
New Directions in Contrastive Rhetoric

ULLA CONNOR

*Indiana University in Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana, United States*

Contrastive rhetoric examines differences and similarities in writing across cultures. Although mainly concerned with student essay writing in its first 30 years, the area of study today contributes to knowledge about preferred patterns of writing in many English for specific purposes situations. This article discusses some of the new directions contrastive rhetoric has taken. Following a brief review of the goals, methods, and accomplishments of research in contrastive rhetoric during the past 30 years, the article examines how contrastive rhetoric has been pursued with varying aims and methods in a variety of EFL situations involving academic and professional writing. Recent criticisms of contrastive rhetoric and their effects on changing directions are then surveyed.

Contrastive rhetoric examines differences and similarities in ESL and EFL writing across languages and cultures as well as across such different contexts as education and commerce. Hence, it considers texts not merely as static products but as functional parts of dynamic cultural contexts. Although largely restricted throughout much of its first 30 years to a fairly rigid form, student essay writing, the field today contributes to knowledge about preferred patterns of writing in many English for specific purposes situations. Undeniably, it has had an appreciable impact on the understanding of cultural differences in writing, and it has had, and will continue to have, an effect on the teaching of ESL and EFL writing.

Despite many developments in contrastive rhetoric in the past 30 years and its contribution to ESL and EFL teaching, its focus on the study of contrast or difference has laid the area open to criticism. In two 1997 issues of *TESOL Quarterly*, three papers (Scollon, 1997; Spack, 1997; Zamel, 1997) criticized contrastive rhetoric for an alleged insensitivity to cultural differences. In other issues, Kubota (1999, 2001) has been critical of perceptions of a cultural dichotomy between East and West and the alleged resulting promotion of the superiority of Western writing. Such criticism stems in part from critics' lack of understanding

about current perspectives in contrastive rhetoric and changes that have taken place in this area in the past decade. Hence, instead of viewing the criticisms from an adversarial perspective (Belcher, 1997), I would like to see them as suggesting the need to articulate a current framework for contrastive rhetoric, especially regarding changing definitions of culture (Atkinson, 1999, Mauranen, 2001).

This article addresses that need by surveying some new directions of contrastive rhetoric, particularly in view of some of its criticisms. As background, I briefly summarize the goals, methods, and major accomplishments of research in contrastive rhetoric during the past 30 years. The area of study has expanded from its early beginnings as the analysis of paragraph organization in ESL student essay writing (Kaplan, 1966) to an interdisciplinary area of applied linguistics incorporating theoretical perspectives from both linguistics and rhetoric (Connor, 1996). I then address criticisms of contrastive rhetoric and their relation to changing directions in the field. These new directions involve innovative views of culture, literacy, and critical pedagogy and have a major impact on the research agenda of contrastive rhetoric.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF CONTRASTIVE RHETORIC

Early History

Initiated 30 years ago in applied linguistics by Robert Kaplan, contrastive rhetoric is premised on the insight that, to the degree that language and writing are cultural phenomena, different cultures have different rhetorical tendencies. Furthermore, the linguistic patterns and rhetorical conventions of the L1 often transfer to writing in ESL and thus cause interference. It is important to distinguish this concern from potential interference at the level of syntax and phonology. In contrastive rhetoric, the interference manifests itself in the writer's choice of rhetorical strategies and content.

Kaplan's (1966) pioneering study analyzed the organization of paragraphs in ESL student essays and identified five types of paragraph development, each reflecting distinctive rhetorical tendencies. Kaplan claimed that Anglo-European expository essays are developed linearly whereas essays in Semitic languages use parallel coordinate clauses; those in Oriental languages prefer an indirect approach, coming to the point in the end; and those in Romance languages and in Russian include material that, from a linear point of view, is irrelevant.

Kaplan's early contrastive rhetoric was criticized for seeming to privilege the writing of native English speakers. It seemed as well to dismiss

linguistic and cultural differences in writing among closely related languages. Kaplan himself (Connor & Kaplan, 1987) has referred to his early position as a *notion*. He has also noted the underdeveloped nature of written text analysis at the time of his 1966 paper, which limited his own analysis of the sample student writing, and, significantly, he has further acknowledged the concept of linguistic relativity as a primary influence.

In discussing early contrastive rhetoric (Connor, 1996), I claimed that “the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativity is basic to contrastive rhetoric because it suggests that different languages affect perception and thought in different ways” (p. 10). This weak version of the hypothesis (i.e., that language influences thought), rather than the once dominant strong version (i.e., that language controls thought and perception), is regaining respectability in linguistics, psychology, and composition studies, resulting in a renewed interest in the study of cultural differences (Gumperz & Levinson, 1996).

