

Japanese EFL Learner's Social Network Development: Making Friends in Japan

Wayne Devitte

Tokai University

JALT 2017

Nov 19th, 2017

Interaction Interviews

Participants

- 13: Nine Japanese and 4 Non-Japanese: each interview was 40-60 minutes in length:
-

Recall interviews

Mackey and Gass (2005, p. 173)

- “Can allow researchers to investigate phenomena that are not directly observable, such as learners’ self-reported perceptions or attitudes”

Dörnyei (2007, p. 143)

- Are “a natural and socially acceptable way of collecting information that most people feel comfortable with and which can be used in a variety of situations and focusing on diverse topics to yield in-depth data”

Limitations of Recall interviews

- 1) Memory limitations on the part of the participants
- 2) Interference of attitudes and aims of the participants
- 3) The limitations of the participants’ speech system (idiosyncratic style): topic constraints and restrictions on terminology

Methodology

Interaction Interviews

Mackey & Gass (2005, p. 163)

- Qualitative studies allow for the “use of categories which are meaningful to the members of the speech community under study”
- Therefore: this study examines the individuals’ behaviour in a holistic manner while preserving their perspective through the use of LMT & interaction interviews

Interaction interviews

Neustupný (2003, p. 127-128)

- Interaction interviews focus “on capturing an act of interaction as much in its original form as possible”
- Seeks to “capture the processes such as noting and evaluation of deviations”
- Developed at Monash University (Melbourne)

Neustupný (2003), Muraoka (2001), Asaoka (1987)

- Commonly used in LMT studies

Neustupný (2003)

- Interaction interview stages:
 - 1) Situational mapping which consists of having the participant reconstruct their schedule by recalling from memory and reporting on specific situations which they experienced
 - 2) Participant explain and/or describe the purpose, content, participants and any other relevant information for each situation
 - 3) Participant to reports on the entire awareness of the situation at the time of in the situation

Allows for the examination of the interviewees’ behaviour towards language and other behaviours during their attempts at social network formation

Language Management Theory

Jernudd and Neustupný, 1978; Neustupný, 2005

- Examines the behaviours interlocutors have towards language and interactions as it conceptualizes problems as a process.
- Problems are “commencements with deviations from norms”
- Follow a six stage process:
 - 1) Norms – expectations (socially-shared or individual) of appropriate and expected behavior,
 - 2) Deviation –behaviour of an interlocutor or the self which deviates from a norm,
 - 3) Noting – whether or not the deviation is noticed,
 - 4) Evaluation – the noted deviations are evaluated as positive, negative or neutral,
 - 5) Adjustment design– the plan made by the participant to attempt to remove the problem,
 - 6) Implementation – the act of implementing the adjustment plan to attempt to remove the deviation

Norms are:

1. Native norms - a person's typical expectations of behaviours
2. Contact norms - expectations /behaviours acceptable in contact situations
3. Dual norms - norms / behaviours from two different systems (simultaneously used)
4. Universal norms - behaviours that may be universally acceptable by all

Research Questions

- (R1) How did Japanese EFL learners establish friendships with NJES friends?
- (R2) What problems do Japanese EFL learners feel they encounter when interacting with their NJES friends?
- (R3) How do Japanese EFL learners make adjustments to their behaviour in their interactions with the NJES friends?
- (R4) What strategies would be beneficial for assisting Japanese EFL learners in their efforts to develop social networks?
- (R5) What factors influence the development of closeness/distance in the social network formation of Japanese EFL learners?

Establishing Friendships

(R1) How did Japanese EFL learners establish friendships with NJES friends?

- Japanese participants seemed to favour using places which they commonly frequent, such as school or work to make friends.
- Japanese participants indicated that having a common interest or hobby was helpful for establishing friendships.
- Some used online apps and SNS sites to meet new people.
- Many of the friendships have been established over a period of time of more than six months with some being several years.
- Some Japanese reported that it is difficult to meet friends regularly but try at least a few times a month.
- Non-Japanese participants felt that meeting was less spontaneous and was always outside of their homes.

Analysis of Results

Noted deviations: Negative (“Problems”)

(R2) What problems do Japanese EFL learners feel they encounter when interacting with their NJES friends?

Linguistic problems

- Comprehension of their interlocutors’ speech: attribute to their skill with English.
- Lacking the necessary vocabulary and grammar to understand what their interlocutors were saying. “need to study English more”.

