8-2012

A Qualitative Study of Mature Taiwanese Writers' Development of Voice and Positioning in English

Shu-Fen Yeh
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF MATURE TAIWANESE WRITERS' DEVELOPMENT OF VOICE AND POSITIONING IN ENGLISH

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Shu-Fen Yeh

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

August 2012

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of English

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Shu-Fen Yeh

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

_____April 23, 2012_____ _____Signature on File_____
Jeannine M. Fontaine, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of English, Advisor

_____April 23, 2012_____ _____Signature on File _____
Sharon K. Deckert, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of English

_____April 23, 2012_____ _____Signature on File_____
Michael C. Reed
Professor of English
The University of Findlay

ACCEPTED

_____Signature on File_____ _____
Timothy P. Mack, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: A Qualitative Study of Mature Taiwanese Writers' Development of Voice and Positioning in English

Author: Shu-Fen Yeh

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Jeannine M. Fontaine

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Sharon K. Deckert
Dr. Michael C. Reed

ABSTRACT

The present study explores nine L2 mature writers' transition between different academic environments, and seeks to create more meaningful grounds for teaching academic ESL writing in the U.S. and college writing in Taiwan. The approach of this study is influenced by Hirvela and Belcher's (2001) reading of terms they define as *voicist*—in other words, terms that refer to voices and identities. The study results have highlighted some of the major challenges of academic writing Taiwanese L2 writers encounter when studying abroad at graduate level. One of the salient problems is inadequate academic writing skills, and the sub-problem is a failure to express ideas with a strong individual voice and to position themselves appropriately in their texts (e.g. having a narrow scope of positioning themselves, applying limited linguistic features to position themselves and lacking confidence to express their ideas and to position themselves in texts). As a result, they face great challenges in the Western educational system, but with their development of academic writing skills, voice, critical thinking through academic writing practices and the processes of socialization along with support from schools, professors and peers, L2 writers can overcome the challenges and become successful writers which can in turn lead to successful academic careers and publishing.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For me, writing a dissertation is a process of transformation from a Ph.D. student into a researcher. It is a process of learning, struggling and growing in my journey of academic learning. Without much help from many people, I could not have finished this research. Therefore, I would like to express my deep and sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Jeannie Fontaine. Her wide knowledge and her logical way of thinking have been of great value for me. Her understanding, encouragement and personal guidance have provided a good basis for the present dissertation. I am also deeply grateful to my committee members, Dr. Decker and Dr. Reed for the sincere insights, support and constructive suggestions for the dissertation.

I thank my Taiwanese participants for their kindness in sharing with me their personal experiences and knowledge. During this work I have collaborated with my colleagues for whom I have great regard, and I wish to extend my warmest thanks to all those who have helped me with my work in the U.S. I owe my loving thanks to my mom, family, and friends in Taiwan. Without their encouragement and understanding it would have been impossible for me to finish this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

As numbers of international graduate students in North American institutions have increased over the last 25 years, research attention on second language writing has increased sharply and begun to shift the primary focus from second language learner (L2) undergraduates to the L2 graduate student population (Leki et al., 2008). Many L2 scholars and educators claim that those diverse groups of ESL students represent social, political, cultural, and educational ideologies informing literacy practices (e.g. Gee, 1996), and that their prior academic writing practices are significant in informing their current writing practices and influencing their writing development. Therefore, Matsuda (1998) has called for research on ESL writers from diverse backgrounds, with a view toward understanding them as writers and exploring how their past educational backgrounds have impacted their writing in different academic contexts.

Many international students arrive in graduate school in the United States as already highly respected and established professionals in their home countries. Even though these students have a high degree of disciplinary knowledge, experience writing within their disciplines in L1, and a background of reading in English, they still need to face the challenge of transitioning between different learning and academic environments. They not only still have to process and learn how to write within the norms particular to given disciplines in their L2, but also have to be quite sophisticated about such features of disciplinary writing as can assist them in positioning themselves appropriately in their writing in relation to their professional audiences (Leki, 2006). However, many of these graduate students may encounter pressures which are particularly strong, as they are often expected to produce scholarly writing within a short period

of their arrival, and are expected to be active participants in their professional discourse communities. In fact, many have had little experience of this type of writing in English (Dong, 1998; Rose & McClafferty, 2001), and some may also have expectations that are different from those of their professors (Belcher, 1994; Fishman & McCarthy, 2001). While the dilemmas and challenges they face are common to all students entering graduate school, international students often need to make additional adjustments due to their new cultural context and its expectations. As one aspect of this transition, many of these graduate students face the challenge of adapting to a new context in which the educational system and culture are strongly linked with the ideology of individualism. Students who come from backgrounds in which their writing is shaped by cultural features such as beliefs related to collectivism may lack authority or voice over their own emerging writing, since they are unfamiliar with notions of genre or the choices available to them in terms of rhetorical approaches to their writing. Obviously, L2 writers have to face and overcome the challenge of adopting different writing styles, learning cultures, and types of voice when dealing with different academic environments. Although L2 writers encounter problems and challenges at the beginning of their graduate studies, the present study has confirmed that they can develop their academic writing, skills, critical thinking or voices through engaging in academic writing practices, experiencing the processes of socialization, and receiving support from schools, professors, and peers. The ideas L2 writers developed during their education were reinforced after they went to their academic career. That is, L2 writers' development of academic writing and their academic voice benefits their future academic career in terms of successfully publishing their papers, expressing ideas, continuing to notice text forms and style in their works, and increasing their awareness of their readers and their ideologies, interests, research fields, and expectations. L2 writers grow to understand the need to be aware of choosing and adjusting their

voices and communicating with readers effectively and confidently, which helps them to present their ideas clearly and to be able to supply an extensive and scholarly literature review with comprehensive methodology and results, and in a form and style common to the discipline. The results of the study, reported in later chapters, attest to the participants' success in developing strategies to meet the demands of their two major transitions (to an English-speaking cultural context, then back to Taiwanese culture and its quite different demands).

As noted earlier, because of the rapid demographic changes over the last 25 years in higher education in the United States, many scholars have researched the dilemmas and struggles faced by L2 English writers from different cultures and linguistic backgrounds. In these studies, topics such as academic writing, academic literacy practices and the development of writing identity and voice in composition have been explored by a number of scholars (e.g. Gee, 1996; Ivanic and Camps, 2001; Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999; Leki, 1995, 2001; Tang & John, 1999; Casanave, 1995, 2004; Matsuda, 2001; Matsuda & Tardy, 2007; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2007, 2008). Some of the findings of L2 writing studies suggest that academic writing is not simply a cognitive or linguistic issue, but is also a social, political and cultural one. In fact, some researchers stress how important it is for L2 writers to legitimatize and position themselves in academic communities, and accordingly how important it is to conceptualize the issues of voice and identity, both in first language and second language writing research (Hirvela & Belcher, 2001; Ivanic and Camps, 2001; Matsuda, 2001).

Voice is one of the terms most commonly brought up when composition teachers talk about what defines good writing quality for students in the Western academic writing system. Composition pedagogy as developed in the English-speaking world depends in crucial ways on the expression of a "self" that is entrenched in American culture and pedagogical practices

(Bowden, 1999; Burnham, 2001). The metaphorical notion of voice, therefore, appears to have developed with strong links to the ideology of the individual in composition pedagogy, an ideology coming from mainstream American society (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999). However, more recently, some proponents of voice argue for an alternative view of the voice metaphor in composition. Lisa Ede's (1989) idea of "situational voice" addresses the fact that writers take on different voices in different situations and occasions. A writer's voice is multiple and he or she selects different voices in different situations, and this situational view of voice can be related to a tenet of post-structuralist thought. Foucault (1980) also states that people have multiple instead of unitary personalities or subjectivities. From the social constructionists' point of view, the writer's voice is constituted and the "author is merely a function of discourse, explicable with reference to the language of discourse communities" (Jacobs, 1995, p.10). As seen in this perspective, a discourse is constituted by groups of readers and writers, and the written piece includes the whole community, not only the writer.

The metaphorical notion of voice, either individualist voice or multiple voice, continues to occupy a significant place in discourse of composition studies in L1. In recent times, the notion of written voice also has played an important role in the progress of writing research and instruction in L2 domains (e.g. Atkinson, 2001; Belcher & Hirvela, 2001; Ivanic & Camps, 2001; Ivanic, 1998; Matsuda, 2001; Matsuda & Tardy, 2007; Prior, 2001) and in academic writing (Ivanic, 1998). L2 researchers argue for a strong link between the concept of individualism in compositional pedagogy and the assessment of text, which can be confusing and difficult for L2 writers who have come from collectivist cultures such as Japan, China, Taiwan and other Asian countries. Writing research, therefore, addresses the significant concepts of voice and identity, and writing instructors often speak of the need to help students acquire a voice or identity.

However, Hirvela and Belcher (2001) argue that L2 students already possess voice and identity within their L1 when they enter graduate school. Some scholars provide evidence to show that L2 writers already have their own cultural understanding of appropriate academic writing (e.g. Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999) and have their own particular ways of positioning themselves within that writing (Ivanic and Camps, 2001).

It is a big challenge for L2 students who have had limited previous cultural exposure to individual expression and argumentation to expect these students to reorient themselves to values found in Western cultures. This kind of transition from collectivist cultures to individualist cultures can be challenging. Therefore, it is important for writing instructors to encourage L2 students to use their own voice (both personal and academic) without infringing on their own culturally-based beliefs about self and identity. It is also important for researchers to understand that L2 writers can maintain their voices which are also consistent with their own cultural values, because "evidence of voice can be found in any language – even in languages that are often associated with 'collectivist' values" (Matsuda, 2001, p. 40), although L2 writers may not be aware of the concept of personal voice or academic personal voice.

Voice represents a concept that is widely used yet vaguely defined, though many L2 researchers present a sophisticated version of the concept of voice in their studies. The term "academic personal voice" is significant since graduate students should have their academic personal voice to achieve their learning in the genre of academic writing in terms of "gain[ing] access to ways of communicating that have accrued cultural capital in particular professional, academic and occupations communities" (Hyland, 2003b,p. 24).

There are a few studies which have been conducted to acknowledge second language mature writers' transition between different academic environments and their difficulties or

challenges in the academic setting, and to explore the contribution of ESL research to our understanding of these topics. There is still much work to be done in the area of L2 writing identity and voice development in composition class (Matsuda, 2001) and L2 writers' positioning in academic writing (Ivanic & Camps,2001). Additionally, the areas of highlighting individual writers' strengths and weaknesses and of understanding diverse groups of ESL students and their challenges of academic writing needs to be investigated further (Larsen, 2003; Ochieng, 2005). Parry (1996) has cautioned that, "teachers need to understand what is most appropriate for students of… particular cultural groups and must base this understanding on realistic expectations of the students' behavior" (p. 666).

Due to the shortage of existing research about L2 writers' transition between different academic environments, particularly focusing on a group of mature writers, it is necessary for writing researchers and scholars to look at this group of participants and to focus on insights that can inform writing program development, and target the writing needs of these L2 writers. This study is a baseline study that seeks to fill the current gap in research with a group of Taiwanese mature writers with regard to their current academic writing practices, voice-related experiences and problems, and their transition between different academic environments.

Purpose of the Study & Research Questions

In order to understand Taiwanese mature writers' transition between different academic environments, this study investigates issues such as L2 writers' challenges in developing academic writing skills, their prior academic writing practices or professional writing experiences, and their views of academic personal voice and positioning in their texts. The approach of this study is influenced by Hirvela and Belcher's (2001) reading of terms they define as *voicist*—in other words, terms that refer to voices and identities. Like other researchers,

Hirvela and Belcher speak of plural "voices" rather than singular "voice." This study investigates three different ways in which L2 writers position themselves within their texts based on Halliday's (1985) three macrofunctions, which will be explained in Chapter 2. These positionings can show how writers form their ideas and views of the world, their sense of authority and certainty, and their particular relationships with their readers. The research attempts to answer three questions to shed light on these issues.

The following questions have served as a guide to the present study:

1. How do mature Taiwanese writers transition between different academic environments? To what extent do Taiwanese writers with experience studying in English speaking countries seem to be aware of the events that shaped their development of voice, and do these events figure into their narratives on their own development as writers? If so, how do they describe these events, and their growing awareness of voice or positioning in their writing? In particular, how have they reconciled differences in their experiences as developing writers in Taiwan, and later in the English-speaking environment, then again as professionals back in Taiwan?

2. What role does positioning play in L2 writers' actual practice in academic writing? What elements in their academic writing seem to reflect positioning or voice? How do they address their rationale for using the forms that they use that help them position themselves?

Significance of the Study

Many L2 researchers indicate the need to understand graduate students' academic writing practice in various contexts. However, the issue of how to represent a group of L2 mature writers and their transition between different academic environments in second language writing

research is still far from being settled. This is particularly true when such writers are studied in the context of a diverse international student population such as what exists in the United States. For this reason, I have chosen to focus on these L2 mature writers who have returned to Taiwan and are pursuing established professional careers there. With focusing on Taiwanese professional writers, this study could enhance the understanding of Taiwanese writers' academic personal voice and their academic writing as a product of their linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds. The result of this study can further enrich voicist research, create more meaningful grounds for the teaching of voice in L2 writing pedagogy, inform current composition instruction, and target the writing needs of L2 students in the United States. This study appropriately responds to various calls for a comprehensive theory of second language writing and takes a step toward confronting the challenges of multicultural writing in colleges and universities in the United States.

Overview of Research Design

Using a qualitative research methodology, this study has investigated the voices of Taiwanese writers to gather insight into their understandings of positioning in academic writing and the writing challenges they experience when confronted with an academic writing task in their English-dominant L2 context, and then again meeting the challenges they face when returning to their home context in Taiwan. Data was collected from three sources using different research instruments over a period of three months. A questionnaire addresses biographical details such as age, sex, level of education, major, etc. The questionnaire also includes five open-ended questions to further gauge the participants' views on writing, and ten items, using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" and "always" to "never," to evaluate the respondents' views and attitudes toward writing and self-presentation in writing.

In-depth face-to-face interviews were then used to examine the participants' perceptions on their development of academic writing experiences, their attitudes toward voicist issues, and problems they have encountered in these areas, as expressed in their own words. Finally, textual analysis was used to understand L2 writers' practices regarding positioning in academic writing and their awareness of self expression. After being completely collected, the data were analyzed and interpreted in three stages. In the first stage, I analyzed the data from the interviews independently by identifying responses as they compare against the guiding research questions of the study. Then, in the second stage I engaged in careful reading of the transcriptions, reviewing the data to code and categorize individual statements and passages according to each participant. In the final stage I examined the L2 writers' textual data to understand their positioning in terms of the linguistic features they include in their texts. The participants of this study included eight Taiwanese writers who had training in academic writing in the United States and have now returned to Taiwan to take up professional positions there.

Overview of Coming Chapters

This study consists of eight chapters, each of which addresses and elaborates a specific aspect of the study in more detail. In chapter 1, this introduction has provided the background and outlined the goals and research questions of the study. Chapter 2 presents a review of related literature, covering issues related to research on voice in English composition pedagogy, voice in second language writing and research, the context of English learning in Taiwan, and second language writers and texts. Chapter 3 illustrates the methodology that will be employed in conducting this study. Since I am using interviews and text analysis as my tools for this research, this study is considered qualitative. Chapter 4 reports and analyzes the data collected through the questionnaire, whose goal was to evaluate the participants' views and attitudes toward writing,

providing additional details to the introductory material. In addition, the questionnaire results provide preliminary ideas of the participants' level of self-representation in writing. Chapter 5 presents data collected from the interviews; including narratives covering the relevant experiences of each participant as they pertain to research question one. Chapter 6 reports textual documents and analyzes texts from each participant to understand how the writer participants seem to position themselves in their writing as they use linguistic features such as pronouns, tense, modality, adverbial modifiers, and other features referencing personal positioning. Chapter 7 summarizes the findings, and specifies how the research questions have been answered by the results. Chapter 8 will serve as the conclusion, in which a general overview of the study will be provided. The most significant findings of the study will be explained here as well as some implications based on those findings. Finally, I will point out the limitations of the study for further studies and provide suggestions for pedagogical policies, as well as second language writing research and practices to consider in the future.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Voice has played an important role in composition pedagogy since the 1970s and remains popular in the United States. However, voice represents a concept that is vaguely defined in spite of being widely used; moreover, there "has never been a consistent methodology for how to use [voice] in the teaching of writing" (Bowden, 1995, p.173). Therefore, to have a deeper understanding of the voice metaphor, this chapter reviews the role and use of voice in composition pedagogy, as well as the theoretical commentaries that seem to shed light on the shape of classroom instruction. To set the stage for further discussion of the voice metaphor in L1 and L2 composition research and pedagogies, the coming sections of this chapter attempt to trace the emergence of voice from the late 1970s and 80s and to focus on the discussion of written voice in composition pedagogy by providing researchers' views of voice through individual and social perspectives, while addressing debates on individual voice in second language writing research. Finally, this chapter also examines differences between Chinese and English rhetorical patterns as well as English teaching and writing in Taiwan, and writing strategies and textual ownership, highlighting studies regarding the issues of second language writing and voice.

Voice in English (L1) Composition Pedagogy

Bowden (1999) described the historical genesis of the notion of voice as part of a reaction, during the late 1960s and early 1970s, "against the perceived depersonalization that resulted from the increasingly mechanized and industrialized world of the eighteenth century" (p.50). Before this time, social and educational systems were emphasizing the impersonal over the

personal, the technological over the natural. However, with the individualist tendencies stressed in social and education systems in the twentieth century, the idea of a personal voice became "extraordinarily popular among American composition teachers" and gained a strong presence in contemporary classrooms and discussion of writing (p.173). Because historical and ideological situations have shifted attention to the development of individual students in social contexts and their education in the United States since the 1970s, Bowden suggests that composition instructors and researchers should seriously reconsider how to apply the voice metaphor in the composition classroom.

Until the late 1960s, the term "voice" was used most often in its literal sense, to refer to the speaking voice including volume, tempo, pitch and tone. In another sense, voice referred to a grammatical category in verbs, for instance to label the "active" voice, a form which today still has strong affinities to values implicit in voice (Bowden, 1999). Active verbal constructions are often considered to be clearer, more dynamic, and more direct than passive constructions because the agent is more conspicuous and active sentences are more familiar.

During this same period, the use of other aural metaphors, such as "tone," "rhythm," and "euphony" were emphasized in writing pedagogy, because the conjoining of speech and writing had a strong presence in early American writing instruction. For example, Stoehr (1968) explains that tone can be righteous, indignant, cajoling or shrill in either written or spoken language, and that these styles "show [the] author's attitude toward his audience" (p.150). Besides tone, rhythm is another feature of aural metaphor in American composition pedagogy. In other words, writers have followed a tradition of using terms associated with spoken language as they engage in revision or invention, so that the resulting text will be more effective and have the vitality to persuade an audience (Bowden, 1999). Without a doubt, instruction often focused more on

training students to be (metaphorically) good orators rather than on writing for writing's sake during this time.

In the early 1970's, the focus on "voice" as a metaphor has shifted to another angle in composition pedagogy, referring to the growing awareness of and emphasis on personal expression in writing. Personal expression came to be spoken of in terms such as "authentic voice," and the expression of this "voice" was regarded as a natural consequence of self-discovery. Steward (1972) explains that when writers begin to find out who they are and what they think, they learn to trust their own voice in writing. Everyone is an individual and is different from others, so each writer's "authorial voice" is unique, notwithstanding the common or shared experiences he or she may share with many other writers (p.9). Under the growing emphasis on issues of personal expression and the unitary self, authentic voice became a buzzword of voice proponents during the late 1960s and early 1970s (Steward, 1972). The current concept of voice was born at this time, with its goals of enhancing self-exploration and fostering more humanistic varieties of academic language. Donald Steward's idea accords with those of James Berlin and other expressionists, which will be further discussed later.

Given the goal of encouraging students' personal voice, the pedagogy of self-expression has emerged, having as the first priority of each student to express what is inside his or her self (Burnham, 2001). In composition class, students are expected to search for their personal voice through essays in which they are encouraged to express personal experiences. Revision and development in writing has come to focus on evidence of personal voice as well as content and organization, rather than correcting or pointing out "mistakes" in spelling or grammatical features of their writing.

Not surprisingly, composition pedagogy as developed in the English-speaking world depends in crucial ways on the expression of a "self" that is entrenched in American culture and pedagogical practices, because the purpose of American education is to help students realize themselves and become true individuals (Bowden, 1999; Burnham, 2001). The metaphorical notion of voice, therefore, appears to have developed with strong links to the ideology of the individual in composition pedagogy, an ideology coming from mainstream American society (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999).

During the 1990s, voice continued to maintain its allure in English composition pedagogy because it appealed to values that both educators and students already held, or to strong values which had been embedded through the ideology of individualism. Peter Elbow (1994) states that voice helps writers conceptualize some of the intangibles in writing and helps them make concrete such abstractions as meaning, power, and honesty. In *Writing with Power* (1981), Elbow demonstrates the role of voice in impacting individual writers to act in the world through the use of objective as well as subjective evaluation methods affecting the revision process.

An Alternative View of Voice: Situational and Social Voice

Bowden (1999) addresses values that are relevant for writers as individuals, such as "the power of speech and the force of the literary narrative" (p.61). However, more recently, some proponents of voice argue for an alternative view of the voice metaphor in composition. Lisa Ede's (1989) idea of "situational voice" addresses the fact that writers take on different voices in different situations and occasions. Ede's idea approaches Cherry's (1988) idea of writing always conveying a representation of the writer's self which will vary in accordance to the way in which audience and other factors of the rhetorical situation are characterized. In this sense,

voice is not single but multiple. In her textbook, *Work in Progress*, published in 1989, Ede articulates a modern concept of how students should consider voice:

> Just as you dress differently on different occasions, as a writer you assume different voices in different situations. If you're writing an essay about a personal experience, you may work hard to create a strong personal voice in your essay….If you're writing a report or essay exam, you will adopt a more formal, public tone. Whatever this situation, the choices you make as you write and revise…will determine how readers interpret and respond to your presence in the text (p.158).

Ede's view of voice is not unitary but multiple, and the concept of voice she focuses on has moved personal expression to a more socially situated or audience-based emphasis. Writers select different voices in different situations, and this situational view of voice can be related to a tenet of post-structuralist thought. For example, Foucault (1980) states that people have multiple instead of unitary personalities or subjectivities. From the social constructionists' point of view, the writer's voice is constituted and the "author is merely a function of discourse, explicable with reference to the language of discourse communities" (Jacobs, 1995, p.10). As seen in this perspective, a discourse is constituted by groups of readers and writers, and the written piece includes the whole community, not only the writer. Both the social constructionist and the post-structuralist eschew the ideas of individual self and "authorial voice" that Stewart (1972) described as presenting the self as unique from other selves (p.9).

The most influential alternative version of written voice owes to Mikhail Bakhtin (e.g. 1986) and his works in the field of linguistics and literacy. Speaking of Bakhtin, Ramanathan & Atkinson (1999) note, "His notion of 'heteroglossia' is the idea that all language-in-use is made up of bits and pieces that were, in effect, borrowed from other language users and infused with

their intentions" (p.50). In this sense, a writer's voice is inevitably multiple and the writer presents many voices intertwined within the text. In other words, voices do not exist in isolation in social milieu and texts can be interpreted in various ways. Bakhtin further develops the theory of heteroglossia and proposes a true dialectical style, called "dialogism," which makes a language user's use of language appropriate to another. Basically, Bakhtin envisions a kind of dialogue between writers and readers as an ongoing activity; that is, writers draw on their own knowledge of how other texts work and explore the responses in a text to previous utterances, in order to characterize the readers' ability to recognize meaning and intertextuality between texts. Bakhtin (1986) uses the term 'speech genres' to capture what is typical about a particular kind of utterance:

> A speech genre is not a form of language but a typical form of utterance; as such the genre also includes a certain typical kind of expression that inheres in it. In the genre the word acquires a particular typical expression. Genres correspond to typical situations of speech communication, typical themes, and to particular contacts between the meanings of words and actual concrete reality under certain typical circumstances (p.10).

When we speak, we create the contexts of use to which our utterances typically belong and create a space for our own voice. More specifically, we choose words depending upon their explicit meanings. We select words to engage with others and to present our ideas in ways that make more sense to their readers. At the moment of their use, we infuse them with our own voices.

The notion of voice has been strongly linked to the notion of individuality. Thus, it is not surprising that instructors focus on individuality in writing and consider this concept as very important for students attending college composition classes. However, Bakhtin's theory of

dialogic principles provides for an alternative conception of voice and for a compromise in the debate concerning the individual versus society or the relationship between self and others. Writing instructors draw on Bakhtin's concept of dialogue which may help them to value different characteristics in writing and to conduct different approaches of teaching academic writing in ESL classes and in freshman composition classes (Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995). Bakhtin has much to inform writers of in terms of realizing that their voices need to be understood in connection to their context and not merely considered to be a purely individual act. Writers' voices are constituted by groups of readers and writers, and by the whole community, not only by the writer. This is consistent with Ede's view of multiple voices and with the concept of voice as more socially situated.

As noted earlier, voice represents a concept that is widely used yet vaguely defined; moreover, there "has never been a consistent methodology for how to use [voice] in the teaching of writing" or research (Bowden, 1995, p.173). For example, Elbow (1981) describes voice in terms of writing which "capture[s] the sound of the individual on the page." (p.287). Bowden (1999) defines "voice as a metaphor having to do with feeling-hearing-sensing a person behind the written words, even if that person is just a persona created for a particular text or a certain reading" (pp. 97-98). However, even in the absence of clear definitions or ideas on how voice is embodied in text, it is important to understand how the notion of voice exists in composition pedagogy. This goal is particularly central as a basis for the present study, since I have proposed that the notion of voice, which is still an important aspect of American composition pedagogy, may be troublesome for some NNS (non-native speakers) students.

Individualist Expression and Voice

Individualists like Donald Grave and Peter Elbow use the notion of individual voice to talk about writing and the personification of the writer in his or her text. Grave (1983) defines voice as "the imprint of ourselves on our writing" (p. 227) in order to refer to a writer's textual presence and even to relate to the writer's self-knowledge. Elbow (1987) locates voice as inherent and emerging, and he notes, "I can grow or change. But not unless I start out inhabiting my own voice or style…In short, I need to accept myself as I am before I can tap my power to start to grow" (p.204). In Elbow's view of voice as the release of a writer's inner self, writers find their own voice through empowerment and self expression because the feature of voice is attained through self-expression. Writing is the process of self-discovery and development; therefore, voice is not static but developing (Elbow, 1987). Murray (1985) also states that developing personal voice leads to authenticity, a type of writing that includes the self and original voice, and a type of writing that pursues the truth and authenticity. This overall thrust has made the metaphor of voice into one of the principles and practices of American university writing pedagogy.

Expressionists like Elbow and Murray conceptualize writing as a creative act of self-discovery and an act of empowering individuals in the world. This notion of empowerment can also be seen as intertwined with the ideology of individualism (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999). Since voice is a central concern and a key component in expressive writing pedagogy, writing instructors who work within this popular framework believe that writing is learned not taught, and is a developmental process leading to expressivity. Therefore, teachers are advised not to impose their views, suggestions or to give students models of writing. Instead, they are encouraged to stimulate the writers' thinking through invention techniques such as pre-writing

tasks and journal writing, and to respond to the ideas that the writer produces. With no direct interference, instructors can create a space for student's self-expression and empower writers to develop their own voice.

The expressivist view of voice has received criticism. The main arguments against this view involve assumptions about the writer's "self," as discussed in the previous section. From the social constructionist and post-constructuralist viewpoint, an author functions through various discourse communities, but not as an "isolated writer whose lone journey within emancipates voice and affirms presence" (Jacobs, 1995, p.10). The expressivist view of "self," or "inner self," ignores the view that considers writing to be a social act between readers, writers, and communities. Another expressionist argument is concerned with the notion of power. The primary goal of expressionist pedagogy in this sense is to enable writers to have power, power being an essential feature of voice that is attained through genuine self-expression. However, the goal of expressionist pedagogy again ignores the fact that the notion of power is not individually constructed. In this sense, the notion of power presupposes some sort of self-other relationship. This point, according to critics of expressionist pedagogy, demonstrates an inconsistency in the expressionist's argument which ignores social forces. Even though expressionists argue that they strive to release the authorial self from society's authority, this proves impossible, as social forces are ubiquitous and cannot be ignored.

The Role of English and Foreign Language Policy in Taiwan

English has spread globally, becoming a symbol of modernity. Because of this, an increasing number of Taiwanese students have become aware of the value of learning and using the English language, and are recognizing the benefits of developing full English proficiency. Taiwan is now an important member in the global village, which has turned toward English as a

means of global communication. In fact, although English continues to maintain the status of a foreign language in Taiwanese society, the English of Taiwan can be characterized as part of the expanding circle of World Englishes, since it has been taught as a required subject at school since 1968, and knowledge of English has become increasingly widespread. Despite its ever-growing importance as a foreign language, however, English has neither been used as a medium of instruction nor as a language of intra-national communication thus far in Taiwan (Chen, 2003).

History of English Teaching in Taiwan

The place of English in foreign language teaching in Taiwan can be traced back to the period of Japanese colonization, from 1895 to 1945. During this time, English was merely offered as an optional subject in secondary schools because learning Japanese was considered to be of the utmost importance, taking precedence over the learning of other languages. After 1949, however, Taiwan was returned to China and the emphasis on Japanese diminished. Still, the status of English teaching had not changed much, and English teaching attracted little attention, at least in the early post-war years. During this time, the aims of English teaching were to simply enable students to acquire some basic skills in speaking, reading, and writing simple English, and to establish firm foundations for the students' subsequent study of English (Tse, 1987).

From 1968 on, English gradually attracted more attention in the Taiwanese educational system, and English gained status as the only required foreign language from middle school through the first year of college. It was during this period that the foreign language policies of Taiwan became almost exclusively English language policy. English teaching became an important subject in school, which was the only place for students to learn English at the time. The aim of English teaching, during this period, was to develop English reading and writing for the purpose of academic and professional use.

After 1993, English language policy and planning in Taiwan was affected by political and economic pressures. It was because of the internationalization of Taiwan that took place during these years that Taiwan's English language policy became drastically restructured. Due to these developments, English teaching policy has now been reinvented to reflect the new status of the English language in Taiwanese society. The importance of learning English today in Taiwanese society is evidenced especially through two principal changes in policy: 1) the inclusion of English as a subject in elementary schools; and 2) the establishment of a national project to encourage people from all walks of life to learn the basics of English (Chen, 2003).

In contrast to developing English reading and writing skills at schools, English language policy in Taiwan now aims to develop English oral proficiency for international communication in all spheres. However, the role of English writing instruction has yet to be fully realized, despite the progress that has been made in promoting the study of English for communication. When the adoption of the communicative approach to language teaching was strongly advocated by the Minister of Education in 2001, some changes began to take place. Teachers devoted more time to teaching speaking and listening skills for examinations, as well as using four-skill-integrating textbooks rather than just reading- and writing-oriented teaching material. With this broader set of goals to meet, teachers had insufficient time to teach writing. In fact, policy statements about these changes ignored or downplayed the importance of writing as a facet of English learning.

Starting in the 2001 school year, as a part of the "Nine-Year Integrated Curriculum" educational reform, English was being taught in the fifth and sixth grades and was extended to the third and fourth grades beginning in 2005. The goals of teaching English within the " Nine-Year Integrated Curriculum" at the elementary and junior high school level are to help students 1)

develop basic English communication abilities; 2) develop interest in and methods for learning English; and 3) learn about their native culture and customs and those of the target language (Chen, 2010). Although only one or two class periods (40-80 minutes) are allotted to English teaching in the elementary school per week, students are encouraged to develop their communicative competence in English rather than concentrating on written forms. The purpose of learning English in elementary school is focused on the development of students' speaking ability, rather than their writing ability. In fact, notwithstanding the Minister of Education's emphasis on oral communication in English, English teaching still reflects a test-oriented approach in the classroom, adding undue pressure to teachers and students alike.

English as a Subject in the Current Educational System

Even though the new language policy has been reformulated in the past few years to accentuate the development of English oral proficiency for international communication in all spheres, the examination system continues to dominate teaching curriculum and instruction. Taiwan is test-oriented, and like many Asian countries such as Japan and Korea, it has been dominated by the phenomenon of so-called "school promotionism" (Yang, 2001)—a phenomenon that focuses on climbing up the school ladder to reach a university or college as the preferred route to success. In order to accomplish this, once they are in high school, students must spend long hours in coaching classes that prepare them for the university entrance examination to be held annually. The result of "school promotionism" is that, as teachers focus on preparing students for these assessments, they forgo pronunciation and communication techniques in order to emphasize the language elements to be covered on the examination. Such elements include vocabulary, grammar, translation and composition. Unfortunately, the oral component of language instruction is neglected in favor of teaching students to mechanically

memorize the elements necessary for the college entrance examination. Likewise, in-depth study of writing in composition classes is sacrificed for the grammatically correct, often memorized regurgitation of paragraphs.

Because of the focus on testing, students don't have enough experience with written practice. To comply with the way that writing ability is assessed in the Joint College Entrance Examination (JCEE) and the General English Proficiency Test (GEPT), teachers tend to isolate grammar lessons and address grammar skills primarily, focusing on the form of paragraphs or the content and organization of essays only secondarily. Students are required to write one paragraph with 100 to 150 words or even two or three paraphrases in 20 or 30 minutes for these examinations. The most common teaching methods adopted by senior high school teachers belong to a limited set; these included asking students to practice different types of English writing, asking students to memorize model sentences and asking students to write a summary after they finish reading a book. To help students write a paragraph or an essay, teachers also offer students pertinent words and sentence patterns to compose their essays and provide model compositions in writing instruction. This need to copy patterns, or even actual passages, will also work against a student's development of their own thoughts and voice.

Hsu (2005) found that Taiwanese students are always given the topic of their essay in the prompt. For example, students are repeatedly required to write descriptive topics or paragraphs on topics such as personal experiences and feelings to achieve the requirement of text type from the Joint College Entrance Examination and the General English Proficiency Test. Gradually, students may lose their interest in writing these unimaginative drills, since they do not feel the topics are challenging. When teachers strongly emphasize descriptive paragraph writing for test-oriented purposes, students may learn basic skills for essay writing and writing form; however

they often acquire little experience in academic writing or in practicing writing skills such as idea-generating, organizing, editing, and citing sources. Writing tends to be limited to asking students to practice on the topics or text types available in previous college entrance exams. Neither do students have opportunities to explore creative writing in their native language; as a result, high school and university students in Taiwan encounter great difficulty in EFL writing because of this limited focus in both first and second writing instruction.

The Taiwanese educational system at large is affected by the practices encountered in lower education. Many of the difficulties in lower education appear in the college setting as well. English composition has been offered as a required or an elective course in many Taiwanese universities, and two key components affect English writing and teaching in mainstream classes: 1.the test-oriented teaching pedagogy outlined above; and 2. global competition in scientific research, education, and trade. Both of these factors have made English proficiency an extremely marketable asset for both the state and the individual (Chen, 2003); but neither serve to foster critical thinking or in-depth development of a strong sense of authorship or voice.

The Taiwanese government launched the GEPT in 2000, which included a writing component. This encouraged some universities to adopt the GEPT or TOEFL as one of their students' graduation requirements, and English writing is predominantly treated as a requirement of school work at the college level. Therefore, many Taiwanese English teachers hold a traditional attitude toward writing instruction in the English composition class, partly because of pressure from graduation requirements, standardized examinations, and large class sizes. To an extent, language contextualization has been achieved in the college classroom. However, there still continues to be an emphasis on teaching to standardized assessments, and there is a

difference of perspectives among Taiwanese educators when it comes to deciding on the best L2 approach to use.

Chen's (2003) study demonstrated that except for this traditional school-based writing style, English writing is done almost exclusively by professionals or by those who work in international-related fields. These professionals usually have the capacity to write English reports, research papers, documents, and also personal letters, supported by their practice of writing emails during their school-age years. The present study aims to hear from these Taiwanese professionals, in particular those who have experienced writing in an English-speaking country and have then returned to Taiwan as professionals. One of the present study's goals is to understand how mature writers have developed their writing practices over the years integrating the two cultural experiences.

Approaches to the Teaching of Writing in Taiwan

The role of grammar instruction in writing and language teaching has been controversial. Some studies report that to attain advanced proficiency in L2 writing, learners need to attend to grammar in their writing; some studies claim that L2 pedagogy genuinely is concerned with learner proficiency in writing and needs to include the teaching of relevant L2 grammar (Hammerly, 1991). In contrast, in light of the research conducted in L2 learning and acquisition, some scholars claim that overt instruction in grammar does not necessarily lead to direct improvement in language learning (Hinkel, 2002). Although the notion of grammar instruction in writing has attracted criticism, under the circumstance of the test-oriented education system in Taiwan there is little chance for teachers to avoid putting heavy emphasis on explicit vocabulary and grammar instruction, translation methods, memorization of vocabulary and model sentence patterns. Chen's (2001) study indicated that ninety percent of writing teachers focus on grammar

teaching and learning, and they believe that correcting grammar mistakes and misused vocabulary improves students' writing ability.

Product-based and writing process approaches compete in second language writing classes and research in Taiwan. Both approaches can be of use to writing teachers to improve students' grammar and writing, depending upon the teachers' teaching methods, goals, and curriculum. Product-based approaches, which focus on producing a finished product, as they are implemented in Taiwan (e.g. Chen, 2001; Sue, 2003) see writing as mainly concerned with knowledge about the structure of language, and writing development as mainly the result of the imitation of input, in the form of texts provided by the teacher (Badger & White, 2000). In one such product-based approach, instructors mainly focus on accuracy at the sentence level. This approach has strongly influenced English teaching and curriculum in Taiwan and is still the most widely preferred approach. As noted earlier, many teachers employ this method to accommodate their teaching to the examination system in Taiwan.

This approach focuses on sentence level accuracy, as well as the traditional concepts of organizing essays; that is, the use of paragraph elements such as topic sentences, support sentences, concluding sentences, and transitions. It also emphasizes paragraph development through particular organizational patterns such as narration, description, classification, and comparison and contrast (Hyland, 2003a). Crucially, as in other product-based pedagogies, in this approach the outcome of the writing process is a single written piece to be evaluated once by an instructor, typically for passing an exam where assessment depends on an inflexible list of factors that are thought to make for good essay writing.

Process-based teaching of writing, an approach which focuses on the process of writing, however, shifts this focus from linguistic knowledge such as grammar-related knowledge and

textual structure to a focus on writing skills, including planning, drafting and revising. It also emphasizes content, ideas, and the negotiation of meaning (Badger & White, 2000). In this approach, writing is not considered to be a simple, straightforward process leading to only one single draft. The process approach, in fact, involves a long progression of idea generation, multiple drafts, interaction with other people, and revising and editing (Flower, 1989).

Implementing the process approach in Taiwan is difficult; Sue (2003) claims that many teachers argue that this approach causes confusion and contradictions when used in composition classes in Taiwan. Taiwanese educators tend to believe that students need explicit directions on writing, grammar instruction, and feedback on grammatical errors. Some researchers have also indicated that many students are concerned with the correction of grammar and vocabulary; without these corrections, some students may feel frustrated and lose interest or confidence in their writing courses (Cohen, 1987). Even though many specialists have a positive attitude toward the process approach, they still continue to implement a traditional product-oriented approach which emphasizes error analysis, modeling, writing practices, and sentence learning. Since the product-based approach benefits students who possess the goal of taking the entrance examination or the GEPT, there is considerable pressure for teachers to maintain this traditional approach in their writing instruction.

In Taiwan, in light of Sue's (2003) and Chen's (2001) studies, educators feel that applying product-oriented approaches improves Taiwanese students' writing; this is especially important for those who have the goal of passing the English test required for college entrance (the GEPT). However, it seems that overemphasizing grammar in the writing class has led to a situation in which Taiwanese developing writers are generally unfamiliar with academic writing

genres. In particular, this emphasis on English instruction based on the proficiency tests causes substantial problems for students who are preparing to study abroad.

Taiwan's writing pedagogy has not developed the goal of explicitly exposing, informing, and teaching Taiwanese students about writing as the communication of ideas; that is, they are not exposed to academic writing as expressing "ideas and values through a writer's choice of words and styles of writing" (Shay, Moore & Cloete, 2002, p. 249). Instead, writing pedagogy in Taiwan has exposed students to what Perl (1979) calls "cosmetic writing," a type of writing that emphasizes mastery of writing mechanics, grammatical accuracy, but with less creativity and student input in writing. In other words, students want to get to one right "answer" rather than choose the form that fits their purposes best. The application of grammar is a valuable component of writing because it allows students to choose various structures of syntax, adding color and texture to their writing (e.g. Hyland, 2004); but test-based or product-centered approaches do not take advantage of this opportunity. The process-based approach also ignores this valuable component of writing—sometimes even more so than traditional approaches (Badger & White, 2000).

Taiwanese students in an English-speaking country are facing difficulties in composing English papers because of their limited training in English writing. Taiwanese students become overly concerned with grammatical accuracy in their papers, which causes anxiety when they are writing in English (Johanson, 2001). Johanson reports that Taiwanese students view writing as a threatening task because of their concern that future readers might discover mistakes or errors in their papers. Due to the perfectionism that is emphasized in "cosmetic writing," students lack the skills or creativity to write academically, especially when they go abroad.

Second Language Writers and Texts

When second language writers enter academia in the United States, they face the challenge of adapting to the conventions of a new academic community. For inexperienced writers, learning to write academically becomes a mysterious journey into a new discourse community, which involves a socialization process as well as cognitive factors. Students must begin to interact with written texts in sophisticated ways and learn to select proper genres for expressing ideas effectively and developing their own knowledge. Therefore, many researchers speak of the need to increase these students' awareness of textual ownership and their familiarity with variations in linguistic features, as well as overall organizational patterns in texts of varying types. Students' awareness of language usage in diverse contexts can help them to express their ideas, as well as to project their voice and claim their identity in the texts they write. In addition, as they are guided to develop writing practices in the English-speaking community, L2 writers may develop appropriate ideas about their own voice in relation to that of other writers. This in turn may help them develop new understandings and practice in a range of areas, including the notions of plagiarism and textual ownership, concepts that are defined very differently in cultures other than those of the western academic community.

Differences between Chinese and English Rhetorical Patterns

It has long been recognized that cultures vary in the forms of expression that are highly valued. One frequently made claim is that Chinese writing is indirect, while Anglo-American English writing is more direct and straightforward. Kaplan (1966), in a later controversial article, argued that Chinese writers have customarily approached topics circuitously, using an essay form called the "eight-legged essay," which was derived from a set of classic Chinese texts entitled *Four Books* and *Five Classics*. This ancient eight-part model was designed to convey

Confucian philosophy and to establish the moral standards for society. This essay form is composed of eight parts (*poti*, *chengti*, *qijiang*, *qigu*, *xugu*, *zhonggu*, *hougu*, and *dajie*); translated literally, these are an opening, an amplification, a preliminary exposition, a first argument, a second argument, a third argument, a final argument, and a conclusion (Cai, 1993). More recently, in composition classes, the four-part model of *qi-chen-jun-he* (introduction, developing the topic, turning points, and conclusion) is frequently taught and used for organizing Chinese essays.

Historically, contrastive rhetoric studies made certain assumptions, and scholars in that field have claimed to have discovered differences between Chinese and English writing (e.g. Kaplan, 1966; Connor, 1996). That is, they believed that there is great variance in the way in which Western and Chinese writers interpret and organize their writing, although the original claims about these issues have been questioned. Besides organization, Matalene (1985) argued that Chinese rhetoric lacks argumentative coherence because of its reliance on history, tradition, and authority and its frequent references to historical and religious texts such as proverbs.

In time, later studies tried to refine the original attempts of Kaplan (1996) and others, although the new sets of claims were again subject to some skepticism. Cai (1999) said that arguments in Chinese seem to use delay, to include narrative, to contain quotations, to borrow references, and to use statements that seem unconnected in the minds of Western readers. Ho's (1998) research proposed similar concepts; Ho found that Taiwanese students are expected to paraphrase a quotation from a classical text or a saying of an ancient sage and to argue for it in a persuasive essay. Students are also required to support and to consider the validity of the concepts and beliefs presented in the quotation they have written, not truly voicing their own thoughts on its content. Ho's study portrays how proficient Chinese writers envision the tasks of

English writing in an EFL setting. However, for Western readers, Chinese writers use too many phrases, sayings, and allusions. The goal of this practice in Chinese rhetoric is to ornament and enliven discourse in the arguments; however, to the Western reader, these forms can be distracting or confusing.

Chinese Students' Writing Strategies

Not only do the rhetorical patterns in Chinese have an influence over the writing habits of Chinese students, but their educational background also influences the ways they write and the linguistic strategies they apply. Under the examination system emphasizing older Chinese cultural and literary influences on the development of authorship, Chinese students are encouraged to use direct sources or recite verbatim the Confucian classics in their writing (Deckert, 1993). Therefore, students include frequent quotable sentences and proverbs, which could be considered to be 'clichés' by Western readers and instructors, in order to polish their writing (e.g. Ho,1998; Scollon, 1991; Bloch & Chi, 1995; Pennycook, 1996). More specifically, Chinese writers use "standard phraseology" and adopt "famous phrases" with many quotation marks in their L1 academic writing as well as "special expressions" (Swales & Feak, 1994, p. 126) intended to adorn their styles. Indeed as Scollon (1991) indicates, "The Chinese student is not writing primarily to express himself or herself …. [In Chinese culture, one] is writing to pass on what one has received." (p. 7). Therefore, students believe that the expert writing strategies for writing a good essay involve memorizing beautiful sentences and phrases, imitating what other people say or the patterns authors use, mastering written mechanics and grammatical accuracy, and using quotes without attribution to a particular authority. Students do not learn to articulate their own beliefs or perceptions directly; rather, they comprehend the concept of

academic writing as the passing on of ideas and values through their choice of words and styles of writing.

