A REVIEW OF AUTHORIAL VOICE INTERVENTIONS AND RUBRICS: MAKING THE CASE FOR A MORE REFLEXIVE, STUDENT-FACING LEARNING TOOL

Jasbir Singh[1]
PhD Candidate – Higher Education Development Centre
University of Otago
jasksing@gmail.com

Associate Prof. Ben Daniel[2]
Higher Education Development Centre
University of Otago
ben.daniel@otago.ac.nz

Associate Prof. Joyce Hwee Ling Koh[3]
Higher Education Development Centre
University of Otago
joyce.koh@otago.ac.nz

ABSTRACT

The development of authorial voice of university students in their academic writing is critical. This paper presents a summary and critical highlights of the pedagogical research, tools and interventions that aim to inculcate awareness and development of authorial voice in the academic writing of university students. The aim of this review is to make a case for a more student-facing and reflexive authorial voice learning tool. The paper argues that the majority of research and intervention that focuses in authorial voice stems from a researcher-facing or assessment perspective. The paper concludes by calling for a voice-specific learning tool that will attempt a more reflexive, student-facing approach to teaching novice student-writers about their authorial voice.

Keywords: authorial voice, voice rubric

INTRODUCTION

Academic writing is the means by which university students express their thoughts, feelings and propositions. More importantly, academic writing is the most common means of assessment at university. Developing an awareness and inculcating a strong and confident authorial voice is a critical aspect when university students learn academic writing. However, lacking a convincing authorial 'presence' that clearly expresses the writer's stance and evaluation towards their content often leads to poor argumentation in academic writing (Ellery, 2008; Gennrich & Dison, 2018; Read, Francis, & Robson, 2001). A lack awareness of how to wield authorial voice can also lead to issues of plagiarism or over-reliance on sources (Ellery, 2008; Mori, 2018). This paper presents the case for the development of a novel authorial voice software that is reflexive and student-facing, and focuses on introducing novice academic writers at university to the rhetorical effects of authorial voice. The paper begins with a brief introduction to the historical pedagogy associated with voice in writing. Following this, an overview of the teaching and learning tools and research that focus on authorial voice and identity is presented, which then informs the development of a new voice-specific learning software. The paper concludes with a proposed design and development for a novel authorial voice-specific learning software.

METHODOLOGY

This study is essentially a review paper for authorial voice-specific interventions and authorial voice-specific rubrics. The scope of this review is only on studies that aimed to scaffold the development of authorial voice within university students, and rubrics designed for the specific purpose of assessing voice strength in university student texts. While delimiting the range of interventions carried out to support the development of authorial voice in academic writing is complicated due to the various approaches to, and conceptualizations of, authorial voice. For the purposes of this paper, we defined interventions as those studies which attempted to assist the development and/or raise awareness of: "authorial voice"; "voice"; "stance and/or engagement"; "authorial self"; and "authorial identity". The reason for the inclusion of these interventions is that they incorporated the teaching of textual, linguistic elements and/or efficacy-related, reflexive approaches to "authorial voice", "voice in writing", "authorship", and "authorial self", etc., and thus reflected current perspectives on the personal-social nature (Ivanič & Camps, 2001) of voice in writing. Moreover, this review also excludes research that set out to merely investigate the prevalence and/or frequencies of voice in student texts, as the aim of this review was to analyse patterns of authorial voice-related interventions and voice-specific rubric designs specifically. Further, the review mostly limits itself to pedagogical research in the last 15 years (i.e., 2006 – 2021, though some exceptional studies, such as the first voice-specific rubric, required exception to this rule). The studies for this review were

located from a variety of sources, such as Google Scholar, JSTOR, and EBSCO. A systematic process of abstract analyses, and later perusal of the text itself, led to inclusion/exclusion of studies for this review. Thematic analyses, such as the table form seen in this article, led to the identification of patterns and the eventual conclusion discussed later in this article.

Authorial Voice in Writing Pedagogy – A Brief History

For a quick overview of how authorial voice has been approached in writing pedagogy, we can follow Correa (2009) and utilize Trimbur (1994), Matsuda (2003) and Atkinson's (2003) classification of three main era of writing approaches: the *pre-process*, *process*, and *post-process* eras. While these aforementioned focuses on ESL pedagogy, they are a useful lens to see how authorial voice has been conceptualised throughout the evolution of approaches to teaching academic writing. We can further inform our historical overview of the teaching of voice in writing by other (e.g., Jeffery, 2010, 2011; Stock & Eik-Nes, 2016) accounts of discoursal and pedagogical approaches to authorial voice in writing.