Sociolinguistic problems

- Lack of background or content knowledge relating to the topics of conversations
- Directness of opinions
- A few of them negatively evaluated the lack of directness of Japanese friends
- Not able fully able to participate in the conversations: Lack of background knowledge

Sociocultural problems

- Overgeneralization / comparing their NJES friend’s behaviour with their native norms focusing on: arranging and attending events, behaviour in izakayas, and touching people of the opposite gender
- Non-Japanese participants overgeneralized / compared the fact that they have not visited many of their Japanese friends’ homes

- Possibly holding themselves to a ‘native-level’ standard: aka. Host-Guest pattern (**Fan, 1994**)
- Following more competent speakers (**Scarcella and Higa, 1981**)
- Differences in native norms. Aka not sharing and thus evaluating others' behaviour differently (**Fairbrother, 2000**)
- Reprocessing evaluations (**Fairbrother, 2000**)

Data Examples

(R2) What problems do Japanese EFL learners feel they encounter when interacting with their NJES friends?

Time constraints of their daily lives or needing a common community

JF2: “I only **sometimes socialize** with my NJES friends. First of all, maybe I am not the kind of person who socializes a lot. And **also...People are really busy in our program**. We are all busy with school work. I try to socialize, but maybe after graduation there will be more chance to meet them.”

JM8: “I am not so close with my NJES. Not as much as Japanese guys, because **we can't meet as frequently** as I can with my Japanese friends. One of the reasons is distance. When FF2 was my teacher, we frequently contacted with each other, but **now we don't have any community or common friends**. We need the same community. So, I don't contact her as much as in the past, so we need to have a community.”

FM1: “In Australia, if you make decent friends with someone, if you share a hobby, occasionally you will receive, you know, contact, to say if you want to come here to do this, to do that. But here, in Japan, it's almost seems to be that **very rarely do I get contacted out of the blue**. To participate, I have to actively want to participate.”

Data Examples

(R2) What problems do Japanese EFL learners feel they encounter when interacting with their NJES friends?

Assume that it is their own lack of knowledge / Make an assumption about their NJES friend's knowledge

JM8: “Especially giving opinion. That's one thing. Like when I talk about the presidential election, it's really difficult to talk about, right? **I don't have any knowledge about it.** Sometimes, I had difficulty in university, because they talk about Obama, Clinton, who is better or not. I couldn't get into that discussion. It's really hard, right? **It is not about vocabulary. Just knowledge.** We don't have any background about politics in Japan. It's kind of cultural. It is difficult. That's one thing I think. **As for my English, it is good, so it is not about vocabulary. Grammar doesn't affect it. It is just the background knowledge.**

JF2: I was “What are they talking about?” I remember that there was another heated debate afterwards about legalizing marijuana. **I remember thinking legalizing marijuana is a topic everyone is wanting to talk about.** I have never thought about it. That's why when one of my friends or someone asked me if it was legal in Japan, I thought NO WAY. I liked the marijuana topic because it is totally new to me and I can learn at least something about other country or how people think about marijuana. **Maybe from what they are talking about, they know, and understand, I don't understand,** I feel kind of anxious. One thing I noticed is that they are quite used to talking to Japanese and they are educated and **they are good at explaining things or making their level of conversation easier.** So, I feel much easier talking to them than others who are not teachers. Ah. Most of them are teachers.”

Data Examples

(R2) What problems do Japanese EFL learners feel they encounter when interacting with their NJES friends?

Classification of problems

(L) Linguistic (infrequent except in the case of JF1, and JF7 and then sometimes)

Lack of vocabulary, colloquial expressions, slang or grammatical understanding (JF1, JF2, JF4, JF6)

(SL) Sociolinguistic (most frequently discussed during all interviews with Japanese participants)

Strongly expressed opinions (all)

Lack of background knowledge of conversation topics (all)

Not being able to fully participate in conversations (all)

Focusing on question/response style conversations (JF1, JF2, JF3)

(SC) Sociocultural (sometimes)

NJES not following Japanese societal norms (JF2, JF4, JF8)

JF2: “It’s just my guess. It doesn’t mean they have strong belief or they have strong opinion, but stating their position is maybe important for their interaction. When I first met this friend or another, I thought. I was shocked. I kind of misunderstood their personality. **I thought they were quite an aggressive person or a person with strong opinions or beliefs. I guessed why they state their position explicitly and I thought about it.** My friend said that argument is totally fine. Argument creates other ideas, so arguing is a kind of process to get a new idea. And **I noticed the conceptualization or idea toward argument is totally different from mine. To me arguing is more sensitive.**”

Analysis of Results

Noted deviations: Positive/other (Non-problems)

(R2) What problems do Japanese EFL learners feel they encounter when interacting with their NJES friends?

