APPENDIX C
Intercorrelations Among FCE Papers and ETS Tests

	TOEFL 1	TOEFL 2	TOEFL 3	TEW	SPK GRAM	SPK PRON	SPK FLCY	SPK COMP	FCE 1	FCE 2	FCE 3	FCE 4	FCE 5
TOEFL 1	1.00000												
TOEFL 2	.55354	1.00000											
TOEFL 3	.56500	.71801	1.00000										
TEW	.43919	.54284	.51782	1.00000									
SPK GRAM	.58721	.43657	.38292	.38729	1.00000								
SPK PRON	.58578	.47240	.47637	.44754	.64102	1.00000							
SPK FLCY	.61371	.42348	.40753	.42906	.78855	.66837	1.00000						
SPK COMP	.64193	.47819	.44714	.43305	.89324	.74693	.87416	1.00000					
FCE 1	.60579	.57021	.62738	.44062	.47310	.52405	.50064	.53396	1.00000				
FCE 2	.53629	.51820	.50162	.47045	.50129	.56657	.48799	.53821	.57632	1.00000			
FCE 3	.58680	.62876	.63841	.52807	.49123	.59153	.52199	.54648	.69970	.66234	1.00000		
FCE 4	.61123	.44312	.49670	.42396	.49685	.52697	.52437	.53489	.52980	.49364	.56273	1.00000	
FCE 5	.55493	.40958	.40419	.36558	.54278	.53077	.56055	.57177	.45530	.45189	.47376	.49156	1.00000

Orality, Oral-Based Culture, and the Academic Writing of ESL Learners

Donald L. Rubin
Rosemarie Goodrum
University of Georgia

Barbara Hall
DeKalb College

Although ESL learners are often quite sensitive to interference of their native language in second language writing, they tend to be less aware of the interference of native culture rhetorical patterns in writing Western academic exposition. Conceptually and pedagogically, however, the construct of interference is inadequate because it implies that native linguistic and rhetorical abilities must be suppressed in order to achieve competence in the target culture's discourse. An alternative approach is to recognize that many native culture rhetorical patterns can be integrated into the discourse norms of academic writing, even when these discourse patterns are oral-based. Expert writers learn to reintegrate oral-based discourse strategies into their writing after becoming aware of the differences between written and oral codes. Although the concept of oral culture is problematic, oral-based cultures can be identified. ESL learners from oral-based cultures thus need not completely divorce themselves from their native rhetorical patterns when they learn to write academic English exposition. Instead, they can learn to capitalize on certain oral-based discourse strategies, such as metaphor and narrative as proof, direct second-person address and elements of redundancy.

From time to time, we find sitting in our ESL writing classes an extraordinary writer whose voice (even in English) rings especially strongly with the cadences and tones of his or her native culture. Such a student is a mixed blessing: although we may relish

Issues in Applied Linguistics
ISSN 1050-4273
Vol. 1 No. 1 1990 56-76

reading each assigned paper, we are duty bound to help that student move closer to the norms of Western academic writing. Consider the following passage, extracted from a paper written by a young Nigerian enrolled in an intensive English program:

> My Japan and American parts made clock jangle a tone which woke me up. The nob of my door was cold like a frozen fish ... My insistent hand, now turned the nob which I assumed to be an ice block. Pushing the door slowly, with the first winter cold to fill my body. Galloped my memory OH! "SODUCO" I whimpered, I guess, that is the company where I bought a carton of frozen chicken when I was hosting my send off party to U.S.A. It's cold room of 30°F seems to be in the same atmospheric condition I am experiencing now. I cried in alarm, casting a glance outside at cold drizzle. "But the weather-" It glitters like the African stars' but not as much as a diamond...

This passage, like much of this student's writing, is marked by an indirectness in referring which frequently results in a humorous tone ("My Japan and American parts"). It contains a high density of metaphorical language ("my memory galloped," "glitters like the African stars"). Periodically, and without any prior foundation, a narrative element -- even direct quotation -- intrudes into the text ("I bought a carton of frozen chicken when I was hosting my send off party"). These features reflect the student's native rhetorical style, an oral-based rhetoric that is well developed in Yoruba culture (Asante, 1990). The result is captivating, but hardly acceptable in a typical American freshman composition class.

And so as teachers we wrestle with the issue of preserving what is authentic and vital in this student's voice, yet preparing him to function in a Western academic discourse community. We believe that those goals are compatible if we move away from thinking about the relationship between native and target discourse patterns -- or about the relationship between oral and written discourse patterns -- primarily in terms of *interference*. Instead, we propose that students can learn to compose strong academic prose by *integrating* oral-based rhetorical strategies in a number of ways. This paper, part of an on-going project to consider relations between ESL students' oral and written discourse, explores some conceptual and instructional dimensions of that alternative point of view.

