

Afterword

Joel Bloch

As the 50th anniversary of the publication of Robert Kaplan's (1966) "Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education" approaches, the publication of this volume is a timely reminder of how this discussion of contrastive rhetoric, now called intercultural rhetoric, has developed. Kaplan's article is still frequently cited and discussed and is often brought up when someone asks about "multilingual rhetorics," even though few, including Kaplan himself, believe that it presents a valid comparison of different forms of rhetoric. I have long thought that Kaplan's article is the single most important contribution to the discussion of second language writing. Its value arose from its ability to synthesize disparate fields that had long existed separately, in this case applied linguistics and contemporary rhetoric, into a new, highly generative area of inquiry. This area has frequently and often vehemently been attacked yet has evolved and consequently endured. Belcher and Nelson's volume is both a step in that evolutionary process and a testament to that endurance.

As Atkinson and Matsuda both pointed out in their dialogue in the final chapter of the book, Kaplan is often credited and blamed for many things he never said. Nevertheless, Kaplan's (1966) article was one of the earliest pieces to look at second language writing as a unique form of discourse, different from the traditional interest in speaking. More interestingly, the questions that Kaplan raised have spread far beyond the field of L2 writing. They are being asked today by rhetoricians and information theorists and have formed the center of the debate over the impact of the internet on learning, communication, and our social interactions.

Even without being directly cited, the framework created by Kaplan (1966) has been used by authors such as Nicholas Carr (2010) and James Gleick (2011) to discuss how the internet and the tremendous amount of available information have affected how we think, much in the same way that culture has been thought to affect how we write. The assumptions presented by Carr and Gleick about the effect of the internet on how we think have been as hotly debated

in recent years as Kaplan's assumptions about the effect of culture on writing. Whether they endure, as has the debate over intercultural rhetoric, will depend on how well these arguments respond to, incorporate, and extend new assumptions and criticisms that will arise.

The term *contrastive rhetoric* integrated two distinct fields of inquiry: the field of contrastive linguistics, which compared and contrasted the linguistic features of various languages, and the field of rhetoric, which incorporates a variety of aspects of written language including epistemology, form, and style. Unfortunately, one of the factors that made the field of contrastive rhetoric vulnerable to extensive criticism was its failure to integrate the complexity of these two fields. Contrastive rhetoric research was never fully able to compare the vast array of the features of written discourse that might be affected by cultural transfer. Nor did the research explore the various components of rhetorical inquiry, particularly the social and historical contexts that were the basis for traditional rhetorical research. Rather, contrastive analysis was often limited to only questions of organization and style. However, the epistemology of intercultural rhetoric was never static. The introduction of the term *intercultural rhetoric* itself was an attempt not only to go beyond the traditional criticisms of the field but also to provide a new framework for discussing cultural rhetorics.

The contents of this book well situate themselves in this tradition of inquiry that has developed over these 50 years while at the same time exploring new areas of interest with new kinds of research tools. As Atkinson discussed in the original conversation with Matsuda in 2008 (in Connor, Nagelhout, & Rozycki, 2008), culture has been in the background of all discussions of contrastive/intercultural rhetoric, although Atkinson feels that this focus does not need to continue in every future discussion. Nevertheless, he laments that, after all these years, we still do not have a clear definition of culture.

However, we do have a changing definition of culture. Thomas Kuhn (1962) argued in his discussion of the evolution of paradigms that for a paradigm to survive it must change in response to its critics. Such an evolution is no more apparent than in the multiple ways the term *culture* is used in this book. Baker takes up this challenge, but like Atkinson (Matsuda & Atkinson, 2008), realizes that clear-cut definitions may not be possible, and that perhaps more important are the new interpretations of culture that can be utilized in these discussions. In the tradition of Sapir and Whorf, Kaplan (1966) attempted to present his four "doodles" as being equal and autonomous, thus not inherently privileging one form over another. However, their application to second language writing assumed that any deviations from the norms of traditional English language

writing, whatever those norms were, were evidence of deficits in the writing of the students. This problem became particularly pernicious in the discussion of such highly charged issues as plagiarism (Bloch, 2008, 2012).

Echoing Atkinson (Matsuda & Atkinson, 2008), Baker calls for a more post-modern view of culture that challenges traditional views of the dominant cultural norms in the teaching of L2 writing. Such arguments are pervasive across all discussions of literacy in school settings (e.g., Heath, 1983), in academic settings (e.g., New London Group, 1996), and in the use of new media as a form of literacy (e.g., Hull & Nelson, 2005). In all these contexts, alternative forms of literacy come into contact with traditional forms. Within the framework of intercultural rhetoric, Baker examines the space where English plays the role of a *lingua franca* (ELF). As with these other areas of contact, Baker raises the question of how various forms of literacy are valued, and he confronts one of the thorniest problems in this field—that of publishing (e.g., Lillis & Curry, 2010). Publishing is a critical area both because it can have a profound impact on the lives of the authors as well as on the nature of knowledge and how we share it. Publishing today is under great pressure from the tremendous growth in the amount of information available on the internet and the ease by which it can be shared online. On the other side of the issue are the traditional forms of peer review and submission standards that may serve to filter out some of this information but might also constrain how such alternative forms of literacy are valued.