Positively (or other) evaluated deviations

Linguistic deviations

- Making repair
- Using questions to elicit information /clarify

Sociolinguistic deviations

- Code-switching, / completely changing from English to Japanese (or vice versa)
- Selection of topics of conversations
- Giving / receiving of advice
- Sharing personal information
- Use of humor

All of the above were seen as being important for developing closeness

Sociocultural deviations

- Factors such as age, many behaviours of the NJES friend were not seen as problems by the Japanese participants

- Following contact norms (Neustupný, 1985; Fairbrother, 2009)
- Following Maxims/ strategies of closeness: care / share / cooperate /trust (Nakayama, 1997)
- Reassessing & re-evaluating interlocutors' values and assumptions (McKay, 2002)
- Developing different ways of seeing (Kramsch, 1993, p. 229)
- Evaluation & reassessment of "actions" taken by self and interlocutors (Nakayama, 1997)

Analysis of Results

Adjustments to Deviations

(R3) How do Japanese EFL learners make adjustments to their behaviour in their interactions with the NJES friends?

Linguistic deviations

- Asking for clarification
- Using technology to check vocabulary or other unknown linguistic information

Sociolinguistic deviations

- Code-switching or changing the language of communication to Japanese
- When they lack background knowledge they will:
 - 1) Actively research (using internet, dictionaries, etc)
 - 2) Ask their NJES friend for clarification or by asking questions

Sociocultural deviations

- (Some) Interact directly with NJES friends

- Following Host-Guest relationship **(Fan, 1994)**
- Learning to negotiate behaviour **(Fan, 1994))**
- Demonstrating / implementing an understanding for *critical cultural awareness* **(Byram, 1997)**

Data Examples

(R3) How do Japanese EFL learners make adjustments to their behaviour in their interactions with the NJES friends?

Clarifying unfamiliar information, vocabulary, etc.

FF2: “I could tell that he has grown up. This is the **first time he has asked me all of the questions**. He doesn’t ever ask anything personal. But if I volunteer information, that’s okay.”

JF3: “I think my English is okay. **If I have any question, or if I can’t say what I want to say**, I just ask him, so. That’s okay.”

JM5: “**I ask might ask my NJES for advice**, there is a huge difference how Japanese and non-Japanese approach relationships. For example, in Japanese culture you have to confess your love, but Americans don’t. **If I don’t know, I ask.**”

JM9: “**If I don’t know something. I just google it.** Or look up the word in a dictionary.”

Using language that allows for mutual understanding: code switching, language shifting

JF7: “Lately I **speak only Japanese**, because I am **talking about girl's talk.**”

FM1: “If her friends or she doesn’t understand, I’ll explain it to her in English, **she translates it into Japanese** and sometimes even when I speak Japanese, because my Japanese communication is broken but effective, she’ll take what I’m saying as I’m saying it and ram it up to native.”

Strategies for Developing Social Networks

(R4) What strategies would be beneficial for assisting Japanese EFL learners in their efforts to develop social networks?

Similar to the findings of **Kudo and Simkin (2004)**:

- 1) Making time to meet friends and taking initiative to contact them
 - 2) Involving one's extended social network by inviting friends of friends to gatherings and events
 - 3) Making opportunities to meet new people through active participation (i.e., meet-ups and international cafés)
 - 4) Frequent the same places
 - 5) Taking risks
- Supported by **Nakayama's (1997)** process of developing closeness which involve multiple appraisals of an interlocutor's behaviour and language:
 - a. Be willing to exchange opinions, advice,
 - b. Use humour, as a means to 'get to know' people
 - c. Allows for the exchange of ideas and can help in cross-cultural exchanges
 - Use code-switching and ask for clarification seem to be typical in intercultural interactions
 - All seem to have a beneficial impact on language development as they help facilitate communication in intercultural interactions.

- Need more *critical cultural awareness* (**Byram, 1997**)
- Exposure to meaning focused relevant topics (**Devitte, 2016**)
- Would benefit from exposure / practice with critical thinking skill sets (**Byram, 1997, Dunn, 2015**)

Analysis of Results

Development of Closeness

(R5) “What factors influence the development of closeness/distance in the social network formation of Japanese EFL learners?”

