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of goals and the linguistic realizations of these concepts, it is first necessary to review our framework and the requisite psychological construct. For our study we conceived of intentions as part of a theory of action in which an agent acts towards an object through mediating artefacts. The antecedent intentions of the agent who acts toward an object are based primarily on desires and/or beliefs about the object, which are then put into practice by using plans. The key components of our construct of an intention can be reduced to belief, desire, object, plan, and action in progress. At least one of the five components was found in each of the passages coded as an intention. While this may appear to be reductionist, it is in fact plausible to have only one of the components and no others. For example, it is entirely possible for a learner to have an intention without a goal in mind or to have a intention to act on a goal without an underlying desire or belief (Bratman, 1997; Harman, 1976; Mele, 2001; Searle, 1983). A second point that emerges about the relationship of concept and linguistic realization concerns register (Halliday & Hasan, 1985). As the CSI, RQ, and communication strategies show, statements of intention are linked to particular linguistic forms. Psychological constructs have a unique, identifiable linguistic register. Such linguistic forms may vary considerably, as is evident from this analysis, but identifying the relationship between construct and linguistic realization provides for a succinctly defined construct resulting in a more reliable identification of the phenomena being studied.

How does awareness of linguistic realizations inform our knowledge of goal-oriented learning activities? The simple answer is that identification of register helps to further refine both theories of intentions and methodology. It is clear from the present analysis that not only beliefs and desire are important to learners as they set goals for writing improvement, but also what they find useful, valuable (important), difficult, or lack in understanding. While belief and desire are discussed at length in the philosophy literature on intentions, only recently have philosophers come to realize that how the pragmatic aspects of an agent’s statements plays a role in the interpretation of intention (Knobe, 2003; Mele, 2003). Another example of how knowledge of register contributes to better understanding of intention was found in the ways in which participants used various hypotactic verbal group complexes. In some CSI, particularly three-part causatives, the link between agent, intention, and goal is made clear, but in other CSI, such as in some desideratives, there is only mention of an agent and the object. The link between agency, intention, and activity is not always obvious in students’ statements about their goals, so they could be prompted to clarify these to their own advantage and understanding. Knowledge of the various conceptual components of an intention on the part of a researcher or teacher in asking students about their goals for writing would lead to more effective questioning as well as identification of intentions.

In this chapter we extend our analyses of students’ goals for writing improvement in two directions. Theoretically, we interpret students’ goals for writing improvement as a dynamic interplay between their motivations and senses of identities as expressed in samples of their academic writing and interviews. Empirically, we present data from an additional, third year of data collection in the context of university studies. But to attain these perspectives we concentrate on the cases of just three students. We describe how the three learners individually motivated themselves, created and adjusted attainable learning goals, and gradually came to express identities, in their writing, as ESL learners and as functioning, novice members in the written discourse of their communities of academic study. As such, the analytic framework in this chapter diverges from the methods (described in Chapter 2) we developed for the main study to account for group trends in learners’ goals for writing improvement. Here we adopt a more interpretive, socio-historical, and personalized set of case-study accounts to describe how the three students each uniquely and progressively developed their goals and their writing in English.

Goals, motivation, and identity

Writers’ representations of themselves are elusive and complicated. For this reason Cherry (1988) recommended studying them from different angles and from a multidimensional perspective. We have tried to do so in the present chapter. We assume that goals reflect students’ motivations, which in turn express and construct their identities. Goals and motivations are integral to the construction of identities because they involve a person’s expectations or desires for who the person wants to be in the future. From the perspective of activity theory (Leont’ev, 1979; Engeström, 1999) people’s goals are focal representations, in the context of actions and situations that form an activity system, of their motivations for long-term development. These are shaped by the sociohistorical contexts of their lives,
arising from their past experiences and in view of an expected future. A situational perspective on motivation similarly links individual learners' behaviors to their unique situations (Paris & Turner, 1994). Situational motivation is "contextualized", "unstable", and "construct[ed] in a given situation or in general will change over time, and is malleable" (Hickey, 1997, p. 183).

