Voicing the Academy

DAVINA ALLISON [a]

[a] *Queensland University of Technology, Australia*
Email: davina.allison@qut.edu.au

Abstract

The development of an appropriate authorial voice is considered to be fundamental to successful academic writing in the target language. Voice research in second language (L2) writing, therefore, seeks to delineate voice salience in L2 academic texts, the relationship between voice and high quality academic writing, the second language writer's development of an appropriate authorial voice, and how voice research might inform second language writing pedagogy. However, while voice research addresses a range of concerns in second language writing, there are a limited number of methods available for analysing authorial voice in texts. The following article investigates Ivanic and Camp's (2001) typology, which indexes voice as a series of ideational, interpersonal, and textual maneuvers, as a possible method for measuring voice. The typology was applied to two long argument essays written by postgraduate international students studying at an Australian university. The results of the application of the typology underscored a range of both normative and non-normative voices in the students' texts. The article concludes that Ivanic and Camp's (2001) typology has the potential to contribute to present understandings apropos of the language resources which correlate to normative and non-normative voice types. The article also provides some recommendations for future research.

Keywords: voice, voice research, L2 writing, Ivanic and Camps, academic writing

Introduction

Matsuda's (2015) etymology of voice in the *2015 Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* attests to its ongoing persuasiveness in second language writing, research, and teaching. From early process models, which located voice as an expression of the writer's individuality, through to recent social constructivist accounts, voice in second language writing research is marked by diverse and often conflicting definitions and approaches (Elbow, 2007; DiPardo, Storms, & Selland, 2011).

Early process writing defined voice as an expression of the writer's individuality demarcating voice as "energy, humour, individuality, music, rhythm, pace, flow, surprise, believability" (Murray, 1969,

p. 144) or "the words somehow issue from the writers centre" (Elbow, 1968, p. 298). Voice was considered to be salient to text quality as well as to the personal liberation of the writer (see e.g., Stewart, 1972; Murray, 1978; Elbow, 1981, 1993; Cherry, 1998).

More recent accounts of voice attend to the social resources which a writer uses to negotiate academic writing practices. A social constructionist view, for example, locates voice as primarily social and as an outcome of the hegemony of the reader, aligning voice with the normative and often coercive conventions of the target disciplinary community (Ivanic, 1998). A social constructivist account, in contrast, conflates the binary of the personal and the social by positioning a writer's voice as agentive, dialogic, and mediated via the text (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986). A social constructivist epistemology of voice takes up Bakhtin's (1981, 1986) social semiotic contending that language is not passively received but is, instead, populated by the author's own goals and intentions. In this way, a social constructivist voice is generative rather than reproductive as the voice resources that are culturally and contextually available are purposefully and creatively co-opted by the author (Prior, 2001). A social constructivist voice is, therefore, defined as an outcome of "the use of discourse and non-discourse features that language users chose, deliberate or otherwise, from socially available yet ever changing repertoires" (Matsuda, 2001, p. 40), or Matsuda and Jeffery's (2012, p. 151) more recent description of social constructivist voice as "a metaphorical concept capturing the sense of author identity that comes through when readers interact with texts."

An Overview of Voice Research

Early research in voice and second language writing critiqued the concept of authorial voice as embedding individualist, post-enlightenment, and Western values which coerced, excluded, and othered L2 writers (see e.g., Gilbert, 1991; Leggo, 1991; Connor, 1996; Ramanathan & Kaplan, 1996; Bowden, 1999; Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999; Canagarajah, 2001; Casanave, 2002). Stapleton (2002) and Helms-Park and Stapleton (2003) also challenged the relevance of expressivist voice arguing that sentence level proficiency, grammar, and genre conventions had more theoretical and practical relevance for L2 writers and teachers than the notion of authorial voice. Helms-Park and Stapleton's (2003) development and trial of a voice intensity rating scale, which evaluated voice in high rated ESL texts across features such as assertiveness (the use of hedges and intensifiers), self-identification (the number of first person pronouns and instances of the active voice), reiteration of the central point, and authorial presence and autonomy of thought, found no correlation between text quality and the intensity of a writer's voice.

Research which posits voice as intrinsic to successful second language writing is, however, plentiful. Zhao and Llosa's (2008) application of the same voice intensity rating scale to both high and low rated ESL texts established, in contrast to Helms-Park and Stapleton (2003), a strong correlation between high intensity voice indices and high-quality writing. Matsuda and Tardy (2007) also investigated the reader reception of texts during the blind review process demonstrating that the reader detected authorial voice across a wide range of discourse features including choice of topic, representation of the field, and the use of particular sentence structures, and genre conventions. The significance of voice in second language writing is further attested to by numerous text-based studies delineating the linguistic features associated with voice in high quality academic writing including Hyland (e.g., 2000a, 2000b, 2005, 2008), Ivanic and Camps (2001), Stapleton (2002), Petric (2010), Davila (2012), and Zhao (2013, 2017). The audience-based identification of normative voice related textual and extra textual features is also characteristic of recent voice research with work by, among others, Tardy and Matsuda (2009), Jeffery (2011), and Tardy (2012).

The L2 writers acquisition of the voice of the target language is also central to voice research. Cadman

(1997), Lam (2000), Phan (2009), Phan and Baurain (2011), Shen (1989), and Viete and Phan (2007), for example, foreground the L2 writer's struggle to acquire the normative voice types associated with Western academic writing. Hirvela and Belcher (2001), in a study of three Latin American doctoral students, found that the students theorized their struggle to establish themselves as effective writers as somehow intrinsic to their development of an appropriate authorial voice in the target language. Hirvela and Belcher (2001), Phan (2009), and Shen (1989) also highlighted the L2 writers' desire to integrate their L1 voice into their L2 academic writing.