Positive influences on closeness development

As per Nakayma (1997)

- 1) Initiated and maintain social networks with NJES who are familiar with Japan/Japanese culture/language
 - 2) Self-disclose personal information by talking about personal topics
 - 3) Try to talk about sensitive or controversial topics
 - 4) Try they learned to joke, banter and use humour with their NJES friends
- These strategies are developed over the duration of the friendship and renegotiated based upon the behaviours witnessed by the interlocutors

As per Byram (1997):

- Disclosing their opinions or ‘learning by listening’ to their NJES friend demonstrates; 1) interest others’ attitudes and reflection on their own, having knowledge of the self and of others on both an individual and societal interactional level, and being able to interpret and relate, and being able to discover and interact
- Reflected by participants through:
 - 1) Self-disclosing of personal information,
 - 2) Discussing controversial issues
 - 3) Learning to joke in English with their friends.
 - 4) When they lacked background knowledge to critically evaluate claims and information were willing to listen to other perspectives in order to access the information

Data Examples

(R5) What factors influence the development of closeness/distance in the social network formation of Japanese EFL learners?

Humor & Talking about sensitive or personal topics (self-disclosure)

JF3: “As I told you before about his suit and tie, **that is a kind of banter**. And his back pain, I **sometimes make fun of him**. I do that with some of my good Japanese friends. He **jokes with me all the time**. Actually, **I make fun of him all the time**. He asked me, why do Japanese universities give me a lot of interviews... Why do they want to know so much about me. I said, maybe they are checking your criminal record.”

JF7: “**Girl’s talk is so similar**. It is the same between Japanese girl’s talk and Australian girl’s talk. My husband was so bad, so I said to her that I want to divorce, what do you think? She said break up while you still can. You can find a good guy. **This is the same as my Japanese friends. Girl’s talk is global**.”

JF4: “First, with Japanese friends, **the contents of the talk**. When we talk about my or their private situation, I feel close to them. Second, the choice of the words. In Japanese there are many types of Japanese words. When **friends use the more casual words, I feel close**. With NJES, firstly, we talk about their life or their country. Then we talk about **some personal view or talk about political issues**. When I talk with them about political issues, and hear their opinion, we share our opinions. I feel really close. Sometimes with Japanese I can talk about political issues, but **it is not interesting to talk with Japanese about it**, because they don’t talk directly, so they copy my opinion or give a broadcast opinion. **So with foreigners, it is interesting for me to talk about controversial issues**.”

Analysis of Results

Conclusions

Implications of study and future research possibilities, including limitations of research:

Pedagogical implications

Language education for Japanese EFL learners would benefit them by:

Devitte (2016)

- Exposing them to meaning-focused topics and information that are cognitively accessible and relevant to their lives (aka. Help them with background knowledge)

Byram (1997, 2008) Dunn (2015)

- Using activities which help them to understand how other communities may present themselves
- Helping them to facilitate skill sets that emphasize critical thinking

Future research (limitations of study)

- Examining participants who are in the initial stages of social network development / have yet to develop social networks with NJESs.
- Performing a similar study in the participants' L1.
- Performing a mixed methods longitudinal study:
 - Examining the frequency of occurrence (noting by Japanese participants) of deviations and other problems.
 - Or focusing on the role of NJES use of correction, clarification and code-switching.

* No direct results determining the extent how social network formation positively affects the acquisition of language

Analysis of Results

Development of Closeness

(R5) What factors influence the development of closeness/distance in the social network formation of Japanese EFL learners?

Factors that contribute to distance

Similar to **Kudo and Simkin (2003)**

- Lack of duration and frequency of interactions can cause distance
- Need to meet and maintain friendships provide time to establish closeness
- Create stability through meeting regularly
- Possibly because of the need to continually assess and reassess behaviours of others
- If time is not invested into the relationship, emotional distance may develop
- Sense of a common community / sharing common interests helps to facilitate closeness as they are important elements of being stable and being comfortable and remaining socially close.

As per **Mendelson (2004)**

- Duration and frequency of interactions, learner proficiency level, and motivation seem to be important
- All of the “higher-level” participants seemed motivated to interact frequently with their friends
- Less frequency of interaction was attributed to having a “busy life”
- Lack of commonality of friends resulted in distance for at least one Japanese participant

