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SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN KOREAN AND AMERICAN DISCOURSE PATTERNS

by Robert F. Norton
American University of Beirut (formerly)

There is an ever increasing need today for people the world over to learn how to communicate with each other effectively. Never before have we found ourselves in greater need to discover ways to communicate messages of utmost importance to people who may have an entirely different way of perceiving and reacting to the world than we.

Many times people are faced with the situation of confronting a person from a different culture and come away terribly discouraged because they are unable to communicate the urgency of their message to the other person. When the backgrounds of the two individuals are very different, or sometimes even when they appear to be the same, a fundamental difference in thinking style might be central to the problem. However, people rarely if ever consider this to be a potential problem. Many are prone to think that everyone else thinks in exactly the same way that he does.

Anyone who has taught and lived in the Orient for any length of time is acutely aware of the great difficulty that Oriental students have in communicating their ideas in English especially in written form. The difficulty of communicating does not seem to be as acute when speaking face to face perhaps because of nonverbal cues that help to convey meaning or perhaps because face to face interaction allows both participants to ask questions when they don’t quite understand a particular point that the other is trying to make.

Teachers of English as a second language have often been puzzled by the fact that students from the Orient (China, Korea and Japan) can often master the grammatical structures of English quite rapidly, but seem to have more difficulty learning to write essays in English than do natives of most Western European countries. This seems to indicate that something isn’t being communicated in the classroom that is essential for native Orientals to master English writing techniques. What is this something? How can it be characterized?

Translators, too, when attempting to translate from Eastern Asian languages into English have similar problems in trying to produce an English counterpart that is as intelligible to native Americans as the original is to native Orientals. It is especially problematical if the translation is very literal. This seems to indicate that there is a difference between the languages
of the two cultures that is broader than the syntactical issues that are usually treated in language classes and classes for translators. This difference seems to be related to the way in which the ideas are joined together to produce written discourse. By discovering the exact nature of these differences, translators might be enabled to produce more intelligible translations and language teachers might be enabled to teach English essay writing more effectively.

After living and teaching English for three years in Korea as a Peace Corps Volunteer, I was even more perplexed by this inability of my students to communicate their thoughts to me in written English when we seemed to do so well communicating with each other face to face. It is true that I knew Korean to some extent. I lived with Korean families or roommates during most of my stay in Korea and could communicate in Korean well enough to shop for food, greet friends and neighbors when we met on the street and engage in simple conversation. However, whenever we had something deeper to talk about we generally found that their English was better than my Korean.

When I returned to the United States in December of 1973, I couldn’t stop thinking about how brilliant and insightful my Korean friends were when we were living together, yet how incomprehensible I had found the written compositions which they turned in to me as assignments. The letters they sent to me as a friend after I was back in the States were much more understandable than the compositions they had submitted to me when I was their teacher. Yet I knew that many more hours of careful thought had gone into their incomprehensible compositions, than had gone into their hastily scribbled letters which were much easier to comprehend. When the time came to select a topic for my doctoral dissertation in Instructional Psychology this apparent difference in thinking style seemed like a very good subject to try to understand. But how could it be done?

I had already begun to look for anything I could find comparing the thinking styles of different cultures and there was relatively very little to find. I also began to examine various techniques of discourse analysis. There were many more comparisons of syntax or grammar differences between languages, but these differences didn’t seem to be particularly relevant to the questions that I wanted to ask. Some of my students in Korea could compose flawless English sentences, but their compositions were still incoherent and unorganized. The sentence is too small a unit to study to gain an understanding of what was wrong with their compositions as a whole.

Other language scholars who had recognized the problem many years before I first encountered it, had already begun to see the need for contrastive studies based on units of discourse longer than just the sentence. This great need was stated in 1966 by Robert Kaplan in the following plea:
In the teaching of paragraph structure to foreign students, whether in terms of reading or in terms of composition, the teacher must be himself aware of these structural differences, and he must make the differences overtly apparent to his students. In short, contrastive grammar is presently taught. Now not much has been done in the area of contrastive rhetoric. It is first necessary to arrive at accurate descriptions of existing paragraph orders other than those common to English (Kaplan, 1966b, p. 14).

This same need for contrastive analysis studies to be undertaken beyond mere grammatical considerations within sentences into considerations of the relationships between sentences and paragraphs was echoed in recommendations made by the Federation internationale de professeurs de langues vivantes at a meeting in Yugoslavia in 1968 (Di Pietro, 1971, p. 12). By 1971, contrastive analysis studies which considered aspects of discourse had been done between English and the following languages: French, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish, Choctaw, Navajo, Papago, certain Eastern European languages (Di Pietro, 1971, p. xiv) and Hopi (Whorf, 1956). By 1978, I was able to find no comparable studies that had been done between English and any of the Oriental languages. Furthermore, although the above studies did mention some aspects of discourse differences, they were primarily concerned with analyzing differences at the lexical and syntactic levels, which involve respectively an analysis of phonetic and word-meaning differences in the former and differences in grammatical relationships in the latter.

There was a contrastive analysis done in 1969 between English and Korean (Whang, Kim, Cho & Lee, 1969), but this was concerned only with grammatical structures and did not involve structural differences at the discourse level. It is only comparisons at the discourse level, that are likely to make possible a characterization of thinking style differences. Many linguists maintain that discourse (which involves the inter-relationships of sentences and paragraphs) is concerned basically with what goes on in the mind (thinking) more than what comes out of the mouth (speaking) or hand (penmanship) (Dufrenne, 1963, pp. 35-40; Kaplan, 1966b, p. 1; Oliver, 1962, pp x-xi). By studying writing style differences, then, especially at the discourse level, we may also be able to infer differences in thinking style.

