

Rhetorical Patterns in Korean College Students' English Expository Writings*

Hoyeol Ryu

(Hankyong National University)

Ryu, Hoyeol. (2006). Rhetorical patterns in Korean college students' English expository writings. *English Teaching*, 61(3), 273-292.

Contrastive rhetoric has helped us understand how members of a cultural group develop a rhetorical pattern. However, since it overly relies upon the traditional culture in the explanation of different rhetorical patterns in different cultures, it seems to fail to draw a comprehensive picture of how rhetorical patterns are determined in each culture. So this study assumes that the explanation of Korean rhetorical pattern by Kaplan and other contrastive rhetoric proponents does not provides us with correct information on contemporary Korean rhetoric. In this vein, this study investigated English expository writings of 27 Korean college students to explore whether Kaplan and other contrastive rhetoric proponents' claims on Korean rhetoric is legitimate. It discovered that, on the contrary to their claims, most of the subjects showed deductive approach to the theme. However, their deductive approach did not lead to the production of the Western rhetorical pattern. The possible reasons for this result maintained in the study are that there had been influence from their previous learning experiences of both general and English composition skills and that their writing skills were not fully developed enough to produce text that shows the clear Western rhetorical pattern.

I. INTRODUCTION

Teaching English composition has been a greatest challenge to many English teachers in Korea. Along with difficulties Korean students inherently have in grammar and vocabulary, many studies have suggested that their text is simply awkward or disorganized to Westerners' eyes. Korean writers' text structure has been pointed out as a major problem to lead to miscommunication with English speakers, in terms that the reader has difficulties in correctly drawing on the writer's intended meaning from the text. Kaplan (1966) attributed this problem to cultural differences between the native and non-native speakers of English. In his explanation, text organization is closely related to thinking patterns that is culturally

* This study is supported by Hankyong National University's Research Grant Program.

rooted. Unlike English writers whose thinking pattern is linear and straightforward, that of Korean writers is characterized as indirect, giving their English readers considerable difficulties in comprehending the text.

Although Kaplan opened a door to the new area of composition studies, his explanation of Oriental text structure has been criticized by many second language writing researchers. One notable feature in his explanation is the heavy reliance upon the traditional rhetoric of Oriental culture. Many of them contended that his explanation was pretty superficial and lacked the proper understanding of the contemporary rhetoric. For example, Mohan and Lo (1985) criticized Kaplan's explanation of Chinese rhetoric that insisted upon the strong influence of ancient Chinese eight-legged essays over contemporary Chinese rhetoric. They maintained that the eight-legged essay carried little influence over contemporary Chinese rhetoric. Instead, they viewed that contemporary Chinese rhetoric was strongly influenced by writing instruction that has origins in Western rhetoric. In addition, it is worth noting that many studies of Oriental text structure have been conducted by Anglo-American researchers. There are clear discrepancies between Anglo-American and the local researchers in providing the explanations of the text structure. The discrepancies should be resolved in order to reach a higher-degree understanding of how today's Oriental writers organize their writings.

This study intends to disclose how Korean college students organize English expository texts. Although Kaplan's claim on the text structure of the Oriental languages provided invaluable insights toward Korean writers' text structure, his claim should have been based upon empirical data. Further, other studies on Korean rhetoric should have been conducted on the basis of the proper understanding of contemporary Korean rhetoric. In other words, the native Korean researchers are in a far better position to identify rhetorical patterns of Korean English writers' text structure than the foreign researchers. Unfortunately, despite the broad use and communicative value of English expository writing, there are few studies that investigated Korean students' English expository text structure by the native Korean researchers.² Even, in the case of Jongseok Ok (1991) and Sun Lee (2001), the collected data are from newspapers and research journals, so it seems hard to directly apply the results of these studies to English writing pedagogy. In this vein, this study attempts to add an empirical datum to the effort to reach a better understanding of how Korean college students organize English expository text.

² There are only three studies that investigated how Korean writers organized English expository text by Korean researchers: Jongseok Ok (1991), Seungbok Lee (1995), and Sun Lee (2001). However, in the case of Seungbok Lee, its focus is rather on linguistic aspects of texts by Korean writers than on rhetorical ones.

II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED STUDIES

1. Development of Contrastive Rhetoric Theories

Kaplan's landmark study of contrastive rhetoric (1966) established the ground for looking at second language writing and its pedagogy from a new perspective. Whorfian view of language and thought are well ingrained in Kaplan's theory that suggests that different cultures generate different thought patterns which, in turn, lead to different rhetorical patterns. Kaplan put this relationship between culture and rhetorical pattern as follows:

Logic (in the popular, rather than the logician's sense of the world) which is the basic of rhetoric, is evolved out of a culture; it is not universal. Rhetoric, then, is not universal either, but varies from culture to culture and even from time to time within a given culture (p. 2).

Based upon such anthropological premises, he proposed the famous five different rhetorical patterns by five different cultural groups. The rhetorical pattern of English culture was drawn as a straight downward line which implies top-down, deductive ways of approaching the theme. The other four culture groups shows striking dissimilarities to that of English. For example, Semitic culture groups were characterized as having parallel structure which does not clearly show the theme by postponing it to the last part of the writing. Oriental cultures were defined as showing an indirect approach to the theme. Kaplan explained that Oriental writers do not express their intentions explicitly. Instead, he added that their intended meaning could be understood by the reader through the repeated remarks which is more or less relevant, but avoid the direct referring to theme. The third example of contrastive rhetoric came from Romance culture. The rhetorical pattern of Romance culture was characterized as digression. Kaplan reported that even professional writers from Romance cultures enjoyed a considerable degree of freedom in introducing the unrelated topics to the theme. The last example is Russian culture which showed the characteristics of parallel constructions and many subordinate clauses. Similar to the rhetorical pattern of Romance culture, that of Russian culture included many irrelevant parts to the theme.

