

The Chinese philosophical/ rhetorical tradition: Debunking some myths

Huang Wu, Hsiao-Li

Te Pua Wānanga ki te Ao (School of Māori and Pacific Development)

Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato (University of Waikato)

Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, New Zealand

[hh5@waikato.ac.nz]

Abstract

In the process of conducting research on the overall rhetorical structuring and internal discourse structuring of texts written in English (120 texts) and in Chinese (120 texts) by experienced and novice writers on the basis of prompts designed to elicit one of four discourse modes (*recount, argument, explanation* and *classification*), I reviewed literature in a number of areas. One of these areas was contrastive rhetoric where I found a number of works that seemed to be based on misunderstanding and/or misrepresentation of the Chinese philosophical/ rhetorical tradition. This short article begins by providing a brief outline of some critical aspects of that tradition, identifies some of the ways in which it has been misinterpreted and/ or misrepresented in literature in the area of contrastive rhetoric and discusses some of the potential dangers associated with misinterpretation/ misrepresentation of this type, dangers that include the creation and promotion of stereotypes based on unacknowledged value judgments.

The Chinese philosophical rhetorical tradition: A short overview

In China, there was no separation between philosophy and rhetoric until comparatively recently (Kennedy, 1998) and there have been many different schools of thought whose recommendations have been very different. Many of these Chinese schools of thought have been largely neglected in the West. As Oliver (1976, p. 145) observes:

If Western rhetoricians neglect the rhetorical theories of Gautama Buddha and Confucius, they at least regard their names with familiarity. We must suspect, meanwhile, that very few of them have even heard the names of other great classical Chinese rhetoricians, including Meng-k'o (known in the West as Mencius), Chuang-Tzu (or Chuang-Chou), Mo-Tzu (the romantic idealist), or Han Fei-Tzu (the legalistic, cynical pragmatist).

Many major developments in Chinese philosophy/ rhetoric can be traced back to the Chou dynasty (the Classical period), which lasted from the time when people from the Western plateau conquered the valley of the Huang (Yellow River) and its tributaries in Northern China (c1040 BCE) till 221BCE when a new dynasty, the Ch'in dynasty, typified by autocratic rule and the rejection of many of the influences from the past, began the process of unification of the country.

Among the major schools of thought associated with the Chou dynasty are *Confucianism, Yin and Yang, Mohism, Taoism, Sophistry* and *the School of Names* and *Legalism*. The differences among these can be profound. Thus, for example, whereas "Taoist rhetoric sees vagueness as a virtue and argumentation as futility; Confucianism strives for clarity and recommends speech as a sharp knife with which to whittle away the sophistries and fallacies from a subject, leaving its true nature

unsullied and unavoidably clear” (Oliver, 1969, p. 3). It is, therefore, unwise to generalize about Chinese approaches to written communication on the basis of the sayings/ recommendations of one particular thinker or one particular school of thought.

The impact of different schools of thought and different thinkers associated with them has varied over time, as has the way in which the thinking of different scholars has been interpreted. One example is the interpretation of *li* (禮). Although it is often now supposed that Confucius¹ and his follower, Meng-k'o (Mencius) considered ceremony and social norms to be paramount, Confucius also placed considerable emphasis on 'moral responsibility' and Meng-k'o consistently emphasized the importance of 'courageous realism' (Oliver, 1969, p. 6).

While Mohism (associated with the thinking of the 5th century BCE thinker Mo Tze and his followers) is generally, in common with Confucianism, thought of as endorsing the subordination of the individual to the collective with the aim of achieving social harmony, it nevertheless recommended a style that aimed for practical results and took full account of the needs of audiences (Oliver 1971, pp. 183-193). In fact, in the 4th and 3rd centuries BCE, Mohist thinkers were responsible for the formulation of “a logical system that has some resemblance to dialectic as practiced in the Greek philosophical schools” (Kennedy, 1998, p. 158, referring to Graham, 1978). Consistent with Confucianism, Taoism and Mohism is a school of thought, *Yin and Yang*, that focuses on the balancing of primordial entities, such as light and dark and life and death. From this perspective, social order is seen as involving the achievement of harmony. As Oliver (1971, pp. 176 – 177) observes, the belief is that “[d]ifferences of viewpoint cannot be overcome by contention” and so it is “disadvantageous to urge ardently acceptance of one's own views”. This has had an enduring impact on Chinese approaches to persuasion and argumentation. However, it could be interpreted as more of a prescription for reasoned argumentation (politely and considerately worded) than it is for the avoidance of the expression of opinions.