In the 1960s, with the dominance of the pre-process style of writing instruction, the emphasis of the teaching and learning of writing was on the final product, with an emphasis on students producing essays deemed correct by the writing conventions of the time (Correa, 2009). In the 70s, with the emergence of more expressive pedagogical trends, the focus was on writing processes that led to individuals expressing their unique perspectives (Matsuda, 2003). This meant a clearer focus on individual authorial voice. Now, there was a lot more attention being placed on the metaphorical voice of the individual writer. The teaching and learning of academic writing started to emphasize more on strategies that helped the student to discover themselves as a writer (Matsuda, 2003; Stock & Eik-Nes, 2016). This pedagogical context then evolved to the post-process era of writing instruction, where a more social-constructivist pedagogical trends meant that while writing was still treated as individual, it was also situated within a social context where the individual had access to and was able to express themselves in multiple voices (Correa, 2009; Matsuda, 2003). Thus, in terms of voice instruction, the focus of writing instruction turned to a more growing emphasis on the socio-personal factors that influence the student as a writer (Ivanič & Camps, 2001) and on facilitating the awareness and deliberate control of writing strategies such as those for expressing authorial voice (Stock & Eik-Nes, 2016).

However, there are issues and challenges that affect student-writer confidence and the ability to express themselves. These issues often stem from a lack of awareness, a lack of instruction, and a lack of reflection about authorial voice. When students lack awareness about their authorial voice and how to go about using it, it can lead to confusion about how they express themselves, their thoughts, and their feelings (Lee & Deakin, 2016; Mei, 2007). In academic writing, this can lead to a poor self-image as an academic writer, and contributes to problems

like plagiarism because students are worried about sounding right, about gaining membership within the academy and building a relationship with the audience in their disciplines. However, specific instructions and support with developing students' authorial voice can strengthen their argumentation skills (Elbow, 2007; Lee & Deakin, 2016; Mei, 2007). Explicit awareness, instruction and reflection about authorial voice has a positive impact on the way students write, their writing quality and confidence as academic writers. For these reasons, there have been a variety of pedagogical intervention-style research and learning tools and aimed at supporting the development of authorial voice.

Authorial Voice Interventions – Overview

While authorial voice is now regarded as simultaneously personal and social, most pedagogical research and tools that scaffold authorial voice in students broadly emphasise either the textual-linguistic or the self-perception identity aspect of authorial voice in academic writing. Textual-linguistic voice deals with the particular words and phrases that can be used to express authorial voice. In terms of pedagogical research, including interventional approaches such as workshops, this aspect of voice is usually researched through corpus analyses of student texts to determine how authorial voice, and the language used to express authorial voice, varies or develops across disciplines and developmental stages. On the other hand, research about more personal, identity-related aspects of authorial voice tends to focus more on how students feel about themselves as academic writer and how they project and perceive themselves as academic writers. This aspect is usually measured and explored through questionnaires, scales and interviews.

The vast majority of the authorial voice interventions (see Table 1) treat voice as a social-personal construct, i.e., a personal expression of authorial selves that is influenced by contextual factors (for example discourse communities and conventions) and personal factors (for example, writing and other experiences). Moreover, the interventions reviewed below follow the philosophies of the post-process era of writing instruction and adopted a grounding in social constructivist approaches to writing. Their methods were determined by their respective aims and the conceptualization of voice they followed. While these authorial voice interventions emphasized voice in academic writing as reflections of personal and social authorial identities, and recognized the importance of exploring both external projections and inner aspects of student-writer voice, they tended to either:

- focus on normative approaches of teaching textual-linguistic features of voice as a skill, with pre- and post-test questionnaires, surveys or interviews to illicit student-writer views in a way that didn't directly connect the change in student self-perception to the growth in linguistic repertoire; or

- highlight revealing academic discourse socialization to students, but largely forwent linking the personal identity-related aspects of authorial voice to authorial selves to specific textual-linguistic models of voice in an explicit manner that is student-facing, i.e., done in a way that would be primarily for students to see the development in their self-perceptions.