Numerous theories of language and literacy learning have adopted these perspectives to focus on the construct of identity and the processes of socialization. Norton (1997, p. 410) defined identity as "how people understand their relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how people understand their possibilities for the future." Identity is not a single subjective mental position, but rather a co-existence of senses of selves (Davies & Harré, 1990; Ivančić, 1998; Norton, 1995, 1997, 2000). Ochs' (1993, p. 288) theories of language socialization elaborated on this mutual interaction between identity(ies) and discourse, proposing that people establish identity(ies) relative to particular communities through "socially recognized, goal-directed behavior" while adopting various stances (i.e., socially recognized points of view or attitude).

An ESL learner's social identity is continually claimed, negotiated, and re-positioned within the activity systems of the discourse communities in which the person engages. An ESL writer's identity develops through multiple interactions in diverse contexts, such as with other students, instructors, acquaintances, and family members. Through participation in academic activities – like attending classes, socializing with other students, taking part in personal activities or entertainments, and writing course assignments – ESL learners invest in, create, and expand their unique (academic) discourse communities, wherein their identities are initially projected and later re-created. Norton's (1995) term, investment, links motivation, language socialization, and identity through the mental, emotional, and behavioral efforts to use a second language in perceived legitimate social milieus. Drawing on Bourdieu (1977, 1982), Norton observed the cultural capital associated with prestige languages, such as English, in which immigrants and sojourning students of English invest. A student's motivation for improving ESL writing abilities can be understood as a prudent investment to obtain and retain linguistic capital represented by academic writing skills in English. By developing more of this linguistic or academic literacy capital an ESL writer also becomes a functioning member of a particular discourse community, for example, the institutional system of a university and of a broader academic discipline.

Writers' identities

Ivančić (1998) established a framework for analyzing university students' projections of their senses of their selves in their writing through four aspects of identity, as: (a) autobiographical self, (b) discoursal self, (c) self as author, and (d) possibilities for self-hood. We adopted this framework for the present analysis, while recognizing that these categories tend to overlap and interact, providing indications, rather than absolute definitions, of selfhood as it appears in a sample of discourse.

Drawing on Goffman (1959), Ivančić (1998) defined autobiographical self as a representation of how writers present their identities in real life including their previous life histories, ways of thinking, points of views, and ideologies in texts. The autobiographical self changes according to the development of a person's life history. In some academic disciplines, writers are encouraged to reveal their autobiographical selves, whereas other disciplines shun personal expressions. We use the term autobiographical self to refer to the students' experiences, interests, ideas, opinions, and commitments. Discoursal self is an image of the writer that emerges in a specific text. Writers may intentionally manipulate indications of their discoursal self to achieve specific purposes, but these may also be projected unconsciously. Indications of a discoursal self do not necessarily reflect the writer's social identity, but may relate more to the norms or expectations of written genres in particular contexts. Self as author is concerned with attitudes of authority (i.e., the extent to which the writer wants to appear authoritative in expressing knowledge). In academic writing, writers can appeal to authority by citations to established authorities or sources on a topic, they can claim their authority by "presenting the content of their writing as objective truth", or they can personally indicate their own "responsibility for their authorship" (Ivančić, 1998, p. 26). Ivančić and Camps (2001) also pointed out that the authorial stance in texts hinges on the dynamics of power relations between the writer and the reader. That is, the more self-assured and epistemologically certain the writer is, the greater power he or she holds or may wish to exert over the reader. In possibilities for self-hood, Ivančić (1998) proposed that there are various ways for writers to present themselves in texts. Writer's identities are multifaceted, and depending on the discourse community, writers emphasize one aspect of their identities over others in their writing. Ivančić argued that possibilities for self-hood are constructed in social contexts each time students write. Even in a discourse community that seems to have restricted rules for written genres, there is always room to negotiate identities and express them in different ways in writing.

The four types of writers' identities may be evident in texts. However, Ivančić cautions that expressions of identities in texts do not necessarily correspond with
Table 8.1: Summary of the three participants' writing samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Field of study</th>
<th>Type of writing</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>My new class mate, XXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1st year at univ.</td>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>Expository</td>
<td>Bravo! Multiculturalism!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1st year at univ.</td>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>Expository</td>
<td>Country profile: Issues of Japanese political system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2nd year at univ.</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The project for Eaton's college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3rd year at univ.</td>
<td>Economics &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Lecture notes with formula, graphs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method

We focus on three Kazuko students—Kazuko, Riko, and Hiroko—over a three-year period (Oct 1st, 2001 to Oct 1st, 2004). Kazuko, Riko, and Hiroko were traditional English major students at a second-year, private, liberal arts university in Western Canada. Each participant had six years of formal English study at secondary schools.

