Rhetorical Awareness in Foreign Language Writing: An Advanced-level Japanese Case Study

Zhini Zeng
The University of Mississippi
&

Ying Liu
Zhejiang University

Abstract

Model texts have long played a central role in Second Language (L2) writing instruction. Research as well as everyday practice has shown that L2 students are able to develop a keener rhetorical awareness through Model Analysis (MA) activities. However, in the context of Foreign Language (FL) writing instruction, the role of models has yet to be explored. In our study, we looked deeply into three students' perceptions of, interactions with and re-appropriation of such models in an advanced level Japanese as a Foreign Language (JFL) class. Through a combination of model analysis, evaluations of student writing products and interviews with students, we found that not only did the students exhibit a wide variety of levels of awareness in regard to the models, their personal writing processes and texts consistently reflected these interactions. The findings suggest that this rhetorical awareness should be emphasized in JFL writing classes.

Key words: rhetorical awareness; foreign language writing; consciousness raising; model analysis; Japanese L2 writing

1.   **Introduction**

The use of authentic model texts in L2 writing classes has evolved considerably over the years. In the 1960s and 1970s, students were encouraged to imitate the "correct forms" provided by the models (McCampbell, 1966; Paulston, 1972). However, this prescriptive use of these models was later criticized in the 1980s for limiting students' creativity and neglecting the expression of their own voices and ideas (Collins & Gentner, 1980; Watson, 1982; Zamel, 1983). Since the 1990s, use of these models in L2 writing classes has largely been informed by the genre theory. To overcome the limitations of the static theory of model texts, scholars such as Matsuda (1997) have proposed a dynamic view of writing in which the organization of a text "reflects the complexity of the process of decision making that writers go through as they respond to their own perceptions of the particular context of writing" (p.52). Genre theorists, including Swales (1990), Bhatia (1993) and Hyland (2004), hold that in order to achieve their intentions, people must follow the social conventions of cultural communities, which can be analyzed and taught to L2 learners.

Model texts of a genre, which display "typified responses to recurring situations" (Gentil, 2011, p.7), play a central role in genre-based SL (second language) writing classes. Researchers have now begun to recognize that when L2 students categorize and analyze the model texts in class, they "become more attuned to the ways meanings are created and more sensitive to the specific communicative needs" (Hyland, 2007, p. 151). Structures of the model texts are analyzed by referring to the writers' communicative purposes in specific rhetorical contexts (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993; 2002). Scholars have observed how L2 learners use genre as a tool to better access the target language discourse communities outside the classroom (Beaufort, 1999; Parks, 2001; Tardy, 2004; 2006). Genre practitioners and theorists have also investigated how learners react specifically to the model texts in L2 writing classrooms and stress the importance of developing a metacognitive awareness in students (Johns, 2008; Hyon, 2001; Negretti & Kuteeva, 2011; Cheng, 2006; 2007; 2008a; 2008b; 2011).

Despite its popularity in second language (SL) writing, the use of models from the genre perspective has generally received little attention in foreign language (FL) classes. There are two main reasons for this. First, current L2 research is generally skewed toward English as a Second Language (ESL) writing (Byrnes et al, 2010; Manchón, 2009; Ortega, 2009). Second, researchers argue that learning to write in a foreign language (FL) context differs strikingly from learning to write in a second language (SL) context: FL students are not usually located within L2 discourse communities right outside the classroom, as are most SL learners; they do not have a practical purpose of writing and thus it would be difficult to incorporate purpose-driven genres in foreign language writing classes (Manchón, 2009; Ortega, 2009). In addition, although the ESP (English for specific purposes) genre approach works well for university-level ESL students as they "have gained appreciable language knowledge" before they are exposed to L2 writing (Byrnes et al, 2010, p. 26), the same approach cannot be applied effectively to FL students who would need more instructed guidance on language use per se. By stressing the fundamental differences between "an immersive L2 environment" and "collegiate FL education in the United States" (Byrnes et al, 2010, p. 44), FL writing researchers re-conceptualize "genre" within the Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) framework (Byrnes, 2002; 2005; Byrnes & Sinicrope, 2008; Byrnes & Sprang, 2004; Byrnes et al., 2010; Yasuda, 2011; Ryshina - Pankova, 2006; 2010).

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is a theory of language that aims to construct a meaning-oriented grammar for purposes of text analysis (Halliday, 1985/1994, p. xv). Grammar is therefore about the "situated choices being made in contexts, rather than rules being fulfilled" (Byrnes et al, 2010, p. 46) Compared to those frequently found in SL settings, a genre-based approach in FL settings also involves studying representative model texts to identify a series of textual features which make up a specific genre. The difference is that a genres-based approach highlighted in FL settings targets writing development from very beginning level learners to advanced FL writers, and accordingly, it focuses more on the linguistic choices students can and should learn at a particular stage of the curriculum (Byrnes et al, 2010, p. 59) In other words, a genre-based approach in

FL writing class "emphasize(s) language rather more" by drawing on functional grammar theory, whereas genres in SL settings stress the importance of the "situatedness" of genres "through rhetorical consciousness-raising" (Hyland, 2007, p. 154).

As several researchers point out, "The usefulness of any pedagogy depends on what the learner has eyes to see" (Macbeth, 2010, p. 37). While the distinctive nature of FL learning is generally assumed (see Byrnes et al., 2010) and has served as a major motivator for the various treatments of models within FL writing, few studies have actually observed foreign language learners in classrooms. It remains to be seen what FL learners actually gain from the model texts and the extent to which their experiences are similar to or different from those of SL learners. In this article, we discuss our qualitative study of three L2 writers' engagement with model texts during an advanced level Japanese as a Foreign Language (JFL) course at a university in the United States. By utilizing such data gathering instruments as model-text analysis tasks and text-based interviews, we examined how JFL writers attempted to analyze the model texts and how these analyses influenced their actual writing processes and essays. It is our hope that a deeper understanding of how FL students learn will further inspire curriculum designers and language educators to more effectively utilize models.

2.   **Literature Review**

2.1.   **Empirical studies on the effects of models in L1 and L2 writing classes**

Models have been used in writing instruction since as early as 1960s (e.g. McCampbell, 1966; Paulston, 1972; Eschholz, 1980). In a survey conducted by Stolarek (1991), of the seventy respondents, who were all composition instructors from four universities in the U.S., 76% stated that they use modeling on a regular basis in their classes. Experimental studies have examined the effects of models. For example, Bereiter and Scardamalia (1984) investigated the knowledge gained by three groups of students (one from grades 3 to 4, one from grades 5 to 6, and one from grade 7) from exposure to three different genres: suspense stories, restaurant review, and an assumed unfamiliar

genre named "concrete fiction." Through comparing the pre-exposure compositions and the post-exposure compositions, they found that after having read a sample of that genre only once, students at all ages demonstrate some ability of learning from the models, whereas the knowledge they acquired was biased toward discrete elements of language and content rather than toward more global rhetorical strategies.

Charney and Carlson (1995) investigated the effects of model qualities on students' writing of research texts. Ninety-five psychology majors, randomly divided into a No-Model control group and four Models groups with different model qualities, were asked to write a Method section for a given experiment. The comparative analysis of the composition qualities showed the Model group's texts were better organized than those of the control group, whereas the quality of the model produces no significant differences in students' compositions. To explore the type of knowledge writers need in order to write effectively, Smagorinsky (1992) compared three instructional treatments of models: models only, model with instruction in general writing procedures, and model with instruction in task-specific procedures. By analyzing the pretests and posttests data of three groups of participants, he concluded that students who were provided with models and instructions, either in general or task specific, improved more in composition than did students who were provided with models only. Taking a similar approach, Stolarek (1994) investigated the different responses between expert and novice writers who were asked to write an unfamiliar genre under five different study conditions: (1) description of the genre only, (2) model only, (3) description and model, (4) model with explication, and (5) description, model, and explication. 143 college freshmen and twenty-one university composition instructors participated in the study. The scores of the composition of the five different groups were compared and stimulated recall interview were also conducted. The findings indicated that novice writers who were provided with a model responded in a manner that is far more similar to the responses of expert writers than do novice writers who were not provided with a model. Based on the study, Stolarek suggested that composition instructors ought to use modeling in composition class.

