CHAPTER 3

CONTRASTIVE RHETORIC: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, first, the theoretical framework of Kaplan’s contrastive rhetoric is reviewed. Kaplan’s epochal paper on cultural thought patterns is introduced followed by the explanation of theories behind contrastive rhetoric, i.e., linguistic relativity, rhetoric and text linguistics. Mauranen’s metatextual analysis is also introduced as a study of contrastive rhetoric study. Then the method of contrastive rhetoric is described. Finally, Contrastive rhetoric studies of texts written in English by speakers of different languages, of those written in different languages, and of English and Japanese texts are reviewed.

3.2 Kaplan’s Cultural Thought Patterns

The study of contrastive rhetoric started with Robert Kaplan’s article ‘Cultural Thought Patterns in Inter-Cultural Education’ published in 1966 (Kaplan, 1980). This article was written for English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers in order to alert them to the reasons for any unfamiliar discourse patterns used by the students. The theoretical framework for the article was a weak version of the Whorfian hypothesis that one’s native language influences thought. In this article, Kaplan studied English texts written by non-native speakers of English (ESL students) as well as professional English translations of texts originally written in other languages. He then concluded that the pattern of developing one’s ideas in a text is different in
different languages and presented the famous graphical representation of the discourse patterns of five major languages, namely, English, Semitic, Oriental, Romance and Russian using spirals and intricate lines.

This article was heavily criticized because of the small sample size, primitive method of analysis, oversimplification of thought patterns, and primarily because Kaplan had represented the English thought pattern as the most straightforward. Kaplan himself admitted the shortcomings of the study and referred to it as a ‘doodles article’ (Connor and Kaplan, 1987). Later in 1972, Kaplan, acknowledging that his article of 1966 had been too crude, published ‘The Anatomy of Rhetoric: Prolegomena to a Functional Theory of Rhetoric’ in which he carried out a careful study on the differences of discourse patterns among writers from different languages and cultural backgrounds.

These two articles of Kaplan’s, especially the one published in 1966, is regarded as the cornerstone, in the ESL field as well as in applied linguistics, for notifying other scholars of the structural differences in texts by writers from different native language backgrounds and for introducing hypotheses worth testing.

There are three specific reasons why Kaplan’s works of 1966 and 1972 are considered important despite the flaws mentioned above. First and foremost, these studies, which were based on the Whorfian hypothesis, gave birth to the study of contrastive rhetoric. Secondly, the fact that he had analyzed the logical development of a paragraph was innovative in the 1960s and 1970s when it was common, under the influences of Bloomfield and Chomsky, to limit analysis to sentences. Kaplan
strongly argued that the logical development of a paragraph should be analyzed since
the writer’s logic is expressed not in a single sentence but in a paragraph (Kaplan,
1972, p. 9; 1980, p. 401). Thirdly, he established the tool for text analysis, using
discourse blocs and discourse units (Kaplan, 1972, p. 27). A discourse bloc
represents the main idea in a paragraph normally expressed as the topic sentence, and
a discourse unit represents the supporting idea. In an ideally structured English
paragraph, there is one discourse bloc supported by a few discourse units.

Inspired by Kaplan’s cultural thought patterns and his analysis of texts written by
writers from different cultures, a number of researchers, including Ulla Connor, John
Hinds, and Alan C. Purves, have conducted studies in contrastive rhetoric for both
linguistic and pedagogical purposes. Researchers such as Mauranenn and Valero-
Garcés have also carried out contrastive analyses of metatextual phrases.

3.3 Theories Behind Contrastive Rhetoric

In the following section, how contrastive rhetoric was generated in the field of ESL
will be reviewed together with the three backbones that influenced the generation of
contrastive rhetoric, i.e., the linguistic relativity hypothesis; rhetoric, which is the
study of effective argument; and text linguistics, which involves the discourse study
of written texts.

3.3.1 Contrastive Rhetoric and ESL

Contrastive rhetoric was generated when ESL professionals acknowledged the need
for teaching reading and writing to students in the 1960s. From the 1940s until the
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1960s, the method of teaching ESL in the United States was the audio-lingual method in which the emphasis was placed on students’ utterances at both pronunciation and syntax. However, in the 1960s ESL professionals became aware that this method was neither improving the students’ reading nor writing skills. They noticed that being able to speak grammatically correct English sentences with native-like pronunciation did not translate into being able to read and summarize or write a text.

The recognition of the shortcomings of the audio-lingual method led ESL researchers and applied linguists to analyze texts written by native and non-native speakers of English. The approaches and methods of analysis were derived from rhetoric and text linguistics. When the results revealed differences in the texts written by writers from different cultures, the differences were discussed based on the linguistic relativity hypothesis. Kaplan was one of the first researchers among ESL professionals to point out that students from the same culture use the same discourse patterns, i.e., that the discourse patterns were culture specific. Thus, from a pedagogical point of view, he claimed that it was important for the teachers to be aware of such differences when teaching reading and writing in ESL settings (Kaplan, 1980). Contrastive text analysis of texts written by native and non-native speakers flourished after Kaplan’s publication in 1966 and henceforth came to be called contrastive rhetoric.

Theories and studies that gave influences on the development of contrastive rhetoric are reviewed below.
3.3.2 Linguistic Relativity

The linguistic relativity hypothesis built in the first half of the 20th century is defined as 'the hypothesis that the structure of our language to some extent determines the way we perceive the world' (Trask, 1999). This hypothesis (sometimes called Sapir-Whorf hypothesis) was formed by B.L. Whorf based on E. Sapir's statement that 'Language and our thought-grooves are ..., in a sense, one and the same' (Trask, 1999).

