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ABSTRACT

In this thesis, I identify and describe three Japanese rhetorical strategies, and investigate whether these strategies conflict with the rhetorical expectations of English writing instructors. Further, I analyze 44 ESL student essays for evidence of these strategies, and explore the possibility of negative transference in the English writing of Japanese ESL students.

My research suggests that native strategies are used by Japanese ESL writers, and that particular strategies are preferred for different rhetorical situations. Also, there is some evidence that when students use native strategies in their papers, they run the risk of having their efforts mistaken for poor organization, inadequate development, and a lack of unity. Hence, their papers may be rated weaker in these areas by their native English instructors.
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SECTION ONE

1.0 BACKGROUND

Most English as a Second Language (ESL) instructors would agree that having some knowledge of their students' native language, especially of those points where it differs syntactically and rhetorically from English, would facilitate instruction. While it is possible to teach composition without such knowledge--instructors in America do it all the time--possessing some familiarity would enable teachers to design a classroom pedagogy specifically geared to meeting the needs of a particular student population. Such knowledge would be useful, for instance, in aiding composition instructors to discern patterns of error resulting both from student misunderstanding of grammar rules, and from differing student conceptions of how exposition should be constructed and meaning conveyed. Yet, despite the seeming benefits of such research, surprisingly little work has been done as of now on non-European languages--a disturbing omission indeed, given that so many ESL students come from other than European backgrounds.

The impetus for this particular study arose out of observations made by various colleagues and myself at three ESL schools: the Voice of Kyoto Language Institute, the University of Redlands Language College of the Pacific Institute, and the American Culture and Language Program at
California State University, San Bernardino. At these schools it was noted that while Japanese ESL students were usually rated superior on diagnostic grammar examinations, they tended to receive lower than average grades for composition when compared to ESL writers of many other nationalities. Furthermore, there seemed to be a regularity to what was being criticized in their papers, with questions about organization, structure, and unity especially prevalent. Even when individual sentences could be understood, it seemed, the main or controlling idea of the whole was often awkwardly presented, or even unintelligible. The nature and frequency of this problem led me to wonder whether issues beyond sentence level grammar were at work, whether these students were writing according to a culturally-based conception of rhetorical "correctness" foreign to that of their American readers. It seemed possible that their difficulties could partially be the result of their continued utilization of culturally-prescribed rhetorical strategies, patterns of organization and topical development which might be discernible in their English writings. What I set out to determine, then, was whether non-English "preferred" strategies are actually utilized by Japanese students in their English writing, and

---

1To cite one example of this phenomenon, 43% of the Japanese students at the University of Redlands tested into a higher level grammar class than they did a writing class. This is compared to 33% for other nationalities.
to what extent this usage accords or conflicts with the rhetorical expectations of American composition instructors.

1.1 CONTRASTIVE RHETORIC

The idea that differing cultural conceptions of rhetorical correctness could lead to language transference problems is not a new one. Kaplan (1966) helped introduce this idea in his groundbreaking study "Cultural Thought Patterns in Inter-cultural Education." In his article, Kaplan hypothesizes that native language patterns of rhetorical organization might negatively transfer to compositions written in English, and he discusses four possible examples of such non-English patterns. His chart illustrates the differences between these strategies. [See Fig. 1]

Fig. 1

As this chart suggests, Kaplan found that students from non-English backgrounds use different organization strategies in their writing, with their methods of paragraph development often varying significantly from development patterns common in English. His study also suggests that these language
patterns may result in negative transfer when these students write English compositions, leading to essays which may be more difficult for native English readers to follow. Yet, Kaplan was careful to qualify these claims, pointing out that "much more detailed and accurate descriptions are required before any meaningful description can be elaborated" (15). Furthermore, he was also careful not to claim that the supposedly linear pattern found in English expository prose was superior to other non-linear patterns.

Nevertheless, many researchers following Kaplan have criticized his findings as being ethnocentric, flawed and misleading. Ricento (1987), Cheng (1982), Li and Thompson (1976), and Hinds (1983), among others, have questioned his methodology, especially his assumption that native rhetorical patterns could be inferred from the sole source of ESL student L2 written production. Furthermore, many have also criticized his categorizations as being far too generic in nature to be of much use (for instance, Kaplan includes Indonesia, Thailand, China, Korea, and Japan under the rubric "Oriental," despite their extremely dissimilar cultural and linguistic traits). Finally, some writers, notably Cheng (1982), Labov (1972), and Gates (1990), have questioned the linear nature of English itself. Cheng, for instance, asserts that its pattern of development is actually circular, while Labov and Gates describe the non-linear English dialect utilized by African-American speakers
of English, one which is beginning to influence traditional academic pedagogy (see also--Sledd 1983).

Despite its flaws, Kaplan's article has helped to establish the idea that there are culturally-dependent variations in the organization of expository prose, and has spawned a variety of studies attempting to document those variations. Wikberg (1990), for instance, documents how Swedish patterns of formal paragraphing (delineated through indenting practices) seem to represent more of an aesthetic choice on the part of the student (i.e. their belief that shorter paragraphs are more "pleasing to the eye" and therefore more readable) than an intent to demarcate a shift in topic--the usual function of indentation in English exposition (143). Furthermore, topical development within Swedish paragraphs may shift without warning, and paragraphs may be formally indented even when they "function neither as a (sub)topic-shift marker nor as a rhetorical means of highlighting a statement or set of statements" (143). Wikberg notes that these factors make it difficult for Swedish students to write paragraphs in English, where the constraints of formal paragraphing are more severe; Swedish paragraphs are either too long (containing several ideas seemingly disconnected), or too short (an English seven-sentence paragraph will often become seven one-sentence paragraphs in Swedish) to satisfy English expository conventions (147-8).
Similar studies have also been conducted on many Asian languages, including Japanese. A number of descriptive studies of Japanese expository prose have appeared recently which facilitate cross-linguistic studies such as this thesis. In particular, the work of Hinds (e.g. 1980, 1981, 1983, 1984a, 1987, 1990), Yutani (1977), Takemata (1976), and Ricento (1987) have provided researchers in the field with detailed descriptions of several preferred rhetorical formats in Japanese expository prose. In their research so far, these writers have isolated three rhetorical strategies not found in English, but which are used heavily in Japanese expository prose. More importantly, Hinds (1983, 1984a) and Ricento (1987) have also indicated that these strategies are "valued" by a Japanese audience, for they were shown to be consistently rated strong by native Japanese readers in unity, focus, and coherence. Further, Hinds and Ricento's research has illustrated that these strategies represent "preferred" means of organizing and relating data in Japanese composition, for Japanese readers in each of these three studies were shown to prefer these strategies over other rhetorical formats, including English cultural patterns of development. Finally, native English readers in both studies were shown to consistently rate the Japanese rhetorical strategies as weak in unity, focus, and coherence. Also in Ricento (1987), native English speakers were found to be routinely unable to reconstruct scrambled
texts utilizing these rhetorical strategies, a discovery that led Ricento to hypothesize that native English speakers have difficulty following such texts. These strategies, thus, suggest a different conception of "correctness" in organization and topical development from that preferred by most American writers, and may signify possible problem areas for Japanese writers of English as they attempt American expository prose.

These studies have both inspired, and proven essential to, my own research. It is hoped that this thesis too will inspire others to conduct similar studies in this or other languages, not only for the possibility of theoretical contributions, but also for the potential pedagogical applications.

1.2 DEFINITION OF TERMS

I define "correct" or "preferred" rhetorical strategies as a particular culture's conception of the most efficient means available for organizing and presenting information. By "expository prose," I am referring, along with Hinds (1983), to non-narrative and non-biographical academic writing intended to explain a body of subject matter, with "expository prose" ranging in form from the position essay to the scientific article. Finally, for the purposes of

---

^2 He felt this difficulty would especially be true with texts that "did not follow a linear development of thematic movement" (i.e. texts which moved according to a "specific-to-general" pattern without foreshadowing by a controlling thesis [152]).
this thesis, I have constructed an operational definition of topic. An NP is the topic of a particular meaning sequence if, following Hinds's taxonomy, it introduces a discussion which is the continuous subject of two or more subordinate clauses (defined more fully in 1.3).³

1.3 METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

In this thesis, I look at prescriptive and descriptive definitions of one English and several Japanese rhetorical strategies. I then conduct a discourse analysis charting hierarchical organization in nine sample essays which utilize these strategies. Following Longacre (1979), Hinds (1979, 1983), and D'Angelo (1974), I break the sample essays down into meaning paragraphs in order to more effectively trace their method of thematic development. "Meaning paragraphs" here refers to a term employed in Longacre (1979), D'Angelo (1972), and Hinds (1979), who differentiate between formal paragraphs, delineated merely by indentation, and "meaning paragraphs," which are delineated by their semantic unity and which may, though need not necessarily, violate the constraints of formal paragraphs. The semantic unity in meaning paragraphs can be determined through analysis of how each sentence in a particular meaning sequence (meaning paragraph) functions in relationship to

³Terminology for this definition has also been borrowed from Smith (1990).
that sequence's topic. A component sentence in a meaning sequence can serve in only a limited number of introductory or subordinate capacities. Consequently, sentences not serving in any of these capacities become useful tools for demarcating the outward boundaries of a particular meaning sequence.

In this thesis, I follow Hinds (1979, 1983) and refer to four general categories of sentence function: a sentence either introduces the paragraph topic (presenting a new topic which is then discussed in the following sentences—this is generally true of the first sentence of a sequence), highlights or explains the topic (e.g. through examples, statistics, details, etc...), offers motivation for the topic (by providing, for instance, explanatory reasons), or provides an unexpected twist to the sequential topic (an alternative to or a comment on the topic). Sentences failing to fulfill one of the above functions in a paragraph sequence constitute "meaning breaks" when they also function as introductory sentences for a new meaning sequence.

Once paragraphs are defined as meaning paragraphs in a composition, the thematic progression of these units can be charted. Meaning paragraphs function in relation to an essay's thesis in a similar fashion as do sentences in a meaning paragraph (i.e., they serve in either introductory or explanatory capacities with regard to the essay topic). Thus understanding the semantic progression in an essay's
paragraphs helps to illuminate the rhetorical organization of the composition as a whole.

My analytical methodology can best be illustrated through an example. Consider the following excerpt from a composition by a native English speaker:

I continued my quiet life throughout high school, feeling very protected and safe whenever I was at home.1 I had a feeling of not wanting to be away from the house.2 I wasn’t like my siblings who went out for sports, drama, speech, etc.3 This pattern continued in college.4 I didn’t have a safe, protected place to be on campus and my weight became a big problem.5 I was not developing a direction with my life and attended three colleges, ending up with a two-year degree.6 My adult life became mere survival.7 I didn’t have the capacity to form and maintain relationships.8 I broke up with any man I was seeing.9 I moved out on roommates.10 I dated men opposite from those Mom would approve.11 I began smoking and drinking as a sign of my "independent thinking."12 Whitfield (1989)

Sentence 1 of the first formal paragraph introduces the general topic of the author’s lifestyle in high school (the author led a "quiet" life). In the modifying clause, motivation for this lifestyle is provided—the author felt "safe" and "protected" at home, hence she did not go out much. Sentence 2 offers more motivation for the author’s behavior by providing a second example of the author’s attitude in high school towards home—the author did not like to be away from it. Sentence 3 is an example of topic commentary (hence, it is an unexpected twist); the author uses the sequence’s discussion of her high school lifestyle and feelings towards home as the basis for her assertion.
that her attitudes about each were different from those of her siblings when they were her age. Sentence 3 does not constitute a "meaning break," however, both because of its semantic connection to the sequence topic (functioning as commentary on that topic), and because it does not serve as an introductory sentence for the sequence following it.

