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長崎大学学術研究発表成果リポジトリ
NAOSITE: Nagasaki university’s Academic Output SITE
I

A British visiting lecturer of English, who has taught English conversation for the past two years in the Economics Faculty of Nagasaki University, has recently proposed that from now on he will give his lesson not in the classroom as he has always done but only in his house. He declares that unless the president of the university allows him this liberty he cannot but resign his position. He is in real earnest and explains that he has come to the conclusion that by far the greater majority of his students are too shy and timid to speak English in the classroom. He hopes that with his personal help in a relaxed home atmosphere they will gradually open their tight-closed mouths. In his opinion what Japanese university students need in the class of English conversation is not so much instruction as therapy. He implies that as far as the subject of English conversation is concerned Japanese students are no more students; they are chronic invalids suffering from morbid fear of speaking. So he proposes that he will from now on be a therapist and have them come to his clinic, i.e., his house. (1)

This English lecturer had taught the same subject in Europe for a number of years before he landed in Japan at Nagasaki. So he has good sources for comparison. He says that in France he could teach fifty students to speak English at a time, in Greece
thirty, but here in Japan even fifteen is too many for him to teach English conversation at a time. He is now convinced that Japanese are too afraid and too shy to speak English. He calls this a "peculiar" Japanese language learning situation. He is sure that he has a good endorsement for his conviction: his two years' instruction at the faculty plus his direct contact and experience with Japanese local educational circles in which very few have spoken to him in English and held an intelligible discussion. He thinks that Japanese intellectuals are either too shy and diffident of their ability in communicating in a foreign language or else they are unspeakably absurd and stupid. Because the latter is very hard to believe he is convinced that Japanese are "peculiarly" poor linguists. (2)

In this paper I want to point out some cultural differences between the English speaking peoples and the Japanese and make clear some of the facts and truths which will explain the reason why Japanese people appear so dumb and shy to the Westerners. It is hoped that this will contribute to understanding some of the important factors involved in foreign language learning in Japan. This paper is born out of the writer's sincere effort at understanding both parties of the controversy presented by the British lecturer and thereby finding some way or other to bring about a happy solution for both, which I am well aware is beyond and above my small power and ability. I only wish that this paper will serve to call the attention of Japanese teachers of English to the fact that more than half of truth of our being poor linguists is to be attributable to the differences of culture, the differences of attitude toward life and therefore toward the use and function of language in general. If Japanese learners and
teachers of English understand this it will be a burden off their shoulders and they will feel much freer; and therefore there will be a step towards improving English teaching and learning in Japan.

II

First, let us reflect how effective or ineffectual the teaching and learning English as a second language has been in Japan, and see to what extent the proposition made by the visiting English lecturer that Japanese are "peculiarly" poor linguists is to be justified. In order to have as accurate and as objective a picture as possible of ourselves in the respect of linguistic competence and performance, let us listen to what some of the outstanding American scholars of Japanese studies have to say about Japanese linguistic performance.

Dr. Edwin O. Reischauer, former American ambassador to Japan and well-known Harvard professor of Asian studies, evaluates in his recent book the Japanese linguistic performance and Japanese instruction in the English language. He says, "The Japanese on their side are notably poor linguists... Even more important would be to modernize their own methods of English instruction..." (3) So it is clear that Dr. Reischauer's estimation entirely agrees with the British visiting lecturer's. Pearl S. Buck in her latest book on Japan has this to say: "... the Japanese are under the greatest linguistic disadvantage. Generally speaking, among all the Asian peoples the Japanese seem to have the greatest difficulty with foreign languages, perhaps particularly with English." (4) Miss Buck compares the Japanese language with others and says that the complexity of the language is a handicap
to the understanding of others. It can be safely said that in the final analysis she has the same opinion as the British lecturer’s about the Japanese people and their linguistic competence. Dr. Herbert Glazer, Professor of International Business at the American University, looks at the English learning situation in Japan from the standpoint of business and says, “The Japanese school system falls down in the teaching of English as a means of oral communication. A natural shyness plus a fear of embarrassment results in only the boldest of Japanese actually speaking English.”(5) This American scholar just echoes the British lecturer. It is rare indeed to find any Western man of distinction praising Japanese for their linguistic capabilities.

