Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, **35** (2015), pp. 81–99.
© Cambridge University Press, 2015
doi: 10.1017/S026719051400021X

Identity in Academic Discourse

JOHN FLOWERDEW
City University of Hong Kong
enjohnf@cityu.edu.hk

SIMON HO WANG
City University of Hong Kong
simon.wang@my.cityu.edu.hk

ABSTRACT

This review article is concerned with the construction of identity in academic discourse. It examines recent journal articles and monographs in applied linguistics and considers various perspectives on the issue. After a brief introduction and review of the theoretical background relating to identity, followed by a characterization of academic discourse and how it relates to identity theory, the article explores the following topics: linguistic resources for audience engagement; voice and academic identity; disciplinary identity; identity in peripheral academic genres; academic identity development over time; academic identity and English as a lingua franca; power, ideology, and critical language awareness in academic identity construction; language reuse, intertextuality, and academic identity; pedagogically oriented studies and academic identity construction; and methodological diversity and innovation in the study of academic identity. The article concludes with suggestions for future work in the field of academic identity research.

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND TO IDENTITY

In this review article, we focus on the construction of identity in academic discourse as studied in recent journal articles and monographs in applied linguistics. Identity has been examined from various perspectives in academic discourse, and this article contextualizes and synthesizes the recent literature on the topic.

There are generally agreed to be two contrasting views of identity. According to one of these views, identity is "an 'essential,' cognitive, socialized, phenomenological or psychic phenomenon that governs human action" (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 3). According to the other, identity is

> a public phenomenon, a performance or construction that is interpreted by other people. This construction takes place in discourse and other social and embodied conduct, such as how we move, where we are, what we wear, how we talk and so on. (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 3).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

This latter view, the discursive one, is the one we are concerned with in this article. It underlies many applied linguistics approaches to identity, including those in conversation analysis, corpus linguistics, discursive psychology, critical discourse analysis, narrative analysis, and positioning theory. According to this discursive, socially constructed view of discourse, identity is multiple and constantly changing. One's identity (or the identity of a group), to quote Benwell and Stokoe (2006, p. 9) again, is "whatever it is agreed to be by other people involved in the discourse at a given time and place." As Omoniyi (2011, p. 260) put it, an individual's identity is determined by a particular configuration of social context, and the appropriate identity in a given context will rise to the top of a hierarchy of possible identities. Given this view, it follows that discourse analysis, in its many manifestations, has an essential role to play in the empirical study of identity. To what extent individuals are free to construct their own identity, their *agency*, and to what extent their identity is controlled by contextual forces, *social structure,* is an important focus for debate in the literature on identity (e.g., Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Bourdieu, 1977; Giddens, 1991).

ACADEMIC DISCOURSE AND ITS RELATION TO IDENTITY

In the field of academic research and higher education, textual production is at the core of negotiating the interactive relationships among the members of academic communities and claiming and constructing academic identities. From writing essays for exams to submitting dissertations for degree requirements, students have to demonstrate their competence to their degree examiners, who function as gatekeepers, in order to move on to the next stage of their academic careers. Similarly, from submitting manuscripts to journals to writing grant proposals, junior researchers have to satisfy the expectations of their more senior colleagues in order to climb up the ladder of their respective academic communities. Such activities involve, among other things, a process of identity transformation and academic acculturation.

While much research attention has been paid to issues of identity in written academic genres, especially the research article, which is generally considered to be the premier academic genre (e.g., Englander, 2009; Hyland, 2012a; Olinger, 2011), more recent studies have also been concerned with spoken genres, namely, classroom teaching (e.g., Biber, 2006), student presentations (Zareva, 2013), and Internet-enabled genres such as scholars' institutional and personal home pages (Hyland, 2011b, 2012b), blogs (Kirkup, 2010), email discussion lists (Matsuda, 2002), and massive open online courses (MOOCs) (De Montes, Oran, & Willis, 2002).

In terms of pedagogy, the teaching of academic writing has entered a postprocess era, as the focus has shifted from an emphasis on the cognitive processes of textual production to an emphasis on the social dimensions of writing as cultural activity (Atkinson, 2003) and of writing as the product of communities of practice (Wenger, 1998), or discourse communities (Swales, 1990). In the postprocess era, teaching

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

and learning are no longer conceptualized as simply a cognitive process, but also as situated social practice during which novice members of communities develop new identities through "legitimate peripheral participation" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 14).

While most pedagogically oriented efforts in the cultivation of academic identity are concerned with traditional genres such as academic essays, journal articles, or dissertations, the development of other genres in the context of professional education may prove more challenging to teachers. For example, law students may find it difficult to learn to write like a lawyer, to meet the expectations of their clients, while at the same time satisfying the requirements of their professors as students (Maclean, 2010). Business students need to learn how to produce texts that conform to the standards of both business professionals and business students (Zhang, 2013). Similarly, medical students need to at the same time construct their identities as both doctors and medical students (Monrouxe, 2010).

If, as referred to above, social identities are constructed through discourse practices within communities of practice, we consider identities as social positions that individuals assume as they interact with others within communities by following certain rules and conventions, while at the same time exercising their agency through their individual linguistic choices (Hyland, 2012a). For example, one can assume the role of a schoolteacher by following the relevant rules and conventions for teachers prescribed by educational institutions; however, an individual teacher also brings his or her personal style and personality to the job to become a unique teacher. Both dimensions are part of the teacher's identity (e.g., Lee, 2013; Trent, 2010). Reflecting this agency–structure dichotomy referred to earlier, an important theme in identity research in the professional academic context, as highlighted by Flowerdew (2011) and Hyland (2012a), is the tension between the disciplinary community's expectations for individual members to display proximity to or conform to certain rules and conventions, on the one hand, and individual scholars' desire to claim their agency and develop their uniqueness, on the other. As Fairclough (1993) points out, modern society has become posttraditional in the sense that individuals now have more opportunities to negotiate their relationships with others, including in the academic field, rather than rigidly following the rules and conventions prescribed by particular social roles or identities (see also Giddens, 1991). Due to the negotiable nature of relationships and identities, discursive practice and dialogue become essential for identity construction, which is also a performative process (Butler, 1990; Goffman, 1959).