Sentence 4, despite being in the middle of a formal paragraph, constitutes a "meaning break," for it fails to either highlight, offer motivation for, or comment upon the topic introduced in sentence 1. Though the words "this pattern continued" imply cohesive ties to the preceding sentences, sentences 5 and 6 make it clear that the topic is no longer that of the author’s "quiet life," but the author’s more destructive pattern of behavior in college (though when viewed in the context of the essay as a whole, the semantic connection between the two topics is clear). Instead, sentence 4 functions as an introduction to a new meaning sequence, with sentences 5 and 6 serving both to highlight and to provide motivation for the sequence topic. The author’s behavior in college was to gain weight and to wander from college to college in a somewhat aimless fashion. The author’s motivation for gaining weight was that she did not feel "safe," and her motivation for wandering from college to college was because her life at that time lacked "direction." Finally, Sentence 7 introduces a new meaning paragraph, the topic of her adult
behavior, with sentences 8-12 highlighting this behavior by providing examples. Significantly, it should be noted that sentence 7 also serves to demarcate a formal paragraph break, illustrating my earlier point that formal and meaning paragraphs are not mutually exclusive phenomena.

Utilizing the above analysis, it becomes possible to trace the thematic progression through each of the three meaning paragraphs. The general topic--the author’s behavior--is introduced, and then discussed first in terms of high school, then college, then as an adult. Furthermore, such an understanding of the semantic progression of the parts allows insight into the rhetorical organization of the whole. Even from this short excerpt, we may speculate that the overriding theme of the complete text is that of the author’s inability to successfully relate to society, with the above meaning paragraphs serving in a highlighting capacity by each providing a description of one step in the development of the author’s overall behavioral patterns. We might further predict that the other paragraphs in the complete text will serve either to introduce the overriding theme or serve in the subordinate capacities of highlighting, explaining, offering motivation for, or providing unexpected twists to this theme. This brief illustration shows how paragraph analysis can be used to delineate both the method, and the nature, of the rhetorical organization in an essay. I feel that the above
analytical method is superior to other forms of analysis for the purposes of my investigation. In my opinion, sentence-by-sentence topical analysis of the translated texts in this thesis would do little to inform on the original semantic intentions of the Japanese author; instead, such analysis would merely highlight the translator's decision as to what, and where, the subject should be. Kuno (1973), Clancy (1980), and Hinds (1984b) comment at length on the periodic ellipsis of both subject and object in Japanese, and Clancy notes that the pronouns used to represent "he," "she," and "they" are actually recent inventions which many Japanese continue to find "unfamiliar and unnatural" (65); hence, many of the traditional markers for tracing lexical cohesion are missing in the original Japanese, making conclusions based on the analysis of such cohesive devices in the English translations suspect.

Finally, it was my intent in this thesis to focus on paragraph movement in the essay, and the above two analytical forms failed either to clearly demarcate paragraph breaks or to illuminate the essay's method of development. This was especially true in my analysis of ESL student writings, where grammar errors or student misunderstanding of English expository conventions often

---

"These pronouns are "kare," "kanojo," and "karera," and literally mean "boyfriend," "girlfriend," and "boyfriends." or many older Japanese, this is still their primary meaning."
gave a false impression of cohesion or the lack thereof.

Consider the following example:

I like snow skiing. Snow are fun. People are very kind, and scenic is beautiful. However, friends can have good time there.

This student clearly has not mastered the conventions of lexical cohesion in English expository prose, though I propose that it is not lacking in unity (it is similar in form to examples of "good" Japanese paragraphing described in Hinds [1984b] and Clancy [1987]). If thematic development in the above paragraph was traced through analysis of lexical cohesion devices (as described by Halliday [1976]), there would seem to be no development beyond the reiteration of "snow" in sentence 2; further, the word "however" in sentence 4 would erroneously suggest a shift in topic. An analysis of NP subject progression (as defined by Smith [1990]) in the above would suggest a similar lack of thematic development, for such analysis would reveal that NP repetition (in either subject or predicate) is lacking in each of the four above sentences.

Unless this student is schizophrenic or thought-disordered, however, and along with him the many other ESL

---

5A similar criticism of Halliday's methodology is expressed in Brown and Yule (1983: 191-6). Briefly, they question Halliday's "insistence that it is the presence of the cohesive markers which constitutes 'textness'" (192). As noted on page 196, texts exist which are lacking in cohesive markers, yet which possess "semantic relations between the sentences" which are discernible to the reader nevertheless.

6As defined by Rochester (1979).
students whose writing exhibits similar qualities, it should be possible to discern a unifying topic (or an attempt at one) in the above example. When analyzed for function using the research methodology I have described, sentence 1 becomes an introductory sentence because it introduces an idea (that of liking snow skiing), which is then developed through sentences 2-4. This functional development in sentences 2-4 takes the form of providing motivation for the student’s initial statement; he likes skiing because the snow is "fun," the people are "kind," and the scenery is "beautiful." Hence, this analytical method works to illuminate unity in a paragraph where other methods, perhaps because of the student’s ignorance of English sentence-level cohesion conventions, do not.

2.0 PREFERRED STRATEGIES IN ENGLISH
2.1 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

First, it is necessary to establish just what are the rhetorical expectations of American composition instructors. For instance, when a professor compliments the power of a particular introduction, the strength of a thesis statement, the unity of a particular essay’s organization, the relevance of its given examples, the skillful development evidenced in its supporting paragraphs, or the appropriateness of its conclusion, what is really being said about that particular student’s essay? In other words, what
makes certain English expository essay introductions powerful? What makes a particular thesis strong, an organization cohesive and unified? When is an essay’s support relevant, its topical development sound, and its conclusion appropriate?

In asking these questions, I am well aware that I am trespassing into a debate which has fomented much controversy over the last twenty years. Writers such as Sydell Rabin (1988), Nancy Sommers (1982), Lou Kelly (1973), William Labov (1972), Henry Louis Gates (1990), Donald Murray (1988), and Linda Rief (1990), among others, have argued since the early 1970’s that the idea of rhetorical "correctness" in English composition is both antiquated and elitist, that attempts to document such conventions are both misguided and futile, and that enforcing such standards in student essays is both unfairly restrictive and ultimately destructive. Research by Labov (1972) and Gates (1990), for instance, has demonstrated that even among native English speakers, dialects exist which manifest rhetorical strategies different from those utilized in more "mainstream" English, thereby making assertions as to one "correct" English rhetorical standard seem unforgivably arrogant and naive. Murray (1988), Kelly (1973), and Rief (1990) strongly advocate the virtues of individual "student languages," arguing that each student has something valuable to say and their own unique, correct way to say it. Indeed,
Soitimers (1982) and Kelly (1973) see the enforcement of evaluatory standards as a damaging "appropriation of student texts" (Sommers 1982: 149-50), resulting in "despairing, sometimes hostile students" and bad writing (Kelly 1973: 645).

Even the CCC has gotten into the act, publishing in 1974 its now famous resolution:

> We affirm the students' right to their own patterns and varieties of language--the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style. Language scholars long ago denied that the myth of a standard American dialect has any validity. The claim that any one dialect is unacceptable amounts to an attempt of one social group to exert its dominance over another. Such a claim leads to false advice for speakers and writers, and immoral advice for humans. A nation proud of its diverse heritage and its cultural and racial variety will preserve its heritage of dialects. We affirm strongly that teachers must have the experiences and training that will enable them to respect diversity and uphold the right of students to their own language. (Larsen: 1974)

With this manifesto, the CCC was merely articulating what many of its contributors had (and have) been arguing for years: that "correct" or "preferred" rhetorical strategies are a discriminatory, artificial construct, and neither exist in English expository prose in any real sense, nor should they exist as models for students.

Yet how accurate is the above claim to respect diversity in English expository prose? Research conducted by Ricento (1987) and by Hinds (1983), for instance, provides convincing evidence that educated native English
speakers prefer certain methods of development over others. In both studies, approximately 50 readers (20 native English and 30 bilingual Japanese speakers) were asked to rate 20 essays on the strength of their unity, focus, and coherence. It was found that native English speakers rated essays utilizing certain rhetorical strategies higher than did their bilingual Japanese counterparts, and that these strategies were preferred consistently. Indeed, Ricento concludes that educated native English readers have strong rhetorical preferences, and rate the success or failure of the rhetorical strategies they read according to a "formal schema" shared by many native English speakers (1987: 131).

Furthermore, even the most ardent opponents of prescriptive notions of "correctness" in rhetorical strategies still refer to writing forms that "work," as opposed to those that do not. Murray, for example, writes that his teaching methodology has evolved from the teaching of "form" (what he refers to as "bad" teaching), to a more open and freeing pedagogy based on "faith:"

...faith that my students have something to say and a language in which to say it. Sometimes I lose that faith but if I regain it and do not interfere, my students do write and I begin to hear things that need saying said well. (1988: 234-5).

Yet Murray openly admits near the end of his article that he is concerned about the many "papers that have no subject, no

7As do native Japanese speakers.
focus, no structure, papers that are underdeveloped" (1988: 235). Obviously, there is a contradiction here; if students, according to Murray, intuitively "write writing worth reading" in their own special, correct "language" (1988: 235), how can one particular student's language be less correct (or lacking) in focus or structure? Many other critics of "correct" or "preferred" rhetorical strategies similarly bemoan their students' inability to focus or structure their papers, including Rabin, who, after castigating her colleagues for their devotion to correctness, discourses at length on the need for students to:

...learn forms and vocabularies different from the ones they use to write personal narratives or letters. The structure as well as the vocabulary of abstraction differs from the structure and the vocabulary of narration, so that telling a student 'to analyze a story' or 'to compare and\or contrast' two writers leads the student into writing quandaries unless the teacher provides models. (1988: 46)

If one must learn a certain form or "structure" in order to successfully write abstraction, then necessarily certain "preferred" forms exist for writing abstraction, forms for which instructors must provide "models."

From such statements it would appear that "preferred" rhetorical strategies for organizing and presenting information do exist in English expository prose, formats which must be learned, and which must be modeled by teacher handouts in order to ensure that this learning occurs.
While Sommers, Murray, Rief, and others are perhaps correct in noting the damaging constraints that conventions of rhetorical "correctness" place on student writers, they apparently cannot escape the influence of these conventions in discussions of their own pedagogy. The fact that these organizational frameworks are imposed, or are prescribed, in no way diminishes the extent of their impact on the student writer, or their importance to that writer. What remains to be established, then, are the characteristics of these "preferred" strategies.

