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INTERCULTURAL RHETORIC

Ulla Connor, Estela Ene and Ana Traversa

Introduction

Intercultural rhetoric (IR) is “the study of written discourse between and among individuals with different cultural backgrounds” (Connor, 2011, p.1). IR examines the influences of first language, culture, and education on the production of texts with the aim of advancing intercultural communication research as well as informing writers, editors, translators, and language and composition instructors and learners, among other users and producers of text. This chapter outlines the history of IR from its contrastive rhetoric (CR) beginnings, briefly discusses IR’s conceptualization of culture, and describes current IR research methods. The grant proposal is used to illustrate how IR research methodology is particularly useful for the study of specific genres across cultures. Finally, special attention is paid to IR research as it applies to English for academic purposes (EAP) practice (in both English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts). The chapter closes with a consideration of future directions for IR.

From “contrastive” to “intercultural”

As Diane Belcher puts it, “in the beginning was Kaplan” (2014, p.59). His “doodles” article (1966), though controversial and even misunderstood, remains a ground-breaking study of student writing because it initiated the systematic analysis of the thesis that one’s first language and culture influence the structure of discourse.

The idea that “cultural thought patterns” existed in L2 writing was provocative. Following in the footsteps of contrastive analysis (CA), which looked primarily at word- and sentence-level structures, Kaplan’s work was the first to consider the above-the-sentence rhetorical structure of texts. The 600 student essays he analyzed were not selected rigorously from the same genre or level of writer expertise. The 1966 article deviated from the scientific method in a number of ways, including material selection and interpretation (Belcher, 2014). However, its thesis gained traction. In fact, research that followed in the CR tradition confirmed Kaplan’s basic argument. For example, the work of Hinds (1990) further reinforced the existence of culturally-related preferences for organizing essays. He found that Japanese and Korean essay writers revealed their purpose for writing towards the end
of their essays, applying an inductive rhetorical pattern. In contrast, Anglo-American writers used a direct, overtly argumentative, deductive pattern.

In the 1990s, Xiaoming Li extended the examination of student writing into the area of assessment. Li (1996) showed that Chinese and American readers of student essays reacted quite differently to the same samples of writing. In Li’s argument, the fact that the Chinese evaluators appreciated a student’s emotional writing more than the American raters did illustrated the presence of culture-based differences in reader expectations, as well as implications for the assessment of writing. Recently, Abasi (2012), working with English-speaking learners of Persian, demonstrated that they not only perceived the structure of an Iranian editorial as less organized than an editorial translated from English, but also had more difficulties organizing their own summaries, took longer, and made more language errors when recounting the Iranian editorial. As Connor (2011, p.3) and Ferris (2009, p.22) point out, such work developed in the classic CR tradition has significant pedagogical implications in that it offers evidence that can raise instructors’ awareness of students’ diverse literacy and rhetorical preferences, as well as inform the choice and design of instructional materials.

A widely perceived weakness of early CR research was that it both represented a deterministic view of culture and overgeneralized findings based on the writing of learners (rather than experts) in static isolation from other developmental and socio-cultural factors that influence writing (Casanave, 2004; see Kubota, 2010). Additionally, some analyses of student writing produced results that did not align with Kaplan’s descriptions. For example, Kubota (1998) and Hirose (2003) showed that Japanese students used, in fact, deductive features transferred from Japanese into their English writing. Based on such data, Kubota and Lehner (2004, in Connor, 2011, p.68) argued for a “critical contrastive rhetoric,” one that is more nuanced in its interpretations. Ryuko Kubota continues to be critical of the idea of culture as monolithic or as a post-colonial hybrid that could become another monolith itself (2014).

Current understandings and uses of culture in IR research

The concept of culture and its transformations are at the centre of CR and the development of IR. In 2008, Connor proposed a multilayered model of IR consisting of three major tenets:

1 Texts need to be seen in their contexts with meaningful contextual and purposeful descriptions;
2 Culture needs to be complexified to include disciplinary cultures in addition to national/ethnic cultures, and
3 Dynamic, interactive patterns of communication are important to consider, which leads to convergences among cultural differences.