In a recent article devoted to the exploration of the origins of contrastive rhetoric, Ying (2000) argues that “the claim that the origin of contrastive rhetoric lies in the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is untenable because the latter is actually rooted in German ideas on linguistic determinism” (p. 260); and these ideas, according to Ying, are incompatible with Kaplan’s (1966) view of rhetoric and culture. Ying claims that Kaplan did not view language and rhetoric as determinative of thought patterns but that he merely argued that language and rhetoric evolve out of a culture. According to Ying, Hymes’s (1962) ethnography of communication can be seen as “an important historical antecedent for contrastive rhetoric” (p. 265); in Hymes’s system, the framework is communication, not language, and is important in studying the patterned use of language, often across cultures.

Matsuda’s (2001) response to Ying (2000) includes a personal communication from Kaplan (March 11, 2001) in which Kaplan admits not having been influenced by Hymes’s work at the time of the writing but having been very much influenced by the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. Matsuda concludes that the origin of contrastive rhetoric was a result of Kaplan’s effort to synthesize at least three different intellectual traditions: contrastive analysis, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, and the emerging field of composition and rhetoric, especially Christensen’s (1963) generative rhetoric of the paragraph. The latter influence encouraged Kaplan to approach contrastive analysis at the paragraph level.

No matter what its origin, Kaplan’s (1966) earlier model, which was concerned with paragraph organization, was useful in accounting for cultural differences in essays written by college students for academic purposes. It also introduced the U.S. linguistic world to a real, if basic, insight: Writing is culturally influenced in interesting and complex ways. Nevertheless, the model was not designed to describe writing for

academic and professional purposes. Nor was it intended to describe composing processes across cultures.

Research Methods

In its early years, contrastive rhetoric was heavily based on applied linguistic and linguistic text analysis. In the 1980s, contrastive rhetoricians included linguistic text analysis as a tool to describe the conventions of writing in English and to provide analytical techniques with which to compare writing in students' L1 and L2. Edited volumes in 1987 (Connor & Kaplan), 1988 (Purves), and 1990 (Connor & Johns) typically included several chapters with a text analytic emphasis, focusing especially on methods of analyzing cohesion, coherence, and the discourse superstructure of texts. A text analytic approach was also adopted in such large international projects of student writing as the International Education Achievement (IEA) study and the Nordtext project. The IEA study compared high school students' writing in their mother tongues at three different grade levels in 14 different countries (Purves, 1988). The Nordtext project (Enkvist, 1985; Evensen, 1986) involved linguists in the Nordic countries whose interest was in EFL writing. Each project was designed to create useful models for instructional practice, and each was heavily text based. In summing up the research paradigm of the 1980s, it is fair to say that more or less decontextualized text analytic models characterized the field of study.

Despite the reliance on the textual analysis of cohesion and coherence patterns in much contrastive rhetorical research, however, some contrastive rhetoric researchers had early on questioned the adequacy of purely text-based analyses as a basis for conclusions that extend beyond the realm of textual features. For example, Hinds (1987) proposed a new phenomenon for analysis: the distribution of responsibility between readers and writers; that is, the amount of effort writers expend to make texts cohere through transitions and other uses of metatext. Thus, Hinds referred to Japanese texts as *reader responsible*, as opposed to texts that are *writer responsible*. And much of my own work on contrastive rhetoric in the 1980s involved building a comprehensive model of texts—one that integrated rhetorical analysis with linguistically oriented analysis. For example, in a cross-cultural study of writing that compared argumentative writing in students' essays from three English-speaking countries, Lauer and I (Connor & Lauer, 1985, 1988) developed a linguistic-rhetorical system that helped quantify both linguistic features in essays (e.g., cohesion, coherence, and discourse organization) and rhetorical features (including the three classical persuasive appeals—logos, pathos, ethos—and Toulmin's 1958 argument model of claim, data, and warrant).

Contrastive studies of academic and professional genres and of the socialization into these genres of L2 writers were a natural development in L2 writing research. Following the lead of L1 writing research and pedagogy, in which the 1970s were said to be the decade of the composing process and the 1980s the decade of social construction, empirical research on L2 writing in the 1990s became increasingly concerned with social and cultural processes in cross-cultural undergraduate writing groups and classes (Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995; Carson & Nelson, 1994, 1996; Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Nelson & Carson, 1998), with the initiation and socialization processes that graduate students go through to become literate professionals in their graduate and professional discourse communities (Belcher, 1994; Casanave, 1995; Connor & Kramer, 1995; Connor & Mayberry, 1995; Prior, 1995; Swales, 1990), and, finally, with the processes and products of L2 academics and professional writing in English as a second or foreign language for publication and other professional purposes (Belcher & Connor, 2001; Braine, 1998; Connor et al., 1995; Connor & Mauranen, 1999; Flowerdew, 1999; Gosden, 1992).

Major Findings of the Past 30 Years

The past 30-plus years have seen significant changes as contrastive rhetoric has benefited from insights drawn from four domains: text linguistics, the analysis of writing as a cultural and educational activity, classroom-based studies of writing, and contrastive genre-specific studies (see Table 1 for sample studies). The genres involved include journal articles, business reports, letters of application, grant proposals, and editorials. Several published papers (e.g., Connor, in press) describe studies in these domains.