Chinese sophistry and legalism are different in many ways from Confucianism, Taoism, Mohism and Yin and Yang. Chinese sophistry was particularly in evidence in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE but may have begun up to a century earlier. The sophists had a particular interest in public speaking and, in particular, in the promotion of the interests of the individual through an emphasis on argumentation (often fallacious argumentation) and on analogy and paradox. In fact, reliance on historical sources, quotations from the classics, analogy, paradox and use of proverbs are particularly associated with the Chinese sophists (Kennedy, 1998, pp. 158 – 161). Similar in some ways to the sophists were the legalists, the most notable of whom, Han Fei-tsu (born around 280 BCE), has been referred to as “the Machiavelli of ancient China” (Oliver, 1971, p. 216). The primary aim of the legalists was to replace traditional norms by unquestioning acceptance of a ruler's authority. Those who wished to exert influence on powerful rulers were recommended to pander to their desires, interests and prejudices rather than pursuing logical argument (Watson, 1967, pp. 75 – 76). In this connection, it is important to note that the works of Chinese sophists and legalists have been frequently condemned.

Even this very brief overview of some of the main strands of ancient Chinese thinking which have impacted, to a greater or lesser extent, on contemporary Chinese oratory

and writing should be sufficient to alert readers to the multi-faceted nature of Chinese approaches to discourse and make them wary of generalization.

Some examples of misinterpretation/ misrepresentation of the Chinese philosophical tradition in literature on contrastive rhetoric

The origin of studies in contrastive rhetoric is generally traced to an article by Kaplan (1966) in which, on the basis of an analysis of scripts written in English by learners of English, he proposed five different types of paragraph development, associating each with what he identified as particular cultural groups (English; Semitic; Oriental; Romance; Russian). At that time, he regarded each of these paragraph development types as being influenced by culturally specific thought patterns. With the 'Oriental group' (Chinese, Thai and Korean), he associated an indirect spiral form of development (one in which a subject is approached from a variety of indirectly related points of view) as opposed to the linear, logical form of paragraph development he associated with English (presented as typically beginning with a topic statement supported by examples related to the central theme). More recently, Kaplan (1987; 1988) has argued that the differences he detected are more likely to reflect different writing conventions than different patterns of thought. From a position in which differences that were believed to exist in the writing of different groups were attributed to patterns of thought, Kaplan moved to a position in which they were attributed to cultural predispositions (c.f. Kaplan, 1966 & Kaplan, 1987; 1988). In each case, the conclusions reached, the assumptions underlying these conclusions and the ways in which they may be interpreted need to be given careful consideration. Laclau and Mouffe (2001 [1985]) argue that discourses and the identities produced through them are inherently political entities that involve the construction of antagonisms and the exercise of power. From this perspective, it becomes apparent that articles such as these run the risk of establishing and/or reinforcing stereotypes, partly through the use of metaphors – the straight line, the spiral etc. Furthermore, as Kubota (1999, p. 11) observes, “a . . . culture is not a monolithic, fixed, neutral, or objective category but rather a dynamic organism that exists in discursive fields in which power is exercised”. In addition, cultural hybridity is becoming the norm in many parts of the world (Hermans & Kempen, 1998). In highlighting this, the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CoE, 2001, p.4) uses the terms 'plurilingualism' and 'pluriculturalism' to refer to a context in which “. . . as an individual's experience of language in its cultural context expands . . . he or she . . . builds up a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact”.