2.2 TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS

In an attempt to define the "preferred" rhetorical strategies being taught in American college composition classes, I conducted a study of the following college composition textbooks—Writing with a Purpose, The St. Martin's Guide to Writing, Passages: a Writer's Guide, Introduction to Academic Writing, Writing: a College Handbook, The Writer's Options: Combining to Composing, and Basic English Revisited: a Student Handbook—with the intent of determining whether similarities or patterns are evident in the types of rhetorical strategies recommended by these textbooks. I chose these particular textbooks because each of them is currently in use as an instructional guide at one
or more universities in the surrounding area, and were recommended by instructors as good sources of current pedagogy in English composition. Considering their popularity as college writing textbooks, any rhetorical description presented as "preferred" by the majority of these textbooks presumably represents a "preferred" pedagogical model common to many teachers, and hence, one which must be mastered by most students.

Prescriptive descriptions of the "preferred" rhetorical structure in the English expository format are remarkably uniform from textbook to textbook. All six of the texts analyzed discuss English expository prose in terms of three components—introduction, body, and conclusion—held together by one unifying idea referred to as the essay's thesis. I will hold to these denominations as I discuss the rhetorical purpose and method of each component.

In all six of the texts, the introduction in an English expository essay is described as having two rhetorical functions: it is the place where writers engage their

---

8Two of them, The St. Martin's Guide, and Introduction to Academic Writing, are used as primary texts in several English Departments. For instance, the LCP Institute at both the University of Redlands and at Citrus College uses Introduction exclusively, while The St. Martin's Guide is generally perceived by many instructors as one of the most popular composition textbooks in the country.

9Alternately referred to in several texts as Beginning, Body, and Ending

10 Or thesis statement
readers' interest and focus the readers' attention on the essay's main idea. The strategies delineated to achieve this task include the necessity of presenting items of interest to the reader, and the further necessity of focusing these items of interest gradually into a thesis statement. A sampling of quotes from the six texts illustrates the importance of these two functions. According to the St. Martin's Guide, the introduction is the all-important place where the writer "engages, holds, and focuses a reader's attention;" it is where the battle for the reader's attention and understanding must be either won or lost (151). Similarly, Basic English Revisited describes the need to "gain the attention of the reader and allow for a smooth transition into the body of the essay" (65), and Writing: a College Handbook admonishes writers that "a good introduction seizes the reader's attention and guides it to the writer's main object" (40).

To satisfy both of these rhetorical requirements, writers are advised to follow a fairly structured methodology: in a prescribed order, writers must include statements which both "engage the reader's interest...[and]...statements that suggest the organization or indicate the scope, focus, or thesis of your essay" (WWP: 199). Reader interest is to be stimulated by beginning the introduction with "interesting" general statements, either anecdotes or "background information about the topic of the
The placement of such information at the beginning is considered essential to ensuring that the reader will be intrigued sufficiently to continue reading. Gradually, though, the general statements of interest in an introduction should become more focused, until it concludes with the essay's thesis statement. The *St. Martin's Guide* explains the rationale for the placement of the thesis statement as follows:

readers expect to find some information early in the text that will give them a context for the essay. They expect essays to open with thesis statements, and they need such statements to orient them. (*SMG*: 402)

The thesis statement in an English expository essay fulfills this orienting function by providing a controlling focus for the otherwise diverse details provided in the essay: "Like the focal point of a picture, the thesis statement directs the reader's attention to the one idea that brings all the other ideas and details into perspective" (*SMG*: 400).

Ideally, the thesis is the "last sentence in the introduction," thereby ensuring the reader's awareness of the controlling topic at the moment before entering into the body of the essay (*AE*: 95); furthermore, it should be "the most specific statement" of the introduction, narrowing the field of somewhat general ideas presented in the beginning background statements until only one idea remains, the "controlling idea for the entire essay" (*AE*: 95). Because of this gradual movement from general to specific, the
English expository introduction is often referred to as having a "funnel" configuration. [See Fig. 2]

Fig. 2: Introduction Structure

Besides orienting readers to an essay’s main ideas, a thesis statement should function also as an orienting device for the writer, serving as a structural and semantic focal point for later development. According to the textbooks surveyed, the thesis statement serves as a sort of outline for the writer and reader, creating "expectations in the reader" which "good writers will go on to fulfill" in the body of the essay (Passages: 168). Further, it foreshadows the author’s position on the essay’s topic, stating the author’s "point" (SMG 403) or stand on the subject, which is then articulated throughout the remainder of the essay. For an essay to be "unified," each paragraph in the body must refer clearly and logically to this main idea introduced in the thesis statement, and be developed sequentially in the order and method promised in that thesis (WWP: 79). As such, the thesis statement places powerful structural constraints on the writer, for each paragraph must "help to advance the main line" of the writer’s position as
articulated in the thesis, and no paragraph can "digress from that line of thought" (WCH: 162). Its presence, then, necessarily helps "determine how the writer selects and organizes information," for good writers take care to ensure that each paragraph in an essay body works both to inform their thesis idea and to satisfy the expectations of their readers in the manner it prescribes (SMG: 151).

Similarly, the essay's body paragraphs should be devoted to the development of the controlling idea introduced in the thesis statement, with each body paragraph discussing one segment or facet of this overriding thesis (WCH: 162). The emphasis here is on the words "one segment or facet," for each of the texts surveyed makes it clear that an individual paragraph should be confined to the discussion of a single, unified idea or facet of the thesis. Ideally, each sentence in a paragraph should contribute information relevant to the development of one topic, and this topic in turn should represent "a new or additional step in the development of the essay topic" (BER: 57). Not to follow this strategy, by including information not related to that paragraph's topic, would violate "the fairly strict rules of paragraphing" (SMG: 406), and might cause readers to "lose their way" (WCH: 110), to not understand "the writer's ideas" (AE: 81), or to become "disorientated" (WWP: 188).
Typically, unity, both within individual paragraphs and within the essay as a whole, is ensured through the use of topic sentences. Topic sentences both state the main point of the paragraph and clarify for the reader the paragraph’s relationship to the controlling thesis (WCH: 110). Generally, the preferred strategy is to place topic sentences at the beginning of each paragraph, for:

although topic sentences may occur anywhere in a paragraph, stating the topic in the first sentence has the advantage of giving readers a sense of how the paragraph is likely to be developed. The beginning of the paragraph is therefore the most commonly favored position for a topic sentence. (SMG: 411)

Hence, topic sentences serve as a "cueing strategy for the paragraph much as a thesis or forecasting statement is for the whole essay," helping readers to grasp at the beginning of the paragraph what its focus and method of development will be (SMG: 407). For readers expect that each sentence following the topic sentence will refer back to that sentence either explicitly or implicitly, in much the same way that they expect each paragraph in the essay to refer back to the thesis statement, the whole suggesting that the "preferred" development strategy of the body of an English expository essay has an overall circular configuration. [See Figs. 3 & 4]

Fig. 3: Paragraph Structure & Development
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As the final section of an expository essay, the conclusion serves as a "last chance" for writers to ensure that their readers understand their essay's development of the main idea, and the broader ramifications of their main idea (WCH: 49). Generally, the preferred strategy seems to be to begin the conclusion with some sort of summary or restatement of the main idea, and then to end it with a somewhat broader statement that either comments on, or introduces an opinion about, that main idea. For example, Basic English Revisited admonishes readers to first "tie all of the important points in the essay together and [then] draw a final conclusion for the reader" (65), Writing With a Purpose refers to the need to not only "echo the introduction" but to "open up the essay" (202), and Academic Writing warns readers to remember the three functions of the conclusion:

- it signals the end of the essay,
- summarizes the main points,
- and leaves the reader with the writer's final thoughts on the subject. (98)
Hence, it would seem that the six texts surveyed advocate a sort of inversion of the introduction structure, with the beginning of the conclusion consisting of a specific reference to the essay's main idea or development, followed by a broader reference to the larger implications of the essay. While writers must take care to connect the conclusion through summary or restatement to the introduction (thereby ensuring closure or "completeness" -- WWP: 203), they must also take equal care to "funnel out" from the thesis, to lead readers from the specific discussion of the essay topic, to an understanding of the essay's significance "that could not have been accomplished by a 'Thus I have shown...' conclusion" (WWP: 203). Examples of such divergence would include a concluding metacognitive comment ("my opinion of the above issue...") or in a viable alternative offered on a problem discussed in the body ("I see two answers to this problem..."). Hence, both these examples would function as an "unexpected twist" to the preceding commentary (per Hind's definition). [See Fig. 5]

Fig. 5: Conclusion
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In sum, English exposition following the "preferred" organizational strategy delineated above would contain: an introduction funneling from a general beginning to a specific thesis statement, several paragraphs independently developing one idea in that thesis yet connected to each other by the common thread of the essay's controlling idea, and a conclusion structure which is the opposite of that in the introduction. What results is what I will refer to as the "hourglass configuration" of the English expository essay. [See Fig. 6]

Fig. 6: English Expository Prose Structure

2.3 ENGLISH ESSAY ANALYSIS

The following essay is from the textbook Academic Writing, where it is described as a "strong example of good writing." It should serve as an illustration of English exposition.

Television--Harmful to Children

Over the past forty years, television sets have become standard pieces of equipment in most homes, and watching television has become a standard activity for most families. Children in our
culture grow up watching television in the morning, in the afternoon, and often in the evening as well. Although there are many excellent programs for children, many people feel that television may not be good for children. In fact, television may be a bad influence on children for three main reasons.

First of all, some programs are not good for children to see. For example, there are many police stories on television. People are killed with guns, knives, and even cars. Some children might think that these things could happen to them at any time. Therefore they can become frightened. In addition, some youngsters might begin to think that violence is a normal part of life because they see it so often on television. They may begin to act out the violence they see and hurt themselves or their playmates.

Second, television can affect children’s reading ability. Reading requires skills and brain processes that watching television does not. If children watch television too many hours each day, they don’t practice the skills they need to learn how to read.

Finally, television may affect children’s schoolwork in other ways. If they spend too much time watching television, they may get behind in their homework. Also, if they stay up to watch a late movie, they may fall asleep in class the next day. Consequently, they will not learn their lessons, and they could even fail in school.

In conclusion, if children watch too much television or watch the wrong programs, their personalities can be harmed. Furthermore, their progress in school can be affected. Therefore, parents should know what programs their children are watching. They should also turn off the television so that their children will study.

For the purposes of the data analysis in this paper, an essay is considered to follow the English expository strategy if it contains: 1) an introductory paragraph which introduces the controlling idea or the point of the essay, 2) support paragraphs which either highlight, offer motivation for, or provide unexpected twists to this controlling idea, 3) and a conclusion which both highlights
the main topic's development, and "funnels out" through providing commentary (e.g. in an "unexpected twist) on that topic. In the first formal paragraph of the above essay, sentence 1 introduces the topic of television's growing popularity, which is then highlighted in sentence 2 through the specific example of television's popularity with "children in our culture." Sentence 3 appears to mark a meaning break; the topic is no longer television's popularity, but what "many people" feel to be its detrimental influence on children. Sentence 4 then offers motivation for this new topic, suggesting that there are three main reasons why people may feel television is a bad influence on children.