INTERFERENCE IN L2 WRITING

Awareness of Language Interference

The notion of language interference helps account for certain dysfunctions in the writing of novice writers. The language interference account is associated most typically with second language (L2) learning situations, but also with prestige dialect learning (Edelsky, 1982; Wolfram & Whiteman, 1971). Instructors working with Chinese ESL students, for example, recognize that the relatively high frequency with which these writers omit articles ("John goes to store to buy book") is due to L1 interference: the Chinese language has no articles (Lay, 1975). Similarly, Spanish-dominant students writing in English produce predictable patterns of spelling errors in English writing that can be attributed to L1 interference (Garcia, 1975).

Students are well aware of this kind of language interference. They frequently mention specific structural differences between English and their L1 when we ask them to reflect on differences between their composing processes in L1 and L2. A Chinese student writes,

> The difference is in gramma We don't have words that can be add such as s to make it mean more than one. We also don't have words that can be add such as d or ed to make it a past tense. All we have are words that state the noun we talk about mean more than one thing. and words that tell the reader the event are in the past. instead of using ed or d.

Similarly, a Latin American student observes,

> Sentences in spanish are longer, usually, and in many cases the subject is explicit [implicit?] and it is not necessary to be written. Besides punctuation is much easier in spanish. It is not necessary to separate 2 sentences with a period when talking about the same subject and as long as what you are writing makes sense.

Awareness of Rhetorical Interference

In addition to interference at the level of discrete features of language or mechanics, current interest in contrastive rhetoric (Kaplan, 1966, 1988) points to rhetorical interference deriving from

broad discourse schemata that may be indigenous to a writer's native culture. These patterns of discourse into which writers are originally socialized, patterns with which novice writers are most comfortable, constitute the writer's native rhetoric (R1).

For example, while narrative may be a universal element of discourse, it is well established that stories in various cultures also conform to certain culture-specific structural patterns. Japanese stories (Matsuyama, 1983) and Vietnamese stories (Schafer, 1981), by way of illustration, tend to dwell on character studies and on relationships between characters. Stories in these cultures may have little by way of plot and action -- elements that most Westerners regard as central to narrative. Culture-specific story schemata interfere with comprehension when readers from other cultures address such texts, even in translation (Kintsch & Greene, 1978; see also Barnitz, 1986).

Every culture, to be sure, sustains multiple rhetorics. Effective writers, no less than effective speakers, vary style as a way of accommodating to and constructing social context (Rubin, 1984). Within a single culture, differences between genres can be substantial, marked, for example, even by mutually exclusive lexical items (Toelken, 1969).

Notwithstanding this sort of register variation within languages, the notion of culturally conditioned rhetorics is still valid and useful (e.g., Oliver, 1969). Some cultures generally favor brevity and pithiness (Hymes, 1974). Some cultures value indirect reference and applaud cleverly obscure metaphors (Albert, 1972). Indeed, these discourse norms apparently dominate instrumental communication strategies, in addition to whatever currency they may have in expressive or poetic genres. In virtually all instrumental communication, however, of which academic prose is one form, North Americans presuppose an effort for clarity and "considerateness."

For ESL writers, then, native culture rhetorical strategies (R1) may be ill matched with patterns of expression expected by readers in the target rhetorical culture (R2). For example, some instructors notice that Japanese students learning to write in English may avoid sharply defined argumentative positions; what some Japanese students regard as appropriate "subtlety," their American instructors interpret as inappropriate "equivocation." In a similar vein, at least some instructors have observed that Chinese students learning to write in English resist the proclivity of Western

academic discourse for novel insight and unique expression; their R1 eschews prominent displays of originality (Matalene, 1985).

We have found that students are generally less aware of rhetorical interference from R1 in acquiring R2 patterns of discourse than they are of L1 language interference. In part this is because the focal awareness of many ESL writers dwells on matters of grammar and mechanics (Raimes, 1988). The obsession with correct surface form, in turn, results because many students have done little actual composing (as opposed to workbook exercises) either in L1 or in L2. They have thus neither attained a high degree of rhetorical sensitivity in writing nor developed a sense of writing as a rhetorical transaction wherein writers can influence real readers (Johnson, 1989).

Finally, another reason why many ESL writers are not attentive to R2 interference is that they have learned to write in L1 by mimicking R2 paradigms. That is, throughout their writing instruction in their native language they were exposed to models and methods that embodied (with varying degrees of quality) prototypical Western academic exposition. An essay is an essay, they are taught; its structure (mainly five paragraphs) is invariant across cultures. Formal schooling can thus exert an influence that dominates over national or ethnic culture (Scribner & Cole, 1973). A Taiwanese student shows the result of instruction in "generic" academic prose:

> It is easy for me to write with Chinese. When I am writing something with Chinese, I always outline the topic of every paragraph first. And then follow the outline to write step by step.

Believing that contrasts with his English essay writing are due to limited L2 language proficiency, not different R2 discourse strategies, he continues,

> But if I write in English, it is very hard for me. Although I still will outline the topic of paragraphs, I always can't follow the outline to write ... Sometimes I have a very good idea that I want to write down in the essay, but I don't know how to express by English.