The fluidity of identity is also a consequence of globalization, a phenomenon that has profoundly changed the landscape of academic communication. For the first time in human history, English has become a global language for scientific communication (e.g., Mauranen, 2012), and users of English as an additional language (EAL) now outnumber those who speak English as their first language (e.g., Haberland, 2011). EAL novice scholars have to face two problems at the same time—lack of experience in academic writing and limited proficiency in English—a situation that originates from their dual identities as new members of the academic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

community and as EAL writers. The traditional distinction between native and nonnative users of English, however, has begun to be broken down, with scholars working on English as a lingua franca (ELF) arguing that the linguistic practices of second language (L2) users should be accepted as equally appropriate as those of their first language (L1) peers, so long as the texts are intelligible (Jenkins, 2013; Mauranen, 2012). ELF perspectives suggest that socialization is, in fact, a two-way street. New members have to develop new identities to be socialized into the community. Meanwhile, the community may also need to change as a result of the participation of new members (Crystal, 2003; Jenkins, 2013).

LINGUISTIC RESOURCES FOR AUDIENCE ENGAGEMENT

Given the fluidity and multiplicity of identities, it is very difficult to study the concept directly in applied linguistics. Following the tradition of sociolinguistics, research attention has focused on specific linguistic features in discourse practices (Hymes, 1977) and how such practices are linked to different aspects of identities, a process referred to as *indexicality* (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004). For example, voice—defined by Narayan (2012) as "the sense of communicating an individual presence behind written [or spoken] words" (p. 85)—as an important aspect of identity, may be indexed through the use of linguistic resources such as hedges, boosters, and attitude markers (Biber, 2006; Hyland, 2005); rhetorical moves in generic structure (Swales, 1990); and citation practices (Mansourizadeh & Ahmad, 2011; see also Castelló, Iñesta, Pardo, Liesa, & Martínez-Fernández, 2012).

If identity is not a fixed entity, but discursively and dynamically constructed through interaction between writers, speakers, and audiences, it follows that the ways audiences engage through the use of different linguistic resources may shed light on the process of identity construction. This issue has been investigated by a number of studies, many of which are corpus-based. One such corpus-based study of abstracts and research articles from the 1970s to the present following a model developed by Hyland (2005) is that of Gillaerts and Van de Velde (2010), which investigated the use of interactional discourse markers (hedges, boosters, and attitude markers) in these genres. As revealed by their use of these markers, Gillaerts and Van de Velde found that authors enact distinct identities in their abstracts as compared to the main body of their articles by using more boosters (e.g., demonstrate, undoubtedly, it is clear that) and fewer hedges (e.g., might, suggest, probably) to promote their research to their readers. They furthermore found that the frequency of use of these markers of interpersonality (i.e., hedges, boosters) had diminished over the 30-year span of the corpus. Also, using the abstracts of applied linguistics research articles as corpus data, Hu and Cao (2011) distinguished (multilingual) authors by their choice of language (Chinese or English) and their methodological approach (empirical and nonempirical). They found that authors writing in English use more hedges than their counterparts writing in Chinese, and researchers discussing empirical studies use more boosters to convey their respective linguistic and disciplinary identities.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Another corpus-based study, this time by Hewings, Lillis, and Vladimirou (2010), focused on citation practices as a discursive tool for constructing interpersonal aspects of identities and establishing authors as members of their disciplinary communities (psychology in this case). Focusing on articles written by researchers from non-Anglophone contexts, the researchers found that citations acted as an indicator of the identity of the author within their (international) disciplinary community, and that these writers, in citing texts primarily published in English, emphasized their international identity at the expense of their local identity. An important implication of such identity building is that locally based research may not receive as much exposure as it might merit, thus imposing a restriction on the flow of knowledge. In a study on citation practices found in a small specialized corpus of research papers, Mansourizadeh and Ahmad (2011) compared the citation types and functions of novice and expert authors, finding that expert writers are more likely to use integral citations (inside the structure of the sentence) rather than nonintegral citations (outside the structure of the sentence) (Swales, 1986) to support their claims, establish links with previous studies, and thereby construct their identity as members of the discourse community.

Closely related to displaying proximity is building consensus with the reader, which may, according to Warchał (2010), be accomplished through the use of conditional clauses. Warchał found that, while 57% of conditional clauses in a corpus of linguistics papers serve as content conditionals dominated by ideational meanings, different types of conditional clauses including epistemic, politeness, relevance, metalinguistic, reservation, concessive, and rhetorical conditional clauses are used to negotiate the interpersonal meanings (and hence the respective identities) between writers and readers. In an article using three case studies of undergraduate essays (not corpus-based, this time), Baratta (2009) argued that students may use the passive voice not necessarily as a means for hiding agency but to reveal author stance on subject matter.

VOICE AND ACADEMIC IDENTITY

Voice, as defined earlier, is the way individuals represent or identify themselves in their discourse (Narayan, 2012, p. 85). In the context of the academy, as Prior (2001) pointed out, voice is at the same time personal and social, in that individual writers express their individual stance towards their subject matter while at the same time appropriating the voices of others through intertextual practices (Bakhtin, Holquist, & Emerson, 1986). At the social level, voice is a means for individuals to articulate social identities prescribed through social labels such as doctors, lawyers, and teachers. At the personal level, however, individuals may assume different roles as principals, authors, and animators (Goffman, 1981) when producing texts according to specific circumstances and contexts. In line with Halliday's systemic functional linguistics (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004), Ivanič and Camps (2001) argued that voice as self-representation of writers may be constructed through different types of positioning, including ideational positioning in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

terms of representing the world, interpersonal positioning in terms of writer-reader relationship, and textual positioning in terms of creating coherent and meaningful texts.

