CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The study of contrastive rhetoric began when Kaplan pointed out the differences in the logical development of texts in different languages. He pointed out that Anglo-American text shows Aristotelian influences in its logical development whereas texts in other languages show different styles of logical development (1966, 1972). His studies suggested that in order to successfully convey the writer's idea to readers in English, the writer must adopt Aristotelian logical development. Genre-specific contrastive studies have been carried out in the field of English for specific purposes in search of more effective ways of teaching the Aristotelian generic structure to speakers of other languages. The present genre-specific contrastive research studies in the field of applied linguistics research articles in English and Japanese. The study aims to draw pedagogical implications effective for teaching academic English to native speakers of Japanese.

The difficulty of adopting Aristotelian logical development by writers of other languages has been highlighted by many researchers who have contrasted academic texts written by non-native speakers of English and those written by native speakers of English. Although Westernization, or more specifically Anglo-Americanization, of the generic structure of English texts written by non-native speakers has been recently observed, difficulties of adopting Aristotelian logical development

particularly in Asian languages and cultures still remain (Eggington, 1987; Taylor and Chen, 1991).

Contrastive rhetoric studies on Japanese and English texts have been carried out extensively on expository texts (Hinds, 1980, 1983, 1990; Kamimura and Oi, 1998; Kobayashi, 1984; Kubota, 1992, 1997, 1998, 1999; Ostler, 1988). Among these, Kubota's studies consistently suggest that Westernization of Japanese culture has had some influence on the logical development of Japanese expository texts and now Japanese expository texts tend to develop more or less according to Aristotelian logical development. Other studies, however, suggest that Japanese expository texts are organized in a traditional inductive style which is quite different from the Anglo-American deductive style of developing ideas in a text. Since no major research has been carried out on genre-specific contrastive studies, the existence of differences in the generic structure of academic texts between the two languages remains to be seen. However, during the writer's teaching of academic writing for four years in Japanese colleges, the writer had observed that Japanese students have difficulty adopting Aristotelian logical development in their writing of English texts.

1.2 Objectives and Methodology

The present research studies the differences in the generic structure of abstract, introduction, method, results and discussion sections between the English and Japanese research articles from the applied linguistics field in order to identify effective ways of teaching Aristotelian logical development, more specifically the cohesion and coherence strategies in Anglo-American texts, to native speakers of

Japanese. This part of study is carried out based on Swales' framework of genre analysis and Kaplan's framework of contrastive rhetoric. In addition, differences between the two sets of articles in the use of metatextual phrases, strategies to maintain coherence and cohesion within the text are studied following Manranen's framework.

To realize these objectives, the following research questions were formulated:

1 How does the generic structure or the logical arrangement of the information elements differ between the English and Japanese research articles in the field of applied linguistics?

2 Is there any difference in the use of metatextual phrases between the two sets of texts?

3 How can the results of research questions 1 and 2 be explained from a socio-cultural point of view?

4 How can the results be utilized in teaching academic English to native speakers of Japanese?

For the first research question, the present research focuses on the generic structure of each of abstract, introduction, background, method, results and discussion and conclusion sections of the research articles. After the moves analysis of a section based on Swales' theoretical framework is completed, a move structure model that contains all the moves found in both sets of data is proposed. Based on this move structure model, differences between the English and Japanese article sections are identified and discussed using Kaplan's contrastive rhetoric framework.

3

For the second research question, the present research compares and contrasts the coherence and cohesion strategies observed in the two sets of data. The study on the use of metatextual phrases based on Mauranen's framework is observed in order to reveal differences in how coherence and cohesion are valued in the two languages.

The findings in reference to the first and second research questions will then be discussed from a sociocultural point of view to answer the third research question. How Aristotelian logical development is accepted and at the same time paradoxically rejected by the Japanese language and culture are discussed from historical and socio-cultural perspectives. Then, pedagogical implications will be drawn from the results and discussion of the study to address the fourth question.

The subjects of the study were empirical research articles from four popular journals in applied linguistics published in the years, 1995 to 2000. The English articles were obtained from the *TESOL Quarterly* and *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. The Japanese articles were obtained from the *Nihongo Kyoiku* (Journal of Japanese Language Teaching) and *Nihongo Kyouiku Ronshu* (Journal of Japanese Language Teaching). The English titles of the Japanese journals are incidentally the same, but they are published by different organizations. *Nihongo Kyoiku* is published by Nihongo Kyoiku Gakkai. *Nihongo Kyoiku Ronshu* is published by the University of Tsukuba.

Applied linguistics was selected as the subject discipline primarily for two reasons: (i) it is the writer's area of expertise, and (ii) neither genre analysis nor contrastive genre analysis studies of English and Japanese have been carried out on applied linguistics articles to the best of the writer's knowledge. Genre analysis studies have largely been carried out on research articles of the 'hard' and 'applied' sciences (Brett, 1994). While a few studies have been carried out on social science articles (Brett, 1994; Holmes, 1997), no studies have been carried out on applied linguistics articles. Some Genre-specific contrastive studies have been carried out on English and other languages like Finnish, Korean, and Chinese (Mauranen, 1991, 1996; Eggington, 1987; Taylor and Chen, 1991); however, there appears to have been very few genre-specific contrastive studies carried out on English and Japanese research articles in the field of applied linguistics.

1.3 Significance of the Present Research

Very few contrastive genre analysis studies have been carried out on English and Japanese research articles in the field of applied linguistics. By identifying differences in English and Japanese concepts of research article structure, cohesion and coherence, the present study establishes a more systematic approach to the teaching of English academic writing to Japanese speakers.