

---

# A Contrastive Study of Written Personal Experience Narratives between English and Japanese

## — Part II —

Yoshifumi KOHRO

### 2.2.4. Studies of global text structure using Labov and Waletzky's framework or related concepts

As Connor (1996) maintains, research on the role of superstructures in writing is just beginning, and application of well known discourse theories of global structures have been relatively few. (89) This is true of personal narrative compositions. Although Labov and Waletzky' theory has been dominant as that which explains a structure in personal experience narratives, only a limited number of narrative or composition analyses have utilized their framework.

First, Martin and Rothery (1986) utilized the Labov and Waletzky's framework in analyzing Australian elementary school children's compositions, although not in second language writing. They reported that the stories classified by teachers as the best or most successful pieces usually conformed to such typical schematic structure as identified by Labov and Waletzky: orientation, complication, resolution, and coda, although they did not provide any quantitative evidence supporting their argument. They mention that young writers who were able to conform to the typical narrative structure were considered to have already mastered the generic structure of narrative in their culture.

Second, Tirkkonen-Condit (1986) analyzed English translations of argumentative text done by Finnish university students, using a four-unit structure consisting of situation, problem, solution and evaluation, although she did not refer to Labov and Waletzky's framework at all. She reported that the students could not detect the flow of text and the problem-solution part because of their indifference to text type markers showing the schematic structure.

Connor (1987) used, for a contrastive purpose, the same schematic structure in analyzing argumentative essays written by English, Finnish, German, and American students in their native languages. She reported that highly-rated compositions in her survey were provided with the typical schematic structure across the four groups, although the German group was lower than the other groups in terms of the use of this structure.

These are the three studies I know of that utilized Labov and Waletzky's framework or related concepts in analyzing global text structures. It may safely be said that few contrastive rhetoric studies of global discourse structure have used their framework in analyzing the superstructure.

#### 2.2.5. Topical Structure Analysis

Lautamatti (1987) developed topical structure analysis in order to describe coherence in texts, focusing on the semantic relationships between sentence topics and the overall discourse topic. In her analysis, coherence in text is traced utilizing the different kinds of topical progressions: parallel progression, sequential progression and extended parallel progression. This approach is based on the following premise of topical development, "sentences in discourse can be

---

thought of as contributing to the development of the discourse topic by means of sequences that first develop one sub-topic, adding new information about it in the predicate of each sentence, and then proceed to develop another.” (88) One type of topical progression in which the sub-topic in a number of successive sentences is the same is called parallel progression. Another type, where the predicate or the rhematic part of one sentence provides the topic for the next, is referred to as sequential progression. Furthermore, the other type of topical progression in which there is a return to an earlier topic interrupted by a sequential progression is called extended parallel progression. Lautamatti argues that the ratio of sub-topics to the number of sentences, the proportion of the types of progression, and the depth of topical progression measured by the number of times the predicate works as the topic for the next may contribute to the perception of a text as simple or complex (100).

Schneider and Connor (1991) investigated three groups of essays written for the TOEFL Test of Written English, using Lautamatti’s topical structure analysis, with some practical modifications. Findings indicate that two topical structure variables, proportions of sequential and parallel topics in the essays, differentiate the highest rated group from the two lower rated groups. The following coding guidelines (427) for topical structure analysis are extremely useful for practical use.

#### Parallel Progression

1. Any sentence topic that exactly repeats, is a pronominal form, or is a synonym of the immediate preceding sentence topic.
2. Any sentence topic that is a singular or plural form of the immediately preceding sentence topic.

3. Any sentence topic that is an affirmative or negative form of the immediately preceding sentence topic.
4. Any sentence topic that has the same head noun as the immediately preceding sentence topic.

#### Sequential Progression

1. Any sentence topic that is different from the immediately preceding sentence topic, that is , not (1)-(4) in parallel progression.
2. Any sentence topic in which there is a qualifier that so limits or further specifies an NP that it refers to a different referent.
3. Any sentence topic that is a derivation of an immediately preceding sentence topic.
4. Any sentence topic that is related to the immediate preceding sentence topic by a part-whole relationship.
5. Any sentence topic that repeats a part but not all of an immediately preceding sentence topic.

