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

The abstract (p 139) sets out the paper’s aim to show the multi-dimensional nature of authorial self-representation with specific reference to discipline-specific courses at tertiary in Italy and to show how disciplinary self develops in this context of constrained access to possibilities for self-representation. This section was written by both authors.

The introduction section (pp 139-141), paragraphs 1-4, discusses how discourse communities, including disciplinary communities, can create a space in which the participant’s self constitutes itself and is constituted. Some areas of previous research have focused on the significance of the individual writer’s voice in discipline-specific discourse; while, in contrast, other research has viewed identity as a social construct, determined by socio-cultural constraints and therefore discourse participants conform to the pre-established rhetorical conventions of the specific discourse community. These communities are located within institutions and have the power to foster particular kinds of identities. This discussion sets the scene for the paper’s main theme, namely, ‘How is discourse internalized in the social practices of a particular academic community and how does it shape the identities of people who participate in it?’ This section is attributed to Iga Lehman.

Paragraphs 5-7 (pp 140-141) discuss how students at tertiary level need to negotiate academic identities as an integral part of their learning process. The power relations in such an institution and the beliefs, values and practices of their academic communities both enable and constrain their possibilities for selfhood. The paper argues that it is the students’ subsequent linguistic expressions
which reflect the degree to which they align themselves with subject positions available, that they are sites of struggle necessary in the processes of disciplinary identity formation. Paragraph 6 (p 141) looks at identity as expressed through the different voices students adopt. It examines some theories of authorial voice and concludes that L2 student writers have to negotiate their identities which are multiple, conflictual and evolving, in relation to changing socio-cultural and discursive contexts. Here the paper introduces the concepts of ‘voice as form’ and ‘voice as content’. This section is attributed to Lehman.

Paragraph 7 (p 141) states the aim of the paper to show how disciplinary identities of second language (L2) Italian tertiary students are influenced by both institutional constraints and institutional possibilities for the development of their selfhood in the courses of English for Business and Economics. This section is attributed to both authors.

Section 2, entitled the ‘Influence of Collective Aspects of Academic Identity on the Formation of Disciplinary Identities’ (pp 142-144) investigates language choices academics make when writing and argues that it involves the coalition of two aspects of their self, which we call the ‘individual self’ and the ‘collective self’ and presents Lehman’s model for authorial self-representation. Figure 2 (p 143) was adapted by both authors. This section is attributed to Lehman.

Paragraph 7 (p 144) of this section is attributed to both authors.

Section 3 (p 144-145) looks at the macro-context and investigates possibilities for academic writer, self-representation at the Italian tertiary level of education, with specific focus on programmes of English for special purposes. This section is attributed to Anderson.

Section 4 (p 145) elaborates on this aspect, examining the position of English as a medium of instruction at the Italian tertiary level. This section discusses the opportunities and difficulties for practitioners to introduce English taught programmes at this level.

Section 5 (pp 145-146), looks at the use of domain-specific texts and how this can facilitate students’ access to the discipline’s literacies and present greater possibility for learners to develop their individual academic identity. These sections are attributed to Anderson.

Section 6 (pp 146-147), examines some of the constraints on this development, arguing that among other aspects; lack of a clear institutional policy on English as a medium of instruction, student and teacher language levels, learning outcomes and clear instruction procedures will have an effect on students’ attitude and motivation to the learning situation. The authors argue that the predominantly monologic instructional technique restricts the opportunities for learners to create their academic
identity through verbal interactions of appraisal or feedback and will limit the students’ opportunity to develop their performance of identity. This section is attributed to Anderson.

In section 7 (p 147) the authors argue that a key feature of the development of academic identity is the interaction between the individual and the discipline’s discourses. It goes onto argue that English for specific purposes courses should provide consistent exposure to and guidance in the processing of the discipline’s texts and help create a sense of academic identity in allowing the student to ‘approach’ the discipline through its discourses. This section is attributed to Anderson.

The final section of the paper, section 8 (p 148) raises questions as to the degree of familiarity learners have with discipline-specific texts and how this may negatively affect the development of their disciplinary identity. This section is attributed to Anderson.

Section 9 (pp 148-149) argues for a wider interpretation of what is considered and ‘academic text’. The authors make a distinction between ‘scientific’ and ‘academic’ texts arguing that the latter provide greater possibility for the development of academic selfhood. This section is attributed to Lehman.

The conclusion (p 149) points out that the paper’s intention was to raise issues and proposals with regards to the development of academic identity within an institutional context, in the light of the complexity of the factors involved in the construction of disciplinary identity of tertiary level students who study in English. It identified avenues for future research within this field of discourse studies and identity, with particular reference to the formation of disciplinary self. This section is attributed to both authors.
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