What major findings in 30 years of contrastive rhetoric research speak to the current debates about cultural differences and L2 writing? First, all groups engage in a variety of types of writing, whereas preferred patterns of writing are genre dependent. Another finding is that readers' expectations determine what is perceived as coherent, straightforward writing. Thus, Kaplan's (1966) diagram of the linear argument preferred by native English speakers may well represent what such speakers view as coherent, though speakers of other languages may disagree, and actual texts may or may not reflect that view.

TABLE 1
Sample Contrastive Studies in Four Domains of Investigation

Domain	Purpose	Examples
Contrastive text linguistic studies	Examine, compare, and contrast how texts are formed and interpreted in different languages and cultures using methods of written discourse analysis	Clyne (1987); Connor & Kaplan (1987); Eggington (1987); Hinds (1983, 1987, 1990)
Studies of writing as cultural and educational activity	Investigate literacy development on L1 language and culture and examine effects on the development of L2 literacy	Carson (1992); Purves (1988)
Classroom-based contrastive studies	Examine cross-cultural patterns in process writing, collaborative revisions, and student-teacher conferences	Allaei & Connor (1990); Goldstein & Conrad (1990); Hull, Rose, Fraser, & Castellano (1991); Nelson & Murphy (1992)
Genre-specific investigations	Are applied to academic and professional writing	Bhatia (1993); Connor, Davis, & De Rycker (1995); Jenkins & Hinds (1987); Mauranen (1993); Swales (1990); Tirkkonen-Condit (1996); Ventola & Mauranen (1991)

RECENT RESEARCH IN ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL WRITING ACROSS CULTURES

Particularly informative for current discussion of difference are results from research in academic and professional writing originating outside the Anglo-American context. According to Atkinson (2000),

The contrastive rhetoric hypothesis has held perhaps its greatest allure for those in nonnative-English-speaking contexts abroad, forced as they are to look EFL writing in the eye to try to understand why it at least sometimes looks “different”—often subtly out of sync with that one might expect from a “native” perspective. (p. 319)

Enkvist, in his 1997 article “Why We Need Contrastive Rhetoric,” recommends that contrastive rhetoric be pursued according to varying aims and methods within different institutions at universities and in EFL situations. In fact, this is what many Finnish university programs offering training in foreign language skills do. Finnish universities have language departments that teach language, literature, linguistic and literary theory,

and applied linguistics. Additionally, however, in the past 25 years Finnish universities have operated language centers that teach languages for specific purposes as well as providing translation and editorial services. Other types of educational institutions interested in contrastive rhetoric include departments of business and intercultural communication.

The review that follows is not intended to be exhaustive; its examples highlight some major directions contrastive rhetoric research relevant to academic and professional setting has been taking in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia.

Europe

In their research, which studies cultural differences between the writing of Finnish- and English-speaking researchers in Finland, Ventola and Mauranen (1991) have shown the value of text analysis in a contrastive framework. They investigated the revising practices native English speakers used with Finnish scientists' articles written in English and compared the writing of Finnish scientists with the writing of native-English-speaking scientists, finding that Finnish writers used connectors less frequently and in a less varied fashion than native-English-speaking writers did. The Finnish writers had difficulty using the article system appropriately, and there were differences in thematic progression. Moreover, Mauranen (1993) found that Finnish writers wrote less text about text, or *metatext*, and that they placed their main point later in the text than native English speakers did. My colleagues and I (Connor et al., 1995) found that Finnish writers had the same difficulties when writing grant proposals.

The studies by Ventola and Mauranen (1991) and Connor et al. (1995) cited above, and the study by Moreno (1998) on cross-cultural differences in premise-conclusion sequences in Spanish and English research articles, show that the contrastive rhetoric framework, originally developed for ESL settings in the United States, can be helpful in analyzing and teaching EFL writing in academic and professional contexts. Moreover, researchers and teachers in EFL situations other than professional ones are also finding the contrastive rhetoric framework useful for a variety of L2 contexts. Thus, a great many English-Polish contrastive studies have appeared in the past few years in journals such as *Text* and *Journal of Pragmatics*. For example, Duszak (1994) analyzed research article introductions in Polish and English academic journals, and Golebiowski's (1998) study dealt with psychology journal writing, finding many textual and stylistic differences. These findings showed that the English texts used more direct, assertive, and positive positions.

Middle East

Research in contrastive rhetoric is not exclusively European and American. In addition to the publication of numerous empirical studies of Arabic-English contrasts, Hatim (1997) and Hottel-Burkhart (2000) have produced contributions to contrastive rhetoric theory. Hatim, whose disciplinary interest is translation studies, made a major study of Arabic-English discourse contrasts, dealing with the typology of argumentation and its implication for contrastive rhetoric. The author is critical of previous contrastive rhetorical research of Arabic, which he describes as being “characterized by a general vagueness of thought which stems from overemphasis on the symbol at the expense of the meaning,” or as analyzing “Arabic writers as confused, coming to the same point two or three times from different angles, and so on” (p. 161). Hatim acknowledges, however, that there are differences between Arabic and English argumentation styles and underscores the importance of explaining why these differences occur rather than just relying on anecdotal reporting about the differences.