What is the evaluation of Japanese performance in a foreign language on our own side? There is an objective reflection given by Prof. Masayoshi Harasawa of Keio University in the form of an English essay in one of the issues of English teachers’ magazines published in Japan. Prof. Harasawa finds the Japanese situation in this field “terribly embarrassing and humiliating to us teachers.”(6) He says you are far from the truth if you expect that after three to eight or more years’ formal study of English in Japanese schools and universities most Japanese youths will be able to use English to some extent at least; “this never is so.” He cannot help confirming Dr. Reischauer’s estimation: he says, “we are notorious or ‘notably poor’ linguists as Professor Reischauer puts it.” Concerning the English teaching on the university level, Prof. Nobuyuki Yuasa of Hiroshima University says, “I think nearly everybody agrees that English education in most universities in Japan is not performing its task in a proper way.”(7) By this is meant that English education in Japanese
universities so far has produced scarcely any Japanese speakers of English. It seems that the evaluations of the Western scholars and the Japanese teachers of English entirely agree in that most of us Japanese are poor linguists. And they only confirm my understanding of the present state of English study and instruction in Japanese schools and universities. There is no reason why the British visiting lecturer of English at Nagasaki University should not be in agreement, justifying his judgment and propositions as to the linguistic performance of Japanese students.

Another point to which Dr. Reischauer, Prof. Harasawa and others agree is that the Japanese educational system, its traditional method of teaching foreign languages, and the attitude of Japanese teachers are responsible for the poor result. There is no doubt that Japanese education is responsible and that it has much to be improved but it seems that the root of the problem lies deeper than has been thought of. It is most likely that cultural differences, that is, differences of attitude in life, are involved and intricately interwoven with the matter. It is assumed that the poor performance of Japanese students in the subject of spoken English is a mere superficial fact while more deeply hidden from outside is their unconscious attitude toward life and therefore toward the use and function of language in general. In the following sections consideration is given to some important cultural aspects of this matter.

III

It can be taken for granted that a person's basic attitude in life, personality and identity do not change whether he uses his mother tongue or a foreign language. If his basic assumption
of life undergoes a change, then it is a conversion, and a conversion is something that takes place in the sphere of religion, not in language. It is true that today we observe occasionally the so-called "Americanized" personality—a Japanese citizen who has been in the United States for some time and returns a changed person especially in his attitude toward language. But this is exceptional. When most Japanese students study English in Japan their personality remains the same. Students carry about them their personality, identity and basic attitude toward language when they study a foreign language. Therefore, it seems to be of vital importance to make clear the fundamental difference between the Japanese attitude toward language and that which is held by the English-speaking people.

I may sound very bold but I believe that we Japanese do not trust spoken language so much as the Westerners do. For example, it is very rare indeed for a loving Japanese husband to say to his wife, "I love you" as his English speaking counterpart would. It is simply not a Japanese custom to assure love by mere verbal expression, which is thought rather a silly, superficial thing to do. Love is supposed to be something beyond words and therefore the less said the deeper. To give another example, an interview with Dr. Kazuo Okochi, former president of Tokyo University, is reported in the interview column of today's Asahi Newspaper (July 4, 1971). In it the interviewer reports that the scholar has recently started a movement for the improvement of the local community and he has a number of visitors every day but that he doesn't talk much. The reporter says, "He believes that in order to say something you had better speak as few words as possible." His attitude toward spoken language is not exceptional amongst
Japanese people. We are a people who readily believe in the virtue of such proverbs as "still waters run deep," "speech is silver," "silence is golden." With equal intellectual capacities, an oyster of a man is much more likely to succeed in life than a talkative parrot of a man in Japanese society. A Japanese young man who talks much is more likely to go into the entertainment business than into the government business. A man of fewer words is in most cases far more trusted and deemed of superior quality. Modesty is always the best virtue and frank criticism, open discussion, and accurate remarks are better avoided in most cases. A man who talks is apt to reveal his own weak points as well as others' and so he is in danger of inviting ridicule upon himself or trouble to others. Thus silence, passive attitude toward spoken language, rather than speech, positive attitude, is encouraged in Japanese society in general.