Table 1: Authorial Voice/Authorial Identity Interventions - summary

Authors, year	Theoretical approach (espoused or implicit), aim and context	Intervention Method	Findings	Textual-linguistic and/or Self-perception, review
(Friedberg, Howard, Nguyen, & Cochran, 2007)	Social-constructivist, expressivist pedagogy; build students' self-perception as author developmental creative writing class	Published student work in literary magazine	Increase in perceptions of self-worth	**Self-perception**; no textual-linguistic link, no explicit theoretical framework for self-perception analyses
(Viete & Le Ha, 2007)	Sociocultural pedagogy, academic socialization and transformational approach; postgraduate L2writing; how supervisors (PhD) can balance between encouraging students' compliance with conventions vs. diversity of voice and discourse organization	Retrospective, introspective reflections between supervisor and student.	Developed roles both can play in helping student-writer make informed choices about their own meaning-making in a way that satisfies their intentions	**Self-perception**; more pedagogical advice than intervention; textual-linguistic features of one student given as examples, no categories explicated
(Schneider & Andre, 2007)	Social-constructivist, Functionalist pedagogy, Ivanič and Camps' (Ivanič & Camps, 2001) and collaborative learning as foundations; undergraduate second-year summary writing	Formed knowledge base within students about summary genre, collaborative peer feedback, student respond to peer critique	Authorial presence increased in student evaluations of discipline content, of their peers' summaries and personal authority from experience as readers	**Self-perception, with genre knowledge**; no textual-linguistic features explicated, more about peer collaboration to increase awareness about summary genre, reader roles and own authorial ownership of texts

(Gemmell, 2008)	Expressivist pedagogy and transformational approach; US college-level writing class.	Encouraged students to use writing notebook to discuss topics critically and reflect on topic without fear of corrections	Increased personal opinions in reflections	**Self-perception**, no textual-linguistic voice elements taught/clarified, more about freedom to express
(Spalding, Wang, Lin, & Hu, 2009)	Expressivist pedagogy and normative approach; Chinese teachers of English; increase literacy and voice using Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory's 6+1 Trait® Writing model	3-week writing workshop including instruction in 6+1 traits, writing practice and student reflection	Increase in voice category of 6 + 1 rubric	**Textual-linguistic**, reflections not linked back to authorial voice elements in explicit manner, 6+1 rubric more about what text should show instead of voice features, and without explicit link to authorial identity, can be prescriptive
(Elander, Pittam, Lusher, Fox, & Payne, 2010)	Expressivist pedagogy and normative approach; undergraduate psychology students in UK university; intervention to improve authorial identity with focus on avoiding plagiarism, evaluated using Student Authorship Questionnaire	Workshops integrated into existing modules, 2-4 weeks before assignment submission, adopted for different groups, emphasizing students seeing themselves as authors: definitions of authorship and role of student as author, authorial decisions, examples of student writing with quotations, discussions of high-profile plagiarism cases, checklist before assignment submission	First-year students showed most improvements in certain areas of authorship beliefs, overall positive growth in authorial beliefs	**Self-perception**, with citations being the only textual-linguistic element being discussed, though not in a way that would explicate authorial voice linguistic features.

(Guerin & Picard, 2012)	Expressivist pedagogy and normative approach; helping novice research writers (PhD) meet disciplinary expectations and avoid plagiarism; Ivanic and Camps and Zhao and Llosa four components of voice as foundations: voice as intersection of both self-representation/identity and linguistic-rhetorical strategies	Argue that experiments with voice is empowering but still need to teach students conventions; developed "*Tryiton*" – combination of Turnitin and text concordance software that shows text-matching, encourages students to incorporate own voice while also learning typical genre language	2 cases presented, with positive results: one student revised work to bring down high number of Turnitin matches, while other student started using more discipline-typical linguistic features.	**Textual-linguistic**, though espouses authorial identity frameworks. The software doesn't appear to explicate/ link the voice/ identity models to text matches or revisions. More about avoiding plagiarism than voice, *per se*.
(Macalister, 2012)	Social constructivist, expressivist pedagogy and normative approach; NZ university writing course for undergraduates/postgraduates; expressivist and normative/ transformational; Ivanic and Camps' (2001) three types of positioning and Casanave's (2002) writing games,	Writing games used to illicit ideational, interpersonal and textual positioning responses to short stories	Positive developments in students' affective responses to readings	**Textual-linguistic**, based intervention on Ivanić's *autobiographical self*, *discoursal self* and *self as author*, but no explicit developments of these three selves made clear to students as writers in relation to positionings, no specific textual-linguistic devices of voice clarified, more about the overarching term "positioning"
(Bird, 2013)	Sociocultural pedagogy, transformational approach; social	Explicit instruction on academic community's purposes	Students improve discourse proficiency, showed	**Self-perception**, students built good knowledge of