Because of the influences of classical Chinese rhetoric and the aims of their educational system, Chinese students may not have appropriate writing schemata for their studies in the western context. For example, it is considered essential for all students who are immersed in the western academic community to acquire the skills necessary for textual borrowing, in order to integrate sources smoothly into their own writing and on the practical level because it will prevent students from committing potential acts of plagiarism. However, Chinese students fail to understand the expectations of writing instructors on issues such as these (Casanave, 2007; Swales & Feak, 1994). Chinese ESL writers tend to hold perceptions about plagiarism, text ownership and text borrowing which differ from the Western values (Scollon, 1995). Since this one issue of textual borrowing is important, I will discuss it in more detail in the next section.

Plagiarism: Textual Borrowing and Ownership

As noted earlier, education and cultural background influence the ways students write and move forward into academic writing (Bloch & Chi 1995). There are many complex things going on behind the surface phenomenon of apparent plagiarism which cannot be cast as a simple "black-and white issue" (Pennycock, 1996, p. 201). The concept of plagiarism is considered cheating in western cultures; but this idea is not ingrained in all cultures (Scollon, 1995). Many instructors may not realize that some Asian cultures approve of direct textual borrowing without formal citation, and even view it as a sign of being well educated. Thus, when non-western students enter a western academic writing community, instructors may risk imposing their cultural ideology upon L2 writers, especially with regards to plagiarism.

Developing L2 writers may encounter problems regarding textual ownership and borrowing because of either lack of awareness of writing in a new set of discourse conventions or lack of preparation by educators in their own culture (Bloch, 2001; Casanave, 2007; Swales & Feak, 1994). In addition to being influenced by cultural views of textual ownership and borrowing, L2 writers may experience problems due to a lack of writing experience and language capacity (Pecorari, 2001; Currie, 1998; Deckert, 1993), which may lead them to use direct citations from sources. To cite yet another possible cause for apparent plagiarism, students may lack understanding of the related notions of originality and voice (e.g. Leki.1992; Ho, 1998; Scollon, 1995). In Currie's (1998) study, she observes that students with lower grammatical accuracy and problems with writing clear or concise sentences often employ the strategy of copying in order to meet the teachers' expectations and in order to survive in their course of study. In addition, these writers may encounter embarrassing situations because they lack the skills to paraphrase (DeSena, 2007) or to quote sources. Students' writing skills and linguistic deficits have thus been shown to directly impact how they reflect upon the issue of plagiarism.

The practice that is labeled plagiarism in the west is encouraged and admired in Chinese culture, which causes conflicts and confusion for Chinese students when they attempt to learn about academic writing in a western context (Bloch & Chi, 1995). Therefore, Chinese students often commit plagiarism because of being unaware of western attitudes toward plagiarism, or because they lack knowledge of the procedures to be used in borrowing from other texts. This problem is only exacerbated in the language learning process, as imitation is an important part of second language acquisition. As Swales and Feak (1994) state, "borrowing the words and the phrases of others can be a useful language learning strategy" (p. 125). However, it is generally true that students have been praised in their home cultures for learning how to employ words or

ideas from other scholars in their own writing, and they have perceived this as a useful way to persuade or convince readers to believe the value of their writings.

What is Good Writing?

In the western classroom, "good writing" is generally seen to involve the writers' individual creativity and critical thinking because the writer is viewed as "an original, individual, creative artist" (Swales & Feak, 1994, p.125). Teachers often expect writers to voice their judgments, display their knowledge, and offer their opinions. Texts, therefore, must display their authors' individuality, and concepts such as voice and textual ownership are commonly accepted in mainstream writing pedagogy. Nevertheless, such concepts create problems for students outside the mainstream, particularly for second language writers from more collectivist or interdependently oriented cultures. Therefore, it is important that L2 instructors help NNS to develop a new kind of awareness of writing in a new set of discourse conventions, while learning to present their ideas and their writer's identity in novel ways. Beyond a doubt, increasing students' awareness of textual ownership, authorship, textual borrowing, intellectual property, and originality (e.g. Bloch, 2001; Casanave, 2007) in the classroom is the best way to avoid problems with plagiarism, while at the same time seeking to increase students' sense of voice and their use of original ideas in their writing. As Leki (1992) states, "…being creative means being innovative, original…"; the successful writing instructor in the English-speaking world tends to encourage his students to write something original, while expecting them to "find their own voice" (p. 71).

Many voice researchers and scholars have widely discussed related concepts such as authorship, authentic voice, and voicist issues regarding students' educational and cultural backgrounds (e.g. Hirvela & Belcher, 2001). These studies have contributed greatly to the

second language domain and have continually attracted L2 researchers to investigate a variety of writing genre contexts through the lenses of differing cultural reference points. Since considerations of genre also touch on the topic of the present study, I will briefly review relevant research on this area in the next section.

Genre-based Pedagogies in Writing Instruction

Expressive and process pedagogies have remained the dominant pedagogical orthodoxy for 30 years in the United States; these writing approaches offer principled ways of using writing for self-discovery and assisting students in developing their individual voice. However, these approaches "fail to consider the forces outside the individual which help guide purposes, establish relationships, and ultimately shape writing" (Hyland, 2003b, p.18). In other words, they ignore other cultural and social factors which shape an individual's perception of learning and understanding. This gap is all the more important in today's global environment. Recently, escalating numbers of international students or NNSs have been entering American universities; as a result, classrooms are now more culturally, socially, and linguistically diverse places than ever before. When these students bring different identities, understandings, and habits in meaning-making to their learning, teachers cannot presume that students' previous learning experiences will provide them with appropriate writing schemata for their studies in their new learning contexts. Their L1 cultural and educational background may interfere with the L2 writing strategies offered to them, and they often have difficulty applying their previous learning experience in different contexts. As some scholars point out, this situation can only be made worse if L2 writing instruction draws too heavily upon the traditional grammar approach (e.g. Matsuda, 2003). Students need to operate within a coherent framework in terms of language

varieties and contexts, as well as to comprehend the characteristics of discourses in different communities and contexts (e.g. Hyland, 2003a, 2003b, 2007; Johns 2002).

In genre theory, language is seen as embedded in social realities and meaning is felt to be created in context. Therefore, writing cannot be seen as limited to a set of cognitive processes, but is rather also a social activity involving a communication process. Genre pedagogies are based on the idea of social relationships, rather than the characteristics of individual writers who struggle with personal expression or surface correction (Hyland, 2003b). Hyland claims that

> Genre refers to abstract, socially recognized ways of using language. It is based on the assumptions that the features of a similar group of texts depend on the social context of their creation and use, and that those features can be described in a way that relates a text to others like it and to the choices and constraints acting on text producers (p.21).

This view stressed by Hyland offers writing teachers a radical new perspective on teaching L2 writers with a focus on the social and cultural aspects of communication. Writing is a way of communicating in academic communities across many contexts. When teachers apply genre-based pedagogies, they help students "gain access to ways of communicating that have accrued cultural capital in particular professional, academic and occupational communities" (p.24). Teachers need to provide students with the tools to access language in a variety of genres, thus enabling students to perceive how language works in real communication contexts and to understand the functional techniques of language use in diverse genres.

It is not an easy task for L2 learners to acknowledge and apply ways of communicating in academic communities when those ways vary from one community context to the next. Therefore, Hyland (2007) claims that genre-based pedagogy should be considered for effective instruction in order to fill the gap between language and contexts or discourses among

communities. He points out some desirable features associated with genre-based writing instruction. First, the most important feature is that genre-based writing instruction offers students an explicit understanding of how target texts are structured and why they are written in a given way. Second, for understanding how texts actually work as communication, teachers using genre-based instruction will emphasize the need for appropriate linguistic choices in the ways that they treat and organize their topics for particular readers. In doing so, these instructors can help students to give their ideas authority (p.151).

Genre and Writing Instruction

In order to sketch some of the particular ways that the genre approach has influenced second language pedagogies, Hyland (2007) lists a number of principles which underpin genre-based teaching in writing instruction. First, writing is a social activity which encourages students to engage in a variety of relevant writing experiences, drawing on analysis and investigating different purposes and readers. Therefore, writers are expected to present or choose effective ways of getting things done in varying contexts. Learning to write is considered to be needs-oriented, requiring explicit outcomes and expectations. Genre-based teaching identifies kinds of writing that learners will need to use in their target situations, and explicitly presents the content students will learn and the expectations students will set for the end of the course. Since learning to write is a social activity, teachers cannot expect weak writers to improve simply by equipping them with the strategies of good writers; instead, teachers need to explore methods of scaffolding students to use knowledge of language and guide them towards a conscious understanding of target genres as they create their own meanings in specific contexts (pp.152-153).

Finally, Hyland (2007) argues that learning to write involves learning to use language. Genre teaching helps students understand how texts are grammatically patterned, how

vocabulary choices are made, how grammar serves to create meaning and how language is structured in texts. Therefore, if teachers offer writers explicit rhetorical understanding of texts, they can help the students to increase their awareness and select the most effective linguistic patterns across academic contexts and genres. In addition, teachers can assist students to see "texts as artifacts that can be explicitly questioned, compared, and deconstructed, thereby revealing their underlying assumptions and ideologies" (Hyland, 2003b, p. 25).

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)

Three major approaches have been used in genre-based pedagogy, and the principles mentioned in the previous paragraph underlying genre pedagogy may be expressed in very different ways through each approach. One of these approaches is Halliday's (1994) Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) approach. The SFL approach constitutes a potentially influential direction in the L2 classroom and clearly articulates both theoretical and pedagogical genres (Hyland, 2003b). This approach "stresses the purposeful, interactive, and sequential character of different genres and the ways language is systematically linked to context through patterns of lexico-grammatical and rhetorical features" (p.22). In this sense, the features of SFL are always considered to be functionally related to the genre and its purposes; therefore, no grammatical or lexical choice is viewed in isolation. Basically, Halliday's theory of systematically linking language to its contexts presumes that language varies from one context to another. In other words, within each context, the underlying patterns are used to characterize how language forms "are culturally and socially recognized to be performing particular functions" (p.22). Essentially, learners can have access to the cultural capital of socially valued genres through the exploration of these contextual patterns and their variations from one genre to the next.

Since writing is used in many ways across many social contexts, the best thing to do is to help students to see written texts as constructs that can be discussed in quite precise and explicit ways and that can therefore be analyzed, compared, criticized, deconstructed, and reconstructed so that students can access and critique these linguistic resources (Hammond & Macken-Horarik, 1999). Employing genre-based pedagogies in writing instruction can lead to beneficial consequences which are summarized in the SFL approach, an approach that I will further expound upon in chapter three, specifically in relation to the rationale for the present research and data analysis.

The English for Specific Purposes (ESP)

A second approach to genre is English for Specific Purposes (ESP), which has been considerably popular in English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts. The ESP approach has been favored by researchers interested in contexts of use and written discourses and viewing genre as a tool for understanding and teaching discipline-specific writing to NNS in professional or academic contexts (Hyland, 2004). That is, the ESP approach has as its central concern for ESL learners to function competently in a range of written genres, which can "determine their access to career opportunities, positive identities, and life choices" (p.43). The ESP approach, therefore, emphasizes the importance of the structures and meanings of texts in academic and workplace contexts through rhetorical consciousness raising. Additionally, ESP teaches students to recognize the ability to see texts as similar or different, and write or respond to them appropriately (Hyland, 2003b).

ESP differs from SFL in the way that it conceptualizes genres. ESP analysts do not see genres as defined by linguistic strategies for achieving general rhetorical goals in a culture, such as narrative, argument and so on. Instead, ESP analysts identify genres within discourse

communities, such as academic disciplines or particular professions, and "use the nomenclature of these communities such as research article, court order or lab report to identify valued genres" (Johns, 2003, p.206). Obviously, as noted earlier, their interests in the communicative needs of particular academic and professional groups lead them to what it is those groups use writing to do. ESP researchers tend to relate texts to more specific communities that use genres to promote their ends and attempt to understand the relations among discourse communities, language, and texts (Rafoth, 1990).

The New Rhetoric (NR)

The third approach is the New Rhetoric (NR) developed by composition researchers in North America. NR researchers are more interested in the social and ideological significance than in rhetorical organization and the language features of genres (Devitt, 2004). That is, the NR approach is not primary focused on discourse structures and features; instead, for NR to understand genres "involves not only describing their lexico-grammatical forms and rhetorical patterns but also investigating their social, cultural and institutional contexts" (Hyland, 2004, p.36). Richard Coe (2002) states that "genres are not just text types, they imply/invoke/create/ (re)construct situations (and contexts), communities, writers and readers." Therefore, through different contexts or disciplines, writers can understand how meanings are negotiated in the writing, and textual regularities are regarded as evidence of how people respond to situations in ways that differ by culture and community (Hyland, 2004).

The Three Approaches and the Present Study

Generally speaking, the SFL approach is more linguistically oriented, focusing on more than ESP discourse structure and features. Even though ESP emphasizes the important structures and meanings of texts, it focuses less on the ways language is systematically linked to context

through patterns of lexico-grammatical and rhetorical features. Additionally, the ESP approach is more oriented to the role of social communities than SFL (Hyland, 2004). Therefore, in order to understand L2 writers' voice and positioning, the SFL approach is more functional for this study; the reasons for this will be detailed in chapter three.

In the next section, I will summarize research applying the notion of voice and related ideas to second language writers. Although this section contains material repeated from earlier in the chapter, this material is included again here in order to present a full picture of the relevant aspects of L2 writing pedagogy.

Application to L2: Voice in Second Language Writing and Research

The notion of voice continues to occupy a significant place in the discourse of composition studies and applied linguistics. In recent times, in a related development, the notion of written voice has played an important role in the development of second language writing research and instruction (e.g. Atkinson, 2001, 2003; Belcher & Hirvela, 2001; Ivanic & Camps, 2001; Ivanic, 1998; Matsuda, 2001; Matsuda & Tardy, 2007; Prior, 2001). Since individual voice is strongly linked with the concept of individualism and has become a key component in L1 composition, the emphasis on voice can be confusing and difficult for L2 students who come from collectivist cultures such as Japan, China, Taiwan, and other Asian countries. Even worse, students in these cultures may have been trained to avoid personal expression in their writing.

To help these students adjust to the expectations of writing in English, some L2 researchers (e.g. Atkinson, 2001; Belcher & Hirvela, 2001; Ivanic & Camps, 2001; Ivanic, 1998; Matsuda, 2001; Matsuda & Tardy, 2007; Prior, 2001; Tang & John, 1999) conduct voice-related studies to understand the degree to which, and the manner in which the voice metaphor influences NNS students in their approach to writing. These L2 researchers also present a

sophisticated version of the concept of voice in their studies. They have called for composition instructors to help L2 writers to establish the concept of ownership of texts, and to sensitize student writers to the expectations of their audience, so that they will understand the conventions of academic and disciplinary writing. This needs to be accomplished through explicit learning and directive teaching (Ivanic & Camps, 2001; Matsuda, 2001). Meanwhile, writing teachers need to involve the voice metaphor as a viable pedagogical tool for L2 writing and understand the cultural ideologies which students already hold when they come to the composition classroom, so that they will be better able to help developing writers from different cultural contexts (Belcher & Hirvela, 2001; Ivanic & Camps, 2001; Matsuda, 2001).

As noted earlier, the ideology of Western individualism has been strongly tied to the concept of voice, which has come under scrutiny in the last decade. Ramanathan and Atkinson's (1999) article, "Individualism, Academic Writing, and ESL Writers," basically rejects the connection between voice and individualism and stresses the social nature of writing. Referring to what they see as a mistaken idea, Ramanathan and Atkinson state that " the core notion underlying [one view of writing] seems to be that as individuals, we all have essentially private and isolated inner selves, which we give outward expression to through the use of a metaphorical 'voice'" (p.47). With second language writers from diverse cultures in mind, they further challenge the ideology of individualism, which appears to be a strong factor embedded within university writing pedagogy in the U.S. They argue that "a concept of written voice that centrally assumes the expression of a 'unique inner self' may be problematic for NNSs" because "the notion of the individual varies substantially across cultures" (p.51). The idea of individualism may or may not comport with other cultural groups, and may carry different values and meanings in other cultures (Heath, 1991). Many sociocultural groups "traditionally orient

their young to group membership," and in such groups, to assert individual empowerment "sets up the views of the individual against those of the group [such as church] or of those in authority [and such views] may be widely discouraged or even punished" (Heath, 1991, pp13-14). Not surprisingly, these cultural groups place a much higher value on learning in groups and downplay the display of individual knowledge.

L2 researchers are more recently reconsidering the concept of voice in relation to written and cultural issues. Two well-known studies bearing on the individuality of self and voice in writing across cultures are those of Scollon & Scollon (1991) and Li (1996). Scollon (1991) found that the notion of self in Chinese culture involves learning to take on the scholar's voice through the role of commentator on the classics and the scholarship of others. Chinese cultural values are opposite in many respects from the individualistic values of western cultures. Cortazzi & Jin (1996) discuss the Chinese culture of the individual; they point out that "every Chinese child is an individual with different abilities and needs, but …in Chinese society…each person must be part of a group or community" (pp.177-178). In this sense, Chinese students are learning interdependence and are taught to express what is socially shared rather than their individual self. In other words, they are becoming themselves, but in relation to significant others.

Wu and Rubin (2000) hold a different view of the impact of individualism on Chinese students. They compare Taiwanese students' writing in Chinese and English and analyze writing features that are conceptually linked to individualism or collectivism. These authors claimed that writing features are associated with a writer's nationality and language, but not only or primarily with the writers' sense of individualism or collectivism. Rather, they claim, Taiwanese students' English writing shows the influence of their L1 writing conventions in terms of indirectness, humaneness, collective virtues, and the limited use of personal anecdotes. Therefore, it appears

that it is more "a matter of socialized discourse conventions than directly attributable [only] to differences in collectivist or individualist ideation" (p.148). This distinction will be important for the present study because it will be important to keep a flexible mind and to realize that the characteristics of students' writings may not directly or simply relate to the matter of collectivist or individualist ideation. This study aims to understand how writers who come from "collectivist cultures" develop their academic writing in English, and whether they challenge (or need to challenge) the ideology of individualism as they develop into mature writers.

Matsuda (2001) is one scholar who argues that voice is not entirely foreign to collectivist cultures and it is a valuable tool for writers of all cultures. He also argues that "voice is not necessarily tied to the ideology of individualism" (p.36) because all humans are individuals and have an individual voice. Johnstone (1996) expresses a similar idea, claiming that not all humans must profess an "ideological individualism" (p.7). Matsuda echoes the critics of expressivist pedagogy as he draws on his experience as an international student in the U.S. to question the idea of being an individual self in the composition class. He points out that the individual 'self' he has projected in one context does not seem to represent the self that he has constructed in a different situation. Reflecting on this, he says that "find[ing] my own voice was not the process of discovering the true self that was within myself; it was the process of negotiating my socially and discursively constructed identity with the expectation of the reader as I perceived it" (p.39). Therefore, the voice can be discerned by readers familiar with the conventions of writing in English, but is not readily identifiable in terms of a single set of linguistic or rhetorical features. He claims that the problems L2 writers may have in constructing individual voice in English are more related to the matter of lacking the knowledge of the linguistic resources or ignoring the appropriate voice-related strategies for writing in English than to any differing "cultural

orientation towards self and society" or to the existence (or complete absence) of an individualized voice (p.51). Matsuda and Tardy (2007) again shift the discussion of voice from the sole province of the writer to the readers' role in the process of constructing voice within a particular context of social interaction and their tendency to bring their own assumptions, beliefs, value, and expectations to bear on the writer's text. Their study broadens the scope of voice to the rhetorical processes that readers enact as they read and evaluate academic texts.

Many agree that voice plays an important role in the existence of an academic writing context (Ivanic, 1998), both from the writer's and reader' perspective. Hirvela and Belcher (2001) accept the concept of plurality of voice. In their study, they do not focus on the issue of helping L2 writers to develop an L2 voice. However, they argue that NNS students, particularly at the graduate level, who have already established L1 voices and identities, will bring these into the L2 writing equation. They also point out that L2 writing instruction and research overlooks the voices or identities already possessed by L2 writers. They believe that NNS graduate students come to the class with an already existing representation of themselves as writers, and they have learned how to establish relationships with the texts they create and the readers they address.

Thus, L2 writers are not devoid of a writing identity and they are not "voiceless" when they enter the classroom (p.84). However, Hirvela and Belcher have observed that "students' success as L1 writers often fails to give them what might seem to be an expected advantage when trying to construct a voice, or identity, as an L2 writer" (p.84). They call for researchers to investigate the issue of transitional voice from L1 to L2. In order to understand how mature writers' transition in voice in L2 contexts, they conducted a study to investigate voice-related issues that need to be accounted for in discussions of voice. Some of these issues include the writers' native language and culture, their prior academic or professional writing experience and

their chosen disciplinary community. Hirvela and Belcher maintain that acquiring a deeper understanding of students' voice-related experiences, problems, and their "hopes and attitudes regarding acquisition of an L2 voice" will enrich voicist research and create more meaningful grounds for the eventual teaching of voice (p.103). These considerations raised by Hirvela and Belcher have played an important role in grounding the data analysis procedures for the present study; in fact, this study is designed to contribute to the need they point out for research on the transition from L1 to L2 with respect to voice.

Linguistic and Rhetorical Features Associated with Voice

From Ivanic's point of view, writing always involves a presentation of the self of the writer. In 2001, Ivanic and Camps conducted a study looking at different perspectives on voice as self-representation, and they argue that developing critical self-awareness of voice or the positioning power of discourses fosters important language skills which can help learners maintain control over the personal and cultural identity they are projecting in their writing. The type of voice that the students choose positions them as "sounding like" members of certain social groups or particular types of people (p.10). In accordance with Harris' (1997) view of voice as socially established and shared ways of speaking and writing, people project what they hope will be a recognizable voice in the context of different audiences and discourse communities. Ivanic and Camps' study does provide L2 researchers with a theoretical basis and practical tools for doing critical discourse analysis related to voice and self-representation on student texts (Atkinson, 2001, p.116).

Writing involves a series of complex acts. One characteristic of writing is that it does not carry the phonetic and prosodic qualities of speech that may act as markers for identity in spoken language. Instead of these, writers may choose linguistic or rhetorical features, intentionally or

unintentionally, to convey their ideas or transform information into texts, to be a marker to represent them, and to express their identity in writing. Some researchers have identified linguistic features that are associated with writers' identities or are present within the text to express the notion of voice; this approach is intended to capture a more concrete pedagogical focus. Ivanic (1994; 1998) has argued that writers' voices and identities can be better understood in terms of linguistic theory that accounts for the syntactic, semantic, and lexical character of a text, as they can be identified in actual linguistic features. In this view, writers may, through the linguistic choices they make, draw upon a particular voice in their writing and align themselves with certain social positions (Ivanic & Camps, 2001). Ivanic and Camps present the example of a writer's using the word "obviously," which reassures the reader of the writer's conclusion and conveys the impression that the writers themselves are sure of their conclusions (p.22). Writers also can use the first-person position to reflect themselves as asserting the right to have a voice. In contrast, a less assertive self is conveyed by the use of certain markers of modality.

The use of the first person is a primarily discussed discursive feature associated with voice. Use of the first person has been identified as a means to construct the author's individual identity (Hyland, 2002a, 2002b; Ivanic, 1998; Ivanic & Camps, 2001; Tang & John, 1999; Wu & Rubin, 2000) and author's knowledge claims (Ivanic, 1998). For example, Tang and Johns' (1999) study shows that writers use 'I' to explore and reveal their identity in academic writing because the first person pronoun is the most visible manifestation of a writer's presence in a text. In addition, writers often use the first person to present their authority in their work, to gain acceptance with regard to their claims, and to show personal responsibility for knowledge claims.

Even though the first person pronoun 'I' is a functional word to represent the self in text, this pronoun may be less common in certain genres. For example, the humanities and social

sciences include many more usages of the first person and exhibit more permissive use of the word than science and engineering writing genres. Therefore, Hyland (2002a) argues that the use of "I" is not only simply constructing the author's individual identity, but is also a matter of involving the issues of genre and discipline, which are specific to writing.

The Importance of Voice

Many agree that voice plays an important role in academic writing (Ivanic, 1998). However, expressing a skeptical view, Stapleton (2002) argues that extending the discussion about voice may be misleading teachers and students into believing that the expression of identity takes precedence over ideas and argumentation. Helms-Park and Stapleton (2003) even argue that there is no such thing as voice and that the concept is completely irrelevant to academic writing and has been overstated in professional literature. Stapleton (2002) expresses concerns that focusing heavily on voice will lead students to think that having a strong voice is a top priority. Helms-Park and Stapleton (2003) suggest that research on L2 academic writing and L2 writing pedagogy would be better directed toward argumentation skills and ideas than voice. Stapleton does raise an important question for further exploration: whether and how voice plays a role in academic writing. However, since he sees these as unanswered questions, he advocates that attention be directed toward more well-known areas of content. Responding to such critiques, Atkinson (2003) mentions that the voice notion should not be dismissed and advocates the need for personal voice or some variety of 'voicist' to be included (Hirvela & Belcher, 2001). Matsuda and Tardy (2007) conclude that voice is relevant to writing generally and to academic writing in particular. However, they add that this relevance "depends on how voice is defined and how its relevance is measured and interpreted" (p.236).

Applications to the Present Study

This study attempts to adopt a version of voice derived from social constructivism or Bakhtinian dialogism. Consistent with my purposes in this study, I apply Bowden's definition of voice to examine how NNS' voices function behind the written words and how their voices are rooted in actual texts, experiences, and personal encounters in their past histories. The approach to voice in this study also has been influenced by Ivanic and Camps' (2001) reading of the term "voice as self-representation" (p.4) with three types of writer positioning: Ideational positioning, interpersonal positioning, and textual positioning.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the rationale for the research methodology, the research setting, the participants, the data collection methods and the data analysis procedure. Qualitative research methodology has been applied to adequately present the views of second language writers and to achieve a better understanding of some significant elements associated with mature Taiwanese writers' voices and their development of academic writing in English. This study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. How do mature Taiwanese writers transition between different academic environments? To what extent do Taiwanese writers with experience studying in English speaking countries seem to be aware of the events that shaped their development of voice, and do these events figure into their narratives on their own development as writers? If so, how do they describe these events, and their growing awareness of voice or positioning in their writing? In particular, how have they reconciled differences in their experiences as developing writers in Taiwan, and later in the English-speaking environment, then again as professionals back in Taiwan?
2. What role does positioning play in L2 writers' actual practice in academic writing? What elements in their academic writing seem to reflect positioning or voice? How do they address their rationale for using the forms that they use that help them position themselves?

Rationale for this Study

This qualitative study set out to explore the viewpoints, as well as the academic writing practices, of mature Taiwanese writers while constructing and using written voice. The study used qualitative methods of data collection and analysis, including metadiscourse analysis. I have decided to use qualitative research methods to conduct this study; researchers such as Creswell (2009) have pointed out that a qualitative study involves an inquiry process aimed at understanding a social or human problem based on building a holistic picture and reporting detailed views of information. Qualitative research methodology is adequate for this exploratory study because of its capacity to gain in-depth and interpretive understanding of the composing process that second language writers employ in different contexts (Creswell, 2007). That is, my research has explored the series of elements or factors that L2 writers feel influenced them while constructing their second language writing voice; in particular, I expected to be able to explore the conflicts or problems L2 writers encountered as they entered a context in which voice or positioning is considered central, possibly because this context is socially and culturally imbued with the ideology of individualism, as well as being culturally different from their home country in other ways.

Characteristics of Qualitative Research

Qualitative research attempts to understand and make sense of phenomena from the participant's perspective. That is, qualitative research is an approach to understanding and interpreting meanings constructed by individuals in interaction with their world. Since "there are multiple constructions and interpretations of reality that are in flux and that change over time," qualitative researchers are interested in understanding what those interpretations are in a particular context or at a particular time (Merriam, 2002, pp. 3-4).

Maxwell (1996) characterizes the outcome of a qualitative inquiry as descriptively rich in nature. Actual word descriptions from participants are used to convey what researchers have learned about a phenomenon and to demonstrate interrelationships between subject and context as opposed to using numbers and statistics as the basis. Therefore, the results of qualitative research are likely to include rich descriptions of the context and the participants, as well as direct quotes from all data collected.

A variety of methods and interpretations characterize qualitative research, as it lends itself to discovering layers of meanings and patterns inherent in descriptions (Creswell, 2007). That is, in order to understand what participants' lives are like, qualitative researchers employ a wide range of methods to collect abundant data for interpretation and meaning reconstruction (Maxwell, 1996). Since understanding is the goal of qualitative research, qualitative researchers become the primary instruments of data collection and data analysis. In addition, " [they] can expand [their] understanding through verbal as well as nonverbal communications, process data immediately, clarify and summarize material, check the respondents for accuracy of interpretation, and explore unusual or unanticipated responses" (Merriam, 2002, p. 5). The inductive process is another important characteristic of qualitative research. Researchers gather data in qualitative studies to build concepts, hypotheses, or theories rather than testing specific hypotheses. Typically, the "findings inductively derived from the data are in the form of themes, categories, typologies, concepts and tentative hypotheses…" (p. 5).

Based on the characteristics of qualitative research discussed above, I can refer to Creswell's definition of qualitative research as "an inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting

detailed views of informants, and conducted in a natural setting" (1994, pp.1-2). More specifically, I include Denzin and Lincoln's (2005) definition here:

> Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self. At this level, qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meaning people bring to them (p.3).

An interpretive qualitative study is suitable for the present research because my study attempts to understand second language writers' voice in academic writing and their experiences of development in English writing in different contexts.

The study is characterized by the features of qualitative research that have been summarized by Merriam (2002), Maxwell (1996), and Creswell (2007) :

1. Qualitative researchers are interested in meaning, how people make sense of their lives and experiences, and how people structure their worlds.
2. The outcome is descriptive through words and pictures and is more concerned with process.
3. Qualitative researchers are the primary instrument of data collection and analysis. Data is mediated through the human instrument rather than through inventories or machines.
4. The process of qualitative research is inductive in that the researchers usually build abstractions, concepts, hypothesis, and theories from details. (Cited in Creswell, 1994, p.145).

These features translated into my study in the following ways:

1. As the researcher of this study, I was interested in exploring the experiences of Taiwanese professional writers in academic writing.

2. The research I presented was descriptive rather than prescriptive because I detailed participants' writing experiences and writing development as they saw them. Additionally, I explored their efforts to develop their academic voice, their difficulty in finding personal authorial expertise in the writing process, and their struggle to project their own position as L2 writers when faced with the challenges of academic writing conventions and contextual constraints.

3. I was the primary researcher because I personally collected the data through interviews.

4. I built concepts and themes based on the collected data.

Research Methods

This qualitative study utilized the data collection methods of survey, interview and textual analysis. Three rounds of interviews were held; also written texts, such as published articles or personal writings, provided two vital sources of data to answer the aforementioned research questions. In the following section, I will discuss my study's research setting, the participants, and the data collection methods and data analysis procedures.

Research Setting

This study included voluntary participants who were faculty in technological institutions and universities located in Central and Southern Taiwan. The interviews were carried out in settings that were convenient to the participants including their houses, libraries, and school settings. The selection of a suitable site is a critical decision in naturalistic research because the researcher must conduct his or her study in a specific native setting for data collection (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, and Allen, 1993). Being able to gain access to the study site is vital

to the researcher because as Creswell (2007) stressed, it provides the researcher with the opportunities to maintain contact with research participants.

The Participants

Participants in the present study were purposely selected to ensure that data was collected from a group of mature writers, namely academic writers, with graduate degrees from English-speaking countries, and who had returned to professional positions in Taiwan. Additionally, as the purpose of the study was to hear the voices of individual NNS professional writers in their development of academic writing in English, I ensured that all participants were selected on the basis of six criteria: 1) participants must have a doctoral degree; 2) all participants must have professional writing experiences in English, defined as published research papers and journal articles; 3) they must have finished their undergraduate studies in their home country (Taiwan); 4) they must have positions as assistant professors, associate professors, professors or temporary faculty in Taiwan; 5) they must have experience of studying in an English-speaking country; and 6) they must have returned to Taiwan after receiving their degree. In order to protect the anonymity of participants in the study, pseudonyms were used to identify the participants. In Appendix A, I presented biographic and demographical information about each participant.

Procedure for Recruiting Participants

Initially, I contacted several universities in Central and Southern Taiwan and explained to the chairpersons of the English Department the nature of my study in order to gather faculty personal contact information and permission to contact them. I emailed or called them and explained to them the purpose of my study in order to invite them to participate. As long as they wanted to participate in the first step of the study, I would name a time and place where they could come in person to fill out the questionnaire and the first informed consent form for

questionnaire participants (See Appendix E); alternatively, they could fill out the questionnaire sent as a Word document and reply by email. As a next step, using data derived from the initial questionnaire, I purposively selected nine mature writers as participants in the interview phase of the study. I contacted participants by their preferred means (email, Skype, telephone) to explain the study in detail and to schedule the first interview. I also asked each participant for three written samples that they were comfortable with having analyzed and discussed in the second interview. At that point, I provided the second informed consent form, assuring the interview participants that their participation in this study would be voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time. Consideration of the participants' time was taken into account, thus, I consulted each of them about their preferences of time and place for holding the three rounds of interviews.

Instruments of Data Collection

The decision to collect different types of data is particularly useful in this qualitative research because multiple data collection methods are necessary to generate different insights about the phenomenon studied (Cohen & Manion, 1994). Therefore, the sources of data collection were a questionnaire, individual in-depth interviews, reflective journals, field notes, and textual data collected from published articles or research papers. Interview and text data were the two main sources of information which was used to answer the research questions. Data was collected by using different collection methods over the period of two months.

Demographic Questionnaires

The questionnaire was used to understand the participants' biographic and demographic backgrounds prior to the first interview as well as to gather information on the views and interests of a broader population than the group of interview participants. The questionnaire

addressed biographical details such as age, sex, level of education, major, etc. Additionally, I included ten items, using a 7-point Likert Scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" and "always" to "never," to evaluate the respondents' views and attitudes toward writing and self-presentation in writing. The questionnaire also included six open-ended questions to further gauge the participants' views on writing. The questionnaire was designed to generate information that helped me both in selecting interview participants, and in formulating interview questions. A copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix B.

Interviews

Lincoln & Denzin (1998) state that "[t]he interview is the favorite methodological tool" (p.36) in qualitative research because it allows the researcher to get close to people and to hear them talk. In the course of the interview, the researcher and respondents are able to move back and forth in time; to construct the past, to interpret the present, and to predict the future (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Clearly, the interview is a useful approach for gathering participants' descriptive data in their own words or voice, and understanding why people do what they do and how they understand their world as they solve a variety of problems (Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

I conducted three main interviews with an assortment of more and less structured questions. These interviews were what Hatch (2002) and others describe as "semi-structured," which allowed me to investigate the informants' responses seen through interview interactions (p. 94). In addition, specific information was elicited from participants primarily through open-ended questions posed in the initial questionnaire for the study (See Appendix B). In the type of interview used in this study, the order of the questions is not determined prior to the interview, so that respondents are permitted to answer in their own ways, and depending on their response, the researcher is able to probe for alternative responses and for clarity during the interviews (Stake,

1995). This manner of questioning has generated rich data collection, as the research of Van Maneen (1990) has demonstrated.

In addition to open-ended questions, I applied another approach that Rubin & Rubin (2005) suggest. That is, I used three kinds of questions: main questions, probe questions, and follow-up questions. Main primary questions were prepared before the interview and asked at the beginning as an introduction to each interview topic, in order to guide the conversation. I asked probe questions when I needed more clarification or more examples about specific issues discussed during the interview. These questions took forms such as, "Could you please tell me more about your thinking on that?" The follow-up questions were asked in the second and third interviews in order to clarify or elaborate upon some core ideas and concepts from previous interviews.

Since all in-depth interview questions of this study revolved around the experiences of the participants in the past or the present time, and some questions were related to their writing experiences while they sought to establish their future professional needs, I was able to develop a holistic viewpoint regarding these Taiwanese writers' academic writing practices. I intended to use this data to elaborate upon the phenomenon for further discussions associated with specific issues such as voice, textual borrowing, and positioning. In the paragraphs that follow, I detail the process and the data that I expected would be produced through these three semi-structured interviews.

Interview Stages and Data

In the first interview, I chose to start with general, non-threatening information about myself, in order to establish trust between the participants and myself, since becoming well-acquainted with the participants could help to reduce their anxiety and to establish a social

connection, thus enabling them to comment in a more open and honest way. As a next step, I simply used open-ended questions to obtain information on educational background and insight into the participants' academic writing practices in both Taiwan and the U.S. In order to generate more information and to avoid leading or biased questions, I asked questions such as "Can you talk about your academic writing experiences in the U.S or Taiwan?" Such open-ended questions helped me to understand what participants perceived as important in their development as writers, independent of my own focus on voice and self-presentation. I had developed a list of open-ended questions as an interview guide for myself to make sure certain topics were covered in the interviews (See Appendix C). The data in this first interview also demonstrated the approaches that participants had used, and the pedagogical approaches they had experienced, in academic writing both in Taiwan and English-speaking countries, including experiences that had influenced their development in terms of voice-related issues. At this first interview, I asked the participants to identify three papers, to be used for analysis, and for discussion in our later interviews (particularly the third interview). I requested that the participants send me these papers electronically, or share them with me in hard copy during the second interview.

The purpose of the second interview was to explore the participants' difficulties and strategies in writing academic papers, and to focus more closely on any of their writing practices that seem related to positioning. At this stage, the interview questions were designed to elicit their feelings, knowledge, and rhetorical background. Among other things, I asked questions such as, "When you write, who is your audience?" and "Do you feel comfortable using 'I' in an essay or written piece for your potential readers?" Additionally, I asked follow-up questions in order to clarify or elaborate some core ideas and concepts that might have arisen in the first interview.

The third interview mainly featured discussion of the participants' written texts, in order to understand their own perspective on the positioning they employed or on their practices affecting voice in their second language (English) writing. At this point, the questions were similar in topic to those of the second interview. However, they were focused on specific written pieces: "Who are you writing this for? When you use "you" in your essay, who are you talking to? Have you revised this piece, and if so, what changes did you make? " Again, follow-up questions arising from the data in the first two interviews were also pursued at this stage.

The duration of the interviews was one hour and the interviews were tape-recorded so as to enable multiple listenings, information reviews, data analyses and interpretations as well as to allow for data retrieval from the audit trail (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). All of the interviews were conducted in Mandarin or English and recorded on a small MP3 player or IC recorder. I posed questions in English and interviewees could respond using both languages as needed in whatever way they wanted. Additionally, all excerpts in Mandarin were translated into English; I allowed the participants to review the transcripts, and had a bilingual language expert review any translations used in the study.

Textual Data

Textual data was collected as part of my study; I had decided to draw upon this data to exemplify writers' ideational, interpersonal, and textual positionings in their actual writing practice. In the textual documents, I was looking for how they seem to position themselves as writers, and how they established and maintained voice in their papers. I also examined how participants negotiate their voice in written discourse. I applied Ivanic and Camps' (2001) three types of positioning as an analytical framework. This approach also maps onto Halliday's (2004) three macrofunctions of language. The analytical data frameworks will be discussed further in

the section on data analysis. The textual documents which I collected will be listed and discussed in Chapter six.

Memos

Memos helped me to develop my own ideas, to clarify and understand those ideas that were connected, to record information, and to reflect on related readings as well as linguistic concepts connected to the study. Maxwell (1996) defines an analytic memo as "any writing that a researcher does in relationship to the research other than actual field notes, transcription, or coding" (p.11). Graue and Walsh (1998) state that memos "elaborate the researcher's understanding…by making connections and positing hunches about what is going on. Put more simply, memos are written notes to yourself about the thoughts you have about the data and your understanding of them" (p. 166). Further, writing memos helps researchers to develop their own ideas and to make decisions concerning what data should be included and how it will be interpreted.

Memo writing is a tool used to work on any problem a researcher encounters in making sense of his topics, setting, or other matters. Hatch (2002) suggests that memos should be written in tentative, hypothetical language with complete sentences and paragraphs. He also recommends that memos may be written as possible explanations for behavior recorded in the data and should describe potential insights that seem to be emerging in the course of the study. That is, it is especially useful to make notes immediately after an interview, to record researchers' impressions of the participant's nonverbal behavior. Whatever form these memos may take, their value basically depends upon on two things. The first is that the researcher needs to "engage[s] in serious reflection, analysis, and self-critique, rather than just mechanically recording events and thoughts"; and the second is that the researcher should "organize [the] memos in a

systematic, retrievable form, so that the observations and insights can easily be accessed for further examinations" (Maxwell, 2005, p.13). For the purposes of this study I utilized index cards for memo writing, which could then be indexed by date and topic.

Data Analysis

Interview Data Analysis

Although all qualitative data analysis is inductive, different theoretical stances and different disciplines have developed particular strategies for data analysis. Basically, analysis of a qualitative study is "the process of making sense out of the data" and a process of "making meaning" (Merriam, 1998, p.178). This study used the qualitative data analysis methods provided by Rubin and Rubin (2005) and the constant comparative method presented by Bogdan & Biklen (1992). As Bogdan and Biklen describe, data analysis is a process involving systematic searching and arranging of data from interview transcripts, field notes, and other qualitative data collection methods. Therefore, in order to make sense of the recorded interview data, I organized the data by simplifying it into smaller, more manageable units and synthesizing it, searching for self-contained patterns, and discovering information to relay to readers.

As Rubin and Rubin (2005) state, interview data analysis is simultaneous with data collection in qualitative research. That is, one should begin analyzing data while the interview process is still under way so that the initial analysis begins with the first transcription of the recorded interviews. Rubin and Rubin recommend that the researcher should examine data and transcripts through multiple readings in order to classify the concepts and themes which describe the data provided by the interviewees. Rubin and Rubin state that the benefit of formulating themes and concepts is to make the research easy for readers to follow and understand, and to enable researchers to decide on certain topics to examine for further information.

Basically, the interview data was analyzed in stages. In the first stage, I carefully read and re-read the transcripts so as to identify the concepts, themes, patterns, and topical markers in the interviews. I planned to review the data in order to code and categorize individual statements and passages according to the central themes. These themes referred back to the research questions in order to break up and segment the data into simpler, more general categories as I strived to formulate different levels of interpretations and analysis. The two vital thematic areas for data analysis were:

Writing Experiences: academic writing development, perceptions of writing academic papers in Taiwan and the U.S., strategies and dilemmas writers encountered.

Voice-related Issues: attitudes toward written voice, awareness of written voice in academic writing, cultural and educational background.

Additionally, my data analysis relied upon the constant comparative method described by Glaser & Strauss (1967). They summarize six steps in the constant comparative method: 1. Begin collecting data; 2. Look for key ideas, recurrent events, or activities in the data that will become the categories to focus on; 3. Collect data that provide many instances of the categories of focus with an eye to seeing the diversity of the dimensions categorically; 4. Write about the categories you are exploring, attempting to describe and account for all the examples you have in your data, while continually searching for new material to reflect upon; 5. Work with the data and emerging model to discover basic social processes and relationships; 6. Engage in sampling, coding, and writing as the analysis focuses on additional core categories.

Textual Data Analysis

Textual documents were also primary data analyzed in this study in answer to the research questions. I analyzed three texts from each participant, to understand how the writers

seemed to position themselves with linguistic features such as pronouns, tense, modality, adverbial modifiers, cultural words, reference to personal experience, and other features. Meanwhile, I examined how the texts produced by the writers were similar and different, both across writers and within individual writers (i.e. different text types).

Ivanic and Camps (2001) offer three types of writer positioning: *ideational*, *interpersonal*, and *textual* corresponding to the three macro-functions of language as proposed by Halliday (1985) as summarized in Table 1. The ideational category is concerned with "representation," that is, talking or writing about something—the ideas, content, subject matter, and story conveyed by language. The interpersonal meaning of language is concerned with "interacting": talking or writing between interlocutors—expressing the self and influencing others. The textual function of language is concerned with *text creating* or talking and/or writing to shape a text (Ivanic and Camps, 2001). Ivanic and Camps further define the three terms of positioning. *Ideational positioning* refers to the way in which the writer selects particular expressions and explains particular ideas or views of the world. While constructing a particular ideational version of self, writers are simultaneously positioning themselves on the *interpersonal* dimension of communication: conveying messages about their sense of their own authority and certainty and about their relationship with their readers. *Textual positioning* refers to writers positioning themselves as having particular perspectives on reality, as having particular degrees of authoritativeness and a particular relationship with the reader, and positioning themselves in relation to the mode of communication itself (p.28).

Table 1

Three Types of Position Related to Halliday's Macrofunctions of Language

Position	In Relation to	Linguistic Realizations
Ideational	Different view of knowledge-making	Verb tense, verb type, first person reference
	Different stances towards topics: value, beliefs and preferences.	Classificatory lexis, syntactic choice
Interpersonal	Different degrees of self-assurance and certainty	Modality, first person reference
	Different power relationships between the writer and the reader.	Mood, first person reference
Textual	Different views of how a written text should be constructed	Noun phrase length, linking devices, semiotic mode.

In analyzing the textual data, I kept in mind Halliday's three macrofunctions of language to enrich the framework of my research. This framework can be used as an analytical tool to link syntax to a text as well as to the meaning it conveys. In the process, voice also can be measured using this framework. This study suggested that it was proper for writers to construct their position utilizing all three macrofunctions integrated into a whole system of language. As parts of that system, each of the macrofunctions contributes to positioning. "Positioning" in this sense, means that the author creates a representation of him or herself within the text which seems to portray a certain type of person or a particular identity. To verify the trustworthiness of this method, I asked one experienced reader, for whom English was his/her first language, to react to the readings and give a quick sketch of their impressions of the writer who has written each of these texts. I then compared the thematic groupings. Each interview was analyzed immediately following the session.

Metadiscourse is a concept that will be important to me in my attempt to gain insight into the ways mature L2 writers convey their ideas and engage with their readers in academic writing. I used this notion in analyzing how writers project themselves into their texts and manage their communicative intentions. More specifically, with metadiscourse analysis, this study explored interpersonal features of discourse that the mature L2 writers might be aware of in terms of elaboration, clarification, guidance, and interaction as they sought to establish a personal relationship with their readers. Metadiscourse items such as those listed in Appendix D was noted in the written work submitted, and might also be addressed in the third interview. For example, writers may be aware of applying hedges and boosters, which may raise the confidence of the writer regarding the veracity of the proposed argument.