Although Kaplan's original study was accepted by many second language writing researchers as a legitimate explanation for rhetorical differences among different cultures, it faced many criticisms for its assertive generalization of the different rhetorical patterns. Mohan and Lo (1985) criticized Kaplan with regard to his heavy reliance on ancient Chinese rhetoric. In contrast to Kaplan's claim that the eight-legged essays represented the Chinese way of organizing text, they maintained that the essay form was simply historical artifacts and no longer used in contemporary Chinese rhetoric. It is quite noticeable that,

while Anglo-American second language writing researchers tended to highlight the differences between the Western and Oriental way of text organization, the Oriental researchers contended that the differences were not so big as the Anglo-American researchers insisted (Yeonhee Choi, 1988; Eggington, 1987; Erbaugh, 1990; Kamimura & Oi, 1998; Kirkpatrick, 1997; Kubota, 1998; Liu, 2005; Matalene, 1985; Mohan & Lo, 1985). The Oriental researchers stressed the influence of the Western rhetoric on the shaping of the contemporary Oriental rhetoric.

The problems of Kaplan's original theory are well summarized in Leki's review of the historical development of contrastive rhetoric (Leki, 1991). She pointed out that its major problem lied in the overlook of non-textual features such as process and context. Proponents of the process approach to writing criticized contrastive rhetoric in terms that it is, by nature, prescriptive, forcing students to follow the prescriptive rules of Anglo-American rhetoric. Another problem is that rhetorical differences could be explained in other ways than cultural differences. A strong factor leading to rhetorical differences could be the writers' different levels of writing proficiency, so it is not appropriate to mention that cultural differences are a sole factor explaining the differences. The third problem identified in the study was that it assumes the negative transfer of writing skills between different cultures. This contradicts many research findings that eventually confirmed the positive transfer from L1 to L2 writing. The last problem is its incompetence to explain rhetorical differences in different discourse communities within a culture. Overall, by positing cultural differences as a sole factor leading to rhetorical differences, it becomes unable to account for the complex mechanism of different rhetorical patterns in diverse rhetorical situations.

In response to the criticisms against Kaplan's original study, contrastive rhetoric has gone through many changes and comes to include the elements that were not originally considered. Kaplan (1987) admitted that he had overly emphasized the rhetorical differences and failed to accommodate various perspectives of second language writing in his original theory. He regretted the failure of providing a balanced view of second writing in the original study in the following manner:

In that study, I tried to represent, in crude graphic form, the notion that the rhetorical structure of languages differs. It is probably true that, in the first blush of discovery, I overstated both the difference and my case. In the years since that article first appeared, I have been accused of reductionism—of trying to reduce the whole of linguistics to this single issue (p. 9).

Since the original study came out, there have been new disciplines emerging that greatly contribute to shaping our understanding of text (Kaplan & Grabe, 2002). First, textlinguistics provides us with invaluable insight toward how sentences are connected and organized around the theme. Cognitive models of writing, on which the process writing

approach is based, add another dimension to writing research. And discourse analysis, which sees writing as a communicative event between the writer and the reader, raises the issue of genre and discourse communities in writing research. Studies in those disciplines have greatly influenced and enriched contrastive rhetoric.

Contrastive rhetoric has also evolved along with the development of writing theories. In response to the development of the process writing approach, Grabe and Kaplan (1989) contended that contrastive rhetoric could be explained in terms of the cognitive-processing model proposed by Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987). They proposed that a writer have to set goals and subgoals for completing writing tasks that could be achieved by activating content and discourse knowledge each of which is associated with content and rhetorical problem space. Kaplan and Grabe maintained that contrastive rhetoric dealt with the rhetorical problem space and provided a satisfying account for the problems in the space. The 1990s observed that the process writing approach handed over its throne to the genre approach. The genre approach emerged as a reaction to the criticism against the reductionism of the process approach in which writing is dealt in individual levels rather than in social context in which writing is situated. It was contended that contrastive rhetoric could be comfortably accounted for by the genre approach (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Kaplan & Ramanathan, 2000). Grabe and Kaplan (1996) assumed that a culture formed a discourse community which had its own genres. Different cultures have different genres. Organizing information in specific ways for effective communication among its members is one of their features. It should be noted that contrastive rhetoric has not been static, but changed continually in line with the development of the new writing paradigms.