To date, the central concern of most voice research in second language writing is to identify the normative features of a successful academic voice and how to most effectively convey this to the second language learner (e.g., Jeffery, 2011; Hyland & Sancho Guinda, 2012; Tardy, 2012; Zhao, 2013, 2017).

Empirical Voice Methods

Methods in voice research include both text-based research as well as reader or audience-based studies. Text based research includes the application of the aforementioned voice intensity rating scale utilised by Helms-Park and Stapleton (2003) and Zhao and Llosa (2008). Spalding, Wang, Lin, and Hu (2009) applied a 6 + 1 Trait rubric with expressivist voice comprising one of the six traits examined while text studies by Martinez (2005) and Sheldon (2009) contrasted the number and usage of first person markers between native and non-native speaker texts.

Reader-based voice research includes an early study by Hatch, Hill and Hayes (1993) which focused on the notion of personality in texts concluding that readers made judgments regarding the personality traits of the writer as being confident, proud, etc. A similar audience focused study by Petric (2010) examined interview data from 30 postgraduate students and concluded that student's perceptions of voice were a response to personal pronoun usage in academic texts. Davila (2012) found that writing teachers constructed student's identities, including ethnic background, based on the degree to which sentence patterns conformed to the norms of the academic community. Matsuda and Tardy (2007) and Tardy and Matsuda (2009), additionally, examined how readers constructed authorial voice during the blind review process.

A comprehensive study by Jeffery (2011) sought to further specify the linguistic items associated by high knowledge readers with voice in academic writing. Jeffery's research found that raters located voice across six categories including literary items such as imagery; rhetorical features; evaluative language use including stance and tone; the use of cliché and hyperbole; stylistics such as sentence length; and the features of global cohesion including clarity and the repetition of key nominals. These items were correlated by the raters with metaphysical attributes such as integrity, authenticity, and soul. Another audience focused study by Tardy (2012) examined the reader response to the extra textual features of the writer (by viewing the participants via video), demonstrating that a presumed knowledge of the writer influenced the reader's perception of the writer's credibility, writing ability, intelligence, socioeconomic status, membership of a minority culture, and authorial presence.

Zhao's (2013, 2017) development and refinement of an analytic voice rubric also foregrounds the reader response to the linguistic features concomitant with voice. Zhao's (2017) rubric required raters to measure voice on a 5- point scale according to a predetermined set of voice salient features including the linguistic items associated with *voice evoked by the presence and clarity of ideas in the content, voice evoked by the manner of presentation* and *voice evoked by writer and reader presence.* Raters were also required to assign holistic ratings in relation to the overall strength or weakness of voice in the texts (2017, p. 76). Applications of this analytic rubric have, thus far, sought to correlate

instantiations of voice in writing to texts that have been rated as high quality in the tertiary context.

Ivanic and Camp's Voice Typology

In the 2001 special voice issue of the *Journal of Second Language Writing*, Ivanic and Camp proposed a voice framework which located voice as an outcome of the linguistic choices made by the writer as they negotiate the ideational, interpersonal and textual macro functions of a text (Halliday, 1985). Ivanic and Camp's (2001) voice prototype was based on an examination of the writing of six South American graduate students studying in British universities. The authors found that the participants constructed a range of voice types relative to how they aligned themselves with particular ideas and views of the world, varied topics of interest, and different stances towards content (the ideational); how they represented themselves according to different degrees of self-assurance (the interpersonal); and the different ways in which they constructed or made meaning in a text (the textual). In Ivanic and Camp's (2001) model, this alignment can be measured via the linguistic choices made by the writer. The ideational voices of the author are, for example, embedded in lexical choices in noun phrases, syntactic choices, verb types, and generic or specific reference; the interpersonal via modality, person reference; and the textual apropos of noun phrase length, syntax, and linking devices (p. 11) (see table 1 below for an overview of Ivanic and Camps typology). Ivanic and Camps' (2001) argued that conceptualising voice in this way attends to both context and authorial agency as "each individual ultimately exercises individual agency to take elements from different voice types and blend them into a unique, heterogeneous voice according to their own interests, motivations, allegiances, and preferences" (2001, p. 21).

After the initial publication of the framework in 2001, however, no further comprehensive application of Ivanic and Camp's (2001) voice model has been published. The following study is an exploratory application of Ivanic and Camp's (2001) research framework to the academic writing of postgraduate international students studying at an Australian university. The aim of the study is to assess whether the typology has any contribution to make to voice research, teaching, and the L2 writer.

Ideational Voice

Ivanic and Camps (2001) suggest that writers take up different positions according to their interests, opinions, and their views of knowledge making. This includes different interests, objects of study, and methodologies; different stances towards topics; and different views of how knowledge is constructed. Ivanic and Camps (2001) argue that these positions are reified in the linguistic choices which a writer makes, which, in turn, shape the writer's voice in a text. The writer's choice of lexis in noun phrases such as in *The line transect methods* and *transient and permanent entities* (p. 12) are indicative of the writer's knowledge of the topic and construct the writer's voice as knowledgeable and interested in such topics of study.

