning collocational restrictions may be aggravated by patterns that have been learned in schools (cf. the discussion in 3.2.2.2).

Finally with regard to the sixth sentence, we may note that Since is an ambiguous connective, indicating time in some situations and reason in others. These meanings must often be differentiated on the basis of linguistic or other contextual clues, at least by the general reader who lacks expert knowledge of the subject under discussion. Even Professors A and C do not readily agree as to whether this "Since" introduces a reason or a time clause. The choice of verb form is one significant factor in distinguishing the 'time' meaning from that of 'reason'. Quirk et al. state:

When since is used in a temporal sense, the present perfect is used in the main clause, also sometimes in the subordinate clause, in referring to a stretch of time up to (and potentially including) the present. (1972:782)

As a time duration adjunct, Since contrasts with the homologous form in reason clauses, which are disjunctive (1972:752). Yumiko's use of the present perfect in the main clause of the sixth sentence is suitable for a temporal interpretation of "Since." Yet when we come to interpret the tense in the "Since"-clause, uncertainty as to what Yumiko may really intend results from her mixing of verb forms throughout the paragraph. That is, she shifts from present tense, in the first three sentences and in the relative clause of the fifth sentence, to past tense in the fourth sentence and in the main clauses of the fifth and seventh sentences. Suppose the form of the verb of the "Since"-clause had been present perfect like that of the main verb of the sixth sentence, instead of past. We could then feel more confident about resolving the ambiguity here in favor of a temporal interpretation than most unenlightened readers feel. Yumiko came to recognize a possible problem of interpretation for this clause and replaced "Since" with "after" in draft PS2. The ambiguity of Since is a problem not just for writers like Yumiko. Nevertheless, difficulties are compounded for readers who come to expect problems in the writing of certain groups of individuals on the basis of nonstandard English such as that which we are considering.

Draft PS2 places the discussion of the local government administration in section V, "Political Function of Lurah" (instead of in section III as in draft PS1). Furthermore, the revised version of (E7i) begins a subsection (V.1) rather than the section as a whole.

Let us first consider what is directly comparable to (E7i). We can then see how the framing of Yumiko's writing changes from draft to draft.

E7ii. 1.administrative change

Local government of Java forms the lowest of a series of administrative units of diminishing size. Authority is strong ceteralized and all the policies are handed from top to the bottom. The officials except the bottom level of villages are appointed civil officers. In the village level officers are elected among the villagers.<sup>36</sup> Thus administrative organizations have different basis above the village levels and in villages. The formers are as the governmental institutions and the latters are based on villagers consensus and will.

However, the national integration have required villages to participate and cooperate with national development policies. The policies of the central government are handed down to the lower level through subdistrict conferences, which are attended by the lurah. There lurahs receive policies in the form of instructions. This is the change since after the village administration was absorbed into the centralized national administrative system established at the time of independence.<sup>37</sup> The village autonomous power to deal with certain aspects of its own affairs has come vaguer than in the past. (PS2:V:8-23:354-369)

The fourth sentence of paragraph one here begins with an initial connective, which falls at the bottom of Yumiko's page in the following manner (E7ii:Ss.3-4):

The officials except the bottom level of villages are appointed civil officers. In the village level officers are elected

The result is a bit of unnecessary confusion for readers, which a change in preposition or word order or punctuation could improve. Next Yumiko adds a bit of logical explanation introduced by "Thus" as an adjunct.

As noted above in the discussion of the original paragraph, "However," introduces a new paragraph and replaces "Though." In the second sentence of this paragraph, "through subdistrict conferences" has been moved out of the initial position. Yumiko strengthens the

coherence of the passage by using "There" to introduce the third sentence. Then she moves the time clause, which begins with "since," out of the initial position in the fourth sentence of paragraph two.

Yumiko did not receive any particular editing comments here from professors who read draft PS2. This suggests that the changes which she made with regard to draft PS1 were successful in advancing communication.

Now let us return to the beginning of section V of draft PS2 (E8i) and consider comparable introductory paragraphs of drafts MA1 and MA2, (E8ii) and (E8iii) respectively, too.

E8i. V. Political Function of Lurah

Several aspects would be considered to analyze the transition in political function of lurah.

Firstly, administrative change in the position. Secondly influence of party politics which led to the bloody conflict in 1965, and thirdly changes under the military dominance after the coup. The first and the third aspects are correlated. (PS2:V:1-7:347-353)

E8ii. VI. Trends in the leadership of the lurah

The function of lurah as a formal as well as the informal leader play an important role in analyzing the transition in the rural democracy. His function as a informal leader, particularly economic function as a large landowner, was discussed in Chapter V. In this chapter I discuss his formal function and the transition in his leadership. (MA1:VI:1-6:565-570)

E8iii. V. Trends in the Leadership of the Lurah

As was discussed in part IV, the polarization of power and resources, particularly land, is the most important factor in the decline of rural democracy. The function of the lurah among the elites, as a formal as well as informal leader, is the most important in an analysis of the diminishing basis of democracy. His function as an informal leader, especially his economic function as a large landowner, was discussed in part IV. In this part I will discuss his formal function as a political leader, both within the village and between the village and



supra-village authorities, and the transition in his leadership. The political changes in these past few decades tend to accelerate the concentration of power in the hands of the lurah. (MA2:V:1-14:857-870)

As Yumiko's focus on democracy becomes clearer, her framing statements do too. In draft PS2, she does well to specify the three aspects that make up the subsections of her topic in section V. She pulls together certain sections from shoo and ten of her original version--"Position of village in local government administration" (PS1:III), "Influence of the political parties" (PS1:VI), and "Influence of the militaries" (PS1:VII)--and places them after the rest of the material from these parts. That is, the content of these three sections together forms the basis for the final section of the "body" of the second draft. This general position in the structuring of information remains stable through further revisions. In the extract from draft MA1, Yumiko specifies the relationship between the preceding chapter and this one. She elaborates on this approach in draft MA2, changing from "chapter" to "part" at the suggestion of Professor B.

Thus, reordering and substitution are two principal techniques of revising which Yumiko employs, along with addition and deletion on which we will focus next.

#### 6.2.3.2 Addition and Deletion

Addition and deletion may occur as components of substitution or independently. Yumiko incorporates some fundamentally new sections into the "body" of her revisions of draft PS1.

In presenting "Concept of Democracy and Concensus" (PS2:II), she includes a quotation and subsequent discussion based on it.

E9i. James Scott wrote in his thesis, Exploitation in Rural Class Relations: A Vietiem's Perspective on the concept of exploitation by the peasants as follows:

Stability and security of subsistence income are more critical to the tenant's evaluation of the relationship than either his average return or the portion of the crop taken by the landlord as rent.<sup>6</sup>

Similarly the democracy in Javanese sense is not to seek for equity but to maintain one's position in the society. It means that as a sharecropper or a landlord or village headman they have to behave according to what they are and keep their social norms according to their status. The purpose of democracy in Javanese villages is to maintain the social order, while fulfilling the equity prospected in their culture and customary laws. It aims to reduce conflicts and maintain harmony in the societies.

Therefore it is understandable that village democracy emphasizes consultation and process to build up consensus, but not decision-making itself. Thus the basis of village democracy was to maintain the communal harmony rather than seeking for individual equity by taking a risk to cause disorder. It is communal harmony that could provide maximum security for each one to maintain his position in the society. Outwardly communal harmony was kept by preventing the direct interference by supra-village authority over the village matters. As a representative of a village, headman used to work as a mediator between the two levels, then from time to time he succeeded to keep his village independent. (PS2:II:20-41:93-114)

Seeming to focus here first on "Similarly," an initial connective that immediately follows the citation from Scott, Professor A comments, "Interesting. On what do you base the remarks?" He then underlines about half the rest of the same paragraph and asks, "Couldn't this be done also by other ways?" The final paragraph here consists of sentences beginning almost exclusively with initial connectives: "Therefore," "Thus," "Outwardly," "As a representative of a village." They do not evoke any direct editing comments, but consideration of them enters into the revision of the passage, (E9iia) below.

The revised paragraph in draft PS2 shows the results of substantial editing by Yumiko, but it elicits numerous further comments from Professor A. At this stage he writes, "quote seems only partly to the point" [sic] and offers an alternative summary statement.

The following selection from draft PS2 begins immediately after the Scott quotation:

E9iia. Security is the most important for the peasants rather than how much share they can get. Communal control of the resources is aimed to provide the security. In the society where resources are communally controlled and social relationship is also an important resource, it is wiser to maintain social harmony and good relationship with his fellows rather than create tensions and open conflicts through mutual competitions. To maintain social harmony, existing social order should be accepted to some extent. As long as one can be rewarded more in this way, this system works. The rewarding mechanism is built in the customary law and communal control of resources. The village democracy emphasizing consultation and process to build up consensus is a scheme to avoid risks to destroy the social system. It is communal harmony that could provide security for each one to maintain his position in the society. Outwardly, communal harmony was kept by preventing direct interference by a supra- village authority in village affairs which might change the balance of power in local communities. (MA1:II:27-41:110-124)

This revised version has no explicit causative connectives, and the initial connectives that occur seem fairly reasonable: "In the society where . . . ," "To maintain social harmony," "As long as . . . ," "Outwardly." At least they do not attract editors' comments. The latter half of the passage, however, remains somewhat unclear to some readers.

As a result of continuing lack of clarity, Yumiko revises the passage again, this time in connection with (E9iib), the end of the following section: "Cultural norms and leadership in democracy" (MA1:III:37-47:222-232).

E9iib.           The power of the leader is very crucial. Because the moral norms urge them to protect the masses and discourage to enforce their power aggressively. But on the other hand they admit the superiority of the elites/leaders over the rest of population and it is considered that they should be rewarded more. Therefore whether "democracy" is practiced or not is highly depends on the moral of the elites. It seems that when the leaders become to lose the moral and to be interested much more in material rewards, democracy starts to decline. In this case actual leadership becomes weak without fully support of themasses. However, when the leaders can get backing from another source, they can coerce following. The gap between the two groups widens, and to reach consensus in decision-making becomes less important from the side of the leaders.

This last paragraph begins with two related units, each of which has initial capitalization and a period as punctuation. The second of these written sentences consists of "Because" plus a single clause. Professor A marks this construction as "incomplete" and puts a question mark beside the pair of clauses. At the beginning of the fourth sentence, "Therefore" seems to attract his attention, too, as indicated by his line in the margin. There are no further comments on the rest of the paragraph, including the other initial connectives --"But on the other hand," "In this case," "However."

Yumiko's revision of the combined passages appears as (E9iii).

E9iii.           James Scott wrote in "Exploitation in Rural Class Relations: A Victim's Perspective" that stability and security are more critical for a tenant in evaluating his relationship with his landlord than equal shares (1975:5). Similarly Javanese peasants are guaranteed minimal security by communal arrangements, but these do not mean that everyone in the villages has equal access to resources.

For example, Soeriokoesoemo wrote in his article "Right to the Wise" that the wise people, by which he means elites in the context of Javanese ideology, have a right to be rewarded more because of their "wisdom," and the proper way to govern a nation is for the common people to be guided by the elites (1920:183-187). Thus

the cultural norms require the elites to redistribute resources and take care of the common peasants paternalistically, but do not aim at equal distribution.

The moral obligation of the elites is a critical factor in maintaining democracy in Java. But observance of the norms can be expected only under the condition that in the society some mechanism (besides moral obligation) exists to control the power of elites. The communal control of land used to be an important basis of democracy. In a society where resources are communally controlled and social relationships are also an important resource, it is wiser to maintain social harmony and good relationships with one's fellows rather than to create tensions and open conflicts through mutual competition. To maintain social harmony, the existing social order should be accepted to some extent. The village democracy that emphasizes consultation and processes in order to build up consensus is a scheme to avoid risks that might destroy the social system. Communal harmony is what could provide security for each one to maintain his position in the society. Under these conditions, the aggressive use of power is controlled, on one hand, and the lives of the masses are made sure, on the other hand. (MA2:II:45-79:207-241)

Yumiko shifts to paraphrasing Scott and returns to "Similarly" to introduce the point she wants to make about her own topic. Next, with an initial connective, "For example," which is new in this version, she introduces an example taken directly from draft MA1 immediately preceding the section cited as (E9iib). Then she uses "Thus" to introduce a conclusion based on the example. Unlike some of Yumiko's earlier uses of initial connectives, these seem to be linguistically plausible to Yumiko's professors. These connectives do not stand out as indicators of a nonstandard use of English. In paragraph three here, Yumiko sets up a contrast in order to try to clarify the confusion that arose at the beginning of (E9iib). Toward the end of this paragraph, she deletes the sentence of (E9iia) that begins "As long as . . ." and also changes the final sentence, which had had an initial connective, "Outwardly." The new concluding

sentence is also full of connective phrases, but the initial one, "Under these conditions," is more summative than is "Outwardly."

There are a few places where Yumiko becomes excessively redundant. When she tries to characterize decision-making mechanisms or processes clearly (MA1:IV:1-26:233-258), she comes up with statements like the following:

ElOi. By legitimation the project is legitimized for the village communities. Usually the process comprises both preliminary deliberations before the rapat desa as well as deliberations and decisions by the village meeting. (MA1:IV:14-17:246-249)

Professor C puts a question mark beside this first sentence.

Professor A suggests that the whole discussion "perhaps belongs in earlier section." The final version appears without the original initial connective.

ElOii. The legitimation of the project occurs next. Usually the process of legitimation comprises deliberations before the rapat desa and deliberations by the rapat desa. (MA2:III:59-62:321-324)

In (El1), Yumiko tries to outline her plan for discussion, but this elicits a series of question marks from Professor C.

El1. This chapter mainly discusses the processes, but the nature of leadership, which varies the processes cannot be ignored. Therefore I also discuss the leadership, particularly that of lurah who has authority to call decision making, and socio-economic conditions which determine the leadership.

Traditionally the Javanese villages have three deliberative institutions, which mostly have decision-making function as well: . . . (MA1:IV:36-42:268-274)

Professor A also questions the use of "Traditionally"--"how long ago?"

In the final version (MA2:III:15-23:404-412), "chapter" becomes "part" and "varies" becomes "influences." "Traditionally" is replaced by "According to customary laws" and "mostly" is deleted.

The lexical changes are all copied from editors' suggestions except for the connective phrase, "According to customary laws," which might still lead to comments if Yumiko's readers were overtly editing.

In the first subsection of MA1:IV, Yumiko describes decision-making in relation to "Socio-economic conditions and leadership" in four specific localities. She receives a lot of editing feedback on paragraph one.

El2i.            Among the four West Javanese villages, 90 per cent of the population were peasants in Sitaraja 96 per cent in Bangajang and Sindangsari. Except Puradadi where only one third of the population engaged in agriculture, those three villages are considered agricultural communities. Only few wealthy group existed, most of them owned about half a hectare land. Thus scarcity of land was not yet serious problem. (MA1:IV:62-67:294-299)

(In the version of draft MA1 that Yumiko gave me, the second sentence above ends with "agriculture.") Compare Professor A's revision of the first two sentences:

Ninety per cent of the population were peasants in Sitaraja 96 percent each in Bangajang and Sindangsari and X% in Purwadadi. The first 3 are agricultural communities; Purwadadi is more urban.

He also indicates a need for "more reference to time . . . in much of the discussion."

Yumiko's own revision reads slightly differently.

El2ii.            In the period between 1963 and 1968, 90 per cent of the population in Situradja were peasants, and 96 per cent each in Bangajang and Singdangsari; Purwadadi, where only one third of the population engaged in agriculture, is exceptional. Thus the first three villages were agricultural communities, and Purwadadi was more urban. Only a few wealthy people existed in these areas; most of the peasants were small landholders. However, most of them owned about half a hectare of land. Thus scarcity of land was not yet a serious problem. (MA2:III:73-82: 463-472)

The lexical changes in the final version follow my editing suggestions except that Yumiko adds initial connectives of her own: viz. the time phrase and the first "Thus." It is not clear to me why Yumiko tended to follow my corrections more closely than she did those of her professors. Perhaps it was because we were spending time together at this stage and my knowledge of Japanese ways of speaking facilitated our communication.

Yumiko's use of initial infinitive phrases also creates difficulties for her readers. In (E13) Yumiko raises an explicit question in order to focus on her central issue in section IV: "Why lurah has such a great power in the rural community?" The answer to Yumiko's question is rephrased by a professor who is overtly editing, deleting the infinitive phrase that begins the second paragraph of (E13).

E13.           The village administrative structure is centered on the lurah and his most intimate followers usually take other opositions. Under the circumstances decision-making process is monopolized by the lurah. This becomes possible by the supra-village administration on the lurah's recommendation(13)(Kana, N.L. p. 57). Why lurah has such a great power in the rural community? There are two dimensions, one is based on economic circumstances relating to landholding which I discuss the above, the other is based on indigenous values.

To examine the first reason, land holding is the most important factor in Java since one of the most densely populated area in the world and most people depend on agricultural for all of major part of their livelihood. Landlord can enjoy economic power as well as political power over the villagers. . . . (PS1:IV:27-38:163-174)

The result in Yumiko's revising is that this passage has no direct counterpart in later drafts.

Yumiko's discussion of landholding continues in relation to some tables which she has adopted. Yet her tables, charts, and



figures tend to raise as many problems as they solve, or else they receive little attention. Professor A concludes that they do not add a great deal to the clarity of the message. The relationships shown between such graphic displays and the text by initial connectives such as thus and furthermore are often quite weak. Professor C tends to favor the use of charts for presenting details in patterns that may combine a number of variables in summary fashion. The charts prior to the final versions, however, need more explanation to be understood by readers in general.

Requests for "evidence" result in the following series of modifications across Yumiko's principal drafts. First there is an expansion of material, from (E14i) to (E14ii). Then when no further editing comments occur, except for one (in the last paragraph of the second extract) concerning the implication of "depoliticizing," the passage is drastically shortened, in (E14iii) and (E14iv).

E14i. The absence of counter power in the villages, such as political parties in 1950's allows military depoliticize rural society. The military takeover of the administration and the emasculation of the peasantry as a political force, had enabled local despots to proliferate at all levels of government.