The data collection and analysis methods were designed to answer the research questions in this study. The methods I used are summarized in Table 2:

Table 2

Data Collection and Data Analysis Methods by Research Questions

Research Question	Method of Data Collection	Methods of Data Analysis
1. How do mature Taiwanese writers who use English regularly perceive their development of academic writing in English?	Interviews journal, questionnaire	Transcription of interview Segmentation and coding Identification of emergent themes
2. What role does positioning play in their academic writing?	discoursal-based interview Text analysis (metadiscourse) Three texts	Transcription of interview Segmentation and coding Selection of relevant material in students' academic writing, journal. Identification of narrative content and features of personal voice and/ or personal involvement in the texts.

3. How do the answers to questions (1) and (2) affect these students' perceptions of the writing voice? How do they believe their experiences with voice and positioning meet their future professional needs as they now see them?	interview	Transcription of interview Segmentation and coding Selection of relevant content and events of personal development Their positioning related to future career

Member Checking

Typically, member checking is viewed as a technique for establishing the validity of qualitative research because it provides an opportunity to understand what the participant intended to do through his or her actions and gives the participant an opportunity to correct errors (Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Therefore, member checking is an ongoing process along with the stages of data collection and analysis. In order to achieve successful member checking, I sent all transcriptions including any relevant English translations to participants for their approval. Later, I highlighted each participant's statements cited in the manuscript and invited them to view the report. It was important to give respondents the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the way their comments and views were interpreted in the study. Each participant was identified by a pseudonym in the study, and they were notified about this in advance.

Trustworthiness

It has been important to establish trustworthiness for this qualitative research, particularly since the researcher's bias could potentially affect the analyses of text-based data in different ways. Therefore, during data collection and analysis, especially as it applied to interview transcripts, I preserved my data in the participants' own words. To ensure that I did not distort

participant data and to eliminate bias and maintain validity in the study, I conducted my research by using the four instruments (questionnaires, in-depth interviews, texts, and analytic memos) which functioned to compare, check, and cross-check emergent patterns or categories. Furthermore, I consulted the original sources repeatedly in order to avoid inadvertently inflating responses or subconsciously assuming data into categories of my own interpretation. Also, I planned to discuss my methods of data analysis with colleagues who were knowledgeable about research and who were well-versed in the subject of my study.

Researcher Bias

The human instrument is the ideal means of collecting data and analyzing data; but the human researcher has shortcomings and biases that might have an impact on the study. Therefore, in qualitative studies, researchers attempt to identify these biases or subjectivities and to monitor them with regard to how they may be shaping the data collection and interpretation, rather than trying to eliminate them altogether (Merriam, 2002). Additionally, qualitative research is concerned with "understanding how a particular researcher's values influence the conduct and conclusions of the study" rather than "eliminating variance between researchers in the values and expectations they bring to the study" (Maxwell, 1996, p.91). Even though I have had experiences of Chinese and English writing for many years in both Taiwan and the United States which may reflect a strong bias toward the design of questionnaire and the guided questions of the interviews, I believe that honest subjectivity, rather than pretended objectivity will lend itself to fruitful and meaningful research. I constantly thought about my potential biases and tried to minimize their effects by attempting to locate and examine cases that disconfirm my expectations. Finally, I relied on the wisdom of my research supervisor, external readers, and

colleagues, who read my manuscript with a critical eye and assisted me greatly with their comments and suggestions.

Summary

This chapter has explained the methodology of my study. The techniques described in this chapter show the procedures I used to collect and analyze the data. Qualitative methods, including interviews and textual documents, were used in collecting data for this study. These sources allowed me to analyze my data from many angles. Methods of analysis were also discussed in this chapter, and data analysis was addressed. Statements from the participants' interviews were coded according to themes related to their academic writing experiences, attitudes toward personal written voice, and cultural and educational backgrounds. Textual data was coded to understand writers' positioning with regard to linguistic features based on three types of writer positioning. What makes this research study different from other studies is that this study included interviews with Taiwanese professional second language writers, a group on which minimal literature is available, and a group whose views and practice are important to an understanding of voice and positioning in second language writing.

CHAPTER FOUR

OVERVIEW OF PARTICIPANTS AND QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Introduction

In this chapter, I will first introduce the nine participants with pseudonyms to protect their identities; the material in these introductions will be taken from the participants' pre-interview writing exercise. The pseudonyms I have used are based on letters and not full names such as Dr. A., a practice that is common among researchers in Taiwan. In this introductory section, I will describe the participants' background, including their ages, majors, and number of years of studying English in Taiwan, as well as their experiences with English writing and publication in Taiwan and other English-speaking countries. I will then show the nine participants' responses on the questionnaire, which included ten items which were formulated using a 7-point Likert Scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" or from "always" to "never," followed by five open-ended questions. The purpose of the questionnaire was to evaluate the participants' views and attitudes toward writing, providing additional details to the introductory material. In addition, the questionnaire results provide a preliminary idea of their level of self-representation in writing.

Overview of Participants

In this section, I will describe the participants in terms of their educational career background and years of learning experience, as well as their personal insights into learning English and writing in English, both in Taiwan and in other countries, and their teaching and writing experience since receiving their Ph.D. I hope to give my readers an understanding of my participants' feelings and struggles in order to help readers personally connect with the Taiwanese writers and understand them. Table 3 presents an overview of the participants'

biographical details such as gender, previous writing experience, level of education (specifically, graduate training in English-speaking countries).

Table 3

An Overview of the Participants' Biographical Details

Participants (Gender/ position)	Previous writing experience	Postgraduate studies in overseas countries (pursuing degree and years)	Age Around
Dr. E (F / Associate. Pro.)	Academic professional	MA in English Language and Literature (3) Ph.D. in Education (5)	45
Dr. C (F/ Full. Pro.)	Personal	MA in English Education (1.5)	55
Dr. R (M / Assistant. Pro.)	Personal	MA in TESOL (2) Ph.D. in TESOL and Composition (3.5)	50
Dr. K(F/ Assistant. Pro.)	Personal/ Essay Academic writing	MA in TESOL (2) Ph.D. TESOL (4.5)	35
Dr. A (F/ Assistant. Pro.)	personal	MA in TESOL & Applied Linguistics (2) Ph.D. TESOL and Composition (5)	40
Dr. T (F/ Assistant. Pro.)	Essay writing	MED in TEFL (1) Ph.D. in TEFL (5)	35
Dr. S (F / Assistant. Pro.)	Personal/ Essay writing	MED in English as Second Language. (1) Ph.D. in Higher Education (3)	55
Dr. H (F/ Assistant. Pro.)	Personal/ Essay writing	MA in TESOL (2) Ph.D. in Education (3)	45
Dr. W (M/ Assistant. Pro.)	Academic professional in Chinese and English	MS in Biological Science (3) EDD in TESOL (5)	45

Dr. E

Dr. E. holds the rank of associate professor in Taiwan. She had obtained her bachelor's and master's degrees both in English Language and Literature in Taiwan. After graduating from her master's program in 1990, she held a position as an instructor at a college for eight years until she left Taiwan to pursue her Ph.D. in Australia in 1998. During these eight years, she had felt a sense of strong commitment to the improvement of her teaching/pedagogical qualifications as well as the advancement of her academic research capabilities. These concerns led her to enroll in a doctoral program in the School of Education in Australia in 1998. Due to her good foundation in language learning in Taiwan, she was confident in her language abilities and performance in her doctoral study in education, and she successfully completed that degree in 2003. Before she came to Australia, she had little experience in academic writing on educational topics because her writing practice had mainly focused on literary analysis. She chose to study in Australia for practical purposes: to get her degree within a shorter time and to keep her teaching position; when she had made this choice, she had seen herself as a teacher more than as a researcher.

As noted above, Dr. E was confident in her English writing ability and language competency to accomplish her Ph.D. study overseas because of her teaching experiences and educational background. However, she told me that readiness and membership in this doctoral disciplinary community were two different matters. She had not realized the importance of shifting her identity from that of instructor to novice researcher once she had entered her doctoral program in education. This transformation was not easy for her because it involved changing her self-awareness and forming a new identity, as well as dealing with other cultural and social issues. In the process, she had to overcome the challenge of the strict requirements in her

program: the need to work independently, to make original contributions, and to avoid plagiarism. After five years of learning and struggling in academic writing and research, she eventually formed her new identity as a researcher and a professional scholar. This new formation was solidly constructed after publishing her first article in 2001, which motivated her to write and position herself as a scholar in her research domain. After completing her doctoral degree, she returned to Taiwan and to her teaching job, which she has held until now. She has now published at least 20 articles or book chapters, either in Taiwan or in international publications.

Dr. C

Dr. C is a full professor at university in southern Taiwan and has been teaching English for more than 20 years. She had obtained her undergraduate degree in English at a well-known university in the central part of Taiwan and she had also completed a master's degree in English Education from the U.S. During her graduate study in the U.S., she feels she did not encounter a great difficulty in academic writing because she followed her professors' requirements and theoretical ideas strictly. During that formative period, she consciously tried to alter her perspectives and views based on their preferences. After receiving her master's degree, she returned to Taiwan to teach at university, a position she has held continuously for the two intervening decades. Due to the policies of the Taiwanese Education Department, she was granted her current position as full professor in the 1990s based on her classroom teaching experience and her number of published works. Under these official policies, a faculty member could be promoted by submitting a qualifying thesis, and was not required to hold a doctoral degree. Her research papers and articles have been published in several journals in Taiwan.

During her master's study, the transition between writing in two different contexts went smoothly for Dr. C., partly because she was aware of constructing a new kind of positioning and quickly adopting new writing strategies in her disciplinary community. Dr. C testifies that she adjusted herself in the English writing environment, relinquished her original writing style formed in Taiwan, and made up her mind to become a member of the Anglo-American academic community. She spoke assertively about wanting to hold a clear position here, while also participating on the international level: "I want to position myself and have my own territory in this academic community. So, I desire to interact with other scholars from various communities." She accepts herself as a mature researcher, so she is eager to vary or modify her writing strategies to fit in with the broader community in which she claims membership.

Dr. C. feels that her developing identity as a professional scholar and teacher became steadier after she attained the rank of full professor. With this higher status in the academic community in Taiwan, she increased her awareness of writing styles or strategies in various ways, working on factors such as methodology, literature review, data presentation, and personal voice as well as critical thinking. After several years of conducting research, she emphasized the kind of open-mindedness that she believes is essential to doing research: "The open-minded researcher has to stand at one side to view something and to accept other's opinions from another side." However, the struggle to balance both teaching and research along with the heavy demands of teaching in Taiwan has caused her to feel frustrated. Gradually, her enthusiasm for conducting research is beginning to fade away.

Dr. R

Dr. R. has attained the rank of assistant professor in Taiwan and has taught English for more than 10 years. He obtained his bachelor's degree in English in Taiwan in 1987 and his

master's degree in the field of TESOL under the department of Linguistics at a prestigious university in the U.S in 1993. He returned to Taiwan to teach at a university as a full-time instructor after completing his graduate studies. In 2006, Dr. R, in his mid-forties, decided to embark on advanced study in language teaching and research, so he left Taiwan to pursue his PhD in TESOL and Composition in the U.S. and completed his doctoral degree in 2010. Before coming to the U.S, he had relatively little experience in academic writing practices. Basically, he only knew how to write essays for the TOEFL and GRE tests. Dr. R has now had a total of six years of academic writing experience in English since entering his master's program (including his doctoral coursework); And he notes that about 95 % of his professional reading has been in English. However, he has published few papers in English.

Dr. R told me that he had felt that he possessed a new identity as an "insider" of Western society, an identity which he secretly relished while still studying in Taiwan. However, his pride in this secret identity was quickly challenged due to his struggles as a graduate student and his performance at the university in the U.S. Dr. R studied very hard, only to fulfill the minimum course requirements for his doctoral program. This was a difficult time for him; but due to his perseverance and hard work, he gradually adjusted to the American educational environment and started to produce more acceptable research papers. Still, since this time in his master's degree program, he has suffered from self-doubt about his identity as a competent L2 learner and writer. Only recently has Dr. R felt he is able to position himself from a new vantage point, picturing himself to be a more competent learner, teacher and writer.

Dr. K

Dr. K just began her work as an assistant professor and has only two years of teaching experience in Taiwan. She completed her bachelor's degree in English at a private college in

Taiwan in 2000. She left Taiwan to pursue her master's degree in TESOL in 2002 in the United States, and she continued her Ph.D. study there in 2004. After she obtained her doctoral degree two years ago in the same field of TESOL, she returned to Taiwan to teach English at a university in the Southern part of Taiwan.

Dr. K had been required to attend an ESL class before entering her American master's degree program. In this course, she experienced academic writing practices and tasks in writing from sources; these included skills such as quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing for academic purposes. Meanwhile, she learned about writing research papers, which helped her to broaden her horizons in the academic world. However, Dr. K has been struggling to manage her L2 academic writing skills in terms of keeping her authority in texts. In a later meeting, she told me that in an attempt to improve her writing skills, she tried hard to read extensively and analyze the elements of good writing from other writers' texts. However, she still encountered great difficulty in completing her master's degree thesis.

Upon embarking on her doctoral study, Dr. K was still uncomfortable and lacked confidence in her English writing. She felt she was not well prepared to position herself as a graduate student while pursuing a master's degree, or later, as a researcher in the doctoral program. Even once she had her Ph.D. degree, she felt she had not transformed herself into a researcher or scholar in the two years since coming back to Taiwan. She positions herself as an EFL teacher, but not as a successful L2 writer. Under pressure from her university's policies and culture, Dr. K feels it is a must for her to be either a good teacher or researcher. Therefore, she is still working to identify herself as a teacher or scholar/ researcher. Addressing her sense to position herself as a researcher, particularly on pedagogical issues, she expressed cautious

optimism: “Hopefully, I can be capable to conduct some constructive studies to help students and have more power to reform the education system and teaching pedagogy in Taiwan.”

Dr. A

Dr. A has been teaching at a National University in Taiwan as an assistant professor since 2010. Before she left for the U.S. to pursue her Ph.D., she had 2 years of teaching experience as part-time university instructor. She obtained her undergraduate major in foreign language and literature in Taiwan, and completed two degrees in the United States: a master’s in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, and a Ph.D. in Composition and TESOL; this study abroad lasted for seven years. Like other international students, Dr. A had difficulty with academic writing at the beginning stage of her graduate study; however, quite soon she overcame the problems she had in understanding her professors’ requirements and began using the conventions of academic writing correctly. However, even though she has acquired the skills for writing academic papers, she did not like to write academically. She believed that it was important to position herself as a knowledgeable person in her papers, and she felt that showing strong communication skills was very important for academic writing. Dr. A felt that communication and negotiation are very important skills for her, as they would help her earn a ticket to enter this academic community. However, she has been struggling to create the proper discourse forms in order to communicate with other scholars. She finds it difficult to engage in sustained dialogue with other scholars. She does not like to adopt a strong voice because she is always concerned about her readers’ feelings.

Dr. T

In 2008, Dr. T obtained her master’s and Ph.D. degree in Education in the U.K, but her bachelor’s degree is in German in Taiwan. She returned to Taiwan after completing her Ph.D.

study and was appointed the same year (2008) to a position as an EFL teacher at a university located in the central part of Taiwan. She had attended a TOEFL program for 6 months in Taiwan before she went abroad for her master's study in 2002. However, the writing practices at the TOEFL program were aimed at helping students pass examinations, not mastering the skills needed for academic writing. Therefore, Dr. T also enrolled in another content-based writing class for 5 weeks in the Education Department, focusing on TEFL (Teaching English as Foreign Language) in the U.K. before entering the master's program; in this additional course, she had to write on a variety of topics. It was very difficult for her, but she feels that it was good writing practice. Through this positive learning experience, she gained motivation for learning foreign language and confidence in L2 writing. As for publication, she had not published any papers during her study in her MA and Ph.D. programs; however, due to school policies and requirements, she has felt pressure to get her papers published in Taiwan.

She told me that she underwent the process of transition from a novice writer to an academic writer after encountering great difficulty at the beginning of her graduate writing. After a year of studying in her master's program and having clear guidance and encouragement from her teachers, she gained confidence and was able to position herself as a skillful L2 writer. In addition, she told me that the growth of her personal voice or critical thinking has greatly benefitted her writing. Over time, she feels that her writing style has shifted because of her own disciplinary community and her newly formed positioning as a knowledgeable scholar/researcher with critical perspectives on the topics she studies.

Dr. S

Dr. S. has a position as assistant professor and has taught at the university for over 15 years. She obtained her bachelor's degree in English in Taiwan and master's degrees in English

as Second Language in the United States. After completing her graduate study, she went back to Taiwan to teach English at the high school level for 4 years. In 1999, she decided to embark upon another new adventure in terms of pursuing her doctoral degree in the U.S. She felt that she had written several good papers during the ensuing period of her doctoral study, even though she had not submitted any writing for publication during her years of graduate study. After coming back to Taiwan, she had several works published in Taiwan, focusing mainly on topics related to teaching, and on students' learning strategies in the classroom.

Commenting on her educational background, Dr. S pointed out that grammar translation was the only teaching method used in her college English classes; this means that her writing practices in the classroom were limited to writing examples illustrating grammar rules and practicing translation skills. Because of this limited experience with writing, Dr. S felt that writing is difficult, especially academic writing. When she finally did encounter classes involving writing, the writing genres assigned were personal writing and essay writing, so she had no chance to experiment with research writing. After entering the research field in her graduate program, she definitely encountered great difficulty in developing her abilities for academic writing. She found out that writing included not only writing skills but also other components such as social, political, and cognitive factors, and sophisticated ways of relating to source texts. At the beginning stage of her academic writing, she used the same strategy, imitation, as most Chinese students did when approaching source material. Developing other ways of conducting literature reviews and structuring research writing was difficult in her new disciplinary community.

Dr. S believes that good writing involves the writer's individual creativity and critical thinking; however, she felt that she had not developed enough confidence to show her voice and

ideas or to position herself as a knowledgeable person in her paper. However, she did note that her writing style became quite well established during her dissertation writing; that is, she learned how to create a dialogue and take turns with other scholars in the academic community. She improved her ability to synthesize ideas from her reading with the opinions of other scholars in a literature review. This great improvement exerted a strong influence on her future research writing.

Dr. H

Dr. H obtained her master's degree in TESOL in 2000, and her doctoral degree in bilingual education in 2006, both in the United States. Regarding her writing practice, she had had no chance to practice academic writing in college because the particular requirements for her major in History did not include much writing. In fact, she notes that she had few chances to write essays, reports, and assignments in her master's program. Since she had not been able to meet the requirement of language proficiency for her master's program, she attended a language program/ ESL before taking any content courses on the graduate level. Until she wrote her thesis, her writing was still in the stage of mimicking or directly imitating sources that she found. Borrowing and repeating others' ideas, often using their precise words, were the only strategies she had at that time. She didn't feel that it was very important to position herself as a scholar or to express her own voice and ideas. Upon embarking on her Ph.D. study, she didn't feel that her writing skills improved much at first; however, she did gradually increase her familiarity with the linguistic forms (words, phrasings and sentence forms) used in academic writing. After coming back to Taiwan, Dr. H had her first experience of publication in the *Journal of National Formosa University*. Due to her heavy teaching load, she has not had enough time to conduct further research or write other papers since completing her doctorate. On this point, she noted in

the first interview, that "if I want to write academic papers in Taiwan, my purpose is trying to keep my status and job."

Dr. W

Dr. W completed his undergraduate and master's degree in biological science and his doctoral degree in TESOL under the Education Department of TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) in the U.S. He has been teaching EFL classes at some universities in the southern part of Taiwan since 2009. He had not experienced any difficulty between college and graduate study because he had remained in the same field of biological science. As for his writing, however, he did struggle with usage issues involving syntax and vocabulary words in English, even though he did not feel he had problems that were content based. Upon embarking on his Ph.D. program in 2004, he had not encountered great difficulty in academic writing because the methodology and organization he used were the same as those used in his science studies in his master's program in the U.S. It is worth noting that scientific style is more formally organized and involves more rigidly specified formats, which may have been part of the reason for Dr. W's statements. Secondly, he also observed that he participated in a very tight social network with his professors and advisors, which benefited him in various ways in helping him to write and complete his papers.

Dr. W did not feel that he presented himself as a knowledgeable writer or scholar in his papers; in contrast, he claimed to be confident about expressing his own ideas in papers due to having enough data and evidence in his study. In other words, the issue of knowledge and evidence outweighed any sense of positioning for him. After graduating from his Ph.D. program, he did not have any publication opportunities in Taiwan. His teaching load was 30 hours per

week, which left him no time to write papers. However, he enjoyed his teaching greatly and loved his teaching career.

Questionnaire Results

In this section, I will present the results from the questionnaire, covering each question in turn and discussing what the responses seem to reveal about the participants' perspectives and/or attitudes toward writing. The Likert Scale used for the first ten items is arranged from high to low and the numbers of participants are listed based on their responses to each item.

Table 4 addresses the participants' views on the consistency they feel in their development as writers, from their L1, Chinese, to their L2, English.

Table 4

Question One: I Think My Experience with Chinese Writing Has Had A Strong Impact on My English Writing.

Likert Scale	No.	Participants
Strongly Agree	1	Dr. W
Agree	2	Drs. S and R
Agree somewhat	3	Drs. K, C and H
Neither agree nor disagree	1	Dr. A
Disagree somewhat	1	Dr. T
Disagree	1	Dr. E

Table 4 shows the degree to which the participants feel that their native language experience has influenced their English writing. Six participants agreed that their Chinese experience had influenced their English writing; however, three of these agreed only "somewhat" and two disagreed with this statement, though none disagreed "strongly." Dr. E expressed the most negative view, with a clear response of "disagree."

Table 5

Question Two: I Feel Comfortable Using 'I' in An Essay or Written Piece for My Potential Readers.

Likert Scale	No.	Participants
Always	1	Dr. T
Occasionally	5	Drs. K, A, W, C and H
Rarely	2	Drs. E and R
Never	1	Dr. S

As shown in Table 5, five participants felt comfortable occasionally using "I" in their writing. Only Dr. T reported that she "always" felt comfortable using "I" in her writing. It seems that Dr. T may be the only participant who comfortably identifies herself directly and explicitly while writing. Drs. E and R rarely feel comfortable using "I" in their papers and Dr. S claims she never uses "I" in her essay or writings for her potential readers. Once again, as for the first question, the responses group toward the middle of the spectrum here, with just over half the participants checking a non-committal "Occasionally" response.

Table 6

Question Three: I Feel That I Present Myself as A Knowledgeable Writer in the Papers I Write.

Likert Scale	No.	Participants
Very Frequently	3	Drs. K, C and E
Occasionally	4	Drs. A, T, H and R
Rarely	1	Dr. W
Never	1	Dr. S

Table 6 shows that seven participants presented themselves as knowledgeable writers in their papers. However, Drs. W and S reported that they rarely or never feel that they present themselves as knowledgeable writers in their papers. Drs. K, C and E presented themselves as knowledgeable writers very frequently, thus positioning themselves as professional scholars in their field. In the open-ended questions discussed below, and later in the interviews, some

participants testified quite strongly that they felt it is important to present their knowledge in their research domain. This will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter and the next, as it was a recurring theme in the response of the participants and emerged as a consistent value that they attached to good professional writing.

Table 7

Question Four: I Feel Confident in Expressing My Own Ideas in Papers I Write.

Likert Scale	No.	Participants
Strongly Agree	1	Dr. W
Agree	7	Drs. K, T, C, H, E, S and R
Agree Somewhat	1	Dr. A

Table 7 shows that seven participants agree with this statement. Basically, all participants were willing to state that they feel confident to a degree in expressing their own ideas in papers. Interestingly, however, Dr. W, who answered "strongly agree," qualified her statement, adding that "my confidence and ideas came from the data I collected." On a similar note, when Dr. R gave me the questionnaire, he orally said that "my confidence comes from ideas and being empowered to express my ideas and my voice in my papers." Dr. A related this question to the differing needs of different genres. These few responses hint at an emphasis on the quality of their ideas as a basis for the participants' sense of confidence.

Table 8

Question Five: I Think My Written Pieces Are Usually Impersonal.

Likert Scale	No.	Participants
Agree	3	Drs. E, S and R
Disagree Somewhat	3	Drs. K, A and T
Disagree	1	Dr. W
None	2	Drs. C and H

Four participants, Drs. K, A, T and W thought that their written pieces were personal, while three participants, Drs. E, S and R, reported that their writings were usually impersonal. Interestingly, Drs. C and H did not reply to this question; in fact, while returning their questionnaire, they orally replied to me that they didn't know how to reply to this question because they had never thought about the matter of their written pieces being personal or impersonal. As has been discussed, this is not surprising, as there has been no emphasis on personal expression in professional writing in Taiwan.

Table 9

Question Six: I Feel Connected to My Writing in English.

Likert Scale	No.	Participants
Strongly Agree	1	Dr. K
Agree	8	Drs. A, W, T, C, H, E, S and R

Table 9 shows that all nine of these mature writers agree with this statement and they feel the connection with their writing in English, with one response of "Strongly Agree" From Dr. K, who claims that she feels strongly connected to her writing in English. These mature writers all report a degree of "connection' to their English writing texts, whether or not they consider their writing to be personal.

Table 10

Question Seven: I Bring My Own Assumptions, Beliefs, Values and Expectations to My Papers.

Liker Scale	No.	Participants
Strongly Agree	3	Drs. K, W and T
Agree	5	Drs. A, C, H, S and R
Disagree Somewhat	1	Dr. E

Table 10 shows that eight participants felt that they convey their personal assumptions, beliefs, values and expectations in their papers. Drs. K, W and T strongly agree with this

statement. Dr. E is the only participant who disagreed with this statement; in fact, she added that this disagreement was a matter of principle for her: "conducting a study without any subjective view is important because researchers need to avoid bias."

Table 11

Question Eight: I Feel That My Writing Style Is Distinctive. (Not Like Other Writers).

Likert Scale	No.	Participants
Agree	3	Drs. W, C and E
Agree Somewhat	2	Drs. H and S
Neither agree nor disagree	2	Drs. A and R
Disagree somewhat	1	Dr. T
Disagree	1	Dr. K

Table 11 shows a split response on this item: interestingly, five participants feel their writing styles are distinctive. Two participants (Drs. T and K) felt their writing is not distinctive, and two (Drs. A and R) who commented that they neither agree nor disagree with this statement, essentially saying they could not judge this either way.

Table 12

Question Nine: When I write I Learn Things about Myself.

Likert Scale	No.	Participants
Strongly Agree	1	Dr. R
Agree	7	Drs. K, C, W, A, H, T and S
Neither agree nor disagree	1	Dr. E

Table 12 shows that eight participants believe that writing can help them learn things about themselves. Dr. R strongly agreed with the statement. Dr. E expressed no opinion on this comment; she added a note of explanation to her response, writing that "writing is self-development not self discovery."

Table 13

Question Ten: Grammar Leads to Direct Improvement in English Writing.

Likert Scale	No.	Participants
Strongly Agree	4	Drs. K, E, S and C
Agree	2	Drs. A and T
Agree somewhat	1	Dr. W
Neither agree nor disagree	1	Dr. R
Disagree somewhat	1	Dr. H

Table 13 shows that seven participants believed that grammar leads to improvement in English writing. Drs. K, E, S and C strongly agreed that grammar is the foundation of English writing and directly improves English writing. Dr. R commented that he neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement. Only Dr. H disagreed, and only "somewhat," with this statement.

Open-ended Questionnaire Results

In this section, I will present the responses to the open-ended questionnaire items in the questionnaire. The responses will be discussed one item at a time, based on themes which were common throughout the response. I will also discuss responses that did not fit into the themes. All responses in this section were written in English by the participants.

Table 14

1. I Feel That I Have Written A Good Paper or Other Written Pieces When_____

Participants	Responses:
Dr. E	I feel that I have written a good academic paper when I have to do a good job on literature review, data analysis and discussion. I have to be very careful with writing style, vocabulary choice and grammar errors. To make sure I express properly and presenting the paper in a critical and creative way, I have to revise my paper several times.
Dr. C	I can receive some feedback from my readers or if someone is interested in my topic and willing to discuss with me. I am extremely interested in the topic and research I conducted. Meanwhile, I could find research methods to solve my research questions and included lots of good references.

Dr. R	I have written a good academic paper when I am very confident about it.
Dr. K	I specifically pointed out my intention or my purpose of writing my paper.
Dr. A	I exhausted my knowledge in the paper I have written.
Dr. T	When I am confident with the ideas.
Dr. S	I feel that I have written a good academic paper when I was a doctoral student.
Dr. H	I have enough time to read and write.
Dr. W	I have good references.

Table 14 shows the participants' views about what makes them feel that they have written a good paper. The participants' responses varied. Drs. E and C gave longer responses related to the importance of expressing their ideas in academic English writing; these two participants also spoke of expressing "critical or creative" views and showing their "interest" in the paper. Additionally, they included other factors such as linguistic features, forms, references, and readers' feedback in relation to their written pieces. Drs. R and T reported that if they had "confidence" in their ideas, they felt that they were writing a good paper. Dr. A showed the importance of presenting an exhaustive range of his "knowledge" in academic writing, stressing the importance of content. Drs. W and C both mentioned the need to have good references, presumably to show their competence and position as a researcher. Drs. S and H seemed ambivalent on this question, since they reported on the context of writing (being a graduate students, having time), rather than their specific feelings about their writing process.

Table 15

2. Expressing My Own Ideas in Academic English Writing is_____

Participants	Responses
Dr. E	It is important because containing critical ideas in the writing makes a piece of academic paper valuable and worth reading. It might be one of the most important criteria that make the paper get accepted into a renowned journal.
Dr. C	It's difficult and important because it is one way to improve your professional knowledge, increase your confident in your research ability and knowledge, explore your research territory, and understands research trend and research methodology.
Dr. R	Expressing my own ideas in academic writing is difficult because I have not had much publishing experiences.
Dr. K	Expressing my own ideas in academic English writing is difficult and important because the writers should have amount of vocabulary words that could express their ideas academically as well as their grammar knowledge and sentence structure. Academic writing is difficult to most people who don't usually read or write the professional articles. That has to put a lot of effort to reach high level to write such paper.
Dr. A	It is important because you need to learn this skill in order to communicate with other scholars and have a better communication in this academic community. It's difficult because academic English writing is not merely a writing skill but you have to be knowledgeable.
Dr. T	It is important because it seems to be a crucial criterion for an academic person.
Dr. S	It's important because I would like my papers published.
Dr. H	It is difficult because you have to follow strict writing form.
Dr. W	It's important because individual comments reflect his/her thought.

As Table 15 shows, two participants (Drs. R and H) echoed the term "difficult," four (Drs. W, E, T and S) used the term "important," and three (C, K and A) agreed with the use of both terms. However, it is interesting that only two of the nine participant (Drs. K and W) repeated

another important phrase in the responses, namely the reference to expressing their own ideas; and of these, Dr. K goes on to speak of language difficulties, a theme also taken up by Dr. H (in his reference to "strict writing form"). Participants tended to emphasize the importance not of their own ideas, but rather of other issues: these included publication (Drs. E, R, S and indirectly K); requirements and standing in the field (Dr. T); and knowledge or research skills (Drs. C and A). Dr. W was the only participant who presented his idea that a writer's words "reflect[s] his/her thought" – in other words, hinting that his personal ideas and voice are associated with his thinking and the content of his writings.

Table 16 presents the responses to the third open-ended question, which addresses the participants' feelings about enjoyment in writing.

Table 16

3. I Enjoy / Don't Enjoy (Circle One) Writing in English Because_____

Participants	Responses
Dr. E	I enjoy writing because it is what I work for. Most importantly, successful writing makes who and what I am
Dr. C	I enjoy writing because I can improve myself and knowledge in academic field. I am motivated to write because I want to learn and know something which is not explored. The more I write the more secret boxes I would like to open and disclose. Meanwhile, I would like to establish my professional career and position.
Dr. R	I enjoy writing because it makes my thinking clear to me.
Dr. K	I enjoy writing in English because I am an English teacher and I have to write English all the time, or my English will not get any further improvement. In fact, since I come back to Taiwan, I worry that my English ability might decrease a little bit. So if I've got any chance of writing English, I will grab it.
Dr. A	I enjoy writing in English because my English typing is faster than Chinese typing.

Dr. T	I enjoy writing in English because I always learn something about the language itself as well.
Dr. S	I enjoy writing because I can express myself through writing.
Dr. H	I enjoy writing in English because it is both interesting and challenging.
Dr. W	I enjoy writing in English.

Table 16 shows that all participants claimed to enjoy writing; however, they expressed quite a range of reasons, with the exception of Dr. W, who offered no further comment. The elaborations given by the other eight respondents might be seen as falling into two different groups, based on their being either more or less personal. Although these judgments are based on only brief answers, they might be related to the well-known categories of "intrinsic" and "extrinsic". The more individual responses came from four participants, while responses that were more career-oriented came from three, while two could not be placed in these categories.

Consistent with the response pattern for an earlier item about self-awareness, only Dr. E responded on the most personal level, claiming that writing made her understand herself better, emphatically stating that "writing makes who and what I am." Dr. R's response was also somewhat personal, as he claimed to understand his thoughts more clearly through writing. Dr. S cited the chance to "express myself," and Dr. H spoke of writing as "interesting and challenging."

In the more impersonal group, Dr. C reported that writing was mainly for the sake of learning and improving in her academic field, adding a note on the need "to establish [her] professional career and position." Drs. C and K spoke of improving their language skills. Perhaps ultimately impersonal is the response of Dr. A, who avoided reference to content

entirely and claimed to enjoy English writing because of the relative ease of typing in English as compared with Chinese.

Table 17 shows the participants' responses on how they think of their readers while writing.

Table 17

4. When I Write, I Think of My Readers in the Following Ways:

Participants	Responses
Dr. E	I would try to make my writing style appeal to them. I would try to get my information/ opinion/findings across in a critical and creative way. I think of my readers as potential audience.
Dr. C	I think about my readers who have the same research field from either Western or Eastern culture and I want to share them the process of my research. So, I lead my reader step by step to understand my purposes of study.
Dr. R	I will consider who would be my readers and if they would like my writing or not.
Dr. K	He or she is someone I've known for years, so he or she can understand my casual writing right away. Someone that I don't know at all. Therefore, I must point out the main idea first, and then explain my reason later. A lot of readers read the first sentence only, so they sort of making their assumption already. As long as they don't bother to read the rest of other writing, I will just simply indicate the main point.
Dr. A	I consider how they feel when they read my papers.
Dr. T	None
Dr. S	Try to understand what I am saying, and imagine my writing purpose.
Dr. H	Their interests, concerns, age range, education level and so on.
Dr. W	Readers' English proficiency levels.

Again, the responses varied considerably. Drs. A, S and R all suggested that they would like the reader to "like" their writing (Dr. R), to "understand" their meaning (Dr. S), or that they "consider how [the readers] feel" (Dr. A). Others tried to say something about their readers. Drs. H and W did this in generic terms, saying they would want to consider the characteristics of their readers (including Dr. H's reference to reader interests); however, they offered no comment on what these characteristics were.

Only two respondents specifically defined the audience they expected to write for. Dr. C reported that her readers are from the same academic disciplinary community. Dr. K went farther, contrasting two kinds of readers in terms of possible shared background: the first kind of reader, she said, "I've known for years, so he or she can understand my casual writing right away." The second imagined reader, though, she described as "someone that I don't know at all." Her subsequent sentence suggests a strategy for dealing presumably with the second kind of reader. Dr. T did not respond to this question because she did not know how to answer.

Table 18 shows the participants' responses on how important they believed their linguistic forms were in writing behavior.

Table18

5. I Think It is Important/ Not Important to Pay Attention to Linguistic Forms in Writing Behavior

Participants	Responses
Dr. E	Yes, it's important. Especially, when you try to write academic paper, you should be aware of words you selected, sentence structures you varied, and the form you followed; otherwise, you won't produce a good paper.
Dr. C	It is very important because it will help you to lead your readers for a better understanding of your purposes and meanings. My writing style and linguistic form have to be accepted by my readers; otherwise, they may get confused and cause some misunderstanding.

Dr. R	I do know this concept and understand it. But, I do not pay attention to use different kind of expression and words in different genres. I just write.
Dr. K	I think it is important to pay attention to linguistic forms in writing behavior because we need to consider our readers whether they understand the written contents or not, therefore, linguistic forms is really important in writing behavior; otherwise, the purpose of writing this paper is meaningless.
Dr. A	I do follow the rules of using grammar when I write because I don't want my paper looks messy or disorderly. It's important because I don't want to exhaust my readers so I like grammar, form, and words before I hand in to them.
Dr. T	I think it's important.
Dr. S	Yes, it is. I will select a proper linguistic form or genres in my field.
Dr. H	I think it is important to pay attention to linguistic forms in writing behavior.
Dr. W	It's important.

Eight participants believed that it was important to pay attention to linguistic forms when they were writing. However, Drs. T, H and W offered no further comment on the importance of linguistic forms in their writing. Even though Dr. R did not pay attention to the usage of linguistic form, he brought out the issue of genres, which Dr. S also referred to.

Two participants responded positively with further comment: Dr. S considered the usage of linguistic forms based on genre, while Dr. E had a strong awareness of using linguistic forms and features; her response, stressing the importance of "produc[ing] a good paper," suggests that she may have been thinking of the need for publication. Drs. C, K and A considered their readers and their understanding of the texts they write; thus, their view of attention to grammatical form revolved largely on correctness, i.e. making their meanings clear. Dr. K added that, without clear expression, "The purpose of writing [a] paper is meaningless." Dr. R admitted that he knows

about choices in linguistic form, but that this factor does not influence his own choices: in his own words, “I just write” without attention to linguistic form.

Discussion

The findings from the ten Likert Scale questions and five open-ended questions discussed in this chapter have provided a preliminary sketch of the participants’ views and attitudes toward writing and self-presentation in writing. However, in some ways, these responses open up as many questions as they answer. For instance, five participants provided answers on the Likert Scale items which differed from, or seemed almost contradictory to, what they said later in response to the open-ended items. I will point out and discuss several of these contradictions in this section.

Grammar and Linguistic Form

In the Likert-Scale questions, they agreed that grammar leads to direct improvement in English writing and they believed that paying attention to linguistic forms was important, for the effect this would ultimately have on whether or not readers could “understand [what they were expressing] in written contexts ” (Dr. K). It seems that participants valued and understood the importance of grammar and linguistic features in writing, again because they felt, justifiably, that faulty linguistic form could lead to misunderstandings. Dr. H was the only participant who (in a Likert Scale item) disagreed with the idea that grammar leads to direct improvement in English writing. Interestingly, though, in response to open-ended question five, she claimed quite emphatically that “it is important to pay attention to linguistic forms in writing behavior.” Also, she agreed somewhat that her Chinese writing has had a strong impact on her English writing. Judging from Dr. H’s response to this open-ended item, in spite of her earlier rejection of the importance of “grammar,” she does consider linguistic form as significant. Since she claimed her

English writing was affected by Chinese writing, it is possible to conclude, at least tentatively, that she probably was aware of rhetorical issues in her English writing.

A more obviously consistent pattern emerged with Dr. R, the only person who answered with 'neither agrees nor disagree' about the possibility that grammar leads to a direct improvement in English writing. In the related open-ended item, he also responded that "I do not pay attention to using different kinds of expression and words in different genres. I just write." From his responses, Dr. R seems to overlook and disregard linguistic forms when writing. Of course, any discrepancy between these two items may reflect the generally negative view of "grammar," which tends to be used in a more narrow sense (to refer to minor surface errors in writing) than phrases like "linguistic form."

Personal versus Impersonal

In Dr. W's Likert Scale responses, he disagreed with the statement that his written pieces are usually impersonal; and he also agreed that "expressing my own ideas is important because individual comments reflect my thoughts." He answered "strongly agree" to the Likert item addressing his level of confidence in expressing his own ideas in paper. However, in response to open-ended question number one, he made no reference to his own ideas or thoughts when he defined the time(s) when he feels he has written a good paper. Instead, he responded that that good writing was directly related to having "good references." It seems that, when Dr. W was explicitly prompted to give a positive opinion about expressing one's own thoughts, this factor seemed important to him. But when defining a "good paper" on his own, he was more inclined to cite more impersonal items, such as the quality of a paper's references. A similar subtle discrepancy shows up with Dr. S. Responding to open-end question three, Dr. S said that she enjoyed writing because "I can express myself through writing." However, in the Likert Scale

question response section, she answered that "I never feel comfortable using "I" in an essay or written pieces for my potential readers." It is interesting that Dr. S claimed to enjoy expressing her own thoughts in writing, while in contrast, she later claimed that she was uncomfortable projecting herself or keeping personal authority in her paper. It is worth noting, however, that in another open-ended item, Dr. S. spoke of "express[ing] herself" in her writing.

Publication and Professional Standing

Generally, it is worth noting the strong presence of wording referring to publication and professional standing in the open-ended items; while this does not directly stand in opposition to ideas such as self-expression it does suggest a pervasive sense of purpose in writing, for at least some of the participants in this study. Similarly, there was something of a tension between the participants' expressed confidence in expressing their ideas, and the difficulty they associated with writing.

It is worth elaborating briefly on this last point. In responding to the relevant Likert-Scale questions, they agreed with statements saying they feel confident in expressing their own ideas in papers and felt comfortable using "I" in their written pieces. Judging from the open-end responses, however, the majority of participants agreed that expressing their ideas in academic English writing is important and difficult. It was interesting to find that the writers' attitudes toward the concept of expressing personal ideas in writing were generally positive. That is, participants seemed to value the idea of expressing their thoughts in academic writing; however, later responses suggested that they did not find it easy to project their ideas in their papers. Moreover, based on a number of participants' reports to different open-ended items, it seems clear that they linked the concept with expressing their own ideas with knowledge representation or professional status, more than with expression of their own ideas. It is also worth noting that

issues such as publication and language concerns were common, so that these factors may somewhat overshadow the participants' feelings about the act of writing or their sense of the quality of their writing. Drs. R and H brought out the relationship between expressing ideas and publication. Dr. H said that "you [writers] have to following strict writing form" and that "I was not allowed to have my personal ideas because of the particularity with regard to form in given disciplines in the academic community." It seems that the difficulty expressing their ideas may stem more from their concern about being judged in their academic communities than from their own personal ambivalence or reluctance.

Voice and Positioning

On another note, it seems that the L2 writers did not mention voice or positioning as an essential component. In contrast, there seems to be a strong correlation between how these participants present their knowledge and the meanings they strive to communicate. Rather than focusing on personal voice, the majority of participants were trying to articulate meanings; this is understandable, since most participants were still at the level of learning to communicate clearly; it is unlikely that they could think beyond this central goal to the issues of personal voice and authority in their writing, even though they were involved in publishing scholarship. However, it is notable that only one participant linked the idea of linguistic choice to differences in genre; and none spoke of using language forms in a way that enhanced their self-presentation, or even the effectiveness of their arguments in a given paper. It seemed that linguistic form, for these participants, could be either correct or incorrect, either clear or unclear to a reader. However, an experienced writer with a deeper understanding of writers' choices would be poised to choose between two equally "grammatical" forms, one of which better represented his or her identity, or could better convince his readers of the points he or she was making.

The results paint a preliminary picture of the participants' understanding of what constitutes a well written paper. Based on their responses to the open-ended question, participants' ideas about having written a good paper related to many factors such as knowledge, confidence, critical views, good references, ideas, and linguistic features.

In fact, it is interesting to reflect further on the participants' perspectives on writing a good paper, judging from the questionnaire responses. In these responses, they focused primarily on elements such as grammar, linguistic features, writing skills, knowledge and publication. They did not relate any of these elements in any way to comments that could be said to represent the issue of voice. Therefore, it may be said that the issue of L2 writers' voice is ignored, in favor of the desire to legitimize themselves in the disciplinary community in overseas countries or Taiwan.

Defining the Reader

Another interesting point I found in their questionnaire responses involves their ideas about their readers, as they emerged in the responses to one open-ended question. Generally, it is clear that the participants had an idea of audience, and felt they needed to adjust their writing to their readership. However, most did not elaborate on the characteristics of their imagined readers, with the exception of Drs. E and C, who identified their potential readers as individuals who belong to their own academic or disciplinary communities. From Drs. E and C's responses, it seems that they were aware of their potential readers and applied their writing strategies or varied "writing styles to readers" (Dr. C). In other words, they may try to understand their readers, their interests and their needs, and may intend to shift their writing strategies and writing styles to be appropriate to the readers. In a note addressed to linguistic form, Dr. C made a

spontaneous reference to readers, saying that "linguistic forms have to be accepted by readers; otherwise, they [readers] may get confused and cause some misunderstanding."

Summary

In this chapter, the nine participants were introduced, and results were presented based on a short questionnaire, which included both Likert Scale and open-ended questions. I briefly narrated their learning backgrounds in two different contexts (earlier in Taiwan, and later during graduate study in English-speaking countries); I also included notes on some conflicts they met as an L2 writer, their beliefs about academic writing and their motives connected with publishing papers and conducting research in Taiwan. Through understanding these aspects from each participant, I was able have a deeper insight into their writing development and the factors which may influence their L2 writing voice. The questionnaire results were presented in order to paint a preliminary picture of their views on writing, particularly on factors that might bear on voice or positioning. In the next chapter (Chapter 5), I will add to this picture by presenting more detailed information from their interview data, and will identify themes emerging from behind the conversations that we shared during these interviews. In Chapter 6, I will present evidence on the participants' actual practice, based on excerpts from the writings they shared with me as part of this study.

CHAPTER FIVE

INTERVIEW RESULTS

In this chapter I present two sections, both based on data from the interviews. In the first, I present narratives covering the relevant experiences of each participant as they pertain to research question one (How do mature Taiwanese writers transition between different academic environments?) and its four subsections. In the second, I present and discuss themes that emerged while analyzing this data as they pertain to research question two. At this point, eight themes are included: (1) Genre Learning and Writing Pedagogies, (2) Narrative Writing and Voice, (3) Awareness of Genre Teaching in Taiwan, (4) Awareness of Linguistic Features, (5) Defining L2 Writers' Authority, Reader Relationship, (6) Awareness of Readers' Expectations in Disciplinary Communities, (7) Keeping Writers' Voice: Negotiation, (8) Taiwanese Mature L2 Writers' Professional Needs.