In a pedagogically oriented study, Castelló et al. (2012) argued that opportunities to receive feedback on writing, knowledge about construction of academic voice, and awareness of different linguistic resources can help student writers improve the quality of their texts and hence better construct their identity as writers through revision. Liang's (2013) work on Taiwanese students learning journalistic English who were writing in the online community *Second Life* (a language course in which participants write and revise their work online) further confirms the interpersonal nature of voice construction and points to the importance of revision and intervention for the identity construction of L2 writers. In a further study on voice, Dressen-Hammouda (2014) focused on the development of disciplinary voice over time, as novice scholars make progress in their academic career. Dressen-Hammouda tracked a number of linguistic features as indexing voice among geology scholars over 10 years post-PhD by means of situated genre analysis and using an index of linguistic features.

Using a corpus-based approach, Lorés-Sanz (2011) focused on the use of first-person pronouns by L1 English writers, L1 Spanish writers, and L2 English writers with Spanish as their L1 and studied how they construct their voices and make themselves visible in their texts through interpersonal positioning. Lorés-Sanz found that the variation of frequency and discourse functions of first-person pronouns is subject to the influence of writers' linguistic and disciplinary backgrounds (a point to be further discussed below in the sections on disciplinary identities and ELF).

Matsuda (2001) defined voice from the perspective of the reader, not the writer, as "the reader's impression derived from the particular combination of the ways in which both discursive and non-discursive features are used" (p. 239). Based on this definition, Matsuda and Tardy (2007) investigated how readers construct the voice of writers in a simulated blind peer review process and found that manuscript reviewers apply their own assumptions, beliefs, values, and expectations when interpreting the voice of the writers they are reviewing. Matsuda and Tardy argued that "shifting the discussion of voice from the sole province of the writer to the jointly constructed reader-writer interaction can provide rich insight into the readers' role in the process of constructing voice" and that "broadening the scope of voice to an overall impression of the author can bring us closer to the rhetorical processes that readers enact when reading and evaluating academic texts" (p. 247).

DISCIPLINARY IDENTITY

Given the importance of disciplines in the academy, identities are often constructed according to the conventions of specific communities of disciplinary practices. Novice members need to follow certain rules and satisfy gatekeepers in order to become socialized into their disciplinary communities. This process of socialization may begin in secondary schools (or even earlier), when students are engaged in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

content area writing tasks (e.g., Kibler, 2011). But L2 students may have concerns in their writing that are different from those of their teachers. As Kibler (2011) found, in an ethnographic study of L2 high school students in the United States, that while science teachers were interested in developing students' skills to write like a scientist, students were more preoccupied with writing clearly. This divergence in perceptions of writing requirements may be partly due to the multiple identities involved: teachers as mentors concerned with introducing students to the disciplinary discourse of science and the L2 students as disadvantaged writers struggling over producing intelligible English texts.

Dressen-Hammouda (2014) studied the longitudinal development of the disciplinary voices of experienced geology scholars after their PhD dissertations by tracking (over a decade) the specific generic moves found in their writing. She found that credible disciplinary voice developed in similar ways among the participants in her study, as they consistently used more personalization indexes (e.g., author pronouns, evaluative adjectives and adverbs, and interpretive comments) and disciplinary indexes (e.g., nominal or adjectival field descriptors, technical verbal adjectives and participles, and references to others' fieldwork) after years of disciplinary experience to engage their audience in discipline-specific manners. In a qualitative text analysis, Maclean (2010) focused on the development of the professional identities of law students. By comparing student texts with professional texts, Maclean found that the students conveyed conflicting identities of law student, on the one hand, and legal professional, on the other, as compared to the experts, who conveyed a single consistent professional identity.

In a book-length treatment focusing on professional disciplinary identity and based on corpus studies of various academic genres, including acknowledgment texts, academic home pages, and biographies, Hyland (2012a) explored how author identity and disciplinary identity interact in academic discourse. This same issue was also explored in a collection of papers edited by Gotti (2009), *Commonality and Individuality in Academic Discourse*.

IDENTITY IN PERIPHERAL ACADEMIC GENRES

While research articles and academic essays have been the major data sources for studies of disciplinary identity, other genres have also provided opportunities for research into identity in academic discourse. In particular, with the development of digital technologies, new genres have developed.

Internet home pages are a conspicuous site where individuals may discursively construct their identities. Echoing the overall themes of individuality versus conformity and agency versus structure of identity research, Hyland (2011a) explored how scholars express their individual selves using the different semiotic resources available in the form of academic home pages under the institutional control of the university. Further highlighting these themes, Hyland (2012b) compared the academic and personal home pages of university scholars (i.e. those web pages under the control of the institutions and those free of such control) to see how they

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

make linguistic choices under different circumstances. In academic home pages sponsored by institutions, these scholars tend to focus more on their identification with their universities following the conventions and expectations of the visitors of the university websites as constrained by the required formatting of the university pages. However, the same scholars utilize a range of multimodal semiotic resources such as pictures and hyperlinks to create a more personal online brand in their personal home pages.

Blogging by academic scholars, unlike conventional journal publication, offers an alternative channel to develop raw ideas and display the emotional side of scholars' selves (Kirkup, 2010). Free of the constraint of rigorous peer review, academic blogging offers an informal platform for scholars to discuss their research and engage with their audiences in the exchange of ideas and information. In a sense, academic blogging is a way for individual scholars to get away from the rigid expectations of the research community and construct a more personal identity (Mauranen, 2013). More subversive is the potential for blogging by students and the creation of hidden transcripts (Scott, 1990) of resistance against the institutionally embedded power and authority of teachers. As Liew (2010) discovered in an ethnographic case study of a student's blog entry, blogging may create a space for students to reveal aspects of themselves that are not publicly available through formal academic discourse or other more overt discursive practices. The irony that lies in blogs, as in other social networking sites such as Facebook and MySpace, is that, despite the public nature of these online discourses, access to them by parents and teachers may be considered by students as an invasion of their privacy (Maranto & Barton, 2010). Young people want to keep these online identities hidden from their guardians and reserved for their peers.

