10-2018

US Researched Writing as the Other Culture for ESL Student Writers

Seiko Hayashi

US Researched Writing as the Other Culture for ESL Student Writers

by

Seiko Hayashi

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

St. Cloud State University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

in Rhetoric and Writing

October, 2018

Thesis Committee:
Carol Mohrbacher, Chairperson
Tim Fountaine
James Heiman

Abstract

In US researched writing contexts, ESL student writers often experience cultural differences and draw a negative conclusion or form a stereotype about it. As a result, they tend to enhance a feeling of disconnectedness to the new academic writing culture. To explore the alternative practice for ESL student writers to create a sense of connection to it, this qualitative study collected interview data from four American writing tutors regarding what they are feeling, thinking and doing when working on researched writing. This study described what it is that American student writers experience when working on researched writing and created hermeneutic cross-cultural conversations to find commonality beneath the different writing cultures. Analysis of this study revealed that American students learn, deepen, and show new knowledge in the process of researched writing. Also, hermeneutic cross-cultural conversations suggested that ESL students' awareness of their cultural expectations might help them see US researched writing correctly and create a sense of connection to it.

Table of Contents

Chapter Page

Chapter 1: Introduction

Before coming to the US, I attended an English school for academic purposes in Japan. The curriculum at the English school was designed for students who aim to go to universities in the US, and teachers were all American. I learned five paragraph essays for the first time as academic writing at the school. Although the new writing system in English was challenging, I enjoyed exploring myself. I was always excited when finding new perspectives through writing essays, which I had not experienced. Academic writing in English was mysterious but attracted me. My positive writing experiences in Japan led me to become interested in further understanding academic writing and led me to come to the US university.

One day in my first semester in the US, I, then an Intensive English Center (IEC) student, was talking about a research paper assignment with my tutor in the writing center of Saint Cloud State University (SCSU). I was struggling with understanding how to write a research paper. I asked my tutor, “Why do I need to read lots of articles to write my paper?” He replied, “I think you came to the university to learn what you’re interested in, and now you are trying to write about the topic you want to know. And yet, don’t you want to know about your topic more?” Then I said, “Of course I want to know, but why do I need to use others’ ideas to write my paper?”

I explained to him about my writing experiences at the English school in Japan. I also explained that I was not required to use any outside readings when writing five-paragraph essays. He patiently listened to my poor English and said, “You mean, you wrote five paragraph essays in Japan by using only your previous knowledges and experiences?” His clear paraphrase of my writing experiences helped me understand exactly what I was doing at

the English school in Japan, and I realized that the research papers seemed to be different writing genre from what I learned in Japan. However, I could not understand at all what I was supposed to do with a research paper and what a research paper should look like during the tutoring session.

After the tutorial session, I felt that I stumbled at the start in the US because I came from Japan with the desire to understand academic writing. I tried to believe positively that I would be able to understand researched writing gradually as I learn in the writing center. Also, I convinced myself that it was just because I did not learn how to write research papers in Japan. At that point, the journey to understand the US researched writing world had begun. The center of the struggle of the journey has been a prolonged sense of disconnection to US researched writing, and the journey has lasted five years and still not completely ended. That is, for the past five years I have been frustrated because I do not exactly know what I am doing when working on researched writing. Also, I have always felt anxious because I might have missed something valuable that I must have learned through US researched writing.

The purpose of this research study is to investigate US researched writing that seems to be common knowledge Americans culturally share and to create a hermeneutic cross-cultural conversation to better understand the US researched writing. To achieve the goals, I collected interview data from American writing tutors of the SCSU writing center. Then, I described their researched writing experiences as manifestation of their culturally shared practice. In later discussion, I reflected on expectations in my culture regarding the themes from American writing tutors' practices, and I also considered US social and cultural contexts that might affect their researched writing practices.

Although the primary motivation of this research is to better understand US researched writing and to create a sense of connection to it for my sake, I hope this study will help writing teachers who work with ESL students who are suffering from a sense of disconnection to US researched writing.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Finishing the IEC program, I started to look for any clues regarding researched writing in the course texts and collected any information that would become part of my understanding of US researched writing. Although all the texts I have read through my course programs have helped me continue the journey to understand US researched writing, I explore, in this chapter, three categories of literature that have shaped this research project. I begin with the literature that discusses writing in US universities and its nature. In the second section, I explore the literature that describes ESL students' written work and their struggles. I then move on to consider the literature discussing how to find commonality beneath the differences to develop successful cross-cultural relationships. At the end of this chapter, I establish research questions that guided this research study.

Nature of Writing in US Universities

The best place to begin my exploration of the literature to establish a framework for this research is with a discussion about the nature of writing in US universities. As an ESL student writer, one of the questions regarding writing in US universities is, "Why are students are required to write so much for class?" In Japan, most liberal arts students 10are not so often required to write for class, and most of the universities do not have the writing center. (Only several universities have the writing center.) Conversely, in the US, I have been writing response papers every week and research papers as a course paper for most of the classes, and many students bring writing assignments to the writing center throughout a year. That is, it seems to me that writing in US universities is a theme that American professors and students

culturally share and make sense. In this first section, I examine expectations and assumptions regarding writing in US universities.

Writer-reader relationship. One of the encompassing questions regarding US university writing is, "What is college-level writing?" While Muriel Harris confesses that she has "a desire to evade answering" this question, she argues that audience awareness is significant for college-level writing. Harris points out that audience awareness is one of the abilities college students need to acquire and present. Harris states that "college-level writing should demonstrate the writer's ability to write effectively to his or her particular audience" (121-123). That is, American university students are expected to understand who the intended audience is and to expand the concept of audience for successful written communication.

Harris explains that one of the problems caused by lack of audience awareness is incompletely informative products to the audience. When students do not attend to their audience and audience needs, their written products are "highly elliptical [or] condensed" and filled with words "from the writer's mind as he or she thinks about it" (126-129). In other words, students' papers lack both universally shared terms and logical flow, which are absolutely needed for effective communication with the audience. Another problem caused by lack of audience awareness is that students might miss an opportunity to use the richness of audience during the writing process. Harris points out that students "have to expand the concept of audience or reader to include the fictionalized aspect as well" (130) to create better products.

Lisa Gadamer and Andrea Lunsford discuss the complexity of the relationship between writers and readers in the composing process. Ede and Lunsford state that "the term

audience refers not just to the intended, actual, or eventual readers of a discourse, but to all those whose image, ideas, or actions influence a writer during the process of composition" (168). That is, college-level writing expects students to expand the concept and function of the audience and to make full use of them throughout of the writing process. The role of the audience is not just to read the product, so students do not have to wait to communicate with them until the product is ready to be read.

In her article, Linda Flower argues the importance of transforming the structure and style of a written text by using the significant concept, writer-based prose and reader-based prose. Flower points out that "effective writers do not simply express thought but transform it in certain complex but describable ways for the needs of a reader" (19). In other words, good writers always try to "take into account the reader's purpose in reading" (37). However, university students often fail to create such "complex but describable" written products. Instead, their written products tend to be "a narrative of their own discovery process" (27).

Flower explains writer-based prose is "primarily a [verbal] record or expression of the writer's flow of thought," which is "written by a writer to himself and for himself" (19). Flower also explains that "the writers' organizing principle is dictated by their information, not by their intention" (25). In other words, writer-based prose focuses on what writers know about the topic rather than what readers need to know about the topic. While stating that "writer-based prose seems to come naturally to most of us from time to time" (34) and "the most natural way to write" (27), Flower points out that writer-based prose is "a major cause of that notorious breakdown of communication between writer and reader" (34).

Flower defines reader-based prose as an appropriate structure for the readers. Flower explains that reader-based prose "creates a shared language and shared context between writer and reader" for “a deliberate attempt to communicate something to a reader” (20). In addition, Flower points out that reader-based prose meets academic audience’s expectations. Flower states that “readers generally expect writers to produce complex concepts—to collect data and details under larger guiding ideas and place those ideas in an integrated network” (27). That is, university students need to transform “the natural but private expressions of writer-based thought into a structure and style adapted to a reader” (20). In other words, students are expected to move beyond writing for themselves to communicate with their academic readers intentionally.

Reader-author (text) relationship. In his article, Patrick Sullivan argues the importance of integrating others’ thoughts into students’ reading, thinking, and writing process. Sullivan states that “college-level writing could only be the direct result of good reading and thinking” (16). Sullivan claims that, while demonstrating organizing and correct grammar use is essential for college-level writing, students should “write in response to an article, essay, or reading selection” (16) and should demonstrate “the ability to integrate some of the material from the reading skillfully” (17). In other words, students are expected to go beyond comprehending college-level reading materials and responding to them with grammatically correct sentences. Rather, they are expected to show how well they interacted with others’ knowledge during reading and thinking by integrating them into their writing skillfully.

Sullivan explains that college-level writing requires students to show the ability to construct their ideas through building on others' thoughts with “a willingness to evaluate ideas and issues carefully” (17). Sullivan’s emphasis on “the ability to discuss and evaluate abstract ideas is, for me, the single most important variable in considering whether a student is capable of doing college level work” (16). In other words, college writing expects students to use writing as an opportunity to construct their ideas through the careful interaction with realities, such as others’ thoughts and issues around them, for the purpose of academic growth.

Ronald Lunsford argues that one of the right attitudes students should bring into college writing settings is openness. Lunsford states that “Open attitude…permits [students] to learn from [their] own writing. We see that kind of learning most powerfully in a conversation that [they have], in a sense, with [themselves]” (187). In other words, openness allows students to have a dialogue with themselves in an honest, frank manner about a text they are interacting with. Through the open, direct dialogue with themselves, students know what they understand or not about a text and ideas and thought emerge from the text.

More important, Lunsford points out that openness allows students to have a dialogue with authors in a fair, curious manner. Lunsford explains that “when a writer brings this attitude to his or her own thinking and writing, it is a relatively logical step to bring that attitude to the writing and thinking of others.” Lunsford also explains that students’ thinking of others develops into “questioning attitude to the authorities” (187). In other words, openness allows students to be accessible to different thoughts and encourages students to carefully negotiate with the differences that authorities represent. In fact, students expand

their current knowledge by integrating others' knowledge, and the process of writing with openness makes it possible for students to expose to and interact with others' different thoughts in a meaningful manner.

The above suggests that US university writing has expectations and assumptions that students' writing activities never exist alone, but instead students should always communicate with the audience and others' knowledge in the process of writing. In other words, student writers are expected to be always aware of the needs of the audience and negotiate with existing knowledge to integrate it into their thinking and writing.

ESL Students' Relationship with US Academic Writing

I have been struggling with a sense of disconnection to US researched writing as an ESL student writer. However, I am not the only one who are excluded from understanding the US researched writing and create unacceptable written products. In fact, other ESL students also increase their feelings of disconnection to US researched writing and suffer from emotional conflicts. In the second section, I will explore the literature describing ESL students' written work and their struggles about joining US writing class and understanding US researched writing. Most of the literature incorporates comments by ESL student writers as evidence of their confusion and frustration in the writing contexts. Their comments describe their painful experiences and emotional burdens in US universities and also demonstrate their negative relationships with US researched writing.

Ethnocentrism and resistance. Yufeng Zhang argues the impact of ESL students' previous writing experiences toward their attitudes for writing in the new academic writing contexts in the US. Zhang states that "the prior writing experiences of ESL students can help

them enrich their writing strategies when used appropriately, but on the other hand, those experiences can also conflict with the expectations in new academic contexts" (18). When ESL student writers feel that US researched writing cultures conflict with their writing experiences in their home countries and the literacy assumptions they brought, they might criticize US writing culture and resist the new writing system.

Zhang discusses how the concept of US researched writing can be challenging for ESL writers due to their implicit literacy assumptions and can trigger their ethnocentrism about writing. Zhang cites an essay written by an ESL student from Taiwan and her comments. The Taiwanese student confesses her conflict and struggle to understand the importance of a thesis in the US. She comments, "It sounded ridiculous to me to have a thesis statement and emphasize this thesis in each single paragraph, which seems that writers apparently think their readers are not smart enough to follow what they are trying to express. It didn't make sense to me" (3-4). Her attitude and perspective for writing seems to be strongly affected by her literacy assumptions, which was gained in her home country. Also, she views US researched writing culture critically and judges its value based on her ethnocentrism about writing, which seems to enhance her emotional conflicts in the US.