Kaplan (1972) has claimed that the indirectness he believed he had detected in the writings of the Oriental group may be related to the influence of the *ba gu wen* (eight-legged essay), a standard compositional format employed by entrants to civil service examinations from the mid 15th century until the early 20th century. In fact, he claimed that this format was typical of expository and persuasive writing in China, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore. Others, including Cai (1993), have also referred to the importance of this format and, in connection with it, of the Confucian concepts of *ren* (仁)(benevolence) and *li* (禮). The first of these relates to the values associated with moral obligation; the second to correct behaviour/ etiquette. Applicants for civil service positions were obliged to demonstrate their ability to promote social harmony through application of the principles of *ren* and *li* in the context of compositions that demonstrated knowledge of the classics, included parallelism and repetition, were

strictly limited in terms of number of words and were made up of eight parts as follows:²

- poti* (破題)(opening) – generally involving two sentences introducing the topic;
- chengti* (承題)(amplification) – elaboration of the topic;
- qijiang* (起講) (preliminary exposition) – focus on straightforward exposition;
- qigu* (起股) (first argument) – generally made up of a limited number of sentence pairs that convey similar meaning in different words;
- zhonggu* (中股) (second argument– the main argument) – a series of parallel sentences constituting the main argument;
- hougu* (後股) (third argument) – an series of parallel sentences that extend on the ideas in the main argument or add to them;
- xugu* (束股) (final argument) – groups of parallel sentences made up of between two and five lines that revisit the main topic/theme and complete any points that remain outstanding;
- dajie* (大結) (conclusion) – concluding remarks – straightforward exposition but allowing for a measure of creativity.

Cai (1993, p.9) has claimed that:

English compositions by Chinese ESL students have consistently shown evidence of use of either the eight-legged or the four-part³ or the three-foot organizational patterns, a restricted expression of personal feelings and views, an indirect approach to the chosen topic, and a preference for prescribed, formulaic language, all of which are so unfamiliar to native English-speaking instructors that they mistakenly perceive these students as ‘poor writers’.

The four-part model to which Cai refers is the *qi-cheng-zhuan-he* model, a model that introduces a topic (*qi*), expands on it (*cheng*), presents another viewpoint on the topic (*zhuan*) and then sums up/ concludes (*he*). Fagan and Cheong (1987) analysed 60 essays written by Chinese ESL ninth grade students, claiming that over 50% of these essays followed the four-part model rather than a topic sentence supported by other sentences (which they represented as ‘the English pattern’). This raises a number of issues. First, the fact that the student texts examined were generally very short means that the focus was, once again, as in so many studies, essentially on the paragraph. Secondly, there seems to have been no valid reason for confining consideration of typical English text structuring to *topic-support*. After all, as Chen (2007) points out, the Problem-Solution (*PSn*) pattern (see Hoey, 1983; van Dijk, 1980), which typically involves four parts (Situation - Problem – Response to problem/ Solution – Evaluation) is a very common one although, of course, what Chen refers to as “the Western Problem-Solution pattern (and its elaboration)’ and ‘the Chinese four-part pattern’ are “by no means the only common patterns expected in Britain or in China” (Chen, 2007, p. 139). In fact, Kirkpatrick (1997) has argued convincingly that neither the *ba gu wen* (eight legged essay) nor the *qi-cheng-zhuan-he* have much impact on contemporary Chinese writing, adding that “as these structures do not influence the writing in Chinese of these students, they are unlikely to exert a great influence upon their writing in English”. In later works, Kirkpatrick (2002a & 2002b) observes that contemporary Chinese textbooks actually advocate a linear style of writing. A more

recent study, by Liao and Chen (2009), also reaches a similar conclusion. They compared the rhetorical strategies of argumentative writing recommended in three Chinese and three English L1 composition textbooks (each published before 1990), finding that they made similar recommendations in relation to, for example, macrostructure, introductory and concluding sections, positioning of thesis statements and support of arguments. They did, however, maintain that they differed in that only the Chinese textbooks emphasized moral and historical appeals and the use of analogy, set phrases and proverbs (p. 695). In connection with the research of Chen (2007), Kirkpatrick (1997; 2002a & b) and Liao and Chen (2009), it is interesting to note that Kubota (1997) has reached similar conclusions with reference to Japanese writers. She has observed, for example, that representations of Japanese expository prose as being characterized by “a classical style (*ki-sho-ten-ketsu*), reader responsibility, and an inductive style with a sudden topic shift” (see, for example, Hinds (1983, 1987, 1990)) can be challenged by “multiple interpretations of *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* offered by composition specialists in Japan” (p. 460). In addition, she found that approximately half of the 46 Japanese university students involved in a study in which they were asked to write essays in expository and persuasive modes in Japanese and in English used similar patterns in their Japanese and English essays (Kubota, 1998) and that overall low scores in relation to ESL organization appeared to be largely influenced by lack of experience in English composition and lack of English language skills (p. 86).

