"Orientalism" and Contrastive (Intercultural) Rhetoric: A Response to What Said Has Said

Deron Walker
California Baptist University, U.S.A.

Thirty years ago, Edward Said (1978) strongly criticized western scholars for "essentializing" the "exotic other." The "Orientalist" that Said described was complicit in a "discourse of power" that helped to enable Europe's exploitation of the Middle East and America's control over parts of the Far East. Postmodernists and post-colonialists of today share Said's concern with neo-colonialism and seek to protect others from harmful stereotypes. Meanwhile, the field initiated as contrastive rhetoric, now often called intercultural rhetoric, commenced when Kaplan (1966) discovered different organizational patterns in the English essays of five groups of international students. Though initially oversimplified, the field began with an explicitly pedagogical purpose: to help second language learners write better English academic essays. This paper will examine how Said-style criticism of "Orientalists," exercised by postmodernists and post-colonialists, has both helped to positively refine generalizations, biases and methodologies and simultaneously inhibited researchers and practitioners from further developing this pedagogically promising field of research in East-Asia.

Key words: contrastive rhetoric, intercultural communication, intercultural rhetoric, Orientalism, postmodernism

INTRODUCTION

Thirty years ago, Edward Said (1978) challenged a world of scholars who study East-West issues to reexamine their generalizations, ethnocentric biases, and research methods with his classic work *Orientalism*. Only a dozen years earlier, Kaplan (1966) had written an article titled "Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education" that pioneered the field of study initially known as contrastive rhetoric, now frequently referred to as intercultural or even comparative rhetoric. After analyzing more than 600 essays, Kaplan identified general rhetorical patterns used in academic writing for five different culture groups. Succinctly defined, contrastive / intercultural rhetoric is known as "the study of how rhetorical expectations and conventions differ among cultures" (Liebman, 1988, p. 6). Throughout its history, the field of contrastive or intercultural rhetoric has maintained a lively, often polarized conversation concerning the best approaches for writing instructors to employ to help East-Asian writers learn to compose English expository essays in a more rhetorically effective style for audiences of academic and professional native English readers.

Although Kaplan's (1966, 1988) purpose was explicitly pedagogical, his ideas and those of subsequent contrastive rhetoric proponents have been criticized almost exclusively in ideologically and theoretically similar terms to those delineated in Said's *Orientalism* though Said made no specific reference to contrastive or intercultural rhetoric in his classic work. This paper, then, will review an extensive body of literature and recent experimental research to explore the ways in which the criticism of contrastive / intercultural rhetoric has followed the same specific themes as Said's critique of Western scholarship on the East in general, how these criticisms have been shaped by larger movements in postmodernism and post-colonial theory, and the value and limitations of these criticisms to the improvement of East-Asian ("Oriental") scholarship. While the terms can be somewhat interchangeable, let *intercultural rhetoric* be the term we use to discuss the present research while *contrastive rhetoric* will represent what the

field was originally called. It will be argued that the types of aforementioned criticisms applied to intercultural rhetorical research have positively contributed to refining generalizations of culture and rhetoric and research methodology in the field. Nevertheless, hypercriticisms of intercultural rhetorical research have had a chilling effect in terms of distracting researchers from the field's original pedagogical focus and discouraging scholars from pursuing contrastive rhetoric-oriented research (Walker, 2008).

Who is an "Orientalist?"

Said put it best when he said,

> There is a difference between knowledge of other peoples and other times that is the result of understanding, compassion, careful study and analysis for their own sakes….and the will to dominate for the purposes of control and external enlargement of horizons, and the will to dominate for the purposes of control and external dominion. (Said, 1978, xix)

Said's quote seems to have captured the essence of the debate in intercultural rhetorical studies. Those who are strongly skeptical, perhaps even hypercritical of intercultural rhetoric, appear to ascribe the worst of motives to intercultural rhetoric proponents. Meanwhile, most proponents of using intercultural rhetoric for teaching university level English composition to second language writers (ESL/EFL) hardly resemble those so-called "Orientalists" who were guilty of "essentializing an exotic Other" that existed in such large numbers in the 19th century and early 20th century, who Said has described so well. Thus, any portrayal of intercultural rhetorical proponents as "Orientalists" by their critics would appear to be an antiquated and greatly exaggerated notion.

Caring educators, people like Robert Kaplan, John Hinds, William Eggington, Carolyn Matalene, Dwight Atkinson, Ulla Connor, and a host of others, including myself, have typically approached the topic as professional language instructors, who have often actually lived among the populations

we have studied for many years. We have shared meals with our students, learned their languages and customs, and become fully empathetic to our students' needs. Proponents of intercultural rhetoric are not musty old imperialists and Bible scholars, but are trained professionals in linguistics, rhetoric and composition and social science, who simply want to help our second language writers to be able to reach the English speaking audiences outside their countries more effectively, so they can be more successful and empowered by their English educations. Kaplan (1988) conveyed that distinctly pedagogical purpose very clearly when he stated,

> What was being sought…was some clear-cut unambiguous difference between English and any other given language, the notion being that any such clear-cut difference might provide the basis for pedagogical approaches that would solve—within the normative academic space of one or two semesters—the writing problems of speakers of other languages trying to learn to function in written English in the peculiar constraints of tertiary-level education in the United States. (p. 278)

In fact, although Kaplan (1966) unfortunately used the term "Oriental" in his title, none of the aforementioned contrastive rhetoric proponents nor any others that I know, myself included, who study, speak, and write about intercultural rhetoric in East-Asia (China, Japan, and Korea) would likely think of or call ourselves "Orientalists." As a collective group, intercultural rhetoric proponents hardly represent the archetypical description of the "Orientalist" described so well by Said (1978) as he depicted "Orientalists" as those who have marched with or like Napoleon in antiquated fashion from 1810-1910; spoken of a European conquest of the "Orient" as liberating (p. 172) or of a regeneration of Asia by Europe (p. 115); belonged to an organization such as the 1st Orientalist Congress in 1873 (p. 211), the American Oriental Society of 1842 (p. 294), or one of those full-blown Oriental Studies departments that were in vogue in "every major European university" by 1850 (p. 191); or lived in a civilization of European heritage who had colonized 85% of the Earth by end of World War I (p. 123). In fact,

Xiaoming Li (2008) has recently illuminated the frequently powerful link between contrastive rhetoric criticism and ideology which appears to clear contrastive rhetoric proponents of any "Orientalizing" ideological bias, as Li reported

> Then, examining the major criticisms leveled against CR [contrastive rhetoric], it suggests that the criticism reflects the changing winds in Western academia. CR, with its continuing focus on the demonstrable linguistic traits of writing rather than their ideological implications, is vulnerable to charges of political neutrality, if not naiveté. (p. 11)

Why then do educators who attempt to remain politically neutral and merely desire to help their students write better in English classes in which the students themselves signed up for of their own freewill often draw such intense criticism that harkens back to a world that has been almost completely vanquished from existence and, more to the point, one that none of the aforementioned educators would in any way approve of themselves?