	identity theories: Ivanić (1998, 2004; 2001) and Bartholomae (1986); conversation as meta-purpose of academic writing so students learn how to negotiate their internalization of conventions according to their knowledge of writer dispositions; semester-long course about writing about writing.	(Bartholomae, 1986) and dispositions (from Ivanić's (1998, 2004; 2001) authorial selves) so students can understand how to invest/be motivated to invest as writers, emphasise academic texts as conversations: 1) Autobiographical identity: generating personally meaningful, unique ideas; 2) Discoursal identity: making clear claims and connecting evidence to claims; 3) Authorial identity: performing intellectual work, specifically through elaboration and critical thinking.	greater authority in texts, writing in ways that contributed to conversation and with a wider range of words and phrases that showed authorial presence vs. students who did not take the course	types of writer projections but study used theoretical models only, with no explicated link to textual-linguistic voice models/ elements. Rather, focus was on broad linguistic strategies/ goals that text should achieve for each type of authorial self from Ivanić's (1998, 2004; 2001) model
(Canagarajah, 2015)	Social constructivist, expressivist and sociocultural pedagogy, normative and transformational approaches; ecological orientation to classroom (see FIGURE), web-supplemented course on teaching	Practice-based, collaborative, foster students' reflexive awareness of own literacy using drafts of literacy autobiography (essentially, reflective journals on own writing practices,	Reports on one L2 student: pedagogy facilitated awareness of multiple factors in voice construction, advocates balance between support	**Self-perception**, Canagarajah's model elaborates how voice is personally-socially constructed, and the reflexive components of this

	L2 writing for 14 advanced Japanese trainee teachers	course textbooks and Canagarajah's voice model, peer feedback	and autobiographical pedagogy	intervention help elaborate that, there is little link to specific textual-linguistic focussed models and elements
(Jarkas & Fakhreddine, 2017)	Social constructivist, expressivist pedagogy, functionalist, normative approach; tested if explicit instruction helped in developing voice; Beirut university advanced undergraduate writing; used Harris' (2006) rhetorical strategies (about ways to include citations in own work)	Explicit instruction the Harris' (2006) three rhetorical moves that describe how to integrate citations into one's text, first in personal narrative, then more formal argumentative assignments, concluded with peer review and reflection	L2 students struggled to maintain and weave their own authorial voice with other voices, although awareness of positioning strategies increased	**Textual-linguistic**, with a focus on linguistic strategies that help develop academic discourse skills.
(Fogal, 2017)	Social constructivist, expressivist pedagogy, normative and transformational approaches; Complexity theory and microgenetic analyses of voice; L2 voice instruction both cognitive and social; seven adult, Japanese L2 learners of English learning TOEFL Argument essay; three week writing course; aim to show teachability of voice. Recognized inherent prescriptive approach but	Three-week workshop, involving instruction on and stylistic analyses using hedges, boosters, attitude markers, authorial self-mentions, and direct reader-references (using Zhao's (Zhao, 2013) reformulation of Hyland's (Hyland, 2008a) voice model)	Learning of authorial voice was varied at first, non-linear, and triggered by repeated stylistic analyses instruction and exercises. All learners developed conceptual awareness of voice. Highlights microlevel components of voice development and its teachability.	**Textual-linguistic**, as it focussed on the reader-researchers' observation of particular rhetorical strategies that the student-writer had to display, with little illumination of formulated, displayed authorial identities to the student-writer themselves.

	justified it as corresponding to learner goals.		
(Fernández & Escobar, 2018)	Social constructivist, expressivist pedagogy, normative and transformational approaches; Costa Riva university, last essays of second-year undergraduates in teaching English; extent to which students' exposure to and practice with lexical bundles (phrases), boosters, hedges and stance-taking strategies allowed them to build stronger discoursal, authorial voices as academic writers	Three workshops in second semester, followed by qualitative survey about effectiveness of workshops. Instructional stylistic analyses of sample texts, discussions and exercises re: lexical bundles (typical phrases in academic writing that indicate stance, organize or have referential expressions), hedges, boosters, and stance-taking phrases.	Positive reports for socializing students into academic writing, alongside introducing them to lexical, linguistic and rhetorical sources (voice as individual and social/cultural accomplishment).	**Textual-linguistic** (largely) – similar to interventions that focus on textual-linguistic elements and strategies, intervention does emphasise social aspects of voice production, but in a way that can emphasise the importance of conventions and the part they play in helping express ideas and opinions – however, intervention does not link/ compare developing usage of stance strategies with authorial self in a way that would be transparent to students instead of just the researcher.