Mohan and Lo (1985) have not only noted that contemporary Chinese books of rhetoric advocate a direct writing style⁴ but also that the *wen-yan* style included a number of varieties in addition to the *ba gu wen* (eight-legged essay). They have also observed that the *wen-yan* style was largely replaced in the early 20th century by the *bai-hua* style, a style that is not only direct but draws heavily on spoken language. However, even if it were the case that the *qi-cheng-zhuan-he* model was typical of contemporary Chinese writing, it is important to stress that it is a model that has often been misrepresented. Mo (1985, pp. 63 & 71) has argued that this model is, in fact, linear rather than circular, and Cahill (2003, p.170) has observed that its third stage model is not typically a ‘turn’, a digression or a rhetorical move of circularity, but “the occasion to develop an essay further by alternative means”. Furthermore, Chou (1989) has noted some striking similarities between the *qi-cheng-zhuan-he* model and the conventional superstructure - *introduction-body-conclusion* – that is often recommended for English essays. Finally, Lin (1987), in examining 50 samples of expository writing submitted in the context of the qualifying examination for Taiwanese government employment, found no instances of circular paragraph development.

Taylor and Chen (1991) examined the introductions to 31 academic papers in geophysics and related fields.⁵ Of the 31, 11 were written in English by first language speakers of English. The others (10 written in English and 10 in Chinese) were written by speakers of Chinese as a first language. They found that each of four moves identified by Swales (establishing the field; summarizing relevant previous research; identifying a gap; introducing the project by stating its purpose and objectives) was present in all cases. The Chinese scientists were, however, less likely to elaborate the moves and tended to pay less attention to summarizing previous research, citing fewer references. As they noted, the second of these may have had less to do with writing conventions than the fact that extensive research archives were not readily available.

Furthermore, it seems likely that a lack of elaboration is commonplace among those who are obliged to write in a second language whatever that language may be and it also seems likely that Chinese academics have, in general, fewer opportunities to submit their work for publication and, therefore, fewer opportunities to rehearse academic article structuring.

A study by Zhu (1997) of 20 sales letters written in Chinese revealed that although some of them included indirect expression, all of them were developed in a linear way without ‘circularity’ or ‘digression’ (p. 543). Similarly, a study by Kong (1998) of business request letters written in English, some by speakers of English as a first language, others by speakers of Chinese as a first language, revealed a similar move structure although there were differences in terms of ‘face relationships’ (pp. 137-138).

Some studies have claimed that there are some significant similarities between samples of texts written by contemporary writers from Chinese-speaking and English-speaking backgrounds. Others have claimed that there are some significant differences. Thus, for example, Matalene (1985), on the basis of the examination of essays written in Chinese, has claimed that they differ from essays by students from Anglo-American backgrounds in that they typically (a) include assertions rather than proofs, (b) present arguments later, and in a less direct way, and (c) rely heavily on appeals to history, tradition and authority. It may be, however, that these findings are attributable as much to the context in which the writing was produced as they are to general characteristics of Chinese writers. Similarly, although it is certainly true that Confucianism is associated with a high level of respect for collective wisdom, it does not necessarily follow from this, as Ng (2002) asserts, that students who have been influenced by Confucianism will be more reluctant than others to state and defend positions with which there is likely to be disagreement. Once again, context may be a deciding factor. Even so, there *are* some things that have been said to be typical of the writing in English of students from a Chinese background that may be present irrespective of context. Thus, for example, Hinds (1987, pp. 143 & 146) has asserted that readers from an Anglo-American cultural background are more likely to make use of extensive cohesive signaling than are writers from some other backgrounds and Wang, Chen and Hsu (1998) have observed that Chinese writers, when writing in English, make more frequent use of ellipsis than is typically the case of Anglo-American writers. These things are likely to be due, in part at least, to the fact that Chinese is a pro-drop language, that is, one in which certain classes of pronoun may be omitted where their referents can be contextually recovered, particularly in subject position (Huang, 1989).