References

- Aikawa, H. (2015). *Intercultural communicative competence for the workplace: problems faced by Japanese business professionals and suggestions for teaching English-as-an-international-language*. (unpublished Master's thesis). Sophia University.
- Asaoka, T. (1987). *Communication problems between Japanese and Australians at a dinner party*. Japanese Studies Centre. 3, Melbourne: Monash University.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dewey, D. P. (2004). A comparison of reading development by learners of Japanese in intensive domestic immersion and study abroad contexts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 303-327.
- Dewey, D. P., Belnap, R. K., & Hillstrom, R. (2013). Social network development, language use, and language acquisition during study abroad: Arabic language learners' perspectives. *Frontiers*, 22, 84-110.
- Dewey, D. P., Bown, J., & Eggett, D. (2012). Japanese language proficiency, social networking, and language use during study abroad: Learners' perspectives. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 68(2), 111-137.
- Dewey, D., Ring, S., Gardner, D., & Belnap, K. (2013). Social network formation and development during study abroad in the Middle East. *System* 41, 269-282.
- Devitte, W. (2016). Critical thinking in Japanese learners: A discourse perspective. *Critical Thinking and Language Learning*, 3(1). p. 23-38.
- Dunn, J. (2015). Critical thinking in Japanese secondary education: student and teacher perspectives. *Critical Thinking in Language Learning*, 2 (1). p. 29-39.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007) *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fairbrother, L. (2000). Analysis of intercultural interaction management within a party situation. *The Japanese Journal of Language in Society*, 2 (2), 33-42.
- Fan, S. (1992). *Language management contact situations between Japanese and Chinese*. Melbourne, Monash University.
- Freed, B. F. (1990). Language learning in a study abroad context: The effects of interactive and non-interactive out-of-class contact on grammatical achievement and oral proficiency. In J.E. Atlati (Ed.), *Georgetown university round table on: languages and linguistics 1990: Linguistics, language teaching and language acquisition: The interdependence of theory, practice and research* (pp. 459-477). Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Freed, B. F., Segalowitz, N., & Dewey, D. P. (2004). Context of learning and second language fluency in French: Comparing regular classroom, study abroad, and intensive domestic immersion programs. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 275-301.
- Ginsberg, R. B., & Miller, L. (2000). What do they do? Activities of students during study abroad. In R. D. Lambert & E. Shohamy (Eds.), *Language policy and pedagogy: Essays in honor of A. Ronald Walton* (pp. 237-260). Philadelphia, PA: Benjamins.
- Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J.J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: Ethnography of communication* (pp. 37-71). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Isabelli, C. L. (2001). Motivation and extended interaction in the study abroad context: Factors in the development of Spanish language accuracy and communication skills. *Dissertation Abstracts International- Section A*, 62(8), 2703-2704.
- Isabelli-García, C. (2006). Study abroad social networks, motivation and attitudes: Implications for second language acquisition. In DuFon, M. A. & Churchill, E. (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 231-258). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Jernudd, B., & Neustupný, J. V. (1987). Language planning: For whom? In L. Laforge (Ed.), *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning* (pp. 69-84).

References

- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kudo, K., & Simkin, K. A. (2003). Intercultural friendship formation: The case of Japanese students at an Australian university. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 24(2), 91-114.
- McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an International Language: Rethinking Goals and Approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, S. (2003). Teaching English as an international language: The Chilean context. *ELT Journal*, 57 (2), 139-148.
- MacKay, A. & Gass, S. (2005) *Second Language Research: Methodology and Design*. New Jersey: Routledge.
- Marriot, H. (1990). Intercultural business negotiations: the problem of norm discrepancy. *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 27(2), 161-175.
- Marriott, H. (1991). Etiquette in intercultural situations: A Japanese business luncheon. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 1(1), 69-99.
- Marriott, H. (1995). The acquisition of politeness patterns by exchange students in Japan. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 197-224). Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Mendelson, V. G. (2004). *Spain or bust? Assessment and student perceptions of out of class contact and oral proficiency in a study abroad context* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Meyerhoff, M. (2015). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. New York, Taylor & Francis.
- Miller, L. (2009). Japanese and American meetings and what goes on before them: A case study of co-worker misunderstandings. *Pragmatics*, 4 (2), 2-721.
- Miller, L., & Ginsberg, R. B. (1995). Folklinguistic theories of language learning. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 293-315). Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Milroy, L., & Gordon, M. (2008). *Sociolinguistics: Method and interpretation* (Vol. 13). John Oxford. Wiley & Sons.
- Muller-Jacquier (2000). Intercultural training. In M. Byram (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*. London: Routledge.
- Muraoka, H. (2001). Management of intercultural input: A case study of two Korean residents of Japan. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 10 (2), 297-311.
- Nakayama, A. (1997). *The communication of closeness in Japanese*. (Doctoral dissertation, Monash University).
- Neustupný, J. V. (2003). Japanese students in Prague. Problems of communication and interaction. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 162, 125-143.
- Neustupný, J. V. (2004). A theory of contact situations and the study of academic interaction. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 14(1), 3-31
- Neustupný, J. V. (2005). Foreigners and the Japanese in contact situations: Evaluation of norm deviations. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (175-176), 307-323.
- Ring, S. A., Gardner, D., & Dewey, D. P. (2013). Social network development during study abroad in Japan. *New Perspectives on Japanese Language Learning, Linguistics, and Culture*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center. pp. 95-121.
- Scollon, R., Scollon, S. & Jones, R. (2012). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach, Third Edition*. West Sussex, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Segalowitz, N., & Freed, B. F. (2004). Context, contact and cognition in oral fluency acquisition: Learning Spanish in at home and study abroad contexts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 173-199.
- Siegal, M. (1995). Individual differences and study abroad. *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context*, pp. 225-244.
- Taguchi, N. (2008). Cognition, language contact, and the development of pragmatic comprehension in a study-abroad context. *Language Learning*, 58(1), 33-71.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998). On the nature of immersion during study abroad: Some participant perspectives. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, IV (Fall), 121-138.

