

Rhetorical Decisions in L1 and L2 Writing: How Do Novice Japanese Writers Differ?

Hiroe Kobayashi

1. Introduction

With the progress of globalization, individual expression of opinions and ideas is gaining importance and more emphasis is being placed on debate and opinion writing in school education in Japan (Ministry of Education, 1998, 1999). In these activities, students are asked to present their ideas and opinions in a logical way. In relation to writing, in particular, whereas the traditional composition training that focuses on the expression of personal thoughts and feelings (Watanabe, 2001) is still stressed in *Kokugo* (L1 Japanese) classes in elementary or junior high school, opinion-writing practice is often provided in senior high schools, mostly outside regular classes to help students prepare for essay writing on university entrance exams (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2002). This special writing training, according to the students interviewed, is given on a short-term basis ranging from 1 to 4 months through individualized instruction prior to the entrance exams. According to a large-scale questionnaire survey conducted (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2002), a great number of Japanese high schools (85% of 79 sample schools chosen nationwide) provided such special L1 essay writing training.

Given the fact that a significant number of high school students received this writing training, the instruction was considered to be a potentially influential factor affecting the quality of Japanese students' L1 and L2 (second language) writing after entering university. Thus, a subsequent study (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2004a, 2004b) was undertaken to examine possible effects of such specialized writing training in L1

and also L2 (English) on the Japanese and English writing of first year university students. The significant findings of this study indicate (1) that the special writing training in both L1 and L2 languages affected the students' choices of discourse mode (e.g., argumentation and exposition) and structure across the two languages and (2) that there were differences among those with different kinds of training, as well as among those with similar training in their choices of such rhetorical features (see Table 1 in Appendix 1). That is, while the choices differed among the groups involved, there were individual differences in the students' use of discourse markers and structures within each group.

Following these findings, the present study takes one step further to examine individual students' writing in more depth to find out (1) what rhetorical features individual writers chose commonly across L1 and L2 writing, and also (2) what factors possibly affected their choice of such features in their writing. To achieve this goal, the study is of an exploratory nature, looking at a selected number of students who consistently employed the same discourse mode in their L1 and L2 writing. The rationale for this selection is that these students would give us more insight into the nature of transfer across the two languages. The section below discusses theoretical background relevant to the present study.

1.1 Theoretical background

Since the seminal work by Kaplan (1966), contrastive rhetoric has made an enormous contribution to the pedagogy of English writing by giving an impetus to explore cultural differences in rhetorical patterns (Hinds, 1987, 1990; Kobayashi, 1984; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 1996; Kubota, 1998a, 1998b; Liebman, 1992). Despite this contribution, however, it has generated much heated discussion over its theoretical assumptions (Connor, 2005; Kubota, 1997; Kubota & Lehner, 2004, 2005; Matsuda, 1997). Kubota and Lehner (2004) contended "contrastive rhetoric has perpetuated static binaries between English and other languages and viewed students as culturally lacking" (p. 7).

That is, contrastive rhetoric has been criticized as tending to essentialize cultures, thus implying the superiority of English rhetoric against those of other written languages, and also as viewing second language writers as "little more than products of a static culture" (Leki, 2000, p. 103).

This static view of culture and the writer, in particular, has received much criticism from other researchers (Matsuda, 1997; Leki, 2000). Spack (1997a), for example, argued that students' approach toward writing is not shaped solely by their cultural and educational backgrounds; it interacts with the academic contexts where students are currently studying. In fact, by means of a longitudinal study of one student coping with a new academic context, she demonstrated how the writer changed from an initial stage where her first language educational background influenced her view of writing to a later stage where she became a part of the new academic community through dynamic interaction with her course instructors and course assignments (Spack, 1997b). Similarly, Matsuda (1997) contended that in the static view, "the writer is not granted agency; he or she does not have the autonomy to make decisions in spite of the circumstance" (p.49), and suggested that factors such as the writer's past experience with the genre and with the particular discourse community also affect students' writing, particularly in the choice of rhetorical features. The underlying assumptions of these views are that culture is not static, but rather dynamic, undergoing changes as time passes, and students are individuals who can make their own decisions in writing.

Against Kubota & Lehner's criticisms, in particular, Connor argued that it is not accurate to view contrastive rhetoric as "static, essentializing, and assimilationist" (2005, p. 135). She maintained that contrastive rhetoric looks at dynamic inter-linguistic / cultural influences; for example, how the academic writing styles of returnee academicians who had studied at US institutions changed (for example, Eggington, 1987). It also includes the point of view of World and International Englishes, dealing with English and EFL (English

as a foreign language) varieties in genre-specific writing. It is apparent that the new contrastive rhetoric advocated by Connor (1996) has expanded its scope by taking a broader, more communicative view of rhetoric across cultures and has continued to generate research in the area of contrastive / intercultural rhetoric (See Connor, 1996, for a comprehensive view; Hirose, 2003; Liu, 2005).

Whereas theoretical discussions over contrastive rhetoric still continue (see for more discussion, Casanave, 2004; Connor, 2005, and Kubota and Lehner, 2005), recent studies have observed dynamic changes in the rhetoric of writing taking place in Japan. Kobayashi and Rinnert (2002) found that the features given in the special preparatory high school level writing resemble those cited as the typical characteristics of English writing; for example, students are asked to take a clear position, for or against the author's assertion or on a social issue presented in the reading materials, and to substantiate it with personal experience, observations or facts. Furthermore, the logical organization of ideas emphasized in the L1 writing training is deductive, in the sense that an opinion or a main idea is stated in the beginning of the writing, followed by details in the body, and often restated in the end. This rhetorical pattern contrasts with an inductive approach, which was once identified as a preferred Japanese one (Hinds, 1990; Kobayashi, 1984).