The present study was designed to characterize the major writing- or thinking-style differences at a discourse level between Korean and English. There are at least six major types of written discourse commonly recognized in the literature, namely: narrative, procedural, expository, hortatory, argumentative and conversational (Callow, 1974; Hinds, 1975). However, I chose to simplify the scope of the present study by looking only at expository essays. Expository essays are those essays designed primarily to explain or describe a particular subject matter, which serves as the main focus of the essay. This type of
discourse was chosen because there are ample examples of this type in both languages and because expository essays are usually shorter and more compact than other types of discourse. I also chose not to look at the writing of students, who often only approximate what is recognized as good writing in both cultures, but chose to examine essays by famous authors who were recognized by scholars in each culture as being outstanding writers. I chose also to examine each author in the original language rather than resorting to mere translations of the Korean essays or writings of Koreans in English.

There are several different techniques for discourse analysis in the literature. They have been developed primarily for looking at English discourse and have not been applied extensively to other languages. The techniques developed by the following linguists and scholars represented fairly completely the major techniques that had been developed by the time the study was conducted in 1978: (1) Francis Christensen (1965), (2) A.L. Becker (1965), (3) Willis L. Pitkin (1975, 1976, 1977), (4) Dennis J. Packard (1976), and (5) M.A.K. Halliday (1976).

All of these theoreticians indicate that Western writing is based almost entirely on a deductive pattern or style characteristic of Aristotelian logic: starting with a general topic sentence and then systematically restricting the meaning by presenting more specific details about the general topic at several different levels of generality—proceeding from the most general to the least general. The following diagram of part of the last paragraph by Mark Twain from his essay entitled "The Bee" illustrates this deductive pattern and illustrates what is meant by different levels of generality according to the discourse analysis technique used in this study:

1 After the queen, the personage next in importance in the hive is the virgin.
2 The virgins are fifty thousand or one hundred thousand in number,
2 and they are the workers, the laborers.
3 No work is done, in the hive or out of it, save by them.
4 The males do not work,
4 the queen does no work,
5 unless laying is work,
5 but it does not seem so to me
6 There are only two million of them [eggs to be laid], anyway,
6 and all of five months
7 to finish the contract in.

(The Bee, Mark Twain)

The numbers as they increase from 1 to 7 denote a corresponding decrease in level of generality and a corresponding increase in specificity. Therefore, it probably would be better to call them levels of specificity rather than levels of generality. However, I chose to conform with the convention in linguistics. This consistent progression from the most general to the least general in more or less a straight line is what has by convention been called linearity.

The relationship between two ideas at different levels of generality is usually referred to as a restrictive relationship and means that the idea with the larger number is more specific in a broad sense than the idea with the smaller number, or that the idea with the smaller number is more general than the idea with the larger number. For example, from the preceding diagram, the two level 2 generalities (the virgins are fifty thousand or one hundred thousand in number and they are the workers, the laborers) each elaborate a detail about virgin bees which makes them next in importance to the queen bee. These two ideas are therefore restrictively related to (more specific than) the level 1 generality, or topic sentence (after the queen, the personage next in importance in the hive is the virgin). Likewise, the level 3 generality in a similar manner restricts the meaning of the level 2 generality under which it falls, the two level 4 generalities restrict the meaning of the level 3 generality, and so forth. Please refer to the diagram.

The relationship between two ideas at the same level of generality is usually referred to as a coordinate relationship and means that the two ideas are equally specific and can be subsumed under the same more general statement to which they are both restrictively related. For example, the two level 2 generalities mentioned above are coordinately related to each other. The virgins are fifty thousand or one hundred thousand in number and they are the workers, the laborers do not elaborate or restrict the meaning of each other, but they both do elaborate or give more detail about the level 1 generality that precedes them. See the diagram. Likewise, all ideas preceded by the same level-of-generality number in the Mark Twain paragraph are considered to be coordinately related to each other for similar reasons.

Although some rhetoricians speak of an inductive format (moving from specific details to generalities) in Western writing as well as the deductive pattern, such paragraphs are very difficult to find in English as is indicated by the following quote, again from Christensen:
The contrast between deductive and inductive, or between analytic and synthetic as it is sometimes put, seems to have led us to assume that the one kind of movement is as common as the other and that the topic sentence therefore is as likely to appear at the end as at the beginning. The many scores of paragraphs I have analyzed for this study do not bear out this assumption. The topic sentence occurs almost invariably at the beginning. In fact, I do not have clear-cut examples of topic sentences in the other theoretically possible positions. (Christensen, 1965, p. 22)

Even the relatively few paragraphs which seem to have an inductive format (specific to general) on the surface seem to revert back to the deductive format (general to specific) to provide details about the major elements of the paragraphs.

In contrast, from my relatively limited exposure to Korean writing before beginning this study (mostly translations into English and English compositions written by native Korean students), I noticed that the deductive pattern does not seem to be as prevalent there as it is in American writing. There are often no topic sentences at all in Korean writing and the text seems to ramble quite freely from one idea to the next. I did not bring any of the compositions written by my own students back with me to the United States—not knowing then that I would later be writing my dissertation on such a topic. However, this free rambling style is well illustrated by the following paragraph written as a class exercise by a Korean student cited by Robert Kaplan:

**Definition of college education**

College is an institution of an higher learning that gives degrees. All of us needed culture and education in life, if no education to us, we should to go living hell.

One of the greatest causes that while other animals have remained as they first man alone has made such rapid progress is has learned about civilization.

The improvement of the highest civilization is in order to education up-to-date.

So college education is very important thing which we don't need mention about it.

(Kaplan, 1966b, p. 10)

This free rambling from one idea to the next may be a signal that Oriental writing is the product of a system of logic that is not deductive.