We collected data through weekly interviews, involving classroom observations, writing samples, and problem-solving tasks. The two Kazuko students—Kazuko and Hiroko—were interviewed once a year over the three-year period. The Riko data were collected during the second and third years of data collection. All Kazuko and Hiroko students had attended a prestigious private school for girls in Japan before coming to Canada.

We used ethnographic methods, including participant observation, semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and document analysis, to collect data. All Kazuko and Hiroko students had attended a prestigious private school for girls in Japan before coming to Canada.

We analyzed the data using a grounded theory approach, identifying themes and patterns in the data. We then developed a comprehensive model of the Kazuko, Riko, and Hiroko students' English writing development.
We present our analyses in respect to Ivanic's (1998) four aspects of writers' identities, analyzing various linguistic features (such as lexical, syntactic, and rhetorical choices), in the three students' essays, following Ivanic (1998) and Ivanic and Camps (2001). We also draw on data from interviews to describe the students' long-term goals, motivations, and life histories.

Findings

Kazuko

During the pre-university ESL program, Kazuko's writing was primarily a means to express her thoughts and at the same time to obtain course grades. Articulating her opinions and making strong claims in her writing was her dominant goal. She preferred to foreground her opinions in her writing, and if she could not do so, she thought that the quality of her writing declined: "I think I, the better have very strong, strong, strong opinion... That if I don't have it, maybe the sentence becomes so weak" (Interview 2). Kazuko's motivation to present an autobiographical self in her writing in English was implicit in her selection of topics for essays and her approach to writing. Whenever possible, Kazuko chose topics that interested her. She had a profound consciousness of being Japanese, so she wrote about the Japanese political system (in her third essay) and Japanese media (in her fourth essay).

Autobiographical self. Kazuko expressed her autobiographical self – particularly her life-experiences, interests, and opinions – vividly in the first two essays she wrote in the ESL program. For example, in her second essay about multiculturalism in Canada, instead of describing general features of multiculturalism, Kazuko focused on her personal sense of the importance of multiculturalism, citing its impact on her personal life: "Multiculturalism is a, to understand as a culture, is important thing... to deal with someone, to deal with the others, so just I wanted to mention that second opinion that why I think multiculturalism is helpful for my life" (Interview 2).

In her essays for university courses, Kazuko's expression of her life experiences were not quite so straightforward, but her belief in writing as a means of self-expression became deeper as she proceeded with her undergraduate studies:

Discoursal self. There was a qualitative difference in Kazuko's expression of her discoursal self between her writing in the pre-university ESL program and in her later academic courses. In her university essays, Kazuko presented herself as belonging to an academic discourse community. For example, she appealed to authority by citing publications, which she never did in her two pre-university essays. The number of citations in her writing gradually increased over the period of our data collection. To establish objectivity in her essays, Kazuko also cited the results of surveys to support her claims. Likewise, her lexicon shifted to words and phrases specific to her academic major (e.g., public hearings, judicial system, Diet, Proportional Representation System) as well as words of Greco-Latin origins (e.g., proclaims, abolish, disregard, prohibit, expulsion). She also used categorical present tense verbs to add authoritative tones to her writing, for example, "has" in Essay 3 and "is deeply influenced" and "allows" in Essay 4:

In conclusion, the Japanese political system has three major problems such as the unsuitable limitation of people's participation in politics, the chaotic independence...
A unique characteristic of Kazuko’s academic essays was that her personal voice suddenly emerged from time to time in her texts, appearing in phrases such as “I strongly believe” (Essay 3) or “I’m unable to see any improvement in Japanese media from when Japan was autocracy before the World War II” (Essay 4). On the latter phrase, Kazuko’s teaching assistant commented, “Isn’t this an overstatement?” Such idiosyncratic ways of expressing her opinions in academic writing marked Kazuko as a novice in this discourse community. Other such indications were her uses of colloquial expressions common to the register of speech rather than formal written discourse, such as abbreviated forms like “aren’t,” “isn’t,” or “can’t”; she sometimes chose general words rather than more specific words (e.g., “people” instead of “citizens”); and she made excessive numbers of citations in her writing.