With such dynamic changes in mind, recent research on second language writing clearly indicates that a variety of factors affect students' construction of L2 text, namely, past L2 writing experience, L1 writing ability, L2 language proficiency, and L2 writing instruction (Cummings, 1989; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001, 2004b; Sasaki, 2002; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996). Whereas these multiple factors have been found to influence the process and product of students' L2 writing, it is possible that such factors as past L1 writing experience and instruction affect their L1 writing as well.

1.2 The study

The present study is descriptive, focusing on a small group of students who experienced special writing training in either L1 or L2 or both languages. By analyzing the essays written by these students, the study aims to identify common rhetorical features that appear across their L1 and L2 essays, and also to explore possible factors affecting their use of such features. The study uses a part of the data collected in the previous study (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2004a). In the section to follow, the participants and the database are described, respectively.

2. Method

2.1 Selection of participants

Five university students were drawn from among 28 students who participated in the previous study (Kobayashi & Rinnert 2004a). In that study, they were all asked to write two essays, one in Japanese and the other in English, in responding to two open-ended topics ("living at home or living alone" for Topic 1 and "traveling with a group or traveling alone" for Topic 2). A total of eight students (30% of all the participants) chose the same discourse mode across the two languages, and five of the eight were selected particularly for this study based on students' special writing training and kinds of discourse mode chosen (see Table 1 in Appendix 1).

Two of the five students were selected from Group 1 ($N = 9$), which consisted of students with intensive experience writing essays in both L1 and L2, another two from Group 2 ($N = 7$), those with intensive experience writing in only L1, and one from Group 3 ($N = 7$), those with such experience in only L2. No students were chosen from Group 4 ($N = 5$) due to having no such experience in either language. The main criterion for selection of students for each of those distinctive groups were the number of essays that they had written during their intensive training; they wrote 8 - 10 or more in either L1 or L2, or both.

The discourse modes that were chosen varied among these five

students; two chose the Argumentation mode (position taken in favor of one side and support given), one Exposition (no position taken; thesis and explanation), while the other two used a Mixed mode, which combines two different modes (Exposition -> Argumentation, and Self-reflection -> Exposition). The students were selected to represent their respective group members who had chosen the same discourse mode across the two languages, although Group 3 with L2 training only had just one such student.

Of these 5 students, 4 were female and 1 was male, and they were assigned the following pseudonyms in this study: Yoko, Noriko, Motoko, Harue, and Koichiro. They were all novice L2 writers with no English writing instruction at the college level, and as first-year students they had not had many chances to write reports in Japanese yet. Their English proficiency was held constant at an intermediate level, according to a computerized CASEC test¹ (ranges for CAEC scores: 534 to 668 points; ranges for TOEFL equivalent: 438 to 493 points), although one student, Motoko, had a slightly lower score than the others. Table 2 below indicates the students' profiles by the special writing training they received and their English test scores.

Table 2. Participants' profiles

Participants	Writing experience	English Proficiency Score	
		CASEC	TOEFL equivalence
Yoko	L1&L2	634	478
Noriko	L1&L2	601	491
Koichi	L1 only	681	493
Motoko	L1 only	534	438
Harue	L2 only	668	491

2.2 Data

Several kinds of data were used for analysis, including essays written in English and Japanese, video-taped recordings of individual writer's composing processes, and audio-taped recordings of the

interview sessions. The previous study (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2004a) collected the data by eliciting students' essays through open-ended prompts to see how the students' past writing experience would affect their ways of responding to the given tasks. To control for possible topic effect, the prompts were alternated, with half of the students in each group writing on Topic 1 ("place to live") in Japanese and on Topic 2 ("travel") in English, and the other half doing the opposite. Following this procedure, three students (Yoko, Motoko and Harue) in the present study wrote on Topic 1 first in Japanese and then on Topic 2 in English, whereas the other two (Noriko and Koichi) wrote on Topic 2 in Japanese and then Topic 1 in English. The students were allowed to use an electric dictionary and to take as much time as they needed to complete their essays. This is partly because students' past writing experience was varied and also because we wanted them to write freely, not being constrained by feelings of insecurity about writing essays in English.

The interview was conducted immediately after each essay was completed, and students were asked 23 question items related to their composing process (for example, how much they had planned before actually writing), their audience awareness, their L1 and L2 writing background and effects of specialized L1 essay writing training and L2 writing training. The present study gave special attention to the seven questions below to obtain the students' writing training background and their perceptions of the training. It should be noted, however, that not all seven questions were applicable to the five students due to their different writing training background.

- Q1. What did you learn from the specialized Japanese essay writing training you received?
- Q2. Does the L1 training affect your current Japanese writing?
- Q3. What did you learn from the specialized English writing training you received?
- Q4. Does the L2 training still affect your English writing?

- Q5. Do you think you are still influenced by the L1 training when you write in English?
- Q6. Do you think you are still influenced by the L2 training when you write in Japanese?
- Q7. Which training do you think has provided greater impact, L1 or L2 training?

3. Results

3.1 Yoko and Noriko, with L1 and L2 writing experience

Nearly half of the students (43%) in Group 1 employed the same discourse mode in L1 and L2 writing. Of the four students using the same mode, only Yoko chose the Mixed mode (Exposition -> Argumentation), whereas Noriko, similar to the other two students, used Argumentation consistently. The following features were the same in both L1 and L2 essays written by these students, respectively.