2. Features of Oriental Text Structure

Oriental cultures have their deep roots in ancient Chinese culture. Particularly, Confucian philosophy has strictly ruled both material and spiritual life of the Oriental people for over 2,000 years. Even it is a strong force that influences their life greatly today. As Kaplan (1966) explained, this philosophic tradition and ancient Chinese literacy practices have strongly influenced Chinese, Korean and Japanese culture regarding the manner of organizing text. The Oriental manner can be characterized as an indirect approach to the theme (Kaplan, 1987; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Hinds, 1990; Hinkel, 2002; Kaplan, 1966; Metalene, 1985). Instead of expressing their ideas in an explicit, direct manner, Oriental people were believed to assume that their ideas can be shared with the readers by allusion to the theme. Kaplan (1966) summarized this indirect rhetorical pattern as follows:

In this kind of writing, the development of the paragraph may be said to be "turning and turning in a widening gyre." The circles or gyres turn around the subject and show it from a variety of tangential views, but the subject is never

looked at directly. Things are developed in terms of what they are not, rather than in terms of what they are. (p. 10)

Such explanation of Oriental rhetoric has been criticized as not having the proper understanding of contemporary Oriental rhetoric (Kachru, 1997; Kamimura & Oi, 1998; Kirkpatrick, 1997; Liu, 2005; Mohan & Lo, 1985). These studies contended that there were many similarities between the contemporary Oriental and Western rhetoric, which obviously came from the recent Westernized writing instruction in Oriental countries. They also pointed out that Kaplan's explanation of Oriental rhetoric was too simplistic to explain the complex process of determining text structure in different rhetorical situations.

1) Chinese Rhetorical Pattern

Historically Chinese culture has had strong influence over that of Korea and Japan. Rhetoric is an example of such influence. Two Chinese traditional rhetorical patterns, the eight-legged and four-move essay form, were identified to have strong effect on contemporary Chinese rhetoric (Connor, 1996; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Hinds, 1990; Hinkel, 2002). The first organization pattern, which used to be employed in the civil service examination in ancient China, was considered as the main source of the indirectness of Chinese text (Kaplan, 1972). According to Cai (1993), the eight-legged essay consists of *poti*, *chengti*, *qijiang*, *qigu*, *xugu*, *zhonggu*, *hougu*, and *dajie*, literally meaning the opening-up, amplification, preliminary exposition, first argument, second argument, third argument, final argument, and conclusion. In the *Chengti*, the writer introduces the topic and expresses the intended thesis of the essay. In the next five parts, the writer elaborates on the topic by quoting necessary excerpts from Chinese classics, and concludes the essay in *dajie*. Another rhetorical pattern that has had strong influence on Korean and Japanese rhetoric is the four-move pattern of *qi*, *cheng*, *zhuan*, and *he* (Connor, 1996; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Hinds, 1990). *Qi* prepares the reader for the topic, *cheng* introduces and develops the topic, *zhuan* digresses from and turns to the related subject to the topic, and *he* concludes the essay. This four-move pattern was considered basic to Korean and Japanese rhetoric (Connor, 1996; Eggington, 1987; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Hinds, 1990). In addition, an important feature of Chinese rhetoric worth noting is the inclusion of quotes from ancient Chinese classics. Matalene (1985) highlighted the importance of this quoting practice in Chinese culture. She explained that American English writing teachers who were unaware of such Chinese writing tradition were likely to mistakenly conclude that plagiarism is a widespread problem to Chinese students.

In response to the studies that highlighted Chinese rhetorical tradition and stressed the difference between Chinese and Western rhetoric, there are many researchers who cast the doubt on the findings of Kaplan and other contrastive rhetoric proponents (Erbaugh, 1990; Kirkpatrick, 1997; Liu, 2005; Mohan & Lo, 1985). Erbaugh (1990) presented a variety of

genres that were popularly practiced in contemporary China. She contended that, since Chinese and Western culture had different contexts for literacy practices, it was not possible to directly compare the two rhetorical patterns. She further mentioned that, if writings of similar or identical genres were compared, the difference became minimal. She explained that Chinese expository writing began with posing an issue and developed with examples and counter-examples in a parallel or chronologically-ordered manner. Chinese expository text was also characterized as emphasizing predictions, cause-and-effect arguments, moral appeals, and final recommendations. Kirkpatrick (1997) stressed that the traditional eight-legged and four-move essay pattern exerted little influence over contemporary Chinese rhetoric. On the contrary, the concept of the four-move pattern was changed to resemble the Western way of developing ideas. In contemporary Chinese composition textbooks, the four-part structure of *kaiduan-fazhan-gaochao-jieju*, which means beginning, development, climax, and conclusion respectively, eventually replaced the traditional concept of the four-move pattern. In addition, he listed several examples that show that writing instruction in China is very close to that in Western cultures with regard to many important writing features. Liu (2005) compared American on-line instructional materials for teaching argumentative essays with Chinese ones. She maintained that, although there were fundamental differences in underlying assumptions regarding the manner of argument between the two cultures, the on-line materials from both countries shared many features in common in respect to the text structure and purpose. Both Chinese and American on-line instructional materials considered tripartite structure consisting of introduction, body, and conclusion as the basic structure. Further, they also agreed on the purpose of argumentative essays as winning the reader's agreement with the writer's point of view.

2) Japanese Rhetorical Pattern

Since Japanese culture has been historically influenced by Chinese culture, its rhetorical pattern shows many similarities to Chinese rhetoric. Kaplan and other contrastive rhetoric proponents regarded the four-move pattern of *ki-shoo-ten-ketsu* as the basic structure of Japanese text (Connor, 1996; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Hinds, 1987). This pattern is identical with Chinese *qi, cheng, zhuan, and he* in terms of how ideas develop in the text. Like Chinese *zhuan, ten* was considered to give Western readers an impression that Japanese expository text is incoherent (Connor, 1996; Hinds, 1987). Hinds (1990) contended that, although Japanese rhetoric appeared inductive in its reasoning by placing the thesis statement in the final position of essays, it eventually was not. He called such Japanese rhetorical pattern as quasi-inductive, which were regarded as neither deductive nor inductive. Hinds (1987) also characterized Japanese rhetoric as reader-responsible. In the study, Japanese was regarded as a situation-focused rather than a person-focused language. While a speaker needs to state both the persons involved in and the situation of

an incident in person-focused language, only the situation is stated in situation-focused language. Therefore, the reader is asked more responsibility for effective communication in situation-focused language. Hinds pointed out the lack of coherence as a main feature of situation-focused language. Unlike person-focused language which has explicit cohesive markers and clear logic, situation-focused language lacks such features, which, in turn, make the text look incoherent to Western readers.