The following is a model passage which was actually analyzed by Schneider and Connor (1991) to provide the essence of the analysis (415-416).

1 There are many *different contributions* between artists and scientists to Society. / 2 First, *artists* contribute to society for entertainment. / 3 *Many people* need it for relax after hard work. / 4 *Artists* contribute to society with make new work fields which are related with kind of activity. /

6 *Scientists* contribute to society with improve knowledge of the people, especially for the students. / 7 In addition *scientists* contribute their new finding for human

---

wealth. / 8 For example, they make transportation easier and faster with new type of jets. / 9 However, sometime *scientists* make new type of weapons which can be used for abolish human life. / 10 In conclusion, *artists* contribute to society with become an film artist, singers and so on. / 11 The other hand *scientist* contribute to society with increase human wealth, / 12 but in contrast *scientists* can make human life to abolish. /

1. Different contributions

- (2). artists
- (3). many people
4. artists
5. artists
- (6). scientists
7. scientists
8. they
9. scientists
10. artists
- (11). scientists
12. scientists

The topical structure analysis above shows that topics in (2), (3), (6), and (11) are those appearing in sequential progressions which they claim are useful in predicting highly evaluated essays. As Connor (1996) suggests, the topical structure analysis explained above has been claimed to be a promising attempt to describe discourse-based coherence, which can be applicable to writing instruction (84).

### 2.2.6. Cohesive Device

Cohesion is defined as the use of explicit linguistic devices to display relationships between sentences and parts of texts, and cohesive devices are referred to as words and phrases working as signals to readers so that they can make logical connections with what has already been stated or soon will be mentioned. Halliday and Hasan (1976) is a pioneering work on cohesive devices, in which the authors outlined five microstructural cohesive devices used in discourse: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. These are assumed to be ties connecting sentences which speakers and writers are supposed to use in achieving cohesive texts.

The following are some of the studies of cohesion which utilized the framework provided by Halliday and Hasan (1976) in L1 writing and L2 writing.

First, Witte and Faigley (1981) investigated, using this framework, relationships between the cohesiveness of L1 students' writing and its overall quality and / or coherence. They define one of the characteristics of coherence as making a text understood in a real-world setting.

Secondly, Norment (1984) investigates the differences and similarities in the relationship between the organization of events by college freshmen in expository and narrative compositions written in their native languages (English, Chinese, and Spanish), and by the native Chinese and Spanish students in a second language (English). His major findings are 1) there is a distinct organizational structure appearing in the writing by native English, Chinese, and Spanish college students, 2) the organizational structure of a language is produced across modes, and 3) when native Chinese and Spanish

---

subject write in English, they employ the same organizational structure that they use in their native languages.

Then, Oi (1984) dealt with expository prose in a contrastive perspective between Japanese and English, investigating both micro-structure and macro-structure. Oi analyzed expository prose in terms of cohesive devices, overall organization, and cultural rhetorical tendencies. Her major findings are 1) Americans writing in English use fewer connectives than Japanese in writing in English and in Japanese and 2) Japanese writing in English and Japanese tend to repeat the same word whereas Americans use synonyms frequently.

Furthermore, Ng (1991) analyzed cohesive devices used in compositions written by native Japanese writers and those written by non-native Singaporean learners of Japanese, using the framework of Halliday and Hasan. This study reveals that native writers wrote longer essays but did not use a significantly higher proportion of cohesive ties than non-native writers and that this results in a higher density of cohesive ties in the non-native essays.

### 2.3. Contrastive studies of discourse features between English and Japanese

In this section I will review some of the contrastive studies of discourse features, including cohesive devices, topical structures, and global text structures, between English and Japanese so that I can demonstrate what aspects of discourse have been investigated with what approaches, together with problems inherent in the studies. By doing so, it is possible for me to indicate what discourse aspects will be worth investigating, together with the methodological problems to be taken into account.