Self as author. Kazuko was self-expressive as an author. As observed above, she frequently used the first person singular pronoun in her university essays, primarily to underscore her opinions but also to guide readers to the organization of a paper. Kazuko’s uses of phrases like “I would like to argue” or “moving on, I would like to discuss” indicated that she was “reader-considerate” (Ivanii & Camps, 2001). She also used plural person pronouns, such as “we,” “us,” “you,” suggesting that as an author Kazuko was positioning herself alongside her potential readers and trying to draw them into her arguments. Put differently, Kazuko did not entirely rely on an authoritative stance to strengthen the credibility of her arguments. She also used rhetorical questions to influence her potential readers:

- How many languages have you heard in Canada? (Essay 2)
- For example, why would many Athenians consider him as impious? (Essay 5)
- Possibilities for selfhood. Kazuko was learning to be a legitimate member of her academic discourse community, but at the same time she wanted her personal voice to be prominent in her writing. Her attempts to express her beliefs and opinions sometimes resulted in sentences that seem awkward for academic writing. But Kazuko gradually established an awareness of the inappropriateness of some of her ways of expressing herself. When asked about sources for her writing Kazuko explained, “I would like to involve my own ideas... However, it is this research paper that doesn’t allow me to do so. I would like to, I like including my ideas, but that is not allowed” (Interview 4). In addition, Kazuko faced inconsistencies in academic conventions and the policies of certain professors about uses of the first person pronoun in her writing:

    - Basically I like to use “I”, but some professors tell us not to do so. If I am allowed to use “I”, I use it several times and I express my opinion. If I cannot use “I”, I write for the audience. Not for specific someone, but people in general. (Interview 5)

Kazuko’s inclination to emphasize her opinions and ideas conflicted with her emerging sense of what is appropriate for writing in her academic discourse community. Kazuko was in the process of understanding the boundaries of, while also establishing practices for, expressing her own legitimate voice in this discourse context.

Rihoko

Rihoko’s essays contrast sharply with Kazuko’s. Throughout her essays, including the ones she wrote in her ESL classes, she maintained an academic or detached tone. Rihoko never displayed her experiences or her interests in her written texts, nor did she use the first person singular pronoun. In these respects, Rihoko took a more authoritative stance in her essays than Kazuko did. Rihoko seemed to have a particular image of “academic discoursal self” in her mind which she believed “correct and ideal” and felt comfortable with. The difference between Rihoko’s and Kazuko’s writing may be that Rihoko opted to stick to her “ideal discoursal self” regardless of practices or norms favored in her field of studies, whereas Kazuko was more flexible in her orientation towards academic writing. Rihoko was not motivated to write about any particular topics as Kazuko was. According to Rihoko, she changed her major from architecture to chemistry because she could not compete with English native speakers in terms of writing quality or expectations. For Rihoko, obtaining good grades and graduating from university seemed more important than writing about what most interested her or expressing her thoughts and ideas (tendencies that we frequently observed in Kazuko’s writing and interviews).

Autobiographical self. No trace of Rihoko’s autobiographical self – as past experiences, interests, or ideas/opinions/commitments – appeared in her essays. Rihoko seemed to intentionally separate her identity, or what she thought to be her identity, and her “real self” from her academic writing. Rihoko believed that eliminating indications of her identity from her writing would lead to the scientific objectivity required in the realm of academia:

    - Identity of my country or my own personality? When I do academic writing, I cannot use words with my own feelings or biases or prejudices, right? So I am trying not to show my identity. I was told not to do so. (Interview 3)

Rihoko’s hesitancy to highlight her opinions or interests can be attributed to her personality as well. She admitted being cautious about making strong claims
in her essays because she was not sure whether she was allowed to do so. Additionally, during the interviews Rihoko seemed to select words carefully and be attentive to what she was saying even in her mother tongue. She never appeared opinionated, and she avoided subjective explanations. Another possible reason for Rihoko’s reluctance to express her personal identity in her academic writing is that her field of study (and thus her writing for or about that field) did not occupy a special place in her identity as it did for Kazuko. For Rihoko the motivation for writing essays came from external obligations such as graduation and course grades rather than from intrinsic desires for self-expression. Even Rihoko’s field of her major did not seem important to her. As mentioned above, Rihoko switched her major from architecture to chemistry, and earlier (in Interviews 1 and 2) she told us she was intending to major in biology.