I have not been able to find a single characterization of Oriental discourse that is anywhere near as thorough as those which have been done with Western discourse. Most are very subjective and are scarcely more than passing comments made in the
course of addressing primarily some other issue. The most thorough source that claims to be analyzing discourse is Robert T. Oliver (1955, 1962, 1966, 1971). He has written many books on Oriental thinking and writing, but his works, though extensive, are also very subjective.

The most empirical work in the contrastive rhetorics of Western and Oriental writing has been done by Robert B. Kaplan (1966a, 1966b, 1967, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1974). He has worked entirely with compositions written in English by foreign students or with English translations of the eight-legged Chinese essays. None of his work has dealt with discourse of Asian languages in the original language. Much of his analysis, also, has been very subjective with no rigidly systematic approach that could easily be replicated. Furthermore, his characterizations of Oriental writing as being indirect and circular, are in no way detailed enough to detect a definite pattern as pervasive as the deductive pattern is in Western writing. Although the eight-legged essay conforms to a rigid structure, the structure seems to be external to the logic, as are the sonnet forms of Western poetry, not something that reflects the logic.

Likewise, since my dissertation, there have not been as many contrastive studies on non-Western languages at the level of discourse or rhetoric as I would have hoped. Furthermore, most of these have again been rather subjective or have not at least specified a system of analysis as rigorous as those already mentioned which have been applied mostly to Western discourse. The studies by Richard M. Coe (1983), Joan Gregg (1983), and Carolyn Matalene (1985) are among the most thorough and these have examined Chinese. Clearly there had been no attempt to analyze the rhetorical pattern of Korean with any degree of objectivity comparable to the analyses that had been done on Western languages by the time I began my study in 1978--and likely there has been none since.

My problem was to find a technique for analyzing Korean discourse that was not so closely linked to the deductive pattern of English writing--so that it could be useful in trying to characterize a pattern that may not be deductive. The techniques of discourse analysis developed by Christensen and Becker are so closely tied to the deductive pattern of Western writing that they were of limited usefulness for analyzing Korean writing. Pitkin's technique, as well as Packard's, which is a simplified version of Pitkin, was the only major technique I was able to find that is far enough removed from the deductive pattern to be useful in characterizing the Oriental pattern.

Although Pitkin's technique sprang from Christensen's and seems very deductive when it is applied to English, it breaks all of the ideas in a paragraph into binary relationships: each idea with its adjacent ideas rather than into levels of generality. When it is applied to English discourse, the binary relationships fall into levels of generality because they are in turn related to
each other deductively due to the deductive pattern of English discourse.

However, if Pitkin’s technique is applied to discourse that is not deductive, the binary relationships would not necessarily fall into levels of generality. Pitkin’s analysis examines primarily whether the second idea of each binary set is more specific than the first, more general, or of equal specificity. The deductive pattern would be expected in the analysis of Korean discourse whenever there is a sequence of ideas that goes from general to specific, to more specific and so forth. Then, levels of generality would appear in a linear fashion just as in the example of Mark Twain’s paragraph already considered. However, if successive ideas were not related to each other by being repeatedly more specific or more restricted than the ones before, the linear, deductive pattern would not emerge and there would be no clear cut levels of generality.

Pitkin also listed a number of relationships possible between ideas in paragraphs other than those linked to degree of specificity. These will be mentioned later when I talk about the technique of discourse analysis that was actually used for the study.

Halliday’s technique is somewhat different from the other discourse analysis techniques already considered in that it is designed to measure the cohesiveness of the discourse rather than the logical relationships of the ideas expressed. Halliday has classified five major cohesive devices: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. These are explained in detail in a book written by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and will not be elaborated here. Most of these devices are concerned primarily with how relationships between ideas are indicated and not so much with what the actual relationships are. For the present study, I was primarily concerned with the types of relationships expressed, their relative frequencies and their sequences. Therefore, I did not make counts of how often each of the relationship-identifying devices were used as is typical in a Halliday analysis.

However, in his description of conjunctive devices, Halliday gives a rather complete listing of the types of relationships that are found in written discourse which is similar to the listing of relationships compiled by Pitkin. The technique for discourse analysis that I eventually used was initially derived from a combination of these two listings and was modified, extended, and refined as the study progressed. A detailed description of the technique actually used is presented in my dissertation (Norton, 1978) and will be summarized in the method section of this paper.

In characterizing the major writing-style differences between Korean and American essayists, I decided to restrict my study to the analysis of the following three aspects of discourse: (1) the types of relationships expressed in the essay, (2) the sequence in
which these relationships are expressed, and (3) the distance between the two ideas that make up each relationship (how much intervening material occurs between them).

Although Kaplan (1966b) does not describe the discourse analysis techniques that he used in his study of what he termed cultural thought patterns, his subjective descriptions of the differences he noted in American and Oriental patterns are adequate to make at least the broad general predictions that American essayists will be characterized by a more linear, deductive pattern, while Korean essayists will be characterized by a more non-linear pattern. A linear sequence is one that presents a general topic, makes one or more specific statements about it restricting its meaning, and then elaborates details about each particular restriction immediately after the restriction—as exemplified in the paragraph by Mark Twain quoted earlier.

Eighteen basic relationships between ideas were analyzed in the present study. These will be described briefly in the method section. Based on the Kaplan characterizations, I was able to make direct predictions about only the restrictive relationships (general to specific or specific to general) and the coordinate relationships (ideas equal in generality to each other) that are characteristic of linear, deductive writing. With regard to types of relationships, I predicted that there would be a predominance of restrictive and coordinate relationships in the American essays and that the proportion of these relationships would not be as high in the Korean essays.