Kaplan attributed his students' un-English-like structures and that the similarity of discourse patterns among native speakers of the same language to the linguistic relativity hypothesis. Kaplan stated that the relationship between logic, rhetoric and culture is as follows:

Logic (in the popular, rather than the logician's sense of the word) which is the basis of rhetoric, is evolved out of a culture; it is not universal. Rhetoric, then, is not universal either, but varies from culture to culture and even from time to time within a given culture. It is affected by canons of taste within a given culture at a given time.

(Kaplan, 1966 quoted in Croft, 1980, p. 400).

In short, in Kaplan's theory, logic and rhetoric are generated in cultural contexts. In the following section, the description of the discipline of rhetoric and its influence on contrastive rhetoric are discussed.

3.3.3 Rhetoric

Rhetoric is the study of appropriate expressions in terms of the lexico-grammatical choices and generic structure for a particular type of discourse. Since the study of rhetoric originated in ancient Greek judicial courts, it has long been regarded as the study of persuasion in speech rather than in written discourse. With the passage of
time, two studies in rhetoric, 'classical rhetoric' and 'new rhetoric' came to be recognized.

**(a) Classical Rhetoric**

'Classical rhetoric' was established by Aristotle in ancient Greece. According to Connor (Connor, 1996, pp. 64-66), the three major components in the communication in Aristotelian rhetoric are the speaker, the audience, and the content of the argument. A speaker, when addressing a speech had to be aware of three points: (i) the means or sources of persuasion, (ii) the language, and (iii) the arrangement of the language. The arrangement of the language refers to the organization of a composition. A well-organized composition had three parts: (i) introduction, or the description of the situation, (ii) argument and counterargument, and (iii) epilogue in which the conclusion is made. Aristotelian rhetoric was forgotten in the Middle Ages but was revived in early 20th century America by those seeking a method for teaching writing.

**(b) New Rhetoric**

In the mid 20th century, there occurred a movement in the United States called the 'new rhetoric'. Seeking a method for teaching writing other than the one based on Aristotelian rhetoric, 'new rhetoricians' used Toulmin's model of argumentative writing established by Toulmin in the 1950s to teach lawyers effective argumentation. Toulmin's model consists of three components: (i) 'claim', (ii) 'data' and (iii) 'warrant'. Toulmin explains (i) 'claim (C)' as the 'conclusion whose merits we are seeking to establish', (ii) 'data (D)' as 'the facts we appeal to as a foundation for the claim', and (iii) 'warrant' as 'propositions' or 'general, hypothetical statements,
which can act as bridges, and authorize the sort of step to which our particular argument commits us.....written very briefly (in the form ‘If D, then C’) (Toulmin, 1958). This ‘new rhetoric’ movement influenced ESL and Toulmin’s model was used in the teaching of argumentative writing in ESL classes.

Since contrastive rhetoric involves the study of the logical development of a text, both Aristotelian rhetoric and the ‘new rhetoric’ influenced it to a substantial extent. Contrastive analysts used both Aristotelian and the Toulmin text models as measures of comparison or evaluation of texts. Kaplan, for example, used the Aristotelian text model as a measure of comparison between the discourse patterns of different languages in his studies (1966, 1972). Connor (1987) and Connor and Lauer (1988) used Toulmin’s model as a measure of evaluation of persuasive writing by students from the United States, England and New Zealand.

3.3.4 Text Linguistics

Another backbone of contrastive rhetoric is text linguistics. Since text linguistics is the study of texts, it would be appropriate to start with the definition of text. Enkvist gives three different definitions of text:

(1) The definition through the intratextual description of text cohesion: a text is a string of language whose overt structure satisfies certain explicit linguistic criteria.

(2) The definition that would appeal to a receptor’s ability to build a coherent universe of discourse around a text: a text is a string of language around which the receptor can build a coherent, noncontradictory universe of discourse.

(3) The definition in terms of their use: a text ...is a string of language produced and interpreted for a certain definite social purpose’.

(Enkvist, 1987, pp. 24-26)
Kaplan, on the other hand, defines text as follows:

In the larger tradition, it has been fairly clearly established that a text is not merely an exploded sentence, that a text is a complex multidimensional structure, and that the dimensions involved include at least syntactic, semantic, and discoursal features — elements of cohesion and coherence — as well as considerations of schematic structure, of audience, and of the sociolinguistic functions of a given text

(Kaplan, 1988, p. 279)

By combining the above definitions, a text can be defined as a meaningful and coherent group of syntactically correct sentences logically arranged for a specific social objective for a certain audience in a certain situation and context.

Text linguistics, therefore, overlaps with discourse analysis, but its main concern is cohesion and coherence in a text. According to Connor, text linguistics in recent publications is treated as 'written, not spoken, discourse analysis — as an analysis of texts that extends beyond the sentence level and considers the communicative constraints of the situation' (Connor, 1996, p. 80). Enkvist writes that text linguistics 'usually means the study of linguistic devices of cohesion and coherence within a text' (Enkvist, 1987, p. 26).

The text linguistic concepts that influenced contrastive rhetoric are the concepts of 'cohesion', 'coherence' and 'schematic structure' or 'superstructure'. 'Cohesion' in text linguistics can be defined as lexico/grammatical cohesive devices to indicate the relationship between sentences and between groups of sentences. Connor, citing Halliday and Hassan, states that there are 'five general categories of cohesive devices that signal coherence in texts: referential, ellipsis, substitution, lexical, and conjunctive cohesion' (1996, p. 83). 'Coherence' in text linguistics refers to the semantic relationship in the text often at the unit of the paragraph. If a text shows
semantic unity, the text is considered coherent. In order to write a meaningful text, one has to link each logical element with cohesive devices while considering the semantic coherence of the text as a whole.

The concept of 'schematic structure', or 'superstructure' in text linguistics refers to the organizational structure of different types of texts such as exposition, argumentation and narration (Connor, 1996, p. 87). Among the famous theories of schematic structure are 'macrostructures' by van Dijk (1972) (See Chapter 2), and the 'problem-solution' text pattern by Hoey (1983). The concept of schematic structure informs that there is an appropriate schematic structure or organizational pattern for any type of text.