The second meaning paragraph in the above essay functions as an English expository introduction because it introduces a topic which becomes the focal point for development in the remainder of the essay. Sentence 4 serves as the essay's thesis statement, introducing the topic of the "three reasons" why television may be a bad influence on children. This sentence accurately foreshadows both the method of the essay's development (a discussion of first reason 1, then 2, then 3), and the author's ultimate position on the subject (television is "bad" for kids). In accordance with proper English expository format, the body paragraphs then discuss this topic; the thesis statement promises that three reasons will be discussed, and sentences
5, 11, and 14 introduce discussions of these reasons. Sentence 5 presents the first of these reasons--that "some programs are not good for children to see." Sentences 6-10 then provide examples highlighting this reason. In sentence 11, the second reason, that "television can affect children's reading ability," is introduced, with sentences 12 and 13 offering explanatory reasons (or motivation) for this assertion. And finally, sentence 14 introduces the third reason, that television may affect children's homework in a variety of ways, with sentences 15-17 highlighting this sentence with examples and supporting details.

Furthermore, the above essay also possesses the English expository-style conclusion. Sentences 18 and 19 highlight the essay's main idea by restating the key reasons why television can be a bad influence on children. Sentences 20 and 21 function as unexpected twists from the main topic; neither introduce a topic which is developed, yet both represent asides from the main idea. Both sentences provide commentary on what parents should do about regulating their children's viewing privileges, with the relevancy of this commentary being dependent in part on semantic connections to earlier discussion in the essay's body (because television can be a bad influence on children, parent's should know "what programs their children are watching" and be prepared to "turn off the television" if necessary). Hence, the final formal paragraph in this essay both
highlights the main idea, and provides an unexpected twist to that idea, serving to "tie things up" in the method demanded by English expository conventions.

While not all English essays follow this format so exactly (for instance, some may not have an explicitly stated thesis statement), all expository essays utilizing this popular strategy have an introduction which presents a topic for discussion, body paragraphs which are explicitly dedicated to that topic's discussion, and a conclusion which both refers back to, and breaks away from, that topic's discussion. What remains to be seen, then, is how this rhetorical strategy of organization and development differs from those strategies utilized in Japanese expository prose.

3.0 PREFERRED STRATEGIES IN JAPANESE

3.1 DISCUSSION OF LITERATURE

The studies which most concern this paper have been conducted by Hinds (1980, 1981, 1983, 1984a, 1990), Ricento (1987), Takemata (1976), and Yutani (1977). In their research so far, these writers have identified three rhetorical strategies which are not used in English expository prose, but which are preferred in Japanese writing. These are the "ki-shoo-ten-ketsu" model, the so-called "tempura" strategy, and the "return to baseline theme" model. Briefly, the main differences between these three strategies and the English expository model lie in the
dissimilar function of the Japanese introduction and conclusion. Alternately, the introductory paragraph introduces a false topic which is then abandoned (chiefly true of the "ki-shoo" model), or the thesis statement is introduced only in the conclusion (a characteristic of the "tempura"). Takemata also notes that conclusions in the "ki-shoo" format are under no cohesive constraints to the essay’s main topic (26); hence they represent an opportunity for the writer to introduce a new topic which lacks connection to the preceding development. Finally, preceding paragraphs in the "tempura" model function inductively to the concluding topic (Yutani 1977: 53-4), with the supporting examples and details provided first, and the author’s position on the topic (and the controlling idea to the essay) provided last.

Before discussing these studies in detail, though, I want to address concerns voiced by several critics on the methodology of the above researchers. Brown and Yule (1983), among others, have criticized the research done by these writers because, though ostensibly intended to explain academic expository prose, it has been conducted on non-academic writing, specifically newspaper articles from the "Tensei Jingo" column in the Asahi Shinbun. As Hinds (1983) notes, this has been done out of expediency; professional translations of Japanese academic prose are just not available, while the Asahi, a Japanese language newspaper
written for the consumption of Japanese, provides sentence-by-sentence English translations of its articles. Furthermore, care is taken to ensure that these translations respect the organizational framework of the original, with structural peculiarities occurring in the originals being maintained in the translations. This adherence to the original's organizational format is critical to this kind of research, "superceding [in importance] the structural properties of individual sentences" (187).

However, to defend the relevancy of their findings, and to dispel similar criticisms of my own work, I have translated sections of Nihongo Sakubun ("Japanese Composition"--Sato 1986), a Japanese composition textbook used as an expository reference at Kyoto University in Japan. This textbook provides a detailed diagram which illustrates the proper organization of a Japanese essay written in an academic setting. I include this diagram and discuss its ramifications on page 49.

3.2 JAPANESE RHETORICAL STRATEGIES

Takemata (1976), Ricento (1987), and Hinds (1983) discuss the first pattern of development, which they refer to by its Japanese name "ki-shoo-ten-ketsu" (according to my dictionary, a term referring to "traditional rules for composing Chinese poetry"), and about which Hinds writes:

Each of the four terms in this expression indicates a functional role. Ki indicates
the introduction; shoo indicates a development of the introduction; ten indicates the abrupt introduction of a tangentially related subtheme; and ketsu indicates the conclusion. There are possible alternatives to this pattern in which, for instance, ten will recur two or more times; or in which ketsu will be missing completely. (Hinds 1984: 45)

In other words, a paper written according to the ki-shoo-ten-ketsu model would begin with a theme which is introduced in the "ki" phase and developed in the "shoo" phase; in the "ten" phase, though, a subtheme (or subthemes) is introduced, which is then developed throughout the remainder of the essay. This subtheme introduced in the "ten" phase of the essay often represents an "abrupt" intrusion of a second (or even a third) main idea for the paper, the "abruptness" here the result of the lack of a foreshadowing in the introductory paragraph. As a result, the native English reader may be surprised and disoriented at suddenly confronting the new topic. Compounding this reaction is the fact that the subtheme introduced in the "ten" section need only bear the most tenuous semantic connection to the initial subject matter discussed in the "ki-shoo" sections; indeed, it is preferred that there not be "a directly connected association (to the major theme)" Takemata (1976: 26). Finally, the ketsu, or conclusion phase, is also

---

11This fact suggests to Hinds (1990) that Japanese writers expect their readers to come from a shared "cultural and temporal" knowledge base (and hence, can "fill in" omitted cohesive devices and controlling thesis statements) to a greater extent than English writers. This makes the
different in form from its American counterpart, in that it need not be in keeping with the development of the preceding essay. Instead, it can introduce a new topic, or "indicate a doubt or ask a question" on a subject seemingly unrelated to either of the two themes developed in the essay body (Hinds 1983, 188-90). [See Fig. 7]

Fig. 7: "ki-shoo-ten-ketsu"

Hinds (1983) provides the following example of the "ki-shoo-ten-ketsu" strategy (note that the third "ten" section consists of four formal paragraphs):12

Harmony in Driving

Ki This columnist first learned to drive and obtained a driving license in New York City. At that time, what the driving instructor most naggingly stressed was "harmony." He said that the understanding of Japanese writing even more difficult for native English readers.

12This essay, as with the "tempura" essay which will be provided later, is taken from the Asahi Shinbun.
knack of driving lay first in harmony, second in harmony, no third and fourth and fifth in harmony.3 
Shoo Ignoring the question of how to shift gears, he lectured, while on the road, on the importance of maintaining the minimum necessary distance between cars.4 There were times when this writer became sick and tired because he kept harping on the matter so much.5 It may be questionable whether American drivers actually place importance on "harmony," but at least that aged instructor kept insisting on it all the time.6

Ten The most frightening thing in the accident in the Nihonzaka Tunnel of the Tomei Expressway on July 11 was that there were about 170 vehicles within the tunnel and most of them burned.7 Why were there so many as 170 vehicles within the tunnel?8 In order to run at a speed of 80 kilometers per hour within the tunnel, vehicles must keep a distance of 80 meters between each other.9 If the vehicles had been running at 80-meter intervals, the total of vehicles on the two lanes from the entrance to the site of the accident about 1.6 kilometers away should have been 40 at the most.10 Since the expressway was crowded that day, the speed may have been less than 80 kilometers per hour.11 Still, 170 vehicles are just too many.12

First, there was disregard of the proper distance between vehicles.13 On expressways, there are cases of vehicles running at 100 kilometers an hour with only 10 to 20 meters between them.14 Even if a driver tries to maintain the proper distance between vehicles, other vehicles cut into the space in front of that driver, immediately destroying harmony.15 Drivers are aware of the danger of a collision and pile-up but keep on driving, comforting themselves with the thought, "It will be all right."16 The piling up of such disharmony is dangerous.17

There was also the fact that warnings were ignored.18 Immediately after the accident occurred, the panel at the tunnel entrance lit up with the warning "Fire Outbreak, Entry Banned."19 But it appears that a considerable number of cars entered the tunnel after the warnings had been posted.20 Did they speed into hell, unable to apply brakes suddenly because the distance between vehicles was too small?21

Ket. The preventive measures taken by the Japan Highway Public Corporation were grossly inadequate.22 Experts should be aware of what a lack of water for firefighting means in emergencies.23 They knew but closed their eyes to
the fact. The psychology of, "It will be all right," on the part of the drivers and of the corporation caused this major accident.

In this example, sentence 1 introduces the topic of the writer’s experiences while learning how to drive in New York City. Sentence 2 highlights this topic by providing a specific detail from the writer’s experience—the writer’s "nagging" driving instructor and his longwinded discussion of "harmony." This sentence serves as the "ki" section, for it presents a topic which appears to function as a thesis statement for the whole. Indeed, the following four sentences (serving per Hinds and Takemata’s definition as the "shoo" section), including one complete formal paragraph, serve to offer motivation for this "ki" topic, providing details and examples which explain the writer’s irritation with his driving instructor.

If the remainder of the essay were to be dedicated to this topic, this essay’s structure might well be in keeping with the English expository strategy discussed earlier. However, sentence 7 functions as an unforeshadowed break from the discussion of the above topic, "unforeshadowed" because it introduces a subject which fails to function in either a highlighting, motivation, or unexpected twist capacity to the initially introduced topic. This new topic, that of a serious accident in the Nihonzaka Tunnel, is then developed in sentences 8-17 (which become, according to Hinds and Takemata’s definition, the "ten" section), with
little attempt being made, beyond references to "harmony" in sentences 15-17, to ensure that the connection between the two topics is understood. Because no warning is provided for this sudden deviation from the introduced topic, the "ten" section represents a clear violation of the constraints demanded by English exposition. While in retrospect, it becomes clear that the importance of harmony in driving is the true controlling idea for the essay, this subject is never introduced; instead, the introductory paragraph introduces a discussion of the writer's "irritating" driving instructor, with the word "harmony" serving as support in a series of examples provided of that instructor's irritating nature.

Besides the lack of either a controlling idea presented in the introductory paragraph or supporting paragraphs explicitly dedicated to the support of this one controlling idea, the above essay deviates from English exposition in that it lacks a proper conclusion. Instead of referring back to either the "ki" or "ten" topics, sentence 22 introduces a third topic, that of the inadequacy of the measures taken by the JHPC to prevent the accident. Sentences 23 and 24 support this assertion by providing examples of the "grossly inadequate" measures, while sentence 25 functions as an unexpected twist to this final topic. Significantly, it is only in the topical commentary provided in sentence 25 that any semantic reference to the
preceding discussion is evident—this being the brief references to "drivers" and "this major accident." Without these almost incidental references, there would be no overt semantic connection between this paragraph and the preceding ones.