With regard to sequences, I predicted that in the American essays there would be a preponderance of either one of the two possible linear, restrictive sequences: general to specific (G->S) or specific to general (S->G). On the basis of Kaplan, Christensen, Becker, Pitkin, and Packard's characterization of American writing as being primarily deductive and on the basis of Christensen's claim that there are almost no instances of inductive paragraphs in American English, I also predicted that the American essays would have a greater number of G->S relationships than S->G relationships. On the other hand, I predicted that if Korean writing is non-linear, Korean essayists (when they did use restrictive relationships) would have no particular tendency to consistently use one sequence over the other and that the Korean essays would then contain approximately equal distributions of both restrictive relationship sequences.

With regard to distance between related ideas, I predicted that the distance between ideas related restrictively or coordinately would be relatively short in the American essays with practically no instances of extraneous material introduced between relationships. On the other hand, I predicted that Korean essays would likely have longer distances between restrictively and coordinately related ideas, that there would be more extraneous material between them, and that there would be a greater number of ambiguities (cases when no relationship between the ideas could be
found)—all of these factors contributing to the disconnected, rambling style that has been observed in Korean writing.

With regard to the other 16 types of relationships between ideas in essays examined in this study (in addition to restrictive and coordinate relationships already mentioned), we might expect that American essayists—if writing linearly—would exhibit a tendency to use consistently one sequence at a time for a given section of writing. Korean essays on the other hand might be expected to exhibit no such consistencies.

Before moving on to the method section, we should consider other variables that could conceivably affect writing style both within the same culture and across cultures. Steps should be taken to control these variables to get as pure a measure of cultural differences as possible. I was able to identify at least 14 such variables. These fourteen include the social determinants of speech or writing identified by Goffman (Newmark, 1974a & b, p. 38) as well as other variables suggested by my own study of intercultural communication (Norton, Tyler and Palmer, 1978). The first 12 variables are personal attributes of the essayist or are related to his background, while the last two are characteristics more related to the essay. The 14 variables are listed below:

1. maturity
2. sex
3. social class
4. economic status
5. climate
6. occupation
7. level of education
8. political ideology
9. historical time period
10. personality
11. bilingualism (the essayist's familiarity with other languages)
12. region within the country
13. context in which the essay was written
14. topic of essay

Although it was expected that most of these variables would have no major effects on the results of this study, they were nonetheless considered as potentially confounding variables and provisions were made in the study whenever possible to eliminate, control, or measure their effects.

Method

Selection of subjects

The essayists and the essays analyzed were selected in a manner that enabled some control over the 14 potentially
confounding variables listed in the introduction. A pool of Korean essays were selected by native Koreans as being well written and typical of Korean expository essays. Then a search was made among the writings of noted American essayists for essays dealing with the same or similar topics so that subject matter content could be minimized as a potentially confounding variable. The potential confounding effects of the first nine variables listed in the introduction were eliminated or at least minimized by matching the essayists from each culture according to these variables. The exact procedures for matching on each variable are elaborated in my dissertation (Norton, 1978, pp. 16-19).

Three of the remaining five variables were controlled by virtue of the experimental design employed and the planned comparisons that were made: the topic of the essay, the personality of the essayist, and his bilingualism. It would have been simpler to use only Korean essayists who had no knowledge of English, but this was impossible due to other constraints of the study which are elaborated in my dissertation (Norton, 1978, p. 18). The topic of the essay was treated as an independent variable along with the culture of the essayist which was the main variable of interest. Any effect due to the personality of the essayist and his bilingualism could be inferred by comparing the patterns of the essayists within each culture with each other and by comparing the patterns of the bilingual Korean essayists with that of the nonbilingual Korean essayists.

The other two potentially confounding variables (the context in which each essay was written and the region within each country from which each essayist came) would tend to influence the personality of the essayist and could be explored further if the essayist’s personality proved to be an important confounding factor.

The essays selected for the analysis are listed by topic, culture, title and essayist in Table 1. The Korean essayists marked by an asterisk (*) are those essayists who have had considerable training in English and may be considered to be bilingual.

Design

A 2 x 5 (2 cultures x 5 topics) factorial design was used to analyze the first two aspects of discourse mentioned in the introduction: (1) the types of relationships expressed in the essay and (2) the sequence in which these relationships are expressed. The first three topics are subtopics of the more general topic nature. The remaining two topics are the general topics philosophy and customs. A range in the similarity of topics was used to provide an indication of the relationship of divergence of subject-matter content to differences in writing styles.
Table 1
Essay Listing by Topic, Culture, Title and Essayist
with Bilingual Essayists Marked with an Asterisk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Korean Essays</th>
<th>American Essays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Essayist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>*Pi, Chun Deuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>*Lee, Yang Ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bees, Flowers</td>
<td>*Lee, Yang Ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rose of Sharon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>The Philosophy</td>
<td>Kim, Jin Sup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Living Man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSTOMS</td>
<td>On Top Knots</td>
<td>Yang, Joo Dong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables consisted of the various measures for each of the three aspects of discourse analysis (relationship type, relationship sequence, and distance between the elements of the relationship). Each of the dependent variables for the first two aspects were analyzed according to the same basic design (mentioned in the preceding paragraph) which compares the relationship content and sequence of the essays in terms of the culture of the essayist and the topic of the essay.

The relationship-type aspect was broken down into the following 18 basic types of relationships which were found to exist between the various ideas expressed in the essays:

1. coordinate
2. restrictive (restrictive and elaborative)
3. contrastive
4. causal (conditional, purposive, reason stating)
5. temporal (chronological, simultaneous, reverse order)
6. locational (same and different)
7. manner
8. affective
9. solutional
10. intensificational
Examples of the first two types of relationships, which are the most important because they proved to be by far the most numerous, have already been provided in the paragraph by Mark Twain diagramed earlier. Examples of each of the other types of relationships are provided in my dissertation (Norton, 1978). The number of times each particular type of relationship and sequence occurred was tabulated for each essay, and the percentages of each per essay were calculated and served as the measure for each dependent variable. Percentages were used to facilitate comparisons among essays of unequal length.