The different opinions and stances embedded in the language choices made by a writer also index ideational voice. The use of classificatory lexis in *the predominant Western-rooted environmental education model,* for example, expresses the writer's stance on the particular topic constructing an opinion-holder voice type (p. 14). Generic reference, evaluative lexis, and syntactic choice also create ideational voice types. The use of the passive construction in *being exploited* in a *competitive, efficiency-based development model has not considered the rate at which natural resources are being exploited* signifies the writer's stance on the use of natural resources (pp. 13-14). The use of generic instead of specific reference as well as nominalisations as in *effective IT capability* also serve to suppress human agency reflecting the writer's alignment with the abstract nature of academic discourse (p. 15).

Table 1 *Types of Author Positioning (Ivanic & Camps, 2001, p. 11)*

Types of Positioning	In Relation To	Linguistic Realisations
Ideational Positioning	▪ Different interests, objects of study, methodologies.	i. Lexical choice in noun phrase
	▪ Different stances towards topics: values, preferences, beliefs.	i. Classificatory lexis ii. Generic reference iii. Evaluative lexis iv. Syntactic choice
	▪ Different views of knowledge making.	i. Verb tense ii. Verb type iii. Reference to human agency iv. Generic or specific reference v. First person reference
Interpersonal Positioning	▪ Different degrees of self-assurance and certainty.	i. Evaluation ii. Modality iii. First person reference
	▪ Different power relations between the writer and the reader.	i. Mood ii. First person reference
Textual Positioning	▪ Different views of how a written text should be constructed.	i. Noun phrase length ii. Mono-vs. multisyllabic words iii. Linking devices iv. Semiotic mode

The writer's perspective on the construction of knowledge from the impersonally objective through to the personally subjective also shapes particular voice types. The linguistic realisations of knowledge-making include verb tense, verb type, reference to human agency, generic or specific reference, and, also, first person reference (p. 18). An objectivist voice is constructed, for example, via the use of present tense verbs, categorical verbs, relational processes, as well as abstract and impersonal ways of referencing human agency in the process of knowledge-making. In contrast, a less objectivist voice might be constructed via direct reference to the thoughts and opinions of the writer as in *I consider the technical framework* (p. 20).

Interpersonal Voice

In Ivanic and Camp's (2001) voice typology, a writer's voice also emerges as a result of the interpersonal stances which a writer takes up in a text. Ivanic and Camps delineate the interpersonal as consisting of different degrees of self-assurance and certainty, and different power relationships between the writer and the reader. The linguistic markers of different degrees of self-assurance and certainty include evaluative lexis such as *big automative companies*, modal markers of certainty or uncertainty, and establishing authority through explicit reference to the author (pp. 21-22). The use of person markers, particularly the first person plural, in addition to the imperative and interrogative mood of the verb, also have the capacity to designate power relationships between the writer and reader as being equal to or as powerful as the reader (p. 26).

Textual Voice

Ivanic and Camps (2001) suggest that voice is also an effect of the writer's position in relation to how academic texts are constructed within particular contexts. The length of noun groups, the prevalence or lack of multisyllabic words and linking devices, as well as the semiotics of a text construct the writer's voice relative to the textual norms of the particular academic discourse community. An imbued with academic literacy voice is shaped, for example, via long noun phrases and multisyllabic words (pp. 28-29).

Method

Participants and Texts

The texts reported on in this paper were selected from a larger data set which formed part of a broader investigation of authorial voice undertaken at an Australian university in 2015. The texts were randomly selected from assignment essays volunteered by participant international students. Two prepared L2 argument essays (3000 – 4000 words) were selected for inclusion in this present study. Due to space limitations, only two texts have been reported on here.

Student A and student B were both international students enrolled in a Master of Education program at the time of the initial study. Student A had been an ESL teacher in Shanghai prior to his enrolment in the MEd program and hoped to continue as a PhD student at the same university. Student B had completed a Bachelor of Education in China. Student A's essay examined the role of non-verbal behaviour in second language acquisition while student B's text explored the cultural influences on the learning styles of Chinese background students studying in Western universities. Both texts had been graded highly: Student A's text had been marked as a B+ and student B's text received a B.

The data presented in this paper is a text analysis only and, as a result, has some limitations insofar as the writer's own voices on their voicing do not form part of the analysis. I also did not have access to the grader's original comments and feedback on the respective texts.

Text Analysis

Ivanic and Camp's (2001) delineation of Halliday's macro functions, as listed in Table 1, provided *a priori* linguistic categories for a grounded analysis of the texts (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The *a priori* categories were treated as descriptive codes and were manually identified in both texts. These descriptive codes were, then, examined for what voice types they evoked across the three macro functions. This generated a series of thematic codes or voice types. A "start list" (see Table 2) of interpretive codes was derived from Ivanic and Camp's (2001) study, and new voice types were added as they arose (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

There were two raters (readers) involved in the initial study: the writer and a senior lecturer and academic with teaching and research experience in second language writing research. The descriptive codes were manually identified in both texts by the writer. Interpretive or thematic codes were likewise, first, developed by the writer and were verified by the second rater. The second rater also generated additional interpretive codes which were added to the list of voice types for each text. Any redundant thematic codes were conflated or refined into one code by the writer. Several of the thematic codes such as *insider voice* and *academic voice,* and *impersonal voice* and *formal voice* have some semantic overlap but also offer enough divergence to augment the analysis, so they have been retained.