Helen Fox cites the conversation with Fumi and describes her resistance to a new writing culture, sometimes "with exasperation" (10). Fumi is a Japanese graduate student majoring in Middle Eastern studies, and she recently has received an award for her fluency in Arabic. However, she still cannot adopt herself to the US researched writing culture, and her papers are full of "Japanese manner of thinking and expression" (6). When Fox explains to her about "the necessity of the topic sentence for the western reader" (7), she says

unsmilingly, “Japanese is more vague than English…It’s supposed to be that way. You don’t say what you mean right away. You don’t criticize directly” (8). Fox states about Fumi’s rebellious reaction, “I am struck by the fact that even though she knows that US academic style is different, even though she’s heard about the needs of the western reader, she still needs to let me know that her way of thinking makes sense” (8). Fumi’s resistance is not only the manifestation of her confusion about US researched writing but also her ethnocentrism about writing. She seems to neutralize her emotional conflicts by justifying her way of thinking and writing.

Disappointment and frustration. Helen Fox argues that the communicative style of US researched writing, which is different from the way ESL students communicate with the audience, could prevent ESL students from demonstrating their knowledge to the audience. Although ESL students try to adopt the new writing system by changing their ways of thinking and writing style, it is time-consuming and emotionally difficult. Unfortunately, their challenges could result in low self-esteem, disappointment, and frustration.

Fox discusses how ESL students might lose their self-confidence when their written products cannot communicate with their audience effectively by citing Kamala’s story. Kamala is from Sri Lanka. Although she “[has been speaking] English for more than thirty years and had been accepted into a doctoral program at a major US university” (3), her papers still make her professors awfully confused. Professors sometimes kindly show her "where she was leaving out important information or where the sentences were too long or seemed tangled" (3). However, their feedback never enhanced her writing improvement but rather continue to hurt her self-esteem. Kamala says, “I felt like a misfit…very unwanted, [and]

very put down. I thought everybody must be laughing at me. I wondered if people knew that I had a culture of my own" (3). Kamala seems to perceive professors' comments on her writing as a recognition of her ability as a person.

Zhang also argue the relationship between ESL students' self-esteem and their written products. Zhang cites an essay written by an ESL student from the United Arab Emirates, who was a good writer in his home country. He writes, "I thought it would be easy to apply my previous writing skill…although in a different language. Besides…I thought that…I would be able to impress my English teachers in the same way as my elementary Arabic teacher." However, his writing received a poor grade. He writes, "In my first paper, negative comments from my teacher were almost per word…[and] my English teacher couldn't grasp the ideas as my Arabic teacher did." He then explains his disappointment, writing that "despair and regret began to grow within my soul gradually. I believed firmly at some point that my writing ability had vanished forever" (11-12). The US researched writing system, which has the different communicative style, prevented him from communicating with the audience, and this painful writing experience hurt his self-confidence.

As two ESL students experienced in the previous stories, Joseph, from Nigeria, struggles with the different writing system and cannot do well in the US university like he did in his home country. Joseph was accustomed to getting A back home, but in the US, "he has been getting C-pluses, B-minuses on his freshman English papers" (Fox 5). A comment from his TA says, "I appreciate your efforts to introduce your own case of displacement with general remarks on the subject. These preliminaries are quite elaborate and long-winded" (6). His way of expressing himself does not match American audience's expectations. Joseph

reacts emotionally and says, “That is totally out of the question. I am accustomed to be an A student” (5). Fox describes Joseph’s frustration, stating that “he [shook] his head to emphasize his state of mind: fed up, discouraged, disappointed with himself, his instructor, the school, the whole experience” (5). Despite his efforts, US researched writing system does not allow him to demonstrate his knowledge on his paper. This unreasonable writing experience seems to prevent him from establish positive relationships to the new academic writing culture in the US.

As mentioned above, ESL students struggle with adopting to US academic writing culture and suffer from emotional conflicts. Hoping to communicate with their academic audience through written work, they are making efforts to overcome this new writing system. However, their attitude of analyzing US researched writing seems to focus too much on “how US academic writing system is different from ours,” and their difference-focused perspectives result in emotional burden, such as disappointment, frustration, and low self-confidence. In other words, it seems that the more ESL student writers are aware of the differences, the more the feeling of disconnectedness to US researched writing. In short, ESL student writers should take another (or alternative) attitude of seeing US researched writing in order to create a sense of connection to it. It is obvious that they need to find commonalities by learning “how we are the same” rather than focusing too much on “how we are different.”

Approaching Cultural Differences

In my third year in SCSU, I started to work as a writing tutor at the writing center. At that point, I was familiar with the writing center culture as an ESL student writer; however, as an ESL writing tutor, I was filled with self-loathing due to my poor English communication

skills. I felt guilty about working at the writing center and got depressed after each session by my inability. Finally, I became unwell. I wanted to share my difficulty with someone to be feeling better, and I talked about my situation to a few American friends. However, unfortunately, everyone's reaction did not make me feel better, but rather made me disappointed because their reactions were not what I needed. I expected my American friends to just listen to me and to give me emotional support, but instead everyone suggested that I go to the health service or the counseling office. I wondered, "Why don't Americans just listen to me?" "Why did Americans tell me to go there?" Given my cultural way of evaluating help, my American friends' reactions did not make sense to me. I was confused and disappointed. As a result, I stopped to talk about my problems to American friends and tried to solve it by myself.

It just happened that I took a class about ESL culture in the next semester, and I learned how to live more effectively with people from other cultures. In the textbook, Carol Archer states that "it is possible to ask questions in such a way that we emphasize what we have in common with other culture rather than reinforcing the differences" (32). After reading her book, my questions were changed from "Why don't Americans just listen to me?" or "Why did Americans tell me to go there?" to "How do Americans express friendships?" Then, I learned that my expectations—just listen to me and give me emotional support—were based on what friends in Japan do, and I also learned why my American friends suggested that I see a doctor or a counselor. Archer explains that "Americans, in order to show caring for one another, try to help one another maintain their independence" (p. 137). That is, that was the way for them to express friendship and help me as friends. Then, I realized that I

could apply this cross-cultural perspective and concept to my better understanding US researched writing and to create a sense of connection to it. In this section, I explore the literature discussing how to find connection and universality beneath the differences to develop successful cross-cultural relationships.

The power of inference. Sally Stoddard argues the importance of the power of inference in reading. Stoddard claims that "[ESL students] need to understand the importance of what is not stated, as well as what is stated, to better comprehend what they read. When ESL students try to comprehend written English texts, they are often confused because not all the information is presented explicitly for them and also because ESL students do not have "enough cultural knowledge to adequately infer the information which is implicit." Stoddard concludes that ESL students need to improve the ability to infer more "from explicit data given in the text" (123-124).

For consideration of the ESL students' confusion, Stoddard explores relations between a common knowledge and a tacit understanding in written texts. If American authors explicitly present American common knowledge in texts, American readers feel that such information is redundant. Therefore, American authors make such information implicit in written texts for American readers, who use American knowledge frame. That is, authors' efforts of constructing implicit texts to reduce redundancy is for the effects on American audience, who share the common knowledge and use American knowledge frame for reading. Nevertheless, ESL students try to comprehend English texts by using their own knowledge frames that unfortunately do not work, and they have a sense of not knowing and enhance "continual feelings of inadequacy" (124) in US academic contexts.

To eliminate the discomforts, such as a sense of not knowing and inadequacy, Stoddard suggests that ESL students need to "push their thinking beyond the obvious" by using questioning strategies toward implicit information. The strategies include why questions and what do you suppose questions, such as "Why does the writer say our shopping center?" and "What do you suppose a 'runnel' is?" Stoddard claims that "once students fill in the gaps in the information, a whole scenario begins to evolve, and they realize that much of what they thought they 'didn't know' they really do know or are able to interpret logically" (125). In other words, when ESL students try to go beyond explicit information with open mind, it is possible that they find the connection between what they thought they did not know and their knowledge gained in their cultures. In short, the power of inference encourages ESL students to become open to culturally different knowledge frames and helps them find and understand what is culturally unseen but actually they know.

Unity lying below differences. Marine Abdallah-Pretceille argues that cultural educators should lead their students to "a subjacent universality" (478) as a goal of cultural training. Abdallah-Pretceille points out that the existing concept of culture, which embraces knowledge-based approach, is no longer appropriate for understanding current cultural diversity. Instead, Abdallah-Pretceille claims that an alternative concept, "culturality" (479), which is based on the notion that "cultures are increasing changing, fluent, striped and alveolate" (479), allows us to analyze the cultural diversity and find underlying universality to establish a common foundation.

One of the features of the knowledge-based approach is attribution to "factual and descriptive knowledge" (477). Abdallah-Pretceille points out that cultural knowledge learned

through this approach would be superficial and also could not help students fully understand other cultures. Abdallah-Pretceille states that “all teaching of cultures built around a selection of cultural facts risks being merely a takeover, a possession of the other” (477) and also states that “description is diametrically opposed to understanding and, consequently, to the solving of difficulties” (478). In addition, Abdallah-Pretceille points out that this approach provides students with not only superficial understanding of other cultures but also culturally biased knowledge. Abdallah-Pretceille explains that another feature of the knowledge-based approach is “a discourse of categorization” (477), and it would enhance opportunity to categorize other cultures based on their differences. Abdallah-Pretceille states that “any excessive focusing on the characteristics of others leads to…cultural dead-ends, by overemphasizing cultural differences and by enhancing…stereotypes or even prejudices” (476). In other words, having a cultural bias, such as labelling, stereotyping, or prejudices, is a logical consequence of the knowledge-based approach.

Because the knowledge-based approach has only allowed us to see the external appearance of other cultures, we are not sure how to go beyond the perceptible differences. Abdallah-Pretceille points out that “the singularities that are wrongly explained using the term differences are more directly perceptible than universality, which requires analysis” (478). That is, to achieve the subjacent universality, we need an alternative approach that provides an opportunity to analyze differences and recognize others, and Abdallah-Pretceille explains that the intercultural approach, which the notion of cultuality embraces, does a better job. Abdallah-Pretceille states that “intercultural reasoning…emphasizes the process and interactions which unite and define the individuals and the groups in relation to each other”

(476). Abdallah-Pretceille also states that "other people cannot be understood outside a communication process and an exchange" (478). That is, we never understand other cultures on the bases of the superficial perception and the judgmental attitude, but instead we need an analytical conversation and interpretation on the basis of "experience of otherness" (478). In short, we understand other cultures in relation to one another, and such intercultural understanding occurs in the process of analytical approach beyond obvious differences toward underlying universality.

Culture bump theory. Cultural bump theory, originated by Carol Archer, explains how cultural differences affect our perceptions. Archer states that living in another country makes us find not only similarities but also differences between the country and our own. As for the similarities, we feel that the two cultures fit together. However, as for the differences, if they conflict or "bump into each other" (Archer 44), we have emotional conflicts, which would prevent the development of productive cross-cultural relationship. Archer explains that "a culture bump occurs when an individual has expectations of a particular behavior within a particular situation and receives a different behavior when interacting with individuals from another culture" (45). In other words, we (un)consciously have assumptions about the normal or ideal behaviors as a reaction to a specific situation, and these assumptions—the way it is supposed to be—come from our own cultural beliefs. As a result, we perceive unexpected reactions as the disconnection with the other(s).

