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Editorial

We are very pleased to announce that for the second issue of the Asia Pacific Journal of Language in Education (APJLE) we have been able to negotiate an exchange of articles with a well-established journal in Canada. *The Canadian Modern Language Review (CMLR)/La revue canadienne des langues vivantes* is an internationally refereed journal now into its 55th volume. It is therefore a significant achievement for APJLE to be able to enter into this exchange agreement. For the first exchange we have selected an article by a well-known Japanese scholar, Ryuko Kubota, assistant professor in the School of Education and the Curriculum in Asian Studies at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. In exchange we have offered CMLR an article by Stephen Bremner of the City University of Hong Kong which will be published concurrently in Volume 55(2) of CMLR and in this issue of APJLE.

This issue opens with an article by Tse Shek Kam, et al.. Tse’s article is a two-year longitudinal study of the growth of writing abilities and psycholinguistic development in a primary 3/4 pupil in Hong Kong through an examination of parent-child written communications. The article provides an interesting insight into the rapid growth in intellectual level and communicative ability which children of this age group experience.

The fruit of our exchange with CMLR, the article by Ryuko Kubota, questions some of the assumptions underlying published findings on Japanese discourse. The article reports on an empirical study the results of which indicate greater commonality than had been assumed in the characteristics of Japanese and English academic writing.

The second Chinese article in this issue is by Li Chi Ming. The article focuses on heterographic words and the teaching of the Chinese lexicon. Li first spells out the difficulties in dealing with Chinese synonymous words with different written forms. After discussing a large number of examples, the author proposes five principles to assist language teachers in handling these words in the classroom.

Published concurrently with CMLR, the article by Stephen Bremner examines the relationship between language proficiency and strategy use in the context of a study of Hong Kong learners. The discussion provides suggestions for alternative directions in language learning strategy research in order to throw more light on its relationship with proficiency.

From this year Putonghua has become a core subject in the Hong Kong primary and secondary school curricula. The third Chinese article in this issue, focussing on issues in the design of the Putonghua curriculum for Hong Kong’s secondary
and primary schools, is therefore a timely offering. In the article, Tong Sau Ling discusses the official syllabus and its relation to Chinese language teaching in particular and language teaching in general.

The next article is an important contribution to our understanding of the practicum components of professional development programmes for teachers. The article by Tinker Sachs, Cheung, Pang & Wong allows the practitioners themselves to describe their experiences and perceptions of the supervision process and identifies general conclusions about the most appropriate means of facilitating professional growth in different contexts.

The opportunities which networked computers offer for the development of writing are the focus of our final article. Curtis & Roskams examine issues in the operation of an approach to the development of writing skills using the capabilities of networked computers. Student reactions to this mode of teaching and learning are explored and analysed to provide guidelines for the more effective exploitation of these resources.

The issue concludes with an insightful review by Monica Hill of a collection of conference papers on lexicography and a response by Gillian Bickley to the review of her book published in the first issue, providing answers to the reviewer’s questions.

Peter Storey and Poon Ming Sun
Chief Editors
編者的話

《亞太語文教育學報》第二期發排在即，我們欣慰地宣布，本刊經與加拿
大著名的、設有評審制度的國際性學術刊物 The Canadian Modern Language
Review (CMLR)/ La revue canadienne des langues vivantes (《加拿大現代語言學
刊》, 現已出至第五十五卷) 達成交換協議。我們所選的第一篇交換論文是日
籍學者 Ryuko Kubota (久保田良子) 博士 (北加羅萊納州大學教堂山分校教育
學院及亞洲研究助理教授) 的論文。本刊則提供香港城市大學 Stephen Bremner
的論文作為交換論文，在本刊第二期《加拿大現代語言學刊》第五十五卷第
二期同時刊出。

本刊第二期冠於刊首的是謝錫金等三位學者合撰的論文。他們做了一個
為時兩年的追蹤研究，通過對親子寫作的分析，研探一位香港小三/四學生的
寫作能力的增長和語言心理的發展。一般認為，這個年齡的兒童經歷到智性
水平和溝通能力的快速增長。本文對這個說法提供了饒有趣味的洞識。

本刊與《加拿大現代語言學刊》交換的第一份收獲，是久保田良子的論
文。該文對有關日語講說的論述所根據的一些假設提出質疑。文章報告了一
個驗證研究，其結果指出，日語和英語學術寫作的特徵實比習常認識的具有
更大的共通性。

本期的第二篇中文論文作者為李志明，討論了異形詞和詞匯教學的問
題。作者指出異形詞在詞匯規範上的困難，然後為語文教師建議了五項處理
異形詞的原則，文中並舉了大量實例。

Stephen Bremner 的論文在本刊和《加拿大現代語言學刊》同時發表。該
文就一份以香港學生為對象的研究，剖析語文能力和學習策略之間的關係，
並建議一些研究語文學習策略的另類方向，以更深入揭示語文學習策略和語
文能力的關係。

從今年開始，普通話成為香港中、小學課程裏的重點學科。這一期的第
三篇中文論文以香港中小學普通話課程設計為焦點，可謂及時。作者唐秀玲
探討了普通話課程綱要和它與中文教育以至一般語文教育的關係。

下一期論文是關於教師專業發展中的實習環節。這篇重要的作品由
Tinker Sachs, Cheung, Pang 和 Wong 共同執筆。文中讓施教者現身說法，談
及他們在指導方面的經驗和感受。作者然後為不同場合中如何最合適地幫助
學員在專業上成長提出了一些帶有普遍意義的結論。

網絡電腦為寫作學習開拓的新領域是最後一篇論文的重點所在。作者 Curtis 和 Roskams 檢視了應用網絡電腦於發展寫作技巧上的運作問題。文中探討了學生對這種施教和學習模式的反應，並加以分析，進而提出一些指引，有助更有效使用這類教學資源。

最後，Monica Hill 為一輯辭書編纂學研討會論文寫了深入透闊的評述，而 Gillian Bickley 則就上一期關於其著作的書評作出回應，答覆了評論者的問題。

司徒彼得、潘鉉燊
主編
從親子寫作看香港小三、四年級學童的
寫作能力及語文心理發展

謝錫金
香港大學課程學系

黃慧萍
明愛成人及高等教育機構九龍日校

蘇周簡開
香港大學語言及聽覺學系

摘要

本研究是從語文學習心理學的角度探討香港小學生的中文寫作。研究
資料取自學生的日記、親子間的溝通寫作以及母親的回應。研究
發現兒童在小學三、四年級時，智力和溝通能力都有急速的發展；
除此之外，研究資料也顯示廣東話會影響他們的寫作。

一、引言

自八十年代開始，不少學者致力研究如何改進香港的語文寫作教學。
事實上，香港的語文環境較其他地方複雜，一方面因為香港身處華洋之間，
形成了雙語學習 (中英語言) 的情況；另一方面，中國語文的學習也隨着香港
的地方語文——“香港話”的急速發展而變得繁複。鍾穎崇 (1994) 指出：“香港
話不只本身有內生成力量，又受普通話、各地華語及外語影響，在沒有強制
性語言政策的自由環境中，可以說是近乎無拘無束地演變”。當口語 (香港話)
與書面語 (現代漢語) 的差別日益擴展，再加上 “香港話” 夾雜英文單字或片語
的特色，便構成了香港人的一個獨特語言心理環境。本文旨在研究這個語言
心理環境對寫作教學的影響。

二、研究的目標及對象

了解學生的學習過程和學習心理，才能設計出適當的教學方法。本研究
的資料主要來一位母親和她就讀小學中年級 (小三至小四) 的女兒的通信。這
些資料包括：學生所寫的日記，在四年級下學期開始的親子書信（用一本簿）；母親每天關後的回覆或回應。其間也夾雜了學生在三年級時手繪及書寫的一本自創兒童雜誌。本文嘗試從親子寫作（日記及書信對話）過程所表現的書寫能力，來作一個基礎研究，觀察一個小學中年級學生的寫作能力及其語文心理；並嘗試就此提出一些小學語文寫作教學應要注意的地方。

本研究只選擇一位小學中年級學生作為研究對象，原因是小三、小四為個人學習寫作發展階段中，由“寫話期”（小學低年級）轉入“初級寫作期”（小學高年級）間的“過渡期”（朱作仁、李志強，1987）。在這個由寫話到書寫的過渡階段中，較能直接地顯現一個以雙語（中英並重）及地方土語為主主要學習方式的人，在發展書寫能力過程中的語言心理狀況，從而發現這個轉變過程中必須克服的障礙或掌握的技巧。

選取親子寫作資料而不採學校裏的作文作為研究資料，是因為學生書寫時並不用擔心自己的用詞或語文規範不合標準，可以盡情地書寫，因而更真實地反映其語文心理狀態。劉國正（1994）指出“無讀者”的寫作活動，很容易使學生書寫時草率了事。以母親作為對象的寫作，提供了學校作文時所沒有真實對象，不必因詞彙不足，或錯別字的局限而把學生所要説的話縮短，更能真實地表現她的寫作能力和境況。而且母親的書寫回應（不論是否合乎正規的寫作架構），更成為一個真實的寫作角色模範（role model），足以反映影響學生書寫方式及心理的語文處境。

雖然親子寫作材料有局限，例如：兒童無須“審題”，無須“用盡辦法填滿格子”（規定字數），無須用特定“文體”來寫作……等等，因此難以用此來全面評核學生的寫作能力；不過，作為評估其寫作的語言心理狀態和現況，卻是絕對勝任有餘。

據香港的人口統計，中層人口佔多，本研究選取中層家庭作研究，可以反映大多數學生所面對的處境。另一方面，伯恩斯丁（Bernstein, 1966）認為不同社會階層的兒童，在家庭中所聽到的言語，在形式和內容兩方面都有很多不同的地方。中層家庭的語言和學校的比較接近，因此學校語言是家庭語言的自然發展，學生可以將家庭語言“轉移”（transfer）到學校語言的學習，以家庭語言為學校語言的基礎，所以在學習書面語或寫作時，較佔優勢。
寫作的能力

一、寫作能力的基本架構

早期的語言心理學家，如韓德（Hunt, 1965）、盧班（Loban, 1976）等，大多認為作文是“語句運用能力”的表現，所以集中在研究語法規範、詞匯、結構、句式、文體風格和標點符號等各方面的運用。不過，維格斯基（Vygotsky, 1962）卻指出語言和書寫的發展，不單是“語句運用能力”的學習，同時也和個人的智力成長發展有關。如蘇啟禎（1975）指出，兒童的語言和寫作表現和他的思想成熟程度相關。

“當教師認為兒童選不適意時，教師假設學生已有了有關的經驗（意），而只是沒有表達能力（詞）；然而兒童可能是根本無經驗也沒有，兒童可能限於思想不成熟而不能清楚表達（如層次倒置）。”

所以學習寫作，並不純粹是語文句式學習的問題，同時也是學習思想程序的問題。而近代的語言教育學者也把思想程序學習包括在寫作的架構中。

另一方面，現代的教育心理學發現真正的學習是要由學生們自行建構（construct）。教師雖能催化這個建構過程，例如：教導的資料與學生的生活相關或是賦予意義；可是卻不能代替學生進行建構。所以，教師可以採取一個由上而下的學習過程（top-down process），例如要求學生先寫一篇文章，然後才在這個過程中教導語法、字形……等部份（Joyce, B., & Weil, M., 1986）。換言之，學生可以在大目標下（如寫作表達自己的心聲）更主動地學習其中的構成部份（語法、字形），而不是無了期地學習其中的構成部份，以致把最終目標迷失（如把寫作看成教給教師的功課，而不是傳達心意的工具）。劉國正（1994）也指出“無讀者”的寫作教學，很容易使學生寫作時感到沉悶，失去寫作動機並逐漸從事。

因此，學習書寫不單是培養個人的“語句運用能力”，而是在與人溝通的大前提下，一種結合思想與語句運用能力的專門技能。從現代訊息論來分析，作文本身是一個信息的輸入、儲存、加工和輸出的過程。