Research on the use of modeling in L2 writing is scarcer. Abbuhl (2011) examines the effect of two instructional treatments (models and models combined with explicit instruction) on the writing of three groups of writers (native speakers of English, higher proficiency nonnative speakers, and lower proficiency nonnative speakers). Using a controlled/posttest experiment design, he found that when given explicit instructions on how to best utilize models, students are more likely to use the rhetorical devices from the model and follow the model organization more closely than those who only receive models without any explicit instructions (Abbuhl, 2011).

Other studies on the use of modeling in L2 class are mostly framed within genre-based pedagogy. To determine to what extent models improved students' L2 writing ability, Henry and Rosemary (1998) randomly assigned thirty-four students into a genre group and a non-group focusing on tourist information compositions. In the genre group, the students read six authentic texts, analyzed their rhetorical structures, and then wrote compositions of similar genre; in the non-genre group, while the same six models were provided and the same writing task was assigned, class activities mainly focused on traditional grammar-oriented activities such as error correction exercises and sentence-joining exercises. A comparison of posttest composition scores showed that the genre group improved significantly whereas the non-genre group did not. Yasuda (2011) examined the development of writing competence of a group of EFL learners in a genre-based English writing course at a Japanese university. Two classes, including a total of 70 students, participated in the study and both adopted a genre-based instruction. Students' compositions at the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester were rated both in terms of a global measure and more specific rating scales such as writing fluency, lexical diversity, lexical sophistication, and so on. A comparison of the pretest data and posttest data showed that although the students' vocabulary size did not improve dramatically over time, students' writing improved significantly in terms of task fulfillment and text organization.

Overall, the above studies generally suggest that explicit attention to models in teaching prepares learners to become better readers, learn what good writing is, and apply this knowledge to their writing. However, as Cheng points out, this trend of research "relied almost exclusively on a pre- and post-test design and on written products" (2006, p.79). There is inadequate attention to how students actually reacted to models and how learning occurred in real contexts of learning. As a result, Cheng (2006) proposed a learner-focused research agenda. In this new agenda, methodological repertoire needs to be expanded, and the focus of inquiry needs to shift from the final text product to L2 learners in the context of learning.

2.2. **Learner-focused research in L2 writing**

In the learner-focused research paradigm, researchers adopted qualitative research methods and discussed various aspects of explicit learning, such as how L2 students analyzed model exemplars, and how such analysis shaped their writing. In a series of longitudinal case studies (2008a; 2008b; 2011), Cheng investigated how a group of L2 graduate students in an ESL writing class engaged with the models during reading and writing. For example, Cheng (2008a) documented a Chinese-speaking graduate student's analysis of model exemplars in preparation for writing. The analysis of the focal student's Model Analysis (MA) tasks, the student's written texts, and the text-based interviews revealed that this student's analysis of the models occurred on two different levels. The first level was rhetorical, in which he focused on the rhetorical parameters of the model such as the writer, the reader, and the purpose of writing. The other level was evaluative, in which he developed an increasingly sophisticated assessment of the model. Cheng's study pointed to a different conceptualization of the role of model in class: MA can potentially facilitate learners' "writerly engagement with texts" (p. 66).

Taking a similar qualitative approach, Lee (2010) investigated the learning process of four first-year international students enrolled in a college level ESP/EAP writing class. She argued that L2 students must travel through an "interpretive distance"—from analyzing the model of the genre in class to re-appropriating it into their own disciplines. Although it is impossible to promise that students will master specific

academic genres in their own disciplines by the end of the course, it could still equip them with an awareness of the what to look for when traveling through their interpretive journey.

3.   **Research Questions**

Collectively, the studies reviewed above demonstrate that model texts serve as pathways for advanced students to enhance their metacognitive awareness of writing. However, because most of the studies were conducted in English L2 contexts, they may not be appropriate for making informed decisions about the use of models for Japanese L2 writers. Thus, our study focused on a group of Japanese L2 learners at a university in the United States. The two main research questions guiding our data collection and analysis were as follows:

(1) What features do JFL learners focus on during their analyses of model texts in an advanced college-level JFL course?

(2) In what way does the model text affect the students' writing strategies and final essays?

4.   **Methods**

4.1.   **Context of the Study**

Our study took place at a comprehensive Midwestern university in the United States. The Japanese program consists of five levels of instruction. We chose to explore the most advanced course in the sequence; prior to level 5, students had been limited to writing for orthography, grammar, or translation practices. Although the majority of the writing tasks in the lower-level curriculum are also contextualized in real-world communicative tasks such as text message or short emails, they have an exclusive focus on oral discourses. Level 5 is the starting point for students to systematically write in Japanese across a variety of genres. More importantly, level 5 is the only curriculum in which reading and writing tasks reciprocally support each other to the extent that most reading assignments also serve as the models for writing.

The course consists of three sections: an 85-minute group session on every Thursday, a 15-minute individual session on every Tuesday and a self-prepared written term paper. Each component equals one credit hour. The group session is required for all level 5 students and is not repeatable while the other two sections are optional and repeatable.

The writing performances we look at in this study come from the group session. Seven students enrolled in the group session, including three undergraduate students and four graduate students. The instructor, a native speaker of Japanese, is a professor specialized in Japanese pedagogy and linguistics, who has been active in these fields for around 30 years. The group session provides students with opportunities to immerse themselves in the cultural discourses of this country through discussion of various texts and other relevant media of modern Japan. According to the syllabus, the major objectives of this session include increasing students' knowledge of Japanese language and culture, developing skills in expressing opinions using authentic Japanese oral and written discourses, cultivating discourse strategies in leading discussions and conducting short oral interviews and exploring heatedly discussed topics and a variety of genres in Japanese society.

The major materials used for the group session are developed by the instructor, which cover one topic each week including geography, politics, rituals, business, social issues, famous figure biographies, knowledge of writing conventions, and newspaper editorials. Each topic comes with pre-reading tasks such as an online research task and open-ended questions, an article selected from authentic Japanese magazines, websites, or book chapters, and post-reading tasks including content questions, vocabulary practices and a composition assignment. Students are asked to complete these tasks before class and be prepared to come to class to discuss the materials in Japanese, with focuses on its linguistic features, cultural and social significances. As the composition is completed before class, prior to the class discussion, this means that there is no explicit instruction given in class. However, since the composition tasks always have similar contexts as the articles students read, the readings can apparently serve as models

for students to learn from. In a few cases, the instructor also includes additional requirements in the prompt such as asking students to adopt a certain type of organizational structure or to use certain expressions, which can be seen as a type of implicit instruction on writing. The instructor provides brief feedback and revision suggestions along with an evaluative grade to the students, usually one week after their submissions.

In addition to this discussion as its major component, the group session also contains some other routine practices that are independent of the material, such as news report listening practice, news report narration and a short interview task named "hero interview." Although these additional routines are not directly tied to the reading/writing tasks, their focuses on developing students' organizational structures in oral discourse still align with the major pedagogical goals of analyzing readings and writing compositions.