As a reaction to the unexpected difference, we have two emotional conflicts simultaneously, "a feeling of disconnectedness" and "a sense of not knowing" (Archer & Nickson 408). Archer and Nickson explain that the sense of disconnection comes from "a

lack of awareness of how one's self fits into the worldview of the other or vice versa" (408). However, unwittingly, we focus on only the contrast culture and make effort to figure out the reason for the different behaviors, asking "why they are different from us" (Archer 32). Archer and Nickson point out that such questions provide us "culture-specific information" regarding the other's culture, and the gained information somewhat satisfies the sense of not knowing. However, Archer and Nickson also point out that "the acquisition of culture-specific information…reinforces the deeper discomfort of disconnection simply because the focus remains on difference" (408). In fact, in the process of asking why questions and gaining culture-specific information, the sense of disconnection with the other(s) resulting from the original culture bump is intensified, and at this stage, we obtain "a strong sense of us and them" (408).

According to Archer, one of the strategies we use in an attempt to cope with the discomfort is "mirroring" (56). Archer explains that we rarely discuss our culture bumps with people from the other culture, but instead we discuss with individuals from the same culture background. When shearing an experienced culture bump with people we culturally trust, we examine the incident "from the point of view that 'they/he/she' are different rather than 'I/we' are different" (55) and figure out the attributes of the culture. As a result, we almost always draw a conclusion about the other(s), form a stereotype, and confirm the normality of our cultural assumptions. Archer calls this coping strategy mirroring because we "merely [look] at [our] own reflection in a mirror" (55-56). Unwittingly, we believe that we understand the other culture and need no further investigation of the culture bump; then, we never become "aware of the self in relation to the other" (Archer and Nickson 408). In fact, Archer and

Nickson point out, consequently, that "[our] bias is neither identified nor acknowledged and remains firmly embedded in [our] unconscious, intersubjective world" (409).

Culture bump approach. As mentioned above, we approach the culture difference instinctively and unconsciously, and we also experience a culture bump as a sense of disconnection with the other(s); therefore, we usually view cultural differences "as problems to be solved" (407). However, the conscious analytical approach to a culture bump allows us to view culture differences "as opportunities to learn more about oneself and others" (407) and leads to a common ground. Archer and Nickson explain that "following the culture bump steps leads inexorably through an analysis of culture bump beyond that initial why question to a more complex question that, though not as instinctive as the why question, focuses precisely on commonalities" (411). In other words, the culture bump analysis provides us the methodology to create a sense of connection with the other(s) by asking a more comprehensive question that searches for "what we have in common with the other culture" (Archer 32) in place of the why question that reinforces the difference.

When we notice cultural differences, our noticing and succeeding why questions are "culture-bound" (Archer 32). In other words, questions such as, "Why are they different from us?" or "Why don't they behave in the way people in my culture do?" are "rooted in our own unexamined, cultural assumptions" (32) or ethnocentrism. However, if we consciously analyze the situation, where we notice the difference, we "would discover that it is actually a universal one" (32), such as expressing friendship or greeting one another. Once the underlying universal theme in the situation is specified, our questions move beyond the question of why they are different to the question of how we are the same. For example, the

question would change from “Why don’t they express friendship in the way we do in our culture?” to “Friendship exists in all culture, and how do they express friendship?” Archer calls such a question the “culture-free question” (33) because it is generic and comprehensive and also because, more importantly, it is formed in the process of identification of “us.”

Archer points out that “trying to answer a culture-bound question is like trying to explain colors to a blind person” (33) because any conversations under the culture-bound question are based on the cultural assumption. On the other hand, culture-free conversations “allow us to have a deeper level of understanding of ourselves and others” (32) because we ask and answer culture-free questions on the basis of the universality. Archer provides the culture bump steps as a template for replicating a culture-free conversation. The eight analytical steps are as follows:

1. Pinpoint a culture bump;
2. Describe the behavior of the other;
3. Describe your own behavior;
4. List your feelings during the incident;
5. Define the universal situation out of the specific incident;
6. Describe your expectation in your own culture;
7. Relate that to the universal shared value;
8. Reflect on how the other perceive the value. (Archer 64-67; Archer and Nickson 411-412)

Through these analytical steps, we examine both their and our” behaviors, expectations, assumptions, and beliefs associated with the behaviors. Archer points out that following

"[the] step-by-step process produces a result that is quite distinct from the one we have seen" (64). That is, this analytical process is totally different from a series of instinctive, unconscious reactions to the difference. The culture bump approach requires "self-reflection and mutual exploration of individual and cultural characteristics as well as of universal themes" (Archer and Nickson 411)

Culture bump approach as hermeneutic conversation. Archer and Nickson cite Hans-Georg Gadamer's hermeneutic circle to explain and clarify the culture bump analysis and to discuss its efficacy to the cultural difference. According to Gadamer, "apparent absurdities" should be approached and understood in the cycle of the hermeneutic circle, which is the rule for us to "understand the whole in terms of the detail and the detail in terms of the whole" (258). Gadamer states that "the anticipation of meaning in which the whole is envisaged becomes explicit understanding in that the parts, that are determined by the whole, themselves also determine this whole" (259). That is, full understanding means creating the unity of the meaning of the parts and the whole. Gadamer clarifies the hermeneutic circle, which is the art of understanding, by explaining how ancient languages are learned.

> We learn that we must construe a sentence before we attempt to understand the individual parts of the sentence in their linguistic meaning. But this process of construing is itself already governed by an expectation of meaning that follows from the context of what has gone before. It is also necessary for this expected meaning to be adjusted if the text calls for it. This means, then, that the expectation changes and that the text acquires the unity of a meaning from another expected meaning. Thus,

> the movement of understanding is constantly from the whole to the part and back to the whole. (259)

That is, this comprehensive hermeneutic process (circle) allows us to achieve the state of full understanding by creating the unity of the meaning. In other words, when just looking at the whole or only examining the parts, ignoring the harmony of the whole and the parts, we probably fail to understand the correct meaning.

Archer and Nickson explain the hermeneutic nature of the culture bump steps by making comparison with Gadamer's hermeneutic circle. Archer and Nickson state:

> This hermeneutic circle is inherent in the culture bump analysis. The culture bump begins with a specific incident (detail) and proceeds to extrapolate a universal situation from the culture bump (whole). It then moves on to examine one individual's expectations of a specific culture behavior (detail) and relates that to a worldview norm (whole). The entire process is repeated by questioning an individual from the other culture as to how he or she perceives the universal quality (whole). This secondary process again begins with a whole and moves to a detail or the second individual's expectations of a specific cultural behavior. (413)

Because the hermeneutic process of the culture bump steps requires us to move back and forth between not only details and the whole but also ourselves and others, we examine not only our worldviews but also others' worldviews. That is, the culture bump analysis allows us to better understand the culture difference by creating the unity of ourselves and other(s). In addition, through the culture bump steps, we are required to be aware of our bias and ethnocentrism "by removing them from the …unconscious states in which they normally

exist" (414). Normally, we view bias and ethnocentrism as a barrier to cross-cultural understanding and think that they should be eliminated. However, the culture bump steps encourage us to use them to have a deeper level of understanding of ourselves and other(s) by becoming "aware of the self in relation to the other" (408).

It is crucial that ESL students acquire another attitude of seeing US academic writing culture in place of the difference-focused perspective and create a sense of connection to it. The literature reviewed in this section offered insights that considering underlying universality and acknowledging unconscious cultural assumptions could positively influence the way of approach to cultural differences and perception of them. The literature suggests that, while recognizing differences is easy, finding underlying universality is difficult because it is unseen and requires the ability and skill to notice it. However, once we find the underlying universality, we could use it to have a conversation with the other on the same ground and to know how we fit into the worldviews of the other. In addition, the literature points out that, while everyone has cultural assumptions and ethnocentrism and uses them (un)consciously to evaluate the other, we usually believe that we should eliminate them. However, if we examine them analytically and hermeneutically, they help us better understand ourselves and others. Taken together, finding the underlying universality and acknowledging our own assumptions and biases should be viewed as an essential process to deal with and understand the cultural difference, and the analytical approach with the hermeneutic conversation should be used to create a sense of connection with the other(s).

Research Questions

The purpose of this research study is twofold: (1) to investigate US researched writing, consisting of common knowledge and values that Americans culturally share, and (2) to create a hermeneutic cross-cultural conversation regarding US researched writing to find the underlying universality and acknowledge expectations in my culture. My research questions are as follows:

1. What is it that American student writers experience when working on researched writing? In other words, what are they feeling, thinking, and doing during the researched writing process?
2. What universal situations are discovered from US researched writing practices?
3. What cultural expectations and assumptions in my culture are found within the universal situations?
4. What US social and cultural contexts and beliefs does US researching writing practice reflect?

Chapter 3: Method

I worked in the writing center of SCSU for two years as an ESL writing tutor, and before that I had regularly went there as an ESL student writer for two years, at least twice a week. For me, the writing center has been the place where not only to talk about my papers I bring but also to find any clues to better understand US researched writing. Also, writing tutors are people who not only give me feedback about my papers but also willingly talk with me about anything on writing. More important, one-on-one nondirective tutoring sessions, which are guided by the questioning method, have developed not only my knowledge and skills of US academic writing but also my ability of inquiry. I believe that all my experiences at the writing center prepared me for this study. I admit that the selection of participants and the data collection are strongly affected by my four-year writing center experiences as a both ESL student writer and ESL writing tutor. In the following sections, I describe details of my research method: selection of participants, data collection, and data analysis.

Selection of Participants

I chose four participants who were working as writing tutors in the writing center during the semesters I was gathering data because I believed that writing tutors were the best participants for this research project as I further explain below.

The participants. All four participants had worked as writing tutors for more than two semesters in the writing center. Two of them, Allison and Dan, were graduate students, and the other two, Alice and Emmy, were undergraduate students. All their names are pseudonyms. I described to each of the four writing tutors about this research project, by explaining that I was interested in researched writing experiences of them, and I briefly

explained the method I would use to gather data, interviews. In the next chapter I introduce Allison, Dan, Alice, and Emmy in detail.

Tutors as collaborators. The reason why I chose writing tutors as participants for this research project was not just because they were experienced writers, but rather because they are experienced collaborators for inquiry. In his article, Kenneth Bruffee defines peer tutoring as "a form of collaborative learning" (91) and claims that "peer tutoring provides a social context in which students can experience and practice the kinds of conversation that academics most value" (91). That is, having conversations is essential for the collaborative learning, and the peer relationship makes the conversation for inquiry possible. However, such productive conversations do not automatically occur between any peers.

The writing center philosophy of what writing tutors should and should not in tutoring sessions significantly impacts on writing tutors' ability of conversation. The philosophy requires writing tutors to "be questioning, responding, listening, and re-saying what students tell them" (Geller 299) during a session not only to understand what student writers are trying to say but also to create and maintain the social context. That is, writing tutors learn the nature of conversation through the daily tutoring sessions and improve their conversational abilities day by day. In fact, the trained conversational abilities of my participants, the four writing tutors, expanded our conversational interviews in the right direction and contributed to the collaborative inquiry over the interviews.

Tutors as cultural informants. One of the goals of this study is to create hermeneutic cross-cultural conversation about US researched writing; thus, participants were required to have ability to explain their researched writing experiences from the cultural perspective. The

second reason why I worked with the writing tutors was because writing tutors play a significant role as cultural informants when working with ESL student writers.

Judith Powers argues that ESL writers need different types of assistance from native speakers need because of the different educational, rhetorical, and cultural contexts that ESL writers bring to the writing center. Powers explains that "second-language writer, already handicapped by an unfamiliar rhetoric, are likely to be writing to an unfamiliar audience as well. Part of what they need from us is knowledge of what that unknown audience will expect, need, and find convincing" (41). In other words, when working with ESL student writers, writing tutors are "cultural/rhetorical informants" (42). Writing tutors need to inform ESL writers directly "what their writing should look like" and "what their audience will expect in terms of presentation, evidence, [and] shape" (45).

Powers points out that "ESL writers are asking us to become audience for their work in a broader way than native speakers are; they view us cultural informants about American academic expectations" (41). In fact, I expected my participants, the four writing tutors, to tell their researched writing experiences as cultural activities, in a direct manner, over the interview sessions, and they actually did.

Data Collection

My hope and believe that examining American student writers' experiences when working on researched writing would provide an opportunity to create hermeneutic cross-cultural conversation motivated me to propose qualitative interview research.

