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ABSTRACT

Most of the existing research on L2 writing to date makes comparisons between L1 and L2 or between NSs and NNSs. There is relatively little research to date, that views L2 learners as L2 users (writers) who have multi-competent knowledge and explores L2 writers’ perspectives on good writing in the L2 context. The overall purpose of this study is twofold. The first purpose is to explore the international Japanese undergraduate and graduate students’ perspectives on good writing and examine the factors that affect L2 writers’ perspectives on good writing in the L2 context from three different contexts: the L1 context; the L2 context; and the future context. This study also explores whether these L2 writers’ perspectives on writing change during their first academic year in the U.S. The second purpose is to examine what is useful for L2 writers from their own perspective and meet the needs of L2 writers with regard to their own goals and experiences as L2 writers.

This research was a longitudinal case study of six Japanese students during their first academic year in the U.S. Data consist of interviews, observations, examination of participants’ writing, and discussions about model writing the participants considered “good writing.”
The data revealed individual differences among the L2 writers regarding how much they struggled with adjusting to L2 and how much their L1 perspectives transferred to their L2 writing and changed. Furthermore, L2 writers’ confidence in L1 writing transferred directly to their confidence in L2 writing at the beginning: the participants with more writing experiences in L1 perceived themselves as better writers and had more confidence in L1 writing than those with less L1 writing experience. However, their confidence level seemed to have changed later in the year.

The findings suggest educators need to increase their awareness that L2 writers bring their perspectives on writing from the L1 context and that these perspectives are tentative because L2 writers acquire mixed perspectives from the L1, L2, and future contexts, thus becoming multi-competent.
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1.1 Problem description

Much compelling L2 writing research at the college level has been conducted in the last two decades in the United States. Most of these studies discuss second language (hereafter L2) writing in terms of text analysis (Hinds, 1983, 1987, 1990; Kobayashi, 1984; Takano, 1993), the process of composing (Moragne e Silva, 1992; Silva, 1992), and learning strategies (Kitao & Kitao, 1986; Yen-Ren, 1996). These studies tend to make comparisons between first language (hereafter L1) and L2 or between native speakers (hereafter NSs) and non-native speakers (hereafter NNSs). The results of these studies only yield similarities and differences. Furthermore, the underlying concept of these studies is the native speaker model, which takes monolingualists who know a single language learned in childhood as their starting point rather than multilingualists who know more than one language. This model compares L2 writing to L1 writing by native English writers, or L2 writers to L1 native writers. Thus, the native speaker model sets up L1 as “the standard” and leads to the perception that the goal of NNSs is to become more like NSs, with the assumption that “the only appropriate models of a language’s use
come from its native speakers” (Cook, 1999, p. 185). In this model, successful L2 writers are those who obtain L2 writing skills that are the same as that of L1 writers (Cook, 1997). The comparative nature of the question regarding whether L2 learners are able to write like NSs inevitably leads to the conclusion that L2 writers are inadequate and still need to learn more -- a view that some have referred to as the “deficit” model of L2 writing.

There is a risk involved in using the deficit model of L2 writing, because it limits the way L2 educators examine L2 writers and their writing. It disregards the important fact that “multilingual” is different from “monolingual,” as L2 writers differ from L1 writers. Nevertheless, most L2 writing research compares NNSs to NSs. Additionally, most L2 writing research compares two different people and two different languages in the same domain: the L1 context of the monolingual native speakers. This in turn leads to the tendency to focus on the linguistic and cultural distance between the NNSs and NSs.

This dissertation moves beyond the existing L2 writing research that compares L2 writers to native English writers or L2 writing written by L2 speakers to L1 writing written by monolingual native speakers. The present study utilizes multi-competence theory (Cook, 1995a, 1995b, 1997, 1999) and looks at L2 learners as L2 users (or writers) who have multi-competent knowledge. Based on this view, this study looks at L2 writing in the context of L2 use (or writing) and explores L2 writers’ perception of writing and approach to writing in the L2 context, focusing on Japanese undergraduate and graduate students.
There is little research to date that explores L2 writing in the context of L2 use from L2 writers’ own perspective. Furthermore, there is relatively little research of the L2 writers’ perspectives on their use of L2 in the L2 context over an extended period of time, which specifically focuses on transitional writing experiences from the L1 to the L2 context (except Spack’s study in 1997). The questions this research seeks to investigate are what perspectives of “use” L2 writers bring to the L2 society and how they change during a transitional period from the L1 context to the L2 context? We need to explore what perspectives on L2 use L2 writers have both in the L1 and L2 contexts, how L2 writers use their L2 in their writing, and how they struggle with writing in the L2 context over time. We need to investigate and better understand L2 writers’ perception of their own use of L2 with respect to their own goals as users of L2.

In this present study, I do not intend to carry out this research as a cross-cultural comparison, nor impose sweeping generalizations about Japanese undergraduate and graduate students’ perceptions of their L2 writing. Rather, I will investigate and make an attempt to take into account the Japanese undergraduate and graduate students’ perspectives on their L2 writing in the L2 context, by examining their attitudes, beliefs, and struggles with respect to their own goals as users of L2, and by focusing on individual writing experiences in both the L1 and L2 contexts. Furthermore, I will examine what factors influence L2 writers’ perspectives on their writing.

To accomplish this, it is necessary to consider the concept of “multi-competence” for the following reasons. “[I]t provides a different perspective from which to look at L2 learning” (Cook, 1999, p. 185) which can help us view L2 writers not as inadequate
people who have not attained the language skills of NSs, but as people with different, neither less nor more, competence from NSs. In other words, this view respects and acknowledges L2 writers as competent adults who use L2 as a tool to accomplish their own goals in their particular field of study. Thus, multi-competence as an outlook view will enable a researcher to explore and better understand L2 writers’ perspectives “by the standards of L2 users, not by those of monolinguals” (Cook, 1995a, p. 58). As a result, this study will be able to provide much more in-depth information of L2 writers’ perspectives on their writing from their educational, cultural, and individual backgrounds. In addition, from the L2 writers’ perspectives on L2 use, this study will be able to provide L2 educators with suggestions for helping their students learn how to become effective L2 writers.

1.2 Purpose of the study

The overall purpose of this dissertation is twofold. The first purpose is, multi-competence as an outlook view, to examine the L2 writers’ perspectives on their writing in L2 through a series of interviews, emails, observations during tutorials, examination of the participants’ writing samples, and discussions about model writing samples that the participants consider to be good writing. The study will also examine what factors that affect L2 writers’ perspectives on their own use of L2 in the L2 context from three different contexts: (1) the L1 context; (2) the L2 context; and (3) the future context. Furthermore, the study will examine whether or not these L2 writers’ perspectives on their use of L2 change while they are studying in the U.S. The second purpose of this
dissertation is to explore what is useful for L2 writers from their own perspective and provide the needs of L2 writers with regard to their own goals and experiences as L2 users.

This research utilizes a case study approach in order to get in-depth information at the micro level, closely focusing on individual writing experience. Specifically, this study explores how newly matriculated Japanese undergraduate and graduate students -- whose L1 is Japanese and who have been educated in Japan -- use their L2 in writing in the new L2 environment and examines their perspectives on use at the level of individual L2 settings. This study focuses on a total of six Japanese students: five Japanese students, from Autumn Quarter of 1999 to Summer Quarter of 2000, and one Japanese student, from Winter Quarter of 2000 to Autumn Quarter of 2000. This is the transitional period for L2 writers going from the L1 context to the L2 context, so it is critical to understand their needs in this period since L2 writers have to struggle greatly with writing in L2 in their new circumstances.

1.3 Research questions

1. How does the L1 context (educational, cultural, and individual writing experience in the L1 Japanese context) affect Japanese students' perspectives on L2 writing in the L2 context?

   (a) What kind of literacy training did Japanese students have in Japan and what kind of texts did they have in Japanese?
(b) What perspectives on writing from their L1 literacy training have Japanese students brought to their L2 writing in the L2 context? Did their perspective change during the first academic year in the U.S.? If so, how did they change? If not, what didn’t they change?

(c) What attitudes toward writing in L1 do participants have and in what context? How do participants perceive themselves as writers?

(d) How were Japanese participants’ previous English classes in Japan helpful for their writing in L2 in the U.S. from their perspectives?

2. How does the L2 academic context affect Japanese students’ perspectives on good writing and their approach to L2 writing?

(a) How are Japanese undergraduate and graduate students trained in the L2 context, and how do they meet academic demands in the L2 context? What kind of texts in L2 do they produce?

(b) How do L2 writers perceive their L2 writing (use) and themselves as L2 writers in the L2 context? Furthermore, what are some prominent factors in the L2 context that affect L2 writers’ perspectives on their L2 writing and as L2 writers?

3. How does the future context affect Japanese students’ perspectives on L2 writing and their approach to development of L2 writing (writing in English) in the L2 context?

(a) What goals do the L2 writers have for their writing? What kind of competence do
the L2 writers want to achieve? Do their goals for writing as well as their perspectives of writing change in the academic environment? If so, how do they change and how are they related to writing skills?

(b) If they believe they need further training, what kinds of literacy training in L2 do L2 writers think they need?

1.4 Rationale of the study

In this dissertation, I have chosen to examine the writing of a specific group of L2 writers both because writing is an essential skill and because, unlike spoken language, accuracy is more important in writing -- as a reduced-cues medium. Furthermore, writing in both undergraduate and graduate school is a key to success in the academic setting. The process of acquiring writing skills is more complex, because they are acquired within a particular culture and because writing is culturally embedded. As Grabe and Kaplan (1996) argue, “writing abilities are not naturally acquired; they must be culturally (rather than biologically) transmitted in every generation, whether in schools or in other assisting environments” (p. 6). That is to say, unlike spoken language, “the skills required do not come naturally, but rather are gained through conscious effort and much practice” (p. 6). It is important to examine L2 writers’ previous training (instruction), practice, and experience in both L1 and L2, and their purpose in writing since “[w]riting . . . involves training, instruction, practice, experience, and purpose” (p. 6). By examining these
factors and exploring students' writing perceptions of use, L2 educators may be able to understand what kind of further training L2 writers need in a variety of academic contexts.

The reason I chose both undergraduate and graduate students is that I was curious whether or not there are significant differences in their perspectives on writing and approach to writing among them. More specifically, the reason I chose graduate students is that the research in the teaching of ESL writing has mainly focused on the writing of undergraduates in spite of the fact that half of the international students in higher education in the United States are in graduate school (Silva, et al., 1994), and little L2 writing research regarding international graduate students has been conducted to date (except Belcher, 1994; Casanave, 1990, 1995; Prior, 1991, 1995; Silva, 1992). L2 writing studies of graduate students are urgently needed, since advanced writing ability in English is one of the critical requirements for their academic success, and since unlike undergraduates, graduate students are required to write a large number of academic papers in English at an advanced level immediately upon arrival, such as term papers, journal articles, and conference proposals in their discipline. Moreover, since English is the language most frequently used in international journals, many graduate students will have to write in English in their disciplines the rest of their careers (Casanave, 1998; Pennycook, 1994). The population of graduate students with serious professional goals represents a rich source of L2 writers.

The present study focuses on Japanese undergraduate and graduate students. The reasons I chose Japanese students as participants are as follows. First of all, the number
of international graduate students has been growing steadily in the U.S. in the last half century. Specifically, the population of Japanese students in the U.S. is 46,292 out of a total of 457,984 international students enrolled in institutions of higher education in the United States in 1996-97 (Snyder, et al., 1998). This number represents about ten percent of all foreign students in the U.S., with Japanese students being the single largest group. Therefore, the results of my study may benefit a large segment of foreign students.

In addition, a large number studies regarding Japanese students’ writing (e.g., Carson, 1992; Carson & Nelson, 1994; Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Hinds, 1983, 1987, 1990; Nelson & Murphy, 1992) have been conducted. Nevertheless, these studies view Japanese students as a group and tend to overgeneralize the characteristics of Japanese students’ writing. Such research can lead to cultural stereotypes and a reductive attitude toward L2 writers. Moreover, existing research seems to indicate that writing is especially difficult for Japanese students, so it is challenging for them to acquire writing skills. There has been little research that has shed light on an individual rather than a group. These underexplored issues have motivated me to look at individual L2 writers in order to better recognize L2 writers’ own viewpoints and values and to better understand L2 writers, particularly from L2 writers’ perspectives on their L2 use in the L2 context. I hope that the findings of this dissertation will provide novel insights missed by previous researchers, who explored L2 writers as members of a national group from the perspective of Anglocentrism, and I hope to contribute toward helping a significant number of future Japanese professionals, many of whom study in the U.S., and most of whom will continue to use English in their careers.
I also selected Japanese participants because as a native of Japan, I am an insider, giving me special understanding of my subjects. Speaking fluent Japanese gives me a natural advantage during the interviews. Furthermore, as a graduate student at OSU for the last seven years, I have acquired L2 writing skills in English and, like my participants, I have experienced the challenges of using L2 in my studies at OSU.

1.5 Significance of the study

Advanced writing ability in English is one of the critical aspects for academic success for both undergraduate and graduate students, specifically graduate students. Though L2 researchers and educators have paid attention to enhancing the writing skills of L2 writers -- focusing upon teaching techniques, developing classroom activities, planning curriculum, etc. in numerous instructional books, teachers’ meetings, and conferences for the last two decades -- less attention has been paid to what perspectives on writing across cultures L2 writers bring to the L2 academic community. In addition, most L2 writing research has been conducted without regard to the students’ social contexts, since most L2 writing research has analyzed L2 texts written by L2 writers in ESL settings.

This study considers L2 writers as individuals in these broader sociocultural contexts, focusing on how L2 Japanese writers perceive writing in both L1 and L2, how they use L2 in the context of L2, and how their perceptions change while they improve their L2 writing abilities. By means of a survey, various interview techniques, observations of tutorials in ESL composition classes, text analyses in L2 written by these
students, and selection of good texts in both L1 and L2 by these participants, this study attempts to increase our understanding of the L2 writers’ perception of writing and their reactions to writing across cultures.

This dissertation should be useful to L2 specialists as well as L2 writers at the undergraduate and graduate school levels. Since this study examines writing perspectives on use, not from the point of view of NSs but from the perspective of L2 writers, it will help L2 researchers rethink the more common “deficit” model of L2 writing, while considering the possible advantages of a “competence” model of L2 writing. Thinking of L2 writers as L2 users (not as L2 learners but as people with their own sets of goals) enables L2 educators to understand: (1) how L2 writers experience and write in L2 in the context of L2 (what difficulties they encounter, what strategies they use, what attitudes toward writing they have, how their attitudes toward writing change, if they change, etc.) and (2) what competence means to L2 writers and what kind of competence L2 writers want to have and achieve as opposed to how they are perceived by their instructors.

Instructors’ increased awareness and understanding of the L2 writers’ perspectives of writing should benefit L2 writers in many ways. L2 writers will not feel forced to imitate American writing styles. They will not have to feel stifled and give up their personal voice, self-expression, and accent, including their LI sociocultural values. When their backgrounds (educational, cultural, and individual writing experience) are respected, international students will be better able to be themselves. This will encourage
L2 writers to: (1) meet their own clear goals, not other people’s goals (their goals might not be like NSs’) and (2) be themselves, that is, be who they are, rather than focusing on their inadequacies.

In sum, viewing L2 writers as L2 users should enable L2 writers to become L2 users more effectively. Also, educators will be able to understand students’ perspectives on writing across cultures and provide writers with more appropriate suggestions on how to use L2 effectively in the context of L2.

1.6 Limitations of the study

This study addresses the perspectives on writing by Japanese undergraduate and graduate students in the L2 context in the U.S. The issue of perceptions on writing across cultures is complicated since the perspectives on writing can be said to be influenced by social, political, cultural, educational, and linguistic factors. In this study, the educational, cultural, and individual (emotional) components of perspectives on writing will only be discussed to the extent that they are related to the L2 users’ points of view.

Although the language component includes literacy (writing & reading) and spoken (listening & speaking) skills, this dissertation focuses only on written language skills and, to a limited degree, on reading skills. Naturally, it is difficult to explore the perspectives on the writing of Japanese undergraduate and graduate students focusing on their writing skills alone, because the perspectives are interrelated with the other components. Still, to the extent possible, this dissertation isolates and examines writing skills alone.
This dissertation uses a case study design, whose sample size is small, with six participants. Additionally, the participants are limited to Japanese undergraduate and graduate students as L2 writers. The researcher conducted a survey to select six students (three undergraduates and three graduate students) with different majors. These six participants can neither represent the whole population of L2 writers at the Ohio State University, nor the whole Japanese undergraduate and graduate student population in the United States. Therefore, the findings may not be generalized to other L2 writers at other U.S. institutions.
2.1 Introduction

This dissertation is a study of the L2 writing perceptions of L2 writers' own use of L2 in the L2 context. It examines the writing of six Japanese students (three undergraduates and three graduate students) who are using English in order to pursue their goals while also adjusting to the L2 culture. In order to explore their perspectives of writing and approach to writing, this study views L2 learners as L2 users (or writers) who have multi-competence based on Cook's multi-competence theory (1995a, 1995b, 1997, 1999). In addition, this study examines cross-cultural discourse: how writing and culture influence each other at the level of the individual. Since little research has examined this area to date, I will review the literature in the following areas: the role of English in Japan, L1 writing research, L2 writing research, and multi-competence theory.

2.2 The role of English in Japan

It is necessary for educators and researchers to consider the role of English in L2 writers' L1 societies when they explore L2 writers' perspectives on writing, especially at
the newly arrived time period. I examine the role of English in Japan from three aspects: the function of English in the educational system and in the media; the implications of English usage on Japanese language; Japanese attitudes toward English; and English as an international language.

2.2.1 The function of English

In general, some people say that Japan is a homogenous and monolingual country, although there are some minorities. Duke (1986) says that Japanese society is “one of the most homogeneous societies in the world not only in physical appearances but also in language.” Almost all people in Japan, except foreigners, are Japanese. They speak Japanese, and 99% of the Japanese population is literate in Japanese. Hence, if you live in Japan, you do not need to speak or to write in English. You have few opportunities to use English in Japan.

Despite this condition, Japan is one of the countries that have been affected by the English language and American culture for the last half century. One of the factors stems from English education in Japan. In the Japanese education system, compulsory education is from first grade to ninth grade: six years in elementary school and three years in junior high school. All students study English as a foreign language for three years from seventh to ninth grades in junior high school. About 98% of junior high school graduates go to high school, although high school is not compulsory. Therefore, most students study English as a foreign language for three years in high school. That is, most Japanese high school graduates study English for a total of six years in junior and
high schools and most Japanese college graduates study English for at least eight years. Although English study for Japanese students in Japan has been focusing on grammar, the Ministry of Education started to hire native speakers of English by the JET (The Japan Exchange and Teaching) program about two decades ago, in order to improve Japanese students' communication skills in English. To learn English and its cultures makes a lot of people eager to be able to communicate with foreigners in English. Currently, Japan is one of the countries in which many native speakers of English can work as EFL teachers. In spite of the economic crisis in the 1990s, "the job market [of English teachers] is still comparatively better than in many other countries" (Leonard, 1999, p. 5).

The other strong influence of the English language on Japanese comes from the media. Regarding English study outside of school, English programs on TV and on the radio are very popular among the Japanese. In addition, Western movies are popular among Japanese people, and many foreigners, especially Caucasians, appear in Japanese television commercials. These TV commercials have brought a number of loanwords into Japanese.

In sum, Japanese people have some opportunities to learn English on Japanese TV and radio programs, if they want. Moreover, they are surrounded by Western culture via the media in their daily lives.
2.2.2 The implications of English on Japanese

In the last century, the Japanese language has changed dramatically. “As a result of the economic, political, and cultural influences of Britain and the United States, and the emergence of English as an international language” (Kay, 1995, p. 67), the Japanese language has absorbed thousands of loanwords from English, and they are well-established. There are currently some loanword dictionaries in Japanese. One of them is Kadokawa’s Loanword Dictionary, in which over half the 25,000 loanwords came after World War II, according to Nihon no sankotosho (Reference books on Japan) (Kay, 1995). As these loanwords are written in katakana in Japanese, vocabulary in katakana has increased in Japanese writing. “When elements of a foreign culture and language are ‘borrowed’ into the culture and language of another, they become adapted to their new cultural and linguistic context. . . . Most English words taken into Japanese show orthographical, phonological, structural or semantic integration into the native linguistic system” (Kay, 1995, p. 68). In Japanese, loanwords from English continue to expand and evolve to fit the changing needs of Japanese speakers. According to Kay (1995), this phenomenon fulfills “an essential role in the development of contemporary Japanese language and culture” (p. 72).

2.2.3 Japanese attitude toward English

There are mainly two different attitudes regarding the acceptance of the English language and its culture in Japan. While the majority welcome English in their lives, a few are disturbed by its invasive quality in daily Japanese life. Most Japanese people,
especially the younger generation, are eager to accept the English language and its culture. As a result, they tend to change their external lives by overusing loanwords from English, listening to Western music, eating Western foods, wearing Western fashions, etc. In addition, the preference of English and its culture is reflected in the word “internationalization” for the past couple of decades in Japan. There are a lot of events that focus on social activities with foreigners in local and urban societies. In addition, more cities, prefectures, high schools, and colleges have their sister cities, prefectures, high schools, and colleges in foreign countries, most of which are in America. It is also considered a part of internationalization to be able to speak English and communicate with native speakers of English, specifically, Americans. Sometimes, these people tend to disrespect their own Japanese language and traditional culture, considering that the Western language and culture are superior to their own language and culture.

There are only a few people who question Westernization, such as Reischauer (1988) and Tsuda (1997), who maintain that English threatens Japanese customs, traditions, and cultural identity. These people criticize overused loanwords, and lament that Japanese people may lose their own language and culture in the near future.

2.2.4 English as an international language

Looking back on the history of Japan, it is surprising that in spite of the fact that English is a late arrival as a foreign language in Japan (Gleadall, 1993), the English language has strongly influenced the Japanese language and culture compared to Chinese and other foreign languages. For the last half century following World War II, loanwords
from English have increased dramatically as they are integrated into the Japanese language. Almost all Japanese people study English as a foreign language at schools, and most of them do not even question it when they hear English via the media such as TV, radio, or the movies. In spite of the fact that Japan is a monolingual country, there is no single day that people do not hear English words and do not see Caucasians on TV. Most people believe that this is a natural phenomenon, because they have not had enough time to think about how this procedure of Westernization has taken place so rapidly and in such a short time.

Based on the information about the function of English in the educational system and in the media, the implications of English on Japanese, and Japanese people’s attitudes toward English, English as an international language is unavoidable. The English language is currently the most frequently used language in the world. Additionally, “the majority of the world’s population who use English today are not its native speakers” (Alatis & Straehle, 1997, p. 4). Kachru claims that “[t]here are now at least four non-native speakers of English for every native speaker, and most of the channels of spread are especially controlled and funded by the non-native users of the language in Asia and Africa, and by agencies that they support” (Kachru, 1994, p. 2).

In a sense, the English language has become the unifying element in our increasingly shrinking globe. The world is getting smaller and smaller, and each country is more dependent on each other both economically and politically. Japan is not an
exception. Suffering from scant natural resources, Japan is strongly dependent on other countries. In order to communicate with other foreigners, it is necessary to be able to communicate in English as an international language.

However, when Japanese people study English, the Westernization of their culture is unavoidable. Mazrui's (1975) argument that "learning English will almost certainly lead to a degree of 'Westernization,' since 'language is the most important point... [that] associations derived from the total experience of 'its people' (p. 48)" (Mazrui, 1975, cited in Pennycook, 1994, p. 260). Although Mazrui focuses on learning English in South Africa, this idea applies to learning English in Japan, as well. While Japanese people do not need to use English in Japan, they do make contact with the American culture when they learn English. Since a language always comes with its culture, such as thoughts, foods, music, fashion, etc., there is a need to consider how English language and the American culture have influenced Japanese students' perspectives on writing in English.

2.3 Cross-cultural discourse in L1 research

It is important for educators to understand students' prior writing experiences and ways of thinking so that they can anticipate their students' needs and meet their expectations better by developing appropriate learning materials. Heath (1983) examines the uses of reading and writing in two communities in the Carolinas, one white (Roadville) and one black (Trackton), both of which represent the mainstream working-class culture. Her goal is to understand the influence of their preschool home and
community or cultural background on children’s acquisition of literacy. In an effort to understand why the black and white working-class children were unsuccessful in school, she asked, “What were the effects of preschool home and community environments on the learning of those language structures and uses which were needed in classrooms and job settings?” (Heath, 1983, p. 2).

Heath (1983) concludes that in Roadville and Trackton the respective ways in which each community structured its families and the roles that the children assumed within their communities determined the ways that children learned to use language. That is, their cultural milieu, their habits and values of behaving that they shared with members of their group, and their religious activities affected the children’s different patterns of using language. In these communities, language was instrumental for one’s access to goods, services, and status. Therefore, Heath argues that in the case of these two communities, race must not be made the main point of comparison. In short, culture is learned behavior, and so is language. This is why the two communities came to have different ways of communicating. Heath writes, “their respective histories, patterns of face-to-face interactions, and ways of adjusting both to the external environment and to individuals within and outside their groups have shaped their different patterns of using language” (Heath, 1983, p. 11).

crucial to examine each writer's reading and writing background within his/her society. More specifically, these autobiographies demonstrate that it is important to examine "Who are writers?" within their communities and "How do writers perceive themselves in their communities when they struggle with writing?" Their perspectives on writing come from their prior experiences in writing in their homes, schools, and communities.

In addition, these autobiographies show that it is also essential to explore emotional factors such as anxiety, motivation, self-confidence, etc., given someone's home environment. Furthermore, a student does not need to abandon his or her native tradition and language in order to embrace other traditions and languages. It is crucial that educators be aware of the diversity of their students and the effects of those diverse cultures on language acquisition and uses of languages in the classroom, for the way someone writes is intimately connected to each individual's personal history.

Consequently, when researchers explore writing, they must be equally aware of each student's prior writing experience in his/her community. In particular, in L2 writing research, it is crucial for L2 researchers to examine L1 writing potential and L1 culture. Unfortunately, this has not been the case for much L2 writing research. Contrastive rhetoric research (CR hereafter) only, in L2 writing research, addresses the importance of examining students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds.
2. 4 Cross-cultural discourse in L2 research: Contrastive rhetoric

1. An historical review of CR studies.

Robert Kaplan (1966) first provided the notion of contrastive rhetoric, which
proposes that each language has a cultural-use preference for organizing written text, and
that the preferred discourse style from different linguistic-cultural backgrounds is
transferred into L2 writing. This was "the first serious attempt by applied linguistics in
the U.S. to explain second language writing" (Connor, 1996, p. 5). However, CR has
been criticized for the following reasons: (1) Kaplan's diagrams were too simple to
explain the variables of the writing patterns (for examples, Chinese, Thai, Korean,
Japanese speakers, etc. are explained as one "Oriental" group); (2) CR examines only L2
products and does not consider educational and developmental processes; (3) it is too
ethnocentric; and (4) it considers transfer from L1 as only a negative influence on L2
writing (Connor, 1996). As a result of this criticism, CR quickly lost momentum in the
L2 writing field.

Nevertheless, from the late 1980s to the 1990s, some CR proponents started to
take a new look at CR (Purves, 1988; Odlin, 1989; Connor, 1996; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996).
One of the motives for this movement stems from Dell Hymes's claim in the 1970s that
language should be examined in relation to social contexts as a part of the organization of
communication, rather than just as language code. This notion has brought new
directions - a "broader, more communicative view of rhetoric" (Conner, 1996, p. 7) - in
CR research. In addition to linguistic variables, researchers have started to consider the
sociocultural variables of writing (Connor, 1996). The most significant change in CR is
“a broader definition of CR in which students’ L1 is shown to be an important resource rather than a hindrance in writing” (Raimes 1991, referred to in Connor 1996, p. 18). As a result, although the early studies of CR were limited to simple features of discourse, such as paragraph organization in different languages, and these studies did not consider the context, in the 1980s L1 texts as well as L2 texts were examined with regard to sociocultural values. Thus, “CR moved ahead to compare discourse structures across cultures and genres” (Connor, 1996, p. 15).

In the thirty years following Kaplan’s early studies, even though the domain of CR research has expanded and Connor (1996) has proposed a new CR with a broader definition, CR research still has the same problem: it tends to generalize learners’ languages, rhetoric, cultures, and English. CR researchers have strongly simplified and generalized L2 writing with little concern. As Leki (1997) asserts, “[CR findings] suffer from being overgeneralized, overinterpreted, and oversimplified” (p. 238). These generalizations are due to the tendency in CR research to create “cultural stereotypes and a reductive perspective about students, learning and teaching (Raimes, 1998, p. 143). These overgeneralizations have often led to a stereotype of L2 students based on race and nationality.

2. Critiques of CR studies

Much research has compared Japanese and English rhetoric based on Japanese and English texts. But the current research has strongly overgeneralized the Japanese writers’ L1, their rhetoric, and English (L2) texts based on simple categorizations. For
example, Hinds (1987), continuing the study of the *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* pattern (1982) which originates in classical Chinese poetry, proposes a new explication of language typology in Japanese and English from sociocultural values and examines L1 and L2 texts from different cultural perspectives: speaker-/writer-responsible for English texts, and listener-/reader-responsible for Japanese texts. In this typology, he classifies the rhetoric of different cultures by the degree to which the speaker or writer is responsible, as opposed to the degree to which the listener or reader is responsible. Focusing upon English and Japanese, he defines English as a "speaker/writer responsible language" and Japanese as a "listener/reader responsible language." Moreover, Hinds provides further explanation for the listener/speaker or reader/writer typology from a sociocultural perspective; the Japanese communication style stems from the social tenet of group harmony.

However, it is an overgeneralization to consider *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* as a prototype of Japanese expository prose and to lump together texts written by any Japanese native as though they represented the whole Japanese expository prose (Kubota, 1997). A form of *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* is not the only rhetorical form in Japanese; this form is used only for some specific writing tasks. Kubota (1997) argues that some Japanese language writers refrain from using it for academic writing. In addition, Namba (1995), providing an historical review of the Japanese language, describes that written Japanese has incorporated some Western rhetoric. Specifically, "language is neither historically fixed nor emergent out of a vacuum; it is fluid, dynamic, and constituted through the change of social and political conditions both within and between language groups" (Kubota, 1997,
Therefore, it is essential to consider language as dynamic and to take into consideration the individual and unique cultural backgrounds out of which texts are created.

In addition to L2 writers' L1 and their rhetoric, CR research views culture as fixed, in spite of the fact that there is a variety of subcultures and intercultures even within one culture, and that culture is changing diachronically, like language. As an example of this fixed view, Carson and Nelson (1992) define Japanese and Chinese cultures as "collective culture" and explore how these cultural differences influence L2 writing styles. One of Carson's (1992) studies examines the educational system of Japanese and Chinese and concludes how these influence L2 writing activities. In China and Japan, according to Carson, the group's function is to serve the needs of the group; in contrast, in the United States, the peer-response groups' function in writing classes is to serve the needs of the individual. Similarly, Carson and Nelson's study (1996) based on three Chinese students concludes that "the kinds of behaviors that Chinese students would normally exhibit in groups are different from the behaviors that are frequently desired in writing groups" in the U.S. (p. 18). Clearly, this oversimplifies Japanese and Chinese cultures and perpetuates a cultural stereotype.

As Leki (1997) warns, we must resist our tendency to make generalizations about international students:

The danger in accepting the traditional contrastive-rhetoric explanations for writing differences or cross-cultural explanations for behavioral differences . . . is that such explanations risk turning ESL students into cardboard characters whose behavior is simply determined by these cultural norms and who have no individual differences or subtleties obscured by these behaviors. (p. 239)
Moreover, in a 1997 article, Spack quotes Connor and Rosaldo respectively in her argument that many CR studies define culture as “a set of rules and patterns shared by a given community” (Connor, 1996, p. 101). This older definition, Spack argues, ignores “the blurred zones in between” (Rosaldo, 1993, p. 209). More specifically, there are not two separate cultures in an ESL student’s mind, but one new culture in his/her mind (cultural hybridity). Spack (1997) proposes that international students (Spack uses this term rather than ESL students) “need to be viewed not as products of culture but as creators of culture” (p. 54). The definition of culture by Connor (1996) focuses on products of culture, while Spack (1997) emphasizes viewing ESL students as creators of culture. I assume that the integration of these two views is important, since ESL students first encounter their L1 culture and learn the cultural values in their community. In brief, as the current definition of CR is limited to explain a complicated process of L2 literacy learners, CR researchers need to change the view of CR.

Moreover, CR not only generalizes and oversimplifies learners’ native languages, rhetoric, and culture, but also English. CR studies describe written English as “straightforward and direct, moving in a straight line from one point to the next” (Leki, 1997, p. 239). However, this definition is limiting English rhetoric, which “cannot be reduced to a single norm” (Kubota, 1997, p. 465). Similarly, Kachru (1997) claims that CR research does not explain all of the varieties of English in the world. Kubota (1997) restates Kachru’s (1992) argument that L2 literacy researchers need to recognize that “[t]he current global spread of English testifies to the existence of different norms of English in different parts of the world” (p. 475).
3. Current status of CR studies

CR is still important and necessary in the field of L2 writing, in spite of the fact that an historical review of CR research shows CR studies have been criticized for strongly overgeneralizing L2 writing (Kachru, 1997a; Kubota, 1997). Kachru (1997a) states,

CR is important, since a great deal of what we know about conventions of writing in several languages, and almost all the information we have of how these conventions differ form teach other and from the conventions of writing in America and/or British English, has resulted from research in CR. (p. 337)

As literacy and culture are closely related, L2 literacy researchers cannot deny a cultural influence on L2 writing and writers’ cultural-use preferences in their writing. Additionally, L2 literacy researchers cannot ignore that “CR research has been offering insight into the cultural aspect of writing” (Kubota, 1997, p. 475). As a result, the findings of CR can provide L2 educators with in-depth information that the expectations of L2 educators and those of L2 writers might be different, stemming from the difference in their writing experience and expectations in their LI and their own cultures. Leki (1997) comments that “CR allows us . . . to accept differences between our expectations and L2 students’ writing by recognizing that the choices L2 students make in their writing originate in different and legitimate rhetorical histories” (p. 244). Despite the well-deserved criticism against it, CR is still important in L2 literacy research, because it recognizes the relationship between culture and language, and it explains the importance of L2 writers’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds. However, we need to change the way we view L2 writers, since the current view of CR limits the way L2 researchers examine
L2 writers and L2 writing. To exploit multi-competence as an outlook view in order to explore L2 writers and their writings will provide L2 writing educators with a different perspective.

2.5 Multi-competence theory

Unlike the existing L2 writing research that compares L2 writers to native English writers or L2 writing to L1 writing based on the norm of monolingual native speakers, this study exploits multi-competence theory (Cook, 1995a, 1995b, 1997, 1999), which takes the norm of multilingual speakers as a starting point to examine L2 speakers, and argues that “L2 users differ from monolingual native speakers in their knowledge of [L2 users’] L2s and L1s and in some [L2 users’] cognitive processes” (1999, p. 185). Cook (1995) argues that L2 speakers are different from L1 speakers as follows: (1) knowledge of L1 is different in L2 users; (2) advanced L2 users differ from monolinguals in their knowledge of L2; (3) people who know an L2 have a different metalinguistic awareness than people who know only an L1; and (4) L2 users have different cognitive processes from monolinguals. In this theory, in order to distinguish the knowledge of L2 speakers from that of L1 speakers, Cook (1991) coined the word “multi-competence,” which refers to “the total language knowledge of a person who knows more than one language, including both L1 competence and the L2 interlanguage” (Cook, 1999, p. 190).

The usefulness of the multi-competence approach is that “it provides a different perspective from which to look at L2 learning” (Cook, 1992, p. 577). Cook (1992) suggests viewing L2 learners as L2 users, based on the norm of the multilingualist, a
model which looks at L2 learners as L2 users who have multi-competent knowledge. He states that there is a significant difference in their approach, in that they view NNSs as “L2 users” rather than as “L2 learners.” The term “L2 user” encompasses the L2 writer’s category more broadly than the term “L2 learner,” because “it includes people who have finished learning as well as those still in the process” (Cook, 1997, p. 279). Moreover, multi-competence theory takes “the standards of L2 users” (Cook, 1995, p. 58) as its starting point, viewing L2 users “as multi-competent language users rather than as deficient native speakers” (Cook, 1999, p. 185). In this way, L2 researchers are able to explore L2 writers and L2 writings in L2 writers’ own right.

Summary

Although many L2 literacy studies have been conducted for the last two decades, there are still some problems in the field of L2 literacy. First, most L2 literacy studies have depended on the native speaker model, comparing similarities between L1 and L2 composing or between L1 writers and L2 writers. Second, there are few theories of L2 literacy to date, as most SLA theories stem from grammatical acquisition and oral English acquisition. Third, in spite of the fact that it is part of L2 literacy research, CR research has never been integrated into the other L2 literacy research, but has developed parallel to it: “[the CR framework] does not take into account the findings of research in literacy” (Kachru, 1997a, p. 345). Although CR research has contributed to L2 literacy research, most CR researchers have tried to generalize and explain L2 writing only from cultural perspectives. Learning L2 literacy and becoming L2 literate is a complicated
process. L2 literacy research and CR research need to cooperate as CR research alone cannot explain it. Although a more sophisticated CR will be able to explain contrastive pragmatics from different cultures (Kachru, 1997), CR is too limited to explain the other individual factors such as difficulties, strategies and individual differences.

In my dissertation, taking the norm of multilingualists rather than that of monolingualists as a starting point, I look at L2 writings and explore the writers' perspectives on their use of L2 in the L2 context. Through this study, I hope that L2 researchers and educators may be better able to avoid generalizing about L2 writers as well as their L1, rhetoric, culture, and English.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Design of the study

3.1.1 Site selection

This research was conducted on the main campus of The Ohio State University (OSU) in Columbus, Ohio. Selecting the OSU campus as my research site had many advantages. First, OSU is the second largest university in the U.S., providing for diversity and a considerable number of international students (22.1% of the total OSU student population in 1997), offering me a large pool of Japanese undergraduate and graduate students to choose from. Furthermore, as a Japanese graduate student at OSU myself, I am familiar with the academic community to which my interviewees are learning to adapt and adjust. Belonging to the same community gave me an insider’s rapport with the Japanese participants selected for the study. Peer intimacy, proximity, and my familiarity with the campus climate allowed me to conduct the study more efficiently, expeditiously, and in much more depth.
3.1.2 Sampling and access

In this study I used a homogeneous sample to describe a specific subgroup: Japanese undergraduate and graduate students studying at an American university. Using a homogeneous sampling strategy allowed me to focus on participants with the same L1 and L1 culture and to study them in depth. To avoid gathering unbalanced data, I selected six participants from different disciplines within the community of Japanese undergraduate and graduate students. In this selection process, I considered the issues of academic major and gender. I included both female and male participants from different fields in order to achieve a more balanced study. Although these participants have the same cultural background (i.e., Japanese as L1, Japanese culture, new arrivals to the U.S.), each is unique and has had different experiences. Ultimately, I looked for information that elucidates individual variations and salient patterns that emerged from those variations, rather than generalizing from my small sample of six to all Japanese undergraduate and graduate students in the U.S.

The specific target population of this study was Japanese undergraduate and graduate students at OSU who had been in America no more than three months and who started their program during the Autumn Quarter in 1999 (in Taro’s case, during the Winter Quarter 2000). The reason I chose the participants who had been in the U.S. less than three months was that it was assumed that these participants had not adjusted to the academic community and American culture yet, nor had they acclimated themselves to OSU. Additionally, since this is a longitudinal study, I selected participants who planned to pursue degrees and study at OSU for at least one year.
I chose the participants for this study as follows: first of all, I got approval for this study by the Human Subjects Review Committee from the Graduate School at OSU. Then, I contacted the Office of International Education (OIE) on campus and talked to an international student advisor to gather relevant information about the new Japanese undergraduate and graduate students on campus. However, as the list of all Japanese students did not show who were new students, I contacted the director of the ESL Composition Program at OSU and got permission to distribute the letter to ESL Composition instructors (see Appendix A). I contacted these instructors by email or phone and visited their classes if they had Japanese students in their classes. I found 20 Japanese undergraduate and graduate students and asked them to fill out the questionnaire regarding their educational and cultural backgrounds (see Appendix B and Appendix C). From the results of the survey, I found five newly matriculated undergraduate and three newly matriculated graduate students. I conducted open-ended interviews with these Japanese students, and selected two undergraduate and two graduate students. The reason I omitted three out of two undergraduate students was that these three were exchange students and planned to stay at OSU only for three quarters. The reason I omitted one out of three graduate students was that this student was quite busy and it seemed unlikely he could participate in my study. I contacted individuals by phone or email and invited them to participate in my study.