Surely a student who has learned to write prototypical Western academic prose in L1 has some head start (for better or for worse) in writing academic prose in L2. And despite some

familiarity with the more or less universal (i.e., uniformly schooled) structures of academic discourse, many students do recognize ways in which R1 discourse patterns may diverge from their R2 target. An especially perceptive Japanese student confirms the observation that Japanese writers are loath to argue pointedly, that they systematically avoid what American readers might call "taking a point of view":

> Most Japanese like to be ambiguous for everything even if they really have clear ideas or attitudes, because we Japanese believe ambiguity as a virtue. I have been disciplined to be fair to everything or everyone since I was a child. But this custom means "fair" as "not clear or not strong". Even in my school days, teachers used to instruct us such type of "fair" things: for example, when they discuss about differences between A and B, they like to value both advantages, not to disagree A or B strongly ... So when I have to write some paper, I often struggle to choose my hopeful idea from among a lot of general ideas and my honest emotional ideas!

Shortcomings of the Interference Model

Interference, whether from L1 or R1, is a problem. The metaphor suggests a signal, such as a radio signal, that is too loud. The signal carries noise, not information, and it must be filtered out to enable the target signal to come through with clarity. According to the interference model, the teacher's job is to help learners filter out L1 and R1 signals, to suppress those elements that diverge from the linguistic and discourse norms of academic English. Teaching methods to help mitigate interference include providing students with appropriate L2/R2 models of academic prose, focusing on contrastive analyses in classroom exercises and providing feedback from "authentic" L2/R2 readers, such as American college student peers.

Instruction to eliminate linguistic and cultural interference, however, too often results in a sort of sanitized prose. One Korean student writes,

> Whenever I write a letter to my friends, I seem to meet my friends in front of me ... Sometimes I write a poem in letter. Some kind of feeling occur into me, I can write a poem with Korean. Compare to writing a letter with English and with Korean, I cannot do well with English as I do with Korean.

> Writing a letter with English never occur any emotion into my mind and heart. Just I write a letter a kind of forms.

Besides the frequently negative impact on voice and liveliness in student writing, the effort to eliminate R1 interference, in particular, has undesirable sociopolitical dimensions. Literacy is not some monolithic, value-neutral set of procedures for getting from thought to expression. Instead, various types of literacies embody different sets of values (Bizzell, 1988; Gee, 1986). For example, the patterns of discourse that constitute Western academic prose are geared toward *transforming* knowledge into new perspectives, but other cultures adhere to rhetorics which avoid transformations in favor of *reproducing* knowledge (Allen & Rubin, in press; Street, 1984). Similarly,Western essayist literacy demands that writers draw explicit conclusions for their readers, but other cultural rhetorics may systematically avoid such directness because it is regarded as insulting and alienating to readers (Scollon & Scollon, 1981).

Instructors who undertake to eradicate R1 interference in student discourse are generally sensitive to the fact that they are participating in a sort of cultural imperialism. Irvine & Elsasser (1988) suggest one antidote to the imperialist stance: allow for greater integration of indigenous language patterns within the superimposed essayist standard. Thus, by way of illustration, they argue that Caribbean students ought to be allowed and encouraged to use R1 forms of humor and Calypso in their R2 academic writing. Linn (1975) advocates a similar approach and calls for integrating the R1 patterns of inner-city African-Americans into their formal essay writing.

The interference model, in sum, may be a useful tool for analyzing inter-language and inter-cultural influences on student expression, but as an instructional tool it has severe shortcomings. Efforts to eradicate R1 interference, to the extent that those efforts are "successful," are likely to result in sanitized, colorless writing. Efforts to eradicate R1 interference, moreover, place the instructor in an ethically untenable sociopolitical posture: the composition teacher as colonizer.

Put another way, the interference model casts the learner's L1/R1 competencies as a form of pathology and the instructor as a surgeon excising the malfunctioning tissue. Friere (1970), pointing out the inappropriateness of pathology/cure-oriented models of education, instead proposes developmental models more consonant

with an agricultural metaphor (planting seeds and creating optimal conditions for their growth). By turning to accounts of developmental relations between oral and written discourse in L1, we identify a notion of integrating rhetorics as an alternative to the interference model.

INTERFERENCE AND INTEGRATION IN L1 WRITING

Differentiating Speaking and Writing in L1 Development

When children initially acquire writing in L1, an important set of achievements revolves around their ability to differentiate written language from oral (Cook-Gumperz & Gumperz, 1981; Kantor & Rubin, 1981; Olson, 1977). They must learn, for example, to use endophoric pronoun reference rather than exophoric ("Our family has always regarded the vase on our mantel with great awe," rather than "We have always regarded it over there with great awe"). Similarly, young writers must also learn to use transition statements and conjunctions to explicitly mark logical relations between ideas ("*If* you tell the teacher *then* everyone in the class will be in trouble," as opposed to the more oral-based "You tell the teacher *and* we'll all get in trouble").

With cognitive and linguistic maturation and with broad experience in writing, most L1 writers do succeed in developing styles appropriate for written communication contexts and in breaking away from inappropriate reliance on oral-based patterns of expression. But for some individuals, a great deal of the time -- and for most individuals, at least some of the time -- a residue of oral communication strategies can interfere with effective writing (Farr Whiteman & Janda, 1985; Shaughnessy, 1977).