Interviews. I collected and recorded data from each of the four writing tutors through conversational interviews because such semi-structured interviews allowed me freedom to

probe for more information by asking immediate follow-up questions. Follow-up questions led the participants to provide detailed explanation about their researched writing experiences and also led them to elaborate on what they might have thought I understood. Nation states that “an advantage of interviews is that they allow the researcher to explore an aspect of knowledge in depth by giving the [participant] repeated opportunities to answer if necessary with some guidance” (552). That is, semi-structured conversational interviews encouraged the four writing tutors to reflect on and reveal more of their researched writing experiences in an analytical manner.

I had interview sessions at the writing center by making an appointment with each writing tutor as a client during their working hours. I made an appointment with each writing tutor several times, and each interview was approximately forty-five minutes to an hour. One of the advantages of this selection was that the participants did not have to spend their private time for the interviews. However, more advantage of having interviews at the writing center was that the setting of the writing center and their familiarities with the site motivated them to enhance conversational interviews. Although interviews were not tutoring sessions, the four writing tutors must have felt having such collaborative conversations was natural in the writing center.

Since my goal was to collect data of the actual researched writing experience of American student writers, I asked the four participants to reflect and talk about one specific research paper they wrote for their classes. It was beneficial for them to focus on one specific paper because the participants could avoid talking about what they might believe they were doing, but they actually were not, and they could also avoid talking about the general writing

process. In addition, I asked the four participants to send their research papers to me via e-mail prior to the first interview so that I could read and prepare for productive interview sessions.

My familiarity with the collaborative interaction. I believe that my familiarity with the work of the writing center helped me promote the conversational interviews. Since I almost internalized the way of inquiring and constructing from the collaborative conversation through the four-year writing center experience, I could encourage the four participants to present their researched writing experiences fairly and accurately. For example, I always shared my interpretation and provided them opportunities to fairly correct my misunderstanding and to adjust differences between my interpretations and their actual experiences. Such collaborative negotiation process motivated them to reflect on their experiences and talk about them more accurately.

My contribution as an ESL student writer. In addition to the four-year writing center experience, my ESL backgrounds contributed to this qualitative interview research. Although writing tutors inform ESL student writers directly what American audience will expect in writing as “cultural/rhetorical informants” (Powers 42), they are not always aware of their attitudes toward writing and their writing behaviors. Hall states that “Culture hides much more than it reveals, and strangely enough what it hides, it hides most effectively from its own participants" (53). In other words, for the four American participants, cultural knowledge of researched writing is obvious and natural enough, so it might be difficult for them to be always conscious of such a common knowledge and to tell explicitly. On the other hand, I did not have enough cultural knowledge of US researched writing to understand the

information that was implicit, so I was confused and asked them to explain explicitly by using follow-up questions. Also, even when they explained explicitly, my different cultural assumptions as an ESL student made me sensitive to the information that was different, or I did not know, so I asked them to describe more details. In short, my lack of cultural knowledge and sensitiveness as an ESL student motivated me to interact with the four American participants more and promoted opportunity for them to verbalize their cultural common knowledge of researched writing.

Data Analysis

I analyzed the data that I collected from the four writing tutors in order to examine American students' experiences of researched writing. Firstly, I transcribed all the conversational interviews, and then I coded to make sense of them by using categories that I started creating when I was collecting the data, such as reader, researcher, and writer. Even though interview data was collected from each participant individually, I analyzed the data thematically as shared experience of them, not as case studies of each writing tutor.

Chapter 4: Results

Each of the four writing tutors had different history and educational background. That is, each of them had different researched writing experience, preference, and perspective. However, my attempt in this chapter is not to present their writing experiences as case studies of individual writing tutor. Rather, I organize and present the interviews in a way that describes the researched writing experience shared by them, the group of American students who study and write in the US university. In the following sections, firstly I introduce the four writing tutors with brief description of their backgrounds and their papers shared with me for this research. Then, I describe what it is that American student writers experience when working on researched writing.

The Four Writing Tutors

Allison. Allison had almost completed her Master of Science in Clinical Mental Health Counseling at SCSU, and she was in her last semester of the graduate program. While working on her masters, she had been working as a graduate writing consultant at the writing center for four semesters, since the fall of 2015.

I met Allison for the first time at the writing center orientation for graduate writing consultants in the summer of 2015. She always spoke to me in a friendly manner with her beautiful smile, and I started to chat with her little by little when we had the same working hours. She was curious about everything, so when she heard I was from Japan, she showed interest in Japanese culture and Japanese. Therefore, when I talked about my theses project, US researched writing, she showed interest as usual in my topic saying that, “You research

researching!" and when I asked her for help with interview sessions with me, she willingly accepted my request saying, "Sounds interesting!"

For our sessions, Allison shared her nine-page research paper with me, which was about how LGBTQ+ individuals view religion and spirituality. She explained that the purpose of the paper was to gain a better understanding about the issue and that through the project she could understand the clinical implications of these perspectives in her future work as a counselor.

Dan. Dan was a graduate student majoring in English Studies at SCSU, and he was in his last semester of the graduate program. He was focusing on creative writing and working on a young adult novel for his culminating project. As a writing consultant, Dan had been working in the writing center since the fall of 2014 (he was an undergraduate then), and this was his seventh semester working at the writing center through his graduate assistantship.

I met Dan for the first time in ENGL 354: Writing Center Theory and Practice. Since I had just finished the IEC program at that time, I was filled with anxiety about starting the college program. On the first day of the class, I was so nervous. Although there were many seats available when I entered the classroom, I sat at the table in a corner quietly, and Dan was sitting at the same table quietly too. Since he started working at the writing center, Dan had been one of my regular tutors, and he always kindly helped with any assignments and shared his insights with me. Thus, when I asked him for help with this research and to participate in several interview sessions, he willingly accepted my request.

Dan's paper was a seventeen-page informational research paper, and the topic was guardianships and wards, which was one aspect of nineteenth-century British culture. He

explained that he used this paper as an opportunity not only to learn more about nineteenth-century British culture and literature but also to use this research to help the historical accuracy of his future fiction novel.

Alice. Alice was an undergraduate student double majoring in English Rhetoric and Philosophy at SCSU, and she was in her last semester of the undergraduate program. She had been working as a writing tutor since 2010, beginning at Saint Cloud Technical & Community College (SCTCC), and she had been working at the writing center at SCSU since 2014.

Alice is an active person. She hosted a conversation circle for international student, and I jointed the circle three years ago. Although I still feel nervous when talking with native speakers, Alice was one of my handful American friends I was able to talk without being too nervous.

The paper Alice shared for this research was her thirteen-page research paper, which was about Sartre's bad faith. She explained that she often incorporated both of her majors, Rhetoric and Philosophy, and this research paper was no exception. In this paper, she applied her knowledge about rhetoric to better understand philosophical texts and ideas

Emmy. Emmy was an undergraduate student double majoring in English Rhetoric and Women's Studies at SCSU. She was in her last semester of the undergraduate program, and she planned to pursue a doctorate in English, focusing on Feminist Theory. She had been a writing consultant since 2014 and worked at both SCTCC and SCSU's writing centers.

Emmy is an energetic, intelligent woman, and she always set the mood of our writing center with various intellectual topics along with animated facial expressions, and her talks

was clear and easy to understand. When I heard she was writing her undergraduate thesis, I was curious to know how she explained her researching and writing process, so I asked her to participate in my research. She was kind enough to accept my request and allowed me to interview her about her researched writing attitudes and practices.

Emmy shared her seventeen-page research paper. She explained that this paper was born of her own frustration and journey through sexual assault, and this paper started as an undergraduate class project and grew into her undergraduate thesis. She also explained that her research passion was qualitative interview data gathering on issues that impact women and children, and this research paper was no exception.

The Four Writing Tutors' Researched Writing Experiences

Researchers and source texts. Since US researched writing requires student writers the inquiry of a topic of choice, the four writing tutors took a critical, independent stance when reading sources. During interacting sources, the writing tutors were not simply taking in information from the texts passively, but instead they actively explore sources to look for something connected with the research topic, which would help and guide their better understanding. Their selective reactions to only information that they were looking for seemed to be supported by their experiences and skills of purposeful reading for research.

I'm reading sources like a researcher. In an interview, Dan and I were talking about the difference between reading source texts as a reader and as a researcher. He referred to the difference of the goals in reading and researching. Dan said, "Your goals in reading are not the same with your goals in researching." To him, the goals in reading were to understand the text and what the author was saying. Dan explained, "Generally when I'm reading things, I

don't have a specific goal in mind other than understanding something…It's like I want to understand just the text and what the author is saying." Dan continued, "So, you're not looking for anything necessarily." On the other hand, the goals in reading as a researcher, to him, were to figure out something and understand something better. Dan said, "Whereas reading as a researcher, then I would be reading deeper, I would be reading for understanding but also will be thinking about if there are specific aspects of the text or particular aspects of the text that I want to analyze deeper." He continued, "I think with researching, you're reading sources, like articles, journals and books with a goal in mind, something you want to figure out."

Also, in another interview, Dan explained his attitude toward reading as a researcher by using "research questions" instead of "a goal in mind." He said, "If I don't have research questions, I don't really know what to look for in finding articles like, "This article will be helpful, this article will be helpful, this article will be helpful." I could be reading so much and not knowing what to do with that." What became clear to me through interview sessions with Dan was that intentional deeper reading "with a goal in mind"—sometimes which is a research question—seemed to be the key feature of reading as a researcher.

So, it's kind of a different dynamic that happens. Another day, Alice and I were also talking about the difference between reading and researching sources. Alice said, "As a reader, it's just me and the author kind of interacting, like they're telling me something and I'm listening. And then as a researcher, I'm not just listening anymore, I'm starting to think critically about it." Alice was feeling that, as a reader, she was just passively absorbing knowledge that the author transmitted. However, once she took a researcher role, she started

critically thinking and arguing against what the author was saying. Alice said, "when I'm researching, there's back and forth. Maybe they are not responding cause it's a written text, but I'll argue with some research on the topic I'm talking about or looking into." She continued and explained by using an analogy from classroom situation.

> So, I kind of think of it as a reader…when you sit in a classroom and the teacher lectures for an hour and there's really no interaction, there are not a lot of questions that are happening or discussion….But when I'm a researcher, it's kind of like being in a classroom that's discussion based, where they may lecture a little bit and I'm like, "Oh, but that doesn't make sense," or "What do you mean?" or "I don't agree with you," So it's kind of a different dynamic that happens.

Thus, Alice felt her reader's role kept her listening to the author; whereas, her researcher's role let her to become more involved in a dynamic discussion with the author, in which her critical thinking and discussion occurred.

Oh, that's going to be important! Emmy was a women's studies major. She said she preferred to do qualitative research and her major data source was interviews from women. Emmy said, "I was doing interviews, and it was important for me to think about the interviews in a qualitative way, I had to like, read through the interviews to find connections. I had to search for those." She explained that there was the big difference between reading and researching the source. When reading, she was "just taking in information to learn something," while, when researching, she was "following another step"—finding the connection to the topic. Emmy said, "When I'm researching, I'm also learning, but I'm

specifically looking for proof of my thesis or of my goal.…I'm looking for a connection to my topic more than just taking in information in a passive way."

Interestingly, she said that to come up sort of connections, when interacting with interview data, was not difficult; rather, it was a natural activity. She explained, "When I read something that means a lot to me, it's almost like instinctive at this point…like there's some kind of a click in my head that says, 'Oh, that's going to be important.'" She continued, "That's when I highlight it," and later on she read again to figure out how that part connected to her topic carefully. Emmy described how regularly such moments became to occur to her when reading sources:

> "Now that I'm a senior.…As a freshman, I didn't always get that. But it takes a lot of critical thinking to be able to, and a lot of self-knowledge to be able to look at something and then pick something out and be like, "Oh that is going to be important" as I read it…it's a learned skill to trust yourself enough to know when something is important."