Reexamining Generalizations

Said (1978) himself wrestled with the question of generalization. While he admitted that some generalizations were necessary, Said was primarily motivated by the fear of a potentially dangerous imperialist resurgence or neo-colonialism, closely associated with modernist thinking. In response to this fear, Said identified two trends of theoretical perspective, post-colonialism and postmodernism (p. 346), which would investigate new modes of colonial practices—not represent simply moving 'beyond" the modernist, colonial era. Said and others who have subscribed to the tenets of postmodernism have expressed a deep distrust of generalizations, pretense to objective knowledge and truth claims in the modernist sense, and especially relevant here, representations of culture. As Said stated,

> The real issue is whether indeed there can be a true representation of

> anything, or whether any and all representations, because they are representations, are embedded first in the language then in the culture, institutions, and political ambience of the representer… interwoven with a great many other things besides 'the truth,' which is itself a representation. (p. 272)

Said described himself as a humanist and asked his reader a very important question in regard to generalizations about culture, "Can human reality be humanely divided?" (1978, p. 46) This is a deep, soul-searching question with which we have all struggled in our postmodern world. Postmodernism may be further defined as a philosophical reaction against the generalizations of knowledge found in modernism, especially the meta-narrative (Foucault, 1983; Lyotard, 1984). Thus, postmodernists have been skeptical of traditional paradigms of knowledge and claims of objectivity found in the empirical scientific method and types of ethnographic narratives on culture that have informed contrastive / intercultural rhetoric research (Atkinson, 2004; Connor, 2004; Walker, 2008). Postmodernism has had both positive and negative influences on the field of study traditionally known as contrastive rhetoric, also more recently called intercultural rhetoric. Postmodernism at its best has enabled us to recognize the limits of generalizations, speak humbly about fallible human constructs of knowledge and culture, and conduct intercultural rhetorical research with greater rigor. Taken to an extreme, however, postmodernist criticism has at times proven excessive, casting an inhibiting influence on intercultural rhetoric by challenging even benign generalizations about culture, engaging in hypercriticism of method, and labeling contrastive proponents as "ethnocentric." Since it would go beyond the scope of this paper to write about all five of Kaplan's (1966) culture groups, and my own teaching and research experience has largely centered on the English writing of East-Asian students (Chinese, Korean, and Japanese), this paper will focus on generalizations made by Kaplan and others concerning the culture group that he clumsily labeled "Oriental." According to Kaplan, the academic essay writing of Asians generally tended to follow an indirect pattern while English rhetoric was more direct or "linear." Thus,

Kaplan's pioneering article on contrastive rhetoric shed some light on cross-cultural rhetorical differences in writing though it raised many more questions that needed to be answered.

While many critics, especially postmodernists, correctly pointed out Kaplan's term "Oriental" was clumsily over-generalized, subsequent research in EFL writing has supported the general findings that East-Asian writers in China (Chu, Swaffar, & Charnay, 2002; Matalene, 1985; Shen, 1989; Xing, Wang, & Spencer, 2008), Japan (Hinds, 1983, 1987, 1990; Mok, 1993; Yoshimura, 2002), and Korea (Eggington, 1987; Walker, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2008; Yang, 2004) do frequently write academic essays in rhetorical patterns that western audiences find excessively indirect. This problem has been exacerbated because it has been observed in both Korea (Eggington, 1987; Walker, 2005) and Japan (Yoshimura, 2002) that very little explicit rhetorical instruction is implemented, at either secondary or tertiary levels, even in the native language writing of students in these countries. In Japan, furthermore, students are seldom taught to write directly in English, but traditionally have received English composition instruction in Japanese for the purpose of translating Japanese into English (Okada, Okumura, Hirota, & Tokioka, 1995; Yoshimura, 2002). Since rhetoric is not typically taught in Japanese or English for either L1 or L2 expository writing, Japanese students may struggle with basic features of English rhetoric such as thesis placement, which often comes much earlier in English than Japanese, or formation of an explicit conclusion that provides closure (Hinds, 1983).

Eggington (1987) noted that a similar lack of rhetorical instruction in Korean secondary and tertiary composition classes hurts student efforts to write effective academic prose in both Korean and English. Korean students studying overseas or learning English composition from foreign English professors in their home countries often suffer tremendous criticism from their English teachers concerning the rhetorical features of their essay writing. Without explicit instruction in rhetoric, these students may eventually implicitly acquire and internalize the rhetorical features of English through the harsh school of trial and error. According to Eggington, this can become

an even greater problem for international students who return to Korea writing in an English rhetorical style and suffer criticism for not writing well in Korean. Raising awareness of rhetorical differences has been observed to have the potential for improving English academic writing ability to a significant degree throughout East-Asia: in Korea (Walker, 2004, 2005, 2006; Yang, 2004), Japan (Yoshimura, 2002), and China (Xing, Wang, & Spencer, 2008).

Even with the awkward over-generalizations found in Kaplan's article, his original findings proved pedagogically promising. As Kaplan (1966, p. 4) put it, the academic English compositions of second language writers, even those of advanced English proficiency, "often seem out of focus" when first language (L1) rhetorical patterns are transferred into the English expository writing of international students. Despite the endless controversies surrounding intercultural rhetoric, Kaplan was primarily concerned with enabling second language writers to overcome negative transfer involving rhetorical patterns that seem awkward to native English readers of academic English writing. Unfortunately, he has spent much of the last forty years defending his original position. The general implications of Kaplan's work, then, are clear. Intercultural rhetoric-oriented writing instruction could potentially empower international students studying overseas in countries such as the United States to write rhetorically improved English academic essays and also overcome the stigmatizing assumptions that western educators typically make about the cognitive abilities of students who fail to meet their expectations.

Nevertheless, through the years, many of the field's most serious criticisms have conveyed strongly Saidist—postmodernist tones, often hypercritical of contrastive rhetoric research method. Such critics have attempted to "problematize" the field, fearing "ethnocentric" overgeneralizations of culture that "essentialize the other" or treat second language writing "deterministically." Many western ESL writing researchers who operate from a postmodern perspective have raised very legitimate concerns that contrastive rhetoric may be misused to stereotype students (Kubota, 1997, 1998, 1999; Spack, 1997). However, as linguist Deborah Tannen (1985) has

noted, some people simply overreact and object to any research that delineates cross-cultural differences for fear of stereotyping, which itself is problematic since ignoring cultural differences often leads to miscommunication and "discrimination of another sort" (p. 212). These cautionary words regarding potentially negative effects from lack of awareness of cross-cultural differences in communication patterns have also been applied to contrastive rhetoric (Walker, 2006; Yoshimura, 2002) as well as gender communication (Tannen, 1985).

Reexamining Ethnocentrism and Method

Said (1978) criticized the "Orientalists" of the 18th and early 19th century for being too textual (p. 52) in their study, describing many of them as Biblical scholars, possessing "vision" but lacking in empirical data (p. 69). As we shall see in this section, many of these same criticisms have been levied at proponents of intercultural rhetoric as well. Even so, the more benign criticisms of intercultural rhetoric have largely been addressed by recent researchers and have allowed both researchers and practitioners to sharpen their understanding of writing and culture. Meanwhile, other criticisms of intercultural rhetoric have become extreme, biased and personal in nature, bringing forth more heat than light, and pushing the boundaries of standards of scholarly argumentation (Walker, 2008).

While the 1980s represented a kind of golden era in intercultural rhetorical research, the 1990s witnessed proponents of intercultural rhetoric often finding themselves on the defensive in the pages of leading journals in linguistics and second language writing for supposedly being "ethnocentric," "deterministic" and imperialistically "essentializing others" as intercultural rhetoric was often misunderstood and misinterpreted to be an imperializing force. Dwight Atkinson, Kaplan's student at the University of Southern California, represents an example of a scholar who was initially excited by the powerful potential of intercultural rhetoric to help second language writers. Atkinson recently declared that despite having had that "eureka!"

experience while reading Kaplan's seminal article (1966) as he was teaching writing in Japan, he subsequently lost his resolve to write his planned dissertation on intercultural rhetoric under Kaplan, instead, opting for a safer topic in technical writing. In his own words, the young Atkinson became apprehensive about pursuing intercultural rhetoric research, "Having some of the shortcomings of contrastive rhetoric rather graphically pointed out to me….I think I avoided the field of intercultural rhetoric so long mainly because of the overwhelming complexity" (2004, p. 278).