Baker gives a few examples of books and a journal in the field of applied linguistics that have revised their policies in the attempt to accommodate alternative forms of English. He quotes the journal's guidelines that say that "every effort will be made to accept different rhetorical styles of writing." Such an approach to publishing raises some interesting questions for future directions for intercultural rhetoric research. As Baker admits, however, it is not clear how far these practices have spread beyond the field of applied linguistics. In response to this issue, I asked a group of doctoral students from a variety of disciplines in my academic writing for publication course to examine the guidelines given by scholarly journals to authors on the use of non-standard English. Almost every journal that mentioned the issue asked that manuscripts be proofread by friends or proofreading services before submission. Although this finding is anecdotal, it raises the question of the role that linguistics should play in the language policies of the fields in which many of our students are writing.

How, then, should alternative forms of literacy be incorporated into the writing curriculum and how should such decisions affect pedagogical practices across different contexts of teaching? Baker's analysis raises even more

questions about the nature of publishing, particularly in regard to the phrase *rhetorical styles of writing*. How do such differences affect the production of knowledge? While some journals, at least in our field, ask reviewers to not consider “grammatical correctness” when evaluating an article, how are other aspects of rhetorical style handled, such as how texts are cited or whether the writer is utilizing the latest research to raise questions and support claims? Baker’s argument may make the greatest contribution to issues ranging from the treatment of plagiarism to the use of intellectual property that are raging today in response to the changes in how information is disseminated and accessed.

The idea of studying rhetorics in their own contexts is not a new response to challenges for intercultural rhetoric that Baker sets out. Such research was central to the types of contrastive analysis that Kaplan (1966) drew upon to draw his “doodles.” Inter- and intra-cultural analysis was essential to our understanding of alternative forms of literacy. Today, it has been the growth of the internet as a literacy space that has forced researchers to examine rhetorics in their own contexts. You’s focus in this volume on the ethics and discourse of an online community is an example of exploring this tradition in intercultural rhetoric.

Much like Baker, You finds that online communities are spaces where mixed forms of language emerge as dominant, with each form contributing unique perceptions to the overall form of the discourse. You’s focus on the Greek concepts of *topoi* and *ethos* as a factor in intercultural rhetoric adds a unique dimension to the discussion. In an online community, as in other types of communities, *ethos* is created through an internally generated set of norms that are shared by all the members of the community. As You found, in an internet-based community, such practices are also constrained by the technological structure of community, what the intellectual property lawyer Larry Lessing (1999) calls the architecture of the community, which is expressed by the computer code through which the discourse is controlled. You’s argument about how the participants could take control of their literacy space for their own goals while their discourse was still affected by the code of the technology offers an important alternative to the deterministic view of technology offered by Carr (2010) and Gleick (2011). As You’s synthesis of rhetoric, discourse analysis, and technology theory shows, intercultural rhetoric offers a dynamic perspective that can frame research across a variety of fields as well as a framework for pedagogy.

You’s research has shown how intercultural rhetoric has developed as a framework for researching discourse outside of the classroom, particularly the kinds of discourses our students may be using in their daily interactions. This perspective is not new, as Connor’s (1998) research on fish selling illustrates. Nor, as the long tradition of rhetorical analysis has also shown, is this a perspec-

tive unique to intercultural rhetoric. This development has a unique importance for intercultural rhetoric in that it reiterates in part the importance of the Sapir/Whorf hypothesis, which was the basis for Kaplan's (1966) analysis.

The work of Sapir and Whorf, as well their teacher Franz Boas, focused on site-specific research that attempted to show that all cultures, regardless of their degrees of literacy, had equally complex forms of thinking. We can see much the same agenda today in the field work on literacy of the New London Group (1996), who like You, have often focused on discourse and literacy in new media. While rejecting the strong hypothesis for cultural determinism that is often credited to Sapir and Whorf, this research reclaims the focus of the Sapir-Whorf research for deconstructing the complexity of the discourse. Much like rhetorical analysis, such research can have a political agenda, as illustrated in Escamilla's chapter on exclusionary discourse in Japan. As Escamilla argues, such research is well situated to challenge some of the criticisms levied against contrastive and intercultural rhetoric. If one compares this study with John Hinds' (1983) study of *ki-shu-ten-ketsu*, one of the first contrastive rhetoric studies involving Japanese, one can see some of the new directions that this kind of research takes in new rhetorical contexts.