Identity construction activity may also be found in some obscure places in academic settings. Attenborough (2011) analyzed library textbook marginalia (comments written by students on the textbook margins that are publicly observable), showing how students negotiate two different identities: doing education (as a diligent student) and doing being a student (with less commitment to education). In an equally creative approach, Olinger (2011) investigated student writers' stances towards a single word, discourse. Based on videotaped collaborative writing sessions and interviews, he found that stances on discourse such as knowledge display and positive evaluation are used to index different discoursal or social identities (e.g., student ethnographer).

ACADEMIC IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT OVER TIME

As Burgess and Ivanic (2010) point out, in order to fully understand the construction of writer identity, it is important to explore the relationship between discourse and time. Writer identity construction may be studied as a process situated in multiple temporal dimensions. Burgess (2012) elaborated a framework consisting of various temporal levels: sociocultural (decades, centuries); ontogenetic (months, years); mesolevel (weeks, months); and microgenetic (seconds, minutes, hours).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Burgess applied this framework to investigate identity development in student writing in an adult literacy class in the United Kingdom. Also concerned with the development of writer identity over time, Ryshina-Pankova (2011) investigated how American students learning to write book reviews in German use different thematization patterns in their sentences over time periods. She found that more advanced writers move away from the direct expression of opinion, as manifested in thematization strategies (e.g., the use of first-person pronouns), and move towards more intersubjective and hence persuasive strategies over time (e.g., thematization of the reader of the book review). As previously noted, in a longitudinal study over a decade, Dressen-Hammouda (2014) investigated the development of voice among scholars in a specific disciplinary field (geology), finding that novice scholars learn to adopt more appropriate disciplinary voices over time as they became more senior members of the academic community.

ACADEMIC IDENTITY AND ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA (ELF)

ELF has been defined as "any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option" (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 7). Since, due to globalization, English became the dominant language in international scholarly communication, users of EAL have become important members of the international academic community of scholars, their numbers now likely outnumbering Anglophones (e.g., Mauranen, 2010). Research attention has been focused on how novice EAL scholars handle difficulties in writing and publishing research articles in English journals (e.g., Cargill & O'Connor, 2006; Cho, 2004; Flowerdew & Y. Li, 2009; Lillis & Curry, 2006; Mur-Dueñas, 2013). Particularly relevant to our theme is the debate between Flowerdew and Casanave on the stigmatization of EAL scholars attempting to publish their work in English (Casanave, 2008; Flowerdew, 2008), with Flowerdew arguing that (following Goffman's conception of stigma) EAL writers might be considered to be treated as a stigmatized group and Casanave disagreeing with this, on the grounds that such an approach may itself have a stigmatizing effect on such writers. The main cause of potential stigmatization of EAL writers is obviously their potential linguistic deficiency in the eyes of academic gatekeepers, who are often (although increasingly less often) native speakers of English. ELF scholars take the view that a distinction should be made between language learners and language users. ELF users, it is argued, should not be alienated (stigmatized) by being labeled as "deficient communicators who struggle with difficulties" (Mauranen, 2012, p. 5), that is, learners. Instead, it should be acknowledged that languages change over time and that, through the contact of ELF users from diverse linguistic backgrounds with weak social ties to the center Anglophone countries (Kachru, 1985), ELF has developed into a commons for all EAL users of English.

As Seidlhofer (2011, p. xii) points out, work on ELF has mainly focused on spoken language, probably because it is easier to study processes of variation

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

and change in this register. One notable article on ELF written communication is Rozycki and Johnson's (2013) study of a small corpus of award-winning engineering research articles written by EAL writers. Rozycki and Johnson found that these papers, despite their undisputed scientific merit, contain a significant amount of what the researchers refer to as noncanonical grammar, such as the dropping of articles and absence of concord in number marking between subject and predicate. The findings thus suggest that the identity of ELF scholars who use noncanonical forms may be becoming a bona fide identity, which is no longer stigmatized.

POWER, IDEOLOGY, AND CRITICAL LANGUAGE AWARENESS IN ACADEMIC IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION

Power is an important discursively constructed dimension of identity. In academic settings, as we reviewed in the section on ELF, L2 academic writers may find themselves in less powerful positions, as they have to conform to the expectations of gatekeepers who are often native speakers (or to nonnative speakers, who nevertheless apply native-speaker norms). Yet, this unequal power relation may be mitigated if there is a change of perspective on the ownership of language and L2 scholars' writing comes to be assessed according to communicative effectiveness, or intelligibility, rather than native-speaker standards, as seems to be happening with ELF.

In the context of language teaching, the power relation between teachers and students and among students has been investigated from an identity perspective. Mayes (2010) investigated the construction of teacher identity in the context of the power relations dynamic in an English composition program at a U.S. university. In an analysis of the institutional context and of the discursive construction of teachers' identities, Mayes found there to be contradictions between the goal of reduction of power difference between teacher and student and some of the teaching practices that were investigated. As a result, power was not effectively distributed as intended. Mayes concluded that critical pedagogy theorists have underestimated the importance of considering the role of micro-level interaction in the construction of power relations.

Also in an English composition teaching context, Liu (2011) focused on how a group of nonnative speakers of English students in Taiwan perceived and negotiated power with their counterparts and email partners in an American undergraduate institute. Liu found that the Taiwanese students felt inferior (less powerful) in relation to their American counterparts due to their limited linguistic skills or to Taiwan's "inferior" cultural status. Some American students also felt less powerful based on their relative disadvantage in computer literacy and global knowledge. Students adopted different discursive strategies to deal with the power differentials they perceived themselves to be subject to in communicating with their international counterparts. While students under the interactional style of balance used a friendly, informal, and conversational communication style to create a "friend"

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

or "classmate" image, students under the endurance style preferred formal, polite, academic, and fact-oriented language and construed a "tourist guide" or "cultural ambassador" identity (Liu, 2011, p. 267).