(Connor, 2008, pp. 299–316)

These tenets are based on a conceptualization of culture that is markedly different from earlier versions. Culture has long been a complex concept; it is probably one of the most contentious subjects in all humanities and sciences. It has been generally defined as the lifestyle of a group of people: values, beliefs, artifacts and behavior, and communication patterns. Mathews (2000, p.2) calls this traditional view “the way of life of the people.” This definition has often led to understandings of culture in purely national terms—“US culture,” “Chinese culture,” and “Finnish culture,” for example. Such a notion of culture came under increasing attack in the post-World War II period, and particularly in postmodernist
criticism. For example, Keesing (1994, p.301) regards culture as largely the invention of Western anthropologists who simply needed “a framework for [their] creation and evocation of radical diversity.” He believes that this essentialist notion of culture, which represented the view of early anthropologists studying rural and homogenous societies, infiltrated our everyday discourse and, over time, led many Westerners to understand culture as something defined by objects and rituals, usually as they related to a non-Western “other” (p.301). In other words, this notion allowed Westerners to define themselves by comparison to what they were not.

The ability to conceptualize culture as used in IR research is critical. Dwight Atkinson (2004) wrote about the need for CR to change its conceptualization from a “received” view of culture to an alternative view that takes into account the changing nature of global communication. The most useful concept in Atkinson’s discussion of new cultural concepts for IR was the distinction between “large cultures” and “small cultures” (Holliday, 1999). Legal culture, business culture, classroom culture, etc., can be analyzed using the parameters conventionally used for culture: norms, values, social practices, roles, hierarchies, and artifacts. We know from genre theory, for example, that various discourse communities have their own norms about genre characteristics and social practices about how to produce and consume these genres. Different norms for research papers often exist from discipline to discipline (Swales, 2004). For example, business executives in any given culture (national/ethnic and professional) know what a typical sales letter looks like, and they have a schema about how sales negotiations are expected to proceed.

Holliday’s discussion of small cultures in educational settings (1999) provides a productive distinction for IR research. Large cultures have ethnic, national, or international group features as essential components and tend to be normative and prescriptive. Small cultures, on the other hand, are non-essentialist and based on dynamic processes that relate to cohesive behaviors within social groupings. Small cultures avoid ethnic, national, and international stereotyping: “In cultural research, small cultures are thus a heuristic means in the process of interpreting group behaviour” (p.240). Small cultures are rooted in activities, and a specific discourse is one of the products of small culture. According to Holliday, “in many ways, the discourse community is a small culture” (p.252).

A complex notion of the interactions of different cultural forces emerges when one analyzes the small and large cultures present in a given situation. National culture overlaps with other, smaller cultures such as professional-academic culture, classroom culture, student culture, and youth culture. This is important for teachers of EAP writing to consider in both ESL and EFL situations, especially when the class includes students from such diverse disciplines as engineering, nursing, business, liberal arts, etc., in addition to diversity in terms of age, gender, and national and socio-economic backgrounds. Postmodern views see culture as “a dynamic, ongoing process which operates in changing circumstances to enable group members to make sense and meaningfully operate within those circumstances” (Holliday 1999, p.248). Thus, culture has become less and less a national consensus than “a consensus built on common ethnic, generational, ideological, occupational, or gender-related interests, within and across national boundaries” (Kramsch, 2002, p.276).

Particularly relevant to current EAP research and pedagogy is the notion of culture from the bottom up; that is, from the perspective of the individual. Atkinson and Sohn (2013) argue that people live “culturally” and propose the cultural study of the person. They aim to describe culture as represented in the lives of its individual users from their perspectives. Thus, they focus on the cultural nature of the individual (how socio-cultural influences contribute to individual identity) as well as on the individual nature of the cultural (how cultural material
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is actively interpreted, appropriated, and (re)created by individuals). Case studies such as one conducted by Canagarajah (2006), for example, portray an individual’s experience negotiating parallel linguistic, ethnic, and academic cultures.

We started our discussion by mentioning several classic classroom-oriented CR research. In the sections below, we highlight the newer IR research that overlays academic and disciplinary culture on top of linguistic/ethnic/national culture. Genre analysis and corpus-based research are explored as research approaches that have had major cumulative effects on the field of IR. Finally, studies of student academic writing will be considered for their pedagogical implications.