According to Hatim (1997), orality has been suggested as explaining the differences between Arabic and Western rhetorical preferences by researchers such as Koch (1983). Koch has claimed that Arabic speakers argue by presentation, that is, by repeating arguments, paraphrasing them, and doubling them. Hatim admits that Arabic argumentation may be heavy on *through-argumentation* (i.e., thesis to be supported, substantiation, and conclusion), unlike Western argumentation, which, according to Hatim, is characterized by counterarguments (i.e., thesis to be opposed, opposition, substantiation of counterclaim, and conclusion). Yet the key is that for Arabic speakers, Arabic texts are no less logical than texts that use Aristotelian, Western logic. To quote Hatim,

It may be true that this [Arabic] form of argumentation generally lacks credibility when translated into a context which calls for a variant form of argumentation in languages such as English. However, for Arabic, through-argumentation remains a valid option that is generally bound up with a host of sociopolitical factors and circumstances, not with Arabic *per se*. It is therefore speakers and not languages which must be held accountable. (p. 53)

Hatim’s (1997) contribution to textual analysis of Arabic and English contrasts is significant. He explains observed differences from an empirical, text analytic point of view. Yet, in well-meaning explanations meant to show the legitimacy of different styles of argument across cultures, Hatim ends up generalizing about preferred argument patterns. And, like Hinds (1987), who analyzed Japanese-English contrasts, Hatim can

become an easy target for those who object to cross-cultural analysis because of the danger of stereotyping.

Another significant non-European contribution to the study of contrastive rhetoric has been made by Hottel-Burkhart (2000), who writes that “rhetoric is an intellectual tradition of practices and values associated with public, interpersonal, and verbal communication—spoken or written—and it is peculiar to the broad linguistic culture in which one encounters it” (p. 94). What is considered an argument in a culture is shaped by the rhetoric of that culture. Hottel-Burkhart refers to the well-known interview of the Ayatollah Khomeini by the Italian journalist Oriana Fallaci, analyzed by Johnstone (1986). In the interview, Fallaci used a logical argument supportable by verifiable facts. Khomeini “offered instead answers based on the words of God and his Prophet” (p. 98), in a tradition in which he was schooled. Johnstone found differences between the two styles of argumentation not only in content but also in arrangement and style.

Interest in contrastive rhetoric in Arabic-speaking countries resulted in the biennial International Conference on Contrastive Rhetoric at the American University of Cairo, Egypt. In a volume of selected conference papers (Ibrahim, Kassabgy, & Aydelott, 2000), 13 chapters discuss studies that deal with distinctive features of Arabic, studies of Arabic-English contrasts, and contrastive rhetorical studies of Arabic-speaking students’ writing in English. The second Cairo conference, held in March 2001, attracted presenters from neighboring countries as well as from Europe and Asia.

Asia

Chinese-English and Japanese-English contrasts have been analyzed in several recent contrastive rhetoric studies. The Chinese-English studies deal with writing for professional purposes, namely, newspaper writing and the writing of sales and request letters.

Scollon and Scollon (1997) compared the reporting of the same news story in 11 Hong Kong and 3 People’s Republic of China newspapers. Four were English language papers, and the rest were written in Chinese. The researchers focused on structural features and point of view as well as the attribution of content to sources. They found that the stories written in either language featured both the classical structure *qi-cheng-zhuan-he* and inductive and deductive organizational structures, concluding that “there is nothing inherent in the linguistic or cognitive structures of either Chinese or English which determines the use of these structures” (p. 107). The practice of quotation, however, differed across languages. According to the authors,

Concerning the question of quotation, our clearest finding is that quotation is at best ambiguous in Chinese. No standard practice has been observed across newspapers in this set and even within a newspaper, it is not obvious which portions of the text are attributed to whom. In contrast, the English newspapers present a face of clear and unambiguous quotation. (p. 107)

Scollon and Scollon are careful to point out that the finding should be interpreted carefully. The seemingly rigorous Western journalistic standard, with rigid conventions for the attribution of authorship, does not necessarily translate into more scrupulous journalistic practice.¹

Zhu (1997) analyzed sales letters written in the People's Republic of China using a rhetorical moves analysis (Swales, 1990). The article contains a great deal of discussion on arguments over a linear versus a circular structure of Chinese discourse and finds that the 20 letters in the sample followed a linear development. Kong (1998) used two analytic frameworks, a move structure approach and Mann and Thompson's (1988) rhetorical structure analysis, to examine Chinese business request letters written in companies in Hong Kong, English business letters written by native speakers, and English business letters written by nonnative speakers whose LI was Chinese (Cantonese). Differences were found in the occurrence and sequencing of the moves as well as the rhetorical structure in the Chinese letters and the English letters. The rich theoretical explanation in the article draws on theories of politeness and face systems. Differences are attributed to different face relationships involved in business transactions rather than to inherent rhetorical patterns of the languages. According to Kong,