Unlike the studies discussed above, there are studies of Japanese rhetoric that emphasized similarities between Japanese and Western rhetoric. Kamimura and Oi (1998) compared Japanese students' English argumentative essays with those of American students with regard to organization pattern, rhetorical appeals, diction, and cultural influences. Some of the findings were intriguing. First, the two groups showed no actual difference in the inclusion of the thesis statement and the conclusion in their writings, implying that the Japanese group was also deductively oriented in organizing the text. In addition, the Japanese group was also shown to be explicit in stating their opinions, thus refuting Kaplan's characterization of Oriental rhetoric as indirect. Kubota (1998) compared the text structure of English expository and argumentative essays written by Canadian college students with that of Japanese expository and argumentative essays by Japanese college students. The results were rather mixed. While there was a clear difference in the text structure of the expository writings between the two groups, there was no significant difference in the argumentative writings. This result indicates that the rhetorical pattern of the Japanese group was not fixed, but changed according to the genre they were asked to write. Moreover, the Canadian students whose writing scores were above the mean in the group placed the thesis statement in the final part of the essay, which clearly contradicted the previous argument on the position of the thesis statement in Western rhetoric.

3) Korean Rhetorical Pattern

Korean rhetorical pattern was considered to resemble Chinese and Japanese one (Connor, 1996; Eggington, 1987; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Hinds, 1987 & 1990; Hinkel, 2005). The four-move structure of Korean rhetoric, *ki-sung-chon-kyul*, is simply Korean pronunciation of Chinese *qi-cheng- zhuān- hē* and Japanese *ki-shoo-ten-ketsu*. They all refer to the same entity with the different pronunciation. Korean rhetoric was also characterized as indirect in approaching the theme. The study of Eggington (1987) is most commonly referred to in discussing Korean rhetorical pattern. He examined how text structure influenced the recall of the material to which the subjects were exposed. More specifically, the subjects were exposed to two different text structures for two minutes one of which was the Western linear structure, the other the Korean indirect structure. The result showed that, when the subjects were exposed to the Korean pattern, they recalled more. Eggington interpreted this as the indirectness of Korean thought patterns. He was convinced that, since Koreans thought indirectly, they were able to recall more from the

text whose structure was indirect. However, the looseness of the study design as well as the assertiveness without adequate evidence makes his claims on Korean rhetoric very problematic.

There were also Korean researchers who explored the difference between Korean and Western rhetoric. Yeonhee Choi (1988) compared the text structures of three writing groups: 1) one was written in English by Koreans, 2) another in Korean by Koreans, and 3) the other in English by Americans. She found that the text structure of English writing by Koreans was more similar to that of English writing by Americans than that of Korean writing by Koreans. In other words, the Korean subjects tended to change the rhetorical pattern, depending upon the language employed in the writing. Yeonhee Choi interpreted this result as the Western rhetorical might be the basic pattern for both Korean and English argumentative texts or the universal pattern for argumentative essays. Jongseok Ok (1991) compared the text structure of newspaper articles published in the U.S. and Korea. The result of his study generally confirmed what Kaplan and other contrastive rhetoric proponents (Connor, 1996; Eggington, 1987; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Hinds, 1987 & 1990; Hinkel, 2005) claimed regarding Korean rhetorical pattern. While ten out of fifteen Korean newspaper articles were interpreted as consisting of the traditional four-move pattern of *ki-sung-chon-kyul*, this four-move pattern did not occur in any of the fifteen American newspaper articles. Further, he maintained that only two Korean newspaper articles could be interpreted as deductively approaching the theme, showing a sharp contrast to the American articles. Seungbok Lee (1995) examined rhetorical differences between English writings of Korean and American college students in an American university, and maintained that the result of his study confirmed the difference between Anglo-American and Korean rhetoric identified by Kaplan and other contrastive rhetoric proponents. Particularly, the study pointed out that the opening statements of the Korean students' writings were problematic for effective communication from American readers' perspectives. Finally, Sun Lee (2001) investigated the introductions of research articles written by Korean scholars with postgraduate education background in the U.S. and in Korea. The result suggested that, although there were minor differences, the text structure was similar to each other between the groups. She interpreted this result as both groups were influenced by the Western rhetoric.

III. RHETORICAL PATTERNS IN KOREAN EXPOSITORY WRITING

1. Method

1) Participants

Twenty-seven students who enrolled a major university in Korea participated in this

study. They were sophomores and juniors from two advanced English reading classes. Thirteen students majored in subjects other than English and the rest majored in English. According to the curriculum of the university, the participants were required to take at least one or two English composition classes taught by the native instructor during their freshman year. Therefore, they had a learning experience to be exposed to the Western rhetorical pattern. In addition, since they had taken the English composition class only six months to a year ago, it was expected that the text structure that they had studied during their English composition classes had influenced their ways to organize text in the study. Therefore, it is interesting to note how their traditional Korean rhetoric and learned Western rhetoric interacted with each other in their texts.

