

To whom it may concern

We hereby confirm that the following article:

***Identity negotiation in cultural and pedagogical contexts: Institutional possibilities for selfhood***

in: Kamila Ciepiela (ed.), *Identity in Communities* Lodz Studies in Language. (2018). 189-199. Frankfurt am Main : Peter Lang, was co-authored by professor **Iga Maria Lehman** from the University of Social Sciences, Warsaw, Poland and **Robin Anderson**, from the Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca, Milan, Italy.

The following is an explanation of the division of the academic input to the paper.

The 'abstract' (p 189) is attributed to **both authors**.

The first 2 paragraphs of the 'introduction' (p 190) which deals with identity negotiation are attributed to **Lehman**, while the last paragraph (pp 190-191), dealing with the place of disciplinary writing in institutional contexts is attributed to **Anderson**.

The section on 'Institutional relations of power and identity formation' (p 191), which deals with how discipline specific communities develop and maintain their particular genres and to what extent institutions, such as universities, have the power to affect the academic writer identity of non-native students, is attributed to **Anderson**.

The section, 'Institutional constraints on selfhood' (191-193), which discusses to what extent and how English L2 students are often constrained by being required to conform to the pre-established rhetorical patterns typical of Anglo-American discourse. This section compares some rhetorical features of Anglo-American texts to those of Polish writers and goes on to analyse potential consequences of the disparities between the two rhetorical styles. This section concludes by challenging the notion that academic

discourse is simply objectivized statements of knowledge expressed in a specific rhetorical style, arguing that academic texts are more varied in their discourse patterns and content, but is also as the representation of an authorial stance. This section is attributed to **Lehman**.

The section; 'Institutional possibilities for selfhood' (pp 193-194), deals with various notions of the concept of voice in writing. The section is divided into 2 parts; voice as form and voice as content. The opening paragraph and the section of 'voice as form' are attributed to **Anderson**. He argues that the social notion of voice form, is consistent with the acceptance and use of disciplinary rhetorical conventions and can be developed through appropriate classroom practices in order to make clear the ways in which patterns of language work in order to shape meaning. These practices necessarily include the non-native learner in participating, reproducing and challenging the socio-culturally conditioned discourses and thereby negotiating his/her academic identity within that community.

The final paragraph in this section (p 194) discusses the influence culture has on writing and makes an argument for inclusivity of native cultural norms alongside the rhetorical norms of the discourse community. This section is attributed to **Lehman**.

The following section, 'Voice as content', (pp 194-195), the first 3 paragraphs extend the notion of writer voice as a product of rhetorical norms and cultural influences to include other factors such as; learner's cognition, personalities and life histories, this is the self as author, how the writer's position, opinions and beliefs, as expressed in the text,

establish authorial credibility. The structural and lexico-grammatical features employed reveal the writer's idiosyncratic choices and contribute to both authenticity and authoritativeness of student voice in academic writing. These first 3 paragraphs are attributed to **Lehman**.

Paragraph's 4 and 5 of this section (pp 195-196), discusses the practical consequences of the above notions and argues for equipping students not only with the discipline-specific, linguistic tools necessary to participate in the discipline's community, but to also find their own voice, which is often formed first in writing. It argues that awareness of the fact that there is no such thing as an 'impersonal academic self', emboldens non-native writers to negotiate their own academic identities. The final paragraph calls for a change the institutional experience into a space where students find their 'unique voice', a sense of their academic identity. These last 2 paragraphs are attributed to **Anderson**.

This is developed further in the section 'Institutional framework for developing the academic self' (p 196), in which adopting and adapting the notion of a 'third culture' is proposed as a way in which discipline specialists can create a context-sensitive, learning environment which facilitates the development of an academic writing identity. This section is attributed to **Anderson**.

The concluding section (pp 196-197) puts forward the argument for classroom communities of difference, in which every time a writer constructs her/his authorial identity she/he is allowed to do so by contesting or following, in varying degrees, the rhetorical patterns available. The authors argue that in this way writing in a second language creates the opportunities for successful identity reconstruction in L2. This section is attributed to **both authors**.

Iga Maria Lehman. University of Social Sciences. Warsaw. Poland.  
ilehman@spoleczna.pl

**Iga Maria Lehman** .....



Robin Anderson. Università degli Studi di Milano. Milan. Italy.  
robin.anderson@unimib.it

**Robin Anderson** .....