**IR research in EAP: ESL and EFL contexts**

*The role of genre analysis*

As the domain of writing in EAP expanded from the teaching of essay writing to other genres in academic contexts, genre analysis has provided IR researchers with methods of analysis that supplement the discourse analysis methods used in previous CR research. The development of genre analysis (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993) was fundamental to IR research, as it forced researchers to compare textual and contextual features of comparable genres across cultures, whereas before the advent of genre analysis there was the danger that apples were being compared to oranges. In addition, the focus on the rhetorical analysis of specific genres led IR research to expand into many additional academic and professional genres.

The number of comparative empirical genre analyses has increased exponentially in the past two decades, not only in number but also in kind. Genre research significantly improves our understanding of the use of language for academic and specific purposes across cultures, both disciplinary and language-based. Published studies have compared the rhetorical moves and linguistic features of the research article in a number of disciplines in various countries (e.g. Ventola and Mauranen, 1991; Duszak, 1994; Moreno, 1998; Mur-Dueñas, 2008). Other genres that have been studied across cultures include the business letter request (Yli-Jokipii, 1996), the sales letter (Zhu, 1997), the grant proposal (Connor & Mauranen, 1999), the application letter (Upton & Connor, 2001), the letter of recommendation (Precht, 1998), web pages (McBride, 2008), and newspaper commentaries (Wang, 2008). Many of the studies use rhetorical moves analysis (e.g. Connor & Mauranen, 1999), but other linguistic analyses are also used to identify and explain cultural differences in writing for a specific genre. Mur-Dueñas (2008) uses metadiscourse analysis to examine Spanish–English contrasts in academic research articles, while Wang (2008) applies systemic-functional appraisal theory to evaluate newspaper commentaries in Chinese and English.

Genre analysis has come a long way from early paragraph-based CR analyses. Cumulatively, the focus and findings of genre studies, such as the ones above, underscore consideration to audience, purpose, and pragmatics. All those who teach writing, are learning to write, or use writing in their profession or occupation can benefit from understanding that the norms of discourse communities or communities of practice (disciplinary or otherwise) shape writing. IR-oriented genre analysis facilitates this type of understanding.

**IR and research grant proposals**

The grant proposal stands out as an essential academic genre that offers fertile territory for IR research, with implications across academic circles all over the world. Grant proposal
writing is a fundamental form of scientific writing: researchers must get money in the first place if they are to publish articles (Myers, 1990). Others acknowledge it as “a genre that all academics will have to come to terms with at some point of their career, usually the sooner the better” (Upton & Connor, 2001, p.235).

Most grant agencies give general advice for writing proposal sections, but such advice is often vague and ambiguous. For example, Connor (2012) pointed out that the National Institutes of Health (2010) gave suggestions such as the following for writing the “specific aims” section: “Don’t be overly ambitious. A small, focused project is generally better received than a diffuse, multifaceted project.” What is “overly ambitious”? How much ambition is enough? It was similar wording in European Union grant-writing guidelines that originally encouraged Connor and Finnish linguist colleagues in the 1990s to study the language of successful proposals. The research resulted in a description of EU grant proposal rhetorical moves (Connor et al., 1995). Connor and Mauranen (1999) is the first study that analyzed the functional components of the genre. Based on the move analysis developed by Swales (1990) and Bhatia (1993), they identified ten required moves:

1. establishing the territory of the proposed research
2. indicating a gap in the territory
3. stating the goal of the proposed study
4. specifying the means of how the goal will be achieved
5. reporting previous research
6. presenting anticipated achievements
7. describing benefits of the study
8. introducing the research team and making a competence claim
9. making an importance claim of the proposed research, and
10. making a compliance claim to indicate the relevance of the proposal to the objectives of the grant funder.

The above-mentioned moves have been subsequently applied in other studies on research and non-profit grant proposals (Connor & Wagner, 1998; Feng & Shi, 2004). Connor (2000) examined rhetorical variations in fourteen research grant proposals and confirmed her move identification by interviewing five grant writers, thus studying the social contexts of grant writing to supplement text analysis. In the course of the actual writing of the grant proposal text, social interactions are very important and constitute a key element of grant-proposal genre knowledge. Based on her own research on proposal writing, Christine Tardy (2003) writes,

Grant proposals function within a larger system of documents with which writers interact as they navigate through the grant-writing process. Documents such as letters of intent and grant-writing guidelines, as well as face-to-face interactions with program officers, are all interconnected genres within the grant-writing process.