In contrastive rhetoric, it is assumed that differences can be found regarding the above three concepts, especially the concepts of 'coherence' and 'schematic structures, in different cultures. A text that is considered coherent in one culture might not be regarded so in other cultures. Similarly, what is thought to be the proper schematic structure of a certain type of text in one language might not be found in other languages; hence the differences in discourse patterns in different cultures.

To summarize, contrastive rhetoric studies the differences and similarities in the use of coherence and cohesion devices and schematic structure between different languages from the sociocultural viewpoint.
3.4 Approaches to Analysis in Contrastive Rhetoric

In this section, the writer will focus on the objectives and analysis methods of contrastive rhetoric.

3.4.1 Objective of Contrastive Rhetoric

In order to identify the difference in coherence strategies and schematic structure between texts, contrastive rhetoric examines the lexico-grammatical and/or structural differences found in either texts written in the same language by speakers of different languages or texts written in different languages. The texts studied should be written for similar purposes in similar settings and contexts. The text types must be the same. It is not appropriate to compare a letter with a journal article. The objective of studies in contrastive rhetoric has been mainly pedagogical; with English, the most popular language, contrasted with other languages and the conclusions drawn from the studies used to improve ESL\EFL education.

There have been some changes in the attitudes of researchers and their approaches. In the 1960s, texts were analyzed based on Anglo-American logic on the premise that the textual features of other cultures were illogical. However, as English became more and more popular as a common language among speakers of other languages, there was a growing tendency to make the readers aware of the varieties of the English language.

3.4.2 Methods of Analysis

Contrastive rhetoric can be described as an interdisciplinary study involving linguistics and one or more of the following studies: pedagogy, psychology,
sociology, anthropology, and cognitive science in recent years, with many researchers interested in the process of writing. Therefore, contrastive rhetoric is expansive in the variety of evidence to be examined and methods used by the researcher. It seems like any text study may be called contrastive rhetoric if it linguistically contrasts multiple numbers of either similar types of texts written in the same language by the speakers of different languages, or similar types of texts written in different languages. However, although there is no clear fixed model of analysis according to Purves (1988, p. 15), there are some popular ones. In this section, the writer will refer to Connor for popular approaches taken by researchers and to Kaplan for the aspects of texts studied in contrastive rhetoric.

Since contrastive rhetoric is an interdisciplinary study, there are a variety of potential methods. However, there are methods favored by a large number of researchers of the field. Combining a set of categories of methods for educational research stated by Lauer and Asher and a framework for composition analysis developed by Bereiter and Scardamalia, Connor introduced a set of methods for contrastive studies:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective inquiry</th>
<th>“identifies problems and phenomena through observation, introspection, and literature review (Bereiter and Scardamalia 1983)”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative descriptive research</td>
<td>“goes beyond case studies and ethnographies to isolate systematically the most important variables developed by these studies, to define them further, and to quantify them at least roughly, if not with some accuracy, and to interrelate them (Lauer and Asher, 1988, p. 82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction and classification studies</td>
<td>“determine the strength of a relationship between several variables and a single criterion.” (Lauer and Asher, 1988, p. 109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling surveys</td>
<td>“Sampling survey research describes a large group, a population, of people, composition, English courses, teachers, or classrooms, in terms of a sample, a smaller part of that group” (Lauer and Asher, 1988, p. 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies and ethnographies</td>
<td>“The case study is a type of qualitative descriptive research that closely examines a small number of subjects, and is guided by some theory of writing” (Lauer and Asher, 1988:33). “Ethnographic research, another kind of qualitative descriptive research, examines entire environments, looking at subjects in context” (Lauer and Asher, 1988, p. 39).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True and quasi experiments</td>
<td>True experiments involve “randomization of subjects into control and experimental groups” (Connor, 1996, p. 162)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Connor, 1996, p. 156)

Connor wrote that the methods popular among contrastive rhetoricians are surveys, text analysis, prediction studies and reflective inquiries. However, Connor recommended combinations of methods and both quantitative and qualitative research (1996, p. 162). According to her, it is important for the researcher not to be pre-occupied with the view that one particular culture is dominant to the other: there is a need to establish a ‘joint basis for comparisons’, referring to the fact that verbatim translation is impossible among languages. Researchers must be careful when selecting the subject texts not to mix the texts from different genres and also those written by different types of authors. When the research requires the assistance of more than one rater, the researcher should consider inter-rater reliability.
3.4.3 Culture and Contastive Analysis

According to Kaplan, writing is a learned activity and thus different from speaking which is an acquired activity (1987, p. 12; 1988, p. 287). Since it is a learned activity, a piece of writing reflects the writer's cultural background, for example, in the choice of topic, in the logic and logical arrangement, and the language itself. These reflect the writer's educational background and the environment in which he/she grew up. Therefore, it is presumable that differences among the texts written by the writers from different cultures can be attributed to cultural differences. In this section, the writer will discuss the text type, dimensions of the text that reflect cultural differences and educational systems with reference to Kaplan's theoretical framework of contrastive rhetoric.