Fortunately, Atkinson did return to the field of intercultural rhetoric some years later. As he described it, "one of the few joys of aging is learning to be less afraid of complexity" (2004, p. 278). Now well published, Atkinson may be less afraid of the perils of being labeled as "ethnocentric" and encountering publishing difficulty, a point that I will return to later in this article. In a reader reaction in *TESOL Quarterly*, Atkinson expressed his distress and reported feeling misrepresented by Kubota (1999) for allegedly espousing the idea that "ESL professionals can and should teach the dominant discourse conventions" (Atkinson, 1999a, p. 747). Atkinson defended his position by asserting that his approach to writing instruction "explicitly opposes the teaching of the dominant discourse convention discussed in the article" and took exception to what he believed was a blatant misrepresentation of his ideas by stating, "Kubota's techniques are textbook cases of essentializing, determinism, and reductionism, which is rather alarming given that these are the very sins that she sees herself attacking" (Atkinson, 1999a, p. 746). One can certainly see how such a hostile exchange would discourage a scholar from pursuing a field of study. I can only wonder if this type of discourse was what young Atkinson had in mind when he discussed "having the shortcomings of intercultural rhetoric graphically pointed out to [him]" (Atkinson, 2004, p. 278).

Said (1978) described a similar escalation in tension in his study of 19th and early 20th century "Orientalism" when he contended that "Orientalists" wished to speak for the whole world (p. 109) with such a rigid state of codification in language that distorted truth, as Nietzsche put it, the truth of

language as

> A mobile army of metaphors, metonyms, and anthropomorphisms—in short a sum of human relations, which have been enhanced, transposed, and embellished, poetically and rhetorically, and which after long use seem firm, canonical, and obligatory to a people: truths are illusions about which one has forgotten that this is what they are. (p. 203)

Then, just as the reader may begin to see the Nietzsche view of truth as "too nihilistic" (p. 203), Said, in similar fashion to postmodernists who have been charged with narcissism, tended to ignore the potential viability of the criticism and attack the critic. Thus, Said (1978) wrote, "Orientalism" was such a system of truths in Nietzsche's sense of the word that, "It is therefore correct that every European, in what he could say about the Orient, was consequently a racist, an imperialist, and almost totally ethnocentric" (p. 204). As if he sensed the extremity of his own tone, Said attempted to smooth over his previous statement and explained further that "some of the sting" would be removed from the "labels" if we would only remember that "the more advanced societies" have "rarely offered the individual anything but imperialism, racism, and ethnocentrism for dealing with 'other' cultures" (p. 204).

The intensity of the charges that Said levied at "Orientalists" of old seemed to gain new life as they have been subsequently hurled at proponents of intercultural rhetoric by their critics, who have often seemed to misinterpret the intentions of well-meaning researchers and practitioners who have not been supporting an imperial conquest, but merely attempting to help their second language students to write better English academic essays. Many of the concerns Said (1978) outlined about "Orientalists," however, have been addressed by proponents of intercultural rhetoric. In fact, many of the important pieces of scholarship in the field in the last twenty years have not been written only by Western "Orientalists" with "a history of complicity with imperial power" (p. 341). Actually, a number of key research articles have come from East-Asians defining and discussing the rhetorical

differences themselves (Chu, Swaffar, & Charnay, 2002; Kubota, 1997, 1998, 1999; Li, 2005, 2008; Matsuda, 1997; Shen, 1989; Xing, Wang, & Spencer, 2008; Yang, 2004; Yoshimura, 2002).

Moreover, the rise in the East-Asian "tiger economies" in the final quarter of the 20th century has produced a more equal playing field so that disparate "discourse of power" spoken of by Said (1978, p. 345) as existing between Europe and the Islamic world in the middle of the last century hardly remains in 21st century East-Asia. Instead, a lively, robust and balanced discourse in intercultural rhetoric among respected peers on both sides of the Pacific Ocean has produced an enhanced methodology that goes beyond text analysis (Atkinson, 2004; Connor, 2002, 2004, 2008; Walker, 2008) among proponents of intercultural rhetoric. This enhanced methodology seems to be producing a recent resurgence in empirical study of intercultural rhetoric in East-Asia (Chu, Swaffar, & Charnay, 2002; Walker, 2006; Xing, Wang, & Spencer, 2008; Yoshimura, 2002).

Notwithstanding, during the 1990s critics of intercultural rhetoric seemed heavily influenced by the "anti-essentialist" and "radically skeptical" stand of Said and other postmodernists on all categorical designations such as "Orient and Occident" (p. 331). Zamel (1997) vividly captured the rising intensity of emotions and flaring tempers as the debate on intercultural rhetoric further polarized when she remarked that the "throat seizes" (p. 341) and that she "bristled" (p. 342) in reaction to certain aspects of intercultural rhetoric that she found offensive. Others joined in as Spack claimed, without supporting evidence, that "the label foreign is intimately connected with U.S. ethnocentrism" (1997, p. 766), despite the ubiquitous, worldwide public usage of terms like "alien" and "foreign," ranging from immigration lines to titles of leading universities of foreign studies abroad, such as the Korean University of Foreign Studies in Seoul, South Korea.

Meanwhile, both Nelson (1998) and Carson (1998) took exception to the critical labeling of intercultural rhetoric proponents. Carson countered that not discussing intercultural rhetoric can be viewed as ethnocentric. She found Spack's position to be an ethnocentric one that restricted the target language

40

instructor's perspective by placing the western emphasis on the individual ahead of the group with which the individual identifies. As Carson put it, "many Asian students may themselves construct their identities primarily as members of their particular cultures" suggesting that educators have "an obligation to know them as they know themselves and to use that knowledge to inform our pedagogical practices" (p. 739).

Carson's comments about Asian students seem consistent with the testimonies of many of the Korean and Chinese students I have taught. Although postmodernist skeptics of intercultural rhetoric have emphasized the individuality of the writer and fluidity of culture, the Korean and Chinese students I have talked to on a daily basis for many years now still frequently discuss their own cultures in very received ways, emphasizing tradition, Confucianism, politeness, indirectness, and an orientation toward others. They often discuss the value of "face" and how they despise blunt and overt criticisms of other people. It hardly seems appropriate to treat these students, then, as if they were radically individualistic and cultureless in the way that it seems American teachers often view native-English-speaking American students. As Atkinson himself once put it, individuals are always "individuals-in-context" (Atkinson, 1999a, p. 642).

Both Nelson (1998) and Carson (1998) discussed why generalizations are important in education. Categorizing, often negatively called "labeling" by postmodernist critics, has always served as a necessary cognitive function of the brain. It may be that classifying "cannot be avoided" but "may be necessary for an orderly life" (Gudykunst & Kim, 1984, p. 84). Applied to language, it represents a basic cognitive process (Lenneberg, 1967) that Sokal (1977) claimed dates back "before the advent of man" (p. 185). While it may be beyond the scope of this paper to fully delineate the well documented essentials of classification, rich discussions of them may be found in other sources (Brislin, 1981; Clark & Clark, 1977; Hurford & Heasley, 1983; Kassin, 1995; Myers, 1996; Nelson, 1977; Rosch, 1977).