Most authorial voice interventions for the *textual-linguistic* aspect of authorial voice tend to have three broad stages: the initial stage uses corpus analysis to measure the extent to which authorial voice is used by the student-writers. Sometimes, this research also measures the beliefs that the students hold about themselves as writers. Then there will be an intermediary stage where voice strategies are taught to the student. This intervention is followed by a post-intervention stage where the effect on the participants is measured, usually through corpus analyses of the student text or a voice-specific rubric.

On the other hand, the research, interventions and tools developed for the self-perceived identity aspect of authorial voice also tend to have 3 stages: an initial stage where the student-writer's current perceptions are explored, then an intervention in the form of reflection or teaching, and a post-intervention stage where the effects of the intervention or tool is measured, usually through interviews and questionnaires. However, most of the learning tools and interventions that focus on the identity aspect of authorial voice tend to focus on the feelings of writers but not extrapolate those feelings into specific linguistic functions that can help students to address their feelings about their authorial voice.

By and large, the authorial voice interventions that focussed on textual-linguistic aspects of voice had prescriptive tendencies with expressivist ideas of teachable voice strategies but tended to not contrast the increasing use of voice features with changes in authorial self-perception in a way that would illuminate growth of self-efficacy to the student-writer, tending instead to have pre- and post- qualitative interviews, survey or questionnaires that were designed to inform the researcher (rather than the student-writer) about the effectiveness of the intervention. Meanwhile, the sociocultural approaches of interventions that aimed to increase student awareness of their authorial identities usually did not link their models of authorial selves to concrete, explicit textual-linguistic voice features in ways that could be used to teach explicit voice-related writing strategies in writing classrooms.

This is not to say that these interventions were denied the impact of the aspects of authorial voice. Rather, given the complex nature of authorial voice, and following Matsuda's (2001, p. 40) influential definition of voice in writing as "the amalgamative effect of the use of discursive and non-discursive features that language users choose, deliberately or otherwise, from socially available yet ever-changing repertoires", most authorial voice pedagogical research and learning tools have either focused on the more empirically-inclined, external-perception-based textual-linguistic aspects of voice or the more abstract notions of the personal-social production of authorial selves. These studies based their methodologies on the particular voice conceptualization or model they followed. Those interventions that focussed on normative approaches of teaching the textual-linguistic features of authorial voice usually had qualitative pre- and post-intervention

surveys, questionnaires or interviews that, while letting the researcher/teacher know about the effectiveness of their intervention, did not link , in a student-facing way, the student feelings about their discoursal selves to the textual-linguistic authorial voice features, nor relate the student feelings about their authorial voice to the developments in their use of textual-linguistic features. Meanwhile, authorial voice interventions that aimed to inculcate student awareness of the personal-social, discoursal nature of authorial voice and identities usually forewent clarifications or direct extrapolation to concrete, textual-linguistic voice features or, again, did not compare any increasing student usage of textual-linguistic voice features to the models of authorial self/voice in a student-facing way that would inform students about changes in both their self-perceived and externally-produced aspects of voice.

As we can see, while pedagogical interventions for authorial voice are student-centred (illuminating authorial voice elements to students as writers, for their development), there is a propensity for these interventions to not relate reflections of student-writer feelings about authorial voice and identity with the more 'concrete' textual-linguistic authorial voice features in a direct, contrastive, coalescent and student-facing way that would explicate the measuring/tracking of self-perception alongside increased use of textual-linguistic authorial voice features. In other words, most authorial voce pedagogical research tends to lean either towards the teaching of concrete textual-linguistic voice features, or to delve into more qualitative student feelings about their authorial voice and identity. Those interventions that do have elements of supporting the development of both the textual-linguistic and identity-related reflexive aspects of authorial voice tend to researcher-facing, i.e., revealing trends of development to the researcher/teacher, rather than giving students tools that they can use in a lifelong manner to learn more about and grow their authorial selves. This pattern can also be seen in the development of authorial voice-specific learning tools such as rubrics. This review will now present a snapshot analyses of authorial voice rubrics to rationalize the need for a more reflexive, student-facing voice rubric.