(a) Writing through Composing

It would be appropriate to first describe the type of writing analyzed in contrastive rhetoric. Kaplan classifies writing into two types. The first type is writing without composing that includes list making and form filling. The second type is writing through composing which can further be classified into three categories. The first category is writing for informational purposes, such as taking notes, writing reports, summarizing, writing analyses and syntheses. The second category is writing for personal purposes, such as personal journals and letters or notes and memoranda. The third category is writing for imaginative purposes, such as fiction and poems (1988, p. 280-283, 1983). Among contrastive rhetoric researchers, the study on writing through composing which shows the language and cultural differences clearly is popular.
Writing through composing is an intellectual activity meaning that the writer needs to know the language, the subject or theme of writing as well as the prospective readers. Kaplan has identified four kinds of knowledge that are needed for the writer to write through composing. These are (i) knowledge of the language, (ii) knowledge of writing conventions (such as punctuation, paragraph indentation and other typographical conventions), (iii) knowledge of the subject and (iv) the knowledge of the prospective readers (1983). These four kinds of knowledge are not the kind of knowledge that a man possesses innately. One needs to be taught about these types of knowledge in an educational setting. However, it must be noted that educational systems differ according to cultures; therefore, how people learn writing and the way it is taught are critical issues to be studied in contrastive rhetoric.

(b) Dimensions of Text Studied and Culture

The next question to be considered is what dimensions of text reflect the above four types of knowledge. Although there are no rules or regulations stated in contrastive rhetoric, Kaplan suggests several dimensions: the semantic network of text structure, the grammatical structure, the rhetorical structure and the question of who the prospective readers are. He also sees the importance of studying the propositional structure and intrasentential grammar, although the terms have not been clearly defined (Kaplan, 1987, p. 19). Through the study of these dimensions, the researcher will be able to see culture specific features of writing.

All the dimensions of text listed above are superficial and can be easily observed. Influenced by researchers, such as Flowers and Hayes (1981) who have suggested that writing is a series of cognitive processes, Kaplan, in addition, stresses the
importance of studying the process of writing (1988, p. 280). Although no model for studying the process of writing exists in the field of contrastive rhetoric, it can be assumed that such study will involve the study of how information is processed in the course of writing to see if there is any evidence of cultural specificity.

For cultural factors that could affect the above dimensions of text, Kaplan suggests two interlocking systems. These are:

1. One deriving from the total ambient environment, from the community of speakers of which the writer is a member (and thus one that at least in some senses implicates the linguistic system
2. One deriving from the cultural conventions that surround the act of writing (1988, p. 285).

Each of the writing types mentioned have different functions and different frequencies in different cultures. In addition, there are differences in the physical appearance of text on a page. All texts are considered to have been produced under the influences of these two systems of cultural factors.

(c) Culture and Educational Systems

One factor which points to evidence of the different text patterns is educational systems. Here, Kaplan takes a further step and suggests that it is important for a researcher to investigate whether there is any other culture involved in the writer’s background apart from the education that he/she has received (Kaplan, 1988, p. 291). There are usually a multiple number of communities in one culture each having its own cultural distinctiveness. Since a person usually belongs to more than one community in a culture, members of the same culture are influenced by the culture of the different communities they belong to. Moreover, in some cultures, the education system is imposed on them by a politically stronger culture. In this case, members of
the politically weaker culture could be integrating their own cultural factors into those of the stronger culture. Studying all the cultural factors that could have influenced the writer is one approach to reaching a successful discussion on the differences in discourse patterns.

3.5 Metatextual Analysis in Contrastive Analysis

Apart from textual patterns or discourse structure, metatextual phrases have been another focus of contrastive rhetoric studies. The study of metatext, or metadiscourse, derives from text linguistics in which coherence and cohesion is the main focus of research. Recently, metatext has been studied within the realm of contrastive rhetoric. This is because the use of metatext has been found to be cultural. Crismore et al. claim that the study of metatext (metadiscourse, in his text) is meaningful because:

First, it sheds light on the nature of metadiscourse itself (still a fuzzy concept), its possible universality, and the potential suitability and application of its categories across languages. Second, contrastive studies such as this one call attention to linguistic phenomena that otherwise might go unnoticed if researchers studied each country’s language and culture separately. Finally, a cross-cultural study helps us better understand the nature of rhetoric and the use of metadiscourse as a rhetorical device in writing.

(Crismore et al., 1993).

Metatext study is also pedagogically important, as claimed by Crismore et al. in the same publication, in the sense that it will help learners to be more conscious of the differences in organization, cohesion, or coherence between their native language and the target language.

As Crismore et al. admit in the above quotation, metadiscourse is not yet an established concept. However, Muraen defines metatext as follows:
...metatext is essentially text about the text itself. It comprises those elements in text which at least in their primary function go beyond the prepositional content, like for example in the italicized part in the following sentence: ‘The paper concludes by explaining why the results of empirical work done by Chang (1983) do not correspond to the expected results.’ Metatext thus serves to organize the prepositional content of the text and to comment on it.

(Mauranen, 1993)

Metatext, in other words, is text that does not affect the propositional contents, but indicates the relationships between them.

Metatext has been categorized by many researchers and is discussed in detail below.

(a) Halliday’s Categorization

The root of the study of metatext is in Halliday’s ‘metadiscourse’ (1973), or ‘metafunctions’ (Halliday, 1994, Halliday and Hasan, 1985) of a text. According to Halliday and Hasan, ‘metafunction’ can be classified into four categories: experiential, logical, interpersonal and textual. Among these four, the latter two are more related to metatext studies. Below are the definitions of these two categories by Halliday and Hasan:

Interpersonal Metafunction: Recognize the speech function, the type of offer, command, statement, or question, the attitudes and judgments embodied in it, and the rhetorical features that constitute it as a symbolic act.

Textual Metafunction: Grasp the news value and topicality of the message, and the coherence between one part of the text and every other part.

(Halliday and Hasan 1985, p. 45)

(b) Vande Kopple’s categorization

Based on Halliday and Hasan’s categories of metafunctions, Vande Kopple proposed seven categories of metadiscourse:
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Textual Function:  
1. Text connectives (used to connect particular blocks of information to each other), e.g., first, next  
2. Code glosses (used to help readers grasp the meaning of words, phrases, or idioms), e.g., x means y  
3. Action markers (used to make the discourse act performed by the author specific), e.g., to sum up  
4. Narrators (used to let readers know who said/ wrote something), e.g., according to, as  

Interpersonal Function:  
5. Modality markers (used to assess certainty and uncertainty of prepositional content and the degree of commitment to that assessment), e.g., obviously, clearly  
6. Attitude markers (used to reveal the author’s attitudes toward the prepositional content), e.g., surprisingly, I find that...  
7. Commentaries (used to draw readers into an implicit dialogue with the author), e.g., you may not agree that...  