Table 2 *Start List of Voice Types*

Ideational	Interpersonal	Textual
Interested in the field voice	Hesitant voice	Imbued with academic literacy voice
Knowledgeable voice	Confident voice	
Professional voice	Authoritative voice	Committed to plain English voice
Managerial voice	Impersonal voice	Reader considerate voice
Militant voice	Self-aware voice	
Opinion holder voice	One among equals voice	
Knowledge as objective voice		
Knowledge as personal voice		
Critical voice		

Results

The application of Ivanic and Camp's (2001) typology to the texts resulted in a diverse range of voice types. In both texts, the writer's ideational, interpersonal, and textual voice types gave rise to academic, academically literate, formal, positivist, opinion-holder voice types via the deployment of linguistic devices such as academic and specialist vocabularies, strong evaluative lexis, long noun groups, modals, and cohesive ties. Both writers, however, also incorporated linguistic items, particularly lexical items, which resulted in less normative voice types such as a vested interests voice type and an interest in other topics voice.

The results of the text analysis are discussed below and examples from the texts are presented in italics or, in the case of longer examples, as indented excerpts within the relevant paragraphs.

Student A

Ideational Voices. The selection of lexis closely associated with the discourse community is consistent throughout student A's essay in classificatory lexis such as *EFL classroom, sociopragmatic rules, linguistic problems*, *target language and culture*, and *non-verbal factors* marking student A's voice as that of a knowledgeable insider. High instances of field specific and classificatory lexis are consistent throughout the essay as per the excerpt below.

> Therefore, it is suggested education for <u>nonverbal communication</u> needs to be taken into consideration in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms in order to develop English learners' <u>intercultural communicative competence</u>. This paper examines the role of <u>non-verbal communication</u> in <u>intercultural communication</u>. The findings indicate that inappropriate <u>nonverbal behaviours</u> may cause potential breakdowns in <u>intercultural communication.</u>

Student A's evaluative lexical choices in relation to the sub-topics of the essay including the role of non-verbal communication in EFL teaching, the challenges faced by Chinese learners, the responsibility of educators in terms of nonverbal communication, and the politics and ownership of English also construct a stance holder voice type. The use of evaluative lexis in the following extract clearly positions student A as someone with strong opinions regarding how instruction in nonverbal communication should occur. After indicating that studying in a different cultural environment is *challenging*, student A outlines how this might be modified for ESL learners, namely, through negotiated expectations. The evaluative lexical items *mutual* and *mutually* (see the example below) are also used in three consecutive sentences in relation to the importance of creating an intercultural space

for students, hence, constructing a strong stance holder voice in the essay.

> Learning to live, work and study in a new cultural environment is a <u>challenging experience</u>. Kim (2005) describes such experience as starting an enculturation process all over again… Kramsh (1998) suggests the importance of <u>mutually establishing</u> a "place", in where students from different cultures can understand each other through dialogical exchange of ideas, emotions, stories and visions. Therefore, <u>mutual understanding</u> seems to be an important factor in intercultural competence. Such <u>mutual understanding</u> is realised by appropriately interpreting and conducting verbal and nonverbal behaviours in intercultural contexts.

This stance holder voice type is further reinforced via student A's use of evaluation in relation to the difficulties faced by Chinese learners. In the example below, which provides background information regarding nonverbal communication, student A depicts Chinese background students as students who are not equipped to cope with the demands of a Western classroom. This is evident in *insufficient language skills, language difficulties*, and *negative impacts*.

> In the field of verbal communication, many studies reveal Chinese background students' <u>insufficient language skills</u> both in and out of academic fields (Berman & Cheng, 2001; Holmes, 2006; Tran, 2009). These <u>language difficulties</u> have <u>negative impacts</u> on their academic performances and participations in classroom activities.

The second paragraph of student A's essay also locates him as someone with a distinct set of beliefs regarding the ownership of English by native speakers. The evaluative term *so called* in the first line below expresses student A's position regarding who defines English native speakers. Student A states that English is an international language which has transcended geographical English-speaking demarcations to become the lingua franca of the international community. Student A also argues that the defining characteristic of this new English is that English learners do not need to adopt the linguistic and cultural norms of the native speaker, challenging the delineation—English native speaker—firstly, by the use of the evaluative lexeme *so called* and, secondly, by means of quotation marks around the nominals.

> Firstly, English learners do not <u>need</u> to incorporate the socio-cultural norms of <u>so called</u> "English native speakers" (1976, p. 38). In other words, English is <u>more than</u> a language owned by some <u>specific</u> countries. Instead, <u>the ownership of English</u> has been globalised. Besides, the purpose of learning English has been enlarged to enable learners to communicate intercultural.

Student A's strong stances are also embedded in his syntactic choices. The use of modality establishes the author's strong interest in the topic as well as reinforcing his opinion holder voice type. The use of *should* in the following passage is used to strengthen student A's argument that nonverbal communication should explicitly feature in the EFL classroom.

> Firstly, it <u>should</u> be explored the possibility of incorporating the knowledge of nonverbal communication into the EFL curriculum. It is especially needed for the education institutions which intend to send their students abroad for study or work, because the students would need a better preparation to survive and function adequately in the new cultural environment. The other issue that <u>should</u> be explored is the learnability and the teachability of nonverbal behaviours.

Student A's strong stance is also augmented by the use of passive constructions which act to modify his claims. In the example below, *it is suggested* and *it is also shown* aligns student A's voice with the detached and abstract voices of the academy (Ivanic and Camps, 2001, p. 18-21).

> Therefore, <u>it is suggested</u> education for nonverbal communication needs to be taken into consideration in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms in order to develop English learners' intercultural communicative competence. This paper examines the role of non-verbal communication in intercultural communication. The findings indicate that inappropriate nonverbal behaviours may cause potential breakdowns in intercultural communication. It <u>is also shown</u> that the necessity of incorporating skills of nonverbal communication into English language teaching in order to enable English learners to communicate cross-culturally.