As there were not enough newly matriculated Japanese undergraduate and graduate students in ESL classes, I went to another class in order to find more newly matriculated students. I found one more newly matriculated graduate student outside the
ESL Composition Program, who could not register for an ESL Composition course in Autumn Quarter, 1999, due to her late registration. I asked her to fill out the questionnaire and had an open-ended interview with her. I asked her to become a participant in my study by phone. Thus, I had two undergraduate and three graduate students who became participants in my study from Autumn Quarter, 1999.

In the Winter Quarter, 2000, one of my professors told me that he had some new Japanese students in his ESL Composition class. I went to his class and met four Japanese students. I asked them to fill out a questionnaire, and I found one newly matriculated undergraduate student. I contacted him by phone and had an open-ended interview with him, after which I asked him to participate in my study. Thus, I started to collect data from him from Winter Quarter, 2000.

In sum, I had collected data from five participants from Autumn Quarter, 1999 to early Autumn Quarter, 2000, and one participant from Winter Quarter 2000 to early Winter Quarter, 2001.

3.1.3 Researcher roles

In my role as a researcher, I acted as an interviewer-as-conversationalist, as well as an informal observer. In my second role as a learner in the interview, I acted as a passive listener. I established trust and mutual respect during the interviews so that I could gain the confidence of my subjects. I believe that this can be achieved more easily when the researcher is an “insider” to the culture of the subjects being interviewed. On the other hand, a disadvantage of being an insider might be that I am immersed in the
material to such an extent that I may be unaware of certain patterns that exist in the situation that I am studying. I had outsiders to validate my impressions: I interviewed students' EFL instructors and professors if it was necessary during the process of data collection to validate my impressions.

I found myself in the role of being both an insider and an outsider. As a native of Japan, I speak fluent Japanese, while as a graduate student at OSU, I have acquired L2 language skills in English. I share the same L1 culture and language with my participants and also share similar experiences of learning writing in English, all of which make me an “insider.” I have, therefore, knowledge of “both identity and difference, self and other, knower and known, researcher and researched” (Wax, 1971, p. 178). My being an insider helped establish rapport with the Japanese undergraduate and graduate students. They were more likely to be more receptive to me than they might have been to a native American who approaches them for research, because I could address them in Japanese as an ethnic insider.

Having lived in the United States and having attended a U.S. university for seven years has also given me the experience that my Japanese participants, who were newly matriculated at OSU, did not yet have. This difference in our experiences separates me from my participants and places me outside of their experiences as new learners of writing in L2. As an outsider, then, I had a better sense of what their teachers expected from them, as well as a better sense of what is “acceptable” in professional academic writing in an American university. Having acquired these expected standards has enabled me to be more objective than I might have been, if I, too, were new to the L2
Furthermore, being somewhat removed (by my seven years of experience at OSU) from my Japanese participants also made me less ready to jump in and say “I understand” to any observations that they made and instead made me a more patient listener during the interviews.

3.1.4 Procedures

After selecting two Japanese undergraduate and three graduate students at the end of Autumn Quarter of 1999 and one Japanese undergraduate student in the Winter Quarter of 2000, I conducted a total of 10 interviews with each of the five participants for one year. In the case of Midori, I conducted a total of 11 interviews with her, since she also took courses in the Summer Quarter, 2000. I interviewed the participants approximately three times in one quarter, at the beginning of the quarter, in the middle of the quarter, and at the end of the quarter. I also observed the participants’ tutorials in ESL Composition once or twice Winter Quarter, 2000 and I had one interview with their ESL Composition instructor if they took ESL Composition courses. In the case of Jiro, I did not observe his tutorials in the ESL Composition course, nor did I interview his instructor in ESL Composition, since he felt uncomfortable about it. In the case of Shinobu, she did not take any ESL Composition courses in Winter Quarter, 2000. However, as she took an independent study from an ESL Composition professor, I observed her tutorials twice and interviewed her ESL Composition professor once.

In addition, I read these participants’ papers prepared for both ESL Composition and academic classes, which they considered their best. Then, I asked them how they...
thought and felt about their papers in English. Moreover, I asked these participants to choose those texts they believed to be good in both Japanese and English at their first quarter and after their first academic year. Finally, I asked them why they chose the texts and why they thought the texts were good.

3.1.5 Data collection time line

My data collection time line was as follows (see Table 3.1 & Table 3.2).
Permission Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 1999</td>
<td>Handed in permission request for Human Subjects to the Graduate School at OSU.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sept. 1999 | Got approval from the Graduate School at OSU for using Human Subjects in my dissertation.  
             | Asked the Office of International Education (OIE) at OSU to provide me with information and statistics regarding the enrollment of new Japanese undergraduate and graduate students in the 1999-2000 academic year. |

Phase 1
Autumn Quarter, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 5th</td>
<td>Got a list of the enrollment of Japanese students in the 1999-2000 academic year via the OIE at OSU; however, it did not indicate who were newly matriculated students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The 6th and 7th | Contacted the director of ESL Composition Program and got permission to distribute the attached memo and questionnaires to teachers in the ESL Composition Program in order to search for Japanese participants.  
                    | Contacted ESL Composition instructors by email or phone and asked if they had Japanese students. |
| The 8th    | Visited ESL Composition classes if there were Japanese students.  
             | Asked Japanese students to fill out questionnaires. |
| The 9th    | Collected questionnaires.  
             | Contacted eight students (five undergraduate and three graduate students) by phone or email.  
             | Conducted open-ended interviews with these eight Japanese students and selected four (two undergraduate and two graduate students). (1/10)  
             | Visited one academic class and found one newly matriculated Japanese graduate student (Midori). Gave her a questionnaire and collected it.  
             | Conducted open-ended interviews with Midori and selected her. (Midori: 1/11) |

Table 3.1: Data collection timeline for five participants (1999 Autumn – 2000 Summer)
Table 3.1 (continued)

| The last and finals week | - Asked these five to choose the texts in both Japanese and English that they considered to be good writing for the next interview.  
- Asked them to choose one paper from ESL and the other from an academic field they considered their best in the Autumn Quarter (2/10) (Midori: 2/11) |
| After finals week | - Conducted semi-structured and text-based interviews with each one of them and discussed a good sample of Japanese writing and a good sample of English writing s/he chose. (2/10) (Midori-2/11)  
- Conducted semi-structured and text-based interviews with these five participants individually and discussed one paper from ESL and the other from an academic field they considered their best in the Autumn Quarter. (3/10) (Midori-3/11) |

**Phase 2**

**Winter Quarter, 2000**

| The 2nd week of Winter Quarter (WQ), 2000 | - Conducted semi-structured interviews with five participants. (4/10) (Midori-4/11)  
- Contacted with the participants’ ESL instructors and got permission for tutorial observations. |
| In the middle of WQ, 2000 | - Examined the participants’ papers before the observations and observed tutorials of ESL Composition Classes.  
- Conducted semi-structured interviews with participants. (5/10) (Midori-5/11) |
| The end of WQ, 2000 | - Asked five participants to choose the paper they considered their best in the Winter Quarter.  
- Conducted semi-structured and text-based interviews with them and discussed one paper from ESL and the other from an academic field they considered their best in the Winter Quarter. (6/10) (Midori-6/11) |

**Phase 3**

**Spring Quarter, 2000**

| The 2nd week | - Conducted semi-structured interviews with five participants. (7/10) (Midori-7/11) |
| The 5th week | - Conducted semi-structured interviews with five participants. (8/10) (Midori-8/11) |
| The last and finals week | - Asked five participants to choose one paper from an academic field they considered their best in the Spring Quarter.  
- Conducted semi-structured and text-based interviews with them and discussed one paper from an academic field they considered their best in the Spring Quarter. (9/10) (Midori-9/11) |

(continued)
Table 3.1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 4</th>
<th>Summer Quarter, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>After one academic year</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The 1st and 2nd week of Autumn Quarter 2000 | - Asked Midori to choose the paper she considered her best in the Summer Quarter.  
- Conducted semi-structured and text-based interviews with Midori and discussed one paper from an academic field she considered her best. (Midori-10/11)  
- Asked these five participants to choose the texts in both Japanese and English that they considered to be good writing for the next interview.  
- Conducted semi-structured and text-based interviews with five Japanese students and discussed the text in both Japanese and English that they considered to be good writing.  
- Discussed all papers they selected as their best and the texts in both Japanese and English they selected as good writing in their first quarter. (10/10) (Midori-11/11) |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Winter Quarter, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The 2\textsuperscript{nd} week | - Got email from one ESL professor regarding Japanese students.  
- Visited his class and gave questionnaires to four Japanese students. |
| The 3\textsuperscript{rd} week | - Collected questionnaires and asked one Japanese student (Taro) to join my study. |
| The 4\textsuperscript{th} week | - Conducted open-ended interviews with Taro. (1/10)  
- Got permission to observe Taro's tutorial from his ESL professor. |
| The 5\textsuperscript{th} week | - Observed his tutorial.  
- Conducted a semi-structured interview with Taro. (2/10) |
| The last and final week | - Observed his tutorial.  
- Asked Taro to choose the paper he considered his best and the texts in both Japanese and English that he considered to be good writing by the next interview.  
- Conducted semi-structured and text-based interviews with Taro and discussed one paper from ESL and the other from an academic field he considered his best in the Winter Quarter, and a good sample of Japanese he chose. (3/10) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Spring Quarter, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 2\textsuperscript{nd} week</td>
<td>- Conducted semi-structured interviews with Taro. (4/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 5\textsuperscript{th} week</td>
<td>- Conducted semi-structured interviews with Taro. (5/10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The last and finals week | - Asked Taro to choose the paper he considered his best in the Spring Quarter.  
- Conducted semi-structured and text-based interviews with Taro and discussed one paper from an academic field he considered his best. (6/10) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3</th>
<th>Summer Quarter, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No interviews.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 4</th>
<th>Autumn Quarter, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} week</td>
<td>- Conducted semi-structured interviews with Taro. (7/10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)

Table 3.2: Data collection timeline for one participant (2000 Winter – 2000 Autumn)
The week – Conducted semi-structured interviews with Taro. (8/10).

The last and finals week – Asked Taro to choose one paper from an academic field he considered his best in Autumn Quarter, 2000.
- Conducted semi-structured and text-based interviews. (9/10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After one academic year</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

December, 2000 – Asked Taro to choose the texts in both Japanese and English that he considered to be good writing for the next interview.
- Conducted semi-structured and text-based interviews with Taro and discussed the text in Japanese that he considered to be good writing. (10/10)

3.2 Data collection methods

The data collection was carried out by triangulation, having been collected from the following sources:

1. A questionnaire for Japanese undergraduate and graduate students in order to identify new matriculated students as initial sampling source.

2. Interviews with Japanese undergraduate and graduate students (open-ended interviews, semi-structured and text-based interviews)

3. Examination of a paper s/he considered his/her best from an ESL Composition course and the other from a course in his/her academic field each quarter.

4. Examination of texts of both Japanese and English s/he considered as good samples at their first quarter and after their first academic year.
5. Two observations of tutorials of ESL Composition course per individual if s/he had.

6. One interview with ESL Composition instructors.

The combination of data collection methods is important in this study, since L2 writing acquisition is a complicated phenomenon. As “each method reveals different aspects of empirical reality” (Denzin, 1978), the triangulation (multimethod) approach increased “both the validity and the reliability of evaluation data” (Patton, 1990). The combination of data methods such as observations, interviews, examination of the text, text-based interviews about written document collection, and analysis provided different data sources, thus enhancing verification and cross-checking of the findings.

1. Questionnaire

The questionnaire provided general information about the Japanese undergraduate and graduate students such as their personal, educational (academic), cultural, and linguistic backgrounds and their attitude toward their writing in L1 and L2. The purpose of this was to identify six Japanese undergraduate and graduate students, based on their backgrounds, as potential participants. Students who had previous experience studying in the U.S. were exempted. The results of these questionnaires were not included for data analysis.
2. Interviews

Interviewing is one of the most powerful methods in qualitative research (Fontana, et al., 1994). Since the purpose of interviewing is to “understand the world from the subjects’ point of view, to unfold the meaning of people’s experiences, to uncover their lived world prior to scientific explanations” (Kvale, 1996, p.1), interviewing allows the researcher to learn from the participants’ perspective and to understand what is in and on the subject’s mind (Patton, 1990); that is, interviewing enables one to access what one cannot directly observe. More specifically, the method of interviewing has great advantages for this study. Since my research questions were intended to understand issues of L2 users’ perspectives on writing, the interview technique could reveal the insights of the participants, such as their attitudes toward their writing and toward their newly acquired community and language, insights which would be impossible to access through mere observation or text analysis. As the interviewer, I tried to listen closely to the interviewees and observed their facial expressions and body language in order to gather optimum information. My observations provided input, which guided me in adjusting my questions as necessary.

Any research method has its weaknesses. Interviewing is no exception. One of the drawbacks of the interview is that it is a limited source of data, since “participants and staff can only report their perceptions of and perspectives on what has happened.” Those perspectives and perceptions are sometimes misleading, due to factors such as “personal bias, anger, anxiety, politics, and simple lack of awareness” (Patton, 1990, p. 245). In addition, interview data can be influenced by the emotional condition of the interviewee
at the time of the interview, who, in turn, can be subject to recall error. However, I attempted to minimize these weaknesses by not having preferred responses as a researcher, but by examining everything objectively. In other words, the researcher attempted to understand each participant's perceptions and experiences from their point of view.

In this study, as mentioned above, interviews were very important in order to examine L2 writers' insights toward their writing in both L1 and L2. A variety of interviews were used for different purposes and theoretical frameworks. I designed and conducted three different interview schedules: open-ended, semi-structured, and text-based interviews. I interviewed my participants in Japanese, as they preferred to answer in Japanese. The participants might be more comfortable in Japanese and might become more expressive as a result. I attempted to provide the participants with adequate time in order to think and reflect during the interviews. I contacted each person by phone or email to set up the interview site, date, and time.

Open-ended interviews were conducted with eight Japanese students (five undergraduates and three graduate students) individually. Open-ended interviews provide insights into the participants' writing experiences in the L1 and L2 contexts. The open-ended format enables the researcher to establish "a human-to-human relation with the respondent" (p. 366). Through in-depth communication, the open-ended interview enables "the researcher to understand and capture the points of view of other people without predetermining those points of view through prior selection of questionnaire categories" (Patton, 1990, p. 24). It also yields a greater scope than the other types of
interviews. Open questions, such as “Could you tell me everything about your experience of learning writing in English as L2 in the L2 context?”, “Could you tell me everything about your experience of learning writing in Japanese as L1 in Japan?”, or “Could you tell me everything about the writing instructions you had in Japan?” were conducted in order to investigate how the participants perceived their learning of writing in English as L2 in the context of L2 use. In this dissertation, asking open-ended questions left the six participants free to tell me about experiences that I would not have learned about, had I asked more structured and specific questions. Especially since my research involves the participants’ feelings and personal development, conducting such open-ended interviews helped me to gather more data.

The semi-structured interviews were conducted individually with six participants selected to participate in this research. In the semi-structured interviews, I asked some major questions. For example, “How do you like writing in L2 in the L2 context?”, “What is your perception on writing in L2?”, “How do you like writing in L1 in the L1 context?”, “What is your perception of writing in L1?” etc. I also probed with subsequent questions as they naturally emerged in the interview process.

The text-based interviews were conducted individually with the six Japanese participants selected to participate in this research. My goal was to examine the participants’ perceptions of writing, comparing and contrasting the participants’ experience in writing in English for their first academic year. Some questions asked were: “Could you describe why you have chosen this text as a good model?” “Could you explain why you have chosen this paper as your best paper in your discipline this
quarter?" "Are you satisfied with your writing skills in this paper?" "What parts of this paper do you like the best?" etc. All of the text-based interviews with the students allowed me to examine what students think, feel, and believe about their writing. They provided me with in-depth information on issues behind the texts that the students wrote. Focusing on the students' own experience with writing in English, I hoped to also discover whether and how the students' perceptions of their own writing would have changed in one year and to determine whether or not they felt they had met their goals as users of L2 writing in the academic L2 context.

As an interviewer, I attempted to listen carefully to the interviewees' words while observing their facial expressions and body language. Accordingly, I revised my questions as needed. I also showed my appreciation of the participants' time and effort at the end of each interview. All of the interviews were tape-recorded. Following each interview, I listened to the tape and transcribed it. Whenever the interviews took place in Japanese, I translated them into English. Soon after the transcription was completed, I emailed interviewees to thank them for their help once more. If confirmation and clarification of my data was necessary, I used the phone conversation or email for that purpose. After each transcription, I reflected on my concerns and experience with both the content and methodology of each interview, in order to improve validity.

The goals of the interviews at different stages of the study are as follows: the initial interview, open-ended, was conducted at the end of Autumn Quarter 1999, with a total of nine Japanese students (five undergraduate and four graduate including Midori), who were selected on the basis of the written questionnaire. The purpose of this
interview was to confirm the answers that they gave in the written questionnaire and to narrow down the number of participants to five, based on their availability and their ability to cooperate in the study, and to determine what goals the participants had as writers in L2. Information regarding their educational background, academic goals, and prior experience in an American university helped me conclude whether they could be included in my study. As a result of the first interviews, I selected a total of five students (two undergraduates and three graduate students).

The second and third interviews were semi-structured and text-based interviews conducted during winter break with the five Japanese undergraduate and graduate students. More specifically, the second interview centered on a good sample of Japanese writing and a good sample of English writing that the interviewee chose. During this interview, I asked the students why they chose a particular text and why they believed it represented “good” writing. In other words, I asked them what made writing “good” in their opinion. The purpose of this interview was to learn what they consider to be good writing, through discussing the texts that they selected as writing. I also asked them what goals they aspired to in their own work.

The third interview focused on two papers that the students wrote themselves. The students were asked to choose their own best writing from: (1) the papers from their ESL class and (2) the papers from their academic discipline. Before the scheduled interview, I asked for copies of these two papers so that I could read them and prepared my interview questions beforehand. The purpose of this interview was to explore the students’ writing experience in the L2 context and find out how they used English in their
writing. I also wanted to learn what they thought of their instructor's comments and whether their perceptions of their own writing had changed during their first ten weeks at OSU.

The second and third interviews listed above began with semi-structured questions to learn why the student chose a certain paper as "good" writing or as his/her "best" writing. For example, I asked questions such as: "What is your perception of good writing?" or "How do you like participating in your ESL class at OSU?" Then, I asked the students specific questions such as: "Are you satisfied with your paper?" "Do you feel you understand and agree with your teacher's comments?" I also asked the students specific questions focused on particular comments on a paragraph or a sentence and what the students thought and felt about a particular section of their writing and the feedback it received.

The fourth interview took place at the beginning of Winter Quarter 2000. During this interview I asked the students what they thought about the grades they got in the Autumn Quarter, how they thought they performed, and how their opinions of their writing changed since they first arrived at OSU. The purpose of this interview was to explore their goals for the Winter Quarter, and to learn whether they had any new strategies to improve their writing in L2.

The fifth interview was conducted in the middle of Winter Quarter 2000. This took place after I had an opportunity to observe two tutorial sessions per student (Observation Tutorial for ESL Composition courses). The purpose of the interview was to learn the students' reactions to their instructor's comments and suggestions during the
tutorial. I also learned about their experiences in writing during their second quarter at OSU and whether they were more comfortable using English, now that they had had more experience.

The sixth interview was conducted at the end of the Winter Quarter 2000. As in the third interview, this interview focused on two papers that the students wrote themselves. The students were asked to choose their own best writing sample from: (1) the papers from their ESL class and (2) the papers from their academic discipline. Before the scheduled interview, I asked for copies of these two papers so that I could read them and prepare my interview questions beforehand. The purpose of this interview was to explore the students' writing experience in the L2 context and find out how they used English in their writing. I also wanted to learn what they thought of their instructor's comments and whether their perceptions of their own writing had changed during their first ten weeks at OSU.

The seventh interview took place at the beginning of Spring Quarter 2000. As in the fourth interview, I asked the students what they thought about the grades they got in the Winter Quarter, how they thought they performed, and how their opinions of their writing had changed since they first arrived at OSU. The purpose of this interview was to explore their goals for the winter quarter, and to learn whether they had any new strategies for improving their writing in L2.

The eighth interview was conducted in the middle of Spring Quarter 2000. The purpose of this interview was to learn about their experiences in writing during their third
quarter at OSU and to find out whether they were more comfortable using English, now that they had had more experience.

The ninth interview focused on one paper that the participants had written themselves. The participants were asked to choose their own best writing sample from the papers prepared for their courses in their academic discipline. Before the scheduled interview, I asked for a copy of this paper so that I could read it and prepare my interview questions beforehand. The purpose of this interview was to explore the students' writing experience in the L2 context and find out how they use English in their writing. I also wanted to learn what they thought of their instructor's comments and whether their perceptions of their own writing had changed.

The last interview was conducted in the Autumn Quarter, 2000, one year after they started studying at OSU. At this point, the participants had experienced life at the university for one year and had been writing in English in an academic setting in the U.S. In this interview, they made new selections of any piece of "good" writing by others in both Japanese and English. My purpose in requesting the first selection was to determine whether the students' perception of what constitutes "good" writing had changed. In addition, I showed the students their previous selections during their first year, and I asked them whether they still thought these were "good" writing. My goal was to determine how the students' use of English had developed. My purpose in requesting the two writing samples of the students' own writing was to determine whether their perceptions of good writing had changed, and if so, how they had changed.
As only Midori took classes and had writing assignments in her fourth quarter, she had one extra interview regarding the paper she chose as her best in her fourth quarter. In the case of Taro, he became a newly matriculated student in Winter Quarter, 2000 so that his interviews were one quarter behind, although the sequence of interviews is the same as that of the other students.

3. Examination of English texts written by the participants and the texts they chose as good model

Throughout one year, I collected a total of four to five papers written by each participant, two papers per quarter, with the students’ permission: one from the ESL composition class and the other from their academic discipline. To examine how the participants revised their papers in the ESL Composition course, I also collected early drafts along with copies of the final drafts graded and commented on by the teachers who assigned them. Then, I conducted individual text-based interviews with my participants regarding these papers. My examination of the texts in L2 allowed me to explore how the participants conceptualized the writing process as they revised their papers. It also stimulated the students to talk about how they used their writing skills in L2. In addition, it allowed me to come up with questions about how they perceived their own writing, which I asked in order to elicit their own opinions about their writing.
4. Observations of ESL composition tutorials

Observations of ESL composition tutorials are crucial in this study, because they have an impact on how participants respond to their ESL composition instructors' advice and suggestions regarding their written documents in L2. Since in tutorials of ESL composition the participants discuss their papers individually with their ESL instructor, the observational data provides in-depth information to account for the students' struggle, opinions, feelings, and attitude toward their own writing.

In this research, observations of tutorials of ESL composition and text-based interviews regarding written texts by the participants complemented each other. In other words, while observations were usually limited to external behaviors, the text-based interviews assured the gathering of data about the insights of the participants regarding their attitudes toward their writing in L2. Observations provided more data about the participants' interactions with their instructors within the L2 community, whereas the text-based interviews provided more data about the participants' personal thoughts and feelings about L2 writing.

3. 3 Data analysis methods

3. 3. 1 Data analysis

A case study is a “descriptive write-up” and it is process-oriented (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). The process of acquiring L2 writing skills is a broad and complicated one. Since “everything has the potential to be data, but nothing becomes data without
the intervention of a researcher who takes notes — and often makes notes — of some things to the exclusion of others” (Wolcott, 1994, p. 3), I considered that everything was crucial and I collected as much data during my observations and interviews as possible. I tape-recorded and wrote down all of the information (what the participants said as well as what they did and how they behaved) during and after every observation, interview, and reading of the participants’ texts in order to make my findings more trustworthy (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992).

Since the data collection and data analysis were tightly interwoven in this research, I did all of the analyses during and after the data collection. Since all interviews and tutorial observations were tape-recorded, I transcribed the tapes immediately after each session. Following this step in my data analysis, I phoned each participant as needed, when I had to confirm some information or ask a further question. The interviews yielded two different kinds of data: the first interview with each participant in the beginning of both quarters was based on the students themselves, their goals, their experience at Ohio State, their level of comfort with English, their attitudes toward writing, and their general perception of themselves as L2 writers in the L2 context. The rest of the interviews were text-based. The data that I gathered from these interviews was directly connected to the “best” writing sample by someone else that the students had selected, and the “best” writing that they felt they themselves had done in the current quarter.

When presenting my data, I first described each of the participants in terms of their educational background, personality traits, years of experience in English speaking,
reading, and writing, previous writing training in Japanese and English, academic
discipline and goals, and their writing experience in English in the L2 context. Based on
these, I categorized and created cross-case clusters to facilitate my analysis and
interpretations. My final analysis was aimed at finding similarities in the Japanese
undergraduate and graduate students’ perspectives of writing, similarities among
undergraduates, and similarities among graduate students in the context of L2 use.

3.3.2 Trustworthiness (Validity)

Throughout my research, I maintained trustworthiness through the following
practices.

1. Prolonged engagement and commitment

I have been engaged in the study of international students’ perspectives of writing
in English during my doctoral studies at The Ohio State University. This subject is of
interest to me because, as a Japanese graduate student in an American university myself, I
have had first-hand experience with writing across cultures, learning to think in a
language other than my native tongue, and learning to write in a second language, for
which I have had to acquire new writing skills. Both in the master’s and doctoral
programs at OSU, I studied Foreign and Second Language Education and read second
language acquisition theory, totaling at least 200 credit hours at OSU.

Prior to my dissertation research, I conducted two studies while I was in the Ph.D.
program. During my first year as a doctoral student, I conducted a study of how a
Japanese undergraduate student struggles with writing in English. Similarly, during my third year in the Ph.D. program, I conducted a study with two undergraduate- and three graduate students about their perspectives on writing. I was surprised to discover that what these students considered to be “good” writing in Japanese was quite different than what they considered to be “good” writing in English. As a result, the Japanese students had difficulty distinguishing how to write “well” in English. These findings motivated me to examine international students’ wider writing experience with English as a second language in an L2 setting and led to my current research.

Since I started my research in September 1999, I had completed three and a half years of background study on this subject. The interviews took a total of one year, following which I began writing up my findings in the form of a dissertation.

2. Sustained objectivity

In order to guard against my own subjective responses to the data, I kept a separate ongoing journal parallel to my research notes. In this journal I kept track of my own personal reactions and feelings in order to separate them from the responses of the interviewees. Since I am a Japanese graduate student myself, there is a risk of interference between the interviewees’ answers and my own opinions. The purpose of this journal was to encounter my own expectations as well as to monitor my personal development as a researcher.
3. Triangulation

In order to ensure the validity of my research, I used triangulation, including interviews, questionnaires, observations, and text analyses. Each of these methods controlled a different aspect of my research, and enabled me to collect and record the data in different ways to ensure trustworthiness.

4. Member checks

After transcribing the tapes of observation of ESL tutorials and the interviews, I telephoned or emailed each participant, to confirm and clarify the information in the transcriptions. In these phone calls or emails, I gave each person the opportunity to make corrections and even add new information, if they felt necessary. Sometimes, I also followed up with a meeting in addition to the telephone call or email. These meetings were used to confirm a particular quote or clarify a point made in the previous interview.
CHAPTER 4

SIX CASE STUDIES

Introduction

In this chapter, in order to arrive at a deep understanding of each participant’s perspectives on good writing and their approach to writing with regard to their own goals and experiences as an L1 writer as well as an L2 writer, I present six case studies, focusing on individuals’ perspectives on good writing and their use of writing in English during their adaptation to academic life in the L2 context in their first academic year in the U.S.

Each case study has the following components:

1. Profile of participant.

I will describe the educational, cultural, and individual background of each participant. Through these descriptions, I will present information about each participant’s previous degree(s), intended degree(s), major, past experience in writing in Japanese and English, experience in living or visiting abroad, gender, age, and a few personal characteristics.
2. Writing experience in the L1 context.

I will display the training that the participants have had in the L1 context, the
texts they have produced in the L1 and the L2 context if the participants have experiences
in studying abroad, and the attitudes toward L1 writing that they hold. In addition, I will
consider the training and texts the participants have had in English as a foreign language.

3. Writing experience in the L2 context.

I will display the instruction that L2 writers have had in the L2 context and the
texts they have produced in the L2 context.

4. Perspectives on good writing.

I will present each participant’s perspectives on good writing from three sources:
(1) papers in English s/he considers his/her best; (2) texts in English s/he chose as good
samples of writing; and (3) texts in Japanese s/he chose as good samples of writing. I
will examine each of these three sources first by comparing the participant’s selections
over time; and next, by comparing the participant’s selections against one another—for
example, I will compare a participant’s perspectives on “good writing” in English with
his or her perspectives on “good writing” in Japanese.

More specifically, in the section of papers in English s/he considers his/her best, I
will present each participant’s perspectives on good writing based on each paper they
chose as a sample of good writing among their papers. These papers are selected either
from papers in a participant’s ESL course or in a course s/he took in his/her academic
field during his/her adaptation to academic life in the L2 context. After presenting each participant’s perspectives on his/her best paper, I will reflect briefly on his/her perspectives on good writing based on the papers in English s/he considers his/her best over the first academic year in the U.S.

In the section of texts in English each participant chose as samples of good writing, I will present the participant’s perspectives on good writing, based on each text s/he chose as a sample of good writing in English—one paper from the beginning of their academic year and a second paper after the completion of their first academic year in the U.S. After presenting each participant’s perspectives on each text that he or she chose, I will briefly reflect on his/her perspectives on good writing in English, comparing the two papers to examine whether or not, and how, his/her perspectives on good writing have changed.

In the section of texts in Japanese each participant chose as samples of good writing, I will present the participant’s perspectives on good writing, based on each text s/he chose as a sample of good writing in Japanese—one paper from the beginning of their academic year and a second paper after the completion of their first academic year in the U.S. After presenting each participant’s perspectives on each text that he or she chose, I will briefly reflect on his/her perspectives on good writing in Japanese, comparing the two papers to examine whether or not, and how, his/her perspectives on good writing have changed.
Finally, I will reflect on how these perspectives on good writing are related across three sources: (1) papers in English s/he considers the best; (2) texts in English s/he considers good writing; and (3) texts in Japanese s/he considers good writing.

In this chapter, I describe what perspectives on writing each participant holds and if and how they have changed. In Chapter 5, I will discuss why they have such perspectives on good writing and if and why their perspectives have changed or have not changed.

Summary of six profiles

The following tables (see Table 4.1 and Table 4.2) provide a broad picture of the six participants in this study. The participants in the tables represent newly matriculated Japanese students who have resided at OSU. Two of them are undergraduate students. One of them is registered as an undergraduate student and was waiting to be admitted into the MBA program when I started interviewing in his first quarter. While he was waiting, he decided to obtain a second BA, as his professor did not write a letter of recommendation for him. Three of the participants are graduate students in Master’s Programs. I use pseudonyms in order to protect the rights of the participants. Table 4.1 summarizes the participants’ gender, age, previous degree, intended degree, major, and previous experience, while Table 4.2 summarizes their prior experience in writing in Japanese.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Previous degree</th>
<th>Intended degree</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Previous experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomoko</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>1 month in high school in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroko</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Management Hospitality</td>
<td>1 month in junior high school in Australia and 1 year in high school in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taro</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>5 months in the U.S. after university degree from Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midori</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1 year in high school in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinobu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Women’s Studies</td>
<td>9 months at a U.S. university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiro</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>3 years in the U.S. from kindergarten to 2nd grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Summary profile of newly matriculated students during their first quarter

Note: The information is based on participants’ first quarter at OSU.

* N/A means no experience of college or universities.

Table 4.1 indicates that there are four female and two male participants. They range in age from 18-26 years old. There are three undergraduate students and three graduate students. Their majors vary and all of them have experience of traveling abroad.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elem. &amp; Jr. High School</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Graduate School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomoko</td>
<td>Kansobun(1)</td>
<td>No writing</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bunshu(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroko</td>
<td>Kansobun</td>
<td>No writing</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diary</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taro</td>
<td>Kansobun</td>
<td>Shoronbun(3)</td>
<td>Papers in Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diary</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midori</td>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>Shoronbun(3)</td>
<td>Papers in Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Papers in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesis for BA in Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinobu</td>
<td>Kansobun</td>
<td>Shoronbun</td>
<td>Papers in Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesis for BA in Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiro</td>
<td>Kansobun</td>
<td>Shoronbun</td>
<td>Papers in Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papers in Japanese and English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Texts the participants produced in both Japanese and English in the L1 context
(1) Kansobun is a response paper to reading. Students read a book which is required or a book they choose and write their response to the book such as how they think and feel about some incidents in the book or about the book itself.
(2) Bunshu is a composition that students write about some incidents in their daily life.
(3) Shoronbun is a short essay that includes a writer’s opinions.
* N/A means no experience of colleges, universities, or graduate schools.
Note: This information is based on the participants’ first quarter at OSU.
Table 4.2 shows that two high school graduates rarely wrote in Japanese after graduating from junior high school, while university graduates and a graduate of a master’s program in Japan had more writing experience in Japanese.
4.1 Tomoko

4.1.1 Profile

Tomoko was 18 years old when we first met. She was very friendly, and she always had a smile on her face. In Japan, where her father is a chief priest of a Buddhist temple, all of her family, her parents, and her two younger brothers have entered the Buddhist priesthood, except for her. Tomoko attended a Christian private girls’ junior and senior high school, which emphasizes teaching Christian ideals. As Tomoko had some Australian teachers of English in junior high, it was fun for her to be able to communicate with these teachers, using some vocabulary and grammar she had learned in her other English classes.

Tomoko developed an interest in communicating in English, which resulted in her majoring in English in high school. Tomoko spent one summer in Australia as an exchange high school student. Her experience of unsatisfactory English communication skills in Australia motivated her to apply to a university in the U.S. in order to improve her speaking skills. Five months after she graduated from high school in Japan, Tomoko came to Columbus, Ohio and enrolled at OSU in the Autumn Quarter, 1999. When I began interviews with her, Tomoko had declared her major as Business, more specifically, International Business, as one of her teachers in high school had recommended her to major in this field, plus she was interested in international relations and politics. Tomoko was also thinking about declaring a second major from another field upon the suggestion
of some of her friends that people who have double majors as undergraduates have an advantage when looking for jobs. At the time I met her, Tomoko had not yet decided which second field she wanted to study.

4.1.2 Writing experience in the L1 context

In elementary school in Japan, Tomoko’s experience of writing in Japanese was to keep a journal, to write *kansobun* (responses to reading), and to write *bunshu* (compositions at the end of each school year). However, Tomoko feels that she never really received any instruction to teach her how to write. In her journal, Tomoko simply wrote what she did, what happened, and what she felt about some happenings on each day. She could write freely in any style she wanted to, and there was no grade on it. Her teacher read her journal every day, and wrote short and very general comments, which were not about her writing. For instance, one example of her teacher’s comments that Tomoko remembers is when Tomoko wrote about an unfortunate event, her dog passing away, and about her sorrow. All her teacher wrote was something like, “All animals as well as human beings give happiness as well as sadness, and all of them die. It is important to know and understand the limitation and the preciousness of life. I am glad that you have learned the preciousness of life.”

Regarding *kansobun*, Tomoko was required to read a book and write her response to the book every summer vacation. She could choose any book she wanted to read, and could read books from any genre, fiction or non-fiction, or literature for elementary school. As she was not instructed how to write a *kansobun*, she just wrote what she
thought and felt about the book she chose. Again, her teachers did not correct anything about the *kansobun* that Tomoko wrote, except for pointing out some grammatical mistakes and making short comments.

At the end of every school year, Tomoko was required to write a composition called *bunshu*, which was supposed to be about her school life, family trips, and some of her memories from that year. As she did not have any instruction on how to write *bunshu*, either, she just wrote freely in any style she liked. Like *kansobun*, instead of correcting anything about *bunshu* except for some grammatical errors, her teachers wrote only a few general comments on Tomoko’s *bunshu*.

One year in her elementary school, although she does not remember which grade she was in, Tomoko’s *bunshu* was selected as the best *bunshu* in her class, and it was compiled in a collection of the best compositions by elementary school students, which was published every school year by the board of education in Suzuka, where Tomoko lived.

As an additional study outside her school, Tomoko took a correspondence course to improve her Japanese language skills during her fifth or sixth grade. This is a class that some families want their children to take, because there are so many intricacies in the Japanese language. In this course, which she took for less than one year, Tomoko learned one of the traditional Japanese formats, "*ki-sho-ten-ketsu*" for writing. Since she was not forced to write in the traditional "*ki-sho-ten-ketsu*" format, Tomoko did not have any practice in using this format.
Tomoko did not write anything in Japanese in junior or senior high school, except for one short composition about her trip to Australia in high school. In this paper, she wrote her personal perspective concerning her experiences in Australia such as what she did, what she watched, and what she thought about different cultures. Overall, therefore, Tomoko had little experience in writing much of anything in Japanese.

Concerning her literacy experience in English as foreign language in Japan, what she read in English was only her English textbooks, and she did not compose in English at all. Rather, English classes in her schools were focused on oral communication as well as grammar and translation.

4.1.3 Writing experience in the L2 context

Tomoko's writing experience in English in the academic setting in the U.S. for her first academic year is shown at Table 4.3. This table shows what kind of writing assignments she had, how many papers she wrote, how long she wrote in each paper, in which course, Tomoko had. In addition, it shows which papers she chose as her best each quarter. In her first two quarters, Tomoko wrote papers in English only in ESL Composition courses. In her third quarter, she had writing assignments only in the First-Year Composition course. In her fourth quarter, Tomoko did not have any writing assignments since she did not take any courses.

In her first quarter, Tomoko was placed in ESL Composition 107, which is the intermediate class for undergraduate students. The major assignments Tomoko had in ESL Composition 107 were essay assignments. She was instructed on how to write a
summary and a paragraph. She was also instructed on how to organize a paper in English. She wrote three papers there: comparison and contrast essay; synthesis-response essay; and response essay. In her second quarter, Tomoko was placed in ESL Composition 108.01, which is the advanced class for undergraduates. The major assignments Tomoko had in ESL Composition 108.01 were also essay assignments based on reading. She wrote three papers: literacy narrative; argument/response; argument/refutation. In her third quarter, Tomoko had writing assignments only in the First-Year Composition course, and they were essay assignments. The assignments focused on reading and discussion. She had to read many articles for every class and discuss some issues with her classmates in this class. Then, she had to write her papers. Although she wrote some papers in this course, she was not instructed on how to organize papers in English as she was instructed in the ESL Composition courses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Writing Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Composition (Education: Teaching and Learning 107)</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Paper #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Paper #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter (Spring Quarter, 2000)</td>
<td>**Paper #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter (Summer Quarter, 2000)</td>
<td>Tomoko did not take any courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: The writing assignments Tomoko had in her first academic year in the U.S.
* Tomoko considers this to be the best paper in her writing assignments in her ESL course.
** Tomoko considers this to be the best paper in her writing assignments in her academic field in that quarter.
4.1.4 Tomoko’s perspectives on good writing

I present Tomoko’s perspectives on good writing in both English and Japanese based on the papers and texts Tomoko selected in her first academic year in the U.S. shown in Table 4.4. Tomoko’s perspectives on good writing in English are based on three papers in English she considered her best: two from ESL Composition courses and one from an academic field. Tomoko did not select any texts in English as good samples of writing because she said she did not know how to recognize good writing in English either at the beginning of the academic year or after completing her first academic year.

Tomoko’s perspectives on good writing in Japanese are based on two texts she considered as good samples of Japanese writing. She selected these texts respectively at the beginning of the academic year and after completing her first academic year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papers in English she considers her best</td>
<td>Texts in English she chose as good samples of writing</td>
<td>Texts in Japanese she chose as good samples of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>“The difference in the social class” by Tomoko.</td>
<td>Tomoko did not select.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>“Academic cheating” by Tomoko.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>“Internet Regulations” by Tomoko.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>No Classes.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1 year</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Tomoko did not select.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: The papers and texts Tomoko selected in her first academic year in the U.S.
Note: The number on the left column refers to quarters in her first academic year.

Perspectives on good writing in English

Papers in English she considers her best

From among the papers she wrote in ESL Composition 107 in her first quarter at OSU, Tomoko chose Paper #3 (Response essay) as her best paper, titled “The difference in social class.” The purpose of the response essay was to write her response based on a short story, “The Stolen Party” by Liliana Heker. Tomoko explained the reasons why she chose this as her best paper in this course, as follows.