4.2.   **The Participants**

Drawn from a larger study in which materials were collected from the entire class, this study looked primarily at three participants—Lee, Emily, and Linda (pseudonyms). We selected these three out of the seven students taking this class as our focal participants for a few reasons. First, they have the most similar academic backgrounds as they are all graduate students in the humanities[1]. The reason we exclusively focused on graduate students in this study was that they all had extensive writing experiences in their native languages, or in Lee's case, in both her native (Chinese) and second (English) languages prior to writing in Japanese. This allows us to attribute their observed writing performances in this class more to their writing skills in Japanese than their general writing abilities. Second, all of them took two credit hours for this course, including both the group session and the individualized session. The other four students instead had different choices. Even though the individualized session is also independent of the group session, we wanted to make sure that all the participants had relatively

---

[1] We originally reached out to all the four graduate students in this course. However, the fourth student who is a first-year MA student in Asian History had to withdraw from our study due to the incompleteness of his writing assignment repertoire.

similar amount of exposure to Japanese instruction. These three students therefore constitute the biggest group we were able to find. Third, none of them took this class to fulfill credit requirements, which means they all have strong motivation in learning Japanese. This is also true based on our observation and the feedback from the instructor. Their dedication to the learning tasks in this course therefore made them unique among the learners. Since our study focused on students' initial and careful reactions to the readings as writing models and their reflections over their own writing, the timeliness, comprehensiveness, and completeness of their data allowed us to trace their development of rhetorical awareness more extensively and more accurately. Last but not least, based on our pre-study interview with the instructor, these three participants represented diverse cultural and educational backgrounds in learning Japanese (as shown in Table 1). The instructor believes that their different previous Japanese learning experiences contribute to their differing perspectives on the model texts and the writing strategies they adopted.

Name	First Language	Major	Year of study	Japanese learning experience
Lee	Chinese	Chinese pedagogy	2nd year Ph.D. student	Lee completed four years of Japanese courses before taking the current course.
Emily	American	Communication studies	1st year Ph. D. student	After six months of independent study of Japanese, Emily worked in Japan as an English teacher for several years. After returning home, she took two years of Japanese courses in the program before taking the course under study.

				Linda took two years of Japanese courses in another program and studied in Japan for a year. After returning, she began her master's program by taking the course under study.
Linda	American	Japanese literature	1st year M.A. student	

Table 1. Participants' Background Information

4.3. **Data Collection**

To address the two research questions, we collected data discussed in this article from three sources: (1) student compositions, (2) model analysis (MA) tasks, (3) and text-based interviews with both the three students and their instructor.

4.3.1. **Student Compositions**

Based on the instructor's suggestion and our review of all the ten composition tasks covered in this class, we decided to use the three participants' compositions "Xの冠婚葬祭" to determine how students incorporated the features of the models into their own writing styles. We selected this particular composition mainly because the article students read before this composition task, "日本の冠婚葬祭," is an ideal writing model for students to incorporate into their own writing. The reading not only shares the same topic with the composition task, but also has a clear organization for students to easily emulate. As mentioned above, although most readings in this class interacted with what the students were required to write to some extent, many of them are not explicit enough as models. Moreover, this composition task was given in the fourth week of the semester, when students became more used to the instructional mode of this course while having not felt tired yet. Although there are two more composition tasks that also bear a close resemblance to what students read, one was missing from one of the student participants while the other appears too early in the course.

4.3.2. **Model Analysis Tasks**

As mentioned before, since there was no explicit instruction on how to prepare writing from the reading, it is difficult for us to find out to what extent students received influences from the readings. Therefore, prior to our interviews with the participants, we asked each participant to complete two MA tasks, which were adapted from Cheng (2008a). We asked the students to highlight with color highlighters what they have learned from the reading and to note the reasons as well. A complete collection of students' MA tasks can be found in Appendix 1.

4.3.3. **Text-based Interviews**

Following students' submitting their compositions and MA tasks, we conducted a text-based interview with each student for about one hour. During the interview, we mainly asked for clarifications, referred to the two works they submitted, to elicit students' verbalized inner thought underlying the rhetorical choices they made in writings. We also asked questions to get an idea about their general writing process which usually reflects the writing strategies students have developed. Our interview also extended to the instructor of this course, who provided evaluative comments on the students' compositions to justify the grades she previously assigned. Moreover, we also asked the instructor to describe the three students based on her own observation, including their personalities, class performances, and learning strategies, if any.

4.4. **Data Analysis**

In our study, we sought to provide thick description and grounded interpretation of the writing experiences of JFL students. For data analysis, we utilized the classic inductive approach (Charmaz, 2006; Merriam, 2009), which allowed us to immerse ourselves in analyzing the transcriptions. To achieve triangulation for the study, we compared patterns generated through analysis of various data sources and sought to unveil overlaps as well as inconsistencies. To improve the reliability of data analysis, we coded the data and summarized the patterns independently. We then compared our findings and generated a final list of patterns. When discrepancies arose, we discussed them until we reached a consensus.

5.   **Findings**

Our analysis of these cases generated three major patterns, the interrelations among which are noteworthy and significant. First, we found that the same model can generate different perceptions from different learners, depending on their levels of sophistication in interpreting the model. Second, the way in which a student engaged with the model had a great impact on his/her final writing product. Third, various types of interpretative readings of the model texts also yielded different writing processes. We illustrate these themes in the presentation of the cases and in the discussion section that follows them, based on unedited samples from our three participants' MA tasks and final essays.

5.1.   **Lee: Model Composition Increases Rhetorical Awareness**
Lee took the Japanese course when she was a graduate student teaching Chinese as a foreign language. Her interpretation of the models was influenced by her academic training in Chinese pedagogy and her extensive professional experiences in teaching Chinese to American students. According to Lee, prior to that semester, she just finished editing pedagogical material designed for Chinese learners, in which learners are asked to write in a particular genre by emulating the model they read before. Lee admitted that her experience in editing this Chinese textbook made her firmly believe that what students are asked to write should be relevant to what they read. In her Japanese class, Lee continued to look for such resemblance in every piece of reading she encountered. Sometimes, she found what she read in class didn't help much with her writing assignment, but she would not give up looking for other potential models through online resources, which usually made her take longer to complete her assignement than other students. Interpretation of her model analysis indicated that Lee demonstrated an awareness of the author's rhetorical considerations behind the linguistic devices. As illustrated in Excerpt 1, Lee first analyzed the beginning of the model by explaining the intention of the author (i.e. to introduce three main types of traditions) and highlighting its logical connection to the other paragraphs that follow. Interestingly, the interview with Lee revealed that her focus

on the linguistic item (e.g. という, 'called, named') came from her knowledge of the rhetorical perspective. By recognizing its uniqueness in the Japanese language, Lee was able to decipher its function as "introducing a new concept or the major theme of the essay". She seemed to have instilled in this phrase some rhetorical meaning, viewing it as helping to establish the author's intention and the rhetorical organization of the text.

Excerpt 1

A segment of the composition model [2]	Lee's analysis [3]
社会の節目の行事をまとめて冠婚葬祭という。冠婚葬祭は、めでたい慶事、めでたくない弔事、その他の三種類がある。代表的な行事の中で、子供が大人になることを祝う成人式（冠）と結婚式（婚）は慶事であり、葬式（葬）は弔事である。 English translation of the model segment above, provided by the researcher [4]: In Japanese, all types of social rituals can be summarized with the phrase *kankon-sousai* (冠婚葬祭ceremonial occasions). There are three types of ceremonies: ceremonies for a happy occasion that one wants to celebrate, mourning events that one does not want to celebrate and the others. Among those representative events, the Coming-of-Age ceremony to celebrate a child's becoming an adult (冠*kan*) and wedding ceremony (婚 *kon*) are celebratory events, funeral (葬 *sou*) is a mourning event.	The general structure of the model: introducing three main types of traditions in the first paragraph, which is followed by three corresponding paragraphs with detailed explanations. という is a useful structure and writing strategy to introduce new/main concept. "代表的な行事の中で、…であり、…である" is a useful structure to introduce different types of customs.

---

[2] Students originally highlighted the model texts during the MA analysis tasks. The researcher has replaced those colorful highlighted texts with underlines for publication in black and white.

[3] In addition to the students' original written annotations, the right columns also contain their oral comments revealed in the interview following the MA tasks, which were transcribed by the researcher with no editing. The full original version of students' written annotations can be found in Appendix A.

[4] All the Japanese texts including the model and the students' compositions were translated by the researcher. The translation however does not take the linguistic errors in the students' composition into consideration by just providing the general meaning of the text written in Japanese.