Authorial Voice Rubrics – overview

Rubrics are a central aspect writing pedagogy as they allow teachers to trace changes in the characteristics they are trying to develop within students. Moreover, social constructionist and post-modern pedagogical systems can mean that rubrics may also be utilized as positive means for self-reflection and awareness within students. In terms of authorial voice, Zhao (2017) and Olivier and Carstens (2018) argue that voice-specific rubrics as crucial for developing authorial voice in student academic writing. In pedagogical practice, however, though voice has been consistently been part of academic writing assessment, it appears to be usually measured/assessed implicitly as part of a holistic appraisal of the rhetorical strategies used within the student text rather than a specific focus on authorial voice development within the student. Moreover, though there are a variety of authorial voice conceptualizations and models, there exist very few voice-specific rubrics, particularly those that have been developed specifically for pedagogical purposes. One

reason for this could be the obscure nature of authorial voice leading to difficulties in creating analytic rubrics (Olivier & Carstens, 2018).

In perhaps a reflection of how voice models influence end-product learning tools, the rubrics developed specifically for authorial voice in academic writing have mostly followed the same patterns found in authorial voice interventions, i.e., the rubrics and scales used to assess the construction/development of authorial voice in academic writing either:

- measure/track authorial voice by analysing textual/linguistic features of voice, with a focus on the reader-perception of how the student has expressed on paper; or
- are explorations of the student's self-perception, and their beliefs about themselves as writers.

To begin with, authorial voice rubrics which track the presence and trace the development of authorial voice in academic writing through discursive, linguistic voice features in student writing are usually based on Systematic Functional Linguistics, particularly Halliday's (1985, 1994) functions of language, and Ivanić and Camps' (2005; 2001), Prior's (2001) and Matsuda and Tardy's (2015; 2012; 2007) theories of authorial identity being expressed through voice in writing. These theories are consistent in their having post-process, social constructivist tones and postulate that the linguistic choices made by the writer (student) are significant. Rubrics such as the 6=1 trait (Education Northwest, 2019) rubric are typical in how voice is usually assessed in academic writing – acknowledged as important, given a different label (e.g., "tone", "engagement with reader") and assessed as an organic part of other abstract, subjective notions of discourse such as "individual expression" that are open to subjective interpretation by the reader/assessor and have descriptors that are teacher-facing, i.e., written in a way that is primarily for use by the teacher/reader. Voice-specific rubrics such as Helms-Park and Stapleton's Voice Rating Intensity Scale (2003, p. 259 - 260), while pioneering and more focussed on voice, still tended have teacher/researcher-facing. A similar pattern can be seen in later voice-specific rubrics that focussed on textual-linguistic expressions of voice. Voice-specific rubrics such as the Stance rubric (DiPardo, Storms, & Selland, 2011, p. 184), Castelló et. al.'s voice rubric for factorial analysis (2012, p. 104), Jarkas and Fakhreddine's (2017, p. 263 - 264) rubric to assess the impact of their intervention for voice in academic writing, Yoon's voice strength rubric (2017, p. 83 - 83) and Fogal's (2017, p. 442) coding scheme for tracking authorial voice development have assessor/reader/researcher/teacher-facing descriptors of rhetorical strategies that are open to the subjective perceptions of the reader, but not styled in a way that would make them reflexive for the student-writer. Zhao's (2013, p. 226 - 229) voice rubric is quite useful as its more abstract voice descriptor categories have been empirically associated with the more concrete textual-linguistic voice features from Hyland's (2008a, 2008b) model of stance and engagement.

However, it is also researcher-teacher-facing. Similarly, while Lehman and Sulkowski's (2020) recent voice rubric, which used student interviews in its formulation, has descriptors styled to explicate discursive features and foregrounds the student-writers' intentionality, it could be argued that this rubric also foregoes an element of post-use reflexivity by not prompting the writer to assess how they feel about the impact of their intentional use of linguistic voice features.

In a similar vein, voice-specific or voice-associated rubric which emphasize reflection and focus on the how students see themselves as writers tend to lack clear, direct extrapolation to concrete textual-linguistic voice features. While Leydens' (2008, p. 252) continuum of rhetorical awareness, which has rubric descriptors for developmental stages of authorial identity, can be adapted to explore how students feel about themselves as writers, its categories lack a direct correlation with a range of textual-linguistic voice features. The same can be said of other prominent scales which explore student feelings of authorship, such as the Student Authorship Questionnaire (Pittam, Elander, Lusher, Fox, & Payne, 2009) and the Student Attitudes and Beliefs about Authorship Scale (Cheung, Stupple, & Elander, 2017, p. 113).