Methodology

Participants (Japanese: demographic details)

Pseudo Name	Gender	Nationality	Age	Occupation	English L2 Experience	English Proficiency
JF1	F	Japanese	Late 20's	Office worker	9 years in Japan + 1 month study abroad: England	Low-Intermediate
JF2	F	Japanese	Mid 20's	Graduate Student	11 years in Japan + 1 year study abroad: New Zealand	Advanced
JF3	F	Japanese	Early 40's	Teacher	12+ years	Advanced
JF4	F	Japanese	Early 20's	University Student (1 st year)	8 years in Japan + travel	Intermediate
JM5	M	Japanese	Mid 20's	Office worker	1 year working Australia	High-Intermediate
JF6	F	Japanese	Mid 20's	University Student (1 st year)	7 years in Japan + travel	Intermediate
JF7	F	Japanese	Late 20's	Office worker	9 years in Japan	Low-Intermediate
JM8	M	Japanese	Mid 20's	Office worker	9 years + travel	High-Intermediate
JM9	M	Japanese	Early 20's	University Student (4 th year)	9 years + 1 year study abroad: Ireland	High-Intermediate

Methodology

Participants (Japanese: contact details)

Pseudo Name	NJES Friends	NJES Friends' Nationalities	Frequency of Contact	Typical contact situation type
JF1	5+	USA/Canada	2-3 times a month	One-on-one, small group
JF2	10+	US/AUS/CA/UKA	3-4 times a month (varies)	One-on-one, small group
JF3	5	ENG, USA	once a week (during semester)	One-on-one
JF4	15+	USA/CA	6-7 times a month	One-on-one, small group, large group
JM5	5+	USA/CA	once a week	One-on-one, small group
JF6	10+	Various: USA/ENG	5-7 times a month	One-on-one, small group, large group
JF7	2	AUS	1-2 times a month	One-on-one
JM8	4+	Various: USA/S.A.	2-4 times a month (online more)	One-on-one, small group
JM9	15+	Various: IRE/USA	About 7 times a month	One-on-one, small group, large group

Methodology

Participants (Japanese: friendship details)

Pseudo Name	Typical gender of NJES friends	Gender of main friend (s)	Length of friendship with main friend	Gender of secondary friend (s) reported on during interview	Length of friendship with secondary friend	Relationship type
JF1	Female	Female (CA)	1 year	-----	-----	Friendship
JF2	Mixed	Female (USA)	1.5 years	Male (USA) /Female (UKA)	1.5 years	Friendship /Friendship
JF3	Mixed	Male (ENG)	3 years	-----	-----	Friendship
JF4	Female	Female (USA)	6 months	-----	-----	Friendship
JM5	Male	Female (USA:FF2)	6 years	Male (CA)	A few weeks	Friendship / Romance
JF6	Female	Female (USA)	6 months	Female	6 months	Friendship
JF7	Female	Female (AUS)	1 year	-----	-----	Friendship
JM8	Male	Female (USA: FF2)	8 years	Male (CR)	8years	Friendship / Friendship
JM9	Mixed	Male (IRE)	3 years	Male (USA)	2 years	Friendship

Methodology

Participants (Non-Japanese: demographic details & contact details)