The dangers inherent in misinterpreting and/or misrepresenting the Chinese philosophical/ rhetorical tradition

It is important to acknowledge and take account of the linguistic and cultural impact of globalization. It is also important to recognize one’s own positioning as a researcher and the impact that that positioning may have on the research. Otherwise, there is a danger that the creation and promotion of stereotypes based on unacknowledged value judgments will be perpetuated. Thus, for example, Kubota (1999, pp. 10-11) notes that “[l]abels used for representing cultures are produced, reinforced, and contested by discourses that manifest power struggles within the culture and between cultures”.

In connection with this, it is important to note that references to aspects of Chinese history and Chinese rhetorical traditions have not always been adequately contextualized and have sometimes been based on assumptions rather than evidence. These sorts of assumptions are now beginning to be questioned. Thus, for example, it was noted above that the *qi-cheng-zhuan-he* model has been found to have much in common with the conventional superstructure *introduction-body-conclusion* (Chou, 1989) and to have a tendency towards linearity rather than circularity (Cahill, 2003; Mo, 1985). Furthermore, although some researchers have detected some interesting differences between the products of Chinese and Anglo-American writing (Fagan & Cheong, 1987; Hinds, 1987; Huang, 1989; Matalene, 1985; Wang, Chen & Hsu, 1998), analysis of the structure of English and Chinese suggests that some of these differences (e.g. subject omission and paucity of cohesive signalling) may be attributable, in the case of first language speakers of Chinese writing in English, to problems with the referential system of English rather than to fundamental differences in perceptions of the roles of writer and reader. In addition, a number of researchers have found significant similarities between aspects of Chinese and Anglo-American writing (Kong, 1998; Lin, 1987; Zhu, 1997). What all of this indicates is the fact that it is unwise to make broad generalizations about contemporary Chinese writing, or indeed, about the writing of any heterogeneous group, on the basis of specific instances.

Endnotes

1. Confucius was a contemporary of Guatama Buddha who died in 479BCE (10 years before the birth of Aristotle).
2. This type of essay was first introduced into civil service exams of 1487 and 1496 (Wilson, 1995) but the essay type dates back at least to the Song Dynasty (Lui, 1974).
3. They indicated that this model included: *qi* (preparation for the topic); *cheng* (introduction and development of the topic); *jun* (turn to a seemingly unrelated topic); and *he* (summing up)
4. A classical style of written Chinese based on the grammar and vocabulary of literary Chinese in ancient China.
5. These were: metallurgy, mineral processing, materials science, and materials and mechanical engineering.

References

- Cahill, D. (2003). The myth of the 'turn' in contrastive rhetoric. *Written Communication*, 20(2), 170- 194.
- Cai, G. (1993). Texts in contexts: Understanding Chinese Students' English compositions. In C. R. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.) *Evaluating writing* (2nd ed.). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Chen, W. C. (2007). Some literature review on the comparison of the Chinese *Qi-Cheng-Zhuan-He* writing model and the Western *Problem-Solution* schemata. *WHAMPOA: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 52, 137 – 148.
- Chou, H. L. (1989). Contrastive rhetoric: Chinese and English. *Paper from the Sixth Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China* (pp. 251-269). Taipei: Crane.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Fagan, E. R., & Cheong, P. (1987). Contrastive rhetoric: pedagogical implication for the ESL teacher in Singapore. *RELC: A Journal of Language Teaching and Research in Southeast Asia*, 18(1), 19 – 31.
- Hermans, H., & Kempen, H. (1998). Moving cultures: the perilous problems of cultural dichotomies in a globalizing society. *American Psychologist*, 53, 1111-1120.
- Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text*, 3(2), 183 – 195.
- Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In Connor, U. & Kaplan, R. B. (Eds.). *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 141–152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. In U. Connor & A. M. Johns (Eds.). *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 87-109). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Hoey, M. (1983). *On the surface of discourse*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Huang, J. (1989). Pro-drop in Chinese: A generalised control theory. In O. Jaeggli & K.J. Safir (Eds.). *The null subject parameter* (pp. 185–214). Dordrecht, Holland: Kluwer.
- Kaplan, R. A. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, 16 (1-2), 11-25.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1972). A convey of examples. *The anatomy of rhetoric: Prolegomena to a functional theory of rhetoric*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1987). Cultural thought patterns revisited. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.). *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 9-21). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1988). Contrastive rhetoric and second language learning: Notes toward a theory of contrastive rhetoric. In A. C. Purves (Ed.). *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric* (pp. 275 – 304). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kennedy, G. A. (1998). Rhetoric in ancient China. In G. A. Kennedy (Ed.), *Comparative rhetoric: An historical and cross-cultural introduction* (pp. 141-170). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (1997). Traditional Chinese text structures and their influence on the writing in Chinese and English of contemporary mainland Chinese students. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6(3), 223 – 224.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2002a). Contrastive rhetoric in Chinese and English. In Lu Guobin (Ed.), 與世界接軌: 漢語文化學: 第一屆淡江大學全球姊妹校漢語文化學學術會議論文集 (Connecting the World: Studies in Chinese Culture: Proceedings of the First Conference of Tamkang University on Chinese Culture) (pp. 421 – 446). Taiwan: Xuesheng Shuju.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2002b). Chinese rhetoric through Chinese textbooks: Uniquely Chinese? In X. Lu, W. Jia, & D. R. Heisey (Eds.), *Chinese communication studies: Contexts and comparisons* (pp. 245-260). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Kong, K. (1998). Are simple business request letters really simple? A comparison of Chinese and English business request letters. *Text*, 18, 103-141.
- Kubota, R. (1997). A reevaluation of the uniqueness of Japanese written discourse: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Written Communication*, 14(4), 460-480.