The above rhetorical strategy places a greater burden on the English reader than does English exposition. The "ki-shoo-ten-ketsu" format violates three formal conventions of English expository prose designed to ensure that native English readers can more easily follow the writer’s train of thought. First, no attempt is made to orient the reader as to the main idea of the essay; the introduction presents a "false" (i.e. abandoned) topic and no thesis statement, hence no foreshadowing of the essay’s development. Second, as such an essay can have two (or three, or four, depending on the number of "ten" sections) main ideas—and these need only be tangentially related—the reader is confronted with the added difficulty of deciphering the writer’s intent and method of development. Finally, as the conclusion need not have any relationship to the essay’s ideas, and can instead make a comment on, or ask a question about, an unrelated topic, the reader is forced to make inferences which may, or may not, be intended. The writer of the above essay expects the reader to fill in the lack of semantic and thematic cohesion, trusting much more than in the English example that his readers possess sufficient "shared knowledge" of
the event to provide their own connections and to follow through to the writer's conclusions. As a consequence, readers here need to be more active than would readers of English expository prose, for the responsibility of their understanding the essay's semantic continuity lies more with them than with the writer.

The Japanese emphasis on the reader's responsibility is also evident in the second rhetorical strategy, the so-called "tempura" or "fish-fried-in-batter" rhetorical strategy which was first discussed by Yutani (1977), and later by Ricento (1987) and Hinds (1990). It is described as "an inductive style of writing" where the writer begins with specific details on one or several topics, then in the final paragraph(s) articulates the controlling idea which provides unity to the whole. According to this rhetorical format, each of the details presented in the initial meaning sequences serves to explain the sequences which follow it, with the whole serving to explain the author's conclusion articulated in the final meaning sequence.

While it differs from the "ki-shoo" format in that it possesses one controlling idea stated decisively in the final paragraph(s), this rhetorical format lacks an introductory paragraph placed in the beginning to orient the reader. Indeed, little attempt is made to prepare the
reader for the author's final conclusion, and the semantic connection between the parts and the whole is often seen only in retrospect. Instead of introductory paragraphs with thesis statements, readers are presented with a series of examples or details, seemingly unfocused, which nevertheless stand in an inductive relationship to each other which is made obvious in the final paragraph(s). [See Fig. 8]

Fig. 8: The "Tempura" Configuration

This specific-evidence-to-general-result-(or conclusion)-construction presents several problems for English readers attempting to grasp the unity in such essays. Without introductory orienting statements, English readers have difficulty both identifying and anticipating the movement in the essay (Hinds 1990: 91). Accordingly, the sudden discovery of the writer's purpose at the end often forces

---

13This characteristic of waiting until the end of the essay to articulate the essay's point is seen by some to parallel the SOV construction of the formal Japanese sentence, where the author's intent (as revealed by verb placement) is also provided only at the very end of the sentence.
the reader to reread the essay in a completely different light—a potentially frustrating and disorienting circumstance for time-pressed English readers. Moreover, as noted by Yutani (1977), the existence of this rhetorical strategy in Japanese newspaper articles makes their translation especially difficult, for newspaper articles written according to this format lack a “lead” to cue readers at the beginning to an article’s significance.

Hinds (1990) discusses several examples of this strategy in academic writing, including the following example which I will discuss here:

Who Are the War Dead?

Around this time 39 years ago, there were air raids in Japan almost daily. In April Tokyo saw B29 bombings once every two days—on April 1, 2, 4, 7, 12, 13, 15, and so forth. Tokyo, Osaka, Kobe and Nagoya were bombed and burned. "In the flow of bombing out river/A praying old woman turns into white wax and sinks." This is a poem by Sakae Fukyama of Toyama City. The big bombings of Toyama City occurred before dawn on Aug. 2, 1945, only a few days before the end of the war. The city was razed, and about 3,000 citizens were burned to death.

Who are the “war dead”? Are the war dead only officers, soldiers and civilian employees of the military who died fighting? It can’t be so. In an all-out war, the home front turns into the battlefront and citizens are subjected to such fierce attacks that 100,000 people are robbed of their lives in one night.

There is no mistaking the fact that people killed in bombings, civilians killed in the Okinawa battle and people killed while being repatriated to Japan are all war dead. To engage in severe self-reflection concerning the fact that the lives of 800,000 civilians were sacrificed is the way to console the souls of the war dead.

That there were so many civilians killed by indiscriminate mass bombings hints at the outcome of
a future nuclear war. As pointed out by Shinjiro Tanaka, who says, "In a nuclear war, the people will definitely be abandoned," the number of civilians killed will be far greater than the number of officers and soldiers killed. Beyond that, there is the danger that they will be exterminated. The basic tragedy contained in modern war is the drastic increase in the number of civilians who will be killed.

If, for instance, the prime minister and all Cabinet members officially attended memorial services for the civilian war dead in Tokyo, Osaka, Okinawa, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki, we would welcome the move. We also feel that this is how it will be possible to deeply consider the meaning of war.

Why is the Liberal-Democratic Party now desperately trying to make official visits by Cabinet members to the Yasukuni Shrine in Tokyo constitutional? Why is the party trying to review the government policy to the effect that such visits may be unconstitutional? Those responsible for carrying out the war are also enshrined at Yasukuni Shrine. (Hinds 1990: 92)

For the purposes of this thesis, an essay is considered to follow the "tempura" strategy if the topic introduced in the final meaning sequence(s) also serves as a unifying idea for the whole, with the preceding meaning sequences serving as support by highlighting, offering motivation for, or providing unexpected twists to the topic introduced in the final sequence(s). The semantic connection between the preceding meaning sequences and the concluding idea in an essay can further be determined by analyzing whether each supportive sequence functions in an "if this is true, then the controlling idea is also true" (i.e. in an inductive)
relationship to both each other and to that essay's concluding meaning sequence.\textsuperscript{14}

In the above essay, sentence 20 introduces the topic of the author's questioning of LDP attempts to legalize visits to the Yasukuni Shrine (visits by government officials to Yasukuni have been banned since the end of World War II because of that shrine's traditional function of glorifying war, war heroes, and the reigning emperor). The writer introduces this final meaning sequence with a rhetorical question asking why the LDP wishes to change the current policy on this issue. In sentence 21, the author provides an unexpected twist to the topic, restating it in a way which emphasizes that the LDP plan is currently unconstitutional (note that sentence 20 merely introduces the sequence topic of the proposal, while 21 includes a reminder that the LDP proposal is unconstitutional). Finally, sentence 22 provides motivation for these questions--the Yasukuni Shrine is where those responsible for World War II are enshrined, hence visits by government

\textsuperscript{14}An analysis of the "ki-shoo-ten-ketsu" example provided earlier shows that its supporting meaning sequences would not fit into the above formula. That the writer's driving instructor nagged incessantly about harmony does not mean that the JHPC was at fault in the accident (indeed, the idea of an accident is not even suggested). The fact that the drivers in the accident were driving too fast also does not support the author's assertion about the JHPC's role in what had occurred. Finally, neither sequence works to highlight, offer motivation for, or provide an unexpected twist to the final sequence.
officials to such a shrine would imply government approval of those who helped to start World War II.

The author of the above meaning sequence is clearly attempting to articulate his disapproval of the LDP's attempts to legalize visits to Yasukuni, both because such visits are "unconstitutional" (hence illegal) and because permitting them would suggest government approval of what the shrine represents. However, exactly what the shrine represents to the author--war and the jingoism which breeds it--is left unstated. Without the preceding paragraphs, this lack of supporting details would be an important oversight--one could then question why Yasukuni Shrine's additional function as a war memorial should prevent government officials from visiting (and worshipping) there. An analysis of the preceding paragraphs, though, reveals that they serve to highlight and provide motivation for the author's concluding assertion, and also that they function inductively in an "if this is true then this must also be true" relationship to both each other and to the final meaning sequence.

Sentence 1, for instance, introduces the topic of the frequent air raids Japan suffered during World War II, with sentence 2 highlighting that topic by providing an example of the frequency of these bombings, and sentence 3 providing an unexpected twist to that topic in an aside commenting on the destruction these daily raids produced. This meaning
sequence is semantically connected to the final paragraph in that it provides motivation for the author's final rejection of the LDP's proposed changes to the constitution, illuminating the author's feelings about war and reminding the reader of the damage suffered by Japan in WWII. In sentence 4 a topic serving a similar function is introduced, that of a poem describing the destruction inflicted on Toyama City. Sentences 5-7 highlight and provide twists to that topic, both by describing the poet, and by providing further examples of the damage and injury she describes in her poem. This meaning sequence again serves to provide motivation for the author's concluding statements--as Japan has suffered extremely from past wars, government officials should not visit a shrine dedicated to glorifying those wars.

So far, the meaning sequences analyzed in "Who are the War Dead?" serve in the functional roles demanded by this rhetorical strategy. Furthermore, both also function inductively in relation to the author's concluding meaning sequence, serving in an "if this is true, then the controlling idea is also true" relationship to the opinion articulated at the end. If war is as bad as the author states, then his concluding assertion that the LDP is wrong for wishing to go to a shrine that glorifies war gains in inductive strength.
The following meaning sequences continue in this pattern. Sentence 8 introduces what appears to be a completely different topic—a discussion of the true meaning of the term "war dead"—yet the development provided in sentences 9-13 has semantic ties to both the preceding meaning sequences, and the final meaning sequence. Sentence 9 asks rhetorically whether the term "war dead" should include only the military and its civilian employees; the answer of course is "no," which sentences 10-13 make extremely clear through highlighting (including the casualty figures provided in sentence 11) and unexpected twists (the commentary provided in sentences 10 and 12). 100,000 civilians were killed during one night of bombing (sentence 11), and over 800,000 were killed during the course of the war (sentence 13), numbers which provide more motivation for the author's final assertion: if war kills civilians too—a fact which war memorials like the Yasukuni Shrine tend to ignore—then perhaps the author is correct in suggesting that it would be inappropriate for government officials to visit shrines which honor only the military dead. The discussion in the two earlier meaning sequences also serves to highlight the discussion in this one, providing examples which support the author's assertions as to the correct definition of war dead in this third sequence. Furthermore, these three meaning sequences work together, providing details and figures which serve to explain the author's
final stand on the issue. As suggested by the unexpected twist in sentence 13, a far better form of honoring the "war dead" would be to reflect on the hundreds of thousands of defenseless civilians whose lives were also lost during the war than to frequent shrines dedicated to that war's instigators.

Sentence 14 also functions to provide motivation for the concluding meaning sequence, introducing the topic of the potential destructiveness of nuclear war, with sentences 15-17 highlighting this topic by providing examples and support of what would happen during such a war. From these examples, we may speculate that the author is against such a war occurring, for he notes in sentence 15 that a dramatic increase in civilian casualties would result, and in sentence 16 that there would be a possibility for the ultimate extinction of the human race. The three preceding meaning sequences also work to highlight this position in sequence four (a semantic connection acknowledged in sentence 14). If conventional warfare is sufficiently destructive to kill 100,000 people "in one night" (sentence 11), then the author is justified in suggesting that a war conducted with weapons over a hundred times more powerful than anything used in WWII would result in proportionately greater civilian casualties. The development in this meaning sequence, when combined with those that came before, work to make his contention in the final meaning sequence.
even stronger in inductive power; when viewed in this context, the LDP’s proposal seems almost threatening, perhaps even signifying a dangerous shift in the government’s policy towards war.