Hinds (1983) claims that the Japanese organizational framework of *ki-sho-ten-ketsu*, beginning – developing – turning the idea to a subtheme — bringing all together for a conclusion, can cause potential problems for Japanese ESL learners when they write in English because the ten part and the ketsu part are different from those in English. He develops this argument on the basis of American and Japanese readers' judgments on organization patterns in terms of unity, focus and coherence which were gained after the subjects read several short newspaper columns: English translation for English readers and Japanese originals for Japanese readers. Hinds maintains that American readers who read English translations tended to evaluate the columns as poor because of their unfamiliar organization patterns. However, this study seems to include some serious methodological problems. First he failed to show proper reasons why he believed these columns were organized in this particular organization pattern. It is my impression that, unlike general expectations, the number of columns written in the typical pattern is quite limited. The other problem seems to lie in his use of translation, which may allow for different variables.

Hinds (1987) argues that there are different expectations as to the degree of involvement a reader will have in reading texts, in accordance with the language he or she uses. He suggests that a writer or a speaker may be responsible for making clear and well-organized statements in such languages as English, while a reader or a listener is more responsible for effective communication than a writer or a speaker in other languages such as Japanese. He mentions that transitional statements as landmarks, which play a crucial role in readers' understanding, tend to be absent or decreased in Japanese because of the reader's responsibility to determine the relationships



---

among parts of an essay and the essay as a whole. Here as well, his sample passage was from the same newspaper column mentioned above. His intuition about the relative responsibilities that readers or writers have is of great importance in considering such discourse features as cohesiveness and coherence of texts, but his arguments lack empirical evidence. In his subsequent study, Hinds (1990) tried to demonstrate that compositions written by Japanese, Chinese, Thai and Korean subjects followed an organization pattern which he referred to as “quasi-inductive,” which comes between inductive and deductive writing styles. He argues that the reader-responsible Japanese language is closely related to a quasi-inductive writing style in that it is readers that are expected to fill in missing information and transitions. It seems to me that he also lacks sound and sufficient empirical evidence to argue that the rhetorical pattern shared among those four languages is “quasi-inductive.”

Oi's study (1984) investigated expository prose in a contrastive perspective between Japanese and English, focusing on both micro-structure and macro-structure. She analyzed expository prose with respect to cohesive devices, overall organization, and cultural rhetorical tendencies. Her major findings are 1) Americans writing in English use fewer connectives than Japanese in writing in English and in Japanese and 2) Japanese writing in English and Japanese tend to repeat the same word whereas Americans use synonyms frequently. It is noteworthy that, contrary to my expectation concerning the present study, American writers used fewer connectives than Japanese writers. It is worth challenging this result with research tools finely tuned and variables more strictly controlled.

Kobayashi (1984) collected 676 writing samples obtained from 226 students consisting of four groups: U.S. college students, Japanese

advanced EFL students in the United States, English-major Japanese students in Japan, and non-English-major Japanese students in Japan. In her study the first three groups wrote in English and the last one in Japanese. According to her results, U.S. students favored the general-to-specific pattern, whereas non-English major Japanese students in Japan favored the opposite pattern. Furthermore, the Japanese students in the U.S. tended to write in the same way as American students. Kobayashi's study is noteworthy in that it included writers of L1 and L2 in the native and the second language setting.

Kubota (1992) is also significant in the area of contrastive studies between Japanese and English. She investigated the transfer of first language patterns, which appeared in expository and persuasive essays, into second language writing. Kubota's findings suggested that the Japanese students preferred the inductive style, but when asked to evaluate styles, they claimed to favor the deductive style.

In her recent work, Kubota (1998) investigated whether or not individual Japanese students use the same discourse pattern, represented by an inductive style, in L1 and ESL writing, and how each individual's use of similar / dissimilar patterns influences the quality of ESL essays. Results showed that about half of the writers used similar patterns in L1 and L2 and that a positive correlation exists between Japanese and ESL organization scores but no negative transfer of culturally unique rhetorical patterns was found.

### 3. Method

In this chapter, I will present detailed research questions again with hypotheses provided in the form of the null hypothesis, attempt

---

to define variables and terms used in the research questions, and operationalize key variables.