For example, a mainstream-culture, native English-speaking college student turns in the following prose as part of a final draft (typed and edited) of a term project:

> Language barrier, perhaps, is the main reason in which children may find it difficult to learn. The three children this project will focus on spoke Spainsih, Portugese, and Chinese. When the family speaks in their home language, and the teachers at school speak in English, another barrier occurs. However Rita, one of the children, has made an extreme effort to learn how to speak English. The willingness to learn plays an important role on the children's progress with their new language.

This passage is marked by the *semantic abbreviation* characteristic of much oral discourse (Collins & Williamson, 1984). Presuppositions (e.g., that these children were experiencing difficulty learning) and identifications (e.g., the identity of the first barrier against which "another barrier" is counterposed) are left implicit. In a prototypical speech situation, the interlocutor would probe and question to overcome any such uncertainty. The writer here also does little to establish topical coherence. In prototypical conversation, conversational partners might collaborate in framing a topic, or the links between topics might simply remain loosely associative.

Too Much Differentiation: Hypercorrection in L1 Writing

Another form of interference between oral and written expression comes about when people carry the distinction between oral and written discourse to extremes. In the normal course of development, most people, in their own languages, learn to differentiate writing and speaking appropriately. Some individuals, however, learn that lesson too well. In seeking to set their writing apart from their more comfortable and familiar oral patterns, these writers *hypercorrect* (Rubin, 1987).

Operating under the principle that "if it seems like natural language it must be wrong," hypercorrecting writers weigh down their syntax with grotesque nominal structures (e.g., "That the obnoxiousness of the fraternity's show of insensitivity could have bothered their guests was beyond their comprehension." For a compelling discussion of the role of nominalization in oral and literate modes of meaning, see Halliday, 1987). Hypercorrecting writers choose indirect over direct expression ("The tendency of the children to react to the scary parts was very noticeable"), and they often select terms or phrases that resemble legalistic formulae ("Their fears were diminished and reduced"). An otherwise interesting account of a visit to the Soviet Union, for instance, is marred by the following L1 writer's hypercorrect caricature of what academic prose is supposed to sound like:

> To militarize the youth seems premature, but it allows the concept of war to become quite natural and moral. To a

> stripling, who can only conceive of being invincible, the thought of serving the Motherland may seem a desirable and romantic state of being. Recent expressions of the Soviet government of a milder attitude toward avoidance of war, and even encouraging peace, are inconsistent with their basic political theology.

Integrating Oral and Written Strategies in L1

The error of hypercorrecting writers is their belief that speech and writing are dichotomous, mutually exclusive means of expression. On the contrary, written texts can be infused with greater or lesser degrees of orality, just as spoken utterances may be marked by varying degrees of literate style (Rubin & Rafoth, 1986; Tannen, 1982, 1985). Thus, for example, the extreme chattiness of newspaper gossip columns arises in part from oral features like direct address ("Just imagine, dear reader, how you would feel..."), exophora ("They're saying that it won't be long before...") and ellipsis ("Just being his daredevil self. That's how Prince Charles brushed off any speculation that...").

As experienced writers develop, they progress beyond the stage of simply differentiating between oral and written styles. With increased expertise, oral and written styles begin to reconverge (Kroll, 1981; Rubin, 1987). Writers become able to introduce elements of conversationality in their prose in order to create a voice and to establish rapport with readers, for clarity or for occasional emphasis. Certain language features contribute to that sense of authorial presence in writing: verbal rather than nominal style; relatively simple syntax, avoiding "periodic" sentences; and perhaps selecting Anglo Saxon-based vocabulary rather than Latinate. Certain broad rhetorical features likewise contribute to orality in writing: use of narrative as a form of proof, tolerance for digression, extended metaphor and redundancy. An L1 student in a college developmental studies composition class, for example, works toward that integration of oral and written styles. He begins his essay entitled "Divorce":

> Jane and Bob could be your neighbors. They happen to be mine, and I am worried about them. Jane and Bob are going to be married next month. They are both eighteen years old. Bob is a foreman at a mobile home construction plant and makes pretty good money. Jane is a receptionist for a doctor

> and makes a little over one hundred and fifty dollars a week. Statistics show that a situation like Jane and Bob are in will end up in divorce. The chances are two out of three that Jane and Bob will not still be married three years from now. Even if they do last together for three years, they will have a fifty percent chance of divorcing tacked on for the next seven years until their ten year anniversary. If they last together for ten years, perhaps then their marriage will be safe. I hope so for their sake, and for the sake of our society which is being torn apart by too many young marriages ending up in pain and misery.

Effective instructional practices for L1 student writers exploit oral communication proficiency as a foundation for developing proficiency in academic writing. In *Beat Not the Poor Desk*, for example, Ponsot & Dean (1982) build upon students' familiarity with the orally-rooted genre of fable in order to establish patterns of concrete support for abstract conclusions in essay writing. Schultz's (1982) "Story Workshop" approach to teaching forms of expository and argumentative writing similarly encourages students to tap into a variety of familiar and lively oral genres in the belief that "[s]ince anyone who learns to write effectively uses these natural forms of discourse intuitively ... we make written expression more effective and greatly clarify and facilitate the process by which students learn to write when we develop a clear and active understanding of these natural forms of discourse and their connection to writing" (p. 2). Other approaches to integrating orality in the teaching of writing are reviewed in Rafoth (1987) and in Rubin & Dodd (1987).