In English routine business request letters written by native writers, the expectations of the roles of the writer and reader are more simple, that is, an information seeker and information giver, on a more or less similar social footing. The mutual assumption seems to be that both sides are very busy and do not want to spend time on speculation. If the price is right for both sides, they will make a deal. This is perhaps why the English letters are more direct, as they put greater emphasis on the ideational content of making the request and tend to make more face-threatening moves. On the other hand, in the Chinese samples, the symmetrical deference system (marked by delayed pattern of the request, the absence of face-threatening moves, and a greater emphasis on the interpersonal elements of "justifying" the request throughout the whole text) is a result of their different social expectations and considerations. (p. 138)

¹ A similar point about sensitivity to understanding reasons behind surface-level difference has been made by Bloch (2001) and Pennycook (1996), who have studied the way Chinese students cite from sources.

Each of these studies disagrees with Kaplan's (1966) characterization of Chinese texts as circular. The authors find explanations for differences in the texts studied, not in the structure of the texts per se but in other contextual factors. It is also worth noting that the studies take the analysis of texts beyond student essays (Kaplan's sample).

With the extensive globalization of business and professional communication, writing in such genres as letters, résumés, and job applications for readers from disparate language and cultural backgrounds is becoming a reality for more and more people. In these contexts, too, L2 writers have been found to transfer patterns, styles, expectations, and contexts from the L1 to the second, third, or fourth language. Predictably, differing reader expectations cause misunderstandings. For example, requests in letters can be interpreted as being too direct when directness is differently valued in the L1 than in the L2. Hence, there is an increasing need for well-constructed studies of intercultural communication, as Mauranen (2001, p. 53) has recently emphasized.

CRITICISMS OF AND ADVANCES IN CONTRASTIVE RHETORIC

Concurrent with these new developments in contrastive rhetoric and their contributions to teaching in ESL and EFL settings, this area of study has become the target of criticism. In 1997, for example, three *TESOL Quarterly* authors criticized contrastive rhetoric for an alleged insensitivity to cultural differences. Spack (1997), who works with ESL students in the United States, was concerned about the practice of labeling students by their L1 backgrounds, and Zamel (1997) disapproved of the tendency of contrastive rhetoric to view cultures as "discrete, discontinuous, and predictable" (p. 343). Scollon (1997), in the same issue of *TESOL Quarterly*, criticized contrastive rhetoric research for being too focused on texts and for neglecting oral influences on literacy, and thus being unable to consider adequately EFL situations like the one in Hong Kong.

Both Spack (1997) and Zamel (1997) invoke changing definitions of culture that juxtapose the forces of heterogeneity and homogeneity and seriously question the latter. Their questions are prompted within a broader interrogation of the concept of culture in the past few years. Atkinson (1999) clarifies the issues and perspectives with a comprehensive review of competing definitions of culture as they relate to TESOL. According to Atkinson, two competing views are the received view and alternative, nonstandard views. The received view conceives of culture as based largely on distinct geographical and national entities, which are presented as relatively unchanging and homogeneous (e.g., *the Japanese*

culture). The alternative views stem from postmodernist-influenced perspectives and have evolved from critiques of the traditional, received view. In connection with the latter, Atkinson discusses concepts such as *identity*, *hybridity*, *essentialism*, and *power*, all of which appear in criticisms of the traditional view:

So used, these terms indicate the shared perspective that cultures are anything but homogenous, all-encompassing entities, and represent important concepts in a larger project: the unveiling of the fissures, inequalities, disagreements, and cross-cutting influences that exist in and around all cultural scenes, in order to banish once and for all the idea that cultures are monolithic entities, or in some cases anything important at all. (p. 627)

From this point of view, one can argue that in the past contrastive rhetoric largely adopted the notion of received culture. For example, I once defined culture as “a set of patterns and rules shared by a particular community” (Connor, 1996, p. 101). Traditional contrastive rhetoric has often viewed ESL students as members of separate, identifiable cultural groups and, as Tannen (1985) pointed out, therefore is susceptible to the same critical judgments currently directed at any research on cross-cultural communication. Thus, Tannen noted that “some people object to any research documenting cross-cultural differences, which they see as buttressing stereotypes and hence exacerbating discrimination” (p. 212). She went on to argue, however, that to ignore cultural differences leads to misinterpretation and “hence discrimination of another sort” (p. 212).