祝新華（1993）指出：

“作文是把從客觀現實中吸取的感性材料，通過頭腦加工製作，再運用文字符號表示出來的過程。作文也是內部言語向外部言語轉化的過程，它必須從壓縮面簡約……自己能明白的言語展開，向具有規範語法結構、能為他人所理解的語言轉化。作文與閱讀過程存在着……”
倒逆關係，閱讀是接受，吸收信息，是內向的；作文則是發送，釋放信息，是外向的。”

寫作既是一個由“內部言語向外部言語轉化的過程”。那麼，“內部言語”與“外部言語”的差別在那裏？如何才能由“內部言語”平穩或成功地轉化為“外部言語”的規範？

二、口語與書面語的差別

李紹林 (1993) 在提及口語與書面語的分別時，指出一般口語與書面語的分別為：

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>口語</th>
<th>書面語</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>處境</td>
<td>* 面對面的溝通</td>
<td>* 見不到讀者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* 能觀察聽眾回應而作修正或解說</td>
<td>* 只能設想讀者的回應並作事先解說</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>運用媒體</td>
<td>* 語音：如輕重音、語調、語速和語氣</td>
<td>* 文字</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* 姿勢：手勢、動作、表情</td>
<td>* 標點符號</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>句法特點</td>
<td>* 句子短小 (七至九個詞)</td>
<td>* 多長句 (複句)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* 不完整句，多省略、停頓</td>
<td>* 多完整句子</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>結構</td>
<td>* 鬆散，支離破碎，省略了關連句</td>
<td>* 架構嚴謹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* 多並行或並列關係</td>
<td>* 着重因果關係</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>用詞</td>
<td>* 動詞比名詞出現率高</td>
<td>* 形容詞及名詞出現率略多於動詞</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

因漢語本身是“方塊字”，所以口語和書面語的差距比西方文字較大。李丹 (1987) 在研究書面言語與內部言語的發展時特別指出：

“中國的書面語運用比口頭語複雜，一般要經過認字、閱讀與寫作三個階段。每個漢字都有獨立的形、音、義，要使兒童掌握一個漢字，就必須能辨別形、音、義。所以獨立寫作是書面語的最高階段，它是兒童掌握的詞匯量、語法修辭、思維能力的綜合體現。”

曾志朗，王士元 (1985) 發現漢字 (方塊字) 的形、音、義三重架構使錯別字對閱讀者的困擾較大 (相對其他拉丁系字形)。引申下來，從口語轉化為書寫語的難度也較大。
三、寫作的語言心理發展階段

朱作仁與李志強 (1987) 把寫作的學習分作五個不同的語言心理階段 (本文只列出小學的三個階段)：

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>分期</th>
<th>年段</th>
<th>表現特徵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>寫話期</td>
<td>小學 低年級</td>
<td>作文起步階段，在認字、寫字、說話和初步閱讀的基礎上，從口述到筆錄、聯詞造句，開始會寫一至三個句子，並聯句成段 (表達一個完整意思的句群)；寫作內容比較淺顯，表達意思十分簡單。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>習渡期</td>
<td>小學 中年級</td>
<td>會寫一個場景，一人的肖像或一件簡單的事等，篇幅加長，懂得寫文章的難度，出現個別的差異，有會寫文章的學生。這階段基本完成從口述向筆述、從句、段向篇章的過渡，開始注意文章的構思，轉變的趨勢表現為：從不分清段落到分清段落，從寫簡單句到比較複雜的複句等。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>初級寫作期</td>
<td>小學 高年級</td>
<td>範圍擴大，聯想合理，能分別運用記載、描寫、說明等表達方法；注意圍繞主題選材、組材。思路日趨有條理；從自然的開頭、結尾向多樣化的開頭、結尾發展；從平鋪直敘，不善於表達思想感情向初步借物抒情發展，有一定的文字表現力；初步掌握了記敘文寫作的一般要求和寫作方法。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

朱作仁描述學生的過渡目標是“從口述向筆述、從句、段向篇章的過渡，開始注意文章的構思”。不過，其間所需要學習和掌握的是甚麼，卻沒有詳細論述。

柏萊德 (Bereiter, 1980) 同樣指出兒童的語言習得，是先從口語開始，然後才漸漸掌握書面語。不過，這個轉換並不平穩，因為書面語和口語是面對着不同的社交處境，口語的語法規範比較寬鬆，而書面語卻具備了不少口語所沒有的特徵：如拼寫、標點、段落；同時也涉及一些特殊的技巧，如篇章組織技巧；而且寫作還可以經過重組、修改，成為精鍊、複雜的作品。

柏萊德認為要“流暢地衍生書面語”，就必須掌握以下六項不同的知識技能：
1. 聯想的操控 (controlled association)
2. 產生書面語言 (written language production)
3. 省思能力 (reflective thinking)
4. 文體風格及語文規則架構 (rules of style & mechanics)
5. 文學及邏輯的判斷 (critical judgement literary/logical)
6. 社會意識 (social cognition)
其中第一至第三項是寫作過程必須具備的知識技能，第四、五項則和寫作技巧及個人風格有關，至於第六項是讀者的培養。依據以上六項技能，柏萊德提出學習寫作的五個層次（階段），每個階段都是基於前一階段學習所得，再附加學習新的技能：

聯想式寫作（associative writing）
- 結合“控制聯想”和“產生書面語言”技能。
- 這種寫作階段所產生的，是不成熟的作品。作者想到甚便寫甚，只以自己的思緒聯想次序為依歸，因此內容不連貫，意念不完整。
- 通常在兒童中期出現（女孩子三年級，男孩子四年級）。
表現式寫作（performative writing）
- 把前一階段技能再結合“文體風格及語文規則架構”的技能。
- 作者能寫出形式完整的句子，並能正確拼寫和運用標點符號。
- 傳統的寫作教學，通常都集中引導學生由“聯想式寫作”發展至“表現式寫作”，所以每一年齡的人都可能如此。
交際式寫作（communicative writing）
- 把前一階段的技能再結合“社會意識”技能。
- 作者為了與人交流，作品中出現明顯的讀者感。
- 通常十歲的兒童能開始這樣的寫作形式；不過起碼要到第十二班（中學畢業），才能運用得較為成熟，甚至在作品中嘗試說服讀者。
整合式寫作（unified writing）
- 把前一階段的技能再結合“文學及邏輯的判斷”技能。
- 文章不單能顧及讀者的需要，也能展現個人觀點和個人風格。
- 小學階段以後的學童，應能掌握。
意境式寫作（epistemic writing）
- 把前一階段技能再結合“省思能力”的技能。
- 寫作成了作者個人思想（反省和思維）的一部份，無需刻意計算，能順意寫出令人感動的文章。
- 寫作的高境界。

韋堅信（Wilkinson, 1980, 1986）在格狄頓研究計劃（Crediton Project）中，主要藉著四種不同的寫作課業（自傳、故事、說明文和議論文）來尋找七至十四歲學生在不同年齡階段的寫作語言心理狀況——認知（cognitive）、情感（affective）、道德（moral）和傳意風格（style）四方面的發展。結果發現（本文只輯錄七歲及十歲孩童兩組之結果）：
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>七歲孩童</th>
<th>十歲孩童</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>認知能力</strong></td>
<td>一般來說，寫作困難，標點符號運用能力低。</td>
<td>仍集中運用敘事形式。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>無論在篇幅和拼寫能力方面，學童的個別差異很大。</td>
<td>敘事方面，能按先後次序。懂安排情節。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>主要或集中運用敘事方式，未能區分主次關係及辨別次序。</td>
<td>能按輕重來決定詳細或簡短地描述。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>仍自我中心。</td>
<td>開始注意空間、環境。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>情感及道德方面</strong></td>
<td>自我中心，未能自我批評，未能體會別人感受。</td>
<td>雖能自我批評，卻較少批評自己的感受。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>仍自我中心。</td>
<td>開始能簡單描述別人。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>文章風格</strong></td>
<td>忽略讀者的存在。</td>
<td>有明顯的讀者感。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>簡單直述句，加上特定連接詞。多局限於個別慣常應用的動詞，少用修飾語。</td>
<td>句法技巧掌握較好，但未能完全掌握較長句子。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>詞語多為具體描述。</td>
<td>能運用成語，甚至個別能運用專門術語。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

綜上所述，學者有關口語與書面語的語言心理及學習階段，對一般“我手能寫我口”（口語與書面語的分別只在雅俗或個別詞彙）的語言來說，已是十分充分，也能幫助其解決由口語過渡到書面語的問題。

不過，對香港學童來說，學習書面語和寫作的處境近似一些雙語國家中學習第二語言（當然也有不少方面不近似），要去明白香港小學生面對的語言處境，必須較多一點理解香港的特殊語文現象。

四、香港的語文現象

鍾嶺崇（1994）認為香港粵語雖正高速發展，但“香港話與普通話（現代漢語）語音屬不同系統，沒有衝突，語法差異不大，問題不嚴重，唯獨是詞彙……引起了教學上及應用上的很大困擾”。所以，建議學生在學習寫作時，“要多做方言詞彙與普通話詞彙轉換的練習”。不過，陳原（1992）卻認為香港話與現代漢語間的差距不止於詞彙，“母語的情感成分是社會語言學者所承認的，但母語（粵方言）在社會生活中如此活躍，則是少見的”。他指出香港話或港式粵語的兩個重要特色：第一是詞彙方面，香港話中常出現自創的新字、新詞，甚至在方塊字不足應用時，應用英文單字或拉丁拼音。第二是香港話的語法及表現方式是現代漢語鮮見的。
其實語言本身就是思想和文化模式的其中一種表現。不同的語言，對環境有不同的看法和理解；所以，同一個詞語可能在兩個語言系統中給人的感受和含義截然不同。蘇啟禎(1975)指出在漢語和英語中，對親屬的觀念有點不同，如“英文中的“aunt”並未表明是姑母或姨母，而“cousin”也未表明是堂親或表親”，相反，漢語中卻仔細地把父系和母系親屬劃分清楚，表示了中國人較着重親屬關係，也表明了兩個社會的生活方式和社會結構有所不同。因此，單去找出對應詞匯是不足夠的。

三、研究方法

本研究是嘗試發掘香港小學中年級學生，在口語過渡到書面語期間的寫作能力及其語言心理狀態，所以研究方式是從一個小學生和母親之間的親子寫作中尋找：

語文技能
1. 標點符號是否運用正確
   包括——句號、逗號、問號、頓號、冒號、引號、感嘆號、書名號及省略號。
2. 字詞
   用詞——名詞、動詞、形容詞比例
   句法及錯別字

文章風格
1. 句法技巧、長短句
2. 組織
   段落及組織
3. 文章長度(平均字數)
4. 文體——記敘文的運用

情感、道德方面及其他個人成長方面的觀察
四、研究的結果

三年級的寫作（日記）

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>文</th>
<th>標點</th>
<th>多用逗號及句號。</th>
<th>在下半月嘗試寫複句時，少用了標點符號。</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>語文</td>
<td>錯別字</td>
<td>寫字用心，平均錯別字（以每百字計算）約1.6</td>
<td>例如：夏五菜——下午茶。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>鐘昌酒店——鐘晶酒店</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>用詞</td>
<td>香港話——話一說，開心——快樂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>動詞較多，名詞多為實體事物。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>少用形容詞</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>風格</td>
<td>句法長短</td>
<td>短句為主</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>有主次不清的現象——今天，我去我同學生日會周海欣。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>嘗試用連接詞來加長句子，不過卻不恰當。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>段落</td>
<td></td>
<td>初期用號碼來標示不同段落，不過卻不另開新行。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>到了下半月開始不用號碼來作為分段標記，不過全文卻只得一段。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文體</td>
<td></td>
<td>加插英文單字（如Christmas shopping）</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | 遇有不懂的字或難以描述的，用圖畫表示，如蛋糕的樣子，頸鍊……等。
| | | 用香港話——媽媽話去Christmas shopping； |
| | | 流水帳式的記述學生曾經歷的事情。 |
| | | 思想邏輯以聯想方式，不以先後次序。 |
| 字數 | 全篇由十數字（一句），到七十餘字，大多為四十至五十字 |
| | | 能比較事物；姐姐收到較多聖誕禮物時，她指出自己只有三件禮物。 |
| 情感 | 家境較富裕，“無飯”家庭——典型的香港家庭，多出外吃飯，到酒樓、酒店 |