The growth of corpus linguistics has greatly impacted how intercultural rhetoric is researched. As Connor (this volume) puts it, corpus linguistics "can become a cornerstone of continued intercultural textual scholarship." Unlike the kinds of technology You examined, which can be either used as a tool for developing literacy or a rhetorical space for literacy practice (Bloch, 2007), the role of concordancing has primarily been as a tool for studying discourse across a variety of contexts, which has allowed for multiple comparisons of research fields, types of discourses, types of users, and even sections of individual papers. Such uses have a clear implication for intercultural research, particularly allowing for the kinds of site-specific comparisons that maintain the integrity of each site. More interestingly, the development of concordancing as a technology has dramatically changed its accessibility and therefore its potential as a research tool.

Whereas access to concordancing programs and corpora was once the privilege of a small group of linguists, the growth of small stand-alone or web-based programs (e.g., Wordsmith, MonoConc 2.2, and AntConc) has allowed individual researchers and teachers to examine the specific questions using the discourse they choose to focus on. Open-access programs, like the View (<http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>) or MICASE (www.elicorpora.info) have redesigned the concordancing program interface to allow researchers with only a minimal technical and linguistic research background to query specific types of texts, users, and discourse contexts.

Gentil demonstrates how various concordancing tools can be integrated to answer specific questions about specific forms of discourses across two languages. Unlike the more general forms of language found in larger corpora such as the British National Corpus (BNC) or Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), Gentil used Wordsmith to compile a specific exemplar of a genre across two different languages—"briefs" or "mémoires" in both English and French that were written with the same rhetorical purpose but often with radically different perspectives. Another program, NVIVO, was then used to further analyze the results. The integration of complementary tools illustrates how different forms of implementation can be used to answer the specific questions the researchers are asking.

This research on integrating rhetorical similarities with lexico-grammatical differences illustrates how the use of these technologies can lead to interesting new hypotheses about intercultural rhetoric that counter the traditional stereotypes about cultural determinism while highlighting some of the more nuanced areas of difference. As Gentil puts it, the conclusions could have been made without the use of the technology, but the technology provided a stronger set of data. At the same time, Gentil points out the limitations of the current research that could be remediated by either changing the framework of the analysis or developing new software. For both of these approaches, Gentil's use of the technology gives us a deeper understanding of both how the use of various technologies has changed intercultural rhetoric and how the goals of intercultural rhetoric can change the design of the technology.

Concordancing programs have allowed both teachers and researchers to focus in on a variety of unique intercultural rhetorical contexts. Such relationships have long been a staple of intercultural rhetorical studies, as Connor's (1998) study of fish sellers exemplifies. Friginal's study of call center discourse illustrates how concordancing has allowed researchers to quantify a larger number of such interactions, which, in turn, can allow for new perspectives on the relationship between culture and discourse in the creation of shared meanings. Perhaps there is no more high stakes rhetorical space for such studies than call centers, where customers interact with a company's representatives in often highly charged situations using a variety of forms of English. Call center agents must negotiate a variety of types of rhetorical contexts using different forms of language, often mixing oral and written discourses. In "offshored" contexts, such as those with customers in the United States and the workers in India or the Philippines, these negotiations and interactions can involve a variety of cultural factors. With the importance of customer satisfaction and the monetary

consequences of successful and unsuccessful interactions, understanding such negotiations can have important social and economic consequences for both employers and employees.

As Friginal's chapter, like You's, illustrates, technological-enabled communication presents intercultural researchers with a variety of site-specific rhetorical contexts for study. Computer mediated communication has long been known for its ability to mix oral forms of interaction expressed in written terms. Temples and Nelson examined the possibilities and limitations of the use of such forms of discourse in an intercultural context. Such research is crucial for teachers trying to take advantage of opportunities that online education has for connecting students from all over the world in ways where online courses are not simply a replication of face-to-face courses but present a potentially richer and more complex educational experience. In another chapter, Cortes and Hardy show how they were able to exploit the ability of concordancing programs to find both specific examples of a syntactic form, in this case, lexical bundles in both Spanish and English, while at the same time providing an expanded context to examine the use of these items across different languages. These examples of intercultural research illustrate how corpus linguistics can frame a methodology for examining how different languages create meaning in different ways, again without the conundrum of perceiving deficits.