There is a higher, more advanced, and more valued way of communication than that by means of spoken language for the Japanese people. It is "communication of a mind with a mind" (a translation from the Japanese ishindenshin). For this type of communication spoken language or speech is not necessarily the main medium but merely one of the contributing factors and it is not always indispensable. The equally important and often more important factors are personality, intuitive feelings, relationship between the two, former experiences with the other party, and a lot of others, which add up to the totality of physical and mental circumstances concerning both parties. How communication with little or no resort to speech is possible can be explained by the fact that Japanese people are homogeneous as to race, culture, language, etc. Just as one party of an old
couple with a long shared life behind them can tell without asking what the other is feeling or thinking, so a great deal is taken for granted by Japanese about one another. Such being the case, the Japanese feel less need for language as a means of communication than, say, Americans do, who, being heterogeneous, must resort to the English language as the most important means of communication. And one of the impacts of Japanese cultural homogeneity on a foreign language instruction is that Japanese students are less motivated to learn to speak because they transfer their general attitude toward the use and function of their mother tongue, Japanese, to their target language, English. The natural consequence is that they become very poor speakers of English.

IV

Another impact of homogeneity of Japanese culture and the ishindenshin pattern of communication is that Japanese people tend to underdevelop logic in thinking. We tend to be more intuitive and subjective than logical or objective in our approach to our environment. In decision making or problem solving, for example, we are often likely to jump to a conclusion without going through the processes of accurate appreciation, objective analysis, logical reasoning, and/or intellectual deliberation of the matter. I think what Prof. Glazer has observed of the Japanese businessman is true: "the Japanese participant in a business situation is unable to analytically survey his environment because to him it is all part of subjective experience in which heart rather than intellect rules." But it is also true that most likely his "heart" (intuition) grasps the situation as well as, or better than, his
"intellect" (scientific research) does.

The difference in cognition and thinking between the English speaking peoples and the Japanese, or for that matter, between the East and West, namely, Eastern subjectivity and Western rationalism, should not lead us to believe that the Japanese are an inferior race, or that the Japanese language is inferior. I am not suggesting this at all. What I want to emphasize is that there exists the difference of culture, of the function of language, and of the way of thinking, between the peoples of the world; which the foreign language teacher will do well to remember, because to learn a foreign language means to tackle another way of thinking and it is not simply to learn like a parrot. As for quality, every culture and every language of the world has strong points as well as weak points. For example, the Japanese language, which is the expression of Japanese culture, allows more "pan-viewpoints", while the English language more "mono-viewpoints." Japanese is fitted for grasping the synthetic whole, while English for analysis. Etc. I think that we should rather believe in cultural relativism that every culture and every language has unique characteristics of its own and that there is no such thing as superior or inferior culture.

The fact that the Japanese tend to be intuitive and subjective rather than logical or objective is due to our traditional way of teaching the native language in our school system, as much as to cultural homogeneity and the ishindenshin pattern of communication. Traditionally, our native language has been taught in school with the main emphasis on reading comprehension. Little emphasis has been placed on speech, public speaking, or how to express one's thought with proper logic. "Modern education in Japan
has been all for producing a people who listen well to authority and who do not fail to comprehend orders from above. The central training in language has been to let the pupil read books and understand the meaning. On the other hand, discipline in speech has been scarce. The only training in speaking given in school has been making the pupil speak the standard Japanese instead of a local dialect, inculcating the manners of greeting [and speaking to elders], and in some cases having the pupil muster up his courage to speak in public.” 43 This speaks not only of the prewar state of Japanese instruction but also of today's. The framework has not been changed. It is true that the individual ego of the Japanese has been awakened to a far greater extent today, but still it is not provided with a well-trained device of self-expression. This will be possible only if the basic direction of Japanese teaching is altered and if it begins to be taught in such a way that the pupil is properly trained in the skill to use the language accurately, clearly, and logically. This must become the first and foremost purpose of teaching the mother tongue in the Japanese elementary school. How slight the speaking aspect of language has been, and still is, in Japanese education is again attested by the fact that very few high schools and universities in Japan include "speech" or "public speech" as a subject in the course of study, as the American counterparts commonly do.