Yoko

- 1) inductive approach
- 2) overall structure including comparison and contrast
- 3) frequent use of discourse markers
- 4) avoiding repetition of the same expressions

Noriko

- 1) deductive approach
- 2) overall structure and internal structure
- 3) prioritizing ideas
- 4) frequent use of discourse markers
- 5) avoiding absolute statement of ideas

Overall, Yoko took an inductive approach in the Mixed mode, first giving comparison and contrast of the two sides of the given topic (Exposition) and then some analysis or an extended perspective,

ending with a statement of a position (Argumentation). [A word in parentheses indicates discourse mode.] Although the overall structure was similar between L1 and L2 writing, her Japanese essay on "Place to live" included an extended perspective that functioned to connect the two different discourse modes smoothly. However, she failed to make such a smooth connection between the two modes in her English essay on "Travel" because the analysis part did not contain an effective transition: the writer simply pulled out one of the reasons stated earlier and added a new reason, and then moved on to a clear statement of her chosen position (see her complete Japanese and English essays in Appendix 2).

The interview data revealed why she chose an inductive approach for the overall structure of her L1 and L2 essays, yet with some difference in the internal structure of the body. According to her account, she learned in the individual tutoring sessions that a conclusion or an opinion can be placed in either the beginning or the final part of a Japanese essay. Given this option, she chose the final position to place an opinion in both L1 and L2 writing. She explained, "I'm in favor of this movement because it is more persuasive to readers when they hear what I see or observe before I come to any conclusion." That is, the choice of an inductive rhetorical pattern reflected her strong desire to gain the reader's understanding of her ideas. Within this inductive overall frame, however, her meta-knowledge of Japanese and English writing brought a difference between the two languages to the internal structure of the body. In her view, the focal point of Japanese writing is to interest or surprise the reader with unique or in-depth ideas, whereas that of English writing is to convey one's ideas clearly and definitely. Based on this perception, she developed an extended perspective in the body of the Japanese essay, which she called "ten (change)," following the traditional Japanese rhetorical pattern, *ki-sho-ten-ketsuron* (introduction-continuation- change-conclusion) that she had in her mind. She explained her rationale for "ten":

I think "ten" is important. The reader would enjoy it, saying "Oh, here is a change ... it's changed a lot ... Having "ten" would make the writing more interesting, so I always want to include it in my writing when I have a good idea for "ten."

Although it has been pointed out that the traditional rhetorical pattern is not suitable for opinion-statement writing (Kotou, 1999), Yoko appeared to believe that this pattern could be applied to the writing of a Japanese short essay. In contrast, she did not include the "ten" in her English essay; she wrote the essay in a three-part form consisting of *kyoron* (introduction), *honron* (body) and *ketsuron* (conclusion) in order to convey her idea clearly to the reader.

Whereas Yoko made a decision on the use of discourse mode and essay structure based on her own preference, discourse markers were used and the same expressions were avoided, according to her, under the influence of the English writing training she had received. First, she made frequent use of discourse markers, particularly those at an overall essay level, such as *Which one is more beneficial traveling alone or group travel?* and *I came to the conclusion* and also at a partial discourse level (connecting paragraphs or multi-sentential chunks of discourse writing paragraphs), such as *First*, and *In addition*. Yoko employed such meta-discourse markers 9 times in her English essay and 6 times in her Japanese essay. To illustrate her use of meta-discourse markers, the second paragraph of her English essay is shown below [the underlined italic phrase and sentence indicate meta-discourse markers and throughout this paper, students' errors remain intact] :

First, I'd like to observe on strong point of traveling alone. First of all, it is good for use not to bother anyone. So, we can travel freely. *Besides*, we can get a sense of responsibility, because we have to do everything by oneself. *In addition* to that, if we are in group, we are apt to satisfy without meeting something new, but if we are alone, we tend to seek meeting

more positively.

Yoko was well aware of the role discourse markers played in the text; she said, "I do want my readers to follow my ideas easily and clearly, so I used connectives" (this is an English translation of her Japanese word "*setsuzokushi*", which she could use to refer to both inter-sentential markers such as connectives and meta-discourse markers).

Another feature she transferred from L2 to L1 writing was to avoid the use of the same expressions. In the composing process, for example, she replaced an adjective "strong" with "attractive" when she described a positive point of travel for the second time in her English essay. She also changed a Japanese word "*kikai* (chance)" in Chinese characters into *chansu* (chance) in *katakana* (one type of Japanese syllabic presentation usually used for borrowed English words). According to her, she learned that the repeated use of the same words is not preferred in English writing, and she applied it to Japanese writing, too.

It appears that Yoko had meta-knowledge about English and Japanese writing and she perceived that each writing has a different purpose, English for communicating message clearly to the reader and Japanese for stimulating the reader with unique perspectives. In spite of such perceptions, she was greatly concerned about the reader in terms of how the reader could follow what she conveyed. Such concern tends to transcend languages, which was likely to induce her to employ rhetorical features such as an inductive pattern and meta-discourse markers commonly in both L1 and L2 writing.

As opposed to Yoko, Noriko chose the single mode of Argumentation across the two languages. In both essays, she first stated her opinion, then gave reasons to support it and ended with a restatement of her opinion. Within this deductive frame, she also developed the body of the essay in exactly the same way in L1 and L2 writing by enumerating three reasons. The English essay below illustrates the structure Noriko employed [the underlined part indicates meta-discourse markers] :

It is necessary for University students to live with their families, because they don't have to spend their money for a house rent and they can save money. So they can spend money for another things, for buying textbooks and so on.

Besides, they have less need to do household works; they can live without washing their clothes. And they don't have to do part time job.