Rihoko’s lack of expressions of an autobiographical self in her writing and her conformity to academic conventions in her essays may be related to her personal experiences. Before coming to Canada, Rihoko failed to gain admission to a university in Japan. That experience had had a considerable impact on her life, which she mentioned repeatedly throughout the interviews. Instead of making another attempt to enter a Japanese university, Rihoko decided to choose the more challenging option of earning a degree at a foreign university (in Canada):

Interviewer: What personal or family incidents have affected your life as an English learner most, for example, marriage, divorce?
Rihoko: Not particularly. If anything, my failure in entering a university [in Japan], rather than family incidents.
Interviewer: That’s all right. So it was the largest incident for you?
Rihoko: Yes.
Interviewer: Then you didn’t want to study English?
Rihoko: No. Failure is frustrating, isn’t it? I felt like doing something challenging, and then I went abroad. (Interview 5)

Because Rihoko’s motivation was to graduate from a Canadian university she made every effort to accommodate her perceptions of written academic discourse in English to attain that goal.

Discoursal self. Rihoko’s commitment to academic-writing conventions appeared in various features of her writing. In all her essays she avoided using first or second person pronouns, even in places she could have used them. She wrote, “one must consider discrimination” instead of “we” (Essay 1), “observers wonder what make the conflict difficult to settle” instead of “you”, “we”, or “I” (Essay 2). Even when she emphasized her own claims, Rihoko avoided phrases such as “I believe” or “I think”. Rihoko also used many categorical present tense verbs to achieve an academic tone in her writing, such as “discrimination sometimes results in” (Essay 1), and “Canada’s diverse ethnic makeup is reflected in architecture at a certain place” (Essay 3). Other academic features in her essays were the frequent use of modals, complex grammatical structures (especially prasal structures), nominalizations, and passive voice. Another strategy Rihoko adopted to place herself in the discourse of her academic discipline, architecture, was to insert many adjectives into her essays. Her third essay written in the first semester in university was replete with adjectives (e.g., in the first paragraph, 23 out of 248 words were adjectives). Many of the adjectives she used were subjective and aesthetically value-embedded (e.g., beautiful, splendid, pleasurable): “However, the podium, a piece of the project, give such an exquisite appearance that one could not help envisaging how gorgeous it would be, if the project of the department store had been completed.” (Essay 3).

In her fourth essay, Rihoko employed fewer adjectives, but instead she increased the number of words specific to her academic major (e.g., podium, perimeters, columns, scones are conjugated in a stripe pattern). These changes in her lexical usages reflect the efforts that Rihoko was making to adapt herself to the register of the academic discourse community, or to put it more critically, how susceptible she was to her proximal environment.

Self as author. As noted above, Rihoko seldom displayed her autobiographical self directly in her writing. This resulted in an “authoritative” tone and a sense of exercising a certain power over the reader. One exception appeared in her first essay: “Sadly, such discrimination sometimes results in unreasonable events when people are driven by anxiety or frustration” (Essay 1). The use of “sadly” here may represent Rihoko’s emotional state, but its personal effect quickly disappears with the subsequent categorical present-tense verb “results in.” Nonetheless, Rihoko was not completely negligent about her potential readers. Like Kazuko, Rihoko sometimes used rhetorical questions to engage her potential readers. Moreover, she used many hedges to lower the certainty of her claims, including adverbs like “perhaps” and “presumably” and the modals “can” and “might.”