Thirty years after Said's classic book, postmodernists still remain inherently uncomfortable with such generalizations; however, the truth is that

classification is a necessary part of the communication process (Gudykunst & Kim, 1984). Thus, Nelson also took exception to Spack's assertion that "teachers and researchers need to view students as individuals not as members of a culture group" (Spack, 1997, p. 772), a false dichotomy. As Nelson elaborated, "Spack has it backwards….Students are both members of groups and individuals, not one or the other….Humans cannot be cultureless or culture free" (1998, pp. 729-731). Spack's false dichotomy remains not only theoretically untenable but also impractical, "an impossible place to begin" (Nelson, 1998, p. 730) for composition teachers. While postmodernist thinking is correct that, ultimately, it is quite necessary to get to know students on an individual basis, without stereotypes, it can be helpful to begin a class with some general expectations, loosely held, about what types of writing styles, strengths, and weaknesses one might find among one's students. Even Said stated, "We all need some foundation on which to stand; the question is how extreme and unchangeable is our formulation of what this foundation is" (1978, p. 333).

Curiously, postmodernist critics do not seem to object when similar generalizations are made about first language writers. Flower (1979) has indicated that first language students have cognitive difficulty when trying to overcome their egocentrism and write to an academic audience. Bartholomae (1985) has contended that the university confronts native-English-speaking college freshmen with a culture that is so foreign to them that one of the greatest challenges becomes "inventing the university" audience for them. Both theories hold wide currency in L1 composition theory, suffering little criticism, which is also true for Tannen's (1985) generalizations about gender differences as cross-cultural communication. Why is it, then, that postmodernists have so sharply criticized intercultural rhetoric proponents in more ways and to much greater extremes than the critiques of generalizations made in other fields?

While "problematization" of intercultural rhetorical studies may ultimately lead to a healthy refinement of method, I would assert that the field of intercultural rhetorical studies has been unnecessarily impeded by an over-

reactive and withering onslaught of postmodernist criticism. The level and intensity of this criticism has undoubtedly discouraged researchers from making practical, pedagogically relevant progress in this field. Instead of conducting studies of teaching treatments for implementing intercultural rhetoric in the classroom, researchers have spent inordinate amounts of time discussing intercultural rhetoric on philosophical and theoretical levels. Instead of thinking of intercultural rhetoric as a rigid method to be perfected prior to implementation, it may be more helpful to think of it as an approach and not a specific method. As Casanave suggested, not all of the tenets of the field are testable, but intercultural rhetoric has always been a "descriptive project" (2004, p. 33). Grabe and Kaplan (1996) explained, "What is clear is that there are rhetorical differences in the written discourses of several languages" which these researchers contended "need to be brought to consciousness before a writer can begin to understand what he or she must do in order to write in a more native-like manner" (p. 198).

Like other studies, intercultural rhetoric is itself a process. Clearly, sufficient evidence supports the existence of generally defined cultural and rhetorical differences in expository writing in East-Asian contexts (Chu, Swaffar, & Charnay, 2002; Eggington, 1987; Flowerdew, 2002; Hinds, 1983, 1987, 1990; Kaplan, 1966; Liebman, 1988; Matalene, 1985; Reid, 1989; Shen, 1989; Walker, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2008, Xing, Wang, & Spencer, 2008; Yang, 2004; Yoshimura, 2002). Contrary to postmodernist criticism, perfect consensus about what those differences entail or imply is not necessary to conduct an examination of or hold a discussion about them. To draw on an example from history, we do not understand history perfectly or have a consensus on the interpretations thereof, but we still study the subject and debate the issues endlessly. Then we simply revise our faulty interpretations as time passes. We would hardly stop teaching history until a hypothetical time came when we could figure out how to present it flawlessly, which seemingly represents what postmodernist critique demands concerning the generalizations of cultural and rhetorical differences in the field of intercultural rhetoric.

The Impact on Intercultural Rhetoric Research

Atkinson (1999b) wrote that although culture is central to learning, it is an "underexamined concept in TESOL" (p. 625). Atkinson counted only 10 articles over the previous 15 years that featured the term culture, or its variation, in their titles in a leading ESL/EFL journal, *TESOL Quarterly*. Atkinson posited two possibilities for this: 1) culture has become a common sense notion meriting little discussion; or 2) the term has been discounted in favor of other concepts, such as identity, as in anthropology or cultural studies. However, the discussion of culture seems to have polarized. Atkinson further classified six articles as adhering to a received view of culture, the traditional idea that culture is a static entity, unchanging and homogenous, based on norms of some ethnic or national group or geographic location. The opposing view, containing two articles, replaced the term "culture" with "identity." Atkinson elaborated that replacing culture with identity had become a favorite conceptual shift among postmodernists. Only two of the articles cited by Atkinson (1999b) attempted to seek a middle ground by viewing culture as a dynamic, fluid, construct.

Recently, the ascendancy of post-Said, postmodernist influence seems to have upset the balance in the fields of second language writing and intercultural rhetoric research. We are currently witnessing an unhealthy emergence of postmodernist dominance in second language writing research anthologies that have been produced and marketed for graduate students and scholars who will teach second language writers and writing instructors. At the beginning of this decade, for example, Silva and Matsuda (2001) edited an anthology on second language writing titled simply, *Landmark Essays on ESL Writing*. This anthology represented an eclectic collection of research articles that covered a breadth of the history and relevant issues of second language writing from 1962-1997, including, structural analysis of compositions, writing as a skill, ideology and research issues, ESL writing assessment, connections between reading and writing, and multiple perspectives on intercultural rhetoric (Walker, 2008).

The subject index of *Landmark Essays* cited 25 pages that discussed intercultural rhetoric directly under four different headings. Three of the chapters in the anthology examined intercultural rhetoric thoroughly, two in support with one taking a more skeptical position. Matsuda's (1997) article, included as a chapter, "problematized" the issue of intercultural rhetoric by arguing that a more "dynamic" model of culture was needed as its foundation rather than the so-called "received" models that had been used in the past. Most importantly, Matsuda's deconstructionist perspective represented only one voice and view among many, allowing it to effectively challenge existing generalizations without inhibiting intercultural rhetoric dialogue. Another text designed to serve professionals and aspiring teachers of second language writing—often used in tandem with the aforementioned anthology—Ferris and Hedgcock's (1998) *Teaching ESL Composition: Purpose, Process and Practice*—devoted a significant section, ten pages, to a very balanced, explicit discussion of intercultural rhetoric that covered both its strengths and weaknesses. These two sources together, then, provided balanced and diverse perspectives on many issues, including intercultural rhetoric.

However, under the recent influence of postmodernism, the field of second language writing has not been so inclusive. Only four short years after *Landmark Essays,* a follow-up anthology of research on second language writing, compiled by Matsuda and Silva (2005), *Second Language Writing Research: Perspectives on the Process of Knowledge Construction,* includes in its 16 chapters an almost exclusively postmodernist perspective, as if other perspectives on knowledge construction no longer exist or have lost relevance. The same anthology also maintains a profoundly biased imbalance toward qualitative research methods as opposed to quantitative, including seven chapters that emphasize the former and two that address the latter. Three additional chapters are described as "strategically combining approaches" (xii), which really makes them qualitative as the quantitative research paradigm, by definition, excludes such a possibility, whereas qualitative research, conversely, does not.

This anthology contains a mere five references to intercultural rhetoric.

