THE LINGUISTIC, SOCIAL AND COGNITIVE DIMENSIONS OF A JAPANESE FESTSCHRIFT

Ian H. G. Ying*
University of Colorado at Denver

This paper examines the linguistic, social, and cognitive dimensions of a Japanese Festschrift in honor of Toshio Nakao (Chiba, et al., 1994). The linguistic features of the festschrift include a delayed introduction of the honoree, a description of the honoree's human impact on his students, descriptions of students' wonder at a time of political turmoil, examples showing the honoree working late to answer his students' questions, the honoree's wife's remark, expressions such as "our failures" and "inadequacy", and the use of the honoree's full name and titles like "professor" or "teacher". The linguistic features find socio-cultural explanations in Confucian thoughts on hierarchical relationships, *ren* (kindness, humanity), the virtues of showing students through the door, passing on knowledge and being a model for people to follow; and the virtue of modesty and humility. In addition, the paper reports on a survey on the cognitive effort involved in the understanding of the text. The results indicate that contrary to McCagg (1996), a Japanese text is not necessarily cognitively more demanding for English readers than for Japanese readers.

INTRODUCTION

Previous genre-specific, cross-linguistic studies have looked at arguments (e.g., Connor & Lauer 1985), business writing (e.g., Kong, 1998; Yli-Jokipii, 1998), promotion letters (e.g., Bhatia, 1993), recommendation letters (Bouton, 1995; Precht, 1998), editorials (e.g., Lux & Grabe, 1991), grant proposals (e.g., Myers, 1985; Connor & Mauranen, 1999), texts such as the wedding invitation and the obituary (Jones, 1997), narratives (e.g., Ying, 1997), political writing (Bolivar, 1992), résumés (e.g., Connor, 1996), and research articles (e.g., Swales, 1990; Taylor & Chen, 1991), including the use of imperatives in research articles (Swales et al., 1998), the structure of introductions to articles in the field of psychology (Golebiowski, 1998), and the use of passive voice in scientific prose (Espinoza, 1997). None, to my knowledge, has examined texts in the festschrift discourse, namely, essays written by different authors as a tribute to a distinguished scholar. This paper intends to bridge the gap.

The paper examines a Japanese festschrift in honor of Toshio Nakao (Chiba, et al., 1994), a well-known Japanese scholar. Two criteria were used in selecting a Japanese text. First, the examination of a Japanese festschrift requires that the festschrift be written by Japanese writers. Second, to best understand the social and cognitive dimensions of a Japanese text in cross-linguistic communication, the text should be written in a language other than Japanese. The analyzed festschrift satisfies both criteria. It was written by eleven Japanese writers and published in English by the Liber Press in Japan. (For copyright reasons, the original text is not attached.)

In the years since Hinds (1980) published his work on Japanese written discourse, studies of Japanese texts have attracted a great deal of attention. In his 1987 article, Hinds argues that Japanese written discourse is characteristically reader-responsible in the sense that readers are expected to make inferential bridges between propositions, to fill information and transitions, and to deduce meaning from a text. In other words, Japanese message receivers are more responsible for completion of intended communication than are Japanese message producers. In 1990, Hinds introduced the notion of *quasi inductive* to characterize Japanese and other oriental

languages such as Chinese, Korean and Thai. *Quasi-inductive* refers to a writing style which cannot be classified as either deductive or inductive. It refers to a style which involves "delayed introduction of purpose", often with the thesis statement buried in the passage. This quasi-inductive style is related to his argument that Japanese is a reader-responsible language. Readers are expected "to think for themselves, to consider the observations made, and to draw their own conclusions" (Hinds, 1990, p. 99). Recent studies in support of Hinds' assertions include Kubota's (1992) dissertation, which compared expository and persuasive essays of both American and Japanese students in their first languages and found that while native speakers of English tend to use a deductive style, Japanese students indeed prefer to organize the essays inductively, placing the main idea at the end of paragraphs. Tucker (1991), who cited Christopher (1983), noted that the lead in the Japanese news story may be buried well into the article. Similar results were also reported by Maynard (1996), who found that Japanese newspaper columns tend to present opinions toward the end of the text. Kobayashi and Rinnert (1996) characterize the Japanese rhetorical pattern as inductive in that it contains specific points leading to a more general point.