Second Language Writer's Learning Experiences and Practices

In this section, I present data collected during the interviews as they pertain to research question one (How do mature Taiwanese writers who use English regularly perceive their development of academic writing in English?) and its four subsections. I will present these in the form of narratives for each of the participants in turn.

Dr. R's Writing Experiences and Practices

Dr. R studied both in Taiwan and the U.S. He earned a B.A. in Applied English in Taiwan and an M.A. in Applied Linguistics as well as a Ph.D. in Composition and TESOL in the U.S. Examining the transcripts of Dr. R's interview, a notable difference between his undergraduate and graduate writings emerged, which help paint a picture of his writing development.

In the early stages of college English writing, he reported that the writing instruction he received in college had mainly focused on narrative; so at this early stage, he had used more colloquial language in his papers rather than academic forms. The papers were primarily first person narratives (e.g. autobiography, reflections, reports, stories, and sometimes literary analyses) that used colloquial vocabulary. His teachers had not explained notions such as genre to the students at this point, but instead had focused primarily on grammar. As a result, at this point, he had felt comfortable writing narratives and using linguistic features that reflected a personal voice (first person pronouns *I,* and *we,* and colloquial forms) in his papers; but he was using few academic words, and he had no understanding of argumentative form or APA style. Thus when he entered, the M.A. program in the U.S, he encountered a confusing new world that required him to meet requirements with which he was unfamiliar.

One difficulty Dr. R encountered involved rhetorical structure. Perhaps because he had never written an argumentative paper, his teachers commented that he relied on his Chinese rhetorical background and thus had trouble with the requisite structure (e.g. the positioning of topic sentences, supporting arguments, and conclusions) for his graduate papers. He comments, "One of the American professors criticized my first paper with the written comment that this paper was good at content but not at form." He especially had trouble with research papers. Dr. R also reported that he lacked understanding of the APA style and he had trouble selecting a proper format in academic writing. Here he again offered a recollection about his teachers: "I was confused about [academic format]; but my professor didn't say anything and just asked me to write with APA. I think they assumed that I already knew this writing skill."

Dr. R reported that as he moved through the M.A. program and on to his doctoral degree he did make some progress in some, but not in all of these areas. After two years of academic

writing in the master's program, he had learned how to write quantitative studies, but he still had trouble with writing qualitative reports up to the standards expected by the readers on his doctoral committee, and he commented on the stress this caused him:

> I [had] to adjust and accept all their comments. . . . [I]t took me so much time to revise what they want[ed] me to do . . . . I still [had] a sense of uncertainty which made me so nervous. Because of this kind of uncertainty, I suffer[ed] lots of pressure while writing… any single sentence and paragraph.

He made progress with APA style. With regard to positioning, he felt that he had made progress during his years of working in the Ph.D. program. He felt that he had been trained to view and interpret material in more flexible, creative and critical ways, expressing his own voice in his texts, but using academic language rather than the colloquial forms of his earlier writing experience. Therefore, when he began writing research papers for his doctoral courses, Dr. R now felt that he could bring his own assumptions, beliefs, values and expectations into his papers, and he felt connected to his writing. Dr. R said that he had begun to write critically, to feel confident in expressing his own ideas in papers, and to understand how to use a personal voice to maintain a sense of authority in his writing. Reflecting on this, he reported that he now felt empowered to write critically and to include his personal views and strong judgments in his papers.

Dr. R believed that the quality of his ideas and knowledge were very important elements for academic writing, and they were also the major sources from which his confidence came, rather than using personal expressions such as the first person "I" in texts. When pressed to elaborate further, he reported that he felt he developed confidence as an academic writer and this

stemmed from being able to take a stance of authority in his writing, rather than simply focusing on the first person pronoun or using colloquial vocabulary.

After two years of Ph.D. course work, Dr. R felt that he remained confused and conflicted about some features of disciplinary writing which could assist him in positioning himself appropriately in his writing in relation to his professional audiences. He said, "I was struggling with the meaning of 'deep' data analysis and categorizing data effectively while writing my dissertation." Therefore, Dr. R had a hard time reaching his committee members' expectations and keeping his voice while writing his dissertation. However, by the end of the dissertation stage, Dr. R had acknowledged the importance of needing to meet readers' expectations beyond those of his advisor.

Dr. E's Writing Experiences and Practices

Dr. E studied both in Taiwan and Australia. She completed a B.A. and M.A. in English literature in Taiwan and a Ph.D. in Education in Australia. Examining the transcripts of Dr. E's interview, I found that Dr. E felt she had managed to master a writing style while working toward her B.A. and M.A. that differed considerably from the requirements of the doctoral program in Australia and what she later came to believe was expected of her in her teaching and publishing endeavors.

In her high school and undergraduate education, Dr. E explained that she had worked hard to write correct sentences and use grammar properly. As a result, she reported that she had little trouble in these areas while pursuing her M.A. and Ph.D. However, other areas (e.g. rhetorical organization and critical thinking) caused her great difficulty.

As a consequence, adjusting to the rhetorical demands of writing at the Ph.D. level was

very difficult for Dr. E. During her B.A. and M.A. studies in Taiwan, she had written short papers and a thesis on literature. While writing these papers, she had enjoyed using critical and creative writing styles that allowed her to interpret and analyze aspects of stories from her own perspective and expressing critical views using her own voice.

Dr. E's background in literature, however, left her feeling unprepared for the rhetorical demands of the papers and research domains required in her Ph.D. program. As she put it, "It [i.e. her doctoral area] is social science research paradigm which is totally different from humanit[ies]." To illustrate the difficulties she experienced in her doctoral work, she elaborated: "I received no preparation in my M.A. program which would help me to think critically"; she also noted that she had not received "writing practice related to argumentative writing, rhetorical skills, conference proposals, article introductions, and research papers." As a result, she was barely able to reach her professors' higher expectations (e.g. rhetorical demands, individual thinking in and contributions to her research field); and for a long time, she felt frustrated about her ability to study in the Ph.D. program.

Dr. E took three years to learn the format of academic writing in order to position herself properly in the disciplinary community and to understand the meaning of critical thinking. During her fourth year, while writing her dissertation, she finally met her advisor's requirements. She was very surprised to have a response from him that consisted of one simple sentence--"That is what I want." Commenting on this moment, Dr. E said that, three year after she had started her studies, she "finally understood and reach[ed] my advisor's expectations." Yet even after her long struggle, it seemed that her newfound understandings were not yet solid. She still felt apprehensive about

conducting research, writing academic papers, and dealing with the issue of expressing voice in her academic papers.

After graduating from the Ph.D. program, Dr. E gained confidence in writing due to her published works. She pointed out that improvement in writing may occur through one's publications and the feedback of professional peers. Dr. E believed that researchers should not bring their own assumptions, beliefs, values and expectations to their papers, since it was important to meet the demands of publication, including objectivity. Therefore, her writing style has shifted based on reader comments, as she has tried to appeal to various readers or reviewers. In the years after obtaining her degree, she considered several writing strategies which she hoped would help her succeed in having her work published. She mentioned having a critical and creative way to interpret things as important for academic writing; so she has worked to include critical thinking and ideas in her papers. Most importantly, she believed that she needed to position herself as a professional and knowledgeable scholar in the paper; therefore, presenting her knowledge became a high priority for her while writing academic papers. Thus, ultimately, although they followed quite different paths, she and Dr. R. both return to the idea of holding authority through knowledge and ideas, rather than through the force of their presentation.

Dr. C's Writing Experiences and Practices

Dr. C studied both in Taiwan and the U.S. She completed a B.A. in English literature in Taiwan and an M.A. in TESOL in the United States. Like the other participants, Dr. C experienced two transitions, one when she began studying in America and another when she returned to Taiwan. However, her perspective on the two transitions involved differed somewhat from that of other participants.

When coming to America, Dr. C felt that her Taiwanese high school and undergraduate writing background had a great influence on her writing in the American context with regards to language use and rhetorical style. During her high school education in Taiwan, her teachers had attempted to minimize what she described as "Chinglish" language (nonnative language use, word order, and rhetorical forms). In her undergraduate work her teachers focused on rhetorical styles[1] and had her use imitation to gain confidence with these. Thus these teachers went beyond her earlier training; however, they did not encourage her to learn how to express her own voice.

Many of the problems covered in her earlier writing training still remained as she began her M.A. program in the U.S. To her surprise, however, her experience now was much more positive than her prior experience. Her American "teachers never pointed out . . . [her] Chinglish"; they just focused on the "meaning" of her writing. They also, unlike her secondary and undergraduate teachers, encouraged her to go beyond imitation and express her own ideas by using "different lenses to view things [critically]."

Once she returned to Taiwan, however, she found she had to return to the concerns of her earlier training. Her teaching position required her to publish two articles per year and present papers in conferences; returning to an earlier theme, she found that professional editors in Taiwan had no patience for "Chinglish" language forms. In addition, she needed to again concentrate on the "rhetorical forms" accepted in the field in Taiwan; this meant she had to trade the authority she had found when she expressed herself in the MA program for a kind of authoritative voice that reflected a more impersonal tone and conformed to the conventions of the disciplinary community. This was the only way, as she put it, that she could "further my own critical viewpoints." Here she emphasized that she found the social aspect of working with

[1] Rhetorical styles: writing practices tend to belong to general rhetorical styles such as descriptive, argumentative or persuasive styles.

editors to be an important part of the writing process. They not only helped her get published, but their feedback helped her to increase her readability so she could keep her voice in her papers by expressing her ideas, while still presenting data analysis, findings and discussion through the conventions accepted in the field.

Reflecting on her writing experiences, she had come to several conclusions about what good writing was: using proper linguistic forms, following rhetorical conventions, maintaining authority in one's own writing, and collaborating and receiving feedback from others. However, she acknowledged that the institution she was teaching at had different goals, which focused specifically on only correct grammar and language forms. In the end, although she herself spoke of expressing voice in her writings, it seems that factors in her training generally, and particularly in Taiwan, had taken precedence over the goal of developing her own positioning or voice in her writing.

Dr. K's Writing Experiences and Practices

Dr. K studied both in Taiwan and in the U.S. She completed a B.A. in English literature in Taiwan and an M.A. and Ph.D. in TESOL in the U.S. Dr. K claimed that her prior writing practices in Taiwan had shaped her early academic writing practices. She further explained that pedagogical approaches in Taiwan have not progressed much past the grammar translation method and the formulaic five paragraph essay over the last 20 years. For instance, in her college composition classes, she had still worked on grammar and language practice and modeling the basic elements of five-paragraph essays (topic sentences, and supporting ideas). She was also encouraged to "adopt a kind of cool response tone while writing an academic argument" instead of using the "I" that helped her to express her voice and authority in e-mail correspondence.

When she went on to study for the M.A. and Ph.D. in TESOL in the United States, however, she found she was required to perform more advanced tasks in order to write longer papers (e.g. research papers and proposals), and she had trouble mastering the skills needed at this level. The first problem she had was using correct grammar and academic word choice. She shared a comment by one professor, who claimed that reading her un-proofread papers was like receiving "a needle injury in . . . [the] eyeball"; this professor went on to say, "I won't be able to read your paper before you see the tutor." Though her earlier training had focused on grammar and form, she was now confronted with a kind of language that she still had not mastered well enough to meet her professors' requirements.

Dr. K also explained that she could not simply translate from English to Chinese. Instead, her professors told her she had to synthesize all of her ideas and categorize them clearly. However, her own focus remained to some extent on issues of form; in particular, she had difficulty focusing on the direct and precise expressions required in English academic writing, and as a result she continued to use Chinese styles. These included the tendency to return back repeatedly, circulating through different points rather than progressing in a linear fashion. To help her understand rhetorical conventions, one of her professors explained:

> [W]riting is just like making a cake; you have to make one layer by layer: one layer for butter, another for chocolate, the other for nuts. You have to separate them and do not mix them together in the same layer.

Listening to her teacher's advice and imitating the style of published articles, she learned that she needed to "mention one thing each time with some supporting ideas, but not grouping everything together."

A second problem she had was with paraphrasing. Due to having insufficient reading skills, she misinterpreted articles that she used as sources for her papers, a problem that was compounded by her own struggle with finding clear phrasing. Therefore, the meanings in her paraphrasing were somewhat different from the authors' meaning. Aware of this, she explained, "I have no confidence in [my paraphrasing, because] I am not sure if my writing is appropriately expressing the author's ideas or not." To compensate, she opted to use direct quotation. Opting to use more quotations solved her troubles with paraphrasing, but it also raised another. She realized that when she "simply restate[d] others' ideas and view[s]," she was unable "to offer an original insight or interpretation." As a result, instead of infusing her own ideas and voice into her writing, she adopted an impersonal tone that relied on other authors' voices (quotations) in her papers instead of her own:

> I use[d] lots of citations in my first academic paper. Twenty references, 20-30 citations within 10 pages, I [thought] it's ok. I felt that I did a good job because I really made effort to do my research. So citations are everywhere. [But] my professor questioned me where your own ideas were?

Another professor tried to help by showing her a paper with four citations, but that confused her still more. Instead of understanding the need to incorporate her own voice, she mistakenly focused on the number of references as a measure of her authority.

Despite her trouble with voice, she continued to progress through her M.A. and on to her Ph.D. program through a reliance on modeling. When the need to interpret quotations arose, she carefully used modal words, "to hide [her] uncertainty… under confident statements."

After she graduated from her Ph.D. and attempted to publish, she explained that she felt able to meet the demands of grammar, word choice, sentence variety, and rhetorical style.

However, she published few articles because she continued to have trouble balancing the need to cite sources with the competing goal of expressing her own ideas and maintaining her own authority and voice as author.

Reflecting on her writing experiences, she explained, "[W]riting a good paper includes a clear purpose and intention, expressing writers' ideas clearly and in the correct format." However "writing shouldn't be only rhetorical. It should be something else." A "student should be able to express her personal voice and . . . creativity without any rules and constraints." And thus when giving feedback to her own students, she focused more on students' ideas and less on their use of correct grammar and format in order to foster their development of their own voices.

Dr. A's Writing Experiences and Practices

Dr. A studied both in Taiwan and the U.S. She obtained a B.A. in Applied linguistics in Taiwan and a M.A. in TESOL as well as a Ph.D. in Composition and TESOL in the U.S. Dr. A's high school writing instruction was designed to prepare her for college entrance examinations. Her classes focused on grammar, memorizing model sentences, responding to narrow writing prompts, and writing short summaries of books she had read. She explained that she did not recall having a "personal voice" in high school; but she noted that she was "comfortable using this writing style," referring to the goals set for her in her high school courses.

After entering the B.A. program in linguistics in Taiwan, Dr. A encountered other sorts of writing demands. The first was a collaborative research writing assignment where each student was asked to write one paragraph of a joint paper. Because she was only responsible for one paragraph, she focused on carefully selecting vocabulary words but did not focus on rhetorical structures that would help her ideas flow in the paper. Her second experience was more positive. In a research class, she was given weekly assignments to explore topics outside of her major (e.g.

baseball), which allowed her to experiment with expressing her voice, especially with regard to choosing different linguistic forms and modeling different rhetorical structures.

When Dr. A. entered the M.A program in the US, she again encountered difficulty because she did not understand the rhetorical format required of a research paper and thus failed her first writing assignment. With help from a classmate who showed her his research paper and research articles, however, she came to realize "what an academic paper looks like," and was able to revise her paper accordingly. Another area she had trouble with in her M.A. program invovled the linguistic features required in academic writing. Here too she found help by looking at others' works (e.g. published research articles). Speaking of her development during this time, she said, "I didn't know how to swim in Taiwan; but suddenly, I could swim automatically in the U.S."

Dr. A's ability to notice rhetorical and linguistic features helped her in her Ph.D. program as well. During her doctoral courses, she learned the facets of methodology for an ethnography paper, and she was able to conduct the research and write up the results "step by step." Her confidence, however, was curbed when she entered the dissertation phase of the program. When writing her dissertation, she ran into trouble while writing her literature review. Her first problem was that she did not understand the rhetorical conventions required for a literature review well enough to synthesize others' works with her own ideas. Her second problem was that she did not fully understand her reader's (professor's) expectations about this area because her professor offered little instruction in this area. One area she did feel positively about, however, was the qualitative research methods portion of her paper. Here she felt some authority, as she felt she had space to express her ideas and voice about the data she had collected.

After she finished her Ph.D. and went on to her academic career, the ideas she developed during her education were reinforced. Wanting to publish her ideas in papers that expressed her voice, she grew to understand the need to be aware of her audience's expectations. She gradually became more able to supply an extensive and scholarly literature review with comprehensive methodology and results, and in a form and style common to the discipline. As her awareness of academic writing developed, she continued to notice "text forms and style" in others' works, and paid attention to submission guidelines, all of which she feels helped her to "find an effective norm for communication."

When returning to the classroom as a teacher and reflecting on her own experiences, Dr. A wanted to give her students the opportunity to develop their own voices, so she assigned writing activities to help them develop their own voices and encouraged them when they did so; however, she noted that their low level of language proficiency inhibited their ability to express their "voice in [their] texts."

After she finished her doctorate and went back to teaching, she understood the need to create a dialogue with other scholars through the publishing of papers. As a result, she attended conferences and presented a small number of papers at conferences in an attempt to sharing her research and teaching experiences with other teachers, as well as to build a social network with other scholars. But she noted that she would have liked to present much more research than she has done.

Dr. T's Writing Experiences and Practices

Dr. T pursued a B.A. in German in Taiwan but wanted to pursue graduate degrees in TEFL in the U.K. To do this, she knew she needed to improve her English writing skills in order to attain a high enough score on the TOEFL TWE to be accepted to a U.K. university; for this

reason, she attended a cram school in Taiwan after completing her B.A. degree. At the cram school, she learned skills that helped her to get an adequate score on the TOEFL TWE (e.g. practice with thesis statements, topic sentences, supporting ideas, and conclusions for argument essays). However, when she arrived at the university in the U.K., she found her writing skills were insufficient for her first year of graduate study which required more advanced writing skills; for instance, the ability to write critically within rhetorical conventions in a way that expressed one's own opinions was required. As a result, the first writing assignment she submitted in her M.A. program was returned for revisions. To improve the paper, her instructor told Dr. T that she needed to work on the conventions of academic writing (e.g. argumentative style). Her instructor also told her she needed to be able to go beyond simply paraphrasing and summarizing and show she could think critically and assertively to express her own voice and opinions.

Attempting to meet her professor's expectations, Dr. T rewrote the paper several times and made progress. Dr. T felt that her ability to write well-organized arguments had improved and she had learned to assertively express her voice: "When I wrote something from my own opinions or some creative ideas, I got a good grade for that paper, so I [was] pretty sure that professors [were] looking of my personal ideas and voice." Dr. T also explained that with her teachers' guidance and instruction, she continued to expand her abilities. She found she could, for example, write in different genres where she could critically interpret other authors' perspectives and then forward her own opinions using her voice.

Once in her Ph.D. program in the U.K., Dr. T was again encouraged to use her own voice in her course assignments. Instead of simply reiterating what she had read in others' works through paraphrasing or quotations, she was again encouraged to engage in critical thinking and express her own ideas. Her professor, however, offered a cautionary note that, as a student

researcher, Dr. T should balance her ideas by hedging her judgments with the modal verbs *would*, *should* and *could,* and she should try to choose objective language for the same reason. To compensate and reduce negotiations with her professor, Dr. T learned to hide behind other authors with similar ideas when writing the literature review for her dissertation, and then only later come forward with her own unhedged assertive voice in the qualitative data analysis section of her dissertation. Here she explained that she enjoyed being able to interpret the data she collected (e.g. from observations and interviews) to express her ideas and voice. On a different topic related to her current feelings, she explained that she especially liked narrative writing because

> It is how I can express my feeling or voice without any imitation. [That is,] I don't need to care about other scholars' voices or about using citations in my paper; just write it. . . , [and] I feel so happy and comfortable when I can write something I want to say in my paper.

Dr. T. clearly enjoyed writing her own ideas more than feeling that she had to conceal her voice in her writing. Accordingly, after leaving graduate school and moving on to publishing, she included fewer sources in her literature reviews, and opted to take more assertive stances in putting her own ideas forward:

> I understood [that] readers' expectations [about including sources] are very important, but I did not think too much about this point. . . . I wanted my readers to accept my ideas and make this world better. I felt it's the reader's responsibility to be interested in the topic or not.

Dr. T soon found, however, that her strategy of not synthesizing other's ideas with her own did not meet with success, as her papers were not accepted or she was asked for revisions.

To appease editors, she again adopted the strategic pattern she used in her dissertation: that is, including other authors with similar ideas in her literature review, and then coming forward with her own voice in the qualitative data analysis section of her papers.

As she began teaching in Taiwan, Dr. T found that the education system had much different ideas about what was important than the ones she had learned in her graduate education. Her teacher colleagues were focusing on grammar exercises and paragraph writing with no emphasis on academic writing, critical thinking, or expressing one's voice. She felt frustrated because she wanted to "empower students" by giving them opportunities to write more academic papers. She even gathered colleagues and conducted action research studies to prove her point; but in the end, she felt that her ideas "were just ideas on papers." The reason for her discouragement was her supervisors' position: when Dr. T proposed research plans or changes in teaching focus, these supervisors replied that the curriculum did not allow enough time for such methodology. They pressured her to abandon her other plans and to focus on grammar, language, and paragraph forms in her writing classes. As a result, although she strongly believed in helping students to write more academically, think critically, and express their own voices, she succumbed to administrative pressure to teach the restricted curriculum.

Reflecting on her educational and professional experiences, Dr. T. said she was pleased to have learned to connect herself to her papers by viewing things in a variety of ways, expressing her own ideas comfortably, and bringing her assumptions, beliefs, values, and expectations into her Ph.D. and publishing. She was also pleased that the voice she found academically enriched her daily life, as she felt more able to think critically about day-to-day life matters and was more comfortable expressing her opinions openly. However, she expressed regret over what little impact her ideas had on her teaching environment. Reflecting on this last

point, she came to the conclusion that the only benefit of the research she had published about her teaching situation was to "credit" herself, as she had little belief that anyone was "going to carry out our suggestions."

Dr. S's Writing Experiences and Practices

Dr. S studied both in Taiwan and the U.S. He earned a B.A. in English Literature in Taiwan, an M.A. in TESOL and a Ph.D. in Education in the U.S. Dr. S pointed out that her prior writing instruction in Taiwan had shaped her thoughts about academic writing and her writing strategies. In her B.A. program she explained that her writing instruction was composed of grammar translation, practice of grammar rules, translation exercises, imitating paragraph models, and writing paragraph-length personal narratives.

As a result of the writing instruction she received in her undergraduate program in Taiwan, she felt she "did not have clue how to write academically" in her graduate program. She explained that her early grammar and imitation work had not prepared her to use academic language, nor had her writing of short narratives prepared her to write in the genres or follow the APA conventions required in graduate school. She specifically spoke extensively about having trouble with literature reviews.

As she moved through her doctoral program, however, she felt she felt she had grown in many of these areas, albeit not all. She had, for example, confidently moved beyond focusing on grammar and gained a command of academic language--vocabulary and linguistic features (e.g. modal verbs), as well as adjusting to the use of APA format. She also felt she had moved beyond imitation and learned to synthesize ideas as she wrote the literature review for her dissertation. While discussing her literature review, she also explained she felt she had gained confidence, as

she was able to include other scholars' work with her own to persuade her readers of her arguments.

Reflecting on her academic writing experiences, Dr. S was pleased that she had improved in many areas, but she had come to believe that there were several areas of good writing that she had yet to master. Although she was pleased that she had learned to synthesize her ideas with those of others, she felt she had not reached a point she could express critical thoughts, exercise much individual creativity, or express her own voice by taking a strong position in her papers. Another area she had trouble with was audience analysis. Specifically, she had trouble deciding which journals would be appropriate for her to submit papers to in her research domain.

Dr. H's Writing Experiences and Practices

Dr. H. studied both in Taiwan and the U.S. He completed a B.A. in history in Taiwan, and an M.A. in TESOL and a Ph.D. in Education in the United States. Looking back at her undergraduate preparation in Taiwan, Dr. H explained that she had not obtained any practice with academic writing in college in Taiwan, and she knew her writing skills still lagged behind the requirements of the graduate program; so she attended a six-month ESL class before attempting to take content courses at the graduate level in the U.S. In this class, she received rudimentary writing instruction in summarizing, paraphrasing, paragraph writing, and essay writing that often involved mimicking models.

Once in the M.A. program, Dr. H continued to use imitation as a strategy. She imitated syntax, sentence structure, and rhetorical format from articles and cited scholars' words, and she also followed the views and ideologies expressed in the writing of other scholars. Even though she did not like to cite references all the time, she explained that she felt she had no choice,

because “having my own voice or ideas is difficult and impossible for me.” Dr. H explained that her professors’ response to her writing also frustrated her:

> I did not receive any help from my [M.A.] professors because they thought I was supposed to be an independent learner and . . . qualified for graduate study. I disagreed . . . . Not all international students have the same educational background as native speakers; we need to be taught explicitly. However, my professors did not give me any positive or constructive feedback to improve my writing or teach me how to write. [As a result,] I wrote all papers by myself because I had found my own way [imitation] to survive at this program.

Originally frustrated with the lack of help, Dr. H reported that after a year of graduate study, she no longer anticipated feedback from her professors and opted instead to simply continue to mimic others’ work, giving up any hope of learning to write academically or gain any authority in her writing. In fact, reflecting on her completion of her M.A., she reported, “I [did] not have enough confidence to argue my points, so I borrow[ed] voices from famous scholars instead.”

Upon embarking on her Ph.D., Dr. H. reported that she was still mimicking others’ works, and that she had finally come to the conclusion that it is not important to position herself as an authoritative scholar who expresses her own ideas and voice. However, during the process of imitation, Dr. H explained she found she had learned to use many linguistic forms, words, phrases, and complex sentences, which helped her to successfully complete her dissertation.

Reflecting on her return to Taiwan after finishing her Ph.D., she felt that the main source of her writing improvement had been in the area of linguistic forms, language use, and sentence structures. However, her limited language ability still impeded her ability to express her creative

ideas and voice, something she identified as a cause of her limited success in publishing in her field. She also attributed her limited success in publishing to her belief that readers do not view L2 writers works as authoritative.

Dr. H also explained that she had become dissatisfied with Taiwanese tertiary education practices where teachers choose to teach grammar instead of academic writing because "they don't know anything about writing" and have little pedagogical knowledge about "L2 writing teaching"; for example, local teachers never think about drawing on "students' cultural [background] to motivate them to write"; moreover, they do not realize that "writing is a kind of talent that requires practice" (rather than grammar instruction), and if L2 writers could put more effort into finding their critical or thinking voice when they write, they might "gain confidence" in their writing.

Dr. W's writing Experiences and Practices

Dr. W studied both in Taiwan and the U.S. He earned a B.A. in biology in Taiwan and an M.A. in biology as well as a Ph.D. in Composition and TESOL in the U.S. Because Dr. W's B.A. was in biology, he reported that he had been reading English textbooks and writing papers in English since he began college. Drawing on these experiences, Dr. W explained that he felt he did not have any problems meeting the requirements for writing in his M.A. program in biology, especially in terms of the format required when writing quantitative papers. The reason, he explained, was that the format required in his M.A. program was similar to that required in his B.A. program: a "literature review, report collected data, and discussion."

Drawing on his background in biology, Dr. W reported that he similarly had few troubles with the format required in the course papers for his Composition and TESOL Ph.D. program: "I had no problem to connect two disciplines [biology and TESOL]." When Dr. W reached the

dissertation stage of his doctoral program, however, he found he had more difficulty. He found that his past experiences of synthesizing and summarizing data helped him to write the literature review portion of the paper, and his past experience with quantitative research methods helped him with the quantitative portion of his dissertation. However, his dissertation involved a mixed-method design which used both quantitative and qualitative instruments, and he felt unprepared for the qualitative portion of the paper:

> I like to use number as data to prove my arguments. [This method] shows everything in terms of being significant or not in studies. If I interpret collected data by myself, I cannot avoid the bias as a human being. I may be too subjective to coding data.

Dr. W also reported he had trouble including his voice in his dissertation. He reported he was used to not expressing his own voice, preferring to use an impersonal style that did not have an "I" in his papers:

> There are no "I," "You," "We" in my life . . . . I don't like to use them. Having personal voice or ideas is not an important issue in my writing. My authority . . . com[es from] the credible sources I cite and "the truth and evidence . . . I report" to "support my critical views.

Dr. W further elaborated on his apprehension about expressing his own voice, saying this feeling stemmed from the fear that if he wrote in a personal style, he would invite criticism and judgment from his readers: "The more ideas you have, the more criticism they will have."

Nevertheless, despite Dr. W's preference for an impersonal style and difficulty reporting qualitative data, he was, with the help of his advisor, able to adapt and complete the qualitative part of his dissertation. In fact, he attributed much of his success in writing his dissertation to the tight connection he developed with his advisor, meeting with him twice per month to discuss

and negotiate meanings in his paper. These meetings also helped to solve problems he had when his advisor and readers asked for different sorts of revisions.

Another area Dr. W's meetings with his advisor helped with was language. Despite Dr. W's feeling that his authority came from his ability to cite credible sources and "report compelling data," he felt his tendency to simply translate Chinese into English rather than having a stronger command of English detracted from his effectiveness as a writer.

Reflecting on his dissertation and postgraduate aspirations, Dr. W maintained that although he had used other strategies to get through his dissertation, his feelings on his authority and voice had not changed:

> Even though I have not published yet, I do not need a personal voice in my papers. I still believe that my ideas and claims must be supported by evidence and argument, and the sources of all ideas and data must be acknowledged. Without it, I have no academic voice.

In a closing statement, Dr. W also expressed a fear that his identity as an L2 writer would restrict his ability to publish because he felt readers would not recognize the authority of an L2 writer's work.

Thematic Analysis

In this segment, I present eight sections where I describe the themes that emerged while analyzing the data from the interviews, beyond the basic narratives presented above: (1) Genre Learning and Writing Pedagogies, (2) Narrative Writing and Voice, (3) Awareness of Genre Teaching in Taiwan, (4) Awareness of Linguistic Features, (5) Defining L2 Writers' Authority, Reader Relationship, (6) Awareness of Readers' Expectations in Disciplinary Communities, (7) Keeping Writers' Voice: Negotiation, (8) Taiwanese mature L2 Writers' Professional Needs.

Genre Learning and Writing Pedagogies

Of the nine participants, eight (all but Dr. W) claimed that they had encountered difficulties in their disciplinary communities. Therefore, it is important to elaborate on this issue in relation to their educational background and the writing pedagogies prevalent in Taiwan. In addressing the issue of writing styles, all nine participants said that there was a lack of academic writing experience and practices in Taiwan. Dr. A said that "I only [knew] how to write email, stories, short essays and autobiographies before entering my master's study in the U.S." because "these are types of genres taught in high school or in universities" in Taiwan. Due to educational policies in Taiwan, teaching academic writing is not prioritized in writing classes in either high schools or universities. Dr. A elaborated on this point:

> In Taiwan, the test-oriented teaching pedagogy was emphasized in composition classes. Therefore, as you know, we were always given the topic of our essay writing in the prompt, memorized model sentences and wrote a summary after we finished reading a book. These English writing practices were adopted by many senior high school and university teachers…There were not many teachers know who knew to teach academic writing when I was at the university.

Drs. H, T and S even pointed out directly that they had no experience with writing academically in Taiwan. No matter what disciplinary communities students were in, "writing teachers only focused on paragraph writing, essay writing, narrative writing, grammar exercises and so forth, but on nothing related to the development of academic writing or on cognitive development." (Dr. T). Dr. S said, "I did feel that I was like a copycat because my ideas or thinking was not important. I just needed to focus on my grammar and the writing form." Dr. E added more information about this issue, saying that " there was no such practice which would

help me to think critically," and "there was no writing practice related to argumentative writing, rhetorical skills, conference proposals, article introductions, and research papers [in college writing]."

Several participants spoke of their earlier lack of awareness about written genres and styles. Dr. K commented, "I did not realize I was supposed to adopt a kind of cool response tone while writing an academic argument." Dr. H pointed out that "the idea of awareness of the variety of writing styles and language usage in different contexts had never come up in my mind." Addressing the notion of variety in genre and style, Dr. S argued that "Many L2 writers are not aware of this issue and have not had enough practice to write in various contexts or genres in Taiwan." Dr. S elaborated further:

> Due to my learning background, it is *impossible* for me to understand the importance of language usage or have the awareness of socially recognized ways of using language such as academic writing or APA form.

Judging from the interview data, none of the nine Taiwanese L2 writer participants were familiar with genre learning approaches such as ESP, SFL or NR[2] in Taiwan, because their writing styles were firmly formed in accordance with Taiwanese Educational methods which centered on examination-focused pedagogy and the traditional Grammar Translation approach. The writing principles they had learned and the writing practices they were assigned in Taiwan were not related to academic writing or to the development of their own thoughts or voice.

Narrative Writing and Voice

All participants had engaged in a limited type of genre writing practice; but these activities were insufficient to give them the sense of controlling a range of different styles. In

[2] The abbreviation of ESP (English for Specific Purposes) , SFL (System Functional Linguistics) and NR (the New Rhetoric)

particular, Drs. A, K and T brought out the issue of voice in relation to their interest in writing narrative. Their previous writing practices and their interests made them feel like writing was a kind of "express[ion] of [their] thoughts and ideas" (Dr. A). Although they were unaware of "voice" as a concept, they tended to develop an early style that was quite personal, as it focused on narrative topics that were typically personal. Even though "I did not remember if I had personal voice in my high school or college writing, I felt comfortable using this writing style" (Dr. K). Drs. A, K and T also pointed out that email writing involves an informal and casual style, like conversation, and that they preferred using this kind of writing style rather than academic writing. In a passage that addresses both informal style and directness, Dr. K elaborated on two quite distinct topics:

> I think email writing is easy. This genre is pretty relaxing; no citation, and just get your things done. Email writing is for communication. However, I did encounter one problem when I tried to email one company. The staff couldn't understand my meaning due to my writing style. This misunderstanding caused me a lot of trouble. I feel that English writing is very direct and you should just mention the most important points for your readers. Details sometimes are not necessary at all because readers may lose patience in reading.

It seems that although email writing is casual and easy for Dr. K, she still needed to learn how to write clearly using this style, and also when to use different levels, ranging from formal to informal.

Participants commented quite extensively on their comfort with informal style, often linking it with the issue of voice or authority. Dr. K, for instance, in addition to the above comment, stated that "I used lots of 'I' in email writing because it is an effective way to keep my

voice and authority." Dr. T said that "I like narrative writing because it is how I can express my feeling or voice without any imitation." Dr. T continued, saying, " I don't need to care about other scholars' voices or about using citations in my paper, just write it"; and " I feel so happy and comfortable when I can write something I want to say in my paper." These comments seem to pit informal writing against the strictures of academic writing, rather than distinguishing the quite different purposes, audiences and styles involved. Reflecting on her experience in Australia, Dr. T makes a similar point, implying that a personal voice is more "effective" than the use of sources:

> In Australia, many writing teachers value this assertion of personal authority and often exhort students to discover their own unique voice in order to achieve self-expression in their writing. It is an effective way to approach readers with your own voice and to communicate with them. They don't want to understand how much you read from books but your critical thinking or reflection from them.

From the point of view of Drs. A, K and T, we might say that writing as personal expression is the center of attention for them and is their principal goal.

In the second interview, I further explored the relationship between their interests and their academic writing. Drs. T and A talked about being in favor of qualitative research methods because of the fact that qualitative research allows the researcher more space to interpret data and to express her own individual ideas. Borrowing other scholars' voices and ideas is not using a writer's true voice, so these two participants were eager to write what they saw and heard in the world, rather than citing others' texts. On the other hand, Drs. H, W and S preferred the informal voice that they were trained to use in the quantitative research methods favored in their earlier

program of studies. They believed that only numbers could prove enough evidence to answer their research questions and give them the confidence to express their ideas.

This comparison points out the importance of prior experience, not this time in cultural terms (Taiwan versus the United States), but in terms of disciplinary training. The participants' writing voice had been cultivated within different disciplinary communities that feature different writing practices. Writing is not just for self-expression, but it is how writers construct and sustain reality, and these writers did this as members of communities, using the language of those communities and adopting the views of these communities, including positive or negative attitudes toward impersonal academic style. Of course, cultural factors played a role as well, as is clear from the previous section on pedagogical practices. And personal preferences for narrative style also play into the mix. But it is worth underscoring here the effect of the participants' chosen disciplines.

Awareness of Genre Teaching in Taiwan

Eight participants encountered the problems of lacking experience with academic writing, as well as not being familiar with the variety of written genres. However, Dr. R was the only participant who mentioned his awareness of teaching genre in his own teaching in Taiwan. Addressing genre pedagogy, he said, "I have greatly paid attention to this issue since coming back from the U.S." Dr. R said that he believes that understanding genre writing is very important for L2 writers:

> Genre writing is specially related [to] style. It is very important because every reader has their own expectation while reading papers. If you are following the rule or format, you will have a more effective way to communicate with your readers. If you use narrative genre to develop your argument or problem-solving, you will confuse your readers a lot.

> They won't anticipate this kind of writing style and format. I think many Taiwanese students do not have this kind of genre practice in school, so they have a great deal of difficulty when they enter the western culture education system.

From Dr. R's point of view, he expressed concern that school genre teaching should have increasingly stressed the need to situate writing with respect to the audiences and contexts for which it is produced. Although, like other participants, Dr. R acknowledged that genre awareness is not commonly featured in Taiwan, he was optimistic about his own development in this area, which he attributed in large measure to his teaching experience:

> My self-consciousness with selecting words or format with different genres is increasing because of my teaching experiences in Taiwan rather than from my overseas learning experiences. This awareness has already become internalized in my life and affects my teaching career. I have been applying genre teaching to increase students' awareness of language use in various contexts in my writing classes.

Dr. R. emphasized the importance of applying teaching genre in Taiwan. Elaborating on this point, Dr. R indicated that "the more learners become familiar with the genres and expectations of their target communities, the greater the accumulated store of experiences they can draw on to meet those expectations." Making a similar point more directly from a critical point of view, Dr. E argued that many "Taiwanese composition teachers were focusing exclusively on formal features of texts as a measure of writing competence," and that they ignored the concept of how texts are the writer's response to a particular communicative setting. Drs. R and E suggested that it is important to help students understand the way language is linked to contexts and how it varies from one context to another through patterns of lexico-grammatical and rhetorical features. Summarizing this point, Dr. R concluded that "teaching

genre involves increasing the learners' awareness of the conventions of writing," which can help students produce texts that are well-formed and appropriate to readers.

Awareness of Linguistic Features

A related issue that emerged from the interview data was the participants' awareness of the usage of linguistic features and forms. Dr. T provided a specific example where sensitivity to linguistic form correlated with a writer's goal (here, of expressing humility):

> [On the one hand]I like to express my personal ideas in my papers; but I don't use strong voice [in my academic writing]….because one of my professor asked [me] to be humble and modest since I am still a student researcher. Therefore, I especially pay attention to selecting modal auxiliary verbs such as 'would, should and could' to balance my voice or to weaken stress [i.e. emphasis]. I express opinion judgments, features, and intentions with an objective voice. I do care about my selected linguistic features based on my writing genres because I think that using vocabulary words properly can help me to modify my voice and express my meaning more precisely.

Since teaching grammar is a major pedagogical goal in Taiwan, many L2 writing teachers teach the usage of modal forms explicitly in class. In fact, Dr. S said that "many writing exercises were related to modal forms" so she felt it was fair to say that "selecting modal forms or using uncertain words to modify a writers' voice is [a] common writing [skill] for Taiwanese writers to have." Dr. C also referred to her choice of modal words in the discussion and conclusion sections of her text; she felt that the use of these forms constituted a tool for leading readers to understand her points without feeling pressure from her as the writer/researcher. Drs. W, S and K also agreed with this point, and said they were careful to use modal words, especially in academic writing, to hide uncertainty and under-confident statements. Except for

modal words, all participants were aware of the issue of the first person singular and plural pronouns when they wrote. During the interview, only three participants, Drs. R, H and W, did not mention their awareness of using modal words in their papers. This matter of usage relates to issues including authority, confidence and voice more generally; these will be discussed further in chapter six.

Being Members of the Disciplinary/Academic Community

Every writer has to balance her desire to foster a strong individual voice with the demands of the larger community to which she belongs; for this reason, I spoke with participants about their sense of community. When I asked participants about their attitudes toward being members of the academic community, some had a strong motivation to be part of their disciplinary communities and some lacked confidence to step into this role. Drs. R, E and C were motivated to step into and to be a member of the academic community. Dr. R spoke enthusiastically about the benefits of joining the academic community, but at the same time he cited the restrictions he felt this placed on one's freedom:

> I do really like to understand what people know in the context, and what people know about the world, what they know about each other, and what people know about what they have been saying. It's interesting because the communities you are entering provide a principal way of understanding how meaning is produced in interaction…[However]in order to position yourself in academic worlds, you have to know that these community conventions will restrict what you can say and how they will and authorize the writer as someone competent to say it. It's the political and power issues that I really don't like.

Dr. E also emphasized the importance of interacting with community members. Although her statement is phrased more positively, however, Dr. E also speaks of constraints, in that she

feels that her choice of language and topic, as well as her voice, must be modified to fit into the prevailing set of values in the community.

> I believe that when I am in engaging with others in a community, I shared in the beliefs or values with them. For example, we have to understand what is interesting or worth discussing in this community. What is the language choice they align themselves with? Or what has been said before? Definitely, I am eager to be part of my academic community so I carefully select topics, forms, and language and research methodology to reach their [community members'] needs. I try to find out interests and generate topics that concern them the most to gain a slight better chance to talk with them. My voice and ideas have to be modified and built up based on other scholars. It's socially constructed rather than from individuals.

Thus, participants felt that it is very important for L2 writers to be members of disciplinary communities, but it is not easy to keep or present their voice within such a community. Those who felt overall positive about membership tended to feel they can accept the restrictions involved. For instance, Dr. C claimed that "keeping my own voice or self-representation in the text is not top priority in the academic writing I am concerned with." Dr. C's idea echoed Dr. R's and Dr. E's opinions about adjusting their writing to fit the context of the academic community. These scholars understand that the community seeks to offer a framework, and so it sets guidelines on how writers position themselves with and understand others. These act as a means of accounting for communicative success. Others also expressed similar ideas. Dr. A said that "L2 writers still have to process and learn how to write within the norms particular to given disciplines…It's important to comprehend the text, forms, styles, people accept in order to find an effective norm for communication."

The participants' understanding of writing in or being a member of the disciplinary community was not only formed in Taiwan, but was slowly developed during their study in the US. Dr. R gave the example of learning acceptable ways of coding and reporting data in his master's and doctoral programs:

> I heavily rely on number[s] to analyze my data and it's easy for me to report collected data and find out the results….however, in my doctoral study, qualitative data reports and coding categories were sort of ambiguous to me….the meaning of 'deep' data analysis and categorizing data effectively were never clearly described in my dictionary... even though I tried hard to write and present myself as a researcher or scholar, I just couldn't reach the goal and it became a big matter to me until I graduated. It's hard for me to pin down the features or points from my collected data through texts.

Given the difficulty of adjusting to the expectations of qualitative research, Dr. R did not feel, during this period, able to participate fully in the research community. As he put it, "It was not necessary for me to discuss the issues of being a member of disciplinary community at that moment." However, as a Ph.D. student, he had to try hard to overcome his reluctance with positioning himself as a member of disciplinary community; to accomplish this, he forced himself to write critically with his own voice. Even though the process of transformation was tough, he appreciated being able to be empowered by and to explore his inner voice.

In contrast, Drs. K, H and W felt that there was no particular need for them to have the intention of being a member of community. They felt that perceptions in this area were a matter of how individual writers understood the community they belonged to and how much power they had in order to enter these social groups. Drs. E (in spite of her enthusiasm for membership) and C also agreed on this point, at least to some extent: they felt that L2 writers' intention to become

community members was less important than their understanding the conventions of the community in advance. They had to understand the requirements constructed in order to survive in the community.

As noted above, even those who felt positive about membership acknowledged limitations, and spoke of the difficulty of achieving membership. Dr. E explained:

> Maybe I can say that I was not familiar with the conventions and expectations from the community at the beginning stage of my dissertation. Therefore, I had terrible difficulty writing and surviving there [in the disciplinary community]. I managed with what I read from the articles and what I learned from my colleagues…I have been trying to position myself within the apparently natural borders of my community through learning to control the legitimate forms of discourse.

Dr. E feels that L2 writers should follow legitimate forms of discourse in their disciplinary communities as the first step in stepping into them. However, Dr. E went through the same situation as Dr. R in terms of not being able to have a clear understanding of the conventions or the culture of the disciplinary communities at the beginning of her Ph.D. study. In contrast, Drs. H, K and W seemed neither to understand the ideas of community nor to be aware of their position in their disciplinary communities. Judging from their interview data, it can be assumed that they have difficulty positioning themselves textually in terms of aspects such as subjectivity, authority, authorship and reflectivity.

Defining L2 Writers' Authority, Reader Relationship

The issue of L2 writers' authority emerged from the interview data, based on comments that the nine participants mentioned. I will discuss these under two headings, which I call "Confidence" and" Authority in Voice." As with other aspects of the data for this study, these

do not represent hard-and-fast categories; however, I have identified these headings as useful working codes for the data to be presented here.

Confidence

In this section, I will discuss a cluster of five sub-themes that can be grouped under the umbrella theme of "confidence," as they represent the ways in which the participants seemed to develop, or want to develop, their sense of confidence. The first four areas are ways in which the participants felt that their confidence could be built: imitation; feedback (including editor feedback) ability to meet the demands of the disciplinary community; and quality of sources. The fifth and last subsection here addresses the notion of power, which is included here because of my sense that empowerment is closely related to confidence.