Thus the village elite lost opportunity to mobilize entire village into the national politics. Though at the same time the peasants also lost channel to reflect their wishes in national policy. Now the national politics are secured in the hand of military and centralized bureaucratic hierarchy.

The presence of militaries in rural society became pressure to the village social life. The attendance of military in village meeting diminishes the autonomous of the peasants. The existence of militaries makes frustrated all the rural population from the top to bottom. The takeover of lurah's position by the military may widen the gap between the rural elite and mass since they have no background of popular support in the community.

The introduction of capitalization in rural economy, initiated by the military and the foreign capitalist partner, destructed the traditional reciprocal economic relationship between the landlord and landless peasants. Thus, the village elite became more rationally to exploit the poor peasants. Along with this changes brought by the military in the past decade there has been increasing numbers of landowners from outside the village, growing commercialization of agriculture and trade with outside (33)(Gordon, p.214). (PSI:VII:30-50:337-357)

(El4i) received four comments providing a professor's opinions on the content, three requests for evidence relative to the first three paragraphs, and a call for a definition of "rationally" in the middle of the final paragraph. These are not matters of a misunderstanding of Yumiko's discourse; rather they represent disagreement over the interpretation of evidence which is not directly available to her readers.

In (El4ii) notice that the occurrence of "thus," in paragraph three, does not correspond to its occurrences in (El4i), in paragraphs two and four. In (El4ii) it is preceded by an explicit relevant example. The final sentence in (El4ii) does not begin with an initial connective, but in this case it seems more natural to use one than not to. "It, as a consequent, . . ." makes a weak ending for the section as a whole, since "it" refers to a subject, "capitalization," that is scarcely central to the rest of the paragraph even though it is important.

El4ii. . . . Under the circumstances, village democracy and autonomy have been set aside for the sake of national development. Development has been obviously benefiting the elites, while decline of democracy has been worsening life of the poor whose economic and political security depend on it.<sup>52</sup>

The military take-over of the administration and the ban of political organization in the village level deminished an opportunity to voice their views.

Placement of militaries in rural areas especially aims to maintain order through depoliticization.<sup>53</sup> Another task of militaries is to pursue government policies smoothly, rather than to develop social conditions for the villagers. For example, implementation of agricultural programs report a lot of cases of corruption by militaries and bureaucrats, and utilization of military force as a threat to force peasants' participation.<sup>54</sup> Accompanied with lack of proper channel to reflect the views of peasants, not only those the village elites, makes the life of peasants difficult.

Thus the presence of militaries in rural society became pressure to the village social life. The existence of militaries in rural area makes all the rural population frustrated. For the lurah it is a threat to his position. Since lurah should be admitted by the government after the election in the village, lurah's performances are constantly watched.<sup>55</sup>

Tasks of militaries in rural areas have two aspects, maintenance of social order through depoliticizing peasantry and support pursuance of government policy especially agricultural development programs. ~~In the former case, the~~ task is carried out by the means to threat freedom of peasantry to mobilize themselves to seek for social justice which used to be an important element of their norms, and village democracy. The latter task became to widen the economic gap in the rural society. Capitalization of rural economy, which is the main feature of development programs have declined the traditional reciprocal economic relationship between the landlord and the poor peasants. It, as a consequent, develops economic as well as political polarization. (PS2:V:150-179:496-525)

The first sentence of (E14iii) continues to show lack of response to a marginal comment from draft PS1:<sup>4</sup> i.e., "This seems a hard statement to verify for all lurah." The second sentence is a paraphrase of the third sentence of the comparable paragraphs in earlier versions. The initial connective "On the other hand" has been deleted from the next sentence. The remainder of the paragraph follows draft PS2 fairly closely, but the rest of the discussion in MA1:VI is not parallel to the earlier versions.

E14iii. In the villages where elected heads remained, military and police pressure ensured that these became the lackeys of the administration, rather than the custodians of

village interests. The increasing importance of military commanders and the civil bureaucracy placed constraint in the villages. One can argue that the double of line of leadership have the potential to mobilize the peasants towards more effective participation. However, it becomes possible provided that the leadership and the dominance are not excessive. Under the excessive control village democracy and autonomy have been set aside for the sake of national development. Development has been obviously benefiting the elites, while decline of democracy has been worsening the life of the poor whose economic and political security depend on it. (Franke, 1975) (MA1:VI:121-131:685-695)

(E14iv) is even shorter than the preceding extract, as the comparable material constitutes the latter half of one paragraph.

E14iv. Hence, when the influence of outsiders over the village affairs was strengthened, within the villages the village elites, with the lurah on the top, and the middle-scale independent farmers became closely related. The government programs, such as agricultural development programs, have been obviously benefiting this group, while the decline of democracy has been worsening the life of the poor whose economic and political security depend on it (Franke 1975). (MA2:V:189-196:1045-1052)

The last two of these extracts fall under the general heading "Influence of outsiders" rather than under the earlier, more restricted heading "Influence of the militaries." Moreover, they do not end their respective sections, as do the first two.

Yumiko finishes the third part (~~ten~~--section VI-VIII) in draft PS1 with the following paragraph:

E15i. Destroying the traditional elite-mass bond, the Green Revolution deprived the security of the landless peasant in rural society. On the other hand, it strengthened alliance between urban and rural elites. (PS1:VIII: 51-53:408-410)

This corresponds to the third paragraph before the end of section IV in draft PS2, and of section V in draft MA1.

El5ii. In another words, the capital intensive agriculture can benefit the landlord class, but it impoverish the poor peasants, then widens the split between the elites and the masses. 35 (PS2:IV:128-130:330-332)

El5iii. In other words, the capital intensive agriculture can benefit the landowners, especially big landholders, but it impoverishes the poor peasants. The widened split between the elites and the masses can be seen in the changes of participation in decision-making. (MA1:V:146-149:545-548)

Following (El5ii) and (El5iii), the final two paragraphs of the comparable sections in drafts PS2 and MA1 are fundamentally the same --see (El6i).

Beside (El6i) Professor A comments:

Nice summary. Maybe this should appear earlier, say ~~at the~~ near the beginning of part 4, in order to help you organize your material to help the reader follow what you say. [sic]

Yumiko follows this suggestion indirectly in (El6iia). She does so in terms of part III since she combines chapters II and III of draft MA1 in writing part II of her final paper.

El6i. It seems that the decline of village "democracy" is caused by the persistent increase of the lurah's economic function as a large landholder since the colonial period accompanied with population growth and conversion of communal land to private land. Then it was accelerated by political influence by supra-village authority over traditional authority of the lurah which used to be regulated by customary law. Conflict over the land reform law, intervention of village politics by outsiders, especially by military men, increasing dependency of the lurah on supra-village authority to reinforce his economic as well as political statuses and increasing direct interference by the central government in village administrations. These trends all account for the decline of the traditional function of the lurah to protect and maintain villagers' welfare, and for the decline of village democracy and autonomy.

Village autonomy has declined since the lurah became more responsible for implementing policy as instructed by the central government. The village democracy declined

in the circumstances that allowed increasing polarization of resources and power. (MA1:V:150-165:549-564)

El6iia. The decline of village democracy is being caused by the persistent increase of the lurah's economic function as a large landholder since the colonial period, accompanied by population growth and conversion of communal land to private land. As the power of the lurah within the village increased, he became more responsible for implementing policy as instructed by the central government. Probably this is because the popular support became less important to maintain his power and also because the support of supra-village authorities became more important to develop his power.

The trends in democracy are clearly seen among the research cases. Among the cases of West Javanese villages, that of Situradja (1 in Chart III, p. 26) is relatively democratic. In this village all the villagers are involved in deliberation before the decision-making as well as in the decision-making itself. As the lurah became more responsible to the outside forces or depended on them for support, the decisions came to be actually made by the leaders before rapat desa (Bangbajang, Purwadadi, Sindangsari) or by the lurah himself (Kebondalam). Before starting to discuss the decision-making processes of each case, I would like to explain briefly about socio-economic conditions and leadership, especially that of lurah in the villages. (MA2:III:49-71:438-460)

Note that Yumiko continues to introduce new sentences with initial connectives such as "Probably" at the end of the first paragraph. She is evidently not copying the passage directly from draft MA1 even though it has received her professor's commendation. She reports that she rarely copies directly from draft to draft. There are frequently minor changes that are apparent. It is possible that she has developed strategies in her English language classes in Japan that facilitate remembering content in terms of particular phrasings. These phrasings may come readily to mind after they have been developed or learned. (See Pawley and Syder, in press.)

Yumiko returns to this same summary material in the last sentence of part IV.

El6iib. Considering the reasons for the control of supra-village authorities over village affairs, and why the village elites came to depend on the outsiders more than in the former period, it might be concluded that the trends, which have existed persistently since the colonial period, were accelerated in the 1960s, by the agricultural development programs of the central government and by the military regime for the sake of maintenance of national security. (MA2:IV:226-233:849-856)

It is evident that Yumiko in her revising uses all the types of changes that Sommers (1980) attributes to expert writers (i.e., addition, deletion, reordering, and substitution) in contrast with Sommers' American student writers. (See my 7.2.2 for further comparative discussion.) Yet Yumiko's writing retains certain characteristics of her "Japanese English." The use of initial connectives is a major feature of this style of writing.

### 6.3 Ethnolinguistic Perspective

There is more to language than words and sentences. Lack of awareness of specific differences in linguistic expectations concerning the function of linguistic forms can lead to problems in interethnic communication. Knowledge about sociocultural functional relativity is important for understanding how people communicate.

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 student reader (G)

who is Japanese puts it. For example, connectives such as But and therefore may be used with no specific, logical meaning at all. Even if the overall outline of a text seems coherent, the immediate relationships between sentences may be very weak. The assumed textual coherence that occurs as a result at a superficial level contrasts with the type of coherence that Yumiko's professors tend to expect. That is, the basic structuring of information in typically English academic writing is expected to show interpropositional relations clearly, with the result that connectives are often left implicit.

On the other hand, there is a feeling among some Japanese, at least, that it is somehow "more dignified" or "elegant" in many situations to express ideas indirectly. There is idealization of semi-telepathic communication (ishindenshin--see Lebra 1976) based on what many Japanese perceive as relatively extensive cultural homogeneity in Japan in contrast with the cultural diversity of the United States (e.g., see Riesman and Riesman 1967). Reliance on implication and restricted code facilitates ease of expression, but it may also mean that writers are not forced to clarify their thinking even to themselves. Rather they leave the task to their readers. (The conduit metaphor seems less prevalent in Japanese than in English.) Many Japanese seem to believe that Americans talk too much and write too directly, in comparison with Japanese normative behavior. As the above-mentioned Japanese reader (G) says with regard to translation from English into Japanese, suitable expression is difficult when the English is "too clear." Much Japanese communication is based on a sociolinguistic consensus orientation, according to



which a leader must plan in order to manipulate the other participants into reaching some desired goal.

At this point the communicative approach which is characteristic of Aristotelian rhetorical patterns and the approach which is characteristic of Japanese rhetorical patterns seem to have something in common.<sup>5</sup> The emphases differ, however, in keeping with the respective ethnolinguistic traditions. Both classical Western and Japanese patterns of overall organization basically consist of introductory, middle, and concluding parts; but the Japanese introductory parts are more elaborated than typical English introductions. Similarly within sections, as we have seen in Yumiko's writing, Japanese use of initial connectives may differ from the patterns normally expected in standard academic English. The framing requirements of Japanese communication encourage careful introduction of a subject and also restraint in expression of personal views in most formal presentations. In contrast, norms of communication for academic English writing favor getting directly to the points under discussion and supporting their expansion. Then, in English, the conclusion is likely to be strongly stated. The differences in orientation make satisfactory communication between Americans and Japanese rather difficult even under the best of circumstances, i.e., even apart from problems of vocabulary and grammaticality within sentences.

My Americanized Japanese readers of English have near-native proficiency in reading standard academic English. As a result, they report that they tend to find it easier to understand the English

of American academics than that of writers whose native language is not English. Within the latter category, however, it is easier for the Japanese readers to understand English written by Japanese than by others, even if they judge the writing to be deviant English in some ways.

Japanese who read English but who have not adopted standard academic English as their goal tend to report that "Japanese English" seems natural to them. They find fewer linguistic discrepancies relative to "English" norms in texts written by those individuals with whom they share a linguistic code.

It is possible for individuals who understand both Japanese and English to go back and forth between English and Japanese systems of communication. Yet such switching of orientation requires some effort for Japanese readers of English who have attained relatively nativelike proficiency in reading standard academic English. This is because they have come to rely on standard academic English norms of interpretation, although they may have passed through various interlanguage stages.

For professors who do not understand Japanese, of course, no such specifically patterned switching involving Japanese is possible. Nevertheless, professors develop experience with the writing of various types of students, including international ones. As a result, professors may switch between expectations regarding standard academic English norms and nonstandard English according to some generalized patterns. Such patterns are not explored in detail in this study.

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

English thus:

To some extent we need to speak English properly for- 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 even 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's Philippine experience has doubtless influenced her attitudes toward language in such a way that they might differ from the attitudes of people without such background. Yet, Yumiko, like many other Japanese, had already studied English for many years before leaving Japan, and her education in Japan included contact with American teachers of English. That experience provided her with some basis for comparison of types of intercultural interaction involving English in educational situations even though the specific contexts were different.

In our final interview, Yumiko went on to discuss the role of English as an international language in relation to regional conferences:

I've heard a very interesting comment before, uh--. There's a conference in Japan that (they)--a big conference of Asian people--most of the participants from Asia, and they admitted and also they accepted each participate- participant's speak their data Japanese English or the Filipino English, and that's, uh, very interesting. And they, you know, that's reflect their- the way of thinking and their culture too, so uh--.

This quotation suggests that some other Japanese share the view that as long as their English communicates effectively, it does not need to match a standard that is foreign to the speakers. Forms of "Japanese English" are not simply "imperfect English." Rather they may be viewed as forms of English(es) as (an) Asian language(s) even though they are not institutionally recognized as are the indigenized regional forms of English in India, Singapore, the Philippines, and various other parts of the world. It would be interesting to compare the views of Japanese who have learned English and participated in interaction between diverse speech communities and those who have learned English but not participated in international activity. Such a comparison, involving Asian English and individual differences, must await further study.

In Yumiko's writings we can reasonably expect to find certain characteristics that are also reproduced by other writers who share the same linguistic expectations at a particular level (see 7.6). These characteristics differ from some in the writings of people with nativelike proficiency in standard academic English. I have argued that one of these characteristic differences involves the use of initial connectives in accord with patterns of overall organization. Such connectives seem to occur with relatively greater frequency in Yumiko's English than they do in standard academic English, although

quantitative studies for comparison are lacking. Difficulties in interpretation arise as a result of the differences for readers of English who do not share linguistic expectations leading to a proficiency in English like Yumiko's. Particularly when there are various instances of nonstandard wording or grammar within sentences, the source of difficulties involving connectives may go largely unrecognized by readers. The beginning of each sentence, however, is a prominent place to show connections in discourse, so readers expect to find grammatical elements there that seem clearly reasonable to them.

The Japanese preference for indirectness in communication has been discussed already. In the context of this discussion, such a preference appears most consistently in the occurrence of initial connectives for which no clear reason is evident to readers whose native language is English. Sentences in Japanese, on the other hand, do not need to have explicit subjects, and verbs normally occur at the end of a clause. There is consequently a broad assortment of phrases that may begin a sentence. Some, of course, are less common than others. A direct object, for example, rarely begins a sentence that contains other phrases preceding the verb (Martin 1975). However, what constitutes a reasonable initial connective in English is likely to reflect the ethnolinguistic backgrounds of people who communicate "in English." What is considered suitable is not necessarily the same for those with different backgrounds.

Notes

<sup>1</sup>The cited comment comes from a taped discussion including Yumiko and another Japanese student and me together with this professor-- see 2.1 for further details.

<sup>2</sup>Logic (in the sense of rikutsu) is often viewed pejoratively as being petty, especially for females.

<sup>3</sup>Recall, once again, the comments regarding presentation of data, in 2.3.

<sup>4</sup>See Appendix A for the paragraph in draft PS1 that precedes (E14i).

<sup>5</sup>Ookuma points out that the ki-shoo-ten-ketsu pattern represents not only the pattern of classical Chinese quatrains. In relation to Aristotelian rhetorical patterns, shoo and ten correspond to the statement (chinjutsu) and proof (shoomei) that are essential for a classical argument (1967:33).

CHAPTER VII  
 READING, WRITING, AND EDITING: IMPLICATIONS OF A  
 STUDY OF YUMIKO'S "JAPANESE ENGLISH"  
 FOR LINGUISTICS .

7.1 Reading, Writing, and Editing: General Background

Reading and writing represent complementary actions, as do listening and speaking.<sup>1</sup> Some writers are instructed to write in the way they talk (cf. Macrorie 1980), or they believe that they do use the same patterns in writing as in talking. In modern times, people generally have believed that writing is a derivative of speech (see 7.2.1: Saussure 1966, Bloomfield 1933; also cf. Grace 1978, Stubbs 1980). On the other hand, Scollon and Scollon (1981) argue that oral patterns which literate speakers among Athabaskans and other groups generally employ are conditioned by the literacy of the speakers. Since oral patterns usually influence patterns of writing of native speakers of English, these oral patterns feed back into patterns of English literacy. The effects of literacy on English language patterns are probably more overwhelming for writers whose native language is not English than for many native speakers of English. The Scollons emphasize the importance of literacy in interethnic, or cross-cultural, communication, too.

Japanese students have little opportunity, particularly in writing, to learn how to express themselves in idiomatic English like that of writers whose native language is English. Reading

(or listening) by itself is not adequate for changing basic linguistic habit patterns such as those of interpropositional connection and overall organization. (Yumiko has not adopted American or British culture generally.)

Hockett claims that reception has priority over transmission of information (1977:118). Of course there must be integration of the expectations of participants in communication for it to occur effectively. R. Scollon (1980a) discusses communicative interaction in terms of "ensemble." Language often represents an interpersonal activity rather than some thing inside (a) head(s).