In the context of teacher education, Vasconcelos (2013) studied how the adoption of a model of dialogic education that places the teacher and students in a more balanced power relation than traditionally found led to a "moment of crisis" in a dialogic speech event in which students negotiated the common sense meanings of the identity marker "Americans" in the context of ethnic diversity and inclusion. A detailed analysis of this linguistic event using the framework developed by Fairclough (1992b) and the rules of dialogue from Burbules (1993) demonstrates how teacher trainees may be engaged in critical questions and moments of crisis related to race and identity.

In an action research study based on a business English course in Singapore, Weninger and Kan (2013) incorporated critical language awareness (Fairclough, 1992a) into the curriculum and made efforts to sensitize students to different metalinguistic resources available for constructing interpersonal relations and identity with their audiences. The researchers argued that a critical approach to language learning is essential because students tend to view language as an instrument of practical utility rather than of identity construction.

LANGUAGE RE-USE, INTERTEXTUALITY, AND ACADEMIC IDENTITY

An important issue in academic identity construction is that of intertextuality, how students and professional academics may appropriate textual features from other texts (e.g., Pecorari & Shaw, 2012). When students or scholars copy directly from sources, they may be accused of plagiarism. Others have argued that a certain amount of such "patchwriting" (Howard, 1993) or language re-use (Flowerdew & Li, 2007) is a natural feature of academic identity development. A special issue of the *Journal of Second Language Writing* recently focused on this issue (Polio & Shi, 2012). In one of the articles in that collection, a case study of two undergraduates in a Hong Kong university working on their writing tasks, Li and Casanave (2012) argued that the identity label "plagiarists" may not be appropriate for students engaged in borrowing chunks of texts from other sources. Less stigmatizing labels such as patchwriting and textual borrowing may be applied to the relevant language re-use practices.

Acknowledging the complex and controversial nature of the topic, again in the special issue of the *Journal of Second Language Writing*, Shi (2012) interviewed a number of students and professors about their views of four specific writing samples by L2 writers involving paraphrasing, summarizing, and translation. The comments made by participants suggested that issues related to language re-use were not as straightforward as they seemed and the standards also varied a great deal across disciplines. In a third study in the special issue, this time focusing on faculty members, Pecorari and Shaw (2012) obtained a finding consistent with Li and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Casanave (2012) and Shi (2012), this time that faculty members may find it difficult to reach consensus when judging the appropriateness of different intertextuality practices.

Language re-use may thus be considered not so much as a matter of avoiding plagiarism, but more of an issue of making identity claims using different linguistic resources available in others' voices and discourses. The study of language practices of English-speaking university students in Bangladesh by Sultana (2014) illustrates this point aptly, as the research participants used linguistic resources from Western media such as mockery, parody, and other exotic ideas to highlight their class-based identity and distance themselves from the innate identity of Bangladesh women.

Given the intertextual nature of writing, Bunch and Willett (2013) investigated how a group of U.S. middle school English as a second language (ESL) students engaged in voice and discourse appropriation when working on a writing assignment in social studies. Using a framework developed by Bazerman (2004), they found that the students employed a variety of language re-use strategies in their writing: drawing on curriculum and content; referencing texts; invoking generally circulating beliefs; getting personal; and using stock phrases, idioms, similes, metaphors, and images.

In a case study of two ESL undergraduates in the United States, Hirvela and Du (2013) investigated the students' understanding of the purposes and functions of paraphrasing, an important technique of language re-use and voice appropriation. Based on a framework originally developed by Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987), Hirvela and Du made a distinction between paraphrasing for knowledge telling and paraphrasing for knowledge transforming, and found that students were more confident with the former, but encountered increasing difficulty with the latter. The shift from knowledge telling to knowledge transforming would seem to be a rite of passage essential for novice researchers in their identity development.

Also interested in students' citation practices, Petrić (2012) compared the direct quotations used in lower-rated and higher-rated MA theses of English as a foreign language (EFL) research students in an English-speaking university in Central Europe. Petrić found that, despite different motivations behind direct quotations, MA students with higher grades tended to use shorter, modified direct quotation, whereas those with lower grades tended to use clause-based quotations. This finding corresponds with the knowledge telling–knowledge transforming dichotomy used in Bereiter and Scardamalia's (1987) study.

PEDAGOGICALLY ORIENTED STUDIES AND ACADEMIC IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION

Since one of the central concerns in identity research in academic discourse is how novice members become increasingly socialized into communities of practice through situated discursive practice, applied linguists and language teachers have explored different options for helping novices in the process of identity

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

transformation, usually in the context of school or university education. We have already reviewed some such pedagogically oriented studies under other headings above, namely, Mayes's (2010) attempt to introduce critical language awareness to language courses, Weninger & Kan's (2013)'s development of a business communication course based on critical pedagogy, and Castelló et al.'s (2012) study on teaching how to construct academic voice.

In response to Matsuda and Tardy's (2007) emphasis on the importance of voice in L2 writing (reported above), Stapleton and Helms-Park (2008) argued that other linguistic issues such as syntax, lexis, and textual organization should be dealt with before voice and identity with novice L2 writers. In contrast with Stapleton and Helms-Park, in a pedagogically oriented study focusing on the academic voice of a group of psychology students using an experimental group and a control group, Castelló et al. (2012) found that explicit teaching of linguistic resources for constructing academic voice through tutorials and collaborative writing, both online and face-to-face, helped student writers in the experimental group find their own voice and improve the quality of texts they produced relative to their counterparts in the control group.

In a teacher education study focusing on the identity development of writing teachers in Hong Kong, Lee (2013) investigated how a number of writing teachers shifted their identities from language teachers to writing teachers, appropriating discourses from the literature on writing pedagogy. The methodology used in this study focused not only on the discursive construction of teacher identity but also on the process of identity development through actual teaching activities, an essential component for understanding the pedagogical issues in academic discourse.