However, McCagg (1996) questioned the validity of Hinds' (1987) assertion that Japanese is a reader-responsible language. After reanalyzing the Japanese and English versions of the newspaper columns used by Hinds (1987), McCagg (1996) argues that "as long as writer and reader share the same set of cultural beliefs, life experiences, as well as similar conceptual and linguistic abilities, comprehension of Japanese messages in general does not require greater cognitive effort on the part of the reader than understanding of English messages does" (p. 237). Kubota (1997) argues that an inductive Japanese style applies only to certain texts in a particular genre and that the entire Japanese written discourse may not share such characterizations (p. 473).

There are several problems with previous studies on Japanese writing. First, the conclusion that Japanese prefers an inductive style is based mostly on examinations of expository writing such as newspaper columns (e.g., Hinds, 1983, 1984, 1987, 1990; Tucker, 1991; Maynard, 1996; McCagg, 1996). Whether such preferences can be generalized to other genres of writing remains unanswered. Second, criticisms of Hinds' arguments appear to be rather vague. Kubota (1997), for example, did not specify *what* texts appear to follow an inductive style, although she argued that only "certain texts in a particular genre" (p. 473) have such characterization. Third, most studies are characteristically descriptive in the sense that they do not provide an explanatory account of why Japanese expository writing prefers an inductive style. In other words, they do not provide "reasons for culture-specific writing styles" (Connor, 1996, p. 100). In an attempt to make new contributions to the genre-specific cross-linguistic study of Japanese texts, this paper examines a Japanese festschrift to explore the linguistic, social and cognitive dimensions of the text.

The theoretical underpinning for examining the linguistic and social dimensions of the text is Fairclough's (1995) "textual analysis", which subsumes two complementary types of analysis: linguistic analysis and intertextual analysis (p. 188). While "linguistic analysis" involves "linguistic systems", including "textual organization", "intertextual analysis" encompasses "orders of discourse", i.e., the particular configurations of conventionalized practices (narratives, for example) in a particular social context. The inclusion of the cognitive dimension of the text adds a fresh perspective to the literature on "textual analysis" (e.g., Ying, 1997), purporting to discuss McCagg's (1996) argument and to address a long-standing issue in

cross-linguistic communication, that of English readers finding it difficult to comprehend an oriental text because of its supposedly incoherent linguistic structure (Matalene, 1985).

LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF THE JAPANESE FESTSCHRIFT

The Japanese festschrift has the following distinctive linguistic features:

1. It exhibits a delayed introduction of the topic, namely, the honoree. In fact, the honoree Toshio Nakao was not introduced until the middle of the second paragraph. The first paragraph describes a time of dramatic upheaval in the late 1960s, with "ideology-ridden factions", "more and more vehement discussions", and everyone being "as fervent as everyone else".
2. It describes students' wonder at a time of political turmoil. "We found ourselves plunged into the powerful vortex of the age" (Paragraph 2) and "we began to wonder when or if we could ever stop it". (Paragraph 2)
3. It focuses on the honoree's human impact on his students, showing his great care, and providing examples of his personal connection with them. "I understand that your father hasn't been well. Do you think you can work your way through college"? (Paragraph 2) He even invited his students to his home for dinner, with his wife giving "delicious substance to these kind words" (Paragraph 2).
4. It gives examples showing the honoree working late to answer his students' questions: "When he finished answering them, it was usually well after dark". (Paragraph 3) Furthermore, he would "keep on talking into the night, one question eliciting another, an answer expanding into a book-length talk, covering syntax and semantics, not to mention phonology and its history" (Paragraph 3).
5. It includes the remarks of the honoree's wife, quoting her as saying that the honoree "gave every spare moment to his studies, not so much as caring to change his clothes at night or in the morning" (Paragraph 5).
6. It uses expressions such as "our failures" and "inadequacy" (Paragraph 10), illustrating the necessity of the honoree's further enlightenment on his students: "Our failures may yet persuade him to enlighten us further" (Paragraph 10).
7. It uses the honoree's full name (Toshio Nakao) eight times throughout the festschrift. It addresses the honoree using titles such as "Professor Nakao" (Paragraph 4) and "our teacher" (Paragraph 10).