For Emmy, reading source texts as a researcher seemed to be strongly supported by her accumulated research experiences and knowledge of the topic. The more she read sources as a researcher, the more she developed her knowledge and familiarity to the topic, the more confident she found the connections instinctively when interacting with source texts.

I'll drive until i see everything that i want to see. Allison and I were in the library location, which is another location of our writing center. I was describing the tutoring session with a Chinese ESL student writer on the previous day. Although I could not find apparent reason, it seemed to me that his topic was not developed well in his paper. So, I wanted to

know how Allison would feel and explain about his paper. Allison said, “Well, it’s like his paper he’s looking for a specific answer,” she continued, “He’s asking a ‘why’ question so he wants to know what that is. Like with the paper that I sent you, I’m not looking to answer a specific question, I’m just looking to understand the experience of that population (LGBTQ+ individuals).” Allison said that, when exploring source texts, she would not look for a specific answer nor have a specific goal in advance because her goal of researched writing was to better understand the topic. Then, Allison described her attitude towards reading research done by others, as much as she could to understand her topic, by using an analogy from a road trip.

> I guess when I research, I try not to have a map all planned out before hand, like I just want to see what is actually out there. Have you ever gone on a road trip? So, it sounds like…if he had a map of exactly where he wanted to go before he left on the road trip. I would be someone who would start driving and see what happens. Like I’m not going to say, “I want to get here.” I just want to say, “I’ll drive until I see everything that I want to see.” I mean I might be like, “Okay, I’m just going to drive North.” So, I kind of have a direction but I don’t have a destination picked out.

Allison’s analogy sounded to me that, during her drive north, which was her research topic, she would write down on the map description of what she saw and found regarding the topic, such as where she found it, what it looked like, how she felt about it, and what she found there. So, she seemed to view reading the source for researching as an opportunity to create her own “informed map” about the topic, which would tell her the whole picture with detailed information.

Researchers and data analysis. For the four writing tutors, analyzing information sources seemed to be a process of constructing a new knowledge. During processing multiple sources, while the writing tutors were defining the value of each information, they were also constructing a new meaning by finding and making connections between each knowledge. They seemed to feel that their analysis developed in a gradual, recursive manner, and a new knowledge, which was constructed through the analysis, had a layer structure.

You have to be that every day. That day, Emmy and I were talking about the goal for research in the library location. Emmy asked me, "Have you ever heard of intersectionality?" She often shared with me what she learned in her class, Women's Studies and Rhetoric Studies, and she was good at using such knowledge to explain about her researched writing experiences. Emmy started to explain. "Intersectionality is taking a look at the different ways that a person's life intersects into like them. She drew four radiating lines on my notebook and said, "For instance if I could use you, on this you're a woman, and on this line, you are a Japanese woman…and then this could be some other part. I don't know about your family growing up but let's say you were middle class growing up, right?" She wrote, along each radiating line, woman, Japanese, and middle class. Emmy continued to explain by using the radiating lines.

> So, each day you can't just choose one of these things. You can't say, "Oh, today I'm just going to be Japanese." Every day, you're a Japanese woman who's from the middle class…this would be your point of who you are. You don't get to choose who you are…You have to be that every day, kind of thing.

For Emmy, it seemed that research was a process of finding concepts of the topic, building the connection of them, and creating systematic knowledge of the topic. Emmy said, “So, when I think about research, I think about it that way…like it can’t just be one thing. It has to be many things.” That is, Emmy seemed to think that, when researching something, she should be aware that “it’s never just one thing” but it’s more complex.

Finding my truth connected to trusting myself. In another interview session, again, Emmy and I were talking about the goal for research. Emmy said that finding her “truth” about the topic through the process of research usually resulted in “trusting” herself. She explained that the knowledge created through the process of analysis should be schematic, and the schematic knowledge could connect to trusting yourself. Therefore, “the idea of expanding the schematic knowledge could be something that would be really important.” Emmy explained that the structure of schematic knowledge would allow students to add another layer to their knowledge; thus, their understanding could become “bigger and bigger every time they [looked] at it.” Eventually, at some point, students would say, “I know this topic.” Emmy seemed to believe that learning “the process of researching and the process of trusting yourself and building on your actual knowledge of how things work” were strongly connected and these were the goal for research.

I think discovery is making the light triangle dark. We had the first snow that day. Allison drew two snowflakes on my notebook and wrote down, next to them, “1st Snow Day!” We started a conversational interview session as usual, and I asked Allison to talk about what she was doing when interacting with source data she collected. Allison said, “As far as the research goes, I have a vague idea of what the topic looks like. So maybe I think the

topic is kind of like a faint shape, it's not definite yet." She drew a large triangle on my notebook and explained, "This is kind of the vague idea of what I think what the topic is, my perception, my initial idea…And then by the time a research, I might fill in so that's a little bit of what my article might say." Then, Allison drew a small rectangle over the triangle, which are overlapped partly, and said, "this is the full source." Then, she blacked out the overlapped area and said, "and some of it is really relevant to my topic and it kind of fills in the idea." She drew a few more rectangles over the triangle. Some area of them were out of the triangle, and she said, "Some of it, there may by some extras. Like this is extra I don't really need. I found that this doesn't really relate to what I was looking but a lot of it does." Then, she blacked out all the overlapped areas inside the triangle, which were relevant to her topic, and said, "I want to fill in the shape." Allison continued:

> I think discovery is making the light triangle, making dark. So, like before the triangles are light, it's not filled in yet…And then through researching it becomes dark…It's like more clear, more defined, the image is sharper, focused. Like this is my triangle before. As I learn more, I get to see the picture.

Allison's original light triangle—a vague idea of what the topic looks like—was gradually filled in by the information from the articles she read and analyzed, and her initial triangle gradually became light to dark. Allison explained that analyzing the collected information was the kind of process of creating a "new meaning, new understanding, new knowledge, or new awareness." That is, Allison was making a proactive decision to shape her own knowledge of the topic by understanding the value of each information from the sources,

defining those pieces of information as they link with each other, and properly selecting and using various information for the knowledge formation.

The discovery is also what's missing. In the process of making the light triangle dark, by filling in the relevant information on the topic and blacking out the overlapped area, Alisson was also, at the same time, finding what was missing in there. She said, "[I'm] processing multiple pieces of information to see how they're related, how they overlap but also where the gaps are," pointing the areas that were not blacked out. Alisson continued,

> I'm researching and realizing there's some gaps, people haven't researched, we just don't know about that. These are what I don't know, the research doesn't know, that people just haven't answered those questions yet. The discovery is also what's missing. Like I discover what's not there…Cause before the researching, I didn't know what was missing either, right? So, through the researching I discover what's missing.

From her experiences of researched writing, Allison seemed to know that her triangle (her imaginary shape of the topic) would not be perfectly filled in through researching and analyzing. In other words, she seemed never to be expecting the complete dark triangle during analyzing source data she collected, but rather she seemed to be expecting the one with several layers of black and white.

Because i didn't have prior knowledge of what it's about. While background knowledge about the topic allowed the writing tutors to easily or naturally come up with some points they wanted to explore, a new, unknown topic required them to have different steps of research to feel familiar with it. Dan said, "I generally have an idea of the main

points of my paper…[but] for this paper, it's a little different because I didn't have prior knowledge of what it's about. I didn't know the legal system of the 19th century England and how it related and dealt with words." It was obvious that he needed several scholars' help to create a basic knowledge of the topic, on which he could build on additional reading of articles and text. Dan explained:

> It was just building my knowledge, constructing the framework. Like a base. Think of it like a building. My research would be the base level. So, once I understand things generally and good enough, I can read more and build on the levels. So, I would say for this paper it was just reading and building upon that knowledge.

Dan seemed to believe that for the productive research it was necessary to feel confident with the basic knowledge of the topic, which meant having a solid foundation would let him explore between concepts in the topic and build connections of them later on. That is, researching came through doing things one small step at a time even for an experienced American student writer.

What happens is i come up with a more complete understanding. That day, Alice and I were talking about getting to "a new understanding of the topic" as the goal of researched writing, and I asked her how to define it. Alice started to explain, "So, a new understanding would be like…a new way to look at [the topic]. Or just a different way to understand it too, not necessarily new but different than what I first thought…or it might be…a deeper understanding of what I'm looking at." Alice also explained that her new understanding of the topic developed as she was analyzing and re-reading source texts. Alice said:

> So, at first, I read through Sartre's piece being nothing. I thought I understood what he meant by the ideal self—the true self. And then I started writing on it, and then I started making connections on the other sources and I talked with my professor and I found that I was misunderstanding a lot of it. I didn't have a good of a grasp on it than I thought I did. So I had to go back to my sources…And then I eventually started to get it better, right? And I could actually start to explain it and understand it in a different way.

Alice added that she repeated this process—analyzing, fixing, and re-shaping her understanding—over and over until she came up with a more complete understanding of the topic. That is, the process of getting to a new understanding was not simple, but rather it seemed to be gradual and recursive.

Researchers and writers and papers. At the writing stage, the four writing tutors seemed to go back and forth between the role of a researcher and a writer. The four tutors had continued to be researchers. They were analyzing and synthesizing to deepen their understanding of the topic. At the same time, as writers, they were organizing and presenting their findings and understandings in the form and structure they made sense and their audience would make sense. Although working from both roles (researcher and writer), the four writing tutors seemed to try to harmonize the two roles to generate an effective written product.

I'm combining the pieces to make a whole picture. Allison explained that, when writing her paper, she was focusing on synthesizing rather than analyzing. Allison said, "Researching is probably more of analyzing than synthesizing. Writing a research paper

would be synthesizing but probably not much of the analyzing anymore…I have done the analysis of the articles by the time I write." In other words, it seemed that analyzing encouraged Allison to interact with someone else's knowledge and look at each piece of information in order to figure out what it meant and see how each piece overlapped one another. On the other hand, writing enabled her to focus on her knowledge, which was generated through her analysis, by allowing her to evaluate each piece of her understanding and to combine them "to make a whole picture" of the topic as her new knowledge.

I try to ignore my readers until I'm toward the end. Alice said that, while understanding of the topic developed in the process of analysis, a deeper understanding often happened when she was writing about it on her paper. Alice said, "I find a lot of time, I don't fully understand the research that I'm about to write until I'm already writing about it. So, a lot of the understanding for me comes in when I'm writing." Also, Alice said that her aha! moments came a lot from writing. She explained that in the writing stage she often felt like, "That's what this means!" or "This is how this is connected to this other thing!" and such "little epiphanies" deepened her understanding of the topic. In other words, although all her work before the writing stage helped her to approach the topic, in a real sense Alice seemed to make more sense about the topic when she started to incorporate sources and her understandings into her paper and as she was doing that. In addition, Alice explained that, in order to maximize the use of her aha! moments during writing, she intentionally pushed out her inner critic—such as "Oh, that's a terrible sentence!"—especially in the early stage of her writing. Alice said,

> I try to ignore my readers until I'm toward the end, because if I pay too much attention to them, I'm never going to write the paper because I'm just constantly going to be like, "This isn't good enough. This doesn't make sense." So, it hinders my own understanding through that writing process, right? So, I try to ignore my readers until I get to that editing stage.

That is, while she admitted the importance of considering the audience when writing, Alice seemed to prefer to use the writing stage as an opportunity to deepen her understanding as a researcher rather than to communicate with the audience as a writer.

I'm organizing what I found out. That day, Dan and I were talking about the difference between to write a report and a research paper. He explained that researched writing was a bit different from reporting the facts he found. Dan said,

> I do have to report facts, so it's kind of a report…[but] because I do have a little bit of interpretation on how things relate and connect, so it's not just 100%, "Here's a fact, here's a fact, here's a fact"…presenting how or what I understand…like for the paper I found some certain connections between certain topics.

In addition, Dan explained how he was feeling while writing his research paper, and he described his writing stage as "organization." Dan said

> I guess the purpose of the research itself is to understand it better. But when I'm actually writing about what I found out, it's more like organizing what I found out…So, I kind of organized the paper as showing the connection I found...I think the way I organized the paper…shows how I understand the topic.