However, although contrastive rhetoric has often defined national cultures in the received mode, researchers in contrastive rhetoric have certainly not interpreted all differences in L2 writing as stemming from the L1 or interference from the national culture. Instead, these researchers have explained such differences in written communication as often stemming from multiple sources, including L1, national culture, L1 educational background, disciplinary culture, genre characteristics, and mismatched expectations between readers and writers. Contrastive rhetoric is thus in a position similar to that of intercultural research on spoken language or intercultural pragmatics analysis. In this regard, Sarangi (1994) suggests the term *intercultural* to refer to migrants’ fluid identities. He recommends the consideration of language proficiency, native culture, and interlocutors’ mutual accommodation or lack thereof in explaining miscommunication between native and nonnative speakers in immigrant language situations.²

² Sarangi (1994) suggested the notion of *interculture* to describe the migrants’ fluid identities of native and target cultures in immigrant situations, reminiscent of Selinker’s (1972) concept of *interlanguage*, which refers to shared features of a speaker’s native and target languages.

A related question deals with an ideological problem regarding which norms and standards should be taught, because the teaching of norms invokes the danger of perpetuating established power hierarchies. This issue has been raised in postmodern discussion about discourse and the teaching of writing (Kubota, 1999; Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999). The discussion has been in the forefront in contrastive rhetoric; recent critics of contrastive rhetoric have blamed contrastive rhetoricians for teaching students to write for native English speakers' expectations instead of expressing their own native lingual and cultural identities.

At any rate, researchers and others working in the current contrastive rhetoric paradigm have adhered to the position that cultural differences need to be explicitly taught in order to acculturate EFL writers to the target discourse community. Teachers of English and others, such as consultants in grant proposal writing, need to educate students or clients about readers' expectations. For example, workshops for Finnish scientists who were learning how to write proposals in English taught a so-called Western style of grant proposal writing (Connor et al., 1995). This style employed a set of rhetorical moves adopted from Swales (1990) and validated by independent empirical research. If the Finnish scientists wished to get European Union (EU) research grants, they needed to follow EU norms and expectations, and these, at the time, were based on Anglo-American scientific and promotional discourse. On the other hand, when Finnish scientists wished to write grant applications in Finnish, it was suggested, following the expectations of the Finnish agencies would be advantageous. Although such a decision about rhetorical choice seems straightforward, as in the case of grant proposals in the project described above, it may be more complex in the case of college writers.

In the EU project described above, my colleagues and I (Connor et al., 1995) became aware of yet another issue facing contrastive rhetoric: that there may not be an English language norm for the writers of EU grant proposals to follow. Because the raters of grant proposals for the EU in Brussels are not solely native speakers of English but are scientists from all EU countries with many different L1s and many different rhetorical orientations, the standards for English language grant proposals have changed. In fact, something like a "Eurorhetoric" may have emerged. This blurring of standards and norms in written language is consistent with recent developments in spoken language. Crystal (1997) suggests that a new kind of English, World Standard Spoken English, may be arising in situations requiring communication in English with people from non-Anglophone countries for purposes of business, industry, and diplomacy.

CONCLUSION

The major changes taking place in the goals and research methods of contrastive rhetoric are affecting the scope of its impact on other areas of applied linguistics and beyond. The influence of contrastive rhetoric theories has expanded beyond the teaching of basic ESL and EFL writing, as the examples given in this article show. The growing influence of contrastive rhetoric in the teaching of such skills as business and technical writing is obvious not only in L2 situations overseas but also in the teaching of mainstream writing in the United States. A recent edited volume by Panetta (2001), for example, recommends the use of contrastive rhetorical theory in the teaching of business and technical writing in non-ESL U.S. classrooms.

In regard to methods of research, contrastive rhetoric has been influenced by new approaches. While adhering to its now well-tested premises (i.e., the cultural resonance of rhetorical patterns and the influence of L1 on second language acquisition) and continuing to rely on text analysis, and while retaining its traditional pedagogical applications, contrastive rhetoric is becoming more responsive to new currents in literacy research. It is embracing research-situated reflexivity and is becoming more sensitive to the social context and the local situatedness and particularity of writing activity. The increasingly context-sensitive research approach often involves studying the talk that surrounds text production and interpretation as well as writing processes and written products themselves (Connor, Halleck, & Mbaye, 2002).

Furthermore, in regard to methods, there has also been a call to study how writing in given cultures is tied to the intellectual history and social structures of these cultures (e.g., Mauranen, 2001; Scollon, 1997). Of course, it may be difficult to show how the patterns of a given culture's preferences in areas such as music, architecture, and literature (high culture areas suggested by Mauranen and by Scollon) or social interactions of everyday life are played out in writing. Yet, at the very least, contrastive rhetoric research could look for patterns across text genres in a given culture. In other words, are there identifiable, similar textual patterns across genres such as essays, grant proposals, and letters of request in a given culture? For example, Finnish writers have been found consistently across genres to delay the introduction of a topic and to use relatively little metatext (Connor et al., 1995; Ventola & Mauranen, 1991; Yli-Jokipii, 1996).