The participants did feel a sense of authority coming from their confidence in controlling their texts and understanding the conventions of their disciplinary communities. However, when I asked them about the writing strategies they used in controlling their texts, Drs. C, K, H, S and W specifically pointed out the skill of imitation rather than innovation or personal control, while writing both in Taiwan or in the United States. Addressing the issue of confidence, Dr. C said that, "after reading an article, I write the abstract for the article and imitate some sentence structures and practice them." In a longer response regarding confidence, Dr. K stated that

> I think I achieve a great benefit through imitation. When I read someone's works and I can imitate their works successfully, I gain more confidence...This stage is very important for L2 writers. Just like learning how to speak, you need to mimic others' use of tone, words, intonation, gesture, body language, and so forth. I can read one author's works and analyze his/her writing styles, format, and language usage within a short period of

time. Then I can learn how to write based on his/her writing style. This cannot [happen] by only analyzing their written pieces, but instead through reading.

Drs. C and K commended the skill of imitation they used in their writing to gain confidence; however, they made no reference to factors directly related to developing their own voice. That is, according to them, whether L2 writers are able to maintain authority in their texts seems heavily dependent on their skillful use of imitation as a developmental strategy. As a variant of this response, Dr. A pointed out her strategy of analyzing syntactic forms and linguistic features from good writers or scholars.

Addressing another issue regarding confidence, Drs. K and H indicated the problem of misinterpretation while reading English writings by other scholars, which kept them from expressing their ideas confidently. Dr. K only felt fully safe while using quotations; as she phrased it, "I do not worry about quotations but I really worry about my misinterpretation…I have no confidence in [my own interpretations] [because] I am not sure if my writing is appropriately expressing the author's ideas or not." On a related note, Dr. K seemed scared of not being able to offer an original insight or interpretation, since she felt she could only simply restate others' ideas and views. Since her confidence in restating these views was already weak, these two areas (accurate citation and original expression) both combined to undermine her sense of confidence in her writing.

A second idea related to confidence comes from the more social aspect of interaction with editors. Dr. C spoke of the importance of having positive feedback, whether from readers or from editors:

Writers can read, write, or practice some writing skills; but they need someone to interact with them and give them some feedback, advice or to give them a right direction for

research goals. It's a sort of social interaction and social construction. If I can have feedback from my readers, it will help me increase my confidence in writing papers and to control my texts in some ways. More directly, these editors' comments will show more or less the readability of my writing, which is how I keep my authority.

Dr. R. also supported Dr. C's idea, and he especially mentioned the issue of providing positive feedback for L2 novice writers and encouraging them in conducting research. The more they gain confidence, the more they can increase their awareness and manage their texts. Consequently, they can increasingly express a sense of authority in the texts they write. The more general theme of the relationship between writers and readers will be discussed in the upcoming section.

The third concept related to confidence that the participants addressed involved the ability to write for the conventions of the disciplinary community; this topic overlaps with one discussed earlier in this chapter. Drs. C, W and E all agreed that L2 writers needed to be familiar with the genres or conventions of their disciplinary community in order to write with authority. Dr. C's comment, referring to "previous studies," relates to this factor: "If I can prove that the result I found is different from previous studies and findings, I will have more confidence to state my points in my paper."

Other participants referred more indirectly to their research community, stressing facts like "truth" and adequate support for their claims. The interaction between these related concepts is probably quite complex. For instance, Dr. W said that "authority is coming from the truth and evidence"; however, she continued, "I do not have any power to have my authority in my papers even though I have evidence; I just try to report the truth."

Dr. E also remarked on a similar idea, but with greater certainty that truth or authority can be clearly established by evidence. Note especially Dr. E's claim that she "cannot say anything" based on her own viewpoint, but that some objective standard of evidence must be the deciding factor in judging her work:

> My authority came from my evidence or data to prove what I said. I cannot say anything based on what I want to say. To prove the teaching plan which I designed is valuable and effective, I had to examine students' midterm and finals to demonstrate their progress and had to use a survey to understand students' attitudes toward my designed course…. My authority is coming from the evidence and data I collected…Your evidence can keep your authority solidly and your words more powerful.

Dr. E added another point in relation to the ability to controlling linguistic features in the disciplinary community; although this topic has been covered in a previous section, it is worth repeating here. Dr. E made a substantive point when she seemed to claim that, if writers can use sophisticated terms and words effectively in their disciplinary communities, they can maintain their authority in texts. As she stated it herself, "[Y]ou use certain words, phrases, terms to show your position or identity in your social groups."

The fourth idea generated was in relation to good background resources. The participants felt that providing enough good background resources was another way to build a sense of authority. They felt that this background support helped them in terms of understanding content knowledge as well as having conversations with other scholars. For some, this was a difficult goal to meet. Dr. A expressed particular difficulty in covering background sources in her course papers and in her dissertation. In academic writing, she felt that writing the literature review was

the most difficult part of any paper. She expressed uncertainty about her ability to cover and synthesize sources effectively:

> The concept of dialogue should be understood and applied while writing the literature review. There is a certain type of dialogue achieved through-- more negotiation with others. I had to talk with scholars or build a scholarship with these people….However, I couldn't make sure if my statements were right or wrong and if my ideas were constructive or not. In order to make sure of my ideas, I needed to read lots of books and synthesize all ideas into my writing (Dr. A).

Dr. S stated that writers could gain their credibility through literature review; more specifically, the participants felt that writers can keep their authority through persuasive dialogue with scholars. The nine participants all credited the importance of displaying knowledge to keep writerly authority in texts, and they believed that displaying their content knowledge to other scholars was essential for academic writing.

Power in Writing

It is worth including here a topic that is related to confidence; even though it does not name a factor or strategy that the participants felt they could use to build confidence. The concept in question is power, or empowerment. The concept of power is always a crucial issue to discuss in relation to negotiation, authority or publication in academic writing. Empowering students or writers to write gives them more space to generate their thoughts and to improve their confidence, as well as to nurture creativity.

The participants spoke of empowerment in terms of their developing scholarly identities. However, they noted that political issues need to be considered while depicting any writer's potential for empowerment. Dr. K expressed some skepticism about being recognized by the

scholarly community, due to her own minimal standing among those who hold power in the established hierarchy:

> Do you think that anyone will empower you as a student researcher? If I were Rebecca Oxford, I would care about my authority in the paper. Since I am not a big person, it is not necessary to consider the issue of power or authority.

Dr. K follows this with a deprecating remark about her own contribution: "Also, I didn't study hard and put effort into this study so how can I have my authority." However, in context, it is possible to speculate that her worry about standing in the community might have undermined her estimation of value in her own work.

Dr. W presents an equally pessimistic view of her ability to be recognized as a scholar. Her view is particularly striking, since she seems to suggest that a novice scholar ought to present as few ideas as possible, so as to avoid provoking negative criticism by those whose voices have weight in the community:

> I think that presenting my authority is not necessary because I will be judged and questioned by other readers. The more ideas you have, the more criticism they will have. I do not have any power to keep my authority either in my paper or in my academic community.

Dr. E addressed this issue of power in academic writing explicitly. Although she acknowledged that "authority came through many ways," she still felt that "it is hard for L2 [novice] writers to have power in academic community." Her ideas came from her own experience with publication, in which she felt she had to subordinate her own feelings in the context of the requirements of the broader research community:

> It's hard to negotiate with other scholars or editors because of their social stature and reputation. Keeping my authority is very important but it won't be the major part of my research paper because sometimes I have to modify my voice and negotiate my ideas with editors to reach the final agreement. Even though I was affirmative about my findings and statement based on my data and context, I still have to slightly adjust my voice and tone.

Dr. E and Dr. C both addressed the issue of negotiation at the metacognitive and textual level which will be discussed further in a later section. However, Drs. T and C addressed the issue of power at the pedagogical level, and for this reason they considered it not to be an important factor in composition instruction in their schools. As Dr. T pointed out, again addressing his teaching, "I am not negotiating power, but I am trying to keep my author from presenting my ideas in texts."

Authority & Voice

Dr. R was the participant who most forcefully emphasized the connection between writers' authority and voice from the individualist or expressivist perspective:

> Authority also came from my personal voice in my paper. I have my personal thoughts and ideas and it offers a new, original insight or interpretation. It's not simply used to restate others' ideas and views in order to report all data and critically analyze it. Of course, once the outcome of the result is quite persuasive, I feel more confident about it and I feel that the authority is coming from my confidence and personal voice.

However, other participants also expressed a need to be present in their writing. Dr. T, for instance, remarked that it is very important not to repeat others' voice in writing; that is, she felt that writers need to bring in their own thinking, ideas, and voice while composing their papers.

Dr. T basically agreed with Dr. R's point of view. She explained that "If I am allowed to write what I want, I think I already present my authority or voice to my readers," because "these ideas belong to me and my personal voice" (Dr. R). However, she felt that using a strong voice in academic writing is not permitted in her disciplinary community. Even thought Dr. T was very confident about her statements, she was taught to be humble and not to force readers to accept her points of view. She had to write and express her ideas in a more subdued tone. Speaking of her experience in academic writing, Dr. T said that

> I used a lot of modality words such as "would", "should", "could"; and my professor also asked us to be humble and modest since we were still student researchers. Even though you have strong confidence, compelling solid evidence, and a literature review to support your argument, you can insist on your voice in humble ways.

Drs. T and R especially had developed a kind of personal voice using humble ways to present their ideas in the discussion and recommendation sections of research papers. In contrast, Drs. A, S and E felt that they had been able to construct their authority well, either by providing extensive and scholarly knowledge or having crucial and comprehensive data. Their perspective on maintaining their authority had been formed and acquired from their prior writing practices. They brought rhetorical values, such as writing to display knowledge or writing grounded in evidential research, into their writing. At the other end of the spectrum, Drs. K, H and W seemed to lack confidence in keeping their authority in their papers because of their writing and publication experiences, which often featured rejection from publishers without supportive feedback, leading to their feelings of discouragement about their chances for further publication. They have only published a few papers in Taiwan and have yet to receive any criticism from

publishers. For an understanding of how L2 writers keep their authority in their writing, I will be returning to this discussion and analysis of these writers' texts in chapter six.

Reader Relationship

Establishing a relationship with readers is important for academic writing. More specifically, L2 writers are likely to develop an idea of how to position themselves depending upon how they view their readers or audiences. Readers always hold their own expectations and anticipations while reading and writers such as the participants in this study are aware of this from their graduate training. Based on the participants' open-ended question and interview data, the result shows three possible ways in which they might consider their readers.

Awareness of Readers' Expectations in Disciplinary Communities

Readers' Interests

In response to the open-ended question, Dr. H wrote of considering readers' interests; however, she did not provide further details related to this in her interview data. In contrast, Dr. R added more explanations in his second and third interviews regarding the issue of readers' interests. He said, "My readers are those who like to read my papers." Dr. R said that

> It is very important to understand readers' interests, ideologies, and their research domains because every reader has his/her own expectations while reading papers. It is important to write something with new, original insight or ideas for interpretation and views to attract readers' attention.

Although Dr. R used to write for his professors, he also thought about other readers who were interested in TESOL, for instance readers of journals such as the *TESOL Quarterly*. Therefore, his definition of his potential readers included *TESOL Quarterly* editors, and he wrote with the intention of making the content of his manuscripts accessible to the broad audience of

those who read the *Quarterly*, not only to specialists (i.e. researchers) in the area addressed. Addressing this issue, he said that "I have to pay attention to 'marketing' because many teachers will read *TESOL Quarterly*, including individuals who may not have a familiarity with the subject matter addressed." Therefore, he especially pointed out the importance of generating topics and content to arouse readers' interests.

A Wider Range of Reader

Another issue Dr. R remarked about was writing for a wider range of readers. If writers target a wider audience while writing, it may not be easy to clearly define the intended readers' interests or expectations. When using an open-ended question, Drs. E and C considered readers as those who were from the same academic or disciplinary communities; given this target audience, they tried to carefully lead their professional peer readers to understand their purposes, findings and opinions through using the critical, logical and creative tools available in the field. Dr. R said that "I have to follow the rule or format my readers used to use in order to have more effective communication with them." However, the diversity within the intended audience also led to the need for flexibility. As Drs. R, E and C mentioned, it may be said that L2 writers need to consider readers' interests and use a variety of approaches, which may help writers to decide how they present themselves in order to achieve effective communication. Dr. E further added more details on aiming at a wider reader relationship:

> I decide my readers while I am writing…you need to keep a wider reader relationship. If the texts qualify for submission to international journals, I analyze the journal and editor group...If the audience matches my potential readers for my paper, I can submit my work to this journal.

Even though Drs. R, E and C realized the importance of having a wider reader relationship for publication, they seem not able to target specific groups of readers before writing their texts. More specifically, they may not have a clear way to present their views so they may vary their positioning in order to communicate with different groups of target readers. Dr. E said that "I don't know if I need to have [i.e. focus on] my potential readers first or my writing first." Even though Dr. E was not sure of her readers' identity while writing (that is, she only discovered her readers later), she did point out quite emphatically that there is a huge difference in requirements between an international journal and a Taiwanese journal.

> If you want to submit to a Taiwanese journal, as long as your topic or study is new and your study is well designed in your methodology, and with proper writing format, your paper will be fine. On the other hand, if you want to submit to a foreign journal, you have to care about rhetorical issues…You must be professional and using standardized English…and second, you must have a critical literature review and have a wider readership (Dr. E).

Judging from Dr. E's statements and those of other participants, it seems that the L2 writers in this study are aware that each group of readers possesses different expectations, and that it is important to build a relationship with their readers. However, their descriptions of their imagined readers remained on the whole quite general.

Readers' Ideologies

Some participants spoke of readers' ideologies as a constraint on expressing their own voice in academic writing. Dr. R mentioned several strategies that he felt were successful in connecting with readers: these included citing readers' works, conforming to their ideological beliefs, and avoiding potential conflict with readers. Therefore, it seems that Dr. R modified his

voice in his papers based on his readers' likely positions or beliefs. However, he spoke with some resentment about feeling he needed to do this in relating his professors:

> I don't feel that [following professors' ideologies] is good or correct. I feel that I was forced to accept their ideology and give up my original voice and myself. I should insist on my ideas. For example, I am a structuralist not post-structuralism. Writing some ideas or papers regarding 'post- something' is not suitable in Taiwan and it didn't make sense to me at that time; however, in order to get a higher score, I had to write something that was not truly my own perspective.

Dr. C also added that "finding professor's ideology and their requirements is a top priority while entering graduate study. Put simply, just writing something they like." Dr. R's and Dr. C's responses revealed multiple questions related to whether L2 writers needed to write for readers or themselves. Dr. R provided one strategy personally when he was trying to express his own beliefs and make a connection with his readers. Dr. R said that

> I cited my professor's [Dr. M] works to build a link between me and my reader. As long as he saw this citation, he would give me a higher score…If you are a professional reader or editor, you might have found many contradicted [i.e. problematic] arguments in my paper. However, [Dr. M] didn't question any of my arguments because he knew what I was talking about and had the same background knowledge. Of course, it's from textbook. Dr. M is a critical person, so in order to "flatter" him or match his ideology, I had to write in this way and cite his works and ideas.

Obviously, Dr. R's writing style is substantially influenced by readers' expectations and ideologies.

Readers' Expectations in Disciplinary Communities

As noted in the previous discussion, readers always bring their expectations with them while reading papers; so if L2 writers are able to increase their awareness of their readers' expectations, they may be able to apply writing strategies that help them to meet readers' expectations. Dr. R was conscious about keeping readers' beliefs in mind when writing. Drs. E, T and K spoke of readers' expectations in terms of disciplinary communities. In particular, some reflected on ways in which their professors as readers encouraged them to freely express themselves. Drs. E and T provide examples:

> They [professors] focus on individual thinking and development. They never try to push me or impose their ideas on me; in other words, they respect students a lot and give them lots of spaces and chances to explore their own territory individually (Dr. E).
>
> When I wrote something from my own opinions or some creative ideas, I got a good grade for that paper. So, I am pretty sure that professors are looking for your personal ideas and voice (Dr. T).

On a less promising note, some cited professor reactions that they felt were negative, critical or dismissive. Dr. K's example features a professor who refused to read her work because of language problems:

> My graduate professors' expectation was 'correct grammar' and they told me that "reading a non-proofread paper is like a needle injury. Just getting a needle in your eyeball is pretty hurtful and uncomfortable." "I won't be able to read your paper before you see the tutor" in impolite way. That is, they did not want to read any paper before it has been proofread even if it is in my first draft. In addition, they were picky about my word usages or academic words, especially, in the literature review (Dr. K).

Dr. E spoke of another professor, who disapproved of the way she expressed emotions in her writing:

> It is not easy to reach every reader's expectation…Three of my dissertation committee members were interested in different research methods. I don't know whom I was supposed to listen to and how to convince others to believe me…My professor didn't like my writing because of my writing style being totally beyond his expectation [as social science]….my writing style was very sentimental, so I added lots of personal feelings or emotions in my writing. My professor told me that I need to put aside personal predilections and instead focus on art and craft if I tried to get into this community.

According to Dr. E, when she attempted to write in the "social science" style or pattern, her efforts were not appreciated by her professor. Dr. E seemed frustrated with the standards that her professor set, which she felt unable to meet: "My professor's requirements are native-like writing, well-organized, philosophical, and critical thinking." Dr. E was aware of the influence of her Taiwanese educational backgrounds on her writing. She talked about her professors' lack of sensitivity to this factor, as well as to the linguistic challenges for second language writers:

> The ways I expressed the meaning of the words or sentences was different from their [professors'] expectations or interpretations….because we were educated in the L2 context [Taiwan]. I thought the way I express the meaning is correct due to my educational background…However, my professor thought I was wrong…I just know how to use the words in simpler way. I don't think my professor was aware of the issue of diversity among international students or their educational background.

On the contrary, Dr. W was relatively unconcerned with readers' expectations. He seemed to ground himself in the conventions of his disciplinary community and in the quality of

the support he provides for his ideas: “My readers will consider claims I make in the light of the evidence.” Dr. W specially was looking for compelling and convincing evidence to support his arguments and to provide the range and currency of the sources he referred to. He concedes that readers’ expectations matter, but he did not think they should constrain his writing:

> Readers’ expectations are very important but I do not think too much about this point… I enjoyed the process of conducting research. Don’t think that your study will change anything from this world….but at least, I need to write something... Maybe nobody will need it or someone will want it. I already said what I wanted to suggest; of course, I want my readers to accept my ideas and make this world better, and that is my hope. Now it’s your [the readers’] choice if you want to pick it up or not.

Dr. T did not pay particular attention to reader’s interests, or try to convince them to accept her ideas. She had decided to express her personal voice and interests in her writing and let readers make the decision if they were interested in her views or not. As previously noted, Dr. K saw readers’ expectations largely in terms of selecting proper linguistic features and perfect grammar; as a result, she especially tried to be careful of rhetorical and language issues. Dr. T expressed a similar point; speaking of using her own voice, she said that “this does not mean that you can use language in messy way to represent your own ideas.”

Dr. E pointed out the ways she constructs texts and ideas with different audiences in mind:

> Your ideas appeal to some kinds of audiences. Under the education research domain, I have to deeply discuss educational policy and plans in Taiwan if I try to publish my paper in the international journals or in SSCI and SCI…I know what my audiences want to read and know. Therefore, I will include all ideas in my paper to get a higher percentage in order to become published. So, let your readers get your point…Each journal attracts a

> certain group of readers….Asian-TEFL is more Asian readers oriented…. [and] focused on the issues about English as second or foreign language…However, if you try to publish your papers in Taiwan, you have to pay more attention to details such as clear form and methodology, but your readers may not care about your discussion or implication.

Drs. E, C, A and R agreed that reaching the target audience for any given text is very important. Dr. E said that "L2 writers need to make their papers become a model which probably will appeal to some international readers." L2 writers modify their papers in accordance with what their readers want; in other words, they have to understand their readers' needs in advance. Dr. A's comment about one particular professor as a reader could be seen as addressing this point. In this case, she appreciated the fact that a particular faculty member had given clear and explicit directions for assignments.

> I still anticipate that professors can function as knowledge recourses because they read and do some research before the class. Why don't they just tell students explicitly about scholars' voice in order to lead students into the academic communities? Or, tell us [students] their thoughts, ideas, and perspectives of viewing things. Take ethnography class, the professor gave us guidance for each paper. How should we write and conduct the study? Everything was clear, so my writing also became well-organized and clear. I think clear guidance is correlated closely with your writing as well. Therefore, I can hit the points they want and need more easily.

From Dr. A's depiction, it is clear that she wanted to understand other scholars' expectations as she worked to enter her professional academic community.

Keeping Writers' Voice: Negotiation

As previously noted, some participants mentioned that their writer's voice could be supported by developing a strong sense of authority. However, this seems difficult for L2 writers because developing their own written voice involves negotiation, which in turn brings in power and political issues. In fact, all nine participants talked about this issue in interviews. Dr. R stated that he sometimes finds it too discouraging to try to defend his own voice: "It [the current publishing process] is not an effective way to negotiate with someone and reach some purposes. I don't feel that I will succeed or win the debate, so I usually follow others' [editors' or professors'] voices." Dr. R seemed sometimes confused about his voice; however, he also seemed to have quite a firm grasp of the interplay between his original texts and his revisions, given the negotiations that take place with publishers and reviewers:

> Everyone has a voice so you need to have your own voice. Of course, I keep my ideas and voice in my first draft and I revised and modified my voice according to my readers' comments. So, eventually your voice will be shifted and geared to somewhere in between-- your voice or others' voices. Teachers' comments and voices will shape your writing voice as well. When they put the question mark in your paper, be smart, you know you have to accept their voice and change your ideas to complement their perspective because you are not powerful and better than them…When I wrote my dissertation, I revised what my readers' said. The same person would read my papers until I get it done and published. Be smart, you have to obey their words. Obviously, they have power to control us in many ways.

Readers' power is always a matter that affects a writer's use of voice. Dr. R decided to relinquish his right to stand for his view; he felt he needed to adjust his voice so he could survive

in his professional field. It is interesting that Dr. R's published texts do contain a strong sense of voice, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

Addressing this notion of negotiation, Dr. E spoke about her struggle to negotiate with an editor whose criticisms she felt were unfair, but with whom she finally reached a middle ground:

> Even though I give up negotiating with them, I sometimes keep my own ideas or adjust my own voice if I am not certain of my statements and really want to keep my voice…One of my editors was concerned about the criticism I made which might cause other readers to be critical. However, the editors even had no concept of the environment in Taiwan. I tried to write this paper because I had a strong motivation to voice out my ideas to the academic community. What's the problem with learning literature in Taiwan? However, the editor tried to weaken my voice and modify my voice. I tried to adjust my voices twice by replacing vocabulary words and revising some sentences but I still want to keep my own ideas in this paper. Finally, we both compromised our positions and perspectives in order to reach a middle ground.

Commenting on such negotiations, Dr. E said she believes that "many writers will insist on their viewpoint but they need to listen to other's voices as well. Look broadly, listen to diverse voices, and accept others' ideas or views as not a bad thing."

Others also addressed the tension between their own voice and the demands of readers (particularly in the publishing process). For instance, Dr. T maintained a strong voice in her original drafts, before she submitted them to a journal; but she felt that she eventually gave up her voice when reviewers asked her to do so.

Power issues can arise anywhere in the writing process. Dr. K felt she had no choice but to express her ideas in the written forms required by her adviser. Although she said, "I have my

own right to write or speak in ways I like," she followed this statement with a disclaimer: "I just don't like his suggestion, but *there is no chance or space for me to negotiate*" (italics mine). Dr. W brought up a dilemma involving conflicting demands made at the dissertation level: "sometimes my chair asked me to revise and my readers asked me to revise as well in a different way. Whom should I listen to?" Dr. H remarked about the difficulty L2 writers have in expressing their own voice in the academic community, citing the issue of power as she did so: "With less power and authority, there is less chance for L2 writers to express their own voice in academic English writing."

Dr. T spoke of ways in which she could compromise, expressing her own ideas in ways that are acceptable in the academic community, for instance writing her literature review in such a way as to favor the ideas of scholars whose viewpoints she agrees with:

> There are some ways to keep my voice in my paper even though I don't like to include my thinking or thoughts in a literature review. Of course, you have your own logical thinking to link all ideas. For example, I will use one scholar who has possessed the same stance as mine and is someone to represent my voice. I will use my own voice in data analysis. I can hide my voice behind someone else. It sounds simple but I can avoid the issues of negotiation with others.

Cultural Adjustment and Taiwanese Mature L2 Writers

As the nine participants talked about their writing experiences in Taiwan and other countries, they came up with different stories related to the understandings they felt they had implicitly reached with readers from different academic communities. In particular they spoke of their development of writing and their experiences with voice after they went back to Taiwan. Speaking of his experience in the United States, Dr. R said that he appreciated his professor for

empowering him to write and giving him space to voice his ideas. Dr. R's voice development had more of an influence on his teaching than on his writing for publication. He stated that "helping students to write with their own voice is always my primary goal in writing class, so I encourage them to express themselves and to show their creativity in papers." He continued,

> I give students higher scores as long as they can express their meaning well. I don't care about their grammar; I think voice is the most important thing at this stage. Of course, [I have certain] criteria in my mind. If [they] can use self-expression well and make less grammar errors, I will give them A.

Dr. R's experience of voice development helped him to integrate the component of voice into L2 writing pedagogy in Taiwan. Meanwhile, Dr. R raised the issue of evaluating voice in L2 writing pedagogy. Dr. K and Dr. A also spoke of their teaching strategies for including the concept of voice in their writing classes. Dr. K said that "I told my students that you don't need to be perfect, but you at least need to understand what you are talking about in terms of having clear meanings, expressions, and your own voice." Dr. A spoke of the limitations that language proficiency can impose on students' attempts to develop their voice: "I give students credit if I could feel their voice when I read. However, their level of language proficiency somehow cut down their voice in texts." Drs. R, K and A believed that voice development for L2 writers is important, so they designed activities for their classes that help students in this area. However, they did not specifically point out their thoughts in connection with genre practices.

In Taiwan, not all L2 instructors have the same freedom as Drs. R and A to manage their classes' content and materials. The essential political issue of institutional control came out when Drs. R, C, T and E mentioned their school policies. In the instructional domain, they realized that the curriculum design in their institutions would not allow them to "empower students" (Dr. T)

or “give students more space to write” (Dr. C). With strictly limited time, many instructors still had to focus on grammar, language or form practice in writing classes. Commenting on this, and on the need to find approaches to foster voice development, Dr. R said that

> I try my best to boost their [students’] voice and critical thinking in the class but it won’t benefit them a lot. Neither TOEFL nor GEPT evaluate voice in their writing. I am a novice voice teaching instructor so I am still trying to figure out voice teaching approaches; at the same time, I need to persuade other teachers to believe in the value of voice in the composition classroom.

With regard to the research paradigm, too, cultural differences featured in some of the participants’ tales. Dr. T mentioned that “I lost my voice after coming back to Taiwan.” Dr. T feels that voice is important, but that the pressures of her academic community in Taiwan led to a weakening of her own voice:

> They [other colleagues] are unconsciously following some instructions and forms so they also ask me to do the same thing… now, when I try to argue with something, I will let it go because I don’t want to get in trouble. However, I do believe that critical thinking is the most important element for being an independent researcher. If not, you probably cannot conduct a study well. I am not a person belonging to a group of voiceless writers; on the contrary, I have to represent myself as a teacher and a researcher. However, my voice is gradually weakened due to school policy, limited time to write, and heavy load of teaching in school.

Dr. T’s explanation indicated that her frustration regarding the partial loss of “[her] voice” also applies to other colleagues’ voices, because as she put it, “nobody is listening to me or us.” She said that “even though our suggestions were brilliant and results were constructive from our

studies, they were just ideas on papers. Who is going to carry out our suggestions or implications?" Therefore, she felt that writing papers for publication was just another practice to "credit yourself." Dr. K also pointed out that many published writings have no effect other than to support the writer's career, and that this leads to a situation where some researchers publish revised versions of existing ideas rather than coming up with their own original content:

> Many professors or researchers are not truly conducting research. They just want to publish something in order to keep their job and position at schools. They simply duplicate some well-designed research or projects with different subjects. I do not feel something new there. I feel that they are writing something which someone has already investigated and talked about they are copying others' voices and ideas and making them there own.

Dr. R added some comments in relation to his school policy on faculty research:

> The president of my school requires us to conduct a study with mixed methods -- qualitative and quantitative methods. No matter how well-designed the methods are that you have, they are looking for only the quantitative method in your study. If the school [has] science or technology as main subjects, such as radiation, they will ask for experimental evidence for the theory or study. For sure, they will focus on the quantitative method to run data through SSPS. They also believe that statistical evidence proves an assumption. On the other hand, if the president has been educated in TESOL or has graduated from [a] humanit[ies] department, he/she will consider [i.e. accept] the qualitative research method. [But] to tell you the truth, so far, the qualitative method is still not acceptable in Taiwan.

Dr. R pointed out that such policies required a second paradigm shift for L2 writers when they returned to their teaching positions in Taiwan. They had already been required to conquer one new research paradigm due to the requirements of their disciplinary communities in the L1 context. Drs. T and R then noted that they needed to suffer through the process of adopting and adjusting to other new forms and writing styles after being back in Taiwan. This dramatic change meant changing their research methodology, positioning themselves in new ways, and adjusting their voices, among other things. Dr. R commented that "[the need to change] could be related to cultural issues instead of political issues" because "every school has its own culture of teaching or research." Dr. R explained that "even though my writing developed… a strong voice and looked powerful during my graduate writing, I believed that I had to hide my voice after coming back to Taiwan." He seemed perplexed about the issue of voice, since he posed questions directly to me such as "what is your true voice?" "Who is going to listen to you?" It seems that Dr. T and Dr. R had the same view and felt voiceless in Taiwan. This is a difficult dilemma—once again, the participants were saying that they felt they needed to either maintain their ownership of ideas and words or sacrifice their authentic voice.

Besides Dr. R's belief in the importance of increasing students' sense of voice in Taiwan's composition classes, he had a positive view of positioning his own ideas and himself in texts, and it helped him in his professional needs when he felt he had succeeded in doing so. Dr. R said that

> I was aware of keeping my voice in my paper which really helped me to adjust my tone in places where I talk about my confidence and show superiority as a writer. So I like to make my paper more personal at the beginning and try to cut down on the theoretical nature of the discussion. I feel this kind of writing style helps me to connect myself and

my readers. However, I was worried about not presenting enough theories to support my arguments and display my knowledge.

Dr. T and Dr. R added their opinions in association with the influence of having their own voice and their lives.

> I have to be capable of doing research by myself in terms of having my personal ideas and thinking because I am an independent learner and researcher now…. with critical thinking. My thinking is affected mutually in both contexts…My life was influenced by my study because I liked to talk about stories with my own voice. I didn't feel that it is wrong. I liked to talk about a story or an event from the beginning to the end but not many people have been patient enough to listen to it. Actually, many people like to hear something about cause and effect or the most important part from the result. If you are a quantitative researcher, you may not have patience to listen to me and you may ask me to tell the result or conclusion. However, talking with my own ideas, voice, and stories has become part of my life. (Dr. T).

> Stepping outside of my own academic box, I can open my heart to listen different voices and prefer to follow my professors' ideology from western culture and form. I should open my heart and mind to accept something new. I know that their ideas are quite good but these may not be able to be effective or useful in Taiwan or in a local context. Perhaps a few years later, someone will accept these ideas (Dr. R).

It could be said that Dr. R's and Dr. T's experiences with voice development have influenced the ways they think and the professional lives they lead. Due to restrictive school policies, the demands of different research paradigms or cultural issues in their institutions, Drs. R and T may be hampered in their efforts to teach voice effectively in the classroom and improve

their own professional position; however, though they realize that their professional needs are tightly connected to the context they find themselves in they still have optimistic views on the possibility of making progress, both in teaching and in their own writing.

CHAPTER SIX

TEXTUAL RESULTS

Introduction

As outlined in Chapter Three, textual documents were also included in the primary data analyzed in this study. In this chapter, I will analyze texts from each participant to understand how the writer participants seem to position themselves in their writing as they use linguistic features such as pronouns, tense, modality, adverbial modifiers, and other features referencing personal positioning. This analysis has been carried out keeping in mind the concept of metadiscourse, an approach to analyze how writers project themselves into their texts and manage their communicative intentions through the linguistic choices they make. I will explore features of discourse that these mature L2 writers use as they seek to establish a personal relationship with their readers. In the process, I will explore how linguistic features such as hedges and boosters may express the confidence level of the writer.

I will first give an overview of the texts that the participants made available for the study. In subsequent sections, selected data from these texts will be analyzed and coded based on elements that seem to convey the writers' positioning. I have looked at forms relating to different views of knowledge, different degrees of self-assurance, and indications of social relationships between the writers and the readers, as well as the writers' particular ways of projecting themselves in texts for communication. I will draw on interview data as needed, to explain the way the writers themselves explained their written choices, and to clarify relationships between texts, especially by the same writer.

The Sample of L2 Writing

Table 19 gives an overview of the written texts that were shared by the participants. All papers were collected before the interview and were discussed with participants during the second and third interviews. The second column shows the type of text examined; these included assignments from coursework and term papers, as well as published and unpublished papers. The third column shows the topic of each paper submitted by a given participant. The samples are illustrative rather than representative; in what follows, I have included quotations from interviews where this material is relevant to the samples discussed.

Table 19

Textual Documents Provided by the Participants

Participants	Text Type	Topic/ Title
Dr. E	Published paper	1. Designing and delivering and English for Hospitality syllabus: A Taiwanese case study. (2009). 2. Tea or coffee: a study of the beverage choice pattern and its affecting factors at teatime in Kaohsiung, Taiwan.
Dr. C	Published paper	1. Exploring the listening comprehension processes of Chinese EFL College students: listening problems, responding strategies and optimum instructional procedures. (2004) 2. Blending video films with novels to enhance EFL college students' English communicative competence: From the views of cognitive learning and communicative language teaching. (2005). 3. Revealing the myth of the black box- the strategic patterns of the reading comprehension process in successful and unsuccessful EFL readers: a case study. (2008).
Dr. R	Term paper Term Paper	1. A literacy autobiography of a[n] L2 English Learner: where is the End of the Tunnel? 2. A semiotic analysis of the UNESCO, world bank and IMF's language literacy ideology: Engaging the third world countries in a deadly liaison

Dr. K	Unpublished paper	1.Differences in English language learning between intrinsically and extrinsically motivated groups of humanities and science engineering high school students (II): A qualitative study
	Published paper	2. Differences in English language learning between intrinsically and extrinsically motivated groups of humanities and science engineering high school students (I): Quantitative studies
Dr. A	Assignment	1. Random observation- 5 days random observations at the space in front of library
	Assignment	2. Participant observation at Goodwill store
	Published paper	3. Significance of native language background in idiom comprehension
Dr. T	Published paper	1. An investigation on the use of ICT in constructing classroom culture of learning in elementary English language classroom in Taiwan
Dr. S	Published paper1	1. A new perspective on the goals of TEFL in Taiwan: Communicative language teaching
	Published paper2	2. Technology and learning English
Dr. H	Published paper	1. 台灣技專院校非傳統學生(周末在職進修專班學生) 的英文學習策略之討論 *Taiwanese nontraditional students' use of English learning strategies*
Dr. W	Assignment	1. SDAIE Classroom
	Research paper	2. A comparative analysis of foreign student needs in Taiwan

---

In the following sections, I will present and discuss selected sample excerpts which can be associated with the three types of writer positioning identified by Ivanic and Camps (2001): ideational, interpersonal, and textual. However, as noted in Chapters 2 and 3 (literature review and methodology), these categories do not serve to classify particular textual features unambiguously; for instance, the use of first person pronouns can be classified under two of their

three headings. As a result, in order to have a clear presentational framework, rather than presenting the samples directly under these headings, I will present them according to linguistic categories, or under classifications that I have devised as umbrella terms to designate a set of linguistic terms. Specifically, the five headings used to organize the data in this chapter will be as follows: 1) Terms referring to Knowledge or Confidence; 2) Strong Phrases and Adjectives; 3) First Personal Pronouns (I and We); 4) Modals, Hedges and Related Forms; 5) Cohesive Lexis.

However, before moving on to discuss the specific examples from texts under the headings just given, it is useful here to present again the three types of positioning identified by Ivanic and Camps. Even though these will not be the guiding principle for what follows, they provide a set of insightful interpretive notions that will be referenced in discussing the textual examples.

Different Types of Writer Positioning

Ivanic and Camps (2001) identify three types of writer positioning: *ideational*, *interpersonal*, and *textual*, which correspond to the three macro-functions of language as proposed by Halliday (1985) as summarized in Table 1. These categories are relevant for understanding the data presented here, although I have organized the chapter according to categories that more directly reflect linguistic features in the texts. One might view Ivanic and Camps' system as appropriate to understanding what writers do with linguistic features, rather than as a system for tagging linguistic features according to their function.

Ivanic and Camps' *ideational* positioning is concerned with "representation," that is, talking or writing about something—the ideas, content, subject matter, and story conveyed by language. The *interpersonal* meaning of language is concerned with "interacting": talking or writing between interlocutors—expressing the self and influencing others. Their *textual* category

is concerned with *text creating* or talking and/or writing to shape a text (Ivanic and Camps, 2001).

Table 1

Three Types of Position Related to Halliday's Macrofunctions of Language

Position	In Relation to	Linguistic Realizations
Ideational	Views of knowledge-making	Verb tense, verb type, first person reference
	Different stances towards topic: value, beliefs and preferences.	Classificatory lexis, syntactic choice
Interpersonal	Different degrees of self-assurance and certainty	Modality, first person reference
	Different power relationships between the writer and the reader.	first person reference
Textual	Different views of how a written text should be constructed	Noun phrase length, linking devices, semiotic mode.

As noted earlier, Ivanic and Camps' framework is useful for conceptualizing and interpreting the relevance of the linguistic features selected for review in this chapter. In what follows, I will return to the five categories used to present the data.

Terms Referring to Knowledge or Confidence

There are many ways to interpret writers' knowledge-making in texts. Some writers will express their knowledge explicitly (as with the theoretical understanding of a subject), while others show their expertise more implicitly. Knowledge is subjective and situated in local experience; and texts related to knowledge exhibit a variety of features; these include present tense verbs to express universal truths and stative verb meaning, and what Halliday (1994) calls "relational processes", such as forms of the verb *to be*, *have*, and *appear* to present indisputable facts. In addition, this type of writing uses verbs to express writers' opinions or knowledge with

wording such as *say, tell,* and *argue*. It is very important to understand how mature L2 writers express themselves in this ideational dimension, as the strategies they use here help provide readers with an idea of the writer's presence, for instance in terms of his or her confidence.

Basically, in this section I will categorize relevant examples into two groups: explicit and implicit reference to knowledge. I have attempted to understand the linguistic features found in the texts, partly by making reference to Ivanic and Camps' framework (2001) in my interpretive remarks about these excerpts.

The first category discussed here deals with explicit knowledge making. The first four excerpts here are drawn from two published papers by Dr. E:

Example 1A: From Dr. E's published paper 1

> *It is generally thought* that there are three approaches to ESP syllabus design, which are language-centered, skills-centered and learning-centered.

Example 1B: From Dr. E's published paper 1

> As content-based ESP instruction is *justifiably* promising in ELT, an urge, as a result, to stress the importance of ESP courses *has been put forward* in Taiwan.

Example 1C: From Dr. E's published paper 3

> *Scientific research is now providing* that tea is effective in a variety of health conditions owing to Polyphones which *are* the antioxidants present in tea (Chen et al., 2003). Tea *has* an effect on hypertension, circulation, cholesterol, diabetes, the brain, strokes, the kidneys and the skin, because of its antioxidants, anti-inflammatory, anti-viral and anti-bacterial qualities (Harra, 2001).

Example 1D: From Dr. E's published paper 3

> Despite the veracity and variances of the legends, *the fact is* that the Chinese have enjoyed tea for centuries. Drinking tea has embodied the elevation and cultivation of human body, spirit, and mind. The nobility considered the consumption of good tea as a reflection of their social status. The common people simply enjoyed its flavor and the culture it represented and permeated in life.

In example 1A, Dr. E uses the phrase *It is generally thought* to express that the categorization she presents is accepted by most people, and at the same time to imply that it is supported by common sense. Later, in Example 1B, which also reports on general knowledge with the phrase *has been put forward,* Dr. E uses the adverbial form *justifiably* to express her own personal confidence in the claim she is relating. This practice comes under Ivanic and Camps' notion of *lexis,* or word choice. In using this form, she displays her ability to confidently assess claims about what is of importance in ESP courses in Taiwan. In example 1C, Dr. E again shows a comfortable familiarity with research on her chosen topic, as she introduced an idea with the phrase *Scientific research is now providing [*i.e. *proving;* possibly a typo if she originally intended to say *providing evidence…].*

Even though Dr. E expresses her knowledge and understanding clearly in these excerpts, it is worth noting that, with the exception of the term *justifiably,* which presents a personal assessment, it is reasonable to say that the other phrases cited express familiarity with scholarly research and opinion, rather than personal judgment on that research. Given examples such as these, we might tentatively say that Dr. E may be basing her certainty on her sources rather than on her own judgment. In other words, she may build her theoretical understanding by relying on scientific research or related sources.

In example 1D, Dr. E confidently uses the noun phrase head (*the) fact,* directly presenting an indisputable situation that has been recognized as common sense—that the Chinese have enjoyed tea for centuries. Dr. E is clearly expressing certainty and understanding related to this subject based on her cultural background and her familiarity with the Chinese historical experience with tea. Of course, again this is a matter of relying on an outside source, this time

the historical record in Chinese culture. Addressing this example, Dr. E further explained in her interview that

> This is a common-sense knowledge or statement because a majority of Chinese people accept it as truth. Therefore, I am confident in what I said and expressed my point here. Some phrases I use such as *the fact is that*, *in fact* or *its truth* to express the truth. I think it is very important to elaborate content knowledge if I want to identify myself as a knowledgeable person and professional in my field. However, I have never thought about other ways to present my view of knowledge.

In example 1E, Dr. C uses the impersonal expression *it is safe to suggest* to introduce her viewpoint, suggesting that this viewpoint is reasonable, and thus expressing a judgment:

> *Example 1E:* From Dr. C's published paper 1
>
> The [sic][3] from students' protocols revealed that comprehension process is not static at all…*It is safe to suggest* for language teacher to teach student those strategies frequently in order to help students improve their comprehension ability. Language teachers *are* also *encouraged* to design their listening courses as well as teaching techniques to meet students' linguistic competence.

The next four examples show places where the participants characterize some definition, belief or idea that is current in professional circles. In example 1F, Dr. T confidently asserts her knowledge of a technical definition, using the term *covers:* In excerpt 1G, Dr. T reliably represents scholarly work with the phrase *have indicated,* as contrasted with the phrase *was considered*, used to report a general belief. In excerpt 1H, Dr. T likewise confidently offers a definition, saying that the phrase cited *is now used more widely* and *has replaced* its earlier

[3] As far as possible, the excerpts from these texts have been kept in their original form; only minimal adjustments have been made, in square brackets, for the sake of making a given excerpt more understandable to readers.

counterpart. Finally, in example 1I, Dr. T again cites a general fact about his field, using the form *it is recognized that.*

Example 1F: From Dr. T's published paper 1

ICT *covers* a wide range of elements: computer workstations and display facilities; specialist hardware; software;

Example 1G: From Dr. T's published paper 1

Paulston and Bruder (1976) *have indicated* that "the lack of knowledge on a theoretical level influences our knowledge of what and how to teach our students in comprehending the spoken language" (p.296). This deficiency may have been caused by the fact that listening *was considered* a passive skill and from the belief that merely exposing the students to the spoken language with comprehensible input was adequate instruction in listening.

Example 1H: From Dr. T's published paper 1

Due to today's emphasis on the function of communication, the term 'Information and Communications technology' (ICT) *is now used more widely* and *has replaced* IT with reference to IT in education (Fallows & Bhanot, 2001).

Example 1I: From Dr. T's published paper 1

The researcher must analysis the language use of its participants as it *is recognized* that language is a major means of learning, in particular in institutional settings, such as schools (Barker & Galasinski, 2001).

In example 1J, Dr. K expresses her knowledge by taking an assured tone with an explicit marker of certainty: *It was asserted that*. Even though Dr. K uses a more confident tone in this sentence, she gives the impression of projecting her authority as deferential to the authority of others. In fact, this is a recurring pattern under this category of knowledge assertion: that is, the participants frequently use passive voice and report general opinion or scholarly work, rather than putting forth their own views. Adverbial forms, such as *typically* in Example 1K, offer more of an evaluation and are found less often in the corpus of texts.

Example 1J: From Dr. K's published paper 1

> *It was asserted* that the integrative orientation is limited to multilingual settings within a dominant community, such immigrant students learning English in a U.S. ESL classroom (Clement & Kruidenier, 1983).

Example 1K: From Dr. K's published paper 1

> There are formative evaluations that *typically* look at such factors as teachers' and students' attitudes toward a curricular innovation, or at the usability of new instructional materials as they are tried out in the classroom for the first time (Long 1984:417).

In her interview, Dr. K expressed pride in this paper, specifically citing its organization, but even more emphatically talking about the time she spent incorporating outside sources. Her interview comment suggests that, for her, she is most "present" in her papers when she can write with authority, based on showing the knowledge she has gained from extensive reading of others' scholarly work:

> I like to talk about concept in a broader way and narrow it down to a special theme related to it… I feel that this [the paper] is well-organized, a clear explanation, and a time consuming paper. Well, I did lots of research, read lots of references, and spent so much time to write it. Of course, I was confident about the quality of my paper and felt that I did keep my authority here.

Dr. C's writing contains forms similar to those cited above; these are given in examples 1L and 1M, which feature a definition (introduced by *is*) and an assertion resting again on a passive form, *are used.*

Example 1L: From Dr. C's published paper 1

> Comprehension, either reading or listening, *is* an active and conscious process in which the listener/reader constructs meanings by using cues from contextual information and from listener's/reader/s prior knowledge, while relying on multiple strategic resources to fulfill the task requirements (O'Malley, Chamot, and Kupper, 1989). The whole process *is* an activity which *involves* many complicated mental steps.