Student A's linguistic choices in relation to knowledge-making also shape his voice as insider and academic. A positivist view of knowledge is evinced, for instance, in the use of verbs related to the processes of research and thinking such as *describe, suggest, argue, discuss, discover,* and *writes that* which recognize humans as knowledge-makers albeit in an abstract sense (Ivanic & Camps, 2001). Researchers are also referred to in the third person including *Berman and Chen (2001) argue, Liu's study (2001) suggests Gao (2000) discusses, supported by Lustig and Koester* or as abstract, agentless entities such as *studies show, this paper* and *paralinguistic factors were considered to be.*

Interpersonal Voices. Student A's interpersonal voice types emerged across evaluation, first person reference, verb mood, and modality locating his authorial voice in the interpersonal domain as self-assured, academic, and authoritative. A confident, assertive voice is evident, for example, in the use of evaluative lexis in *the <u>necessity</u> of incorporating skills of nonverbal communication, two <u>important</u> areas of communication study*, *such <u>mutual</u> understanding is realised by <u>appropriately</u> interpreting and conducting verbal and nonverbal behaviours in intercultural contexts*, and *nonverbal communication is a <u>significant</u> reason for the difficulties in the intercultural communication between Chinese background students and those from other countries*. Likewise, the use of the strongly evaluative *so-called* in *so-called "English native speakers"* signifies an assertive and challenging voice type.

The strength of student A's interpersonal stance is supported by in-text references and appeals to authority as in *according to those studies, many of the challenges in intercultural communication met by the Chinese background students can be traced back to language education, since the current language education <u>fails</u> to include both linguistic skills and intercultural communication skills* and *<u>many studies reveal</u> Chinese background students' insufficient language skills both in and out of academic fields (Berman & Cheng, 2001; Holmes, 2006; Tran, 2009)*. Verb mood also consolidates student A's assertive, opinionated voice type as there are two instances of the imperative mood in the essay which direct the reader towards the best course of action. In the introduction, for example, the imperative *needs to be* is used in relation to nonverbal communication and its incorporation into EFL programs. *Do not need* is, similarly, used in paragraph two in *Firstly, English learners <u>do not need</u> to incorporate the socio-cultural norms of so called "English native speakers" (1976, p. 38).*

Modality in student A's text creates a more attenuated interpersonal position both amplifying and also softening the force of student A's assertions. The use of *should* in *the study also suggests that teachers <u>should</u> use more nonverbal behaviours in language classrooms to improve learners' study motivation* and *the scope of English language education <u>should</u> be widened to include* shapes student A's voice as confident and certain. In contrast, hedging devices soften student A's assertive stance aligning his voice type with the convicted but cautious voice types of the academic discourse community (Hyland,

2005). *Seems to be* and *may* in the following sentences, for example, *Therefore, mutual understanding seems to be an important factor in intercultural competence* and *nonverbal communication may serve as the underlying reason for Chinese background students' incompetence in intercultural communication* hedge the strong evaluative lexis deployed in each sentence.

Textual Voices. Student A's textual positioning also constructs his authorial voice as that of an academic insider. The frequency of multisyllabic, academic lexical items as well as specialist words associated with TESOL and Applied Linguistics—as per the example below, constructs an academically literate voice type.

> In the past <u>centuries</u>, <u>researchers</u> have learnt a great deal about <u>nonverbal communication</u>. <u>Nonverbal communication</u> is <u>considered</u> as an <u>indispensable component</u> of <u>human interaction</u> and it bears close <u>relationship</u> with <u>culture</u>. Each <u>culture</u> has a set of norms <u>regarding</u> the <u>appropriateness</u> of different types of body <u>language</u> and <u>paralinguistic factors</u>.

The voice of an academically literate insider is also reinforced by means of relatively long noun phrases including *the appropriateness of different types of body language and paralinguistic factors* in the example above, and *the important semiotic systems* and *the culture-specific properties of body language* in the example below. A reader considerate voice is similarly shaped by a high frequency of linking devices, headings, and discourse markers in the text including *in this study, much discussion, Firstly*, and *according to.*

> In this study, <u>much discussion</u> has been made about the function of body language. <u>Firstly</u>, body languages are seen as a semiotic system by the participants in this study. Antes (1996) describes this unique function of body language as being able to stand alone and replace the spoken language. <u>According to</u> Antes (1996), body language is one of the important semiotic systems that people use in their lives. <u>Furthermore</u>, the study <u>also</u> indicates the culture-specific properties of body languages. <u>According to</u> Birdwhistell (1970, p. 81), it is very unlikely "to discover any single facial expression, stance, or body position which conveys an identical meaning in all societies." <u>From this perspective</u>, the body language system should be presented with verbal system to the learners so as to enable them to be really competent in that language (Antes, 1996).

Student A is an Insider

Student A's voice types across the ideational, interpersonal, and textual macro functions reflect his alignment with the norms of Western academic discourse. The use of specialized, multisyllabic lexical items associated with general academic discourse and the specific lexis of the field construct a knowledgeable, insider voice. This insider voice type is also reinforced by student A's fundamentally positivist, abstract view of knowledge-making which shapes his voice types as appropriately impersonal (Ivanic & Camps, 2001, p. 18-21). The use of strong evaluation and modality likewise align student A with the critical, assertive and cautious form of argumentation highly valued in Western academic writing (Hyland, 2005).