SOCIO-CULTURAL EXPLANATIONS

The distinctive linguistic features of the Japanese festschrift find socio-cultural explanations in Confucian thoughts. It has been noted that the most profound influence in Japan has been Confucianism (Reischauer, 1988). The delayed introduction of the topic finds an explanation in hierarchical Confucian relationships, which stress the importance of attending to *Li*, the rules of propriety (Fung, 1983). This Confucian code of *Li* lays down a set of appropriate rules for human interaction. These rules include a strictly structured social hierarchy in which rulers have to have power over subjects, fathers have to have power over sons, and husbands have to have power over wives (Knapp, 1992). The carry-over from *Li* means that human behavior, verbal or written, needs to observe the rules of propriety. In Japanese culture, as in

most Asian cultures, the teacher is in a higher position, and the student is in a lower position. A person in a higher position has the right to introduce the topic (Scollon & Scollon, 1995). In other words, it is inappropriate for students, persons in a lower position, to introduce a topic at the onset. Hence the necessity of setting the scene of a time of turmoil and describing students' wonder and confusion prior to introducing the honoree.

Arguably, the description of political turmoil also reflects the Confucian thought on human beings' place in society. For Confucius, human beings always exist in a polity. In this political context of differentiation according to one's position in a hierarchy, one should be responsible and be a responsive participant (Tu, 1979). Hence, the necessity of a description of a political turmoil at the onset and of the honoree as a responsible and responsive participant in the ensuing paragraph.

Confucius' emphasis on hierarchical relationships accounts for the use of the honoree's full name and titles such as "Professor Nakao" and "our teachers". Japanese students are not supposed to address their teachers using their first names. A teacher is always called *sensei*, 'teacher', because in a "vertical" society like Japan (Nakane, 1970), terms of address are used to index status differences. Thus, persons in lower positions need to show deference to people in higher positions. The use of first names breaches such vertical/hierarchical relationships and is contrary to Japanese culture, which fosters differentiation of status differences (D. Matsumoto, 1996). Hence it is important for the students to use titles to address their teacher--the honoree.

Confucian thought on *ren* (kindness, humanity) provides an explanation for the description of the honoree's human impact on his students in the second paragraph. *Ren* is a concept of personal morality in classical Confucianism (Tu, 1979). The achievement of *ren* lies chiefly in the social and moral process of becoming human. Intrinsic in the process of learning to be human is moral self cultivation, which can be achieved by giving expressions to human sentiments and through engagement with others. Hence the use of the honoree's "kind words" showing concern about the physical condition of a student's father (Paragraph 2) and the illustration of a close relationship with his students at dinner table (Paragraph 2).

The description of the students' wonder and the honoree's great care for them through his conversations, his working late to answer the students' questions, and his wife's remark showing that he is a dedicated scholar all illustrate important Confucian thoughts on the virtues of a good teacher--the virtues of showing the students through the door, passing on knowledge, and being a model for people to follow (Rao, 1996). The use of sincere and benevolent language is a good way of showing the student through the door. As Confucius put it, "From the accuracy or inaccuracy of a man's speech his obliquity or uprightness may be gauged" (Soothhill, 1968, p. 932). Mirroring the Confucian virtue of sincerity and benevolence (Huffman, 1998), the Japanese text includes the honoree's remarks such as "Looks like you got jilted. Can't be helped, I'm afraid. Time's the best doctor when it comes to lost love" (Paragraph 2). These caring remarks showed the students through the 'door' at a time of wonder and confusion. Because it is also the duty of a good teacher to pass his knowledge on to his students, the Japanese festschrift shows the honoree as the person who kept on talking into the night, addressing students' questions and helping them with their problems. Furthermore, a teacher should serve as a good model for students. Thus, the Japanese text describes the honoree as "an awe-inspiring hard-worker" (Paragraph 4), devoting his every spare moment to his studies. "[T]he result is a stream of impressive books" (Paragraph 5).