Finally, the meaning sequence beginning with sentence 18 functions as an unexpected twist to the final sequence topic, offering an acceptable alternative to the LDP proposal. Instead of visiting shrines dedicated to the glorification of war and military dead, sentences 18 and 19 suggest that the government’s time would be better spent visiting memorials dedicated to the civilian war dead. As many rhetoricians argue, by offering a workable alternative in a discussion, the author appears more reasonable, more able to understand the other side’s concerns; the author is saying that he appreciates the LDP’s wish to honor the WWII dead, but that he is concerned with their particular method of doing so. The information presented in the preceding meaning paragraphs again works to support the author’s point in this one. Knowing the author’s feelings about both war and the civilian casualties it engenders—which we learn in the preceding paragraphs—the reader has an easier time understanding the author’s assertions in this instance.

As illustrated by the above analysis, each of the preceding meaning sequences work inductively to highlight, offer motivation for, and provide unexpected twists to the author’s position as stated in the final meaning sequence.
Also, they work together to help explain and highlight each other, with each serving as a partial foundation for the discussion in the following meaning sequence. Significantly, there is a lack of an introductory paragraph and a thesis statement in the above essay. While the author’s intent in the above is to assert that official visits by Cabinet members to the Yasukuni Shrine should not be permitted, it is not until paragraph six that any suggestion is given that the controlling topic might shift in this direction. Until then, the essay’s controlling idea appears to be the moral necessity of considering the number of civilian dead in any discussion of wartime casualties. While, as Hinds notes, "in retrospect, it is possible to see how the author reached the final paragraph" (1990: 93), until that last paragraph, little attempt is made by the writer to prepare the reader for the essay’s conclusion. And though this essay’s concluding statements do serve to provide unity and closure for the essay (which is missing from many "ki-shoo" essays), the lack of an introductory paragraph designed to prepare the reader for both the thesis and its development makes this unity initially difficult to perceive and proves that it differs significantly from the English expository format described earlier.

In this chapter so far, I have identified two culturally preferred rhetorical strategies in Japanese exposition. Both differ in several important ways from the
English expository format described earlier. The first rhetorical format, the "ki-shoo," varies from English exposition through its lack of an English introduction, the abrupt intrusion of a second (or third) theme in the essay's body, and the opportunity for the writer to introduce an unconnected topic in the conclusion. The second rhetorical format, the "tempura," also lacks an introductory paragraph, but has a conclusion that fulfills a similar function in the essay (serving to introduce the the point of the essay, the main idea which each of the preceding paragraphs contribute to inductively). Before discussing the third, the "return to baseline" strategy--which is closer in format to the English expository--I want to address the issue I raised earlier on (page 31), the question of whether these two strategies serve also as pedagogical models in Japanese academic exposition.

The textbook *Nihongo Sakubun* provides the following diagram to illustrate the proper organization of a Japanese essay written for an academic setting. [See Graph 1]
Graph 1 (from *Nihongo Sakubun*):

The Organization of the Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preface-</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raise a question/Mention a problem</td>
<td>Establish a topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main topic-</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear statement of problem or topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development-</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Essay's Craft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotations</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Illustr.</th>
<th>Compare/Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in your own words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion-</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOUR POSITION (your judgment, claim)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie things up/Introduce a NEW topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the above diagram is similar to English in that it recommends a preface ("joron") which appears to function as an introduction (i.e. it introduces a topic which is developed throughout the essay), the format it suggests differs from English in two ways. First, the author's

15A version of the actual Japanese text in romanized transliteration is in Appendix A.
position on the topic ("iken"), the specific claim or judgment on the subject matter being discussed ("handan: shucho"), is made only at the end of the essay. Though only one general topic is discussed, the point of this discussion (i.e. the thesis statement) is provided only in the concluding sequence—a rhetorical method reminiscent of the "tempura" strategy discussed earlier. Second, among the writer's options listed in the description of the conclusion is the ability to "introduce a new topic" ("kongo no kadai"), one of the more startling characteristics (to English readers) of the "ki-shoo-ten-ketsu" rhetorical format. Hence, this academic model appears to represent a synthesis of the two Japanese rhetorical strategies discussed, offering student writers the choice between them. This reinforces the Hinds, Ricento, Yutani, and Takemata contention that the rhetorical methods they describe in Japanese journalistic writing are also present in Japanese academic exposition.\(^{16}\)

The peculiarities described in both strategies make them understandably more difficult for many English readers to follow. Indeed, both the strategies discussed above suggest a "writer-friendly"—as opposed to "reader-friendly"—attitude towards the reader-writer relationship. In English academic exposition,
expository prose, the responsibility for ensuring the reader's understanding of the writer's ideas lies with the writer; hence, English writers spend considerable time providing cueing devices like thesis statements and introductory paragraphs. In Japanese expository prose, however, the responsibility for the reader's understanding of a writer's work appears to be more evenly distributed, for the reader is forced to make do without the cueing devices English readers expect to find in their expository readings. Interestingly, a number of more western-like patterns do exist, ones which utilize a more familiar general-to-specific strategy of development, and which often include an introductory paragraph and even a thesis statement. As noted in Hinds (1983, 1987) and Ricento (1987), these more Western strategies, known collectively as the "jo-ha-kyuu," are less preferred by Japanese readers than the two other forms delineated above, yet their organization patterns are far more recognizable to English readers. Still, as the following discussion of the "return to baseline theme" strategy will illustrate, even within this category of rhetorical forms, obvious differences exist between them and the "preferred" English expository strategy described earlier. Hinds (1987) describes the "return to baseline theme" strategy as one where the essay possesses both an introduction and a thesis statement, yet where the
development of the thesis is carried out in an extremely recursive manner which many English readers would consider unusual. According to Hinds, the development of the strategy is such that "each paragraph in an essay restates the main theme of the essay before providing a different perspective or development of that theme" (1987: 45).

Hence, while this essay format promises a more recognizable movement (from introduction-to-thesis to development-of-thesis to conclusion), it employs a paragraph structure even more demanding than in English expository prose (where only a part of the theme must be restated in the topic sentence). As this format is relatively rare, I could find no academic models of it in any of the texts I studied. Still, it should be obvious what this latter rhetorical strategy represents: a strategy of development far more intelligible to English readers than the other two I have described, yet one which still might not be acceptable because of the redundancy promised by its method of thesis development and the abundant use of overt cohesive devices. [See Fig. 9]

Fig. 9: The "Return to Baseline" Model
I = Introduction
Th = Thesis Statement

The significance of the above to the teaching of English composition to Japanese students should be obvious.
Each of the three rhetorical strategies outlined are very different from the popularly preferred English expository format, and each presents potential comprehension problems for native English readers. What remains to be shown is whether Japanese ESL students utilize the above strategies when they attempt American expository prose, and whether usage of these strategies is more prevalent in those essays receiving lower grades.

SECTION II: DATA ANALYSIS

4.0 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

This chapter is meant as a preliminary step towards documenting the usage of native strategies in Japanese ESL expository prose. First, I will illustrate that these strategies are present in compositions written by Japanese writers. I will then investigate whether this usage is more prevalent in essays which were judged by native English speaking teachers to be of lower quality because of their poor organization and unclear rhetorical structuring. The possible role the presence of native rhetorical strategies might have played in the grade the papers received will also be discussed.

4.1 SUBJECTS AND METHODOLOGY
Subjects were 15 Japanese college students in three intermediate level ESL writing classes, ranging in age from 18 to 23 years old, with TOEFL scores between 475 and 525. Over the course of a ten-week period, the students were assigned: two evaluative essays, one information or description essay (their choice), and one compare/contrast essay. Paper length was to be 1-2 pages, and students were allowed to write on any topic they chose. All of these students received instruction in the "preferred" English strategy for meeting the assignments, including textbook models and sample essays, and were told that their papers would be graded on organization and clarity of topic development, as opposed to "correctness" in grammatical usage. Papers were then graded by each of the three teachers. Papers judged highest in quality (as subjectively rated by these three native English speaking instructors) were graded "A", with "B" grades being given to papers of intermediate quality, and "C" to those judged of the lowest quality. I then collected the essays and analyzed each to determine the expository format used by the student writer.

4.2 RESULTS

A total of 44 essays were analyzed in this study. This analysis produced the following results:

17 The purpose in assigning these particular essay types was to see if Japanese students used different rhetorical methods to satisfy different types of assignments.
ESSAYS RECEIVING AN "A" GRADE (10 TOTAL):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apparent Strategy Used</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>KI-SHOO</th>
<th>Tempura</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP. CONTR.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESSAYS RECEIVING A "B" OR LOWER GRADE (34 TOTAL):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apparent Strategy Used</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>KI-SHOO</th>
<th>Tempura</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP. CONTR.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>&quot;A&quot;-Graded Papers</th>
<th>&quot;B&quot; and Lower Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English:</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI-SHOO:</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempura:</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline:</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18Essays marked "other" either utilized strategies different than the ones discussed, or (and especially with essays graded "B" or lower) utilized no discernible strategy of organizing and presenting data.
As the above charts illustrate, essays written according to the English expository format, though representing only 28% of the total number of essays, still accounted for 60% of the essays receiving an "A" grade. Japanese rhetorical formats, including the "ki-shoo" (18% of the total and 20% of "A" graded essays), "tempura" (34% of the total but only 10% of "A" graded essays), and the "return to baseline" strategy (2% of the total and 0% of "A" graded essays) fared less well. Though essays using identifiable Japanese rhetorical styles accounted for a combined total of 54% of the essays in the study, they produced only 30% of the papers receiving an "A" grade. More specifically, exactly 50% of the papers using the English-style expository format received "A" grades, as compared to 25% of the essays utilizing the "ki-shoo" method, 8% of the essays using the "tempura" strategy, and 0% of the essays utilizing the "return to baseline method."

Also interesting was the regularity with which certain forms were used for certain assignments. The "ki-shoo" strategy, perhaps because its form naturally invites comparisons between its "ki" and "ten" sections, was the Japanese rhetorical form most often (33%) used for comparison\contrast essays, while the more decisive nature of the "tempura" conclusion perhaps explains its preponderance (54%) in evaluation essays. At the same time, 40% of the students in the study used the same rhetorical
strategy regardless of the assignment. This would seem to suggest that some students have a single preferred rhetorical format which they use regardless of the assignment given to them.

4.3 DATA ANALYSIS

An example of a ki-shoo-ten-ketsu strategy of development can be seen in the following "C"-rated compare/contrast essay (note that the second meaning paragraph, marked by "shoo," consists of two formal paragraphs; also, I have corrected spelling errors, but otherwise have left the essay intact):

**Evaluation About Cars**

ki Now I am devoting to buy and choose a car.1 American society is car society.2 If they don't have a car, so they can't go anywhere.3 The car can carry everything, some car carry car and many people.4 There are many different kinds of cars and companies.5

shoo I want to buy Nissan, Honda, Toyota, Mazda's car.6 Because Japanese company's car has good engine and mileage.7 All of my friends told me, "I should buy Japanese car in Southern California.8"

shoo I will compare with American car and Japanese car.9 I like American car, but American car is a little bigger than Japanese car, and American car has bad mileage.10

ten And it's different way of think about car from Japan and American.11 American use car more easy going (optimistic) than Japanese.12

ket. I impressed American, because they fix their car by themselves more than Japanese.13 It explain that they have many knowledge about cars.14
In what I argue is the "ki" section of the above essay, sentence 1 introduces the topic of the author's desire to choose a car, with sentences 2-4 providing explanatory reasons for this decision (America is a "car society" where people without a car "can't go anywhere"—so, he needs one, too). Sentence 5 functions as a meaning break, introducing a new (what I argue to be the "shoo") topic of the "many different cars and companies" the author wishes to choose from. This "shoo" section is semantically tied to the preceding "ki" section in that sentences 6-8 provide highlighting details describing what the author wants to buy, and motivating reasons for his decision.