From the above listing it is obvious that the relationships among the ideas in a paragraph or essay can be quite complex. In fact, the very same ideas may be related to each other in more than one way. Whenever such multiple relationships were detected, both were counted. These 18 basic relationships were arrived at by beginning a crude analysis of both American and Korean essays using the relationships suggested by both Pitkin and Halliday. Whenever a relationship was not classifiable it was compared with other unclassifiable relationships and a new category was created whenever possible. I found that virtually every idea in all of the essays analyzed was related to at least one other idea in the essay by at least one of the 18 relationship types. Occasionally, two or more different readings of the same section were possible. Whenever this occurred, only what appeared to be the most obvious interpretation was counted. However, such occurrences were considered to be ambiguities and a record of them was also kept and analyzed.

The relationship-sequence aspect consisted of the following eleven sequences, which were derived respectively from relationship types 2, 4, 5, 9, and 13 listed above:

(1) general --> specific (G-->S)
(2) specific --> general (S-->G)
(3) cause --> effect (C-->E)
(4) effect --> cause (E-->C)
(5) chronological relationships
(6) simultaneous relationships
(7) reverse time order relationships
(8) problem --> solution (P-->S)
(9) solution --> problem (S-->P)
(10) high ranked --> low ranked (H-->L)
(11) low ranked --> high ranked (L-->H)
An example of the first sequence, which turned out to be the most prevalent in English, is provided by the Mark Twain paragraph mentioned earlier. An example of the second, which turned out to be the most prevalent in Korean, is provided in the passage by Lee Yang Ha in the discussion section of the present paper. Examples of the othersequences can be found in my dissertation (Norton, 1978). The percentage of usage for each sequence also served as the measure for the eleven dependent variables from this aspect.

For the third aspect of discourse, the distance between related ideas, no objective measuring technique was discovered. The distance between ideas related by the various relationship types, was analyzed rather subjectively on the basis of anecdotal insights that were observed when analyzing each of the essays. I tried to develop an objective technique, similar to the one developed by Halliday for measuring distance of cohesion, but was unable to come up with a consistently objective technique.

Procedure

Each of the essays was analyzed by me in the original language. Because of my inadequacies with respect to written Korean, I used at least two and usually three translations of each essay made by native Koreans to assist me in deciding on the best interpretation of each passage. Each translation consisted of two parts: (1) a word by word translation with the English written directly under each word of the original and (2) a free translation to capture in grammatical English the same meaning as the original. Whenever a disagreement could not be resolved by my own knowledge of Korean or by a dictionary, the Korean instructor at Brigham Young University was consulted for his interpretation.

Because of the length of time and technical skill required to analyze a single essay, it was not feasible to have two independent analyzers examine each essay. However, to get a measure of the reliability of the technique, one essay from each culture was independently analyzed by a native, upper-level graduate student at Brigham Young University trained in linguistics. Each of their analyses was compared with my analysis of the same essay to get a measure of interrater reliability. For the 312 relationships identified from *The Bee* by Mark Twain, there was an agreement of better than 90%, and for the 268 relationships identified from *Tree* by Lee, Yang Ha, there was an agreement of better than 80%.

Each of the essays was divided roughly into four equal sections (about 125 to 200 words in length) to provide at least four measures of each author so that an indication of his consistency could also be obtained.

For the purpose of this study an idea was defined as any predication that included an object or other modification of the verbal element, had an identifiable subject, and could thus stand alone. This means that any complete sentence, clause, and many
verbal phrases were counted, but simple adjectives, adverbs and prepositional phrases and their respective Korean equivalents were not. Thus in the sentence: *The boy, tired of doing his homework, went to bed.* The verbal phrase *tired of doing his homework* would have been counted twice, once for the entire phrase and once for the phrase *doing his homework.* Naturally, the core sentence (*The boy went to bed.*) would also have been counted.

Although the other discourse analysis techniques have considered only complete sentences as discourse units, I feel that the units must be smaller because some writers use long, strung-together sentences while others use short, choppy sentences to convey the same message. It was not uncommon to find 14 or 15 such predications in a single sentence in several of the essays studied. Compound subjects, objects and main verbs were also counted separately in the present analysis for the same reason. However, because of the preponderance of restrictive and coordinate relationships in essays from both cultures and because of the systematic interrelatedness of these two types of relationships, the restrictive relationship was counted only once for the coordinate sequence as a whole and not counted as a separate restrictive relationship for each coordinate idea that restricted the more general idea. In turn only coordinate ideas adjacent to each other were counted as coordinate.

Looking at the following diagram of the first sentence of Mark Twain's seventh paragraph from "The Bee" will clarify what this means:

1. During substantially the whole of her short life of five or six years, the queen lives in the Egyptian darkness and stately seclusion of the royal apartments, with none about her but plebian servants,

2. who give her empty lip-affection in place of the love which her heart hungers for;

2. who spy upon her in the interest of her waiting heirs and report
2. and exaggerate her defects and deficiencies to them;
2. who fawn upon her
2. and flatter her to her face
2. and slander her behind her back;
2. who grovel before her in the day of her power
2. and forsake her in her age and weakness.