2) Data Collection

To collect the data for this study, the instructor for two advanced English reading classes were contacted and requested to collect the data for the study. The subjects were asked to write a topic regarding the relationship between physical and mental health (Refer to Appendix A). The topic was selected on the assumption that, since it was a common topic presented in many English writing textbooks, the subjects must be familiar with the topic, which asked them no special knowledge. The subjects were instructed to write at least 200 words. This was because there should be a certain length necessary to draw the data adequate for the analysis in the study. In addition, in order to accurately examine how they structure their ideas and put them in writing without the interference with the lack of grammatical and lexical knowledge, the subjects were given a writing assignment and asked to submit it a week later. This gave them enough time to complete the assignment with help from reference books such as dictionaries and grammar books.

3) Data Analysis

This study is intended to examine the claims on Korean rhetoric by Kaplan and other proponents of contrastive rhetoric. Two major questions are raised in this study. One question is whether specific patterns of logic can be found in the subjects' writings. Kaplan (1966) defined the logic of Oriental culture as inductive. Hinds (1990) characterized the Korean rhetorical pattern as quasi-inductive, meaning that it is neither deductive nor inductive. The answer helps us either affirm or reject their arguments. The other question is whether the *ki-sung-chon-kyul* pattern is the dominant structural pattern in the texts. This question is much more complicated than it seems. In contrast to Kaplan's claim (1966) that culture is the major force that determines rhetorical patterns, it seems that there are many variables to be considered in seeking the answer to the question. Eventually, all of the elements which constitute a rhetorical situation seem to contribute to the development of text structure. Then, the question becomes whether the determination of text structure is

independent of the complexities of rhetorical situations.

The participants' texts are analyzed by using the paradigms in Connor and McCagg (1987) and Berman and Katzenberger (2004). In Connor and McCagg (1987), text was regarded as a complex proposition with sub-propositions fulfilling rhetorical functions. Each sentence is looked upon as a basic constituent that makes up the overall text. Each sentence is examined in terms of the relationship with other sentences as well as the function it plays in relation to the overall text. Further, since the thesis statement plays a critical role in framing the text, special attention is paid to it in this study. Berman and Katzenberger (2004) explained how the thesis statement in expository text frames discourse by means of topic definition. They proposed that topic definition be realized through two dimensions of generalization and anchoring. The first dimension, generalization, needs to include both an explicit generalization and some specific elaboration of the topic. The elaboration expands or extends the notion carried by the generalization by means of additional ideational commentary. In contrast, anchoring delimits the generalization by referring to concrete instances related to the topic. In this study, defining the logic displayed in the text as either deductive or inductive requires a precise definition of the thesis statement. Even though a general statement referring to the topic is located at the beginning, the text cannot be always regarded as deductive. Deductive text is supposed to include a thesis statement which frames the text and delimit its scope adequately.

2. Results of Text Analysis

1) Placement of Thesis Statement

In contrast to the claim by Kaplan and other proponents of contrastive rhetoric that Korean rhetorical pattern is inductive or quasi-inductive, 23 out of 27 students put the thesis statement at the beginning of their writings. This result is quite striking from the perspective of contrastive rhetoric. However, there is little doubt that the subjects approached the theme deductively in their writings. Moreover, there was no case where the thesis statement was located at the end. The other four writings can be interpreted as neither deductive nor inductive. In those cases, no clear thesis statement emerged, and it was fairly difficult to identify what the writers' points were in the texts. As Kaplan and other proponents of contrastive rhetoric characterized Korean rhetoric as indirect, the rhetorical pattern of the four subjects' texts could be also defined as indirect, in terms that the theme was never stated explicitly in the texts. Overall, it was rather unexpected that 23 out of 27 students approached the theme deductively and only the rest four students indirectly approached the theme. One possible explanation of this result can be found in the composition test many Korean high school students are required to take for admission to college. The university the subjects were attending also required its applicants to take the

composition test. In other words, their learning experiences of composition skills for the admission might contribute to their heavy preference of deductive rhetoric over other ways to approach the theme.

The thesis statements in the study show many distinct features worth discussion. One notable feature in the students' thesis statements is that some students simply copied or slightly modified a part of the direction given to them in the assignment, and used it as their thesis statements at the beginning of their writings. Thirteen students began their writings with copying or modifying a part of the direction. Among them, six students simply copied the phrase "mental health is closely related with physical health" in the direction, and the other seven students used the word "affect," in order not to exactly copy the direction. One obvious reason for using the direction as the thesis statement is that they were short of linguistic and composition skills necessary to create their own thesis statement. Another feasible reason is that the students might think that there was no choice except for copying or modifying the phrase in the direction. They might think that, since what to write about the topic was too obvious, there was no room to begin the writing with their own words. In any case, it shows the importance of topic selection and wording in the direction of writing assignments and tests.

Instead of explicitly referring to the relationship between mental and physical health at the beginning, there were nine students who alluded to mental and physical health with such expressions as body and soul, a surgery, stress, bad mood, an experience to be sick, and smile. An important point here is that, when the students alluded, their writings tended to be non-deductive. All of the four writings that was considered as non-deductive in the study begin with allusions. The following is an example of the writings that begin with allusion:

People live under the stress that comes from their life and the stress can cause lots of disease - such as heart disease, gastroenteric trouble. Then, to protect our body from many disease that caused by stress, What should we do? Studies show that Laughing 15 seconds can lengthen one's span of life for 2 days. When he laughs, hormones are secreted from brain and scientists call the hormones, Enkephalin, Endorphin, Dynorphin, etc. They, the hormones, help people live healthy. Especially, Dynorphin can reduce one's pain 400 times better than a pain-killing drug. Unfortunately, we cannot, however, make them a pill. So you can get these hormones only by laughing. Laughing by force can also make a person healthy. Laugh! Then you will be happy. And your happiness will make your body healthy.