In another example, shown in Excerpt 2, Lee identified a transitional device that connects the second and the third paragraph and was able to predict its textual purpose of creating "a happy to sad" transition for introducing subsequent paragraphs.

Excerpt 2

A segment of the composition model	Lee's analysis
慶事とちがい、弔事は突然やってくる。大切な知り合いの訃報を受けたら、すぐに駆けつける。 English translation: <u>Unlike the celebratory events, mourning events always come suddenly.</u> When receiving the obituary of an important person you know, you need to act soon.	This is a transition between the two paragraphs, from the event that people celebrate to the event that people mourn. "… とちがい" is a useful phrase the author uses to make this "from happy to sad" transition.

While Lee analyzed the model, she actively positioned herself as the writer of a similar type of article. Such association of the model with her own writing led to careful rhetorical decisions in Lee's own writing process. For example, in her essay on Chinese customs, Lee utilized the phrase "...とちがい" ('unlike …') from the model that helped her create a smooth transition from a discussion of the traditional dress color at Chinese wedding ceremonies to an exploration of the traditional color for Chinese funerals. The underlined sentence in Excerpt 3 is both a natural end to the analysis of the celebratory event and an insightful way to begin discussion of mourning traditions in Chinese culture.

Excerpt 3

A segment from Lee's writing assignment (中国の冠婚葬祭) after the MA work

慶事の結婚式とちがい、葬式で伝統的な色は白。通夜または葬儀の手伝いは…(Paragraph 4)

English translation:
  Unlike the celebratory wedding, the traditional color of a funeral is white. Attending the wake or helping at the funeral are … (Paragraph 4)

The rhetorical features of Lee's own writing significantly corresponded to elements she previously identified in the MA work, even including those previous MA tasks that were not directly tied to the composition in question. For example, the underlined sentence (seen in Excerpt 4) that connected her introduction and the elaborated discussion that followed is another organizational device she utilized from another model 聞き上手 (*Become a Skillful Listener*). Lee's personal engagement with the models indicates that she used the insights she gained as a set of heuristics to apply to future textual features in her own writing, rather than as a set of strict rules or even a template.

Excerpt 4

A segment from Lee's writing assignment (**中国の冠婚葬祭**) after the MA work

中国では、冠婚葬祭という社会の節目の行事は大切なしきたりである。… では、中国の伝統的なしきたりを二、三拾って紹介しよう。 (Paragraph 1)

English translation:
In China, there are important traditions for social events called *kankon-sousai*…Then, let me introduce a few Chinese traditions to you. (Paragraph 1)

In addition to the rhetorical awareness Lee demonstrated in her MA tasks and essays, what also stands out are the writing strategies she

mentioned in the interview. She discussed preparing extensively for each writing task by reading online resources written in Japanese, not only for inspiration but also to "avoid linguistic or cultural errors resulting from translation." Recalling the necessity to "read a lot before being able to write" on her own, Lee offered another intuitive explanation:

> "I don't think I just copied the sentence from those essays I read or from the model essay. After reading them, I have this feeling about how my own essay will come into being. That sounds weird, but that's how I wrote."

Lee's perceptive comment on the necessity to "have this feeling" before she starts writing might be more clearly illustrated by the example she gave about how she prepared during this pre-writing stage. She accessed three to five articles online on the same topic and always focused on how the authors began or ended the discussion, how they summarized or elaborated with examples, and how they utilized unique rhetorical skills to improve their writing. Lee explicitly emphasized the importance of "genre". For example, to prepare for this particular writing assignment on Chinese customs, she browsed informational websites on customs in various cultures written in Japanese, then she read native Japanese's blogs with a more casual tone. In this way, she was able to uncover the possible meanings within Japanese L2 writing and establish a linguistic repertoire of all the necessary elements centering on a certain writing topic.

5.2. Linda: Model Composition as Inspiration for Content
Linda is also a graduate student with extensive experience in academic writing. However, her academic training is in Japanese literature.

Linda was also able to analyze the model and transfer the input gained from it to their own writing. Linda's annotations in her MA tasks appeared longer and more elaborate than Lee's (see Appendix A). However, upon closer inspection, unlike Lee's rhetorical reading of the model, Linda generally employed the model as a template to help her

not only regulate the language but also the content of her essay. Seen in the example in Excerpt 5, she chose a similar idea to that of the highlighted section in the model as the subject of her essay. This type of content-driven approach can be found throughout Linda's MA work. Interestingly, from Linda's annotation in the right column, she seemed also to be applying critical thinking by asking questions and expressing reactions. Our interview with her instructor further verified what we have observed as she recalled "the originality is really really important for her (Linda). I think she tends to question and she also tends to provide opinions in a very assertive way." According to the instructor, Linda seemed more comfortable writing a more argumentative essay in which she is asked to present her counter argument to someone else's opinion.

Excerpt 5

A segment of the composition model	Linda's analysis
最も大きな慶事である結婚式の披露宴には、友人や親戚はもちろん、仕事関係の人からも招待されることが多い。<u>招待されたらなるべく出席したほうがよい。断わると、これからの仕事に悪い影響があるかもしれないからである。</u>どうしても出席できないときは、必ず祝電を送るべきである。さて、披露宴の会場へ行ったら、受付で名前を書き、祝儀袋に包んだお祝いの<u>お金を出す。</u>いくらぐらいにするかは結婚する人と自分との関係による。 Translation: At the biggest celebratory event, wedding ceremony, friends, relatives, and of course, colleagues will be invited in most cases. If you are invited, you'd better attend the ceremony since rejecting an invitation may negatively impact your networking in the future. If someone cannot make it for whatever reasons, he/she must send a congratulatory message. Also, when arriving at the event venue, one needs go sign at the wedding reception and give the congratulatory money wrapped in a gift bag. The amount of money depends on the relationship between the attendee and the groom/bride.	Who's invited to celebratory events? Recently, there has been a trend towards family and friends only, although it is not unheard of for work colleagues to be invited too. However, it is generally not seen as acceptable to allow personal matters to get mixed up with work, and vice versa, and work relationships are not typically that close, so it's more rare. What do you do at these events? Go, eat, drink, and typically there are gifts. It is very common to register for gifts in the case of weddings and births, and cash gifts are not typical.

What really stands out in Linda's annotation is the extent to which the model influenced her decisions about what to include and what to leave out. As seen in Excerpt 5, Linda felt compelled to have her essay parallel each paragraph in the model, regardless of whether she believed it to be a worthy topic or not. She elaborated on this phenomenon in the interview, in which she admitted that she intended to "copy" the overall content of the model as "to make a parallel is easier than to point something out of the blue." She admitted that she even had to sacrifice authenticity by focusing on aspects that were not unique to American weddings, such as how to respond to a wedding invitation or what kind of presents one should give at a wedding (seen in Excerpt 5). On the other hand, some details that are unique to American weddings, such as the registry and the cake, were left out since there was no parallel within the model. We can see clearly from Excerpt 6 that Lee's discussion of Chinese wedding traditions was more culturally based, signaling a stronger awareness of the readers' background compared to Linda's interpretation.

Excerpt 6

Lee writes about Chinese wedding traditions	Linda writes about American wedding traditions
中国の結婚式で新郎をテストする風習がある。結婚式の前に新郎が新婦の家までお出迎えに行き、新婦を抱きかかえて車まで行き、式場に行くことである。しかし、花嫁介添人たちは簡単に新郎が*（に）入らせないように、難しい問題を聞いたり、普通にはしないリクエストをしたりする。…ちなみに、中国で結婚式の伝統的な色は赤、… Translation: At Chinese wedding, we have the tradition to test the groom. Before the ceremony, the groom will go to the bride's parents' house to pick her up, holding the bride to the car and go to the ceremonial venue. Also, the bridesmaid will not let the groom in easily. They will ask him challenging questions or make some uncommon requests to him. …In addition, the traditional color of Chinese wedding is red, …	家族や友達はもちろん、仕事関係の人も時々招待される。招待状ももらったら出席するべきだが、どうしても行かなくてもいけないというわけが*（では）ない。披露宴へ行ったら、お金かプレゼントが*（を）出す*（渡す）。結婚式は通年に*（トル）あるが、春と夏は特に人気である。 Translation: Of course, family members and friends will be invited and colleagues will sometimes be invited too. Although one should attend the wedding ceremony upon receiving the invitation, it is also ok if one cannot make it

	anyway. If you go to the wedding party, you should give the congratulatory money. Wedding ceremony can take place anytime throughout the whole year but it is more popular to have it in spring or summer.