Four of those references appear in one article. Li (2005) wrote from a predominantly postmodernist perspective and discussed issues of direct relevance to intercultural rhetoric while seemingly attempting to minimize the issue of intercultural rhetoric itself. Along with a scant four references to intercultural rhetoric in her chapter, Li did not discuss any of the traditional proponents of intercultural rhetoric such as Kaplan, Hinds, and Eggington. Li made only one reference to Connor, a rather neutral and benign supporter of intercultural rhetoric, one who "problematizes" and lateralizes the field more than deepens it in her historical and philosophical syntheses of intercultural rhetoric. Instead, Li (2005) almost exclusively discussed intercultural rhetoric under the influence of a postmodernist approach, vacillating uncomfortably between ambivalent "problematization" and a statement for seemingly reluctant inclusion of the field in the larger discussion of second language writing.

Another recent anthology, edited by Matsuda, Ortmeier-Hooper, and You (2006), *The Politics of Second Language Writing: In Search of the Promised Land,* does not index a single reference to intercultural rhetoric or any of its derivatives in 300-plus pages. Clearly, the trend in American-based second language writing research, under the predominant postmodernist influence, would be to minimize discussions of intercultural rhetoric and treat the field with neglect if not contempt. This postmodernist bias was revealed in Casanave's (2004, 2005) recent writings, composed with an explicitly stated set of postmodern-influenced assumptions.

Casanave's (2004) recent *Controversies in Second Language Writing* devoted an entire chapter to intercultural rhetoric; however, the author demonstrated a clear bias in favor of a very critical postmodernist approach against intercultural rhetoric. While Casanave appears to cover both sides of the issue, her attitude toward intercultural rhetoric seems negatively biased. Casanave even lamented that "Kaplan's doodles (schematic rhetorical representations) simply will not go away" but complained that these "doodles" appear in Japanese newspapers "as a taken for granted truth" (2004, p. 31). This should not be so surprising for someone such as Casanave, who

taught English in Japan, given the scope of Hinds' work (1983, 1987, 1990) in intercultural rhetoric in that country. The Japanese context, in fact, seems more in need of intercultural rhetoric as the Japanese have minimized their English writing programs at tertiary levels to be more translation-oriented. The state of Japanese English education, in general, and English writing, specifically, has been thoroughly delineated and well substantiated by Japanese scholars cited in Yoshimura's (2002) dissertation on intercultural rhetoric in Japan.

Casanave (2004) further demonstrated imbalance in her presentation of the intercultural rhetoric debate as she thoroughly described almost seven pages of criticism of intercultural rhetoric, but covered only three pages of proponents' positive contributions under a section mysteriously titled "The Defenders Strike Back." A close read of that section illustrates Casanave's bias in that she mostly cited Connor and Leki as intercultural rhetoric "defenders," moving the field "forward," when these two have served mainly to "problematize" and lateralize the field in different geographic areas and genres, a tactic favored by postmodernists. Neither did Casanave cite many of the more powerful findings of intercultural rhetoric research such as Chu, Swaffar, and Charnay's (2002) impressive quantitative study, which appeared in *TESOL Quarterly* a couple of years before Casanave wrote her article.

In multiple sources Casanave (2004, 2005) has demonstrated her lack of belief in intercultural rhetoric as a useful pedagogical construct as when she inaccurately asserted, "principles of intercultural rhetoric cannot be applied directly to classroom writing instruction" (Casanave, 2004, p. 43). This was a curious claim since at the time of her writing studies had already been performed that actually did apply intercultural rhetoric principles directly to writing instruction. Casanave's (2005) hypercriticism of intercultural rhetoric has come across even more clearly in another recent writing where she explained her value of the narrative in L2 writing research, "narrative inquiry in L2 writing research can potentially help L2 writing researchers dismantle stereotypes of cultural patterns in writing and of writers labeled simplistically as representatives of their respective cultures" (p. 29). In short, Casanave's

(2004, 2005) negative view of intercultural rhetoric seems to derive from a postmodern perspective, her desire to treat all students as individuals without contexts, and some misconceptions that she seems to harbor about intercultural rhetoric itself. Casanave (2004), like many postmodernists in second language writing, appears to operate under the misconception that intercultural rhetoric proponents are obsessed with written products, grammar, paragraph writing, and stereotyping students with simplistic labels. Nothing could be further from the truth (Walker, 2008).

Pedagogically Promising Research

Regardless of "Orientalist" critique and postmodernist skepticism, a number of recent studies involving East-Asian students have demonstrated that postmodernist "problematizations" can contribute positively toward establishing intercultural rhetoric as a significant pedagogical force in second language writing classrooms (Liebman, 1988; Walker, 2006; Xing, Wang & Spencer, 2008; Yoshimura, 2002). Twenty years ago, Liebman was ahead of her time in inviting her freshmen native English speaking and ESL writing students to become ethnographers and revisit and critique Kaplan's (1966) original article in their response papers. Liebman (1988) stated that even though she began the ethnography with a "negative view toward contrastive rhetoric" that she concluded the study with the ability to see intercultural rhetoric as "a powerful and informative concept" (p. 16).

Despite allowing her "own perspective [to] creep in, for so many of the papers do reflect [her] opinion," Liebman concluded that her ESL students had benefited substantially from this ethnographic approach to their writing classes and the further sharing of their ideas in teacher conferences. Many students were supportive of Kaplan's (1966) ideas; most notably, all three Japanese students in Liebman's (1988) study confirmed the indirectness of Japanese rhetoric. All three students indicated that indirectness was taught in Japanese, attaching it to Japanese notions of politeness. One student, Junko Tanaka, elaborated, "[The Japanese] prefer to be modest and polite, what we

call the old-fashioned way" (Liebman, 1988, p. 10).

However, students were not unequivocal in their support of Kaplan's work (1966) but expressed ambivalent feelings about his conclusions. One student, Kazumi Mase, summed up the complexity of the topic well. Mase initially stated, "My first idea [when reading Kaplan] about linguistics was that a person that doesn't speak a language can never understand the structure of that language" but elaborated that doing an ethnographic study can change one's thinking, "my research [showed] that my idea about the language was wrong. Although I've been speaking Japanese more than twenty years, I had never noticed that Japanese was such an indirect language until I researched it by myself" (Liebman, 1988, p. 11). I have often received this type of response when discussing intercultural rhetoric. Students or educators may understandably become angry if they believe their languages or cultures are being criticized or stereotyped. Notwithstanding, if engaged in lengthy, thought-provoking, student-centered, ethnographic study, students will often acknowledge, even appreciate that important differences do exist between the different rhetorical communities (Walker, 2008).

One of the few pedagogically relevant studies of intercultural rhetoric in East-Asia was conducted by Yoshimura (2002) who studied 105 subjects, 74 male and 31 female, from a variety of majors studying in required general English courses at Kyoto Sangyo University, a private university in Japan. The treatment consisted of regular, formal, explicit instruction in intercultural rhetoric and the employment of an intercultural, rhetorically-based conscious-raising activity as reinforcement. After one semester of instruction, all students were tested and both experimental groups significantly improved their writing fluency, measured by total word production. The experimental groups improved in rhetorical proficiency and discourse level accuracy as rated by three judges. The findings reported supported previous research in the Japanese EFL setting (Mizuno, 1995; Otaki, 1996, 1999) that "indicate the beneficial effects of explicit classroom instruction in contrastive rhetoric" (Yoshimura, 2002, p. 120).