Instead of starting the writing with an explicit thesis statement, the writer began her writing with the different topic, stress. It seemed to the writer that stress exclusively represented a mental state that led to physical illness. The discussion of stress continues

in the second sentence. Then, the topic changes abruptly from stress to laugh in the third sentence, and the changed topic continues until the end of the writing. Although the writer attempted to relate laugh with physical health at the last sentence, it cannot be considered as stating the thesis asked in the direction. As a matter of fact, there are two topics in the writing. The first one is used as a preparatory step for introducing the second one. Conclusively, there is no doubt that the introduction of stress at the beginning contributes to the incoherent parallel structure.

2. Development of Text Structure

The students' writings in this study show diverse text structures. Although there are many writings that follow the three-move pattern of the Western rhetoric, there are also many cases that deviate from the Western pattern. Since it is not practically possible to explain the structure of all the collected writings, they are divided into the three categories and a representative sample from each category is discussed in full in this part. The first category includes the writings whose text structure clearly resembles the Western rhetorical pattern. They show the three-move pattern of introduction, body, and conclusion. The second category consists of the writings which shows some deviations from the Western rhetorical pattern, but which can be comprehended without difficulties. The writings of the last category is so disorganized that it is not easy to identify what the writer intends to convey in the writing. Lack of coherence and multiple topics are the common features of writings in the category. Twelve writings are regarded as falling in the first category, seven in the second category, and eight in the last category. In contrast to the fact that 23 out of 27 students placed the thesis statement at the beginning of their writings, there are only 12 writings that can be regarded as following the Western text organization pattern strictly. This can be interpreted as many students were unable to maintain coherence throughout the text. The lack of competence in maintaining coherence is particularly evident in the eight writings that are severely disorganized and give the reader difficulties in comprehending what the writings are about. The text presented below can be regard as that which follows the Western rhetorical pattern:

Mental health affects physical health in many ways. When you are not mentally well, or when you are stressed out, it can have a negative effect on your health. When stress is out of control, stress hormones increase, and the body's immune system suffers. This causes many stress-related health problems. However, relaxation techniques such as deep breathing and meditation can actually make your mind healthy. These activities will also make your body strong and healthy by lowering the stress hormone levels in the blood. Remember the saying, "A sound mind in a sound body."

The first sentence expresses the thesis of the writing clearly and enables the reader to predict what follows in the later part. The phrase “in many ways” in the first sentence frames the text and tells that the topic will be discussed from various perspectives. The writer presented the case in which certain mental conditions negatively influenced physical health from the second to fourth sentence. Then, there is a shift of the sub-topic, which is clearly marked by the transition word, however, in the fifth sentence. The sixth sentence adds more explanation to the fifth sentence that tells how mental exercises positively influence physical health. Finally, the conclusion which emphasizes the opening sentence comes at the last sentence. The structure of the above text clearly follows the three-move pattern of Western rhetoric. If it is considered that there are 12 out of 27 writings that clearly show the Western pattern in the study, Kaplan’s explanation of Oriental rhetoric (1966) seems rather exaggerated.

The following text falls in the second category in which texts can be characterized as those which follows the Western three-move pattern in a broad sense, but includes some deviations from it. The writings of seven students in the study fall in the category. The students whose writings fall in this category seem short of composition skills to maintain coherence throughout the text. The deviations found in their writings sometimes make it difficult for the reader to comprehend the text properly.

The mind has a powerful influence on the physical body. Fear, for example, can trigger release of the hormone adrenaline, causing the heart to pump faster and leading physical sensations such as sweating. On the other hand, pleasurable thoughts and feelings can trigger the release of endorphin in the brain, leading to muscle relaxation. The link between mental health and physical health may be important as we see here. Therefore, if one person makes ceaseless efforts to have a positive thinking, however tough he or she has troubles living his or her own life, he or she will naturally have strong body as well as healthy mind. In conclusion, the most important and instant way to live healthily and long is just enough to have positive mind and smile.

The text above begins with a clear thesis statement. Then, an example that elaborates the thesis statement is introduced in the second sentence. The third sentence adds an example that is seen from a different perspective. However, the fourth sentence is not connected to the previous sentences and seems to simply restate the first sentence. The fifth sentence further deviates from the first three sentences and introduces new topics like ceaseless efforts and tough life. Finally, the writer reaches the conclusion at the sixth sentence in which he puts forth his argument on the topic. This text seems to follow the Korean rhetorical pattern of *ki-sung-chon-kyul*. The first sentence corresponds to *ki*, the second and third to *sung*, the fourth and fifth to *chon*, and the last to *kyul*. In the writing, the *chon* part makes it distinct from the Western rhetorical pattern, in terms that a new topic which

does not have any relationship with the previous part is abruptly introduced, giving the reader considerable difficulties in understanding how the writer's ideas flow in the text.