In response to widespread problems of plagiarism among students learning academic writing, Elander, Pittam, Lusher, Fox, and Payne (2010) administered an instructional intervention to a large group of UK university students ($N = 364$) focusing on the issue of authorial identity. The intervention consisted of a discussion with students of relevant topics such as the definition of the terms "author" and "authorship," the concept "authorial decision," and examples of student writing with suspected or alleged plagiarism. Evaluation based on a postintervention Student Authorship Questionnaire and follow-up focus groups suggested that the intervention helped students to gain more confidence in developing their own authorial identities while avoiding plagiarism.

Targeted more specifically at international research students in an Australian university, Li and Vandermensbrugghe (2011) reported on a writing support group composed of two experienced faculty facilitators and 38 research students engaged in activities such as reading and commenting on members' writing and text revision strategies. Based on the observation of faculty facilitators, questionnaires, and focus group discussions with student participants, they found that the group writing activities provided helpful support for the novice writers in their academic identity building in terms of stylistic changes, improvement at discourse level, attention to the writing context, and reader awareness development.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Although all of the studies we have referred to in this article have focused on identity or some aspect of identity in their investigation, they have not always invoked specific identity theories or conspicuously used identity as an analytical lens (Gee, 2000). Given the interest in identity from different perspectives, as found in these studies, efforts might be made to promote conversations among proponents of these different perspectives, with a view to developing a more coherent theory or set of theories of identity in academic discourse.

With increasing research attention being paid to identity issues across the social sciences, it is not surprising that the studies reviewed in this article come from a number of different subfields in applied linguistics, for example, English for academic purposes (Gillaerts & Van de Velde, 2010; Hewings et al., 2010; Kibler, 2011; Mansourizadeh & Ahmad, 2011), higher education (e.g., Castelló et al., 2012; Kwan, 2013; Li & Vandermensbrugghe, 2011), pragmatics (e.g., Hu & Cao, 2011), critical discourse studies (e.g., Attenborough, 2011; Mayes, 2010), and the newly emerging field of ELF (e.g., Mauranen, 2013). In terms of data collection and analysis, the studies also draw on different research paradigms, including conversation analysis (e.g., Vasconcelos, 2013), ethnography (e.g., Burgess, 2012; Kibler, 2011), corpus linguistics (Hyland, 2011a, 2011b Hyland & Tse, 2012), longitudinal qualitative research (e.g., Dressen-Hammouda, 2014), action research (e.g., Castelló et al., 2012; Li & Vandermensbrugghe, 2011), and interview survey (Zhang, 2013).

Innovation in methodology often leads to theoretical insights. In the studies that we have reviewed, we have identified many attempts to break new ground in various fields. For example, a number of studies have touched upon genres that are relatively unexplored such as academic and personal home pages (Hyland, 2011a, 2012b), academic blogs (Kirkup, 2010), library textbook marginalia (Attenborough, 2011), and virtual cyber communities (Liang, 2013).

In terms of future research, studies of various topics on identity may borrow analytical tools and data sources from one another to generate new and interesting scholarship on identity. For example, the critical language awareness approach might be applied to enrich the debate on ELF, for which power relations and (critical) language awareness are key issues. More work can be done on voice and reader engagement with regard to the newer Internet-enabled academic genres. In addition, most pedagogically oriented studies focus on written genres, probably because written texts can be more easily accessed. However, more research is needed on the various spoken academic genres, not least because, with the increasing international mobility of the student body, students and novice scholars need help in improving their speaking skills in academic contexts. Research input on how identity is discursively constructed through these genres would provide important insights for novice scholars' academic socialization.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gotti, M. (ed.). (2009). *Commonality and individuality in academic discourse*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

This edited collection focuses on the relationship between shared disciplinary norms and individual traits in academic discourse (spoken and written). The volume highlights how, despite the standardizing pressure of cultural and language-related factors, academic communication remains in many ways a highly personal business, with participation in a disciplinary community requiring a multidimensional discourse that combines professional, institutional, social, and individual identities.

Hyland, K. (2012a). *Disciplinary identities: Individuality and community in academic discourse*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

This monograph explores the tension between the desire of individuals to claim their personal identities, on the one hand, and the pressure to conform to institutional and communal expectations in discursive practices, on the other. It synthesizes a number of studies focusing on identity construction in different genres such as representational essays, academic bios, undergraduate reports, research articles, and book reviews. Aspects of identity in this monograph include gender, professional status, and culture. Corpus-based approaches are used throughout, thereby demonstrating the value of the corpus method in studying the discursive construction of identity.

Kirkup, G. (2010). Academic blogging: Academic practice and academic identity. *London Review of Education*, *8*(1), 75–84.

Concerned with a relatively underexplored genre, the academic blog, the study investigates, by means of interviews with a small sample of academic bloggers, the audience for academic blogs and the motivations and costs of blogging. This book argues that academic blogs can be regarded as an academic genre for scholars to establish their identity as public intellectuals through discussing their ideas in a more concise and accessible way.

Lorés-Sanz, R. (2011). The construction of the author's voice in academic writing: The interplay of cultural and disciplinary factors. *Text & Talk: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, *31*(2), 173–193.

This study is motivated by the need to help Spanish authors make informed decisions in identity construction when using personal pronouns in writing research articles in English. Using a corpus approach based on texts collected in the field of business management, the author compares the use of personal pronouns by L1 English authors and Spanish authors of English research articles and explains the divergence in terms of both linguistic (cultural) and disciplinary factors.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, D. (2003). L2 writing in the post-process era: Introduction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *12*(1), 3–15.

Attenborough, F. T. (2011). "I don't f***ing care!' Marginalia and the (textual) negotiation of an academic identity by university students. *Discourse & Communication*, *5*(2), 99–121. doi:10.1177/1750481310395447

Bakhtin, M. M., Holquist, M., & Emerson, C. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Baratta, A. M. (2009). Revealing stance through passive voice. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *41*(7), 1406–1421. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2008.09.010

Bazerman, C. (2004). Intertextuality: How texts rely on other texts. In C. Bazerman & P. Prior (eds.), *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices* (pp. 83–96). London, UK: Taylor & Francis.