(p.11)

Such studies further the knowledge we have about the relationships between texts and culture. Even when such studies analyze rhetorical organization of grant proposals without directly comparing across languages, the research accumulates—study by study, language by language—into a database of information that can be then used in IR-oriented research.
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and teaching. Grant proposal studies are an illustration of the manifestations of disciplinary cultural norms, and also capture their enactment across international contexts. This is a valuable contribution by virtue of corpus-based methodology utilized as well as the broad focus of the research.

**Corpus-based IR research**

Over the past decade, corpus linguistics has provided a powerful method of linguistic analysis for IR studies. In fact, a significant portion of the genre research mentioned above uses the tools and methods of corpus linguistics—large databases of texts selected on the basis of their pertinence to a specific research question, and computer-searchable with software for linguistic analysis (Biber et al., 1998). When applied in a contextually and culturally sensitive manner, corpus research can become a cornerstone of intercultural textual scholarship. Context-sensitive, quantitative textual analyses using corpus linguistics methods allow us to compare similar texts across languages, or texts written by proficient native speakers of a language and those written by L2 learners. Such studies provide potentially generalizable data about linguistic and rhetorical preferences across languages and cultures. They allow researchers and teachers to “understand more fully the specialized registers that students seek to master, as well as the differences from other registers that students are exposed to” (p.170). Language instructors, especially those in EFL situations who often teach groups of speakers of only one L1, benefit from knowing what may be difficult for L2 learners as a result of that specific L1.

There are two approaches to corpus-based research (Biber et al., 2007), both of which can be (and have been) productive for IR. By following a *top-down* approach, researchers look for the organizational patterns used by a discourse community. Studies developed in this vein include the seminal work on move analysis by Swales (1990). Researchers have used move analysis to determine the discourse organization of research articles in various disciplines (see chapters on corpus analysis and genre in this book). Connor and Mauranen (1999), Connor (2000), Upton and Connor (2001), and Upton and Cohen (2009) mainly used this approach to identify the moves in grant proposals and philanthropic fundraising letters.

On the other hand, *bottom-up* corpus research focuses on smaller linguistic units (such as lexical items like verbs and pronouns, or lexical bundles) to understand patterns of use characteristic of a specific genre. A valuable product of this approach is Coxhead’s 2000 Academic Word List (AWL), which has numerous pedagogical applications (Chen & Ge, 2007). Academic word lists now exist for other languages, such as French (Cobb & Horst, 2004); at the same time, discipline-specific academic word lists are being developed for English in order to avoid the over-generalizations in Coxhead’s AWL (Hyland & Tse, 2007).

The blending of critical and corpus-based approaches is a recent and meaningful approach to IR research. The Belcher and Nelson (2013) volume illustrates this very combination of approaches, applying it to the study of socio-political identities online (You, 2013) and in public media (Escamilla, 2013). Two chapters in the volume directly forward the IR agenda by comparatively analyzing written discourse. Cortes and Hardy (2013) compare English and Spanish history writing corpora to examine the semantic features of lexical bundles in their larger linguistic context in both languages by taking into consideration the affective meaning and co-occurrence of the lexical bundles in both languages. Temples and Nelson further innovate by focusing on cross-cultural interaction in asynchronous, computer-mediated communication, and finding distinctive patterns in the use of interpersonal pronouns by
Canadian, Mexican, and US students. Clearly, corpus studies benefit from considering not only the textual level but also the social situations and purposes of writing.

Aside from blending IR with corpus linguistics and critical discourse analysis, the studies in Belcher and Nelson also illustrate the importance of integrating an emic perspective and qualitative analyses into the textual analysis. Temples and Nelson, for example, take quantitative corpus analysis one step further by organizing the analysis into groups in which they examine, quantitatively and qualitatively, the language use of each study participant. This approach is in accord with Connor’s (2013) observation that, while corpus linguistic methods are well developed for the analysis at the textual level, ethnographic annotations should be added to the corpus data for discursive and social-level analysis, to include information about the author, audience, and other important contextual matters. By collecting ethnographic background information about the writer and writing context, the researcher can complement the quantitative analyses facilitated by corpus tools with qualitative, in-depth analyses of an entire corpus or specific data subsets. After textual analysis, once trends have been revealed, the reasons for them and other crucial information are revealed by interviewing individual writers or focus groups. This approach was taken by Ene (2008) in her study of graduate native and non-native English speaking academic writers, in which the corpus-based linguistic analysis of the writers’ texts was complemented by data from participant interviews. Her combined approach helped understand the corpus data not only as a reflection of linguistic interference, but also of social and personal factors such as age, socialization, and motivation.