The use of expressions such as "our failures" and "inadequacy" illustrates the Confucian thought on the virtue of modesty and humility (Stapleton, 1997). Confucius praises those who

express themselves with humility, because he believes that if one remains humble, one is not satisfied, and to be dissatisfied with oneself is the best incentive to achieve higher levels of virtue (Chang, 1997). Concepts related to individual humility are extremely important in Japan (D. Matsumoto 1996). To feel a sense of inadequacy is a virtue that the Japanese are supposed to have. This is especially the case when the editors of the festschrift were the honoree's former students. Thus, the use of "our failures" and "inadequacy" mirrors the roles and expectations of the members of the Japanese academic discourse community.

Another possible explanation is that since Japan is often considered a shame culture, which has the characteristic of a high degree of consciousness of the standards imposed by others (Pelzel, 1986), the editors of the Japanese festschrift were very sensitive to whether they had done an adequate job in the judgment of others. This is especially the case when the person they were honoring was their professor. The sense of inadequacy means losing face in relation to the perception by others (Y. Matsumoto, 1988). Thus, the use of "our failures" and "inadequacy" indexes the social threat of shame or losing face.

DETERMINING THE COGNITIVE EFFORT IN UNDERSTANDING THE TEXT

In the introduction of this paper, I reviewed McCagg's (1996, p. 239) argument on writer and reader responsibilities for understanding a Japanese text. He contends that "as long as writer and reader share the same set of cultural beliefs, life experiences, as well as similar conceptual and linguistic abilities, comprehension of Japanese messages in general does not require greater cognitive effort on the part of the reader than understanding of English messages does". It is not difficult to infer from his argument that if the writer and the reader do not share the same set of cultural beliefs, life experiences, as well as similar conceptual and linguistic abilities, then comprehension of Japanese messages in general requires greater cognitive effort on the part of the English reader than the Japanese reader. To find out whether understanding the Japanese festschrift is cognitively more demanding for English readers than for Japanese readers, I conducted the following study.

Participants

Twenty American students and twenty Japanese students participated in the study. The American participants were junior (8) and senior (12) undergraduate students. The Japanese participants were junior (7) and senior (13) undergraduate students studying at a US university. Participants had no formal training in linguistics, nor were they aware of the purpose of this study.

Material and Design

The material used for the study was the Japanese festschrift. The design follows Hinds' (1983) evaluation questionnaire format. Hinds' evaluation questionnaire format included the 'unity' (logical development and flow of thought), 'focus' (staying on the topic without wandering) and 'coherence' (sticking together of major part of writing) of the English version of the Japanese newspaper columns. Undoubtedly, these are important concepts for evaluating a text, but the concepts of 'clarity' (clearness as to understanding) and 'relevance' (pertinence to

the topic under discussion) are also important textual dimensions that would affect the cognitive effort in understanding of a text. Hence my evaluation questionnaire includes these two concepts as well. Table 1 illustrates the expanded evaluation format presented to the participants.

Table 1. An Expanded Evaluation Questionnaire Format (Based on Hinds, 1983)

		poor----------> excellent				
1. Unity:	logical development and flow of thought	1	2	3	4	5
2. Focus:	staying on the topic without wandering	1	2	3	4	5
3. Coherence	'sticking together' of major part of writing	1	2	3	4	5
4. Relevance	pertinence to the topic under discussion	1	2	3	4	5
5. Clarity	clearness as to topic understanding	1	2	3	4	5

I asked the participants in both L1 language groups to evaluate the organizational properties of the Japanese text along five dimensions. They were asked to evaluate each dimension on a scale of one to five--1 being poor, 5 being excellent.