The first reason Tomoko believed this paper was good was that she got an “A-” on this paper with positive comments from her instructor, such as “good personal..."
background,” “good, competent work,” and “good conclusion.” These positive comments made Tomoko very happy and gave her more confidence to believe that this was a good paper. Tomoko also felt confident in this paper as she followed her instructor’s advice and added everything that her instructor suggested. For example, Tomoko wrote this paper in a format of introduction, body, and conclusion that she learned in this course. In the introduction, as her instructor suggested, she wrote a broad and general idea on a focused issue. She began by writing her personal experience of meeting with many international students from different cultures in an American university; then she moved the focus to briefly summarize the story about “The Stolen Party,” followed by a thesis statement which expressed her admiration for Herminia (maid) and disrespect for Dona Inez (employee). Tomoko believed she was able to write the connection from a broad issue based on her experience to a focused issue. In addition, Tomoko was satisfied that she was able to expand her conclusion from a specific context to a broader context as her instructor taught in class. More specifically, Tomoko moved from an incident of the story to her own opinions about prejudice.

The second reason was that she spent a lot of time and worked very hard on this paper and it gave her satisfaction. The third reason was she was able to express exactly what she wanted to say in this paper, such as why she respected Herminia and disrespected Dona Inez. Specifically, Tomoko liked the last part of her conclusion, as she believed this was what she wanted to say:

The way to see the people in a different social class will pass on to children. The difference in a social class would exist forever. The difference in social class seems to be ridiculous for me. I think all people should be treated fairly. (Tomoko’s paper in ESL Composiition 107)
She liked writing about what she thinks and feels while referring to the text. She was also satisfied with the way she was able to find her voice and express herself in English. Overall, the major reasons that Tomoko chose this paper as the best paper in ESL Composition course 107 were that she got a “A” from her instructor, wrote this paper following her instructor’s suggestions, spent a lot of time and worked hard, and expressed her opinions in this paper.

In her second quarter, Tomoko had writing assignments again only in her ESL Composition course. When I asked Tomoko to choose the best paper that she wrote in her ESL Composition class, she said that she felt she did not have a “best” paper, since she did not spend a lot of time in writing papers and did not work very hard writing in English this quarter. Although Tomoko felt that she did not have the best paper in this course, she chose Paper #3 (argument/refutation) as her best paper. In this paper, Tomoko was required to read from some articles on the assigned topic and write a paper, using refutation and opposing arguments to argue for or against a thesis. For her topic, Tomoko chose to argue for a punishment for academic cheating and she titled her paper “Academic cheating.”

Tomoko described the reason she chose this paper as her best as follows: first of all, Tomoko believed that this paper was good, since she wrote it following her instructor’s directions. My observation data of Tomoko’s tutorials of ESL Composition courses shows Tomoko was willing to follow her ESL instructor’s suggestions and advice on her papers. She was instructed to write an introductory paragraph, a thesis statement clearly indicating the approach she chose, supportive arguments as taught in class, some
refutation, citations from the assigned sources, documentation, conclusion, and a list of the works cited. She followed these instructions closely.

More specifically, she wrote a thesis in the introduction as she was taught in class. Tomoko wrote her thesis statement at the end of the introduction: “Even though some people say that major penalties are not necessary, I believe that it is necessary, and especially the serious penalty is important to reduce cheating” (Tomoko’s paper in ESL Composition 108.01). Tomoko then gave some reasons to support her thesis, why she believed the necessity of strong penalties to reduce cheating. She was fond of the reasons to support her thesis: “One of the reasons that I think the serious penalty is necessary is that I think cheating is bad and students should be graded fairly” (Tomoko’s paper in ESL Composition 108.01).

Secondly, Tomoko believed this paper was good because she could express what she wanted to say in this paper. She had strong opinions about the need for serious penalties in order to reduce academic cheating. She considered this paper good since it allowed her to put into words the thoughts that she had on the subject of education. For this reason, she liked the following section of her paper the best:

However, I can say that it is necessary to have the serious penalty and reduce cheating. At the same time, we should find the solutions except the penalty. For instance, we should think over the education system such as just only emphasizing on grades. At the same time, students also should think over the really meaning to study, what for they study, and why they study. (Tomoko’s paper in ESL Composition 108.01)

Thus, she believed that these papers are good because she followed her instructor’s directions, wrote a thesis and paragraph to support the thesis, and could write what she wanted to say. Overall, the major reasons that Tomoko chose this paper as her best paper
are the same as her reasons for choosing the best paper from her first quarter: she wrote this paper following her instructor's suggestions and expressed her opinion in this paper. However, as she did not work hard, that criterion was not there.

In her third quarter at OSU, First-Year Composition was the only class where Tomoko had writing assignments. Tomoko chose Paper #1 (argumentative essay) as her best paper (see Appendix D). The assignment for this paper asked the students to think about a social or political issue about which they feel strongly. Students were required to write a thesis statement and support that statement with arguments and counterarguments. They were also required to do some research for this paper by consulting the Internet and to provide citations for all sources.

The title Tomoko chose for her paper was "Internet Regulations." The reasons Tomoko considered this paper as a sample of a good paper in this course were as follows. First, Tomoko said she was confident about the introduction to her essay. She believed that this introduction was very good, since she could first write about something general and unrelated to the Internet, and then focus on the Internet. This was what she was instructed in her ESL Composition courses. The following is from her introduction:

Over two hundred years ago, the founders of our country created a unique concept known as the freedom of speech. This purpose of enabling each individual to freely speak their minds has opened the doors to many controversial issues. Lately, the Internet has been the concentration of these arguments." (Tomoko's paper in First-Year Composition 110).

Tomoko felt very comfortable with the way she connected general concepts with specifics about the Internet, stating "Over two hundred years ago . . ." and "Lately . . .". She clearly presented her thesis in her introduction: "I believe that the Internet should be
regulated so that everyone can use Internet safely” (Tomoko’s paper in First-Year Composition 110). She said that she tried to take a risk and it went well, which made her very happy.

Second, Tomoko believed that this paper is good because the body of her paper was written very well: she believed that the contents she wrote were appropriate to support her thesis. She wrote her reasons why the Internet should be regulated and gave some examples such as crimes committed by the Ku Klux Klan, Neo-Nazis, and others. She also wrote her opinion that some web sites support and encourage violent behaviors, providing information on how to make pipe bombs and weapons. She gave a case of the Columbine High School shootings as a counterargument for freedom of speech. Then, she discussed the validity of some information we can obtain on the Internet, such as easy accessibility to web sites for pornography and wrote about the spreading of computer viruses.

Third, Tomoko wrote her own opinion. She considered her own ideas to be original and important. She particularly liked the paragraph she wrote on pornography as she believed this is her own point of view while much has been discussed about KKK and bombing in high schools, not many people argue about the problem of pornography on the Internet. She considered her own ideas to be original and important. Tomoko wrote her own suggestions regarding the problem of the Internet in her conclusion. The following excerpt is from Tomoko’s conclusion.

What the public needs to realize is that all the negativity on the Internet adds to the steady corruption of our youth. More and more schools are relying on the World Wide Web as a valuable learning tool, but with all of the inappropriate material available, it is not so valuable. [omitted] . . . . but in my opinion, the
government, in association with parents and teachers, need to monitor minors activity on the Internet so that its primary uses can be enjoyable and education, rather than destructive. (Tomoko’s paper in First-Year Composition 110)

Tomoko was satisfied with what she said here.

The next reason Tomoko believed this paper to be her best was that she spent a lot of time in searching for the information or the websites in order to write this paper and revise this paper. Her hard work to complete her paper made her feel confident with it. In addition, she got a “B+” for her final draft, which made her happy because she believed that “B+” was a reward in a non-ESL class. She had competed with American students at their level. Overall, the major reasons that Tomoko chose this paper as the best paper in her academic field were that the introduction is well-written with a clear thesis, she presented some reasons to support a thesis in the body, she wrote her own opinions from her own point of view, and she spent a lot of time and worked very hard.

To summarize, the criteria that Tomoko had had for her first academic year were whether or not she wrote her papers following her instructor’s directions, whether or not she wrote her own point of view in her papers, and whether or not she worked very hard in order to complete her papers. In terms of written skills in English, Tomoko had never written any papers in English until she took the ESL Composition course 107 in the Autumn Quarter. In the interview with her in her first quarter, Tomoko told me that she could not enjoy writing in English due to her lack of English vocabulary and expressions. She confessed that it was much easier for her to write in Japanese than in English, as she knew grammar, vocabulary, and a wide variety of expressions in Japanese. Tomoko said she had no idea what good writing in English should be. More specifically, she did not
know what was good and what was bad in English writing. Thus, to follow her instructor's advice seemed to be the best way for her, and she depended strongly on what her instructor taught. Tomoko seemed to strongly rely on her instructor's evaluation on good papers in English, and she was satisfied with what she had done following her instructor's advice.

In our interview after finishing the first quarter, Tomoko explained that the format of English writing she learned in the first quarter in the U.S. was very clear. It was easy for her to follow this format, although she had difficulty with vocabulary and expressions in English. Tomoko described that the organization of writing in Japanese was difficult for her, because she had never received any formal writing instruction. Tomoko said: "I've learned how to write papers for the first time this Autumn Quarter." The writing format she learned in the first quarter at OSU became her core format in her later English writing, and the criteria of good papers taught by her first instructor became the standard that she followed when evaluating good papers in English.

In her second quarter, she followed her instructor's directions and wrote her papers as she did in her previous ESL Composition course. For example, she continued to write her introductions by moving from a broad issue to a more focused discussion, as she had learned in ESL Composition 107. However, according to Tomoko, she did not work very hard in this course. One of the possible reasons may be due to the number of the credits. Tomoko said that three credits for ESL Composition 108.01 made her less motivated to study harder, compared to her previous ESL Composition Course 107 for five credits, because this meant it did not strongly affect her GPA.
Although Tomoko seemed to follow everything that her instructor said, she was struggling a little bit with the restrictive format of writing in English in her second quarter. Even as she saw how the format works and helps her to write coherent essays, she still couldn't help but question why she had to follow such a strict structure. In the second interview of her second quarter, Tomoko said: “I sometimes wonder if I can write the thesis anywhere other than in the beginning. My instructor strongly emphasizes how to state a thesis, support, development, etc., but I’m wondering how important the structure is. Why was it necessary to state a thesis in the beginning? Why couldn’t I have the freedom to wait until the end to state the thesis?”

In her First-Year Composition 110, Tomoko applied everything she had learned in ESL Composition 107 to her writing assignments in the class. She said that she also did not learn how to write in English from taking First-Year Composition. Tomoko said, “We read articles, discussed them, and just wrote. If I did not take ESL Composition 107, I’d probably be helpless in writing papers in English.”

Thus, Tomoko was greatly appreciative of her ESL instructor in ESL Composition 107 for the instruction she provided. The writing skills she acquired in her first ESL Composition class seemed to become critical for her in the first year of the university in the U.S, and served as the core in her future writing in English.
Perspectives on good writing in Japanese

Texts in Japanese she chose as good samples of writing

Tomoko chose “Shoujyo no egao (A girl’s smile)” by Hironori Kobayashi (1999) from the Newsletter of the Japanese Students’ Organization at OSU as a sample of good Japanese writing at the beginning of her first academic year. In “Shoujyo no egao,” the author wrote about his trip to Thailand. Tomoko chose this article as a good writing in Japanese for the following reasons. First of all, this text has natural flow. This text describes the location in detail, and has good expression. Tomoko pointed out how in the first paragraph of the article, the coldness in Tokyo was juxtaposed well against the warmth in the country. In the opening, the author placed himself in a train in Tokyo, then he went to a coffee shop where he wrote about his trip to, and meeting the girl in, Thailand. By the end of the article, the author brought his readers back to Tokyo very smoothly. In Tomoko’s opinion, this article is good because of the contrast between the big city, Tokyo, and the country, a village in Thailand, was so well written. She believed the article had natural flow that helps readers to transport themselves to Tokyo and Thailand. Even though Tomoko has never been to Thailand, she could be easily transferred to Thailand when she read the article, and she could imagine the descriptions of the location. In other words, Tomoko could travel to the location in her mind and could feel what the writer thought and did. Thus, for Tomoko, what makes writing good is when both the writer and readers can share the same experience.
In addition, Tomoko believes that the authors’ expressions when he describes things are very good. One example of a good expression in Tomoko’s opinion is “walking around freely like a dead carp” in the following sentence:

After a while, I who got off the train at Shibuya Station was walking around freely like a dead carp that is floating on the water. (Translated by researcher)

Following are a few more good expressions according to Tomoko:

I have been standing riveted to the girl since a while ago. Every time when she meets my gaze, she happily smiles at me. If I looked up the word “smile” in the dictionary, her smile would be exactly that smile. It does not have any envy or jealousy. It is a face of innocence without any acting. I took my camera from my pocket and at the moment I tried to take her picture, her smile all of a sudden turned to a business smile. She was used to having her pictures taken. As I continued to take one picture after another, her face turned hard. I was swept irresistibly by a sense of sin. It’s rude to take pictures in this situation, and I put the camera in my pocket. Then, her smile came back. I thought this was right.” (Translated by researcher).

Among the good expressions in the above writing are being “riveted to the girl” or describing the girl’s smile as being exactly like the dictionary definition, or being “swept irresistibly by a sense of sin.” With such expressions, the author describes a scene so vividly that the reader can share in his experience. For example, although Tomoko never met this girl in real life, she could see her smile clearly in her imagination, simply from reading the words on the page. Thus, for Tomoko, it is good writing in Japanese as the author can help readers to transport themselves to the location s/he is describing with good expressions. Then, readers can travel to the location in their minds and feel what the writer thought and did.

Tomoko chose “Aozora seppo (Sermons in the blue sky)” by Jyakucho Setouchi (1997), as a sample of good Japanese writing after her first academic year in the U.S.
The author is a Japanese Buddhist nun who is the chief priest of a Buddhist temple. This book is composed by monthly sermons at a temple by Jyakucho Setouchi. The reason Tomoko chose this book among many books is that she was interested in how a Buddhist nun views human being's lives.

The major reason that of all, Tomoko chose this book as a good writing in Japanese was due to the content of this book rather than writing techniques. More specifically, although Tomoko was born in the family where her father is a chief priest of a Buddhist temple, it had been very difficult for her to understand the philosophy and teaching of Buddhism, and the teaching of Buddhism was always far away from her daily life. However, this book introduces Buddhism in a reader-friendly style, having real relevance for the needs of ordinary people. This made Tomoko understand the teaching of Buddhism easily, and the book gave Tomoko a connection between the teachings of Buddhism and her daily life.

Tomoko said in the interview that she was not sure if she was asked whether this Japanese writing was technically good in this book. However, whether or not the content of the book was interesting to her and whether or not she was able to learn something from the book were more important for her when she selected good writing as a reader.

Overall, the genres between these two texts Tomoko chose at the beginning of her first academic year and after one year are different, so that the major criteria of good writing in these two texts for Tomoko are different. In the former text, such as a short story based on the author's experience, writing techniques that attract readers into the text are important for Tomoko. On the other hand, in the latter text, Aozora seppo, Tomoko
regards the content as more important than technique. In other words, if the content was interesting to her and if she understood the content clearly, then it was good writing in her opinion. According to Tomoko, her perspectives on good writing in Japanese have not changed during her first academic year in the U.S.

To summarize, Tomoko’s perspectives on good writing as a writer and as a reader are different, although languages here as a reader and as a writer are different: her perspectives on good writing as a writer were in English and her perspectives on good writing as a reader were in Japanese. The criteria of good writing that Tomoko held as a writer include to work very hard to write her papers and to state clearly what she wants to say. They are the criteria that come only from her perspectives as an L2 writer. Tomoko’s perspectives on good writing as an L1 reader concerns whether or not the content of the book is interesting to her and whether or not the book has information she wanted to have.
4. 2 Hiroko

4. 2.1 Profile

Hiroko, who is polite 18-year-old woman, came to OSU in the Autumn Quarter, 1999 after she graduated from a private high school, where she majored in English. Like Tomoko, Hiroko attended a Christian private girls’ junior and senior high school, whose teaching emphasizes Christian ideals and oral communication in English. She spent one summer in Australia in junior high school as an exchange student. In addition, Hiroko attended an American high school in California for one year as an exchange student. During that year, she stayed at one American family’s house. At the end of the school year there, she passed an examination for graduation and she holds a certificate of graduation from an American high school. After this graduation, she went back to Japan after this graduation and she also graduated from a high school in Japan. The experience of studying in high school in the U.S. made her decide to pursue her degree in the United States. She wanted to improve her speaking skills in English. Like Tomoko, five months after she graduated from high school in Japan, Hiroko came to Columbus, Ohio and enrolled at OSU in the Autumn Quarter, 1999.

Her major was Management Hospitality when she started studying at OSU. She wanted to get a career as a ground hostess at an airport after her completion of degree; however, she changed her major to Management of Computer Information in the Department of Business at the end of her first academic year since she thought she was able to major from any field to become a ground hostess as well as since she was more interested in studying computer.
4.2.2 Writing experience in the L1 context

The experience of writing in Japanese in elementary school Hiroko remembers is *kansobun* (responses to reading). She had to read books and write her responses to these readings a couple of times a year, usually on summer and winter vacation. She could choose any book from any fields, read them, and wrote *kansobun*. As Hiroko was not taught how to write *kansobun*, she just wrote what she thought and felt about the book. Her teachers simply gave their short comments on Hiroko's *kansobun*. At the end of every school year, Hiroko was required to write *bunshu* (compositions at the end of each school year), and she usually wrote about the best memory of that year. Her class bound *bunshu* written by all of her classmates as one book and she kept them as a memory of each school year. *As kansobun*, Hiroko did not have any instruction how to write *bunshu* from her teachers. She just wrote her best memory in each year freely in the style she wanted to do. Although Hiroko remembers her teachers gave her short comments on her *bunshu*, she does not remember the comments she got.

The additional paper what Hiroko remembered and wrote in her elementary school was a paper for her presentation for running for a position of secretary of school board. She got a sample of a presentation from her senior friend who ran for election and followed the sample. Although Hiroko did not remember the sample clearly, she said she just wrote what she would do if she was elected. She asked her homeroom teacher to read the paper before her presentation. Her teacher read it and said that was all right. He did not correct nor give comments.
In junior high school, Hiroko wrote *kansobun* once a year; however, she did not have any instruction about this at all like elementary school. Thus, according to Hiroko’s memory, she did not learn specific writing formats in Japanese, and what she read in her high school was textbooks in *kokugo* classes and some books about American cultures and life. She did not write any papers in Japanese for two years in her high school in Japan.

Regarding her literacy experience in English as foreign language in Japan, English classes in her schools were focused on oral communication as well as grammar and translation. She did not compose in English at all. However, in an American school, she practiced writing some short essays which consist of one and a half pages in English in order to pass her composition exam for her graduation. During her practice, what she was instructed in how to write short compositions in English was to write a format of introduction, body, and conclusion. It was very simple instruction, and she did not learn anything except this format there.

### 4.2.3 Writing experience in the L2 context

Hiroko’s writing experience in English in the academic setting in the U.S. for her first academic year is shown at Table 4.5. This table shows what kind of writing assignments she had, how many papers she wrote, how long she wrote in each paper, in which course, Hiroko had. In addition, it shows which papers she chose as her best each quarter.
Like Tomoko, Hiroko had writing assignments only from her two ESL Composition courses and First-Year Composition in her first academic year in the U.S., as the classes in which she registered were general courses such as Mathematics, Economics, etc. In her first quarter, Hiroko was placed in ESL Composition 107, like Tomoko, and the major assignments Hiroko had were essay assignments in ESL Composition 107.01. She was trained how to write a summary as well as a paragraph and how to organize the paper. She wrote three papers there: literacy narrative; argument/response; and argument/refutation. In her second quarter, the major assignments Hiroko had in ESL Composition course 108.01 were also essay assignments based on reading. Like Tomoko did, Hiroko wrote three papers there: literacy narrative; argument/response; and argument/refutation. In her third quarter, the assignments Hiroko had in the First-Year Composition course was also essay assignments. The assignments of this class focused on reading and discussion. She had to read many articles for every class and discuss some issues with her classmates in this class. Then, she had to write her papers. Although she wrote some papers in this course, she was not receive instruction on how to organize papers in English, as she had in her ESL Composition courses. In her fourth quarter, Hiroko did not have any writing assignments, since she did not take any courses.
### 1st Quarter (Autumn Quarter, 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Writing Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Composition (Education: Teaching and Learning 107)</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Paper #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Paper #1 is considered Hiroko's best paper in her ESL course.

### 2nd Quarter (Winter Quarter, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Writing Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Composition (Education: Teaching and Learning 108.01)</td>
<td>Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Paper #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Paper #2 is considered Hiroko's best paper in her academic field in that quarter.

### 3rd Quarter (Spring Quarter, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Writing Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Composition (English 110)</td>
<td>**Paper #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Paper #1 is considered Hiroko's best paper in her writing assignments in her academic field in that quarter.

### 4th Quarter (Summer Quarter, 2000)

Hiroko did not take any courses.

---

Table 4.5: The writing assignments Hiroko had in her first academic year in the U.S.
* Hiroko considers this to be her best paper in her writing assignments in her ESL course.
** Hiroko considers this to be her best paper in her writing assignments in her academic field in that quarter.
4.2.4 Hiroko’s perspectives on good writing

I present Hiroko’s perspectives on good writing in both English and Japanese, based on the papers and texts Hiroko chose in her first academic year in the U.S. (shown in Table 4.6). Hiroko’s perspectives on good writing in English are based on three papers in English she considered her best: two from ESL Composition courses and one from her academic field. Hiroko did not choose any texts in English as good samples of writing, because she said she did not know how to recognize good writing in English either at the beginning of the academic year or after completing her first academic year. Hiroko’s perspectives on good writing in Japanese are based on two texts she considered as good samples of Japanese writing. She chose these texts at the beginning of the academic year, and after completing her first academic year, respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papers in English she considers her best</td>
<td>Texts in English she chose as good samples of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts in Japanese she chose as good samples of writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Is the liberal arts education important?” by Hiroko.</td>
<td>Hiroko did not select.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Which is better, to live alone or with others?” by Hiroko.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Gun possession” by Hiroko.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Classes.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After 1 year</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Hiroko did not select.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*“Onnatachi no jihado” (Women’s Jihardo)” by Setsuko Shinoda (1997).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: The papers and texts Hiroko selected in her first academic year in the U.S. Note: The number on the left column refers to quarters in her first academic year.

**Perspectives on good writing in English**

**Papers in English she considers her best**

In her first quarter, among the papers Hiroko wrote in ESL Composition 107, she chose her paper titled “Is the liberal arts education important?”, which is a comparison and contrast essay, as her best paper. Hiroko explained the reasons why she chose this as her best paper in this course, as follows. The major reason was that she revised the first
draft following her instructor’s advice. In her first draft, she was advised that her paper did not have a topic sentence, and there were some comments like “redundant,” etc. After many revisions, Hiroko could finally write what her instructor said: “The text has to have clear main points.” She believes that her paper has a clear main point. It is: “We can see many differences and similarities in these two articles” (Hiroko’s paper in ESL Composition 107).

The second reason was that she was very satisfied with this paper, since she could write what she wanted to say from her point of view. She said in her paper:

There are similarities in the two articles; both Sorkin and Bird discussed the same topic and have the same audiences. However, there are a lot of differences, too. The biggest difference is the ideas toward the liberal arts education. Sorkin insists we need liberal arts education. But Bird insists we do not need it. (Hiroko’s paper in ESL Composition 107)

Thus, this was what she wanted to say: that there are differences between Sorkin’s article and Bird’s article, although there are similarities. The third reason was that she spent a lot of time revising and writing this paper. In the interview, Hiroko showed all of her drafts, and she said, “I really spent a lot of time for this paper.” She was satisfied with making efforts. Overall, the major reasons that Hiroko chose this paper as her best paper in ESL Composition 107 were that she wrote this paper following her instructor’s suggestions, wrote what she wanted to say, and worked hard spending a lot of time to revise and write this paper.

In her second quarter, among the papers Hiroko wrote in ESL Composition 108.01, she chose her paper, “Which is better, to live alone or with others?,” which is an argument/response paper, as her best paper. Her reasons are as follows. First, Hiroko
followed her instructor’s directions and suggestions in order to write this paper. For example, this paper has a strong body paragraph. To Hiroko, this means that she wrote what she wanted to say consistently and clearly, using a strong argument. She also could argue well in this paper. She could write body paragraphs well that support her thesis, including her experience. In writing an argument response paper, Hiroko believed that her argument became more effective if she included her own experience, and she included it. In addition, she wrote a good conclusion, expanding a little bit after she got a suggestion from her instructor. During tutorials of ESL composition course, Hiroko easily accepted her instructor’s comments on her papers. She wrote this paper based on the instruction she got in ESL Composition as well as tutorials, followed it, and chose this paper as good writing. She got “A-” for this paper.

Hiroko also had more criteria. She could write her experience and opinions in this paper; in other words, she could write what she wanted to say. She wrote in her conclusion:

I think to live with others is hard in one opinion, but it is much enjoyable and helpful for us. Sarton discussed that there are more advantages to live alone, but I do not think so. I think there are more advantages to live with others, and we can get more rewards from it. (Hiroko’s paper in ESL Composition 108.01)

Moreover, to write her opinions gave her confidence, and she was satisfied with that. Hiroko was also satisfied with her efforts at writing this paper. She spent a lot of time writing the outline and content of the paper. Overall, the major reasons that Hiroko chose this paper as her best paper are the same as her reasons for choosing her best paper from her first quarter: she wrote this paper following her instructor’s suggestions, and she expressed her opinions in this paper.
In her third quarter, among the papers Hiroko wrote in First-Year Composition, which was her first academic writing course, she chose “Gun Possession,” which is an argumentative essay, as her best paper (see Appendix E). Her first reason was that she followed her instructor’s advice: her instructor advised Hiroko to compare Japan to the U.S. regarding gun control, and she followed it. Her second reason was that Hiroko could write what she wanted to say in this paper. Although it was difficult for her to write her opinion from an objective point of view, as her instructor suggested, based on facts and avoiding “I,” “I believe,” “I think,” etc., she believed that she could argue and defend her position well.

In addition, Hiroko believed that this is a good paper, because she took a risk in order to attract readers. For example, she used questions and answers that she believed attract readers, because questions in the introduction make readers think about what they think, as well as what the author is trying to say.

Why do you have guns at home? It is because of protection from murders. Yes! We need to protect ourselves by having guns. Why don’t you have guns at home? Because we do not need to have them: crimes seldom occur. The previous one is the United State case and the back one is Japan case. We can see such big differences in people’s thought. Our goal is to change our society and to make people think as last one. As many researchers show crime rate goes down where guns are not allowed in houses, so gun control law in the United State should be changed. (Hiroko’s paper in First-Year Composition 110)

Moreover, like Tomoko, Hiroko was satisfied with her effort of writing this paper and competing with American students. Although it was hard for her to discuss some topics with her American classmates and give some comments on their papers, Hiroko made it through this class. She was very satisfied with her grade for this paper, “B+.” She said it was more than she could get in the non-ESL composition course. Overall, the
major reasons that Hiroko chose this paper as her best paper are that she followed her instructor's directions, she took a risk, she made an effort, and she got a good grade on it.

To summarize, ESL Composition 107.01 was the first academic writing course that Hiroko took, and she said that she learned fundamental rules in English writing in an academic setting, such as how to organize a paper, how to write a paragraph, how to write a thesis statement, etc. The assignments in this course gave Hiroko a strong foundation in writing in English. As she had never taken any single writing course in Japan, Hiroko felt she learned how to write in English in this class. Later she also took ESL Composition 108.01, which enhanced what she learned in her previous ESL Composition course.

In these two ESL Composition courses, Hiroko had a great deal of writing assignments. In the last interview of her second quarter, Hiroko said, "I think I am used to writing in English via a great deal of writing assignments there. I do feel more comfortable with writing in English now." To be used to writing seemed to be important to her. Continuously, she said, "I think I probably will be able to write a good paper through much practice following what I was instructed in my ESL Composition courses."

While following ESL instructors' directions in her writing assignments became Hiroko's basic criterion in order to write good papers in English, she struggled with writing in English and felt she could not really express what she was thinking. In the second interview of the second quarter, while she was taking her second ESL Composition course, she expressed her feelings regarding her writing to follow the organization, thus:
I sometimes wonder why the organization and the thesis statement are so important. It should have more variation. My paper that has a clear organization is too simple. I would like to write a more elaborated paper, but I do not know how I can do that.

Hiroko was a little bit stressed out that her papers in English were too simple for her. In the last interview of her second quarter, she said:

I just wrote in the format instructed by my ESL instructors’ direction. If I confess my real intention, it is good for me to write my papers in following the direction in order to get a good grade. However, I would like to expand a variation of expression in English in the future, then, I will be able to write better papers in English.

The difficult parts in writing in English for Hiroko were: (1) she could not express in English exactly what she wanted to say in Japanese; and (2) there were a lot of things she needed to think about in academic writing. Hiroko continuously said:

I like writing letters in English to my friends in high school in the U.S., since I can express my feeling and thoughts in free writing there; however, I can’t enjoy writing academic papers since there are a lot of things to need to think in academic writing.

Through one academic year, what Hiroko learned through the assignments in her first ESL Composition course has become the core in writing her papers in English and it was very critical for her in writing papers in English. In the last interview of her second quarter, Hiroko said, “I had a great deal of writing assignments in ESL Composition courses, and they made me used to writing in English.” In the two ESL Composition courses, Hiroko was instructed on how to write papers in English and wrote following her instructors’ directions. In her First-Year Composition 110 course, Hiroko wrote her papers based on what she learned in her ESL Composition courses. In the last interview of her third quarter, she said, “I probably would not be able to take this course if I did not
take any ESL Composition courses. In her opinion, good writing in English is what her instructor taught her: a paper should have good organization that has an introduction, body, and conclusion. The introduction should have a thesis statement, the body should support her thesis statement, and the conclusion should refer back to the thesis statement. Thus, Hiroko commented, "I think I have the skill to recognize whether or not a paper has this organization and a thesis statement."

Thus, Hiroko confessed she did not know what good writing in English was at the beginning of her first academic year; however, she was instructed and learned how to write papers in English through her ESL Composition courses. Hiroko was appreciative of what she had learned in her ESL Composition courses, and the English writing skills she learned there became important for her when writing academic papers in her first academic year in the U.S.

**Perspectives on good writing in Japanese**

**Texts in Japanese she chose as good samples of writing**

As a good sample of Japanese writing, Hiroko chose “Watashi no shaotaiken – Kobayashi Yoshinori Arasuka shotaiken (My first experience: Yoshinori Kobayashi’s first experience in Alaska)” (1999) by Hironori Kobayashi from the Newsletter of Japanese Students Organization at OSU at the beginning of her first academic year. Hiroko chose this article as good writing in Japanese for the following reasons.

First, it has an attractive introduction to readers. It does not start writing something like, “I traveled to Alaska.” Instead, it starts with a description of nature in
Alaska. It invites readers into the story, according to Hiroko. Moreover, Hiroko said, although it may not be a criterion of good writing in Japanese, it is attractive to Hiroko that the author uses some English vocabulary in the text, such as "interaction," "Natural Resources," "Anchorage," "update," etc. Additionally, it includes some English sentences such as "No, why don't you go ahead and make yourself comfortable, hun."

The author did not translate what the American people with whom he communicated in his trip said into Japanese. Instead, he wrote it down as he heard it, in English. According to Hiroko, this is very attractive to her as a reader.

Moreover, she chose this article as a good sample of Japanese, because she could enjoy reading and could understand the article easily. Hiroko could understand how the author feels and what he wants to say. She believes this is because the author uses understandable idioms and vocabulary. Overall, the major reasons that Hiroko chose this article as a good sample of Japanese are as follows. It has an attractive introduction. It uses English vocabulary in the text. She enjoyed reading and understood it easily.

As a good sample of Japanese writing, Hiroko chose, "Onnatachi no iihado" (Women's iihado) (1999) by Setsuko Shinoda after one year. This is an essay about five single Japanese women. The major reason that Hiroko chose this book as good writing in Japanese is due to the content of this book, rather than the writing technique. The five stories of the five single women in this story bear close resemblance to Hiroko's daily life. Specifically, Hiroko sympathized with and liked the theme of the book: anyone, even women, can do what they want to do at any age if they have the will. Another reason is that sentences in this book are not difficult, and this book is reader friendly. The other
reason is that each story made Hiroko think and imagine as all of these five stories do not tell what these five women did at the end.

Hiroko said in the interview that she did not know whether this text is good writing or not, but that when she selected good writing, she decided by whether or not the content of the book was interesting to her. Overall, comparing these two Japanese texts Hiroko chose as good writing samples in Japanese, the common criterion for good writing in Japanese for Hiroko is simple sentences rather than difficult sentences or writing techniques. In other words, if the text is reader friendly and if she understands clearly, then that is good writing for her. As Hiroko said, it is attractive to readers to use English vocabulary; therefore, both of the texts she chose contained English vocabulary. This criterion, that good writing in Japanese must have English vocabulary, is related to the Westernization of the Japanese language. The Japanese language itself has been influenced by Western languages, especially English, and many loanwords are used in Japanese. Hiroko’s perspectives on good writing in Japanese have not changed in her opinion during her first academic year in the U.S.

To summarize, Hiroko’s perspectives on good writing as a writer and as a reader are naturally different. The criteria for good writing that Hiroko held as a writer include to spend a lot of time to write her papers and make an effort, to write what she wants to say in the paper, and to follow her instructor’s advice. On the other hand, Hiroko’s criteria for good writing as a reader include whether or not the content of the text is attractive to her, whether or not it is reader friendly, and whether or not she understands the content clearly.
4.3 Taro

4.3.1 Profile

With management and economics as his undergraduate major at the Tokyo Science University in Japan, Taro enrolled at OSU as an undergraduate, majoring in Business Administration in the Winter Quarter, 2000. His original plan was to begin the MBA program, soon after he completed his BS in Japan; however, his professor in Japan did not write a letter of recommendation for him, but suggested that he become an undergraduate at OSU. Taro took his professor's advice and studied hard at OSU for two quarters and asked his professor again to write a letter of recommendation. However, he could not get a letter of recommendation from his professor again. Thus, he decided to pursue a second BS Degree in his third quarter at OSU, instead of MBA. Taro is going back to Japan after he completes his BS Degree at OSU. However, in the near future, he would like to come back to the U.S. in order to pursue the MBA in the field again.

The major difference of Taro from the other participants was that he came to OSU and enrolled in the American Language Program, intensive ESL program, in the Spring and Summer Quarters, 1999 for five months. However, he went back to Japan in August due to a family crisis, and he came back to OSU in the Winter Quarter, 2000, where he started taking academic classes.

Taro was the only participant who was matriculated in the Winter Quarter, 2000, among the participants in my study. Thus, the first Quarter for Taro was Winter Quarter, 2000, instead of Autumn Quarter, 1999, and the second Quarter for Taro was Spring Quarter, 2000, instead of Winter Quarter, 2000, and so on.
4.3.2 Writing experience in the L1 context

In elementary school in Japan, Taro’s experience of writing in Japanese was to write *kansobun* (responses to reading) and *bunshu* (a composition at the end of each school year) which was about his school life, a family trip, etc. a couple of times a year. According to his memory, he did not receive any writing instruction on how to write them. These compositions were not graded by his teachers, instead, Taro got some comments on them; however, Taro does not remember what comments he got on his papers. Taro did have instruction on how to write in “*ki-sho-ten-ketsu*” which is one of the traditional writing formats in Japanese in the fifth or sixth grade; however, he was not forced to write in that format. In junior high school, he wrote *kansobun* once a year, but he did not have any instructions about writing, either. Taro practiced how to write *shoronbun* (short essays that includes one’s point of view) in order to prepare for his entrance examination of the university in Japan. He did not have any instructions about *shornbun*, either.

At the university in Japan, where Taro majored in Business Administration, he wrote some reports for his courses, a thesis for BS Degree, and wrote essays for his own pleasure. He had no formal instruction in academic writing in Japanese there, either. Taro referred to theses written by senior students in order to write his thesis. Additionally, he asked some of senior students to read the draft of his thesis and give him some comments and corrections. These senior students gave Taro some grammatical corrections and pointed out some unclear or redundant sentences. Taro believed these comments were very effective to polish his thesis. Taro also believed that his thesis was
well written, and he gave me a copy of the first chapter of this thesis his first Quarter at OSU. While he was a university student in Japan, he taught how to write *shoronbun* (an essay examination) to the students who were preparing for the entrance examination of universities at a preparatory school.

Taro likes both reading and writing in Japanese. He has read many books from a broader variety of genres such as mysteries, fictions, non-fictions, etc. in Japanese. He also has written many essays as a hobby. He places some of his favorite essays on his website because he wants many people to read and enjoy his essays. In addition, he likes to get the other people's responses to his essays. Taro says in the second interview:

I think I'm an entertainer. I would like to write compositions that everybody can enjoy. I'm working very hard to do it.

Thus, Taro likes writing essays to have the other people enjoyed reading his essays. Regarding English classes as foreign language in his schools in Japan, they were focused on grammar and translation, and he was not instructed how to compose in English at all.

4.3.3 Writing experience in the L2 context

Taro's writing experience in English in the academic setting in the U.S. for his first academic year is shown at Table 4.7. This table shows what kind of writing assignments he had, how many papers he wrote, how many pages he wrote for each paper, in which course. In addition, it shows which papers he chose as his best each quarter.

In his first quarter, the writing assignments Taro had were essay assignments in ESL Composition course and a critical analysis paper in his field. In ESL Composition
course, Taro was placed in ESL Composition course 108.01 which was the advanced course for undergraduate students. He was instructed how to write synthesis and how to organize papers in English. In this course, he wrote three papers: literacy narrative; argument/response; and argument/refutation. In one of the courses in his field, Introduction to International Business (Business Administration 555), Taro wrote one critical analysis paper. In his second quarter, the writing assignments he had were essay assignments in the First-Year Composition course. He wrote three essay papers: personal narratives; blending personal and academic writing; and public discourse and pop culture. Taro did not take any courses in his third quarter and did not have any writing assignments. In his fourth quarter, the writing assignments he had were a reflection paper and interpretive essay papers in a course of History.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Writing Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Composition (Education: Teaching and Learning 108.01)</td>
<td>Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Paper #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Writing Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Composition (English 110)</td>
<td>Paper #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Paper #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Quarter (Summer Quarter, 2000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taro did not take any courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)

Table 4.7: The writing assignments Taro had in his first academic year in the U.S.
* Taro considers this to be the best paper in his writing assignments in his ESL course.
** Taro considers this to be the best paper in his writing assignments in his academic field in that quarter.
Table 4.7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Writing Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States History to 1877</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(History 151)</td>
<td>**Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception paper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.4 Taro’s perspectives on good writing

I present Taro’s perspectives on good writing in both English and Japanese based on the papers and texts Taro selected in his first academic year in the U.S. shown in Table 4.8. Taro’s perspectives on good writing in English are based on four papers in English he considered his best: one from ESL Composition courses and three from an academic field. Taro did not select any texts in English as good samples of writing because he said he did not know how to recognize good writing in English either at the beginning of the academic year or after completing her first academic year. Taro’s perspectives on good writing in Japanese are based on two texts he considered as good samples of Japanese writing. He selected these texts respectively at the beginning of the academic year and after completing his first academic year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papers in English he considers his best</td>
<td>Texts in English he chose as good samples of writing</td>
<td>Texts in Japanese he chose as good samples of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st</strong></td>
<td>“Argument essay” by Taro.</td>
<td>Taro did not select.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>“The modern version of Peach Boy’ (Momotaro)” by Taro.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>“Gun control” by Taro.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>“Taking sides write-up 2” by Taro.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1 year</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Taro did not select.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: The papers and texts Taro selected in his first academic year in the U.S.
Note: The number on the left column refers to quarters in his first academic year.
Perspectives on good writing in English

Papers in English he considers his best

From among the papers Taro wrote in ESL Composition 108.01 in his first quarter at OSU, he chose Essay #3 that was an argument/refutation essay as his best. Taro titled his paper simply “Argument essay” and did not give a specific title. In this paper, Taro argues academic cheating from the point that “the underlying problem is not cheating itself, but the rule or definition of cheating” (Taro’s paper in ESL Composition 108.01).

The major reason Taro considers this paper good writing was that he took a risk and wrote this essay in his own way. Taro followed his instructor’s advice in the first two essays in ESL Composition 108.01, and these papers were getting closer and closer to what his ESL instructor had expected. Taro was uncomfortable with the papers, following his instructor’s expectation. He did not feel any voice in his essays, and he doubted if they were truly his essays. Taro tried a different strategy for Paper #3. He wrote his first draft in Japanese and translated it into English. He was strongly confident in his Japanese draft as well as in the English version. He believed that since his Japanese draft was very good, his English version was also good.