Indeed, most people learn about adapting to audiences, about collaborating, about exploring a topic and about communicator responsibility primarily through spoken interaction. Composition instruction can guide student writers in extrapolating that knowledge from the realm of orality to the realm of academic writing. Such instruction is grounded in a concern for integrating speaking and writing; it is not obsessed with preventing interference of speech with writing.

ORAL-BASED CULTURE AND ORALITY IN ESL WRITING

Among L1 English speakers, then, orality is an element of mature writing style. Educators understand how to capitalize on L1

students' oral competencies in instruction leading to academic writing skills. This integrative approach harbors promise for working with students for whom L1 is a language other than English and for whom R1 is a rhetoric other than Western literacy-based academic exposition.

Problems with the Concept of "Oral Culture"

Since considerable controversy attends the construct *oral culture*, one must exercise caution in using that construct to categorize some subset of speakers or writers. In what Bizzell (1988) calls the "Great Cognitive Divide theory," similar to what Street (1984) characterizes as the "autonomous model of literacy," orality becomes associated with certain modes of thought: concrete rather than abstract, situation-bound rather than inferential, holistic rather than analytical (see Ong, 1982; see also Gee, 1986 for a useful review of seminal writings on oral culture). The emerging consensus holds, however, that it is not literacy or orality *per se* that govern modes of thought, but rather the critical factor is the way cultures *use* literacy or orality for epistemic purposes (Allen & Rubin, in press).

Further complicating the notion of oral culture is scholarship that sometimes glosses across orality as a trait of (1) communication process, of (2) individuals or of (3) cultures. Generalizations that may hold about the *process* of engaging in speech as opposed to engaging in writing (e.g., the process of writing is more apt to function as a cognitive facilitator) do not necessarily hold for contrasts between highly literate as opposed to less literate *individuals* (e.g., highly literate individuals have greater metalinguistic awareness). And none of these generalizations necessarily extend to comparisons between literate as opposed to oral *cultures*. One cannot readily predict the cognitive status, for example, of a highly literate individual who happens to be a member of a largely oral culture, engaging in oral communication.

It is also problematic to consider the parameters that might reasonably set apart an oral from a literate culture. If an oral culture is one in which no one engages in literate behaviors, then it is virtually a null set as we approach the 21st century. Because of the shifting relationship between orality and literacy (i.e., writing-like speech and speech-like writing), some scholars have simply abandoned the concept of oral culture as inherently misleading (e.g., Tannen, 1985).

The Concept of "Oral-Based Culture"

Still, consistent with the notion of contrastive rhetorics -- i.e., the principle that cultures embody characteristic ways of meaning and expressing and interpreting -- there remains considerable utility to the concept of oral-based culture. (We use the term "oral-based culture" to distance ourselves at least partially from the oversimplification inherent in "oral culture.") We want to claim, for example, that a person who writes conforming to an oral-based rhetoric presupposes a certain intimacy, a commonality of purpose and background with the reader, a relationship of solidarity and good will.

Viewed in this light, the distinction between oral-based and literacy-based cultures bears some similarity to Hall's (1976) well known distinction between high-context and low-context cultures. In a high-context culture, as in an oral-based culture, much shared meaning is presumed. In such cultures, spare or loosely organized texts are therefore adequate for conveying "new" information to listeners or readers. Hall, in fact, characterizes Chinese literacy as high-context: the meaning of a particular orthographic character is not easily inferred unless one is privy to shared prior knowledge about the history and associations of symbols in Chinese culture.

One effect of oral-based (or high-context) presuppositions is that the onus for intelligibility shifts a bit from the writer to the reader. As Zellermeyer (1988) observes with respect to fictive prose composed in Hebrew, the oral-based text may be perceived as "inconsiderate" by someone who is socialized into rhetorical norms that demand explicitness and clarity. In oral-based rhetorics, the reader is a cooperative reader, an effort-expending seeker of meaning rather than just a passive receiver of meaning (see also Hinds, 1987). Besides, if the reader is regarded as sharing a common world view with the writer, it can then be an affront to spell out that which is mutually understood.

Oral-Based Rhetoric in ESL Students' Writing

In reflecting on their composing processes in the L1/R1 as opposed to writing English exposition, some ESL learners are aware of this oral-based element in their native writing styles. A Spanish student writes,

> In spanish the writing process doesn't takes place in an orderly way. Even thought we have learned, rather been taught, that we should have an Introduction, body and conclusion in our essays, most of spanish speaking people don't do it. We go from one tought to the other and back. If we remember we forget something important. that's the way it works and people is used to understand a "messy" essay ... However, english papers make sense when written, read and comprehended with an english mind. English readers have an easier time when they read. whether it is a letter, a book of horror stories or a text book, the english writer makes life easier for the english reader.