Benwell, B., & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity.* Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
Biber, D. (2006). Stance in spoken and written university registers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *5*(2), 97–116. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2006.05.001
Bourdieu, P. (1977), *Outline of a theory of practice.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004). Theorizing identity in language and sexuality research. *Language in Society*, *33*(4), 469–515.
Bunch, G. C., & Willett, K. (2013). Writing to mean in middle school: Understanding how second language writers negotiate textually-rich content-area instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *22*(2), 141–160.
Burbules, N. C. (1993). *Dialogue in teaching: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
Burgess, A. (2012). "I don't want to become a China Buff": Temporal dimensions of the discoursal construction of writer identity. *Linguistics and Education*, *23*(3), 223–234. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2012.04.001
Burgess, A., & Ivanic, R. (2010). Writing and being written: Issues of identity across timescales. *Written Communication*, *27*(2), 228–255.
Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London, UK: Routledge.
Cargill, M., & O'Connor, P. (2006). Developing Chinese scientists' skills for publishing in English: Evaluating collaborating-colleague workshops based on genre analysis. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *5*, 207–221.
Casanave, C. P. (2008). The stigmatizing effect of Goffman's stigma label: A response to John Flowerdew. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *7*(4), 264–267.
Castelló, M., Iñesta, A., Pardo, M., Liesa, E., & Martínez-Fernández, R. (2012). Tutoring the end-of-studies dissertation: Helping psychology students find their academic voice when revising academic texts. *Higher Education*, *63*(1), 97–115. doi:10.1007/s10734–011–9428–9
Cho, S. (2004). Challenges of entering discourse communities through publishing in English: Perspectives of nonnative-speaking doctoral students in the United States of America. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *3*(1), 47–72.
Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
De Montes, L. E., Oran, S. M., & Willis, E. M. (2002). Power, language, and identity: Voices from an online course. *Computers and Composition*, *19*(3), 251–271.
Dressen-Hammouda, D. (2014). Measuring the voice of disciplinarity in scientific writing: A longitudinal exploration of experienced writers in geology. *English for Specific Purposes*, *34*, 14–25.
Elander, J., Pittam, G., Lusher, J., Fox, P., & Payne, N. (2010). Evaluation of an intervention to help students avoid unintentional plagiarism by improving their authorial identity. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *35*(2), 157–171. doi:10.1080/02602930802687745
Englander, K. (2009). Transformation of the identities of nonnative English-speaking scientists as a consequence of the social construction of revision. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *8*(1), 35–53.
Fairclough, N. (ed.). (1992a). *Critical language awareness*. London, UK: Longman.
Fairclough, N. (1992b). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society*, *4*(2), 133–168. doi:10.1177/0957926593004002002
Flowerdew, J. (2008). Scholarly writers who use English as an additional language: What can Goffman's "stigma" tell us? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *7*(2), 77–86.
Flowerdew, J. (2011). Action, content and identity in applied genre analysis for ESP. *Language Teaching*, *44*(04), 516–528.
Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2007). Language re-use among Chinese apprentice scientists writing for publication. *Applied Linguistics*, *28*(3), 440–465.
Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2009). The globalization of scholarship: Studying Chinese scholars writing for international publication. In Rosa Manchón (ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 156–182). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Gee, J. P. (2000). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, *25*, 99–125.
Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gillaerts, P., & Van de Velde, F. (2010). Interactional metadiscourse in research article abstracts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *9*(2), 128–139.
Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Gotti, M. (ed.). (2009). *Commonality and individuality in academic discourse*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
Haberland, H. (2011). Ownership and maintenance of a language in transnational use: Should we leave our lingua franca alone? *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(4), 937–949. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.08.009
Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
Hewings, A., Lillis, T., & Vladimirou, D. (2010). Who's citing whose writings? A corpus based study of citations as interpersonal resource in English medium national and English medium international journals. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *9*(2), 102–115. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2010.02.005
Hirvela, A., & Du, Q. (2013). "Why am I paraphrasing?" Undergraduate ESL writers' engagement with source-based academic writing and reading. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *12*(2), 87–98. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2012.11.005
Howard, R. M. (1993). A plagiarism pentimento. *Journal of Teaching Writing*, *11*(2), 233–245.
Hu, G., & Cao, F. (2011). Hedging and boosting in abstracts of applied linguistics articles: A comparative study of English- and Chinese-medium journals. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(11), 2795–2809. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2011.04.007
Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London, UK: Continuum.
Hyland, K. (2011a). The presentation of self in scholarly life: Identity and marginalization in academic homepages. *English for Specific Purposes*, *30*(4), 286–297.
Hyland, K. (2011b). Projecting an academic identity in some reflective genres. *Ibérica: Revista de La Asociación Europea de Lenguas Para Fines Específicos (AELFE)*, *21*, 9–30.
Hyland, K. (2012a). *Disciplinary identities: Individuality and community in academic discourse*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Hyland, K. (2012b). Individuality or conformity? Identity in personal and university academic homepages. *Computers and Composition*, *29*(4), 309–322.
Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2012). "She has received many honours": Identity construction in article bio statements. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *11*(2), 155–165. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2012.01.001
Hymes, D. (1977). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. London, UK: Tavistock.
Ivanič, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*(1–2), 3–33. doi:10.1016/S1060–3743(01)00034–0
Jenkins, J. (2013). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. London, UK: Routledge.
Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Kibler, A. (2011). "I write it in a way that people can read it": How teachers and adolescent L2 writers describe content area writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *20*(3), 211–226.
Kirkup, G. (2010). Academic blogging: Academic practice and academic identity. *London Review of Education*, *8*(1), 75–84.
Kwan, B. S. C. (2013). Facilitating novice researchers in project publishing during the doctoral years and beyond: A Hong Kong-based study. *Studies in Higher Education*, *38*(2), 207–225. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.576755
Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Lee, I. (2013). Becoming a writing teacher: Using "identity" as an analytic lens to understand EFL writing teachers' development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *22*(3), 330–345. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2012.07.001
Li, L. Y., & Vandermensbrugghe, J. (2011). Supporting the thesis writing process of international research students through an ongoing writing group. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *48*(2), 195–205. doi:10.1080/14703297.2011.564014
Li, Y., & Casanave, C. P. (2012). Two first-year students' strategies for writing from sources: Patchwriting or plagiarism? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(2), 165–180. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.002.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Liang, M.-Y. (2013). Rethinking authenticity: Voice and feedback in media discourse. *Computers and Composition*, *30*(3), 157–179.
Liew, W. M. (2010). Digital hidden transcripts: Exploring student resistance in blogs. *Computers and Composition*, *27*(4), 304–314. doi:10.1016/j.compcom.2010.09.004
Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars interactions with literacy brokers in the production of English-medium texts. *Written Communication*, 23(1), 3–35.
Liu, Y. (2011). Power perceptions and negotiations in a cross-national email writing activity. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *20*(4), 257–270. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2011.06.001
Lorés-Sanz, R. (2011). The construction of the author's voice in academic writing: The interplay of cultural and disciplinary factors. *Text & Talk: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, *31*(2), 173–193.
Maclean, R. (2010). First-year law students' construction of professional identity through writing. *Discourse Studies*, *12*(2), 177–194.
Mansourizadeh, K., & Ahmad, U. K. (2011). Citation practices among non-native expert and novice scientific writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *10*(3), 152–161.
Maranto, G., & Barton, M. (2010). Paradox and promise: MySpace, Facebook, and the sociopolitics of social networking in the writing classroom. *Computers and Composition*, *27*(1), 36–47.
Matsuda, P. K. (2001). Voice in Japanese written discourse: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*(1–2), 35–53. doi:10.1016/S1060–3743(00)00036–9
Matsuda, P. K. (2002). Negotiation of identity and power in a Japanese online discourse community. *Computers and Composition*, *19*(1), 39–55. doi:10.1016/S8755–4615(02)00079–8
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*(2), 235–249.
Mauranen, A. (2010). Features of English as a lingua franca in academia. *Helsinki English Studies*, *6*, 6–28.
Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Mauranen, A. (2013). Hybridism, edutainment, and doubt: Science blogging finding its feet. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *12*(1), 7–36.
Mayes, P. (2010). The discursive construction of identity and power in the critical classroom: Implications for applied critical theories. *Discourse & Society*, *21*(2), 189–210. doi:10.1177/0957926509353846
Monrouxe, L. V. (2010). Identity, identification and medical education: Why should we care? *Medical Education*, *44*(1), 40–49. doi:10.1111/j.1365–2923.2009.03440.x
Mur-Dueñas, P. (2013). Spanish scholars' research article publishing process in English-medium journals: English used as a lingua franca? *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, *2*(2), 315–340.
Narayan, K. (2012). *Alive in the writing: Crafting ethnography in the company of Chekhov*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Olinger, A. R. (2011). Constructing identities through "discourse": Stance and interaction in collaborative college writing. *Linguistics and Education*, *22*(3), 273–286.
Omoniyi, T. (2011). Discourse and identity. In K. Hyland & K. Paltridge, *The continuum companion to discourse analysis* (pp. 260–276). London, UK: Continuum.
Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2012). Types of student intertextuality and faculty attitudes. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(2), 149–164. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.006
Petrić, B. (2012). Legitimate textual borrowing: Direct quotation in L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(2), 102–117. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.005
Polio, C., & Shi, L. (eds.) (2012). Textual appropriation and source use in L2 writing [Special issue]. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(2).
Polio, C., & Shi, L. (2012). Perceptions and beliefs about textual appropriation and source use in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(2), 95–101.
Prior, P. (2001). Voices in text, mind, and society: Sociohistoric accounts of discourse acquisition and use. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*(1–2), 55–81. doi:10.1016/S1060–3743(00)00037–0
Rozycki, W., & Johnson, N. H. (2013). Non-canonical grammar in Best Paper award winners in engineering. *English for Specific Purposes*, *32*(3), 157–169. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2013.04.002
Ryshina-Pankova, M. (2011). Developmental changes in the use of interactional resources: Persuading the reader in FL book reviews. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *20*(4), 243–256.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca: A complete introduction to the theoretical nature and practical implications of English used as a lingua franca.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Shi, L. (2012). Rewriting and paraphrasing source texts in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(2), 134–148. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.003