Editing of language involves trial and error, planning, rehearsal, and revision of linguistic material on the basis of feedback from a listener or reader to a speaker or writer. When material is written, external feedback is generally absent or delayed compared with that in spoken language exchanges. Nevertheless, since a writer is normally also a reader, internal feedback remains as a guide to expected reception.

Monitoring of speech is necessary, according to Labov (1970), for a speaker to achieve consistency with normative patterns that are developed especially after puberty, as is the case with most English learned as a foreign language. If a speaker is tired, distracted, or intensely involved in a subject, or unable to hear himself, he may stop monitoring, and patterns that were acquired later may give way to ones acquired earlier. If this is true of oral language, it may also be true of written language. Overt academic correction is never likely to produce invariable language performance.



In an academic setting, sooner or later, interpersonal exchanges concerning written communication are likely to occur in addition to internal feedback. Yet readers, other than supervising professors and editors, tend to be more passive than listeners in their attitude toward interpreting writing, or decoding it. This greater passivity can be accounted for by the fact that words are set in front of a reader instead of being perceived auditorily, even though their perception involves time in both cases. In interpreting, a reader is less likely than a listener to experience an encoding process that parallels that of a writer and speaker. This lack of parallelism is all the more likely when reader and writer start their interpretations from different forms of language: e.g., a standard language and an interlanguage or some other nonstandard code. The reader's response is conditioned by his assumption that the writer's internal feedback has already led to certain communicative adjustments (Nida 1964) which progress from partly formed ideas (see Grace 1981a) in the direction of the reader's expectations. This assumption by the reader is in line with Slobin's (1977) "charge to Language" that it should be quick and easy to process clearly. In this case, however, language should be seen from the point of view of the reader rather than from that of the writer.

One characteristic difference between the products of writing and of speaking is the relatively greater durability of the former. This leads Ong to describe writing as "a kind of faking. . . . The letters are all there at once, but the word really cannot be" (1973: 15). This situation sets the stage for different kinds of editing

processes for writing as compared with those for speaking. A writer's internal feedback provides relatively speedy, clear editing that can be set down in durable form in addition to, or in place of, original textual material. This type of editing contrasts with external editing, to which the writer has less immediate access. If this external feedback comes in the form of marginal or appended notes, the message form is set and relatively clear, depending on the general legibility of the editor's writing. The clarity of the content of the feedback is less certain, however, and question on various points of content may require further interaction between the writer and editing reader. If comments are given orally, there is no permanent record except as they are perhaps taped or transcribed. Immediate clarification may be requested in oral interaction, but the rate of the commentary depends on the editing reader more than on the listening writer. The editor's control of the rate of commentary in such a case contrasts with the situation for a writer who receives written comments.

Editing is a culturally conditioned activity. According to Hockett:

In editing, cultural conditioning (that is, the monitoring of production via feedback, so that what is overtly transmitted conforms to pattern) enters in two ways. In the first instance, it enters in the editing process itself: each segment actually produced, at any size level, whether ultimately retained or discarded, is shaped entirely and absolutely by the particular individual's internalized share of the culture. In the second instance, it enters in the form of the larger pattern towards the filling-out of which the editing process is aimed. (1977:119)

The "internalized share of the culture" of a Japanese writer such as Yumiko differs from that of any of her American professors. The

differences between Japanese and Americans are usually greater than those among the American professors relative to the reading of standard academic English. With regard to Hockett's "first instance," differences in cultural conditioning lead to difficulties for interpretation that will remain even after the initial stages of editing have been completed. A writer's internal feedback may be sufficient to establish patterns suitable for readers who share her own native language or stage of an interlanguage or level in some other linguistic code. Nevertheless, such patterns may not match corresponding patterns for any of her other readers. In the case of Japanese English such as Yumiko's, the writer's cultural conditioning is likely to lead to comprehension problems for her non-Japanese readers. The difficulties are due in large measure to major differences between the writer and readers in terms of their "internalized share of the culture." The "larger pattern" that is mentioned by Hockett seems to relate to normative patterns of exposition<sup>2</sup> that appear in genre forms which may have different characteristics in various languages. (See the discussion in 7.3 and 7.4.)

In relation to Hockett's "larger pattern," interlanguage development may lead to a type of code blending that involves the writer's native language and an interlanguage approximation of some other standard language. Some evidence for this thesis was presented in chapter 4 in relation to the broad patterns of organization shown in the overall outlines of the parts of Yumiko's papers. Similarly in chapter 6, this type of code blending occurs in the structuring

of information within sections of Japanese papers which follow patterns that are expected in standard academic English.

Discourse is founded on the exchange of verbal messages. Normative patterns of discourse represent shared linguistic expectations within a speech community. Hymes (1966, 1974) suggests that there is cross-cultural variation in the use of language along with a degree of invariance in the code structures of various languages; that is, different functions may be performed in various languages by formal and substantive linguistic universals. Cross-cultural variation is exemplified both in the discussion of broad patterns of organization for Yumiko's writing (particularly with regard to drafts PS1 and PS2, where change is most noticeable) and in the consideration of the use of connectives in comparable passages. There is less variation among the functions that are readily available for use within a language than there is among the structural forms within a language, thus allowing for paraphrasing. Universals facilitate translation between languages as long as the potential functional diversity is recognized.

Part of the editing process for some writers, including Yumiko, involves going from outlines, implicit or explicit, to more elaborate presentations of ideas. Editing a series of related drafts can create overt evidence of paraphrase sets, which represent changes in the wording of a message without changes in its cognitive content aside from focus (see Pike and Pike 1977:382). Grace defines a paraphrase set as "the set of possible construals of a thought," that is, "ways in which that thought might be expressed to the satisfaction of the speaker-to-be in the language to be used" (1981b:184, 183). These

are open to different interpretations, however, by individual readers (including the writer).

A written message ordinarily is decontextualized as compared with oral communication and must be highly conventionalized if its meaning is to be taken as in the text (cf. Olson 1977b, Reddy 1979, Grace 1981b). However, if reader and writer do not adequately share knowledge of the world and ways of interpreting such knowledge, comprehension difficulties result. An editor, of course, may be the same person as the one who is writing, or he may be a different reader. In either case he must be aware of the diversity in covariation between forms and functions in order to help present a message as clearly as possible. (See Bridgwater 1962 for a discussion of copy editing at a university press.)

To try to understand particular shifts in patterns of discourse organization in Yumiko's English, we need to examine the writings in their sociolinguistic contexts from the perspective of both writer and reader, as they are editors. Sherzer summarizes Hymes' argument for ethnography of speaking by saying:

language and speech have a patterning of their own . . . not identical to the grammar of language in the traditional sense; yet it is linguistic as well as cultural in organization and thus merits attention by linguists. (1977:43-44)

An ethnography of speaking includes components related to (act) situation, participants, ends, act sequence, key, instrumentalities, norms, and genres (see, e.g., Hymes 1974:53-62). Sherzer continues:

The careful study of these components of speaking in their own terms, with regard to both terminology and patterned organization, as well as of the relationship between the

function of speech and these components leads to a description that captures each society's unique cultural organization of language and speech. (1977:44)

There is a further need for cross-cultural discussions of features and patterns which emerge in such studies.

The results of attempts to communicate will be mutually satisfactory to a writer and reader only if these participants share basic assumptions concerning writing (and reading): i.e., assumptions about the responsibilities of authorship and reading (including editing) by experts and about acceptable patterns of written expository discourse for a particular situation. The assumptions that are made by each participant must be understood to some degree if communication is to occur at all.

## 7.2 Instrumental Writing and Editing

### 7.2.1 Writing and Language

Research into the relationships between writing (and reading)<sup>3</sup> and "language," with its spoken, written, and other forms, is not very extensive in the field of linguistics (see Stubbs 1980). For the early Greeks, "grammar" was associated with the art of writing and reading, and letters were considered to be of primary importance for the study of language (Lyons 1968, Robins 1967). Later Wilhelm von Humboldt identified language as "the living capability by which speakers produce and understand utterances" rather than with observed results of linguistic acts, according to Robins (1967: 174). By the beginning of the present century, attitudes had shifted so that linguists like Saussure and Bloomfield basically considered

writing to be subsidiary to "language," which was equated with spoken forms:

Language and writing are two distinct systems of signs; the second exists for the sole purpose of representing the first. The linguistic object is not both the written and the spoken form of words; the spoken forms alone constitute the object. (Saussure 1966:23)

Writing is not language, but merely a way of recording language by means of visible marks. (Bloomfield 1933:21)

We today are so used to reading and writing that we often confuse these activities with language itself. . . . A speech-utterance is the same, whether it receives a written record or not, and in principle, a language is the same, regardless of the extent to which speech-utterances of this language are recorded in writing. For the linguist, writing is, except for certain matters of detail, merely an external device, like the use of the phonograph, which happens to preserve for our observation some features of the speech of past times. (1933:282)

Since Bloomfield (like Saussure) considered "language" to be fundamentally oral, he was concerned here with the differentiation of language forms and secondary actions involving language. A few years later Bloomfield wrote, "[I]t is a great mistake to confuse the acquisition of literacy with the acquisition of speech: the two processes are entirely different" (1970a:385). This does not mean that they are completely separate, however.

Interrelations of literacy and speech are becoming more obvious in the light of recent linguistic studies of literacy: e.g., studies by Ferguson, Goody, Olson, Ong, and the Scollons. In distinguishing between secondary (metalinguistic) and tertiary (attitudinal) responses to language, Bloomfield (1970b) shows that people tend to react more emotionally to discussions of matters of literacy than they do to talk about the acquisition of speech. People often seem

to feel insecure (or even threatened) in discussions concerning cultivated language. Perhaps this is because norms of literacy are generally acquired in relation to schools, while most norms of oral language are not. In the modern world, some degree of literacy has been internalized by most schooled people. Linguists must no longer consider writing to be "merely an external device" for keeping records.

In discussing "literate and illiterate speech" (popularly viewed as 'good' and 'bad' language), Bloomfield commented in 1927:

Our writing is not entirely parallel with speech. . . .  
Writing, like telegraphy or short-hand, is an activity that deals with language, but it is quite different, far less practiced and ingrained, far more superficial in our make-up, than speech. (1964:392)

Here Bloomfield emphasizes the instrumental nature of writing as a physical channel. Yet we can also consider writing from a different perspective, namely as a mode of social communication involving cultural norms of interaction and interpretation, and certainly people are doing so. This view raises questions about linguistic codes and their interrelationships with other factors in ethnographies of communication. Writing and speaking may create different impressions on readers and listeners as in the case of Yumiko and her professors. Nevertheless, individual case studies, particularly of many writers for whom English is not a native language, would show that writing and oral language are often not sharply distinctive as act sequences. Although Bloomfield recognized that literary dialects might develop through the interaction of speaking and writing and become "obligatory for written records, regardless of the



writer's actual dialect" (1933:292), still, for him, "the decisive events occur in the spoken language (1933:486).

Since then, linguists have generally given meager attention to written language as a type of language in its own right. Nonetheless, we have Grace's (1978) writing paradox (see my 1.2).

### 7.2.2 Models of Writing and Studies of Students

Models of writing as a linear process consisting of exclusive stages of prewriting, writing, and rewriting are patterned on traditional rhetorical models of speech, according to Sommers (1980). She argues that they are inaccurate because writing is generally recursive, while speech cannot be erased.<sup>4</sup> Focusing on the rewriting stage, Sommers defines revision as "a sequence of changes in a composition--changes which are initiated by cues and occur continually throughout the writing of a work" (1980:380). These changes involve deletion, substitution, addition, or reordering. Revision in this sense is unnecessary in a linear model, although it is an essential process for the experienced writers whom Sommers studied.

Sommers also investigated expository writing done by mainland American university students who had average verbal ability as measured by SATs (Scholastic Aptitude Tests). These students, in contrast with the experienced writers, tended to act as if the meanings that they wished to communicate were in the text already. (Cf. Olson 1977b; Grace 1981a:60; 1981b:175-178.) They were concerned with wording it suitably, but not with seeing it from a new perspective. They would redo their work just in order to satisfy the rules of a teacher-reader. Sommers found that while experienced writers made

most of their changes by adding or deleting at the sentence level, her students neither added appreciably to their work nor did they reorder.

Jacobs (1979), too, investigated writing problems of university students, but her study was conducted in Hawaii. Jacobs' group with middle ability produced only detail, lacking relevance. The low group did just the opposite, providing only pre-structured generalizations. Whether or not English was identified as their native language, Jacobs found that all these students might miscommunicate by "failing to reduce structure when such reduction is called for" (1979:46). That is, the students were asserting presupposed information.

However, neither the attitudes of Sommers' students nor the problems of Jacobs' students represents Yumiko's problems with writing in English as a second language. Instead Yumiko's response to content in terms of restructuring seems to be characteristic of many foreign students, at least at advanced levels of study. Yumiko pays attention to finer details in later drafts.

### 7.2.3 Planning in Editing

One stage of editing involves planning. Ochs (1979) discusses planning in terms of organization of thoughts (i.e., one kind of structuring of information) before expressing the thoughts in discourse of various degrees of formality. Givón specifies the "communicative parameters" applicable to the extreme pole of formal-planned, educated, book-written language. These include (1) "extremely careful planning, with corrections, rewriting, and reformulation";

(2) "time-pressure . . . in terms of space," balanced against time for preplanning; (3) minimal communication stress, (4) accompanying the "absence of face-to-face monitoring"; (5) minimal initial presuppositional assumptions, subsequently increased according to careful planning; (6) "no immediately obvious context, topic, or task" (1979:106). There may be fewer constraints concerning space in relation to student writing than there are for books. This may be counter-balanced, however, by constraints on time for preplanning with regard to regular course papers. Time-pressure causes writing to be more "pragmatic," less planned. Although Yumiko was not writing a book, and consequently was not aiming for this extreme pole of language, she was writing in a serious academic framework for which these parameters have relevance. Let us examine their application here.

Student writers and their readers, who are mostly professors, do not necessarily share congruent expectations with regard to editing. Some of the differences may be greater, but less recognized consciously, when the students are writers whose native language is not English, in contrast with native speakers of English. The lack of awareness of the specific nature of differences is likely to be especially troublesome if there seems to be considerable disparity between a student's oral and written performance. Even though Yumiko's oral language shows some of the same kinds of nonstandard grammar patterns that her writing has, these tend to be overlooked by most of her interlocutors. These patterns attract a lot more attention,

however, when they occur on paper than when they occur as fleeting sounds. (The physical presence of an interlocutor may make it harder to be aggressively critical than one can feel comfortable being with paper.)

Yumiko basically accepts her "Japanese English" as adequate for her purposes and does not seem to be very concerned about it except at the stage of her final drafts: MA1, MA1i, MA2. Let us consider her writing in relation to Givón's parameters of planning. When Yumiko reformulates the organization of her drafts on the basis of new content, she rewrites some substantial portions. Yet there is a relatively small amount of rewriting in the sense of major rewording or paraphrasing of the same information, except where her editing readers have indicated trouble spots. At the same time, since Yumiko does not usually copy sentences directly, there are often minor variations between sentences that are basically synonymous.

Givón's parameter concerning "time-pressure" is not relevant as presented because Yumiko was not writing a book. Nevertheless, students face time-pressure from the academic calendar and the larger scheduling of their lives. There were minimal constraints in terms of space or of reproduction costs, but family affairs precluded extensive periods of preplanning.

Communication stress arose primarily in relation to one crucial reader (Professor B)<sup>5</sup> because he "didn't want to read." As a result of this encounter, Yumiko was under somewhat more communication stress in regard to later drafts (MA1 and MA2 particularly) than she might have been otherwise. There was no "face-to-face monitoring" at

the actual composing stages of writing, but there was some at the editing stages.

Relative to initial assumptions, Givón's fifth parameter, Yumiko started out writing in a rather restricted code (cf. Bernstein 1971, cited in my 1.4.2). She did so because she was writing for professors whom she knew to be informed already about the area of her paper. After discovering that some readers such as Professor B reacted negatively to her style, she attempted to write in a more elaborated code for a more general audience. That is, she began to assume less background knowledge on the part of her readers. Nevertheless, the academic situation provided some immediate context for her writing, even though the basic topic deals with other places and times.

### 7.3 Genre and Rhetoric

Expository writing, at least as I characterize it for English, aims to set forth a reasonably clear explanation of the nature of a subject, primarily by means of description and argument.<sup>6</sup> Traditionally Japanese writers, however, tend to follow an "angular" approach gradually focusing on the main point they wish to communicate. (Cf. Kaplan 1966.) The underlying Japanese pattern of rhetorical organization seems quite resistant to change.<sup>7</sup>

Along with many other people, Nakamura (1964) sees certain "non-rationalistic tendencies," or preferences, of the Japanese as reflections of their linguistic conditioning. This does not mean that Japanese people cannot think logically, nor even that many of them do not think logically. Rather, common linguistic habits of Japanese tend to facilitate fashions of speaking (cf. Whorf 1956

and Hymes 1974) that differ from those typical among native speakers of most standard varieties of American English. Nakamura claims that starting from a relatively tightly-knit social basis,

there is little intention to make each man's understanding and expression universal or logical, so that, in general the thinking of most Japanese tends to be intuitive. . . . The forms of expression of the Japanese language are more oriented to sensitive and emotive nuances than directed toward logical exactness. (1964:531)

Regarding the style of communication of competent Japanese scholars, Nishio (1957) comments that they have paid little attention to making their communication (either oral or written) easy to understand. However, Nakamura claims that now "people want to be more accurate and clear with regard to expression" (1964:538). These are basically claims that could be empirically tested. Yamagiwa (1965) disputes Nakamura's claims concerning logic, but the claims seem to represent linguistic preferences that may differ from some in the West.

Aristotle makes the following recommendations and observations in his Rhetoric concerning the structuring of information. If the listener seems to be attentive, an introduction should be a minimal statement of the subject. The need to arouse attention is more likely to arise later in a discourse. Elaborate introductions are favored by people who lack strong evidence to support their argument. The conclusion should review the argument, with as much repetition as seems useful. "The first step in this reviewing process is to observe that you have done what you undertake to do. You must, then, state what you have said and why you have said it" (Aristotle 1954:1419b).