### 3.1. Research questions and hypotheses

#### 3.1.1. Contrast between J1 and E1

##### a) Research question 1

Is there any difference between personal experience narrative compositions by Japanese college students and those by American counterparts written in their L1, in terms of the use of cohesive devices, topical structures, global text structures and the contents of texts?

##### b) Hypothesis 1

There is no difference in these discourse features between the personal experience narrative compositions written by the two groups.

It is necessary to have data as a base line which is to be obtained in analyzing personal experience narratives in L1 written by both groups. It has been claimed that the L1 rhetorical patterns already acquired interfere with acquiring L2 writing systems and that problems observed in L2 writing are reflected on L1 rhetorical patterns. Therefore, it is crucial to make clear what features, in terms of the three discursal points above, are observable in narratives in L1 written by the two groups which are free from L2 influence. It seems possible to indicate some fundamental differences in narratives in both languages by contrasting those written by the Japanese with those by Americans.

Based on the arguments I have made so far, it is assumed that Japanese writers will prefer loosely connected implicit textual relationships to tightly connected explicit ones and that this fact will be observable in all the discourse features mentioned above.

### 3.1.2. Contrast between J1 and E2 & Contrast between J2 and E1

#### a) Research question 2

Is there any difference between personal experience narrative compositions in L1 and those in L2 written by the same group in terms of the use of cohesive devices, topical structures, global text structures, and the contents of texts?

#### b) Hypothesis 2

There is no difference in these discourse features between L1 compositions and L2 compositions written by the same group.

These are the contrasts between narratives in L1 and in L2 written by writers in the same group. It is highly probable that L2 proficiency (Pennington and So, 1993; Hirose and Sasaki 1994) and L1 writing ability (Cumming, 1989; Sasaki and Hirose, 1996) will affect some aspects of writers' L2 narrative writing. It is possible to identify the effects of L2 proficiency or L1 writing ability on the L2 narrative compositions when I find some conspicuous differences between the two, because I am intending to provide the subjects with similar narrative topics, one in L1 and the other in English.

It is assumed that those with lower L2 proficiency will avoid complicated or elaborated descriptions of a specific event and juxtapose superficial narrative events, and that they will be less likely to

---

provide sufficient cohesive devices than those with higher L2 proficiency. If I can observe such tendencies, I may be able to suggest that those learners are employing a strategy of avoidance on the discourse level, which seems significant in SL writing research. In addition, it is intriguing to contrast two groups in terms of their avoidance behavior on the discourse level. It is also of great interest to investigate the relationship between writers' L1 writing proficiency and their avoidance behavior on the discourse level. Taking these assumptions into consideration, I will create 2 more sub-research questions regarding the research question above, together with their hypotheses.

a) Research question 2 (a)

Is there any effect of L2 proficiency on personal experience narrative compositions written by the same group in terms of the use of cohesive devices, topical structures, global text structures, and the contents of texts?

b) Hypothesis 2 (a)

There is no effect of L2 proficiency on personal experience narrative compositions written by the same group in terms of the use of cohesive devices, topical structures, global text structures, and the contents of texts.

a) Research question 2 (b)

Is there any effect of L1 writing ability on personal experience narrative compositions written by the same group in terms of the use of cohesive devices, topical structures, global text structures, and the contents of texts.

b) Hypothesis 2 (b)

There is no effect of L1 writing ability on personal experience narrative compositions written by the same group in terms of the use of cohesive devices, topical structures, global text structures, and the contents of texts.

3.1.3. Contrast between E1 and E2 & Contrast between J1 and J2

a) Research question 3

Is there any difference, except for grammar and quantity, between personal experience narratives written by non-native speakers in L2 and those written by native speakers in L1 in terms of the use of cohesive devices, topical structures, global text structures, and the contents of texts?

b) Hypothesis 3

There is no difference in these discourse features of personal experience narratives written by native writers and those by non-native writers.

This contrast will be done between narratives written in L1 and those in L2 which are written by two different groups: English narratives written by native speakers of English and those by non-native speakers, and Japanese narratives written by native speakers of Japanese and those by non-native speakers. Through these contrasts, it is possible to delineate some distinctive differences between native writers' typical narratives and non-native varieties both by Japanese EFL learners and by American JFL learners. Here as well, L2 proficiency can be a crucial factor explaining the differences.