三年級暑假日記（自創的雜誌）

形式

現代多媒體的一個嘗試。雖名為“兒童故事書”，實際二十一頁裏，只有五頁是兒童的寫作（一個故事，兩首儿歌式的詩），其餘的包括：句式練習、
從親子寫作看香港小三、四年級學童的寫作能力及語文心理發展

寫作方面

童話——貪心的小狗

| 語文標點 | 多用逗號及句號。
| 常使用說話標點符號，能運用省略號。
| 錯別字 | 全篇只有兩個別字，比率（以每百字計算）約0.9。
| 用詞 | 香港話詞匯較少。
| 動詞較多，名詞多為實體事物。
| 較多運用形容詞。
| 用詞不當——“豐盛的晚餐”。
| 句法長短 | 以短句為主。
| 仍有表主不夠的現象——“只須唔啲一定會把肉吞下食走”。
| 段落 | 全文仍是一段。
| 文體 | 記敘體，有明顯的引言和結尾句。
| 字數 | 全篇共二百二十個字。
| 情感 | 改寫後，意旨不明。
| 原故事教訓人們不要貪心，現在有點變成了不要愚拙的意味。

詩兩首

這兩首詩有改編的意味，其中的意念和用字，明顯地與小三、小四日記、書信中所運用的不同。長度方面，第一首共四十四個字，第二首則有六十七個字。詩中沒有錯字，只有一個別字。港式粵語及詞匯較小三的日記明顯，如“涼爽的風”，“雪白煮入棉花”；更出現自創詞匯，如“天藍塗給大海”，“碧綠染給葡萄”（也可視為誤用不適當的介詞）。韻律方面：第一首一韻到底，每一句都用“……來了”的形式寫作，但沒有任何的格律對照；第二首則呈現多樣化的平衡格律。中間四句，每一句的寫作形式都是“顏色+動詞+介詞+名詞”。

感情與其他方面

1. 句式練習——明顯仿效學校的中英文寫作練習（填充作句）。
2. 遊戲方面——多為坊間的“智力測驗”形態，如找出兩幅相似圖形中不同的地方，數學推理，數點數目等等。
3. 繪畫方面——十一頁中繪有圖畫的佔十六頁。
四年級的日記

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>語文</th>
<th>標點</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>多用逗號，有時甚至全篇都用逗號，只在終結時用句號。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>也有不少段落根本不用逗號，只是用一點(·)就算了。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>使用感嘆號和問號，也能用：“”來覆述別人的說話。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>錯別字</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>写字多比較不用心，錯別字約為 1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>別字較多，錯字較少</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>用詞</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>香港話比前嚴重，口語化的傾向明顯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>動詞較多，名詞多為實體事物</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>同樣少用形容詞。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>風格</th>
<th>句法短長</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>長句，甚至間中用四句子來完成整篇日記。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>句法上仍有疑問不清，但較前進步。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>例如：“許先生派了一份禮物給我他，是禮品的，我很喜歡。放學後個</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>個人走回家裏來就給我一份閃閃亮的糖果和牙刷給我了，我也喜歡。”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>香港句式詞語</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“我和姐姐玩小童，就要去 Mr. Wong 道”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“到家後看了看九個字，之後上到山頂妹妹照了幾張相。”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“是上一班姐姐教我”（用英中字本來寫的英文稱呼）</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>段落</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>雖沒有明確分段，但日記中多用“之後”（如口語），也有用“然而”（比例約</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>為 8.2%）作分段或連接詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>全為一個段落的文章</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>文體</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>用最少忽略英文單字（出現三數次，如 mink，人名 Mrs. Wong）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>大部份採公式化寫作（記敘文）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“今天我早起 x x 時 x x 分起床，……吃甚麼，做了甚麼……吃完</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>飯就睡覺。”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“雖多以時間先後來作寫作次序，卻開始能夠掌握上次輕重關係，間中</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>會在重要的地方加插一些細微。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>有近似感受式結語</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>字數</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>全篇字數由一百二十字至一百七十餘字，大多為一百四五十字。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>感情及其它</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>描述婆婆、姨姨、母親，但卻少提及爸爸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>漸多描述學校發生的事情</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX 回來問昨天我整你的 AA 搞得醒不醒得？我說：“還未”她驚慌地問我：</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“你的姐姐有沒有說給先生聽？我說“沒有””</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“今天有一位李先生和一位中大來看我們上學，我和……一組，我們首先做工作紙，</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>然後分圖片，之後看圖片，之後討論，很快他們便走了。”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>開始留意親屬，學校以外的人，但着重事件多於人物。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-----

Home eating, see Cinderella, then go to dance. In dancing there were many people crying! I don't know whether...
親子通信（與四年級日記同一時期）

學生的書信

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>語文</th>
<th>標點</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 多用問號及感嘆號。最典型的一封信，全篇八句，問號佔了五個，感嘆號佔兩個。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 錯別字 |
| • 寫字比同期的日記用心，平均錯別字（以每百字計算）約1.5個驚方——驚慌 砂糖汁——檸檬汁 你記是回家——幾時（何時） 郵票部——郵票簿 以經——已經（錯了一次，經母親修正以後，每次都寫得正確） |
| • 錯字比別字少 |

| 詞文 | 用詞 |
| • 香港話的詞匯愈來愈多及明顯 |
| • 動詞較多，名詞多為實體事物。 |
| • 開始使用形容詞——曾一連十天，每天都用不同的方式來稱呼媽媽。美麗的媽媽、快樂的媽媽、漂亮的媽媽……等等。 |
| • 後期寫成英語單字來開始——“Hello”，或“Hi. 媽媽”。 |

| 風格 | 句法長短 |
| • 短句，多為問句及請求句。 |
| • 省略詞語，口語式句子大為減少“為甚麼你今天國畫這麼遲來？” |
| • 仍以香港話詞匯為主“你話的問答比賽”“寫信到大個給你好嗎？”“彈琴和彈小提琴”“不喜歡吃children menus” |

| 段落 |
| • 全文只用一個段落 |

| 文體 |
| • 少直接敘述，較多說明。 |
| • 後期嘗試用請求——“求求你！” |
| • 甚至嘗試提出理由來支持自己的請求“我可不可以看大江南北……大江南北說中國的……” |
| • 也採另一種來作為支持自己行動的理據“……老師說：‘讀書是對，但不能讀死自己，起馬也有些娛樂’但是你又不給我看電視，我不知怎麼辦？” |
| • 思想邏輯架構不嚴謹，以聯想為依歸。 |

| 字數 |
| • 約一百九十至二百七十字，大部份約為一百二十字。 |
（續上表）

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>情感</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>對不少事物只知道表面，而不明白內裏細則或原因。</td>
<td>“為甚麼要半夜一時去買桃花？”</td>
<td>“為甚麼爸爸不喜歡人叫新年快樂呀？”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>渴望知道別人的感受，也想讓別人關心</td>
<td>“媽媽，你是不是為了買樓整到十分煩腦？”（後來卻又用筆刪除）</td>
<td>“你可不可以在今次問我問題呀？”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

媽媽的書信

母親的回應書信，寫作字數由最少三十二字到最多約二百五十字，但絕大部份的篇幅約為一百字以內，到了後期更愈寫愈短，平均只有約五十字。

語法方面，母親的寫作通順，不過同樣是夾雜了不少香港話的詞匯和語法在其中。例如運用英文單字（她所寫的書信中，接近一半夾雜一至兩個英文單字在其中）。

例如：“朱太忘記帶禮物給你，你以提她呢。”
“我今天做完工便去開會吃飯”
“你現在發燒，要小心些，一定要着多些衫呢。”
“另我發覺你忘記帶 $63.60, 真失敗。”

不注意標點符號，口語傾向非常明顯。

“今天如有空，可否收拾書架，中、英、數、其他，不許其他人亂放呢。”
“另外要吃 Sudafed 藥水一茶匙，收鼻水。”

書信多是回應和對女兒作息時間的編排，語句多是命令式：“不要……你要……如果要……可以……不可”等等。到了後期，才有一些請求或協商意味的句語出現：“可否……”

母親也間中改正女兒的錯別字，前後約七次（包括改正英文單字）。

至於感情及其他方面，母親透過寫作來安慰女兒，發出日常生活指引、讚美、鼓勵及開解女兒與父親間的衝突。正如她自己說：

“……因為想知道你每天做甚麼事情，又想知道你有甚麼需要呢。……”

五、現象分析

口語入文

本研究發現學生三年級時，平均錯別字（每百字計算）約為 1.6，但在她升
從親子寫作看香港小三、四年級學童的寫作能力及語文心理發展

讀四年級的自創雜誌上，卻降至 0.9，不過在四年級的日記中，回升至 1.45；在同期的親子通訊中，又再升至 1.5。祝新華(1993)的研究，指出國內的民族學生，一般三年級作文的釵別字比率為 1.49，而四年級的釵別字為 1.23。由此看來，香港學生的釵別字比率一般來說，比國內為高。不過，由於本研究中主要採用日記及書信，沒有經過一般作文時的自我修改過程，所以釵別字比率較高是正常的現象。至於學生自創雜誌中的釵別字比率偏低，則明顯經多次校正的結果。四年級親子通訊中的釵別字比率較同期的日記高，原因可能是通訊中所用的口語較多。

祝新華(1993)的數據顯示，國內學生的釵、別字比例為一比二，但本研究的釵、別字比例卻為一比三，甚至一比五(自創故事書)。別字較釵字多，可能是因為學生早已“聽聞”那個字詞，卻不曾“閱讀”，所以對那字形陌生，在下筆時用了自己熟悉的同音字來代替，所以別字較多，是口語入文的其中一個結果。

這種口語入文的現象，不但反映在釵、別字比例上，也反映在用詞和句法結構上。李紹林(1993)提及口語的特點是句子短小(七至九個詞)，較多不完整句，多省略，停頓。本研究所得，發現四年級日記寫作所用的句子，明顯較三年級長，也較同期親子通訊的句子長。表示學生寫作日記時，較接近學校的作文，而在寫親子通訊時，則較接近口語。不過，無論是日記或是親子通訊，都出現香港話的獨特形式——出現英文單字。甚至在不懂拼寫英文字時，以譯音替代：

如用“部非”來替代“buffet”(自助餐)。

不單如此，有些是用香港話的中英混合語法和省略方式：

如“我不想吃 children menus”

直譯是“我不想吃兒童的餐單”，事實上，她不是不想吃兒童餐單，而是不想吃兒童餐單中所示的食物。在現代漢語中沒有這樣的語法規律，也不容許這容易混淆的省略方式存在。不過，這方式卻在沒有規範的香港話中比比皆是。

口語入文雖然干擾了學生掌握正確書面語法架構的能力，卻在另一方面對學生的寫作產生了助力。本研究發現學生日記的寫作方式及架構異常呆板，到了四年級，差不多已成了刻板的流水賬記錄：

“今早我一早(或是××時××分)起床，……吃(或和誰一起吃)早餐……”
上學⋯⋯落堂⋯⋯(做功課或玩耍)⋯⋯吃完飯就睡覺。’

單看日記的記錄，看不了多篇，就會發現每篇都大同小異，以為學生的生活
沉悶，或是她不懂寫作。不過，若同時觀看她同日所寫的親子通訊（語文規範
較低，多用香港話），卻發現當日發生了兩件事，而她也能活潑地把事件描
述出來，甚至出現柏萊德（Bereiter, 1980）認為會在第十二班才會嘗試的說服
式寫作；雖然在起初時，只是含糊的嘗試：