Patterns in language written by adults usually result from some kind of language instruction. We might, consequently, assume that a

Japanese writer of English would be conscious of the differences in orientations expressed in typical Japanese and English rhetorical models. This assumption, however, does not necessarily seem to be valid, as Yumiko demonstrated. Instead, if the differences are observed by writers only casually, the result might reasonably be some kind of blending in the overall patterns of discourse organization: e.g., labeling the first section "Introduction" while treating it together with the following section as ki (see 4.2.2).

For comparative descriptions and analyses, what does the English expository genre correspond to in Japanese? Setsumei and kaisetsu 'explanation, commentary' are described by Fujikura (1967) as representing a genre for news reporting. A genre that seems somewhat similar is represented by hookoku·repooto 'report, information', described by Shiozaki (1967). The function of this genre, however, is basically that of presenting proposals, primarily in relation to business. Other words for "report" suggest the publication of notices. The preferred term for "paper" in the academic sense is ronbun 'an essay, treatise, thesis', although repooto may also be used in reference to term papers (Fumiko F. Earns, personal communication). Ronbun is a word that is also used for "discourse." The morpheme ron occurs in several other compounds related to argumentation or demonstration. Thus it seems that ronbun may be the nearest Japanese equivalent to "expository discourse," but it is not taught as a genre to students of writing.

Thus we find writers such as Yumiko trying to communicate in some genre which they have not been formally taught how to use for

any language. It is not surprising that such writers have difficulties with editing when readers and writers have different expectations about the type of communication in which they are engaging. Continued interaction is likely to bring about changes, either in the form of communication or at least in the expectations of writers and readers. When the readers are professors, their expectations are less likely to change than is the form chosen by the writer. Here the readers are primary, in a sense, and Slobin's (1977) "charge to Language" to be quick and easy tends to favor them rather than the producer, who is seeking to be rhetorically expressive, too. Changes in language use must be understood in relation to specific sociocultural environments in which they are embedded and evaluated.

#### 7.4 Linguistic Norms and Coding

What can we conclude about the nature of language on the basis of this investigation?

Not all the linguistic knowledge of an individual can be classified in terms of separate, or separable, languages. (Cf. the discussion of "my language" in R. Scollon 1980a.) The idiolect for Grace (1981a) represents a systematic interpretation of all of an individual's linguistic experiences. It is not necessarily identified with any single recognized language. A language is "some kind of sum of some kind of abstractions from the idiolects of its speakers" (Grace 1981a:115). A language and its description are not isomorphic, as Grace emphasizes. Speakers make subjective identifications concerning languages. "Proper speakers" (Grace 1981b:20) produce the language data which people recognize as the basis for



a normal linguistic description. These speakers are ones whom an individual will consider as models in the use of some particular language. Language norms, or typical patterns, are basically established in relation to a social reference group of some sort. 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. These characteristics may show up in spelling, reflecting phonological features, as in "formaly" for formerly (PS2:IV:59:261); in lexicogrammatical choices as in the use of Because, Though, and While as nonsubordinators; or in patterns of organization in discourse, in terms of introductions--both of whole drafts of papers and in the use of initial connectives. Taking Yumiko's English as representing a dialect in some sense (cf. 1.5), it is appropriate to compare patterns in Yumiko's writing with the norms of some standard variety of English. When blending occurs, there can be systematic differences between linguistic codes without every code's necessarily representing a distinct system in its own right.

The degree of tolerance of deviance from standard linguistic forms depends to a considerable extent on the personalities of the participants in a communication situation and on their past experiences. Some people such as Professor B have quite rigid expectations concerning the necessity of conforming to rules of an approved standard grammar in order for communication to occur, at least in certain academic situations. Other people seem less preoccupied

with forms. The types of editing done by various readers consequently differ. As a writer whose native language is not English, Yumiko says she does not expect her language to match "standard English," although she recognizes that her writing needs to be understandable to readers of English. Participation in a speech community is not identical to being a member of it. On the other hand, Yumiko belongs to several linguistic communities in the sense of distinguishable intercommunicating groups, including those that use English and/or Japanese at a particular university.

An audience typically assumes that any linguistic form has some meaning. If a reader cannot understand a message in the way in which it is expressed, he seeks to understand it as it should have been put according to some standard grammar with which he is familiar. Analysis of such attempts at understanding involves the concept of semigrammaticality (Gleitman and Gleitman 1970; see my 1.5). Sentences that do not show some systematicity in their deviance are generally incomprehensible. A similar assumption, within a greater range of flexibility perhaps, must hold with regard to broader patterns of organization, too. A description that would account for such deviance must be separate from the standard grammar in order to distinguish deviance from normality. If a writer or reader attends primarily to the content of a message rather than to the grammaticality, he may overlook many constructions that are ungrammatical in the standard language.

Yet the cumulative effect of a lack of grammaticality may tax the reader until comprehension diminishes markedly. Although I

have not examined this effect through any formal testing, various readers of nonnative English writing have commented informally on the tiring effect of struggling with continued semigrammaticality. The effect may also be noted in terms of the places at which readers who overtly edit forms cease to do so (e.g., Professor B: draft PS1:II:15:40; Professor C: draft MA1:V:45:444). Cessation of overt editing suggests a switch from careful reading to skimming, if not to complete discontinuation of reading. Some professors correct what they consider to be obvious problems of grammar and style in samples of three or four pages in different parts of a lengthy draft. Yumiko's professors report trying not to let any cumulative effects of the nonnativeness of students' English bias their evaluations when they read papers. That is, these professors generally resist the notion of double standards and argue that the "same learning," in some sense, should be required of all students. At the same time, they admit that it is not possible to treat students all alike in terms of language, or at least of grammar.

Attitudinal adjustments that are made should be principled insofar as possible rather than ad hoc. Those readers who attend chiefly to content and tend to overlook difficulties involving form may have an easier time here. However, it is not possible to separate linguistic form and the organized presentation of content in any neat way since they necessarily interact. Besides forms that deviate from standard grammar, forms that are considered grammatical but nonidiomatic may cause interpretation difficulties, too. In such

cases the implicit meanings that are involved may be ambiguous, even in a particular context.

Other sources of errors in encoding and decoding, as suggested by Jones (1977:162-164), include misunderstanding of the signalling of certain interpropositional relations, mistaken identification of nuclear constituents due to the misrepresentation or misreading of cues, erroneous conjectures concerning hierarchical organization of referential structures, interference arising from the perception of context, and lack of shared vocabulary and presuppositions.

Some of the professors in this investigation recommend peer review of student writing. They also see a need for bilingual editors to assist with final versions of major papers on campuses that are serious about having international students. Language standards for writers whose native language is not English should relate to prospective needs for international communication with regard to journals and conferences. Such standards should have an interdisciplinary basis. There is less concern about regular class papers, particularly when professors feel that foreign students, unlike many writers whose native language is English, are "in essence never giving you a first draft." Writing in a nonnative language tends to require and receive more thought than writing in a native language. However, if the normative patterns of discourse are noticeably different for writer and reader, there may still be cause for concern about editing even when a draft has been carefully thought out.

Of Yumiko's three principal readers (Professors A, B, and C), one appears to be very much oriented toward content, largely overcoming a prescriptive attitude toward grammar. Another seems concerned first with general acceptability of linguistic form as it affects reading comprehension; this concern overshadows other issues of content. The third reader is intermediate, correcting form and questioning some of the content but declaring that the paper is mostly in "pretty good shape" or "pretty good English." The most important factors seem to be comprehensibility, interpretability, acceptability, appropriateness --rather than grammaticality. Language examinations that are required at the time of admission to study are not always good indicators of success.<sup>8</sup> Factors such as comprehensibility may vary widely, depending on how well a reader knows a writer's background, subject, and perspective from the start. That is, it matters whether the text is the only readily available basis for interpretation.

#### 7.5 "Japanese English" and the Nature of Language

Yumiko's academic English writing represents a sample of a cultivated "Japanese English" interlanguage or dialect. It may share some common features with the language that is used by other Japanese who have learned some English without attaining nativelike proficiency. It is inherently rule governed in that it provides for structuring of information according to recognizable patterns, even if they are nonstandard ones. That is, it generates messages that are in acceptable forms of communication, at least within certain communities, even if the messages are not considered fully grammatical in terms of some standard language. (Cf. the discussion of semigrammaticality in

7.4 and 1.5.) There is more to knowing a language than what linguists have often discussed.

There are differences in linguistic proficiency among individuals, of course, even in regard to native languages. Greater differences are discernible in patterns of proficiency among individuals for whom English is a second language. Yet patterns exist that are broader than those of individuals. Sociolinguistic factors are inextricably bound up with changes in languages as they actually occur in relation to individuals. Since a basic function of language involves the connecting of ideas for communication, study of connective relations and other means of achieving coherence is important for linguistics. Patterns in the use of connectives and in overall organization in "Japanese English" are one indication of ways in which idiomaticity in the structuring of information may differ between dialects involved in interethnic communication. Investigation of potential shifts in the use of linguistic connections and connectives is a principal reason for conducting a longitudinal study here of an individual writer. My focus is on data from the language of a native speaker-writer of Japanese, but I think that the principles that are involved in the discussion could cover other cases of code blending as well.

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? Through what stages are the changes likely to develop? What other changes are associated with the ones on which we are focusing? How do the changes affect the structure and efficiency of communication? Most basically, why

do such changes occur, in particular situations? These are the problems of constraints, transition, embedding, evaluation, and actuation, respectively, that Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog (1968) consider fundamental for a theory of language change. Let us see how these problems are reflected in the current investigation. First of all, it is clear that academic institutions impose certain constraints, formally or informally, on ways of communicating that are normally considered appropriate or acceptable in scholarly situations. When a writer like Yumiko wants to succeed in scholarly communication in a nonnative language, she must meet at least the minimum standards that are institutionally established. It seems unlikely that the writer would fully adopt the discourse patterns of her readers, even if she knew who all of her readers would be. It is more likely that changes in discourse patterns will proceed only to the point where the writer no longer receives prominent signals that miscommunication is occurring. Various editing readers can assist in transition to institutionalized standards with regard to language. On the other hand, when editors and other people who institutionalize language do not understand some 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. This is part of the reason for differences in actuation of changes in language learning. 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.

A case study is not an adequate basis for predicting what stages of development are likely to occur in interlanguage. It suggests, however, that overall patterns of organization may be affected sooner than interpropositional connectives, at least for someone who starts from a broad perspective of a subject. It seems easier to rearrange outlines fairly consistently than to change one's approach to sentence cohesion, particularly when problems of cohesion are not clearly recognized. Matters of focus, whether direct or indirect, involve both personal and shared linguistic expectations--not simply binary oppositions. The complexity is one reason for proposing an analysis in terms of blending rather than language transfer.

In terms of embedding, both linguistic and social, Yumiko's academic "Japanese English" represents a linguistic code that has developed from that of classroom instruction into a principal means of academic communication for her both in and out of classrooms. Thus it has been shaped by institutional constraints from the beginning, and the particular genre with which we are concerned here remains under similar constraints. But the expectations of professors seem to differ in Japan and America (and the Philippines); or Yumiko, at least, perceives them differently. Evaluation as to what changes are desirable, actually or ideally, is based on sociocultural norms. One particular professor, by his evaluation of Yumiko's written language, motivated her to learn on her own the significance of linguistic patterns of overall organization. Yumiko changed her conception of "proper" patterns for American academic English communication. This happened after all of her years of studying English. Editors also



caused her to modify her use of particular subordinators--especially Because, Though, and While--and to shift her use of initial connectives so that readers whose native language is English can determine some reason for them more readily. It is not clear to what extent she has really made fundamental changes in her use of initial connectives except for subordinators. Certainly, the pattern of use of initial connectives in introductory parts 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 that she writes 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. These connectives occur less frequently in later introductions and conclusions than in those parts of earlier drafts, particularly the first (PS1). Yumiko's professors raise fewer questions concerning organization and connections where there are fewer connectives that seem to lack reasonable interpretations. Thus, external feedback through editing seems to lead to structural changes in Yumiko's "Japanese English," bringing it closer to standard academic English. Yumiko has come to focus more on what seems obvious to her. The connections between sentences have greater implicit coherence then and do not rely on

as many explicit connectives to provide a feeling of coherence. It would be interesting to examine other elements of cohesion besides connectives in the data to see what correlations might appear, but that is another project. Yumiko has come to recognize, by her own report, that her newly modified "Japanese English" expresses her meanings more accurately in communicating with an international 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 on account of writing style when they must try to interpret the papers of non-proficient writers, especially where those readers bear some responsibility to or for those writers. Otherwise the readers would find even less tolerable than usual the increasing burden that is created by the continuing need to process sentences that are semi-grammatical for them.<sup>9</sup> Writers also tend to make adjustments, of course, spurred on by whatever meaningful rewards they are offered contingent upon their approaching the normative patterns of standard academic English (as evaluated by professors). In an academic environment, neither the writer nor the reader is free of constraints of written communication.

Learning of a second language by an individual represents a special type of language change, in contrast to historical developments that more generally attract the attention of linguists, but the two kinds of change are not completely separate. With regard to the role of

individuals in language change beyond language learning, there remains a need for more research. 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. In discussing different sociolinguistic systems that comprise the same formal linguistic system, Hymes says: "In sum, the competencies of users of a language, and thus their language itself, may change, even though the differences may not appear in the structure of the language within the limits of the usual description" (1974:73). I expect that changes in language patterns for the structuring of information might occur for a fairly large number of individuals if meaningful differences were made salient to teachers of English as a foreign language. Since this type of English is widely taught as a cultivated language in schools, the potential impact of teachers is great, for better or worse. However, the impact tends to remain quite unstructured.

#### 7.6 Extension of Findings to a Broader Data Base

In an attempt to determine whether Yumiko's language use is purely idiosyncratic, which I believe it is not, I have looked into some shorter, relatively unedited selections written in English by other Japanese. These include ten short essays (about 250 words each) that were written by college English majors in Nagasaki (examined in Easton 1973) and one seminar paper (ten pages) written by a graduate student

in Hawaii. The ethnographic data available concerning these writings are not adequate for the writings to be considered in the same light as Yumiko's. Nonetheless, these writings also show a very high rate of use of initial connectives. Most of the Nagasaki essays might also be seen as following the four-part Japanese patterns of organization. This latter conclusion is quite tentative. The fact that these essays were written as assignments in English classes, together with the combination of assigned topics and limited length, makes it difficult to trust the results as representative of what these writers might have done in more substantial papers that could be considered comparable to Yumiko's.

In stating the Observer's Paradox, Labov (1972b) claims that language is the most fully systematic when it receives the least attention. Writing, particularly in academic genres, normally receives more attention than speaking, especially when compared with casual speech. Consequently, formal written discourse usually reflects a limited linguistic style of an individual. On the other hand, if time constraints require rapid production, the results are somewhat closer to those of casual uses of language. Similar results may appear if a writer prepares an intentionally intermediate version of an exposition.

Comparisons could be made involving cross-language communication in situations differing as to the degree of literacy required of the participants or expected on the basis of their language backgrounds. Other comparisons could be made of specific types of differences among writers such as students for only some of whom English is a

first, or dominant, language. These are arenas where the disciplines of linguistics, English or other languages, and education could fruitfully interact, because they are (or should be) grounded in the related fields of social and cultural anthropology and cognitive psychology.

### 7.7 Implications for Linguistics

I have pointed out some problems for linguistics and have raised some questions about the institutionalization of language. The central issue is that of where to draw lines within grammars and why. First, if our understanding of appropriate uses of initial connectives depends on analysis beyond the level of sentences, what grounds exist for excluding larger (rhetorical) units of discourse from the scope of linguistic inquiry? This question naturally leads to interest in details of focus in sentences and in paragraphs. Focus is such a complex matter, however, that it deserves separate study. Second, how should a grammatical description of "Japanese English" mesh with a description of other forms of English? Literature on interlanguage, on interference, and on related topics does not provide clear guidelines here because the literature generally tends to reflect the perspectives of Western linguistics rather than approaching questions ethnologically. The ethnography of speaking requires investigators to attend to participants' perspectives of language. In a case such as Yumiko's where "Japanese English" is not targeted on a specific Western form of English (viz. American or British), the norms cannot be taken for granted.

We do not yet have answers to many of the questions that I have raised, since there is little evidence available at present for comparative studies. I hope that this investigation of connections and connectives in discourse may serve as a model of a beginning, to encourage further research along related lines.

We still do not have adequate theories of blending, nor of discourse, but the implications of rudimentary theories should be pursued so that we may learn more about the nature of linguistic convergence and the natural history of the construction of languages, particularly nonnative languages. It is not clear at present to what extent distinctive linguistic areal features occur in the discourse patterns of regional Englishes such as those used by some Japanese, Koreans, Filipinos, and Thais. We need additional descriptive studies of various linguistic codes and of combinations of codes. Such studies should be ethnographic, taking the views of actual language users into account. Then we may consider more productively how questions of intelligibility relate to defining the structuring of particular languages and dialects. We may lose valuable opportunities for interaction between the building of theories and the collection of data if we do not attend to contextualized uses of language.

The effects of literacy on language use and on language change require further research. Studies of editing are important in order to assist in informed policy decisions dealing with a wide range of communication issues. The discipline of linguistics can benefit from analysis of data derived from academic contexts outside language

departments. Such data can direct linguists' attention to specific aspects of the nature of language in use that they tend to overlook if they try to exclude performance data from their interests. We need a greater awareness of the range of educational opportunities that surround us as students of language. By increasing our understanding of the nature of language in broad contexts, we may not only advance the field of linguistics; we will also be better prepared to make a useful impact on the world beyond the limits of the discipline of linguistics.

In conclusion, let us summarize the findings concerning the data in this study. The structuring of information involves functionally organized communication of either knowledge or ideas, and if it is to be coherent, it must be systematic in some sense. When a writer such as Yumiko writes English, she tends to use patterns of connections that differ from those normally employed by writers of standard academic English. This difference in orientation is evident in this study of editing with particular focus on linguistic code blending involving patterns of connections and connectives. These can be viewed in terms of aspects of communication that Slobin (1977) mentions but then neglects in relation to language contact situations. The code blending is expressive rhetorically, and it may affect the ease and clarity with which some language is processed, both in production and comprehension. What seems readily expressive to some writers may not be so for readers, and vice versa.