(The Bee, Mark Twain)
Notice the level 1 generality and the nine level 2 generalities under it. Each of the level 2 generalities restricts the meaning of the level 1 generality by providing a specific example of how even though the queen bee is surrounded by thousands of servants, she is always in seclusion because none of the plebian servants provide the companionship for which she hungers. Each of the nine level 2 generalities restricts the meaning of the level 1 generality, but rather than counting all nine, I only counted this as one restrictive relationship. Likewise, each level 2 generality is coordinately related to the other eight, but rather than counting 36 such relationships (the 1st to the 2nd, the 1st to the 3rd, the 1st to the 4th, etc.), I counted only the 8 adjacent relationships as coordinate (the 1st to the 2nd, the 2nd to the 3rd, the 3rd to the 4th, etc.). This simplified the analysis to some extent, but also minimized the number of restrictive and coordinate relationships found.

Results

The data from both the relationship-type analysis and from the relationship-sequence analysis were analyzed using a two-way univariate analysis of variance according to the balanced 2 x 5 factorial design described in the design section, using the model

$$Y = A(I) + B(J) + AB(IJ) + E.$$  

The following four planned orthogonal comparisons were also made on the topic main effect and on the interactions to shed some light on the effects of any of the potentially confounding variables controlled by the design:

1. the two essays on spring were compared with the two on trees,
2. the four essays above were compared with the two on bees/flowers,
3. these six essays on nature were in turn compared with the two on philosophy, and
4. the eight essays on philosophy and nature were in turn compared with the two on customs.

Relationship-type analysis

We are mostly interested in the main effect for culture (Korean versus American) because this will tell us if there are any particular types of relationships which one culture consistently uses more than the other. Table 2 displays the mean percentages of the various relationship types used by each culture. Only the F-ratios and probabilities of the statistically significant differences are included.

By far the most striking result of the relationship-type analysis is the overwhelming percentage of the total observed relationships that is accounted for by just two relationship types. Over 50% of the relationships identified for both cultures are either restrictive or coordinate relationships: 27.1% restrictive and 24.5% coordinate for the Korean essayists and 22.7% restrictive and 28.1% coordinate for the American essayists. This is especially significant when we take into consideration the fact that our conservative analysis technique tended to minimize the number of such relationships counted. None of the other 16
Table 2
Percentages of the Various Relationship Types as Used by Each Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP CULTURE</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coordinate</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restrictive</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Restrictive</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborative</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contrastive</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Causal</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>.0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Temporal</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Locational</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>.0053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Loc.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>.0194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif. Loc.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Affective</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Solutional</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Intensiificational</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Concessional</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>.0158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Objectival</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ranked</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.0443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Complemental subjectifying</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Simile</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Causal Denial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Contradiction</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Negational</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Ambiguous</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indented relationships are subdivisions of the relationships they follow and their percentages sum to equal the category percentage above.
relationship types even come close to either of these two types. Furthermore, the percentage of both the restrictive and coordinate relationship types among both cultures is surprisingly similar. Notice also that the essayists from both cultures seem to use essentially the same percentages of most of the other types of relationships as well.

Although there are four relationships and three relationship subdivisions which do show statistically significant differences between Korean and American essayists, these differences don't seem to be meaningfully significant because they account for such a small percentage of the total number of relationships. Furthermore, four of these (the locational relationship type, the same location subdivision, and the ranked and objectival types) also showed significant or nearly significant topic main effects as well. These results indicate that American essayists tend to use these relationship types more, but also that there is considerable variability in using them among the American essayists and even variability within the same essayist when he is writing about different topics.

Relationship-sequence analysis

The relationship sequence analysis provides the information most relevant to our major concern: the organizational pattern of written American thought versus that of written Korean. The mean percentages of the various relationship sequences used by each culture are recorded in Table 3, along with the F-ratios and probabilities of the statistically significant and nearly significant relationship-sequence differences.

Note especially that for the restrictive relationship type and subtype there is a highly significant interaction (p < 0.0001) between sequence and culture, with American essayists consistently using more G --> S sequences and Korean essayists consistently using more S --> G sequences. However, both the Korean and American essayists tended to use more of the G --> S sequence when using the elaborative subtype of the restrictive type of relationship—though the elaborative type of restriction was used relatively infrequently in both cultures. There was also a significant interaction among the various types of causal sequences, with Korean essayists consistently using more C --> E sequences than Americans and American essayists tending to use more E --> C sequences than Koreans—especially among the causal relationships expressing reason. However, American essayists seem to be equally comfortable using both causal sequences (C --> E and E --> C).

Only one of the sequences that was significant across the two cultures was also used in significantly different amounts for different topics. This was the ranked sequence L --> H (F = 3.29, p = 0.024) which has only marginal significance discriminating between cultures. This indicates that the sequences in which the various relationships are expressed are much more stable indicators of cultural differences in writing style than are the
Table 3

Percentages of the Various Relationship Sequences Used by Each Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>CULTURE</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Restrictive</td>
<td>G → S</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>103.84</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Restrictive</td>
<td>G → S</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>171.27</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborative</td>
<td>G → S</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restrictive</td>
<td>S → G</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>S → G</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborative</td>
<td>S → G</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Causal</td>
<td>C → E</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>C → E</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>C → E</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>.0019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>C → E</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Causal</td>
<td>E → C</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.0658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>E → C</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>.0163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>E → C</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>.0127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>E → C</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>.0014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chronological</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Simultaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Solutional</td>
<td>P → S</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Solutional</td>
<td>S → P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>(3.72)</td>
<td>.0632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ranked</td>
<td>H → L</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ranked</td>
<td>L → H</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>(3.49)</td>
<td>.0714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indented relationships are subdivisions of the relationships they follow and their percentages sum to equal the category percentage above.
various types of relationships.

**Relationship-distance analysis**

When analyzing the Korean essays, I had the feeling that there was a greater amount of extraneous material between related ideas in the Korean essays than in the American ones. However, I now feel that this apparent difference can be explained more parsimoniously in terms of the results of the relationship sequence analysis. The reason for this will be elaborated in the discussion section.