Example 1M: From Dr. C's published paper 1

> In parsing, words and phrases *are used* to construct meaningful mental representations of text. Language learners first decode individual words by matching the aural or visual pattern of the word with its representation in the declarative knowledge stored in Long-tem Memory (LTM) (Gagne, 1985).

Discussion

It can be said that the L2 writers in example 1K, 1L, and 1M are projecting their knowledge implicitly. First, these (like some of the earlier examples) contain no explicit linguistic marker directly referring to the author's ideas. Examples1L and 1M are presenting ideas as general truths. That is, the writers basically present the ideas they are discussing as unquestionable as they cite or paraphrase meanings from their resources. Although this shows the writers' confidence as a well-informed professional, it does not personalize that confidence as reflecting or supporting the authors' own viewpoints.

As previously noted, there are many ways involved in communicating a writer's knowledge in texts. Ivanic and Camps (2001) believe that knowledge-making may be presented as an empirical process, one that involves research, thinking, and writing. This view is prevalent in academic disciplines, which often favor a particular set of linguistic features associated with assertions about knowledge. Typically, these involve agentless passive verbs used to describe the processes of research, thinking and writing. In examples 1A, 1E, 1H, 1I and 1M, Drs. E, C and T use no first-person references, and they identify with a view of knowledge as the product of human mental and verbal processes. In example 1E, Dr. C uses the agentless passive cognitive process verb *are encouraged*. In example 1M and 1H, Drs. C and T use passive verbs (such as *are used* in the same way for reference to the research process. In example 1B, Dr. E suppresses reference to specific researchers by referring instead in general terms to *an urge…to stress the*

importance of ESP courses that *has been put forward in Taiwan*. In example 1E, Dr. C studiously avoids the first person to background her own activity as a researcher by the use of an impersonal construction in referring indirectly to her own view: *It is safe to suggest*. Something similar could be said of other examples, for instance in the phrasing *It is generally thought* from Dr. E's example 1A. Other participants also use impersonal forms, such as *it is also hoped* (Dr. T), and *it was asserted* (Dr. K in example 1J). The extensive use of such forms shows a strong familiarity with a set of linguistic codes used in scholarly writing, normally to distance the writer from the reader and from her content.

In contrast to the use of impersonal forms, the perception of knowledge in personal ways involves a greater recognition of human agency in the construction of knowledge; this can be realized in frequent references to researchers and writers by employing various forms of attribution (Ivanic and Camps, 2001). Even though passives and other impersonal forms were predominant in the writings submitted for this study, the participants did frequently cite other scholars, using active verbs. The reference to Paulston and Bruder (1976) in Example 1G is typical of this practice. Mentioning sources in this way builds a kind of academic voice that displays scholarly knowledge as the product and property of individuals (Ivanic and Camps, 2001). I mention Dr. T's example 1G here to draw attention to the issue of source mentions, which are found in all nine participants' writings. Dr. R's writing is exceptional in terms of the personal/impersonal scale; in fact, Dr. R is the only participant who did not use any impersonal constructions to refer to his own work in the two assignment papers he submitted for analysis. Instead, he uses language that establishes personal connection to the ideas he proposes or cites. In the following section, I will continue to elaborate on other examples in this "knowledge" category.

Knowledge Terms: Different Degrees of Self-Assurance and Certainty

In this section, I will provide some examples to display how writers differ in the degree of their self-assurance and certainty in texts. The first four examples (1N, 1O, 1 P and1 Q), from three different writers, seem to illustrate a relatively high degree of self-assurance.

Example 1N: From Dr. R's term paper 1

> *One may notice* that *all* these violent events were monitored by UNESCO, the World Bank and the IMF (International Momentary Fund) in silence. These violent incidents in Caffentzis's article *make it clear* that there *must be* something fundamental wrong with the UNESCO/World Bank/IMF literacy ideology.

In example 1N, Dr. R's knowledge-making feels self-assured for several reasons. First, he uses the phrase *One may notice that,* to indirectly invite his readers to share his observation; however, the tone of the statement is weakened somewhat by the modal *may* and the impersonal pronoun *one*. He also uses *make it clear,* to emphasize his understanding, followed up by the modal verb *must* to underscore his confidence in his assertion, and again to appeal to the reader for agreement. This use of *must* by Dr. R's use of *must* can be seen as a device that addresses readers, either to focus their attention or to include them as discourse participants.

Example 1O: Dr. C's published paper 2

> Strategies discussed here *are currently practiced* and *have been prove[n]* to be effective in raising students' listening comprehension as well as communication skills by *the author*. Sample exercise and relevant listening strategies applied to help students enhance their comprehension ability and oral expression are listed and fully explained.

In example 1O, Dr. C expresses that *strategies have been prove[n] to be effective* to show her confidence in her statement. That is, Dr. C was certain of the fact because it has been "proven," and not simply "claimed" or "believed." In fact, although the syntax of the sentence may make it hard for readers to see, Dr. C indicates directly her authority, through expressing

explicit reference to herself; not only is this statement "proven"—it was proven *by the author* herself.

Example 1P: From Dr. R's term paper 2

> *In fact,* the combination of reading simplified readers with non-subtitled film serves as a stimulating starting-point to bridge the habits of reading for pleasure and the development of communicative competence that the EFL college students can use in their own real world.

Another example of making a claim introduced by an explicit maker of certainty, *in fact*, appears in Dr. R's example 1P. Dr. C also uses the phrase *in fact* in her published paper1, in an excerpt not reported here: *in fact, students' listening skill is generally poor*. Interestingly, in her interview Dr. C showed some ambivalence about speaking assertively; she clearly feels a connection to her own ideas, thinking they are "right and better"; however, she also feels that she should not "insist" that her ideas are right:

> I will keep some parts of my ideas but I won't insist that only my voice or the result is correct. You need to keep your authority in your professional field not your in personal opinions… At least, at that moment, I believe my opinions are right and better.

In example, 1Q, Dr. E offers a self-assured assessment, namely that the trend of investigating coffee *has triggered the interests of researchers.* Additionally, in example 1Q, Dr. E provides enough information to guide readers to understand the background resources and researchers she cites. Dr. E provides specific researchers/scholars' names and the content of studies clearly in order to identify herself in the position of knowledgeable researcher in this research domain.

> Over the last five years, this trend *has triggered the interests of researchers* (Li, 1985; Wang, 2000; Lin, 2000; Chuang, 2002; Chien, 2003) in investigating coffee chain market and consuming behavior…. The attention to tea *seems to* be relatively less attended or otherwise neglected. The direct comparison between tea and coffee in the field of

> consumption patterns is also scarce. In the beverage consumption, coffee, a western product, *seems to* be replacing tea as a leading beverage in teatime activities in Taiwan.

Addressing Example 1Q, Dr E showed that she is aware of making specific choices that accurately reflect her own sense of certainty about each statement in her paper. Again, her confidence is buoyed when she has sources to back up a statement:

> I am more assured [in] the first statement I made in relation to less attention to tea, due to background resources I used. In the second *seems to* I wrote, I was not completely certain of my statement because I was not sure about my point. It's just my assumption. So, I don't feel that I keep my authority in this sentence.

There are many ways to interpret L2 writers' knowledge-making or the degree of assurance in their texts. As seen in several of these examples, modality and hedges help writers to control their presentation, allowing them to either project self-assurance or a more tentative voice, or ranging between the two. In a later section, I will address more examples that show the participants' usage of modal verbs in their texts.

Strong Phrases and Adjectives

Ivanic and Camps' "ideational" positioning, encompasses writers' particular stances towards the propositions in their text; that is, writers represent their values, beliefs, and preferences through lexis, generic reference, evaluative lexis and syntax. The examples in this section, like those in the last, would fall into this category of ideational positioning.

Example 2A and 2B contain a series of adjectives (and the occasional verb as well) with strong connotations that carry Dr. R's value judgments on the topic he discussed.

Example 2A: From Dr. R's term paper 2

> All of the policies and programs proposed by UNESCO, the World Bank and the IMF are *tactics* to create a *deadly* relationship in which the African countries or the Third World countries are *doomed* to economically and intellectually depend on their *powerful*

> partners more and more. Eventually, these *borrowing countries* are to *be degraded* into a state of total dependence in which they are free to *be exploited* by the western agencies. *Ironically***,** no matter how *bleak* this picture is, like the other squares, this version of semiotic square implied that the dependence/independence dualism can be negated and that the path leading out of the logic is in existence. For instance, the validation of the third term non-dependence in this version of square can *radically destabilize* the static dependence/independence dualism. The ways to disengage this deadly relationship with the UNESCO/World Bank/IMF *alliance* include resisting their literacy policies, raising the lower ranks of African students' awareness of the UNESCO/World Bank/IMF alliance's motives hidden behind its literacy discourses, reconsidering the UNESCO membership offer and so on. The exits of the *deadly* relationship are out there in the literacy discourses constructed by UNESCO, the World Bank and IMF if we care enough to look for them.

> *Example 2B:* From Dr. R's term paper 1
>
> To make things worse, in this endless tunnel, we the L2 English learners were not confident to use our L1 or local knowledge to facilitate our English learning because it was rejected by the *monolingual* bias (Block, 2004), an assumption that a single L1 remained completely intact in spite of contact with a second language. That is, compared with the native English speaker, the L2 English learner *was doomed to be entrapped* in an *inferior* position, no matter how hard we tried.

Looking more closely at example 2A, we find an example of classificatory lexis that positions the writer, even in Dr. R's subtle choice of the term *borrowing countries* to refer to countries which are ever-lastingly dependent on the World Bank and the IMF. Dr. R's choice of the word *partners* rather than *organizations* or *associations* might be seen as projecting an ironic stance towards his topic. Dr. R's personal position comes through more forcefully as he argues that third world countries are to be *degraded* into a state of dependence because of their *powerful partners*. In example 2A, the adjectives *deadly* (to modify the relationship), *doomed* (to modify the Third World countries), *powerful* (to modify *partners*, referring to the UNESCO/World Bank/IMF alliance), and the verbs *exploited* and *degraded*, are all lexical choices carrying Dr. R's strong value judgments on the issues which he is discussing. In Example 2B, likewise, Dr. R uses *doomed* to modify the learner, whom he characterizes as *entrapped* in an *inferior* position.

In example 2A, the words *deadly* and *doomed* represent Dr. R's adversarial stance toward UNESCO, the World Bank, the IMF and the United States; these terms strongly imply that the United Nations commits violence on a global scale. In example 2B, the words *doomed* and *inferi*or express Dr. R's stance, in which he urges resistance against the *monolingual bias* he speaks of in that paper; these strong terms help him to assert his identity as an L2 learner who is unfairly seen as *inferior* to L1 learners. Elsewhere in his term paper, he writes of his own experience, saying that he was *trapped in the endless tunnel of learning English and.… doomed to be entrapped in an inferior position, no matter how hard [he] tried*. Dr. R could have chosen less value-laden language, but he did not, and this choice speaks to a highly differentiated voice in his writings. Dr. R's lexical choices construct a voice that clearly conveys an impression of his values and beliefs. The verb phrases *be exploited, be degraded* and *be entrapped,* far from representing the impersonal use of the passive cited in the previous section, carries Dr. R's position powerfully, by underscoring the position of the L2 speaker as exploited. By choosing a passive verb in this case, Dr. R is implying responsibility on the part of powerful agents for unscrupulous or unfair actions taken by these agents.

In fact, Dr. R. is unusual among the writers studied in his tendency to convey such a strong indication of voice in his writing. In his second interview, Dr. R added detailed information regarding these texts when he emphasized his personal commitment to the arguments he was making:

> I wrote about these topics because I wanted to increase the awareness of these issues in academic communities. Therefore, I brought my personal values and beliefs into the texts because of my confidence in the views. My linguistic choices may have been influenced

by my personal experiences, my academic writing ability, and my strong motivation to evaluate, criticize and comment on these topics.

Dr. R's two texts analyzed here stand as the strongest example of adjectival and phrasal lexis in support of a passionately felt position. However, other examples of forceful wording do appear in other writers' texts, though in relatively muted form. In one passage (example 3C, discussed in the next section), Dr. S wrote, *Today, if we can't read English, the amount of information we can access on the internet is severely limited.* Dr. S used *severely limited* to emphasize people's limitations in accessing information on the internet if they do not have the ability to read in English. However, more subtle aspects of lexical choices can position writers either as strong or weak in their voice. These include personal or impersonal ways of referring to people, and using generic or specific nominal reference. These lexical choices are particularly important when they are viewed from the standpoint of how humans are presented in texts. The two examples I present here from Dr. E serve as a quite dramatic comparison with Dr. R's example in 2A and 2B.

Example 2C: From Dr. E's published paper 1

> Literature has documented its positive effect in *English Language Teaching (ELT)* where *students* demonstrated a positive attitude towards language learning and exhibited confidence in academic study (Flowerdew 1993, Snow and Brinton 1988) as well as increased the chances of academic success in terms of English language proficiency and content performance (Kasper 1995)…Discipline-based instruction also helps encourage *students* to construct schemata, increase metacognitiion of the reading/writing process, and lead to the use of efficient comprehension strategies (Kasper 1995/96).

Example 2D: From Dr. E's published paper 1

> As *content-based ESP instruction* is *justifiably promising* in ELT, an urge, as a result, to stress the importance of ESP courses has been put forward in Taiwan. The Ministry of Education has promulgated that students in the professional and vocational education system should learn English in the professional and vocational education system should learn English specific to their fields of study.

In example 2C and 2D, Dr. E has positioned herself as a teacher and a researcher, and her neutral tone, which is more typical of the texts analyzed for this study, supports this stance. In her choice of expressions, Dr. E specifically shies away from the personal. For example, *English Language Teaching (ELT), Discipline-based instruction* and *content-based ESP instruction* imply the presence of people involved in a group identity as teachers; but the people themselves, as so often are in educational/teaching discourse, not identified. *The Ministry of Education* is again a collective reference, and its mention shows another place where Dr. E uses the name of the governmental department rather than any reference to the individual administrators or the head of a government. The names *Flowerdew, Snow and Brinton, and Kasper* appear only in parentheses as authors of academic publications, and without active verbs to bring them into the text as an active presence. Only the generically present *students* appear in these excerpts as agents in subject position in the sentences. She also expresses her stance toward content-based ESP instruction being *justifiably promising* in ELF, using forms that projecting a neutral scholarly attitude toward the content-based ESP instruction with which she may be associated.

Returning to Dr. R's example 2A again for comparison, he uses the name of organizations such as *UNESCO, the World Bank* and *the IMF* as collective references and *western agencies* as a generic reference to people in terms of their power and tactics. In the context of the strong language discussed above, these bland terms might be seen as a dehumanizing step, presenting these agencies and institutions as impersonal, uncaring entities. However, Dr. R's own positioning shows through in terms such as *validation* and *literacy discourses,* which can be said to project his own professional viewpoint. Moreover, the collective institutional reference terms he uses must be read in the presence of his strong language elsewhere. As I mentioned above, passive verbs such as *be degraded* and *be entrapped*

imply the presence of some "degrading" or "entrapping" agent; in this context, the institutional references are almost humanized in a negative way, since they seem to represent the implied agent.

Dr. R and Dr. E wrote their papers with different purposes in mind, and these abstracted examples showed the very different voices associated with their goals. Dr. R wrote more like an adversary of powerful forces; in contrast, Dr. E wrote more like an established professional advocate of ESP instruction in Taiwan. In her interview, Dr. E said, "I do believe that ESP classes need to be considered in Taiwan education systems to help student to make language improvement in a variety of fields." In contrast, Dr. R's comment on how his paper reflected his personal connection to his topic, and how input from his professor was helpful in strengthening that connection. Interestingly, he speaks of his goal, wanting his paper to be "persuasive":

> I did have a strong feeling of how politics and power could control the third world countries. Therefore, I am willing to project my own voice and ideas in this paper. My professor, Dr. X, did give me some comments about my paper and he said I should talk about Taiwan instead of Africa to have a close connection with my paper. If I can discuss or analyze the similar issues in my context, my paper will be more persuasive and valuable.

The two papers also differ in the extent to which each actually "positions" its author. For example, in example 2C, Dr. E introduced her point by citing other scholars (Flowerdew, Snow, Brinton and Kasper). So this sentence could be seen as positioning these scholars rather than Dr. E. Authorship is ambivalent here, because Dr. E paraphrases these authors' ideas rather than quoting them directly. She also represented other authors' ideas to demonstrate her ideational positioning in the same paragraph without encompassing her own ideas or using evaluative lexis.

In example 2D, she is more clearly (if subtly) positioning herself in the discourse (for instance with the adverb *justifiably*), even though the first person pronoun is not included in this text.

First Personal Pronouns: I and We

The use of the first personal pronoun reference is the most overt expression of the writer's identity and it may fulfill various functions, including the expression of his/her claims or arguments (Tan & John, 1999). The textual purpose of personal pronouns generally in written discourse is to refer "directly to the writer, the audience of writing, and specific things or persons other than the writer or audiences" (Hinkel, 2004, p126). It usually involves the use of the first person pronoun, often co-occurring with a verb that depicts what Halliday (1994) terms "mental processes of cognition". The reference of *I* is referring to the writer himself/herself; that is, *I* is in principle the least ambiguous among pronouns from the readers' point of view or a grammatical point of view.

Not all of the participants chose the option of using first person forms: Drs. K and H are two authors who on principle do not include any first personal pronounce references in their written texts. In his interview, Dr. H made it clear that this was a deliberate choice for her on two grounds, namely the formal conditions of academic writing as she understands them, and her own lack of confidence:

> I will try to avoid personal writing because it's academic writing. I will use the researcher or author to replace *I*. I have never used *I* in my paper. I know only a few people that use *I* in their papers. If the person is knowledgeable and confident about his/her statements, I think it is ok for him/her to use *I* in their paper. I don't reach that level, so I don't use this word *I*.

In the second interview, Dr. K mentioned that the most difficult part of writing for her is the conclusion section, because she had to include her own voice in terms of explaining her assumptions and answering research questions. However, even when she is aware of expressing her opinions, Dr. K does not use first personal references to express her claims and arguments because, in her own rather ambivalent words,

> I am afraid of using *I* in my academic writing. There are many ways I can choose to express my meaning instead of using *I*. I know if you are a skillful writer, you won't have this problem of using *I* or not because he/she knows how to explicitly or implicitly imply his/her ideas in their writing without using any *I* or *We*. It's another rhetorical issue…Sometimes I really want to use *I* in my academic writing but I cannot use it. I feel a little bit sad about this point.

Dr K here is implicitly making reference to the skill, noted earlier, that the participants seem to have developed in using impersonal forms, passive verbs, and phrasing that generally encodes authorial distance rather than language that makes them personally present in their writing.

At the other extreme, not surprisingly, is Dr. R, who uses first person forms comfortably and in versatile ways, which he seems aware of, as his interview comments show.

Example 3A: From Dr. R's term paper 1

> In my autobiographic reflections *I* indicate that *we* are guided by western-oriented learning constructs such as the monolingual tenet and deprived of our local knowledge to facilitate *our* language learning. As trivial as my personal literacy experiences are, *I believe* that my literacy autobiography is of value to the field of language teaching because it illustrates that escaping from the constraints of the monolingual biases is possible.

Example 3B: From Dr. R's term paper 1

> Even though these experiences are personal, *I* am *positive* that they are shared by many L2 English learners world-wide. *I* write the paper with the belief that increasing the critical awareness of the colonized milieu in which *we* are situated is the first step to escape from the faulty concepts accepted by *us*.

In Dr. R's term paper one, he reveals his personal literacy experience through writing autobiographical reflections. In the paper, he emphasizes that these autobiographical reflections helped him to escape from the constraints of the monolingual bias he discusses. In example 3A, Dr. R begins to claim his position as a language learner explicitly and uses authoritative voice in claiming that his experience as a learner and developing professional is valuable. In fact, he states his authority firmly first in terms of using the first person singular pronoun *I*, after which he tries to shift his position to one of equality with readers, showing the relative balance of power between himself and readers by using the first person plural pronoun *we*. He then shifts his authority back to the personal level, expressing his opinion explicitly to his readers in a sentence beginning with *I believe that*. This passage presents Dr. R as self-assured, believing he has a role in creating knowledge and understanding and taking responsibility for his own.

Similarly, but in an even stronger mode, in Example 3B, Dr. R uses the first person singular *I* along with the assertive word *positive* to assert his own right to construct knowledge, to understand and to display responsibility for his opinions. Dr. R positively asserts that many L2 English learners world-wide will go through the same learning situations as he has experienced and described in his paper. Dr. R then again shifts his positioning to the inclusive *we* to show himself as one of community of L2 learners, at least at first sight. In his interview, Dr. R addressed his practice of using first person forms. In the process, he makes a subtle remark about his use of *we*, namely that, since his professor was his only reader, the form actually functioned, for this intended reader, as an exclusive rather than an inclusive pronoun. Dr. R

seems to be aware of carving out an identity that is not shared by at least this one reader (his professor):

> It is a way to approach other scholars and communicate or negotiate with them. Using *we*, I can refer to or include readers as part of the community, promote group solidarity and establish a connection and common ground between myself and my readers. The word *I* has been comfortable for me to use in this paper. Here, I want to emphasize the problem which is not only happening to me but to all other L2 learners including Taiwanese or other international students who start with a similar learning experience, and I tried to persuade them to take the same step I took. Since this was a course paper, I knew that my professor was the only reader and that he couldn't be part of us. I tried to express the problem which is prevalent in many Asia countries and EFL/ ESL learners to my readers.

Dr. R uses *we* to include himself and another group of people, presumably at least Taiwanese or Asian students; but his intention is to exclude other readers in the academic community or the disciplinary community of English as a whole. Dr. R is aware of his position as an L2 learner and projects his identity in the text explicitly.

Dr. C's usage of first person forms, although superficially similar, is actually quite different:

> *Example 3C:* From Dr. S published paper 2
>
> Without a doubt, *we* are in the center of a "monumental technological paradigm shift, one which will eventually change the way that all instructors teach and the way students learn" …while technology should not take over the language classroom, it *must* be embraced in order to allow *educators* to do those things which they are unable to do themselves….Today, if *we* can't read English, the amount of information *we* can access on the internet is severely limited…It is essential that *we* make informed decisions about how the technology can be successfully integrated into the language classroom.

As opposed to the example cited above, the occurrences of *we* in excerpt 3C refers very generally to writers and audiences involved in the texts, to learners and teachers, and not to a narrowly defined group in which Dr. S is asserting membership. In the first sentence, Dr. S tried to use the first person plural pronoun to include writers and the academic community, particularly educators. Here, Dr. S speaks of the technological paradigm shift in the language classroom using *we* to indicate that this shift is potentially of interest to the wider disciplinary community. Later in the same passage, the reference of *we* seems to shift. In the phrases *if we can't read English*, and *we can access* seems clearly to refer to learners (but again generically; she could have written *if anyone can't read English,…)*. Finally, in the next sentence, the *we* of *we make informed decisions* seems again to refer to educators in the community at large.

This contrast shows that these L2 mature writers can use personal reference in a range of ways, some of which express a more personal viewpoint while others are more impersonal. It is also clear that some mature L2 writers consciously shift between first person singular and first personal plural *we* as inclusive and exclusive references for different and quite specific purposes. Like the patterns found in regard to impersonal usage, this suggests considerable linguistic sophistication on the part of these TESOL professionals. Generally, however, as the examples below show, the participants (with the exception of Dr. R) show some limitations or ambivalence about their use of first person forms.

At this point, I will present a set of other examples (3D-3L) together, all of which include first person reference. Since different sets or individual excerpts are relevant to any given point in the discussion, I will present the examples here as a group, then will refer back to the set by example number in the commentary that follows.

Example 3D: From Dr. T published paper 1

Due to the realization of a lack of relevant literature, *we* hope to explore the teacher's perspectives on using ICT in teaching English language,…

Example 3E: From Dr. A published paper 1

Therefore, in this study, *I* sought to find out if Taiwanese L2 learners of English use their Chinese background idiom knowledge in their English idiom comprehension.

Example 3F: From Dr. A published paper 1

In view of the above stated East-West culture divide, *I* note that Liontas (2003) used Spanish L2 learners of English in his research.

Example 3G: From Dr. E published paper 3

We seek to determine whether coffee, a western product, is gradually replacing tea, an Asian local product, in teatime activities in Southern Taiwan.

Example 3H: From Dr. E published paper 3

It is *interesting* to note that male participants in *our* study were older and had higher incomes than the females;

Example 3I: From Dr. C published paper 2

Thus, *we* can see every reason to bring the positive and motivating aspects of films into our language classrooms.

Example 3J: From Dr. C published paper 3

During the warm-up, *I* posted general questions about students' opinions toward reading English and what they did to improve their comprehension ability.

Example 3K: From Dr. C published paper 1

To make sure they knew how to think their thoughts aloud, *I* present several math problems to them and asked them to think aloud while working on the solution.

Example 3L: From Dr. W assignment paper 1

In table 4 and 5, *I* couldn't understand the meaning of correlation among same investigated characteristic. *We* use correlation between two different characteristics.

Most of these examples involve reference to authorship, rather than to the author's positions or independent thoughts. For instance, in the straightforward examples 3E and 3F, Dr. A communicates her intentions as writer and her understanding of a published source, respectively. Likewise, in examples (3D, 3G, and 3H and 3J), Drs. T, E and W use *we* or *our* to include co-author(s) in their reference; this can be seen as an extension of the singular *I* used to refer to a single author. Again, these statements refer to the authors' intentions or to their paper's organization, rather than to the author's positions, stance or conclusions.

Addressing example 3D, Dr. T emphasized that she viewed this "authorial" or text-organizational use of *I/we* as an exception to a general prohibition on such forms elsewhere in her writing:

> I just wanted to point out that this paper was written by two authors and to emphasize our anticipation and purposes for conducting this study again with our readers. I am aware of avoiding *I* and *We* in our paper. This is the only sentence I have used the first person plural pronoun with in this paper.

Drs. T and E use *we* with verb *hope to* and *seek to* showing their expectations and purposes in their studies. The uses of these verbs may seem somewhat subjective and personal in tone, but in fact they can be seen as conventional forms that represent accepted ways of presenting the writer's intentions.

The careful reader will have noted that two examples on the list do represent personal expressions of cognitive positions. One of these, 3L, from a course assignment paper, Dr. W uses *I* to express confusion over part of an assigned reading; this can be seen as a personal note to her instructor, rather than an attempt to express himself personally. He then follows up with a

usage of *we* that seems intended to be generic (i.e. to mean that "people in general" use correlation in a particular way.

The other example, 3I, represents a rare instance where the writer, Dr. C, directly uses first person (here, plural) to express an opinion growing from the paper. As with some of the earlier features that show strong positioning, examples of this sort are relatively infrequent in most of the participants' writings.

Basically, these L2 mature writers have used the first person plural pronoun to establish rapport with the readers, to contrast with the singular form, and in one case, to establish solidarity in a way that partially excludes as well as including some readers. However, their practice and viewpoints regarding this usage both point to a developing feature in their writing, in most cases (with Dr. R. again as the exception).

Modals, Hedges and Related Forms

Ivanic and Camps (2001) define the term of *interpersonal positioning* as referring to the way one constructs a particular ideational version of self in which writers are conveying messages about their sense of their own authority and certainty and their relationship with their readers. Two closely related strategies that support these L2 writers' interpersonal positioning can be found in the use of modal verbs and hedges. Since these linguistic features express the confidence level of the writer regarding the veracity of the proposed argument, their function can be seen as overlapping with the "knowledge" forms discussed earlier, as well as with the "strong" phrasing identified in a previous section. Like these other choices, the choices made in this area can help the writer position herself with respect to her content. Of course, some modals (like *must*) express firm commitment to some proposition, while others (e.g. *may)* suggest skepticism. However, it would be simplistic to conclude that these are "strong" and "weak" modals (or

hedges), and to assume that authors using them have a strong or weak voice, respectively. Consider that a writer may be expressing a strongly held belief in using a "weak" modal or a hedge (cf. *This new treatment <u>may</u> help Alzheimer's patients (but the evidence is slim)).* Of course, when the modals in question are directly affixed to a writer's stated position, it may be justified to equate the use of "weak" modals with "weak" voice. But this needs to be done with some caution. Having said all this, I will proceed to discuss modal usage in these two categories, with the examples of strong modals coming first, since these can be interpreted in the most straightforward way.

Strong Modal

In examples 4A, Dr. R again projects a strong voice, this time through his use of modals.

> *Example 4A:* From Dr. R's term paper 1
>
> Based on Fernandez's interpretation of Greimas' semiotic square, in order to sustain the stability of all the statistic dualisms, repressing the third term is a *must*. However, if one's goal is to destabilize the static dualism in a discourse, he/she *must* validate the third term/position.

In example 4A, Dr. R employs the modal verb *must* (as both verb and verbal noun) to assert his voice and keep his authority in the statement. That is, he explicitly addresses his meaning of necessity, in order to reflect his assertions and at the same time invite his reader into the text as affirming his (Dr. R's) view here. With this one small word, Dr. R closes down alternatives and heads off conflicting views, while expressing certainty and constructing rapport, indirectly, with any reader inclined to accept his position. He creates involvement with the topic and invites solidarity with an audience. More specifically, in this example, he varies the use of *must* in the two sentences. In the first sentence, Dr. R aligns with Fernandez' voice to confirm an argument by Fernandez, using *must* as a noun. In the second sentence, Dr. R uses *must* as a modal verb in the third-person singular, inviting the reader again into the text, as the reader can

imagine identifying with Dr. R's generic *he/she* as this reader comes to see an essential contradiction between the position of Fernandez and the contradictory position that he/she (the reader) *must* also accept. Dr. R uses this *he/she* as what could be seen as a deictic reference to a participant who might well turn out to be the reader. Seen this way, the form helps again to construct rapport, since the reader is invited to take a joint position with Dr. R.

In his interview, Dr. R addressed the idea of using "important words," by which he seems to mean words such as this strong modal, as well as those discussed in an earlier section; he also talks about "show[ing his] ideology" to readers, which again comes through with the strong modal. However, between making those two points, he veers away from elaborating further on the linguistic point, coming back to the content of his sources and his arguments:

> I have to use important words, ways to expresses things, and references. That is, when I write, I will cite important scholars in research fields, create another support for argument, and/or show my ideology to my readers.

In fact, even though we have cited several examples of personal positioning by Dr. R, it is important to digress here, to note that Dr. R also based himself on other forms of textual support beyond his strong language. In particular, like the other participants, he felt that he often constructed his interpersonal positioning in written texts by relying on reports, articles or other references; that is, he is very aware of projecting a sure and persuasive voice based on the reliable reports and other references that he cites. The following is a very specific example from Dr. R:

> *As indicated by* Hulbert and Mason (2006), when developing countries have problems with trade balance, they are required by the IMF to keep deposits based on the western measure of their capacity so that they can get economic aids. Naturally, when the African countries are measured against the international currency, they do not measure well. In other words, when accepting the World Bank and the IMF's austere measures,

> these borrowing countries are *entrapped in a deadly relationship* from which they *are not able* to disengage easily.

In the example above, side by side with the strong language analyzed earlier in Dr. R's paper, he manages to moderate his claims and avoid strong predictions and implications of certainty by using this citation and introducing it with a mild *as indicated by*. In addition, he uses a more academic voice with the modal verb *be able to*, mellowing the strong impression created by the phrase *entrapped in a deadly relationship*. Meanwhile, Dr. R does not reduce his responsibility for the truth value and accuracy of the evidence by using more tentative forms such as the modal *would*. In other words, Dr. R does not convey hypothetical or presuppositional meanings in his claim.

Returning to our main point ("strong" modal usage), in example 4B, Dr. T also uses the modal verb *must* to assert his voice and keep his authority over the statement in the text.

Example 4B: Dr. T's published paper 1

> In order to understand the teaching and learning in a classroom, the researcher *must* analyze the language use of its participants as it is recognized that language is a major means of learning, in particular in institutional setting, such as schools (Barker& Galasinski, 2001).

Recall that Dr. R used *must* in example 4A as a device that explicitly addresses a prospective researcher, either to focus his/her attention on the subject or to include him/her as a discourse participant. However, Dr T's phrase *the researcher* is a generic reference in which Dr. T does not refer explicitly to any scholar or researcher. Therefore, in example 4B, even though Dr. T uses a strong modal verb *must* to empathize her voice, the sense of authority conveyed by Dr. T here is considerably less strong. In fact, Dr. T's own words testify to the reluctance that can be found in this excerpt:

> In my paper, I usually don't like to use a very strong voice to state my ideas, since I know that I have to state my ideas objective[ly] by not [being] too subjective, by using hedge to modify my voice in this paper, especially when I write the conclusion and implication sections. If I really wanted to point out the strong impact on the issues, I would use *must* to emphasize the obligation and all that as necessary in my statement. Otherwise, I will use *should* or *may* in my texts.

Other modal verbs such as *can, may, might, shoul,* and *would* were found in the nine participants' texts as well. It is beyond the scope of this selective overview to review these other usages in detail, in particular given the complexity involved in reviewing the "weak" modals. It suffices here to say that the frequent use of these forms does show a persistent effort on the part of these writers to portray accurately their level of confidence in the statements they make.

Hedges, Intensifiers and Adverbs

Although this section claims to look at the well-known category of "hedges," I will also consider here a set of forms that have been labeled in almost opposite language, as "intensifiers"—that is, forms that increase the emphasis on a given point rather than decreasing it.

In academic prose, hedging has numerous social and rhetorical purposes (Hinkle, 2004), and it can take many linguistic forms such as adverbs, adjectives, and modal verbs. In the nine participants' written texts, hedges are used extensively with the general goal of projecting their ideas without claiming rhetorical certainty. As suggested above, although this usage may indicate uncertainty, it may also help to position a writer with respect to the ideas she is expressing or evaluating.

Among the most common hedges is the use of linking verbs like *seem* and *appear* in place of a bold copular form of *be*. Examples 4C and 4D are drawn from texts by Dr. H and Dr. R respectively.

Example 4C: Dr. H's published paper 1

> Among variables influencing one's use of language learning strategies, academic major and years of EFL learning *seemed to* be positively correlated with the use of language learning strategies in the study.

Example 4D: Dr. R's assignment paper 2

> In order to get accepted by the majority of the society and to secure a stable future, pursuing a Western-oriented discipline such as English *seemed to* be a valid decision for a high school graduate like me. And that was why I was plunged into the endless tunnel of English learning

Linking verbs, including *seem* and *appear,* which refer to a strong (but not definite) possibility, are prevalent in academic prose (Hyland, 2004). In example (4C and 4D), Drs. H and R use *seem* to refer to the process of reasoning or conclusions from reasoning that may not be completely certain. In example 4C, Dr. H is assessing the degree of certainty associated with a correlation that has been suggested in the language learning literature. In contrast, in example 4D, Dr. R is offering an opinion on a personal choice he made. Addressing this example (4D), Dr. R clearly explained his reasoning for using this form:

> Since this is my autobiography of my English learning, I can positivity claim my point of view; however, I think I should use a more tentative voice to represent myself because not everyone who is an L2 learner will have the same perspective on this issue. So, I use *seemed* to show my view that there is a strong possibility that this point is correct or true based on my personal experiences with writing especially during the 1980s to 1990s.

It is interesting to contrast the use of hedges, which soften an author's tone or imply uncertainty, with another class of discourse words that many linguists call *intensifiers*; unlike

hedges, these terms actually suggest increased certainty, rather than lack of complete certainty as regards a given statement. In Anglo-American formal written texts, both hedges and intensifiers are used extensively with the general goal of projecting degrees of certainty; in the process, these same forms bear on a writer's sense of authority, particularly as it is perceptible to the reader through the writer's textual practices. The uses of these forms are highly conventionalized in academic writing and their use is practically requisite in expressions used to articulate personal positions or points of view.

Example 4G: Dr. C's published paper 3

> However, limited by the learner's linguistic competence, there is *rarely* a perfect *match* between input information and existing background knowledge.

Example 4H: Dr. C's published paper 3

> They are reaching out and acting on their own inclinations toward analysis by activating their learning strategies in what is probably *an indeterminable number of* different ways in order to " make sense" of what they read.

In excerpt 4G, the form in question is *rarely*, which establishes a delicate balance between the *match* in question being non-existent and being occasionally possible. In 4H, Dr. C again suggests probability, this time directly with the adverb *probably* (as well as the noun phrase *an indeterminate number of*), which functions as a further hedge expressing lack of specificity.

In their interviews, Dr. R and Dr. C both suggested that they deliberately choose some forms to emphasize their feelings of confidence in their ideas:

> Since I am confident in what I am saying, I use adjectives and adverbs to emphasize my ideas and voices. I want [not only] to produce persuasive text but [also] to reach the overstated tone of my texts. (Dr. R)

I state my beliefs regarding what I am doing and saying strongly so that I can take a stand on the issues. I have been teaching reading for over 20 years so my experiences are the reflection of knowledge and belief established through things I have read. My teaching experiences really influence my beliefs so I bring them into my study. I want to make a forceful impression on readers so I like to use stronger words (Dr. C)

Drs. R and C seem to enjoy the frequent use of emphatic terms even though these constitute an expression of personal opinion in lieu of factual rhetorical support. They seem to project their self-assurance and statement of belief through linguistic forms, such as adjectival and adverbial words, to establish their authority as writers.

Cohesive Lexis

The use of cohesive lexis is another strategy for L2 Taiwanese mature writers to keep their ideas flowing in order to connect to their readers and concerns the particular ways of communicating with their readers in terms of having a "reader considerate voice" (Ivanic and Camps, p. 29) in their writings. Cohesion refers to the connectivity of ideas in discourse and sentences to one another in a text. Therefore, the flow of information that L2 writers create will help them express their meaning clearly and have better communication with their readers. Although this feature of a text does not directly support positioning, I include some examples of cohesive lexis here, as it does support the strength of the text and help present the writer as authoritative in her ways of expressing her meanings.

Examples 5A and 5B illustrate passages with a particularly clear pattern of cohesive devices.

Example 5A: Dr. S' published paper 2

> *CAI* is good for motivating *students* to study English. *Students* are anxious to use computers. *Many students* are tired of traditional English classes and are interested in a new style of learning. When *they* use a computer, they feel…*They* can study English with their own learning style…*They* seem to be willing to spend more hours and do more exercises on a computer than by hand (Kitao, 1993c).

In example 5A, Dr. S displays a cohesive chain spanning the entire text excerpt, from *students* to *many students* and to the final *they*, helping the reader to keep track of the chain's starting point throughout the reading. The ideas Dr. S tried to express were straightforward. However, in example 5B, Dr. C uses a more complex chain from *Some films* to *They, it, this medium* and the final *we;* in this passage, though cohesive ties are well used, the initial term *some films* does not seem anchored in what precedes it, and the plural form *they* is followed by the singular *it*, which seems intended to introduce a new referent, something like *the use of these films.* Given this, readers could easily lose track of the chain's starting point; however, it is still worth noting that Dr. C. has maintained a consistent referent in this passage:

Example 5B: Dr. C published paper 2

> There's also a wealth of non-linguistic and cultural information that can be exploited and focused on with appropriate assignments. *Some films* can lead into discussion of psychological and social questions, which offer language learners the possibility of thinking critically as well as using their imaginations. *They* contribute not only to the development of inferential skills but also to aesthetic appreciation of the storyline and technical aspects of the film…. Furthermore, *it* can also help promote the kind of classroom ambiance in which "students and teachers learn together". Since *this medium* makes explanations clear, grabs the students' interest…Thus, *we* can see every reason to bring the positive and motivating aspects of films into our language classroom.

In the first plural personal pronouns *They* Dr. C represents a specific thing *some films* in this sentence; but as noted above, the following sentence may confuse readers with its confusing

singular *it*. She later uses the general term *this medium* to refer to *films*, another choice that is not grammatically congruent, as *medium* is non-count and *films is a count noun*; however, this minor point does not lead to reader confusion. Moreover, the final plural personal pronoun *we*, presumably meant to represent people in general, is not used clearly; since she has not referred earlier to any first person plural entity as the inclusive or exclusive *we* in this paragraph, the reader may be confused as to whether this particular example refers to the author and her colleagues, to the general public, or to the inclusive pair author-reader. Addressing this passage, Dr. S explained her efforts to construct a cohesive chain as a way to connect with readers:

> I knew that it was dull to simplify the construction of a cohesive chain and conjoin text only by personal pronouns from the first to the final sentence. However, it is the best way for me to create a cohesive chain to refer back to both the immediately preceding sentences and even three of four sentences farther along in a sequence. From my point of view, it's a clear-cut cohesive chain which I like because it will help my readers to understand my meanings.

In addition to repeated reference in cohesive chains, other well-known cohesive devices show up in the papers I have examined. These include explicit guides to the reader about a paper's organization, as well as connectors and transitional words such as *however*, which establish logical relationships between ideas in the text. In examples 5C to 5F, Dr. T has provided such explicit guides for her readers. Again, although these cannot be overtly read as revealing the author in a personal way, they do help to establish a writer-reader relationship, which in turn contributes to establishing the writer's positioning.

Example 5C: Dr. T's published paper.

This will be followed by a discussion on the classroom culture of learning.

Example 5D: Dr. T's published paper.

> In attempt to understanding the culture of learning in Taiwanese elementary English language classrooms where ICT is used, the research adopted a qualitative methodology and a case study. *It will be illustrated in more detailed in the next section*.

Example 5E: Dr. T's published paper.

> In answering the research questions, *this section will present the main findings of this research, which are concerned with: (1)…; (2)…; (3)…*

Example 5F: Dr. C's published paper 2

> *However,* since watching films or video films is a popular habit for many people do in their leisure time…*Therefore,* the way I which they watch tend to passive and uncritical….Hence, how to successfully combat students' "sit-back and relaxed" attitudes when they watch video films in the language classroom *is* one of the prime responsibilities for every language teacher at the college level.

In example 5C and 5D, Dr. T provides readers with a clear introduction and direction for the information she will continue to discuss. In example 5E, Dr. T lets the reader know what will come next in her paper, as she lists her findings under three clearly listed points. In example 5F, Dr. C employs more sentence connectors such as *however*, *therefore,* and *hence* to link her ideas and make the information flow. Dr. C's last sentence here contains an 18-word subject and a 14-word predicate, which may be somewhat heavy for the reader. Dr. C explains that "I was unconsciously composing this sentence since I felt the grammar and meaning were both correct." She did not feel that the syntax and language she used would confuse her readers. When I asked Dr. T's ideas regarding her writing style, she responded that she strives for clarity in her writing:

> I need to point out my clear ideas, and tell them [readers] what I want to do and my purposes. Why do readers need to spend time to read my paper and why let them be disappointed with my work? If writers don't clearly point out their main purposes or

arguments, I won't read their works as well. I really hope everyone can clearly catch my main points and my argument. I will discuss my points in a step-by-step manner and let my readers follow me smoothly.

There are many methods which L2 writers can employ to create a reader-considerate voice in their papers. Above examples show that the L2 Taiwanese writers in this study do focus on rhetorical features such as those presented in this and the previous sections.

Discussion

Based on the interview data and textual data analyzed and interpreted in this chapter, some interesting points will be discussed further in this section, in order to provide readers with a deeper understanding and a more well defined perspective on these L2 mature writers' positioning and voice selections in texts. In this section, I will comment further on the patterns found in the data, under the following headings: Knowledge Expression; Cultural Consideration; and The Notion of Reader.

Knowledge Expression

About these L2 mature writers' knowledge-making, the nine participants seem skillful in projecting their knowledge in their texts. They were able to utilize linguistic features such as noun phrases, lexis, explicit markers, adverbial forms, impersonal forms, and passive verbs to facilitate their knowledge expression. However, an interesting pattern emerged with the nine participants when one asks about their using a confident tone to express their knowledge and support their authority. Even though they show their knowledge confidently by representing scholarly ideas with explicit markers and phrases, all of the participants (even Dr. R to some extent) gave the impression of projecting deferential authority to others, rather than building their own independent voice. In addition to other evidence, one can gather this from the ways that the

participants mention sources. As seen the textual data I discussed, I draw attention to the issue of source mentions, which are found in all nine participants' writings and in their interview data, to conclude that these L2 mature writers attempt to build a kind of academic voice by displaying scholarly knowledge. In other words, it seems that L2 writers show their knowledge and understanding of background sources, rather than putting forth their own views, as a way of positioning themselves in their professional roles. Although the writing in the corpus displays strong competence in academic language, the relative lack of personal views is striking, and can also be seen in the relative infrequency of adverbial forms such as *obviously,* which can be used to interject the author's own judgments even into the discussion of others' work. Even though Dr. E positioned herself confidently with her own voice when she showed some knowledge about common sense or subjects related to her cultural background, this type of confident expression did not extend to other areas, such as general scholarly, theoretical or pedagogical points.

Cultural Considerations

As pointed out earlier in this chapter, first personal pronouns function as explicit linguistic markers to present subjectivity. In examining the nine participants' textual and interview data, I found that these L2 mature writers use first personal references to project their meanings directly, to stress writer-reader solidarity, and to create in- or out- group boundaries. Drs. R and C were two participants who used *I* to stand for themselves. However, most participants shied away from this practice, feeling that it is inappropriate in academic writing. In fact, this undesirably increases the writer's responsibility for the truth value of the proposition, and in some cases may even diminish his or her solidarity with the reader, thus achieving the opposite effect from what the writer may have intended. Dr. R was the only participant who liked to use strong statements with apparent subjectivity and a personal tone to convey his degree of

conviction or to achieve rhetorical emphasis. The nine participants' textual and interview data also shows that they seem to be aware of using first personal pronouns in their writing. In other words, they understand how to use personal pronouns to express their meaning by either using the exclusive and inclusive *we*. However, as the examples show, their use of these pronouns served limited functions, often simply tagging them as authors of their work, rather than identifying them as personally linked to some position, belief or conclusion.