One kind of blending results from differences between typical Japanese four-part patterns of overall organization in discourse

and English three-part patterns. The ki-shoo-ten-ketsu model represents an orientation in ways of thinking that differs from the Introduction-Body-Conclusion orientation that typifies standard academic English exposition. A second kind of blending is evident in the frequent occurrence of initial connectives in Yumiko's English. These forms may reflect a Japanese tendency to use elaborate and indirect introductions even at the level of sentences.

No reason for the use of these initial connectives may be obvious to (American) professors who are reading "Japanese English." These readers may consequently question the relationships or emphases that they perceive in texts. These characteristics of organization and reactions to it represent ethnolinguistic differences "in English." There is linguistic functional relativity involved where the same labels for parts and the same positions in sentences have different communicative functions for people with different ethnolinguistic backgrounds. Such functional relativity tends to lead to miscommunication when readers use a set of norms of interpretation that differ from those of a particular group of writers. Language is social. For a writer such as Yumiko, "Japanese English" is in a sense an Asian language, reflecting the linguistic expectations of a particular Japanese community of language users. Some of her expectations change when she finds herself in a different community, in America. Insofar as she accepts "Japanese English" as a legitimate code for communication, she is likely to make adjustments in it in the direction of a standard English only to the extent that this seems to be necessary for intergroup communication. Editing may involve self-correction,



or changes may be responses to another's corrections. The latter especially are likely to be temporary adjustments.

Each language has characteristic ways of structuring information for the communication of linguistic relationships. People whose linguistic backgrounds reflect dissimilar languages are likely to structure information differently because they do not fully share a set of structuring conventions. When basic ethnolinguistic patterns differ, it seems to be quite difficult to change them by means of ordinary academic instruction alone. The clarity that is perceived with regard to connections among linguistic relations in writing depends on both a writer and a reader and on the circumstances in which communication is attempted. The decision of a writer concerning what to include in a message form should be based on an assessment of various factors: who the potential readers are, what they know, how they feel, and how they might act as a result of the communication. Such consideration should include some degree of awareness of the various ethnolinguistic factors of communication, particularly the place and nature of written language as it is perceived by participants in a communication situation. Linguists, in their descriptions of languages, also need to attend to these factors, so that the data can be interpreted accurately in the building of theories.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup>"At root to read also means to tell. And if you are listening and telling at the same time you are conversing, and so reading also is DiaLogos" (Quasha 1976:73).

<sup>2</sup>By normative patterns of exposition I mean the patterns of overall organization of discourse that are considered standard for a particular language in a specific sociocultural context. (Cf. chapter 5 and 7.3.) These are composed of language-specific patterns in the structuring, or presentation, of information.

<sup>3</sup>It should be understood that writing and reading are basically interconnected throughout this discussion.

<sup>4</sup>The statement concerning erasure of speech applies to live situations, of course. Practices concerning the editing of speech may be changing gradually as the use of various modern recording devices becomes more widespread. Devices such as tape recorders and films allow recursive editing much as does writing.

<sup>5</sup>This matter has been discussed in 1.2.

<sup>6</sup>Not everyone, not even all teachers of English, agrees as to what constitutes "expository writing." A description of the basic, required undergraduate course in a department of English seems relevant to a characterization of this genre.

ENGLISH 100 Expository Writing: Four Major Forms  
Practice in representative forms of expository writing:  
descriptive and narrative exposition, autobiographical  
writing, interpretations of completed events, and  
presentation of arguments on social or cultural issues.  
(General Information Bulletin of the University of  
Hawaii at Manoa 1979-1981:67)

The Bulletin lists two other courses that seem pertinent also:

"ENGLISH 130 Problem Solving and Argument on contemporary issues"

and "ENGLISH 210 Writing term papers."

<sup>7</sup>Scollon and Scollon suggest a similar resistance to change in relation to English in the case of overall narrative structures in Chipewyan. They argue that a composite version of a text gave "a complex mixture of Athabaskan four-part structure and what was perhaps Cree or European three-part structure" (1979:66).

Labov (1972a) discusses the structure of English narrative syntax in terms of answers to basic questions. His structural scheme consists of an abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, result, and coda, of which the first and last occur less frequently than the middle four parts. The structure seems somewhat similar to that of traditional Japanese writers, if we take into account essential differences between narrative and expository genres.

<sup>8</sup>TOEFL, the principal test of English as a foreign language, lacks a productive writing section.

<sup>9</sup>I found that in working intensively with the data from Yumiko's writing, I was starting to write "In ano(ther words)" myself, showing some evidence of adjustment to nonnative patterns by at least one reader-writer.

## APPENDICES

Draft PS1 has been retyped and is accurately reproduced in Appendix A in its entirety except for Figure 1 and Yumiko's list of references, which I have omitted at the end. Hyphenation practices, as they affect line turns, and the use of transitional repetition at the ends of pages represent distinctive characteristics of this draft which do not reappear in Yumiko's later drafts. Deviations here from norms of standard academic American English represent characteristics of Yumiko's written English at this stage of her development.

The introductions of drafts PS2, MA1, and MA2 are presented in Appendix B. (The beginning of PS2:II is also included as it completes a page.) The conclusions of drafts PS2, MA1, and MA2 are presented in Appendix C.

APPENDIX A

DRAFT PS1

Javanese Rural Elite: PROTECTOR OF THE PEASANT MASS OR EXPLOITER

Yumiko.

I. Introduction.

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 accidentally. Especially in the past a few decades rural societies suffered drastic changes caused by national political and economic development policy of the Central Government. Recent studies on rural poverty shows that these changes are not benefited but rather disadvantages at least to the rural mass, especially landless agricultural laborers<sup>(1)</sup>.

This paper concentrates on the adaption of the rural community to the outside influence, especially that of the rural elites. Since the scope of interest and activity of the peasants are limited to the local community, the first people to contact with it have been the village elites and only those people can cope with, adapt with and survive. In another words, the rural elites have worked as mediator between local communities and the central government, then have developed their power by the role.

It is said that Javanese villages are traditionally an autonomous political units. However, the transition in rural society, especially after 1965 abortive Coup, shows the villages are becoming less autonomous. In this regards I focuss my discussion on the : (1) influence of national integration and penetration of national party activities in rural society during post independent period to Sukarno era, (2) influence of depoliticization of villages by militaries, and of (3) economic development under the present regime; on the (a) foundation of rural authority, and (b) function of rural elites in the local community.

---

(1). For example, study by William Collier and Soentoro on the decline of traditional welfare institution of rural economy (1977), and by Richard Franke on rural poverty.-

## 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 far beyond within most of the daily patterns of mutual interest and aid take place.<sup>(2)</sup> (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<sup>(3)</sup> ( pp. 83-86 of Kartodirdjo, and pp. 83-85 of In Search of Southeast Asia).

Though the village headman were absorbed into the court hierarchy as a direct or indirect royal appointee in the course of their personal patron-client relationship with central authority<sup>(4)</sup> (Jay; 1956 p. 219), to the eyes of peasants only the village authority which was led by the headman had power as a patron of local community. In this sense the power of lurah is exactly

that the ....

that the King, and the society just like a small kingdom.

The villages were sustained by tradition and customary laws with the exception of government intervention in matters of maintaining peace and order, taxation of various kinds, cadastral registration and in well irrigated areas also in matter of land use <sup>(5)</sup> (Tjondronegoro; 1978, p.463). The system was more clearly defined under the Dutch colonial rule, the office of lurah was gradually made elective and thus placed in a much more intimate relationship with the villagers <sup>(6)</sup> (Jay; 1956, p.219). Thus, Javanese villages acquired somewhat autonomous political conditions and they were free from direct control of central government on socio-political village affairs.

At the same time the growth of the urban sector of Javanese society led to its acquiring a monopoly of the higher position in government and a consequent shutting off village heads from political advancement <sup>(7)</sup> (Jay; 1956, ibid). Therefore historically in pre-independent period Javanese villages limited the expansion of lurah's power within the local community, and rural politics was isolated from national politics.

The national integration after independence brought changes to the rural society. National development programs on education, economy and social infrastructure have permeated into the rural society. The headman was the point of contact for any government actions, all entrances into the village, for any official purpose whatsoever, must be channeled through him. His rule became more important between the village and the national government for welfare and development of his people. To make success of these projects direct pressure was applied to the headman.

Considering his role, the autonomy of villages are highly relying on his standpoint, villagers' side or the government side. When the village has to accept the government order without actual participation in decision-making  
in the ....



in the name of national development, he changes his nature from traditional authority to protect his people as a "father" to more sophisticated collaborator. This causes destruction of the traditional valued conservative peasants society. Some lurah attached new dimensions (besides his traditional power) by alliance with the national political parties to secure and protect his authority. After the collapse of party activities in rural areas, especially after 1965 abortive coup, some lurah are taken place by military on the pretext of the national security or by wealthy outsider (usually urban dwelled) because of economic benefit from this position. Or if traditional lurah survived, in most cases he has made alliance with the bureaucrats who are in a position to "direct" villages. Probably some lurahs unwillingly allied with outside force to protect his people from direct oppression or some did to strengthen his own power. But in a way, the leadership of lurah itself has problems. His absolute authority is preventing the "awake" of the peasants masses.

### III. Position of village in local government administration.

Local government of Java forms the lowest of a series of administrative units of diminishing size. Authority is strongly centralized and chains of command carefully worked out and strictly adhered to the selection of officials for all but the bottom level of villages is by appointment of the central government. There is a critical line between the civil officers appointed by the government and village authorities elected by the villagers<sup>(8)</sup> (Jay; 1956, ibid.). Though the national integration and external influences, especially those originating from the supervillage level, were usually received by the village administration in the form of instructions. Through subdistrict conferences, which are attended by the lurah, assignments were passed on from levels above the village. Since the village administration was absorbed into the centralized national administrative system which can be characterized

authoritarian.....

ritarian, the village autonomous power to deal with certain aspects of its own affairs has become vaguer than in the past. For example, matters of administration and assistance used to be the domain of the supravillage administration, while the village was responsible for those of its own affairs the initiative for which had come from the village itself. These days, the village administration appears to be no more than a body executing what has been instructed from above by the supra-village administration<sup>(9)</sup> (Kana, N.L; 1975, pp. 56-57). Thus structurally villages are administrative units with strong orientation toward supravillage levels in a vertical direction. Village autonomy has so far not led to spontaneous clustering between villagers themselves, and intra-village coordination is as yet no easy problem to deal with. By the depoliticizing policy after the 1965 abortive coup there were practically no alternative channels of communication through which the rural population could voice their wishes and complaints. Yet potentially lurah can function such a channel.

As a consequence with lacking institutional intra-village relationship<sup>(10)</sup> only bureaucratic channels are connecting villages to the central government. Without the peasant mass participate in village socio-political affairs ideology with guidance of by the village elite, which by no means benefit the non-elite villagers, and widen the gap between the elite and the mass.

In short, the Indonesian government now firmly established the villages in the hierarchy of local administration. To implement government policy more direct control was imposed on them, particularly on the lurah. This fact makes villages less autonomous, and lacking of adequate channel to reflect peasants view in government policy allows one way instruction from central government to the villages. And besides civil service, the existence of KORAMIL (the commander of military district) oppress the popular participation. Recent moves

---

(10). Intra-village relationship is mainly based on individual interest such as kin ties and small scale commercial activities.-

to appoint lurah as a government official or the regulation that lurah should be admitted by the central government tends to change lurah's position closer to the government rather than to his people<sup>(11)</sup> (Kompas).

#### IV. Power structure in the village.

The most important element of lurah's power is originating within his community as well as his relation with higher level administration. In the villages, a group of lurah and his followers is the strongest politically. Because village social organization which control the villagers' lives are centered around lurah and his officials. Besides lurah, there are potential leaders such as army people, school teachers, religious and political leaders, national and regional bureaucrats, wealthy peasants, and wealthy merchants. According to circumstances surrounding rural society these people take the position of lurah. In the period of 1950-54 when Jay did research in Central Java, the power of headmen heavily depend for support on their neighborhood groups and identified themselves largely with the values of the rural population<sup>(12)</sup> (Jay; 1956, p.221). Rural authority may still embedded in socio-cultural factors such as patron-client relationship created by economic environment, religious or spiritual leadership as advisers. There is some changes in foundation of headman's power which I discuss later. But the hierarchical structure of village administration of which headmen exists on the top and in which he has dominant and absolute power remains the same. (see : the chart on the following page ).\*

Lurah and carik have direct contact with the local bureaucracy. This accessibility to the higher authority gives better position to them to manipulate  
village .....

---

\*I have omitted Yumiko's "Figure 1" here since it is not closely related to the points that I am discussing and it is difficult to reproduce.

village politics. The role of the lurah and his group is very important because of two reasons. One is that the group is bound to be the strongest by forming factions according to social ties. The other is originating political power from the position, which also simultaneously offers social prestige and economic power.

The village administrative structure is centered on the lurah and his most intimate followers usually take other positions. Under the circumstances decision-making process is monopolized by the lurah. This becomes possible because of village officials are not elected but appointed by the supra-village administration on the lurah's recommendation <sup>(13)</sup> (Kana, N.L. p. 57).

Why lurah has such a great power in the rural community ? There are two dimensions, one is based on economic circumstances relating to landholding which I discuss the above, the other is based on indigenous values.

To examine the first reason, land holding is the most important factor in Java since Java is one of the most densely populated area in the world and most people depend on agricultural for all of major part of their livelihood. Landlord can enjoy economic power as well as political power over the villagers. According to Geertz, traditionally village citizenship was based on landownership. Those who had only house lot or did not have any land were not considered as full citizens <sup>(14)</sup> (Geertz, 1956, pp. 14-15). Not only economic standpoint but also politically landless or new-landless villagers were discriminated <sup>(15)</sup> (see: Ismael, J.E.; 1963, p. 259). Traditionally the social stratification of Javanese villages is particularly connected with the village members' relationship to the land. According to the study in Central Java, 37 % of all owners have no land, and 47 % of them have land under 0.2 ha ( see : Table 1).

---

(15) Before the Indonesian Revolution in 1945 only full citizen who owned both a rice field and household plot could become a member of the village's council, with the right to speak and vote.

Table 1. Miri: Land Ownership of Sawah.

Area owned (a)	Number of Owners	Percent of all Owners
None	60	37
Under 0.2 ha	77	47
0.201 - 0.8 ha	24	14
0.801 and over	3	2
T o t a l	164	100

(a). Includes land for the village official.

Source : Village records (adopted from Table 2 of Penny, D.H., and Singarimbun, Masri on p. 81)<sup>(16)</sup>.

Thus about 84 % of peasants are landless or near-landless (see : Table 1 above), then have to depend on others farmers' land. Furthermore, several of the 116 families did not depend on the land entirely but had some income from other sources. The average amount of land controlled by this relatively privileged group of village officials and government employees, at 0.55 hectare per family, was over twice the village average<sup>(17)</sup> (Penny and Singarimbun, p.82).

Land holding are divided into two categories : privately owned land and communal land<sup>(18)</sup> (Geertz; 1956, p.15). The communal land include the plots allotted to the village officials in lieu of salary and land allotted to retired village officials. The degree of control over the land is the same as for owned land, short of seeling or alienating it.

The land granted to the village officers is the best quality and rather big, as seen in Table 2 of the following page.

Compared with the average size of land holding in Java which is 0.7 hectare, table 3 shows far greater land is allotted to the village officials.

As observed.....

Table 2. The size of land granted to the village officers  
in the two regency of Central Java.

Regency of Karanganyar		Regency of Demak	
Village officers	Size of the granted land(in hectare)	Village officers	Size of the granted land(in hectare)
Lurah	6	Lurah	17
Kmituwa	3	Kamituwa	4
Carik	3	Carik	12
Kebayan	2	Kebayan	3
Jogotirto	1	Ulu-Ulu	1.5
Pamong Tani	1	----	--
Modin	1	Modin	3
Jogoboyo	1	Kepetengan	3
----	-	Bekel	4

Source : The Survey of Villages' Administration, Governor's Office, Samarang, 1969, pp.91-96 (mimeograph) (adopted from Table III of Smith, Theodore on p. 22) <sup>(19)</sup>.

As observed, the village officials can become one of the largest landholder, thanks to the granted land. This fact is very important to consider their power over landless and new-landless peasants who are the majority of rural population. Because of this economic benefit, some military and urban based wealthy city dwellers are interested in becoming lurahs <sup>(20)</sup> (Gordon, pp.214-217). There are changes on this land allotted to the officials. Some lurahs receive salary from the government instead of this lots <sup>(21)</sup> (Kompas). It is more common in outside Java. This bureaucratization of lurah changed lurah's power weaker against instruction and guidance of kecamatan, or sub-district local government.

#### V. Sources of Lurah's authority.

King in Javanese ideology means "father" for the all villagers. According  
to the .....

to the Javanese beliefs an ideal King has characters of wayang's heros, such as humble, patient, calm, kind, bullient, rich but not extravagant, and to the enemy brave and strong to protect his people. His relation with villagers is like as a "father". "Father"<sup>(22)</sup> (Priyono, p.64), has an absolute power over the family and as a head of family he should lead his children, and his children should obey him. Soeriokoesoemo wrote in his article "Right to the wise" that the wise people, which he means elites in the context of Javanese ideology, have a right to be rewarded more because of "wisdom" and the proper way to govern the nation is for the common people to be guided by the elite<sup>(23)</sup> (Soeriokoesoemo, pp. 183-187).

According to the Javanese view lurah is a wise people to rule the villagers' everyday life as well as spiritual life relating to various kinds of Javanese spirit. His role was to keep harmony of all elements and to maintain peace and order of the village. The villages \*\*\*\* where the traditional type of lurah remained, lurah's authority is oftenly related to his personal supernatural power. He might be always in the conflict of national authority represented by the local bureaucracy in the area. As long as his authority is still originating in the peasants value, he still keep strong ties with his followers and his position in the village is guaranteed, since he is in a position to mobilize his people according to his will.