Linda's writing also consistently corresponded to her reading of the model. Due to the fact that she failed to perceive the author's rhetorical intention, Linda's own composition jumped back and forth between celebratory and mournful events. She began with a discussion of commencements, followed by weddings, baptisms, funerals, and celebrations of Christmas. Her lack of rhetorical reading of the model also led to a less self-conscious writing style— her writing process can be summed up by her lively comment in the interview, "I was just like, okay, go!" Feeling no impulse to "get prepared for writing" as Lee insisted, Linda merely consulted the English text for content and electronic dictionaries for help with vocabulary.

5.3. **Emily: Model Composition as the "Vocabulary Repertoire"**

Emily is the only one of the three who lacks formal foreign language classes in Japanese. During her years working as an ESL teacher in Japan, she translated every Japanese vocabulary word back into English. This unique educational background was very different that of the other participants, both of whom have many years of college-level training in Japanese. Such differences can be easily observed in Emily's interpretation of the model.

It is obvious that what caught her attention was mostly unfamiliar lexical items. Seen in Excerpt 7, this was further verified by the frequent short comment in her annotation "These are vocabulary I can use."

Excerpt 7

A segment of the composition model	Emily's analysis
社会の節目の行事をまとめて冠婚葬祭という。冠婚葬祭は、<u>めでたい慶事</u>、めでたくない弔事、その他の三種類がある。<u>代表的</u>な行事の中で、子供が大人になることを祝う成人式（冠）と結婚式（<u>婚</u>）は慶事であり、葬式（<u>葬</u>）は弔事である。 Translation: In Japanese, all types of social rituals can be summarized with the phrase 冠婚葬祭 (ceremonial occasions). There are three types of ceremonies: ceremonies for a happy occasion that one wants to celebrate, mourning events that one does not want to celebrate and the others, etc. Among those representative events, the Coming-of-Age ceremony to celebrate a child's becoming an adult (冠) and wedding ceremony (婚) are celebratory events, funeral (葬) is mourning event.	These are the vocabulary and structures I can use. This model provides me with helpful vocabulary that I didn't learn before: 慶事、弔事、婚、葬, and etc.

Despite her efforts to learn the vocabulary strictly from the model, her use of it in her composition revealed a lack of rhetorical knowledge. Excerpt 8 shows Emily's attempt to use "そして also" and to transition from a discussion of funeral traditions to birthday celebrations, both of which are clearly incorrect. Moreover, the next transition "次は祝賀のこと Next, celebratory events" at the beginning of paragraph 4 is unnecessary because the preceding paragraph refers to birthday celebrations. Although she recognized the grammatical function of the two connecting phrases, "そして also" and "次 next", Emily failed to go beyond the lexical level to the more complex understanding of the rhetorical considerations required by that specific context.

Excerpt 8

A segment from Emily's writing "American Traditions" （アメリカの冠婚葬）
アメリカの葬式は宗教によって、違うしきたりがある。… 死人の家族へカセロールとか弁当を持ってくるべきである。(Paragraph 2) 　<u>そして</u>*(トル)最も大切な誕生日で大きな誕生会をする。 … 二十一才では飲酒は*(が)許される。(Paragraph 3) 　<u>次は祝賀のこと</u>。代表的なのは結婚式である。…(paragraph 4)

Translation:
Depending on the religion one belongs to, funerals in America can vary in rituals. … Attendees will bring a casserole and lunch box to the family of the dead. (Paragraph 2)
Also, people will have a birthday party for the most important birthdays. … 21 is the age when one receives the permission to drink alcohol. (Paragraph 3)
Next, celebratory event. A representative example can be the wedding ceremony. … (Paragraph 4)

The writing process Emily demonstrated was very similar to that of Linda in that she mainly used online dictionaries to look up new vocabulary words. When asked about the resources she employed during her writing process, she responded: "As far as I understood what I want to say (content from English texts), just try to figure out how to say it (vocabulary from dictionary)."

6.   Conclusion

The three participants have demonstrated different types of interpretations of model texts used in the JFL class. Each resorted to using them as potential resources for her own writing; however, each used them in different ways. The answer to the first research question posed earlier in the article, "What features do JFL learners focus on during their analysis of model texts in an advanced JFL course?", seems to be that it depends on their levels of awareness of the model texts. For Emily, the texts only provided a repertoire of isolated and decontextualized linguistic items that served no larger rhetorical purposes; however, Linda was able to use the model texts as a template in which to insert relevant content; and for Lee, they provided a pathway for understanding the rhetoric in Japanese. These results indicate that rhetorical awareness should also be emphasized in JFL writing classes: Only when students become aware of the link between textual features and contextual purposes can they analyze the model compositions more fully in ways that will potentially benefit their writing.

Regarding the second research question, "In what way does the model text affect the learner's writing strategies and final essays?", our findings revealed that the way in which a learner engages with the

model is highly consistent with his/her final writing strategies and output. In this study, only Lee developed a somewhat intuitive understanding of the interactions between the text and the authors' intentions, which helped her fine tune her conscious construction of the socio-rhetorical meanings in her composition. However, the other two participants in our study were only able to use the website as English to Japanese dictionaries. We can conclude that a rhetorical reading of the model could potentially help students to develop self-directed rhetorical writing.

As a 3-case study, the current study certainly has its limitations that reduce the generalizability of the findings, and one must proceed cautiously in making generalizations to other FL learners and instructional contexts. Future inquiry into how FL learners at different levels interact with writing models within a range of instructional settings would be essential. However, the in-depth investigation of the meaning of these cases and its implications for the larger educational context also shows promise of using case study method to continue to provide a thick description of this dynamic and complex process of FL writing.

The present study offers valuable pedagogical implications for both JFL and other LCTL writing classes. Traditionally, it has been thought that the genre-based approach would be better suited to more advanced second language learners (e.g., Yasuda, 2011; Byrnes et al., 2010). Such a concern has led to "the prevalence of the grammar-oriented approach in which language is taught as an object" in lower level foreign language writing classes (Yasuda, 2011, p.127). However, our findings show that the rhetorical parameters of a text must also be taught to less proficient LCTL writers. We cannot take it for granted that students will notice these subtle interactions between text and context, since such a sophisticated and dynamic view of writing is not necessarily innate in LCTL students. Through explicit discussions of models in class, students could learn to create a salient link between form and function, contextually analyze the model texts and re-appropriate those textual features in light of their own communicative purposes in new rhetorical contexts.

The present study also suggests that, despite the importance of distinguishing the pedagogical contexts between foreign language writing and second language writing, it is equally important to explore the potentiality of applying findings in SL writing to a FL context. When carefully introduced, the rich achievements in genre-based literacy research will bring new incentives to LCTL writing.

References

Abbuhl, R. (2011). Using models in writing instruction: A comparison with native and nonnative speakers of English. *SAGE Journals,* 1(3), 1-12.

Beaufort, A. (1999). *Writing in the real world: Making the transition from school to work.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1984). Learning about writing from reading. *Written Communication,* 1(3), 163-188.

Bhatia, V. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings.* New York: Longman.

Bhatia, V. (2002). Applied genre analysis: Analytical advances and pedagogical procedures. In A. M. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 279-283). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Byrnes, H. (2002). The role of task and task-based assessment in a content-oriented collegiate foreign language curriculum. *Language Testing,* 19(4), 419-437.