CONCLUSION

Overall, then, most authorial voice interventions and tools have been developed in ways that are very much focused on informing the researcher only. While the current literature on authorial voice interventions is extensive, and aims to address an intricate, crucial aspect of developing students as academic writers, it will benefit from the development of learning tools that are more reflexive and primarily student-facing. Rubrics can be a powerful tool for reflection and growth, if designed for encouraging reflexivity and continuous. Thus, a more inward-looking voice-specific rubric that can also elucidate associated textual-linguistic voice features would be a novel addition to the already-vast literature on authorial voice development. Discursive interventions and learning tools should not only make the construction of rhetorical strategies such as authorial voice explicit to students, but do so in a way that supports critical awareness of the student as an academic writer in their academic communities, thus enabling students to not only learn academic writing conventions but also play a more agentic, reflective role in the development of their authorial identities.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, D. (2003). Writing and culture in the post-process era. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 49-63. doi:10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00126-1

Bartholomae, D. (1986). Inventing the University. *Journal of Basic Writing, 5*(1), 4-23.

Bird, B. (2013). A Basic Writing Course Design to Promote Writer Identity: Three Analyses of Student Papers. *Journal of Basic Writing, 32*(1), 62-96.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2015). "Blessed in my own way:" Pedagogical affordances for dialogical voice construction in multilingual student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 27*, 122-139. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2014.09.001

Casanave, C. P. (2002). *Writing Games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/41343608

Cheung, K. Y. F., Stupple, E. J. N., & Elander, J. (2017). Development and validation of the Student Attitudes and Beliefs about Authorship Scale: a psychometrically robust measure of authorial identity. *Studies in Higher Education, 42*(1), 97-114. doi:10.1080/03075079.2015.1034673

Correa, D. (2009). Exploring Academic Writing and Voice in ESL Writing. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura, 14*, 103-132.

DiPardo, A., Storms, B. A., & Selland, M. (2011). Seeing voices: Assessing writerly stance in the NWP Analytic Writing Continuum. *Assessing Writing, 16*(3), 170-188. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2011.01.003

Education Northwest. (2019). 6+1 Trait Rubrics. Retrieved from https://educationnorthwest.org/traits/traits-rubrics

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

Elbow, P. (2007). Voice in writing again: Embracing contraries. *College English, 7*. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.umass.edu/eng_faculty_pubs/7

Ellery, K. (2008). Undergraduate plagiarism: a pedagogical perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(5), 507-516. doi:10.1080/02602930701698918

Fernández, L. C., & Escobar, C. F. (2018). EFL Learners' Development of Voice In Academic Writing: Lexical bundles, Boosters/Hedges and Stance-taking Strategies. *GiST Education and Learning Research Journal*(15), 96-124. doi:10.26817/16925777.392

Fogal, G. G. (2017). Tracking Microgenetic Changes in Authorial Voice Development from a Complexity Theory Perspective. *Applied Linguistics, 40*(3), 432-455. doi:10.1093/applin/amx031

Friedberg, L., Howard, J., Nguyen, H., & Cochran, T. (2007). Making the Authorial Authoritative: Using a Student Literary Magazine in a Developmental English Class. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education, 24*(1), 3-7. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/42802611

Gemmell, R. (2008). Encouraging Student Voice in Academic Writing. *The English Journal, 98*(2), 64-68. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/40503385

Gennrich, T., & Dison, L. (2018). Voice matters: Students' struggle to find voice. *Reading & Writing, 9*(1). doi:10.4102/rw.v9i1.173

Guerin, C., & Picard, M. (2012). Try it on: Voice, concordancing and text-matching in doctoral writing. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 8*(2), 34-45.

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

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London, England: Edward Arnold.

Harris, J. (2006). *Rewriting: How to do things with texts*. Logan: Utah State University Press.

Helms-Park, R., & Stapleton, P. (2003). Questioning the importance of individualized voice in undergraduate L2 argumentative writing: An empirical study with pedagogical implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 245-265. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2003.08.001

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

Hyland, K. (2008b). Persuasion, interaction and the construciton of knowledge: Representing self and others in research writing. *International Journal of English Studies, 8*(2), 1-23. doi:https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.8.2.49151

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Ivanič, R. (2004). Discourses of Writing and Learning to Write. *Language and Education, 18*(3). doi:10.1080/09500780408666877

Ivanič, R. (2005). The discoursal construction of writer identity. In R. Beach, J. Green, M. Kamil, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives on literacy research* (pp. 391-416). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

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:https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00034-0

Jarkas, N., & Fakhreddine, J. (2017). The dance of voices: A study on academic writing at AUB. In L. R. Arnold, A. Nebel, & L. Ronesi (Eds.), *Emerging writing research from the Middle East-North African region* (pp. 241-263). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouose and University Press of Colorado.