Student A's lexical choices in nominals, however, also reflect his own vested interests as well as his strong stance in relation to cultural differences as the primary source of difficulty for Chinese background learners; the responsibility of EFL organizations to explicitly instruct in nonverbal communication; the coercive nature of academic norms; and the monopolization of academic discourse by English native speakers. The voice types identified in student A's essay are listed in Table 3.

Table 3 *Student A's Voice Types*

Voice Type
Academic voice
Interested in the field voice
Interested in the topic voice
Vested interests voice
Knowledgeable voice
Authoritative voice
Equal-to-the-discourse-insider voice
Educator voice
Educated voice
Reader considerate voice
Self-assured voice
Detached voice
Abstract voice
Challenging voice
Interested in academic research voice
Insider voice
Opinion-holder voice/Stance-holder voice
Particular points of view voice
Tentative voice/cautious voice
Formal voice
Impersonal voice
Positivist voice

Student B

Ideational Voices. The lexical choices in student B's essay indicate an interest in the specific topic of the essay, Applied Linguistics, academic study and research, as well as a range of other preferences and beliefs. Nominal groups in the text indicate, first, an alignment with the broad academic field of research, teaching, and learning. This is evident in academic and teaching related lexis such *as the process of students' cognition, the textbook knowledge, the study tasks,* and *a brief discussion.* Student B's interest in Applied Linguistics as well as the topic of the essay is also marked in noun combinations such as *Chinese society, Chinese traditional thoughts, the language characteristics, the operative principle of Grice, Chinese classroom culture,* and *the traditional teaching and learning styles.*

Strong evaluative bundles in student B's text including *realistic education issue, troubles Chinese national public language,* and *perfectly represents* further shape his voice as interested in, indeed, as having a personal stake in the field. This is also reflected in his argument that learning English is difficult for Chinese students due to the differences between Chinese and Western teaching and learning styles. Student B's recommendation that cultural education should form a significant part of second language education for Chinese students is also expressed via strong evaluation such as *extensively and deeply studying the cultures in English language countries is a necessary condition of successfully conducting international culture exchange,* and *what more significant is to encourage students to establish a profound understanding on the cultures of English-American countries, cultivate students' language communication capability, finally achieve in the true sense of "Understanding" English.*

Evaluative word choices in student B's essay also indicate an interest in topics and ways of expressing ideas outside of the norms of the academy. Non-academic evaluative lexis such as th*e charm of popular culture, bashfully looks, hurriedly looks up, sing greatly English songs,* and *the brilliant lines in their favourite operas* suggest an interest in vocabulary and topic preferences that do not cohere with

Western academic discourse.

Student B's syntactic choices align more, however, with academic discourse as manifest in instances of the passive such as *is both influenced, would be hoped to be achieved,* and *could be lost,* as well as a high frequency of the modal - *could.* The positivist and tentative stance expressed by the use of this hedge is evident in *this could reduce the process of serial communication and the efficiency of teaching* and *Moreover, teachers could introduce students to come into contact with a certain language phenomenon repeatedly, help students to build initial perceptual knowledge, and then leading students to make an induction and find out the regular issues or common issues.*

Reference to human agency in student B's text further reinforces his academic insider voice type as researchers and scholars are referred to in the third person or via their surnames including e*xperts suggest, according to Condon,* and *some researches.* Student B's reference to his own agency as the writer of the essay in *this essay starts with, it is argued,* and *it follows an argument i*s also abstract and positivist.

Interpersonal Voices. Instances of strong evaluation in student B's text shape his interpersonal voice types as self-assured and certain. Very strong evaluation in lexical bundles such as *crucial challenge, poor efficiency, deep thinking and profound knowledge,* and *a superior opinion* create an assertive voice type. The use of *essential, more precisely,* and *positive and correct* in the following example underscores the opinion holder voice type which results from student B's evaluative choices.

> Although these methods are <u>essential activities</u> in English study, they are not actually learning styles, or to be <u>more precisely</u>, they are not <u>the positive and correct</u> learning styles which are advocated by the modern foreign language teaching strategy.

This strong interpersonal stance is also evident in the use of *great deal, widely practiced,* and *perfectly represents* in:

> The style of foreign language teaching and learning is both influenced a <u>great deal</u> by respectively culture. Henry (1960) illustrates categories teaching methods, and some of them even <u>widely</u> <u>practised</u> in current times. r relative methods are <u>perfectly represents</u> the Chinese language learning styles; on the other side, practising problem solving, discussing and debating are closer to western culture learning styles (Shi, 2006).

Modality further contributes to student B's confident, opinion holder, and academic insider voice types. The didactic use of *should* in *teachers <u>should</u> not only instruct students to study, therefore, teachers <u>should</u> use more methods, skills and arts of cooperating with students,* and, also, in *Independent learning, it <u>should</u> be the students' genuine freedom* constructs a confident voice type while the use of hedging devices reinforce student B's alignment with the caution valued in academic discourse as evident in *the new curriculum <u>may</u> change the situation of "unification classroom",* and *intercommunication <u>could</u> be slow down or break off.*

Textual Voices. Student B's textual positioning also develops an academic insider voice type in the essay. The long nominal groups in the text shape student B's authorial voice as academically literate, aligned with the academic community, and as wordy and sophisticated. Long nominal groups including *disorder of sentence structure and misuse of referencing, the difficulties and the strategies of English academic writing, a number of academic vocabularies*, and *the synonyms of some English word* position student B's textual voice as aligned with the target academic discourse community. The high frequency of cohesive devices in student B's text are also concomitant with this academically literate voice. The

linking devices in the text, as underscored in the example below, also signpost the text, thus, shaping a reader considerate voice.