---

However, unlike the contrast in research question 2 above which focuses on detecting avoidance on the discourse level, this contrast may render it possible to make clear the differences between a native norm and a non-native variation in terms of the discourse features above.

### 3.1.4. Definitions of terms and operationalization

As mentioned in the previous section, it is possible to hypothesize that Japanese writers may prefer 'loosely connected implicit texts' to 'tightly connected explicit ones' and that this tendency will be observable in all the discourse features. One of the major purposes of the current study is to confirm whether or not this hypothesis is correct. Here I will define some key terms so that I can operationalize them for quantitative analyses. Thus, writers' tendencies to write 'loosely connected implicit texts' or 'tightly connected explicit texts' will be made quantitatively explicit in the following analyses of their texts.

#### 3.1.4.1. Loosely connected implicit texts and tightly connected explicit texts

It is crucial to define two different types of texts in terms of textual features which are considered to be present in typical Japanese texts and American ones. By 'loosely connected implicit texts,' I mean texts which are susceptible to more of the readers' own interpretations. These texts may not provide the readers with sufficient cohesive devices as landmarks for showing the flow of logic. In addition, it is assumed that, in this type of text, ties among topics are so loose on the topical structure level and even on the global discourse level that

readers need to interpret implicitly stated contents by themselves. On the other hand, 'tightly connected explicit texts' means those which leave less room for readers to interpret in their own ways. This is made possible by furnishing readers with sufficient cohesive devices to direct them so that they can interpret effectively what is explicitly written in the text. Both on the topical structure level and the global text structure level, one single topic is likely to be fully developed rather than several unrelated ones being juxtaposed. When reading this type of text, readers may get the impression that they are simply decoding what was written in the texts with the help of fairly fixed decoding procedures. It is my assumption that the former type of texts tend to be produced by typical Japanese writers and the latter by typical American writers, and that such discourse features as defined above can be operationalized and measured through the following quantitative procedures.

#### 1) Global text structures

Differences in global text structures may be quantitatively measured using a subjective scale to be done by bilingual raters. I will ask 4 bilinguals with native-like reading proficiency in both languages (2 American raters and 2 Japanese raters) to evaluate compositions written by both groups. They will determine whether or not each narrative composition has the features claimed to be typical of personal experience narratives, using the following scale: 1) the feature is not present, 2) the feature is somewhat present, and 3) the feature is clearly present. The table below is a probable evaluation sheet. Needless to say, the raters need to be trained, using the typical personal experience narrative features defined by Labov and



---

Waletzky.

Orientation	1	2	3
Complication	1	2	3
Evaluation	1	2	3
Resolution	1	2	3
Coda	1	2	3

Typical personal experience narratives should have scores close to 3 in all the points above, whereas those with different features will be given scores close to 1. My assumption is that Japanese writers' personal experience narratives will be rated lower in the feature of complication, because of their probable tendencies to juxtapose a few loosely connected topics in the complication part rather than elaborating on one single topic in the hope that readers will supplement the logical connections among the topics included. This tendency may be true of writers who write in their L2, because they are assumed to avoid elaborating one single topic due to their lack of L2 proficiency. Therefore, I believe that low evaluations in these items can be an index for predicting loosely connected text structures.

## 2) Topical structure

Schneider and Connor (1991) used percentages of t-units in each type of topical progression averaged across essays in each rating group, which is perfectly applicable to the current analysis. Furthermore, Lautamatti's (1987) concept of the topical depth, that the depth of topical progression assessed by the number of times the predicate works as the topic for the next sentence may contribute to the

perception of a text as simple or complex, should be employed in the current quantitative analysis as well.

Based on these quantitative measures, it may be predicted that topically well-developed narrative compositions involve more sequential topical progressions rather than parallel topical progressions, whereas those with superficial topical juxtaposition have fewer sequential progressions. It is assumed that the percentages of t-units to sequential progressions observed in personal narrative compositions by the groups to be compared can be used in this analysis, together with the average topical depth for each group, which are assessed with the number of times the predicate works as the next topic.