Most importantly, it help students spending their time for only studying. They can concentrate studying only, because they don't have to earn money or do household things, like I above-mentioned.

Therefore, I think college or University students should live with their families.

According to her, she learned the above structure in the English writing training she received in a preparatory school. Furthermore, she was taught the importance of discourse markers (in her term, "connectives"), and learned to place a key discourse marker at the beginning of a paragraph, as evidenced by her use of *Besides*, *Most importantly* and *Therefore*² in the above essay. By applying this knowledge, she repeatedly practiced writing essays in English, and this practice helped her to internalize the structural knowledge. The planning stage prior to actual writing reflected this: on the blank sheet she was given, she first stated a position, "It is better for college students to live with their family," and then listed three supporting points in Japanese.

According to her explanation, Noriko did not learn how to structure text in the Japanese writing training. Instead, she was told to write in anyway she would like without being restricted by a certain type of organization. What she had learned from the L1 training, however, was to prioritize ideas and to avoid an overly strong statement of ideas. When she was planning for the above essay, she took time to prioritize the three reasons, and decided that "it [living

with a family] help students spending their time for only studying" was the most important. For her, the most important reason was what she wanted to tell the reader most, and it had to be placed toward the end of the essay. She said:

To tell my position is not that important. What is important to me is to tell the strongest reason for my opinion. I usually place this reason toward the end. Why? If I started it too early, the reader might lose interest in reading the whole essay. I want to keep the reader's interest until the end.

Although ordering of importance is also a part of English writing (Smalley and Hank, 1982), Noriko's comment above echoes what Yoko said about her preference for an inductive approach. Just as Yoko liked to tell the most important idea toward the end of her essays, so did Noriko, albeit within a deductive frame, due to her great concern for the reader.

The two rhetorical features Noriko described above were also observed in her Japanese essay. Although she did not spend much time on planning, she reported she had a general direction for writing before starting to write: that is, to write about reasons and place the most important one toward the end of the essay. When she actually started, she wrote each paragraph as one entire chunk by attaching to its beginning the following meta-discourse markers: *First* and *Secondly*, and *Finally the biggest reason I think*. The two essays turned out to be almost identical in terms of overall and internal structure. Nevertheless, there was one marked difference between the two: Noriko developed the most important reason in much more detail and with a unique perspective for her Japanese writing, whereas she did not elaborate it as much in her English writing.

The fifth common feature was to avoid expressing ideas in a rigid form in both L1 and L2 writing. According to her, if the writer stated

an idea in too strong a form, there was a likelihood that she would face counter-arguments by potential readers. With this idea in mind, she revised the Japanese sentence, "This is a kind of experience we cannot get when we travel in a group" into "This is a kind of experience we may not get quite easily ... ," and in a similar fashion, she changed an English sentence "They don't have need to do household works," into "They have less need to do household works [the underlined part shows her original and the double line indicates its revision]. She learned from her L1 writing training to soften her expression to avoid any potential objections by the readers, and transferred it to her English writing.

By having received both L1 and L2 writing training, Yoko and Noriko gained meta-knowledge about writing in each language and also had chances to apply such knowledge to actual writing. Through this experience, they apparently developed their own sense of writing style, by incorporating what they thought to be of value for their writing, particularly for the reader's sake. As shown above, what was chosen by these writers tended to transfer across the two different languages.

3.2 Koichiro and Motoko, with L1 writing training only

Similar to Group 1, who had both L1 and L2 writing training, almost half of the students (44%) in Group 2, with L1 writing only, chose the same discourse mode across the two languages. Koichiro used Argumentation, and Motoko, like another G2 student, employed Exposition consistently. The features below were commonly seen in both their L1 and L2 writing.

Koichiro

- 1) deductive approach
- 2) overall structure with counter-argument
- 3) frequent use of discourse markers

Motoko

- 1) deductive approach
- 2) overall structure
- 3) original thesis
- 4) use of discourse markers
- 5) stating important ideas in a definite form
- 6) concrete examples

The structure Koichiro created for Argumentation in his L1 and L2 essays largely consisted of four parts: position, counter-argument, supporting reasons and position. For example, in his Japanese essay, he first stated his preference for "traveling alone," and immediately after that, he discussed advantages of the opposite side, such as the safety of group traveling. However, he refuted those advantages by saying that "*I think* they are *not* needed for traveling," because he thought that the purpose of traveling is to get away from everyday affairs, but traveling with friends puts us back into the same daily routine. After this refutation, he developed one strong reason to support his position based on his concept of travel, and then moved on to restate the position. When writing in English, Koichiro basically followed the same overall structure including counter-argument and refutation, and even the same expression for negation, "*I think* it's *not* so important" when he refuted the advantages of living with a family [the underlined italic phrases in the two quotations above indicate the same expression]. Furthermore, in order to signal the structure clearly in both Japanese and English, he did not forget to use meta-discourse markers such as "*There are many merits when we travel in a group.*"

The use of such a rather complex structure accords with the recommended features of English argumentative structure (Langan, 2000). According to him, however, he learned it in his L1 writing training, together with the concept of the short essay. In the interview, he told about this concept, "the purpose of a short essay is to tell your opinion and why you think that way, and so I think a short essay has to

be logical, consisting of an opinion and reasons." Not only had he gained the knowledge from the training, but he also practiced writing essays many times by applying it to his Japanese writing, reportedly having been given chances to write and receive feedback from teachers at a variety of places including individual tutoring sessions, a correspondence course for essay writing and regular Japanese classes. Through this practice, he apparently internalized the concept of a short essay, and learned to make a clear distinction between an essay and *sakubun*, in which he perceived that the writer conveys his or her feelings and thoughts. When given a writing task, he first asked the researcher the question, "Am I supposed to write a short essay or *sakubun*?" After having heard the researcher's response, "You can write in anyway you like," he followed what he thought he had to do in essay writing for college entrance exams in the course of writing.