(Summarized in Valero-Garces, 1996)  

(c) Mau ranen’s Categorization  
Later, Mau ranen, dropped the interpersonal metadiscourse category and developed the purely textual classification system of metatext outlined below:  

| Connectors: | Conjunctions, adverbial and prepositional phrases, which indicate relationships between propositions in text; however, for example, as a result, ...  |
| Reviews: | Clauses (sometimes abbreviated), which contain an explicit indicator that an earlier stage of the text is being repeated or summarized: So far we have assumed that the corporate tax is a proportional tax on economic income.  |
| Previews: | Clauses (sometimes abbreviated), which contain an explicit indicator that a later stage of the text is being anticipated: We show below that each of the initial owners will find this policy to be utility maximizing.  |
| Action markers: | Indicators of discourse acts performed in the text: the explanation is, to express this argument in notation, to illustrate the size of this distortion, ...  |

(Mau ranen, 1993)
(d) Hyland’s Categorization

More recently, Hyland, using the term metadiscourse to refer to metatext, defines it as follows:

Metadiscourse has always been a rather fuzzy term, often characterized as simply ‘discourse about discourse’ or ‘talk about talk’. However, because it is based on a view of writing as a social and communicative engagement, it offers a very powerful way of looking at how writers project themselves into their work to manage their communicative intentions. I shall use the term ‘metadiscourse’ to discuss those aspects of the text which explicitly refer to the organization of the discourse or the writer’s stance towards either its content or the reader.

(Hyland, 2000, p. 109).

As for the categorization of metadiscourse, he first functionally distinguishes textual metadiscourse from interpersonal metadiscourse. Then he categorizes the textual metadiscourse into six categories and interpersonal metadiscourse into five categories shown in the table below.

**Table 3-1 Functions of Metadiscourse in Academic Texts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logical connectives</td>
<td>Express semantic relation between main clauses</td>
<td>in addition / but / thus / and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame markers</td>
<td>Explicitly refer to discourse acts or text stages</td>
<td>finally / to repeat / here we try to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endophoric markers</td>
<td>Refer to information in other parts of the text</td>
<td>noted above / see Fig / in section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidentials</td>
<td>Refer to sources of information from other texts</td>
<td>according to X / (1990) / Z states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code glosses</td>
<td>Help readers grasp meanings of ideational material</td>
<td>namely / e.g. / such as / i.e.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hyland, 2000, p. 111)
It should be noted that Swales treats metadiscourse (metatext) analysis as a research process in genre analysis in a negative manner because the definition of the term has not gained consensus among the researchers and the distinctions among the categories of metatext are fairly subjective (1990). However, Mauranen, and other researchers have identified interesting differences in the use of metatext between two languages, most of them involving English. The studies are pedagogically important, for metatexual devices for the cohesion and the coherence of text have been revealed to vary with language.

3.6 Previous Studies in Contrastive Rhetoric

The research done in contrastive rhetoric since Kaplan's presentation of his 1966 article is vast and wide in variety since the study is interdisciplinary. Noor (2001) categorized the methods and dimensions of text studied in contrastive analysis of expository prose into six categories and evaluated each method. The six categories are:

1. Comparison of texts written in a common second language
2. Comparison of texts written in different languages
3. Analysis of texts from different cultures to see how those languages compare in regard to certain discourse features
4. Analysis of texts in different languages to investigate reader versus writer responsibility
5. Study of texts from a certain culture to draw conclusions about the temperament of that culture
6. Study of texts to examine the influence of culture on topic accent

(Noor, 2001)
Noor’s work is meaningful in many ways; however, many of the studies have more than two themes from different categories thus making it hard to categorize them.

In this section, previous studies in the following three categories are reviewed; (i) contrastive studies on the rhetorical structure of texts written in the same second language, namely English, (ii) contrastive studies on the rhetorical structure of texts written in different languages to see linguistic (cultural) differences, and (iii) contrastive studies on the use of metatext.

Many of the works reviewed in this section focus on expository texts. However, the definition of expository text has been questioned by some researchers (Grabe, 1987; Y. Kachru, 1997). In fact, Grabe has suggested that although it is possible to ‘define expository prose as a distinct major text genre, a number of text-type distinctions exist within expository prose’ (Grabe, 1987, p. 135). Therefore, the definition of expository text in the present research will follow Hinds who, citing Longacre (1976), states that it is text that ‘simply explains a body of subject matter’ in which the ‘body’ can be animate or human. If the body is human, it should be simply a subject of explanation and analysis (Hinds, 1980, p. 120).

3.6.1 Studies of Texts in English

The review of this category includes (a) studies using ESL students’ texts and (b) genre-specific contrastive studies.
(a) Studies Using ESL Students’ Texts

After Kaplan’s article in 1966, many researchers adopted his approach and studied English texts written by speakers of different languages for ESL objectives. Ostler studied the differences in syntax and rhetorical patterns of English essays written by Arabic, English, Japanese and Spanish speakers with pedagogical objectives in mind (1988). In the same publication, she also presented her study on the structural differences between English essays written by Arabic speakers and English-speakers and claimed that English essays written by Arabic speakers has a Koranic structure. Noor (2001) has criticized these works arguing that one should not compare English texts written by native speakers of English with those written by ESL students who are still in the course of learning the language.