“我可不可以看大江南北（電視旅遊節目）⋯⋯大江南北說中國的⋯⋯”

然而在數個月後，她在請求母親幫助解決問題的方式下，已經較能有組織地
運用不同理據來支持自己的要求。
她首先說出自己的境況：
“⋯⋯我一聽到電視聲，就很想去看⋯⋯”
然後指出在家中不單自己如此（用訴說秘密的方式——請不要告訴姐姐）：
“⋯⋯姐姐⋯⋯每天也看電視，連考試期間也是⋯⋯”
最後借用權威（教師）來作為理據：
“⋯⋯老師說，‘讀書是對，但不要讀死自己，起馬也有些娛樂’但是你又
不給我看電視，我不知怎麼辦？⋯⋯”

雖然這篇書信的用語及句法有不少地方尚待改進，但基本的架構及組織
已相當成熟。換言之，小學生其實擁有比盛載其思維短小的語文書寫能力，
在無法表達思緒下，把書寫的範圍局限了。謝錫金（1990）在比對學生的思維
錄音與實際寫出的文章時，發現小學生雖然盡力用對應方式來把粵語改寫
為標準漢語，然而因為對應能力不足，於是多採“減少句式”和“意念刪除”策
略來進行書寫（只用最簡單的句式，寫出思想過程中最淺白、較容易寫出的
東西）。本研究的發現也許可以作為這些“減少句式”和“意念刪除”策略的最典
型例子——學生為了完成日記書寫，漸漸發展出一套既快捷，而又不會出現
重大錯誤的安全模式，結果是刻板而局限的書寫；但在親子通訊時，由於“讀
者感”強、規範少，而出現多樣化的演變。

本研究同時發現一個特別的現象，自從學生書寫親子通信後，其書面書
作規範的掌握較前倒退——四年級後期的日記出現比前較多的香港話，句子
架構也轉為較短語句（若能得到學生同歲在學校的作文比較，則應更能肯定這
個現象）。為甚麼有這個現象出現？

維爾斯基（Vygotsky, 1987）認為人在學習外在知識時，是要經過一個“自
言自語（private speech）的過程，把“外部語言”轉化為“內部語言”。李丹
(1987) 在觀察小學低年級學生上課時，指出：
“低年級小學生的內部語言還不發達，尚未養成不出聲思考的習慣。低年級學生發言積極性很高，往往未想好就舉手發言，這表明低年級學生的外部語言急需向內部語言轉化才能適應學習的需要。”

而本研究的日記及親子寫作，因它們本質上屬私人（個人的內心活動）記述，正好反映了學生在這個思考過程中的活動（即成了“自言自語”過程的部份記錄），顯示香港的小學生是用粵語作為思維的工具。

另一方面，這個現象（學生寫作因開始親子寫作而偏離現代漢語規範）也明確地顯示了角色模範（role model）對學生語文發展的影響。雖然本研究中的母親和女兒開始寫作親子書信時，表明重點不在批改語文；不過，母親這些少於七十字書信中的寫作方式（包括間中批改錯別字），對女兒的語言發展的影響卻遠比學校的課本範文為大。其中一個明顯的例子是英文單字入文和口語入文現象。

當女兒提出：
“星期一去 Marriott，我想食薯條”
母親的回應是：
“……星期一去 Marriott 最好吃 children’s menu 裏一餐，不要吃薯條”

母親對女兒英文單字入文的現象，不但不加以改正，反因自己的習慣，加上多一個英文詞匯，於是女兒在兩日後，再討論去酒店吃飯時，這樣書寫：

“……下次我去 Marriott 我想食部非得不得呀？我不喜歡吃 children menu……”

女兒因母親同樣使用英文單字，而認為用英文單字入文是理所當然，甚至想吃自助餐時，第一個浮現的是英文單字 buffet，但因不懂怎樣串寫，於是自創一個音譯新名詞——“部非”。同時，也運用口語中的省略原則，把母親“吃 children’s menu 裏一餐”（本身已是口語）進一步省略為“吃 children menu”。

思維成長發展

寫作不單是語文技能的反映，也是個人思維的迴響。從學生和母親的親子寫作中，可見現代電子傳媒（特別是電視）的影響。學生經常問母親可否准許她看某電視節目，電視上放映的某一套電影。
Frost (1990) 指出電子傳媒（如電視……等）使現代的青少年及兒童得以更早接觸更多的知識，無論日常生活應對與一般知識，俱比昔日同年齡的為多。然而電子傳媒由於時間空間的限制，多以“頭條”形態來處理。所以現代青少年及兒童雖然比前有更多的知識，然而只是不知詳細內容及意義的“頭條”知識（headline knowledge）而已。不單內容不足，而且因為媒體眾多，不少時候都站在不同的層面和觀點來評論，對沒有核心觀點、分辨技能尚未發展成熟的青少年及兒童來說，只會做成混亂。所以 Frost 進一步指出，“現代的教育工作者，所面對的是一群比前有着更多一般知識，卻同時是更為混亂，甚至習慣混亂，不認為需要條理的青少年和兒童”。

本研究雖然重點不在研究現代電子傳媒對兒童的影響，卻同時在親子書信中發現小學中年級學生對不少事情已有初步認識，對週遭事物及親友有不少觀察和疑問，只不過往往是苦無機會去查詢。例如：

學生知道家人通常會在大除夕半夜一時才去買花，在親子書信中發問：
“為甚麼要半夜一時半才買桃花？”

感受到父親在新年時的禁忌，於是詢問：
“為甚麼爸爸不喜歡人叫新年快樂？”

不明白為甚麼媽媽要自己看自己的日記，於是直接查問：
“為甚麼要給你看我日記呀？”

甚至感受到媽媽的不快樂：
“Hello，媽媽，你是不是為了買傢俬整到十分煩腦呀！”

不過在寫了後，卻又馬上用筆劃去了。

這些詢問，表示了小學中年級兒童的“社會意識”開始加強了，不過卻找不到適當的渠道來表達自己的關注和疑惑。假如這些關注長久找不出合適的出路，兒童極可能成為“混亂的一代”。本研究發現親子書信是一個很適合溝通，解決疑難的途徑。

另一方面，親子書信中，也流露了小學中年級兒童的成長需要。Erikson (1963) 指出在學齡期的學童，主要的成長任務（developmental task）是發展“勤勉”（industry），若甚是失敗，就會落入“自卑”（inferior）的境況中。Linn & Fabricant (1996) 指出在這個階段中，“孩子們特別看重勝利感，或是失敗時的自卑感。學校成績往往成了勝利與否的一個表徵，“在這階段，老師們有很大的力量使我們感到有成就或自卑。”事實上，不但教師，家長對培養兒童的
自我形象也有很大的影響力。

親子書信中，學生很清楚地把自己的成功與失敗，直接與學業能力拉上關係：

“⋯⋯還有先生獎禮物給我，不過我沒有勤學獎呢，又沒有交齊功課獎，甚麼也沒有呢，真失敗⋯⋯”

為甚麼她會把成功失敗、恐懼與快樂與學業拉上關係？

“⋯⋯至於你話的問答比賽，我很驚方我不識答，你可不可以和我溫習呢？⋯⋯”
“我都是很驚慌宗教啊！因我驚慌不拿到 100 分啊！如果我不得 100 分，只得 90 幾分，你會不會不開心呀？”
“今天我總結 (宗教科) 100 分啊！你開心嗎？”
“我中文默書一百分呢！不過我英文默書只是 90 分呢！你會不會不開心？”

究其主因，是因為學生意識到母親着自己的學業成績，而且要求很高 (取得 90 分也懼怕母親可能不滿)。在親子書信中，母親不止一次提出渴望女兒能取得優等生獎：

“你可否勤力些每天都溫數學，中、英文便可以拿一段及取優等生獎。”
“你要努力讀書，考到一段才可以買動物呢。”


“媽媽，你喜不喜歡我呀？請答______。我很喜歡你呢！”
“你會怪我 (寫) 這麼小東西嗎？”
“你會怪我這麼多東西講嗎？”
“為什麼前頭你寫不不會怪你煩的，為什麼有 2 個不字呀？”

其實學生心底中總是想媽媽保證無論自己如何，學業成敗⋯⋯等等，母親都會一樣愛惜自己，把自己引以為榮。
親子通信中頗值得留意的是：學生通信中很少提及父親，就算提及，也只是一些較為疏遠的描述，沒有如對母親般的依戀。

“……我給爸爸整到我留血啊！因為他用手指甲來整我，整到我這樣呢！你看又話我整他很痛，我沒有整他流血呢！”
“不要比人看我的日記！”
“有沒有給爸爸看我日記呀？只可你和姐姐可以的呢，其他人不得呢？”

對爸爸的感覺雖然不陌生，卻把他歸入“其他人”的類別之中。不過，由於本文的重點非社會學或心理輔導，所以不詳加論述。

六、結語

小學中年級學生的語文心理處境

本研究發現香港小學生在踏進中年級(小三、小四)階段，思維上的能力得到進展，不但可以作簡單的敘述，更開始懂得推理和表達自己的感受。在語法技能方面，本來可以相應作出發展——由寫話期進入寫作期；不過，這階段的小學生因思維能力的進展，對事物認識的渴求，深為電子傳媒所吸引。再加上生活圈子擴闊，聆聽和溝通能力的需求也相應提高，不過日常生活及電子傳媒均採用香港話作為溝通媒體，在吸收這些外來訊息的過程中，學生同時吸納這些訊息的載體——香港話；運用香港話作為思維語言。影響所及，學生口語入文的情況反而比小學低年級更甚。

研究對寫作教學的意義

延長過渡階段

香港話始終只是一種地方口語，無法，也不能代替現代漢語作為書面語的規範。不過在學習書面語規範的過程中，由寫話期過渡到寫作期需要延長一點，幫助學生先發展自己的思維，打好思考的核心和思考方式的基礎，然後才進入現代漢語書寫的重點學習階段。

蘇敬禎(1979)指出，在語言學習的過程中，學生可以運用“居間作用”——將新舊經驗聯系的學習方式，可以是透過詞匯對應方式，或是翻譯方式來學習新的詞匯和句式，這方式是“經濟而且有效的學習方式”。

所以，在這個過渡階段中，教師要放棄不准學生用口語入文的規條。容
許他們先寫出腦中的東西，然後教師再與學生一起討論和修正，鼓勵他們逐漸在這過程中增加詞匯和句法的知識（而不是一次過學會所有的東西），使學生能有適當的成就感和勝利感，他們對寫作才會有興趣和信心。

與家長及傳媒合作

家長和電子傳媒是構成兒童學習的重要處境；所以，香港不但需要“英文一分鐘”、“粵語正音大使”，更需要“中文一分鐘”甚至創作“書面語言香港話對應詞匯”的節目，使香港學生身處的處境也提供一點助力。

另一方面，香港的父母其實非常關注兒女的學習（特別是中產家庭），他們要兒女們去學習跳舞、彈琴、拉小提琴……等等，渴望兒女們的學業進步。所以，由家長去幫助兒女在寫作方面成長，絕非不可能的事；不過，他們需要清晰和有步驟的指引，假如教育界能在這方面進一步研究和推動，相信香港下一代的寫作能力會逐漸得以提升。
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An Investigation of Japanese and English L1 Essay Organisation: Differences and Similarities
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Abstract

Previous studies in contrastive rhetoric have discerned a tendency for Japanese texts to be inductive and for English texts to be deductive, although text quality was not usually assessed. The present study compared Japanese and English L1 essays written by university students in Japan and in Canada; 22 expository and 24 persuasive essays written in each language were analysed. Each essay was evaluated in terms of organisation and analysed for macro-level discourse features. Results show that inductive patterns were identified in Japanese more often than in English and were used more often in the persuasive mode than in the expository mode across both languages. However, across languages and modes, the quality of inductive essays usually ranged between average and low, while deductive essays were usually ranked as being of average to high quality. Results indicate that although Japanese and English may exhibit rhetorical differences in overall frequency, they may also share characteristics of good writing.
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Introduction