Interestingly, in Chinas culture, *I* is always subordinated to *we,* and Chinese people like to show modesty when they speak or write. It seems that L2 writers may have to put aside their homeland ideology of collectivism and adopt the values of individualism while writing in overseas countries when they try to write academically. Although the writers in this study had accomplished this to some extent, it may be due to cultural conditioning that they felt reluctant to interject themselves too visibly into their writing by the use of first person reference. As in so many of the observations that have emerged from this study, the participants have each found ways to situate themselves with respect to the two cultures in which they developed as writers, and to find ways to understand their positioning with respect to usages such as first person reference.

The Notion of Reader

Readers were important to my participants. The mature L2 writers in this study were all willing to work to consider their readers' needs; however, in connection with that willingness, a few thoughts come up which deserve further consideration. First of all, recall that, in the earlier chapter on interview data, the participants did not seem to clearly visualize the kind of reader they wanted to write for. They had often written for the professor as an audience of one, and they now considered their audience in terms of a somewhat amorphous group of professional

TESOL educators. Given this, the main goal they were able to elaborate in terms of meeting reader needs involved the desire to be clear and be understood by the reader, a goal that they saw in terms of correctness and structure, rather than in terms of defining the background, experience or other characteristics of their readers.

To meet this reader need for clarity, the participants made efforts to build sentences clearly and structure their texts cohesively. All nine participants used connecting, juxtaposing or signposting in their texts. All displayed the same writing strategy of expressing cohesive chains in the entire text for the reader to understand and follow. In particular, all used explicit guides to the reader, announcing the intended structure of their papers or sections of their papers. Dr. T used an especially rich array of signposting expressions in her texts, while Dr. R less often included point lists for his paper's content, or sentence connectors to indicate logical relations in the text, or cohesive chains (which were found in all writers to some extent).

In summary, judging from their textual data, backed up by their interview statements, it seems that their attempts at developing a reader-considerate voice were based largely on the ability to build strong cohesive chains and include clear signposting expressions in their texts. Of course, it is true that, if any author writes sets of sentences which are easy to understand in terms of their relationships, readers should be able to more easily understand and follow what the writer is pointing out. However, from the textual data I analyzed, given the limited sets of strategies they seem to rely on, they may not be fully equipped to reach the goal they have set of making their texts clear and easy to follow. Recall that Dr. C explicitly claimed that, if she felt the "grammar" of a particular long sentence was correct, then the complexity of the sentence should pose no problems for readers. It might benefit these writers, strong as their skills are, to have more exposure to a range of strategies that can make text more accessible to readers.

In addition, returning to the point made at the start of this section, these writers could benefit from being able to identify and write for a diversified set of audiences, based on elements other than textual clarity, important as that goal is.

CHAPTER SEVEN

RESPONSES TO RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In this chapter, I will relate the results from chapter four, five and six to the overview of the research questions for the study. For the reader's convenience, I repeat the original research questions here:

1. How do mature Taiwanese writers transition between different academic environments? To what extent do Taiwanese writers with experience studying in English speaking countries seem to be aware of the events that shaped their development of voice, and do these events figure into their narratives on their own development as writers? If so, how do they describe these events, and their growing awareness of voice or positioning in their writing? In particular, how have they reconciled differences in their experiences as developing writers in Taiwan, and later in the English-speaking environment, then again as professionals back in Taiwan?
2. What role does positioning play in L2 writers' actual practice in academic writing? What elements in their academic writing seem to reflect positioning or voice? How do they address their rationale for using the forms that they use that help them position themselves?

Research Question One

Given the results of this study, I would like to answer research question one using several prominent ideas which emerged from the participants' interviews regarding their development in Taiwan and in overseas countries.

Academic Writing Development in Taiwan

The results of this study show that the majority of the participants related their early development of English writing to the product-oriented teaching approach, to writing practice, and to the text-oriented educational system in Taiwan, which they used as their point of reference. In this study, the nine participants credited their training in Taiwan for their improvement in language proficiency; however, they did not feel that the training and writing practice they experienced in Taiwan had helped them to improve their general academic writing skills, in particular with regard to voice, or positioning.

Three major elements that participants felt had affected their writing development are writing pedagogy, writing practice and their school's policies. The first two of these can be treated together, as they intertwine and are both rooted in classroom practice in Taiwan. The Taiwanese L2 instructors who taught this study's participants used traditional writing pedagogies emphasizing such components as mastery of writing mechanics, the structure of language, correctness of forms, and grammatical accuracy. This led to a writing style that prioritized imitation in the language learning process and overemphasized grammar in the writing class. One result was that these Taiwanese developing writers feel that they faced a great challenge to develop a familiarity with academic writing genres and academic writing strategies. In particular, this emphasis on teaching grammar, to prepare students for the proficiency tests, may cause substantial problems for students who are preparing to study abroad, if they enter a new context in which they lack the skills or creativity to write academically. Furthermore, this approach to writing pedagogy has downplayed the important concept of writing as a social act and writing as the communication of ideas; that is, students in such a system are not exposed to the idea that academic writing involves expressing "ideas and values through a writer's choice of words and

styles of writing" (Shay, Moore & Cloete, 2002, p. 249). Students are not encouraged to express their own unique thoughts or to problem-solve. Rather, they are encouraged to apply writing skills such as "memorizing vocabulary, model sentences, and paragraphs for college writing" (Dr. A). As Dr. T said, "the writing skills I had learned and the topics I wrote about were not academic enough for my first year of graduate writing." As we can see, Taiwan's writing pedagogy is not guided by the kind of goals that can lead students to understand the importance of academic writing conventions and format or to develop their own thoughts or personal voice, even in the disciplinary community.

In addition to the influence of pedagogy, English language policy in Taiwan also plays an important role in L2 writers' academic writing development. The Minister of Education now aims to develop English oral proficiency for international communication in all spheres. Policy statements about the set of changes that stress this goal have ignored or downplayed the importance of writing as a facet of English learning. Because of this emphasis on oral and not written communication, teachers have had insufficient time to teach writing. These policies further explain why the L2 writers in this study have experienced writing instruction that depended on "memorize[ing] or imitate[ing] model sentences, paragraphs, and summaries" (Dr. R). Because there is little time to teach writing, teachers offer students "pertinent words and sentence patterns to compose their essays" (Dr. A) and provide model compositions for students to imitate. The resulting tendency to copy patterns, or even actual passages, may work against a student's development of their own thoughts, voice, and their understanding of ownership or authority.

Narrative writing practice is another element affecting the participants' development of academic writing. As Drs. E, A, T and K mention, narrative writing was the predominant writing

style they experienced in high school. Through narrative, participants actually included their personal voices and ideas while composing their writing; however, the study results demonstrate that they seem to still "lack the confidence to express their ideas in academic writing" (Dr. K). Even though they had relatively fewer constraints in their later training, and were encouraged to develop a "strong and direct voice" (Dr. A), their writing practice did not help them to develop an awareness of when to " us[e] a strong voice while writing academically" (Dr. T). From their writing practice and development in the L1 context, it also seems that their academic writing ability was not adequate to meet the expectations demanded by the pedagogy practiced at the graduate level in Western culture. It lacked the foundation needed to allow these participants to meet their university (especially graduate) professors' expectations for expressing their voice in academic writing. As one reader of this dissertation pointed out, the problem of transitioning from narrative writing to fully developed academic writing is difficult for students whose first language in English. The problems involved in developing academic writing skills are considerable, and high school training in L1 English contexts is typically also not up to the task. Nevertheless, it is worth pointing out that the challenge is all the greater for international writers such as those in this study, who may have experienced particularly limiting forms of teaching, as well as having other linguistic and cultural barriers to deal with. Given all that my participants have had to overcome in the transitions they have made, it is quite remarkable that their texts, analyzed in Chapter 6, show such sophisticated mastery of many elements of English academic writing. In the next section, I will return to cover the obstacles and strategies that the participants shared with me.

View of Development of Academic Writing in Overseas Countries

Due to the influences of prior writing practice and writing experiences in Taiwan on the nine participants, they still had to process and learn how to write within the norms particular to given disciplines when they began to study overseas. In fact, after embarking upon their graduate studies, every participant viewed their experiences with writing development and perceived their difficulties in academic writing differently.

Knowing How to Write for a Disciplinary Community

Some researchers stress how important it is for L2 writers to legitimatize and position themselves in academic communities (Hirvela & Belcher, 2001; Ivanic and Camps, 2001; Matsuda, 2001). Comments related to this point surfaced at many points in the interviews.

From the interview data presented in Chapter Five, the nine participants remarked that they still had to process and learn how to write within the norms particular to given disciplines, since they were expected to be active participants in their professional discourse communities. To meet this goal, again, they realized that they needed much expertise that had not been a part of their early training as developing writers. They commented that they had no knowledge of writing skills or writing styles in the first year of graduate study, mentioning specific elements such as familiarity with APA style (Dr. R) and citations (Drs. K and S). They also were not aware of rhetorical matters such as how to use sophisticated wording (Drs. E, A, K and T), or of how to summarize and synthesize (Drs. A, T, C and W) in order to clearly express meanings or ideas (Dr. T). Once again, these are challenges faced by every graduate student; however, the present study looks at the way they were perceived and met by one special group of current Taiwanese professionals.

After a few years of academic writing experiences, the nine participants all stated that they had improved in their understanding of how to express themselves adequately within their disciplinary arena. They had learned how to consciously write within the norms particular to given disciplines in their academic communities and how to use sophisticated features in their professional writing. For example, Drs. R, E and W especially noted that they had needed to change their writing styles based on feedback from readers or editors, and Drs. E and T mentioned that they had improved their ability to meet readers' expectations. Drs. A, R, C and E also further stated that they had progressed in their understanding of negotiation and communication. Drs. R, E, C, T, S and A all reported that they had developed in their ability to understand how features of disciplinary writing can play a role in assisting them to position themselves appropriately in relation to their professional audiences while writing academically.

The participant writers understood that writing for academic contexts is not simply related to writing skills or rhetorical issues such as "synthesizing all ideas into writing" (Dr. A), "writing in the correct format, citing sources" (Dr. K), or "organiz[ing] and edit[ing]" (Dr. W). However, academic writing becomes much more difficult and complicated if " [it is] not a skill issue but a matter of communicating with people using one's own knowledge and one's own communication skills" (Dr. A). If one takes into consideration social, political, cognitive, and cultural factors, it becomes an even more complex issue. Therefore, academic writing may become a difficult job for L2 writers "if they try to incorporate their professional writing skills, knowledge and critical thinking into academic writing" (Dr. A). To be successful L2 mature writers, they must write and think differently and select an appropriate way to position themselves in texts. The learning and adjustment that these mature writers made in successfully completing their graduate study, and then returning to work in their original Taiwanese context,

represents quite a complex journey, and one whose stages they had become quite aware of, as the richness of their own commentary shows.

Motivation

L2 writers' motivation for academic writing tends to be particularly high in overseas countries. The participants mentioned factors that motivated them to make improvements in their academic writing skills (Drs. K, A and S), and to become full members of their disciplinary community (Drs. E and C), to position themselves as researchers based on their published works, and to know how to communicate with scholars (Dr. A), as well as to maintain their voice in texts (Dr. E). These claims are evidence for their strong motivation to grow as writers in their academic community.

However, the study results also show that the nine participants have not formed solid ideas of membership in their academic communities in Taiwan. Earlier, in the U.S. their integration into the academic community had developed gradually because they realized that, as researchers or scholars, it was important to share their interests, beliefs, and values with other members of the academic community (Dr. R). In other words, these L2 mature writers had become aware of what roles they have to play in the academic community. They were motivated to present their voices or beliefs and are eager to contribute their studies, ideas, and findings to the academic community in overseas countries. To meet this goal, L2 writers were motivated to position themselves to "sound more like" members of their new social groups in their texts (Dr. R) after they entered Western cultural education.

The nine participants were aware of the importance of publication (Drs. R and A), and they had increased their understanding of how much power they had in order to enter the social group (Drs. R, E, H and T). However, some participants were still confused about their newly

formed identities because they felt that their voices, and consequently their positions of authority, were weak in their disciplinary communities.

It is obvious that these L2 mature writers are eager to publish enough in order to survive in their disciplinary communities. Because of this, they had sought chances to interact with other scholars and gain feedback (Dr. A), and had looked for opportunities to exercise using power in their voices (Drs. R and T), as well as to legitimatize themselves solidly as scholars in their research territories. Since being a scholar motivated them to keep their voices in papers, they were also able to increase their awareness of "selecting topics, forms, and language and research methodology to reach community members' needs" (Dr. E), interests, and ideologies (Dr. R).

The Concept of Writing a Good Paper

These L2 writer participants have expanded their views of what it means to write a good paper. The nine participants devalued grammar correction in their writing because they knew that a purely formal grammatical approach serves to foster neither critical thinking nor in-depth development of a strong sense of authorship or voice. They explained that in Taiwan, the idea of writing as a matter of grammar or skill was important. However, their concept of writing a good paper had gradually changed in various ways in terms of redefining the meaning of good writing. In particular, they had come to realize that learning to write academically involves a whole range of "cognitive factors" (Drs. R, E, C, A and T) and knowledge-making (Drs. E, C, A and S).

They believed that increasing or including their "critical thinking" in texts was very important, more so than issues of usage or grammar (Drs. R, C, E and T). The concept of "good writing" was generally seen to involve the writers' individual creativity and critical thinking. For example, Dr. E said that having a critical and creative way to interpret things or "having a sense of logic" (Dr. T) is important for an academic writer. This led them to grapple with specific

questions, such as whether to adopt the values of individualism and slip into a new identity through the English "*I*." However, all nine participants stressed that a writers' knowledge is an important component for writing a good paper; one might see this viewpoint as a way to find a middle ground, maintaining a relatively impersonal measure for "good writing."

Readers' Expectations

As Hyland (2007) claims, writing is a social activity which requires one to engage in a variety of relevant writing experiences and to investigate different purposes and readers. The participants defined their readers in professional terms, as those who were from the same academic or disciplinary communities (Drs. E and C), or as "professors and editors" (Dr. R). The interview data showed that Drs. R and T realized their Western readers' strict requirements regarding critical thinking and clear expression; consequently, these two participants included strong arguments and strong, clear personal voice in their texts. In fact, Drs. R and T seemed to associate their usage with their greater awareness of readers' expectations. However, on the whole, the participants seemed not to have an understanding of reader expectations that was broad enough or specific enough to help them to write with particular editors/reviewers' expectations in mind. Although they had changed and grown in so many ways, this was one area where their development seemed still to be a work in progress.

Growing Awareness of Their Development of Voice

After a few years of study in overseas countries, the participants identified several essential elements that they believe influenced their developing voice in academic writing. The first thing they mentioned is related to empowerment. Drs. R and T were able to view things from various perspectives and develop a strong voice in their writing when their teachers empowered them to write. Dr. R indicated that he could "transform this power into his writing."

Dr. R's view can be approximated to Elbow's view of voice as the release of a writer's inner self; writers find their own voice through empowerment and self expression. The participants' testimony supports the belief of many writing teachers that writers in general, and L2 writers in particular can develop their writing if writing teachers can empower and encourage them to express their thoughts.

Apart from the issue of empowerment, Drs. E and T also point out that their professors' expectations or schools' requirements made them value things differently. For example, due to Drs. E, T and R's awareness of being individual and independent researchers/writers with critical views and ideas in their writing, they gradually started to write something with their own opinions confidently and to develop a stronger voice and varied perspectives in their writing. However, not all participants spoke of this kind of learning. By contrast, Drs. W and C felt that their voices were based on the quality of the evidence they presented. In any case, all agreed that positioning themselves as knowledgeable scholars with a scholarly voice is very important.

Their improving academic writing abilities helped them to develop more confidence over time through gaining more control over the academic voice in their texts. These writers had been learning to "select proper genres for expressing ideas effectively" (Dr. R) and to find ways to express their own knowledge (Drs. R, E, A and S) in their disciplinary communities. That is, when these L2 mature writers began to figure out what rules they had to follow, they started to interact with written texts in a more sophisticated way and to increase their awareness of language usage in diverse contexts.

Readers' Expectations Regarding Voice

Readers always hold their own expectations and anticipations. Being aware of this, writers usually try to create optimally relevant texts, and readers in turn anticipate this when

searching for meaning. This concept might be seen as an extension of Grice's (1975) notion of "conversational maxims," which seek to explain successful communication in terms of interactants' mutual assumptions of rationality and cooperation in conversation. Similar ideas of cooperation can be said to apply to the writer and reader of a written text. However, this kind of relationship may break down because of particular writers' educational and cultural backgrounds, particularly if a given writer's readers do not share some basic beliefs, assumptions or values. L2 writers, who may have had less chance to explore their academic voice, may develop what Dr. E called "wrong interpretations of writers' expectations" in academic contexts. L2 writers do not automatically know what kind of guidelines they should follow and what kind of voice they need to display in order to meet Western readers' expectations (Drs. E and A).

As some researchers also state, as long as L2 writers can perceive a wider readership and become sensitive to their readers' expectations, they can easily legitimatize and position themselves in academic communities (Hirvela & Belcher, 2001; Ivanic and Camps, 2001; Matsuda, 2001). The writers in this study had worked to understand their readers and their ideologies, interests, research fields, and expectations. The nine participants felt that with this understanding, they could choose and adjust their voices and communication with readers effectively and confidently. However, some participants expressed ambivalence about this need. In particular, Dr. R stressed that in his opinion, L2 writers should not reorient themselves to values found in Western culture to the point that they must leave their own beliefs and ideologies behind. In trying to meet reader expectations, a number of tricky questions arise: Whose voice takes over? Whose meaning is heard? Who has the power to repopulate or resist another's words? When writers identify their professor as their main reader and feel they need to reflect the professor's ideologies in their texts, power is unequally distributed. To some extent, the results

of this study hints at this danger, since the professor was often listed as the audience for graduate level papers.

Distinguishing Issues in Two Contexts

Given the results of this study, it may say that these L2 learners' writing purposes have been different in their two contexts. In Taiwan, their focus in senior high school was primarily on paragraph form and grammar skills, which works against students' development of their own thoughts and voices. When L2 writers enter into college writing, they have more chances to explore their voices due to the genres they practices such as narrative writing, autobiography and e-mail. However, these writing genres are taught because of the purpose of passing the GEPT test, not for facilitating L2's academic writing skills and their academic voice or communication with various readers.

In contrast, in Western culture, the graduate programs are mainly theoretical or research-based and follow strict conventions or forms for academic writing. Obviously, academic writing is the only writing style which L2 writers have to use for surviving in graduate programs. Here, the emphasis is on skills such as the effective use of citations, and on the writers' ways of expressing their ideology or stance, as well as on interacting with other educators and readers in their graduate training programs. As noted earlier, this cultural divide causes considerable problems, as Western educators often do not realize that these graduate students need great help and support in developing their academic writing skills or academic voice.

Voice and Positioning for Professional Needs

The adjustments and learning that these participants experienced in their Western graduate training had to be further modified in most cases once they returned to Taiwan; this modification involved both their practice as teachers and their writing as researchers.

First, it was a challenge to the participants to reflect their graduate training in their own teaching. Drs. R, A and K said that their voice development in the U.S. greatly influenced their teaching methods; therefore, they now emphasize the concept of voice in their writing classes and in evaluating student writing, in order to develop students' voice and critical thinking. However, this position cannot be easily maintained and defended, given official policies in many Taiwanese institutions. Even though Drs. R, A and K stressed the need to integrate voice in L2 writing pedagogy in Taiwan, they also said that they felt compelled to give priority to language skills or forms in their teaching approaches due to the strict time limitations, the goals of their school's curriculum, and school policies.

Second, since returning to their teaching positions, these L2 writers are required to write publishable papers in their teaching position. Here, too, official policies play a role: they are supposed to adopt or adjust to new forms, writing styles, and voice in their texts based on their schools' policies, which include preferences for research design (quantitative, qualitative or mixed). The voice they developed in their overseas studies stressed critical thinking, professional knowledge, and keeping authority in their papers. However, in Taiwan, publication is just another practice to earn professional credit; personal voice is not felt to be an essential component for publication. Consequently, the majority of these L2 mature writers did not feel that the concept of personal voice is important for their academic writing in Taiwan, although they did value learning ways of positioning themselves as researchers/scholars, a task which they still could not manage well.

Once again, the competing demands of the Western graduate world and the professional world in Taiwan have caused these writers to each find his or her own compromise, valuing what they learned in their graduate work, and yet recognizing the need to now exist within the

demands of their professional situations in Taiwan. As it became clear numerous times from this study's results, these writers have faced not one, but two challenging cultural transitions in their careers.

Research Question Two: Roles of Positioning in L2 Writers' Actual Practice

The Role of Positioning

Due to English language policy and planning in Taiwan since 1993, English teaching policy has been ignoring or downplaying the importance of writing as a facet of English learning. Moreover, Taiwanese students do not grow up in a culture of individuality, are not educated to value the expression of their own ideas, and are not aware of the important concept of positioning themselves in texts. Therefore, they bring their own understanding of L2 writing and position themselves differently in texts when they enter the Western educational system. In order to understand how the nine mature Taiwanese L2 writers in this study position themselves in texts, research question two attempts to identify their perceptions of the roles of positioning in their academic writing.

The study shows that the majority of these writers place a much higher value on general academic issues (rather than individual ones), and they emphasize the need to present their knowledge in texts. Therefore, in textual data, they frequently mention resources, argue their points, and cite other scholars, basing their notion of a strong, confident voice on positioning themselves as knowledgeable and well-informed. Thus, even though they hope to position themselves as confident scholars or knowledgeable writers, they generally seem to take a somewhat conservative view of positioning. That is, they generally do not want to present a critical view with a strong argument or a strong voice, even though they consciously recognize the value of personal voice, individual knowledge, and critical thinking in their L2 writing.

Elements in Their Academic Writing Reflecting Positioning or Voice

Ivanic and Camps (2001) state that writers can present their views through their selection of particular linguistic features or expressions. Given the textual results discussed in Chapter Six, we may conclude that these professional writers do display positioning in their texts, based on their particular selections of linguistic features. There are elements in their academic writing which seem to reflect positioning or voice. Even though I did not use Ivanic and Camps' three types of positioning (ideational, interpersonal and textual) as categories to analyze the data, this system is useful as an organizing principle. Looking at the data through a modified version of their system, I found the first two of their categories to be most effective in looking at positioning in my participants' writing. That is, elements of ideational and interpersonal positioning seemed more important than Ivanic and Camps' third type, textual positioning. While the third type relates mostly to elements of cohesion, or clarity, and while these were important to the writers, I felt that these were less a matter of positioning or voice. as I conceive of these concepts in this study.

Various elements emerged in L2 writers' texts reflecting their ideational positioning. First, in the area of knowledge-making, they seem to use a wide range of explicit markers such as noun phrases (e.g., *the fact*), passive forms (i.e., *it is asserted that, it is generally thought*), and other impersonal forms and expressions (e.g., *it is safe to suggest*), all of which actually serve to convey a sense of impartial, scholarly voice. Through employing such explicit markers of certainty in their texts, they display their familiarity and understanding of their subjects.

In contrast, linguistic forms that represent or project personal presence in their texts are less frequent. Their use of exclusive and inclusive first person pronouns ranges from a highly conscious differentiated use (by Dr. R), to a complete avoidance of these forms (Drs. K and H).

Lexical choices carrying the writers' judgments, such as strong adjectival or adverbial forms, are also less commonly used. Dr. R is the only participant who presents a strong tone to convey his values, beliefs, and preferences. Other participants, such as Dr. K, use adverbial forms such as *typically*, again more in support of a scholarly position than to emphasize strength of personal conviction.

However, the textual results presented here do not entirely support Scollon's quite definite statement (1991) that "the Chinese student is not writing primarily to express himself or herself …. [In Chinese culture, one] is writing to pass on what one has received." (p. 7). To varying degrees, the writers in this study are able to articulate their own ideas directly and project their voices through the lexis they choose. They no longer comprehend the concept of academic writing as merely the passing on of ideas and values through their choice of words and style of writing. In fact, they do seem to carefully select words for their ideational positioning, not simply citing, but also evaluating the ideas they "pass on" through adopting a scholarly voice that evaluates as it displays knowledge.

As noted earlier, an important strategy these writers use to position themselves as professional scholars is mentioning sources. In accordance with Ivanic and Camps' (2001) ideas, mentioning sources displays writers' knowledge as the product and property of individuals. They also state that this involves a greater recognition of human agency in the construction of knowledge as writers employ a variety of forms of attribution. Of course, proper citation is an essential strategy for avoiding plagiarism. However, L2 writers may rely heavily on mentioning sources which are allied in some way with what they want to express, and look for ways to make those sources speak to their audience on their behalf; or, conversely, they may find sources that are contrary in some way, and express their own disagreement through evaluative response to

sources, rather than directly. In any case, Dr. A discussed the importance of presenting an exhaustive range of "knowledge" in academic writing, stressing the importance of content. Drs. W and C both mentioned the need to have good references, presumably to show their competence and position as researchers.

Personal pronouns seem to reflect L2 writers' ideational positioning or voice since these are typically used as an explicit support for a writer's own agency. In responding to the relevant Likert scale questions, many participants agreed with statements saying that they felt confident in expressing their own ideas on paper and felt comfortable using "I" in their written pieces. The interview results also show that several of these writers consciously choose personal reference to themselves to project their meanings directly, to stress writer-reader solidarity, or to create insider versus outsider boundaries in their texts. Therefore, it is possible to assume that Taiwanese L2 writers understand and are able to manage the function of personal pronouns as explicit markers to refer "directly to the writer, the audience of writing, and specific things or persons other than the writer or audiences" (Hinkel, 2004, p126): that is, to project their authoritative voice and their identities in their texts.

Not surprisingly, the participants said they used the first person singular *I* more in their personal writing than in scholarly articles. For example, in Dr. R's autobiographic reflections, he did not hesitate to use the first person singular *I* so as to position himself as an L2 learner and to reveal his personal literacy experience. On this point, Dr. R's voice presentation was consistent with the views of Expressionists, whom Elbow (1987) and Murray (1985) define as conceptualizing writing as a creative act of self-discovery. In Elbow's view of voice as the release of a writer's inner self, writers find their own voice through empowerment and self-expression because the feature of voice is attained through self-expression. Other participants

also use first person singular *I* as an explicit reference to refer directly to themselves in a range of functions, such as taking responsibility for their opinions. Dr. R's practice is contrary to Wu and Rubin's (2000) claim that writing features are associated with a writer's nationality and language. Wu and Rubin claim that Taiwanese students' English writing shows the influence of their L1 writing conventions in terms of indirectness, humaneness, collective virtues, and limited use of personal anecdotes. In fact, Dr. R's writing style in terms of directness, critical tone, and frequent use of personal references, is quite heavily influenced by Western cultural Education, and one could read an ideology of individualism reflected and displayed in his texts. Other writers, too, showed a whole range of ways in which their writing, far from being anchored only or predominantly in their L1 training, had developed to incorporate much of what they had come in contact with during their graduate training.

Even though they may be less consciously focused on the relationship between their linguistic choices and personal voice, these writers do seem to select elements that reflect their positioning as knowledgeable and proficient writers in academia. In the next section, I have identified elements that might be classified by Ivanic and Camps as "interpersonal." However, I am aware that there is considerable overlap between this and the 'ideational' category. For example, although Ivanic and Camps list modals as interpersonal, these forms also express a level of confidence in the author's knowledge; thus, they could also be seen as ideational, depending on the particular modal and context.

Modal verbs are a key element for L2 writers to emphasize their interpersonal position as well as to contribute to knowledge-making, and express the confidence level of the writer. L2 writers seem to use a whole range of positioning features frequently, such as modal verbs or intensifiers, adverbs, explicit markers of certainty and explicit references, to help them position

themselves clearly as they express their ideas in academic writing. One reason for the common use of modals by Taiwanese writers is rooted in their original English learning experience. Many Taiwanese writing teachers put heavy emphasis on explicit vocabulary and grammar instruction, and modals are a class of words that receive special emphasis in English classes, because of their semantic and structural peculiarities. In fact, in the interviews, all of the participants stated that they had constructed an understanding of using modality in their writing. Since learning modal verbs and hedges is common practice in writing instruction in Taiwan, it can be said that these writers' current practice reflects their own writing instructors' beliefs regarding the structuring of language, and their experience with imitating input, in the form of texts provided by their teachers (Badger & White, 2000). In addition to its being rooted in their English learning experience, these L2 writers' adoption of modal verbs to position themselves may have further gradually developed in their overseas writing experience. This one linguistic example provides interesting evidence of how these writers have taken elements of their original training and adapted them to the needs of their later professional writing development.

Awareness of Selecting Linguistic Features

From the textual and interview data, I have been able to perceive the nine participants' awareness of selecting words and other linguistic features to express or position themselves in their texts. The first element these writers mentioned explicitly was the use of personal pronouns to express their authority and to establish a relationship with their readers. Three were explicitly aware of shifting their authority back and forth and controlling the power between the readers by integrating the first person singular *I* and the plural pronoun *we*. The most telling example occurs in Dr. R's term paper, where he begins by claiming his position as a language learner explicitly (using *I*), then shifts his position to one of equality with the readers (through the use of

we), after which he shifts his authority back to express his thoughts to his readers as an individual.

In other examples, Drs. R, S, C and T included *we* in their conclusions for several reasons: (1) to project their position in the community; (2) to be situated in the readers' point of view; (3) to include the readers; (4) to balance the power with the readers. That is, even though these L2 writers try to emphasize their ideas and to position themselves as mature writers with a Western Academic writing style, they still show a sense of collaborative culture through their written text, such as by consciously selecting the plural pronoun *we* rather than the first person singular *I*. These writers consider writing to be a social act between readers, writers and the community. Some participants, for example, Drs. E and K, have been deeply influenced by the Western education system and follow the conventions of academic writing; but they still possess their own cultural identity in their writing. That is, they attempt to be aware of using hedges and avoid using personal pronouns, but they show their tendency to situate themselves in the community and display their cultural identity of collectivism, rather than projecting an individual presence in their texts.

The second element these L2 writers spoke about overtly as well as displaying explicitly in their writing was the desire to display knowledge clearly and show their self-assurance. That is, they were aware of expressing their knowledge by using an assured stance or a more confident tone in sentences with an explicit marker of certainty. As previously noted, they used noun phrases or impersonal forms in referring indirectly to ideas in their professional areas. As they frequently select these linguistic features, they feel they are consciously identifying themselves as confident writers or scholars. For example, Dr. E showed that she is aware of

making specific choices that accurately reflect her own sense of certainty about each statement in her paper.

When L2 writers can use a series of adjectives and adverbs with strong connotations that carry their value judgments on the topic they are discussing, they are aware of constructing their beliefs, values, and voice in their texts. However, eight participants include fewer terms carrying judgments or interpretations of information, findings, and events (e.g., avoidance of emotive descriptors). These writers were aware of avoiding an emotional or personally academic register or of over-generalizing their ideas in the texts. In contrast, Dr. R's interview reveals that even though he seems aware of exaggerative and emphatic adjectives which are not prevalent as formal register in academic writing, he still feels justified in expressing his values and stance through selecting strong adverbs or adjectives. That is, Dr. R has deliberately positioned himself as a mature and critical writer since he has produced persuasive text within the confines of restricted academic language, and has capitalized on the limited choices available in texts (Hinkel, 1997). Of course, as noted in Chapter Six, the notion of genre enters here to some extent, since one of Dr. R's submitted papers was meant to be a more personal paper on literacy development. Still, his interview data shows him to be the most active of the participants in his deliberate desire to project his own voices in his texts.

The third element these writers use to refer to their position as skillful writers is cohesive chains, a domain that was not covered in detail in Chapter Six, as it was felt to be relatively marginal for the focus of the present study. The textual data shows that the participants consider ways to organize their papers such as sentence variation, argumentation, and persuasiveness. The use of cohesive chains is one of the strategies they adopt to keep their ideas flowing, and this particular way of communicating with their readers may be viewed as a "reader considerate

voice" (Ivanic and Camps, 2001, p. 29). Even though I did not focus on this area in Chapter Six, it is safe to hypothesize that the participants are very aware of such terms, since they will have received training on these elements of text as academic writers in the English-speaking world.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Conclusions

In negotiating their transition between different academic environments, the Taiwanese writer participants in this study faced issues such as their view of academic personal voice, their prior academic writing practices and their challenges with academic writing. Voice is one of the terms most commonly brought up when composition teachers talk about what defines good writing for students in the Western academic writing system. The results of the present study have shown that these L2 Taiwanese writers had developed strategies to at least partially express their voice during their study abroad. But they differed in the degree to which they were aware of their academic personal voice; and they also faced a second transition when they returned to professional positions in Taiwan. Since the transition to adopting academic personal voice was an essential component in their training in the United States and other English L1 countries, they developed critical thinking, professional knowledge and authority in their papers. Additionally, they developed strategies, whether consciously nor not, which enabled them to control their academic personal voices to some extent through their choice of words, phrases, and syntactic forms in their texts. Still, even though these L2 mature writers' command of voice had been developed this way in their graduate programs, and they were able to successfully write and publish papers in Taiwan, their realization of academic personal voice is still weak. That is, they seemed to take a somewhat conservative view of positioning and were not able to present their academic personal voice with consistent confidence or with a strong argumentative voice as they made points in their texts. The ambivalence they felt about issues regarding positioning, and some of their own practices, suggests that their development of strong personal voices was still a

work in progress, especially as they were confronted with their most recent task, of incorporating what they had learned in their graduate study into the situation and the constraints on their teaching and research in Taiwan.

A mixed picture emerged from the results. These participants were skillfully able to find ways to express their knowledge in terms of selecting proper genres for expressing ideas. However, in texts, generally, the participants often relied more on sources when explaining their level of confidence in their writing, instead of displaying their own critical views or trying to develop a strong argumentative voice. Moreover, the list of features that were highly developed in their texts was limited. With one exception, they tended to shy away from strong, confident wording. In contrast, they used modals quite frequently. Although this last element (modals) helps support a writer's voice and can express confidence (through forms like *must*), modals tend to be used in hedges, which express tentativeness rather than certainty or strongly held views. As a result, L2 writers who are limited to such features run the risk of too often positioning themselves as L2 writers with less confidence in their texts and less strength in their voice and arguments than might be warranted.

It seems clear that the participant writers' prior writing practices may not have fully equipped them to write well with personal voice in academic contexts, particularly once they returned to their professional lives in Taiwan. Since returning to their teaching position, these L2 writers are required to write publishable papers in their teaching positions. They are supposed to adopt or adjust to new forms, writing styles and voices in their texts based on their schools' policies. The voice they developed in their overseas studies stressed critical thinking, professional knowledge and authority in their papers. However, in Taiwan, publication is just another practice to earn professional credit; academic personal voice is not felt to be an essential

component for publication. Consequently, the majority of these L2 mature writers did not feel that the concept of academic personal voice is important for their academic writing in Taiwan, although they did not consciously downplay the value of personal voice, individual knowledge, and critical thinking, and they did value learning ways of positioning themselves as researchers/scholars, a task which they felt they still could not manage well.

There is clearly a gap in L2 research to display how mature writers move to the United States to study and adopt new writing styles and then move back to their home countries. Research is needed to understand the difficulties and challenges involved in these transitions, and how the writers in question deal with aspects of their academic personal voice. In this study, the data showed how one group of mature L2 writers encountered and solved their difficulties using their prior writing training, and how they eventually developed their academic writing skills. Addressing the first transition these writers experienced, this study reveals a gap involving the transition between academic writing training or practices L2 writers received in Taiwan and what the American system was designed to give them. Secondly, the data also shows that even though L2 writers can often effectively use words, phrases, sentences, argumentative strategies, and structuring devices in their own writings, they are still challenged with positioning themselves confidently as scholarly writers. No doubt, they tend to be afraid of displaying a strong, original voice in their texts. This represents another gap between the training L2 writers received in overseas countries and what the American system was designed to give them—a gap that has potential consequences for L2 writers such as these, as they develop their academic writing abilities for publication in Taiwan. This can be a daunting problem for L2 students when they return home, particularly if they continue in professional roles that require writing for publication.

In fact, it is worth stressing again the nature of the differences between the two systems. In particular, written assignments and examinations in Taiwan typically require students to display language proficiency and grammar skills instead of demonstrating knowledge, critical thinking, and familiarity with the content of their writing. All of the participants in this study went through considerable struggles as they adjusted their writing practice to reflect the need for academic writing, critical thinking and positioning as they studied abroad. Without earlier experience in advanced issues regarding writing styles and academic personal voice in Taiwan, L2 Taiwanese writers like these may find it hard to develop the awareness that would allow them a full range of options as they write on different topics for different audiences. However, their solid understanding of ideas of membership in their academic communities, of readers' expectations, and of power issues helped the participants to develop their academic writing, to select or adjust proper voice and positioning, and increase their motivation for displaying their voices as researchers and scholars in order to meet Western readers' expectation.

In short, even though these L2 Taiwanese mature writers are able to display their professional knowledge in texts and develop their understanding of academic personal voice, they still face a challenge of positioning themselves acceptably in terms of including a wide scope of linguistic features and having more strong voices or critical views, which would allow them to gain the status of legitimate participants in the writing process who may add to or transform their profession's discourse from within. If they do this successfully, they may gain more credibility as members of the publishing community, feel more empowered to express their views and align themselves effectively within existing academic discourse communities as they use alternative styles for different purposes and for different readerships.

In the following sections of this chapter, I will discuss the implications of the study, and suggestions that might help L2 writers such as my participants to develop smoothly into fully empowered professionals. These comments will come under the following headings: Implications for Taiwanese Universities; Implications for Professional L2 Writers; Implications for Graduate Instructors; A Special Consideration: Support for Dissertation Students; Implications for Graduate Education in the United States; and Suggestions for Future Research.

Implications for Taiwanese Universities

This study has shown aspects of the transition for one group of L2 mature writers between different academic environments; it has documented their difficulties while studying in overseas countries, and some of the challenges involved in taking up professional work back in their home environment. Or course, students' prior writing practices everywhere will have a great impact on their academic writing, not only in Taiwan but in all education systems. As pointed out earlier, L1 students are likely to face the same problems as L2 writers have. Academic writing is challenging for both L1 and L2 writers when they step into graduate programs. It is obviously important for graduate programs to understand and help students to learn and improve their academic writing through the process of writing and socialization because few students enter their graduate programs fully prepared for the demands of M.A. or Ph.D. programs and ready to write academic papers. In this section, I will emphasize the implications for higher education levels particularly, and provide some practical suggestions for Taiwanese universities to serve the needs of students who want to study abroad and function in professions that may require publication and/or regular writing in English. In fact, I feel that it is in these earlier university contexts that future professionals can best begin to prepare for academic writing in English.

Currently, Taiwanese students still learn English through the grammar translation method, and they tend to practice writing via the formulaic five paragraph essay. This pattern strikingly demonstrates that writing pedagogical approaches in Taiwan have not progressed much over the last 20 years. The present study results have highlighted some of the major problems Taiwanese L2 writers encounter when studying abroad at the graduate level, even after over 8 years of English training using the grammar translation teaching approach for text-oriented purposes,. One of the salient problems these writers face is having inadequate academic writing skills, and a sub-problem is their failure to express ideas with strong academic individual voice and to position themselves appropriately in their texts (e.g. having a narrow scope of positioning themselves, applying limited linguistic features to position themselves, and lacking confidence to express their ideas and to position themselves in texts). As a result, they face great challenges in the Western educational system and as they have not fully developed their academic writing skills as required for graduate study. Taiwanese universities and instructors could gain a sense of this phenomenon from the nine participants' narratives presented in this study.

In order to help students be successful learners and writers in overseas countries, the goal of the Taiwanese education system should be to help students step into their academic learning or writing context; the development of writing skills must also be considered a part of a socialization process. A great deal of support is imperative to lessen the stress of a later transition to a new phase; so Taiwanese universities should prepare accessible writing courses for students to develop their basic academic writing skills. These basic academic writing skills will help students to deal with uncertainty regarding the expectations during the undergraduate phase of their development, and will help them become self-directed in their learning in Taiwan, as well as possibly later in overseas countries. In relation to students' needs for skills, norms, and

knowledge for graduate study, following are some suggestions I would like to provide for Taiwanese universities whose students may want to study abroad and/or function in professions that may require publication and/or regular writing in English.

Such students need well-designed courses and extensive writing practices to prepare them for academic writing in their future study or research fields. The situation in Taiwanese universities is complex. For instance, students who enroll as English majors have relatively more chances to practice their academic writing skills than students from other disciplines. I will address the English department situation below. But something needs to be done to support students from other disciplines as well. A perennial dilemma is involved here: whether the English Department should (or is able to) shoulder the burden for writing instruction for a wide range of disciplines, or whether some or all of this responsibility belongs to the other departments in a university. Surely, the English department should open academic writing courses as best they can base on students' needs, and should offer information for students regarding inter-disciplinary learning. Conversely, instructors in other disciplines should encourage students to take basic academic writing courses in the English Department. Admittedly, given the current situation, problems may arise. For instance, science or social sciences students may not be able to get much help through inter-disciplinary academic writing courses in the English Department, because not many writing instructors are qualified to teach the requirements in different subject areas.

However, it is worth returning to a more general need for training in academic writing, which should fall within the domain of the English department. Curriculum designers in the English department should develop an overall course design for training in academic writing. The first year of this training should focus on basic academic writing skills such as academic

form, APA style, using citations, references and understanding different types of academic genres, in order to develop students' English writing abilities within the conventions of academic writing. The second year of academic writing practice should aim to develop more advanced academic writing skills such as understanding the concept of readers' expectations, synthesizing ideas from readings to develop the students' academic voice and position themselves well. The university may consider applying genre-based teaching approaches (e.g. English for Specific Purposes, System Functional Linguistics) or integrate social views of writing and may also explicitly state goals related to teaching academic writing. The two approaches just mentioned, ESP and SFL, are more grounded in Taiwan contexts because they focus on linguistic components, but also on situating these with regard to broader discourse structures and text features. More specifically, Taiwanese students can have more chances to view the relationship between texts/language and contexts and learn how to write appropriately in different contexts or genres. Therefore, Taiwanese instructors should improve their students' understanding of how linguistic features can shift and control their voice in different rhetorical situations, and help students increase their awareness of the choices they make when using language. Some activities will be discussed based on modifications of the principles of ESP and EFL teaching pedagogies in the following section.

The third and fourth years of academic writing should lead them to complete an academic paper and understand the academic world or the broader research domains in which they may wish to work later. In addition to using a course curriculum rooted in solid L2 proficiency goals, the element of socialization should be integrated in this stage. For instance, faculty members in the departments can schedule regular in-house mini-conferences, workshops or panels to introduce their research fields/domains and their interests in research topics. This kind of faculty

and administrative support may alleviate some of the uncertainty and lack of awareness that students now experience, through providing students with clear expectations and guidelines about professional life and academic writing. Additionally, English programs could also invite outside attendees or scholars/researchers to share their stories of preparing for professional lives and learning to write, and the problems they faced while studying at the graduate level. Guest speakers such as the participants in the present study could share valuable insights with students, while also emphasizing to them the important social or cultural factors which influenced their successful learning or writing development. Knowing something about other people's paths toward writing and publishing successfully can contribute to how graduate students understand their own writing issues. They can be made to realize that others have faced the challenges they may themselves face, and that the most common obstacles can be overcome. Students could also become familiar with, and even adopt, the values, skills, attitudes and knowledge needed for membership in academic communities.

Setting up an academic support group for students is important because peer support may lessen the stress of a new transition to a new phase of academics. This also would be a chance to develop a full range of L2 research domains for L2 immature researchers who need some opportunities to explore their research fields and their interests with the help of mature researchers. This kind of training or support can help students become self-directed and may also help L2 students to transition to another academic environment, for those intending to study abroad, for instance. If Taiwanese educators can understand this kind of preparation, they can help students be ready to make good sense of the learning situation or cultures in overseas graduate programs.

Extended writing-related experiences may be beyond the curriculum for most Taiwanese universities today. However, L2 writers need even more than has been outlined so far. They need not only to acquire academic writing skills, but also to explore the kinds of experiences that lead to publication and professional activity. This process should begin early, before they go abroad to study. There should be a consistent four year curriculum design of sequential academic writing training which addresses the problems of students with differing aims and goals, including those whose plans include graduate and professional training involving regular practice in English writing. As part of this program, Taiwanese L2 instructors need to fulfill the aims of each particular component course in the long term, and in particular to assist students with meeting the goals of preparation for overseas study and to motivate students to step confidently into the academic world.

To reiterate a point made earlier on a number of levels, there is clearly a very large gap between the training or support that this study's participants received in Taiwan, and what the American system expects in terms of preparation. The problematic gap between the training in the two contexts still represents a considerable obstacle, and again, it should be taken up before L2 students embark upon their overseas graduate study. We need to acknowledge that many L2 students are particularly ill-prepared for their graduate study or academic writing in terms of being "good writers," and that many will face considerable challenges at the graduate level. Therefore, Taiwanese universities should try to reduce the gap and build a connection, so that students may later be able to experience effective or successful learning or writing in the Western cultural educational system.

At best, new pedagogical directions might be explored in Taiwan, ultimately bringing the two systems somewhat closer and helping students to feel ready to step into this socialization

process in graduate school. And although it may not be possible to bridge that gap or markedly change it in the short run, some preliminary steps might be taken.

Genre-Based Approaches

A new direction in teaching pedagogy could shift the emphasis in Taiwan from the current traditional teaching approach to a genre-based pedagogy, to emphasize the relationship between positioning and readers as well as to focus on the usage of linguistic features and the selection of forms that are appropriate for any given context. A critical teaching approach could help students control their ability to exercise power while writing. L2 writing pedagogy should offer opportunities for L2 instructors to use integrative approaches to develop higher level critical thinking skills, to support the development of students' academic personal voice, and to empower students to control their learning. As seen in this view, ESP and EFL teaching approaches should be integrated into writing pedagogy in Taiwan in ways that are more grounded in Taiwanese contexts. These methods typically help students to understand how they use language in order to accomplish real communicative goals such as participating in discipline-specific knowledge construction, and help them become able to function in the discourse acceptable for the community. Such ability is crucial for all learners because today's complex society expects its students to be equipped with the ability to meet the social and linguistic needs of various contexts for full participation in these contexts.