Japanese teachers of English as a second language cannot afford to overlook the deplorable state of teaching and learning the first language, Japanese, in the present school system. The Japanese seventh grader who starts learning English in junior high school has already formed a basic attitude toward the use and function of his first language (Japanese), which he transfers to
his second language (English). If he has been very much encouraged to comprehend Japanese but not so much or very little to use it, which is the case, he is not motivated to use another language either. It follows that for the Japanese teacher of English to be successful in his job and produce Japanese speakers of English he must ask his colleague of Japanese instruction for a complete change in direction. This has scarcely been done yet as far as I know. I believe it is high time that we should do so. The teaching of Japanese as the native language in our school system must be reformed so that the pupil should be more encouraged and motivated to think in the language, to express and assert himself in the language, and to learn to persuade others by dint of logic in the language—at least as much as to absorb cultural heritage in the language. If this should take place in the field of teaching and learning Japanese as the native language in Japan, Japanese teachers of English as a foreign language will be able to expect that there will gradually be a drastic improvement, an innovation, in the field of English instruction as well.

V

From a pragmatic point of view, success or failure of teaching and learning English in Japan depends on the actual needs of a second language on the part of learners. We must grasp the reality with Japanese students of English and know what are their needs and motives in learning English. With this purpose in mind I made an inquiry into students' motivation in learning English on the university level very recently. I formulated a simple questionnaire in Japanese and asked my students to fill it out. Statistically speaking, I think I procured a fairly good
sampling of students. I picked up indiscriminately 50 economics major seniors of a regular four-year national university who have at least 9 years' English learning behind them; 50 naval architecture major freshmen of a private four-year university who have had at least 6 years' English instruction; and 50 business major second-year students of a three-year national junior night-college who have studied English at least for 7 years. The institutions are respectively the Economics Faculty of Nagasaki University, Nagasaki University of Naval Architecture, and College of Commerce Attached to Nagasaki University.

The questionnaire and the findings are as follows:

Questionnaire
1. In your past (6, 7, 8, 9, 10, or more) [Please check your case] years of learning English as a second language which of the four abilities do you think you have developed most? Please check one: Hearing Speaking Reading Writing
2. Do you feel interest in English? Please check either of the two: Yes No
3. Which ability do you want to develop most at present? Please check one: Hearing Speaking Reading Writing
4. Do you think there will be a chance or chances in future for you to make use of your English? Please check either of the two: Yes No
5. Supposing there will be a chance or chances for you to utilize your English in future, which ability do you think will be the most useful for you? Please check one: Hearing Speaking Reading Writing
This is a rather simple questionnaire but good enough for my purposes. They are to find out respectively (1) for which skill in the language the Japanese college students have so far spent the greatest amount of time; (2) whether they are willing to continue to study English or they think they have had enough; (3) if they are willing to continue, which skill they want to develop most; (4) whether they believe in the real personal use of English as a second language in their future; and (5) if they think their English will be useful to them in their future, which skill they believe will be the most important to them.