Traditional authority is characterized as patron-client relationship. The poor peasant or landless laborer who depends on a landlord for a largest part of his livelihood, or totally of it, has no tactical power. He is completely within the power domain of his employer without sufficient resources of his own to serve him as resources in the power of struggle. The political participation of the village is determined by the influence networks surrounding the lurah. His wealth and the wealth of his family, his control over the village .....

village officers, and the natural tendency of all to defer to a semi-charismatic figure are the based on which his traditional authority is built. The personal relationship between patron and client is established for over years in the rural community. It is hardly for clients to cancel the relationship.

This patron-client relationship can be seen on the occasion of election for the village officials. There is no formal campaign, but the villagers are invited for several occasions and distribution of gifts is the important element of the campaign. According to a report on an election, candidates are not those who have ability, but those who are rich. The customs of village citizens are to choose one not by the reason that the ability of the candidate is different but by the reason that the amount gift given to them. This is seen more clear in villages which is prosperous, so that election of lurah became place for power struggle. Most important purpose of conflict is fighting for the land given to the lurah<sup>(24)</sup> (Smith, pp. 18-19). Thus, the campaign for the election is not to prove one's ability or policy but to show what he can give to buy the vote. Buying votes by candidates prior to election can happens. Under these circumstances, theoretically, a person without influence based on traditional criteria could be elected to the village headship through bribery. When traditional bond based on patronage and reciprocal values between the elite and the mass is destructed, there is an opportunity for outsider or military to control the village society. When it happens, the status of the poor peasants in rural society becomes very unstable.

#### VI. Influence of the political parties.

In 1950's national political parties became very popular in rural Indonesian villages. In spite of this, I think that political parties did not change

the rural .....



the rural society, but the collapse of them and emergence of militaries played a greater role for it.

By and large political party organization has no deep roots in rural community and mass following of parties. It was the vertical and dyadic relationship existing in rural society that encouraged popular participation in party activities. The Indonesian Communist Party adopted a strategy to win the top village administrators to their side, realizing full well that the key position of the village head is an important determinant of the stand of many other villages. In case where the village headman refused to collaborate, the party would devote considerable efforts to get him replaced by somebody else more sympathetic to the party's cause<sup>(25)</sup> (Tjondronegoro; 1978, pp.466).

Thus the impact to encourage the popular participation in party activities came from the leadership of the village elite over the rural population. The elite had the most prestige and could command the greatest patronage in traditional terms - men of substance, either in land or in political authority and frequently in both. Jackson and Moeliono's study on the Dar'ul Islam movement in West Java shows that the political participation of the village is determined by the influence networks surrounding the lurah<sup>(26)</sup> (p.45). And the motivation was often personal relation of his with the party leaders. He supported the party activities as a patron. Thus, the penetration of political parties had no character to reconstruct village social structure. Rather it was used by the village elite to secure or maintain their power within the village.

The only notable fact is that creation of a new social and political group consisted of full-time party workers, village functionaries, village teachers, small traders, middle peasants and the youth. Especially teachers

who had.....

who had stayed in urban areas to attend teachers college picked up progressive political view. They became innovators of the village, assisting the peasants to improve their agricultural technique and teaching how to protect themselves against manipulation of landlords and moneylenders. In later years a number of teachers became the new village chiefs, replacing the traditional headmen<sup>(27)</sup> (Utrecht, pp. 276-277).

The emergence of this new type of village headmen became possible by the assistance of political parties. But it happened when the leaders joined the parties because of their ideology. On the other hand, a number of traditional headmen joined the party activity because of their personal interests. In this case, the various political pillars were simply established on existing patron-client relationship.

Therefore, party activities themselves did not contribute much for the peasants to realize their exploited situation in the rural society. Rather it contributed to strengthen the power of the village elite. The establishment of new types of headmen who are mostly teachers are owing to their education in urban areas and attainment of progressive political views through party activities. Furthermore, it is important teachers acquired the position at the outside of the social structure of rural economy. Hence, his activities does not disturb his own interest.

#### VII. Influence of the military.

After the 1965 abortive coup, the military regime which came into the power took interested in depoliticization of rural society. Military of the Military Territory is placed in each district<sup>(28)</sup> (Hofsteede, p.51). The meeting presided over by the subdistrict head to instruct government programs is also attended by the military<sup>(29)</sup> (Hofsteede, ibid.). For the sake of govern-

ments' security.....

ments' security policy, the military cast control over the command of the lurah. Because of this, the lurah is forced to accept the instruction of the govern - ment otherwise more direct oppression such as disapproval of the lurah's posi - tion or relief of the position are performed. After the coup some of the lurahs in the area xxxx where communist was very active were replaced by military men (30) (Hukson,D; p.333).

The GOLKAR'S performance in 1977 election shows the dominance of the mi - litary over the rural politics allied with bureaucracy. The GOLKAR is creating a new political structures of dependence in the villages by a cooperation of the village heads, landlords, and the middle level peasantry<sup>(31)</sup> (Gunar; p.760).

In the village where elected heads remained, military and police pressure ensured that these became the lackys of the administration, rather than the custodians of village interest. Moreover, a pervasive village spy system was inaugurated whereby an assistant headman or a "strongman" in each village had regularly report in the activities of his fellows.<sup>(32)</sup> (Hinkson,; .333 ).

It appeared that the increase in the importance of a regions' military comman - der vis-a-vis the head of civil bureaucracy places the latter under certain constraint, and that administrative efficiency would be adversely affected whe - re the double line of civil and military authority obscure the chain of command for decision-making, evaluation and accountability. On the other hand, one can argued that the double line of leadership have potentially to mobilize te pea - sants towards more effective participation. However, it becomes possible povi - ded that the military's dominance over the local community is not excessive.

The absence of counter power in the villages, such as political parties in 1950's allows military depoliticize rural society. The military takeover of the administration and the emasculation of the peasantry as a political force, had enabled local despots to proliferate at all levels of government.

Thus....

Thus the village elite lost opportunity to mobilize entire village into the national politics. Though at the same time the peasants also lost channel to reflect their wishes in national policy. Now the national politics are secured in the hand of military and centralized bureaucratic hierarchy.

The presence of militaries in rural society became pressure to the village social life. The attendance of military in village meeting diminishes the autonomous of the peasants. The existence of militaries makes frustrated all the rural population from the top to bottom. The take-over of lurah's position by the military may widen the gap between the rural elite and mass since they have no background of popular support in the community.

The introduction of capitalization in rural economy, initiated by the military and the foreign capitalist partner, destructed the traditional reciprocal economic relationship between the landlord and landless peasants. Thus, the village elite became more rationally to exploit the poor peasants. Along with this changes brought by the military in the past decade there has been increasing numbers of landowners from outside the village, growing commercialization of agriculture and trade with outside <sup>(33)</sup>(Gordon, p. 214).

#### VIII. Green Revolution and village elite.

The most important changes under the Green Revolution is the development of class division. Critical consideration here are the decline of traditional resource-labor arrangement which worked as a welfare institute for the landless laborer and the resumption of land concentration under capital intensive commercial oriented agriculture. Moreover, the depredations of local military despots and the pursuit of a policy of capital substitution for labor, may induce a polarization, not just between the haves and have-nots but between the military and the capitalist landowning class on one hand the poor and landless on the other hand.

In 1940's and early 50's there was an emergence of commercially minded landlords and usurers<sup>(34)</sup> (Hinkson; p. 328). The large landowners became the main economic power at the village level and had rapidly accumulated land at the expense of the middle and poor peasants. The background of this land concentration might be seen by the rise of their political power and monopolization of privilege acquired by the position. It became possible by their relationship with outside force, such as bureaucrats in government agencies which pursuit development program in local areas and military. Before the 1965 abortive coup, their relation with urban based political party also worked.

When the central government implements an agricultural development project, the provincial government arranges the contact with lower levels local government officials. The necessary equipments, materials and funds are channeled at the village level by the lurah. All farmers are assumed to join the program. The lurah receives the total allocation for the village and he is responsible for distributing it as well as for collecting loans<sup>(35)</sup> (Birowo, p.31). As to the participation in the project, the village are not able to argue. They are forced to join by the military and local government officers. Between the upper level government authority and peasants, the lurah function as an acceptor of instruction and initiator of the project in the village. Lurah's position is very sensitive. There must be two cases. One is that the lurah accept to avoid more direct oppression. And the other is practical benefit from the implementation particularly to he and his group. Since he is responsible for all allocation of resources, he can preferentially allocate for his follows and kins who support his political power.

The existence of Governmental agencies for agricultural programs in the villages allow direct intervention of village affairs. The "target system" adopted by the abuse of administrative power to pursue elite group interests in rural areas.....

ral areas. But there is an alliance between national elite, namely bureaucracy and military, and local elite, village officials and landlords to manipulate the interest among themselves.

The top-down flow of modernization overlaps within urban-rural subordination. The implementation of Green Revolution changed rural economy from the self-sufficient type of commercialized, capital intensive type. The latter type represents the urban based market economy. The institutions from the central government forced entire rural population to accept the latter type of economy. Lack of channel to reflect the villagers view in development program results in the subordination of peasants to the urban population, particularly the urban elite. Though both the rural elite and the poor peasants suffered from changes, the elite could adjust themselves by cutting off their relation with the poor as a patron and allying with the urban based elite.

Destroying the traditional elite-mass bond, the Green Revolution deprived the security of the landless peasant in rural society. On the other hand, it strengthened alliance between urban and rural elites.

#### IX. Conclusion.

Lurah's authority which is originated in traditional Javanese social structure and indigenous values is weaken when Javanese villages are in contact with outside influence, namely urban based highly centralized national politics. Traditional lurah gained power with support of his followers in the village by practicing his role as a patron. With this patron-client relationship, the rural mass minimum right to participate in decision-making process in rural politics. Even though systematically all the decision-making and election of their leaders were in the hand of village meeting which was attended by village members and open to the rural democracy. They did not have freedom for the parti-

cipation.....

cipation, but at least within the system traditional society secured their lives. According to Javanese ideology, each person have his own capacity. The elite has originally possessed the trait as a leader and the mass are supposed to follow him. This Javanese thought was a right and wise way to rule the world and keep harmony within the society.

I think the Javanese traditional leader worked as long as the rural society remained very traditional. To some extent he was a protector of the mass, providing enough assistance to guarantee the peasant's life. Even though under the face of protector, he was an exploiter.

But, when the rural society started to change in a name of modernization, namely towards destruction of traditions, the village elite also changed their character. They became less protective. Since the patronage is based on reciprocal culture value, the rationalization of activity which goes together with modernization hardly to exist. This can be seen in the case of implementation of agricultural development program in the villages. The high input in cultivation of high yielding variety changed landlord more commercially oriented, and they tended to limit the economic benefit of peasant masses particularly landless agricultural laborers. The village officials who were in a position to access to the assistance of the central government strengthened their power to be cooperators of the landlords. Only those elites could get benefit from modernization, and lacking of mechanism to reflect mass wishes and complaints of the mass shut out the small people's opportunity.

Hierarchical order of local administration diminished village autonomy especially military oppression deprived the channel to reflect villagers wishes in various program imposed on them by the central government. This is fatal for masses, there is alliance among elites. But masses who used to be always initiated and guided by elites are not able to cope with the changes without their assistance.

Political party movements which penetrated Javanese rural society in 1950 also failed to mobilize the peasant mass. Even popular participation in PKI (Indonesian Communist Party) were initiated by the rural elite class.

Hence, it is the traditional relationship between the elite and the mass that hinder the restructure of rural social strata. Lack of class consciousness of the peasants makes it very difficult, but the creation of the peasant proletariat followed by the Green Revolution are changing the situation. However, as long as the peasant still consider ~~xxxx~~ themselves as followers, to reform rural society is difficult.

The prevalent political system in the rural Java is a process of undergoing conflicts among patriarchial, autocratic, and democratic system. And this conflict is mainly brought into by the outside influences( note : The democratic system here I mean is the village council attended by th all members of the villagers which has potential to reflect the villagers' ideas and needs.).

-----

M---, May 8, 1980.

Yumiko.-

---ooo---



## APPENDIX B

### INTRODUCTIONS

B1. PS2: DEMOCRACY AND FUNCTION OF LURAH IN RURAL JAVA

I. Introduction

The wet rice cultivating Javanese villages have been developed a strong unity as a community, and they had been politically autonomous mainly functioning as a cooperative body to engage in agriculture. The settlement pattern in general is a nucleated residential unit surrounded by the land cultivated by the residents. The several hamlets units have expanded into an administrative organization, a desa (village), which is under control of a headman called lurah.<sup>1</sup> Today it forms the lowest unit of a hierarchical local administration system.

In a village headed by a lurah, a basic social relationship besides kinship has been a patron-client relationship based on economic interaction. Kin groups consisting of independent nuclear families are not a source of social control and factions. Therefore power is based on somewhat mutable element, allocation of land and labor. Patronage of landlords to the poor population who depend on them economically is a main feature of leadership in rural society.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, the scarcity of land did not allow the emergence of a single strong patron. Factions and cliques there are very complex, and had been developed more in the process to politicize rural population.<sup>3</sup>

The politics and social relations are of course not democratic in Western sense. Even though, during the period when a leader had to seek for the basis of his power within the community, social relationship was important to maintain his power, then a sort of democracy was practiced. Javanese culture encourages the harmony in the society, adat (customary laws) by which rural societies used to be regulated, primarily aimed to maintain the harmony and certain extent of equity. Thus, leaders were not expected to use their power too aggressively even though they had a dominant power over the rest of the population.

For the past few decades the rural communities have been experienced drastic changes. After 1950s national politics penetrated even into rural areas, on the

hand rural population have been depoliticized since the attempted coup and counter coup in 1965. Economic polarization between the landlord class and the poor peasants have been developed constantly since colonial period, then accelerated by agricultural development projects started in 1960s. All of these account for the reinforcement of relationship between village elites and supra-village level elites, and the decline of democracy of villages. In another words, the social relationship which was originally based on locality has been affected by the changes firstly the extension of the basis of leadership from local community to national level to legitimate it, secondly subordination of it to the higher level authorities.

The change of rural leadership is not dichotomous such as tradition versus modernity. It is a process for the traditional authority to adapt to the changing circumstances. Patron-client relationship still remains. But it is practiced in limited base, only some of village population participate while pushing the increasing number of poor peasants out of it. This fact accounts for the decline of village democracy.

This paper attempts to figure out the changes occurring within village circumstances which are responding to changes brought in from outside of villages, particularly transition on "democracy". To analyze the theme I particularly take a role of village headman because in rural society he is on the top of power structure formally as well as informally. He plays an important role in economic and political polarization in a village which very much affected village democracy.

Indonesia is, however, too complex a country to allow generalization, even within Java. The degree of social changes is various depending on regions. Obviously four important factors have to be taken into account to tackle the theme; population density, types of economic activities, the social organization, distance from the urban centers or political centers. Considering these elements which vary the rural conditions, my primary attempt is to outline the changes basically

in Central Java in the period since independence to the attempted coup in 1965 (particularly after mid-1950s when party politics penetrated into the rural society) and the period after the coup when the village population were depoliticized while strengthening control by central government over the lurah and reinforcing relationship between lurah and supra-village authorities.

Economic polarization started in colonial period has been developed after the independence and through the 1950s and early in 60s, then the agricultural development programs actively implemented after 1960s reinforced the split between the landlords (Among them lurah is mostly the biggest landholder.) and landless peasants. While political changes within the villages are defined firstly factionalization and competition over the power among the village traditional elites in 1950s, secondly competition between new emerging village elites who were supported by political parties and the traditional elites and attempts to create new social order, thirdly clash between the two groups in 1965, and the following incident, depoliticization and emergence of new type of lurah, such as military men and outsiders who have no basis of power within the local community and highly depend on supra-village authorities as a source of their power.

## II. Concept of Democracy

Before to start discussion, I would like to define democracy in the context of village politics which I analyze in this paper.

The principle of democracy is represented by the goal, democracy, and the means to reach the goal itself. The former would be defined social and economic equity and political autonomy, namely the goal will be found in economically, politically and socially egalitarian societies which allow anyone to improve one's condition without limitation by others than mutual competitions.<sup>5</sup>

## B2. MAI: TRENDS IN "DEMOCRACY": THE CASES OF JAVANESE VILLAGES

### I. Introduction

A great Indonesian nationalist Mohammad Hatta wrote that "In villages a democratic system remained in force and lived a healthy life as part and parcel of adat-istiadat (customary laws)." and that "On the basis of the communal ownership of the soil, each individual, in carrying out his economic activities, felt that he had to act in accordance with common consent." (Hatta, 1956, P.32) He stated that the democratic structure which should be the basis of the Indonesian nation was based on the indigenuous democracy prevailing in the villages. (ibid. p37)

The ideas of "democracy", popular participation and concensus building while maintaing communal consent seems to reflect the basic social relationship in Indonesian villages, which had provided minimal guarantees of protection and material security to their members. Traditional patterns of "democracy" which represented by Musyawarah (collective deliberations to achieve unanimity) in decision making and gotong royong (communal cooperative work) in execution of the decision have been considered to be the basis of the socio-economic system of the local communities and they are considered to be basis of national development. (Hatta, ibid., pp37 38, Sukarno, 1953, ppl69-170, Supomo, 1945, p190, Wirosardjono, 1980, p61) However, it is questionable whether such a traditional "democracy" still exists in rural society. The "democracy" seems to have existed only in a society where communal control of resources was strongly implemented. There cooperative work and deliberation to achieve concensus were necessary because everyone in the society should depend on each other and inter-dependency was fairly balanced. To reduce conflict and maintain harmony were indispensable. It is most effectively practiced in relatively closed or cohesive society where resources are ample.

Today the Javanese villages are rarely isolated and national integration

after the independence does not let villages stay out of various national programs. The population growth and scarcity of land are also internally changing the socio-economic conditions. This paper attempts to relate questions of "rural democracy" to the changing social and economic environment of Javanese villages focussing on the period from the 1860s to the mid-1970s. "Democracy" is apparently changing its nature depending on the socio-economic conditions where it is practiced, and it cannot be discussed without understanding the social changes.