In contrastive rhetoric research, researchers have investigated cultural characteristics of written texts in various languages based on the hypothesis that each language and culture has rhetorical conventions unique to itself (Kaplan, 1966, 1972, 1988; Grabe & Kaplan, 1989). In previous studies on Japanese and English, Japanese texts have been characterised as inductive and reader-responsible, while English texts have been characterised as deductive and writer-responsible. It has also been claimed that Japanese written discourse contains 'delayed introduction of purpose' and a four-unit pattern called ki-sho-ten-ketsu. A recent study by McCagg (1996), however, challenges the notion of reader-responsibility as a characteristic of Japanese written texts.
While such differences in discourse preference may exist in a relative sense (that is, Japanese may exhibit unique discourse patterns in certain genres to some extent), they have tended to be oversimplified and overgeneralised, resulting in a static, exotic, and monolithic image of Japanese written language divorced completely from English. Odlin (1989), for instance, writes, “According to Hinds, the ki-sho-ten-ketsu form ... constitutes a norm of Japanese style” (p. 62) (for similar comments, see Kaplan, 1988; Ramanathan & Kaplan, 1996; Rubin, Goodrum, & Hall, 1990; Scarcella & Lee, 1989). Emphases on cultural differences seem to have resulted partly from the research design used by previous studies, in which rhetorical patterns in Japanese and English texts are compared in terms of overall frequency, with no reference to how the quality of such patterns might be judged by members of the target discourse community. The fact that a certain rhetorical pattern occurs more frequently in Japanese than in English does not in itself prove that the pattern is actually ‘preferred’ in the community. A ‘preferred’ rhetorical pattern in a culture is identified in essays that readers evaluate as of high quality. Thus, the quality of texts also needs to be studied in order to arrive at a more accurate understanding of the characteristics of Japanese and English written texts. This paper will report the findings of a study in which rhetorical structures in L1 Japanese and L1 English essays written by university students were analysed at comparable levels of organisational quality.

**Previous studies on Japanese and English**

**Japanese**

According to Hinds (1983), a common organisational framework for Japanese compositions is *ki-sho-ten-ketsu*, which originates in classical Chinese poetry. *Ki* is the introduction of an argument, *sho* develops what has been introduced, *ten* turns to a subtheme that is not directly connected to the major theme, and *ketsu* is a conclusion. Hinds claims that what characterises Japanese writing is unexpected topic shifts introduced by *ten* paragraphs. In order to illustrate this idea, Hinds presents an essay which was written for a newspaper, ‘Tensei Jingo’ (*Vox Populi*, *Vox Dei*), and was translated into English for the English version of the newspaper. Hinds claims that the organisation of this essay is very different from that of English expository prose because of the presence of a sudden topic change introduced by a *ten* paragraph. Hinds asked Japanese-speaking readers and English-speaking readers to evaluate several ‘Tensei Jingo’ essays on criteria of ‘unity,’ ‘focus,’ and ‘coherence.’ He found that the Japanese readers consistently gave the essays higher marks than the English readers.

Hinds (1987) extends his explanation of Japanese expository prose by proposing the notion of ‘reader-responsibility.’ Presenting an article from ‘Tensei Jingo’ as an
example, he claims that the rhetorical organization used in the essay (i.e., presenting old information in a ten paragraph without providing any referent for it) makes the reader responsible for finding the link between the topic of the ten paragraph and the main theme. Thus, in Japanese, it is the reader, not the writer, who is responsible for making connections between arguments.

Hinds (1990) introduces another notion, ‘delayed introduction of purpose’ or ‘quasi-inductive,’ which, he claims, characterises not only Japanese but also Chinese, Korean and Thai. Again, Hinds presents two essays from ‘Tensei Jingo’ and maintains that the main idea of each essay does not appear until the end and that the paragraph before the main idea does not provide the reasons or evidence for it.

Hinds’s notion of ‘reader responsibility,’ however, has been challenged by McCagg (1996). McCagg reanalysed both Japanese and English versions of the ‘Tensei Jingo’ essay discussed by Hinds (1987) and concludes that, as long as the reader and the writer share common cultural and linguistic knowledge, comprehending Japanese texts requires of the reader no greater cognitive effort, in general, than understanding English texts.

Several empirical studies support the idea that certain features are unique to Japanese texts. A study conducted by Kobayashi (1984) compared L1 expository and narrative essays written by Japanese university students writing in Japanese (JJJ) and American students writing in English (AEA). A major focus of analysis was the arrangement of general and specific statements. Kobayashi found that the JJJ used the specific-to-general (inductive) pattern more often than the AEA, while the AEA used the general-to-specific (deductive) pattern more often than the JJJ. The frequent use of the specific-to-general pattern by Japanese students corresponds to Hinds’s notion of ‘delayed introduction of purpose’ or ‘quasi-inductive’.

A study by Oi (1984) also examined L1 Japanese and English essays written by students. Oi’s examination of macro-level rhetorical features revealed that (1) as with Kobayashi’s findings, Japanese students tended to use the specific-to-general pattern, while American students used general-to-specific more often; and (2) Japanese students tended to mix argumentations (‘for,’ ‘against,’ and ‘neutral to’ the argument), while American students did not.

Burttott (1983) examined logical relations between propositions in English essays written by English-speaking, Japanese-speaking, and Arabic-speaking students, finding that students in all three groups employed all the types of logical relations that were used for the text analysis. However, as well as concurring with the findings of both Kobayashi and Oi, Burttott also identified ending text with a generalisation as a preferred Japanese strategy. Japanese writers also tended to use causal chains (i.e., A because B as a result C because D) and ‘adversative’ relation in the context of a cause or reason (i.e., adversative information is introduced after
a result or reason and then developed by a subsequent result or reason).

Ostler (1990) identified several unique characteristics of English essays written by Japanese-speaking students, compared with those written by Arabic-, Spanish-, and English-speaking students; for example, the use of a smaller number of words per sentence and a lack of syntactic elaboration (i.e., less use of relative clauses, nominals, passives, etc.). Ostler also noted frequent use of inductive organisation in essays by Japanese-speaking students, a finding which corresponds to those of other researchers.

Kobayashi and Rinnert (1996) found that the greater the reader’s exposure to English writing, the higher the evaluation the reader gives to a deductive ESL essay compared to an inductive ESL essay. Their study involved two groups of Japanese university students, inexperienced versus experienced in English writing; and two groups of English teachers in Japan, non-native English-speaking teachers and native English-speaking teachers. These four groups of readers represented four levels of experience in English writing. The researchers found significant group differences in the readers’ ratings of two essays in which the rhetorical pattern had been manipulated for inductive and for deductive organisation respectively.

In summary, one feature commonly identified by researchers as a characteristic of Japanese writing is ‘induction,’ represented by ki-sho-ten-ketsu. ‘Reader responsibility’ is not unanimously agreed upon as a characteristic of Japanese written discourse.

English

Rhetorical characteristics of English have been described through two different types of research since Kaplan (1966); one type is theoretical or prescriptive, the other empirical or descriptive. From a theoretical and historical point of view, Kaplan (1966, 1972) states that English rhetoric is influenced by the Greek philosophers and by Roman, medieval European, and later Western thinkers. The nature of English exposition is described as linear, in the sense that a paragraph begins with a topic statement supported by examples and illustrations and contains a number of ideas all related to the central theme. There are both deductive and inductive patterns of development. Kaplan (1988) and Grabe and Kaplan (1989) mention that writing instruction in the United States reflects two traditions: both the Aristotelian (syllogistic) and Galilean (taxonomic) (Wilkerson, 1986) and the emphasis on a logical and technological world view that has been prevalent from the eighteenth through the twentieth centuries (Berlin, 1984). Hinds (1987) proposes, from the perspective of the writer-audience relationship, that English is primarily a writer- and well-organised statements.
Descriptive analyses of English rhetoric, on the other hand, are conducted by means of empirical studies. Perhaps because the initial interest in contrastive rhetoric emerged from ESL pedagogical needs (Kaplan, 1988), English rhetoric is studied as a reference category with which other languages are compared. The characteristics found in English rhetoric can be summarised as follows:

1. Deductive: English expository writing tends to be organised deductively (Kobayashi, 1984; Oi, 1984) and ‘front-loaded,’ with a topic statement developed by a detailed supporting idea at the beginning (Ostler, 1987, 1990).

2. Logical: English expository essays tend to link ideas from the general to the specific, a technique often regarded as a source of coherent discourse in English (Burtoff, 1983); they tend to progress in a linear fashion, with little mixture of arguments (e.g., ‘for’ and ‘against’) (Oi, 1984); narrative prose tends to be developed with little digression (Soter, 1988).

3. Direct and assertive: Scarcella & Lee (1989) identified explicit statements of personal opinion and thesis in all English essays examined. It is important to note, however, that the existence of Inner Circle (Kachru, 1985) varieties of English (i.e., American, Australian, Canadian, British, and New Zealand) has been recognised, and that a monolithic conceptualisation of Inner-Circle rhetorical norms can be problematic (cf. Kachru, 1995).

**Issues and the purpose of this study**

As we have seen, theoretical and empirical studies on the rhetorical characteristics of Japanese and English generally support the notion that Japanese is characterised by induction and English by deduction. However, there are some issues that need to be raised.

First, previous studies have tended to emphasise cultural differences, while similarities have been overlooked. Similarities may exist because of the cultural and linguistic influences of English on Japanese since the late nineteenth century, when Japan dramatically increased its contact with the West. The Japanese language has been transformed through the influence of texts translated from English (see Kubota, 1997 for more detailed discussion). Some researchers of contrastive rhetoric question the emphasis on cultural difference from a similar point of view, and claim that rhetorical styles similar to that of English exist in other languages, including Hindi (Kachru, 1988), Arabic (Sa’adeddin, 1989), and Chinese (Mohan & Lo, 1985; Taylor & Chen, 1991). Although empirical studies on Japanese generally support the existence of culturally specific rhetorical preferences, some findings also reveal features shared by Japanese and English. Data in Kobayashi (1984), for example, show the use of the general-to-specific (deductive) pattern in Japanese essays (24%...
for expository with visual prompts, and 50% for expository with verbal prompts), although there was a statistically significant difference in percentage between Japanese and English essays.

Secondly, Hinds’s claim that *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* represents a typical form of Japanese expository prose should be critically interpreted. Although this classical style certainly existed, the claim that it represents modern expository prose is highly speculative, since language changes over time. Also, the ‘Tensei Jingo’ column from which Hinds’s examples were drawn is specifically intended to be different from expository writing in academic discourse: that is, it is intended to entertain readers by involving them in the writer’s reactions to current issues (cf. Hikita, 1981; Asahi Shinbun Editorial Committee, 1981). Moreover, there is no evidence that the majority of the Tensei Jingo essays exhibit the *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* pattern (cf. Kubota, 1997).

Another issue that throws doubt on Hinds’s claim is the fact that there is no single interpretation of *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* among academics and composition specialists in Japan. Kokai and Fukasawa (1981), for instance, present two variations of the style, one of which is linear and appropriate for logical (expository and argumentative) writing, while the other is similar to Hinds’s interpretation and suited for literary writing. Moreover, some academics claim that *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* is not appropriate for interpreting or writing expository and persuasive texts (Kubota, 1997). For example, Kinoshita (1990), citing Hinds (1983), argues that *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* is used primarily for literary writing, not for academic writing, and that Hinds misunderstands this point. These views of *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* call into question the legitimacy of identifying this style as a defining characteristic of Japanese prose.

