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Introduction
Japanese scholarship has often followed an independent line of development in certain areas of scientific endeavor. The study of language and scientific approaches to primatology are two prime examples where the motivating intellectual force for research has been derived from specifically Japanese perspectives. It is fruitless to understand Japanese work in areas like psycholinguistics, natural language, and the structure of mental representations, without understanding the sources from which the relevant research questions are derived. At the same time, Japanese psycholinguistics has also been influenced from Anglo-American theoretical concerns.

This paper attempts to sketch a representative sub-section of the field of Japanese psycholinguistics, employing the topic of language processing as an illustration of theoretical approaches to questions of language behavior, and by extension, the degree to which linguistics and psychology collaborate in the actual practice of Japanese psycholinguistics. As a sample database, the research reported on here is derived from a representative survey of professional journals in linguistics and psychology, limited to research reported in the last twenty years.

Unlike MacKay's (1973) useful classification of developmental steps in early psycholinguistics and Kess' (1976, 1990, in press) historical overviews of the past century of activity, no such inventory as yet exists for Japanese psycholinguistics. Nor does the contribution of Japanese psycholinguistics figure at all in the comprehensive overviews that purport to cover the field of psycholinguistics for the Annual Review of Psychology. Indeed, these overviews are quite comprehensive, but are largely limited to reports of Anglo-American social science. In this respect, there is little difference between the first modern overview in the Annual Review of Psychology by Rubenstein and Aborn (1960), and later ones in the same Annual Review of Psychology by Ervin-Tripp and Slobin (1966), Fillenbaum (1971), Johnson-Laird (1974), and Danks and Glucksberg (1980). Even the current review by Foss (1988) contains no mention of Japanese pursuits.

The history of Anglo-American psycholinguistics over the past century is well-known. But the research paths of concern to Japanese psycho-
linguistics during this period are either ignored or are considerably less transparent in the commonly accessible literature.\(^1\) Questions like whether there were independent developments, in contrast

Questions like whether there were independent developments, in contrast to or in complementation to Anglo-American research goals, and even the question of what is happening currently are only vaguely answered by scanning the usual literature. The occasional promising title, as for example, Jun Haga's (1988) fine *Gengoshinrigaku Nyuumon* [Introduction to Psycholinguistics], does not overview Japanese psycholinguistics, but typically presents the author's own work.

There is no question that fields related to psycholinguistic interests have been particularly rich and more than occasionally serve as the subject of overview articles. For example, Fukuzawa, Onose, Fukuda, and Nishitani (1990) chronicle the directional trends in psychological studies of reading in Japan from the 1960s through the 1990s, Takano, Okajima, Sakurai, and Watanabe (1986) chart trends in educational psychology in Japan, and Watanabe and Ohtsuka (1979) reflect the earlier fascination with cross-cultural psychology in the 1960s and 1970s. Of course, the emphasis on foreign language acquisition and the establishment of a sound language pedagogy have always made Applied Linguistics a field of particular interest, and this can be traced in the continuing emphasis in the literature (see, as an example, Sasaki 1991), as well as the recent realization of the professional Japanese Association of Applied Linguistics (JAAL in JACET).

**Psycholinguistic Studies of Language Processing**

Certainly the most striking work in Japanese studies on language processing has been in the area of kana–kanji processing. The orthographic expression of phonological fact is carried by the two syllabic kana systems, hiragana and katakana, and one expects that this will incur processing in the left hemisphere. It is of course the left hemisphere which undertakes online left-to-right sequential processing in space, as well as sequential processing in time. But the Japanese writing system incorporates Chinese-based kanji characters into the printed form of the language as well, making for an orthographic system which incorporates both form-based and meaning-based symbols into the decoding process. The general finding has been, of course, that there is a left hemisphere advantage for linguistic stimuli like kana and a right–hemisphere advantage for abstract configura-

\(^1\) Unfortunately, this lack of knowledge is a general failing of Western assessments of the theoretical and research directions in psychology and related social sciences as intellectual enterprises developed within Asia. See, for example, Shapiro's (1986) article for a lament on the general neglect of Asian psychology in the United States, and Harris' book (cited in Levine 1991) for even more specific commentary on *The Cross-cultural Challenge to Social Psychology*. 
tional stimuli like kanji (see Endo, Shimizu, and Hori 1978; Feldman and Tur-
Nishikawa and Ninna 1981; Nomura 1981; Paradis, Hagiwara, and Hildebrandt
1985; Sasanuma 1975; Sasanuma, Itoh, Kobayashi, and Mori 1980; Sugishita,
Iwata, Toyokura, Yoshioka, and Yamada 1978; Toma and Toshima 1989;
Yokoyama, Imai, and Furukawa 1991. This result is consistent with hemis-
pheric advantages in processing Chinese characters reported in logographic
writing systems like Chinese itself (see Keung and Hoosain 1989), and some
even make the claim that the right hemisphere is specialized for kanji pro-
cessing (see Hatta 1981a). It is of course certainly conceivable that the five
types of potential orthographies realized in hiragana, katakana, English
alphabetic, kanji, and pictographs each require their own processing system,
as Hatta (1985) has suggested. And indeed, others like Fujihara (1989) have
found processing differences for kana and numerals (see also Shimahara
1987). The notion of separate processing sub-systems, or modules, is per-
fectly compatible with the modularity camp in the debate between modular-
variety of evidence has supported the possibility that the domain-specific
language processing system is encapsulated to deal with linguistic input
alone in the initial bottom-up analysis of the linguistic input, and it would
not be surprising to see the system further subdivided into smaller sub-
systems.