To the questionnaire was attached the explanation of the four skills in the language: by *hearing* is meant the ability to listen and comprehend the English language when spoken such as you hear in an English TV or radio program or in your possible future travel in English-speaking countries. *Speaking* means the ability to express yourself orally in such a way that a native speaker of English can understand you. *Reading* means the ability to comprehend what is written in black and white such as an English newspaper, magazine, or book. And by *writing* is meant the ability to write what you have in your mind in English without taking too much time.
The result of the investigation is as follows:

**Findings**

(Figures mean percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Type of Students</th>
<th>Naval Architecture Major Freshmen</th>
<th>Private Univ.</th>
<th>Business Major Sophomores Night-College</th>
<th>Economics Major Seniors National Univ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Of the Most Developed Skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Of Present Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Of Present Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Of Possible Personal Future Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Of the Most Useful Skill in Future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It seems that the above list of findings tells us, among other things, the following: (1) A greater majority of the students who answered the questionnaire feel that their past learning has been concentrated on reading. (2) Most of them are interested in English after having learned it for more than 6 years. (3) Most of them feel a far greater need for aural-oral ability in the language. (4) Roughly, nine out of ten students think there will be a chance for them to utilize their ability in the language. (5) A greater majority of them consider that speaking will be the most useful skill to them in future.

A more detailed analysis of the findings will tell us a lot more about those students questioned. But suffice it to say in summary that a very great majority of them today feel they have had enough reading, which is passive learning of written English through translation in reality, that at present they are most interested in acquiring speaking skill, and that they believe speaking will be the most important ability for them in future. It seems to me that there has been rising a nation-wide need for active ability in speaking English, reflecting Japan's increasing international relations. As a matter of fact, the character of English as a foreign language itself has undergone a kind of transformation in the past decade: it is considered to be not merely the language of the British or the American people but the most useful means of international communication for the Japanese. The students' demand for a more workable knowledge of the language, rather than a static and passive knowledge, accurately responds to the national demand for international communication. Because the Japanese cannot survive without peaceful international relations, it is indispensable that we provide youths of Japan with
a vital and dynamic medium for international communication. It will only do justice to the actual needs of our students.

VI

We have observed that most of us Japanese are poor linguists mainly because Japan's homogeneous culture and traditional education tend to have a counter effect on expressing ourselves orally both in our native language and in a foreign language. On the other hand, we have seen that Japanese people today have ever increasing need for a practical tool of international communication, and that most of our university students are asking for speaking ability, more than any other, of a second language. It is imperative that we should answer their request properly and promptly. But how will it be done successfully inside our rather counteracting culture? This is a difficult question that faces all serious teachers of English in Japan today. I can hardly believe that any one has so far given a satisfactory answer yet. The visiting British lecturer in Nagasaki University has faced this challenge and means to try to give his answer by experimenting from a native speaker's point of view. If he is allowed to go ahead with his proposed project, the result will be noteworthy.

There seems to have been a certain amount of progress made in the field of teaching English as a foreign language in Japan in the past twenty years, very much owing to the application of structural linguistics to English instruction in Japan, such as oral approach, pattern practice, on the one hand, and on the other, to the wide use of audio-vidual aids such as television, radio, tape recorder, films, slides, language laboratory. Also, more and more native speakers have come to be employed for teaching spoken
English in Japanese colleges and universities. It seems, however, that something has long been overlooked in the whole scheme of teaching English as a foreign language, and that seems to be one great reason why there has not been really innovating progress made in the field. Just as in the field of linguistics, recently, transformational grammar has carried a drastic reflection on basic postulates of linguistic analysis and has generated a new way of looking at language, so we must thoroughly reflect fundamental assumptions of English language teaching in Japan in order to make it truly successful.

One thing that I think has not been enough considered by Japanese teachers of English is the cultural difference, which, as I have roughly sketched in this paper, constitutes the greatest difficulty in learning English as a foreign language in Japan. It is quite another matter with Europeans, for example. Their native languages, as well as English, belong to the Indo-European family of languages. "People who speak one of the Indo-European languages find it easier to learn another language of the same group." Linguistically, geographically, and culturally, the European peoples are close to one another. Therefore, there are few fundamental differences in culture, and what small cultural differences they have don't bother European learners of English as a foreign language. Whereas Japanese students face a diametrically different culture in English and their learning it as a foreign language is constantly impeded by their own culture.