Furthermore, none of the previous studies except Hinds (1983) and Kobayashi and Rinnert (1996) have investigated how rhetorical patterns used in texts are evaluated by native speakers. The studies by Hinds and Kobayashi and Rinnert, however, do not investigate what kinds of rhetorical patterns are used by student writers. Hinds asked readers to evaluate a few published texts translated from Japanese, and Kobayashi & Rinnert’s subjects evaluated a few ESL texts whose rhetorical and linguistic features had been manipulated for the study. A study that investigates the types of rhetorical patterns used by writers would need to include essay evaluation in order to determine whether a particular rhetorical pattern is ‘preferred’ by the target language audience. Students’ frequent use of a certain pattern does not necessarily indicate that the pattern is regarded as desirable in the culture. For example, a researcher may find that first-person pronouns are used more frequently in English academic essays than in similar essays in Japanese. However, the use of first-person pronouns in English academic writing is more prominent among basic writers than among skilled writers (Lunsford, 1980), and it is certainly not ‘preferred’ in the academic discourse community.
These issues call for a study that takes into account text quality judged by experienced readers, multiplicity of rhetorical forms and modes, and similarities as well as differences between Japanese and English rhetorical structures. The purpose of this study is to investigate how the rhetorical structures used in L1 Japanese and L1 English essays written by university students vary according to both essay quality and modes (expository and persuasive). Expository and persuasive modes were chosen based on the classification of exposition by Martin (1989): that is, ‘analytic exposition’ and ‘hortatory exposition.’ In this study I will refer to the former as the ‘expository’ mode and to the latter as the ‘persuasive’ mode. According to Martin, both kinds of exposition are vital in our society because they are a primary means of interpreting the world in new ways and of changing existing social orders. Making explicit what rhetorical forms in each mode are favoured will provide students and teachers with more effective means of constructing arguments.

**Method**

**Participants**

This study involved two groups of students: Japanese students writing in Japanese and English-speaking students in Canada writing in English. Each group had two subgroups: students writing on an expository topic (22 students for each language) and students writing on a persuasive topic (24 students for each language). Students at six universities in Japan and two in Canada volunteered to participate in the study. The participants were undergraduate students, mostly in the upper division (third and fourth year), graduate students, and returning students who were graduates of degree programs. This selection was based on the assumption that such students would provide data demonstrating the outcome of academic training in their home country. Most of the students were majors in humanities or social sciences. Table 1 shows gender and average age for each group. In both language groups, participation was solicited by visiting classes, with professors’ permission; through professors who agreed to distribute materials to their classes; or by posting a notice on campus for the English group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Average age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese expository group</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English expository group</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese persuasive group</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English persuasive group</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The writing task

Each Japanese- and English-speaking student wrote one essay in his or her L1 on either an expository topic or a persuasive topic. The general topic for both modes was ‘Violence on TV’; the topic was kept consistent in order to minimise the influence of different topic areas on rhetorical structures in comparing the two modes. The topic was chosen based on the assumption that it is an issue common to both cultures and familiar to the students.

The expository mode analyses the world as it is and defends this interpretation (Martin, 1989). Thus, the expository topic was developed to elicit a thesis (judgement) with arguments (reasons); students in this study were asked to explain why restricting violence on TV is a difficult issue (see Appendix A). The persuasive mode also consists of a thesis and arguments, but it challenges the world and makes a suggestion as to how it should be changed (Martin, 1989). Students were therefore asked to write their own opinion on whether violence on TV should be restricted (see Appendix B). The prompts were given in the students’ L1, and writing was done outside the class. All essays were typed in order to facilitate scoring and text analysis. All errors were kept unchanged in the typed texts.

Evaluation of essays

Scoring schemes

In order to compare Japanese and English rhetorical structures at comparable levels of organisational quality, all the essays were scored on the dimension of organisation. The scoring scheme used for this study was developed based on the descriptors for global coherence in the Holistic Coherence Scale developed by Bamberg (1984) for scoring L1 English essays and on the descriptors for organisation in the criteria developed by Hirai (1971) and Minato (1976) for scoring L1 Japanese essays. The holistic scoring guide used in this study ranked criteria from 5 (excellent) to 1 (poor) and included descriptors for each score (see Appendix C). The scoring evaluated whether the main idea was stated clearly, whether there was a clear sense of beginning and ending, whether reader orientation was provided, whether the organisational plan was discernible, whether there was digression, and whether sentences and paragraphs were logically linked.

Raters

Two native speakers of Japanese and two native speakers of English rated the essays. The Japanese raters were professors of education at a private university in Japan. They were experienced in marking Japanese essays written as part of entrance
examinations for the university. The raters who scored the L1 English essays were graduate students of language education, one of whom had experience in marking both ESL and L1 English essays, while the other had experience only in scoring ESL essays.

Scoring procedure

The scoring scheme was first explained to the raters. The raters agreed on the validity of the scheme. After a practice session, each essay was scored by the two raters independently. Essays were divided into several batches, and the raters reported their scores and shared their comments after scoring each batch in order to secure consistency. After the scoring was completed, the two raters’ scores on each essay were tallied to make a total rating which ranges from 10 (excellent) to 2 (poor).

The inter-rater reliabilities, measured by Cronbach alpha coefficient, were 0.82 for Japanese L1 expository; 0.89 for Japanese L1 persuasive; 0.86 for English L1 expository; 0.78 for English L1 persuasive.

Text analysis

Focus of the analysis

In this study, three dimensions in each essay were examined: (1) the location of main idea(s); (2) the macro-level rhetorical pattern; and (3) the presence or absence of a summary statement. The analysis was focused on macro-level features that contribute to the organisation of macrostructures; that is, semantic global structures, commonly understood as ‘gist’ or ‘summary’ (van Dijk, 1980; van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983). This focus was chosen because the characteristics of Japanese essays reported in previous studies (i.e., a tendency towards inductive organisation and unexpected topic shift) lie at the macro level.

First, a ‘main idea’ was defined according to each topic. A main idea for the expository topic had to do with ‘the reason(s) why the restriction of violence on TV is a difficult issue,’ whereas one for the persuasive topic was concerned with ‘the writer’s opinion on the restriction of violence on TV.’ The location of a main idea in the expository essays was identified as initial, middle, final, collection, comparison, or obscure. An essay using collection enumerates more than one reason for the difficulty of restricting TV violence without an encompassing statement, while an essay using comparison states the reasons for the difficulty of restricting TV violence in contrast or in an adversative relation to each other (Appendix D). In the persuasive mode, the location of a main idea was identified as initial, middle, final, collection, or obscure (Appendix D). When there were two different main
ideas in a persuasive essay, the location of each was noted separately (e.g., initial and final).

The second dimension is the macro-level rhetorical pattern. The categories for patterns were drawn from the basic logical relationships proposed by Meyer (1975, 1985a, 1985b). Meyer’s categories were modified so that induction would be distinguished from deduction. The present study used five basic types for macro-level rhetorical patterns: collection, comparison, explanation, specification, and induction. Collection (abbreviated Col) is a pattern that enumerates or lists elements; comparison (Comp) shows a pattern that contains two elements arranged in a relation of comparison or contrast, in an adversative relationship, or as alternatives to each other. A text structured by explanation (Exp) makes a statement of the theme or main idea, followed by a supporting reason. A text structured by specification (Spec) states the theme or main idea with a preview statement of a supporting reason or a point of view for the subsequent argument, and then explains it in more detail. Induction (Ind), on the other hand, presents the main idea towards the end, based on the preceding argument that constitutes a premise. These five basic patterns, and several combinations of two patterns, were identified as macro-level patterns exhibited in the essays (see Appendix E).

The third category is the summary statement, which is a summary of information already given in the text. Presence or absence of summary statement was identified for each essay. The summary statement for an essay whose macro-level pattern was induction was coded as ‘0’ (see Appendix F).

The location of a main idea often coincides with the macro-level pattern, but not always. For example, an essay identified as explanation for a macro-level pattern may have a main idea at either initial or middle, while the macro-level pattern of an essay with the main idea stated at initial may be identified as specification or other.

Coding

Since reliability had been established for the coding criteria, coding of the location of the main idea(s), the rhetorical pattern, and the presence or absence of a summary statement was done by the researcher. A preliminary test of reliability was conducted using 22 Japanese expository essays and 24 Japanese persuasive essays. The initial coding involved four categories: the location of the main idea, the macro-level pattern, the presence or absence of a preview statement, and the presence or absence of a summary statement. Four Japanese coders (Coders A and B for expository and Coders C and D for persuasive), all school teachers in Japan, coded essays after a practice session, discussing their decisions to see if any agreement could be reached. With expository essays, the reliabilities between my coding and those of Coders A and B, as measured by Scott’s Pi, were 0.93 and 0.93
for the location of the main idea; 0.88 and 0.94 for the macro-level pattern; 0.89 and 1 for the preview statement; and 0.90 and 0.90 for the summary statement. As for persuasive essays, the reliabilities between my coding and Coders C and D, as measured by Scott’s Pi, were 0.94 and 1 for the location of the main idea; 0.79 and 0.79 for the macro-level pattern; 0.88 and 1 for the preview statement; and 0.86 and 0.70 for the summary statement.

Two more reliability tests were conducted. One Japanese/English bilingual graduate student coded four randomly selected Japanese essays for each of the topics, with no discussion during coding. The reliabilities, measured by Scott’s Pi, for the combined set of essays were 0.84 for the location of the main idea; 0.86 for the macro-level pattern; and 0.46 for the summary statement. Another graduate student who was a native speaker of English coded twelve randomly selected English essays in the expository mode and eight essays in the persuasive mode; again, there was no discussion during coding. The reliabilities, measured by Scott’s Pi, for the combined set of essays were 0.57 for the location of the main idea; 0.75 for the macro-level pattern; and 0.70 for the summary statement.

A higher agreement rate may be more desirable for scientific inquiry. However, interpretation of texts is not fixed or uniform, and multiple interpretations are possible. On the other hand, text interpretation is influenced by the conventions of a discourse community. The range of agreement obtained seems to be acceptable from this dialectic understanding of language.

**Results**

Table 2 shows the mean scores, the highest and the lowest scores and standard deviations for organisation of Japanese and English L1 essays.

**Table 2  Mean scores, highest and lowest scores, and standard deviations for organisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expository</th>
<th>Persuasive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two levels of organisational quality—above the mean and below the mean—were used for the comparison between Japanese and English rhetorical structures. Table 3 shows the scores (10 being the highest and 2 the lowest) in the two groups, that is, those above the mean and those below the mean, and the number of essays in each group.
Table 3  Scores in the groups above the mean and below the mean and number of essays in each group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expository</th>
<th></th>
<th>Persuasive</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above M (N)</td>
<td>Below M (N)</td>
<td>Above M (N)</td>
<td>Below M (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>10, 9, 8, 7</td>
<td>6, 5, 4</td>
<td>10, 9, 8, 7</td>
<td>6, 5, 4, 3, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>9, 8, 7, 6</td>
<td>5, 4, 3</td>
<td>9, 8, 7, 1</td>
<td>6, 5, 4, 3, 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location of the main idea

Table 4 shows the overall results for location of the main idea.

Table 4  Location of the main idea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of main idea</th>
<th>Expository</th>
<th></th>
<th>Persuasive</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=22)</td>
<td>(N=22)</td>
<td>(N=24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial + Final</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several differences between Japanese and English emerged. In the expository mode, more than half the English essays, but none of the Japanese essays, stated their main ideas in the initial position; the predominant location for Japanese essays was collection. Collection appeared in almost one-third of the English essays as well. While close to a quarter of the Japanese essays had their main ideas in the final position, there was only one English essay with the main idea at final.

In the persuasive mode, on the other hand, the Japanese and English groups were more similar. For both languages, the predominant location was initial (about 50%) and the second most frequent location was final (about 30%).
Tables 5a and 5b show the results of the comparison between the two languages and the two modes according to two different levels of quality.