Yoshimura (2002) further found that the first language could facilitate

positive transfer with intercultural rhetoric-oriented instruction, not just negative interference (Walker, 2006). Yoshimura concluded that the use of the L1 (Japanese) allowed students who wrote in Japanese then translated their writing into English to more easily assess their own work rhetorically than those who only wrote in English. In this study, those students who wrote directly in English appeared to have more difficulty applying the principles of intercultural rhetoric instruction. Yoshimura's subjects further indicated by survey that intercultural rhetoric-oriented writing instruction helped them to write more easily, start earlier, and produce more English of a higher quality. Yoshimura believed this result was at least partly attributable to the lowering of the students' affective filters (Krashen, 1982). The researcher explained that at the beginning of the study students' affective filters had been high due to their inexperience in L2 writing (Okada et al., 1995) and their previous "form-focused" instruction that had heightened their anxieties about making errors. Apparently, intercultural rhetoric-oriented writing instruction gave the students more confidence when writing in English and helped them to relax and write more effectively.

Yoshimura (2002) found that intercultural rhetoric-oriented writing instruction can enable students to improve their writing effectiveness, awareness of audience expectations in the target language, and ability to avoid negative transfer from the L1 to the L2. The other equally important implication of Yoshimura's work was that writing instructors should not prohibit students from using their first language in their writing classes, as they often do. The researcher noted that for low-proficiency learners, especially, the L1 could be a significant source of comfort and assistance in tackling the enormously complex task of brainstorming, organizing, developing, and revising a composition in a second language. Thus, Yoshimura has significantly added to what we know about the potential for intercultural rhetoric-oriented composition pedagogy to be a powerful force in the EFL writing classroom in East-Asia (Walker, 2008).

Meanwhile, Walker (2004, 2006) conducted a quantitative study of 65 university level students in six English Grammar and Composition courses at

Handong Global University in South Korea. This study's teaching treatment of reinforcing classroom intercultural rhetoric-oriented writing instruction with intercultural rhetoric-oriented writing instruction rendered in teacher conferences and peer response groups (experimental group) helped lower-level Korean university writers make significantly better improvements in their essay writing when compared to their control group peers, who only received intercultural rhetoric-oriented writing instruction through classroom lectures, discussions, and written feedback on essays. Walker's study of intercultural rhetoric teaching methods for EFL university students established that 1) intercultural rhetoric instruction, taught even through the traditional composition methods of lecture and written feedback on essays (control group), can help students write better English academic essays; 2) intercultural rhetoric-oriented use of specific composition techniques such as teacher conferencing and peer response activities in tandem (teaching treatment) can significantly increase the improvement in students' English academic essay writing, especially for lower level English composition students (Walker, 2004, 2005, 2006).

This study's main contribution is the finding that intercultural rhetoric-oriented writing instruction can be an integral part of a writing curriculum, especially when traditional lecture and written feedback are reinforced with innovative teaching techniques such as teacher conferencing and peer response. It is important to note that this effect bears great significance since it was the low level students, those needing improvement the most, who received the greatest benefit from the teaching treatment. The implication of this finding is even more noteworthy because a vast majority of ESL/EFL university level writing students may indeed enter their undergraduate writing courses as low level writers, as was true in this study (41 of 65 subjects). Succinctly stated, intercultural rhetoric-oriented writing instruction reinforced by teacher conferencing and peer response activities could be helpful to a majority of second language writing students in many contexts (Walker, 2004, 2006, 2008).

Taking an ethnographic approach to intercultural rhetoric, as Connor

(2004) recently suggested, these three studies initiated student-centered discussions of intercultural rhetoric. All three studies, one ESL, two EFL—Korean and Japanese—demonstrated that intercultural rhetoric can be employed to deliver effective English academic writing instruction to non-native writers of English. Consistent with a postmodernist point of view, these three studies used a student-centered, ethnographic approach since it has been well established that not every writer will employ the same style of rhetoric commonly found among people who share an L1 background. Atkinson's (2004) "problematizing" of culture reminds us how complex culture is and that an individual's school, youth culture, or other background factors may lead them to have different perceptions of culture and rhetoric than what is commonly reported for their national, ethnic, or language group in a global sense.

Finally, Xing, Wang, and Spencer (2008) investigated the potential impact of e-learning on raising overseas students' cultural awareness and creating an interactive learning environment to improve the rhetorical composition of Chinese English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students. As Said (1978) would want it, two of the three researchers were Chinese. These researchers succinctly redefined five features of contrastive rhetoric, similar to those drawn from other researchers, some of them Asian. Xing, Wang and Spencer's (2008) five features included (with East-Asian style appearing first in each pairing)

1. Inductive v. Deductive (Delayed Thesis)
2. "Start-Sustain-Turn-Sum" v. "Introduction-Body-Conclusion"
3. Circular v. Linear (Topic Sentences and Changes)
4. Circular v. Linear
5. Explicit Discourse Markers (Transitions)

Simply stated, the aforementioned researchers asserted that East-Asian when compared to American English style academic writing 1) features a delayed thesis statement; 2) turns more to unrelated subjects or other angles

than proceeds in a linear fashion; 3) contains fewer topic sentences, but 4) incorporates more topic changes; and 5) uses fewer transition markers. Xing, Wang and Spencer (2008) studied 90 Chinese students with 15 English university lecturers including 60 doctoral of philosophy students (Ph.D.) at Harbin Institute of Technology (HIT) in China. Thirty students were put into an experimental group and thirty into a control group. Thirty remaining students were undergraduate Chinese language studies students who provided a baseline for identifying rhetorical features in Chinese. Students in both experimental and control groups received four hours of language instruction per week. In addition, the experimental group students used the e-course for supplementary writing instruction. Primarily, students in the e-course could gain awareness of and proficiency in the various rhetorical styles by viewing models of essays using Chinese and English rhetorical patterns and obtaining advice from tutors and other students on their writing via electronic chat rooms and bulletin boards.

The results of the study demonstrated that significant differences existed in the rhetorical styles between the Chinese and UK writers (instructors). The Chinese doctoral students in both experimental and control groups improved their rhetorical proficiency on essays significantly in the study. The control group with conventional writing instruction improved in two of four areas (number of paragraphs and position of thesis paragraph) while the experimental group improved in three of four areas (two aforementioned plus number of discourse markers) although there were limitations in the e-learning course in availability of materials and limited opportunities to be online with native speakers. Thus, intercultural rhetorical instruction applied through the e-learning environment appeared to facilitate higher rhetorical proficiency in the target language of English for the Chinese doctoral students.

Pedagogical Implementation: The "How To"

What do these studies tell us about implementing intercultural rhetorical

instruction in our second language writing classrooms? These studies illustrate many principles and techniques that we can employ to help raise students' awareness of cross-cultural aspects of written communication. In particular, we know that rhetorical styles do differ among writers from various linguistic and cultural backgrounds which can interfere with clear communication in writing. Lecturing about and discussing these rhetorical differences in writing classes may be helpful to second language writers. Nevertheless, clearly, more in-depth writing instruction is necessary to reinforce and personalize principles of rhetorical preferences, so that students can successfully apply them to their writing and compose rhetorically smoother English essays—as was the case in the three pedagogically-oriented studies of intercultural rhetoric in East-Asia cited here (Walker, 2006; Xing, Wang, & Spencer, 2008; Yoshimura, 2002).