Hypothesis

My hypothesis was that if McCagg was right, the English participants would find the Japanese text to be more difficult to comprehend, and their ratings of the text would therefore be lower than those of the Japanese participants. In other words, the English participants would give a lower evaluation score of the text than the Japanese participants in at least three of the five dimensions.

Procedure

At the beginning of the survey, the participants were asked to report their major and class standing, which appeared at the top of the evaluation sheet. The procedure ensured that the results did not include those who majored in linguistics. None of the Japanese participants surveyed majored in linguistics. This procedure also ensured that in their evaluation of the Japanese festschrift, the participants would not be biased in favor of or against either text due to their background knowledge.

The participants were then instructed in writing to read a text honoring a well-known scholar and to evaluate the text along the five dimensions on the evaluation sheet. They were asked to read the festschrift, but they were not told that the text was written in English by Japanese writers to honor a well-known Japanese linguist. The meaning of the word 'festschrift' was explained in writing on the chalkboard, as it appears in the text. To ensure that the participants understood the meanings of the five concepts (unity, focus, coherence, relevance and clarity) used in the survey, they were instructed to go over the concepts and their definitions on the evaluation sheet presented in Table 1. They were told to raise their hand if they did not understand the concepts and their meanings, but none of them did. They were also reminded of the meaning of the five scales, although they were clearly indicated on the evaluation sheet. In other words, the students were told explicitly that 1 means 'poor' and 5 means 'excellent'. The

participants were given no time limit for reading and evaluating the text. After the evaluation, both the text and the evaluation sheets were collected.

Results

Table 2 shows the English and Japanese readers' evaluation of the Japanese text. With regard to the 'coherence' 'relevance' and 'clarity' of the Japanese text, the English participants scored higher than the Japanese participants. The Japanese participants, on the other hand, scored higher than the English participants with respect to the 'unity' and 'focus' of the Japanese festschrift.

Table 2. Readers' Evaluation of the Text

	English (n = 20) Mean (s.d.)	Japanese (n =20) Mean (s.d.)
Unity	3.5 (0.7)	3.7 (0.5)
Focus	3.2 (0.9)	3.5 (0.8)
Coherence	3.3 (0.8)	3.1 (1.1)
Relevance	3.7 (0.9)	3.5 (0.8)
Clarity	3.6 (0.6)	3.3 (0.9)

DISCUSSION

The results show that in interpreting the Japanese text, the English participants found the Japanese text to be 'clearer', more 'coherent' and more 'relevant' than the Japanese participants (Table 2). The findings did not support my hypothesis, namely, they do not support McCagg's (1996) argument that if the writer and reader do not share the same set of cultural beliefs, life experiences, as well as similar conceptual and linguistic abilities, comprehension of Japanese messages in general requires greater cognitive effort on the part of the English reader than the Japanese reader. Nor do the results support the long-standing contention that English readers find it difficult to comprehend an oriental text because of its incoherent linguistic structure (Matalene, 1985). In fact, the English readers found the Japanese text more 'coherent' than did the Japanese readers.

One reason for the findings is that understanding of the stories in the Japanese text is something that both the English and Japanese readers could relate to in terms of their physical experience in the academic world. It was part of their cognitive environment, consisting of not only what they were aware of, but, more importantly, all the facts that they were capable of becoming aware of (Sperber and Wilson, 1995). In other words, the stories in the Japanese text are a narrative structure that represents what Kintsch (1998) calls "the common format for all forms of mental representation" (p. 33). Thus, demands on processing effort do not necessarily depend on the writer and reader having "the same set of cultural beliefs, life experiences, as well as similar conceptual and linguistic and abilities" (McCagg, 1996, p. 239). In fact, few of us can claim that we share such characteristics. This is even true of a relatively homogeneous community like the mainstream American middle-class. A cursory look at social variables such as age and gender of this speech community will point to a different picture (e.g., Tannen, 1990; Freeman and McElhinny, 1996).