**Table 5A  Location of the main idea: Above the mean vs. below the mean**  
(Expository)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of main idea</th>
<th>Above the mean</th>
<th>Below the mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscure</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5B  Location of the main idea: Above the mean vs. below the mean**  
(Persuasive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of main idea</th>
<th>Above the mean</th>
<th>Below the mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial + Final</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscure</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the expository mode, both differences and similarities were observed. Among the essays ranked above the mean, the main idea was predominantly located at *collection* for the Japanese essays, while in the English essays the most frequent...
location was initial, followed by collection. Among the essays below the mean, on the other hand, the percentage of collection in the Japanese group decreased and the most prevalent location was final; in fact, all of the five Japanese essays with the main idea at final fell below the mean score. Among the English essays below the mean, he most dominant location was still initial, but its percentage declined. In each language, one essay identified as obscure was in the below-average group.

In the case of the persuasive essays ranked above the mean, although initial was the most dominant location in both languages, the English group exhibited a higher rate of final and a lower rate of initial than the Japanese group. By contrast, Japanese persuasive essays below the mean showed a much lower rate of initial and, as in the expository mode, final was the most common location. In the English group below the mean, initial was observed more frequently than final.

The fact that English persuasive essays above the mean exhibited a higher rate of final than those of the Japanese group contradicts previous findings that L1 English writers prefer the deductive style. Therefore, the persuasive essays were divided into three quality groups, high, medium, and low, as shown in Table 6, for a further analysis. The results are shown in Table 7.

**Table 6  Scores in the high, medium, and low groups in the persuasive mode and number of essays in each group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>10, 9, 8</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>7, 6, 5</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>4, 3, 2</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>9, 8</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>7, 6, 5</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>4, 3</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7  Location of the main idea: High, medium, and low (Persuasive)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>(N=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>7 87.5</td>
<td>5 62.5</td>
<td>4 44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>1 12.5</td>
<td>1 12.5</td>
<td>3 33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial + Final</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 12.5</td>
<td>2 22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscure</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This breakdown shows similarities between Japanese and English. The predominant location among the high group was initial; among the medium group the predominant location was initial, followed by final; and among the low group, the predominant location was final. Obscure was identified only among the low group.

Macro-level rhetorical patterns

To show the results concisely, some of the macro-level patterns shown in Table 8 are collapsed into larger categories: explanation for Exp, Exp (Col) and Exp (Comp); specification for Spec, Spec (Col) and Spec (Comp); and induction for Ind, Ind(Col) and Comp->Ind (see Appendix E).

Table 8 shows differences as well as similarities between the languages and the modes. In the expository mode, while specification was predominantly used in English, the Japanese group did not use specification at all and used explanation (specifically Exp(Col)) and Col most frequently. The pattern Comp->Exp was identified in three Japanese essays but not in any of the English essays. The two language groups had almost the same number of essays using explanation and each had only a few essays with inductive patterns: three in Japanese and one in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of main idea</th>
<th>Expository (N=22)</th>
<th>Persuasive (N=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Col</strong></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp-&gt;Exp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the persuasive mode, both languages shared the two most common patterns: the sub-patterns of explanation and induction. However, they differed with respect to the sub-patterns of induction. In Japanese, the most commonly used sub-pattern was Ind, followed by Comp->Ind, while the most common sub-pattern in the English
group was Ind(Col).

Compared to the expository mode, the English persuasive group used specification less frequently, and the only sub-pattern identified was Spec(Col), whereas the Japanese persuasive group used sub-patterns of specification, of which Spec was the most frequent. Induction was observed more often in the persuasive mode than in the expository mode in both languages. Across mode and language, explanation was used in about 30% of the essays.

How then do Japanese and English compare in terms of macro-level rhetorical patterns when essay quality is taken into account? Tables 9a and 9b show the rhetorical patterns used by the above-average and below-average groups. Some of the categories are again collapsed into larger categories: explanation, specification, and induction.

**Table 9A  Macro-level patterns: Above the mean vs. below the mean**

(Expository)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of main idea</th>
<th>Above the mean</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Below the mean</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp-&gt;Exp</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9B  Macro-level patterns: Above the mean vs. below the mean  
(Persuasive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above the mean</th>
<th></th>
<th>Below the mean</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of main idea</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the Japanese expository essays, explanation was identified only in the above-average group, while Comp->Exp and the sub-patterns of induction appeared only among the essays below the mean. Collection (Col) was identified in both above-average and below-average groups. A closer examination of the essays using Col, however, reveals some differences among them. One difference was that all above-average Japanese essays using Col also contained a summary statement, whereas none of the below-average essays with Col did. Among the English expository essays, specification and explanation appeared in both above- and below-average groups, but the rate was higher in the above-average than in the below-average group. In both languages, the sub-patterns of explanation tended to appear among the essays above the mean, while essays identified as other fell below the mean.

Among the Japanese persuasive essays ranked above the mean, the most common patterns were explanation and specification, followed by induction. Among the Japanese essays in the below-average group, the use of explanation and specification decreased, and induction became the predominant pattern. Among the English persuasive essays above the mean, the most common patterns were the sub-patterns of induction, followed by the sub-patterns of explanation. Among the below-average English essays, explanation was the most frequent pattern. The persuasive essays were further divided into three quality groups, high, medium, and low, following the analysis of the location of main idea. The results are shown
in Table 10.

**Table 10  Macro-level patterns: High, medium vs. low (Persuasive)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIGHJapanese (N=8)</th>
<th>English (N=8)</th>
<th>MEDIUMJapanese (N=9)</th>
<th>English (N=10)</th>
<th>LOWJapanese (N=7)</th>
<th>English (N=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specification</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comp-&gt;Exp</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Induction</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis reveals some similarities between Japanese and English—among the high group, *explanation* and *specification* were the patterns most frequently identified; among the medium group, while the percentage of *explanation* remained almost the same, *specification* decreased and *induction* increased; and among the low group, *induction* and *other* were the most common patterns for both Japanese and English.

**Presence of a summary statement**

The results of the analysis of the presence of summary statement are shown in Table 11. Tables 12a and 12b show the breakdown for above-average and below—average essays.
Table 11  Presence or absence of a summary statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary statement</th>
<th>Expository (N=22)</th>
<th>Persuasive (N=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+: A summary statement is present.
-: A summary statement is absent.
0: The main idea is placed at the final position.

Table 12A  Presence or absence of a summary statement: Above the mean vs. below the mean (Expository)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary statement</th>
<th>Above the mean</th>
<th>Below the mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=10)</td>
<td>(N=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12B  Presence or absence of a summary statement: Above the mean vs. below the mean (Persuasive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary statement</th>
<th>Above the mean</th>
<th>Below the mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=12)</td>
<td>(N=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although a few more Japanese expository essays than English ones lacked a summary statement, and there were slightly more English persuasive essays without a summary statement than Japanese ones, there were some similarities across languages and modes: essays without a summary statement usually appeared in the below-average group in both languages, while almost all the essays ranked above the mean, except those which stated the main idea at the final position, had a summary statement.

Summary and discussion

The results of this study have revealed both differences and similarities between Japanese and English L1 essays and between the expository and persuasive modes. The results, however, should not be interpreted as generalisable text features in the two languages, since the sample size was small, participants were not randomly selected, the study included only two specific essay topics, and only a small number of raters and analysers were involved in the study. Replication and further research involving different Inner Circle varieties of English are necessary in order to arrive at a more generalisable understanding of the nature of rhetorical patterns in Japanese and English. Nonetheless, the results give insight into currently available knowledge on the cultural characteristics of Japanese and English.

Differences between Japanese and English

In the expository mode, specification, which places the main idea in the initial position, was the most frequently used macro-level pattern in English (55%). In Japanese, this pattern was not observed at all, while the macro-level patterns collection and explanation (27% each) were observed most commonly. The most frequent location of the main idea in Japanese was collection (59%), followed by final (23%), whereas final was identified in only one of 22 English essays. In the persuasive mode, induction, a macro-level pattern, was used in both languages, but the frequency was slightly higher in Japanese (33%) than in English (25%).

These findings appear to support, to some extent, the claim that Japanese writers prefer the inductive pattern and English writers prefer the deductive pattern. However, when essay quality is taken into consideration, the legitimacy of this claim becomes questionable.

Similarities between Japanese and English

In the expository mode, the two language groups shared some features when essays above the mean and the ones below the mean were compared: (1) essays with the main idea at the final position were evaluated below the average; and (2)
the pattern *explanation* tended to appear in essays above the mean. In the persuasive mode, the most common location of the main idea was *initial* (about 50%), and the next was *final* (about 30%) for both languages. Similar features emerged when Japanese and English were compared according to three levels of quality, high, medium, and low: The most common location of the main idea among the high group was *initial*, while among the medium group the most common was *initial*, followed by *final*; among the low group the most common was *final*. While the most common macro-level patterns for the high group were *explanation* and *specification*, *specification* decreased and *induction* increased in the medium group, and *induction* was the most common pattern in the low group.

Across modes and languages, essays using *induction* tended to fall in the average to low quality range, while essays with *explanation* (and *specification*, although it was not used in Japanese expository mode) tended to belong to the average to high quality range. The frequency of the pattern *explanation* was almost the same (about 30%) across languages and modes. Also, essays without a summary statement and those in which the main idea was identified as *obscure* tended to fall below the mean, and the macro-level patterns identified as *other* tended to appear in the lower quality range.

In this study, most inductive essays (those that placed the main idea at *final* and those with *induction* as the macro-level pattern) were not evaluated highly. This suggests, contrary to the previous findings (e.g., Hinds, 1990; Kobayashi, 1984; Oi, 1984; Ostler, 1990), that the inductive pattern may not actually be ‘preferred’ in Japanese.

*Macro-level patterns specific to Japanese*

In all essays in both modes, certain patterns were used in Japanese but not in English: Comp->Exp (3 expository essays and 1 persuasive essay) and Comp->Ind (1 expository essay and 3 persuasive essays).

The pattern Comp->Exp in the expository mode introduces content that is often background to the issue, then contrasts the topic with the first content, after which a supporting reason is stated. This pattern thus tends to give a long introduction before the writer gets to the point. The pattern Comp->Ind in the persuasive mode introduces two elements in an adversative or compare/contrast relationship and then draws the main idea in at the end. The first element tends to be an antithesis of the second, which eventually leads to the conclusion, and thus it is difficult to predict where the argument goes. These features correspond to some of the findings of previous studies that Japanese students prefer an inductive pattern, that they never get to the point (Ostler, 1990), and that Japanese is characterised by sudden topic shifts (Hinds, 1983, 1987, 1990). In the present study, however, essays with
such patterns were in the minority; moreover, most of them were rated below average. These facts question the legitimacy of claims made by the above researchers.

The findings that Japanese-specific styles were not appreciated by Japanese readers and that essays of above-average quality in both languages shared the same patterns (such as explanation for the expository mode, and explanation and specification in the persuasive mode) predict a very small possibility that Japanese L1 conventions interfere with ESL writing. They predict, instead, either positive transfer of L1—L2 common rhetorical structures or transfer of poor L1 organisational skills resulting in poor L2 texts, both of which possibilities have been confirmed by Kubota (1998).

The findings of this study suggest that the notion of ‘cultural conventions of writing,’ which is the main focus of contrastive rhetoric research, may need to be re-conceptualised. ‘Cultural conventions’ have been considered culturally unique, prevalent, and preferred. In this study, the Japanese sample certainly exhibited some patterns unique to it, and certain patterns were observed more often in Japanese than in English. However, these features were certainly not observed in the majority of the sample, and they were not necessarily preferred by the Japanese readers. In English, the pattern specification was certainly predominant in the expository mode. However, this pattern was shared with Japanese in the persuasive mode, and writers in this study used other patterns, many of which were shared with Japanese. The findings of this study open up the possibility that culturally unique features may be neither prevalent nor preferred, and that predominant preferred patterns may be shared with other languages.