It is worth noting that a significant portion of the work with kana-
kanji processing and word recognition differences ascribed to the writing
system type overlaps and/or is derived from work with decremental loss of
such abilities in aphasics (see, for example, Hayashi, Ulatowska, and Sasana-
uma 1985; Morinaga and Kiyoshi 1988; Paradis, Hagiwara, and Hildebrandt
1985; Sasanuma 1975; Sasanuma, Itoh, Kobayashi, and Mori 1980; Sugishita,
Iwata, Toyokura, Yoshioka, and Yamada 1978), or is complementary to capi-
talizing on developmental abilities in children (see Steinberg, Isozaki, and

Differences in processing kanji, as well as the possibility of hemis-
pheric advantages in processing kanji, have also been investigated (see Elman, Takahashi, and Tohsaku 1981; Endo, Shimimizu, and Hori 1978; Hatta
1977a, 1977b, 1981b, 1981c; Hayashi and Hatta 1978; Langman and Saito
1984; and Nomura 1979). The general finding is that kanji recognition is
facilitated by considerations of imagery and iconicity. Very simply, the
more concrete the kanji referent of the Chinese character, the quicker its
recognition; the greater the iconicity of the kanji form of the Chinese char-
acter, the more prototypical the kanji is perceived to be.

In turn, differences in representational models of kana (Itsukushima
1981) and differences in processing kana, as well as the possibility of hem-
ispheric advantages in processing kana (see Hatta 1983, 1985; Hatta, Ohnos-
shi, Yamamoto, and Ogura 1981) have also been investigated. In general,
there has been and continues to be tremendous interest in writing systems
and the possible processing systems that may be involved in lexical access
and comprehension (see Hatta 1985, 1986). A variety of experiments have been cross-orthographic by contrasting English (Hatta, Hatae, and Kirchner 1984), Korean hangul (Endo, Shimizu, and Nakamura 1981) and even numerals (Fujihara 1989; Itsukushima, Tozawa, and Itagaki 1990). Much of this work is reflective of the general interest in the uniqueness of the Japanese writing system, and by extension, in the possible uniqueness of the associated processing systems. There is no question that a case can be made for unique processing systems to deal with varying types of input, even if it is all in one domain, as for example, the orthographic domain (see Hatta 1985). Again, as suggested above, such a position is quite compatible with the modularity side of the debate between modularity and interactionism (see Fodor 1983, and Kess 1991a, 1991b, in press). And while some sound experimental work has been done on this topic (see Hatta and Dimond 1981), the presentation of the question can overlap the boundary into the larger introspective tradition abbreviated by the concept of Nihonjinron. For example, consider the recent popularization of the discussion about possible brain differences, as exemplified by the wide reception accorded Tsunoda’s Nihonjin no Noo [The Japanese Brain] (see also Tsunoda 1984).

Although speech perception fits naturally within the domain of processing and comprehension of natural language, the literature here is so vast and specialized that it is beyond the scope of this paper except for mere mention. More traditional concerns are mirrored in some discussions, as for example, the use of the click monitoring paradigm to determine segmentation procedures (see Fukuda 1983). Sound symbolism (see Haga 1988), and the related notion of auditory speech images (see Inoue and Inoue 1986), have always have been a rich source of experimentation. But the real focus of current work in speech perception is related to industrial uses of acoustic principles for speech recognition devices. These have the potential to be attached to a range of industrial applications, encompassing their implementation in interactive devices ranging from language learning to virtual reality simulations.

Word recognition and lexical access is a focal topic in much Anglo-American contemporary psychological research, so much so that Foss’ recent (1988) overview singles it out as the most productive area in psycholinguistics as practiced by psychologists. This emphasis is of course reflected in Japanese work, where familiar and reliable tasks like lexical decision and pronunciation tasks investigate the scope of factors like priming (see, for example, Harada 1987). Most word recognition studies by Western psychologists have focussed on aspects of written-word recognition, (see Kess in press); similarly, word recognition studies in Japanese also involve written-word recognition, and processing dimensions associated with kanji reading and/or recognition (see Kawaguchi 1987).