One rather specific outcome of writing in a culture in which readers expect and tolerate a greater decoding burden is that discourse structures intended to guide the reader's processing, known as "metadiscourse" (Crismore & Hill, 1988), simply don't exist. A good many of our Japanese students, for example, tell us, as one student has said, that "Japanese don't have a first paragraph to tell what I going to write." Or,

> Japanese writing style has no conclusion. And normal essay has only one paragraph ... Also, Japanese writing permits to ignor grammar ... Another different point is a Japanese writing has no style except poem, and polite letter.

Of course this Japanese student is quite mistaken in most of these assertions about Japanese writing. In fact, the paradigmatic macrostructure known as *ki-shoo-ten-ketsu* is well documented in Japanese exposition (Hinds, 1987). The point is that relative to North American norms for exposition, Japanese writing appears, even to this native Japanese writer, to be highly unstructured, lacking especially metadiscursive elements to guide the reader.

Another characteristic of oral-based rhetorics is their reliance on formulaic themes and expressions. Because literacy-based rhetorics place a premium on innovative expression, lack of redundancy and novel insight, Western academic prose avoids cliche and "tired, hackneyed" themes. Oral-based cultures, in contrast, encourage frequent use of traditional formulae; they are a way of celebrating and reproducing group identity (see, for example, Albert, 1972) with no surprises, no sneak attacks. Some students see their R1 discourse, accordingly, as more "sentimental" or "romantic." A Nigerian student describes some rules for using formulae in his oral-based culture:

> In addition, we don't have vocabularies in Ibo, but we use proverbs in replacement of vocabularies. We use also idioms without idioms in your writing in ibo, your sentences might not be superior. furthermore, we use short stories in making an explanation of most of the things, which readers may be confused when reading. For example if you want to explain that a person was confused when he had two goodlucks at a time, you can put the story with another objects like saying that. "once upon a time crab was told that his trap cought a mighty animal, on his way to the bush to get this animal his brother met him on the way and told him that his wife had given birth to a baby boy. In this situation he was confused and dont know the one to go first. Then he was going front and back, that made crabs to have two heads.

Along with the lack of reader-based organizational cues and a preference for traditional themes and formulae, oral-based rhetorics favor what Cicero would have called "the grand style." High diction sometimes takes precedence over substance; redundant ideas are acceptable if they are a vehicle for euphonic words. Arabic-influenced styles, for instance, are profoundly tied to an oral-based rhetoric (Ostler, 1987) with a good many genres in Arabic culture exhibiting this sort of emphasis on voluptuous vocabulary and form. A handbook for introducing American business executives to Arabic cultures (Almany & Alwan, 1982) asserts,

> The language of literary Arabic is one in which the form seems to count far more that the substance. That is, the writer appears to concern himself more with the impact on his reader of word arrangement and sounds than with the meaning such words are intended to communicate. As long as he pays attention to the grammatical and idiomatic aspects of his writing, a successful Arab writer has only to make it diffusely comprehensible: his duty does not extend as far as making his meaning clear-cut and unequivocal. (pp. 81-82)

While this handbook characterization of Arabic-influenced writing is likely too extreme, many ESL composition instructors will regard as fairly typical the florid diction but generally vacuous content in this sample from a Saudi Arabian student:

> The occurrence of crime is different from state to state according to the culture, laws, and punishment. The percentage of it is depend upon the severity or lenity of

> punishment. Because of the severe punishment in Saudi Arabia, the percentage of crime is reduced ... The main purpose of the severe punishment is to punish the society. Whenever the punishment is awesome, the percentage of crime is diminished. This rule conduced to the reduction of crime ...

In a like vein, a Nigerian student seems to push the limits of credulity in his journal entry, even as he displays surprisingly intense language:

> I personally think that a research paper is one of the most interesting process of learning despite the fact that it seems a little difficult it enables a student to learn sagaciously. Similarly, I am filling ecstatic because it will be my first time of pressing my index finger on the key of a computer in research of one thing or another.

Flowery diction, formulaic themes and expressions, and lack of organizational cues are just three among several stylistic elements deriving from oral-based R1s. These, along with other features of oral-based rhetoric, fit well into the continua Purves & Purves (1986) enumerate for classifying cross-cultural differences in students' writing style: (1) personal-impersonal; (2) ornamented-plain; (3) abstract-concrete; (4) single-multiple aspects of topic; (5) prepositional-appositional connectives; (6) characterizing-narrating-dramatizing; and (7) message focused-reader focused. Using these dimensions, oral-based writing in both L1 and L2 can be characterized as personal, ornamented, concrete, multiple thematic, appositionally connected, narrating or dramatizing, and most likely message-centered (i.e., inconsiderate).

The impact of these R1 rhetorical patterns is not always so evident, however. Just as L1 English speakers often hypercorrect when overcompensating for differences between speech and writing, so is it common to find ESL writers producing the most voiceless, the most bland of compositions. A student from Oceania displays this type of hypercorrect vapidness:

> Learning to speak a foreign language is not an easy task for anyone. However, children do have a distinct advantage over adults. One advantage is that children have not yet established a certain style of speaking which makes it easier for them to learn another language...Adults have established a certain style of speaking unlike children, who don't have a

> particular style. This makes it harder for adults to change the way they speak, but children on the other hand can easily speak or "imitate" how others speak around them.