- Kubota, R. (1998). An investigation of L1-L2 transfer in writing among Japanese university students: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(1), 69-100.
- Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(1), 9-35.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2001 [1985]) *Hegemony and socialist strategy. Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.
- Liao, M-T., & Chen, C-H (2009). Rhetorical strategies in Chinese and English: A comparison of L1 composition textbooks. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(4), 695-720.
- Lin, C. Y. (1987). A second thought on Robert Kaplan's theory of Chinese thought pattern. *Paper from the Third Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China*, 187-196. Taipei: Crane.
- Lui, A. Y-C. (1974). Syllabus of the provincial examination (hsiang-shih) under the Early Ch'ing (1644 – 1795). *Modern Asian Studies*, 8(3), 391-396.
- Matalene, C. (1985). Contrastive rhetoric: An American writing teacher in China. *College English*, 47, 789-808.
- Mo, J. Q. (莫建清). (1985). 從段落的觀點談英語閱讀 (Talking about English reading from the prospective of paragraphs). *Paper from the Second Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China* (pp. 55-72). Taipei: Crane.
- Mohan, B. A., & Lo, W. A-Y., (1985). Academic writing and Chinese students: Transfer and developmental factors. *TESOL Quarterly* 19(3), 515-534.
- Ng, R. M-C. (2002). Culture and modernization: The case of the People's Republic of China. In X. Lu, W. Jia, & D. R. Heisey (Eds.). *Chinese communication studies: Contexts and comparisons* (pp. 33-45). London: Ablex Publishing.
- Oliver, R. T (1969). The rhetorical tradition in China: Confucius and Mencius. *Communication Quarterly*, 17(1), 3 -8.
- Oliver, R. T. (1971). *Communication and culture in ancient India and China*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Oliver, R. T. (1976). Rhetoric and the social matrix: Reflections from the Asian classics. *Communication*, 4(2), 134-151.
- Taylor, G., & Chen, T. (1991). Linguistic, cultural and subcultural issues in contrastive discourse: Anglo-American and Chinese scientific texts. *Applied Linguistics*, 12(3), 319-327.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction and cognition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Wang, Y-K., Chen, Y-S., & Hsu, W-L. (1998). *Empirical study of Mandarin Chinese discourse analysis: An event-based approach*. Proceedings of the Tenth IEEE International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence. Taipei, Taiwan. Retrieved June 7, 2010, from http://www.iis.sinica.edu.tw/IASL/webpdf/paper-1998-Empirical_Study_of_Mandarin_Chinese_Discourse_.pdf
- Watson, B. (1967). (Ed. and trans.). *Basic writings of Mo Tzu, Hsun Tzu, and Han Fei Tzu*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wilson, T. A. (1995). *Genealogy of the Way: The construction and uses of the Confucian tradition in late imperial China*. Stanford University Press.
- Zhu, Y. (1997). An analysis of structural moves in Chinese sales letters. *Text*, 17, 543-566.