Byrnes, H. (2005). Content-based foreign language instruction. In C. Sanz (Ed.), *Mind and context in adult second language acquisition* (pp. 282-302). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Byrnes, H., & and Sinicrope, C. (2008). Advancedness and the development of relativization in L2 German: A curriculum-based longitudinal study. In L. Ortega & H. Byrnes (Eds.), *The longitudinal study of advanced L2 capacities* (pp. 109–138). New York: Routledge.

Byrnes, H., & Sprang, K. (2004). Fostering advanced L2 literacy: A genre-based cognitive approach. In H. Byrnes & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs* (pp. 47-53). Boston, MA: Thompson-Heinle.

Byrnes, H., Maxim, H., & Norris. J. (2010). Special issue: Monograph issue realizing advanced foreign language writing development in collegiate education: Curricular design, pedagogy, assessment. *Modern Language Journal,* 94, 1–235.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* London: Sage.

Charney, D., & Carlson, R. A. (1995). Learning to write in a genre: What student writers take from model texts. *Research in the Teaching of English,* 29 (1), 88-125.

Cheng, A. (2006). Understanding learners and learning in ESP genre-based writing instruction. *English for Specific Purposes,* 25(1), 76-89.

Cheng, A. (2007). Transferring generic features and recontextualizing genre awareness: Understanding writing performance in the ESP genre-based literacy framework. *English for Specific Purposes,* 26(3), 287-307.

Cheng, A. (2008a). Analyzing genre exemplars in preparation for writing: The case of an L2 graduate student in the ESP genre-based instructional framework of academic literacy. *Applied Linguistics,* 29(1), 50-71.

Cheng, A. (2008b). Individualized engagement with genre in academic literacy tasks. *English for Specific Purposes,* 27(4), 387-411.

Cheng, A. (2011). Language features as the pathways to genre: Students' attention to non-prototypical features and its implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 20(1), 69-82.

Collins, A., & Gentner, D. (1980). A framework for a cognitive theory of writing. In L. W. Gregg & E. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 51-72). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eschholz, P. (1980). The prose models approach: Using products in the process. In T. R. Donovan & B. McClelland (Eds.), *Eight approaches to teaching composition* (pp. 21-36). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Gentil, G. (2011). A biliteracy agenda for genre research. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 20, 6-23

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (1999). *Construing experience through meaning: A language-based approach to cognition.* New York: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2002). Genre: Language, context and literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 22, 113–135.

Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 12, 17-29.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 16, 148-164.

Hyon, S. (2001). Long-term effects of genre-based instruction: A follow-up study of an EAP reading course. *English for Specific Purposes,* 20, 417–438.

Hyon, S. (2002). Genre and reading: A classroom study. In A. M. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 121-139). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Johns, A. M. (2008). Genre awareness for the novice academic student: An ongoing quest. *Language Teaching,* 41, 237–252.

Lee, H. (2010). *Responding to genre-based writing instruction: An interpretive study of L2 writers' experiences in two graduate level ESP/EAP writing courses.* Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University.

Macbeth, K. P. (2010). Deliberate false provisions: The use and usefulness of models in learning academic writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 19(1), 33-48.

Manchón, R. M. (2009). Introduction: Broadening the perspective of L2 writing scholarship: The contribution of research on foreign language writing. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 1-22). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Martin, J. R. (1992). *English text: System and structure.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Matsuda, P. K. (1997). Contrastive rhetoric in context: A dynamic model of L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 6(1), 45-60.

McCampbell, J. (1996). Using models for improving composition. *English Journal,* 55, 772-776.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Negretti, R., & Maria, M. (2011). Fostering metacognitive genre awareness in L2 academic reading and writing: A case study of pre-service English teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 20, 95-110.

Ortega, L. (2009). Studying writing across EFL contexts: Looking back and moving forward. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 232-255). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Parks, S. (2001). Moving from school to the workplace: disciplinary innovation, border crossings, and the reshaping of a written genre. *Applied Linguistics,* 22(4), 405-438.

Paulston, C. B. (1972). Teaching writing in the ESOL classroom: Techniques of controlled composition. *TESOL Quarterly,* 6(1), 33-59.

Ryshina-Pankova, M. (2006). Creating textual worlds in advanced learning writing: The role of complex theme. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 164-183). London: Continuum.

Ryshina-Pankova, M. (2010). Toward mastering the discourses of reasoning: Use of grammatical metaphor at advanced levels of foreign language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal,* 94, 181–197.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J., & Feak, C. (2004). *Academic writing for graduate students.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Tardy, C. M. (2004). *Exploring the interactions between writing instruction and disciplinary practice: Pathways of four multilingual writers.* Ph.D. diss., Purdue University, Indiana.

Tardy, C. M. (2006). Researching first and second language genre learning: A comparative review and a look ahead. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 15(2), 79-101.

Tardy, C. M. (2009). *Building genre knowledge.* West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

Watson, C. (1982). The use and abuse of models in the ESL writing class. *TESOL Quarterly,* 16, 5-14.

Yasuda, S. (2011). Genre-based tasks in foreign language writing: Developing writers' genre awareness, linguistic knowledge, and writing competence. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 20 (2), 111-133.

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing process of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly,* 17, 6-28.

Appendix A

Lee's analysis of model (冠婚葬祭: 日本のしきたりを知ろう Traditional Family Ceremonies: Get to know the Japanese Customs)

Lee's highlights of the model text	Lee's annotation in Model Analysis Task (Transcribed without editing, notes in the brackets added by the researcher)
社会の節目の行事をまとめて冠婚葬祭という。[1] 　冠婚葬祭は、めでたい慶事、めでたくない弔事、その他の三種類がある。代表的な行事の中で、子供が大人になることを祝う成人式（冠）と結婚式（婚）は慶事であり、葬式（葬）は弔事である。[2] そして故人の霊を祭る法事やお盆など（祭）がある。広い意味では、お中元とお歳暮も含まれるかもしれない。冠婚葬祭は大切な行事である反面、毎日あることではない上、伝統的なしきたりを知らなくて困ることがある。マナーを解説したネットサイトがたくさんある。 　最も大きな慶事である結婚式の披露宴には、友人や親戚はもちろん、仕事関係の人からも招待されることが多い。招待されたらなるべく出席したほうがよい。断わると、これからの仕事に悪い影響があるかもしれないからである。どうしても出席できないときは、必ず祝電を送るべきである。さて、披露宴の会場へ行ったら	The general structure of the model: introducing three main types of traditions in the first paragraph, which is followed by three corresponding paragraphs with detailed explanations. という is a useful structure and writing strategy to introduce new/main concept. [1] "代表的な行事

、受付で名前を書き、祝儀袋に包んだお祝いのお金を出す。いくらぐらいにするかは結婚する人と自分との関係による。（相場をネットなどで調べることができる）。祝儀袋には格があって、沢山包むときはより豪華な飾りのものにする。日本では結婚式場に品物のプレゼントを持っていく習慣がない。休日で大安の日は、結婚式のラッシュだ。反対に仏滅の日は結婚式場はがらがらである。

慶事とちがい、弔事は突然やってくる。大切な知り合いの訃報を受けたら、すぐに駆けつける。会社関係の人なら、通夜と葬儀の手伝いを申し出る。あまり大きくない会社の社内の人間の弔事なら、会社中で通夜から告別式までを手伝うのが普通だ。通夜は普通の洋服でも地味でさえあれば構わないが、告別式には黒い喪服を来ていく。車も赤など派手な色を避ける。持っていく香典は、五千円から一万円ぐらいが適当である。

日頃世話になっている人に贈り物をするのがお中元と歳暮である。お中元は6月の末から8月にかけて、お歳暮は11月末から12月中旬に贈られる。本来は持参

の中で、…であり、…である" is a useful structure to introduce different types of customs.[2]

This is a transition between the two paragraphs, from the event that people celebrate to the event that people mourn. "… とちがい" is a useful phrase. The author uses to make this "happy to sad" transition.