Pseudo Name	Gender	Nationality	Age	Occupation	Japanese L2 Experience	English Proficiency
FM1	M	Australian	Early 30's	Chef	6 months Japanese school: 2 years living in Japan	Native
FF2	F	American	Late 30's	Teacher	10 years living in Japan	Native
FM3	M	Australian	Early 30's	Teacher	4 years living in Japan	Native
FM4	M	American	Late 20's	Teacher	3 years in University + 4 years living in Japan	Native
Pseudo Name	Number Friends	Friends' Nationality		Frequency of Contact	Typical contact situation type	
FM1	10+	Japanese		daily/a few times a month	One-on-one, small group	
FF2	6+	Japanese		a few times a month	One-on-one, small group	
FM3	2+	Japanese		a few times a month	One-on-one, small group	
FM4	10+	Japanese		once a month	One-on-one, small group	

Methodology

Participants (Non-Japanese: friendship details)

Pseudo Name	Typical gender of NJES friends	Gender of main friend (s)	Length of friendship with main friend	Gender of secondary friend (s) reported on during interview	Length of friendship with secondary friend	Relationship type
FM1	Mixed	Male (JPN)	2 years	Female	2 years	Friendship / Romance
FF2	Mixed	Male (JPN)	6 years	Male (JM8) /Male (JM5)	8 years/6 years	Friendship
FM3	Mixed	Female (ENG)	1.5 years	-----	-----	Friendship
FM4	Female	Male (JPN)	2 years	Female	6 months	Friendship / Romance

Communicative and Interactional Competence

Multiple considerations of the term competence i.e.:

Neustupný (2004) defines competence as:

- An interlocutor's ability to interact appropriately in a language may not be necessarily representative of their knowledge or skill with grammar or vocabulary

Chomsky (1965)

- Proficiency in syntax and lexis may be advanced, but sociolinguistic competence may not be
- Competence is linked to the linguistic system and therefore is internalized by native speakers
- Knowledge of grammar and the ability to perform in a language were distinguishable
- Performance in a language should not be an object of research in linguistics

Hymes (1972)

- Communicative competence' replaces 'competence' as social knowledge is necessary for a speaker to produce and interpret speech in specific contexts
- Proposed eight sociolinguistic rules: Situation, Participants, Ends (i.e., goals and outcomes), Acts, Key (i.e., tone), Instrumentalities (e.g., spoken and written), Norms, and Genre (SPEAKING model)

Communicative and Interactional Competence

A progression from competence to interactional competence

Byram (1997)

- Discourse competence “as the ability to use, discover and negotiate strategies for the production and interpretation of monologue or dialogue texts which follow the conventions of the culture of an interlocutor or are negotiated as intercultural texts for particular purposes” (p. 34).

Neustupný (1997)

- Created a model with eight key rules which attempts to capture how languages work in context
- Model considers socially shared concepts of appropriate and expected behavior

Neustupný (1997)

1. Switch-on Rules - under what conditions communication is switched on and off,
2. Variation Rules - which sets of communication means will occur together, such as languages, dialects, styles, ways of speaking, etc. and how participants select from among them,
3. Setting Rules - when, where, and in what situations communication will take place,
4. Participant Rules - who interacts with whom, when, and in what manner,
5. Content Rules - what is communicated, such as themes, topics, functions, word meanings, politeness, and humor,
6. Frame Rules - which determine how content is located and ordered in communicative acts,
7. Channel Rules - whether spoken, written, or non-verbal communication is used, and
8. Management Rules - how problems are noted, evaluated, and dealt with

Communicative and Interactional Competence

Recognition of three different types of competence

Neustupný (2005)

- Language users possess three different types of competences:
 1. Grammatical competence (GR): grammar, lexis, phonology, graphemics, etc.
 2. Nongrammatical communicative competence (NGC)/ Sociolinguistic competence: interpretation of the social meaning of the choice of linguistic varieties and determines the appropriate social meaning for the communication situation.
 3. Sociocultural competence: features of a society and its culture which are manifest in the communicative behaviour of the members of the society
- All three competencies are necessary for interactional competence

Intercultural Communicative Competence

Recognizing the need for interculturality in communication

Byram (1997)

- Intercultural speakers, need to be able to negotiate differences in norms which requires them to
 - be cognizant of their own and others' attitudes
 - have knowledge of the self and of others on both an individual and societal interactional level,
 - be able to interpret and relate,
 - be able to discover and interact,
 - have critical cultural awareness
- Critical cultural awareness, influences the other sub-components and focuses on interlocutors making a critical evaluation of another's norms as well as taking a critical perspective on one's own norms.
- The goal of critical cultural awareness is for interlocutors to transform themselves from foreign language learners into *mediators*
- Allows language learners to understand the underlying assumptions of linguistic and non-linguistic behaviours in both their native language and the language being used,
- Are able to actively negotiate common ground in intercultural interactions

English as an International Language for Intercultural Speakers

Moving away from “native-speaker” dominance

McKay (2002, 2003)

- Users of English will use English in ways that will be significantly different from monolingual speakers of English
- Individuals need to gain insight into their own culture

Muller-Jacquier (2000)

- Intercultural relationships require, regardless of whose language is being used, awareness of the significance of what is said, how it is said, and the context in which it is said.