I hypothesize that typical Japanese narrative compositions will display a series of parallel topical progressions without elaborating each topic sufficiently, represented by low percentages of sequential progressions, and that writers who write in their L2 will show a similar tendency due to their relative linguistic constraints. I believe that low percentages of sequential progressions can reveal writers' tendencies to create topics which are not tightly connected with one another.

### 3) Cohesive devices

As I mentioned in the previous section, several studies have analyzed writers' use of cohesive devices in compositions on the basis of the theoretical framework generated by Halliday and Hasan (1976). One of the studies of great relevance to the present study is Ng (1991). She analyzed cohesive devices used in compositions written by native Japanese writers and those written by non-native Singaporean

---

learners of Japanese, using Halliday and Hasan's theoretical framework of cohesive devices. I will also employ her methods in analyzing the cohesive devices used in narrative compositions written by both groups of writers for the present study.

The following table illustrates the items investigated by Ng (1991).

Lexical cohesion

Repetition

Synonym / hyponym

Superordinate

Collocation

General item

Conjunction

Adversative

Additive

Causal

Same item

Supplementary

Temporal

Transitive

Reference

Demonstrative

Pronominal

Comparative

Ellipsis

## Substitution

I will count the number of occurrences of each type of cohesive device and of cohesive ties, which are the relationships between the cohesive and presupposed referents. The relative frequency of an individual cohesive item, which can be determined by dividing the number of occurrences of a specific cohesive device by the number of T-units involved in one narrative composition, can be an index showing how frequently a writer uses the cohesive device. Average relative frequency scores for all cohesive items gained from the two groups writing on both topics can indicate the group's tendency to use cohesive devices, in particular, how frequently and what types of cohesive devices each group tends to use. Furthermore, cohesive density is to be measured by dividing the total number of T-units in one composition by the total number of cohesive ties. Average scores gained from the two groups for each type of narrative composition can indicate to what extent each group depends on cohesive devices in writing narrative compositions.

It is my assumption that Japanese writers and those writing in their L2 will tend to have fewer cohesive devices, which is to be reflected by lower group mean scores than other groups for the cohesive items above in their narrative compositions.

### 3.2. Study Participants

Probable subjects for the current study are 30 Japanese college EFL learners studying at a Japanese university and 30 American college JFL learners at an American institution, since a minimum of 30 data is indispensable for a statistical analysis to be sound. The first

---

condition to be met is that the male-female ratio of one group is not drastically different from that of the other, since there may be a possibility that male writers' rhetorical pattern differs from that of females. Secondly, it is also hoped that writers' majors in one group be similar to those of the other, because their tendencies in composing may be influenced by their composing pattern acquired in the course of their study in a particular field. Thirdly, ideally, L2 proficiency in one group should be similar to that of the other. However, it is almost impossible to find similar groups of subjects in term of L2 proficiency because of the difficulties in measuring L2 proficiency in two different languages with a single test. Finally, the intellectual maturity of one group is desired not to be drastically different from that of the other group.

### 3.3. Tasks

Prior to the task administration, it is imperative to conduct a questionnaire survey for both groups so that I can obtain detailed information about the subjects concerning the following points: 1) subjects' previous writing experiences, including instruction they have received both in L1 and L2 writing, and 2) their attitudes toward written communication, including their perceptions about their readers and preferences of writing styles concerning the discourse features to be investigated. Then, data regarding subjects' L2 proficiency, assessed with reliable standardized tests such as the TOEFL test, is indispensable. Furthermore, data concerning subjects' L1 writing ability reflected by their actual personal experience narrative compositions, which will be assessed by native raters, is also necessary.

The following directions will be provided for the subjects both in Japanese for the Japanese group and in English for the American group.

Directions

- (1) Describe the scariest experience you have ever had in English within 400 to 600 English words.
- (2) Describe the funniest experience you have ever had in Japanese within 800 to 1000 Japanese letters.
- (3) These two compositions should be written at home within a week or so. The use of dictionaries is permitted, but do not ask others including native speakers for proof-reading.
- (4) Start with the L2 composition first.