However, in spite of the fact that he thought his paper would be much better compared to Paper #1 and Paper #2, his professor’s major comments on his first draft of Paper #3 were negative according to Taro. His professor commented:

...you haven’t supported the arguments extensively. In particular, you need specific examples to illustrate your points. You also need a new reputation paragraph with a clear sense of what you are reputing with regard to academic cheating (comments on Taro’s Paper #3).

Also during his tutorial, the instructor commented:
what’s missing is the support for the arguments. I’ve said in class many times, what really helps the argument paragraph is if you give specific examples (comments in tutorial).

Taro was very disappointed with these comments, since he thought his paper was perfect except for his small grammatical mistakes. In his interview with me after he got his first draft of paper #3, he described his attitude toward his final draft of Paper #3 as follows:

What is wrong with my writing? What do I have to change? What is academic writing in English? What is “good writing” in English? If there is “good writing” in English, I would like to know it.

After he was depressed for a while, Taro regained his confidence in his writing skills in Japanese, and he decided to write the final version of Paper #3 in his own way. Taro said to me in the following interview:

I’m going to write my Paper #3 in my own way. To tell the truth, I do not want to write my papers in a way I do not like. If I write my papers following the style I’ve learned in my class, my paper would be the same as the other students’ papers. In other words, what I have to do is to place my contents in a specific format. I believe writing should have individuality, otherwise it will not be interesting.

I already had a clear sense of what good writing should be. I can’t change it, and I am going to stick to my principles.

Thus, Taro wrote Paper #3 in his own way and he believed that Paper #3 was the best paper among the papers he wrote in his ESL Composition course, because he worked very hard and because he wrote it following his “principles.” He got a “B+” for this paper. Although he was disappointed with this grade, he was satisfied with his paper. The other criterion for good writing for Taro was that he could write what he wanted to
say in this paper. Overall, the major reasons that Taro chose this paper as his best paper in ESL Composition 108.01 were that he took a risk in order to express his opinions in his own style and that he worked very hard to do this.

Taro chose two papers as his best papers from his First-year English Composition course, which was the second course about English writing for Taro. He wrote three essays, response papers, and portfolios in this course. His first choice was his second paper that he was required to write and the other was about public discourse and pop culture.

The first paper Taro considers to be good was an essay that focused on blending personal and academic writing. The title was “The modern version of ‘Peach Boy’ (Momotaro).” In this paper, Taro created a story based on ‘Peach Boy’ (Momotaro),” one of the Japanese traditional stories. Taro called his story a modern version of “Peach Boy’ (Momotaro).” This essay was the first story that Taro composed in English. The major reason Taro chose this paper as a good paper is that he enjoyed creating and writing this story very much. To enjoy writing is an important criterion of good writing for him as a writer. In addition, he said his confidence about the paper is critical for him. He felt confident about this paper since he spent a lot of time developing the story, and he could develop the story quite well with appropriate punch lines of jokes that he felt were important. All of these made him feel this was his paper. He spent a lot of time writing these punch lines of jokes, and this is what he wanted to say. Taro told me in the interview, “You would probably see my effort to create settings in this story while reading.” In addition, it was fun for him to read this paper as a reader. His decision to
place this story on his website also indicates his level of confidence. Thus, good writing for him means to enjoy writing, creating settings and stories, to spend a lot of time to write the paper, to have his own development, and to write enjoyable texts for readers.

The second paper Taro considers to be good was an essay that focused on public discourse and pop culture. The title was “Gun control.” In this paper, Taro compared gun control in Japan and the U.S. The major reason Taro chose this essay as a good paper was that he could say what he wanted to say in this paper. Taro tackled this topic of gun control enthusiastically because this was something that he wanted to say to Americans for a long time. More specifically, Taro believed that whether or not people possess guns was an emotionally charged argument. Thus, proprietorship is not what we think logically in our brains but what we think emotionally, according to Taro. He believed that Americans own guns because they want to, even if they know it is dangerous; on the other hand, Japanese do not own guns because they do not want to, and they would not own old guns even if they removed the ban on the possession of guns. Taro was satisfied with this essay since he could summarize it from the point of view of a nation who does not need to own guns.

The second reason is that Taro spent a lot of time to search for information regarding the regulations of gun control in the U.S. and the problems on the Internet. He collected a lot of information in order to write this paper. The reason Taro chose this essay as a good paper was that he believed he could have a persuasive argument. Taro also showed statistics, using some data at the beginning of this paper, and he argued emotionally throughout most of the paper. According to Taro, this paper has a persuasive
argument: he is thinking with his heart rather than his head in most of this paper, although the paper seems to aim at persuasion, using statistics. There was one point, however, that Taro regretted. That was that he could not write his own solutions in this paper, although he wanted to present them. Taro believed this essay would be more persuasive if he would add the solutions. However, except for this point, Taro believed that this essay is clear and has enough persuasive arguments. Overall, the major reasons that Taro chose this paper as his best paper are as follows. He wrote something that he wanted to say in this paper, he spent a lot of time to get information regarding this topic in order to write this paper, and he could write a good persuasive argument from his point of view.

Taro did not take any courses in his third quarter at OSU. In his fourth quarter, among the papers he wrote, he selected his paper titled "Taking sides write-up 2" in his History course as his best paper for the following reasons (see Appendix F). He said that he likes the introduction to his paper, specifically because he believes that the introduction is written in his own style. That is, he did not have to change the way he normally writes in Japanese, to express himself in English. As can be seen in the sentences quoted below from his essay, Taro likes using modifiers to elaborate on the subject of his sentences.

That is why, the issue of whether the American Revolution can serve as a development model is important. The question of whether Third World countries should look for guidance from this remarkable historical event is the major issue the two authors, Richard B. Morris and Carl N. Degler, address. (Taro's paper in History 151, p. 1)
Taro believes these two sentences are strongly influenced by his writing style in Japanese. The distance of the subject and verb is quite far away. For example, the subject “the issue” and the verb “is” are not close. The second sentence also has the same structure. The subject “The question” and the verb “is” are far way from each other. Taro said that he knows that the subject and verb should be closer in American writing style, and sometimes, it is not acceptable if the subject and verb of the sentence are far from each other. He said that if he said, “It is important that . . .,” reversing the location of subject and verb, his sentence becomes very simple, and he does not want to write in that way. Overall, he was strongly satisfied with the risk he took in writing closer to how he would have written in Japanese.

In addition, the reason he chose this paper as his best is that he took a risk. He wrote this paper, using some word usages from his history textbook, which were new to him. Phrases such as “the issue of whether” and “the question of whether” were not familiar to him, but reading helped to broaden the scope of his English expressions. Thus, he could use these new phrases and it made him feel that he could express what he wanted to write more appropriately than before. Moreover, he chose this paper as his best because he spent a lot of time to get resources in order to write this paper and he worked very hard. Overall, the major reasons in the third quarter that Taro chose this paper as his best paper are because he wrote in his own style, took a risk, spent time, and worked hard.

To summarize, the criteria that Taro had for his first academic year were to write papers in his own way, to take a risk in order to write, to say what he wanted to say, and
make an effort to write English papers. Taro had a strong sense of himself as a "writer" and his perspectives on good writing did not change throughout his first academic year.

**Perspectives on good writing in Japanese**

**Texts in Japanese he chose as good samples of writing**

Taro chose "Nihongo oshiete" (Teach me Japanese), a short story written by one of his friends as a good sample of Japanese writing at the beginning of this first academic year. This short story written in a conversational style describes one unexpected meeting between a Japanese lady and a foreigner on a subway in Tokyo. Taro explained the reasons he selected this writing as a good sample as follows.

First, Taro chose this short story since the author helped him to transport himself to the subway the author is describing. In other words, as the author describes the situation very well with natural flow, Taro could travel to the location and situation in his mind and could have the same experience the author had. Taro believed that it was good writing because the narrative has natural flow and brings readers to the story. Specifically, Taro liked the introduction of this short story. Following is an excerpt that I have translated from it (Japanese into English).

On Sunday, bought three postcards at free market: a gray fat cat wearing a crown, a vinyl doll in red dress, and a jumping yellowish green frog.

On [my] way home, took a rest at a coffee shop just next to a ticket gate. Looking into [my] face in the mirror on the wall, saw dark rings beneath [my] eyes. It is a warning from [my] body not to stop by anywhere on the way.

Went to the platform; while waiting for the subway a dove flew down: coo coo coo, and moved its head up and down as it walked, as always.

"Cute, isn’t it?"

Heard a voice. There was a man with mustache, standing, leaning back on iron pole. Blue coat, white polo shirt, beige pants. Holding a paper bag.
Accosting me.
“What is the name of this bird?”
Well-mannered Japanese.
“Dove.” [written in kanji]
“Dove [written in katakana], do you like doves?”

Second, the writing should have the author’s uniqueness. Taro said that this story had “uniqueness.” It is written in very simple sentences and no unnecessary words; and yet, it is clear enough to describe the scene. The sentences in the story have no subject, but readers can understand that this is a young Japanese lady. According to Taro, this is the author’s unique way of writing: just the words “On Sunday” and “at free market” immediately locate for readers this lady who is shopping at the free market on a calm Sunday afternoon. Also when the writer says, “On my way home, took a rest at a coffee shop,” it is significant in Taro’s opinion that readers can tell that the lady must have been tired after her shopping. Later in the essay, the reader learns from the conversation that the man is a foreigner. It is impressive to Taro that the author conveys a lot of information in very few words. He likes how naturally the author shifts from the free market to the coffee shop and then to the subway, where a conversation ensues between the author and a stranger, which comprises the majority of the essay.

Thus, Taro said this story is consistent. At the end of the story, the author returns to the postcards she had bought in the beginning, like nothing had happened. However, something did happen, and the author leaves the readers thinking. Taro liked it that readers can think more about the story afterwards. Overall, the criteria of good writing in Japanese essays for Taro are whether or not the text has a natural flow and brings readers
to the story, whether or not the writing has the author's uniqueness, and whether or not it is consistent.

Taro chose "Futsuna onnano futsuna ichinichi" (One ordinary woman's ordinary day), a short story written by one of his friends as a good sample of Japanese writing at the end of his first academic year. Taro chose this article as good writing in Japanese for the following reasons. First, according to Taro, his choice of good writing in Japanese depends on whether or not he likes the writing. He chose this text because he liked it. Second, Taro chose this article since this text has natural flow. For Taro, "the natural flow" means that each elaborated sentence is connected naturally. Third, it is persuasive. The text kept Taro keep reading, and he could feel satisfaction after he finished reading. According to him, it is not good writing if the reader stops reading while s/he is reading. Good writing should have readers keep reading. Third, it is readable. The text had unique style and is crisp. Taro believes each essay should have a writer's uniqueness that attracts readers. This text is unique, according to Taro.

In sum, Taro's selection of two essays shows that he likes reading essays very much. These two essays were written by his friends. He also writes essays. He and his friends sometimes discuss essays they write. Taro has clear criteria of good writing in essays, and they did not change throughout his first academic year.

To summarize, Taro's perspectives on good writing as a writer and as a reader are different. The criteria of good writing that Taro held as a writer include to take a risk and write in his own way, to work hard, and express what he wanted to say. They are the criteria that come only from his perspectives as an L2 writer. Taro's perspectives on
good writing as a reader concerns whether or not the text has natural flow, whether or not the texts make readers keep reading, whether or not it is readable, and whether or not the text has a writer’s uniqueness.
4.4 Midori

4.4.1 Profile

Midori, who is a very polite and always soft-spoken 24-year-old woman, was brought up in a Christian family, where her father is a professor. She graduated from Ferris University, a private women's university in Japan in 1999 with a BA in English and American literature, and she started her Master's Program at OSU, majoring in Foreign and Second Language Education, in Autumn Quarter, 1999. Because her father’s career took her family to Australia, Midori had the opportunity to go to high school in Australia for a year. Midori holds a teaching certificate for teaching English at the secondary level in Japan; however, she does not have any teaching experience thus far. She would like to become an English teacher at the secondary level in Japan after she completes her Master’s degree.

She came to the U.S. mainly to improve her English language skills as well as to study methodology of teaching foreign languages. Although she studied foreign language education in order to get a teaching certificate, she believed that she did not have enough ability of English to teach at the first interview with me in her first quarter. Midori wanted to improve her writing skills so that she could provide effective feedback on her future students’ writing. Moreover, Midori believes that the U.S. has similar problems in school that Japan has, such as violence in schools, and she was interested in learning how the U.S. solves these problems.
4.4.2 Writing experience in the L1 context

In elementary school in Japan, Midori’s experience of writing in Japanese was to write poems, to keep a journal every day in her fifth grade for one year, and write *kansobun* (responses to reading). She never received any writing instruction on how to write a poem, a journal, or reader’s response essays. She was also not graded on her writing, but only received some comments.

For instance, one example that Midori remembers is a journal that she wrote about a secret place she made with a friend of hers. She wrote about how excited she was about the secret place that nobody but she and her friend knew. The comment that Midori got on this journal from her fifth-grade teacher was that “Readers can clearly understand how you felt, and this is well written.” Midori remembers that she was very happy with this comment.

Looking back on her writing experience and instruction, she said that she might have had writing instruction that emphasized expressing her own opinions, although she was not sure when and how it was introduced to her. Thus, to write her own opinions in her papers in Japanese has been always in the forefront of her mind since elementary school, and she feels that it is fun to write something about what she thought.

During high school in Australia for one year, Midori did not have any opportunity to write in English. In the last year of high school in Japan, Midori practiced writing *shoronbun* (an essay examination) in order to take the university entrance exam. Some universities in Japan recently have the applicants sit for an essay examination, and applicants are usually given a topic and they write about the topic in a limited time.
Midori was required to take this exam in order to enter her university. In addition to high school, Midori also went to a cram school after school for one year, in order to study more and prepare for the university entrance exam. Midori was given a short article and a title in cram school about which she had to practice writing. She was taught how to express her opinions clearly, focusing on how to organize an essay based mainly on a traditional Japanese format for writing essays, called *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* (look in Chapter 2). Her teacher helped her with the parts in her writing that were unclear and not strong enough to support her opinions.

At the university Japan, where Midori majored in English and American literature, she wrote short papers in Japanese. She was required to read books from a field of English and American literature and had to write a short response, itemizing what she thought and felt about each chapter usually once a week. This was not a coherent essay but a list of her opinions. For example, Midori was required to read *Frankenstein* and *Pride and Prejudice* in her English literature class. Her teacher read Midori’s responses very carefully and pointed out when Midori’s interpretations were wrong. In addition, in a seminar on American literature, Midori was also required to read a couple of chapters of *The Great Gatsby* every week and write up her response in one or two pages. In this class, her professor gave very few comments on her writing. The only comment that Midori remembers is what her teacher orally told her: “Your reading ability has become very deep.” In other words, the professor recognized Midori’s capacity to grasp and understand deeply, but no comments on her writing.
Moreover, in her thesis for her Bachelor’s Degree, Midori researched about a life of one unwell-known British author for literature and wrote about it in Japanese. Midori was satisfied with her thesis because she wrote the author’s backgrounds in details and it is informative as well as her thesis was readable. Midori had no formal instruction in academic writing in Japanese. What Midori remembers is that her professor told her that the thesis would be much better if Midori’s points of view as a Christian was integrated into her thesis.

At the university in Japan, Midori also learned how to write in English from both American and British teachers. She learned about the differences between the use of a colon and semicolon, the organization of an English paper, such as the fact that the main topic comes first in English writing unlike in Japanese. Midori also was required to write two five-page papers in English usually in one course. Midori handed in a short draft a couple of times before she handed in the final draft. One comment from her teacher that Midori remembers is when her teacher wrote, “Mysterious English!” Midori said that her use of the English language in her paper must have been interesting to her teacher. Looking back on her writing experience in English in Japan, Midori feels that she did not understand how to write in English at that time although Midori took a total of eight English classes. She feels that she just wrote something what she thought or felt like keeping a journal. She does not remember how they were evaluated, but she remembers there was no grade except some corrections of grammatical mistakes.

Just before she came to OSU, Midori went to a private English school for two months in order to prepare for her studies at the university in the U.S. She studied
reading, writing, speaking, and listening, as well as note taking there from her American teachers. She also took a course in academic writing once a week there, in which she learned some modes such as cause and effect, argument, or comparison contrast, etc. She was told that an argument paper, which included the author’s opinions as well as the opposite opinions, was most frequently assigned. In every class, she learned one new rhetorical mode and she read some articles prepared by her teachers and wrote about them, using the rhetorical mode she had learned. In this class, her teacher emphasized the differences between Japanese writing and English writing: In Japanese writing, the thesis comes at the end, whereas in English, it comes at the beginning. Looking back on her learning experience in this private English school, Midori believed that what she learned there was very useful in class. For example, she can write something like outline while note taking. However, she regretted to study how to write in English more there since her papers in English were not good, upon arriving in the U.S.

4. 4.3 Writing experience in the L2 context

Midori’s writing experience in English for her first academic year in the U.S. is shown at Table 4.9. This table shows what kind of writing assignments she had, how many papers she wrote, how long she wrote in each paper, in which course, Midori had. In addition, it shows which papers she chose as her best each quarter. Midori had a great deal of writing assignments in her field through her first academic year. The major writing assignments in her field were research papers and reflection papers.
More specifically, Midori wrote six papers totaling 64 pages in her first quarter, 61 pages in her second quarter, 86 pages in her third quarter, and 40 pages in her fourth quarter at OSU. Although I asked her to select the best paper she considered to be good writing from the papers she wrote in her academic discipline each quarter, Midori expressed her feeling that she could choose two but not one because she strongly believed that two of her papers were equally written very well in her first and third quarter. Thus, as researcher, I agreed with her request to discuss both papers, although my policy was to ask each participant to choose one paper that she considered “good.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Writing Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st Quarter (Autumn Quarter, 1999)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in TESOL and Bilingualism (Education: Teaching and Learning 703M)</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Paper</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends and issues in language, literacy and culture (Education: Teaching and Learning 804)</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Paper</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master seminar (Education: Teaching and Learning 925M45)</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film and video in language teaching (Education: Teaching and Learning 925.45)</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd Quarter (Winter Quarter, 2000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Composition (Education: Teaching and Learning 108.02)</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods and Techniques of Teaching English to Speakers of Others (Education: Teaching and Learning 640)</td>
<td><strong>Paper</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)

Table 4.9: The writing assignments Midori had in her first academic year in the U.S.
* Midori considers this to be the best paper in her writing assignments in her ESL course.
** Midori considers this to be the best paper in her academic field in that quarter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selecting and Developing Second Language Instructional Materials</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Annotated</td>
<td>8pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Education: Teaching and Learning 710)</td>
<td>Mid-term</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>8pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Education: Teaching and Learning 710)</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Description paper</td>
<td>2pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Education: Teaching and Learning 710)</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Text evaluation</td>
<td>2pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Education: Teaching and Learning 710)</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Material project</td>
<td>8pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Experience (Education: Teaching and Learning 884F45)</td>
<td>**Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Final project</td>
<td>30pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(journals and reflection)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Education: Teaching and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning 963M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drama, Story, and Creativity</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Artifact</td>
<td>2pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Education: Teaching and</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>3pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Education: Teaching and</td>
<td>**Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Final paper</td>
<td>6pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Education: Teaching and</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>5pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning 798)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.4 Midori's perspectives on good writing

I present Midori’s perspectives on good writing in both English and Japanese based on the papers and texts Midori selected in her first academic year in the U.S. shown in Table 4.10. Midori’s perspectives on good writing in English are based on five papers in English she considered her best: one from ESL Composition courses and four from an academic field. In addition, Midori’s perspectives on good writing in English are based on two texts in English as good samples of English writing. She selected these texts respectively at the beginning of the academic year and after completing her first academic year.

Midori’s perspectives on good writing in Japanese are based on two texts she considered as good samples of Japanese writing. She selected these texts respectively at the beginning of the academic year and after completing her first academic year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>&quot;Final project: Tutoring</td>
<td>&quot;The cornerstones of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experience&quot; by Midori.</td>
<td>method&quot; (1979) by Clifford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. Prator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Taishu kyoiku shakai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no yukuie (The direction of mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>education in a modern society and mytholgy of equality after World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>&quot;Critical Review&quot; by Midori.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;End-of-term project&quot; by Midori.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>&quot;My Reflection&quot; by Midori</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>&quot;Final Reflection Paper:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where I Have Traveled This Quarter&quot; by Midori.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>&quot;Writing from the vantage point of an outsider/insider&quot; (1999) by Xiao-ming Li.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nihongo ga mieruto eigo mo mery (When you see Japanese, you can also see English) (1994) by Hiroyuki Araki.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10: The papers and texts Midori selected in her first academic year in the U.S.
Perspectives on good writing in English

Papers in English she considers her best

From among the papers she wrote in her academic field in her first quarter at OSU, Midori chose her final project that was required to write about her language learning/tutoring experience as a “good” paper. The title was “Final project: Tutoring experience.” In this paper, Midori wrote about her tutoring experience of teaching Japanese to one of her Turkish classmates for seven weeks. The paper consists of four parts: the first part is a formal paper about her tutoring experience; the second part is seven lesson plans; the third part is her reflections of tutoring and a sample of other materials and the learner’s work. Midori specifically liked the part about her tutoring experiences and she expressed the reasons she considered this paper as a good paper as follows. First, Midori provided clear reflection on good and bad points of her tutoring, analyzing references, and she wrote what she wanted to write. Second, she enjoyed writing about a special memory and a good experience. More specifically, she was happy to write about her first experience of tutoring that was what she wanted to write. Third, she spent a lot of time to prepare for lessons and write this paper. Overall, the major reasons that Midori chose this paper as her best paper in her field in this quarter were that she wrote what she wanted to write, enjoyed writing about a special memory, and spent a lot of time writing this paper.

In the second quarter, from among the papers she wrote in ESL Composition 108.02 in her second quarter at OSU, Midori chose a paper of a critical review as a good paper from this course. In this paper, from the five annotated bibliographies that she
wrote, she chose two articles that focus on different points of view on teaching language and discussed them, giving her own opinions. The reason Midori chose this paper as a good paper is as follows. First of all, Midori believes that she could write this paper very clearly in a clear organization. She said it might be due to her teacher’s instruction. Midori believes that she could write this paper following her instructor’s advice.

Secondly, Midori believes that her paper has a good introduction. In the introduction, she wrote the background of the theme that she would talk about in this paper, such as the reason she is interested in this topic. In addition, she wrote why culture should be taught in foreign language education, and shared her experience. Moreover, in the two paragraphs, she explained the differences between cross-cultural communication and intercultural communication. Using a quotation, she described the problems in teaching cultures such as stereotyping, which she believes help to describe the background for the context in which culture in foreign language education is taught. She was satisfied with what she wrote there.

Thirdly, Midori believes that this paper is very coherent. Midori analyzed these two articles by herself, wrote each of the main ideas, then compared two different opinions. More specifically, in this paper, Midori explained the background, described each problem, compared the similarities and differences, then explained them in the Japanese context, all of which are connected very well. Midori was happy with what and how she wrote. She also was happy that she worked very hard for this paper. Overall, the major reasons that Midori chose this paper as her best paper in ESL Composition course 108.02 were that she followed the professor’s instructions to write this paper,
organized this paper well, wrote what she wanted to write from her own perspective, wrote this paper with coherence, and worked hard to complete this paper.

From among the writing assignments in her field that Midori had written in the second quarter, she chose "Video review" from "End-of-term project" as a good paper. Midori expressed the reasons she considered this paper as a good paper as follows. The main reason Midori chose this paper as good was that first of all, Midori believed that she summarized what she intended to write and the text was well organized. She also used a chart to describe the information, and she believes that this made this paper more clear. Moreover, Midori enjoyed writing this paper because this topic was what she was interested in. She has been interested in this topic that describes how to integrate technology into a foreign language classroom, and she presents the organization of lesson plan of using technology in a language classroom. Midori was satisfied with her feeling that she could write everything that she wanted to say and that she made an effort to write this paper. In addition, Midori believed that readers could understand this paper clearly because Midori uses a couple of indexes and charts. Overall, the major reasons that Midori chose this paper as the best paper in her academic field were that she summarized what she intended to write, organized this paper well, took a risk using charts and indexes, enjoyed writing this paper, wrote what she wanted to say, and made an effort.

From among the writing assignments in her field in her third quarter that Midori had written, she chose "My Reflection" from "Self-introduction: Final project" in Spring Quarter as the best part of this paper. The main reason Midori chose this paper as a good one was the same as the reasons she chose a reflection paper in the Autumn Quarter. In
the paper titled "My Reflection," Midori wrote about what she observed in ESL classes in high school in the U.S. In this experience of observing ESL classes in an American high school, everything was new to Midori, and she enjoyed her observations. In addition to observations, she had several opportunities to talk to the ESL instructor and her relationship with him was very good. Thus, it was fun for her to write about a special memory and a good experience.

Another reason was that Midori learned how to integrate culture into ESL classes through her observations and she could connect her experiences and observations in the U.S. to her future teaching of EFL in Japan. She also referred to a couple of articles in order to support her idea of integrating culture in the EFL context. Thus, she could write something new that she had learned and it was fun for her. She also spent a lot of time to complete this paper. Overall, the major reasons that Midori chose this paper as her best paper in her academic field were that she wrote about her special memory and good experience, wrote something new that she learned from her point of view, and spent a lot of time to write this paper.

In her fourth quarter, Midori chose her "Final Reflection Paper: Where I Have Traveled This Quarter" as her best paper (see Appendix G). Midori explained the reasons why she chose this paper as one of her best papers in this quarter as follows. First of all, Midori believes that she wrote what she intended to write and the text was well organized, using "First of all," "Secondly," "My third point," "The fourth point," and "Finally." Midori believes that readers can follow this paper clearly. Furthermore, Midori enjoyed writing this paper. The topic of how to integrate dramas in class was new.
to her, but she learned how to use dramas in class and connected it with how to introduce dramas in the classroom in Japan. Thus, she wrote about what she leaned and what her ideas were. Furthermore, she worked very hard and her professor gave this paper a grade of “A” with some positive comments. Overall, the major reasons that Midori chose this paper as her best paper in her academic field were that she wrote what she intended to write, organized this paper well, wrote this paper clearly for readers, enjoyed writing, wrote about something she leaned, worked hard, and got a good grade.

In sum, papers in English she considers her best are related to the papers in which she wrote what she thought and felt. In addition, a clear organization is also important for good writing for Midori. Working hard is also a criterion of her good writing in her papers.

**Texts in English she chose as good samples of writing**

In her first quarter at OSU, although Midori felt that she did not have enough experience in reading in English to be able to choose among good articles, she chose “The cornerstones of methods” (pp. 5-15) written by Clifford H. Prator, as a sample of good writing in English. This article is from a book called *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* about language teaching methodology (eds. M. Celce-Murcia & L. McIntosh, 1979). This one chapter was required reading in one of Midori’s courses, Issues in TESOL and bilingualism. Midori describes the reason she selected this article as a good sample of English writing as follows.
Midori believed that this article was good writing in English among the articles she read in her first quarter, because the text was readable and understandable for her. This article provides Midori with new information concerning her field; however, in spite of the fact that the information in the article was new to her since the field of TESOL (Teaching/Teachers of English speakers of other language) was new for her, Midori was pleased that she could understand this article. Midori believes this is because the new information for her is well organized and the issues are clearly explained. The organization of this article is consistent. Overall, the major reasons that Midori chose this article as a good sample of English were that she believed that this article was readable and understandable, provided her with new information, and was well organized.

As a good sample of English writing after her first academic year at OSU, Midori chose "Writing from the vantage point of an outsider/insider" (1999) by Xiao-ming Li. This was also one of the articles Midori was required to read in one of her academic courses. The major reason Midori selected this article as a good sample of English writing is that this article gives her a new point of view and makes her realize that she should not try to change herself. More specifically, she tried to think and behave like an American upon arriving in the U.S., but this article written by a former international student taught Midori to be herself. Midori’s experience in the U.S. matched that of Li, and there was something she could share. After Midori read this article, she decided not to think and behave like Americans, but to be herself. Overall, the major reasons that
Midori chose this paper as a good sample of English writing were that this article gave her a new point of view and made her realize that she should be as she was and gave her strong impressions.

In sum, as a reader, good writing in English should be informative for Midori, and it should be reader friendly. It should be well organized and it should be consistent.

**Perspectives on good writing in Japanese**

**Texts in English she chose as good samples of writing**

As a good sample of Japanese writing in the first quarter, Midori chose the first chapter of the book, "*Taishu kyoiku shakai no yukue* (The direction of mass education in modern society and mythology of equality after World War II)" written by Takehiko Kariya (1999). This book is about Japanese education after World War II. The main criteria that brought Midori to choose this chapter are as follows.

First of all, this book is readable. Midori said that there might be many factors to decide what compositions are readable: however, a readable composition for her means that the choice of vocabulary is appropriate, the mode of expressions is not difficult, and the content is attractive to her. Midori believes that this book has these factors. Midori did not have any unfamiliar vocabulary in reading this book, and she believes it might make her understand this book well. Although Midori found that this author had some cynical expressions, they were not too difficult and were at the level she could understand. Thus, Midori did not have to sit up to read it, but could relax with the book.
Midori also said that the content of this book was very interesting to her. This book points out the problems that the current Japanese education has been having since World War II, and these problems are analyzed well from different aspects, such as the historical and social context, according to Midori. She felt that what this book says about the current conditions and problems regarding Japanese education are what she needed to understand as a future educator. Thus, the content was attractive to her.

Another reason that Midori considers this chapter of this book as good writing is that the author compensates for Midori’s lack of ability to express her opinions. While Midori was reading this book, she was impressed, since this book clearly represented Midori’s own vague ideas regarding education. In other words, the author represents and explains ideas regarding education that Midori had trouble expressing. Thus, there was something that Midori could share with the author. Overall, the major reasons that Midori chose this book as a good sample of Japanese writing were that this book was readable, the content was interesting to her, and the book clearly represented Midori’s own vague ideas regarding Japanese education.

As a good sample of Japanese writing after his first academic year at OSU, Midori chose a book titled “Eigo ga mieruto Nihongo momieru” (If you can see English, you can see Japanese, too). The reasons Midori chose this book as a good sample of writing in Japanese are as follows. First of all, the content of this book was interesting to Midori. This book clearly describes the problems of English education in Japan and presents the solutions, according to Midori. As a future language educator, Midori could rethink the current conditions of English education and what she should do in the near
future. Secondly, this book is well organized with clear major and minor chapters. In addition, each chapter starts with thought-provoking sentences such as "Why can't Japanese speak English?" and these sentences make Midori reconsider the problems of English education and keep reading this book. Overall, the major reasons that Midori chose this book as a good sample of Japanese writing were that the content of this book was interesting to her, this book clearly describes the problems of English education in Japan and presents the solutions, plus this book was well organized.

To summarize, from the reader's point of view, Midori's perspectives on good writing in Japanese did not change through her first academic year in the U.S. As a reader, a good writing in Japanese should be informative like a good writing in English, and the content should be interesting to Midori. In addition, it should be well organized in order to understand the content clearly. Midori’s perspectives on good writing as a writer and as a reader are different. The criteria of good writing that Midori held as a writer include to work hard in order to write her papers, to write what she thinks, and to enjoy writing. They are the criteria that come from her perspectives as a writer. Midori’s perspectives on good writing as a reader concerns whether or not it is readable and whether or not the content of the text is interesting.
4. 5 Shinobu

4. 5. 1 Profile

Shinobu, a 24-year-old woman, is a very active and sociable person. She is a self-professed feminist. She refers to herself in the third person, using her last name. In March 1999, she received her Bachelor’s Degree in International Studies from Meiji Gakuin University, one of the largest private universities in Japan, and she came to OSU in September, 1999 in order to pursue an MA in Women’s Studies.

Shinobu started being interested in Women’s Studies while she was in the university in Japan. She attended one exchange program and had an opportunity to study one summer at one university in the U.S. Then, later, she studied at Howard University in the U.S. for two semesters (nine months) when she was a senior at a Japanese university. This is the one thing that distinguishes her from the other Japanese university graduates in this study.

The major reason Shinobu decided to come to the U.S. to study was that Shinobu believes that the U.S. is at the most advanced country in the study of Women’s Studies. Although some classes have been recently offered at some universities in Japan, the number is still low, according to Shinobu. She would like to study Women’s Studies in the U.S. and work in the U.S. for a while after completion of her degree. Then, she would like to go back to Japan and teach Women’s Studies at a university or work as a feminist social worker in a community.
4.5.2 Writing experience in the L1 context

Regarding her background in writing in Japanese, Shinobu wrote *kansobun* (response to reading) and *bunshu* (a composition at the end of each school year) at the elementary and junior high schools. Shinobu had no explicit writing instruction on how to write *kansobun* and *bunshu* from her teachers in elementary school and secondary school. Shinobu started to be identified as a good writer early in her life. Shinobu was awarded some prizes in her school life in Japan. One of her best honors was that she won the third prize for her essay in Tokyo district in the elementary school. Moreover, her teacher in high school suggested Shinobu publish one book since she had good writing skills.

Shinobu read many books in gender and ethnic issues and wrote some papers in the university in Japan. She wrote about circumcision of black women in Africa for her senior year research paper in Japanese at a university in Japan. Although she was not instructed how to write in Japanese, Shinobu read many articles and books in order to write her senior year research paper. She was identified as good writer throughout the years she attended schools in Japan. As her hobby, Shinobu read many books from a broader variety of genres in Japanese. She likes her writing in Japanese and she had a very strong confidence in her writing skills in Japanese when she started studying at OSU in the U.S.

Concerning her literacy experience in English as foreign language in Japan, English classes in her schools were focused grammar and translation and she did not
compose in English at all. Regarding her experience of writing in English at Howard University in the U.S., Shinobu wrote some short reflection papers, for which she did not receive any instruction on how to write these paper.

### 4.5.3 Writing experience in the L2 context

Shinobu’s writing experience in English for her first academic year in the U.S. is shown at Table 4.11. This table shows what kind of writing assignments she had, how many papers she wrote, how long she wrote in each paper, in which course, Shinobu had. In addition, it shows which papers she chose as her best each quarter. Shinobu had many writing assignments in her field through her first academic year. The major writing assignments in her field were critical review papers, research papers, and response papers.
Shinobu did not take any courses.

Table 4.11: The writing assignments Shinobu had in her first academic year in the U.S.
* Shinobu considers this to be the best paper in her writing assignments in her ESL course.
** Shinobu considers this to be the best paper in her writing assignments in her academic field in that quarter.
4. 5. 4 Shinobu’s perspectives on good writing

I present Shinobu’s perspectives on good writing in both English and Japanese based on the papers and texts Shinobu selected in her first academic year in the U.S. shown in Table 4.12.

Shinobu’s perspectives on good writing in English are based on three papers in English she considered her best: three from an academic field. In addition, Shinobu’s perspectives on good writing in English are based on one text in English as a good sample of English writing. She selected this text after completing her first academic year. Shinobu’s perspectives on good writing in Japanese are based on one text she considered as good samples of Japanese writing. She selected this text after completing her first academic year. The reason Shinobu did not select any text she considered as good samples of writing in both English and Japanese at the beginning of the academic year was that she had a very difficult time to adjust to her academic life in her department in her first two quarters and she could not afford to take extra time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Papers in English she considers her best</strong></td>
<td><strong>Texts in Japanese she chose as good samples of writing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>“Connector Paper” by Shinobu.</td>
<td>Shinobu did not select.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>“The struggling journey to reconstruction of my body” by Shinobu.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>“Response Paper #1” by Shinobu.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No classes.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1 year</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>“Jibunn wo shiru tameno tetsugaku nyumon” (Introduction to Philosophy: In order to know oneself) (1995) by Seiji Takeda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12: The papers and texts Shinobu selected in her first year in the U.S.
Perspectives on good writing in English

Papers in English she considers her best

From among the papers she wrote in her academic field in her first quarter at OSU, Shinobu chose “connected paper” as her best paper. This was a paper regarding review articles. In this paper, she reviewed four articles, focusing on the basic theoretical and historical background of the field of Women’s Studies. I discussed her thoughts about her paper with her, including her professor’s comments. The main reason that she chose this paper as her best paper is because she spent a lot of time to complete this paper and she worked very hard through the whole quarter. This is the only reason she believed that this paper is good.

Shinobu indicated early in the second interview with me that this paper is a good one because she included what her professor expected her to include in the paper. Later in the interview, she said that she was not fond of this paper from the bottom of her heart. The reason is that she could not write this paper the way she wanted to, and she could not write her opinions clearly.

According to Shinobu, her professor in Women’s Studies required many factors in this review essay as described in the syllabus. For example, it is stated in the syllabus that “... you will not be writing this review essay only to discuss their approach to particular ideas that they have in common. You will also consider and compare the methodologies they use to produce that knowledge” (syllabus). Thus, the syllabus described what students should include in the paper, such as topic and approach. The
requirements that should be included in the paper were surprising for Shinobu, who had been writing in whatever style she wanted to and she liked her way of writing. Shinobu said:

I felt answering questions in a test rather than writing paper since I just followed the requirements in this paper. I think that there should be more freedom that students can write whatever they want. For example, I can write whatever I want if I were told just to write review essay. I believe that we should have that kind of freedom.

Thus, although Shinobu did not think this paper was good from her point of view as a writer, she felt this might be good from her professor’s point of view, since she tried to integrate her requirements in this paper.

The most difficulty she had in writing this paper was that she had little knowledge in her field. Since she had never learned feminist theory, it was difficult for her to analyze and criticize articles and have her own opinions. A part of a comment Shinobu got from her professor shows Shinobu’s difficulty:

You haven’t really written a connector paper here, however. It is more like a selector paper in since you note similarities and differences between the 2 articles. For a connector paper, you want to have those points interact, and you want to comment on your own conclusions from putting them together.

Shinobu believes that she has not yet obtained knowledge in her field and she lacks sufficient knowledge in her field to form her opinions. In addition, there was new terminology in her field that she did not understand. She felt that she lacked knowledge in her field rather than writing skill in English itself. Thus, Shinobu believed that this is a good paper from her perspective and that she did her best to write this paper; however, she also thought it is not a good paper from the standpoint that she did not say what she wanted to say. Shinobu had a lot to say in this paper; however, she did not know how to
write clearly what she wanted to say in English. Overall, the major criterion of good writing for Shinobu is whether or not she spend a lot of time and work hard in order to complete papers.

From among the papers she wrote in her academic courses in her second quarter at OSU, Shinobu chose “The struggling journey to reconstruction of my body” as her best paper. There are six main reasons she chose this paper as her best: discovery; the conversation between subject and object; the product through herself; she could write what she wanted to write; clarity; and making an effort.

The first reason is that in the process of writing this paper, which she titled “The struggling journey to reconstruction of my body,” Shinobu had an insight, which was very helpful to her. This is primarily why she chose this paper as one of her best writing samples. In writing the paper about her body, Shinobu was able to ask many useful questions regarding a very touchy issue for her. She told me how she had had a complex regarding her body size until she came to the U.S. last September. This was because, by Japanese standards, she is bigger than average, which became an issue that made her have a complex about her size.

Among other problems, a more practical problem was the fact that it was difficult for her to find women’s clothing that fit her. Therefore she began to buy men’s clothes, which were bigger, and which fit her. She sometimes also ordered women’s clothes from overseas. She always felt ashamed about her body, which is bigger than an average Japanese woman’s body. Through this class and through writing this paper, she realized that her image about her body was constructed in the Japanese society in which she was
raised. It was a liberating insight for her to realize that her body size is not her fault, and is not even a problem; it is simply a social construct that imposes its values of "femininity" onto a Japanese woman. Shinobu was then able to analyze herself using the theory of social construction.

The second reason Shinobu liked this paper is that she had a conversation between subject and object. Shinobu described how, in order to produce a well-written paper, there must be an ongoing conversation between the author and the material that one is writing. She referred to this as a conversation between "subject" and "object." She said that in a good paper, this conversation is constant; in other words, the conversation between the author and the material she is writing is constantly coming and going.

The third reason is that this paper is the product through herself and the fourth reason is that Shinobu could write what she wanted to write through this process. For Shinobu, the long conversation between herself and her topic helps her to thoroughly process the material in her own mind before she writes down her words. Shinobu said that when she wrote this paper, she thought and struggled a lot about her topic, and she expressed her struggle to me in the Japanese phrase, "umi no kurushimi," which means "labor pains" in English. She said that, in order to write good papers, she needs to have "labor pains." This is a good paper since she had labor pains. The more pain she has, the better paper she could produce, according to her. Shinobu also learned the value of brainstorming before sitting down to write. More specifically, she feels that a writer must first gain information and comprehend it, and then reconstruct it in her own understanding and express it from her own viewpoint. The paper should not be objective.
but subjective, not superficial, but consciously and thoughtfully presented. Shinobu could write what she wanted to write through her own process. That is why she chose this paper as a good one.