Connor and McCagg studied cross-cultural differences in the organizational pattern of the immediate written recall paraphrase of a rather long English expository prose (1983, 1987). The paraphrase task was carried out by university students, both native English-speakers and advanced level ESL students. The results showed that there is not much influence of L1 text structure seen in the immediate recall paragraphs by non-native speakers of English. They concluded that this could have been because the subjects did not have sufficient time to digest the contents of the passage and to restructure it.

(b) Genre-specific contrastive studies

Contrastive rhetoric studies using ESL learners’ writing may have implications for ESL/EFL settings, but may not be truly defined as contrastive studies since such studies compare and contrast English texts written by native speakers with those
written by ESL students who do not yet have a good command of the language. However, there are contrastive studies that have compared and contrasted texts written for similar purposes in similar contexts, i.e., texts from the same genre. In this section, the studies that depict the language specific differences will be reviewed followed by the discussion on internationalization observed in the rhetorical pattern of academic texts.

(i) English and Finnish

Mauranen (1991, 1996) conducted genre-specific contrastive rhetoric studies using English texts written by Finnish-speaking scholars and English-speaking scholars. Her study (1991) on academic texts written in English by Finnish scholars and English speaking scholars showed that the structural patterns of the two sets of texts were similar, although Finnish scholars were found to have difficulties with the use of connectors and reference, and with thematic development, resulting in a lack of coherence in their texts. Based on the analysis of interviews with the writers, Mauranen suggested that it is important for Finnish writers to be aware of culture-specific rhetorical patterns and to be given English text-writing training.

Mauranen carried out further research on thematic development in two different languages, English and Finnish, using L1 paragraphs written by native speakers of English and Finnish and L2 paragraphs written in English by Finnish speakers (1996). These paragraphs were taken from journal articles in the medical and economics fields. The results showed that Finnish speakers had problems in handling theme-rheme development when writing in English despite the fact that they had no such difficulties when writing in their native language. This shows the difficulty in
handling foreign language features that do not exist or exist in different forms in one's native language. Mauteranen suggested that this finding be utilized in foreign language teaching. In addition, she highlighted the 'illogical' development of text and flexibility on the reader's side:

Anyone who, for instance, in the academic world comes across non-native writer's texts should be aware of the fact that texts which consist of impeccable sentences may appear unusual, even somewhat incoherent in their organization, but that this does not necessarily result from faulty thinking. ... Thus, while it is useful for writers to widen their foreign-language competence to include textlinguistic skills, it is also at the same time necessary to increase general awareness of global discourse structures as outcomes of specific and culturally shaped strategies.

(Mauteranen, 1996, pp. 226-227)

(ii) English and Asian Languages

Eggington identified two rhetorical patterns observed in modern Korean academic texts on public administration: one traditional Korean and the other showing traces of influence of English rhetorical pattern. Korean researchers, who had studied in English speaking countries preferred the Aristotelian, linear style. However, it should be noted that:

(Although a significant number of Korean academic text is written in the Aristotelian style), significant segments of the Korean population, including college students, are unable to retain the information presented in this linear style as well as they can retain information presented in a more traditional non-linear style.

(Eggington, 1987, p. 166)

Eggington's study suggests that as the number of Korean researchers who participate in international publications increases, the preference for writing style may shift from the traditional Korean style to Aristotelian style.
Taylor and Chen carried out a contrastive study on introductions in science texts written in English by a group of Anglo-Americans, a group of Chinese and introductions written in Chinese by another group of Chinese. Their conclusion is similar to Eggington's:

Our conclusion must therefore be that there is an internationalization of scientific discourse that is nevertheless heavily qualified by significant variations in both regional and disciplinary cultures.

(Taylor and Chen, 1991)

From the above two studies on text organization by Asian writers, it can be assumed that the Westernization of rhetorical structure of research articles is in progress in Asian academic discourse communities, although there are still many researchers who have difficulty adapting to the change.

(iii) English and Czech

Westernization of rhetorical structure seems to be happening not only in Asian languages. Čmejrková carried out a moves analysis study of English academic texts written by Czech scholars and found that the text structure which once resembled those of German academic text now resembles English text and concludes that this is due to their 'cross-road position in Central Europe' and due to 'their wish to enter (English speaking) Europe' (1996).

3.6.2 Studies of Texts in Different Languages

The study of texts written in different languages usually compares texts written by native speakers. Generally, the results of the studies in this category have revealed the existence of language-specific rhetorical patterns and their differences. Since the
present study is a contrastive study on English and Japanese research articles, contrastive studies on English and Japanese will be emphasized.

(a) *English and other languages*

The IEA (The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement) Study of Written Composition which is one of the IEA projects started by Purves, is briefly introduced in Connor as follows:

The aim of the project is to describe the current situation in composition teaching in different cultures. The final IEA project data set will include some 20,000 compositions by students of three age levels (12, 16, 18) from 16 participating countries.

(Connor, 1987, p. 58)

The IEA Writing Study's objective is to see how one becomes literate in a particular community in a particular culture under the influence of the school system, home background and other cultural factors (See Purves, 1987, Vähäpassi, 1988). Some contrastive rhetoric studies using IEA data have been conducted by Purves (1988).

Connor used IEA data to analyze argumentative patterns (persuasive writing) in L1 compositions. This was a neglected area in contrastive rhetoric in which the expository prose was often the main concern (Connor, 1987; Connor and Lauer, 1988). In her study carried out in 1987, she studied argumentative patterns of L1 compositions from England, Finland, Germany and the United States. Underlining the importance of looking at the process of writing, she analyzed the compositions linguistically, psycholinguistically and sociolinguistically to see why the writer chose certain sentence types. Her research revealed that the use of Situation + Problem + Solution + Evaluation pattern is weak in Finnish and German texts, compared with the others. However, one limitation of the study is that she did not mention how she
studied these L1 compositions: whether she used translations of the compositions or read the original compositions on her own is not clarified anywhere. Connor and Lauer’s study (1988) compared and contrasted L1 texts from three English speaking countries: England, the United States and New Zealand. They studied the superstructure, informal reasoning, and persuasive appeals observed in the data and interestingly found out that there were cross-cultural differences among these three groups of L1 texts.