The fact that Koichiro used a very similar structure for Argumentation to that of a typical English essay suggests that his Japanese instruction on argumentative writing may have been heavily influenced by English writing conventions or it could be taken to support the argument that the four-part argumentative essay is a modern version of the traditional Japanese pattern, *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* (Cahill, 2003). While this issue remains unresolved, it was Koichiro's view of the short essay that facilitated his transferring the structural knowledge to his English writing.

As opposed to Koichiro's choice of Argumentation, Motoko used Exposition, which was the most frequently used mode by all the students writing in Japanese (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2004a). The overall structures she created in both L1 and L2 writing were the same in terms of having a thesis, explanation and repetition of the thesis. However the internal structure of the body, which explains the thesis, was different. She developed the body of her L1 essay by explaining her own thesis, "I think that the act of choosing a place to live is the first step to a life we will lead in the future," with concrete examples; on the other hand, she used comparison and contrast to explain her

English thesis, "I think that we decide we travel whether by ourselves or with people we know depends on when and where." In both writings, she did not take a position on the given topics, but she focused on explaining the original theses she created in response to the prompts.

Motoko's L1 and L2 essays were both well structured with a thesis placed in the two positions, the beginning and the final position. This structural feature tends to make her writing different from that of the other students who chose Exposition, yet placed a thesis only in the end position. That is, Motoko used a deductive approach, whereas the others employed an inductive one. However, in the interview, she did not make clear where she obtained the knowledge. What she had learned about L1 essay writing in her L1 training, according to her, was to express one's own opinion with confidence and state it in a definite form. She translated this idea into a verbal phrase, "*watakushi wa ... to ... kangaeru (I think that ...)*" and added this phrase to the beginning of a sentence whenever she expressed important ideas or made assertions in both English and Japanese writing. In total, she used it six times in English, and four times in Japanese. In her case, the phrase "*I think*" is not a softening strategy, but rather reflects her strong intention to make her assertion definite across the two languages.

Lastly, Motoko appeared to know how she could achieve good coherence in writing. First, she made sure to have her thesis say the same thing in the two positions: in the process of her writing, she carefully rephrased the initial thesis and placed it in the end of an essay. Also, like Yuko and Noriko, she paid attention to the use of such key meta-discourse markers as *For example*, *On the other hand*, and *Therefore*, by placing them at the beginning of each paragraph. Where does such a strong sense of coherence come from? It can be assumed that she might have learned the use of such discourse markers in her L1 writing training³, and at the same time her positive attitude toward writing and a great deal of general writing practice she reportedly did

in elementary through high school may have contributed in part to the development of such sense and desire to achieve coherence. She reported that she loved to write and wrote a lot. Although her English proficiency score was the lowest among the five students in the study, she spent 82 minutes, the longest time, to complete her English essay. As a result, her English essay retained the same overall structure and effective coherence as her Japanese essay. She did not lower the quality of her writing just because of her lower English proficiency. In her case, the strong sense of coherence she cultivated in her past L1 writing practice and her desire to write well probably made it possible to transfer her L1 writing style to L2 writing.

3. 3 Harue, L2 writing training only

Among Group 3 students, who had experienced special L2 writing training, only Harue used the same mode (Mixed, Self-reflection -> Exposition) across the two languages. The other students did not demonstrate this tendency; most of them chose a single mode, Argumentation in their L2 writing, and a variety of Mixed modes (e.g., Exposition -> Argumentation and Argumentation -> Exposition) in their L1 writing. Harue was an exception in terms of consistency across L1 and L2 writing. The common features found in both essays are as follows:

- 1) inductive approach
- 2) loosely structured frame
- 3) reflecting personal feeling and thought
- 4) concrete examples including anecdote and quotation

In writing both her English and Japanese essays, Harue opted to follow an inductive approach, where she gradually led the reader to a neutral conclusion in an inductive way. In her English essay on "Place to live," for example, she began to reflect on how she felt when she was living with her family in her high school days, and then described the

reality she was facing by living alone in her college (Self-reflection). She then compared it with the life of her friend living with a family, quickly summarized the strong points of living alone, and came to a conclusion, a neutral position that each way of living has its own merits (Exposition).

In such a loosely structured frame, Harue's writing included plentiful concrete information such as personal experiences, thoughts and direct quotations, which could be considered characteristics of *sakubun*-writing. She reported in the interview that she wrote as if she were telling a story, and the insertion of direct quotations appeared to serve the purpose. Her Japanese essay, in particular, was striking in terms of containing two quotations, a short one to introduce her topic and a considerably longer one to develop the content of the body.

In the interview, Harue explained why she wrote in such a way and did not apply what she had learned in her English writing training:

I know the English structure has an opinion statement first and then reasons to explain it. I learned this structure in the English writing training. But it seems to me too formulaic. I am not comfortable with it. I like a more Japanese way of writing.

She resisted against writing her English essay in the way she was taught. In her perception, she was basically forced to learn English writing conventions in order to pass a college entrance exam, and in fact followed it because she wanted to pass the exam. But because the exam was over, she did not feel the need to write in the English way any more. She returned to the way she used to write at her earlier time; that is, to write freely about a topic as if she were writing a novel. It appeared that she had her own writing style, which she cultivated by reportedly having read a great many books when she was in elementary and junior high school. Harue's case shows that receiving instruction by itself cannot exert an influence on students' choice of

rhetorical features; it is the writers themselves who make the decision whether or not to adopt what they are taught.