IR and student EAP writing

In her discussions of contemporary IR, Connor (2011) emphasizes the importance of understanding that the rhetorical structure of writing is shaped under the influence of all of the small and large cultures—ethnic and otherwise—a writer belongs to simultaneously. As also indicated by the studies mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the reality remains that L1 and L2 student writing across any combination of languages is likely to diverge in certain respects and to varying degrees in the use of linguistic structures and devices such as lexical and syntactic variety, coordination, subordination, and passivization (Hinkel, 2005); coherence and cohesion devices (Moreno, 1998); methods of presenting evidence and addressing reader expectations (Keck, 2014); and argumentation and sequencing (Hinds, 1990), at basic as well as near-native proficiency levels (Ene, 2008). Current IR research, working with an expanded definition of culture and varied methodologies, adds to this list some nuances of the complex relationships between cultural background and texts.

The contributions of authors such as Abasi (2012) and Akbari (2009) on the pedagogical value of IR and the ways it translates to instructional contexts illustrate “the negotiated nature of cross-cultural practices” (Abasi & Akbari, 2014, p.114). Xiaoye You has conducted rhetorical analyses that demonstrate the cross-pollination between traditional Confucian and Western rhetorical choices throughout the history of Chinese rhetoric (2005, 2010). Work such as his points at the dynamic nature of culture and the socio-political changes that affect the evolution of discourse practices. Towards the end of his book, You (2010) ponders the influence of English as a global language and China’s exam-oriented culture on the spread of writing patterns that are both similar and dissimilar to the oversimplified US-based, five-paragraph essays required in standardized national exams. In a recent analysis of student writing in English by 40 Chinese undergraduate students, Ene (2014) presents findings that support You’s observation that Chinese students’ writing is increasingly Westernized but
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still combines typical Chinese and Western (US-based) features. Most of her participants displayed strengths not found in previous studies, such as relatively strong theses and topic sentences. However, the participants’ writing was also partly traditionally “Chinese” in that it provided vague support for main ideas and refrained from forefronting writers’ selves via personal opinions or reflections from a personal point of view. You (2010) and Ene (2014) are examples of research that shows that inter-cultural rhetorical features evolve with the contexts around them. This is, in Abasi and Akbari’s (2014, p.114) words, “the negotiated nature of cross-cultural practices.” The continued re-examination of writing practices in context is necessary if we want to accurately describe rhetorical norms for the benefit of students.

Research on EFL writing has produced ample evidence that the writing of EFL learners needs to be understood not only in terms of linguistic forms—below or above sentence-level—but also in the context of the local as well as the global environment. For one, writing is often not the most important skill one needs to develop in EFL contexts (Ene, 2013, 2014). Additionally, such contexts are often constrained by a lack of financial resources, an exam-driven culture, inhumane workloads, and political instability resulting in frequent and confusing policy changes (Ene, 2013; Reichelt, 2009). This conglomerate of factors creates the conditions for EFL writing to either adhere to or diverge from the norms of traditional Western rhetoric. The adherence may be related to the fact that some students want to study or work abroad, while the divergence may result from the fact that writing is exchanged in ELF or EIL contexts, where English is everyone’s and no one’s language, and local nuances infuse discourses in English. Adherence can therefore simply result from the demands of national policy, while divergence may come from diversity in approaches to teacher education. In some cases instructors themselves can be ideologically opposed to teaching traditional English writing conventions when they see the English language as a colonizing power that is incompatible with the writing practices of local cultures (Casanave, 2009; You, 2010).

As a culturally grounded writing practice, source documentation (especially the culturally-informed distinction between “proper” documentation and plagiarism) has been a productive area of study in IR/EAP. Much has been written that finds ties between cultural values such as collectivism and the minimal use of citations in the work of, for example, East Asian students (Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2005; Shi, 2006; Liu, 2008). However, more recently Keck (2014) points out that developmental factors are involved in the use of citation techniques to a greater extent than culture. Both L1 and L2 novice writers in Keck’s study identified the same excerpts as important to refer to, and then copied more from source texts instead of paraphrasing or citing, while the more advanced student writers were more likely to use paraphrasing and citations.