The fifth reason is clearness. Choosing the right words is another point that Shinobu shared with me about what she thinks “good” writing should be. For her, thinking and writing clearly means finding powerful expressions that will have a strong impact on the readers. She said that she could write this paper very clearly, because she was able to choose appropriate words to express her opinions. Through the tutorial sessions that she had with her ESL professor, Shinobu learned to write more precisely and she acquired new vocabulary to express exactly what she was thinking. For example, when she wrote “Clothes and shoes at shops also have forced me to know that my body size is not ‘normal’” (Shinobu’s paper, p. 2) her professor helped her express herself by teaching her about the impact of inverting this sentence. “Clothes and shoes” thus become the subject of the sentence and they act upon the author by “[forcing] her to know” that her body is too big. In other words, it is the small shoes and dresses in the shops that make her realize she is larger than the average Japanese woman.

Shinobu said her ESL professor helped her choose precise words and taught her some new expressions, such as the word “wrestling” in order to talk about the difficulty she had with Japanese society’s definition of a woman’s body versus her own feelings and comfort about her body. She wrote the following sentence to describe this discomfort: “Wrestling with social construction and self-control of my body has been an issue for me for a long time” (Shinobu’s paper, p. 4).
Another reason Shinobu gave me for why this paper was "good" in her opinion is because she worked very hard at this paper. She spent a lot of time thinking about it and revising it, until it expressed exactly what she wanted to say.

From among the papers she wrote in her academic courses in her third quarter at OSU, Shinobu chose "Response Paper #1" as her best paper (see Appendix H). The main reason she chose this paper as her best was the same as the reason for her paper in her second quarter at OSU. This paper has discovery, the conversation between subject and object, the product through herself, her own point of view, and her efforts. More specifically, she had a long "labor pain" in order to produce this text. That means she thought a lot in order to have her own point of view through the long conversation between this text and herself before she started writing this paper. This is expressed in the last paragraph of this paper, in Shinobu's own words:

What I realized through this paper is the fact that I have been trying to conceptualize "differences," "diversity" only in my brain; I am confused by the way in which I integrate my knowledge and experiences of "differences"; I have been hesitant to expose my confusion and feeling about "differences" to people. Actually, the experience of confusion is also considered as my "difference." Practicing "difference" is the appropriate way for me to combine these knowledge and experiences. I know that I am standing at the very first stage of practicing "differences." (Shinobu's paper, pp. 5-6)

To summarize, during her first quarter at OSU, it was a big shock for Shinobu to be told by her American professors that her writing in English was not acceptable for academic work at the university level. But, Shinobu had strong confidence and pride in her writing skills in Japanese, and therefore was hurt to be told this. She became indignant and decided that she did not want to follow the writing style of an academic
society that does not accept her writing. She consequently concluded that the professors in her department were less tolerant of international students. They expected international students to have the same English skills as graduate students who were native speakers of English. Shinobu was one of two international students in her department, and her English was weaker than the other international students’. The fact that most of her classmates had a bachelor’s degree in Women’s Studies also made her feel insecure and hopeless because she didn’t have any background in Women’s Studies. In the middle of the quarter, Shinobu was directly told by one of her professors that she should improve her English skills in both literacy and spoken skills, because otherwise, she may misunderstand some concepts discussed in class and may be misled in the field.

At the end of her first academic year, Shinobu had this to say about her writing experience in her very first quarter as a new student in an American university:

I emotionally hated the papers in English written by Americans. I had my own style in Japanese and they did not accept my writing. I did not like the society that did not accept my writing style. Even though I tried to write papers following the expectations of my professors, I felt that that was not my style, and I rebelliously refused.

Shinobu suffered from rejection by the academic society in the United States, and she resisted writing her papers the way that she was instructed during the first quarter. In her first interview with me in the first quarter, Shinobu said:

I think anyone can write academic papers in English if they are trained. Writing academic papers in English has some specific formats and the way to write. If you know the rules, you can write it. Since I have not had training in academic writing in English, I can’t write it well. That’s it.
During her interview with me at the end of her first academic year, I reminded Shinobu of this comment, by letting her read the transcription of our first interview together.

When she read it she laughed saying,

I think I did not know academic writing in English as well as in Japanese when I came to the U.S. That's why I gave this kind of answer. After I have been studying and writing papers in English in the U.S., I fully realize that it is not easy to write a good academic paper in English.

To summarize, Shinobu has become conscious of being a feminist writer who integrates theory into her analysis of herself from the point of view of being a Japanese woman.

**Texts in English she chose as good samples of writing**

Shinobu chose “Foundational Dilemmas: A critical Evaluation of Multi-axis Liberation Theories” written by one of her classmates as a sample of good English writing following her first academic year. This is a critical paper that her classmate wrote in one of the required courses in Women’s Studies. This is the paper that Shinobu’s professor suggested to her to read as a sample of a critical paper when Shinobu went to ask her professor how to write a critical paper. Although she read this paper, she could not write her critical paper. Her professor said she should drop this course if she could not write a critical paper. After all, Shinobu dropped this course.

The major reason Shinobu chose this paper as good writing in English is that the author understood and discussed feminist theory very well in her opinion. According to Shinobu, to have one’s own critical points based on reading was a very hard task. She
did her best to have her own critical points after she read articles and discussed with one of her classmates; however, Shinobu could not do this. Her classmate had her own critical points in this paper as follows:

A typical question addressed by feminist theorists like Kimberle Crenshaw and Deborah King is how these binary categories of identity interact to form differing experiences. For instance, how do black women experience discrimination differently than either white feminist discourse or male antiracist discourse purport? (Her classmate’s paper, p. 1)

According to Shinobu, writers have to have knowledge to argue and have their own ideas or opinions, in order to write good papers in an academic setting. Her classmate shows her knowledge in this paper based on her own point of view. Thus, Shinobu believes this is good writing. In sum, good writing in English should reflect the writers’ point of view, according to Shinobu.

Perspectives on good writing in Japanese

Texts in Japanese she chose as good samples of writing

Shinobu did not choose any sample of good Japanese writing at the beginning of her first academic year at OSU. This is not because she could not choose, but because she did not have time to select it. She had a very difficult time to adjust to her new life at OSU during her first quarter.

Shinobu chose “Jibunn wo shiru tameno tetsugaku nyumon” (Introduction to Philosophy: In order to know oneself) by Seiji Takeda (1995), as a sample of good Japanese writing at the end of her first academic year. The author is one of her professors in her university in Japan. When she read this book at the university in Japan about three
years ago, she did not think this is really a good book. However, after she finished one academic year, Shinobu felt that it is a very good book and one that she would like to own throughout her life.

The major reason that Shinobu chose this book as good writing in Japanese is that the author of this book integrated a difficult philosophy into his life and described it in a reader-friendly fashion. In other words, most books of philosophy are very difficult for Shinobu; however, this author himself understands philosophy entirely and reintroduces philosophy from his own point of view.

To summarize, Shinobu’s perspectives on good writing in Japanese are not writing techniques, but the author’s own point of view that is expressed clearly to readers. Shinobu’s perspectives on good writing as a writer and as a reader have a difference and a similarity. The criteria of good writing that Shinobu held as a writer include to spend a lot of time and work hard and to have one’s point of view in her papers. On the other hand, Shinobu’s perspectives on good writing as a reader concerns whether or not the content of the text is interesting to her. Although these perspectives are different, it is her perspectives both as a writer and reader that the author of the text has his or her point of view.
4. 6 Jiro

4. 6. 1 Profile

Jiro, who is a 26-year-old male, appears reserved but is not afraid to speak his opinion clearly. He attended Nagoya Institute of Technology in Japan for his BS and MS for six consecutive years, majoring in Mechanical Engineering. After he completed his Master's degree in 1999 at the Nagoya Institute, he enrolled at OSU in a second MS Program, again in Mechanical Engineering during the 1999 Autumn Quarter. He did not have prior work experience.

Although he hesitated over which university he should choose to continue studying for the Ph.D. in Japan or in the U.S. to study, two major reasons made Jiro to decide to come to the U.S. to study. The first reason was that his experience of studying two years in his MS Program in Japan did not make him feel confident enough about the social significance of his studies and in his special skills in his field, specifically, his skills of practical mechatronics as a mechanical engineer. As Jiro believes that the U.S. is at the top of the world in the research of his field, to study and get a MS in the U.S. had the most potential for him to enhance his knowledge and capability in his field and to have confidence as mechanical engineer.

The second reason was that Jiro wanted to gain “international perspectives” through his experience of studying and living in the U.S. His father who has many opportunities to meet foreigners on business advised Jiro that it is very important to recognize what a country Japan is and what the Japanese nation is through Jiro’s experience of living abroad. In addition, Jiro believed to improve his English language
skills would be beneficial to survive in enterprises in his future career. Jiro would like to go back to Japan and work for a major car company as a mechanical engineer after he completes his Master's degree at OSU.

The major difference of Jiro from the other participants was that Jiro had lived in the U.S. with his family for three years in elementary school due to his father's business. He attended an American school on weekdays and a Japanese school on Saturday at this period. Jiro did not have any difficulties to adjust to an American elementary school and to readjust to a Japanese one. He believes this was because he was young.

4.6.2 Writing experience in the L1 context

During the three years age seven to ten when Jiro attended elementary school in the U.S., he had some opportunities to write very short compositions in English. He remembers that he wrote some short compositions, using some vocabulary given by his teacher. He is not sure whether or not he can call them compositions. He wrote them as he liked and gave presentations in class. The way of teaching was not to correct something wrong but to give some opportunities to write about something, according to Jiro. Jiro did not learn how to write compositions in English. In addition, his compositions were neither corrected nor graded by his teacher.

In a Japanese school on Saturdays in the U.S., Jiro remembers that he learned how to use transitional words such as "however," "but", etc. However, he did not learn how to write compositions in Japanese there. Although Jiro does not remember if he had some changes of his Japanese writing in his living in the U.S., his spoken Japanese changed.
Although Jiro did not recognize this change in his Japanese, his father said to him just before they moved back to Japan that Jiro's spoken Japanese had become strange after his three-year stay in the U.S. as Jiro had started using mixed vocabulary with both English and Japanese in his Japanese spoken sentences with inappropriate Japanese grammar.

In elementary school and junior high school in Japan, Jiro was required to write a reader's response (kansobun) every summer and winter vacation. He was not fond of reading itself, and he did not like writing as required. He never received any writing instruction on how to write these compositions. He was also not graded on his writing, and he does not remember whether or not he received some comments. Thus, Jiro did not have any model, and he wrote as he thought about. In his fifth or sixth grade, Jiro learned a format of ki-sho-ten-ketsu; however, he does not remember if he wrote in that format.

In high school, Jiro had some writing experiences including some papers to prove something in physics and science classes, short compositions in Japanese language classes, and a long paper in a health and physical education class. However, he was not instructed how to write, and he does not remember how he wrote. Since Jiro's university did not require him to take an essay examination (shoronbun), he did not study how to write one in his high school.

In both undergraduate and graduate school in Japan, where Jiro majored in Mechanical Engineering, he wrote progress reports in Japanese a couple of times a year. In these one or two-page progress reports, he wrote what he was doing in his study, how much his study was progressing, and what problems he had in a free format.
Jiro wrote two graduation theses in Japanese: Robotics for his Bachelor’s and Assistive Technology for Master’s Degree. However, he had no formal instruction in academic writing in Japanese. He showed drafts of these theses to his professor’s assistants, professors, and his classmates to get some feedback on them, and corrected them. While writing his thesis for his Bachelor’s Degree, he showed the draft of his thesis to his professor’s assistant at first, then later his professor. The assistant who had read many articles in his field marked some parts that should be corrected or changed. Some examples of the corrections at the micro level were unclear sentences, wrong usages of technical terminology, etc. At the macro level, he was showing unclear organization. Some examples were that there were no explanations about a sentence that Jiro wrote so, the sentence needed to be explained more, or this sentence should come earlier, etc. Looking back on this experience, Jiro agreed with these comments and corrected them. He thinks that the drafts that he wrote was not clear for readers although he understood what he should write in his mind and he just wrote it.

The corrections Jiro got on the drafts of his thesis for his Master’s Degree were different from these on the drafts for Bachelor’s Degree. They focused on a broader flow rather than in details, such as what was written academically, what problem he brought up, how he defined terminology, what he offered as a solution, what experimentation he performed, what result he had, and what his conclusions were. Thus, the corrections Jiro made at this level were focused on the content of his thesis. From these two different experience of being corrected by these two different professors, Jiro believes that either one is neither good nor bad regarding how to evaluate compositions.
Looking back on his these writing experiences, he did not have any model in order to write his theses. However, he referred to many articles in his field in order to write his thesis. What he had learned naturally by reading these articles was how to organize theses since most articles have a common format that consists of an introduction, experimentation, results, and conclusion. Jiro worked on undergraduate students’ senior-year research papers (*sotsugyou ronbun*) to revise the wording when he was a graduate student.

4.6.3 Writing experience in the L2 context

Jiro’s writing experience in English for his first academic year in the U.S. is shown at Table 4.13. Jiro took ESL Composition 107G and 108.02, intermediate and advanced ESL, in his first two consecutive quarters. ESL Composition 107G was Jiro’s first academic writing course in his life. He had never had any courses on how to write either in English or in Japanese. Jiro believed that he learned the fundamental rules about how to write in English in this course. They included how to write with clear organization, how to connect each paragraph based on the content of the paper, how to use transitional words, how to construct sentences, etc. Jiro believed these issues were very important to write in English, and he was aware of these issues in writing his papers.

In ESL Composition 108.02, Jiro wrote three papers. All of these were related to the same project in this course. Whereas Jiro was satisfied with ESL 107G, he was not pleased with ESL Composition 108.02. He did not choose any papers as a good paper in this course, since he did not feel that he wrote a good paper.
ESL 108.02 required him to write a research paper. Although his ESL teacher strongly recommended him to choose a topic and practice writing a research paper, Jiro’s opinion was that it was impossible for him to write a research paper without finding a topic about which he cared to write. Thus, he indicated that the purpose of this course did not match his own goals, and he was not motivated to write papers in this course. During the interview at the end of his second quarter, he said that this course might have been beneficial for him if he would take it when he was ready to write his thesis.

In his field, Jiro wrote a great deal of laboratory report assignments. Since he was usually assigned to write one lab report every week per course, he wrote a total of 18 lab reports in two courses each quarter, totaling 54 lab reports in his major in three consecutive quarters in the L2 context.

In the field of engineering, Jiro had writing assignments consisting of laboratory reports usually every week. He wrote a total of 18 laboratory reports in his first quarter since he took two courses in his major. Each assignment as a number such as “Homework #,” and the report as an assignment does not have any specific title.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Quarter (Autumn Quarter, 1999)</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Quarter (Winter Quarter, 2000)</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Quarter (Spring Quarter, 2000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Assignments</td>
<td>Writing Assignments</td>
<td>Writing Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laboratory report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laboratory report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mechanical Engineering 786)</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Laboratory report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laboratory report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13: The writing assignments Jiro had in his first academic year in the U.S.  
* Jiro considers this to be the best paper in his writing assignments in his ESL course.  
** Jiro considers this to be the best paper in his writing assignments in his academic field in that quarter.
4. 6. 4 Jiro’s perspectives on good writing

I present Jiro’s perspectives on good writing in both English and Japanese based on four papers in English Jiro considered his best; two texts in English he chose as good samples of writing; and two texts in Japanese he chose as good samples of writing shown in Table 4.14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papers in English he considers his best</td>
<td>Texts in English he chose as good samples of writing</td>
<td>Texts in Japanese he chose as good samples of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>“Modification of the characteristics of metal materials by means of carbon-composition” from ESL.</td>
<td>“Shared control framework applied to a robotic aid for the blind”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Homework #9” [to design a battery pack] from his field.</td>
<td>“Tokushu habatakeNihonjin” (Special issues: Japanese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>“Homework #5” [to design a battery pack] from his field.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>“Lab 3: Engine testing and temperature effects” [to design a battery pack] from his field.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>No classes.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1 year</td>
<td>“Exhaust emissions and their control”</td>
<td>“Kigyo kenkyu” (Research on companies)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14: The papers and texts Jiro selected in his first academic year in the U.S.
Perspectives on good writing in English

Papers in English he considers his best

From among the papers Jiro wrote in his ESL Composition 107.G in his first quarter, he chose a data analysis paper as his best writing. Jiro titled this paper “Modification of the characteristics of metal materials by means of carbon-composition.” The requirement of the paper was to choose a data in his field, analyze, and explain the data.

The major reason Jiro considered this as his best paper was that he followed a clear organization, connected every paragraph based on their content, used good transitional words, and constructed grammatical sentences, as he was instructed in this course. Jiro accepted that these issues were very important to write good papers in English. Jiro applied his perspective on good writing in this paper in the following ways.

At the macro level, he organized his paper clearly, consisting of five sections titled: “introduction, definition, location of data tables and discussion, conclusion, and future work.” In addition, he made sure these sections were clearly connected, and the relationship of each section was clear to the reader. Jiro was very satisfied that he followed this sequence just as his instructor had taught him.

At the micro level, Jiro became conscious of the importance of good transitions and word usage in writing good papers after he learned how to use them effectively. For example, Jiro begins the first sentence of his paper with a general statement, followed by a specific statement that begins with “However” and presents the problem. Jiro was pleased with the way he could use the transitional word “however” effectively.
Jiro also was happy to be able to use expressions effectively, such as “as can be seen in Table 1,” “In this paper,” “The objective of this paper,” “There are mainly two notable facts,” etc. Having just arrived in the U.S., Jiro did not know the variations of words or how to use them, until he was introduced to new vocabulary in this course. Jiro found using these words made his paper more clear and the connective words gave it a natural flow, which is why he believed this paper was well written. The other reason Jiro considered this as his best paper was that he spent a lot of time to write this paper and worked hard. In addition, he could write what he needed to say in this paper. Overall, the major reasons that Jiro chose this paper as his best paper in ESL Composition 107.G were that he followed his instructor’s directions, used expressions effectively, spent a lot of time, and wrote what he should say.

From among the writing assignments in his field that Jiro had written, he chose one laboratory report that he wrote later in the Autumn Quarter as a good report. This report did not have any title. It was simply labeled Homework #9. Jiro expressed the reasons he considered this paper as a good paper as follows.

The main reason Jiro chose this report as a good one was that he wrote this report briefly with clear sections. He described eight symbols used in this report at the beginning of this report. Then, he wrote six sections: voltage requirement, energy requirement, power requirement, number of strings, summary, and conclusion. In this report, Jiro focused on numerical formulas and numbers and kept the numbers of sentences to a minimum.
Looking back on his writing experience in this quarter, Jiro found out that the reports he wrote earlier in the Autumn Quarter focused strongly on explanation. In his earlier reports in this quarter, he described and explained more than he needed to, and consequently his papers were quite long. However, he realized that a report should be shorter from the reader's point of view. Since his professor who was a reader of these reports had enough background to understand these reports in this field, Jiro started thinking that he needed to reduce his explanations to a minimum. Thus, while revising his report over and over again, his report became shorter and shorter. Although the reports he wrote later became much shorter than the earlier reports he had written, Jiro believes that what was said in this later report was clear. In other words, this report was short, but it was clear. Jiro said:

The most important criterion to choose a good report is how briefly it is written in order to report what he needed to.

Ideally, it is the best to write reports that are understandable only with numerical formulas, charts, numbers, etc.

The brevity and clarity were the most important for him in writing his reports. Thus, Jiro believed that this report he wrote in the late Autumn Quarter was a good one, since it had these criteria. In addition, Jiro considered this as his best paper because he made efforts to write this paper and worked hard. Furthermore, he could write clearly what he needed to say in this paper. Overall, the major reasons that Jiro chose this paper as his best paper in his field in this quarter were that the paper has the brevity and clarity, he wrote this paper clearly, and he made efforts.
From among the writing assignments in his field that Jiro had written during his second quarter, he chose one laboratory report as a good report. Jiro expressed the reasons he considered this paper as a good report as follows. In order to explain clearly why Jiro believed Homework #5 was a good paper, he compared the Homework #5 paper that he wrote at the end of this quarter with Homework #1 that he wrote at the beginning of this quarter. Jiro said his Homework #1 which was 24 pages long has more expressive words. Looking back on this report, Jiro felt that he explained concepts that he did not need to. For example, he believed that he did not need to describe “block diagram of the control system” in the introduction section of “the solution to problem 1,” because the reader was his professor, who already had this information that was considered general information in his field. In addition, Jiro believed that he should have integrated each chart into each appropriate part in his report, although he attached all charts to the end of this report. He believed that, then, he would be able to reduce his explanation in words.

In contrast, Homework #5, which was eleven pages long, is shorter. In this report, Jiro integrated many charts, tables, and numerical formulas into the content of the report, and explained everything in a couple of lines under each chart and table. Jiro believes that he reported what he should do in this report, keeping the number of sentences to a minimum. Jiro said:

Sometimes, explanation in ten sentences could be written in one sentence with a chart. To present what I need to report in fewer sentences and in less time is important in writing reports. “Fewer sentences” for me means brevity.

Jiro believed that this report was very clear to his professor, although there were not a lot of explanations in many sentences. Thus, Jiro believes that he did not have to spend an
excessive amount of time to compose sentences as a writer, and his professor did not have to spend extra time as a reader. To avoid spending “excessive time to compose sentences” for Jiro does not mean that he does not have to spend a lot of time to write his reports. Actually, he spent a lot of time in writing Homework #5. But Jiro would rather spend more time to write a clear report by creating more appropriate charts and tables than to spend a lot of time to describe everything in sentences. Thus, good report writing for Jiro means being clear, keeping to a minimum the number of sentences, and presenting the material in good sequence and organization. He spent a lot of time and worked hard in order to write this lab report.

From among the writing assignments in his field in his third quarter, Jiro chose one laboratory report as a good report, titled “Lab 3: Engine testing and temperature effects” (see Appendix I). The criteria that Jiro considered this paper as a good report were the same as those that Jiro said for his best lab report in his second quarter.

Jiro chose this report because he focused on only what he needed to write in this report and avoided writing extra explanations. Thus, Jiro believed this report was brief and was conveyed in a good sequence and organization, although the amount of explanations in the sentences did not decrease dramatically compared to the other reports he had written at OSU. Overall, good writing for Jiro here is the same as good report writing: clear and keeping the number of sentences to a minimum. In addition, to spend a lot of time and make efforts are important for Jiro.
In sum, papers in English he considers his best are related to the papers in which he wrote what he needs to write and he worked hard. In addition, the brevity and clarity are important for good writing for Jiro.

Texts in English he chose as good samples of writing

As a good sample of English writing at the beginning of his first academic year at OSU, Jiro chose “Shared control framework applied to a robotic aid for the blind” (pp. 717-722) written by Peter Aigner and Brenan McCarragher. This was one of the articles Jiro read in Japan before he came to the U.S. The reasons Jiro selected this article as a good sample of English writing are as follows.

First, the authors have a consistent argument. Second, the text has good flow and is clear between one sentence and the other. Third, the text is compatible between background and conclusion. Fourth, the text uses readable expressions, and readers can understand it easily.

Regarding good writing, Jiro has the same criteria in both Japanese and English to decide good writing. The most important criterion for Jiro is the fourth for reading articles written in English. Jiro believes that using easy expressions is a pivotal point for readers’ extent of understanding when non-native speakers read English writing. They can look up unknown words or technical terminology in a dictionary; however, English writing, which unnecessarily uses many difficult expressions, is not good in Jiro’s
opinion. The article Jiro chose as a sample of good writing in English was very readable for him at this point. That is why he chose this article as a sample of good writing in English.

As a good sample of English writing after his first academic year at OSU, Jiro chose “Exhaust emissions and their control” written by Giorgio Rizzoni and Krishnaswami (Cheena) Srinivasan. This was one of the articles Jiro read soon after completing his first academic year at OSU. The reasons Jiro selected this article as a good sample of English writing are as follows.

First, this article has a consistent argument. More specifically, although this article covers a relatively wide range of issues, it is written logically without complicating the discussion. The second, the authors describe what they have to present in this text effectively and compactly. For example, they explain the content, using equations, bullets, and figures. Specifically, the effective layout of figures in this text helps Jiro to read this article, since he did not have to flip the pages back and forth to refer to the figure when reading this text. These help Jiro to easily understand the content of this text.

In sum, regarding writing in English, writing instruction in L2 strongly influenced Jiro’s perspectives on good writing in English. ESL Composition 107.G was Jiro’s first academic writing course in his life. Although he held a master’s degree in mechanical engineering, he had not taken any courses on how to write either in English or in
Japanese. He had, in fact, written a master’s thesis during the previous academic year. But in Japan, writing classes are not a general requirement in college, or in graduate school.

Jiro believed that in ESL 107.G, he learned the fundamental rules about how to write in English, such as a good outline, a clear relationship between each paragraph, effective usage of transitional words, etc. He accepted and followed this instruction in his writing, and he believed that this course complemented his lack in writing. Jiro was able to adapt what he learned in ESL and to apply it to his engineering class in which he wrote the data analysis paper discussed above. The skills and techniques that he acquired for good writing helped him write this data analysis paper as well as the lab reports in his engineering classes.

Compared to the other university graduates in Japan in this study, Jiro was willing to accept the writing instruction that he received in L2. He followed his instructor’s directions in writing and he made the transition well from writing in L1 to writing in L2.

Through his experience of writing reports in his field for three quarters at OSU, what Jiro found out regarding report writing are as follows. First, he recognized that it was very important to understand what he needed to report before he started to write and to write only what he needed. In order to write better reports, Jiro believes that he needed to spend more time before starting to write. For example, Jiro clearly has to understand problems of experimentation, readers’ background, and how much information readers
need to understand his reports, before starting to write reports. This requires more time for him to think but less to write, and this is harder for him than writing a greater number of sentences.

Second, Jiro recognized that he needed to keep the number of sentences to a minimum. The reports are not about how he could write intensively, using long sentences or adding explanations in details. Rather, it is important to write as an engineer, since the reports in his field are not about description of emotions but experimentation and results. In other words, what he writes clearly with minimum words is the most critical point in his writing. Third, a report that requires less time for a reader to read is good one. In other words, a report that one can clearly understand in less time is better.

Consequently, after three quarters at OSU, a good report for Jiro is one that clearly presents only what one needs to read, in a minimum number of sentences, and one that makes readers understand the material quickly.

**Perspectives on good writing in Japanese**

**Texts in English he chose as good samples of writing**

As a good sample of Japanese writing in the first Quarter, Jiro chose a feature article titled “*Tokushu: habatake nihonjin* (Feature articles: Fly, Japanese)” in a journal of *Nikkei bijinesu* (Japanese economics and business) (1999, pp. 32-47). There was no specific reason for Jiro to have chosen the article in the economics and business field, since he chose this article from among the articles in Japanese he had read just before he came to the U.S.
Jiro was very humble to express his reasons why he selected this writing as a good sample. In the first interview in the first quarter, he said that he could not give an abstract grade such as “A” or “B,” since he had never been trained to evaluate writing. He said that people who were trained how to evaluate writing probably could evaluate writing much better than he could. Thus, he emphasized that he did not know how to evaluate good or bad writing.

The major criteria that brought Jiro to choose this featured article as good writing in Japanese were, first, he could understand what it said clearly; second, these articles were reasonable and had a clear focus. In other words, how much he could understand was very important for Jiro as a reader. In order to understand the article clearly, Jiro believed it should be written reasonably. According to Jiro, this article was logically written, discussing Japanese society and people in many different social positions, from many points of view.

After he mentioned all these, Jiro added the content of the article is also important, especially when he reads it. It should be informative for him. This feature article consists of some articles written by some authors as a management critic, presidents of some major companies in Japan, a superintendent of the Japanese representative rugby football team, etc. It offers some hints for Jiro on how to survive in the 21st century. Thus, there should be something new for him in the article when he reads it.

As a good sample of Japanese writing after his first academic year at OSU, Jiro chose a feature article titled “Kigyo kenkyu (Research on companies)” from one Japanese newspaper. There was no specific reason for Jiro to have chosen the article in the
newspaper. The major reason he chose this column as a good sample of Japanese writing was simple: it was information he wanted to get. As he is planning to work for Toyota automobile company after completing his degree at OSU, he was very curious about what policies this company has and how it is surviving during the severe economic conditions in Japan in the 1990s. He could get this information in this column and he was satisfied with them after he finished reading. The other major reason he chose this column as a good sample of Japanese writing was that it has one theme and that the column is written toward that theme.

To summarize, regarding Jiro’s perspectives on good writing in English and Japanese, Jiro has the same criteria for both. However, there are differences in his perspectives on good writing from the viewpoint of a reader and a writer. As a reader, an additional criterion of good writing in Jiro’s opinion is that it should have new information that Jiro wants to have; as a writer, an additional criterion of good writing is to make an effort to produce texts.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I presented the results of six case studies, focusing on the individuals' perspectives on good writing during their adaptation to the L2 academic context in their first academic year in the U.S. In this chapter, I analyze and interpret the results across the six case studies, focusing on the factors that affect L2 writers' perspectives on writing in English as L2 in the academic setting in the U.S. (L2 context) from the perspective of three different contexts: the LI context, the L2 context, and the future context (see Table 5.3). While considering these six participants as multi-competent adults who use L2 as a tool in order to accomplish their own goals in their particular field of study in the academic setting in the U.S., I pose three major research questions, addressing each of the three above-mentioned contexts to guide my analysis and interpretation.

To answer the first research question, "How does the LI Japanese context affect Japanese students' perspectives on L2 writing in the L2 context?" I examined the participants' perspectives on writing from their educational, cultural, and individual
writing experiences in the L1 Japanese context. More specifically, what kind of L1 literacy training did they have? What kinds of texts did they produce in L1? How did the Japanese culture affect their L1 literacy training in Japan? How did they perceive their writing and themselves as writers in Japanese? Additionally, I reviewed the recent foreign language education in Japan and examined if Japanese participants’ previous study of English as a foreign language in Japan was helpful to their English academic writing in the U.S.

In order to answer the second research question, “How does the L2 academic context affect Japanese students’ perspectives on L2 writing in the L2 context?” From their educational experience in the L2 context, I examined how the students were trained, how they met academic demands in the L2 context, and what kinds of texts they produced. In addition, I explored how they perceived their writing in L2 and how they perceived themselves as L2 writers. Moreover, I examined what factors in the L2 context affected their perspectives on writing in English.

To answer my final research question, “How does the future context affect Japanese students’ perspectives on L2 writing and their approach to the development of L2 writing in the L2 context?” or more specifically, “What writing goals in L2 writing do the L2 writers aspire to in the L2 context and in their future context?” and “How do their goals influence their perspectives on good writing and approach to writing in L2?” I explored their perspectives on writing in English as L2 from the point of view of their future goals as L2 writers. I was interested in finding out what kinds of texts they would
produce and what kind of training they thought they would need. In summary, I compared and contrasted significant patterns in these six Japanese writers’ perceptions on writing from the three aforementioned contexts.

Furthermore, I examined the data to discover whether there were different factors in the L1 context when comparing high school graduates, university graduates, and a graduate of the master’s program in Japan, and in the L2 context, when comparing undergraduates and graduate students. In other words, I investigated whether there were any differences in writing experience among the six students, comparing high school graduates who had less writing experience, university graduates who had more, and a graduate from the master’s program in Japan, who had the most experience in L1 writing. My examination also disclosed differences in L2 writing experiences in two different programs, the undergraduate and graduate schools at OSU, with regard to writing process and products. In the following section, I will discuss the findings according to the three research questions that I have posed.

1. How does the L1 Japanese context (educational, cultural, and individual writing experience) affect Japanese students’ perspectives on L2 writing in the L2 context?

My original intention in choosing this research question was to discover whether Japanese students’ perspectives of L2 writing were influenced by their L1 Japanese context, assuming that there would be a strong influence from the L1 context. Specifically, with regard to the students’ educational and cultural experience in the L1 context, I assumed that the literacy training that the Japanese students received in Japan
influenced their perspectives regarding L2 writing. I assumed that the students’ attitudes, beliefs, and cultural values regarding writing in Japanese would be transferred to their writing in English in the U.S.

Furthermore, I was very curious to find out how the students were trained in classes of English as a foreign language in their recent English education in Japan and whether the English classes they had taken in Japan were helpful to them in their English writing classes in the U.S. My assumption was that the English classes in Japan would probably be helpful, at least as far as teaching sentence construction was concerned. Additionally, I was curious to find out whether their learning experience of English as a foreign language in Japan influenced their perspectives regarding their L2 writing. In short, my intention was to discover how the L1 context affected students’ overall perspective regarding their L2 writing.

The data revealed that all six students, who share a similar educational and cultural experience in the L1 context, had some common perspectives with regard to writing; however, there were individual differences insofar as each student’s attitudes, beliefs, and values affected his or her L2 writing in the L2 context.

1. (a). What kind of literacy training did Japanese students have in Japan and what kind of texts did they have in Japanese?

One common factor discovered among the participants in this study was that none of them had taken a single writing course in elementary school through graduate school in Japan. Perhaps, this is not so surprising, as Leki (1992) notes that the U.S. is one of
the few countries in the world where people take writing classes. Where did the participants learn about writing, without having taken any formal writing courses in Japan? Although all of the participants in this study expressed in the interviews that they learned how to write in Japanese on their own, they might have had some experiences to shape their view of writing.

Although there may be many factors that affect their perspectives on writing and on their approach to writing, at least one possible factor may be the participants' literacy training in Japan, as schools are viewed as the institutions most responsible for literacy education in Japan. Therefore, it is important to begin by looking at these six participants' literacy training in Japan in order to understand their perspectives on writing and their approach to writing, as all of the participants in this study had had a very similar literacy training from the elementary through secondary school, more specifically, in a class of kokugo (national language) at the elementary and secondary levels and a class of kobun (ancient Japanese writings) at the secondary level, established by the Japanese Ministry of Education (Hirata, 1999; Namba, 1995).

In kokugo class, students in Japan read textbooks selected by the Japanese Ministry of Education. The readings in these textbooks are selected from a broad range of genres, such as essays, scientific reports, excerpts from novels, etc., which are considered good samples of writing based on the content and writing techniques. The readings also include metaphors, proverbs, idiomatic phrases, etc., which are considered common heritage in Japanese. In the kokugo class, in order to confirm their comprehension of the texts, the students are asked to answer some questions such as
“Why did s/he say it that way in that situation?” “How did s/he feel when it happened?” etc. This task usually requires students to carefully read the text at least twice.

Literacy training in Japanese education also includes training in practicing and memorizing of hiragana (46 phonetic syllables mostly for function words), katakana (46 phonetic syllables for loanwords or onomatopoeia), and kanji (Chinese characters for content words). More specifically, hiragana is used to write postpositional particles, verb, adjective, and adverb endings, and some words. Katakana is used for loanwords from foreign languages, and vocabulary in katakana has been increasing in Japanese writing as the number of loanwords has been increasing (see Chapter 2). Hiragana and katakana have two to four strokes. Kanji is more complex than hiragana and katakana: each kanji has a specific order of one to twenty-four or more strokes to write and each kanji usually can be read in a couple of ways in different contexts.

Japanese students learn hiragana in the first grade and katakana in the second grade. In addition, they start learning kanji in the first grade and continue learning more new kanji throughout their school life. Japanese students must learn approximately 900 kanji in the elementary school and another approximately 1000 kanji in junior high school. Thus, by ninth grade, students have to learn approximately 2,000 kanji that enables them to read the Japanese newspapers. In addition, they learn another 1000 kanji in high school. These kanji are introduced to students in textbooks in kokugo class so that students learn kanji in context.

In short, for a Japanese student to be able to read and write, he or she must know a certain number of these characters, so Japanese students spend a great deal of their time
practicing and memorizing more characters in or outside a class of *kokugo*. When a Japanese student considers writing, therefore, this includes having to use these *kanji* to communicate. To read, write, and understand more *kanji* is very important in the Japanese educational system as well as in Japanese society in general. People are generally considered to be more sophisticated and educated when they know more *kanji*.

Although the students I interviewed in this study expressed that they did not receive explicit writing instructions in Japanese, they were provided with some opportunities to write. Every summer vacation, the students were assigned to write *kansobun* (responses to reading), which required them to read books and write their responses to the books as their homework. They could select any book from any genre, such as fiction or non-fiction, that they wanted. In *kansobun*, they were required to write what they thought and felt about the books they selected. They were also assigned to write *bunshu* (a composition at the end of each school year) that required them to write about some of their memories from that year such as school events and family trips. The compositions were compiled as *kurasu bunshu* (a class composition) or *gakunen bunshu* (a year composition). They did not have any explicit writing instruction on how to write *kansobun* and *bunshu*. They wrote freely in any style they liked and they were not graded on their writing. Their teachers usually wrote some comments on the contents of the writings.

In addition to *kokugo*, in junior high school and high school, students are also required to take a class of *koten* (classical Japanese). As in *kokugo* class, students are required to read textbooks selected by the Japanese Ministry of Education. The readings
in these textbooks are selected from excerpts from Japanese literature in kobun (ancient Japanese writings) and Chinese literature in kanbun (classical Chinese). In kobun, the students read novels, diaries, essays, and poems in the original texts. They learn classical Japanese grammar. They use a classical Japanese-modern Japanese dictionary and translate them into modern Japanese in order to understand. In kanbun, they read poems and novels written only in kanji, which originally came from China. They also learn grammar of kanbun and translate them into modern Japanese to understand.

In sum, the review of the literacy training in Japan revealed that these six participants were educated in a very similar literacy training at the primary and secondary school. Although there was no formal writing instruction, the literacy training that they had in schools included reading from a broader range, practice and memorizing of hiragana, katakana, and kanji, and some writing activities.

1. (b). What perspectives on writing from their L1 literacy training have Japanese students brought to their L2 writing in the L2 context? Did their perspectives change during the first academic year in the U.S.? If so, how did they change? If not, why didn’t they change?

I found two common perspectives on good writing in their English papers and one common perspective on writing from all of the participants. In addition, I found one common perspective on writing only from university graduates in Japan, possibly stemming from their Japanese literacy training as well as Japanese culture. More specifically, the two common perspectives on good writing in the participants’ English
papers were “to work hard” or “to do one’s best” (gambaru) and “to express one’s opinion.” The common perspective on writing was “to have more flexibility of style and presentation.” Furthermore, one common perspective on writing only from university graduates in Japan was the use of non-assertive linguistic devices.

In the following section, I will discuss these perspectives, focusing on the factors that influenced the participants’ L2 writing from the L1 context in terms of their L1 literacy training and provide a more in-depth, cultural interpretation of them.

To make an effort (gambaru)

One of the criteria of good writing in their papers in English which the participants in this study expressed was how much effort they put into writing their papers. In other words, the papers on which they made an effort (ganbatta) were good writing in their opinion. For example, they said, “This is a good paper because I worked very hard” or “This is a good paper because I did my best” or “This is a good paper because I made an effort.” Another example is that the reason Jiro did not choose a paper he considered as his best from the ESL Composition course in his second quarter was that there was no paper on which he worked hard. Similarly, the reason that Tomoko was reluctant to choose a paper she considered as her best from her ESL Composition course in her second quarter was that she believed she did not work hard. Thus, the papers on which they made an effort were good papers while the papers on which they did not work hard were not good papers, in their opinion.
I was surprised to learn this because I had assumed that the criterion of good writing included textual features such as good organization, good thesis and argument, good support, and useful details. Can working hard to write one’s papers become a criterion for good writing? Where does this criterion come from?

A possible reason for this attitude is that these participants acquired it in the Japanese educational setting and society, both of which reflect Japanese culture. The virtue of working hard and doing one’s best is a part of the Japanese culture, and to be discouraged is considered as not good. More specifically, the emphasis on making an effort is derived from Confucian philosophy, and the belief has put down strong roots in Japanese culture. Stevenson and Stigler (1994) describe this belief in current Japanese schools as follows:

The belief in the ultimate positive efforts of hard work is not an abstract credo, but a practical guide in the everyday lives . . . . Japanese schoolchildren are able to tell you, “Yareba dekiru” (If you try hard you can do it), or that they really seek to be a “ganbaru kodomo” (a child who strives to do his or her hardest). (p. 98)

Similarly, Samimy et al. (1994) explain the virtue of making an effort displayed by Japanese children from the Japanese cultural perspective, presenting the Japanese effort (or gambare) model that discusses notions of gambare, amae, and giri (effort, dependence, obligation). For example, they explain Japanese children’s success in mathematics in this way. Doing one’s best is the virtue of Japanese culture, and Japanese children are always encouraged to work hard by parents, teachers, and people surrounding them.
Japanese culture reflects Japanese literacy training. A kokugo class also is no exception. For example, the participants in this study said they were always encouraged to do their best in reading, writing, and practicing kanji. In a kokugo class or outside of class, the participants in my study spent a lot of time practicing and memorizing kanji. In the process of learning kanji, making an effort such as to follow the stroke order that each kanji has and to practice kanji many times is highly valued by teachers as well as their parents. The participants were also encouraged to work hard and do their best in composing a piece of writing. Thus, they learned to make an effort through their literacy training, which is a virtue in Japanese culture not only in school, but also in society.