Table 3 below shows a summary of the common features across L1 and L2 writing by each student and the probable source of knowledge for each feature.

Table 3. Summary of common rhetorical features across L1 and L2 writing by five students*

Students	Mode	Rhetorical features*
Yoko	Mixed (Exp -> Arg)	-inductive approach (L1) -similar overall structure (L1) -use of discourse markers (L2) -avoiding repetition of the same expression (L2)
Noriko	Arg	-deductive approach (L2) -overall and internal structure (L2) -prioritizing ideas (L1) -use of discourse markers (L2) -avoiding absolute statement of ideas (L1)
Koichiro	Arg	-deductive approach (L1) -overall structure with counter-argument (L1) -use of discourse markers (L1)
Motoko	Exp	-deductive approach (L1) -overall structure (L1) -original thesis (L1) -use of discourse markers (L1) -stating important ideas in a definite form (L1) -concrete examples
Harue	Mixed (Self -> Exp)	-inductive approach (L1)** -loosely structured frame (L1) -anecdotes & quotations (L1) -reflecting feelings & thoughts (L1)

Arg: Argumentation, Exp: Exposition, Self: Self-reflection; Mixed: two modes combined; ->: direction of overall movement

*Information in parentheses indicates possible source of knowledge the students obtained from L1 or L2 special writing training.

**In case of Harue, she received knowledge from non-special writing training.

4. Discussion

The findings above indicate that L1 and L2 writing experience interact with each other and also there is a positive transfer of both L1 writing experience to L2 writing and L2 writing experience to L1 writing. At the same time, the findings also suggest that whether students transfer certain text features from one language to another may depend on several interrelated factors, which include (1) the nature of their special writing training, (2) audience awareness, and (3) students' perceptions and preference. First, the special writing training definitely influenced students' writing although the content of the instruction they had received tended to differ among them. For example, most of them used meta-discourse markers such as *There are two reasons* and *Most importantly*, frequently to signal the overall and internal text structure to the reader. The source of this knowledge, according to Yoko and Noriko (with L1 and L2 training), was from the special L2 writing training, and according to Koichiro and Motoko (L1 training only), from their L1 training.

The students first gained such knowledge in their special writing training; however, what made the learned knowledge transferable across the two languages was their strong awareness of audience and their desire to communicate ideas clearly. The kind of writing students practiced in the special training had a real audience (university professors), whom they had to convince in order to be accepted into the university they hoped to enter. Practice writing for such a purpose led the students to develop audience awareness, which induced them to make frequent use of discourse markers. Reader awareness tends to easily extend across different languages.

Students' perceptions and preference for writing also affected their choice of rhetorical features, particularly, text structure. As already stated, Yoko consistently chose an inductive approach because she valued this movement of ideas in order to make her writing more persuasive to her readers. Nevertheless, she chose different internal

structures, with "*ten*" (an extended perspective) for Japanese writing, and without it for English writing, following her perceptions of the respective writing conventions. Similarly Harue preferred to write freely in her own way that she had developed prior to the special L2 writing training, and rejected what she had learned in the L2 writing training. These cases suggest that when students have their own preference based on what they value and believe, they tend to transfer their rhetorical choices across L1 and L2 writing.

In order to make rhetorical choices transferable, however, students also must have internalized meta-knowledge about writing. The students in this study seemed to have acquired this knowledge and showed it during the interview. Some students said, "I followed the sequence I had in my mind when writing," and others talked eloquently about their meta-knowledge about writing, using special terms, namely, *jyoron* (introduction), *honron* (body) and *ketsuron* (conclusion). The acquisition of such knowledge must have resulted from repeated practice of writing, where the students applied it to actual writing and received teacher feedback. In fact, they practiced writing essays, more than 10 times in the case of L1 writing training only, and at least 20 times when they received combined L1 and L2 training. Repeated practice together with teacher feedback apparently helped to transform their knowledge into a schema they relied on for both L1 and L2 writing. This kind of schema together with other writing conventions such as discourse markers could lead to better quality of writing or better writing ability whether writing in L1 or L2 (Hirose & Sasaki, 1994; Spack, 1997b).

The findings of the study also provide evidence that many rhetorical features such as deductive structure, conscious ordering of ideas, and the use of meta-discourse markers are commonly shared by both Japanese and English writing when students write argumentative and expository essays. This finding confirms what the students in an earlier study (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2002) reported on the content of the instruction they received in the special L1 short essay training, and

also what Kubota and Shi (2005) observed in the analysis of Japanese language art textbooks used in junior high schools. At the same time, there may be some differences in the academic writing between Japanese and English. To investigate such differences further, future study should look at a larger number of students who use the same discourse mode as well as those who use different modes across L1 and L2 writing.

Lastly, the study suggests that students are individual agents who make decisions about what rhetorical patterns and text features to adopt in their writing in Japanese and English. Whereas special writing training provides meta-knowledge and practice, the past L1 literacy training and experience they receive in elementary, junior high, and senior high school also contribute to the make-up of their meta-knowledge about writing. Given all this knowledge and writing experience, it is the students who are empowered to make rhetorical decisions according to what they believe to be best for their writing.

Acknowledgments: This research was supported by a research grant from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research [C2], Research Code 1458029). I wish to express my special gratitude to Carol Rinnert for her generosity in allowing me to use a part of the data we collected in our collaborative study and also for her assistance with stylistic improvement. My sincere thanks go to the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments, and to Michiko Kasuya and Masako Kawamura for their assistance with the study. We are indebted to all those students who participated in this study and shared their experiences in the interviews.