Possibilities for self-hood. One of Rihoko’s problems was how to include her subjective impression in her writing about architecture while also maintaining a perspective of objectivity. Rihoko wanted to avoid expressing her personal voice in her texts, but detailing her own impressions was mandatory for her course requirements. As observed above, Rihoko did such things as making strenuous efforts to insert value-laden adjectives into her university essays. But eventually Rihoko ceased to explore the possibility of aligning her self-hood with discoursal practices in the field of architecture. She changed her major to chemistry, thinking she would not be required to expose her personal self in academic writing in English and believing that studies in chemistry were likely to produce better grades.
Jina

Jina’s identity as an ESL writer related to her degree of comfort expressing her thoughts. She often compared her comfort level writing in Korean to oral communication. She attributed her discomfort writing in English mainly to her lack of English vocabulary and sentence structures, which produced a disjuncture between her intended thoughts and her capacities to express them in English texts:

Interviewer: Do you think your writing in English is different from your writing in Korean?

Jina: Yeah, of course. Because limited, because of limited vocabularies. And even though I write, I write vocabularies or I use right vocabularies or right structure, it can be slightly different from what I meant.  

(Interview 2)

Like Rihoko, Jina tried to follow the specific conventions of academic writing in her program in economics. But virtually all her writing for university courses consisted of mathematical formulas, visual graphs, and charts. Perhaps because of this, at the time of the fourth interview, Jina was not fully satisfied with her English writing proficiency, so she decided to take a non-credit writing course designed for non-native English speaking undergraduate students. Her fourth writing samples, a narration and description from this course, were strikingly similar to those she produced in her pre-university ESL course.

Autobiographical self. Jina expressed her autobiographical self clearly in her second essay in the ESL program. Writing on the topic of human slavery and an activist’s effort to buy back slaves, Jina composed an essay with two parts, a summary and a response. The first section described the activist’s efforts, whereas the second part contained many judgmental remarks. Jina used such phrases as “I think” and “in my opinion” to express her condemnation of the activist’s behavior: “I think Vogel’s [the activist’s name] actions are not appropriate in a long term. In my opinion, giving money to poor parents is more effective than to slave traders to prevent slavery.” (Essay 2) As this extract shows, Jina’s tone was evaluative, reflecting her past academic knowledge about the topic of slavery and its economic system. However, in her writing for economics courses Jina’s free expression of such evaluations, reflecting her autobiographical self, disappeared. This transition seemed to reflect Jina’s academic goal of adhering to the academic conventions required in her major.

Jina’s past experience as an immigrant was another influence, and one that subsequently distinguished her from Kazuko and Rihoko. When asked why she decided to study in an English-dominant country like Canada, Jina replied:

When I meet Korean immigrants who live here, firmly rooted here, I think the first generation all has the same jobs – convenience store or self-employed business, more or less small business. Without proper education, however fluently they can speak English, in most cases, the second generation will have the same job. Because they’ve seen their parents’ jobs when they were very young. (laugh) So they think it would be much easier to continue on with their parents’ family business rather than getting a white-collar, office job. If they didn’t get much education, they almost always think like that. In my case, I’m not sure if I am going to stay here or go back to Korea. Anyway, if I get more education, I think I will have many opportunities to actualize my real self. Otherwise, I have no choice but getting a job in a convenience store… It is a great motivator for me.  

(Interview 5)

Jina’s motivation to learn English and obtain a university degree was to improve her socioeconomic status. Throughout the interviews, Jina expressed her intention to secure an office job in the future, emphasizing the importance of getting good grades for such employment. Writing in English was not a means of expressing herself, but rather a way to obtain excellent course grades. As a consequence, the writing samples Jina brought to our interviews were lecture notes, exam questions and answers, and supporting charts and graphs. None showed any indication of her autobiographical self.

Discoursal self. Jina, however, proved to be a persuasive author, as shown in these statements from her pre-university essays in the ESL program:

But this is triggering a controversy. Some people think adding chlorine will keep water out of bacteria or viruses, while others think it will make water more hazardous with the possible risk of cancer or health problems.  

(Essay 1)

Human trading is a hard and complicated problem to be rooted out at once. Although the solution is a makeshift, this is the second best solution.  

(Essay 2)

Like Kazuko and Rihoko, Jina relied on categorical present tense verbs to convey the objectivity and logic of her judgments. Another strategy Jina used to make her discoursal self prominent in her writing was the inclusive first person plural pronoun “we”:

Furthermore, we can’t certain that freed slaves aren’t enslaved again.  