This criterion of good writing in their papers seemed to be stable for these Japanese participants over their first academic year in the U.S. This might be because they had been educated in Japanese society for a long time, and this value of Japanese culture was transferred to their L2 writing in the L2 context. This might be also because “working hard” fits in with the process approach that the OSU ESL Composition Program integrates.

To express one’s opinion

Another common criterion for good writing that the participants shared was the ability to express their opinions or to state what they wanted to say in their papers in English. This criterion illustrates Japanese literacy training in kokugo class. In other words, this belief seems to come from the six participants’ experience in kokugo class, in which they were provided with some opportunities to write, as I mentioned above. In
their writing, the participants were encouraged to express their ideas, although these participants did not receive explicit writing instructions in Japanese. Their teachers encouraged them to become writers, telling them that they should write “what they think” and “what they feel” about some incidents in their lives or in the stories in their texts. For instance Midori said, “I remember that I was always encouraged to express my opinions” (described in Midori’s session in Chapter 4).

The six participants did not receive any grades on kansobun and bunshu texts. They only received comments based on what the teacher thought about what the students wrote, rather than about their writing technique. The teachers’ comments were mostly positive, as described in detail in Tomoko and Midori’s case studies in Chapter 4. Although Carson’s study (1992) indicates that in Japanese education “[l]anguage teaching encourages children to express what is socially shared rather than what is individual and personal” (p. 141), the participants in my study were in fact encouraged to write their personal opinion in their writing rather than socially shared expression.

A review of recent Japanese educational history in the last half century has shown that the Ministry of Education in Japan has been emphasizing that students express their opinion in writing. This current Japanese literacy training illustrated in kokugo class might be interpreted in two ways. First, to express one’s opinion in writing in Japanese might come from the Japanese tradition. To express one’s opinion in writing was not uncommon outside academic writing such as nikki (journals) in class and kokannikki (exchange diary). In nikki, students write what they think usually regarding daily incidents and their teachers write a short response. In kokannikki, as Kubota (2001)
describes, an exchange diary that is casually written in a notebook by a student's specific group of peers. These two forms of writing indicate that to express one's opinion in writing is already an established tradition in Japan.

The other interpretation might be that Japanese education has been influenced by education in the U.S., just as language itself has been influenced by English (Namba 1995; Kubota, 1997). In other words, this reflects Japanese adaptation borrowing from literacy training in the U.S. Grabe and Kaplan (1996) comment on recent literacy training at the primary level in the U.S. as follows:

Many teachers now stress early composing practice for children, encouraging students to express themselves in writing that is both meaningful and purposeful. (p. 32)

"To state what one wants to say in writing" is the same criteria that the American children currently have in the U.S. In addition, Jiro's early learning experience of writing in English in the U.S. also shows this same literacy training in his session in Chapter 4.

The literacy training, which these participants received in Japan, focusing on their comprehension and expression of ideas¹ in writing, is likely to have been influenced by Western writing traditions at the elementary and secondary school levels (Hayashi & Hayashi, 1995; Ike, 1995; Kay, 1995; Koike & Tanaka, 1995; Kubota, 1997; Nishiyama

---

¹ The Ministry of Education has revised the course of study six times since 1947 (Hirata 1999; Namba 1995), and the participants in this study were educated under the fourth and fifth course of study of Japanese language education, issued in 1978 and 1989, respectively. The common denominator of these two revisions was to improve students' presentation (hyogen) and comprehension (rikai). More specifically, in the fourth revision, the aim was to cultivate the ability to express ideas in writing and the objective was to raise one's expository writing ability and knowledge. Similarly, the fifth revision further emphasized presentation (hyogen), comprehension (rikai), and language matters (gego-jiko) (Namba 1995).
Thus, to express one’s opinion would be a result of Japanese tradition as well as influences from the West.

Like the other criterion of good writing, “to express what one wants to write” seems to be a constant criterion for these Japanese participants over their first academic year in the U.S. This might be because these participants had written in this way in Japan for a long time. In addition, this might be because this criterion was influenced by English writing in the U.S., and these participants were required to express their opinions or to state what they wanted to say in their papers in English in the L2 context. Thus, this perspective was smoothly transferred to their L2 writing and it was stable.

To have more flexibility

It was often observed among the participants that, although they did not have any specific format to write in Japanese, they seemed to have different values from English academic writing regarding their perspectives on writing. Upon arriving in the L2 academic society in the U.S., they seemed to have more flexibility of style and presentation in their writing, specifically with regard to the location of the thesis statement. For example, Taro, Midori, and Shinobu believed that the thesis statement could be not only in the introduction but also in the middle or at the end of the paper. Interestingly, even Tomoko and Hiroko, who strived to follow their ESL Composition instructors in the L2 context, seemed to have this influence and questioned less flexibility in the English paper. In the second interview of the second quarter, Tomoko said, “I sometimes wonder why it’s so important to have a thesis statement in the introductory
paragraph. It can come in the middle or later in the paper, I think.” Hiroko similarly expressed during the last interview of the second quarter that she felt her paper in English was so simple, pointing to the issue of where a thesis statement was in the first.²

For Jiro, who had been writing his papers in the field of Mechanical Engineering in Japan, it seemed that he did not have this perspective on writing, as he said there was not a big difference between Japanese and English writing. This seemed to be due to the type of papers he wrote. According to Jiro, the order of what he writes in Japanese and English in his field is almost the same, and he just follows it. However, curiously, although Jiro seemed not to have the perspective of having more flexibility of style and presentation regarding his lab reports, I would see this perspective surface in his explanations for why he chose samples of good Japanese writing both at the beginning and after his first academic year in the U.S. The common reason why Jiro chose these Japanese texts as good samples of writing was that each text had a consistency toward the thesis that was written at the end of the text. He commented in the interview, “Even the thesis statement does not come first; if the explanation leads toward the thesis statement in the end, it has consistency. That's why it is good writing.” Thus, the thesis statement can come at the end if the text is consistent, according to Jiro.

Where did they obtain this perspective on their writing, without having taken any specific writing courses in Japan? I assume that these participants may have learned a model of writing that values more flexibility of style and presentation in their writing as a

² The participants in this study seemed not to be aware of the flexibility of English writing such as other possible organizations of English writing, because they were exposed to certain types of English academic writing that emphasizes specific organizations and patterns.
result of their reading experience. These factors might be involved in reading texts that are influenced by Japanese culture. Although I assumed there might be many factors that affected this perspective on writing, at least one of the possible factors might stem from the reading training in *kokugo* class.

One possibility might be that these reading samples from a broader variety of writing formats in *kokugo* class as well as a class of *kobun* seem to have provided these six participants with more flexibility of style and presentation in their writing. Most novels reflect the Japanese literacy tradition. According to Namba (1995), the senior high school teaching guidelines in Japan recommend three types of writing in order to write clear expository prose: *Sokatsu-shiki* (a theme stated at the beginning and at the end of the discourse), *Tokatsu-shiki* (a theme stated at the beginning of the discourse), and *Bikatsu-shiki* (a theme stated at the end of the discourse), all of which are introduced in high school in Japan. Although the students in this study did not mention these three types of writing, it is possible that they have been influenced by reading texts demonstrating these types. In addition, I assume that these students came in touch with Japanese traditional literacy in *kobun* class. These classical Japanese writings must have also influenced, although subtly, the students’ opinion of what is good writing.

Another possibility might be that, whereas some readings reflect the Japanese literacy tradition, the participants may have read writings that reflect a more Western writing style. By rereading texts from a broader variety, the students seemed to have more samples to model in their writing. Thus, their perspective on writing that demonstrates more flexibility of style and presentation seems to stem from their reading
and writing experience in the L1 literacy training they received. They brought this perspective on L2 writing and, except for Jiro, they felt that academic writing in English was a little restricted, when they had to follow a certain format in English writing.

The findings of this study show that there is a difference in the time of adjustment between high school graduates and university graduates, as well as the graduate of a master's program in Japan: the former need less time to adjust to an academic writing format in English than the latter. This might be because the former had less reading and writing experience in L1 than the latter. Although the former had the value, they were weak and did not strongly affect their writing in L2. Thus, although they kept the question in their mind, they could easily follow their ESL Composition instructor's direction. On the other hand, the university graduates from Japanese universities and the student with a master's degree from Japan seemed to have stronger values on this perspective than the high school graduates in Japan, and they needed more time to adjust. However, there is an exception. In the case of Jiro, although he had the perspectives in his Japanese texts of good samples, being a graduate of a master's program in Japan, he could easily follow the specific format in L2 writing. According to Jiro, the writing style in Japanese in the field of Mechanical Engineering is similar to English writing style in the same field. More specifically, based on his writing experience in Japanese and English in his field, Jiro expressed that there is probably not a great difference between Japanese and English writing in his field. That may be why Jiro could adopt English writing easily.
Kubota (1997) discusses that the discourse of modernization and Westernization has influenced Japanese writing style from the late 19th century through the 20th century. Jiro’s experience of writing in Japanese and English indicates that the Japanese writing style in his discipline has been influenced by English writing style.

In sum, although none of the participants (high school graduates, university graduates, and the graduate of a master’s program) in this study had taken a single writing course in Japan, the literacy training that the six students received within the L1 cultural context seemed to influence their perspectives on their writing. However, while all six participants brought with them their perspectives on writing form, more flexibility of style and presentation in their writing, there were individual differences in the way that each participant adjusted to his or her L2 writing in the L2 context. This might be due to his or her reading and writing experience in L1 as well as in L2 and to his or her discipline.

Non-assertive linguistic devices

The findings of this study suggest that the perception of writing that only university graduates in Japan brought into their writing in L2 was the use of non assertive linguistic devices. These participants experienced the difference of the use of non assertive linguistic devices in English in their first quarter at the academic setting in the U.S.

For example, Midori realized she often used modals such as “may,” “might” and clauses such as “I think” in her papers when her professor suggested to her that she
should use modals such as “should” and “must” and clauses with “I believe.” Similarly, Taro and Shinobu had been given the same suggestion by their ESL professors. Taro had a difficult time translating modals such as “darō” (might), “kamoshirenai” (might) and clauses “tashikadewanai” (to be uncertain), etc. Even Jiro, who expressed that there was not a major difference between Japanese and English writing in the field of Mechanical Engineering, stated that many theses that he read in his field in Japan had these uncertain words in Japanese, and he also used to write in that way. However, he gradually realized that he should not use these hedges specifically in lab reports in the academic setting in the U.S.³

Kachru (1997) comments on this difference between American and Japanese cultural values, as follows:

Japanese essays are more tentative in their tone and emphasize empathy by mentioning the possibility of family and friends being victims of crimes. American essays appeal to abstract reasoning by expressing indignation at taxpayer money keeping the criminals alive and cared for in prisons. (p. 59)

The participants in my study might have learned to share this Japanese cultural value in their writing through their reading and writing experience in Japanese, although there might be many possible reasons for this. Clancy (1986) notes that “communicative style . . . both reflects and reinforces fundamental cultural beliefs about the way people are and the nature of interpersonal communication” (p. 213). Although she indicates this in her study of spoken communication, it also can apply to written communication. Jiro’s

³ Although the participants in this study experienced that they should not use hedges in their English writing, it is not always true in English academic discourse. Writers are encouraged to use more non-assertive linguistic devices in some English academic writing (Weissberg & Buker, 1990).
case reflects that, even though the papers in his field seem to be influenced by the Western writing style, writing in Japanese in his field still has non-assertive linguistic devices which stem from Japanese cultural value, according to Makoto.

Although there might be many possible reasons why only university graduates in Japan brought non-assertive linguistic devices in Japanese writing to English writing, one reason might be their greater reading and writing experience in their L1. For this reason, these participants might have shared more Japanese cultural values in their writing in Japanese than high school graduates in Japan. Or another possibility might be that high school graduates in Japan might have brought these cultural values into their writing, but they simply did not show it in this study due to their having less writing opportunities in L2 in their first academic year.

To summarize, findings from the interview data as well as the texts written by the participants in this study suggest that both Japanese undergraduate and graduate students have learned reading and writing discourse influenced by Japanese culture in their institutional setting as well as society. Although the Japanese participants in this study had never had writing courses in Japanese, they tend to bring their Japanese cultural values regarding their writing in the L1 context to their L2 writing in the L2 academic setting. However, to what extent L1 writing influences L2 writing seems to vary, due to one's educational experience as well as writing and reading experience.

1. (c). **What attitudes toward writing in L1 do participants have and in what contexts? How do participants perceive themselves as writers?**
When I first began this study, I had two assumptions. First, I assumed that there would be differences among high school graduates, university graduates, and a graduate of the master’s program in Japan with regard to the way they perceived themselves as writers in Japanese: the participants who were educated longer in Japan would have more confidence as writers than the participants who were less educated in Japan. Second, I assumed that Japanese students’ attitudes as writers in Japanese would affect their perspectives with regard to their writing in L2.

The analysis of the collected data seems to confirm my assumptions, namely that the university graduates from a Japanese university and the graduate of the master’s program in Japan had a positive attitude toward their writing in Japanese and identified themselves as good writers in Japanese in the L1 context more than the high school graduates did. They were also likely to bring their attitude in Japanese and identification to writing in the L1 context to English writing in the L2 academic setting.

Why do university graduates and the one graduate of the master’s program in Japan have a more positive attitude and more confidence in their Japanese writing than high school graduates? It seems that this stems from their individual writing experiences. More specifically, it is possible that their greater writing experience and their experience of being recognized as good writers at an institutional setting have contributed toward their positive attitude.

Jiro, for example, due to his good writing on his undergraduate senior-year research paper, was appointed to revise undergraduate students’ senior-year research papers at his master’s program in Japan. This experience seemed to enhance his
confidence as a good writer in Japanese. My observations in our formal and informal conversations confirmed his confidence in his Japanese writing. In Taro’s case, he got recognition for his writing in Japanese at his university as well as outside the institutional setting by writing his senior-year research paper and by posting his writing samples on a website for writers. His recognition that he was a good Japanese writer was obvious in our formal and informal conversations and my observation of his interaction in the ESL tutorials.

Unlike Jiro and Taro, who seemed to establish their identity as good writers in Japanese later on in school, Midori and Shinobu were identified as good writers earlier in their schooling, and their identification as good writers continued throughout their school years (see Chapter 4). Their identification as writers in Japanese seemed to have been gradually constructed through being accepted and recognized in institutional settings within Japanese society. Throughout our informal and formal conversations, I could see Midori and Shinobu’s pride at being good writers in Japanese. On the other hand, high school graduates who had less writing experience seemed to have less confidence in their English writing skills. In Tomoko’s case, she was identified as a good writer in the elementary school when she won some prizes in kansobun and bunshu, like Midori and Shinobu. However, she rarely wrote in her secondary school and did not have further opportunities to be recognized as a good writer. Less writing experience and no chances to be recognized as a good writer seemed to have caused Tomoko to feel that she was not a good writer anymore. Like Tomoko, Hiroko had less writing experience in Japanese,
and did not identify herself as a good L1 writer in Japanese as a result of her experience in Japan. From our conversations, it was clear that she did not have any confidence in her Japanese writing.

In sum, although there might be other reasons, two of the possible factors that influence the participants' attitude toward their writing and their identification as writers would be greater writing experience and the experience of being recognized as good writers at an institutional setting. The first four participants seemed to have stronger confidence as writers in Japanese through their greater writing experience and being recognized as good writers in Japanese society. On the other hand, the last two participants seemed to have less confidence as writers in Japanese because they had less writing experience and were less recognized as good writers in an institutional setting.

The findings of this study suggest that these participants seem to bring their attitude and L1 writer identity to their L2 writing. More specifically, the four participants who had already achieved success in L1 writing were comfortable and confident in Japanese writing; and upon embarking on their study at OSU, they kept their confidence in their Japanese writing ability and identification as good writers in the L1 context and they carried it to L2 writing. Hirvela and Belcher (forthcoming) explain this phenomenon as follows:

[Students, particularly at the graduate level . . . already possess voices and established identities as professional writers in their native language. Having achieved some measure of success and recognition as L1 writers, these students come to our classrooms with an already existing self-representation of themselves as writers, indeed as good writers. (p. 3)
On the other hand, the high school graduates in Japan who had less writing experience and less confidence in Japanese seemed to have a negative attitude toward their writing in L2 and had less confidence as writers in English.

In addition, through the first academic year in the U.S., how the university graduates and the one graduate from the master’s program in Japan perceived their writing and themselves as writers varied: they had confidence, lost it, and regained it. On the other hand, the perspective of the last two had not changed: they remained less confident. Why did the former four participants’ perspective change while the latter two participants’ perspective did not change?

It is possible that these four participants knew how to communicate in their Japanese writing, because they had already learned “how to establish relationships with the texts they create and the readers they address” (Hirvela & Belcher, forthcoming, p. 3) in their Japanese writing in their society, due to their greater writing experience and their experiences of being recognized as good writers at an institutional setting, either through having undergraduate students’ senior-year research papers or a master’s thesis accepted, or through winning a prize for a writing project in the institutional setting that seemed to boost the students’ self-esteem and give them confidence as writers. These students have already gained strong identification as good writers. Hirvela and Belcher (forthcoming) coined “writerly identity” for the concept of identifying oneself as a writer.

Thus, these four participants who already knew how to communicate with readers as well as who had already established a writerly identity in Japanese seemed to need more time to adjust to L2 writing as the text and readers in the L1 context were
mismatched with those in the L2 context. Reid (1993) notes that “communication between writer and reader is most effective when experiences, schemata, and cueing systems are shared” (p. 49). Simply put, these four participants did not share these experiences in the L2 context.

Similar to three doctoral students in Hirvela and Belcher’s study (forthcoming) and one doctoral student in Casanave’s study (1992), the participants in my study struggled in writing their papers in English. In our last interview, Shinobu expressed her feeling, looking back on her writing experience: “I had confidence with my writing skills in Japanese, however, my writing in English was rejected by my professors. I did not want to write my papers in the way that the society rejected me. The first two quarters were my ‘identity crisis.’” Midori, in our first interview of her first quarter, showed her conflict: “My writing style in Japanese was not accepted here. I think I have to change my thinking in order to write papers in English. That means I have to change. I strongly feel I have to become an actor in order to play someone else.” For Taro, who strongly identifies himself as a good writer in Japanese, it was very difficult to write his papers, following certain formats in the ESL Composition course in his first quarter. In the first interview of his first quarter, he said: “I think my ESL professor does not understand my writing style.” Although these three participants once lost their “writerly identity” they brought from their L1 writing in the L1 context, they gradually seemed to regain it in their L2 writing. (I will discuss this more in the major question #2).

Whereas these three Japanese university graduates’ attitude to their writing and identification as writers in Japanese transfer to that of their L2 in the L2 context, Jiro’s
case was different. He had confidence in his Japanese writing skill as the other three had, but Jiro did not have to struggle as much as the other three participants. The first possible reason for this might be that he had the same major in Japan and the U.S., which afforded him with background knowledge necessary in his field. The second possible reason might be the type of texts he had to produce: the majority of the texts Jiro produced were lab reports and experimental reports that required more tables and charts rather than explanations in words. According to Jiro, there is not a big difference in writing reports in his field in Japanese and English and the criteria of good writing is the same in his field: good writing should have clarity and consistency in his field in both Japanese and English.

Compared to the four students who received post-secondary degrees in Japan, the high school graduates in Japan had negative attitudes toward their writing and identified themselves as OK writers. Both Hiroko and Tomoko expressed their lack of confidence in their writing skills in Japanese in questionnaires and in our first interviews. Tomoko noted: “I do not know what is good writing in Japanese, much less in English.” Similarly, Hiroko commented: “I think I do not know how to write academic papers in Japanese.” Moreover, their lack of confidence in their writing skills in Japanese seems to be related to their choice of good writing samples in Japanese. Both Tomoko and Hiroko expressed their feelings in their interviews both during the first quarter and after their first academic year that they were not sure whether or not the Japanese texts they selected were good writing. Their lack of confidence in their Japanese writing seems to transfer to their L2
writing. Thus, their less writing experience and less confidence in their Japanese writing seemed to allow them to easily accept English writing conventions by ESL professors.

To summarize, the data I gathered from my interviews and my observations with the six participants led me to conclude that to perceive oneself as a good writer depends upon both previous writing experience and on being recognized as a good writer in an institutional setting. This positive attitude and confidence can transfer from L1 writing to L2 writing. Ironically, however, the participants who have more writing experience and more confidence in the L1 context seem to struggle in the L2 context more than the participants who have less writing experience, because the former try to keep the way they write, as they believe themselves to be good writers.

1. (d). How were Japanese participants’ previous English classes in Japan helpful for their writing in L2 in the U.S. from their perspectives?

The research question came from my curiosity to discover whether the English classes the participants took in Japan were helpful to them in their English writing classes in the U.S. Little research has been done to examine whether English taught in Japan is useful in L2 writing. To understand the participants’ perspectives on whether or not their English classes in the L1 context were helpful for L2 writing in the U.S., I saw the need to explore how the L1 Japanese context affected students’ foreign language education and looked at their English lessons in Japan.

When I first began this study, I had assumed that the English classes in Japan would probably be helpful to the students in their L2 writing in the U.S., at least insofar
as sentence construction. What I found in the data I collected in the interviews and through email communications over the academic year with the Japanese participants was that they all felt that their previous experiences of learning English as a foreign language in Japan was helpful, because they learned how to construct grammatically correct sentences in English.

Jiro, for example, said that his English classes in Japan helped him learn precise grammar, and his email to me at the end of his first academic year stated:

In order to write down a sentence accurately, we do need the knowledge of correct grammar; I've never had a systematic education in learning the grammar, except the ones I had in the school days back in Japan.

Like Jiro, all of the participants appreciated the grammar lessons in their English classes in Japan and admitted that they were very useful for them in English writing.

Why was the students' previous experiences of learning English as a foreign language in Japan helpful only for sentence construction? My review of foreign language education in Japan has revealed that the Ministry of Education has been trying to improve Japanese students' oral communication skills rather than their literacy skills for the last two decades, by inviting many native speakers of English from the inner circle countries. More specifically, the objective of studying English as a foreign language in Japan is to be able to communicate orally in English as an "international language" with others who have different languages and cultures, so that Japanese citizens can participate in the international society that our world has increasingly become (Hirata, 1999; Monbusho 1999). The focus of the Ministry of Education in Japan is on oral communication rather than on written communication. Thus, the students usually are not required to write
beyond one sentence in English in class, so teachers hardly instruct students on how to write essays or papers in English. This might be why all of the participants in this study felt their previous experiences of learning English as a foreign language in Japan was helpful only for sentence construction.

Another possible reason might be the measurements of English ability. Even though oral communication skills in English have been stressed in Japan as the main objective, students’ oral communication skills are rarely measured. Rather, their assessment has remained focused on grammar and translation. This seems to be due to the system of the entrance examination required for high schools and universities in Japan. Students are under a lot of pressure to succeed in these examinations, which are focused on grammar and translation from English to Japanese. Therefore, teachers of English in Japan also focus on grammar and how accurately their students can translate from English to Japanese. In order to translate clearly, they need the skills of English sentence construction.

Interestingly, through our informal and formal conversations in our interviews and my observations during their first academic year, while the participants admitted English grammar instruction in Japan was very useful, I often heard their complaints about their continuing lack of precise knowledge of grammar in their English writing. Midori, for example, mentioned her professors’ suggestion to ask somebody to proofread her papers due to her inaccurate use of English grammar. Similarly, Shinobu was not satisfied with her grammatical skills, because some of her American professors took some points off her papers because of the grammatical mistakes in her writing. Like
Shinobu, Taro was also upset by the fact that his First-Year English Composition instructor did not give him an “A” because he made grammatical errors. Surprisingly, even Tomoko and Hiroko, who majored in English in private high schools in Japan, were displeased with the fact that ESL Composition professors were able to find so many inaccuracies in their grammar. Apparently, these five participants were unhappy with their grammatical mistakes.

Why was there conflict of evidence? The grammar they had learned was helpful in their L2 writing, but they still had a problem? Although there might be other factors behind the problems Japanese students had with grammatical mistakes in English, one of the possible reasons would be because the participants strongly relied on the training that they received in Japan. Flower (1990) asserts, “the major transition which writers have difficulty learning is . . . how to apply already-practiced writing skills in new ways for new purposes” (p. 115). The observation data and interview data in my study indicate that the participants relied on the training that they received in Japan. The participants, for instance, relied on translation from Japanese to English, since they studied English grammar mostly through translation exercises from English to Japanese in Japan. They used their Japanese-English dictionaries a lot, which sometimes meant the participants chose awkward vocabulary in English to express what they were thinking in Japanese. Sometimes, the words they chose did not fit the sentences they composed in English, causing inaccuracy of grammar.

Another possible reason might be that they had learned English grammar in isolation in Japan. More specifically, the instruction of English as foreign language in
Japan was focused on form only, rather than on the connection between form and meaning, so that the participants in my study were instructed in grammatical form alone or sentences in isolation. As a result, they did not learn how to use grammar appropriately in a given context; even though they had grammatical knowledge in English, they seemed to make grammatical errors.

Ellis (1990) discusses declarative knowledge and procedural knowledge: the former is new knowledge that involves “knowing that” and the latter is automated knowledge that involves “knowing how.” Ellis states: “Many of the errors that learners produce are not the result of a lack of declarative knowledge, but rather of procedural knowledge (p. 8). He further explains that language learners need to practice using their knowledge. Similarly, Brown (1987) and Larsen-Freeman and Long (1994) discuss comprehension (or reception), which refers to one’s underlying knowledge, such as rules of grammar and performance (or production), which is “the overtly observable and concrete of grammar manifestation or realization of competence” (p. 24) and is “actual production (speaking, writing) or the comprehension (listening, reading) of linguistic events” (p. 25).

As the participants in this study rarely composed beyond the sentence level in English in Japan, it seems that they do not have procedural knowledge or performance but declarative knowledge or comprehension. In other words, even though they know the rules of grammar and can comprehend grammar very well, they cannot always implement them successfully in appropriate context.
Interestingly, only Jiro did not express dissatisfaction with the grammar that he learned in Japan. Among the six students, Jiro was the only one who was not unhappy with the English grammar training that he received in Japan. One possible reason might be the kinds of the papers he wrote. As mentioned before, the majority of his writing in his first academic year in the U.S. was lab reports for engineering classes, which do not require arguments and opinions, but straight facts. What he wrote in English was to briefly describe the figures with certain specific expressions, such as “This table shows...” or “The findings of this research indicate...”. Thus, most of his lab reports consisted of graphs, tables, and mathematical formulas and he did not have to explain a lot in words. Another possible reason why Jiro was satisfied with his English grammar might be because his professors did not correct his grammatical mistakes at all, but only paid attention to the content of his lab reports. Thus, Jiro seemed not to have had to pay attention to the small details of grammar.

In sum, while learning English grammar was helpful for the participants in constructing sentences, their knowledge was not sufficient to produce good texts in English.

2. How does the L2 academic context affect Japanese students’ perspectives on good writing and their approach to L2 writing?

One common factor observed among these six students in my study was that they were trained how to write academic papers in English in ESL Composition course(s), which was their first academic writing course in English for them. Japanese students
required this instruction in order to best meet their needs. Thus, their first ESL Composition course was very important for both undergraduate and graduate students to make a smooth transition from the L1 context to the L2 context, and what they learned in ESL Composition strongly influenced their perspectives on good writing in English.

Moreover, the findings of this study indicate that there are differences between undergraduate and graduate students, regarding how they are trained, how they meet academic demands, and what kinds of texts they produce. There are also differences between how they perceive their writing and themselves as L2 writers and what factors in the L2 context affect L2 writers' perspectives on writing in the L2 context.

2. (a). How are Japanese undergraduate and graduate students trained in the L2 context, and how do they meet academic demands in the L2 context? What kind of texts in L2 do they produce?

In order to best meet the different needs of undergraduates and graduate students, ESL Composition courses are divided into classes for undergraduates and classes for graduate students, in which they are trained in different ways. The ESL Composition courses for undergraduate students emphasize reading and writing connections in order to meet the writing task required, which involves writing about reading in a broader range of subjects in the academic setting. The Director of the ESL Composition Program at OSU commented: "[with undergraduates] we take a more generalized EAP [English for Academic Purpose] approach [than we do with graduate students], emphasizing reading/writing connections, since almost every undergraduate writing task across the
curriculum entails writing about reading” (personal conversation: 01-24-01). The instruction that Tomoko, Hiroko, and Taro had in the ESL Composition courses focused on writing about what they had read. They first learned how to paraphrase and summarize articles they were given. Later, they were instructed to write essays such as a narrative, compare and contrast, or argumentative essay in some specific formats. In these papers, they were required to read some articles that served as the basis of their papers and they had to write in a required format.

On the other hand, while the EAP approach is also used for graduate students, ESL Composition courses for graduate students focus more directly on each student’s academic field, alone. All papers in these courses are closely related to each student’s academic needs in his/her field, focusing more on discipline-specific writing. For example, Midori, Shinobu, and Jiro were first taught how to write summaries and annotated bibliographies, using articles in their field. Later, they studied how to write research papers, choosing topics from their disciplines. As graduate students need “more than summarizing and paraphrasing skills to begin to enter into dialogue with experts in their fields” (Belcher & Braine, 1995, xxiv), the instruction of graduate students at OSU is quite different from that of undergraduates: the former focuses on general topics and the latter focuses directly on each student’s academic field.

The academic demands and texts in English writing in the L2 context among undergraduate and graduate students are also different. The texts undergraduate students produce are more general, but the texts graduate students produce are more specific to their discipline (see Table 5.2). In addition, the amount of writing assignments is quite
different between undergraduate and graduate students (see Table 5.1). Two undergraduate students in my study rarely produced texts in their first academic year except for their ESL Composition courses and the First-Year English Composition course (see Table 5.1). These students produced expository writing in their First-Year English Composition course. Similarly, in the case of Taro, he produced only three papers in a history course and two papers in a business course in addition to his ESL Composition course and First-Year English Composition course.

Unlike the undergraduate students, the graduate students had a lot of writing assignments in their discipline upon arrival in the U.S. (see Table 5.1). For example, Jiro was overwhelmed with the number of lab reports in his field, while Midori and Shinobu had to write many more demanding critical review papers, reflection papers, and research papers than undergraduates (see Table 5.2).

Thus, how Japanese undergraduate and graduate students were trained, how they met academic demands, and what texts they produced in the L2 context for their first academic year were different. These differences seemed to be closely related to their perspectives on writing and on themselves as L2 writers. I will comment on this in the next question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomoko</td>
<td>3 (12)*</td>
<td>3 (12)*</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 (24)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroko</td>
<td>3 (9)*</td>
<td>3 (9)*</td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 (18)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taro</td>
<td>3 (10)*</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4 (14)</td>
<td>3 (9)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midori</td>
<td>8 (73)</td>
<td>3 (15)*</td>
<td>10 (94)</td>
<td>7 (4)</td>
<td>3 (15)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 (253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinobu</td>
<td>3 (25)*</td>
<td>3 (24)</td>
<td>4 (31)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3 (25)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiro</td>
<td>3 (11)*</td>
<td>19 (260)</td>
<td>18 (330)</td>
<td>18 (264)</td>
<td>6 (29)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54 (854)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: The number of the papers and pages the participants produced in English in the L2 context
* ESL Composition courses

Table 5.1 shows the number of the papers and the number of pages the participants produced in English in the L2 context for their first academic year. The number in each column refers to the number of papers each student wrote, and the number in each parenthesis refers to the number of pages they wrote. These are presented for each quarter with a total for the academic year. Overall, Table 5.1 shows that the amount of writing assignments for the graduate students was a lot more, compared to the writing assignments for undergraduates during their first academic year in the U.S.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomoko</td>
<td>essay*</td>
<td>essay*</td>
<td>essay</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroko</td>
<td>essay*</td>
<td>essay*</td>
<td>essay</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taro</td>
<td>essay*</td>
<td>essay</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midori</td>
<td>reflection projects</td>
<td>article review*</td>
<td>reflection</td>
<td>reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinobu</td>
<td>article review*</td>
<td>reflection</td>
<td>reflection</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiro</td>
<td>data analysis*</td>
<td>lab reports</td>
<td>lab reports</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: The types of writing the participants produced in English in the L2 context
* ESL Composition courses

Table 5.2 shows the types of writing the participants produced in English in the L2 context for each quarter. N/A means the student did not write any papers at all that quarter. Overall, Table 5.2 shows that the type of writing between undergraduate and graduate students is different: the former produced essay texts, mainly in ESL courses, while the latter produced texts in their fields.
2. (b). How do L2 writers perceive their L2 writing (use) and themselves as L2 writers in the L2 context? Furthermore, what are some prominent factors in the L2 context that affect L2 writers’ perspectives on their L2 writing and as L2 writers?

The interview data for one year at an American university suggest that both undergraduate and graduate students tend to perceive their L2 writing and themselves as L2 writers in different ways. The undergraduate students appeared to have less confidence in their L2 writing and themselves as L2 writers in their academic setting; on the other hand, the graduate students seemed to have more confidence in their L2 writing and as L2 writers in their disciplines after completing their first academic year.

In this section, I will discuss the factors that influenced the participants’ perspectives on L2 writing in the L2 context in more detail. The factors in the L2 context that affect L2 writers’ perspectives on writing seem to be different between undergraduate and graduates students.

For undergraduate students, their first ESL Composition course seems to be important to write their papers in their first academic year. Similarly, it seems to be also crucial for graduate students to understand how to write in L2; however, graduate students’ writing experience in their discipline and their professors’ responses to their writing in their fields seem to have more influence on their perspectives on L2 writing and on them as L2 writers. This might be because they have a lot of writing assignments and they communicate with their professors through writing much more than undergraduate students.
The first ESL composition course

The findings of this study suggest that the first ESL Composition course is crucial for both newly matriculated Japanese undergraduate and graduate students in their first academic year. For example, undergraduate students did not know how to paraphrase, summarize, or write papers when they first came to the university in the U.S. More specifically, for Tomoko and Hiroko, the writing assignments in their first ESL Composition courses became the core for how to write English papers in their first academic year as they were instructed how to write in English there.

For Tomoko and Hiroko who took two ESL Composition courses (intermediate and advanced levels) for their first two consecutive quarters, what they learned in the ESL Composition courses, such as how to write a summary, how to write a thesis statement, and how to organize paragraphs, met their academic demands in the First-Year English Composition course. In the last interview of her third quarter, Tomoko said: “I would not be able to write papers in the First-Year English Composition course if I had not taken any ESL Composition courses.” Similarly, Hiroko said: “American freshmen have already learned how to write papers in English, but I did not have any idea how to write in English. What I’ve learned in the ESL Composition courses was crucial for me.” For both Tomoko and Hiroko, the texts they produced in ESL Composition courses matched the texts they were required in the First-Year English Composition course. Thus, they could make a smooth transition from ESL to their academic writing course.

Although what Taro learned about L2 writing in his ESL Composition class that he took in his first academic quarter was crucial for him, and although he said that he
learned the fundamental rules of how to write in English there — such as internal citations, references, grammar rules — he also said he had difficulty conforming to the writing style he was taught about English writing — such as organization, placement of the thesis, the way to support his thesis, etc.

ESL Composition courses were also important for graduate students. As graduate students were expected to write their papers in their respective disciplines, the instruction they received in their ESL Composition courses was very helpful for them to learn how to write research papers. Jiro, for example, could apply his writing skills in writing a data analysis paper in ESL in order to write lab reports. Midori and Shinobu could write their critical review papers, reflection papers, and research papers, utilizing the skills they had learned in ESL. Although the types of texts they produced were different, depending on their discipline (see Table 5.2), these three graduate students found that their first ESL Composition Course provided them with the fundamental skills on how to write papers in English.

The first ESL Composition course strongly influenced the participants’ perspectives on good writing in English. Among all of the participants in this study, I found two common perspectives on good writing that stemmed from the first ESL Composition course that they took. A criterion that the participants brought up as necessary for good writing in English was to have good organization in their papers. The participants seemed to have more flexibility of style and presentation in their writing before arriving in the U.S. However, in their classes at OSU, they learned how to organize a paper in English in the academic setting, accepted it, and followed it.
Although there are individual differences in the time it took to adjust to the academic writing format in English, to have a good organization that they learned in their ESL Composition course became one of the criteria of good writing in their papers in English.

Interestingly, for the question in their last interviews, “Do you think your L2 writing experience influenced your L1 Japanese writing?” All of the participants except Taro answered that their future L1 writing would be influenced by their L2 writing experience. They commented that they would write their paper in Japanese, following the basic format of “introduction, body, and conclusion.”

Another criterion of good writing that the participants said they learned in writing their English papers was to give examples to support their thesis. Before they came to OSU, they believed that they did not need to give specific examples when writing, because they did not use examples when writing in Japanese; however, they realized that some specific examples are always needed in English writing in order to express themselves precisely. Interestingly, while the writing style in English papers requires more examples, the participants still believe that this criterion does not match the criteria of good writing in Japanese, and that when writing in Japanese, they need fewer examples than when writing in English.

In sum, the first ESL Composition course in the academic setting in the U.S. is important for both newly matriculated Japanese undergraduate and graduate students and strongly shapes their perspectives on good writing in English. Two perspectives on good
writing in English that stem from the experiences of the participants in their first ESL Composition course are to have a good organization and to give some examples to support a thesis.

**Writing experience in their discipline**

What I found was that the way graduate students perceived their L2 writing and themselves as L2 writers changed in their first academic year. More specifically, this change seemed to take place in two steps: change from a good Japanese writer to becoming a novice L2 writer; and from a novice L2 writer to becoming a writer in an academic discipline. The findings of this study suggest that there seem to be a number of factors that influence these students’ perceptions of their writing in L2, as L2 writers. Among these, two prominent factors include students’ interaction with their writing in their discipline and their professors’ attitude toward their writing.

From my interviews, I learned that unlike undergraduates, graduate students were required to write a large number of academic papers in English at an advanced level of discourse immediately upon beginning their studies in their academic disciplines (see Table 5.1). Such advanced writing skills were a critical aspect of their academic success. Many of the writing assignments in their disciplines seemed to influence the three graduate students’ perspectives on L2 writing in the L2 context, so that they could transform themselves from a good Japanese writer to becoming a novice L2 writer, and from a novice L2 writer to becoming a disciplinary writer. They seemed to view their writing in L2 from these perspectives.
More specifically, upon their arrival in the academic community in the U.S., Midori, Shinobu, and Jiro were able to bring their confidence as good writers in Japanese into writing in English in the L2 context. Their perspectives on writing in L2 were strongly influenced by the L1 literacy training and cultural values (shown in Research Question 1 of this section) at the early stage of their first academic year. However, they learned that some of the perspectives they had brought on writing from the L1 context did not match those in L2.

Since writing in English in their disciplines was a new experience for them, they had to learn a certain way to write in English in their fields. For example, the field of TESOL and the field of Women’s Studies were new to Midori and Shinobu, respectively. Although the field of Mechanical Engineering was not new to Jiro, writing lab reports was a new experience for him. Since these three participants had to learn how to write in their fields, they viewed their writing in L2 as novice writers at the beginning of their first academic year.

However, through a great deal of writing experience in their academic fields, they started writing as disciplinary writers. Midori, for example, who was studying TESOL, commented in the last interview of the third quarter, how important it was for her to write her papers as an educator. She said, “I believe it is crucial to integrate my experience of learning and teaching in a foreign language into my papers, especially my field, education.”

Like Midori, it was obvious that Shinobu’s perspectives on writing came from her feminist point of view. She said, “It is very important to write my papers, integrating
feminist theories as well as integrating my point of view as a Japanese woman who was raised in Japan and who has experience studying in the U.S.” Shinobu’s identity as a disciplinary writer shows in her choice of a good sample of Japanese writing after only one academic year. One of the major reasons she chose “Tetsugaku nyumon” (Introduction to philosophy) was that the author integrated a difficult philosophy into his life and described it in a reader-friendly fashion. Moreover, Shinobu used the term “labor pains” when referring to brainstorming and the revision process, in order to produce good papers, although she could have simply said “hard work.” This might be because Shinobu has become conscious of being a feminist writer who integrates theory, learning, and her analysis of herself from the point of view of being a Japanese woman.