Yamuna Kachru carried out a contrastive study of L1 expository writings (literary criticism texts and scientific texts) in Hindi and American English. She studied culturally determined theoretical structures, cohesive devices and stylistic choices observed in the data. The study involved both psychological and sociocultural approaches. The findings suggest that rhetorical structure is language-specific. However, the writings from both languages showed ‘linear’ and ‘circular’ development. Kachru did not address the possibility of Hindi text being influenced by the structure of English text.

Other popular studies in this category are Clyne’s on German and English texts (1983, 1987) in which he studied the difference in rhetorical organization between the two languages, and works by Hinds, which will be introduced in detail in the following section.

(b) English and Japanese

Contrastive rhetoric studies on Japanese and English can be classified into two major categories: (i) lexicon and syntax (microscopic study) and (ii) rhetorical organization
macroscopic study). Maynard’s studies (1994, 1996) are examples of a microscopic study. However, since the present study is on rhetorical organization and coherence and cohesive devices in the English and Japanese research articles, the focus of this section will be on macroscopic studies.

Many of the earlier contrastive studies on Japanese and English rhetorical patterns were conducted by John Hinds. Hinds’ studies were carried out using texts written in English by English speakers and texts written in Japanese by Japanese speakers. According to Connor (1996, p. 42), Hinds was the first to criticize Kaplan’s first work saying that Japanese expository writing is systematically developed in a way that is different from western logical tradition (Hinds, 1980, 1983). Hinds, in his works published in the 1980s and 1990s, continued to clarify and specify Japanese rhetorical patterns as observed in expository texts. Following Hinds, Kobayashi (1984), Oi (1986), Kubota (1997, 1998), Oi and Kamimura (1997, 1998) have been conducting studies on the rhetorical pattern of Japanese expository texts for both academic and pedagogical objectives by examining and elaborating on Hind’s theory. Following is a review of Hinds’ studies and studies by other researchers.

1) Hinds’ Studies on Japanese Rhetorical Pattern

Hinds’ studies on Japanese expository texts started with his research on the rhetorical pattern of Japanese expository writing, especially the Japanese traditional rhetorical pattern ‘ki-shoo-ten-ketsu’ (1980, 1983). ‘Ki-shoo-ten-ketsu’ originally comes from the classical pattern of Chinese poetry and consists of four units. Hinds, citing Takemata (1976), described each unit as follows:
(ki) First, begin one’s argument.

(shoo) Next, develop that.

(ten) At the point where this development is finished, turn the idea to a subtheme where there is a connection, but not a directly connected association [to the major theme].

(ketsu) Last, bring all of this together and reach a conclusion.


In an article published in 1980, Hinds also introduced another popular structure ‘jō-na-kyuu’ in which the theme of the prose is mentioned repeatedly. With some examples from Japanese newspaper articles (expository prose), he wrote that Japanese paragraph contained (i) an introduction, (ii) directly or indirectly related comments, and (iii) an optional generalization or summation, or both. Although different from the hierarchical structure observed in English expository prose, Hinds emphasized that Japanese expository prose was written systematically based on its own structural pattern in which the writer consistently returned to the baseline theme. Thus, he argued against Kaplan’s theory in which English expository text was described as more systematically structured than text in any other language.

In 1984, Hinds, as cited in Connor (1996, p. 41-43), published another article in which he continued to claim that Japanese rhetorical pattern was systematic based on his study of an essay column ‘Tensei Jingo’ in Asahi Shimbun, a major newspaper in Japan. The subject of the column was either current news or seasonal topics often related to nature. The column was popular among Japanese people for its academic, yet literary, tone. The column was translated into English and printed in the Asahi Evening News, the English version of the paper, under the title of ‘Vox Popli, Vox
Dei’. In the article, Hinds showed how the column followed Japanese traditional ‘ki-shoo-ten-ketsu’ pattern and wrote that despite its popularity among Japanese speakers, English speakers did not evaluate it highly because it lacked ‘unity’, ‘focus’ and ‘cohesion’ from their point of view (Connor, 1996).

In 1987, Hinds analyzed expository prose using a new typology basis, ‘responsibility’. Based on his study on ‘Tensei Jingo’, Hinds claimed that in Japanese expository prose, the writer expects the reader to process the written information and make out the writer’s argument. In other words, it is the reader’s responsibility to understand the prose. On the other hand, in English expository prose, it is the writer’s responsibility to make the prose understandable for the readers.

Hinds, based on his study again on ‘Tensei-Jingo’, characterized Japanese writing style as ‘quasi-inductive’ which is different either from deductive or inductive. He explained how he reached the conclusion:

We may more appropriately characterize this writing as quasi-inductive recognizing that this technique has as its purpose the task of getting readers to think for themselves, to consider the observations made, and to draw their own conclusions. The task of the writer, then, is not necessarily to convince, although it is clear that such authors have their own opinions. Rather, the task is to stimulate the reader into contemplating an issue or issues that might not have been previously considered.

(Hinds, 1990, pp. 99-100)

He goes on to add that English speakers must understand that their traditional inductive or deductive style may not be well applied to texts written by non-native speakers of English (Hinds, 1990, pp. 99-100).
Thus Hinds' characterization of Japanese expository prose developed from the mere introduction of the traditional 'ki-shoo-ten-ketsu' pattern to his own characterization of it as 'quasi-inductive'. Throughout, Hinds was consistent in asserting that Japanese rhetorical organization is not unsystematic, as described by Kaplan (1966), but is systematic in its own way. Hinds' assertion of this was timely as other linguists were starting to divert from the western centered point of view to one that values the characteristics of each culture. However, Hinds' studies could not avoid criticism for they were based on expository prose with sample texts taken solely from one newspaper column, i.e., 'Tensei-Jingo'.