This intercultural rhetorically-oriented writing instruction should begin in student-centered fashion. One could start as Liebman (1988) did by turning students into ethnographers to reexamine and analyze the findings of other scholars in intercultural rhetoric such as Kaplan (1966) or someone more recent. Students may compare the claims of the researchers with their own papers and writing instruction that they had growing up and synthesize the information into a research paper. In addition to learning about intercultural rhetoric, students would acquire very valuable critical thinking and research skills. Students could discover the similarities and differences of rhetorical styles on their own, with gentle guidance from their instructors, which should help them to internalize cross-cultural conventions of academic writing.

This ethnographic study can be reinforced in a variety of ways and means. Teacher conferencing and peer response seem like fruitful ways to facilitate the student-ethnographic self-discovery process accompanied by gentle mentoring and non-direct instruction to promote the independent learning of the student. As Liebman's (1988) study suggested, students respond better to intercultural rhetoric if they are allowed to make discoveries for themselves. As discussed earlier, teacher conferences make great forums for facilitating student higher order thinking, building struggling students' confidence, and

reinforcing principles of English rhetoric taught in the classroom (Carnicelli, 1980; Jacobs & Karliner, 1977; Oye, 1993; Patthey-Chavez & Ferris, 1997; Walker, 2004, 2005, 2006). Whether it is the native English speaking (NES) college freshman (Bartholomae, 1985) or the second language writer who has difficulty adjusting to the culture of American-style college education, one-on-one, "non-direct" discussions (Rogers, 1994) with students about their writing in teacher conferences can help students to internalize writing principles and apply them to their own writing through social interaction (Newkirk, 1995; Patthey-Chavez & Ferris, 1997; Vygotsky, 1978). Research on the value of teacher conferencing, conducted through non-direct instruction, speaks with a virtual consensus as to the value of teacher conferencing to facilitate higher order critical thinking and discovery learning. My experience as a practitioner has been very consistent with these findings.

Succinctly stated, peer response has also demonstrated great potential as it was an important part of both Walker's (2006) intercultural rhetorically-focused teaching treatment in South Korea as well as the e-learning study in China through electronic chat rooms and bulletin boards (Xing, Wang, & Spencer, 2008). Although success was obtained in those two studies, other research with both first and second language writers has shown less success with peer response. In terms of second language writing, perhaps, the odds of success could be enhanced by tapping into the first language skills as Yoshimura (2002) did or by typing peer review comments as was done with Xing, Wang, and Spencer's (2008) study of the e-learning context. Using the first language (L1) orally as a bridge in peer response to writing in the second language could ease some of the stress students have with the activity of peer response if their speaking skills in English are limited. Also, using the native language or being able to write remarks on a bulletin board, even in the target language (English), could provide students with more comfort in distance and a feeling of greater competency and effectiveness in communication, which may possibly alleviate some of the social and cultural stress that especially East-Asian students have in terms of terms of criticizing the writing of others, elders in particular (even with small age differences).

55

Finally, the computer can be used to bring people together. Native English speakers (NES) can be brought into the classroom from another country using video, chat room, or various types of technology. Bulletin boards can be handy to store templates for comparison models between various styles of rhetoric. The technology can be used to permit students to give more successful feedback to each other on their papers. All of these methods can be combined as well in various shapes and forms. For instance, in the e-learning situation, teacher conferencing could be used to follow-up on and reinforce what happened in the online chat rooms and with the feedback on student papers. Students could even chat in their native languages as long as they write in English. Both electronic discussion groups and teacher conferencing could be used to facilitate reinforcement of the ethnographic investigation students undergo in exploring the writing of both the first language academic culture and the second one as well.

CONCLUSION

In summary, Said's (1978) classic discussion of "Orientalism" and postmodernism carry similar themes in terms of challenging the generalizations, ethnocentric biases, and research methods that Westerners use and operate under when they study Asia. For Europeans, this has typically meant the Middle East while Americans have been more interested in the Far East. Specifically, these same themes can be found with similar criticisms made toward the proponents of intercultural rhetoric in East-Asia (China, Japan, and Korea). On the positive side, such criticism has led to reflection on generalization, ethnocentric biases, and method and produced better study methods that may be partly responsible for a recent surge in research studies in this area, particularly in EFL contexts.

Conversely, hypercriticism has likely inhibited pedagogical study in the field as few classroom research studies were initiated until just recently. Such hypercriticism, while understandable, has proven unwarranted as contrastive /

intercultural proponents hardly represent the archetypical "Orientalist" described so well by Said (1978). In fact, it would appear that it is the lack of political agenda on behalf of the modern contrastive / intercultural rhetoric proponent and effort to maintain "political neutrality" and freedom from ideological biases that would make the intercultural rhetoric proponent an "honest broker" (Li, 2008). Unlike the "Orientalist" of the past, the modern contrastive / intercultural rhetoric proponent should be seen as an empowerer and not an oppressor, one whose genuine concern seeks no colonial or neocolonial outcome, but merely desires to enable the second language student to become a better writer and master of the rhetorics of both languages (Eggington, 1987; Kaplan, 1988; Walker, 2006, 2008).

Today's contrastive / intercultural rhetoric proponent, for instance, has clearly understood the contextual nature of writing, the supremacy of audience, and the equality of rhetorics and cultures (Eggington, 1987; Hinds, 1983; Walker, 2006, 2008). Thus, today's intercultural rhetoric researcher / practitioner has employed far more sophisticated methodology than any Saidist "Orientalist" ever would have by using ethnography (Connor, 2004, 2008; Liebman, 1988), e-learning (Xing, Wang, & Spencer, 2008), teacher conferencing and / or peer response (Walker, 2006), and the students' native language(s) (Yoshimura, 2002) to problematize discussions of culture and give voice to the perspective of "the Other," who freely participate in the discussions of language, culture and writing. Thus, future research and practice should continue to explore the aforementioned pedagogical possibilities of the field of intercultural rhetoric and examine how innovative methods in ethnography, composition studies, and e-learning can be applied to intercultural rhetoric-oriented research and practice. It is hoped that these recent empirical studies (Walker, 2006; Xing, Wang, & Spencer, 2008; Yoshimura, 2002) will make a valuable contribution in that direction.

THE AUTHOR

Deron Walker is associate professor in the Dept. Modern Languages and Literature of California Baptist University in Riverside, California, U.S.A. His current research interests cover issues related to second language writing, including intercultural rhetoric and pedagogical grammar. His recent publications include a study on employing teacher conferencing and peer response to facilitate intercultural rhetorically-oriented writing instruction in an EFL environment (2006) and an examination of the effects of postmodernism-based criticisms on the field of intercultural rhetoric (2008). Email: dwalker@calbaptist.edu

REFERENCES

Atkinson, D. (1999a). Comments on Ryuko Kubota's "Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for Applied Linguistics research and ELT.": Postmodern Applied Linguistics: Problems and contradictions, *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(4), 745-749.

Atkinson, D. (1999b). TESOL and culture. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(4), 625-654.

Atkinson, D. (2004). Contrasting rhetorics/contrasting cultures: Why contrastive rhetoric needs a better conception of culture. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 3*, 277-289.

Bartholomae, D. (1985). Inventing the university. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer can't write: Studies in writer's block and other composing process problems* (pp. 134-165). NY: Guilford Press.

Brislin, R. (1981). *Cross-cultural encounters.* Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Carnicelli, T. A. (1980). The writing conference: A one-to-one conversation. In T. R. Donovan & B. W. MacClelland (Eds.), *Eight approaches in teaching composition* (pp. 101-132). Urbana, IL: National Council for Teachers of English.