> <u>To summarise</u>, from the start of this essay, it introduces the DeKeyser"s relationship theory on language teaching and learning process, and applies this theory into a comparison of English and Chinese education in both traditional and modern ways. <u>Then</u> it discusses the reception and discovery learning on students" learning style. It follows an argument on the diversity in culture aspect with the theory from value orientation, uncertainty avoidance, sense of hierarchy and modesty. <u>At last</u>, it makes some suggestion on transforming English learning style into inquisitive, autonomous and cooperative patterns, and how to optimise and improve learning style on cultural literacy. <u>Thus</u>, in the process of learning English as foreign language, it is necessary to help students to study the English pronunciation, grammar, sentence structure and vocabulary in an effective style.

Student B is Polyphonic

Student B's voice types indicate a strong alignment with Western and academic ways of voicing. The incorporation of long, field-related nominals relative to traditional Chinese teaching and learning methods and Western learning styles; strong evaluative lexis; as well as a positivist view of knowledge making shapes student B's ideational voice as that of an academic insider with a particular interest in the topic of the text. A high frequency of passive constructions and cohesive markers, further, augment student B's academic voice. The voice of an insider is additionally developed via student B's interpersonal positioning as evinced in strong evaluative lexis, and both intensifying and softening modals.

Table 4 *Student B's Voice Types*

Voice Type
Interested in learning and teaching voice
Academically literate voice
Passionate voice
Teacher voice
Assertive voice
Interested in non-academic ways of voicing
Reader-considerate voice
Objective voice
Interested in other topics
Positivist voice
Self-assured voice
Tentative voice
Knowledgeable voice
Non-academic voice
Formal voice
Opinion-holder voice/stance-holder voice
Interested in the field voice
Wordy voice
Sophisticated voice

Student B's word choices in some nominal groups, however, construct a voice type which conflicts with the norms of the target discourse community. Student B's interest in more creative ways of voicing including an interest in singing, opera, and metaphor as a way of expressing complex ideas, constructs a non-academic voice type in the text. The list of interpretive codes which emerged in the

analysis of Student B's text are listed in Table 4 above.

Conclusion

This article has presented the results of the application of Ivanic and Camp's (2001) voice typology to the essays of two non-native speaking students enrolled at an Australian university. In the text analysis, the linguistic realisations of Halliday's ideational, interpersonal, and textual macro functions were treated as instantiations of a writer's voice. These instantiations or descriptive codes were analysed thematically for what voice types they evoked. The thematic analysis of the texts resulted in the emergence of various voices including an academic insider voice, a knowledgeable and interested voice, an opinion holder voice, a cautious voice, and a reader considerate voice.

The results of the application of Ivanic and Camp's (2001) voice typology indicate that, while the typology requires further investigation and validation as a method, it has numerous potential benefits for voice research and pedagogy. The typology, firstly, affords an account of a writer's voice as polyphonic, and as encompassing a broad range of contextual and textual features including, for instance, long, multisyllabic noun groups, text semiotics, hedges, and evaluative bundles. The analysis also situated the writers' voices as either normative or non-normative as both student A and B moved in and out of alignment with the high status writing practices of the academic community, and, in this way, the analysis underscored a range of language resources concomitant with successful or normative academic voices. The linguistic realisations of less normative voice types were also delineated in the results of the text analysis (Ivanic & Camps, 2001, p. 30).

Possibilities for future research might include extending the present study to a larger corpus of texts in order to further demarcate the ideational, interpersonal, and textual features associated with successful academic voice types. Incorporating the writer's own views on their voice types might also strengthen present understandings of the experiences and needs of second language writers as they negotiate the demands of written assessment. Another possible direction for future research might be an investigation of the reader response to the voice types developed in L2 texts. Given that the texts in the present study scored quite highly, a focus on both the normative and non-normative voice types has the potential to provide a clearer picture of what kinds of rebellion are permissible in academic writing (Matsuda, 2001).

Ultimately, though, the results of the text analysis reported on in this paper attest to the power of the academy to compel writers to use the features of high quality academic writing (Stapleton, 2002). The results of the analysis also call attention to the need to explicitly teach the language features which correlate to academically literate voice types so that L2 writers can effectively deploy them in their writing.

References

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination.* Austin: University of Texas Press.
Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays.* Austin: University of Texas Press.
Bowden, D. (1999). *The mythology of voice.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
Cadman*,* K. (1997). Thesis writing for international students: a question of identity? *English for Specific Purposes, 16* (1), 3-14.
Canagarajah, S. (2001). The fortunate traveller: Shuttling between communities and literacies by economy class. In D. Belcher & U. Connor (Eds.), *Reflections on multiliterate lives* (pp. 23-37). New York: Multilingual Matters.

Casanave, C. P. (2003). Narrative braiding: Constructing a multistrand portrayal of self as writer. In C. P. Casanave & S. Vandrick (Eds.), *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education* (pp. 131-145). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cherry, Roger D. (1988). Ethos versus persona: Self-Representation in written discourse. *Written Communication, 5*, 251-276.

Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davila, B. (2012). Indexicality and "standard" edited American English: Examining the link between conceptions of student and perceived authorial identity. *Written Communication, 29* (2), 180-207.

DiPardo, A., Storms, B. A., & Selland, M. (2011). Seeing voices: Assessing writerly stance in the NWP analytic writing continuum. *Assessing Writing, 16,* 170-188.