Future directions

Recent work in IR indicates that the field will continue to evolve alongside the idea of culture. It has long moved away from equating culture with nationality or ethnicity without necessarily taking these out of the equation. IR now accommodates conceptualizations of culture ranging from the individual as a culture (Atkinson & Sohn, 2013), to global culture (Baker, 2013), to digital culture (Belcher, 2014, p.62). While this in theory widens the research territory and potential impact of IR research, it can also potentially weaken it. The expansion of the definition of culture has led to too many possible operationalizations. This in turn dilutes the concept, as culture can be too many things rather than a concentrated
something. IR is so intrinsically blended into almost any study that considers culture as a variable that its individuality is at risk. However, we argue that culture, no matter how we define it, always influences communication, and therefore research in applied linguistics and related fields should continue the IR tradition.

The integrity of the IR field can be preserved by continuing to focus on the original pedagogical goal of CR: to reveal rhetorical patterns in order to be able to explain them to students of writing. Some recent instruction-oriented IR studies, for example, have explored the role of technology in teaching IR. Xing et al. (2008) showed that their Chinese learners who had access to an e-course on IR were able to make their writing more like that of native English writers than those who did not. Walker (2011) commends their approach as one of several ways in which rhetorically-oriented teaching can be effective at improving student writing in a target language. Walker also supports engaging the students as ethnographers who analyze and compare texts, allowing the use of the L1 (especially at lower levels of proficiency) to support fluency and confidence, and using teacher conferences and peer responses as an opportunity to discuss rhetorical features.

Contextualized text analysis continues to be as important as the new definitions of culture for consolidating the basis for a new theory of IR, in which three relevant components are overlaid: (1) texts in contexts; (2) culture as a complex interaction of small and large cultures (Holliday, 1999); and (3) texts in intercultural interactions (Connor, 2011, p.2). In light of this framework and to summarize what has been said so far, IR assumes that (1) the study of writing is not limited to texts but needs to consider the surrounding social contexts and practices; (2) national cultures interact with disciplinary and other cultures in complex ways; and (3) intercultural discourse encounters—spoken and written—entail interaction among interlocutors and require negotiation and accommodation.

Methodologically, much of the recent analysis of EAP writing contexts through the IR lens has been in depth and qualitative. Despite the current emphasis on qualitative analyses of writing contexts, we need to continue conducting quantitatively-oriented textual analyses that compare similar texts in writers’ L1 and L2. Such studies provide explicit, generalizable examples about different linguistic and rhetorical preferences across languages and cultures. In order to effectively explore intercultural rhetoric, studies should continue to consider both the textual level and the social situations and purposes of writing. Corpus linguistic methods complemented by ethnographic methods can facilitate deep analyses, both quantitative and qualitative.

The scope of IR has already expanded beyond written interaction and texts other than the academic essay or research paper. We see now research on classroom chats that draws attention to chatroom text as a genre in its own right (Temples & Nelson, 2013) or studies of teacher education and professional development (Ene, 2013; Reichelt, 2009), taking into account not only the writing product but many surrounding socio-political aspects that affect intercultural communication. The widening of IR’s scope to encompass the writing process, multimedia/digital discourse, and policy, among other factors, is inevitable and desirable. At the same time, more pedagogically-oriented IR research, especially in EFL contexts, is necessary in order to counterbalance the skewed orientation towards English (Abasi, 2012; Abasi & Akbari, 2014).

**Conclusion**

This chapter has discussed IR research and applications in linguistics, with particular attention to EAP instruction. We have reviewed its historical development in modern applied
linguistics over the past 50 years and considered its major theoretical, methodological, and practical contributions. We have focused on the significant expansion of IR in scope, from student writing as its object of analysis to its many contributions to various other EAP and ESP situations. However, we need to underscore the fact that the impetus for Kaplan’s (1966) CR was to support international students in US universities as they wrote for their new native English-speaking audiences. The goal to provide relevant language teaching in a variety of second- and foreign-language situations should continue to be central to IR. Comparing texts in the students’ native language with texts in the target language (cross-cultural text linguistics) is needed, and we now have good, reliable methods to do that in ways that lead to generalizable findings that can be translated into relevant instruction. In other words, IR today encompasses two major areas of research and instruction: cross-cultural studies of texts and intercultural studies of interactions. Both are needed.
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