Note

1. The computerized CASEC (Computerized Assessment Systems for English Communication) test, created by the Eiken (English STEP Test) administrators, contains four sections: vocabulary, idioms, listening, and dictations. Students self-administered the test at their own pace and their scores are reported in the form of a numerical score (out of a possible 1000 points) and a proficiency level

- (like the Eiken step test), along with TOEIC and TOEFL equivalents.
2. A discourse marker, *therefore*, in this essay can be taken to function as a signal for both overall structure and partial levels.
 3. It is also possible that Motoko and Koichiro learned the use of discourse markers by being exposed to English rhetorical features while reading English textbooks in their high school.

References

- Cahill, D. (2003). The myth of the "turn" in contrastive rhetoric. *Written Communication*, 20, 170-194.
- Casanave, C. P. (2004). *Controversies in second language writing; Dilemmas and decisions in research and instruction*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetorical: Cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, U. (2005). Comment by Ulla Connor, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 132-136.
- Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 39, 81-141.
- Eggington, W. (1987). Written academic discourse in Korean: Implications for effective communication. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis in L2 text* (pp. 153-168). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis in L2 text* (pp. 141-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. In U. Connor & A.M. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 87-109). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Hirose, K. & Sasaki, M. (1994). Explanatory variables for Japanese students' expository writing in English: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3, 203-229.
- Hirose, K. (2003). Comparing L1 and L2 organizational patterns in the argumentative writing of Japanese EFL students. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 181-209.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, 16, 1-20.
- Kobayashi, H. (1984). Rhetorical patterns in English and Japanese. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18, 737-738.
- Kobayashi, H. & Rinnert, C. (1996). Factors affecting composition evaluation in an EFL context: Cultural rhetorical pattern and readers' background. *Language Learning*, 46, 397-437.
- Kobayashi, H. & Rinnert, C. (2001). Factors relating to EFL writers' discourse level revision skills. *International Journal of English Studies*, 1, 71-102.
- Kobayashi, H. & Rinnert, C. (2002) High school student perceptions of first

- language literacy instruction: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11, 91-116.
- Kobayashi, H. & Rinnert, C. (2004a). *Transferability of composing competence across languages: From L1 to L2*. (Report for the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Research Code 1458029).
- Kobayashi, H. & Rinnert, C. (2004b). Composing competence: How L1 and L2 writing experience interact. In M. Baynham, A. Deignan and G. White (Eds.), *Applied Linguistics at the Interface*, pp.105-118. British Association for Applied Linguistic, Equinox.
- Kotou, A., Ed. (1999). *Daigaku nyushi, shutten. Asahi shinbun, 2000 nen ban [University essay exams, the source (of articles) from the Asahi Newspaper, year 2000 version]*. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbun.
- Kubota, R. (1997). Reevaluation of the uniqueness of Japanese written discourse: Implications to Contrastive Rhetoric. *Written Communication*, 14, 460-480.
- Kubota, R. (1998a). An investigation of Japanese and English L1 essay organization: Differences and similarities. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54, 475-507.
- Kubota, R. (1998b). An investigation of L1-L2 transfer in writing among Japanese university students: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 69-100.
- Kubota, R. & Lehner, A. (2004). Toward critical contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 7-27.
- Kubota, R. & Lehner, A. (2005). Response to Ulla Connor's comments, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 137-143.
- Kubota, R. & Shi, L. (2005). Instruction and reading samples for opinion writing in L1 junior high school textbooks in China and Japan. In X. Li, X. & C. Casanave, C. (Eds.) (2005). *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, Special issue*, pp. 97-123, 15 (1).
- Langan, J. (2000). *College Writing Skills*. Fifth Edition, Boston: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Liebman, J. D. (1992). Toward a new contrastive rhetoric: Differences between Arabic and Japanese rhetorical instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1, 141-165.
- Leki, I. (2000). Writing, literacy, and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 99-115.
- Liu, L. (2005). Rhetorical education through writing instruction across cultures: A comparative analysis of select online instructional materials on argumentative writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 1-18.
- Matsuda, P.K. (1997). Contrastive rhetoric in context: A dynamic model of L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6(1), 45-60.
- Ministry of Education (1998). *Kotogakko gakushu shidouyoryo kaisetsu, Gaikokugo hen / Eigo hen [Teaching guide for foreign languages/ English language in high school]*. Tokyo: Kyoiku Shuppan.
- Ministry of Education (1999). *Kotogakko gakushu shidouyoryo kaisetsu, Kokugo hen [Teaching guide for Japanese in high school]*. Tokyo: Kyoiku Shuppan.
- Rinnert, C. & Kobayashi, H. (2001). Differing perceptions of EFL writing among

- readers in Japan. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(1), 189-209.
- Sasaki, M. & Hirose (1996). Explanatory variables for EFL students' expository writing. *Language Learning*, 46, 137-174.
- Sasaki, M. (2002). Building an empirically-based model of EFL learners' writing processes. In S. Ransdell & M. Barbier (Eds.), *New Directions for Research in L2 Writing* (pp.49-80). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Spack, R. (1997a). The rhetorical construction of multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 765-774.
- Spack, R. (1997b). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: A longitudinal case study. *Written Communication*, 14(1), 3-62.
- Watanabe, M. (2001). Sakubun shidou ni miru kosei to souzouryoku no paradokkusu: nichibei shotoukyoiku hikaku kara [A paradox of individuality and creativity through composition lessons: a comparison of Japanese and American Elementary Schools]. *Journal of Educational Sociology* 69, 223-242.