するして渡すものだが、最近はデパートから相手先に配送してもらうのが最も多い型であろう。シーズンになると、大手のデパートではそのための特別会場を設けて対応する。贈るものは人によって異なり、時代によって流行もあるが、定番になっているものもある。例えば、お酒、お菓子、食料品、調味料などはいつも人気がある。お中元とお歳暮は、特にビジネスの世界では、相手に誠意を伝える適切な手段と考えられている。

Appendix B

Linda's analysis of model (冠婚葬祭: 日本のしきたりを知ろう
Traditional Family Ceremonies: Get to know the Japanese Customs)

Linda's highlights of the model text	Linda's annotation in Model Analysis Task
社会の節目の行事をまとめて冠婚葬祭という。　冠婚葬祭は、めでたい慶事、めでたくない弔事、その他の三種類がある。代表的な行事の中で、子供が大人になることを祝う成人式（冠）と結婚式（婚）は慶事であり、葬式（葬）は弔事である。そして故人の霊を祭る法事やお盆など（祭）がある。広い意味では、お中元とお歳暮も含まれるかもしれない。冠婚葬祭は大切な行事である反面、毎日あることではない上、伝統的なしきたりを知らなくて困ることがある。マナーを解説したネットサイトがたくさんある。 　最も大きな慶事である結婚式の披露宴には、友人や親戚はもちろん、仕事関係の人からも招待されることが多い。招待されたらなるべく出席したほうがよい。断わると、これからの仕事に悪い影響があるかもしれないからである。どうしても出席できないとき	This model gave me a lot of vocabulary. The main phrase 冠婚葬祭 is repeated all throughout here and there. Celebratory events, mourning, and customs. In the U.S., it is widely assumed that there is no particular unified culture, but that is wrong. There are many customs that people are simply unaware of. Weddings, Baby Showers, Birthdays, etc. Who's invited to celebratory events? Recently, there has been a trend

は、**必**ず**祝電**を**送**るべきである。さて、**披露宴**の**会場**へ**行**ったら、**受付**で**名前**を**書**き、**祝儀袋**に**包**んだお**祝**いの<u>お**金**を**出**す。</u>いくらぐらいにするかは**結婚**する**人**と**自分**との**関係**による。（**相場**をネットなどで**調**べることができる）。**祝儀袋**には**格**があって、**沢山包**むときはより**豪華**な**飾**りのものにする。**日本**では**結婚式場**に**品物**のプレゼントを**持**っていく**習慣**がない。**休日**で**大安**の**日**は、**結婚式**のラッシュだ。**反対**に**仏滅**の**日**は**結婚式場**はがらがらである。

　慶事とちがい、**弔事**は**突然**やってくる。<u>**大切**な**知**り**合**いの**訃報**を**受**けたら、すぐに**駆**けつける。</u>**会社関係**の**人**なら、**通夜**と**葬儀**の**手伝**いを**申**し**出**る。あまり**大**きくない**会社**の**社内**の**人間**の**弔事**なら、**会社中**で**通夜**から**告別式**までを**手伝**うのが**普通**だ。<u>**通夜**は**普通**の**洋服**でも**地味**でさえあれば**構**わないが、**告別式**には**黒**い**喪服**を**来**ていく。</u>**車**も**赤**など**派手**な**色**を**避**ける。**持**っていく**香典**は、**五千円**から

towards family and friends only, although it is not unheard of for work colleagues to be invited too. However, it is generally not seen as acceptable to allow personal matters to get mixed up with work, and vice versa, and work relationships are not typically that close, so it's more rare.

What do you do at these events?
Go, eat, drink, and typically there are gifts. It is very common to register for gifts in the case of weddings and births, and cash gifts are not typical.

Funerals
Interestingly, in the U.S., there is a wide variety of funeral possibilities. Some are closed, for-family-only affairs, and others are relatively open to the public. Recently, people

一万円ぐらいが適当である。

　日頃世話になっている人に贈り物をするのがお中元と歳暮である。お中元は6月の末から8月にかけて、お歳暮は11月末から12月中旬に贈られる。本来は持参するして渡すものだが、最近はデパートから相手先に配送してもらうのが最も多い型であろう。シーズンになると、大手のデパートではそのための特別会場を設けて対応する。贈るものは人によって異なり、時代によって流行もあるが、定番になっているものもある。例えば、お酒、お菓子、食料品、調味料などはいつも人気がある。お中元とお歳暮は、特にビジネスの世界では、相手に誠意を伝える適切な手段と考えられている。

have been tending towards making funerals less solemn, and so the traditional custom of wearing all black has been falling out of favor.

Customary Holidays Particularly at Christmas, people send out Christmas cards, usually with a picture and some seasonal greetings, to their friends and family, and occasionally even to work associates. Gifts are exchanged at Christmas, and people often go to church, but it has become a commercial holiday so not necessarily.

Appendix C

Emily's analysis of model (冠婚葬祭: 日本のしきたりを知ろう Traditional Family Ceremonies: Get to know the Japanese Customs)[5]

Emily's highlights of the model text	Emily's annotation in Model Analysis Task (Transcribed without editing, notes in the brackets added by the researcher)
社会の節目の行事をまとめて冠婚葬祭という。冠婚葬祭は、めでたい慶事、めでたくない弔事、その他の三種類がある。代表的な行事の中で、子供が大人になることを祝う成人式（冠）と結婚式（婚）は慶事であり、葬式（葬）は弔事である。そして故人の霊を祭る法事やお盆など（祭）がある。広い意味では、お中元とお歳暮も含まれるかもしれない。冠婚葬祭は大切な行事である反面、毎日あることではない上、伝統的なしきたりを知らなくて困ることがある。マナーを解説したネットサイトがたくさんある。 最も大きな慶事である結婚式の披露宴には、友人や親戚はもちろん、仕事関係の人からも招待されることが多い。招待された	These are the vocabulary and structures I can use. This model provides me with helpful vocabulary that I didn't learn before: 慶事、弔事、婚、葬、祭, and etc.

---

[5] All the three learners originally used different color highlighters to highlight what they have learned from the model text on the model analysis task sheet presented previously. The researcher has replaced those highlighted texts with underlines for publication in black and white and presented them along with the model text in the very left column. The right column contains the learner's annotations of the model analysis task consisting of both their written comments on the model analysis task sheet and their oral comment in the interview, following the model analysis task as transcribed by the researcher, with no editing

らなるべく出席したほうがよい。断わると、こ
れからの仕事に悪い影響があるかもしれない
からである。どうしても出席できないとき
は、必ず祝電を送るべきである。さて、披露
宴の会場へ行ったら、受付で名前を書き、
祝儀袋に包んだお祝いのお金を出す。いく
らぐらいにするかは結婚する人と自分との
関係による。（相場をネットなどで調べる
ことができる）。祝儀袋には格があって、
沢山包むときはより豪華な飾りのものにす
る。日本では結婚式場に品物のプレゼントを持
っていく習慣がない。休日で大安の日は、
結婚式のラッシュだ。反対に仏滅の日は結
婚式場はがらがらである。

　慶事とちがい、弔事は突然やってくる。
大切な知り合いの訃報を受けたら、すぐに
駆けつける。会社関係の人なら、通夜と葬儀の
手伝いを申し出る。あまり大きくない会社の
社内の人間の弔事なら、会社中で通夜から
告別式までを手伝うのが普通だ。通夜は普通
の洋服でも地味でさえあれば構わないが、
告別式には黒い喪服を来ていく。車も赤など派
手な色を避ける。持っていく香典は、五千
円から一万円ぐらいが適当である。

　日頃世話になっている人に贈り物をする

のがお中元と歳暮である。お中元は６月の末から８月にかけて、お歳暮は11月末から12月中旬に贈られる。本来は持参するして渡すものだが、最近はデパートから相手先に配送してもらうのが最も多い型であろう。シーズンになると、大手のデパートではそのための特別会場を設けて対応する。贈るものは人によって異なり、時代によって流行もあるが、定番になっているものもある。例えば、お酒、お菓子、食料品、調味料などはいつも人気がある。お中元とお歳暮は、特にビジネスの世界では、相手に誠意を伝える適切な手段と考えられている。

The Shared LCTL Symposium: A Call to Action

Stéphane Charitos,
Columbia University

Emily Heidrich,
Michigan State University

Koen Van Gorp,
Michigan State University

Luca Giupponi,
Michigan State University

"It is hard work and it could - likely will - take years, but it will be worth it."