In other words, in researched writing, Dan seemed never to be a reporter, who simply report the facts themselves in writing. Rather, he seemed to view the writing stage as both an opportunity to turn his analysis and understanding into the form and structure that made sense to him as a researcher and a place to present the new form and structure of a new knowledge of the topic as a writer.

I'm heavily researching, it's usually for writing a paper. It was the final interview session with Emmy. Emmy and I were talking about the attitude toward the final product of researched writing. Emmy explained that her hope and belief as a researcher of women studies impacted the way and the goal of writing her paper. Emmy explained that her research topic was what matters to all of us and "narratives of women's lives" had power to make people realize that "we have a problem that need to be fixed." However, she was feeling that "people don't find those valid forms of research very often." Therefore, Emmy believed that she had to create written products that would "work on helping to change the world for the better." Emmy explained that "when I'm heavily researching, it's usually for like, writing a paper…I have to have a product," and "[I'm] getting other [women's] narratives out there as valid forms of research." Emmy added, "My goal [of writing] is to be rhetorically strong" to persuade the audience to look at the problems. Emmy seemed to believe that one of the researcher's jobs was to present the knowledge, which people should know, in the written form to make the society for the better.

Chapter 5: Discussion

In the previous chapter, I described what the four American writing tutors were feeling, thinking, and doing during the process of researched writing. That is, I offered descriptive answers to the first research question: What is it that American student writers experience when working on researched writing?

In this chapter, I construct a hermeneutic cross-cultural conversation in line with Archer's culture bump analysis, which requires to move back and forth between not only details and the whole but also ourselves and the other to achieve the comprehensive understanding of the culture difference. First, I re-visit US researched writing practices that are described in the previous chapter (detail) and analyze them as culture differences to extrapolate a universal situation (whole). Then, I examine expectations in my culture (detail) to a specific universal situation. In other words, I offer answers to the second and third research questions: What universal situations are discovered from US researched writing practices? and What cultural assumptions do I have within the universal situations? In addition, in later discussion, I also consider how US cultural values are reflected on the writing tutors' researched writing experiences and where their cultural assumptions come from. That is, I offer answers to the fourth research question: What US social and cultural contexts and beliefs does US researched writing practice reflect?

Through the discussion of this chapter, I not only gain an awareness and appreciation for US researched writing but also create a sense of identification and connection with it.

Hermeneutic Conversation Based on Archer's Culture Bump Analysis

Archer states that "a culture bump occurs when a person has expectations of a particular behavior and gets something different when interacting with individuals from another culture" (67). In addition, Hall points out that "culture hides much more than it reveals, and strangely enough what it hides, it hides most effectively from its own participants. Years of study have convinced me that the real job is not to understand foreign culture but to understand our own (53). In other words, while we easily notice the things that are different from our own culture, we are often unaware of what expectations we culturally have within a particular situation.

In this section, I re-visit three themes that are raised in the previous chapter and examine what the four American writing tutors are actually doing in each theme (detail) to define universal situations (whole). Then, I reveal expectations and assumptions in my culture (detail) within each universal situation. While Archer states that "[our assumptions] have been refined by that particular individual's personality and life experience," Archer points out that "if we ask where [our] assumptions came from…many of them are culturally based" (136). Therefore, although my own experiences and observations in my culture might be personal and subjective, I assume that they are culturally-based and use them as the source and evidence to explore the expectations and underlying values in my culture.

Culture difference 1: American students read texts as a researcher.

What are American students exactly doing by reading texts? In an interview, Emmy explained that, when working on researched writing, she was reading sources as a researcher. As a researcher, she always reads sources with a goal in mind. Emmy said, "When I'm

researching, I'm also learning, but I'm specifically looking for proof of my thesis or of my goal.…I'm looking for a connection to my topic more than just taking in information in a passive way." Emmy was not reading sources for pleasure, but rather she was learning about her topic by reading them closely and expanding her knowledge of the topic by finding useful information there.

Alice, when reading sources for researched writing, was having a conversation with the existing knowledge. Alice said, "When I'm a researcher, it's kind of like being in a classroom that's discussion based, where they may lecture a little bit and I'm like, 'Oh, but that doesn't make sense,' or 'What do you mean?' or 'I don't agree with you,' So it's kind of a different dynamic that happens." It sounded like Alice simply disagreed with the existing knowledge when reading sources, but actually she was learning about her own topic by challenging and negotiating with the knowledge and trying to achieve the full understanding of it.

Universal situation: How students learn new knowledge. The above, Emmy and Alice's description, which is a manifestation of what American students are exactly doing when reading source texts, suggests that the universal situation is how students learn new knowledge. Students learn new knowledge in cultures all over the world, but how they learn varies from one culture to another. In other words, the situation, how students learn new knowledge, is universal, but where students learn with who, what they use for learning, and how they use it vary from one culture to another. So, now I need to ask a question, "How do students in American culture learn new knowledge?" because I have not exactly considered that.

In the US, America students, in order to gain new knowledge, look for source information outside the class by themselves, examine texts and research done by others independently, and find and select useful information and knowledge to help them better understand their own topics. The question now becomes, “How do students in my culture learn new knowledge?”

Expectations in my culture: Students learn new knowledge from a teacher. The emphasis on independent learning of new knowledge in US culture, which often occurs through researched writing, is in direct contrast with expectations in my culture. When students in my culture are in the universal situation defined above—how students learn new knowledge—they are expected to be dependent on a teacher, and new knowledge is transferred from a teacher to students in the class. For example, in my culture, a teacher lectures in line with the textbook and writes knowledge from the textbook on the blackboard. At the same time, students listen to the lecture quietly and simply transfer the knowledge on the blackboard to their notebooks. Also, because students do not ask questions in the class, negotiation between a teacher and students rarely happens in my culture.

In examining what is happening in the classroom, role definition shows up in teacher/student relationships, and a strong emphasis on identity in role is seen as underlying value behind the expectation in my culture. In other words, in my culture, a teacher and students are considered to be separate. A teacher plays the role of a teacher, and a student plays a student. Therefore, students are comfortable relying on a teacher in the class and simply taking in new knowledge from a teacher in a position of dependence. Students in my

culture never separate from their role of students nor play the role of researchers, who learn new knowledge independently.

Culture difference 2: American students analyze the source.

What are American Students Exactly Doing by Analyzing the source? Emmy explained that the structure of students' knowledge constructed through researched writing was schematic; therefore, their understanding about the topic can be developed. Researched writing requires American students to analyze someone else's knowledge from source texts and to understand what others say about the topic. The process of analysis allows students to break down the knowledge into smaller pieces; as a result, students could understand the knowledge as a whole in terms of the detail. More importantly, however, the process of analysis also allows American students to choose a piece of the knowledge and add it to their own knowledge about the topic as another layer of understanding. Emmy said that, therefore, students' understanding could become "bigger and bigger every time they [looked] at it" and eventually they would say, "I know this topic." That is, American students are expanding their knowledge about the topic and making it more complex in the process of analyzing others' knowledge in researched writing.

In an interview, Allison explained how the shape of her knowledge about the topic could change through the process of analysis. She said, "As far as the research goes, I have a vague idea of what the topic looks like," and she described her initial idea as "a faint shape," "it's not definite yet," and "it's not filled in yet." However, as she learned more about others' knowledge from sources and analyzed it, she got the picture of the topic. She explained that, "It's like more clear, more defined, the image is sharper, focused." That is, for Allison, the

process of analysis is for the knowledge formation, and she would achieve a more complete understating of the topic.

Universal situation: How students deepen their understanding of new knowledge. The question that "What were Emmy and Allison actually doing by analyzing the source?" helped me to examine the situation, which should be the shared experience by American students, and to extrapolate the universal situation. I identify that the universal situation is how students deepen their understanding of new knowledge. That is, students from cultures all over the world deepen their understanding, which is a universal concept, but how they do varies from one culture to another.

In US university settings, American students deepen their understanding—or develop their own knowledge—by analyzing existing knowledge they collected independently. American students break down the knowledge into smaller pieces in order to "understand the whole in terms of the detail and the detail in terms of the whole" (Gadamer 258). After that, they choose some pieces of knowledge that are relevant to their topic, make connections between them or add them to their current knowledge as another layer, and make their knowledge about the topic more complex.

Expectations in my culture: Students internalize existing knowledge. In US culture, students deepen their understanding in the process of analysis and it suggests knowledge construction by students themselves, while in my culture knowledge preservation seems to be valued in school education. Thus, when students in my culture are in the universal situation defined above—how students deepen their understanding of new knowledge—they are expected to absorb and internalize the knowledge. For example, students in my culture read

the textbook over and over, highlight important words and points, and memorize them. Also, they review the notes many times and internalize the knowledge on the notes directly, which was transferred from the teacher in the class. Since students do not go beyond the knowledge they learned in the class as students, they do not look for outside sources to learn the knowledge differently.

In reflecting on where the behaviors in my culture come from, it seems that both teachers and students believe that the knowledge should be preserved. Therefore, students in my culture are comfortable memorizing and internalizing existing knowledge without changing any form and structure of it. They do not challenge nor negotiate with the existing knowledge when deepen understanding of it. Also, both teachers and students seem to believe that the knowledge valued by the society should be shared among members. As a result, students might be motivated to absorb the knowledge to be appreciated as a part of the society.

Culture difference 3: American students create written products.

What are American students exactly doing by creating written products? Dan explained that researched writing was not just simply reporting facts or someone else's knowledge that he found from source texts. He said, "I do have to report facts, so it's kind of a report…[but] because I do have a little bit of interpretation on how things relate and connect, so it's not just 100%, "Here's a fact." In the process of reading and analyzing sources, he was not only learning and taking in others' knowledge but also constructing and achieving a complex understanding of his topic. As a result, his written product would consist of both others' knowledge and his knowledge. Dan also said, "When I'm actually writing

about what I found out, it's more like organizing what I found out…So, I kind of organized paper as showing the connection I found...I think the way I organized the paper…shows how I understand the topic." In other words, Dan was organizing and clarifying his understanding of the topic in the process of writing, and his final product showed the structure of his new knowledge about the topic, how it worked, in an organized manner.

When Emmy and I were talking about writing a paper as a final product of the research, Emmy explained that the goal of creating the written product was to persuade people to look at the complexity of the problems within the topic and to make them realize that they needed to change it. Emmy said, "When I'm heavily researching, it's usually for like, writing a paper…I have to have a product… [and I'm] getting other [women's] narratives out there as valid forms of research." In other words, to achieve her goal, she integrated women's experiences, which she valued as powerful evidence, into her written product and showed how she understood the structure of the topic through the research and what problems she found there.

Universal situation: How students show what they learned. The universal situation that arises from the described situation above, which would be a manifestation of what American students are exactly doing by creating written products, is how students show what they learned. Students are required to show what they learned in cultures all over the world, but how they show varies from one culture to another. Now the question becomes, "How do students in American culture show what they learned?"

In the US university, students show what they learned about a topic by creating written products. They try to explain how they understood the topic in an organized manner

in their paper. They do not simply report others' knowledge they found and used for their knowledge formation, but rather they integrate it as part of the structure of a new understanding. When their written products are well organized enough, students can show what they learned—the structure of a new understanding—as clearly as possible to the audience (or a professor).

Expectations in my culture: Students meet the demands of teachers. In contrast to US preference of written products as an opportunity to show what students learned and how, providing students a set of question to answer is welcomed in my culture. That is, when students in my culture are in the universal situation defined above—how students show what they learned—they are expected to show how much/well they internalized the knowledge on the test.

Overt authority seems to be the underlying value that exists between a teacher and students in my culture. That is, the relation between a teacher and students is typically vertical, and students are taught to conform by teacher's direct authority. For example, a teacher chooses the knowledge that students should internalize for the test and then, on the test, asks students to select the correct answer or to answer the questions as the way they learned in the class. At the same time, students try to meet the demands of teachers on the test by showing how much/well they internalized the expected knowledge in a required manner. In other words, teachers in my culture do not place much importance on the process of students' knowledge construction, which might occur outside the class. Instead, teachers expect students to acquire the same knowledge that was transferred in the class. Thus, students in my culture, who try to meet the demands of teachers on the test, would

comfortably use others' knowledge as their knowledge when answering questions. In addition, students are also comfortable answering questions without explaining why and how.