More specifically, based on the principles of ESP teaching pedagogy in the writing classroom, I will suggest that L2 instructors should emphasize the importance of the structures and meanings of texts in academic contexts by rhetorically raising consciousness, so that L2 writers can improve their understanding of the differences between different genres within academic writing (e.g. conference proposals, research papers, articles). Instructors need to help

developing L2 writers increase their awareness of how to position themselves and select the forms that project the proper academic personal voice in different genres; the instructors also need to help learners understand the relationship among discourse communities, language forms, and texts.

In addition, I suggest that writing instructors should help L2 writers develop the thinking skills necessary for academic writing such as classifying, applying concepts, comparing, contrasting, judging, evaluating and applying new concepts, establishing hypotheses, interpreting data and drawing conclusions. For example, L2 writers can use background knowledge, reference materials, and other resources to analyze and refine arguments. Additionally, L2 writers need to develop their literacy and their ability to exercise power in their writing; so writing instructors should encourage students to see the very real relationship between rhetorical production and the material conditions of their own lives. Seeking to foster this kind of critical understanding, some instructors begin their courses with personal or expressivist writing assignments and then incrementally broaden the subject matter by asking questions: "Where did you get these ideas from?"; "What value system are they informed by?" Instructors who use such questions suggest that, even if our thoughts are not entirely our own, this does not necessarily invalidate the democratic notion that we can exercise agency by choosing our actions and judging between right and wrong. It should be noted that these thinking skills are very helpful for students to make judgments and evaluations, and express personal or critical opinions. It is important to teach academic writing, thinking skills and distinct linguistic features that need to be learned when carrying out an activity within a certain knowledge structure.

Based on the principles of the SFL (Systemic Functional Linguistics) teaching approach, I encourage teachers to help students understand the structure and nature of genres, as well as the

relationships between genres, in order to control these forms and use them creatively, while at the same time raising learners' awareness of the choices they make in writing and how these affect the content and positioning in texts. I suggest that L2 writers can best be helped to develop advanced writing skills and to understand discipline-appropriate language through authentic subject matter content (e.g. sociology or political science, psychology or English); since such specifically focused texts can help students to learn about both the language and the social-cultural knowledge within given disciplines. Increasing L2 writers' abilities to function in the discourse acceptable for a given community is also a good way to develop their understanding of positioning. Therefore, in writing classes, instructors can empower students by increasing their awareness of context and task-appropriate meaning-making resources, while in the process helping L2 writers develop the ability to use language to accomplish real communicative goals such as participating in discipline specific knowledge construction. It is a valuable teaching approach for increasing students' understanding that what we do with language is interdependent with what is talked about, the relationship between readers and writers, and expectations for how particular texts should be organized.

Implications for Professional L2 Writers

The study results have shown that mature L2 writers believed that they needed to position themselves as professional and knowledgeable scholars in their papers; therefore, presenting their knowledge became a high priority when writing academic papers or for publishing these papers. Thus, ultimately, although they followed quite different paths, they returned to the idea of holding authority through knowledge and ideas, rather than through the force of their presentation. Another area these writers had trouble with was audience analysis. Specifically, they had trouble writing for their readers and deciding which journals would be appropriate for

them to submit papers to. These are two areas in which professional L2 writers still need to improve, because it is very important for them to present their own ideas critically, position themselves appropriately in their manuscript and find the right place to publish their papers.

Voice in Publication

The study revealed that the L2 writer participants quite often assumed voices in their texts that were weaker or less empowered than they might be. Therefore, in this section I will provide some suggestions to enrich L2 immature writers' understanding of voice in academic writing or for publication. Even though mature L2 writers have academic writing skills, the writers in this study still relied heavily on citing sources, essentially hiding their own voice and gaining confidence from other scholars' voices or from well-known references. However, writers' own thoughts, critical views and suggestions/reflections are often more valuable (or are at least very important) for reviewers/readers. Therefore, I would suggest that L2 writers cut down on the theoretical nature of the discussion, while at the same time adding more of self or personal voice to their texts. It is very important for L2 writers to generate their own statements or arguments in texts, through synthesizing ideas from others and infusing their own voice or critical views. At the same time, L2 writers have to adjust their tone in places where they may want to convey their confidence and competence as professional writers, by extending their lexical choices to represent their values, beliefs and preferences**.** Presenting one's own voice in an academic text is very important for completing a successful academic paper. One easy way, especially for Taiwanese writers, to achieve this is to use more strong words, phrases, adjectives, phrasal lexis or explicit markers in support of a passionately felt position or to express their thoughts and ideas. L2 writers have to be aware that they connect themselves with their readers through their ideas (which the participants have noted); however, they also need to realize that

they can express these ideas, at times more effectively, by exploiting a full range of linguistic tools, rather than by relying heavily on conventional markers or impersonal forms. That is, professional L2 writers should go beyond the confines imposed by the conventions of academic writing and allow themselves to explore the full range of expressive options available to them in academic writing.

Increasing the Sense of Audience

The results of this study have shown that the nine participants are relatively unaware of their audience; that is, they do not target a certain group of readers when they are constructing their manuscripts. Instead, they search for their readers after they complete their manuscript, or they conceptualize their readers in terms too vague to be useful. This problem may be solved if writers come to understand their relationship to readers and their understanding of readers' expectations, so that they gain a sense of who they are as writers and of their writing communities. It is a thinking process, so L2 writers can learn though social systems mediated by texts and the ways they can effectively take part in them. Therefore, L2 writers should always ask questions or make predictions in order to connect with their writing and audiences. What are readers' purposes, anticipations, choices, interests and attitudes toward their texts? How could you write more specifically for your audiences? How are readers using their experience, coupled with knowledge of the language? L2 writers can also draw often and deeply on sources that can help them to know their audiences better. There are two areas in which I would suggest that Taiwanese L2 writers can cultivate their sense of readers and understanding readers' expectations. First, in order to understand their readers, they need to interact and build their social network with other scholars, especially with those in the same research domain. Interacting with these mature researchers and having help from them through this positive

socialization is essential for L2 immature writers to make sense of their potential readers culturally and socially. There are several ways L2 writers can approach their potential readers: L2 writers either can exchange ideas and constitute voice through social interaction in virtual worlds such as Blackboard, Facebook or Twitter; or they can attend conferences and present papers in an attempt to share their research and obtain feedback. L2 writers need to interact with their peers by reading their studies and books or talking with them in order to understand their voices, beliefs and values. Therefore, L2 writers may acknowledge that adjusting their voice while composing their manuscripts can help them to increase awareness of their readers and their sense of the readers' expectations.

Second, and on another level, L2 writers need to understand who the reviewers/readers of each journal are, because each journal may have its own requirements, theoretical preferences, and guidelines which writers need to be aware of. That is, reviewers/readers may specifically look at some points they need to focus on in the manuscripts they review. Of course, some of these may be virtually universal, but others may be idiosyncratic to any particular journal. Besides following the guidelines, L2 writers should understand different journals may be intended for specific audiences, or may favor certain topics over others, or may be identified with writing that espouses or advocates a particular theoretical position. All of these preferences are important, and L2 writers need to be aware of the factors that are important to any publication to which they submit their work. In sum, academic personal voice may not be a major element included explicitly in a typical list of publication guidelines. However, within the guidelines, and the unwritten understandings about any given publication, L2 writers need to be able to position themselves as confident and critical writers and legitimize themselves

appropriately with a strong academic voice in their writing in order for their work to be published.

Implications for Graduate Instructors and Program in the U. S.

The study results have shown that L2 writers experience different cultural and educational backgrounds; consequently, they have their own ways of selecting linguistic features and expressing meaning based on their needs and social position. Graduate instructors should understand the phenomenon of diversity which L2 writers bring into the classroom. They need to move toward tolerating more diversity in writing styles, including characteristic styles that may carry an L2 voice. Moreover, they should develop the humility to learn from students, as well as the open mindedness to consider alternative perspectives. Such an orientation will enable L2 instructors to be alert to the teachable moments that arise from students' diverse writing practices and to develop their own strategies to help their graduate students to develop their academic voice in academic writing.

Developing the Format of Academic Writing

The study has also shown that even though Taiwanese graduate students may have met the requirements for entering a graduate program, they have still not yet developed the format of academic writing in the disciplinary community; that is, they still need to learn the conventions of academic writing such as APA style and argumentative forms. They need to become familiar with a whole range of activities, such as writing proposals and research papers, citing sources, and citing and handling references. Students' academic writing should continue to be at the center of learning in higher education, but it is often an invisible dimension of the curriculum; that is**,** teachers or professors may assume that academic writing is part of the common sense knowledge students bring with them, so they do not explicitly teach it within graduate level

disciplinary courses. In addition, Taiwanese graduate students have also not explored other important issues such as the need to have a personal academic voice when expressing critical ideas in their texts. Essentially, then, on both fronts, L2 writers' writing skills are insufficient for their first year of graduate study. Graduate instructors, therefore, should not neglect this point and should provide more help for L2 writers to improve their familiarity with academic writing.

There are several ways which L2 graduate instructors may consider providing support for their international students. Many L2 students may be unfamiliar with commonly assumed skills such as reading syllabi and understanding instructors' requirements. These newly arrived students they do not have the cultural experiences that L1 students bring, such as years of education in the American system. Therefore, their misinterpretations may cause them to fail on a given assignment, as Drs. A and T experienced. Secondly, Taiwanese and other Asian students need as much explicit instructions, guidance and detailed feedback as possible. It is even better for graduate instructors to hold follow-up writing conferences, in order to scaffold and to facilitate the development of L2 graduate writers. Graduate instructors have to realize that their constructive feedback is almost certainly a highly significant factor in directing students toward successful learning and writing in their disciplinary communities. The interactivity of such conferences could do more than just foster improved writing; it could also provide graduate instructors with a chance to understand students' immediate needs such as the diverse cultural, educational and writing needs of their students. With better communication and more regular contacts between students and instructors, it could be possible to clarifying meanings and resolving ambiguities that L2 graduate students experience. Thirdly, graduate instructors can hold debates for enhancing students' ability to think critically and expanding students' affirmative or negative options. Critical thinking consistently demands questioning, investigating

and problem solving, analyzing and scrutinizing argumentation, and examining and restructuring knowledge or voice. Finally, graduate instructors may discuss texts that illustrate well-known writers' voice, and then may ask students to write papers imitating the author's voice. This writing practice could help them to model writing styles or voice from effective writers and understand how they should position themselves as researchers, scholars, student researchers or Ph.D. students.

Modeling and Imitation Skills

The study also shows that the participants are worried about their status as L2 writers, when their graduate program seems geared to the needs and abilities of the first-language users. In this situation, L2 writers may feel unable to reach what they perceive as their professors' too-high expectations, and they may instead opt to simply try to mimic others' work. In such a context, even mature L2 writers may still heavily rely on modeling or imitating as a developmental strategy. In fact, many instructors do not recognize this as a valid technique, and so they ignore its presence. However, L2 writers often have background experience that makes this strategy familiar to them; moreover, as second language writers, they have a special need to integrate the kinds of linguistic forms used in academic writing. Given this, they need to engage in imitation and use models, as they develop a range of lexical and syntactic choices in their writing. L2 graduate instructors should be aware of this need. Rather than discouraging imitation out of hand, these instructors should serve as mentors during the imitation stage, while also encouraging L2 writers to move beyond imitation and learn to synthesize ideas on their own, even as they write a literature review (paraphrasing and summarizing the ideas of published scholars).

To support their students' needs for models, instructors can also provide more examples or paragraphs for students to read and discuss, providing guidance on how these developing writers can themselves adopt strategies similar to those used in the models, without necessarily slavishly imitating the originals. In order to increase L2 writers' awareness of positioning in texts, L2 graduate instructors should specifically point out the ways authors express themselves, by stressing specific linguistic features (word choice or structures) which affect the authors' voice presentation and positioning in their texts. In other words, through this writing practice, L2 writers may learn the ways of associating with dominant conventions and patterns, while also accommodating them critically into their own practice. This would be an effective way for L2 writers to construct a clear picture, and learn to consciously position themselves in their writing.

Writing Center

The idea of "Academic Writing Support" is a way for L2 writers to improve and refine their writing skills if they do not get as much instruction from their professors as they expected or as they needed. In this circumstance, a writing center can become an available place for even advanced L2 writers to get help with their academic writing, provided the writing center prepares for the needs of these writers. Writing centers should recruit professional editors who have experience working with dissertation students or advanced writers. Academic Writing Support groups or on-line Academic Support Groups should carefully proofread and edit all academic texts, provide each author with individualized advice on how he/she can improve their English writing weaknesses, and offer specific and general suggestions for improving L2 writers' academic writing. Even though editors will edit or proofread with grammatical correctness and style in mind, special attention should be paid to the necessary conventions of academic writing

in English. The group also needs to provide consultations with L2 advanced writers before or after editing each text, and provide feedback to the specific needs of each writer.

Advanced L2 writers may have special needs; for example, Taiwanese writers need help clarifying subtle aspects of their expression, structuring paragraphs and sentences, modifying the strong/weak voice of their ideas or arguments and selecting linguistic features to represent their positions through a clear academic personal voice in their texts. Advanced Taiwanese L2 writers value ideas and express their meanings in a different way from L1 writers; so if they are able to express themselves or create a more individualistic stance, they may present their ideas more clearly and communicate better with their readers.

Tutors/editors need to increase their understanding of L2 writers' voice or positioning in their texts, particularly when they encounter advanced writers. L2 writers' ongoing needs for support should be brought to the attention of graduate programs and writing centers. Building a network of professional editors as support or assistance to advanced L2 writers may be a good way to solve the problems of these writers. In a discourse community (e.g. a graduate program) where much communication takes place, L2 writers could find an easy way to approach editors or tutors in a more dialogic way online. It is very important to support or provide various sources for Ph.D. students to interact with editors/tutors who can give them feedback and provide assistance.

A Special Consideration: Support for Dissertation Students

This study has shown that mature L2 writers face a challenge in keeping their academic personal voices in their texts. It is not easy for L2 graduate writers to keep their position as student researchers. It is a transformation process for L2 writers from students into student researchers, so it is important for the Ph.D. student to maintain their tone and voice. Therefore,

as previously noted, the skills of critical thinking and synthesizing ideas become crucial elements for L2 writers to develop their academic personal voice or establish critical or argumentative views. At this point, L2 writers tend not to rely heavily on citing other scholars directly, and try to articulate their own arguments or theory or relate the existing literature to their own current work. It is challenging, but L2 writers still can overcome the challenge by gradually increasing their ability to grasp meaning correctly and confidently from the process of reading or re-reading scholarly works. L2 writers should not hesitate or should not be afraid to express their understandings and display their knowledge in their first draft. Further, they should try to redefine meaning or understanding, develop or discover a writers' voice and modify their academic personal voice through the process of several revisions in writing.

Another suggestion, similar to the one above; doctoral students need regular conferences with their advisors once they reach the especially demanding stage of their dissertation, because this kind of social link plays a crucial role in their success in writing a dissertation. This social aspect of writing and negotiation with advisors, leading to multiple opportunities for feedback and revision, creates the environment which will allow the students to construct their own voice. It can also pave the way for further opportunities for these dissertation advisees to work with readers/editors/reviewers in order to get their papers published. In other words, the negotiating skills they develop during the dissertation phase can carry over into their future careers in publication. Judging from the stories of my participants, many dissertation students may not be receiving instruction in the areas they need to ensure the right direction of their study and to meet their committee members' expectations. Therefore, I would suggest that dissertation students have a good mentor or good scholarly relationships to compensate for this point.

Writing a dissertation is a long-term project; so dissertation students may be able to use the mentor relationship as an opportunity to develop their understanding of readership or to get some help in certain areas that remain unclear to them even after their doctoral course work. This is also an excellent time for the dissertation writer herself to deepen her understanding of herself as a writer and researcher. Extended discussion with mentors can help the dissertation researchers extend their views and interpret data through various perspectives. Both advisors' and other mentors' voices are very important and valuable for students who are writing a dissertation. Without extensive negotiation and close mentoring relationships, these developing researchers may have a hard time reaching the committee members' expectations or expressing their own voice. Like Dr. R, most other participants also encountered many obstacles during the process of writing their dissertations, which made this a time of anxiety and uncertainty, rather than a time for growing confidence and mastery in their field.

L2 Current Research Suggestions

For L2 Writing Researchers

I would recommend that researchers make analysis explicit in association with L2 writers' academic writing development, teaching pedagogies and educational systems in different contexts, and extend their understanding of L2 writers' development of academic personal voice through the processes of revision and socialization. In particular, detailed study of an area such as L2 writers' needs for future publication may provide a great contribution to the fields of second language writing, language acquisition, curriculum design and the educational system (including undergraduate and graduate programs) in Taiwan and in the United Sates.

The methodology of this study is quite productive in marrying the text and the interview. Obviously, the data showed that participants' interview data can cooperate with their textual analysis quite effectively. In terms of textual analysis, I believe that employing voice within this analytic framework, that is, Halliday's (1985) three macro-functions of language and Ivanic and Camps' (2001) three types of writer positioning, helps to provide the foreground for the voice issue and provides students with an established position in L2 writing. This analytic framework has helped this study to categorize and discuss the samples that were presented directly under headings according to linguistic categories. Thus, having a framework which equips writing instructors with a deeper understanding of how to address those areas in their pedagogy should be valuable for L2 researchers and instructors to extend the concept of positioning employing various linguistic features not only in academic writing but also in non-academic writing. Further research with this methodology and with different ethnic groups in different geographical contexts may shed more light on this topic, which is so vital to acquiring L2 writing skills and a written voice.

The study shows that Taiwanese professional writers are aware of presenting their voice in texts for the purpose of knowledge presentation and publication. Therefore, I would suggest that L2 researchers explore L2 writers' hopes and attitudes regarding acquisition of an L2 voice in both L1 and L2 contexts. More studies regarding L2 writers' needs to acquire voice from L2 to L1 contexts should be added to the L2 writing research field. These studies can help L2 researchers to enrich their understanding of how and what elements or problems may affect L2 writers in expressing their L2 voice and their voice-related experience after they come back to Taiwan. Additionally, since there is little research focusing on the field of L2 mature writers' academic voice development in both Taiwanese contexts and overseas countries, further study is

needed to show in more detail how such L2 mature writers move to overseas countries to study and adopt new writing styles, then move back to Taiwan. As is, although the present study makes a contribution to the area, the data, particularly regarding L2 mature writers' second transition, is not adequate. Therefore, I would like to suggest that the data could be a more in-depth study for multicultural individuals to see their difficulties with academic personal voice after moving back to their L2 context. Some questions may be important for future research: What are L2 Taiwanese or other Asian professional writers' perspectives on acquiring voice in their texts and contexts? What is their transition from the L2 context back to the L1 context in relation to grounding the data analysis procedures for the present study? Whose voice takes over? Whose meaning is heard? Who has the power to repopulate or resist another's words? When writers identify their professor as their main reader and feel they need to reflect the professor's ideologies in their texts, power is unequally distributed; how do these power issues play out in graduate programs with international student populations? To some extent, the results of this study hint at danger in this area, since the professor was often listed as the audience for graduate level papers.

This study's results highlight some components which influence mature L2 writers' voice development in academic contexts. Therefore, it may be valuable for L2 researchers to extend the currently popular discussion of voice either from educational, cultural or individual imposition to the more social aspect of voice acquisition. That is, L2 researchers can explore their understanding of how L2 writers adopt and infuse other voices into their writing through interacting with peers or professors, and how L2 writers may change their positioning in texts or their published works after they interact with others.

References

Atkinson, D. (2001). Reflections and refractions on the *JSLW* special issues on voice. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 107-124.

Atkinson, D. (2003). Writing for publication/writing for public execution: On the (personally) vexing notion of (personal) voice. In C. P. Casanave & S. Vandrick (Eds.), *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education* (pp. 159-175). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Atkinson, D., & Ramanathan, V. (1995). Cultures of writing: An ethnographic comparison of L1 and L2 university writing/language programs. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(3), 439-598.

Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal, 54*(2), 153-160.

Bakhtin, M. (1986*). Speech genres and other late essays.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Belcher, D. (1994). The apprenticeship approach to advanced academic literacy: Graduate student and their mentors. *English for Specific Purposes, 13*, 23-34.

Belcher, D., & Hirvela, A. (Eds.). (2001). Special issue on voice in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 1-2.

Bloch, J. (2001). Plagiarism and the ESL student: From printed to electronic texts. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 209-228). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Bloch, J., & Chi, L. (1995). A comparison of the use of citations in Chinese and English academic discourse. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 231-274). Norwood, NJ: State University of New York Press.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bowden, D. (1995). The rise of a metaphor "voice" in composition pedagogy. *Rhetoric Review, 14*, 173-188.

Bowden, D. (1999). *The mythology of voice.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann.

Burnham, C. (2001). Expressive pedagogy: Practice/ theory, theory/practice. In G. Tate, A. Rupiper., & S. Schick (Eds.), *A guide to composition pedagogies* (pp. 92-112). New York: Oxford University Press.

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.

Cai, G. (1999). Texts in contexts: Understanding Chinese students' English compositions. In C. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), *Evaluating writing: The role of teachers' knowledge about text, learning and culture* (3rd ed., pp. 279-297). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Casanave, C. P. (1995). Local interactions: Constructing texts for composing in a graduate sociology program. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language* (pp. 83-113). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Casanave, C. P. (2004). *Controversies in second language writing: Dilemma and decisions in research and instruction.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Casanave, C. P. (2007). *Controversies in second language writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Chen, D. W. (2001). *The identity crisis of EFL composition instruction in Taiwan.* Paper presented at the 18th Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China, Taipei.

Chen, S. C. (2003). *The spread of English in Taiwan: Changing uses and shifting attitudes*. Taipei, Taiwan: Crane.

Chern. C.-L. (2010). *An overview of English language education at primary level in Taiwan*. Paper presented at An open symposium on primary school English education in Asia. Retrieved Dec 04, 2010, from http://www.gavo.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp/L2WS2010/papers/L2WS2010_S-03.pdf

Cherry, R. D. (1988). Ethos versus persona: Self-representation in written discourse. *Written Communications, 5*, 251-276.

Coe, R. M. (2002). The New Rhetoric of genre: Writing political briefs. In A. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 195-206). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cohen, A. (1987). Student process of feedback on their compositions. In A. L. Wednen & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 57-59). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Cohen, M., & Manion, L. (1994). *Research methods in education* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.

Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 169-206). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Currie, P. (1998). Staying out of trouble: Apparent plagiarism and academic survival. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(1), 1-18.

Deckert, G. D. (1993). Perspectives on plagiarism from ESL students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 24*(2), 131-148.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DeSena, L. H. (2007). *Preventing plagiarism: Tips and techniques*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Devitt, A. (2004). *Writing genres.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Dong, Y. R. (1998). Non-Native graduate students' thesis/dissertation in science: self-reports by students and their advisors from two U.S. institutions. *English for Specific Purpose, 17,* 369-390.

Ede, L. (1989). *Work in progress: A guide to writing and revising.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Elbow, P. (1981). *Writing with power*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elbow, P. (1987). Closing my eyes as I speak: An argument for ignoring audience. *College English, 49,* 50-69.

Elbow, P. (1994). Introduction. In P. Elbow (Ed.), *Landmark essays on voice and writing* (pp. xi-xvii). Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press.

Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing without teachers*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elbow, P. (1999). Individualism and the teaching of writing: Response to Vai Ramanathan and Dwight Atkinson. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(3), 327-338.

Erlandson, D., Harris, E., Skipper, B., & Allen, S. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fishman, S., & McCarthy, L. (2001). An ESL writer and her discipline-based professor. *Written Communication, 18*, 180-228.

Flower, L. (1989). Cognition, context and theory building. *College Composition and Communication, 40*, 282-311.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. Hertfordshire, England: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W.R., & Gall, J.P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction* (6th ed.). White Plans, NY: Longman.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourse*. Bristol, PA: Routledge.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discourse of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Graue, M. E., & Walsh, D. J. (1998). *Studying children in context: Theories, methods & ethics.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Grave, D. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *Introduction to functional grammar (*2nd ed.). London: Arnold

.

Hammerly, H. (1991). *Fluency and accuracy.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Hammond, J., & Macken-Horarik, M. (1999). Critical literacy: Challenges and questions for ESL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*, 528-544.

Harris, J. (1997). *A teaching subject: Composition since 1966.* Upper Saddle River. NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in educational settings.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Heath, S. B. (1991). The sense of being literate: Historical and cross-cultural features. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Person (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 3-25). New York: Longman.

Helms-Park, R., & Stapleton, P. (2003). Questioning the importance of individualized voice in undergraduate L2 argumentative writing: An empirical study with pedagogical implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(3), 245-265.

Hinkel, E. (2002). Teaching grammar in writing classes: Tenses and cohesion. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 181-198). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hirvela, A., & Belcher, D. (2001). Coming back to voice: The multiple voice and identities of mature multilingual writers. *Journal of Second language writing, 10*(1-2), 83-106.

Ho, I. (1998). *Relationships between motivation/ attitude, effort, English proficiency, and sociocultural educational factors and Taiwan technological university/ institute students' English learning strategy use.* Unpublished dissertation, Auburn University, Alabama.

Hsu, J. Y. (2005). *A study of senior high school English teachers' practices and beliefs about writing instruction.* Unpublished master's thesis, National Sun Yat-sen University,

Kaohsiung, Taiwan.

Hyland, K. (2002a). Options of identity in academic writing. *ELT Journal, 56*(4), 351-358.

Hyland, K. (2002b). *Teaching and researching writing*. Harlow, England: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2003a). *Second language writing.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

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

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and Second Language Writing.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. New York: Continuum.

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

Ivanic, R. (1994). I is for interpersonal: Discoursal construction of writer identities and the teaching of writing. *Linguistics and Education, 6*, 3-15.

Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Ivanic, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 3-33.

Jacobs, D. L. (1995). *Positioning the subject in discourse: Toward a rhetorical theory of voice in writing.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Johanson, R. (2001). *The role of interactions in academic writing: A collective case study of five Taiwanese doctoral students in a graduate school of education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.

Johns, A. M. (2002). Genre and ESL/EFL composition instruction. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamic of second language writing.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Johnstone, B. (1996). *Linguistic individual: Self-expression in language and linguistics.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural communication. *Language Learning, 16,* 1-20.

Larsen, D. S. (2003). *Freshman college students acquiring academic writing: An examination of basic writers and ESL writers.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Leki. I. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Leki, I. (1995). Coping strategies of ESL students in writing tasks across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly, 29,* 235-260.

Leki, I. (2001). Interlude: Developing meaningful literacy courses. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading/writing connections* (pp. 201-206). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Leki, I. (2006). You cannot ignore: graduate L2 students' experience of and responses to written feedback practices. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 266-285). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Leki, I., Cumming, A., & Silva, T. (2008). *A synthesis of research on second language writing in English.* New York: Routledge.

Li, X. (1996). *Good writing in cross-cultural context.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lincoln, Y., & Denzin, N. (1998). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Liu, Y. (2008). Taiwanese students' negotiations with academic writing: Becoming playwrights and film directors. *Journal of Second Language Writing 17*, 86-101.

Matalene, C. (1985). Contrastive rhetoric: An American writing teacher in China. *College English, 47*(8), 789-808.

Matsuda, P. K. (1998). Situating ESL writing in a cross-disciplinary context. *Written Communication, 15(*1), 99-122.

Matsuda, P. K. (2001). Voice in Japanese written discourse: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(1-2), 35-53.

Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of Second Language Writing. 12*(1), 65-83.

Matsuda, K. P., & Tardy, M. C. (2007). Voice in academic writing: The rhetorical construction of author identity in blind manuscript review. *English for Specific Purposes, 26*, 235-249.

Maxwell, J. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Maxwell, J. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study application in education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Murray, D. (1985). *A writer teaches writing*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Ochieng, A. M. (2005). *Secondary voices, familiar territory: An exploratory study of ESL academic writing practices. A case study of Kenyan students in a North American University.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA.

Ortmeier-Hooper, C. M. (2007). *Beyond "English language learner": Second language writers, academic literacy, and issues of identity in the U.S. high school*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 3277145)

Ortmeier-Hooper, C. M. (2008). English may be my second language, but I'm not 'ESL'. *College Composition and Communication, 59*(3), 389-419.

Parry, K. (1996). Culture, literacy, and L2 reading. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(4), 665-691.

Pecorari, D. (2001). Plagiarism and international students: How the English-Speaking University responds. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 229-245). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Pennycock, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(2), 201-230

Perl, S. (1979). The composing process of unskilled college writers. *Research in the Teaching of English, 3*(4), 317-336.

Prior, P. (2001). Voice in text, mind, and society: Sociohistoric accounts of discourse acquisition and use. *Journal of Second Language Writing. 10*(1-2), 55-81.

Rafoth, B. A. (1990). The concept of discourse community: Descriptive and explanatory adequacy. In G. Kirsch & D.H. Roen (Eds.), *A sense of audience in written communication* (Vol.5, pp. 140-152). Witten Communication Annual. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ramanathan, V., & Atkinson, D. (1999). Individualism, academic writing, and ESL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8(1),* 45-75.

Rose, M., & McClafferty, K. A. (2001). A call for the teaching of writing in graduate education. *Educational Researcher, 30*(2), 27-33.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scollon, R. (1991, March 21). *Eight legs and one elbow: Stance and structure in Chinese English compositions.* In Proceedings of the second North American Conferences on Adult and Adolescent literary. Multiculturalism and citizenship Canada: International Reading Association.

Scollon, R. (1995). Plagiarism and ideology: Identity in intercultural discourse. *Language in Society, 24*(1), 1-28.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (1991). Topic confusion in English-Asian discourse. *World Englishes, 10,* 113-125.

Shay, S., Moore, R., & Cloete, A. (2002). Roles under construction: The intersection of writer agency and task design in South Africa. In D. Foster & D. Russell (Eds.), *Writing and learning in cross-national perspective: Transitions from secondary to higher education.* Mahwah, NJ: National Council of Teachers of English and Lawrence Erlbaum.

Stapleton, P. (2002). Critiquing voice as a viable pedagogical tool in L2 writing: Returning the spotlight to ideas. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(3), 177-190.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Steward, D. (1972). *The authentic voice: A pre-writing approach to student writing*. Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Stoehr, T. (1968). Tone and voice. *College English. 30*(2), 150-161.

Sue. S. M. (2003, November). Product-Oriented or Process-Oriented Approach Toward Teaching ESP? – in the Case of an EFL Nursing English Course. In Yui-nam Leung (Chair), *Curriculum Reform in EFL*. Symposium conducted at the 12th International Symposium on English Teaching, Hsinchu.

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Tang, R., & John, S. (1999). The 'I' in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun. *English for Specific Purposes, 18,* 23-39.

Tse, J. K. P. (1987). *Language planning and English as foreign language in middle school education in the Republic of China*. Taipei, Taiwan: Crane.

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Wu, S. Y. & Rubin, L. D. (2000). Evaluating the impact of collectivism and individualism on argumentative writing by Chinese and North American college students. *Research in the Teaching of English. 35(2),* 148-178.

Yang , S. K. (2001, March). *Dilemmas of Education Reform in Taiwan: Internationalization or Localization?* Paper presented at the 2001 Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society, Washington D. C., USA, 13-17.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Overview of the Background of participants

Participants (Gender/ position)	Previous writing experience	Postgraduate studies in overseas countries (pursuing degree and years)	Age Around
Dr. E (F / Associate. Pro.)	Academic professional	MA in English Language and Literature(3) Ph.D. in Education (5)	45
Dr. C (F/ Full. Pro.)	Personal	MA- English Education(1.5)	55
Dr. R (M / Assistant. Pro.)	Personal	MA in TESOL (2) Ph.D. in TESOL and Composition (3.5)	50
Dr. K(F/ Assistant. Pro.)	Personal/ Essay Academic writing	MA in TESOL (2) Ph.D. TESOL (4.5)	35
Dr. A (F/ Assistant. Pro.)	personal	MA in TESOL & Applied Linguistics (2) Ph.D. TESOL and Composition (5)	40
Dr. T (F/ Assistant. Pro.)	Essay writing	MED in TEFL (1) Ph.D. in TEFL (5)	35
Dr. S (F / Assistant. Pro.)	Personal/ Essay writing	MED in English as Second Language. (1) Ph.D. in Higher Education (3)	55
Dr. H (F/ Assistant. Pro.)	Personal/ Essay writing	MA in TESOL (2) Ph.D. in Education (3)	45
Dr. W (M/ Assistant. Pro.)	Academic professional in Chinese and English	MS in Biological Science (3) EDD in TESOL (5)	45

Appendix B: Demographic Questionnaires

Dear Participant,

Thank you for your participation in this study. Please provide the following demographic information honestly and openly.

1. Name: _____ English name: _____

   E-mail address: _____Skype: _____

   Facebook: _____Please circler gender: M / F

   Age _____(18-25) (26-30) (31-35) (36-40) (over 40)

   Occupation: _____ School: _____

2. Schools attend(ed) in English-speaking countries:

   Country_____ Pursuing degree: _____

   Major: _____Year of study: _____

   Years spent in College / University? _____

   Country_____ Pursuing degree: _____

   Major: _____Year of study: _____

   Years spent in College / University? _____

3. Schools attended in Taiwan:

   University _____

   Major: _____Year of study: _____

   Graduate: _____

   Major: _____ Year of study: _____

   Years of learning English: _____

4. Attending EFL/ ESL preparation courses:

   Country:_____ Course: _____

   Others: _____

5. Please list any kinds of writing you do on a regular basis:

6. Have you published written pieces in English? If so, where, when, and on what subjects:

Journal: _____ Year: _____

Topics: _____

Journal: _____ Year: _____

Topics: _____

Others: _____

Section 2: Please circle the response that best represents your reaction of these statements.

You will answer twenty-five items, using a 7-point likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree and 6-point liker scale from always to never, to evaluate statements. Please underline or highlight the response that comes closest to how you feel about each statement.

SA= Strongly Agree A= Agree AS= Agree somewhat N= Neither agree nor disagree DS= Disagree somewhat D=Disagree SD=Strongly Disagree

1 I think my experience with Chinese writing has had a strong impact on my English writing

SA A AS N DS D SD

2 I feel comfortable using 'I' in an essay or written piece for my potential readers.

Always Very frequently Occasionally Rarely Very rarely never

3 I feel that I present myself as a knowledgeable writer in the papers I write.

Always Very frequently Occasionally Rarely Very rarely never

4 I feel confident in expressing my own ideas in papers I write.

SA A AS N DS D SD

5 I think my written pieces are usually impersonal.

SA A AS N DS D SD

6 I feel connected to my writing when I write in English.

SA A AS N DS D SD

7 I bring my own assumption, beliefs, value and expectations in my papers.

SA A AS N DS D SD

8. I feel that my writing style is distinctive. (not like others writers)

SA A AS N DS D SD

9. When I write I learn thing about myself.

SA A AS N DS D SD

10 Grammar leads to direct improvement in English writing.

SA A AS N DS D SD

Section 3: Open-ended Questions:

Instructions to participants: Please write a short answer to these questions using either English or Mandarin.

1. When I write the way I choose to use is

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. I feel that I have written a good paper or other written pieces when_____

   _____

   _____

3. Expressing my own ideas in academic English writing is (difficult, easy, important, etc.)_____ because _____

   _____

   _____

4. I enjoy / don't enjoy (circle one) writing in English because_____

   _____

   _____

5. When I write, I think of my readers in the following ways:_____

   _____

   _____

6. I think it is important/ not important to pay attention to linguistic forms in writing behavior

   _____

   _____

Appendix C: Interview Guides
The First Interview Guide (Interview Questions) for the Researcher

These questions are meant as initial openers and participants will be involved to elaborate on answer. I will ask probe questions and follow-up questions to clarify details about what they say.

1. Can you describe your writing experiences in Chinese and English? What similarities or differences do you encounter between the two languages?

2. Explain your early academic English writing experience. What kinds of writing did you do when you first wrote? What was the biggest challenge for you in English writing when you first wrote English papers in Taiwan? Did you find it similar to write in English and in Chinese, or where these quite different, and why? What did you find to be easy or not as challenging in English writing?

3. Can you describe one of your academic writing experiences in Taiwan? More specifically, can you relate one academic writing experience that you expected and were prepared for and one thing that you had not expected and were not prepared for? How did your teachers in Taiwan describe 'good writing'?

4. What was it like to begin writing in the ESL context? How were the expectations different in the U.S./Australia from what you had experienced before? What were some learning experiences you encountered during your first two years of English academic writing?

5. By the time you began your dissertation, how had your feelings about English writing changed compared with your first English writing experience?

6. After studying in an English-speaking country and writing your dissertation, how have your views on writing in English changed? How has your technique improved? What can you do now that you could not do when you first began?

7. Think of your academic writing level when you first arrived at the graduate program in the U.S. and your writing level when you finished the program. Do you think that you notice any improvement in your writing over time and, if so, in what ways did you notice improvement?
8. What do you believe makes a good academic paper?

9. What part of academic writing did you have the least amount of difficulty with?

10. What are your difficulties in academic writing? Why do you perceive this to be difficult?

11. What challenges did you face when attempting to write academically in the English speaking country/countries in which you studied? How does this differ from your academic writing challenges in Taiwan?

12. What strategies did you use to improve your academic writing?

13. What similarities did you encounter between academic writing practices in Taiwan and academic writing practices in the USA?

14. What differences did you encounter between academic writing practices in Taiwan and academic writing practices in the USA?

15. What are the most significant differences between the two contexts?

The second Interview Guide

1. Do you think that you express yourself well in academic English writing? If so, how?
2. How do you select the topic? How did you come up with topics?
3. When you write academically, who is your audience? What strategies do you use to connect with your readers? How has this changed?
4. Did your audience change once you began to write academically in Taiwan? What about when you write in the U.S.?
5. Do you feel connected to your writing when you write in English? (express yourself)- Has this changed over time? If so, how?
6. How would you describe your writing style for (journal, email,) or in the assignments?
7. Do you include your personal views in your paper? If so, how has it changed?
8. Do you describe your interests through academic writing? if so, what are they?
9. How is your opinion on a topic demonstrated in your academic writing?
10. Do you feel confident in expressing your own ideas in academic writing? if so, in what ways?
11. How do you see your relationship with your readers? If so, how has it changed?
12. Do you feel comfortable using "I" in an essay or written piece for your potential readers? If so, when and how do you develop this strategy?
13. Do you use "you" in your essays, if so, who are you talking about?
14. Do you use the first person plural pronoun 'we' in your writing? if so, how? And what purpose does this meet?
15. Do you see your writing as "personal" or "impersonal" mode more frequently?
16. Do you think that maintaining your personal authority is necessary in the publications that you submit in your home country?
17. Are you concerned with any specific linguistic features or forms while writing? If so, why and how?
18. How do you think your academic writing formations in the English-speaking graduate program will affect your ability to write published works later on?
19. How do you believe your training in writing will meet your professional needs, now and in the future, as you see them?
20. How did your experience in the U.S. transfer to the writing you now do in Taiwan? Do you need to change your writing practices or strategies now that your context has shifted to Taiwan?
21. Would you like to elaborate on any of your other responses in the questionnaire? For instance (name an item whose response falls at one end of the likert scale).

Third Interview Guide

1. Do you think that you express yourself well in this paper? If so, how?
2. How do you select the topic? How did you come up with topics?
3. Can you tell me who your audience while writing this paper is? What strategies do you use to connect with your readers?
4. Do you feel connected to your writing? (Express yourself)? If so, how?
5. How would you describe your writing in this paper?
6. Do you include your personal views in your paper? If so, how?
7. Do you describe your interests through this writing? if so, what are they?
8. How is your opinion on a topic demonstrated in this paper?
9. Do you feel confident in expressing your own ideas in this paper? if so, in what ways?
10. How do you see your relationship with your readers? If so, how?
11. Do you feel comfortable using "I" in this written? If so, why?
12. When you use "you" in your essays, who you are talking about?
13. When you use the first person plural pronoun 'we' in this paper? What purpose does this meet?
14. Do you see this written peace as "personal" or "impersonal" mode?
15. Do you think that you maintain your personal authority in the paper?
16. Are you concerned with any specific linguistic features or forms while writing? If so, why and how?
17. Which transitions do you choose to use based on the context?

Appendix D: Metadiscourse items

Attitude markers: admittedly, agree, agrees, agreed, amazed, amazing, appropriate, astonish, correctly, curious, desirable, disappointed, disagree, dramatic, essential, expected, fortunate, hopefully, important, inappropriate, interesting, prefer, remarkable, shock, striking, surprised, unbelievable, unexpected, unfortunately, unusual,
Boosters—actually, always, believe, beyond doubt, clear, conclusively, definite, demonstrate, doubtless, establish, evident, find, found, in fact, incontestable, incontrovertible, indeed, indisputable, know, known, must (possibility), never, no doubt, obvious, obviously, of course, prove, proves, realize, realized, realizes, really, show, showed, shown, shows, sure, surely, think, thinks, thought, truly, true, undeniable, undeniably, undisputedly, undoubtedly, without doubt.
Self Mention --- I , we, me, my our, mine, us, the author, the author's , the writer, the writer's.
Hedges- about, almost, apparent, apparently, appear, appeared, appears, approximately, argue, argued, argues, around, assumed, broadly, certain amount, certain extent, certain level, claim, claimed, could, couldn't, doubt, doubtful, essentially, estimate, estimated, fairly, feel, feels, felt, frequently, from my perspective, from our perspective, from this perspective, generally, indicate, indicated, indicates, in general, in most cases, in most instances, in my opinion, in my view, in this view, in our opinion, in our view, largely, likely, mainly, may, maybe, might, mostly, often, on the whole, ought, perhaps, plausible, plausibly, possible, possibly, postulate, postulated, postulates, presumable, presumably, probable, probably, quite, rather X, relatively, roughly, seems, should, sometimes, somewhat, suggest, suggested, suggests, suppose, supposed, supposes, suspect, suspects, tend to, to my knowledge, typical, typically, uncertain, uncertainly, unclear, unclearly, unlikely, usually, would, wouldn't

Appendix E: Informed Consent Form
The First Informed Consent Form (for Questionnaire Participants)

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Shu-Fen Yeh, a doctoral candidate in English Composition& TESOL at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. The following information is provided in order to help you make an informed decision whether or not to participate. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to ask.

The purpose of this study is to understand Taiwanese mature writers' voice and positioning in L2 writing and their development of academic writing in English. Participation or nonparticipation will not affect the evaluation of your performances at the college. You will complete a demographic questionnaire including participants' biographic details such as age, sex, level of education, major, etc. Additionally, you will answer twenty-five items, using a 5-point likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree and always to never, to evaluate your views and attitudes toward writing and self-presentation in writing. You also need to answer five open-ended questions. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research; the questionnaire should not take more than about 15 or 20 minutes.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators or IUP. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you choose to participate, you may withdraw at any time by notifying the Project Director or informing the person administering the test. Upon your request to withdraw, all information is pertaining to me. If you choose to participate, all information will be held in strict confidence and will have no bearing on your academic standing or services you receive from the University. Your response will be considered only in combination with those from other participants.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please sign the statement below.

Researcher: Shu-Fen Yeh, PhD Candidate, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
English Department, Leonard Hall
1302 Oakland Ave. Essex # 214, Indiana, PA, 15701
724-349-3598
mlkp@iup.edu

Project Director: Dr. Jeannine M. Fontaine
110 Leonard Hall
Indianan University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, PA 15705
Phone: 724-357-2261

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724/357-7730).

The First Informed Consent Form (continued)

VOLUNTARY CONSENT FORM:

I have read and understand the information on the form and I consent to volunteer to be a subject in this study. I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I have the right to withdraw at any time. I have received an unsigned copy of this informed Consent Form to keep in my possession.

Name (PLEASE PRINT)

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Phone number or location where you can be reached: _____

_____

Best days and times to reach you: _____

I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature and purpose, the potential benefits, and possible risks associated with participating in this research study, have answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above signature.

_____ _____

Date Investigator's Signature

Informed Consent Form
The Second Informed Consent Form (for Interview Participants)

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Shu-Fen Yeh, a doctoral candidate in English Composition& TESOL at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. The following information is provided in order to help you make an informed decision whether or not to participate. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to ask.

The purpose of this study is to understand Taiwanese mature writers' positioning in L2 writing and their development of academic writing in English. I am inviting you to participate in the study because you have indicated that you would be willing to take part in interviews about your experiences in second language writing. Participation in this study will require 60 minutes of your time for each interview (there will be a total of 3). I will collect three papers that you would be comfortable with having analyzed and discussed in the second interview. Participation or nonparticipation will not affect the evaluation of your performances at the college.

You will have three individual interviews with me, at times and in place that are convenient to you. Each interview will take approximately 60 minutes. The language you will use during the writing exercise, individual interviews will be either Chinese Mandarin or English, at your convenience. You do not need to prepare answer to the questions; they will be provided to you simply for your information. Your interviews will be tape-recorded. Therefore, I ask your permission to record our conversations. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators or IUP. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you choose to participate, you may withdraw at any time by notifying the Project Director or informing the person administering the test. Upon your request to withdraw, all information is pertaining to me. If you choose to participate, all information will be held in strict confidence and will have no bearing on your academic standing or services you receive from the University. Your response will be considered only in combination with those from other participants. The information obtained in the study may be published in journals or presented at conferences but your identity will be kept strictly confidential.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please sign the statement below.

Researcher: Shu-Fen Yeh, PhD Candidate, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
English Department, Leonard Hall
1302 Oakland Ave. Essex # 214, Indiana, PA, 15701
724-349-3598
mlkp@iup.edu

Project Director: Dr. Jeannine M. Fontaine
110 Leonard Hall
Indianan University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, PA 15705
Phone: 724-357-2261

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724/357-7730).

The Second Informed Consent Form (continued)

VOLUNTARY CONSENT FORM:

I have read and understand the information on the form and I consent to volunteer to be a subject in this study. I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I have the right to withdraw at any time. I have received an unsigned copy of this informed Consent Form to keep in my possession.

Name (PLEASE PRINT)

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Phone number or location where you can be reached: _____

_____

Best days and times to reach you: _____

I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature and purpose, the potential benefits, and possible risks associated with participating in this research study, have answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above signature.

_____ _____

Date Investigator's Signature