In this paper "democracy" is analyzed mainly from the aspects of decision-making process within the community and of outside influences towards it. Socio-economic changes are generated from transition of control over resources and transition of leadership. These changes explain the changing nature of "democracy". To analyze the role of leaders in the decision-making I have particularly dealt with the role of a villageadman, called lurah, because in a rural society he is on the top of the power structure formally as well as informally. "Democracy" in Javanese sense does not mean equal status and power of the individuals. There is a initiator and a leader to deliberate with the masses and build consensus. It is a guided democracy. Therefore the role of the leaders is important to analyze the topic.

Indonesia is, however, too complex a country to allow generalization, even within Java. The degree of social changes varies depending on regions. Four important factors obviously have to be taken into account; population density, types of economic activities, the social organizations and distance from the urban centers or political centers. Considering these elements which vary the rural conditions, my primary attempt is to outline the possible conditions of democracy in Javanese villages and to figure out the changes occurring there. I utilized data from some field researched in four West Javanese villages during the period of 1963-1968 (Hofstede, 1971) in Jagakarsa (suburbs of

Jakarta) in 1976 (Tjindarbumi, 1977) in Kebondalem (East Java) and Oro-Oro Ombo (suburbs of Madiun in East Java) in 1972 (Priyono, 1973). The socio-economic conditions of these villages are explained in chapter IV. The two areas, Jagakarsa and Oro-Oro Ombo are in the suburbs of cities, called desa-kota (city-village in literal). They are not villages in a strict sense, since village organizations have less function to organize cooperative work for agriculture. However, I include them because the village administration and leadership have many interesting points to show the increasing direct control by the supra-village authority. They might be extreme cases, compared with the conditions in most of rural villages. But it is not impossible considering social and political changes particularly for these 20 years.<sup>(1)</sup> The rest of informations only trace the general social changes in Java. The field researches are including not all the data that I need, particularly the patterns of control over the resources. Thus I believe that the data on general changes may supplement the research data and explain the background which accounts for the changes.

Chapter II and III define the general concept of democracy and decision-making which Javanese consider ideal and "traditional". This part also discusses socio-economic conditions of a society where the democracy is expected to be practiced. Chapter IV discusses how actual decision making takes place in the villages where researches were done, depending on the nature of decisions, of the social relationship and leadership prevailing the societies. Chapter V and VI explains the backgrounds which vary actual decision-making process and the degree whether the society is "democratic or less democratic". Chapter V focusses on the economic basis of the societies, and chapter VI focusses on the leadership in transition which is influenced both by the internal socio-economic basis and by outside authority and power corresponding to national political transition.

## B3. MA2: TRENDS IN "DEMOCRACY": THE CASES OF JAVANESE VILLAGES

I. Introduction

A great Indonesian nationalist, Mohammad Hatta, wrote that "in villages a democratic system remained in force and lived a healthy life as part and parcel of adat istiadat (customary laws)" and that "on the basis of the communal ownership of the soil, each individual, in carrying out his economic activities, felt that he had to act in accordance with common consent" (1956:32). He stated that the democratic structure which should be the basis of the Indonesian nation was based on the indigenous democracy prevailing in the villages (ibid:37).

The ideas of "democracy," popular participation, and consensus building in decision-making, while maintaining communal consent, seem to reflect a basic social relationship in Indonesian villages, which used to provide minimal guarantees of protection and material security to their members. Probably before the colonial period such democracy was practiced.<sup>1</sup> During the colonial period, socio-economic changes, especially changes in land distribution from individual to communal holdings, certainly affected labor relationships and social stratification in Javanese villages. As a consequence, the power of landholders and village

---

<sup>1</sup>Internally, rural communities were based on rather egalitarian social relations without strong authorities. The villagers were sustained by tradition and customary laws (Tjondronegoro 1978a:463).



officials who controlled the land redistribution was strengthened (Furnivall 1944:141). On the other hand, van der Kolff found in 1936 that the feeling of solidarity between the rich and the poor was restrengthened in a village where he had found a big gap between the rich and the poor 14 years earlier (1936:22, 45). Schiller interprets this phenomenon "as a perception by larger landholders of the virtual collapse of the larger economic system on which they had come to depend" (1980:83). Thus, on one hand, the decline of democracy is caused by socio-economic transition within the villages. On the other hand it is influenced by socio-economic and political transitions occurring outside of the villages. After the 1960s, the period on which this paper focuses, the democracy has been affected by both internal and external trends, and has changed its features.

Traditional patterns of democracy which were represented by musyawarah (collective deliberations to achieve unanimity) in decision-making and goton royong (communal cooperative work) in execution of the decisions have been considered to be the bases of the socio-economic system of the local communities and they are considered to be bases of national development (Hatta 1956:37-38, Sukarno 1953:169-170, Supomo 1945:190, Wirosardjono 1980:61).

Traditionally customary laws have regulated Javanese rural societies. According to the laws, the inhabitants of the villages are entitled to choose their own headman

and to replace him when his performance does not satisfy the villagers. The village administration has an executive function: to execute instructions given by a higher level authority and arrange the internal affairs of the village, including the execution of decisions of the rapat desa, the village meeting (Hofsteede 1971:52). The highest authority in the village is the rapat desa. All adult members of the village community have the right to attend the meeting and to speak and vote at it (*ibid.*). Before 1945 only the villagers who owned both house lots and a rice field could become the members of the rapat desa.<sup>2</sup> The villagers who owned only house lots or no land at all did not have a right to attend the rapat desa, but informally they were consulted (Van Niel 1960:22-23). Thus formal as well as informal institutions have existed to reflect the ideas of all the villagers in decision-making. The proposals are submitted to the rapat desa, and they are discussed according to musyawarah, the ways of deliberation to reach a consensus of opinion.

These are traditional and ideal processes of democracy in Javanese rural societies. However, considering social, political and economic changes both within and outside the villages in these past few decades, it is questionable

---

<sup>2</sup>J.A. Ismael, "Social Change and Rural Welfare in Indonesia" in Social Research and Problems of Rural Development in South East Asia, Paris, UNESCO, 1963, p. 259, cited in Hofsteede 1971:52.

whether such democracy still exists in rural societies. Such democracy seems to exist only in a society where communal control of resources is strongly implemented. There cooperative work and deliberation to achieve consensus are necessary because everyone in the society must depend on each other and interdependency is fairly balanced. Reduction of conflicts and maintenance of harmony are indispensable. These conditions do not exist today in most villages. Externally the villages have been changed, too. Traditional democracy is most effectively practiced in relatively closed or cohesive societies. Today the Javanese villages are rarely isolated and national integration since independence does not let villages stay out of various national programs. The population growth and scarcity of land are changing the socio-economic conditions internally.

This paper attempts to relate questions of rural democracy to the changing social and economic environments of Javanese villages focusing on the period from the 1960s to the mid-1970s. Democracy is apparently changing its nature depending on the socio-economic conditions where it is practiced, and it cannot be discussed without understanding the social changes.

In this paper democracy is analyzed mainly from the aspects of the decision-making process within the community and of influences affecting democracy. Socio-economic changes developed from transition of control over resources

and transition of leadership. These changes explain the changing nature of democracy. To analyze the role of leaders in the decision-making, I have particularly dealt with the role of the village headman, called lurah, because in a rural society he is at the top of the power structure formally as well as informally. Democracy in the Javanese sense does not mean equal status and power of individuals. There is an initiator and a leader to deliberate with the masses and to build consensus. It is a guided democracy. Therefore, the role of the leaders is important for an analysis of the topic.

Indonesia is, however, too complex a country to allow much generalization, even within Java. The degree of social changes varies depending on regions. Four important factors obviously have to be taken into account: population density, types of economic activities, the social organizations based on economic as well as political activities,<sup>3</sup> and distance from the urban centers. Considering these elements which vary the rural conditions, my primary aim is to outline the possible conditions of democracy in Javanese villages and to figure out the changes occurring there. I utilized data from some research done in four West Javanese villages during the period of 1963-1968 (Hofstede 1971), in

---

<sup>3</sup> Depending on the economic activities, the social organizations have different characteristics. For example, in irrigated agricultural communities the needs for cooperative work developed relatively strong political organizations and close ties among neighborhoods. Considering social organizations, types of kinship which affect economic and political interactions should also be taken into account.

Jagakarsa (a suburb of Jakarta) in 1976 (Tjindarbumi 1977), and Kebondalam (East Java) and Oro-Oro Ombo (a suburb of Madiun in East Java) in 1972 (Priyono 1973). The socio-economic conditions of these villages are described in Part III. Jagakarsa and Oro-Oro Ombo are suburbs, called desa kota (city-village, literally). They are not villages in a strict sense, since the village communities do not have any function for organizing agricultural production. In desa kota, particularly in the case where most of the residents do not have jobs within the community, the community becomes no more than a residential unit. The traditional social relationship which is a basis for democracy in rural Java diminishes in such villages. However, I include the cases of desa kota because the suburban village administration and leadership have many interesting points showing the increasing direct control by the supra-village authority. Compared with conditions in most rural villages, the cases of desa kota might be extreme. But in any of the villages similar conditions might occur, considering social and political changes all over the nation, particularly for these past 20 years.<sup>4</sup> The rest of the information given traces the general social changes in Java. The field research

---

<sup>4</sup>As reported by Hinkson (1965) since the attempted coup the political control by the government, especially in rural areas, has been strengthened. A spy system was inaugurated whereby an assistant headman or "strong man" in each village had regularly to report on the activities of his fellows.

Socially the traditional welfare institutions based on agricultural activities have been declining rapidly under various agricultural development programs which have been implemented nationwide (Collier and Sventoro, unpublished paper).

does not include all the data I need, particularly the patterns of control over the resources. Thus I believe that the data on general changes may supplement the research data and explain the background which accounts for the changes.

Part II defines the general concepts of democracy and decision-making which Javanese consider ideal and traditional. This part also discusses socio-economic conditions of a society where such democracy is expected to be practiced. Part III discusses how actual decision-making took place in particular villages where research was done, depending on the nature of decisions, of the social relationships and leadership prevailing in the societies. Parts IV and V explain the factors which vary the actual decision-making process and the degree to which the society is democratic or less democratic. Part IV focuses on the economic bases of the societies, and part V focuses on the leadership in transition which is influenced both by the internal socio-economic bases and by outside authority and power, corresponding to national trends.

## APPENDIX C

## CONCLUSIONS

C1. PS2: DEMOCRACY AND FUNCTION OF LURAH IN RURAL JAVA

VI Conclusion

In rural Java democracy in the village politics has been practiced through participation in the process of decision-making, which is so called the principle of musyawarah literally meaning collective deliberations to achieve unanimity. This popular participation aims to build up consensus in the local society through consultation with less conflicts. This is the basis of village democracy in rural Java.

Democracy in this sense does not mean to achieve social, economic and political equity through mutual competition but to keep social order regulated by customary laws and social norms which provide maximum security for peasants, particularly for the poor, and as a consequent provide equity to some extent.

Internal democracy based on relatively egalitarian social relationship in the villages started to decline because of economic and political polarization. It caused by reinforcement of economic status of lurah as a landlord and control over the communal land starting in colonial period. The trends persistently have been existed after the independence, then conflict over the land before 1965 coup and implementation of agricultural development programs actively pursued in 1960s especially after the coup accelerated the economic function.

On the other hand lurah's political status declined as his economic function has been reinforced and the central government has been more directly interfere his authority.

Javanese democracy depends much on relatively balanced economic dependency. Actually economic resources were not equally distributed, but social norms have prevented great polarization in spite of unequal social order. Paternalistic traditional role of lurah to avoid excessive interference by the higher level authorities and maintain independence of village societies. When these elements



started to be destroyed, democracy in the village also did to decline. The two factors, economic one and political one are correlating.

Main events which account for the changes are firstly transition in village economy which started in colonial period and reinforced by the agricultural development programs, secondly political transition just before 1965 and military oppression after that.

Economic and political scenes in Javanese villages are under influence of new systems which do not originate in indigenous society. While socialrelationship 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".

## C2. MA1: TRENDS IN "DEMOCRACY": THE CASES OF JAVANESE VILLAGES

### VII Conclusion

In rural Java democracy in village politics has been practiced through participation in the process of decision-making, which is the principle of so called musyawarah. This popular participation aims to build up consensus in the local society through consultation with less conflicts than voting by majority rules. This is the basis of village democracy in rural Java.

Democracy in this sense aimed to maintain social order requested by customary laws and social norms which provide security for peasants, particularly for the poor, and as a consequence provide equity to redistribute resources.

Internal democracy based on relatively egalitarian social relationships in the villages started to decline because of economic and political polarization. It was caused by reinforcement of the economic status of the lurah as a big landholder and by control over the communal land starting in the colonial period. The trends persistently have existed persistently since the independence, during the conflict over the land before the 1965 coup and during implementation of agricultural development programs, which were actively pursued in the 1960s especially after the coup accelerated the economic function of the lurah.

On the other hand, the lurah's political status has declined as his economic function has been reinforced and as the central government has been more directly interfering with his authority.

Javanese democracy depends much on relatively balanced economic dependency. Actually economic resources were not equally distributed, but social norms have prevented great polarization in spite of unequal social order. Paternalistic traditional role of the lurah avoid excessive interference by the higher level authorities and maintain independence of village societies. When these elements started to be destroyed, democracy in the village also began to decline. The two factors, economic and political correlate.

The main events which account for the changes are, firstly transition in the village economy which started in the colonial period (by population growth

and reinforcement of political power of lurah) and has been reinforced by the agricultural development programs; secondly, political transition particularly that just before 1965 and military oppression after that.

The question whether "democracy" is still exist or not is answered differently depending on the socio-economic conditions of the villages and dependency of the rural leadership on the outside force. However generally it can be concluded that the common villagers are tended to be excluded from the decisionmaking processes. The decisions are made either by the formal and informal leaders or only by the formal leaders, particularly by the lurah. Even the rapat desa is held, it is only for the formality. But is this greatly different from traditional way? Traditional norms highly valued the role of the leaders. Thus even decision was made by deliberating with all the villagers, actual decision was already made by the elites. Consensus was important only to make the decision legalize without much conflicts. Who participate in the process depends on the fact who are the important members of the society. The democracy became to be practiced only by the few members of the society. For the poor peasants this means decline of the democracy. The extreme case is all the decisions are made by the lurah, in this case the society is not democratic. Thus socio-economic conditions of the villages and the leadership of the lurah account for the degree of democracy practiced in the villages.

### C3. MA2: TRENDS IN "DEMOCRACY": THE CASES OF JAVANESE VILLAGES

#### VI. Conclusion

In rural Java, democracy in village politics has been practiced through participation in the process of decision-making, which is the principle of so-called musyawarah. This popular participation aims to build up consensus in the local society through consultation, with fewer conflicts than rule by majority voting. This used to be the basis of village democracy in rural Java.

Democracy in this sense aims to maintain social order regulated by customary laws and social norms which provide security for peasants, particularly for the poor, and as a consequence provide equity to redistribute resources.

Internal democracy based on relatively egalitarian social relationships in the villages started to decline because of economic and political polarization. It was caused by reinforcement of the economic status of the lurah as a big landholder and by control over the communal land starting in the colonial period. The trends have existed persistently since independence, during the conflict over the land reform, in the 1960s, before the 1965 attempted coup, and during implementation of agricultural development programs, which were actively pursued in the 1960s, especially after the coup accelerated the economic function of the lurah. On the other hand, the traditional authority of the lurah, who is responsible for maintenance of democracy and autonomy, has declined as his economic function has been reinforced and as the central government has been more directly interfering with his authority.

Javanese democracy depends much on relatively complementary economic dependency. Actually economic resources were not equally distributed, but social norms have prevented great polarization in spite of the unequal social order. The paternalistic traditional role of the lurah avoided excessive interference by the higher level authorities and maintained the independence of village societies. When these elements started to be destroyed, democracy in the villages also began to decline. The two factors, economic and political correlate.

The main events which account for the changes are these: Firstly, transition in the village economy, which started in the colonial period (due to population growth and reinforcement of the relation between the lurah and outside forces) and which has been accelerated by the agricultural development programs in the 1960s; secondly, political transition which strengthened the control over the authority of the lurah by the central government, particularly that just before 1965 and military suppression after that.

The question of whether democracy still exists or not is answered differently depending on the socio-economic conditions of the villages and on the dependency of the rural leadership on outside forces. However, generally it can be concluded that the common villagers tend to be excluded from the decision-making processes, particularly since the 1960s. The decisions are made either by the formal

and informal leaders or only by the formal leaders, particularly by the lurah. Even if the rapat desa is held, it is only a formality.

Traditional norms highly valued the role of the leaders. Even in the past, the actual decision-making was led by the elites. But there were still processes by which the common villagers could participate in deliberation to legitimize the decisions because the commoners were also important members of the rural societies.

Who participates in the process depends on who the important members of the society are. Today "democracy" has come to be practiced only by a few members of society. For the poor peasants this means a decline of democracy. The extreme case is that where all the decisions are made by the lurah; in this case the society is not democratic. The socio-economic conditions of the villagers and the leadership of the lurah account for the degree of democracy practiced in the villages.

## REFERENCES

- Agheyisi, Rebecca N. 1977. Language interlarding in the speech of Nigerians. Language and linguistic problems in Africa: Proceedings of the VII Conference of African Linguistics, ed. by Paul F. A. Kotey and Haig Der-Houssikian, 97-100. Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.
- American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. 1975. Boston: American Heritage and Houghton Mifflin.
- Arapoff, Nancy. 1968. The semantic role of sentence connectors in extra-sentential logical relationships. TESOL Quarterly 2.243-252.
- Arena, Louis A. 1975. A method for improving the writing skills of foreign students in university level expository English composition courses. New directions in second language learning, teaching, and bilingual education, ed. by Marina K. Burt and Heidi C. Dulay, 281-291. (On TESOL '75.) Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Aristotle. 1954. Rhetoric. Trans. by W. Rhys Roberts. New York: [Random House] The Modern Library. (Reprinted from the Oxford translation of Aristotle.)
- Ballmer, Thomas T. 1978. Logical grammar. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Bernstein, Basil. 1971. Language and socialization. Linguistics at large, ed. by Noel Minnis, 227-245. London: Victor Gollancz.
- Bloch, Bernard. 1970. Syntax. Bernard Bloch on Japanese, ed. by Roy Andrew Miller, 25-89. New Haven: Yale University Press. (Reprinted from Language 22. 1946.)
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. Language. New York: Henry Holt.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. Literate and illiterate speech. Language in culture and society ed. by Dell Hymes, 391-396. New York: Harper and Row. (Reprinted from American Speech 2. 1927.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970a. Linguistics and reading. A Leonard Bloomfield anthology, ed. by Charles F. Hockett, 384-395. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. (Reprinted from The Elementary English Review 19. 1942.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970b. Secondary and tertiary responses to language. A Leonard Bloomfield anthology, ed. by Charles F. Hockett, 413-425. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. (Reprinted from Language 20. 1944.)