Similarly, from my interviews with Jiro, I gathered that he had never written lab reports before, and during the first quarter, he did not make the connection between good writing in general and good writing in lab reports. Later, after experiencing a great deal of lab report assignments in the U.S. (see Table 5.1), Jiro began to make connections between writing good engineering papers and writing good papers in general. As he commented in our interviews, “As a mechanical engineer, to write reports in minimum words is important.”

My findings suggest that these three graduate students have come to view their writing as specialists in their field, through a lot of practice with writing papers. This might be because writing is a valuable tool to become specialists in their fields, as Casanave’s study (1990) shows. These three participants were not only writing their papers to survive in an academic context, but also to present themselves in writing, as
specialists in their field. For example, writing in the field of TESOL seemed to make Midori think about her teaching and learning experience and helped her to become a language educator. Similarly, writing in Women's Studies was likely to make Shinobu become sensitive about her body, helped her to look at her body in different ways, and helped her to appreciate being a woman. Like these two participants, writing in Mechanical Engineering seemed to provide Jiro with more opportunities to think as a mechanical engineer and helped him develop confidence as a mechanical engineer. Thus, through writing, these participants said that they were able to think, feel, integrate some knowledge in the field, and identify themselves as specialists. Casanave (1995) notes:

Writing can . . . function to introduce novice community members to discipline—specific issues that lie buried in jargon and research activities—issues that ultimately have to do with what it means to identify oneself as a member of a discipline or profession. (p. 86)

Through a lot of practice writing in their fields, not only do students become a member of their discipline professionally, but they also build their self-esteem and confidence.

Professors' attitudes toward their writing

The findings of this study also suggest that the professors' attitudes toward the participants' writing was valuable to help them become specialists in their field and contributed to their perspectives on English writing. In the case of Midori, for example, the professors in her field were very generous toward international students. Even though Midori wrote her papers in her own way, her professors made suggestions without rejecting the way she wrote. Their major comments on her papers were always positive. Her improvement in L2 writing was gradual with her professors' positive attitude toward
her writing, and eventually, she was able to recognize that she could write as she was, without assuming a different writer’s voice. Jiro’s improvement in his field and in L2 writing also benefited from his professors’ positive evaluation on his lab reports. Moreover, his advisor was very supportive: he did not only give him constructive feedback on his papers, but also found him an internship during the summer and promised him a TA-ship as a grader in the following year.

In contrast, Shinobu’s experience that her writing was severely rejected by her professors gave her a negative perspective on L2 writing. In her last interview with me, Shinobu said looking back on her writing experience, “I did not want to write in the style that the people (professors) and the community who rejected me used.” Her professors’ negative and unsupportive attitude toward her writing seemed to have made her resistant to conform to the L2 writing connections. Although her writing has improved as a result of tutoring with an ESL professor in her second quarter, the experience that her writing was not accepted in her field made her feel she was not accepted into the professional community. Finally, in her third quarter, a different professor’s positive attitude toward Shinobu’s papers enabled Shinobu to believe that she could in fact write as a feminist in Women’s Studies, while maintaining her Japanese identity.

All of these examples demonstrate how essential it is for students to have a positive attitude toward their writing from their professors so that they can make a smoother transition from their L1 context to the L2 context. The nurturing relationship between professors and students also contributed to the students’ confidence in their field as specialists as well as in their L2 writing. Moreover, the support of their professors
contributed to their perspectives on good writing in English. In her 1994 study, Belcher asserts the importance of the relationship between doctoral students and their advisors:

For some graduate students, both nonnative speakers and native speakers, it may be crucial to find a mentor who can inspire enough trust and admiration in students to encourage the risk-taking entailed in challenging and attempting to contribute to the established knowledge of a community. (p. 32)

In sum, my findings suggest that the professors' positive attitude toward students' English writing in their field is valuable for students to become specialists in their field and contributes to their perspectives on writing.

3. How does the future context affect Japanese students' perspectives on L2 writing and their approach to the development of L2 writing (writing in English) in the L2 context?

My original intention in choosing this research question was to discover whether Japanese students' perspectives on L2 writing were influenced by their future context. Specifically in the future context, I assumed that goals for L2 writing would influence students' perspectives on L2 writing. The data revealed that the goals for L2 writing the students would like to attain influence their perspectives on L2 writing.

3. (a). What goals do the L2 writers have for their writing? What kind of competence do the L2 writers want to achieve? Do their goals for writing as well as their perspectives on writing change in the academic environment? If so, how do they change and how are they related to their writing skills?
I speculated that goals for writing that the Japanese students would like to attain in their future context would differ among individuals, and that each student's goals would influence differently his or her perspectives on L2 writing and approach to L2 writing in the L2 context. In addition, I was very curious to discover whether these participants aspire to become native-like writers in L2.

This study, while small in scale, suggests that clear goals regarding how participants will use writing in their future careers influences their perspectives on writing and approach to their writing, which is different for each student. More specifically, undergraduate students who had unclear goals for their careers were not sure how they would use writing skills, whereas graduate students who had more clear goals for their careers wanted to improve their writing skills for their future career.

Upon arriving in the U.S., the two undergraduate students, Tomoko and Hiroko, had unclear goals for their future careers, and they were not sure if they would need writing skills in English after they completed their degrees in the U.S. In other words, the writing skills to pass their courses seemed to be enough for them, and they did not expect to improve their writing skills beyond the skills they needed in their academic setting. Tomoko and Hiroko were likely to believe that it was almost impossible for them to write exactly what NSs write, and they did not expect to have writing skills on the same level as the NSs.

On the other hand, in the case of Taro, although he was also an undergraduate student, he was different from these two undergraduates: he had already had a bachelor's degree in Japan and he was planning to attend the MBA program at OSU, upon arriving
in the U.S. He had a clear goal for his future career: to become a businessman or a professor at a university, Taro wanted to improve his writing skills in English in his field. Like Taro, the three graduate participants in my study had clear goals for their future careers: Jiro, Shinobu, and Midori wanted to become an engineer, a feminist scholar, and a language educator, respectively. Their clear career goals motivated them to improve their writing skills specifically in their fields.

However, upon arriving in the U.S, their goals as L2 writers in their field such as what for and how they would use writing in the future seemed to elude them, although they knew they would need to improve their writing skills for their future careers. At the beginning of their first academic year, their goals for writing in L2 were focused on pursuing their academic studies in the L2 context rather than to pursue their careers in their future context. These four participants’ goals for the writing skills that they wanted to attain were to be able to write their papers like native speakers of English in the academic setting in the U.S.

This might be due to the reality that they had to struggle and adjust in order to write in a new language and in a new academic setting upon arriving in the U.S. They might not have extra time to think about their future goals more specifically, because they had to work hard to manage to write academic papers in their fields. Because of the immediate need to write academic papers in a setting where many of the students were native speakers, their goals were focused on succeeding in the academic setting instead of on their future career.
The findings of this one-year longitudinal study suggest that undergraduate students’ perspectives on writing seemed to be still in the L2 academic context. Undergraduate students still had unclear goals for using writing in their future, as reflected in their writing only for a particular writing assignment, after one academic year. This may be because they were young and they did not have clear ideas about why they would need to write and to what extent they would need writing skills in the future. They seemed to view their goal of writing only for writing papers in order to complete their degree in the L2 academic context.

On the other hand, during their first academic year, the graduate students’ perspectives on writing seemed to have been gradually moving toward their future careers rather than the academic context in the U.S. More specifically, compared to the undergraduate students, whose goals for using writing in their future careers became gradually more clear through their writing experience in their field during their first academic year, graduate students were more motivated to improve their writing skills toward their clear goals. They started to look beyond the academic setting. For example, Midori, Shinobu, and Jiro started writing as an educator, a feminist, and a mechanical engineer, respectively.

Individuals’ goals are important for writing and will affect their perspectives on writing, as Flower et al. (1990) note: “what is important in college is not the apparent genre or conventions, but the goals” (p. 251). Even though Flower et al. are commenting on the goals in L1 writing, his comment can be adapted to L2 writing: based on the findings of this study, we have evidence that goals for writing are crucial for graduate
students who are L2 writers. Similarly, Hayes (2000) discusses the importance of goals in writing. He places goals as one of the factors in the individual that is one of the two major components in Hayes's model (General Organization of the New Model). More specifically, Hayes claims multiple goals: “In writing, there are many situations... that involve multiple goals which interact with each other to determine the course of action” (p. 17). This explains that graduate students in this study had two goals to become good writers in their academic setting as well as in their future career, although as I described earlier, the latter goal has been stronger than the former goal during their first academic year. As Hayes (2000) asserts, one’s goals are closely related to one’s motivation in writing, and to have clear goals is one of the prominent factors for becoming successful L2 writers.

3. (b). If they believe they need further literacy training, what kinds of literacy training in L2 do L2 writers think they need?

What I found is that when the participants have clear career goals regarding what they will use writing for in the future, they have a more specific vision for the kind of competence they will need in their writing skills, or the kind of texts they will have to produce in their future.

Undergraduate students who have unclear goals for using writing in their future are not sure if they need advanced writing skills beyond the skills they need in the academic setting. They believe they may not need further literacy training after their completion of degrees at OSU. On the other hand, graduate students who have more
clear goals for writing in the future believe they need further literacy training. As their goals are different, the kind of competence they want to achieve and the kinds of literacy training that are required are different among these participants. For example, Jiro feels that he would need to learn writing, such as an introduction of research conducted by a company, and increase his vocabulary in a field of business and economics, as he wants to work for a major automobile company in Japan. Shinobu feels that she would need to learn how to write a newsletter in English for communities in the U.S., as she would like to become a feminist social worker. Midori feels that she would need to acquire more advanced skills to edit her future students’ compositions. This shows that each participant needs different writing skills for their future, due to their different goals.

Interestingly, although these participants mentioned that their goals are to be able to write like native speakers of English in the early interview of their first academic year, they believe that they do not need to write like native speakers of English after one academic year. For example, Midori stated in the last interview of her third quarter, “I’ve realized that I do not need to become like an American. There are many ways to behave, speak, and write, as there are many different Americans.” Similarly, Shinobu said, “I would like to become an independent writer who is different from native speakers of English. This means I can write by myself without any others’ help.”

A possible reason why they do not believe they must write like native speakers would stem from their clear goals in their field. More specifically, when they started studying in the academic setting in the U.S., they had to compete with native speakers of English; however, later in their first academic year, their goal became to write as writers.
in their field. Their writing experience in their field might have them believe that it would be more important to write as specialists in their field rather than as native speakers of English.

In sum, my findings suggest that Japanese students’ perspectives on L2 writing were influenced by their future context. More specifically, their clear goals concerning how they will use writing in their future careers influences their perspectives on writing, which is different for each student.
### Table 5.3: Perceived factors that influenced participants' perspectives on writing in the L1, L2, and future contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1 context</th>
<th>L2 context</th>
<th>Future Context</th>
<th>Future goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary &amp; University &amp; Secondary</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomoko</td>
<td>++writing</td>
<td>+teacher</td>
<td>++prizes</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+EL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taro</td>
<td>++writing</td>
<td>+professor</td>
<td>++readers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midori</td>
<td>++writing</td>
<td>+writing</td>
<td>[ struggle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinobu</td>
<td>++writing</td>
<td>+professor</td>
<td>++prizes</td>
<td>+ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--professor's attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 5.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jiro</th>
<th>++writing → ++ESL → ++professors’ attitudes → ++writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

++ Very strong positive influence on her/his writing.
+ Strong positive influence
0 Neutral
- Strong negative influence
-- Very strong negative influence

Table 5.3 shows perceived factors that influenced participants’ perspectives on writing both in the L1 and L2 contexts at their different levels of education. The perceived factors that influenced the student’s perspectives on writing are revealed by three contexts (the L1 context, the L2 context, the future context). The major perceived factors from the L1 context are writing, teacher, prizes, and professors. Those from the L2 context are ESL courses, professors’ attitude toward the students’ writing, grades, and writing. Those from the future context are clear goals for the future. The strength of influence of each factor is individual by the symbols (++, +, 0, -, and --), which are explained in the key below the table. The arrow indicates the consistency of the factor.
6.1 Summary

Most of the existing research on L2 writing has compared non-native speakers of English to native speakers, whether explicitly or implicitly. This comparison has led to the “deficit” model – that is, that non-native speakers of L2 are “inadequate” L2 writers and they still need to learn more. The present study grew out of the ongoing debate over whether non-native speakers of L2 who are L2 learners should be required to write like native speakers of L2. In recent research, Cook (1995a; 1995b; 1997; 1999) has argued in favor of a “multi-competence” model – that is, that L2 learners are L2 users who have multi-competent knowledge and are multilingual. The concept of “multi-competence” helps a researcher to view L2 writers who use L1 as well as L2 in a broader context. In short, in the deficit model, the standard that is used is the standard of native speakers; on the other hand, in Cook’s multi-competence model, the standard that is used is the standard of L2 users. In this study, I rely on Cook’s model and view the participants in my research “as multi-competent language users rather than as deficient native speakers” (Cook, 1999, p. 185).
Based on the multi-competence theory, I explored the L2 writers’ (Japanese undergraduate and graduate students’) perspectives on writing and their approach toward writing in L2 during their adaptation to the L2 academic context in their first academic year in the U.S. In seeking to learn about the perspectives of the six Japanese students who participated in this research, I focused on the factors that affect L2 writers’ perspectives on good writing in English as L2. These factors have included the students’ cultural experience, their literacy training and writing experience in L1, their training and writing experience in L2, their professors’ attitude toward their writing, and their future writing goals. I examined these and other factors as they affected students in their academic setting in the U.S. (L2 context) from three different contexts: the L1 context, the L2 context, and the future context.

This research was conducted as a case study of six Japanese students during their first year at an American university. To select the final six participants, I relied on a questionnaire followed by an interview. To gather the data, I used approximately ten interviews with each of the six participants over one year. The interviews varied between an open-ended interview, a semi-structured interview, and a text-based interview. These interviews were based on examination of two papers each quarter: one paper that each participant considered his/her best from an ESL Composition course (if they took an ESL course) and the other paper from a course in his/her academic field. I also based my interviews on examination of texts of both Japanese and English that each participant
considered as good samples during their first quarter and after their first academic year. Additionally, I interviewed the ESL instructors for five out of six students and also observed tutorial sessions in ESL Composition once or twice.

The participants whom I interviewed included three undergraduates and three graduate students. Of the undergraduates, one already had a baccalaureate from a Japanese university; and among the graduate students, one already had a master's degree from a Japanese university. They ranged in age from 18 to 26 years old. They all had received literacy training in Japanese and all of them had studied English as a foreign language in Japan before they came to the United States.

The overall purpose of this study was to examine the participants’ perceptions of writing, comparing and contrasting their experience in writing in Japanese in the L1 context with their writing in English in the L2 context. The study also aimed to examine the factors that affect L2 writers’ perspectives on their own use of L2 in the L2 context from three different contexts: (1) the L1 context; (2) the L2 context; and (3) the future context. Furthermore, the study explored whether and how the students’ perceptions of their own writing in the academic L2 context changed in one year. The other purpose of this study was to explore what would be useful for L2 writers from their own perspectives in order to meet their needs with regard to their own goals and experiences as L2 users.
6.2 Conclusions and Implications

Not much attention has been paid to the perspectives on writing that L2 writers bring to the L2 academic setting. This study is of value to the area of L2 writing research and has implications for research on the development of L2 writers, although it is difficult to generalize from the small sample in my study. Multi-competence theory as an approach in this study can help a researcher view L2 writers not as inadequate writers who have not attained the writing skills of native speakers (NS), but as L2 writers who have different competence from NSs and who use L2 as a tool in order to accomplish their goals. More specifically, the perspective of multi-competence theory helps L2 educators to understand that the participants in this study were not deficient in their writing skills but had different perspectives on good writing due to different educational, cultural, and individual writing experiences. Thus, L2 educators will be able to provide their students with appropriate suggestions and facilitate their writing skills.

Based on the results of this study, one conclusion is that each of the L2 writers brought his or her perspectives on writing from his or her educational, cultural, and individual writing backgrounds in his or her L1 context into the L2 academic setting, and one's beliefs affect one's writing in L2 in different ways. Moreover, with respect to the relationship between L2 writers' perspectives on writing and changes in their L2 writing during the period of this study, a tentative conclusion is that L2 writers created new perspectives on writing that stem from both their L1 writing experience and L2 writing experience. This shows that being multi-competent cannot simply mean replacing L1 with L2. For example, the participants' perspectives on writing during their first
academic year in the U.S. reveal that they kept some perspectives on writing from their L1 context, such as making an effort and writing what they want to say, while they adapted some perspectives on writing from their L2 context, such as following a certain format. From the perspective of multi-competence theory, it is clear that these participants are not deficient, but they are different.

Another conclusion is that there are individual differences among the participants regarding to what extent their perspectives on writing from their L1 educational experience, L1 cultural values, and L1 writing experience in the L1 context transfer to their L2 writing and to what extent they struggle with adjusting to L2 writing in the L2 context, although they all have been educated in similar literacy training within the same culture in Japan. More specifically, the L2 writers who are university graduates in Japan struggled more and took more time to adjust to academic writing in the U.S. than the L2 writers who are high school graduates in the L1 context. The study by Carson, et al. (1990) supports this finding at the point that writing skills in Japanese did not appear to transfer to English writing skills. This might be true for many reasons.

First of all, university graduates, who are older, are more embedded in the L1 culture and apply more L1 cultural values such as non-assertive linguistic devices in their L2 writing than high school graduates, who are younger and less embedded in the L1 culture. Second, there may be differences in their educational and writing experience in L1. Furthermore, the participants who had more writing experiences in L1 perceived themselves as better writers and had more confidence in L1 writing than those with less L1 writing experience. The L2 writers’ confidence level in L1 writing seemed to transfer
directly to their confidence level in L2 writing at the beginning of the academic year. Those with more writing experience and who had received more recognition for their writing in the L1 setting perceived themselves as good writers, held a more positive attitude toward their L2 writing, and had more confidence as good writers in English, at first.

However, their confidence level seems to have changed later in the year due to influences from the L2 context such as professors’ suggestions or attitude toward the students’ writing. The students lost their confidence when their writing in L2 was not deemed acceptable; however, they gradually regained their confidence through professors’ acceptance or positive attitude toward their writing. On the other hand, my research indicates that students who had less L1 writing experience in Japan have a negative attitude toward their writing and less confidence in L1 writing, which directly affected their confidence level in English throughout the year. This also might be due to their limited writing experience in L2 writing in their first academic year. In sum, the students who had more confidence and more writing experience in L1 seem to struggle in L2 writing more than those who had less writing experience and less confidence, because the former tried to hold onto their style of writing and their self-evaluation as good writers in L1.

The individual differences apply not only to their L1 background but also their disciplinary field. One participant in this study, whose major is Mechanical Engineering, led me to conclude that the disciplinary field in which a student is learning L2 writing also makes a difference in a student’s adjustment to L2 writing, since this participant had
some foundation in his field, plus there was not a big difference in writing in both
Japanese and English in his field. He had a comfort level, which helped him to build on
what he already knew. Thus, the ability and speed with which each individual can adapt
to the L2 context seem to vary.

Another conclusion is that there is a difference between undergraduate and
graduate students regarding their approach to their reading in English in the L2 context.
None of the three undergraduates selected good samples of English writing in both their
first academic quarter and after the end of their first academic year, while graduate
students did. This seems to reveal that undergraduates do not have enough time to think
about good writing in English. This might be because they are more concerned with
deciphering the English sentences than with judging whether a piece of writing is “good”
or because they read less English texts in general, compared to graduate students.

Another conclusion we can draw from this research is that most Japanese students
who study English as a foreign language are not ready initially to write good academic
papers in the L2 academic setting, and ESL Composition courses are crucial for them
upon arriving in the U.S., to survive during the transitional period from L1 to L2. All of
the participants in this study expressed their feelings during their first quarter at OSU that
they did not know how to write papers in English and that the writing skills they acquired
in their ESL Composition courses became critical for them in their first year of the
university in the U.S.

Another conclusion is that the students’ perspectives on good writing as writers
and as readers are different. The major criteria of good writing that the students held as
writers include to make an effort in order to write their papers and to write what they want to say. These are the criteria that come only from their perspectives as L2 writers. The students' perspectives on good writing as readers concern whether or not the content of the texts are interesting to them, whether or not the texts have information they wanted to have, and whether or not the texts are written easily and understandably.

The results of this study have significant implications for ESL and L2 writing instruction. This study suggests that ESL educators and professors in the students' academic fields need to increase their awareness and understanding of the L2 writers' perspectives on writing which they bring with them from the L1 context. In other words, in order to help the students to make an easier transition from the L1 context to the L2 context and facilitate their L2 writing, it is crucial for educators to be aware that each student brings his or her own perspectives on good writing from their educational, cultural, and individual writing backgrounds in their L1 context into their L2 writing, and their beliefs affect their writing in L2 in the L2 academic setting. Moreover, ESL educators and professors in the students' academic fields need to be aware that L2 writers' perspectives are tentative because L2 writers who are multi-competent have mixed perspectives from the L1 and the L2 context, which change with writing experience in the L2 context.

This study also suggests that it is important for students to be aware of what is good writing in L2. To achieve this awareness, it is important for ESL educators and professors in students' academic fields to create opportunities to share, and encourage discussions about, their students' perspectives on good writing. That is, it would be
useful to inquire how students have learned how to write in their home country. At the beginning of the academic term, educators might discuss students’ perspectives on good writing in a comfortable atmosphere in the classroom or hold conferences with each student. Educators can also ask students to write their notion of good writing as related to their educational, cultural, and personal experiences in L1.

Liebman’s survey (1992) of Japanese and Arab ESL students, investigating how writing is taught in these two cultures, supports this argument. Liebman concludes that rhetorical instruction does differ in these two cultures. While in Japan instruction emphasizes the expressive function of writing, in Arab countries, it emphasizes the transactional function. The way that these two techniques of rhetoric are taught in the L1 educational setting has a direct impact on students’ L2 writing. When ESL educators and professors in students’ academic fields are aware of these differences, they will be able to provide L2 writers with more appropriate suggestions on how to write in L2 effectively in the L2 context. From the perspective of multi-competence theory, the L2 writers’ difficulties in L2 writing come from their different backgrounds and cultural values. Viewing L2 writers who have multi-competence as L2 users (not as L2 learners) enables L2 writers to become L2 users more effectively.

The results of this study also suggest that ESL educators and professors of students’ academic fields also need to be aware of the individual differences among Japanese students, even though they share the same cultural and educational experiences. Contrastive rhetoric studies have been focused on the writing style that Japanese students tend to have, which overlooks the individual differences between the Japanese students’
L1 cultural values and the extent to which they bring L1 cultural values to L2. There are also differences among the types of papers that students write in their disciplines. L2 educators need to have “the awareness of the individual as distinct from the group and consequently the need for private introspection” (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996, p. 12).

The findings of this study also suggest that it is crucial for L2 writers to raise their consciousness about differences and similarities between their own perspectives on good writing that they bring from the L1 context and the concepts of good writing in L2 academic writing in the L2 context. This consciousness-raising will help L2 writers realize that they are writing for different readers in a different context, with different expectations and will help them reduce conflicts that come from their prior writing experience in their L1.

Thus, through the mutual understanding between educators and students regarding differences and similarities in perspectives on good writing in the L1 context and in the L2 academic setting, L2 writers will have an easier transition from the L1 context to the L2 context. L2 writers will not feel forced to imitate English writing styles of NSs. They will not have to stifle and abandon their personal voice and self-expression. When their cultural, educational, and personal backgrounds are respected, students will be better able to be themselves. Respecting L2 writers’ multi-competence will encourage L2 writers to: meet their own clear goals and not other people’s goals and be themselves. Their goals are not to become like NSs.

The results of this study suggest that the Ministry of Education that controls English education as a foreign language in Japan needs to focus on teaching how to use
grammar in context and how to write short compositions in English. The current purpose of teaching or learning English as a foreign language in Japan is to communicate with others who speak different languages and cultures, and not necessarily to survive English writing in an academic setting in the U.S. However, there is still a need to increase Japanese students’ writing skills in the future. Even Japanese people who do not leave their country have more opportunities to communicate in English on the Internet, as English is the language that is most frequently used in cyberspace. To be able to teach English writing well, so that Japanese students of English feel competent in using English, Japanese teachers of English themselves need to be trained in how to teach writing in English.

6.3 Recommendations for future research

First of all, this research used a case study design, and the sample size was small. For future study, gender differences, students from a wide range of fields, and analysis of texts in students’ best writing in L1 are recommended. Moreover, the participants of this research were only Japanese students. Other future research can be applied to students from other countries to examine their particular L1 background, L1 cultural values, and their adjustments to L2 writing in the academic setting. There might be different perspectives on good writing among L2 writers, who have different cultural and educational backgrounds.

Secondly, much previous research, with few exceptions (Kubota, 1997; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996, 1999), has been conducted from an Anglo-centric perspective, while the
current study was conducted from the perspective of Japanese writers themselves. When viewed from the L1 perspective, different conclusions can be reached regarding Japanese students’ L2 writing. For example, as Carson’s study (1992) shows, “[l]anguage teaching encourage[s] children to express what is socially shared rather than what is individual and personal” (p. 141) in Japanese education. The participants in this study were encouraged to write their personal opinion rather than socially shared expressions in Japan. More L2 research from the perspective of L2 writers themselves is recommended.

Lastly, specifically at the graduate level, in the fields that a researcher is not familiar with the content of the field as well as content of the writing, collaboration between an L2 researcher and an insider of the field are recommended. For example, I had a difficult time understanding the content of lab reports in the field of Mechanical Engineering selected by one of my participants due to my lack of knowledge in that field. Although a few studies of collaborative research between an L2 researcher and an insider of the field at the undergraduate level have been conducted (Dudley-Evans & Henderson, 1993; Fishman & McCarthy, 2000), more research should be conducted. In addition, collaborative research between an L2 researcher and an insider of the field at the graduate level should be also conducted. Collaboration with an insider will help to enhance and confirm an L2 researcher’s interpretation of the participants’ perspectives of writing.
APPENDIX A

A LETTER TO ESL COMPOSITION INSTRUCTORS
November 12, 1999

Dear teachers of ESL Composition Program:

I am Megumi Abe, a doctoral candidate in Teaching and Learning in the Education at the Ohio State University. I am currently writing my dissertation on a new approach to cross-cultural written communication: L2 users’ perception of English in the L2 context.” With permission from Dr. Diane Belcher, the Director of the ESL Composition Program at the Ohio State University, I would like to ask you to distribute the attached memo and questionnaire to newly arrived Japanese graduate students studying in the U.S. in September 1999, in your ESL Composition class. The questionnaire is so as to select approximately five volunteers who will participate in the study. In order for the questionnaire to be useful to the researcher, all questions must be answered fully as possible. Respondents (who must be Japanese graduate students to qualify as subjects) will receive $5 for their time and effort. I would greatly appreciate it if you could set aside some of your time to distribute the memo and questionnaire to your Japanese graduate students at your earliest convenience. I would like to stop by before or after your ESL Composition class on Friday, November 19th to pick up the questionnaires and to pay the students for their time.

Would you please email me or call me if you have any questions regarding the questionnaire? My email address and phone number at home are as follows:

Megumi Abe
abe.4@osu.edu
688-9121 (Home)
College of Education

Sincerely,

Megumi Abe
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JAPANESE INTERNATIONAL GRADUATE STUDENTS
November 12, 1999

Dear potential participant:

I am Megumi Abe, a doctoral candidate in Teaching and Learning in the College of Education at the Ohio State University. I am currently writing my dissertation. My topic is: “A new approach to cross-cultural written communication: L2 users’ perception of their use of English in the L2 context.” I would like to ask newly arrived Japanese graduate students who started studying in the U.S. this September to fill out a questionnaire, so as to select approximately five volunteers who will participate in my study. In order for the questionnaire to be useful to the researcher, all questions must be responded to as fully as possible. Respondents (who must be Japanese graduate students to qualify as potential subjects) will receive $5 for their time and effort. I would greatly appreciate it if you could take your time to fill out the questionnaire at your earliest convenience. I would like to stop by before or after your ESL Composition class on Friday, November 19th to pick up your questionnaire and to pay you compensation for your time.

Would you please email me or call me if you have any questions with respect to the questionnaire? My email address and phone number at home are as follows.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Megumi Abe
abe.4@osu.edu
688-9121 (Home)
College of Education
Questionnaire for Japanese international graduate students

I. Biographical information

1. Name: ___________________________  Home phone number: ______________ Email: ___________________________

2. Age: _______________  Sex (Please circle): MALE  FEMALE

3. How long have you been in the United States (US)? _______ year(s) _______ months(s)

4. When did you start to study at the Ohio State University (OSU)? _______________

5. What is your major of study at OSU? _________________________________________

6. Which degree are you seeking for? MA  MS  PHD  Others: _____________

7. If you are in MA/MS program,
   (1) Are you planning to write MA/MS thesis at OSU? (Please circle) YES  NO
   (2) Are you going to study for your PHD after you complete your MA/MS? YES  NO
   (3) If yes, are you going to study for your PHD at OSU? YES  NO

8. Please describe the specific reasons why you decided to study in the US. Feel free to use the reverse side of this sheet if you need more space.

9. What is your plan after you complete your degree in US?

________________________________________________________________________

10. Where did you attend university(s)? (If you have more than one degree in Japan or US, please write all degrees you have). In addition, if you wrote thesis (theses), which thesis (theses) such as undergraduate senior-year research papers (sotusgyo ronbun) or MA/MS thesis (theses) and in which language did you write it? (If you have written more than one thesis, please write all you have written).

Name of University: ___________________________  Name of University: ___________________________

Major: ___________________________  Major: ___________________________

The degree you obtained: _______________  The degree you obtained: _______________

Type of thesis: ___________________________  Type of thesis: ___________________________

Language: ___________________________  Language: ___________________________

II. Language background (English) in Japan

1. Have you ever taken tests such as TOEFL test, Michigan test, the Cambridge test, and IELTS? (Please circle) YES  NO

(1) If yes, which test(s) and when did you take? If you take one test more than once, please write the most recent date.

The name of the test: _______________  When: _______________

(2) If you test you took included the written test, please write your most recent score of written test.

Written score: _______________
2. Have you taken a spoken English test such as the TSE or SPEAK test?    YES NO
3. If yes, which test and when did you take? The name of the test: _________ When: _______
4. Did you study English in Japan?    YES NO
5. If yes, for how long did you study English? _______ year(s) _______ month(s)
6. If yes, where did you study English? Please mark as many as apply.
   (1) Kindergarten    YES NO _______ year(s) _______ month(s)
   (2) Elementary school    YES NO _______ year(s) _______ month(s)
   (3) Junior high school    YES NO _______ year(s) _______ month(s)
   (4) High school    YES NO _______ year(s) _______ month(s)
   (5) College/University    YES NO _______ year(s) _______ month(s)
   (6) Graduate school    YES NO _______ year(s) _______ month(s)
   (7) Private English school    YES NO _______ year(s) _______ month(s)
   (8) Others    YES NO _______ year(s) _______ month(s)
   Where: _______________________________________
7. What kind of instruction did you get when you studied English in Japan? Please number the following activities according to their frequency in your instructional background. For example, #1 would mean the most frequent, #2 would mean less frequent, etc.
   _______ Translate
   _______ Listen to tapes
   _______ Learn about American culture
   _______ Study grammatical rules
   _______ Write compositions
   _______ Speak English with native speakers
   _______ Read English books
   _______ Have English dialogues with classmates
   Others: __________________________________________
8. Did you learn how to write compositions in English in Japan?    YES NO
9. If yes, where, when, from whom (e.g., high school teacher) did you learn it?
   Where: ___________ When: ___________ From whom: ___________
   Where: ___________ When: ___________ From whom: ___________
   Where: ___________ When: ___________ From whom: ___________
10. Did you have any opportunities to write English composition/papers in Japan?    YES NO
11. If yes, to whom did you write English and how often?
   To whom: ___________________________ How often: ___________________________
   To whom: ___________________________ How often: ___________________________
12. Did you learn how to write research papers in English before you came to US?    YES NO
13. If so, when, where, and from whom (e.g., college professor)?
   When: ___________ Where: ___________ From whom: ___________
14. Please rate your own proficiency in English in the following areas:
  书写作文：5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Average 2 = Poor 1 = Very Poor
   组织作文：5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Average 2 = Poor 1 = Very Poor
   语法：5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Average 2 = Poor 1 = Very Poor
   阅读理解：5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Average 2 = Poor 1 = Very Poor
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Listening comprehension  5  4  3  2  1  
Pronunciation              5  4  3  2  1  
Fluency                    5  4  3  2  1  
Vocabulary                5  4  3  2  1  
Knowledge of American culture  5  4  3  2  1 

III. Writing experience in English in US
1. What classes are you taking this quarter (Autumn 1999) at OSU? (Please include ALL ESL classes you are taking)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department (e.g.)</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>The title of class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDU T&amp;L 906</td>
<td></td>
<td>Language learning across culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Did you learn how to write research papers in US? YES NO
3. If so, when, where, and from whom?
   When: __________ Where: __________ From whom: __________
   When: __________ Where: __________ From whom: __________

Please describe your writing assignments in your academic field.
4. How many papers do you have to write this quarter? Please circle the number.
   0  1  2  3  4  5 more
5. Did you write any papers so far this quarter at OSU? If so, did you ask somebody to check your grammar on your papers or to revise your papers before you handed them in? YES NO
6. If yes, to whom, what, and how often did you ask?
   The person you asked   What paper   How many times before you handed in
   (e.g.) A tutor at Writing Center Research paper 2
   ______________________  ______________________  __________
   ______________________  ______________________  __________
   ______________________  ______________________  __________

7. How do you feel writing papers in English in your academic field. Please describe as much as you can.

   ______________________________________________________

8. Do you write anything in English except your academic papers? YES NO
9. If yes, what kind of writing (such as diary, journal, creative writing, poetry, short stories, etc.) and how often do you write?

   What kind of writing   How often
   ______________________  ______________________
   ______________________  ______________________
   ______________________  ______________________
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10. How do you feel about these kinds of writing?

11. Have you ever published your academic papers in English? **YES** **NO**

12. If yes, how many papers have you published in English?

13. How much time do you usually spend on academic and non-academic reading and writing in English in an average day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading in English</th>
<th>Academic field</th>
<th>Non-academic field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hr(s)</td>
<td>min(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hr(s)</td>
<td>min(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Attitude toward English
1. Please reply to the following questions by circling the most appropriate number. (Please circle)

1= Strongly disagree 2= Disagree 3=Neutral 4= Agree 5= Strongly agree

**In English:**
(1) I like reading for leisure. 1 2 3 4 5
(2) I like reading in my field. 1 2 3 4 5
(3) I like writing for leisure. 1 2 3 4 5
(4) I like writing in my field. 1 2 3 4 5
(5) It is easy to read in my field. 1 2 3 4 5
(6) It is difficult to write in my field. 1 2 3 4 5
(7) I would like to improve my reading skills. 1 2 3 4 5
(8) I would like to improve my writing skills. 1 2 3 4 5
(9) I have confidence in my reading skills. 1 2 3 4 5
(10) I feel comfortable with my writing skills. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Comparing yourself to native speakers of English, how well do you think you write composition/papers in English? (Please circle)

Much better Better About the same A little worse Much worse

3. Why do you think so?

4. Comparing yourself to other Japanese people studying in US, how well do you think you write English? (Please circle)

Much better Better About the same A little worse Much worse

5. Why do you think so?
6. Do you feel more confident (or comfortable) when you write English than when you write Japanese? YES NO

Please explain:

V. Grammar feedback and revision: Please answer the following questions if you have any experience with asking native speakers of English (NSE) for help with assistance with paper revision before you hand in your term papers.

1. How often do you use/seek the following feedback?
   (1) Grammar feedback by NSE:
   (2) Organization feedback by NSE:
   (3) Idiomatic feedback by NSE:

2. How useful do you find the following: (Please circle)
   (1) Grammar feedback by NSE: Not useful at all Somewhat useful Very useful
   (2) Organization feedback by NSE: Not useful at all Somewhat useful Very useful
   (3) Idiomatic feedback by NSE: Not useful at all Somewhat useful Very useful

3. How much are you satisfied with: (Please circle)
   (1) Grammar feedback by NSE: Not useful at all Somewhat useful Very useful
   (2) Organization feedback by NSE: Not useful at all Somewhat useful Very useful
   (3) Idiomatic feedback by NSE: Not useful at all Somewhat useful Very useful

VI. Language background in Japanese
1. What kinds of writing experience (such as reading response, kansobun, diary, journal, essay, poetry) did you have in school and outside school in Japan? Could you also describe how often you wrote them?

   In school
   Kansobun (once a year)  
   \[\text{Elementary school: } \]
   \[\text{Junior high school: } \]
   \[\text{High school: } \]
   \[\text{College/University: } \]
   \[\text{Graduate school: } \]

   Outside school
   Diary (every day)  

   \[\text{Elementary school: } \]
   \[\text{Junior high school: } \]
   \[\text{High school: } \]
   \[\text{College/University: } \]
   \[\text{Graduate school: } \]

2. Have you had any instruction about compositions in Japanese? YES NO

3. If yes, please describe what kind(s) of instructions did you have and when it was?
4. Comparing yourself to other Japanese people, how well do you think you write Japanese? (Please circle)
   Much better  Better  About the same  A little worse  Much worse

5. Do you have any opportunities to write Japanese in the US?  YES  NO
6. If yes, what kind of writing do you do?

7. Do you have any opportunities to write something in Japanese in US such as academic paper, journal, essay, poetry, diary, etc.?  YES  NO

8. If so, what writing and how often?
   The kinds of writing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The kinds of writing</th>
<th>How often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How much time do you usually spend reading and writing in Japanese in both your academic field and your private life in an average day?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading in Japanese</th>
<th>Writing in Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic field</td>
<td>Non-academic field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ hr(s) ___ min(s)</td>
<td>___ hr(s) ___ min(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ hr(s) ___ min(s)</td>
<td>___ hr(s) ___ min(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Please reply to the following questions with respect to email.
    (1) I currently read more in Japanese than in English when using email.  YES  NO
    (2) I currently write more in Japanese than in English when using email.  YES  NO

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP!
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JAPANESE INTERNATIONAL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS
Dear potential participant:

I am Megumi Abe, a doctoral candidate in Teaching and Learning in the College of Education at the Ohio State University. I am currently writing my dissertation. My topic is: "A new approach to cross-cultural written communication: L2 users' perception of their use of English in the L2 context." I would like to ask newly arrived Japanese undergraduate students who started studying in the U.S. this summer or autumn to fill out a questionnaire, so as to select approximately five volunteers who will participate in my study. In order for the questionnaire to be useful to the researcher, all questions must be responded to as fully as possible. Respondents (who must be Japanese undergraduate students to qualify as potential subjects) will receive $5 for their time and effort. I would greatly appreciate it if you would take your time to fill out the questionnaire at your earliest convenience and mail it to me before December 18, 1999.

Would you please email me if you have any questions with respect to the questionnaire? My email address and phone number at home are as follows.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Megumi Abe
abe.4@osu.edu
College of Education
Questionnaire for Japanese international undergraduate students

I. Biographical information

1. Name: ___________________________
   Home phone number: _____________ Email: ________________
2. Age: _____________ Sex (Please circle): MALE FEMALE
3. How long have you been in the United States (US)? ______ year(s) ______ months(s)
4. When did you start to study at the Ohio State University (OSU)? ________________
5. What is your major of study at OSU? _________________________________________
6. Which degree are you seeking for? BA BS Others: _____________
7. Are you planning to write undergraduate senior-year research paper at OSU? (Please circle) YES NO
8. Please describe the specific reasons why you decided to study in the US. Feel free to use the reverse side of this sheet if you need more space.

9. What is your plan after you complete your degree in US?

10. If you attended university(s) before you came to OSU, please write a degree(s) you have. In addition, if you wrote undergraduate senior-year research papers (sotusgyo ronbun), in which language did you write it?
    Name of University: _______________
    Major: _______________
    The degree you obtained: __________
    Type of thesis: ____________________
    Language: _________________________

II. Language background (English) in Japan

1. Have you ever taken tests such as TOEFL test, Michigan test, the Cambridge test, and IELTS? (Please circle) YES NO
   (1) If yes, which test(s) and when did you take? If you take one test more than once, please write the most recent date.
      The name of the test: ____________ When: __________
   (2) If you took the test included the written test, please write your most recent score of written test.
      Written score: ____________
2. Have you taken a spoken English test such as the TSE or SPEAK test? YES NO
3. If yes, which test and when did you take? The name of the test: ____________ When: __________
4. Did you study English in Japan? YES NO
5. If yes, for how long did you study English? _______ year(s) _______ month(s)
6. If yes, where did you study English? Please mark as many as apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Month(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private English school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where: _______________________________________________________________________

7. What kind of instruction did you get when you studied English in Japan? Please number the following activities according to their frequency in your instructional background. For example, 1 would mean the most frequent, 2 would mean less frequent, etc.