The questionnaire used in this study only gives descriptors for the end points of the scale (poor and excellent). The participants were assumed to understand what the midpoints represent. Although it is unlikely that this contributed to the result that ratings converge towards the

midpoint, it would be interesting to find out whether the result can be replicated when descriptors are given for the midpoints as well.

The paper does not address how L1 Japanese speakers will respond to texts with underlying North American discourse patterns. It would be interesting to find out how L1 Japanese speakers will interpret an American story similar to the one investigated in this study or other types of academic discourse that follow the Aristotelian tradition.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, I analyzed a Japanese introductory text in a festschrift discourse and pointed out some important linguistic and socio-cultural dimensions of the text. I also discussed the cognitive effort involved in processing the text. This study breaks new ground in examining Japanese written discourse by including, for the first time, the festschrift discourse with a linguistic and a corresponding socio-cultural specificity and precision not found in previous genre-specific cross-linguistic studies of Japanese texts. Furthermore, it provides evidence that understanding the Japanese text is not necessarily cognitively more demanding for English readers than for Japanese readers. This evidence does not support McCagg's (1996) argument that comprehension of Japanese messages in general requires greater cognitive effort on the part of the English reader than on the part of the Japanese reader if the writer and the reader do not share the same set of cultural beliefs, life experiences, as well as similar conceptual and linguistic abilities. Nor does it support the contention that English readers find it more difficult to comprehend an oriental text because of its incoherent linguistic structure. In so doing, the paper provides insights into the nature of language, society and cognition. The Japanese text in the festschrift discourse not only mirrors a socially constituted reality of the insertion of history/society into a text and of this text into history/society (Kristeva, 1980), with festschrifts seen as typical rhetorical engagements within a situated socio-cultural context rather than merely as a text type, but it also demonstrates that in cross-cultural communication, understanding of the Japanese text is not necessarily cognitively more demanding for English readers than for Japanese readers, since stories are "the common format for all forms of mental representation" (Kintsch, 1998, p. 33).

NOTES

*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the AAAL meeting in Stamford, Connecticut in 1998. I would like to thank Doug Adamson, Wendy Ashby, Julian Heather, and the audience at the meeting for their helpful comments.

REFERENCES

Bhatia, V. (1993). *Analyzing genre*. London: Longman.

Bolivar, A. (1992). The analysis of political discourse, with particular references to Venezuelan dialogue. *English for Specific Purposes, 11* (2), 159-176.

Bouton, L. (1995). A cross-cultural analysis of the structure and content of letters of reference. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17*, 211-244.

Chang, H. (1997). Language and words: Communication in the Analects of Confucius. *Journal of Language and Social* Psychology, 16 (2), 107-131.

Chiba, S., et al. (Eds.) (1994). *Synchronic and diachronic approaches to language. A Festschrift for Toshio Nakao on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. Tokyo: Liber Press.

Christopher, R. (1983). *The Japanese mind.* NY: Ballantine.

Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Connor, U. & Lauer, J. (1985). Understanding persuasive writing: Linguistic/rhetorical approach. *Text, 5* (4), 309-326.

Connor, U. & Mauranen, A. (1999). Linguistic analysis of grant proposals: European Union Research Grants. *English for Specific Purposes, 18* (1), 47-62.

Espinoza, A. (1997). Contrastive analysis of the Spanish and English passive voice in scientific prose. *English for Specific Purposes,16* (3), 229-243.

Faircough, Norman. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language.* London: Longman.

Freeman, R. and McElhinny, B. (1996). Language and gender. In S. McKay and N.

Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 218-280). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fung, Y. (1983). *A history of Chinese philosophy* (D. Bodde, Trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Golebiowski, Z. (1998). Rhetorical approaches to scientific writing: An English-Polish contrastive study. *Text, 18* (1), 67-102.

Hinds, J. (1980). Japanese expository prose. *Papers in Linguistics, 13,* 117-158.

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

Hinds, J. (1984). Retention of information using a Japanese style of presentation. *Studies in Linguistics, 8*, 45-69.

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

Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Chinese and Thai. In U. Connor and A. Johns (eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 87-110). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Huffman, J. (1998). *Modern Japan.* NY: Garland.

Jones, A. (1997). *Text, role, and context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A paradigm of cognition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knapp, B. (1992). *Images of Chinese women: A western view.* Troy, NY: The Whiston Publishing Company.

Kobayashi, H. and Rinnert, C. (1996). Factors affecting composition evaluation in an EFL context: Cultural rhetorical pattern and readers' background. *Language Learning, 46* (3), 397-437.

Kong, K. (1998). Are simple business request letters really simple? A comparison of Chinese and English business request letters. *Text, 18* (1), 103-141.

Kristiva, J. (1980). *Desire in language.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Kubota, R. (1992). Contrastive rhetoric of Japanese and English: A critical approach. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto.

Kubota, R. (1997). A reevaluation of the uniqueness of Japanese written discourse. *Written Communication, 14* (4), 460-480.

Lux, P. & Grabe, W. (1991). Multivariate approaches to contrastive rhetoric. *Lenguas Modernas, 18*, 133-160.

McCagg, P. (1996). If you can lead a horse to water, you don't have to make it drink: Some comments on reader and writer responsibilities. *Multilingua, 15* (3), 239-256.

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

Matsumoto, D. (1996). *Unmasking Japan*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12,* 403-26.

Maynard, S. (1996). Presentation of one's views in Japanese newspaper columns: Commentary strategies and sequencing. *Text, 16* (2), 391-421.

Myers, G. (1985). The social construction of two biologists' proposals. *Written Communication, 2* (3), 219-245.

Nakane, C. (1970). *Japanese society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Pelzel, J. (1986). Human nature in the Japanese myths. In T. Lebra and W. Lebra (Eds.), *Japanese culture and behavior: Selected Readings*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Precht, K. (1998). A cross-cultural comparison of letters of recommendation. *English for Specific Purposes, 17* (3), 241-265.

Rao, Z. (1996). Reconciling communicative approaches to the teaching of English with traditional Chinese methods. *Research in the Teaching of English, 30* (4), 458-471.

Reischauer, E. (1988). *The Japanese today*. Tokyo: Tuttle.

Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. (1995). *Intercultural communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Soothhill, W. (1968). *The analects of Confucius*. NY: Pragon Books.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Stapleton, P. (1997). Japanese and American television commercials: A cultural study with TEFL applications. *JALT Journal, 19* (1), 123-137.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. et al. (1998). Consider this: The role of imperatives in scholarly writing. *Applied Linguistics, 19* (1), 97-121.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand. Women and men in conversation*. NY: William Morrow.

Taylor, G. & Chen, T. (1991). Linguistic, cultural, and subcultural issues in contrastive discos analysis: Anglo-American and Chinese scientific texts. *Applied Linguistics, 12* (3), 319-336.

Tu, W. (1979). *Humanity and self cultivation: Essays on Confucian thought*. Berkeley, CA: Asian Humanities Press.

Tucker, A. (1991). *Decoding ESL*. Portsmouth, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Ying, H. G. (1997). The equilibrium of *yin* and *yang* and dialogics of silence: A textual analysis of a Chinese Hui narrative. *Semiotica, 115*, 345-360.

Yli-Jokipii, H. (1998). Power and distance as cultural and contextual elements in Finnish and English business writing. In S. Niemeier, C. Campell and R. Dirven (Eds.), *The cultural context in business communication* (pp. 121-144). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.