- Boas, Franz. 1911. Tsimshian. Handbook of American Indian languages, Part I, ed. by Franz Boas, 283-422. (Bureau of American Ethnology. Bull. 40.) Washington: Government Printing Office.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and John R. Swanton. 1911. Siouan: Dakota (Teton and Santee dialects) with remarks on the Ponca and Winnebago. Handbook of American Indian languages, Part I, ed. by Franz Boas, 875-965. (Bureau of American Ethnology. Bull. 40.) Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Bridgwater, William. 1962. Copy editing. Editors on editing, ed. by Gerald Gross, 52-70. New York: Grosset and Dunlap.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and points of view. Subject and topic, ed. by Charles N. Li, 25-55. New York: Academic Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1957. Syntactic structures. The Hague: Mouton.
- Corder, S. Pit. 1978. Language-learner language. Understanding second and foreign language learning, ed. by Jack C. Richards, 71-92. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Coulmas, Florian. (ed.) 1981. A Festschrift for native speaker. The Hague: Mouton.
- Coulthard, Malcolm. 1977. An introduction to discourse analysis. London: Longman.
- Crewe, William. (ed.) 1977. The English language in Singapore. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.
- Crothers, Edward J. 1979. Paragraph structure inference. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Dik, Simon C. 1968. Coordination. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Dubois, Carl C. 1973. Connectives in Sarangani Manobo narratives. Linguistics 110.17-28.
- Dunn, John A. 1979. Tsimshian connectives. International Journal of American Linguistics 45.131-140.
- Easton, Barbara Jo. 1973. An analysis of difficulties encountered in English composition by Japanese college students. M.A. research paper, Ball State University.
- Ferguson, Charles A. 1978. Patterns of literacy in multilingual situations. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1970, ed. by James Alatis, 382-390. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.



- Fillmore, Charles J. 1973. A grammarian looks to sociolinguistics. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1973, ed. by Roger W. Shuy, 273-287. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Daniel Kempler, and William Wang. (eds.) 1979. Individual differences in language ability and language behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Forman, Michael L. 1972. Zamboangueno texts with grammatical analysis, a study of Philippine Creole Spanish. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. Philippine languages in contact: Honolulu radio station K.I.S.A. University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 5(10).137-151.
- Fromkin, Victoria. 1973. Speech errors as linguistic evidence. (Janua Linguarum Series Maior, 77.) The Hague: Mouton.
- Fujikura, Teruo. (藤倉輝夫) 1967. 解説・説明 (Kaisetsu·setsumei). In Morioka et al., II.200-211.
- Gass, Susan. 1979. Language transfer and universal grammatical relations. Language Learning 29.327-344.
- Gibbons, John. 1979. Code-mixing and koinéising in the speech of students at the University of Hong Kong. Anthropological Linguistics 21.113-123.
- Givón, Talmy. 1979. From discourse to syntax: Grammar as a processing strategy. Syntax and semantics, 12, Discourse and syntax, ed. by Talmy Givón, 81-112. New York: Academic Press.
- Gleitman, Henry, and Lila Gleitman. 1979. Language use and language judgment. In Fillmore et al., 103-126.
- Gleitman, Lila R., and Henry Gleitman. 1970. Phrase and paraphrase: Some innovative uses of language. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Goffman, Erving. 1976. Replies and responses. Language in Society 5.257-313.
- Goodman, John S. 1967. The development of a dialect of English-Japanese pidgin. Anthropological Linguistics 9.43-55.
- Goody, Jack. (ed.) 1968. Literacy in traditional societies. Cambridge: University Press.
- Goody, Jack. 1977. The domestication of the savage mind. Cambridge: University Press.

- Grace, George W. 1978. Ethnolinguistic notes n.s. 6: Intellectualized language 2: Writing. MS.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1979. The dilemma of the disciplines. University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 11(1).1-10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981a. An essay on language. Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981b. Ordinary language. MS.
- Gray, Bennison. 1977. The grammatical foundations of rhetoric: Discourse analysis. (Janua Linguarum Series Maior, 51.) The Hague: Mouton.
- Grimes, Joseph E. 1975. The thread of discourse. (Janua Linguarum Series Minor, 207.) The Hague: Mouton.
- Gumperz, John J. 1977. The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching. RELC Journal 8.1-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1978. The conversational analysis of interethnic communication. Interethnic communication, ed. by E. Lamar Ross, 13-31. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, T. C. Jupp, and Celia Roberts. 1979. Crosstalk. Southall, Middlesex: Center for Industrial Language Training.
- Gumperz, John J., and Deborah Tannen. 1979. Individual and social differences in language use. In Fillmore et al., 305-325.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme: Part 2. Journal of Linguistics 3.199-244.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1976a. Categories of the theory of grammar. Halliday: System and function in language, ed. by G. R. Kress, 52-72. London: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1976b. Theme and information in the English clause. Halliday: System and function in language, ed. by G. R. Kress, 174-188. London: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1978. Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning. London: Edward Arnold; Baltimore: University Park Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
- Hinds, John. 1979. Organizational patterns in discourse. Syntax and semantics, 12, Discourse and syntax, ed. by Talmy Givón, 135-157. New York: Academic Press.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980. Japanese expository prose. *Papers in Linguistics* 13. 117-158.
- Hockett, Charles F. 1955. A manual of phonology. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 21(4). (Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics Memoir, 11.) Baltimore: Waverly Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1958. A course in modern linguistics. New York: Macmillan.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1961. Linguistic elements and their relations. *Language* 37.29-53.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1967. Where the tongue slips, there slip I. To honor Roman Jakobson, II.910-937. The Hague: Mouton.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977. Ethnolinguistic implications of recent studies in linguistics and psychiatry. The view from language, ed. by Charles F. Hockett, 107-123. Athens: The University of Georgia Press. (Reprinted from Report of the Ninth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Study, ed. by W. M. Austin, 175-193. Georgetown University Institute of Languages and Linguistics, Monograph Series, no. 11. 1962.)
- Hudson, Richard. 1981. Some issues on which linguists can agree. *Journal of Linguistics* 17.333-343.
- Huebner, Thomas. 1982. A longitudinal analysis of the interlanguage of an adult Hmong English learner. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii.
- Hymes, Dell. 1966. Two types of linguistic relativity. *Sociolinguistics*, ed. by William Bright, 114-158. The Hague: Mouton.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. Speech and language: On the origins and foundations of inequality among speakers. *Daedalus: The Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 102.59-85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1974. Foundations in sociolinguistics. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977. The state of the art in linguistic anthropology. *Perspectives on Anthropology 1976*, ed. by Anthony F. C. Wallace et al., 48-69. (American Anthropological Association, special publication 10.) Washington, D. C.: American Anthropological Association.
- Ishimori, Nobuo. (石森延男) (comp.) 1974. 中等新国語. (Chuutoo shin kokugo). Tokyo: Koomuratosho.

- Jacobs, Suzanne B. 1979. A study of coherence: Implications for teaching writing in an academic context. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1924. The Philosophy of grammar. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1940. A modern English grammar. Part V. Syntax (Fourth vol.) London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Jones, Linda Kay. 1977. Theme in English expository discourse. (Edward Sapir Monograph Series in Language, Culture, and Cognition, 2.) Lake Bluff, IL: Jupiter Press.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1978. English in South Asia. Advances in the study of societal multilingualism, ed. by Joshua A. Fishman, 477-551. The Hague: Mouton.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.) 1982. The other tongue: English across cultures. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kaplan, Robert B. 1966. Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. Language Learning 16.1-20.
- Keenan, Elinor Ochs, and Bambi B. Schieffelin. 1975. Topic as a discourse notion: A study of topic in the conversation of children and adults (1). Subject and topic, ed. by Charles N. Li, 335-384. New York: Academic Press.
- Klein, Edward F. 1981. The acquisition of English in Hawaii by Korean adolescent immigrants: A longitudinal study of verbal auxiliary development. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii.
- Koontz, Carol, and Joanne Anderson. 1977. Connectives in Teribe discourse. Discourse grammar: Studies in indigenous languages of Colombia, Panama, and Ecuador, ed. by Robert E. Longacre, 335-384. (SIL Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields, Publication No. 52, Part 2.) Arlington: University of Texas.
- Labov, William. 1970. The study of nonstandard English. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971. The notion of "system" in creole studies. Pidginization and creolization of languages, ed. by Dell Hymes, 447-472. London: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972a. The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In his Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English vernacular, 354-396. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972b. Some principles of linguistic methodology. *Language in Society* 1.97-120.
- Lakoff, George. 1973. Notes on what it would take to understand how one adverb works. *The Monist* 57.328-343.
- Lebra, Takie S. 1976. Japanese patterns of behavior. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.
- Lehmann, W. P., and Lloyd Faust. 1951. A grammar of formal written Japanese. (Harvard Yenching Institute Studies, 5.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Levy, David M. 1979. Communicative goals and strategies: Between discourse and syntax. *Syntax and semantics*, 12, Discourse and syntax, ed. by Talmy Givón, 183-210. New York: Academic Press.
- Llamazon, Teodoro A., S.J. 1969. Standard Filipino English. (Language Research Series.) Manila: Ateneo University Press.
- Longacre, Robert E. 1976. An anatomy of speech notions. Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.
- Lyons, John. 1968. Introduction to theoretical linguistics. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Mackey, William F. 1970. Interference, integration and the synchronic fallacy. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1970*, ed. by James Alatis, 195-227. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Macrorie, Ken. 1980. Telling writing. 3rd ed. Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden.
- Martin, Samuel E. 1975. A reference grammar of Japanese. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Morioka, Kenji. (森岡建二) 1968. 文章構成法 (Bunshoo kooseihoo). In Morioka et al., 1.80-100.
- \_\_\_\_\_, et al. (eds.) 1967-1968. 作文講座 (Sakubun kooza), I-II. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- Morito, Yoshihisa. 1978. Japanese English: The use of English by the Japanese today. *The teaching of English in Japan*, ed. by Ikuo Koike et al., 597-613. Tokyo: Eichosha.
- Nagara, Susumu. 1972. Japanese Pidgin English in Hawaii: A bilingual description. (Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 9.) Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.

- Nakamura, Hajime. 1964. Ways of thinking of Eastern peoples: India-China-Tibet-Japan, rev. English trans. ed. by Philip P. Weiner. Honolulu: East-West Center Press.
- [National Council of Teachers of English.] College Composition Committee Conference. n.d. [1973/4?] Students' right to their own language. Mimeo.
- Nemser, William. 1971. Approximative systems of foreign language learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching (IRAL)* 9.115-123.
- Nida, Eugene A. 1964. *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nishio, Minoru. (西尾実) 1957. 日本人のことは" (Nihonjin no kotoba). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1979. Planned and unplanned discourse. *Syntax and semantics*, 12, *Discourse and syntax*, ed. by Talmy Givón, 51-80. New York: Academic Press.
- Oke, David O. 1975. Synchronic languages and the problem of interlingual influence. *Analyzing variation in language*, ed. by Ralph W. Fasold and Roger W. Shuy, 269-282. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Ookuma, Goroo. (大熊五郎) 1967. 文章構成の方法 (Bunshoo kosei no hoochoo). In Morioka et al., II.35-57.
- Olson, David R. 1977a. The formalization of linguistic rules. *Language learning and thought*, ed. by John Macnamara, 111-116. New York: Academic Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977b. From utterance to text: The bias of language in speech and writing. *Harvard Educational Review* 47.257-281.
- Ong, Walter J., S.J. 1967. *The presence of the word: Some prolegomena for cultural and religious history*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. Why talk? A conversation about language with Walter J. Ong conducted by Wayne Altree. (The National Humanities Faculty Why Series.) Novato, CA: Chandler and Sharp.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977. *Interfaces of the word: Studies in the evolution of consciousness and culture*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Pawley, Andrew, and Frances H. Syder. In press. Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. *Language and communication*, ed. by Jack C. Richards and Richard W. Schmidt. London: Longman.

- Pike, Kenneth L. 1981. Tagmemics, discourse, and verbal art, ed. by Richard W. Bailey. (Michigan Studies in the Humanities, 3.)
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Evelyn G. Pike. 1977. Grammatical analysis. (SIL Publications in Linguistics, Publication No. 53.) Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Platt, John. 1975. The Singapore English speech continuum and its basilect "Singlish" as a "creoloid." *Anthropological Linguistics* 17.363-374.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Heidi Weber. 1980. English in Singapore and Malaysia. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Quasha, George. 1976. The age of the open secret a writing piece on ethnopoetics, the other tradition, and social transformation. *Alcheringa: Ethnopoetics*, ed. by Michel Benamou and Jerome Rothenberg, 65-77. (New Series 2[2]. A First International Symposium.) Boston: Boston University.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1972. A grammar of contemporary English. London: Longman.
- Reddy, Michael J. 1979. The conduit metaphor--a case of frame conflict in our language about language. *Metaphor and thought*, ed. by Andrew Ortony, 284-324. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, Jack C. 1979. Rhetorical communicative styles in the new varieties of English. *Language Learning* 29.1-25.
- Riesman, David, and Evelyn Thompson Riesman. 1967. Conversations in Japan: Modernization, politics, and culture. New York: Basic Books.
- Robins, R. H. 1967. A short history of linguistics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Rozencveig, V. Ju. 1976. Linguistic interference and convergent changes. (Janua Linguarum Series Maior, 99.) The Hague: Mouton.
- Sampson, Gloria, and Jack C. Richards. 1973. Learner language systems. *Language Sciences* 26.18-25.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1966. Course in general linguistics, ed. by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehay; trans. by Wade Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schank, Roger C., and Robert P. Abelson. 1977. Scripts, plans, goals and understanding: An inquiry into human knowledge structures. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Schmidt, Richard W. To appear. Interaction, acculturation and the acquisition of communicative competence: A case study of an adult. TESOL and sociolinguistic research, ed. by N. Wolfson and C. L. Judd. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Scollon, Ronald. 1977. Two discourse markers in Chipewyan narratives. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 43.60-64.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1979. Variable data and linguistic convergence: Texts and contexts in Chipewyan. *Language in Society* 8.223-243.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980a. Another common sense: An anti-vita. MS.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980b. Communicative style and research style: a problem in discovery, application, and reportage. (Paper presented at the 40th Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology, March 1980.)
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Suzanne B.-K. Scollon. 1979. Linguistic convergence: An ethnography of speaking at Fort Chipewyan, Alberta. (Language, thought, and culture: Advances in the study of cognition.) New York: Academic Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980. Literacy as focused interaction. *Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative and Human Cognition* 2.26-29.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (eds.) 1981. Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication. (Advances in Discourse Processes, 7.) Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- \_\_\_\_\_. In press. Face in interethnic communication. *Language and communication*, ed. by Jack C. Richards and Richard W. Schmidt. London: Longman.
- \_\_\_\_\_. To appear. Cooking it up and boiling it down: Athabaskan story retellings. Coherence in spoken and written discourse, ed. by Deborah Tannen. (Advances in Discourse Processes, 10.) Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Scollon, Suzanne B.-K. 1982. Reality set, socialization, and linguistic convergence. MS.
- Selinker, Larry. 1969. Language transfer. *General Linguistics* 9.67-92.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972. Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching (IRAL)* 10.209-231.
- Sherzer, Joel. 1977. The ethnography of speaking: A critical appraisal. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1977*, ed. by Muriel Saville-Troike, 43-57. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.



- Shinzato, Rumiko. 1981. A study of adverbial clauses in Japanese. University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 13(1).91-107.
- Shiozaki, Susumu. (塩崎進) 1967. 報告・レポート (Hookoku Repooto). In Morioka et al., II.212-223.
- Sinclair, J. McH., and R. M. Coulthard. 1975. Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils. London: Oxford University Press.
- Slobin, Dan I. 1977. Language change in childhood and in history. Language learning and thought, ed. by John Macnamara, 185-214. New York: Academic Press.
- Smith, Larry E. (ed.) 1981. English for cross-cultural communication. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Sommers, Nancy. 1980. Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. College Composition and Communication 31.378-388.
- Strevens, Peter. 1982. The localized forms of English. In Kachru, 23-30.
- Stubbs, Michael. 1980. Language and literacy: The sociolinguistics of reading and writing. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1978. Relations between subordination and coordination. Universals of human language, 4, Syntax, ed. by Joseph H. Greenberg. Stanford: University Press.
- Tarone, Elaine. 1979. Interlanguage as chameleon. Language Learning 29.181-191.
- Topping, Donald M. 1962. Loanblends, A tool for linguists. Language Learning 12.281-287.
- University of Hawaii at Manoa. General information bulletin of the University of Hawaii at Manoa 1979-1981.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1954. Is a structural dialectology possible? Word 10.388-400.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1963. Languages in contact. The Hague: Mouton.
- \_\_\_\_\_, William Labov, and Marvin I. Herzog. 1968. Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. Directions for historical linguistics: A symposium, ed. by W. P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel, 97-195. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Whorf, Benjamin L. 1956. The relation of habitual thought and behavior to language. *Language, thought, and reality*, ed. by John B. Carroll, 134-159. Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press. (Reprinted from *Language, culture and personality, Essays in memory of Edward Sapir*, ed. by Leslie Spier, 75-93. Menasha, WI: Sapir Memorial Publication Fund. 1941.)
- Widdowson, H. C. 1973. An applied linguistic approach to discourse analysis. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh.
- Yamagiwa, Joseph K. 1965. Language as an expression of Japanese culture. *Twelve doors to Japan*, ed. by Richard K. Beardsley and John W. Hall, 186-221. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Yamaguchi, Masaru. (山口正) 1967. 修辭について (Shuji ni tsuite). In Morioka et al., II.117-133.