Carson, J. G. (1998). Comments on Ruth Spack's "The rhetorical construction of multi-students": Cultural backgrounds: What should we know about multilingual students? *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(4), 735-740.

Casanave, C. P. (2004). *Controversies in second language writing: Dilemmas and*

decisions in research and instruction. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Casanave, C. P. (2005). Uses of narrative in L2 writing research. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 17-32). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Chu, H. J., Swaffar, J., & Charnay, D. H. (2002). Cultural representations of rhetorical conventions: The effects on reading recall. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 511-545.

Clark, H. H., & Clark, E. V. (1977). *Psychology and language.* NY: Harcourt Brace.

Connor, U. (2002). New directions in contrastive rhetoric. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 493-510.

Connor, U. (2004). Intercultural rhetoric research: Beyond texts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 3*, 291-304.

Connor, U., Nagelhout, E., & Rozycki, W. V. (Eds.). (2008). *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Eggington, W. G. (1987). Written academic discourse in Korean: Implications for effective communication. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 153-168). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. S. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Flower, L. (1979). Writer-based prose: A cognitive basis for problems in writing. *College English, 41*(1), 19-37.

Flowerdew, J. (2002). *Academic discourse.* London: Longman.

Foucault, M. (1983). *This is not a pipe.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing.* New York: Longman.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (1984). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text, 3*(2), 183-195.

Hinds, J. (1987). Reader-writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), w*riting 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. 89-109). Alexandria, VA.: Teachers to Speakers of Other Languages.

Hurford, J. R., & Heasley, H. (1983). *Semantics: A coursebook.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobs, S., & Karliner, A. (1977). Helping writers to think: The effect of speech roles in individual conferences on the quality of thought in student writing. *College English, 38,* 489-505.

Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning, 16*, 1-20.

Kaplan, R. B. (1988). Contrastive rhetoric and second language learning: Notes toward a theory of contrastive rhetoric. In A. C. Purves (Ed.), *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric* (pp. 275-304). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kassin, S. (1995). *Psychology*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* New York: Pergammon Press.

Kubota, R. (1997). A reevaluation of the uniqueness of Japanese written discourse: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Written Communication, 14*, 460-480.

Kubota, R. (1998). An examination of L1-L2 transfer in writing among Japanese university students: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7,* 69-100.

Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly, 33,* 9-35.

Lenneberg, E. H. (1967). *Biological foundations of language.* New York: Wiley.

Li, X. (2005). Composing culture in a fragmented world: The issue of representation in cross-cultural research. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 121-134). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Li, X. (2008). From contrastive rhetoric to intercultural rhetoric: A search for collective identity. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout, & W. V. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric.* (pp. 11-24). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Liebman, J. (1988). Contrastive rhetoric: Students as ethnographers. *Journal of Basic Writing, 7*(2), 6-27.

Lyotard, J. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Matalene, C. (1985). Contrastive rhetoric: An American writing teacher in China. *College English, 47*(8), 789-808.

Matsuda, P. K. (1997). Contrastive rhetoric in context: A dynamic model of L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 6*(1), 45-59.

Matsuda, P. K., & Silva, T. (Eds.). (2005). *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction.* Mahwah, NJ:

Lawrence Erlbaum.

Matsuda, P. K., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., & You, X. (Eds.). (2006). *The politics of second language writing: In search of the promised land.* West Lafayette, IN: Parlor.

Mizuno, A. (1995). The teaching of contrastive rhetoric toward the goal of logical internalization. *Sugino Joshidaigaku Kiyo, 32,* 87-96.

Mok, W. T. (1993). Contrastive rhetoric and the Japanese writer. *JALT Journal, 15*, 151-159.

Myers, D. G. (1996). *Exploring psychology* (3rd ed.). New York: Worth.

Nelson, G. (1998). Comments on Ruth Spack's "The rhetorical construction of multi-students": Categorizing, classifying, labeling: A fundamental cognitive process. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(4), 727-731.

Nelson, K. (1977). Some evidence for the cognitive primacy of categorization and its functional basis. In P. N. Johnson-Laird & P. C. Wason (Eds.), *Thinking: Reading in cognitive science* (pp. 223-238). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newkirk, T. (1995). The writing conference as performance. *Research in the Teaching of English, 29*(2), 193-215.

Okada, T., Okumura, K., Hirota, T., & Tokioka, Y. (1995). Eisakubun shido kenkyukai, JACET, Kansai, Shibu, *Daigaku hi okera eisakushido no arikata: Eisakubun jittai chosa no hokoku.* (Research Group on Teaching Writing, Kansai Chapter, JACET. (Ed.) Teaching Writing at Colleges and Universities: A Survey Report).

Otaki, S. (1996). How to start and finish medical research writing: Cultural variations in English writing by Japanese. *Practical English Studies, 4*, 25-36.

Otaki, S. (1999). Contrastive rhetoric of academic and intercultural awareness. *Studies in Comparative Culture, 45*, 24-33.

Oye, P. (1993). Writing problems beyond the classroom: The confidence problem. In T. Flynn & M. King (Eds.), *Dynamics of the writing conference: Social and cognitive Interaction* (pp. 111-119). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Phattey-Chavez, G. G., & Ferris, D. R. (1997). Writing conferences in the weaving of multi- texts in college compositions. *Research in the Teaching of English, 31*(1), 51-90.

Reid, J. (1989). English as a second language composition in higher education: The expectations of the academic audience. In D. M. Johnson & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 220-234). New York: Longman.

Rogers, C. (1994). *Freedom to learn (*3rd ed.*).* New York: Macmillan.

Rosch, R. R. (1977). Classification of real worlds objects: Origins and representations in cognition. In P. N. Johnson-Laird & P. C. Wason (Eds.), *Thinking: Reading in cognitive science* (pp. 212-222). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism.* NY: Random House.

Shen, F. (1989). The classroom and the wider culture: Identity as a key to learning English composition. *College Composition and Communication, 40*, 459-466.

Silva, T., & Matsuda, P. (Eds.). (2001). *Landmark essays on ESL writing.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sokal, R. R. (1977). Classification: Purposes, principles, progress, and prospects. In P. N. Johnson-Laird & P. C. Wason (Eds.), *Thinking: Reading in cognitive science* (pp. 185-211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spack, R. (1997). The rhetorical construction of multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 765-774.

Tannen, D. (1985). Cross-cultural communication. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 203-216). NY: Academic Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walker, D. (2004). *Contrastive rhetoric teaching methods for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) university students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

Walker, D. (2005). *What happens when Korean EFL learners write in English?* Paper presented at the 1st Kyungbuk National University-KOTESOL Conference: Globalization and Foreign Language Education, Taegu, South Korea.

Walker, D. (2006). Improving Korean university student EFL academic writing with contrastive rhetoric: Teacher conferencing and peer response can help. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 3*(4), 71-111.

Walker, D. (2008). Postmodernism in intercultural rhetoric: Problematizing the deconstruction of an academic discipline. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 18,* 123-142.

Xing, M., Wang, J., & Spencer, K. (2008). Raising students' awareness of cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric in English writing via an e-learning course. *Language Learning and Technology, 12*(2), 71-93.

Yang, E. Y. (2004). The problems of Korean EAP learners' academic writing and the solutions. *Korea TESOL Journal, 7*(1), 93-107.

Yoshimura, T. (2002). *Formal instruction of rhetorical patterns and the effectiveness of using the L1 in argumentative writing in an EFL setting.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Japan.

Zamel, V. (1997). Toward a model of transculturation. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 341-352.