Some of the great advances in contrastive rhetoric research have come from problematizing what is meant by *contrastive* and by *rhetoric* (e.g., Matsuda & Atkinson, 2008). It has taken many years of research to understand the importance of this problematization. Canagarajah illustrates how this process will continue by beginning his chapter with a new problematization of the terms *inter*, *cultural*, and *rhetoric*. In doing so, Canagarajah returns to the central question that has both plagued and invigorated the last 50 years of research: What is it we mean when we speak of culture? Canagarajah presents a chart listing eleven oppositional terms contrasting traditional or modernistic approaches to culture with new or postmodernistic approaches. As he puts it, regardless of the problematic nature of the research in this area, people are continually negotiating their experiences in these cultural contact zones, often successfully, but sometimes not. Therefore, it can be argued that the same question Kaplan posed in 1966 is still viable.

However, in response to these new frameworks for intercultural rhetoric research and pedagogy, Canagarajah argues for a "practice-based perspective." As do a number of papers in this collection, this "cosmopolitan approach" focuses on individuals interacting in "contact" zones across a variety of rhetori-

cal spaces, where they negotiate, absorb, remix, and transform various forms of language into new forms that can differ greatly from standard forms. It is the goal of both the research and the pedagogy to capture and facilitate this fluidity of movement.

It is thus fitting that this volume, itself a sequel of sorts, reprises the Matsuda-Atkinson (2008) dialogue on the future of intercultural research. As with any good sequel (e.g., *The Godfather: Part II*), it both elaborates and reflects on its predecessor. Just as *The Godfather: Part II* can be seen as a response to criticism of *The Godfather* by returning to the same situations but in more fragmented and complex ways, Atkinson and Matsuda return to the same themes but often with less certainty that the answers are there. Some issues, such as whether intercultural rhetoric is a field, seem to have disappeared. On the other hand, a number of issues they have raised seem in some ways to be extensively addressed in this book. There are a number of constructive critiques in Atkinson and Matsuda's chapter of the current state of research.

The growth in the use of concordancing to some extent responds to their call for different types of methodologies. Atkinson and Matsuda themselves return to wrestle with the central question of culture—what it is, what its effect on literacy is, what its role in research and pedagogy is. While Canagarajah seems to want culture to recede from its current prominence, Atkinson in particular wants its definition to be expanded but further problematized, citing Robert Lowie (1920), into a “hodgepodge” of influences. Matsuda connects Atkinson's definition to Canagarajah's cosmopolitanism, focusing on the often chaotic and complex process of negotiation, as often illustrated in this book, that he feels exists in contrast to the more monolithic and simplistic notions of culture that were sometimes found in previous research. From a much different framework but with similar outcomes, the intellectual property lawyer Larry Lessing (1999) has referred to a “remix” culture, which, similar to the variety of rhetorical contexts explored throughout this book, requires new definitions and rules for creativity and behavior.

This somewhat simplistic connection I have made between the cosmopolitan world of intercultural rhetoric and the remix world of the internet is an attempt to gauge how far we have come since the publication of Kaplan's (1966) article. At the same time, we are still addressing the larger question of the implications of our changing concepts of literacy. The remix culture of the World Wide Web, as has the expanding field of intercultural rhetoric, has changed how we value the contributors of new forms of literacy and the nature of their contributions. Such changes call for new rules and laws that both support and

constrain the creation of these artifacts. The research presented in this volume has addressed these challenges this new world of intercultural interactions has raised, both regarding the research of the linguistic artifacts created inside and outside the university and the cultural contexts in which these artifacts are created. Thus, intercultural rhetoric has positioned itself not simply for a discussion of questions about L2 writing but as a framework for discussing the larger issues that have been raised by the evolution of the relationship between literacy and culture.

References

- Bloch, J. (2007). *Technology in the second language composition classroom*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bloch, J. (2008). Plagiarism in a contrastive rhetoric context: How is it evolving? In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout, & W. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 257–274). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bloch, J. (2012). *Plagiarism, intellectual property and the teaching of L2 writing*. Bristol, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.
- Carr, N. (2010). *The shallows: What the internet is doing to our brains*. New York: Norton.
- Connor, U. (1998). How like you our fish? Accommodation in international business communication. In M. Hewings & C. Nickerson (Eds.), *Business English: Research into practice* (pp. 71–99). Harlow, U.K.: Longman.
- Gleick, J. (2011). *The information: A history, a theory, a flood*. New York: Pantheon.
- Heath, S.B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text*, 3, 183–195.
- Hull, G.A., & Nelson, M.E. (2005). Locating the semiotic power of multimodality. *Written Communication*, 22, 224–261.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning: A Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16, 1–20.
- Kuhn, T.S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lessing, L. (1999). *Code and other laws of cyberspace*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lillis, T., & Curry, M.J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.

Lowie, R. (1920). *Primitive society*. New York: Boni & Liveright.

Matsuda, P.K., & Atkinson, D. (2008). A conversation on contrastive rhetoric: Dwight Atkinson and Paul Matsuda talk about issues, conceptualizations, and the future of contrastive rhetoric. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout, & W. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 277–298). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 60–92.