Appendix 1**Table 1.** Comparison of individuals' discourse modes across languages

	Japanese Essay	English Essay	Comparison
Group 1			
1-1	Exp	Mix (Exp → Arg)	*
1-2	Mix (Exp→Arg)	Mix (Exp → Arg)	=
1-3	Mix (Exp→Arg)	Mix (Self ↔ Arg)	*
1-4	Exp	Mix (Arg ↔ Exp)	*
1-5	Arg	Arg	=
1-6	Mix (Exp→Arg)	Arg	*
1-7	Mix (Arg→Exp)	Arg	*
1-8	Arg	Arg	=
1-9	Arg	Arg	=
Group 2			
2-1	Self	Arg	x
2-2	Arg	Arg	=
2-3	Arg	Mix (Exp → Arg)	*
2-4	Exp	Arg	x
2-5	Exp	Mix (Arg ↔ Exp)	*
2-6	Exp	Exp	=
2-7	Exp	Exp	=
Group 3			
3-1	Mix (Exp→Arg)	Arg	*
3-2	Mix (Arg→Exp)	Arg	*
3-3	Mix (Self→Exp)	Exp	*
3-4	Exp	Arg	x
3-5	Mix (Self→Exp)	Mix (Self → Exp)	=
3-6	Exp	Arg	x
3-7	Mix (Arg→Exp)	Arg	*
Group 4			
4-2	Mix (Exp→Arg)	Self	x
4-4	Exp	Mix (Self → Arg)	x
4-5	Self	Mix (Self → Arg)	*
4-6	Exp	Mix (Arg ↔ Self)	x

Arg: Argumentation; Exp: Exposition; Self: Self-reflection; Mix: Mixed;

→: direction of overall movement; ↔: movement back and forth; =: same; *: partial overlap; x: different

Appendix 2: Sample essays by Yoko

English essay

There are many chances that we travel when we are university student. Which one is more beneficial traveling alone or group travel?

First, I'd like to observe on strong point of traveling alone. First of all, it is good for us not to bother about anyone. So, we can travel freely. Besides, we can get a sense of responsibility, because we have to do everything by oneself. In addition to that, if we are in group, we are apt to satisfy without meeting something new, but if we are alone, we tend to seek meeting more positively.

In the contrary, sometimes traveling alone is danger, especially women.

Second, I'd like to observe on strong point of group travel. Above all, it is more safety than traveling alone. And, we can share pleasure or happiness of travel with someone of group.

However, group travel has some bad point. We tend to ease too much, because we can enjoy the travel without meeting something new. Besides, it is little difficult to go to somewhere we want to go freely.

I think the most attractive point of travel is meeting something new. In addition to that, travel makes us more rich psychically, especially traveling alone.

So, I come to the conclusion that traveling alone is better than group travel if we are student particularly. I'm sure that we can develop through traveling alone.

Japanese essay

大学入学にあたって、一人暮らしを始める若者は多い。私もその一人である。今まで家族と住んでいた私にとって、家族から離れて住むということは、不安と期待が渦巻く未知なる世界だった。

さて、ここで一人暮らしと家族と住むことの両方について、利点と欠点をそれぞれ述べてみたい。まず一人暮らしの利点は、自分のペースで生活ができる、すべてを自分一人でやらなければならないので責任感がつく、などが挙げられる。逆に欠点は、家の中に迷惑をかける人がいないことか

ら墮らけた生活をしがちになることや、病気やけがなど緊急を要する事態になったとき、特に一人では対処しきれない場いには非常に困ることである。

一方、家族と住む場合の利点は、すべてを自分でやる必要がないので自分の時間をより多く持てる。緊急の事態に陥っても支えてくれる人がすぐそばにいて安心、などが挙げられる。逆に欠点は、一人暮らしと比べて、すべてを自分でやることを強制されてはいないので、親に頼りがちになり易い、また複数の人々と住む場合は自分勝手には生活できない、などが挙げられる。

ここで、広島大学について考えてみたい。広島大学の学生は90%以上が一人暮らし、というかなり特殊な環境に置かれている。そのため、一人暮らしの少ない他大学と比べると、学生同士が支え合って生活をする傾向が強い。私はここに新しい家族の形態を見た。

近年、一人になった高齢者同士と一緒に暮らす新しい家族の形態が増えているというニュースを見たが、広島大学の一人暮らしはこれに近いものかもしれない。誰かがけがや病気をすると、自分も一人暮らしだからこそその人の不安な気持ちもよく分かるのですぐに駆けつけてあげられる。一人で食事することに寂しさを覚えるのなら、皆で食事が出来る。これらは、たいていの学生が一人暮らしだからこそ出来る特権である。

離れてみて初めて家族の有難さやぬくもりを実感した、と多くの一人暮らしの若者が言うように、一人暮らしを始めて、改めて気付かされることは多い。また、自分が困っている時にすぐに駆けつけてくれる友人の存在は何者にも代え難く、ここに友情の大切さを再度実感することだろう。大学という新しい環境での生活を、一人暮らしという方法で送ってみるのは良いことだと思う。それは一つの自己成長の機会でもあり、また、今まで気付かなかった新しい自分を発見できるチャンスでもあり、そして周囲の人達の有難さを実感できる良い機会であると、私は考える。

English translation of extended perspective (bolded in the above essay)

Recently, I've seen news that an increasing number of senior citizens have begun living together after they became alone or lost living

partners, forming a new type of family. I think living alone for Hiroshima University students is closer to this type of living arrangement. When someone gets hurt or ill, we can come and take care of him or her immediately. If someone feels lonely eating alone, we can join him or her too. There are easy things to do for students because most students live alone themselves.