The first topic is designed to elicit such personal experience narratives as Labov and Waletzky (1967) could obtain from their subjects. Although the second topic is slightly different from the first, it is assumed that writers will compose typical personal experience narratives when they are provided the second topic because of its extremely personal nature. It is not realistic to have them write two different compositions in class hours, taking into account their L2 proficiency constraints and fatigue caused by writing during class hours. Furthermore, the use of dictionaries should be also allowed, considering their L2 constraints here as well. Another important thing to be noted by the subjects is that they should not start with their L1 compositions first, because it is anticipated that their L2 compositions

---

may be excessively influenced by the L1 composing pattern they would have just employed in writing the L1 compositions.

### 3.4. Data analysis procedure

The following data analysis procedures will be taken for the research questions raised in the previous section, respectively.

#### 3.4.1. Contrast between J1 and E1

##### a) Research question 1

Is there any difference between personal experience narrative compositions by Japanese college students and those by American counterparts written in their L1 in terms of the use of cohesive devices, topical structures, global text structures and the contents of texts?

##### b) Hypothesis 1

There is no difference in these discourse features between the personal experience narrative compositions written in their L1 by the two groups.

#### 3.4.1.1. Global text structures

A series of *t*-tests for independent samples will be conducted regarding the five typical features of personal experience narratives (orientation, complication, resolution, evaluation and coda) to see if there are any differences in mean scores between the two groups, using subjective evaluation scores, from 1 to 3, which will be provided by two

native and two non-native raters who have native-like proficiency in reading in their L2.

#### 3.4.1.2. Topical structures

*t*-tests for independent samples will be conducted, using percentages of parallel progression, sequential progression, and extended parallel progression, to see if there are any differences in their ratios between the two groups. Furthermore, mean scores of topical depth, which will be obtained from the two groups by dividing the number of times the predicate works as the topic for the next sentence by the total number of T units, will be used to investigate if there is any difference in topical depth between the two groups. Here as well, a series of *t*-tests will be conducted.

#### 3.4.1.3. Cohesive devices

The relative frequency of an individual cohesive item, which can be gained by dividing the number of occurrences of a specific cohesive device by the number of T-units involved in one narrative composition, can be an index showing how frequently a writer uses the cohesive device. Average frequency scores for all cohesive items gained from the two groups writing on both topics can indicate the group's tendency to use cohesive devices, in particular, how frequently and what types of cohesive devices each group tends to use. In addition, cohesive density, which is to be gained by dividing the total number of words in one composition by the total number of cohesive ties, will be also calculated. Average scores gained from the two groups for each type of narrative composition can indicate to what extent each group



---

depends on cohesive devices in writing narrative compositions. Differences in mean scores between the two groups with respect to the points above will be measured using *t*-tests for independent samples to see if the differences are statistically significant.

#### 3.4.1.4. Contents

A qualitative analysis is mandatory in analyzing the contents of the personal experience narrative compositions.

#### 3.4.2. Contrast between J1 and E2 & Contrast between J2 and E1

##### a) Research question 2

Is there any difference between personal experience narrative compositions in L1 and those in L2 written by the same group in terms of the use of cohesive devices, topical structures, global text structures, and the contents of texts?

##### b) Hypothesis 2

There is no difference in these discourse features between L1 compositions and L2 compositions written by the same group.

The same analysis procedure as above will be implemented here as well in terms of the four discourse features to be quantitatively analyzed. However, for the following two sets of research questions with hypotheses, a basic factorial design (Factor X with three levels x Factor Y with three levels) is effective in order to see if there are any effects of L2 proficiency and L1 writing ability on quantifiable aspects of the discourse features.

a) Research question 2-1

Is there any effect of L2 proficiency on personal experience narrative compositions written by the same group in terms of the use of cohesive devices, topical structures, global text structures, and the contents of texts?

b) Hypothesis 2-1

There is no effect of L2 proficiency on personal experience narrative compositions written by the same group in terms of the use of cohesive devices, topical structures, global text structures, and the contents of texts.

a) Research question 2-2

Is there any effect of L1 writing ability on personal experience narrative compositions written by the same group in terms of the use of cohesive devices, topical structures, global text structures, and the contents of texts?

b) Hypothesis 2-2

There is no effect of L1 writing ability on personal experience narrative compositions written by the same group in terms of the use of cohesive devices, topical structures, global text structures, and the contents of texts.