Jeffery, J. V. (2010). *Voice, genre, and intentionality: An integrated methods study of voice criteria in the evaluation of secondary students' writing.* (PhD). New York University, New York.

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

Lee, J. J., & Deakin, L. (2016). Interactions in L1 and L2 undergraduate student writing: Interactional metadiscourse in successful and less-successful argumentative

essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 33*, 21-34.

Lehman, I. M., & Sułkowski, Ł. (2020). Representation of voice in English essays of non-native students of business. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 1-14. doi:10.1080/14703297.2020.1712221

Leydens, J. A. (2008). Novice and insider perspectives on academic and workplace writing: Toward a continuum of rhetorical awareness. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, 51*(3), 242-263. doi:https://doi.org/10.1109/TPC.2008.2001249

Macalister, J. (2012). Giving 'voice' a voice in the academic writing class. *The English Teacher, XLI*(1).

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

Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of Second Language Writing - J SECOND LANG WRIT, 12*. doi:10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00127-3

Matsuda, P. K. (2015). Identity in Written Discourse. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*, 140–159. doi:10.1017/S0267190514000178

Matsuda, P. K., & Jeffery, J. V. (2012). Voice in student essays. In K. Hyland & C. S. Guinda (Eds.), *Stance and Voice in Written Academic Genres*. New York: Palgrave macmillan.

Matsuda, P. K., & Tardy, C. (2007). Voice in academic writing: The rhetorical construction of author identity in blind manuscript review. *English for Specific Purposes - ENGL SPECIF PURP, 26*, 235-249. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2006.10.001

Mei, W. S. (2007). The use of engagement resources in high- and low-rated undergraduate geography essays. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 6*(3), 254-271. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2007.09.006

Mori, M. (2018). Our speech is filled with others' words: Understanding university student and instructor opinions towards paraphrasing through a Bakhtinian lens. *Ampersand, 5*, 45-54. doi:10.1016/j.amper.2018.11.002

Olivier, A. P., & Carstens, A. (2018). A heuristic framework for voice instruction at the doctoral level. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus, 55*, 7-26. doi:10.5842/55-0-768

Pittam, G., Elander, J., Lusher, J., Fox, P., & Payne, N. (2009). Student beliefs and attitudes about authorial identity in academic writing. *Studies in Higher Education, 34*(2), 153-170. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802528270

Prior, P. (2001). Voices in text, mind, and society: Sociohistoric accounts of discourse acquisition and use. *Journal of Second Language Learning, 10*(1-2), 55-81. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00037-0

Read, B., Francis, B., & Robson, J. (2001). 'Playing Safe': Undergraduate essay writing and the presentation of the student 'voice'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 22*(3), 387-399. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690124289

Schneider, B., & Andre, J.-A. D. (2007). Developing Authority in Student Writing through Written Peer Critique in the Disciplines. *Writing Instructor*. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ824627.pdf

Spalding, E., Wang, J., Lin, E., & Hu, G. (2009). Analyzing Voice in the Writing of Chinese Teachers of English. *Research in the Teaching of English, 44*(1), 23-51. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/27784348

Stock, I., & Eik-Nes, N. L. (2016). Voice features in academic texts – A review of empirical studies. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 24*, 89-99. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2015.12.006

Trimbur, J. (1994). Taking the Social Turn: Teaching Writing Post-Process. [Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness, Patricia Bizzell; Critical Teaching and the Idea of Literacy, C. H. Knoblauch, Lil Brannon; Common Ground: Dialogue, Understanding, and the Teaching of Composition, Kurt Spellmeyer]. *College Composition and Communication, 45*(1), 108-118. doi:10.2307/358592

Viete, R., & Le Ha, P. (2007). The growth of voice: Expanding possibilities for representing self in research writing. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 6*(2), 39-57.

Yoon, H.-J. (2017). Textual voice elements and voice strength in EFL argumentative writing. *Assessing Writing, 32*, 72-84. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2017.02.002

Zhao, C. G. (2013). Measuring authorial voice strength in L2 argumentative writing: The development and validation of an analytic rubric. *Language Testing, 30*(2), 201-230. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532212456965

Zhao, C. G. (2017). Voice in timed L2 argumentative essay writing. *Assessing Writing, 31*, 73-83. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.08.004