Reflection of US Cultural Values within US Researched Writing Practice

Particular values receive a great deal of emphasis within a particular culture. Archer points out that "that a value receives emphasis in American culture does not mean that all American behave in the prescribed way," while, Archer emphasizes that "yet, it is possible to trace cultural patterns" (136). That is, US culture is no exception in this regard. In his book, "American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective," Edward Stewart lists and considers numerous US cultural values that Americans have been sharing and believing, and which form their behaviors and perception of the world.

In this section, I examine some of those cultural values that seem to be highly associated with US researched writing practice, taken together with the four American writing tutors' writing experiences, to answer the fourth research question: What US social and cultural contexts and beliefs does US researched writing practice reflect? The values I examine here are self-motivation, self-reliance, and personal achievement, which all "can be loosely grouped under the heading of individualism" (Archer 136).

Self-motivation in US researched writing. An area of the US cultural values that seems to be associated with US researched writing is self-motivation. Stewart states that:

> Unlike some other societies, American culture does not attribute particular meaning to place of birth, family, occupation, politics or the other ascriptive considerations which can be used to define the self. The existence of the individual is matter of chance with no significance attached to origin or destiny. Self-definition is determined primarily

> by personal achievement. The individual himself should set his own goals and then make up his own mind on how to pursue them. Motivation, in the sense of long-range goals, as well as motivation for a specific and immediate task, should originate with the person…The idea of self-motivation naturally accompanies an identification of the self with a specific individual. Americans tend to dislike motives originating in others which are then applied to them. They strongly reject motivation in the form of orders, injections and threats emanating from authority. (72)

As in the US researched writing context, students' interests should come from their own academic motivations, and their academic self-motivations allow them to be independent from academic authority.

Freedom to decide what you want to learn. American students are allowed to choose the topics that they would learn, as new knowledge, based on their own interests. Dan said, "Whereas reading as a researcher, then I would be reading deeper, I would be reading for understanding but also will be thinking about if there are specific aspects of the text or particular aspects of the text that I want to analyze deeper." In addition, American students are also allowed to find and use source texts independently to better understand their own topics. Dan said, "I think with researching, you're reading sources, like articles, journals and books with a goal in mind, something you want to figure out."

In the US researched writing context, American students have considerable freedom to decide topics they would like to learn and to decide sources to pursue their learning. That is, it is expected that American students' motivations, academic interests and searches, should come from themselves.

Set your goals and pursue them. In an interview, Allison explained what she was looking for during exploring source texts by mentioning to a Chinese ESL student's paper. Allison said, "Well, it's like his paper he's looking for a specific answer…Like with the paper that I sent you, I'm not looking to answer a specific question, I'm just looking to understand the experience of that population (LGBTQ+ individuals)." It seemed that Allison "[disliked] motives originating in others" (Stewart 72), such as expectations or questions from teachers, because such motives would take away her independence. Instead, she was comfortable with focusing on her own academic interests and needs when learning new knowledge.

Also, Allison explained how she maintained her independence by making an analogy between the attitude towards reading sources and a road trip. She said, "I'm not going to say, "I want to get here." I just want to say, "I'll drive until I see everything that I want to see." I mean I might be like, "Okay, I'm just going to drive North." So, I kind of have a direction but I don't have a destination picked out." That is, Allison preferred to "set [her] own goals and then make up [her] own mind on how to pursue them" (Stewart 72) independently rather than depend on academic authority and take the path to toward the expected goal. Self-motivation makes it possible for American students to be independent of expectations from authority.

Self-reliance in US researched writing. Regarding self-reliance, Stewart states:

> Myth of the American frontier which have persisted until recent years stress a number of values which are invoked indiscriminately and, hence, are not descriptive of behavior. Nevertheless, these cultural norms carry considerable emotional impact. One of the most important of these is self-reliance, which in its pure form no longer makes sense in the complex technological culture of the United States. The fierce self-

> reliance advocated by Emerson has yielded to a search for autonomy, self-actualization and personal growth…We shall refer to these various constellations of assumptions and values as self-reliance, a cultural norm which persists in American society as a potent focus for the emotions and motivations of Americans. To the same extent that self-reliance is supposedly sought, its opposite, dependence, is avoided. Since Americans can envisage few fates worse than to be dependent, self-reliance is a powerful incentive and it is one Americans themselves may inappropriately employ to motivate people overseas. (71-72)

As in academic settings, American students try not to place themselves in a position of dependence. They search for and enhance their academic autonomy and personal growth through the researched writing process.

Desire for academic autonomy. When he was not familiar with his own topic, Dan allowed himself to research basic knowledge about it because he knew that having the solid basic knowledge would help him go further in his research. Dan said, “It was just building my knowledge, constructing the framework. Like a base. Think of it like a building. My research would be the base level. So, once I understand things generally and good enough, I can read more and build on the levels.” It seemed that Dan preferred to depend on his own knowledge even when learning the unfamiliar topic. In other words, Dan seemed to believe that he could learn every necessary knowledge through his own research, and it was his desire for autonomy. American students are accustomed to researching by themselves for learning and seem to value it as academic autonomy.

Embodiment of search for personal growth. Emmy explained that her goal of researched writing was finding her "truth" about the topic, and the process to achieve the goal provided her a sense of "trusting" herself. Emmy said, "The process of researching and the process of trusting yourself and building on your actual knowledge of how things work" were strongly connected. In other words, analyzing others' knowledge and constructing schematic knowledge about the topic by adding another layer of understanding allowed Emmy to expand her actual knowledge and eventually to believe that "I found my truth" and "I know this topic." In US researched writing contexts, expanding schematic knowledge by analyzing existing knowledge allows American students to develop the ability to build their own knowledge about the topic and enhance their academic autonomy. That is, it is embodiment of their desire for academic personal growth.

Opposite of self-reliance is dependence. Archer states that, "In American culture [self-reliance] suggests that the Self is the sole factor" (136). American students feel comfortable constructing their own knowledge about the topic through their own analysis, and they believe that how they understand the topic is more valuable than how others did. Alice said that the goal of researched writing was "a new understanding of the topic" and explained that "a new understanding would be like…a new way to look at [the topic]. Or just a different way to understand it too, not necessarily new but different than what I first thought…or it might be…a deeper understanding of what I'm looking at." In other words, Alice was trying to avoid simply taking in someone else's knowledge without changing any structure of it, but rather she was motivated to construct or reconstruct a new knowledge in the way she made sense. That is Alice was trying not to place herself in a position of

dependence, which is opposite to self-reliance. Of course, American students take in and use others' knowledge in researched writing. However, their emphasis on academic autonomy and personal growth motivate themselves to analyze it by themselves, construct a new understanding independently, and avoid any position of dependence.

Personal achievement in US researched writing. The final US cultural value I will consider here is personal achievement. Stewart states:

> The importance of motivation in American society may well be associated with the phenomenon that the self-images of Americans tend to be general and vague. Motivation helps to fill this void, since it is a dynamic concept that associates the self with action and leads to the belief that the self is what the self does…Restless and uncertain, [an individual] has recurrent need to prove himself and thereby attain an identity and success through his achievements. Hence, his accomplishments must be personal, visible and measurable, since the culture does not provide a means of evaluating and knowing the self except through externals of performance and attainment. It is this kind of motive which has been called achievement…In American culture, achievement is given a material meaning or, at least, a visible and measurable interpretation. This attitude leads to the American emphasis on technology and, secondly, on publicity — rendering visible unrecognized accomplishments. (39-41)

As in US universities, achievement must be visible. US researched writing provides students with an opportunity to make their academic progress and success visible and to prove their academic accomplishments.

Written products define academic self. Archer states that "the existence of the individual is matter of chance with no significance attached to origin or destiny. Self-definition is determined primarily by personal achievement (72). In the US, destiny and origin, such as where one was born and family's occupation, do not define the self, but instead personal achievement—what you completed, what you did, and what the outcome was—defines who you think you are.

This US cultural value can be seen in the written products. Dan said, "When I'm actually writing about what I found out, it's more like organizing what I found out…So, I kind of organized paper as showing the connection I found...I think the way I organized the paper…shows how I understand the topic." In other words, Dan created a written product regarding his research and showed his personal achievement—what he found, what he constructed, and how he understood about the topic. However, more importantly, proving his achievement in the form of researched writing allowed him to define his academic self. That is, Dan could define himself as a person who knew about the topic by showing a new understanding of the topic he found. American students prove their personal achievements and define their academic selves by creating written products in researched writing settings.

Written products prove progress and success. In the US, not only self-definition but also progress and success are determined by personal achievement. Thus, accomplishments must be visible, and this cultural assumption is no exception in US researched writing. Emmy explained that, for her, the goal of researched writing was to create a written product and publish it. Emmy said, "When I'm heavily researching, it's usually for like, writing a paper…I have to have a product," and "[I'm] getting other [women's] narratives out there as

valid forms of research." Emmy viewed writing a paper and publishing it as the essential process to make her research visible. In other words, her emphasis on a written product and its publicity might be a manifestation of her desire to prove her progress and success regarding her research. For American students all the process of researched writing is necessary to construct a new knowledge of the topic; however, to create written products is significant to prove the progress and success of their research in the US university where accomplishments must be visible.

Chapter 6: Implications

In the literature that describes ESL students' written work and their challenges in US researched writing contexts, ESL student writers often experience cultural differences and feel disappointed in US researched writing. While they try to adapt to the new writing culture, they, consciously or unconsciously, draw a negative conclusion or form a stereotype about it. As a result, ESL student writers do not develop any of real awareness and appreciation for US researched writing, and they enhance a feeling of disconnectedness to the new academic writing culture. In fact, ESL student writers need alternative practice to create a sense of connection to it

At the same time, the literature suggests that writing teachers who work with ESL students should learn the cultural backgrounds and educational experiences of the students to better understand them and their products. Also, the literature suggests that writing teachers should understand ESL students' painful experiences and emotional burdens in US academic settings to better support them. However, the literature seems to seldom discuss how writing teachers could help ESL student writers adopt alternative or new practices that would develop their real awareness and appreciation for US researched writing.

In this chapter, I consider the implications of the two main findings of this study, hoping that I am able to explain how these findings may be important for the practices of ESL student writers and writing teachers who work with them.

US Researched Writing Could Serve as an Important Learning Site for ESL Students

One of the meaningful findings of this study for me is that American students learn, deepen, and show new knowledge in the process of researched writing. As an ESL student writer, I had been working on researched writing without having such an idea before conducting this research. However, what if writing teachers and ESL student writers consider US researched writing as stated above—a process of learning, deepening, and showing a new knowledge?

ESL student writers are likely to consider researched writing as 10-page writing activity, which makes them feel overwhelmed and nervous. Therefore, they seldom see researched writing as an opportunity to negotiate meaning of other's knowledge, deepen understanding of it, and expand their current knowledge of the topic. Also, if ESL students do not experience the negotiation and analysis before actually starting to write a paper, they never see researched writing as a place where to show the process to achieve a new understanding of the topic and the structure of it.

If writing teachers help ESL students learn what to do in the process of researched writing step by step, instead of just asking them to write a 10-page term paper, ESL students might be able to work on researched writing without being too overwhelmed or confused. In addition, if ESL students become aware that researched writing is not just 10-page writing activity but much more than that, they might be able to spend more time negotiating and analyzing others' knowledge and organizing and explaining their own knowledge on paper with more confidence. That is, if researched writing is learned as a process of learning, deepening, and showing new knowledge, ESL students begin to consider researched writing

as a worthy enough activity to develop their ability and practice about knowledge making. In short, US researched writing could serve as an important learning site for ESL student writers.