**Pedagogical implications**

The initial purpose of contrastive rhetoric research was to offer pedagogical suggestions for teaching ESL writing (Kaplan, 1966). In this respect, the findings of this study offer some implications as to what type of rhetorical structures would help students improve their English writing. It was found that well-organised L1 English expository essays tend to exhibit a certain macro-level pattern, specification, in which a main idea, as well as a brief preview statement of the subsequent arguments, is stated in the introduction. Being able to use this pattern would benefit ESL writers. In this study, the macro-level pattern explanation (Exp(Col)) was used by both good Japanese writers and good English writers in the expository mode. This indicates that Japanese students can be encouraged to use this pattern in English writing.

This study also revealed a multiplicity of effective rhetorical structures, particularly in the persuasive mode. In the persuasive mode, while the L1 English
persuasive essays in the high and the medium ranges used Spec(Col) and Exp(Col), they also made use of several other patterns, including two sub-patterns of induction. This indicates that effectiveness of organisation may not depend solely on rhetorical structures; it may be determined by how well the text communicates and appeals to the reader, a possibility which requires further investigation.

For both expository and persuasive writing, it can be said that students will be able to write effectively by learning to manipulate the patterns specification and explanation. More importantly, however, teacher and students should be aware that good rhetorical structures are not fixed but open to possibilities. Nakamura (1979) argues that it is important for Japanese learners of English to make an effort to adopt the writing style that native speakers use, especially on the sociolinguistic level. However, he also argues that such an effort is merely a means to an end; the end is to go beyond the imitated English code and express one's voice based on one's own identity. Teaching the privileged forms of rhetoric in the target language is likely to become the end itself, but it should be understood as merely a necessary step for going beyond the imitated code.

The pedagogical implications discussed earlier are in line with suggestions made by other researchers of contrastive rhetoric, who recommend that teachers and students raise their awareness of cultural differences in writing conventions (cf. Connor, 1996; Kaplan, 1988; Leki, 1991; Reid, 1989). Contrastive rhetoric researchers have offered such suggestions based on the assumption that cultural uniqueness exists in written text conventions. The results of the present study, however, indicate that such pedagogical suggestions should be offered with caution. Over-emphasising cultural differences may create and reinforce stereotypes and may also discourage L2 writers from using L1 rhetorical patterns that are appropriate in L2 writing.

As the results of this study indicate, teachers should understand that not all ESL students from Japan are conditioned by a certain cultural rhetorical convention that is unique to Japanese. Teachers need to be aware that there are a number of different ways of organising a text in students’ L1, some of which may be similar to preferred patterns in English. Furthermore, not only students’ L1 rhetorical styles but English rhetorical styles are open to possibilities. It is important for teachers and students to have a critical understanding of what are often referred to as cultural conventions of writing and to explore rhetorical devices that will enhance the effectiveness of written communication in the target language.
Notes

1. The four-unit pattern in Chinese consists of *chi* (introduction of topic), *cheng* (elucidation of topic), *juan* (turning to another viewpoint), and *he* (conclusion) (Tsao, 1983).
2. There are some studies on letter-writing in Japanese as compared with letter-writing in other languages (Jenkins & Hinds, 1987; Oi & Sato, 1990). Their results revealed some salient differences in format, language use, and content among languages.
3. Translation needs to be used with caution. As Hinds admits, the quality of translation may have affected the low ratings given by American readers. American readers' lack of background knowledge of current issues in Japan may also have negatively affected their ratings (cf. McCagg, 1996).
4. These two modes correspond to 'referential discourse' and 'persuasive discourse' proposed by Kinneavy (1971).
5. An attempt was made to ensure that both language groups would be similar in terms of age, year at school, sex, and major. However, because of the English-speaking students' more diverse personal and educational backgrounds compared to the Japanese students', as well as difficulties in soliciting participation from English-speaking students, the English-speaking group was slightly different from the Japanese group; it included more graduate students than the Japanese group, a few first- and second-year students, and several science and engineering majors (three science or engineering majors in each of the expository and persuasive groups). The average age was higher in the English-speaking group than in the Japanese group, and there were more males than females.
6. The criteria developed by Hirai (1971) include items such as 'Is the text clear and easy to understand?' 'Does the text contain devices to facilitate understanding of the audience?' 'Is there unity in development?' 'Is intended information conveyed in well-formed sentences and paragraphs?' 'Is the overall organisation natural and logical?' A scoring guide for expository writing in Minato (1976) includes the following: 'The main idea is presented clearly.' 'Arguments are arranged in a logical progression.' 'The relationship between paragraphs and that between a paragraph and the entire text are clear.' A scoring guide for argumentative writing includes items such as 'The organisation is logical, clear and appropriate for stating the thesis.' 'The conclusion and supporting ideas constitute a logical relationship.' These criteria confirm the legitimacy of the scheme developed for this study to score Japanese essays.
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Appendix A

Writing task: Expository

Please write a composition that conforms to the following situation. There are no right or wrong answers to this task. This is not a test.

Situation:

You are taking a course called ‘Analysis of Social Issues.’ Your professor has given you the following writing assignment:

People’s concern about violence on TV is growing. As a result, there is a move to restrict it. However, the restriction of violence on TV is a difficult issue. Explain why. (Analyse the issue objectively and discuss the reason(s) why. Do not present your opinion for or against the restriction.)

Write about 250 to 300 words (one page, double-spaced, if typed) (600 to 700 characters in the case of Japanese).

Appendix B

Writing task: Persuasive

Please write a composition that conforms to the following situation. There are no right or wrong answers to this task. This is not a test.

Situation:

You have been asked to write your opinion on the following issue for a column called ‘Opinion’ in a campus newspaper: There is a growing concern about violence on TV. In your opinion, should violence on TV be restricted?

Please take a position for or against the restriction. Try to persuade your audience of your point of view.

Please write about 250 to 300 words (one page, double-spaced, if typed) (600 to 700 characters in the case of Japanese).
Appendix C

Holistic scoring of organisation

Score 5: Excellent

- Main idea(s) is stated clearly and effectively.
- There is a clear sense of beginning and ending and they work very effectively.
- Reader orientation (e.g., announcing the topic) is provided.
- Details are organised according to a clearly discernible plan.
- There is no digression.
- Sentences and paragraphs are logically and effectively linked together.
- Paragraphing is logical and effective.

Score 4: Very good

- Main idea(s) is stated, but less effectively than 5.
- Beginning and ending are effective.
- Some reader orientation is provided.
- Details are organised according to a discernible plan.
- There is little digression.
- Sentences and paragraphs are linked together well.
- Paragraphing is good.

Score 3: Average

- Main idea(s) is stated, but not as effectively or logically as 4.
- There is a sense of beginning and ending, but they are not as effective as 4.
- Some reader orientation is provided, but not as effectively as 4.
- There is an organisational plan, but it does not appear as clearly as 4.
- There is a flow, but some digression is seen.
- Sentences and paragraphs are linked together, but a little awkwardly.
- There are paragraph breaks but they are a little awkward.

Score 2: Not very good

- Main idea(s) is not stated clearly or effectively.
- Beginning and ending are awkward and not very effective.
- Reader orientation is not provided very much; even if it is, it is not very effective.
- Writer’s plan is not very clear; the writer rambles on.
The links between sentences and paragraphs are awkward and not very logical.
Paragraph breaks are awkward and not very logical.

Score 1: Poor

Main idea(s) is not stated.
The writer creates little sense of beginning and ending.
Writer assumes the reader shares his/her context and provides no orientation.
There is no discernible organisational plan; the writer either lists or follows an associative order.
There is frequent digression.
There is no logical digression between sentences and paragraphs.
There is no paragraph break, or no logic in the breaks.

Appendix D

Location of main idea(s): Expository

1. Initial: The reason(s) for the difficulty of the restriction of violence on TV is stated in the introduction.
2. Middle: The reason(s) for the difficulty of the restriction of violence on TV is stated in the middle section.
3. Final: The reason(s) for the difficulty of the restriction of violence on TV is recognised in the conclusion.
4. Collection: More than one reason for the difficulty of the restriction of violence on TV are enumerated.
5. Comparison: The reason(s) for the difficulty of the restriction of violence on TV is stated in the relation of contrast or adversative between two views.
6. Obscure: The reason(s) for the difficulty of the restriction of violence on TV is not clearly stated.

Location of Main Idea(s): Persuasive

1. Initial: The writer’s opinion on the restriction on violence on TV is stated in the introduction.
2. Middle: The writer’s opinion on the restriction on violence on TV is stated in the middle section.
3. Final: The writer’s opinion on the restriction on violence on TV is stated in the conclusion.
4. Collection: There is no encompassing statement of the writer’s opinion on the
The restriction of violence on TV but the opinion is expressed in more than one location.

5. Obscure: The writer’s opinion on the restriction of violence on TV is not clearly stated.

Appendix E

Macro-level patterns: Expository

1. Col: Reasons for the difficulty of the restriction of violence on TV are enumerated.
2. Comp: Two elements are stated in a relationship of compare/contrast, adversative or alternative.
3. Explanation
   - Exp(Col): The theme (that the restriction of TV violence is a difficult issue: the wording can be different) is presented and then supporting reasons are enumerated.
   - Exp(Comp): The theme is presented and then a supporting reason is expressed by comparing or contrasting two elements.
4. Specification
   - Spec: The theme and a preview statement of a supporting reason or a point of view for the subsequent argument are presented, and then it is explained in more detail.
   - Spec(Col): The theme and a preview statement of supporting reasons or points of view for the subsequent argument are presented, and then they are explained in more detail by enumeration.
   - Spec(Comp): The theme and a preview statement of supporting reasons or points of view for the subsequent argument are presented, and then the reason or argument is explained in more detail by comparing or contrasting two elements.
5. Comp->Exp: After a certain content is discussed, the theme is stated in a relationship of compare/contrast, adversative or alternative, and then a supporting reason is stated.
6. Induction
   - Ind: The main idea is placed at the end and the preceding arguments constitute supporting reason(s) for it.
   - Comp->Ind: Two elements are stated in a relationship of compare/contrast, adversative or alternative and then the main idea is drawn in the end.
7. Other: Neither of the above.
Macro-Level Patterns: Persuasive

1. Col: Equally weighted arguments on the topic are juxtaposed.
2. Comp: Two elements are stated in a relationship of compare/contrast, adversative or alternative.
3. Explanation
   • Exp: The writer’s opinion on the topic is presented and then a supporting reason is stated.
   • Exp(Col): The writer’s opinion on the topic is presented and then supporting reasons are enumerated.
   • Exp(Comp): The writer’s opinion on the topic is presented and then a supporting reason is presented by comparing or contrasting two elements.
4. Specification
   • Spec: The writer’s opinion and a preview statement of a supporting reason or a point of view for the subsequent argument are presented, and then it is explained in more detail.
   • Spec(Col): The writer’s opinion and a preview statement of supporting reasons or a point of view for the subsequent arguments are presented, and then the reasons or arguments are explained in more detail by enumeration.
   • Spec(Comp): The writer’s opinion and a preview statement of supporting reasons or a point of view for the subsequent arguments are presented, and then the reasons or arguments are explained in more detail by comparing/contrasting two elements.
5. Comp->Exp: After an opinion which is against the writer’s is presented, the writer’s opinion is stated and it is supported by a reason.
6. Induction
   • Ind: The main idea is placed at the end and preceding arguments constitute supporting reason(s) for it.
   • Ind(Col): The writer’s opinion is realised in the final section; the preceding arguments constitute premises or reasons which are arranged in a form of enumeration.
   • Comp->Ind: After two elements are stated in a relationship of compare/contrast, adversative or alternative, the writer’s opinion is drawn at the end.
7. Other: Neither of the above.
Appendix F

Summary statement: Expository

+ : The theme (that restriction of violence on TV is a difficult issue: the wording can be different) is re-presented in the conclusion.
− : The theme is not re-presented in the conclusion.
0 : The theme and main idea are placed at the end of the essay.

Summary statement: Persuasive

+ : The writer’s opinion on the topic (restriction of violence on TV) is re-presented or what was discussed in the text is summarised.
− : The writer’s opinion on the topic is not re-presented or what was discussed in the text is not summarised.
0 : The writer’s opinion is placed at the end of the essay.