Finally, because cultures and genres are viewed as dynamic and fluid, contrastive rhetoric would be well advised to study texts diachronically to identify the evolution of patterns and norms. For example, in a corpus of letters of application covering a 10-year period (Upton & Connor, 2001),

Upton and I observed a stylistic change. Letters in the earlier years showed greater differences between the cultural groups (Finnish, Flemish, and U.S.) whereas letters in the later years evidenced a more homogenized style, with fewer differences. We have speculated that a universal form for a letter of application may be in progress in the global business environment. Further research needs to be conducted for a definitive answer, and contrastive rhetoric provides a useful framework.

THE AUTHOR

Ulla Connor is professor of English and director of the Indiana Center for Intercultural Communication at Indiana University in Indianapolis.

REFERENCES

- Allaei, S. K., & Connor, U. (1990). Exploring the dynamics of cross-cultural collaboration in writing classrooms. *The Writing Instructor*, 10, 19–28.
- Atkinson, D. (1999). Culture in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 625–654.
- Atkinson, D. (2000). On Robert B. Kaplan's response to Terry Santos et al.'s "On the Future of Second Language Writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9, 317–320.
- Atkinson, D., & Ramanathan, V. (1995). Cultures of writing: An ethnographic comparison of L1 and L2 university writing/language programs. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 539–568.
- Belcher, D. D. (1994). The apprenticeship approach to advanced academic literacy: Graduate students and their mentors. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13, 23–34.
- Belcher, D. D. (1997). An argument for nonadversarial argumentation: On the relevance of the feminist critique of academic discourse to L2 writing pedagogy. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6, 1–21.
- Belcher, D. D., & Connor, U. (Eds.). (2001). *Reflections on multiliterate lives*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analyzing genre: Language use in professional settings*. New York: Longman.
- Bloch, J. (2001). Plagiarism and the ESL student: From printed to electronic texts. In D. D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies* (pp. 209–245). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Braine, G. (Ed.). (1998). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Carson, J. G. (1992). Becoming biliterate: First language influences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1, 37–60.
- Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1994). Writing groups: Cross-cultural issues. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3, 17–30.
- Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1996). Chinese students' perceptions of ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5, 1–19.
- Casanave, C. P. (1995). Local interactions: Constructing contexts for composing in a graduate sociology program. In D. D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 83–110). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Christensen, F. (1963). A generative rhetoric of the paragraph. *College Composition and Communication*, 16, 144–156.

- Clyne, M. G., (1987). Cultural differences in the organization of academic texts: English and German. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11, 211–247.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, U. (in press). Changing currents in contrastive rhetoric: Implications for teaching and research. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, U., & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How much impact on revision? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3, 257–275.
- Connor, U., Davis, K., & DeRycker, T. (1995). Correctness and clarity in applying for overseas jobs: A cross-cultural analysis of U.S. and Flemish applications. *Text*, 15, 457–475.
- Connor, U., Halleck, G., & Mbaye, A. (2002, March). *Cross-cultural issues of academic literacy in U.S. research labs: Fronting the socialization dimension*. Paper given at the American Association of Applied Linguistics conference, Salt Lake City, UT.
- Connor, U., Helle, T., Mauranen, A., Ringbom, H., Tirkkonen-Conditt, S., & Yli-Antola, M. (1995). *Tekokkaita EU-projektiehdotuksia* [Successful EU grant proposals]. Helsinki, Finland: Tekes.
- Connor, U., & Johns, A. M. (Eds.). (1990). *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Connor, U., & Kaplan, R. B. (1987). *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Connor, U., & Kramer, M. (1995). Writing from sources: Case studies of graduate students in business management. In D. D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 155–182). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Connor, U., & Lauer, J. (1985). Understanding persuasive essay writing: Linguistic/rhetorical approach. *Text*, 5, 309–326.
- Connor, U., & Lauer, J. (1988). Cross-cultural variation in persuasive student writing. In A. C. Purves (Ed.), *Writing across languages and cultures* (pp. 138–159). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Connor, U., & Mauranen, A. (1999). Linguistic analysis of grant proposals: European Union research grants. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18, 47–62.
- Connor, U., & Mayberry, S. (1995). Learning discipline-specific academic writing: A case study of a Finnish graduate student in the United States. In E. Ventola & A. Mauranen (Eds.), *Academic writing: Intercultural and textual issues* (pp. 231–253). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duszak, A. (1994). Academic discourse and intellectual styles. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21, 291–313.
- Eggington, W. G. (1987). Written academic discourse in Korean: Implication for effective communication. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 153–168). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Enkvist, N. E. (Ed.). (1985). Text linguistics and written composition [Special issue]. *Text*, 5(4).
- Enkvist, N. E. (1997). Why we need contrastive rhetoric. *Alternation*, 4, 188–206.
- Evensen, L. S. (Ed.). (1986). *Nordic research on text linguistics and discourse analysis*. Trondheim, Norway: University of Trondheim, Tapir.
- Flowerdew, J. (1999). Writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 123–146.
- Goldstein, L. M., & Conrad, S. M. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 443–460.