ESL Student Writers Can Create a Sense of Connection to US Researched Writing

Through the hermeneutic cross-cultural conversation in this study, I found that unawareness of the expectations in my culture had made it difficult for me to understand US researched writing and had created a sense of disconnection to it within me. Archer states that "ethnocentrism is the largely unconscious belief that one's own way of doing things, one's own beliefs and way of life is the correct way or the normal way of living and everybody is ethnocentric about his or her culture" (7). Therefore, it might be a challenging task for ESL students to hunt their culturally gained expectations. However, if ESL student writers become aware what cultural expectations they unconsciously have and believe, they might be able to reduce a sense of disconnection to US researched writing and rather create a sense of connection to it

As Archer points out, the ethnocentrism allows ESL student writers to believe that their expectations are correct and normal—universal. Therefore, when noticing the difference in US researched writing settings, they likely to see the incident "from the point of view that they/he/she are different rather than I/we are different" (55). Also, because ESL students are usually unaware of the blinders of expectations that their cultures have placed on them, they seldom imagine that American students have different expectations or do things differently.

If writing teachers help ESL students examine their expectations analytically and hermeneutically and find that the cultural expectation they have is not universal but just a

variation, they might be able to understand that the expectation American students have also a cultural variation that should be respected. More specifically, ESL students might be able to understand how to learn, deepen, show new knowledge varies in cultures. In addition, if ESL students become aware that their cultural expectations and ethnocentrism have prevented them from seeing US researched writing correctly, they might realize that a sense of disconnection to it has been created by themselves. That is, if ESL students start to understand the structure (or trick) to create a sense of disconnection to US researched writing, they are virtually ready to create a sense of connection to it.

Chapter 7: Final Thoughts

When I was working on my first research paper with my tutor in the writing center, my journey to understand US researched writing began. It was almost five years ago. Since then, I have been frustrated because I am always not sure what to do while working on researched writing. Also, I have been concerned about something valuable I could/should have learned through this new academic writing system. However, my relationship to US researched writing has evolved in the two years it has taken me to conduct this research study and write about it.

While I collected the interview data when working as an ESL writing tutor in the writing center, I worked on this part of writing about the study after beginning to take classes for the MA TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language). Over the last year, I have had some opportunities to work on researched writing for class, and I found that the anxiety over researched writing within me has been reducing and that my researched writing practice has been positively changing. This is partly because I am getting used to the US academic culture in the five years. However, I think, it is mostly because I put into practice the implications I considered in the previous chapter to work on researched writing.

During the last year, I used each researched writing assignment as a learning site for better understanding of the topic, not as a just 10-page writing activity. I tried to learn others' knowledge with a goal in mind, deepen my understanding by borrowing the way of analysis the four American writing tutors described in this study, and show the structure of my new understanding in my paper. Also, I tried to be aware that my cultural expectation is not universal but a variation and that US researched writing expectation is also a variation that

should be respected. Thus, this research study has positively affected my understanding of US researched writing and helped me create a sense of connection to it.

At the same time, however, I am still struggling with how to improve practical skills to complete the researched writing tasks. How can I set my own goals and better negotiate someone else's knowledge, moving out of simply comprehending them? How can I better analyze the source and data to expand my current knowledge and make my understanding more complex? Also, how can I better organize my understanding process of the topic by integrating others' knowledge and show the structure of a new knowledge clearly? In fact, these questions are not just for me, but rather these are probably the challenges that ESL student writers face or would face even after reducing their emotional conflicts between US researched writing and their own writing cultures. That is, these questions might be the problems that I would address in my future study.

The primary motivation of this study was to better understand US researched writing and to create a sense of connection to it for my sake. Having discussion-based interviews with American writing tutors helped me learn what it is that American student writers experience when working on researched writing. Encouraging them to freely describe what they were feeling, thinking, and doing in their own words allowed me to collect factual data. Also, creating a hermeneutic cross-cultural conversation helped me define universal situations, reflect on expectations and assumptions in my culture, and examine US cultural values behind US researched writing. Encouraging myself to move back and forth both between details and the whole and between ourselves (sometimes myself) and the other allowed me to find commonality beneath the differences and to create a sense of

identification and connection with US researched writing. Thus, I believe that a degree of progress has been made with regard to the research task based on my primary motivation.

Lastly, I hope, even slightly, this study could help writing teachers and prospective writing teachers working with ESL students who are suffering from a sense of disconnection to US researched writing. That is the end of my long journey.

Works Cited

Abdallah-Pretceille, Marine. "Interculturalism as a Paradigm for Thinking about Diversity." *Intercultural Education*, vol. 17, no. 5, December 2006, pp. 475-483, *EBSCO*, Doi:10.1080/14675980601065764.

Archer, Carol. *Living with Strangers in the USA: Communicating beyond Culture.* Prentice Hall, 1991.

Archer, Carol, and Stacey Nickson. "Culture Bump: An Instructional Process for Cultural Insight." *Handbook of College and University Teaching*, Sage Publications, 2012, pp. 406-423, culturebump.com/uploads/Culture_Bump_Ch26_from_book.pdf.

Bruffe, Keneth. "Peer Tutoring and the Conversation of Mankind." *College English,* vol. 46, no. 7, Nov. 1984, pp. 635-652. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/376924.

Ede, Lisa, and Andrea Lunsford. "Audience Addressed/Audience Invoked: The Role of Audience in Composition Theory and Pedagogy." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 35, no. 2, May 1984, pp. 155-171. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/358093.

Flower, Linda. "Writer-Based Prose: A Cognitive Basis for Problems in Writing." *College English,* vol. 41, no. 1, Sep. 1979, pp. 19-37. *JSTOR,* doi: 10.2307/376357.

Fox, Helen. *Listening to the World: Cultural Issues in Academic Writing*. National Council of Teachers of English, 1994.

Gadamer, Hang-Georg. *Truth and method.* Sheed & Ward, 1975.

Geller, Anne Elle. *"A Big Tangled Mess": New Graduate Student Tutors Reflect on Their Experiences in the Writing Center*. Dissertation, New York U, 2001.

Hall, Edward T. *The Silent Language*. Doubleday & Company, 1959, monoskop.org/images/5/57/Hall_Edward_T_The_Silent_Language.pdf.

Harris, Muriel. "What Does the Instructor Want? The View from the Writing Center." *What is "College-Level" Writing?* Edited by Patrick Sillivan and Howard Tinberg, National Council of Teachers of English, 2006, pp. 121-133, wac.colostate.edu/books/collegelevel/chapter9.pdf.

Lunsford, Ronald. "From Attitude to Aptitude: Assuming the Stance of a College Writer." *What is "College-Level" Writing?* Edited by Patrick Sillivan and Howard Tinberg, National Council of Teachers of English, 2006, pp. 178-198, https://wac.colostate.edu/books/collegelevel/chapter13.pdf.

Nation, Paul. *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Powers, Judith K. "Rethinking Writing Center Conferencing Strategies for the ESL Writers." *Writing Center Journal*, vol. 13, no. 2, Spring 1993, pp. 39-47. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43441929?read-now=1&loggedin=true&seq=9#page_scan_tab_contents

Stewart, Edward C. *American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Intercultural Press, Inc., 1972.

Stoddard, Sally. "Cultural Assumptions, Frames, and the Allowable Economies of English: A Cross-Cultural Problem." *Teaching across Cultures in the University ESL Program.* Edited by Patricia Byrd and Janet C. Constntinides, NAFSA, 1986, pp. 123-125, files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED331286.pdf.

Sullivan, Patrick. “An Essential Question: What is ‘College-Level’ Writing?” *What is “College-Level” Writing?* Edited by Patrick Sillivan and Howard Tinberg, National Council of Teachers of English, 2006, pp. 1-28, wac.colostate.edu/docs/books/collegelevel/chapter1.pdf.

Yufeng Zhang, Yufeng. “The Impact of ESL Writers’ Prior Experience on Their Writing in College.” National Council of Teachers of English, 2010, pp. 1-25, www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Books/CollegeLevel2/YufengZhang_final.pdf.

Appendix A: Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in a research study regarding the research writing process. You were selected for this study because of your status as an experienced writer at St. Cloud State University. I, Seiko Hayashi, am conducting this research as part of my MA thesis project at St. Cloud State University.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to analyze and clarify the research writing process and specific concepts regarding the writing process.

Procedures

If you decide to participate in this research, you will be asked to discuss the topics regarding research writing processes and concepts during a meeting. The duration of your participation is one hour, and I will record the discussion and keep a journal of the responses. I will store the recorded discussion and my journal in my password protected PC. If direct quotes are used, you will be given a chance to review and edit the quotes before publication.

Risks

There is no foreseeable risk. Also, I will provide you with my contact information in case you might have questions.

Benefits

I anticipate your participation will help I analyze and clarify the writing process and concepts that would contribute to research writing instructions in future ESL writing classrooms. As such, your participation could contribute to growing body of literature and best practices in the fields of rhetoric and writing studies.

Confidentiality

Data will be presented in aggregate forms with no more than 1-2 descriptors and will be destroyed when my degree is awarded.

Research Results

Results will be made available in the Write Place located in Room 117 in Building 51 by the week of May 1st. Also results will be made public and stored in the SCSU Repository. Your participation will remain confidential at all times.

Contact Information

If you presently have questions, please ask them at this time. If you have additional questions later, you may contact me, Seiko Hayashi, at hase1301@stcloudstate.edu or Dr. Carol Mohrbacher at 320-308-5472 or at camohrbacher@stcloudstate.edu.

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal

Participation is voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time, for any reason without penalty and it will not harm any current of future relationship with the researcher of SCSU.

Acceptance to Participate

By signing below, you are indicating that you are at least 18 years of age and that you consent to participation in the study. Thank you.

_____

Participant Name (Printed)

_____

Participant Signature

_____

Date

Acceptance to Audio Record

By signing below, you are indicating that you consent to audio record during a meeting. Thank you.

_____

Participant Name (Printed)

_____

Participant Signature

_____

Date

Appendix B: IRB Approval

ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY
EDUCATION FOR LIFE.

Institutional Review Board (IRB)
720 4th Avenue South MC 204K, St. Cloud, MN 56301-4498

Name: Seiko Hayashi
Address 340 6th Ave. S,
Saint Cloud, MN 56301 USA
Email: hase1301@stcloudstate.edu

IRB PROTOCOL DETERMINATION:
Expedited Review-1

Project Title: Bridging Researched Writing Between US and ESL writers.
Advisor Carol Mohrbacher

The Institutional Review Board has reviewed your protocol to conduct research involving human subjects. Your project has been: **APPROVED**

Please note the following important information concerning IRB projects:
- The principal investigator assumes the responsibilities for the protection of participants in this project. Any adverse events must be reported to the IRB as soon as possible (ex. research related injuries, harmful outcomes, significant withdrawal of subject population, etc.).

- For expedited or full board review, the principal investigator must submit a Continuing Review/Final Report form in advance of the expiration date indicated on this letter to report conclusion of the research or request an extension.

-Exempt review only requires the submission of a Continuing Review/Final Report form in advance of the expiration date indicated in this letter if an extension of time is needed.

- Approved consent forms display the official IRB stamp which documents approval and expiration dates. If a renewal is requested and approved, new consent forms will be officially stamped and reflect the new approval and expiration dates.

- The principal investigator must seek approval for any changes to the study (ex. research design, consent process, survey/interview instruments, funding source, etc.). The IRB reserves the right to review the research at any time.

If we can be of further assistance, feel free to contact the IRB at 320-308-3290 or email ri@stcloudstate.edu and please reference the SCSU IRB number when corresponding.

IRB Institutional Official:

Latha Ramakrishnan

Dr. Latha Ramakrishnan
Interim Associate Provost for Research
Dean of Graduate Studies

OFFICE USE ONLY

SCSU IRB# 1608 - 2012	**Type:** Expedited Review-1	**Today's Date:** 9/15/2016
1st Year Approval Date: 8/29/2016	**2nd Year Approval Date:**	**3rd Year Approval Date:**
1st Year Expiration Date: 8/28/2017	**2nd Year Expiration Date:**	**3rd Year Expiration Date:**