Kramsch (1993)

- Speakers need reflection of one’s own and others’ cultures, a middle ground or “third place”

Closeness

Nakayama (1997)

- Six steps in closeness development:
 - 1) Estimation - progress (or not) to a higher degree of closeness.
 - 2) Determine self-attitude towards closeness
 - 3) Decide upon the “maxims and strategies”
 - 4) Decide the course of actions
 - 5) Perform acts to establish closeness.
 - 6) Reflect on how the act was received/performed through reactions others

Scollon, Scollon and Jones (2012)

- Other factors influencing closeness: power, distance, and the weight of imposition based on various social status and psychological distances

Nakayama (1997)

Three Maxims of *Shitashisa* (closeness)

1. be emotionally close,
2. be mutually comfortable
3. be socially close

Seven strategies

1. Care
2. Share
3. Trust
4. Relax
5. Be stable
6. Co-operate
7. Belong together

Problems in Communication in Contact Situations

Fan (1992)

- Three types of contact situations;
 - 1) Partner Situations
 - 2) Third-party situations
 - 3) Cognate-language situations

Neustupný (2003)

- Fourth type: speakers of mutually intelligible languages

Neustupný (2004)

- Internal contact situations (defined by ethnic, social, gender, age, use area, degree of competence, and other similar features)
- External contact situations (so-called intercultural contact situations, defined by a cluster of features that operate across boundaries of national networks)

Problems in Communication in Contact Situations

Sociolinguistic examples of “problems”

Marriott (1991, 1995)

- forms of etiquette and politeness greetings

Asaoka (1987)

- leave taking
- evaluating the arrangement of communication networks

Neustupný (2005)

- The use of referent honorifics (*irassharu* as opposed to *iku*, etc.) by non-Japanese in Japanese contact situations

Sociocultural examples of “problems”

Asaoka (1987)

- Seating arrangements

Aikawa (2015)

Sociolinguistic and sociocultural problems were more common and more influential in determining how interlocutors viewed the others' cultural groups.

Fairbrother (2000)

- physical posture
- different treatment of racial groups

Miller (2009)

- purpose of business meetings, other interactional problems

Fairbrother (2000)

- Gift giving

Social Networks and Social Networks in SA

Milroy and Gordon (2003)

- Defined as “the relationships [which individuals] contract with others as they reach out through social and geographical space linking many individuals”

Meyerhoff (2015)

- Who one works with, where one goes to school, where one goes to socialize with others, who one’s friends are, and where one lives

Dewey (2004), Dewey, Belnap & Hillstrom (2013), Dewey, Bown & Eggett (2012), Ginsberg & Miller (2000) Hernandez (2010), Miller & Ginsberg (1995), Taguchi (2008)

- Research which examines the out-of-classroom language use of learners suggests that there is a relationship between L2 development and social network formation in study abroad (SA)

Freed (1990), Mendelson (2004), Segalowitz & Freed (2004)

- Social network formation positively affects the acquisition of language suggests that the relationship but is unclear

Social Networks and Social Networks in SA

Mendelson (2004)

- Did not find any direct correlation between language use and improvements in language proficiency for either group

Freed, Segalowitz, and Dewey (2004)

- Study abroad setting individuals made significant gains in their speech fluidity, however, immersion group had more linguistic gains
- **Freed (1990)**
- Advanced-level learners made more gains in their L2 development through exposure to language in the form of reading and listening
- Lower-level learners gained more from their interactions with native speakers

Wilkinson (1998, 2002), Isabelli-García (2006)

- Motivation seems to also influence social network formation
- Progression from an ethnocentric to an ethnorelativist frame of reference, equals more willing they are to engage in social network formation with native speakers

Kudo and Simkin, 2004

Several factors influenced the development of intercultural friendships (Japanese)

1. Frequent contact, through propinquity and shared friendship networks which increase familiarity between interlocutors,
2. Similarity of personal characteristics and age,
3. Self-disclosure and openness of communication,
4. The receptivity of other non-Japanese