The last category is that which greatly deviates from the Western rhetorical pattern. It cannot be considered as the Korean pattern either. Instead, the topic is discussed in various perspectives, but the theme is never directly stated. In this vein, the writings in the category well show the characteristics of the Oriental rhetoric described by Kaplan (1966). The following writing from an English-major student clearly shows the indirect approach to the theme:

Sometimes I talk to my mother like this "Mom, I'm so depressed today, so I can't study anymore." Then, my mother bring me out and give some fresh air. And this means that I affect a lot by my feelings. All of us might have this kind of experience. For example, when you separated with your boy friend or girl friend, you can do nothing. Some people think that there is no relationship between mental conditions and physical health. Though you are that kind of person, you might have this experience which I mentioned before. If there is no relationship between mental conditions and physical conditions, how can you explain this situation? I think this kind of experience helps to prove this theory. In many research, the praise is very effective to raise efficiency. Many students studied harder, when heard a pep-talk from their teacher or parents. We can guess again from this. Our mental conditions really affect our physical condition. So, if you want more efficient work, you have to control not only your physical conditions but also mental condition. The harmony of two condition makes your best efficiency.

In response to the direction that asked the subjects to explain the relationship between physical and mental health, the writer began the text with her personal experience that she thought was related to the topic in the first two sentences. In the third sentence, she attempted to draw on meaning from the anecdote. She took an example for what the first three sentences attempt to convey in the fourth sentence, but the message is not clear at all. Then, she returned to the topic by stating the opposite to what she really thinks in the fifth sentence where her real intention is signaled by the determiner, *some*. In the sixth sentence, she revealed what she really meant in the previous sentence and relates it with the anecdote in the beginning two sentences. The thesis statement that takes the form of a rhetorical question appears again in the seventh sentence. Apparently, it distracts the reader due to its location and the unclear relationship with the previous sentences. The phrase "this kind of experience" in the eighth sentence refers back to the anecdote presented at the beginning. The abrupt topic shift to "praise" occurs at the ninth sentence and the same subtopic continues to be elaborated until the twelfth sentence. The thirteenth and fourteenth sentence can be regarded as the conclusion. However, it is not easy to find the relationship

between the conclusion and the previous part either. Overall, the text can be characterized as completely disorganized and incoherent. Moreover, it is not easy to find the relationship between the topic given in the direction and those discussed in the text. The features present in the writing also resembles those of basic writers discussed in Perl (1979), in that basic writers assume that, regardless of how their texts are structured, their writings are always understood by their readers.

IV. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This study bears some important points regarding the understanding of Korean rhetoric and teaching English composition at college level. First, in contrast to the previous understanding that Korean writers do not approach the theme deductively, 23 out of 27 subjects in this study began their writings with a clear thesis statement. This result clearly refutes what Kaplan and other proponents of contrastive rhetoric claimed on Korean logic. Their claims are based upon the understanding of the traditional Korean culture. However, although there remains some influence of the traditional culture in contemporary Korean rhetoric, it is an overstatement that the traditional culture critically determines how today's Koreans think. Culture changes with the passage of time, so how its members think also changes. In addition, what Kaplan and other proponents of contrastive rhetoric overlooked is the possibility of diverse rhetorical reasoning within a culture. Depending upon the writer's background and the rhetorical situation where he or she is situated, the way to reason is likely to change. Kachru (1997) even cast a doubt on the notion of monolithic rhetoric within a culture. It is obscure why some contrastive rhetoric theorists are reluctant or resistant to admit the fact that there are variations among the members of each cultural group in text organization, depending upon their linguistic and writing abilities, socio-economic background, learning experiences of writing, and other factors leading to different text organizations. Kaplan and other contrastive rhetoric proponents simply failed to adequately explain what real Korean rhetoric patterns are. It seems that the study of Korean rhetoric requires more extensive work than we can imagine. Contrastive rhetoric is probably a small part of the whole picture.

The overwhelming occurrence of the thesis statements at the beginning of the subjects' writings sharply contrasts with the result of Jongseok Ok's study (1991) in which only two out of fifteen English newspaper articles published in Korea put their thesis statements at the beginning. In order to understand this contrast, we need to review how the subjects had practiced composition skills. They had been required to take a composition test that evaluated their composition and logical abilities to get admission to the university they were attending. Since this composition test was crucial to their admission, they had received intensive training on how to improve their composition and logical skills throughout their high school years. It must be that their deductive reasoning displayed in

this study partly comes from this intensive training which emphasized the importance of deductive reasoning for the clear display of their ideas in the text. In addition, there is no doubt that their training of English composition skills in college partly shapes their English composition abilities displayed in their writings for this study. Unlike oral language skills, literacy skills are not acquired naturally, but should be learned through various literacy experiences. Their experiences of studying English composition with the native instructors and the textbooks to teach EFL students the Western rhetoric partly lead to the difference between the result of this study and that of Jongseok Ok's.

Although the subjects in this study overwhelmingly placed the thesis statements at the beginning of their writings, it did not lead to linear, straightforward text structure recommended in the Western rhetoric. Among 24 writings with the thesis statement placed at the beginning, only twelve writings show the Western rhetorical pattern. Seven writings include some part that can be regarded as unnecessary or irrelevant to the theme, and eight are completely disorganized and incoherent. In other words, many students failed to develop their deductive reasoning into the coherent three-move text in this study. The reason for this result can be found in the subjects' incompetence to produce coherent text. Their English composition skills were developing, not fully developed. Learning composition skills takes time, and it is gradual (Britton, et al., 1975). The subjects might understand the importance of placing a thesis statement at the beginning for producing a clear text, but not how to develop the thesis statement to a coherent text. In this vein, they did not seem familiar with the Western rhetoric sufficiently. Another reason may be that there is some influence from unknown sources, probably from Korean rhetoric, to their text structure. If they were influenced by Korean rhetoric, the influence is likely to decrease with more practice of English composition. Since they would practice and be exposed to practical or technical writings which apparently require the linear Western rhetorical pattern, it is very unlikely that the influence of Korean rhetoric increases.