As was discovered earlier in my discussion of a professional example of the "ki-shoo-ten-ketsu," the "ki-shoo" sections of essays using this rhetorical format may correspond closely to the rhetorical structure exhibited in English exposition. Both rhetorical formats have an introductory paragraph which is then developed in the following meaning sequences. In the above student essay, if the writer were to continue developing the introduced topic in the initial "ki" sequence, this essay would satisfy the constraints demanded by the English expository format, becoming then, per Hinds (1983) and Ricento (1987), easier for native speakers of English to both follow and appreciate.
Sentence 9 appears to continue this initial theme, introducing a new meaning sequence offering motivation for the author’s decision (stated in sentence 6) to buy a Japanese car. This new topic initiates a comparison between American and Japanese cars, which is further developed by the highlighting in sentence 10. The author prefers Japanese cars because American cars are too big and have poor gas mileage, which provides an explanatory reason for his earlier stated decision.

In sentence 11, an unrelated theme (ten) is introduced, that of a comparison between American and Japanese ways of viewing their cars. This new theme is both unforeshadowed by the introduced "ki" semantic discussion of the author’s choice in cars, and lacks an inductive connection to the preceding meaning sequences. By unforeshadowed, again, I am referring to this meaning sequence’s lack of a highlighting, motivating, or unexpected twist connection to the preceding discussion. Further, there is no inductive connection to the preceding topical discussion—the fact that the author wishes to buy a Japanese car does not support his contention in the "ten" section that Americans are more easy-going when they drive ("use") their cars, nor does the fact that American cars are bigger than Japanese cars and have bad gas mileage necessarily mean that Americans use their cars in a "more easy going" fashion.
The concluding meaning sequence (beginning with sentence 13) in the above essay also appears to be functioning as a "ketsu" sequence, both by failing to refer back to the preceding discussion, and by introducing a meaning sequence unrelated to the topic. Sentence 13 introduces the topic of the author’s feelings about Americans—he is impressed with them because they can fix their cars by themselves—with sentence 14 highlighting his feelings with the explanation that Americans have more "knowledge about cars" (sentence 14). Beyond the tangential reference to "cars," however, no semantic connection exists between this concluding sequence and the preceding meaning sequences. In a similar fashion to the "ketsu" section described in "Harmony in Driving," the last meaning sequence here has broken from the thematic thread of the essay, introducing a new and unrelated topic.

Although we can identify the rhetorical strategy in use in the above essay as the "ki-shoo-ten-ketsu," to many English instructors this essay would seem to be completely unstructured, lacking in any coherent, organizational strategy. First, though the essay does possess an introductory paragraph, the theme it introduces is a false theme in that it is not developed beyond formal paragraph three. Second, while the writer does technically attempt to fulfill the assignment, his essay appears to jump in focus and theme from paragraph to paragraph, undermining what
strengths his essay might otherwise possess. Finally, his conclusion fails to tie the essay together, or even to refer back meaningfully to either of the first two themes discussed in the essay, violating yet another English expository convention. Hence, though his essay adheres closely to a rhetorical format preferred in his country, the above writer received a low grade for poor organization and lack of structure.

Another example of what appears to be the ki-shoo-ten-ketsu at work can be seen in the following "C+"-rated informative paper (quotes are from an unnamed source):

**AMERICAN FOOTBALL**

ki Sport play a major role in the lives of practical everyone the players, the coaches, the officials, and the spectators!1 Interest in sport is the result of several factors.2

shoo There is increased emphasis of personal physical fitness.3 Formal exercises or calisthenics, while worthwhile, not popular nor motivating to the promotion of fitness as participation in sports.4 "Through sports participation, children and adult gain fitness but also develop skills, group and personal satisfaction, and enjoyment."5

ten The author of the Sports Education Series have been carefully selected.6 They include experience teacher, coaches, and manager of college and professional team.7

ten This sports series helps reader experience exciting sports from the point of view of participant and coaches, to learn some of the reasons for success and causes of failure, and "to receive basic information about teaching and coaching techniques."8

Each volume in the series reflects the philosophy of authors, but common theme runs through all the desire to "instill in the reader a knowledge and appreciation of sports and physical activity which will carry over throughout his life as a participant or a spectator."9
ket. I like American football. I think all different Japanese football because American football is very famous in America and player is very big. Probably foods, practice, life, everything fundamental different but Japanese football is nearing American football. But Japanese football is still a fledgling.

As with the first student paper, this essay also possesses an apparent introductory meaning sequence ("ki") containing what appears to be a thesis statement. In the above essay, sentence 1 introduces a general discussion of the public's interest in sports. Sentence 2 functions as an "unexpected twist" by commenting that there are reasons for this public interest; further, this sentence appears to operate as the thesis statement, with the foreshadowing mention of "several reasons" suggesting the probable direction of further development. Indeed, the following sentences (#'s 3-5) serve to offer motivation for the "ki" topic, highlighting it by providing examples of these "reasons." The benefits of personal physical fitness, the motivating factor of competition, and the development of "skills, group and personal satisfaction, and enjoyment," are all mentioned as possible explanations for the popularity of sports within the public.

Sentence 6, however, represents an abrupt semantic break in this essay's thematic development. As with "Evaluation About Cars," the "ten" section in this essay introduces a completely unforeshadowed topic--in this case a

---

19 Again, this is per Hinds' definition of the term.
discussion of the qualifications typically possessed by contributors to the Sports Education Series. According to the "highlighting" in sentence 7, contributing writers are generally teachers, coaches, or managers of college and professional teams. Sentence 8 introduces a second "ten" sequence, that of the benefits of the Sports Education Series itself, with sentences 10 and 11 contributing to this sequence by highlighting examples of these benefits.

So far, the rhetorical structure evidenced in the above essay is in keeping with the "ki-shoo-ten-ketsu" model discussed earlier. It possesses an initially introduced and developed "ki-shoo" topic which is then abandoned in favor of the new topic presented in the two "ten" sequences. Furthermore, as in the other student essay, the concluding meaning sequence in this essay introduces a final unforeshadowed and unconnected topic, that of the author's feelings toward American football. According to sentences 10-13, the author likes it, believing American football to be both different from Japanese football (for example, in "foods, practice, life"), and superior to Japanese football (Japanese football is still a "fledgling"). Such a lack of thematic connection between the conclusion and the preceding meaning sequences is yet another indication that it is a "ki-shoo-ten-ketsu"-style essay.

Both of the above "ki-shoo-ten-ketsu" examples could be diagnosed as the writers merely having a lack of competence
in written English. Yet the similarity between the rhetorical strategies utilized above, and the "ki-shoo-ten-ketsu" model described by Hinds and Takemata, suggests that this is not so, but rather that the errors depicted above are the result of differing cultural conceptions of rhetorical preference. Furthermore, six other essays possess structural qualities similar to these two, suggesting that this strategy is popular with Japanese ESL writers.

The "tempura" strategy, where inductively connected meaning sequences are drawn together by the final meaning sequence of the essay, was also evident in the ESL essays examined. Consider for example the following "B"-graded evaluation essay:

Why Do I Crave Midnight "Infommercials"? 20

I remember the late-night salespeople's unnatural smiles when they introduce the product on TV.1 When I was in Japan, we didn't have "infommercials."2 Instead, between talk shows at around noon we have almost similar commercials that are presented by a department store.3 But these products were usually more of a practical use.4 The most famous TV commercial [there] was for 2 sets of leather blankets introduced by a cheap price.5 Sometimes also some exercise machines and knives.6 They usually call the product's name again and again, and say "If you order it right now you will get a free watch," or "It's being introduced for only a limited time -- Hurry, or you will miss this special chance!," or "If you order them right now we will engrave your name on each knife."7 This "limited time" goes on for ever (or almost one year).8
I liked to see their expression when they praise the product, saying "It's incredible," "wonderful," "fantastic," "first time ever." I used to have fun mimicking them.

When I came to America last year and turn on TV to look, I saw an "infomercial" for 'caruse [sic] molecular hair setter.' I said to myself, "I have to write down the number." I almost called as I thought that program was on only that night. Then another me said "Wait a minute, this kind of commercial is usually repeated several months. At least I'll have a chance to see it again." And I was right. I still meet those same people saying same things over and over on TV almost anytime I turn on the TV around midnight.

So you might ask, "Then why do you crave for infommercials if it's always the same thing--boring!" I didn't know why I watch that program over and over again, until almost I remember I'm not watching them to buy their product. Rather, I realized I was saying to myself "No, I will never buy that, I would not be tricked." I really want to try all of them, but I enjoy the sensation and I feel a kind of satisfaction to say "Well, you don't need it. You are smart enough to know that." You can call me bizarre or weird, but it's one of the things I do to get rid of my stress, especially during the exam.

As mentioned earlier, for the above essay to be using the "tempura" strategy, each of the initial meaning sequences must function to highlight, provide motivation for or an unexpected twist to the topic introduced in the final sequence. Sentence 19 (and the title) introduces the discussion of the author's reasons for craving "infommercials" despite the fact that they are "boring."

21A suggestive point, and a possible avenue for future research, is that when a title is provided in both the student and professional examples of Japanese writing, it seems to serve as a sort of missing thesis statement, often providing the reader the little orientation they receive. It remains to be established, though, whether this is indeed its intended rhetorical function.
with sentences 20-24 providing commentary on (unexpected twist) or highlighting examples of those reasons. Sentence 20, for instance, comments on the author’s earlier ignorance of her own reasons. Sentence 21 comments on the author’s state of mind when she watches "infomercials," while sentences 22-24 provide examples of the reasons the author chooses to watch these commercials. According to these examples, the author enjoys the sensation of saying "no" to these commercials (sentence 22). Saying "no" makes her feel smart (sentence 23) and helps to relieve stress (sentence 24).

Hence, the concluding meaning sequence serves rhetorically to answer the title’s, and sentence 19’s, question: the author "craves" infomercials because of the feelings of power and self-control they give her. The preceding meaning paragraphs function to highlight (give examples of) and offer motivation for this concluding idea. Sentence 1, for instance, introduces the topic of the author’s reminiscences about "infomercials," with sentence 2 introducing a contrast (or unexpected twist) to this introductory sentence. Sentences 3-8 of this meaning sequence then highlight sentence 1 by providing descriptive examples of the Japanese version of "infomercials."

The first meaning sequence (sentences 1-8) is semantically connected to the concluding sequence because it functions to provide motivation for the concluding
sequence's main idea, introducing examples of both the excitement and the temptation provided by the viewing of "infommercials." Sentences 3-7, for instance, highlight these temptations by providing examples of the "great" deals being offered on such shows. In terms of the "tempura" formula discussed earlier, they also serve in an "If this is true then..." capacity in regard to the final meaning sequence, for if the bargains being offered in the "infommercials" are really tempting, then her claim to an elevated sense of self-control at the end gains in inductive strength.