It is true that there are several instances of gigantic leaps in train of thought in the Korean essays. However, there are such leaps in the American essays as well. For example, in Mark Twain's *The Bee*, he begins the essay by relating that Maeterlinck introduced him to the bee, then in paragraph two he introduces the term bee scientist. He proceeds thereafter describing the bee for six paragraphs before jumping back to Maeterlinck, who we find out from the next paragraph is probably a bee scientist. He continues to talk about bee scientists for three more paragraphs and then jumps back to his train of thought on bees for a long concluding paragraph.

**Discussion**

We are now ready to look at what all this means regarding our original predictions that American essayists are linear, deductive writers, using mostly restrictive and coordinate relationships in a general to specific sequence, whereas Korean essayists are more likely to use a non-linear, non-deductive approach to writing, which involves primarily other types of relationships and different sequences. The results clearly give support to the prediction and the widely held notion that English is basically a deductively organized language, for in the American essays the proportion of restrictive and coordinate relationships predominated and the percentage of G→S sequences (characteristic of deductive organization) was much higher than the corresponding percentage of S→G sequences. Furthermore, the prediction that the Koreans are not deductive writers is equally well substantiated by the higher percentages of S→G sequences found for them among the restrictive relationships.

However, what was not expected is the finding that the proportions of restrictive and coordinate relationships among both the Korean and American essayists were nearly equal—51.6% for the Korean essayists and 50.8% for the American essayists. The Koreans appeared to have a slight edge in the restrictive domain, while the Americans led in the domain of coordination—though the difference was not statistically significant. What was even more surprising is the fact that the proportions of most of the other relationships for the two cultures were also nearly equal. We had predicted that Koreans might use fundamentally different types of
relationships, but this finding suggests that the same fundamental relationships may be basic to communication in all cultures.

It is fairly obvious from the predominance of the S→G in the Korean essays analyzed that they must be basically inductively organized. Each of the Korean essays analyzed is most strongly characterized by the inductive (S→G) sequence, while its counterpart among the American essays is contrastingly characterized by the G→S sequence— that is in every essay except The Wild Apple by Thoreau. The individual essayist percentages for the two restrictive sequences are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restrictive G→S</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Trees</th>
<th>Bee/Flower</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Customs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restrictive S→G</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Trees</th>
<th>Bee/Flower</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Customs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This means then, that the hypothesis about Korean being non-linear must also be incorrect, for an inductive sequence is every bit as linear as a deductive one, it merely moves in the opposite direction. Because these essays are allegedly typical of most other Korean essays, this inductive organizational pattern is likely to be characteristic of most Korean writing.

It seems unusual that such a dominant feature of the Korean organizational pattern has not been characterized earlier. However, when we consider the mind set that is established by the strong deductive pattern of English, it is easy to see how an
inductive pattern may be difficult to notice. When one has become accustomed to having virtually all coordinate and more specific ideas presented following a general topic sentence which prepares the mind to relate the ideas in a certain way, it is little wonder that such ideas, when presented without the topic sentence (relationship indicator), seem to be unrelated and disconnected. When we are used to finding the relationship indicator before the ideas which it relates, our minds are hopelessly lost when the relationship indicator doesn’t come until the end. Furthermore, by the time we finally get to the relationship indicator in an inductive pattern, we have already forgotten the ideas which it is supposed to relate.

It is probable that some of the other relationship differences uncovered by this study are likely to contribute to miscommunication problems between the two cultures as well. However, since the restrictive and coordinate relationships already discussed seem to make up such a large percentage of the total organization structure, it seems feasible that by altering only these relationship sequences, one can make considerable headway toward producing a legible translation of many Korean literary works. Pointing out these differences in organizational patterns could also be very helpful in teaching newly arriving foreign students how to express themselves more understandably in writing to native Americans. Such awareness should also help Americans trying to communicate with Koreans.

How useful such an approach could be, might best be illustrated by introducing a portion of one of the Korean essays analyzed in the study and systematically rearranging it from its inductive pattern to a more deductive one, compatible with American expectations. The following paragraph is quoted verbatim from one of the translations that I used to assist me in the analysis of the essay, Rose of Sharon, by Lee Yang Ha. Although most of the internal sentence structure has already been rearranged by the translator to be fairly understandable in English, the overriding inductive structure remains and makes it difficult for a native American to follow with a single reading.

The flowers are shy, indirect and modest. But they have not less self-confidence. The reason is that every blossom, one by one, is wilted and withered up during the night after it has begun to blossom, but the routine to open new flowers still keeps on until August, September, and October. It blossoms continuously up to the time we feel white-cotton-trouser-and-jacket chilly in the morning and in the evening. If we count the blossoms to open and be withered during the period, how many thousands or how many ten thousands of blossoms there will be, I wonder? The period in which the flowers blossom most flourishingly is in the middle of August. At this time there are several hundreds of blossoms on the tree that is as high as I am. Our fathers, who had thought it the greatest happiness on
the earth to thrive brothers and sisters, the posterity to succeed sons and grandsons from a hundred generations to a thousand generations, might have loved the rose of Sharon for the first reason as above. On the other hand, as for the flowers, it would be evaluated as a virtue as much as they are prosperous like this, as long as they last like this. For this reason, our fathers also might have loved the rose of Sharon and loved its being modest and accessible.

(Rose of Sharon, Lee Yang Ha)

The main intent of the author in this section of the essay is to explain the two main reasons why the founding fathers of Korea loved the rose of Sharon enough to select it as the Korean national flower. Notice that the less important reason of the two main reasons—*that it blooms for such a long season*—is presented first. We are not told, however, until the last sentence that this is one reason why the founding fathers selected it as the national flower. The main reason—*because the rose of Sharon produces so many blossoms*—follows the lesser reason, and the statement that this is indeed the main reason, follows even later.