This notion of hypercorrection as stifling voice is consistent with Connor & McCagg (1987) who found little evidence of L1/R1 interference in ESL students' written paraphrases. Instead, those paraphrases were far more constrained by the structure of the stimulus texts, far more reproductive than was the case for L1 English writers.

LEARNING TO INTEGRATE ORAL-BASED DISCOURSE STRATEGIES IN ESL WRITING

Effective L1/R1 writers of English, we have claimed, learn to capitalize on elements of conversationality in their writing. For them, speaking and writing reconverge in certain respects (Rubin, 1987). By the same token, L2 writers of English who are most comfortable with oral-based R1s need not jettison their oral-based strategies altogether. To do so, indeed, would risk hypercorrect or at best voiceless prose. Instead, ESL writers can learn to exploit their oral-based strategies and integrate them into R2 writing.

Mangelsdorf (1989), for example, decries the separation of speaking and writing in ESL instruction and suggests a variety of classroom activities that combine oral and written production in some manner. In general, structured oral communication activities can contribute to writing in three ways (Rubin, 1987; Rubin & Dodd, 1987). First, speech can *accompany* writing, as in pre-writing discussion or peer writing conferences. Speech can also be an *adjunct* to composing processes, actually taking the place of behaviors usually enacted in writing. Such is the case when writers dictate their drafts or read their drafts aloud in order to detect errors. Finally, structured oral activities can function as *cognitive calisthenics* to increase writers' flexibility of expression. When learners are asked to take the roles of varying participants in some rhetorical transaction, they learn to incorporate more social contextual sensitivity into their writing.

But beyond deliberately structured classroom manipulations, ESL writers can simply be encouraged to become aware of their R1 oral-based strategies. Instead of suppressing them, they can experiment with them in their L2/R2 writing. In the terminology of currently ascendent pedagogical ideology, they can be empowered to use elements of their own authentic voices in their writing (see, for

example, Johnson, 1989). In more traditional terms, ESL writers can learn to incorporate oral-based stylistic elements -- metaphor and narrative as proof, direct second-person address, certain uses of redundancy, oratorical cadences, and so on -- that can enhance the effectiveness of their writing.

REFERENCES

Albert, E. (1972). Culture patterning of speech behavior in Burundi. In J.J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 72-105). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Allen, J.B. & Rubin, D.L. (in press). Cross-cultural factors affecting initial acquisition of literacy among children and adults. In S. Yussen & M.C. Smith (Eds.), *Reading across the life span*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Almany, A. J. & Alwan, A. J. (1982). *Communicating with the Arabs*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Asante, M.K. (1990). The tradition of advocacy in the Yoruba courts. *Southern Communication Journal, 55*, 250-259.

Barnitz, J.G. (1986). Toward understanding the effects of cross-cultural schemata and discourse structure on second language reading comprehension. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 18*, 95-116.

Bizzell, P. (1988). Arguing about literacy. *College English, 50*, 141-153.

Collins, J.L. & Williamson, M. (1981). Spoken language and semantic abbreviation in writing. *Research in the Teaching of English, 14*, 23-35.

Connor, U. & McCagg, P. (1987). A contrastive study of English expository prose paraphrases. In U. Connor & R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 texts* (pp. 73-86). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Cook-Gumperz, J. & Gumperz, J.J. (1981). From oral to written culture: The transition to literacy. In M. Farr Whiteman (Ed.), *Variation in writing: Functional and linguistic-cultural differences* (pp. 89-110). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Crismore, A. & Hill, K.T. (1988). The interaction of metadiscourse and anxiety in determining children's learning of social studies textbook materials. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 30*, 249-260.

Edelsky, C. (1982). Writing in a bilingual program: The relation of L1 and L2 texts. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*, 211-228.

Farr, M. & Janda, M.A. (1985). Basic writing students: Investigating oral and written language. *Research in the Teaching of English, 19*, 62-83.

Farr Whiteman, M. (1981). Dialect influence in writing. In M. Farr Whiteman (Ed.), *Variation in writing* (153-166). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Friere, P. (1970). Adult literacy process as cultural action for freedom. *Harvard Education Review, 40*, 205-225.

Garcia, R.L. (1975). A linguistic frame of reference for critiquing Chicano compositions. *College English, 37*, 184-188.

Gee, J.P. (1986). Orality and literacy: From the savage mind to ways with words. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*, 719-746.

Hall, E.T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. New York: Anchor Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1987). Spoken and written modes of meaning. In R. Horowitz & S.J. Samuels (Eds.), *Comprehending oral and written language* (pp. 55-82). San Diego: Academic Press.

Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor & R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 texts* (pp. 141-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Irvine, P. and Elsasser, N. (1988). The ecology of literacy: Negotiation of writing standards in a Caribbean setting. In B. Rafoth & D. Rubin (Eds.), *The social construction of written communication* (pp. 304-320). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Johnson, D.M. (1989). Enriching task contexts for second language writing: Power through interpersonal roles. In D.M. Johnson & D. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 39-54). New York: Longman.