The final two meaning sequences (sentences 9-11 and 12-18) introduce and discuss topics which serve in similar semantically-connected capacities with regard to the concluding sequence. Sentence 9 introduces a meaning sequence describing the author's feelings towards Japanese-style "infommercials," with sentences 10-11 highlighting her feelings. She "liked" the expressions on the faces of the salespeople, which she mimicked with her friends, and enjoyed watching these expressions. This sequence's discussion foreshadows the enjoyable "sensation" (sentence 22) she feels while watching "infommercials," the feeling of amused superiority she receives contributes to the feeling of satisfaction she gets from such viewing. Sentence 12 introduces the topic of American "infommercials," descriptive examples of which are provided in highlighting
sentences 13-18. As with the meaning sequence describing Japanese "infommercials," this sequence operates in both a highlighting and motivation-providing capacity in relation to the final topic, providing examples of both the temptation she feels and the self-control she exhibits.

As illustrated in the above analysis, each of the non-final meaning sequences appears to function in either a highlighting, motivation, or unexpected twist capacity to the concluding sequence. Furthermore, each sequence serves to support the other: the second sequence describing the author's enjoyment of the Japanese "infommercials" depends on the preceding sequence's description of these "infommercials" for impact; the author's ironic enjoyment of the Japanese "infommercials" discussed in sequence two gives insight into the author's feelings towards the American version of such commercials discussed in meaning sequence three. The meaning sequences function inductively to support both each other and the final topic, a cohesive characteristic of the "tempura" rhetorical strategy.

Another "B"-graded example of what appears to be the "tempura" strategy can be seen in the following evaluation essay:

About Grown-up Persons in Japan

Before I come to America, I was thinking that America have nothing to do with me.1 When I was young child, I didn't know America at all.2 I didn't know English, too.3 And when I looked [at] foreign country people, I thought wonder because
hair, eyes and skin's color, and language were different.4

But when I became high school student, I began to be interested [in] America.5 And I thought I want to speak English, and I want to become independent, because my parents were strict with me.6

And I think almost all grown-up persons of Japan are strict.7 I think most American children grow up [with] freedom, but Japanese children are different.8 For example, there is fierce competition for higher education in Japan, and there is high school graduates who have failed this college exam.9 So almost all grown-up persons of Japan say "study very hard," and they make children go to private tutorial school when young child.10 And they think they make children enter high level of school.11

Why do they make children study?12 Why do they make children enter high level of school?13 Because I think they defend pride themselves.14 And I think they are worrying about society, so I think they make children enter high level of school.15 Why do they worry about society?16 I don't know, but I think study isn't forced substance.17 I think study do for oneself.18 I think grown-up persons of Japan are mistaken.19 I am one person of these, me, too.20

So I wanted to go to America.21 And I stay here now.22 I think I really had better that I came here.23 I think grown-up persons of Japan should reconsider about pride of personal.24 I think grown-up persons of Japan should learn from America.25

In the above essay, the writer is arguing that Japanese parents should learn from American parents and become both less strict with their children and less concerned about issues of personal pride. However, this thesis goes unmentioned in the first three paragraphs. Instead, the writer provides seemingly unfocused details about her feelings toward America. She yearns for the "freedom" of American children; she wishes to become more "independent" like Americans, and to speak better English. It is only at
the end of the fourth paragraph that the writer introduces the real issue, stating that "grown-up persons of Japan are mistaken," both because they are too concerned with how society views them, and because study is not a "forced substance." And it is only in her final formal paragraph that the writer provides the reason for her earlier discussion of America, suggesting that Japanese parents should learn from the American example she refers to in formal paragraphs 1-3.

Indeed, with both essays, the semantic connectiveness of the whole is made clear only in the concluding sequence, with this unity becoming clear in retrospect. In "Infommercials," the reader could initially be led to believe that the writer’s thesis is concerned with the similarities and differences between Japanese and American "infommercials," as the first four formal paragraphs provide examples of both types. In "Grown-ups," a similar confusion over the actual topic could result, with the writer’s initially introduced topic (in sentence 1) suggesting a discussion of her feelings about America. Similar to the "ki-shoo-ten-ketsu" examples, the above essays could be diagnosed as resulting from basic writer errors. I have attempted to argue, however, that such organization is the product of a differing cultural conception of correctness in organization.
Finally, one possible example of the "return to baseline theme" strategy was identified from among the essays I analyzed. The "return to baseline theme" model is one in which writers restate their main topic at the beginning of each paragraph, providing a slightly different perspective on or development of their theme with the exposition following each mention. The example I found, which received a "C" grade, is as follows (sentences underlined for emphasis):

Working Mothers

When working parents have a children or babies, who cares for their children or babies? They're two types. For one thing, they have a jobs, for another, they're students who someone high school, someone college or university students.

I think every mother are staying at home is best. Because they have to protect their children or babies. For example, sometime children or babies touch the knife, fire or oven (around kitchen and dining room).

All of mother need protect their children. And more points are they have to teach their children or babies. For example, sometimes read a book and they see a dog and mother say "This is a dog" they remember it. Sometimes watch the TV. They say "What’s that?" Mother say "That’s ____." But mother things. Woman needs their free time (alone times) also changes mind for relax mind time. Sometime they want to play their hobbies. There are only a few hours. It’s good for them and their children or babies. Because sometimes mothers study about children care or house hold. But if it’s become a so long time, they get a tired and die away for care their children or babies.

I think children and babies need a mother, every time, because another person
(for example, babysitter, caregiver) never give to them a parent's love, mother work, mother's words, especially under 5-year-old child and baby. They need a conversation with parents to promote the development of mind and brain, of care.

I think sometimes mother need help (doctor, caregiver, babysitter, etc.) but almost no need.

Children need a parent's words and big love.

In this sample, the assignment was to describe something with at least two parts, with sentences 2 and 3 suggesting that, in this case, the two categories of working parents would be discussed. The real topic of this paper, though, is evident from sentences 4, 7, 19, and 21, which all reiterate the importance of having a mother stay at home with her children. This writer has decided to write an argument paper (a misinterpretation of the assignment), and seemingly has chosen the "return to baseline theme" strategy for presenting her argument. Note how the development after each of these sentences suggests a different reason for needing a mother's presence--after 4, for protection; after 7, for education; after 19 and 21, for love--in keeping with Hind's description of this rhetorical strategy.

So far, each of the essays I have discussed appears to utilize a conventional Japanese rhetorical strategy of organizing and presenting data. As a point of contrast, consider the following example of an "A" essay where the student is utilizing the English expository format:

**Studying in a Foreign Country**
Should a person study in a foreign country? 

This is an important question with two sides to it. 

In a foreign country, there are some good reasons for studying in a foreign country. First, students from abroad can learn foreign language. They have to speak and listen foreign language, but they may be bilingual because of this in the future. Second, they can meet some new people and some new cultures. In my school, there are Japanese, Koreans, Taiwanese, Indonesians, and Americans. They speak each other national languages, but when they talk together, they are talking in English. Then they can understand each other, and can understand other country’s culture. Third, they have some educational possibilities. It is good that they have some dreams; however here they think that they can do as much as they can. Finally, students have more job opportunities. They can dream about the jobs they can get by making good use of their knowledge and experience.

There are, on the other hand, many good reasons against studying in a foreign country. First, it can be expensive. The price of tuition and rent continues to rise and the cost of living can cost two hundred dollars a month. However, now, because of a strong yen rate and a weak dollar rate, the tuition is becoming cheap. Second, they live in a place away from family and friends. So to speak, they are alone. When they want their family or friends to help, their family or friends are not near them.

Should a person study in a foreign country? In order to answer the question, a person must weigh both sides. On the one hand, there is a new language, new people, new culture, educational possibilities and job possibilities. On the other hand, there is expensive, and being away from family and friends and no one to help. The reasons for studying in a foreign country outweigh the reasons against studying in a foreign country. Therefore, the answer is positive--a person should study in a foreign country.

In the above essay, sentence 1 introduces the topic of whether a person should study in a foreign country, with the unexpected twist in sentence 2 providing the comment that this issue has two sides. These two sentences serve as an
introductory sequence in that the subject they introduce becomes the controlling idea for the whole essay—that of a discussion of the two sides to this question—with the essay's body sequences being devoted to highlighting each side of this "question." Sentence 3, for instance, introduces the discussion of the good reasons to study in another country, with sentences 4-14 providing highlighting examples of those reasons. Similarly, sentence 15 introduces the discussion of several reasons against studying in a foreign country, with sentences 16-21 providing highlighting examples and commentary on this introduced topic. In the concluding sequence, the initial sentences restate both the essay's thesis ("Should a person study in a foreign country?"—sentence 22), and the essay's development of that thesis (sentences 24-25). Furthermore, sentences 26 and 27 provide commentary on the topic (in this case, the author's decision on the question), again in keeping with the constraints of English exposition. Indeed, all three of the necessary constraints of this rhetorical form are present here: an introduction which presents a topic for discussion, body paragraphs which are explicitly dedicated to that topic's discussion, and a conclusion which both refers back to, and breaks away from, that topic's discussion in a commentary aside.

5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION
I have attempted to define the culturally "preferred" rhetorical format in English expository prose, and to compare this to three Japanese rhetorical strategies identified by Hinds (1987), Takemata (1976), and Yutani (1977). Furthermore, I have endeavored to illustrate that the three Japanese rhetorical strategies discussed above do occur in Japanese ESL expository prose. Finally, I have documented patterns in the student usage of these strategies and shown a correlation between such usage and lower grades.

It thus appears evident that these strategies are utilized by Japanese ESL writers, though the frequency and extent of this usage in the general Japanese ESL population remains to be established. Further, there is some evidence that each of these Japanese rhetorical forms is preferred for a different rhetorical situation, with the "ki-shoo" format being used more for compare/contrast assignments, and the "tempura" strategy for descriptive and argument assignments. Finally, while many other variables no doubt enter into the assignment of student grades, it is significant that the majority of the "A" papers in this study did not use Japanese rhetorical strategies, while the majority of those who did use a Japanese rhetorical strategy received a "B" or lower. This suggests that when ESL students use native rhetorical strategies in their English writing, they run the risk of having their efforts mistaken
for poor organization, lack of focus and inadequate development.

This has clear implications for language teachers. Japanese student essays could be misdiagnosed as being deficient or lacking in organization, unity, and development, when in fact, many possess a clear, concise method of organization, only one which is different from those typically encountered by English readers. What many of these essays are lacking is the "preferred" English expository structure, and ESL instructors should be prepared to make the differences clear to their students.

My findings would seem to support calls for separate classes for ESL (and certain English dialect) students and native standard English speakers, for it is doubtful that many native standard English speakers would have learned rhetorical strategies other than those generally utilized in America. Hence, they will have different needs than their ESL counterparts, who will have to be taught a new "correct" expository format possibly very different from the ones they had mastered as students in their own country.
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APPENDIX A

B. kakubu bun no kosei (te-ma no tenkai)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>joron-</th>
<th>mondai teiki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>te-ma no settei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>honron</th>
<th>mondai to suru taisho no meikakuka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'topic' no settei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sakubun no gijutsu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in yo iikae reishi (zuhyo) taisho/hikaku bunseki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ketsuron-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iken (handan: shucho)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ketsuron no matome, kongo no kadai nado |