Elbow, P. (1968). A method for teaching writing. *College English, 30* (2), 115- 125.

Elbow, P. (1981). *Writing with power*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elbow, P. (1994). What do we mean when we talk about voice in texts? In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), *Voices on voice: Perspectives, definitions, inquiry* (pp. 1-35). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Elbow, P. (2007). Voice in writing again: Embracing contraries. *College English, 70*, 168-188.

Gilbert, P. (1991). From voice to text: Reconsidering writing and reading in the English classroom. *English Education, 23* (4), 195-211.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hashimoto, I. (1987). Voice as juice: Some reservations about evangelic composition. *College Composition and Communication, 38* (1), 70-80.

Hatch, J. A., Hill, C. A., & Hayes, J. R. (1993). When the messenger is the message. *Written Communication, 10* (4), 569-598.

Helms-Park, R., & Stapleton, P. (2003). Questioning the importance of individualised voice in undergraduate L2 argumentative writing: An empirical study with pedagogical implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12* (3), 245-265.

Hirvela, A., & Belcher, D. (2001). Coming back to voice: The multiple voices and identities of mature multilingual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 83-106.

Hyland, K. (2000a). Boosters and lexical invisibility: Noticing modifiers in academic texts. *Language Awareness, 9* (4), 179-301.

Hyland, K. (2000b). "It might be suggested that…": Academic hedging and student writing. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 16* (2000), 83-97.

Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies 7* (2), 173-192.

Hyland, K. (2008). Disciplinary voices: Interactions in research writing. *English Text Construction, 1* (1), 5-22.

Hyland, K., & Sancho Guinda, C. (2012). Introduction: A context sensitive approach to stance and voice. In K. Hyland & C. Sancho Guinda (Eds.), *Stance and voice in written academic genres* (pp. 1-11). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ivanic, R. (1998). Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

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.

Jeffery, J. (2011). Subjectivity, intentionality, and manufactured moves: Teachers' perceptions of voice in the evaluation of secondary students' writing. *Research in the Teaching of English, 46* (1), 92-127.

Lam, W. S. E. (2000). Second language literacy and the design of the self: A case study of a teenager writing on the Internet. *TESOL Quarterly, 34* (3), 457-483.

Leggo, C. (1991). Questions I need to ask before I advise my students to write in their own voices. *Rhetoric Review, 10* (1), 143-152.

Matsuda, P. K. (2001). Voice in Japanese written discourse: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 35-53.

Matsuda, P. K. (2015). Identity in written discourse. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *35*, 140-159.

Matsuda, P. K., & Tardy, C. M. (2007). Voice in academic writing: The rhetorical construction of author identity in blind manuscript review. *English for Specific Purposes, 26*, 235-249.

Murray, D. M. (1978). Write before writing. *College Composition and Communication, 29* (4), 375-381.

Petric, B. (2010). Students' conceptions of voice in academic writing. In R. Lores-Sanz, P. Mur-Duenas, & E. Lafuente-Millan (Eds.), *Constructing interpersonality: Multiple perspectives on written academic discourse* (pp. 325-336). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Phan, L. H. (2009). Strategic, passionate, but academic: Am I allowed in my writing? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *8*, 134-146.

Phan L. H., & Baurain, B. (2011). Problematizing and enriching writing academic English: An introduction. In L. H. Phan & B. Baurain (Eds.), *Voices, identities*, n*egotiations, and conflicts: Writing a*cademic English across cultures. Bradford, UK: Emerald.

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.

Ramanathan, V., & Atkinson, D. (1999). Individualism, academic writing, and ESL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8* (1), 45-75.

Ramanathan, V., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). Audience and voice in current L1 composition texts: Some implications for ESL student writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5* (1), 21-34.

Sancho Guinda, C., & Hyland, K. (2012). Introduction. In K. Hyland & C. Sancho Guinda (Eds.), *Stance and voice in academic writing*. London: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Shen, F. (1989). The classroom and the wider culture: Identity as a key to learning English composition. *College Composition and Communication, 40* (4), 459-466.

Spalding, E., Wang, J., Lin, E., & Hu, G. W. (2009). Analyzing voice in the writing of Chinese teachers of English. *Research in the Teaching of English,* 44, 23-51.

Stapleton, P. (2002). Critiquing voice as a viable pedagogical tool in L2 writing: Returning spotlight to ideas. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11* (3), 177-190.

Stewart, D. C. (1972). *The authentic voice: A pre-writing approach to student writing*. Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Tardy, C. M. (2012). Voice construction, assessment, and extra-textual identity. *Research in the Teaching of English, 47* (1), 64-99.

Tardy, C. M., & Matsuda, P. K. (2009). The construction of author voice by editorial board members. *Written Communication, 26* (1), 32-52.

Viete, R., & Phan L H. (2007). The growth of voice: expanding possibilities for self in research writing. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 6* (2), 39-57.

Zhao, C. G., & Llosa, L. (2008). Voice in high-stakes L1 academic writing assessment: Implications for L2 writing instruction. *Assessing Writing, 13* (3), 153-170.

Zhao, C. G. (2013). Measuring authorial voice strength in L2 argumentative writing: The development and validation of an analytic rubric. *Language Testing, 30* (2), 201-230.

Zhao, C. G. (2017). Voice in timed argumentative essay writing. *Assessing Writing, 31*, 73-83.

Author Biodata

Davina Allison is the coordinator of Academic English 1 and 2 at the Queensland University of Technology. She is also a poet with work published in various Australian and international literary journals.