As for these two pairs of research questions and hypotheses, Two-way ANOVA (Factor X: L2 proficiency with 3 levels: high, mid, and low; Factor Y: L1 writing ability with 3 levels: high, mid, and low) should be conducted in order to identify the effects of L2 proficiency

---

and L1 writing ability on all the quantifiable data on the discourse features above.

### 3.4.3. Contrast between E1 and E2 & Contrast between J1 and J2

The same analysis procedure as in 3.4.1. and 3.4.2. should be employed here as well, except for the basic factorial design to be done in 3.4.2..

#### Bibliography

- Connor, U. (1996) *Contrastive Rhetoric*. Cambridge and NY: Cambridge UP.
- Connor, U. (1987) Argumentative patterns in student essays: cross-cultural differences. In *Writing across languages: analysis of L2 texts*, edited by U. Connor and R. B. Kaplan, 57-71. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Cumming, A. (1989) Writing Expertise and Second Language Proficiency. *Language Learning*. 39 (1) 81-141.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and R. Hasan. (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London and New York: Longman.
- Hinds, J. (1983) Contrastive Rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text*, 3 (2), 183-195.
- Hinds, J. (1987) Reader versus writer responsibility: a new typology. In *Writing across languages: analysis of L2 text*, edited by U. Connor and R.B. Kaplan, 141-152. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Hinds, J. (1990) Inductive, Deductive, Quasi-Inductive: Expository Writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. In *Coherence in Writing: Research and Pedagogical Perspective*, edited by U. Connor and A. M. Jones, 87-110. Alexandria, VA: TESOL, 1990.
- Hirose, K., and Sasaki, M. (1994) Explanatory Variables for Japanese Students' Expository Writing in English: An Explanatory Study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3 (3), 203-229.

- Sasaki, M., and Hirose, K. (1996) Explanatory Variables for EFL Students' Expository Writing. *Language Learning*, 46 (1), 137-174.
- Kobayashi, H. (1984) Rhetorical Patterns in English and Japanese. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18 (4), 737-738.
- Kubota, R. (1992) *Contrastive Rhetoric of Japanese and English: A Critical Approach*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Toronto.
- Kubota, R. (1998) An Investigation of L1-L2 Transfer in Writing among Japanese University Students: Implications for Contrastive Rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, (1) 69-100.
- Labov, W. and J. Waletzky. (1997, originally 1967) Narrative Analyses: Oral Versions of Personal Experience. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7 (1-4), 3-38.
- Lautamati, L. (1987) Observation in the development of the topic in simplified discourse. *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text*, edited by U. Connor and R.B. Kaplan, 87-114. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Martin, J. R., and J. Rothery. (1986) What a Functional Approach Can Show Teachers. In *Functional Approach to Writing: Research Perspectives*, edited by B. Couture, 241-265. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Ng, S. K. (1991) An Analysis of Cohesive Devices in the Written Language of Native and Non-native Writers of Japanese, Unpublished B. A. Thesis. Singapore: National University of Singapore.
- Norment, N. Jr. (1984) *Contrastive Analyses of Organizational Structures and Cohesive Elements in Native and ESL Chinese, English and Spanish Writing*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Fordham University
- Oi, M. K. (1984) *Cross-cultural Differences in Rhetorical Patterning: A Study of Japanese and English*. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45 (8), 2511A.
- Pennington, M. C., & So, S. (1993) Comparing Writing Process and Product across Two Languages: A Study of 6 Singaporean University Student Writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2, 41-63.
- Schneider, M., and U. Connor. (1991) Analyzing Topical Structures in ESL Essays: Not All Topics Are Equal. *SSLA*, 12, 411-427.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (1986) Text Type Markers and Translation Equivalence. In J. House and S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag.

---

Witte, S. P. and L, Faigley. (1981) Coherence, Cohesion, and Writing Quality, *College Composition and Communication*, 32, 189-204.