This study bears some important pedagogical points. In today's world where English is becoming the most dominant medium for communication among people across cultures, the mastery of the Western rhetorical pattern surely helps our students prepare for their future. In many English composition classrooms, grammar and vocabulary are the main focus of the instruction. However, how to organize text also requires practice. Literacy skills are not naturally developed, but should be learned. Students should be provided sufficient opportunities to practice how to organize their text and to be exposed to model texts. Another important point identified in this study is that mastering composition skills takes time. The subjects' placement of the thesis statement at the opening part but their failure to produce the linear, straightforward text structure well proves the point that writing skills are developmental. It is obvious that the subjects were becoming familiar with the Western rhetoric. Therefore, there should be an effort to provide English composition instruction over an extended period of time. Ideally, college students should be provided English composition instruction throughout their college years. It is certain

that one or two English composition courses does not guarantee the composition skills necessary to meet the real world. Further, the instructors need to realize the importance of genres in developing their students' writing skills. Different genres require different languages and text structures. The belief that a common text structure and language expressions can be applied to various genres is simply mistaken.

REFERENCES

- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Berman, R. A., & Katzenberger, I. (2004). Form and function in introducing narrative and expository texts: A developmental perspective. *Discourse Processes*, 38, 57-94.
- Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A., & Resen, H. (1975). *The development of writing abilities (11-18)*. London: Macmillan
- Cai, G. (1993). Text in contexts: Understanding Chinese students' English compositions. In C. R. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), *Evaluating writing* (2nd ed.). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Choi, Yeonhee. (1988). Text structure of Korean speakers' argumentative essays in English. *World Englishes*, 7, 129-142.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing*. Cambridge, UK; Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, U., & McCagg, P. (1988). A Contrastive study of English expository prose paraphrases. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 73-86). Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Eggington, W. G. (1987). Written academic discourse in Korean: Implications for effective communication. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 153-168). Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Erbaugh, M. S. (1990). Taking advantage of China's literacy tradition in teaching Chinese students. *Modern Language Journal*, 74, 15-27.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1989). Writing in a second language: Contrastive rhetoric. In D. Johnson & D. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing* (pp. 263-283). New York: Longman.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing*. New York: Addison-Wesley Longman.
- Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 141-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. In U. Connor & A. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in writing:*

- Research and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 89-109). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Hinkel, E. (2002). *Second language writer' text: Linguistic and rhetorical features*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kachru, Y. (1997). Cultural meaning and contrastive rhetoric in English education. *World Englishes, 16*, 337-350.
- Kamimura, T., & Oi, K. (1998). Argumentative strategies in American and Japanese English. *World Englishes, 17*, 307-323.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning, 16*, 1-20.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1972). *The anatomy of rhetoric: Prolegomena to a functional theory of rhetoric*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1987). Cultural thought patterns revisited. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 9-21). Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Kaplan, R. B., & Grabe, W. (2002). A modern history of written discourse analysis. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*, 191-223.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (1997). Traditional Chinese text structures and their influence on the writing in Chinese and English of contemporary mainland Chinese students. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 6*, 223-244.
- Kubota, R. (1998). An investigation of Japanese and English LI essay organization: Differences and similarities. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 54*, 475-507.
- Lee, Sun. (2001). A Study of Korean and English research paper introductions based on Swales' Move Analysis. *Journal of Applied Linguistics Association of Korea, 17*, 23-54.
- Lee, Seungbok. (1995). *Syntactic, lexical, and rhetorical differences in English prose written by native speakers of English and by native speakers of Korean*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Leki, I. (1991). Twenty-five years of contrastive rhetoric: Text analysis and writing pedagogies. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*, 123-143.
- Liu, L. (2005). Rhetorical education through writing instruction across languages: A comparative analysis of select online instructional materials on argumentative writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*, 1-18.
- Matalene, C. (1985). Contrastive rhetoric: An American writing teacher in China. *College English, 47*, 789-808.
- Mohan, B., & Lo, W. (1985). Academic writing and Chinese students: Transfer and developmental factors. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*, 515-534.
- Ok, Jongseok. (1991). *Korean and English expository prose: A study in contrastive discourse*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Kansas.
- Perl, S. (1979). The composing process of unskilled college writers. *Research in the Teaching of English, 13*, 317-336.

Ramanathan, V., & Kaplan, R. B. (2000). Genre, authors, discourse Communities: Theory and application for (L1 and) L2 Writing Instructors. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*, 171-191.

APPENDIX

English Writing Assignment

Department:

Year:

Name:

- People often say that mental health is closely related with physical health. Explain how one's mental conditions affect his or her physical health.
- Your writing should be at least 200 words long.
- In case that you need more space to write, you may use the reverse side to complete your writing.

Applicable levels: tertiary

Key words: contrastive rhetoric, teaching composition

Hoyeol Ryu

Department of English

Hankyong National University

67 Sukjung-dong, Ansong

Gyeonggi Province, 456-749

Email: hoyeol@hknu.ac.kr

Received in May, 2006

Reviewed in June, 2006

Revised version received in August, 2006