- Golebiowski, Z. (1998). Rhetorical approaches to scientific writing: An English-Polish contrastive study. *Text*, 18, 67–102.
- Gosden, H. (1992). Research writing and NNS: From the editors. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1, 123–140.
- Gumperz, J., & Levinson, S. (1996). *Rethinking linguistic relativity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hatim, B. (1997). *Communication across cultures. Translation theory and contrastive text linguistics*. Exeter, England: University of Exeter Press.
- Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text*, 3, 183–195.
- Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 141–152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- 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. 87–110). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Hottel-Burkhart, N. G. (2000). The canons of Aristotelian rhetoric: Their place in contrastive Arabic-English studies. In Z. M. Ibrahim, N. Kassabgy, & S. Aydelott (Eds.), *Diversity in language: Contrastive studies in English and Arabic theoretical and applied linguistics* (pp. 93–110). Cairo, Egypt: The American University in Cairo Press.
- Hull, G., Rose, M., Fraser, K. L., & Castellano, M. (1991). Remediation as a social construct: Perspectives from an analysis of classroom discourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 42, 299–329.
- Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. Sturtevant, *Anthropology and human behavior* (pp. 13–53). Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.
- Ibrahim, Z. M., Kassabgy, N., & Aydelott, S. (Eds.). (2000). *Diversity in language: Contrastive studies in English and Arabic theoretical and applied linguistics*. Cairo, Egypt: The American University in Cairo Press.
- Jenkins, S., & Hinds, J. (1987). Business letter writing: English, French, and Japanese. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 327–354.
- Johnstone, B. (1986). Arguments with Khomeni: Rhetorical situation and persuasive style in cross-cultural perspective. *Text*, 6, 171–187.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning*, 16, 1–20.
- Koch, B. (1983). Presentation as proof: The language of Arabic rhetoric. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 25, 47–60.
- Kong, K. (1998). Are simple business request letters really simple? A comparison of Chinese and English business request letters. *Text*, 18, 103–141.
- Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 9–35.
- Kubota, R. (2001). Discursive construction of the images of U.S. classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 9–38.
- Mann, W. C., & Thompson, S. A. (1988). Rhetorical structure theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text*, 8, 242–281.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2001). On the origin of contrastive rhetoric: A response to “The Origin of Contrastive Rhetoric Revisited” by H. G. Ying (2000). *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 257–260
- Mauranen, A. (1993). *Cultural differences in academic rhetoric*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Mauranen, A. (2001). Descriptions or explanations? Some methodological issues in

- contrastive rhetoric. In M. Hewings (Ed.), *Academic writing in context* (pp. 43–54). Birmingham, England: University of Birmingham Press.
- Moreno, A. I. (1998). The explicit signaling of premise-conclusion sequences in research articles: A contrastive framework. *Text, 18*, 545–585.
- Nelson, G. L., & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*, 113–132.
- Nelson, G. L., & Murphy, J. M. (1992). An ESL writing group: Task and social dimensions. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*, 171–194.
- Panetta, C. G. (Ed.). (2001). *Contrastive rhetoric revisited and redefined*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*, 201–229.
- Prior, P. (1995). Redefining the task: An ethnographic examination of writing and response in six graduate seminars. In D. D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 47–82). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Purves, A. C. (1988). *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ramanathan, V., & Atkinson, D. (1999). Individualism, academic writing, and ESL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*, 45–75.
- Sarangi, S. (1994). Intercultural or not? Beyond celebration of cultural differences in miscommunication analysis. *Pragmatics, 4*, 409–427.
- Scollon, R. (1997). Contrastive rhetoric, contrastive poetics, or perhaps something else? *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 352–363.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1997). Point of view and citation: Fourteen Chinese and English versions of the "same" news story. *Text, 17*, 83–125.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10*, 201–231.
- Spack, R. (1997). The rhetorical construction of multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 765–774.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, D. (1985). Cross-cultural communication. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 203–216). New York: Academic Press.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (1996). Explicitness vs. implicitness in argumentation: An intercultural comparison. *Multilingua, 15*, 274–275.
- Toulmin, S. (1958). *The uses of argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Upton, T., & Connor, U. (2001). Using computerized corpus analysis to investigate the textlinguistic discourse moves of a genre. *English for Specific Purposes: An International Journal, 20*, 313–329.
- Ventola, E., & Mauranen, A. (1991). Non-native writing and native revising of scientific articles. In E. Ventola (Ed.), *Functional and systematic linguistics* (p. 457–492). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ying, H. G. (2000). The origin of contrastive rhetoric revisited. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*, 259–268.
- Yi-Jokipii, H. (1996). An approach to contrasting languages and cultures in the corporate context: Finnish, British, and American business letters and telefax messages. *Multilingua, 15*, 305–327.
- Zamel, V. (1997). Toward a model of transculturation. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 341–343.
- Zhu, Y. (1997). An analysis of structural moves in Chinese sales letters. *Text, 17*, 543–566.