(Essay 2)

Jina’s strategy for denoting her discoursal self, however, changed drastically in her university writing. Her assignments in economics mainly involved the use of formulas and calculations, so Jina turned to using domain-specific lexical phrases (e.g., quantity demand, quantity supplies, price elasticity, price ceiling, and equilibrium prices).

Self as author. Jina’s writing for her undergraduate major mostly involved exam papers or note-taking primarily intended for her personal reference,
typically about a variety of mathematical formulas and calculations. There was no room in these writing tasks for the concept of self as author, as Ivanč (1998) defined it, as the degree to which an author exerts an impression on a potential reader.

Possibilities for selfhood. Nonetheless, Jina expressed a strong desire to write logical and persuasive essays throughout our six interviews.

Interviewer: Do you have distinct topics that you want to write about in English and in Korean?

Jina: Generally speaking, yes. Because the topics that I want to write in Korean are relevant for Korean readers, and those that I want to write in English will be topics that I want Canadians to know about Korea. For example, I'm thinking of such topics as why Korean universities lack international quality. On such topics I think I can make some conclusions. I would like to write on such topics for newspapers in Korean.

(Issue 6)

Jina's differentiation of writing for Korean or Canadian readers hints at a wholly different context in which Jina opted to resolve the dilemma of expressing herself in writing: personal Internet websites.

I wrote in English lots of times in my Internet homepage. I guess I wrote about my personal thoughts or feelings in English a lot there. I have two homepages. One is Daun, and this is open to everyone. So in that homepage, I rarely express my private feelings. The other one is called "Sayworld". In that homepage, only some very close friends of mine can even see my very personal feelings or thoughts. In this case, I think I wrote in English a lot.

(Issue 6)

For one website, Jina mainly wrote in Korean and the content of her writing was less personal. For the other website, Jina frequently used English, and the content of her writing was more emotional (e.g., involving topics such as love or hatred toward another person). In this way, Jina established an emotional outlet to fulfill her need of self actualization in a context that was not available or relevant to her academic studies.

Discussion

The academic writing of all three students, in the transition from pre-university ESL to university degree programs, reflects their unique academic contexts and personal histories, experiences, and beliefs. Differences in expressing their writer's selves increased as they advanced through their different academic programs. In Kazuko's case, zeal for her major upheld her strong tendency to express her autobiographical self. In Jina's case, the nature of her major prohibited the expression of personal voice in her university writing (so she sought to do so in her personal space on the Internet). Rihoko believed that academic writing should not reveal any personal voice, so the disparity between her belief and the written assignments required for her undergraduate major induced her to change her major to chemistry. Casanave (1995, p. 108) reported similar cases of graduate students changing their academic major after taking a course because they did not feel ownership in the discipline. She attributed these cases to the fact that the students failed or did not choose to "construct contexts for writing."

These students' expressions, developing uses, or repressions of Ivanč's (1998) four categories of a writer's identity represent their desires and struggles to acquire membership in their respective academic communities. These processes of participation in academic communities relate directly to identity negotiation because identity is "concerned with the social formation of the person" (Wenger, 1998, p. 13). When newcomers to a community notice features of the community that are foreign but also crucial to obtain in-group membership (Giles & Johnson, 1981), newcomers tend to negotiate their identities in the new community in regards to these features. As Sfard and Prusak (2005) have argued in respect to immigrants from the former Soviet Union to schools in Israel, their learning focuses on closing the gap between their "actual" and their "designated" identities. This interrelationship between writers' identity negotiations and processes of entering academic discourse communities has been well documented in studies of both L1 (e.g., Dysthe, 2002; Herrington, 1992; Hull & Rose, 1990; Ivanč, 1998; Prior, 1998; Wilder, 2002) and L2 writing development (e.g., Angéli-Carter, 1997; Belcher, 1994; Gentil, 2005; Ivanč & Camps, 2001; Leki, 2001a; Spack, 1997). For example, Angéli-Carter (1997) described problems faced by an ESL undergraduate student because his primary writing experience had previously been to write letters to his friends from prison. The student resisted academic writing because it "suppress[es] his self, his 'soul,' as he called it" (p. 279), and thus experienced an arduous process in establishing his identity as a writer of academic discourse.