I believe that it is of vital importance that Japanese teachers of English should compare the two completely different kinds of culture in the course of their teaching. By so doing we can correct the misconception widely held among our students that
Japanese are poor linguists because the Japanese have no adequate ability for language. The cause is, as we have seen, to be attributed, far more greatly than most of them suppose, to the difference of the two kinds of culture which are at opposite poles. Once they are rid of such misconception, they will be more confident in themselves, and it will considerably facilitate their learning English. Because our students have fairly good motivation, as we have seen, what they need most now is self-confidence. Understanding of cultural differences will have a favorable effect on them, and it will finally contribute to the ultimate purpose of teaching and learning English as a second language in Japan: international communication, which is "possible only when we have understood each other's socio-cultural tradition as well as its concrete expression, i. e., language." (14)

Notes

1. The three proposals by the British visiting lecturer to the president of the university with whom he is contracted as to how to improve his English teaching situation are as follows: (1) his teaching of English conversation is all to be done at his house instead of in the classroom. (2) The number of students to be taught at a time is to be reduced to a maximum of fifteen. (According to the present system he is to teach some 160 students at a time.) (3) His students are to be classified according to the degree of proficiency possessed by each student in his own estimation at the outset.

2. It is greatly regretted that the English visiting lecturer should have made his proposals on the "all or nothing" basis. Today after a couple of months' discussion with the university authority he has small chance of winning the sanction for his proposals and now he is prepared to go back home to England frustrated in his teaching and
disgusted with the bureaucratic ways of handling professional matters.


9. Transferring a person’s culture-directed attitude to a foreign language situation is very common, especially when he lives in his native country where he is immersed in its culture and cannot get thoroughly free from its influence. I quote my own experience here to make the point clear. When I lived in the United States several years ago, my friends and mates and host family called me Tak (diminutive of my first name Takemasa). In English-speaking countries people call one another by pet name, nickname, or first name in most cases; to call oneself or others by family name sounds rather formal and makes you feel some distance. On the other hand, even close friends call each other by their family names and don’t feel any distance in Japan. This custom of calling one another by our family names so pervades our social life that it is difficult for the Japanese’ student of English to switch to calling his English or Ameri-
can friend(s) and himself by first name in an English situation in Japan. I often find myself transferring my habit of calling myself by family name on the telephone in the Japanese situation to an occasional English situation: I hear myself saying to my English friend in spite of myself, "Hello, this is Fujita" in English, which is a translation of the Japanese I say on the telephone. And my English friend on the other end of the line feels bad and uncomfortable wondering what makes me put in this uncalled-for distance. The tone of the replying voice tells me that something is not quite right. And very soon I realize that I should have said, "This is Tak." But it’s too late. For I have already put in unnecessary formality at the very outset, which has only a negative effect on a friendly conversation.

Another interesting case of culture transferring at the telephone is given by an elderly Japanese lady who has lived in France for seventeen years. She says, "It is almost a year since I returned to Japan. But the fact is that when there is a call, I find myself picking up the phone and answering in French 'allo' involuntarily." The other party of the line is amazed and asks, "Is this Mrs ___ ?" She feels herself to be a slave of the habit and repeats to herself that she must not say 'allo', but the next time she picks up the phone she says 'allo' atomatically in spite of herself and she is astounded by herself.


10. Herbert Glazer, op. cit. p. 52

11. According to Prof. Tetsuya Kunihiro of Tokyo University, Japanese culture is defined as "implicational culture" and that of the English-speaking peoples "expressive culture." What is characteristic about implicational culture is that it looks at the world from "pan-viewpoints," while expressive culture views the world from "mono-
viewpoints.” The two categories of culture are well defined and contrasted by the anthropologist.

See *ELEC Bulletin No. 32* (Tokyo: English Language Educational Council, Winter 1971) p. 49


The bracketed addition mine.