The implications of generative transformational grammar, and the resulting research paradigm which held sway for almost two decades between the 1960s and the 1980s, has had a ripple effect in both Japanese linguistics and psycholinguistics. With the sentence as the basic unit, and
matching concepts like grammatical/ungrammatical, competence/performance, and deep structure/surface structure, much psycholinguistic experimentation was directed at processing considerations involving the constructs established by syntactic analysis. Some of these are derived by what must now be considered 'older' generative grammar concepts (see for example, Nagata 1981, 1984, 1987a, 1987b, 1989a, 1989b; Omura and Utsuo 1981). More recent articles incorporate the increasing role of thematic relations in experimentally assessing the interface between syntax and semantics in sentence processing. Such recent studies modify the generative focus on sentence as primary unit by instead employing theoretical constructs like the argument structure of predicates in propositions. Thus, sentence processing is not simply limited to syntactic form, but incorporates the richer insights of compositional semantics. For example, concepts like thematic relations broaden the field of endeavor for a more accurate view of on-line processing (see Endo 1989; Ishida 1989; Ishiguro 1985; and Iwatate 1980). Form has its day too, as can be seen in the attention paid to the role of modular parsing strategies (see Mazuka and Lust 1988; Tsugawa and Umemoto 1984; Tsuzuki 1986; and Urakami 1984). One can again quote the modularity vs. interaction debate here, with parsing strategies upholding a strictly modular position, and thematic relations being claimed as supportive of an interactive position.

Because of the lack of a satisfactory theoretical template to discuss sentence production, most work is limited to a discussion of where the motor program has gone wrong. Hence the interest in the glimpses in the failed production program as captured by speech errors, and the special structural errors which demonstrate the dimensions of the functional level of sentence production (see Terao 1989). However, some studies address how factors like point of view on the part of the speaker will elicit different patterns in production (see Ishiguro 1985).

Recent studies in aphasia also continue to examine sentence processing in aphasics (see, for example, Kudo 1984; Kudo, Tateishi, and Segawa 1982). Such studies have even found the notion of thematic relations to be useful concepts to understanding what has or has not been damaged (see, for example, Hagiwara and Caplan 1990). Other studies of aphasia continue to examine a wide variety of decrements by examining processing at levels other than syntax, as for example, deep dyslexia in reading performance (see Hayashi, Ulatowska, and Sasanuma 1985), semantics (see Kudo 1987), and so forth. In sum, this is a particularly fertile area with a long tradition, and we mention it here because of its natural affinity with studies of language processing.

Semantic considerations in processing are also the focus of considerable attention recently, not just in more traditional areas of experimentation like recall (Ishige and Hakoda 1984; Kikuno 1991; Tajika, Taniguchi, Kamiya, and Neumann, 1991; Toyota 1985; Yokoyama, Imai, and Furukawa 1991) and recognition (Hara 1982; Nagata 1978; Naka 1984), but also in the more current preoccupation with the contribution of semantic factors to the
process of integrating information (Harada 1982). Not surprisingly, the area of discourse studies also shows keen interest in semantic considerations, for the on-line processing of conversation that is heard or text that is read requires access to dimensions of the knowledge base that can be broadly labelled as semantic knowledge. In addition, such discourse studies and reading studies also examine the structural patterning of larger pieces of discourse in either conversation (Tahara and Ito 1985), narrative (Takahashi 1991; Yonezawa 1989), or text (see Iwanaga 1990; Kawasaki 1988; Kuhara 1980; Kuwabara 1985; Kuwabara, Sannomiya, and Nomura 1983; Mitsuda 1986, 1987, 1990). Needless to say, it is the science of reading that has been most active in this area of determining the structure of narratives, stories, and texts in general.

Although there is a long tradition in the field of literature, metaphor does not seem to have been a particularly fertile field of research in an experimental sense (but see Kusumi 1985). This may be changing, as witnessed for example, by this topic serving as the basis of a Japanese symposium at the recent Third International Conference on Intercultural Communication in Taiwan in 1991 (see, for example, Giles, Kess, and Uda 1991).

Lastly, developmental psycholinguistics matches adult studies of perception and production in its vitality, and certainly in its breadth. In point of fact, most of the areas represented in studies of adult abilities in production and perception are matched by studies of how children develop in their acquisition of a first language. To mention but a few areas, there are studies in kana–kanji processing (Steinberg, Isozaki, and Amano 1981; Toma and Toshima 1989), sentence comprehension (Ishiguro 1985; Iwatate 1980; Nagata 1984), sentence production (Nagata 1984; Tahara and Ito 1985), semantic factors in memory and recall (Kikuno 1991), and discourse processing (Mitsuda 1990; Takahashi 1991). There is also some interest in what the child requires in order to be able to establish the conventional range of a concept represented by a linguistic category in a language (Matsumoto 1985; but see also Motoyoshi 1984). There is even considerable interest in adult acquisition, that is, in what adults would also require to be able to acquire miniature artificial languages (see Nagata 1981; Mori 1982).

In general, one must say that the field of natural language processing in Japan is one with a considerable tradition. It is also a field of intellectual endeavor with considerable uniqueness in the problems which it chooses to examine, some driven by language–specific factors and some driven by recognition of universally pressing problems of description. There is much to be learned here, and it is hoped that this brief overview gives at least a flavor of the rich resources available to the interested scholar of natural language.
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