Kantor, K.J. & Rubin, D.L. (1981). Between speaking and writing: Processes of differentiation. In B. Kroll & R. Vann (Eds.), *Exploring speaking-writing relationships: Connections and contrasts* (pp. 55-81). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teaching of English.

Kaplan, R.B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning, 14*, 1-20.

Kaplan, R.B. (1988). Contrastive rhetoric and second language learning: Notes toward a theory of contrastive rhetoric. In A. Purves (Ed.), *Writing across languages and cultures* (Written Communication Annual, Vol. 2). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Kintsch, W. & Greene, E. (1978). The role of culture-specific schemata in the comprehension and recall of stories. *Discourse Processes, 1*, 1-13.

Kroll, B.M. (1981). Developmental relations between speaking and writing. In B. Kroll & R. Vann (Eds.), *Exploring speaking-writing relationships: Connections and contrasts* (pp. 32- 54). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Lay, N.D. (1975). Chinese language interference in written English. *Journal of Basic Writing, 1*, 50-61.

Linn, M. (1975). Black rhetorical patterns and the teaching of composition. *CCC, 26*, 149-153.

Mangelsdorf, K. (1989). Parallels between speaking and writing in second language acquisition. In D. Johnson & D. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 134-145). New York: Longman.

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

Matsuyama, U.K. (1983). Can story grammar speak Japanese? *The Reading Teacher, 36*, 666-669.

Oliver, R.T. (1969). The rhetorical tradition in China. *Today's Speech, 17*, 1, 3-8.

Olson, D.R. (1977). From utterance to text: The bias of language in speech and writing. *Harvard Educational Review, 47*, 257- 281.

Ong, W. (1982). *Orality and literacy*. London: Methuen.

Ostler, S.E. (1987). English in parallels: A comparison of English and Arabic prose. In U. Connor & R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 texts* (pp. 169-185). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ponsot, M. & Deen, R. (1982). *Beat not the poor desk.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Purves, A. C. & Purves, W. C. (1986). Viewpoints: Cultures, text models, and the activity of writing. *Research in the Teaching of English, 20,* 174-197.

Rafoth, B.A. (1987). Speaking and writing: Building connections for effective composition instruction. *Journal of Educational Opportunity, 2,* 25-30.

Raimes, A. (1988). Language proficiency, writing ability, and composing strategies: A study of ESL college student writers. *Language Learning, 37,* 439-467.

Rubin, D.L. (1987). Divergence and convergence between oral and written communication. *Topics in Language Disorders, 7,* 4, 1-18.

Rubin, D.L. (1984). The influence of communicative context on stylistic variation in writing. In A.D. Pellegrini & T. Yawkey (Eds.), *The development of oral and written language in social contexts* (pp. 213-232). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Rubin, D.L. & Dodd, W.M. (1987). *Talking into writing: Speech exercises for basic writers.* Urbana, IL: ERIC/RCS and National Council of Teachers of English.

Rubin, D.L. & Rafoth, B.A. (1986). Oral language criteria for selecting listenable materials. *Reading Psychology, 7,* 137-152.

Schafer, J. (1981). Coupling as text-building, myth evoking strategy in Vietnamese: Implications for second language reading. In S. Huddelson (Ed.), *Learning to read in different languages* (pp. 115-126). Washington, DC: CAL.

Schultz, J. (1982). *Writing from start to finish.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. (1981). *Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Scribner, S. & Cole, M. (1973). Cognitive consequences of formal and informal education. *Science, 182,* 553-559.

Shaughnessy, M. (1977). *Errors and expectations.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Street, B.V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, D. (1982). The oral/literate continuum of discourse. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Spoken and written language* (pp. 1-16). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Tannen, D. (1985). Relative focus of involvement in oral and written discourse. In D. Olson, N. Torrance & A. Hildyard (Eds.), *Literacy, language and learning* (pp. 124-148). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Toelken, B. (1969). The pretty language of Yellowman: Genre, mode and texture in Navaho coyote narratives. *Genre, 2,* 211-235.

Wolfram, W. & Whiteman, M.F. (1971). The role of dialect interference in composition. *Florida FL Reporter, 9 (1,2),* 34-38, 59.

Zellermeyer, M. (1988). An analysis of oral and literate texts: Two types of reader-writer relationships in Hebrew and English. In B. Rafoth & D. Rubin (Eds.), *The social construction of written communication* (pp. 287-303). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Don Rubin is an associate professor in the Departments of Language Education and Speech Communication at The University of Georgia where his research and teaching focus on relations between oral and written communication, social cognition and communication, and cross-cultural communication.

Rosemarie Goodrum, an ESL instructor in the American Language Program at The University of Georgia, has also worked in the field of Adult Basic Education for limited English proficiency individuals.

Barbara Hall, an assistant professor in the English Department at DeKalb College, Georgia, specializes in teaching composition to ESL students. She has also developed literacy programs for bilingual and refugee groups.

(Received March 2, 1990)