Stapleton, P., & Helms-Park, R. (2008). A response to Matsuda and Tardy's "Voice in academic writing: The rhetorical construction of author identity in blind manuscript review." *English for Specific Purposes*, *27*(1), 94–99.

Sultana, S. (2014). Heteroglossia and identities of young adults in Bangladesh. *Linguistics and Education*, *26*, 40–56. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2014.01.009

Swales, J. (1986). Citation analysis and discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics*, *7*(1), 39–56.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Trent, J. (2010). From rigid dichotomy to measured contingency. Hong Kong preservice teachers' discursive construction of identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(4), 906–913. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.10.031

Vasconcelos, E. F. de S. (2013). "I just wanted to make sure that everyone knew I was American": A critical discourse analysis of a dialogic speech event. *Linguistics and Education*, *24*(2), 86–100. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2012.12.003

Warchał, K. (2010). Moulding interpersonal relations through conditional clauses: Consensus-building strategies in written academic discourse. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *9*(2), 140–150. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2010.02.002

Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning as a social system. *Systems Thinker*, *9*(5), 2–3.

Weninger, C., & Kan, K. H.-Y. (2013). (Critical) Language awareness in business communication. *English for Specific Purposes*, *32*(2), 59–71. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2012.09.002

Zareva, A. (2013). Self-mention and the projection of multiple identity roles in TESOL graduate student presentations: The influence of the written academic genres. *English for Specific Purposes*, *32*(2), 72–83.

Zhang, Z. (2013). Business English students learning to write for international business: What do international business practitioners have to say about their texts? *English for Specific Purposes*, *32*(3), 144–156.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400021X Published online by Cambridge University Press