- Translate
- Learn about American culture
- Listen to tapes
- Study grammatical rules
- Write compositions
- Speak English with native speakers
- Read English books
- Have English dialogues with classmates
- Others: ___________________________________________________________________

8. Did you learn how to write compositions in English in Japan? YES NO

9. If yes, where, when, from whom (e.g., high school teacher) did you learn it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>From whom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Did you have any opportunities to write English composition/papers in Japan? YES NO

11. If yes, to whom did you write English and how often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To whom</th>
<th>How often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Did you learn how to write research papers in English before you came to US? YES NO

13. If so, when, where, and from whom (e.g., college professor)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>From whom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Please rate your own proficiency in English in the following areas:

- Writing compositions
- Organization of compositions/papers
- Expressions in compositions/papers
- Grammar
- Reading comprehension
- Listening comprehension
- Pronunciation
- Fluency
- Vocabulary
- Knowledge of American culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing compositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of compositions/papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressions in compositions/papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of American culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Writing experience in English in US
1. What classes are you taking this quarter (Autumn 1999) at OSU? (Please include ESL classes you are taking)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department (e.g.)</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>The title of class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDU T&amp;L 906</td>
<td></td>
<td>Language learning across culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Did you learn how to write academic papers in US? YES NO
3. If so, when, where, and from whom?
   When: __________ Where: __________ From whom: __________
   When: __________ Where: __________ From whom: __________

Please describe your writing assignments in your academic field.

4. How many papers do you have to write this quarter? Please circle the number.
   0 1 2 3 4 5 more

5. Did you write any papers so far this quarter at OSU? If so, did you ask somebody to check your grammar on your papers or to revise your papers before you handed them in? YES NO

6. If yes, to whom, what, and how often did you ask?
   The person you asked
   (e.g.) A tutor at Writing Center
   What paper
   Research paper
   How many times before you handed in
   2

7. How do you feel writing papers in English in your academic field. Please describe as much as you can.

8. Do you write anything in English except your academic papers? YES NO

9. If yes, what kind of writing (such as diary, journal, creative writing, poetry, short stories, etc.) and how often do you write?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What kind of writing</th>
<th>How often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How do you feel about these kinds of writing?
11. How much time do you usually spend on academic and non-academic reading and writing in English in an average day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic field</th>
<th>Non-academic field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading in English</td>
<td>__ hr(s) ____ min(s)</td>
<td>__ hr(s) ____ min(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing in English</td>
<td>__ hr(s) ____ min(s)</td>
<td>__ hr(s) ____ min(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Attitude toward English

1. Please reply to the following questions by circling the most appropriate number. (Please circle)

   1 = Strongly disagree  2 = Disagree  3 = Neutral  4 = Agree  5 = Strongly agree

   **In English:**

   (1) I like reading for leisure.
   (2) I like reading in my field.
   (3) I like writing for leisure.
   (4) I like writing in my field.
   (5) It is easy to read in my field.
   (6) It is difficult to write in my field.
   (7) I would like to improve my reading skills.
   (8) I would like to improve my writing skills.
   (9) I have confidence in my reading skills.
   (10) I feel comfortable with my writing skills.

2. Comparing yourself to native speakers of English, how well do you think you write composition/papers in English? (Please circle)

   Much better    Better    About the same    A little worse    Much worse

3. Why do you think so?

4. Comparing yourself to other Japanese people studying in US, how well do you think you write English? (Please circle)

   Much better    Better    About the same    A little worse    Much worse

5. Why do you think so?

6. Do you feel more confident (or comfortable) when you write English than when you write Japanese? YES NO

   Please explain:
V. Grammar feedback and revision: Please answer the following questions if you have any experience with asking native speakers of English (NSE) for help with assistance with paper revision before you hand in your term papers.

1. How often do you use/seek the following feedback?
(1) Grammar feedback by NSE: ______________________________________
(2) Organization feedback by NSE: ______________________________________
(3) Idiomatic feedback by NSE: ______________________________________

2. How useful do you find the following: (Please circle)
(1) Grammar feedback by NSE: Not useful at all Somewhat useful Very useful
(2) Organization feedback by NSE: Not useful at all Somewhat useful Very useful
(3) Idiomatic feedback by NSE: Not useful at all Somewhat useful Very useful

3. How much are you satisfied with: (Please circle)
(1) Grammar feedback by NSE: Not useful at all Somewhat useful Very useful
(2) Organization feedback by NSE: Not useful at all Somewhat useful Very useful
(3) Idiomatic feedback by NSE: Not useful at all Somewhat useful Very useful

VI. Language background in Japanese
1. What kinds of writing experience (such as reading response, kansobun, diary, journal, essay, poetry) did you have in school and outside school in Japan? Could you also describe how often you wrote them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(e.g.)</th>
<th>In school</th>
<th>Outside school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school:</td>
<td>kansobun (once a year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Have you had any instruction about compositions in Japanese? YES NO
3. If yes, please describe what kind(s) of instructions did you have and when it was?

4. Comparing yourself to other Japanese people, how well do you think you write Japanese? (Please circle)
Much better Better About the same A little worse Much worse
5. Do you have any opportunities to write Japanese in the US? YES NO
6. If yes, what kind of writing do you do?

7. Do you have any opportunities to write something in Japanese in US such as academic paper, journal, essay, poetry, diary, etc.? YES NO

8. If so, what writing and how often?
   The kinds of writing
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   How often
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

9. How much time do you usually spend reading and writing in Japanese in both your academic field and your private life in an average day?

   Academic field          Non-academic field
   Reading in Japanese     hr(s) min(s)          hr(s) min(s)
   Writing in Japanese     hr(s) min(s)          hr(s) min(s)

10. Please reply to the following questions with respect to email.
   (1) I currently read more in Japanese than in English when using email. YES NO
   (2) I currently write more in Japanese than in English when using email. YES NO

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP!
APPENDIX D

TOMOKO'S PAPER
Over two hundred years ago, the founders of our country created a unique concept known as the freedom of speech. This purpose of enabling each individual to freely speak their minds has opened the doors to many controversial issues. Lately, the Internet has been the concentration of these arguments. The “net” is the newest form of global interaction and in many cases it has replaced books and newspapers. It is an insightful resource that can be both entertaining and educational. In addition, it is easily accessible for anyone that simply wants to “browse” around, at home, at work, in libraries, and in schools. As we enter into the new millennium, focus has turned to the Internet as the primary source of information and communication, but there are many potential dangers that lie beneath this seemingly wonderful resource. I believe that the Internet should be regulated so that everyone can use Internet safely. “Hate” literature, sites supporting violence, pornography easily accessible to minors, false information, “browsing” on the Internet at work rather than working, computer viruses set passed via the Internet, and shopping scams are just a few examples of the hazards hidden in the World Wide Web.

Hate literature” within the Internet so readily accessible, groups such as the Ku
Klux Klan, Neo-Nazis, and anarchists have found an easy way get into peoples’ homes and mind. The Internet has become these groups’ newest media source and they use it to manipulate individuals and recruit followers. There are web sites for each of these groups that contain disturbing and discriminatory material though the freedom of speech doesn’t allow. Such material can lead to not only the destruction of an individual, but essentially, the destruction of an entire group of people. There is one article about a student who became the first person in the nation to be sentenced for committing a hate crime over the Internet. According to the article, “Machado, 21, was convicted in February of violating the civil rights of 59 Asian students at University of California, Irvine to whom he sent threatening e-mail in. The message, signed “Asian Hater,” warned that all Asian should leave campus or the sender would “hunt all of you and kill you stupid asses.” (Lubman). This is just one example and there are thousands of hate crimes over the Internet.

Also available on the Internet are web sites supporting and encouraging violent behaviors. These sites contain instructions on how to make bombs, cause death to a person using bodily force, and, depending on the ability of the hacker, a person may be able to initiate a missile attack. A concrete example of this would be the Columbine High School shooting. Apparently, the gunmen found sites on the Internet that gave explicit instructions on how to create pipe bombs and other deadly weapons. The result was a tragedy that shocked America and gave the public a new outlook on the access of the material available on the Internet. Why does it take such an event to open the eyes and hearts of Americans? This worries many parents and lawmakers because children can use these sites to harm others without comprehension the effects of their actions. Parents need to take an active role in their child’s activity on the Internet.

In the past few years, pornography has become increasingly more available on the
Internet. Because of the accessibility, lewd sexual conduct has replaced the accustomed view of sexuality. No longer is sex a sacred bond formed by happily married couples and a symbol of love and devotion, but it is a gruesome act. It is almost a contest to see which web site can display the most graphic and surreal images. Pornography on the Internet has spiraled out of control and access to certain related web sites is now easier than ever. Many of these pages have warnings that read, “Do not enter unless you are at least eighteen years of age,” however, an inquisitive child will ignore this statement and proceed to find explicit pictures and illustrative language. Often, on such web sites, women, and even men in some cases, are viewed as sexual objects rather than people. The outcome is an overall poor understanding and a lack of respect for sexuality. This can be extremely inappropriate and destroy a child’s perception of sex. My suggestion would be to create passwords for these web addresses so that only verified users can be granted access or the creation of a way to completely eliminate the ability to access these sites from certain places, such as the library and in schools.

Another rising problem with the Internet is the spreading of computer viruses via Internet mail. These viruses can be essentially deadly to a computer hard drive. They can completely wipe out the memory on a computer and any systems stored within it. They are expensive to have fixed and, in some cases, are impossible to repair. Prevention of such viruses has become much easier to come by. Virus detectors and anti-virus software is available on the Internet and in stores. Also, news programs often mention any large computer virus that is being passed at the current time.

A with is the validity of some information that can be obtained on the Internet. The First Amendment grants all Americans the right to speak our mind and cannot dictate what we are allowed to publish. Henceforth, when using the Internet to research a certain
topic, it might be difficult to distinguish between the numerous amounts of conflicting data. There is no way to tell what information is accurate without consulting another source outside of the World Wide Web. Wouldn't it just be easier to know that all of the information was true? Many argue that the government should design some type of regulatory board that would screen all of the sites before they were available to the public. This would decrease the chances of seeking out false data and citing the information to support a point being argued. If someone wished to post false information, the government could display a disclaimer to warn users.

On a recent news program, there was a story that featured a young woman whom had her identity stolen over the Internet. By using a credit card or by releasing a social security number over the Internet, even for personal identification, an individual is risking having their life stripped from them. The information available to a perpetrator is virtually unlimited once personal numbers are obtained. They can be used to open new accounts, charge goods and services, and ruin otherwise good credit. There are quite a few shopping scams as well that require a person to meticulously examine the fine print, so not to be taken advantage of. These companies that sell products through the Internet rely on the customers' carelessness to make easy money. One way to prevent this from happening is to pay attention to the terms of the agreement and to never give out personal information, such as social security numbers, over the Internet. This type of thing happens to thousands of people every year, yet is never magnified to the extent this particular story was. These crimes are not considered as newsworthy as other topics such as celebrity gossip.

Certain individuals will do anything to get a laugh, make some money, or have their point and cause heard, and the Internet provides an open door into the homes' of unsuspecting people. However, when does it cross the line? Americans are so fortunate to
have the freedom of speech, but many take the freedom for granted. What the public needs
to realize is that all the negativity on the Internet adds to the steady corruption of our youth.
More and more schools are relying on the World Wide Web as a valuable learning tool, but
with all of the inappropriate material available, it is not so valuable. John Mclean, a
Massachusetts police officer who tracks electronic sex offenders, suggests that “Parents
should instruct kids never to meet alone with anyone they’ve encountered online, or respond
to sexually explicit e-mail,” (Meyer). This might be extreme, but in my opinion, the
government, in association with parents and teachers, need to monitor minors activity on the
Internet so that its primary uses can be enjoyable and educational, rather than destructive.
English 110

Paper #1 Final draft
18, April 2000

"Gun Possession"

Why do you have guns at home? It is because of protection from murders.

We need to protect ourselves by having guns. Why don't you have guns at home?

Because we do not need to have them: crimes seldom occur. The previous one is the

United State case and the back one is Japan case. We can see such big differences in

people's thought. Our goal is to change our society and to make people think as last one.

As many researches show crime rate goes down where guns are not allowed in houses, so
gun control law in the United State should be changed.

One very interesting research shows clearly that the huge differences in crime rate
between gun-allowed country and gun-prohibited country. They compared a crime rate
between Macon, Georgia; It has one of the loosest laws about gun possession in U.S, and
Toyama prefecture; It is just a normal Japanese city. Surprisingly, the population of
Macon is 10 times less than the population of Toyama, but the murder cases occurred in
Macon in 1997 is more than 100 times compared to the case in Toyama. Not only these
cities case, we can see such huge differences in crime rate between the United State and
Japan as whole countries. According to the research, criminal rate in the United State in
1996 is 1000 and the criminal rate in Japan is 300. These huge differences occur only
because the difference in law about guns.
The other issue about guns possession at home is responsibility to take care of guns. Every year we hear that people are killed by guns accidentally. For instance, little kids were playing with their parents' guns and shot somebody. People mistook their visitors for murderers and shot them. As we all know, guns are dangerous and to have them it requires very heavy responsibility. However, we often see a lack of it. Our laws allow people to have guns, even with what the law says, the responsibility to take care of guns is too heavy for us, so we, each individual, should not possess guns and we can reduce unexpected accidents.

According to the USA Today, 68.8% of people in the United State agree with the law that is enforcing gun control. (Koch) Almost 70% of people want to change the situation right now, and prohibit having guns. People are not only just saying this, but also they are trying to act as they say. Research tells that, compared to 1993, the percentage of people having guns at individual home declined from 51% to 36%. (USA Today) As we know from this result, many people know it is better to live in society without guns, and they want to change this society like that. It is sad that about 30% of people still think that having guns is okay, and 36% of people are still having guns at houses. Now is a time for us to think about this big social issue, "gun possession", seriously and abolish guns from this society.

As I mentioned in this essay, I think the gun control should be thought about more seriously now in the United State. It is clear from many researches that crime rate in this country will go down when guns are prohibited. Who does not want to live in this
society safely? As long as we do not change the law and situation about guns, we will
never be able to get the real safe world. This "gun" issue has been discussed for a long
time and it is not at all an easy problem to solve. However, we should not give up; think
about it patiently and hopefully soon all people will understand what is best for all of us.
At that time, we will finally be able to get a real peaceful world.

Good research and a pretty strong argument. Hard to follow in parts. Also your intro is
very confusing. This grade is much higher when we factor in all
The effort you've done.
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Taking Sides Write-up 2

1. Describe the major issue these essays address. Why is the issue important?

The American Revolution was one of the remarkable historical events in world history as well as American history. The war was not amicable and made many sacrifices but the resulting success of the Americans has drawn the attention of peoples in disgruntled situations all around the globe, in particular in Third World countries. They are looking for a model or a guide to follow to bring success to their problems. That is why, the issue of whether the American Revolution can serve as a development model is important. The question of whether Third World countries should look for guidance from this remarkable historical event is the major issue the two authors, Richard B. Morris and Carl N. Degler, address.

2. What position does each author take on the issue?

Morris argues that the American Revolution was both a war of decolonization and a movement of broad political, social, and economic changes and reforms. He mentions analogies between the American Revolution and modern revolutions; in addition, he concludes that the American Revolution has much relevance to the revolutions of the emerging nations of later times. He, therefore, suggests that the American Revolution is able to serve as a model for emerging nations.
Degler, on the other hand, argues that because of its unique conservative attempt to maintain the "status quo," the American Revolution should not be a model for Third World nations to imitate although he agrees with some analogies.

3. What evidence does each author use to support their position?

Morris mentions several analogies between the American Revolution and Third World countries. He regards the American Revolution as the first successful decolonization movement of the modern world; likewise, he assumes that Third World countries are young nations that have just emerged or are in the process of emerging from colonialism. Morris also points the similarities of devices or characteristics, such as non-cooperation, civil disorder, provisional congresses, even war itself, and existence of a charismatic leadership.

On the contrary, Degler notes the differences between American successful revolt against colonial rule and the revolt against Europe in Third World. According to him, the American Revolution is too special to be a model for Third World countries today. He focuses on the conservative under the American Revolution and explains that the colonials revolted against British rules in order to protect and bring back the freedom they enjoyed before abuses. The colonial or newly independent countries today, on the other hand, struggle for or cherish self-government as a new and desirable existence. Degler also mention the differences of circumstance at the time of independence. In the case of the American Revolution, America was a middle class democracy before its revolution; additionally, probably most Americans could read and write at the time of independence, and probably most of them owned their own land. In the case of Third World, on the other
hand, the forms and practices of self-government are unfamiliar for them because of either lack of time to develop them or lack of opportunity to practice them.

4. How do the view of the author differ?

Morris focus on surface issues and similarities between the American Revolution and Third World countries today. His approach is so-called “loose construction”. On the other hand, Degler deeply survey the issues and compares the American Revolution and struggles in Third World countries. His approach is so-called “strict construction”.

5. How do you account for the two different viewpoints of interpretations on the same questions? What lessons does this provide about historical practice.

The major reason why the two different viewpoints of interpretations on the same questions may be the difference of two author’s approaches to defining the American Revolution. As it is stated above, Morris regards the American Revolution as a war of decolonization and changing society. On the other hand, Degler regards the revolution as conservative and “status quo”. In this point, it is already very natural that the interpretations of the two authors are different because they uses different ruler, the American Revolution, for measuring same objects, “Can the Revolution Serve as a Developmental Model for Third World Nations Today?”

This Taking Sides Issue 6 shows us the importance of approaches to issues. As far as these essays are concerned, “strict constructionists” seem to be more academic and persuasive that “loose constructionists” because former, in this case Degler, focus on issues
more deeply and can persuade readers with reasonable evidences. For example, when Degler states his interpretations about the American Revolution, he shows comparative issues or interpretations at the same time.

Probably, history is merely aggregation of historical issues; however, interpretations towards historical issues are very variable depending on author's approach. If historical misreading happens, wrong models may apply. This Taking Sides also alert us the risk of misreading and misunderstanding in history.

\[ \text{ keep up your good work.} \]
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273
EDU T&L 633  
July 19, 2000

**Where I Have Traveled This Quarter**

When I started this course, to be honest, I was not sure if I could utilize drama in a classroom in Japan. I myself had no experience being a classroom where drama was used. Furthermore, when I read the article about "Hattie," I thought that it would be almost impossible for me to do this in a classroom and I was not sure how students would react to that. However, through this quarter, I learned a lot about drama. Now I believe that there are ways to introduce drama using in a classroom in Japan. I would like to mention that at the end of this paper. Before going to that section, I would like to talk about five things that I learned from the classes and the articles. It includes the comments from Dr. Trisha Long. Actually, these comments did stimulate me and helped me understand deeply.

First of all, I was impressed to read the Dr. Long's comment: "If learning how to learn means learning how to question, to dialogue, to interpret and 'nuance' a text, is this not learning how to learn?" I strongly agree that these are "leaning how to learn." When I read the reflection by 6-grader-girl, Jessica, in the first part of the article by Edmiston and Wilhelm (1998), I could see how drama helped her "ask," "wonder," and "try to figure out." Then I remember KWL strategy. It is always important to know where we are right now as well as where we are going. KWL strategy will be the good start to let students ask and also interpret the text critically. In the classroom in Japan, students rarely raise their hand and ask question. Desks are neatly set toward the front where a teacher stands and "teach." To be honest, it is also difficult for most of Japanese students to come up with question. That is because we are not supposed to read a text...
critically. We learned what the text says and not what is in there. As a future teacher, I would like to help students think more critically using drama strategy because now I strongly believe learning text is not just read the text and translate the literal meaning.

Secondly, I learned that drama using simulate students' motivation. Having been involved in the final project, I realized how actually fun it is. I came to think that I want to introduce one of the heroes in Japan. With that motivation, I did some research and am getting to be an "expert" on him. In the process of preparing for the final project, I found myself try to do better job and cooperate with other members in the group. In my school year, I remember "learning" about him. However, I never felt this exciting feeling by learning about him at that time because we had to just memorize what he did and in which period of Japanese history he lived. In this final project, I had to interact with other people as if I were Hideyoshi the Shogun! I am surprised at myself being so excited about pretending that I was him. By imagining that I was Hideyoshi, I was able to think about the historical facts from the different point of view. Interestingly enough, in my mind, the pieces of historical incidents that I just memorized became coherent and came to alive with meaning. Even though I used to like Japanese history, I never felt it this way. The more I learned in this way, the more motivated I became. It is a good "chain reaction."

My third point of learning from this course would be interaction in a classroom. This could be between the teacher and students, among students themselves, or with the world outside the classroom (Edmiston and Wilhelm, 1998). In this course, interaction happened many times. The most impressive one is the group activity. In my group, I was able to take a risk and express whatever I thought because I felt so secure which I never felt in other group activity before. We shared own reflection on the reading materials, raised ideas about each project and respected
opinions of ourselves. It brought us all the closer to each other. I remember when we shared our artifact. It was such an interesting and thoughtful moment. We saw something deep inside ourselves. We shared something that comes from our heart. I think I never forget that moment.

As many students say throughout the articles, interactive projects stay in their head longer than learn something by memorizing for tests (Stevens, 1998). Also, the interaction with the world outside the classroom will give students great learning opportunities of real ideas, events, and materials. The other interaction happened in this course was the comment for our reflection from Dr. Long. The comments and answers to my questions encouraged me to ask more and to read and interpret the text critically as well. In a classroom in Japan, we have about forty students. As is mentioned in Dr. Long's comment for my reflection, however, it is important for a teacher to build a learning environment in which all students can open up possibilities to move toward excellence in learning, and by doing so, all students will be able to be capable of moving deeply into a variety of content areas. I agree with this. This is necessary in a classroom. And I think more interactions are needed in order to interact with them with better understanding because interaction helps a teacher know students' needs and interests. With drama using, I believe that I will be able to let all students be involved in the activity even though the number of students will be nearly forty. I will be able to reduce the number by forming small groups. Furthermore, it will greatly work for Japanese students. Several ways of drama using will cause a lot of interaction in a classroom.

The fourth point is about "knowledge." I was impressed by the word by John Dewey: "Knowledge is the means rather than the end product of education" (Edmiston and Wilhelm, 1998). I immediately thought about the entrance examination in Japan. In order to enter senior high school and university, we have to take an examination which has usually been testing
students' knowledge learned by heart. Even though recent examination stresses the students' personality and assigns them to express themselves by letting them write critical essay, it still causes students memorizing instead of "learning." It also affects learning attitude at school as well as teaching style. When I went to a senior high school as a student teacher, I tried not to translate English sentences word by word. Though it was a common teaching style in English classroom since I was a high school student. Whether a student can translate every sentence or not did not seem to matter. Rather, it could be better if one grasp the content of the text and then go deeply. However, the students were afraid of new teaching style. Even though, they enjoyed each activity, they came to me and asked the whole word-by-word translation at the last class because they had to prepare for a test. At the first class of EDU T&L 633, the illustration of three circle of "teacher," "content" and "students." The middle circle "content" is covered its left edge by "teacher" and its right by "students." So, "content" is the medium of interacting between a teacher and students. When I learned this illustration, I remembered my experience of student teaching. I wish I could go deeper inside the text. In order to do that, English classrooms need more meaningful text. We have to use the textbook authorized by the Ministry of Education. When I went student teaching, I asked students what they want to say in English. According to their answers, they are more interested in real life. I was astonished by the difference between students' needs and the content of their textbook. However, I got some ideas from this course that I may use "juicy" and authentic text such as newspaper article. Using that will help students understand not only language but also the culture of English speaking and other countries. Learning a lot of things other than language itself will be "knowledge" for students. Finally, the first article that we read struck me a lot. It said that excellence in teaching lies in how we relate to people (Heathcote, 1984). From this article, I learned that it is crucial for
teacher to preserve interests in children. Sometimes teacher may need to come down from the teacher's platform (in Japan, there is a teacher's platform in front of the classroom) and stand at the same eye level as that of students'. That will help teachers to see the world through students' viewpoint. I also learned from the article that a teacher must be able to look straight at him/herself, and take his/her own measure. When I was a student teacher, I think I was not confident enough. Now I can understand that I did not see myself from my own eyes. I tried not to look nervous. I think this means that I saw myself from students' eye level. Rather, Heathcote said that teacher needs to take his/her own measure and be obsessed with him/herself. These ways of thinking even gave me joy and excitement rather than nervousness which I felt when I was a student teacher. Relating to people may also mean to relate to oneself.

From the class, I learned that every student has imagination. They do have curiosity and potential possibilities. I think it is one of teacher's roles to elicit and let them aware that they have this unlimited possibility. Japanese students may be shy but they do have many brilliant ideas. If they can take a risk in drama situation, they will be rather encouraged by that. Currently in Japan, teenagers have serious problems. They commit serious evil as well. The number of dropouts is also increasing. As a future teacher, I am concerned by these facts. And actually, these problems are what I would like to do something seriously. In fact, Japanese students are also creative and imaginative. I will utilize drama and help them know their possibilities. More specifically, letting them be “experts” and “as if” drama will greatly work in our context. In these ways, I think that I can still use a textbook and go into deeper learning. I know when they form small groups, they come up with such wonderful ideas. It is pity if their possibilities are buried by the pressure of entrance examinations. There is no way which does not bring their creativity and imagination into their learning. I am so glad that I found a way to help them be active and
autonomous learners by using drama. I will keep trying to utilize the strategies of drama using in Japan!

It was such a pleasure meeting you over the last five weeks. You have given me hope about the ways in which this methodology might work in your country. Your reflections and the ways in which you participated in class tell me that you will carry the tenets of this methodology in both your head and your heart.

I wish you all good things as you continue your journey in teaching and learning.

Best,

[Signatures]
APPENDIX H

SHINOBU'S PAPER
Response Paper #1

I am facing the difficulty of conceptualizing "differences" and "diversity" in my personal life as well as in my present academic world. This includes the Women's Studies Department at the Ohio State University and in this Latina Feminism class. The issues of "differences" in my personal life and the Academy have slightly different meanings; however, they are connected with the question of how I theorize and practice the issue of "differences." Simultaneously, I am investigating the way(s) in which I integrate the concept of "differences" into practice. Since "differences" is one of the important themes in this class, to analyze texts of Latina feminism helps me to know where I am standing in the process of articulation. In this paper, I would like to pursue the reason why I have difficulty of conceptualizing "difference," particularly responding to two articles: Garcia's "Introduction" in Chicana Feminist thought and Baca Zinn and Dill's "Difference and Domination" in Women of color in U.S. society.

Since the class started, I have been questioning what the Latina Feminism is and what it means in the United States. Is there a distinctive characteristic that defines thought as Latina Feminism? What kind of texts, activities and thoughts are considered to be Latina Feminism? Who is the authority to define these things? How do Chicano feminists conceive their differences within the Latina community? Many articles I have read in the class respond to some of these questions. Chicano feminist thought emerged from the nationalist movement of Mexican Americans and women’s or feminists’
movements. Chicano feminists fought not only for racism and inequality in larger American society, sharing a sense of ethnic consciousness with other Chicanos, but also against sexism within that movement. (Garcia 4-5) Because the lives or situations of Latinas are explained as a systematic interlocking of race, gender and class, their demands or goals and their conception of feminism differ from those in what is called "Anglo Feminism." (NietoGomez 55) In my opinion, this complexity of Chicana’s life leads them to perceive "differences" among women in more distinct and accurate ways. As a matter of fact, Chicano feminists were aware of their differences in the community. (Garcia 9)

Although I am coming to understand the fundamental consciousness of Latina Feminism, my series of inquiry are not completely answered when the issue of "agency" and the relationship between Latina Feminism and Anglo Feminism are discussed in a broader sense. As Garcia states in the "Introduction" of the Chicana Feminist Thought, "Chicanas during the movement years...more importantly displayed their agency in combating injustice."(Garcia 9) This was a struggle of regaining "agency" to speak for Chicanas and to represent Latinas’ voices and experiences by themselves both in the Latino movement and the women’s movement in the 1960s and 1970s. When the purpose of this struggle to regain agency is for changing a discourse of gender system in the Latino community and for revealing racial and class privilege of white women in the women’s movement, it is significantly important to search for the core argument of Latino Feminism; however, if the purpose of Latino Feminism is simplified into the discussion of "backlash," I am lost during the process of perceiving a broader picture of feminism as a whole. How can I articulate various feminisms that are explained and
theorized separately, maintaining values of cultures and histories? Thus, to theorize a specific feminism like Latino feminism contains the assumption or possibility that one can reach the essential principle of Latino feminism including all "differences" in the Latino community. If some of the dominant thoughts are taken into account does it mean that the power mechanism and the notion of privilege among multiple oppressions perpetuate in this theorizing? One more question can be raised: who theorizes "feminism" anyway?

Baca Zinn and Dill's article, "Difference and Domination" gives me a hint to acknowledge the way of integrating the existence of multiple feminisms; however, they do not go any further from that in terms of transformation of theory to practice. They explain "diversity" of feminisms not as a supplement for theorizing a gender system which is conceptualized in Anglo feminism but as a tool to understand the mechanism of multiple oppressions such as race, gender and class: "the lives of women of color are not a variation of a more general model of American womanhood. Instead, their experiences are formed by many of the same forces that shape the lives of others." (Baca Zinn and Dill 10) Therefore, various feminisms do not function or exist separately; their relationship is "relational." (Baca Zinn and Dill 10)

I think that this understanding is the major conceptualization and accumulation about the subject of "diversity," which most feminists agree upon. Nevertheless, the question about the transformation from the theoretical understanding to practicing "differences" is not actively discussed in this article or in most of the academic institutions. As far as I have experienced in my past, my academic training is truly reflected by this lack of communication among various feminisms. I studied Japanese
feminism in Japan: I studied black feminism at Howard University; now I am studying Anglo feminism and Latina Feminism at OSU. It is difficult for me to integrate all my knowledge and histories about feminism. Japanese feminism is positioned and measured by the relationship to Western feminism, especially white feminism in the United States. Black feminism, which I learned at Howard, is theorized from the Afrocentric perspective. Even here at OSU, the curriculum of Women’s Studies is divided and taught separately based on "difference" among women. How can I connect the knowledge I learned in the past, being conscious about many "differences": national and geographical difference (power relations), cultural differences, racial differences, institutional difference, etc. My knowledge is split. In other words, I do have knowledge in my brain, but my experiences of practicing "differences" remain separated from each other.

The transformation from the concept explained in a paper to practicing "differences" is actually getting started in my academic world, the Women’s Studies Department at OSU. We (graduate students in this department) are rethinking and challenging the way in which we learn "feminism" based on the concept of multiple feminisms as a whole and how we teach it to undergraduates. Our primary goal would be to change the curriculum in the department. Moreover, this challenge is an inquiry of how this department and people in there conceive "differences and diversity" among women and feminisms. This is not an easy task at all. First of all, we have to recognize what the specific problems are in this department and why they have been perpetuated. The second difficulty is how to alter it into a better curriculum and how we work together toward the goal. Meanwhile, this working process makes us reconsider our own perceptions, experiences of "difference" in the past and at the present.
I am not an exception for this transformation. Frankly speaking, I am lost as I indicated above; however, I believe that my conceptualizing process about "difference," and "diversity" is also "relational" and mutual among our classmates. My conceptualization and integration could be polished and reached by other classmates' processes through discussing and sharing works. The outcomes of our practicing "differences" that I am now involved in would not be the ideal one which Baca Zinn and Dill theorize in the article.

Many feminists have argued and tried to make a theory of "differences" in papers and articles. Doing that, they have also believed that if a concrete theory were established, they would apply it to practice. They (we) need to move forward from this stage. As I mentioned above, feminists have reached a certain understanding of "differences and diversity" of feminisms. Why cannot we apply it to practice? If we face difficulty, that reveals a vulnerable and problematic point of our understanding. I feel that it is possible to theorize "differences" from practicing "differences" in our actual world; theory comes from practice, activism. At my personal level, I believe that practicing "differences" in my department will lead me to integrate and combine my knowledge and experiences of "differences."

What I realized through this paper is the fact that I have been trying to conceptualize "differences," "diversity" only in my brain; I am confused by the way in which I integrate my knowledge and experiences of "differences"; I have been hesitant to expose my confusion and feeling about "differences" to people. Actually, the experience of confusion is also considered as my "difference." Practicing "difference" is the
appropriate way for me to combine these knowledge and experiences. I know that I am standing at the very first stage of practicing “differences.”
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JIRO’S PAPER
LAB 3: ENGINE TESTING AND TEMPERATURE EFFECTS

NAME:
DATE: 05/08/00
Part I: Willans Line Model and Engine Efficiency Map

The engine has been tested under three different speeds; 1400RPM, 2000RPM, and 2500RPM. For each engine speed, two types of Willans Line have been generated; one in a non-dimensional expression using mean effective-pressure and fuel-pressure, and one using actual torque and fuel consumption.

2-1 Willans Line (Non-dimensional representation)

\[
y = 0.341x - 390.56
\]

FIG 1-1 Willans Line Model (non-dimensional expression) 1400 RPM

\[
y = 0.4716x - 951.15
\]

FIG 1-2 Willans Line Model (non-dimensional expression) 2000 RPM

\[
y = 0.1532x - 203.72
\]

FIG 1-3 Willans Line Model (non-dimensional expression) 2500 RPM
FIG 1-4 Willnas Line Model (direct physical quantity) 1400RPM

\[ y = 0.0087x + 0.0734 \]

FIG 1-5 Willnas Line Model (direct physical quantity) 2000RPM

\[ y = 0.0092x + 0.153 \]

FIG 1-6 Willnas Line Model (direct physical quantity) 2500RPM

\[ y = 0.0421x + 0.2122 \]
2-3 **Engine Efficiency Map**

Provided the engine efficiencies calculated from the acquired data, the engine efficiency map has been generated. The map has been drawn manually by plotting each data point to a graph sheet. Please see the attached sheet (FIG 1-7) on next page.

**Comments on the acquired Willans Lines:**

- For RPM=1400 and 2000, the results seems to be reasonable. The maximum efficiency of the engine lies around the value from 30% to 45%.

- For RPM = 2500, the result seems to be unreasonable. The engine efficiency is about 10%, and this is too low for a gasoline ICE. As can be seen in FIG1-3, the range of the mean fuel-pressure at this speed is nearly double to that at 1400 and 2000RPM. Therefore, this bad data is likely to due to an inappropriate measurement of the fuel flow. (The engine is consuming too much fuel.)

**Comments on the engine efficiency map:**

- As can bee seen in the drawn map, the island of the maximum efficiency lies around the mid-speed high-torque region. And as far as the efficiency map itself is concerned, the low efficiencies in the high-speed region seem to be a natural data. In this respect, the low efficiency data at 2500RPM may have be a reasonable data; however, this cannot be decided only from the obtained experimental results.

In addition, it is obvious that the amount of data itself is lacking; specifically, we need more data in the low-load operating points in order to draw a more precise efficiency contour map. It might have been better to control the throttle to make the engine run at the specified load-torque and speed. Numbers of data at the high-load region have been squeezed into a small range; therefore they were less useful for creating the contour map.
Part 2 Temperature Effects

2-1 Fuel Use Correction Factor

By assuming that the data given by the TA represents the engine operation at 85 deg C and 15degC respectively, it is able to obtain the average value of the temperature correction factor (TCF). Please refer to the attached data spreadsheet (Appendix B) for detail.

Average Temperature Correction Factor (TCF) at 2000RPM:

\[
TCF_{average} = \frac{(fuel\ used)}{(fully\ hot\ fuel\ used)} = 1.53
\]

From this average value of TCF, we can write:

\[
TCF_{average} = 1 + \left(\frac{fully\ hot\ temp - engine\ temp}{x}\right)^{3.1} = 1 + \left(\frac{85 - 15}{x}\right)^{3.1} = 1.53
\]

\[
x = 86.0
\]

Thus, for the used HONDA engine, the equation of TCF can be written as:

\[
TCF = 1 + \left(\frac{85.0 - engine\ temp}{86.0}\right)^{3.1}
\]

Figure 2-1 shows the plot of the acquired expression.

![Figure 2-1 Temperature Correction Factor](image-url)
2-2 Engine Warm-Up Prediction.

The objective in this section is to develop an equation that relates the engine
temperature gradient \( \frac{dT}{dt} \) [degC/s] and the fuel mass flow rate \( \dot{m}_f \) [g/s]; i.e., find the
constant \( K \) and \( B \) in the following expression:

\[
\frac{dT}{dt} = K \dot{m}_f + B
\]

It is predicted that the above expression only holds when the excess heat-energy
produced by the fuel significantly contributes to the engine temperature increase; i.e.,
when the engine temperature does not saturate. As the engine temperature increases, the
excess heat-energy from the fuel will balance with the heat conduction at the engine
surface and at the radiator, and this saturation is likely to occur easily especially in a
small scale engines.

Figure 2-2 shows the plot of the engine temperature increase WRT time. As can
be seen in this figure, the engine temperature begins to saturate at a temperature near 70
deg C, and it is not reasonable to apply eq. (2-1) when the engine is above this
temperature.
From the above discussion, only several data was able to be used for estimating the constants in eq.(2-1). From the temperature limitation (70deg C), only the data acquired in 1400 RPM could be used. And within this data, some of them have been discarded to acquire a reasonable tread line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engine Temp [degC]</th>
<th>dT/dt [deg C/s]</th>
<th>mf [g/s]</th>
<th>Used/Discarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58.30</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Discarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.20</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Discarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.60</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.20</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 2-3 shows the plot of the used data, and the equation of its tread-line.

![FIG 2-3 Fuel Mass Flow Rate V.S Temperature Gradient](image)

\[
y = 0.038x + 0.1749
\]

From Fig 2-3, equation (2-3) can be written as follows:

\[
\frac{dT}{dt} = 0.038\dot{m} + 0.175
\]
Part 3: Driving Cycle Prediction

3-1 Preparation

The objective of this section is to perform the engine simulation over a given driving cycle, and assess the effect of the initial temperature to the overall fuel consumption. The simulation code has been written in MATLAB (Driving Cycle.m).

The following equation has been used for simulation:

1) Engine warm up prediction

\[
\frac{dT}{dt} \bigg|_u = 0.038 \dot{m}_{f,u} + 0.175 \quad \text{(3-1)}
\]

and,

\[
T_{n+1} = T_n + \frac{dT}{dt} \bigg|_n \times \Delta t \quad \text{(3-2)}
\]

where,

\[
\Delta t = 1.0[\text{sec}]
\]

2) Fuel mass flow rate prediction

The fuel mass flow rate at an arbitrary engine speed and load-torque has been calculated by interpolating the value of fuel flow at 1400RPM and 2000RPM at that load-torque.

Fuel flow at 1400 RPM:

\[
\dot{m}_{f,1400}(\text{Torque}) = 0.0087 \text{Torque} + 0.0734 \quad \text{(3-3)}
\]

Fuel flow at 1400 RPM:

\[
\dot{m}_{f,2000}(\text{Torque}) = 0.0092 \text{Torque} + 0.153 \quad \text{(3-4)}
\]

Fuel flow at N RPM:

\[
\dot{m}_{f,N}(\text{Torque}) = TCF \left[ \dot{m}_{f,1400} + \left( \frac{\dot{m}_{f,2000} - \dot{m}_{f,1400}}{2000 - 1400} \right)(N - 1400) \right]
\]

\[
\text{(3-5)}
\]

3) Temperature Correction Factor (TCF)

\[
TCF = 1.0 + \left( \frac{85.0 - T}{86.0} \right)^{3.1}
\]

\[
\text{(3-6)}
\]
3-2 Results
Fig 3-1 and 3-2 show the plot of simulation result.
Comments:

As can be seen in fig 3-2, the simulation result shows that the initial engine temperature has a significant contribution to the fuel consumption over the driving cycle. In this simulation, starting the driving cycle from a fully-hot temperature has reduced the fuel consumption for about 1.5% compared to the cold-start situation. Although small, this is an important contribution.

This result indicates the possibility improving fuel economy by means of engine pre-heating. If the amount of energy required for heating up the engine to its fully hot temperature can be kept at a negligible level, pre-heating the engine from cold start will be an effective way to reduce fuel consumption of a vehicle. Moreover, since the required heating time increases with the volume and the surface area of the engine, this pre-heating concept becomes an extremely important issue for a large-scaled engine.
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