Notice how much easier the passage is to understand if the order is rearranged and other minor changes (involving mostly transitional divices) are introduced in order to render the train of thought in a more deductive pattern:

Our fathers, who had thought it the greatest happiness on earth to thrive brothers and sisters and have much posterity to succeed them as sons and grandsons from a hundred generations to a thousand generations, loved the rose of Sharon [enough to designate it as the Korean national flower] mainly because they are prosperous and they last a long time. If we count the blossoms to open and be withered during the period; how many thousands or how many tens of thousands of blossoms one tree will bear, I wonder. The period in which the flowers blossom most flourishingly is in the middle of August. At this time there are several hundreds of blossoms on a tree that is as tall as I am. Another reason why our fathers might have loved the rose of Sharon is because of its accessibility and its modesty in lasting as long as it does. It blossoms continuously up to the time we feel white-cotton-trouser-and-jacket chilly in the morning and in the evening. The flowers are shy, indirect and modest. But they have not less self-confidence. The reason is that [although] every blossom, one by one, is wilted and withered up during the night after it has begun to blossom, the routine to open new flowers still keeps on until August, September and October.

The same technique that I used to transform the original, seemingly rambling structure into the much more legible deductive
American pattern, could easily be used by translators of Korean writing to make their translations more understandable to an American audience—whenever understanding the content is considered to be of major importance. Likewise, Korean students coming to study in the United States could be directed by their English teachers to try first writing their compositions in Korean just as they have always done. Then, when translating them into English before turning them in, they should move from the end of their essay to the beginning. This should greatly help them to approximate more closely the pattern that has become accepted in the United States. Eventually, as the American pattern becomes more habitual, students can try to write their assignments directly in English.

In a similar manner, translators going from American or English writing into Korean could proceed in an analogous fashion from the end of the English version to the beginning to produce the inductive pattern more acceptable in Korea. The important thing to remember is to put the important ideas at the beginning for Americans and at the end for Koreans.

This is an oversimplification, since there are other types of relationships that are expressed in essays besides the restrictive and coordinate ones, and these other relationships also have their preferred sequences in the two different cultures. However, since the restrictive and coordinate relationships seem to be so pervasive in both cultures, much of the difficulty in communicating might be overcome by such a relatively simple strategy. Similar strategies could be developed for the other types of relationships as their directional sequences become identified more completely.

One of the most interesting insights gained from the study is that although the essayists came from two very different cultures, they still tended to use the same kinds of relationships to express their thoughts and amazingly they even used the same proportions of most of the different relationship types. It seems quite likely that the same fundamental relationships may be basic to communication in all cultures, with the restrictive and coordinate relationships being the most abundant. As in the Korean and English analysis, sequence—not type—of relationship may account for the major differences in modes of expression in different cultures.

Korean has many similarities with Chinese and Japanese—especially in the early written form of the language. All three languages originally used the same ideographic characters. This fact has undoubtedly had an important influence on the modes of expression of the people from these three broad cultures. All Korean scholarly works were written in Chinese characters until the overthrow of the monarchy by the Japanese around the turn of the century and today Chinese characters are still used extensively even in newspapers. I would, therefore, expect to
find many similarities in Korean, Chinese, and Japanese discourse patterns.

The following observation by Carolyn Matalene (1985) about the importance of memorization and attention to form in China applies equally well to Korea and is consistent with the inductive pattern which seems to be so pervasive in Korean expository essays:

To be indirect in both spoken and written discourse, to expect the audience to infer meanings rather than to have them spelled out is a defining characteristic of Chinese rhetoric and one that like the emphasis on memorization is consistent with the nature of the language. The Chinese written language is ideographic, pictorial, concrete; from the characters on the page the reader must synthesize, infer, and "create the text." (p. 801)

The nature of the written language clearly requires extraordinary feats of memorization as well as extraordinary attention to form—the expert calligrapher follows rules for making each stroke within each character. . . . Certainly the prescriptions of the written language ultimately affected social practices, and there emerged a cultural phenomenon which made memorization and formalism the defining attributes of intelligence: The Chinese examination system. (pp. 796-797)

Matalene goes on to elaborate how the Chinese Examination System has been used for thirteen centuries in China to select members for civil service, the most honorable and influential career that a scholar can pursue. Memorizing the classics and composing poems and essays according to the traditional forms became prerequisites for membership in the governing elite. Boys between the ages of eight and fifteen were required to learn by heart The Four Books and The Five Classics of the Confucian canon, which contain over four hundred thousand characters. Such a task at a rate of two hundred characters of text a day requires about six years of memorizing.

Memorization and attention to form are also very important in Korea. Certainly the inductive form of communicating requires a much greater capacity for remembering than does the deductive form, for one must remember all of the seemingly unconnected details until the generality that subsumes them is finally presented at the end of the paragraph or the end of the discourse. Koreans, Japanese and Chinese are experts in the art of memory and this likely explains the special joy they find in writing the way they do.

I feel it would be very productive to conduct similar studies
on other types of Korean writing to see if the inductive, linear pattern is as pervasive as the present study suggests. It would also be useful to carry out such studies on a number of diverse languages to see if further evidence is forthcoming for the psychic unity of mankind in terms of the types of relationships used to connect ideas. It would also be useful to see how many different sequences people in various parts of the world have found for systematically linking ideas so that they can communicate effectively with each other. I would be happy to collaborate with anyone working in other cultures who is interested in using this discourse analysis approach to try to identify the thinking or organizational patterns of other language systems.
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