(ii) Other Studies on Japanese Rhetorical Pattern

Inspired by Hinds, other researchers, most of them Japanese, conducted their own research on Japanese rhetorical patterns. In the 1980s, the researchers seemed to have agreed that there is a culturally preferred rhetorical pattern and that the Japanese rhetorical pattern can be generalized as inductive (specific to general) rather than deductive (general to specific).

Burtoff (1983), as cited in Kubota (1998), carried out a study to identify and describe culture-specific strategies beyond the scope of the explicitly taught rhetorical conventions in English essays written by English-speaking, Japanese-speaking and Arabic-speaking students. His findings revealed that Japanese writers tended to conclude essays with a generalization.

Kobayashi (1984) studied narrative and expository texts written by four groups of students: U.S. college students, Japanese advanced ESL students in the U.S., and two
groups of Japanese college students in Japan, i.e., English majors and non-English majors. The first three groups wrote compositions in English while the last group, i.e., the non-English majors, wrote compositions in Japanese. Her study revealed that Japanese students who wrote in Japanese tended to use the ‘Specific to General’ pattern: they began with specifics and concluded with a general statement. American students, on the other hand, tended to use the ‘General to Specific’ pattern: they began with a general statement followed by specifics.

Ostler (1988) compared the syntactic measures and rhetorical patterns in English texts written by Arabic, English and Japanese speakers and found that Japanese writers tended to develop the theme in the latter part of their essay, moving away from the initial topic.

Oi’s study in 1986 and Oi and Kamimura’s study in 1997, both on the rhetorical pattern of Japanese and American students’ argumentative essays, also revealed that while American writers preferred the ‘General to Specific’ pattern, Japanese writers preferred the ‘Specific to General’ pattern, or the ‘Omission’ pattern in which the theme was missing due to the writer’s intention to avoid expressing his/her opinion explicitly (Kamimura and Oi, 1998).

In the 1990s, these conclusions were challenged by Kubota’s dissertation published in 1992, cited in Connor (1996). Kubota discovered that Japanese and English L1 expository and persuasive essays were written according to the ‘Specific to General’ pattern. However, she also found that when asked to evaluate styles, about half of the Japanese students showed a preference for the ‘General to Specific’ pattern. She
claimed that this is because Japan had been politically and economically influenced by the Western world. In her papers published in 1997 and 1998, Kubota emphasized the dynamics of Japanese rhetorical pattern as follows:

The purpose of this article is to present arguments that challenge the premise that Japanese written texts are characterized by a unique cultural convention identified as ki-sho-ten-ketsu and are very different from English texts. The first argument is that language and culture need to be viewed as dynamic rather than exotic and static. Second, the claim that ki-sho-ten-ketsu constitutes a typical pattern for Japanese expository prose is overgeneralized from a small number of selected samples. Third, the multiple and often conflicting interpretations and functions of ki-sho-ten-ketsu offered by Japanese composition specialists bring into question the legitimacy of claiming this pattern as the typical preferred style in Japanese. Finally, a review of the development of the modern Japanese language reveals a continuous influence of English and European languages on Japanese writing.

(Kubota, 1997)

In summary, based on his research on the Japanese rhetorical pattern 'ki-shoo-ten-ketsu', Hinds claimed that Japanese rhetoric is as systematic as English rhetoric. However, other researchers, besides Hinds, have come to the conclusion that Japanese rhetorical pattern is inductive whereas English rhetorical pattern is deductive. Despite this, Kubota has emphasized the dynamism of genre. Further studies have to be done on Western influence on Japanese rhetoric in order to study this aspect.

3.6.3 Studies on Metatext

In 1993, Mauranen studied the use of metatext in Finnish and English economic texts and discussed the differences between the two. English-speaking scholars used more metatext than Finish speaking scholars, while Finish text showed a more 'reader-responsible' features, i.e., features that show that greater reliance on assumed shared knowledge is placed on the reader. She concluded:
Despite a relative uniformity of academic papers imposed by requirements of the genre, there is significant intercultural variation in the rhetorical preference of writers.

(Mauranen, 1993)

Inspired by Mauranen, Valero-Garcés (1996) studied the use of metatext in Spanish and English economic texts and drew similar conclusions: Spanish-speaking writers use less metatext and their text shows a more reader-responsible features compared with Anglo-American scholars. From these studies, it can be assumed that English writers consciously use metatextual phrases to maintain cohesion and coherence within the text, while Finnish and Spanish writers tend to rely on the readers to process the information in the text.

3.7 Summary

Contrastive rhetoric developed in the ESL field based on the assumption that the differences between L1 and L2 English texts can be attributed to the students’ native culture which may be inherently different from the English speaking culture. Kaplan was the first to point out that the logical development of a text differs according to the language and culture of the writers. Following Kaplan, researchers like Connor and Hinds carried out studies on the differences in the discourse structures observed in texts by writers from different cultures.

Contrastive rhetoric studies on discourse structure have revealed that there are non-English speaking cultures that are now in the course of shifting from their traditional logical development of discourse to Aristotelian logical development of discourse. This is because more and more researchers from non-English speaking cultures are
working in English speaking environments. However, those who are used to the traditional logical development have difficulty in adopting the Aristotelian rhetorical structure. Further research in contrastive rhetoric will be necessary to draw effective pedagogical implications for both ESL (English as Second Language) and ESP (English for Specific Purposes) fields.

Another focus of contrastive rhetoric is the study of metatext. Mauranen is the forerunner in the field. The study of metatextual phrases reveals the differences in the use of the coherence and cohesion devices between different languages. Contrastive studies on metatextual phrases are significant in that they provide both theoretical and pedagogical implications for the field of language teaching in applied linguistics.