How can we reimagine foreign language learning for the context of higher education today? How can we make sure that foreign languages remain relevant and an important part of the landscape of education in the United States? By focusing on innovative ways to partner across institutions and collaborate, the participants at the Shared LCTL Symposium in September 2018 discussed these key questions (resulting in the quote above from one of our participants). As a whole, the Shared LCTL Symposium (SLCTLS) focuses on how sharing languages, and, specifically, LCTLs, can work at different institutions, from small liberal arts consortia to large public institutions.

SLCTLS grew out of two independent grant projects focused on LCTLs, funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The University of Chicago received a grant to create the Mellon Collaborative Partners (https://melloncollaborativepartners.uchicago.edu), which develops shared course sequences in the target language using pairs of instructors from across institutions. Michigan State University facilitates the LCTL Partnership on behalf of the Big Ten Academic Alliance. The goal of the LCTL Partnership (http://lctlpartnership.celta.msu.edu/) is to create sustainable models for language instruction through various projects, including collaboratively developing open educational resources across the

Big Ten Academic Alliance. As part of a learning process about each other's grants and aims, the working groups at both institutions shared information about activities, including encouraging attendance at professional development opportunities.

The symposium began with a keynote talk by Stephane Charitos of Columbia University, entitled "The Future of Language Study in the U.S. Short-Term Crisis or Permanent Plight?" He highlighted the state of language study in the United States, showing how the "crisis" of declining enrollments in foreign languages is not a new trend and that institutes of higher education need to focus on promoting language education as a whole, both within and outside of our institutions. Many language programs try to focus on getting students who are already interested in language to choose *their* language, but Charitos emphasized that we should focus on communicating the need for language education to students and administrators, as well as working to match needs with student trajectories. If we can work on this collaboratively, he says, the "rising tide raises all boats," and all languages will benefit from these efforts. Charitos summarized this call for action as "four integrated axes of action."

Inform

The axis of "inform" means that we should better inform students about the value and availability of language education. However, we should not just focus on transmitting information *to* students, but rather focus on both giving out and gathering information. Charitos also advocated for institutions to mine their existing data on language enrollments more extensively and deeply to get a clear picture of trends as well as successes (See the next axis "Advocate"). As an example of a successful information activity, Charitos highlighted the storytelling campaign at Michigan State University that gives a platform for students to talk about the transformative power of language learning. (http://www.languages.celta.msu.edu/)

Advocate

The axis of "advocate" includes creating compelling arguments to rally support for languages from decision makers. Charitos specified that there is a distinct difference between informing and advocating. Whereas some activities on campus may be called "language advocacy" (activities aimed at getting the word out to students about languages), Charitos would only consider it advocacy if it really targeted decision makers with things like data-driven evidence of effectiveness and showing how language programs align with key institutional strategic goals and priorities.

Innovate

The axis of "innovate" encourages language programs to focus on developing tracks, courses, and activities that meet the needs of current students. This could include things like focusing on language for special purposes (healthcare, business, etc.), experiential learning, heritage language education, and possibly even incentivizing advanced language study. These new initiatives do not necessarily have to come at the cost of more "traditional" offerings, but language programs may find that through the process of this innovation, enrollments and enthusiasm may lead the programs in some different directions that they have in the past.

Collaborate

The axis of "collaborate" calls language programs to work together to enhance language education for all. Opposed to the traditional competition for students that may be interested in language, we should collaborate to make sure that the "total is more than the sum of the parts." Charitos highlighted current collaborations and initiatives for sharing materials, including the Shared Course Initiative, the Big Ten Academic Alliance, the LCTL Partnership, the Mellon Collaborative Partners project, and the Center for Open Educational Resources and Language Learning (COERLL).

At the conclusion of the keynote, the symposium organizers separated the group into four groups to have a round table discussion on each of the four integrated axes of action. The groups were tasked with

discussing some guiding questions together and then naming their top ideas for action for their axis.

Innovation - Ideas for Action

- Rewrite the curriculum, with a focused look at majors and minors and evaluating the credits needed to get a major. If they started at the beginning of the program as a freshman, could they complete a major without overloads?
- Understand students will not be "mini-professors" and there is a need to listen to the students on their desire to have both language and content at all levels.
- Use partnerships with the community to gain expertise for specialized courses

Inform - Ideas for Action

- Inform students
  - Engage in outreach to new/transfer students
  - Speak with advisors in different colleges about languages and how their students could benefit from language education
  - Invite alumni and employers to give talks as to how a language can be used
  - Encourage students to tell their stories
- Collect data
  - Conducting a survey during placement exams to know student motivations
  - Identify the institutional data that needs to be examined and set up a plan to analyze and communicate that data
- As part of the informational campaign, work to set up competency, practical, and advanced certificates and show how they can be used in the real world.

Advocate

- Use stories collected by current students or alums to illustrate concepts when talking to stakeholders.
- Organize co-curricular activities to be able to highlight the power of reaching across disciplines (e.g., talks, films, etc.)
- Promote scholarships, even non-traditional ones, by tying them to language courses. (Money talks!)
- Find and highlight innovative projects in the classroom
- Bring language to the community, including underserved populations (e.g., prisons), and highlight the transformative experiences there.

Collaboration

- Inter-institutional collaboration
  - Streamline communication across campuses to encourage and develop shared courses
  - Hold focus groups to find innovative ways for on-campus collaboration between LCTL programs
- Working together within the same institution:
  - Institutes should have an overarching unit encompassing all languages and programs so that it serves as a supporting entity
    - Work with this institute to offer professional development for instructors: Train instructors with a week of workshops to give a solid foundation before starting the academic year. Presentations can include best practices, standards, lesson planning, microteaching, tech support for audio/video recording
  - Host a luncheon for all instructors to meet and interact with colleagues across languages
  - Curricular and co-curricular programming across languages (e.g., a graphic novel reading club where many languages could read the same graphic novel, each in the students' L2, then come together for discussion) or develop

        curricular activities around one theme in different language classes. (e.g., Portuguese, Hindi, Korean, and Hebrew develop same activities around International Women's Day (students create videos, make work visible).

○ Bring in international faculty and researchers from across campus/disciplines as guest speakers to language classes.

    ■ Connect language/culture classes with researchers to inform research questions, as opposed to finding translator after research questions have been developed.

As SLCTLS continued, there were updates on both of the grant projects, a panel on the CourseShare initiative at the Big Ten Academic Alliance from various stakeholder perspectives, and a panel about practical experiences in sharing courses with perspectives from participants in different consortia. We concluded with a "town hall" discussion on the themes that arose from discussions throughout the Symposium. (You can read more about the Symposium as a whole on the LCTL Partnership blog: http://lctlpartnership.celta.msu.edu/blog/)

We want to continue and expand the conversation that was started at the Shared LCTL Symposium in September 2018. The call for action is an important one and should be heard and addressed by as many stakeholders in LCTL education (and beyond) as possible. If you want to participate in this conversation or have ideas relating to these four axes that you want to share with the LCTL community, do not hesitate to contact us. We hope to encourage this dialogue and, ultimately, to create a sustainable platform to share these ideas.

The future of language education in the U.S. concerns all language teachers, no matter which language you are teaching. Let's focus on how to create that "rising tide" that will benefit all foreign language educ