Kazuko and Rihoko experienced similarly cumbersome and painful processes of coming to participate in their academic communities, notably when they were required to write lengthy essays in their limited English without much background knowledge or experience in their disciplines. Whether they stuck to the same academic community (as Kazuko did) or sought a more congenial one (as Rihoko did), they were attempting to acquire a new voice as a writer in that larger context. The three students' maturity or cognitive/affective development as a social being may have also influenced their perceptions of and commitments to their discourse communities as well as their construction of relationships between themselves and their social environments (Kohlberg, 1969; Kohlberg & Mayer, 1972; Norton, 2000). Kazuko, who had more and longer life experiences,
seemed to have conceived a clear career path and so incorporated learning in the discourse community into her identities and life. The two younger students, Jina and Rihoko, had vaguer ideas about university studies, and so positioned themselves as merely acquiring some tools for success in whatever undefined future careers they might have.

From the perspective of Locke and Latham (1990), the three students' behavioral patterns of writing can be understood as on-going processes of goal setting and adjustment to unique sociocultural factors. Locke and Latham (1990) maintained that the success of learning goals depends on the goals' specificity and perceived difficulty. The more specific and concrete the goal, in view of optimal difficulty, the more successful the learner will be in his or her field of learning (Locke, 1996). As Kazuko and Jina illustrated, their past experiences such as paternal influences or perceptions of other immigrants' unsuccessful careers in Canada influenced their initial setting of goals for academic achievement. But their more specific goals for writing improvement arose from their interactions with their academic communities. In this regard, Wenger (1998, pp. 173-174) drew a useful distinction between three ways of belonging to a community of practice - engagement, imagination, and alignment - which he defined as:

- Engagement – active involvement in mutual processes of negotiation of meaning;
- Imagination – creating images of the world and seeing connections through time and space by extrapolating from our own experience; and
- Alignment – coordinating our energy and activities in order to fit within broader structures and contribute to broader enterprises.

For Rihoko, her imagined academic community did not correspond to what her academic program really required. There was a non-alignment. She found it difficult to engage herself. Rihoko perceived that she should omit her personal voice in her writing - as a way of participating legitimately in her imagined academic community - but the norms of the community actually required her to express her own judgments and opinions, which Rihoko was not, as an author, prepared to do. So she changed her academic major. In terms of Norton's (1995) metaphor of investment, Rihoko had to find a new market in which to invest her linguistic capital. In contrast, both Kazuko and Jina seem to have imagined communities which did not differ much from those that existed in the academic communities of their majors. Able to engage themselves in relevant academic discourse and to align themselves in the communities, Kazuko and Jina gradually acquired in-group membership. From Norton's (1995) concept of investment, we can see that Kazuko had ideal conditions to encourage her further investment in revealing her identity in her academic writing because of the close correspondence between imagined communities and existing communities. For Jina, a huge gap existed between her pre-university ESL writing assignments and those assigned in her university courses, but she readily conformed to the new writing conventions of her major and gradually adjusted herself to her imagined academic community. She did so even though this investment involved repressing her expression of personal identity.

The personal agency of each of the three participants is important here (McKay & Wong, 1996). The differences in their academic contexts do not in themselves explain the different ways in which Kazuko, Rihoko, and Jina sometimes expressed and at other times repressed their identities in their English writing. For example, Kazuko's personal determination to express herself in her academic writing related fundamentally to her being a mature university student, her past educational experiences, her home culture, and her paternal influence.

The interplay among the three participants' writing goals, motivations, and identities emphasizes the importance of rules and community from the perspective of the components of an activity system (Engeström, 1999). The students conceptualized the rules of academic writing conventions in respect to the imagined communities as well as the existing communities of their university courses. Discrepancies in rules between imagined and existing communities sometimes resulted in students conforming to a rule (Jina) and other times relinquishing the actual community (Rihoko). At these points the role of personal agency intervened. Only when the participants felt secure in placing themselves as legitimate members of their perceived existing communities, not their imagined communities, could they establish the precondition for negotiating their expressions of their identities as writers in English. At that point, it was the learner's personal agency that decided the possibility and extent of further investment in linguistic capital through the development of academic writing abilities in English.