LLT Journal, e-ISSN 2579-9533, p-ISSN 1410-7201, Vol. 28, No. 2, October 2025, pp. 715-728

LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

VOICE IN ACADEMIC WRITING: THE TRANSPOSITIONING OF AUTHOR IDENTITY IN RESPONDING TO MANUSCRIPT BLIND REVIEWERS

Setiono Sugiharto
Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia, Indonesia
setiono.sugiharto@atmajaya.ac.id
*correspondence: setiono.sugiharto@atmajaya.ac.id
https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v28i2.12386
received 16 May 2025; accepted 24 August 2025

Abstract
Voice as one of vital elements in academic writing can impinge upon the quality of one's writing. Despite robust controversies over the usefulness of this metaphorical notion, a plethora of studies on voice has contributed to our understanding of its role in determining writing quality. The foci of these studies, however, are constricted on either voice as individual or voice as social, ignoring the perspective of voice as dialogic. This case study investigates the written reviews of a manuscript author by four blind reviewers in different international Scopus-indexed journals. Drawing on the ideas of "voice as dialogic" and of "transpositioning" of identity, this study seeks to identify and to examine the authorial strategies of an author in constructing his own voice in textual realizations as responses to the manuscript blind reviewers. In doing so, it attempts to finds out the author's writing identity as manifested in the texts constructed. Relativism's methodology was employed in order to provide the construction of certain phenomena (i.e. dialogical voice) as accurately as possible. Results revealed that the manuscript author employed two key authorial strategies: *averring established authority* and *foregrounding the ecologies of knowledges.*

Keywords: authorial strategies, averring established authority, foregrounding ecologies of knowledge, transpositioning of identity, voice

Introduction
The notion of voice as a metaphorical construct in academic writing has attracted considerable attention of scholars in the field of second language writing. Despite the fact that not all writing scholars have reached consensus over its importance and necessity for writing (see, for example, Helms-Park & Stapleton, 2003; Matsuda & Tardy, 2007; Matsuda & Jeffrey, 2012; Mhilli, 2023;Stapleton, 2002), the effects of voice on the quality of writing cannot be underestimated (Langum & Sullivan, 2020; Tian & Liu, 2024), and the arguments against the importance of voice in academic writing are still inconclusive (Matsuda & Tardy, 2007). In fact, a plethora of studies has demonstrated the usefulness of voice in academic writing (Guan & Xu, 2024; Ivanič, 1998; Ivanič & Camps, 2001; Kobayashi & Rinnert 2023; Lee & Ye, 2023; Li, 2024; Liu & Zhang, 2023; Matsuda

This work is licensed under CC BY-SA.
Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

& Tardy, 2007; Mhilli, 2023; Park, 2023; Sugiharto 2024a, 2024b; Zeng, Liu & Bowen, 2024). Focusing on different aspects of voice in academic writing, these studies have overall contributed to our understanding that voice plays an ineluctably instrumental role in shaping how a writing product comes into being, and more importantly how voice can mirror a writer's identity, self and positioning. It thus stands to reason that most studies, if not all, on voice always integrate the perspective of identity in writing.

Despite the wealth of insights generated from the above studies (with the exception of Matsuda & Tardy, 2007) studies on the dialogical aspect of voice are indeed scarce. Furthermore, as related to the integration of perspectives on voice and identity, identity in writing is conceived as relatively bounded and fixed to one's individual self. Even when the social aspect of voice is included in the analysis of the studies, identity is still construed as compartmentalized and immobile and therefore identifiable as one's individual construct.

To close this void, the present study attempts to identify and to examine the authorial strategies of a manuscript author in constructing their authorial voice in the written published products as a response to the manuscript reviewers. Drawing on the idea of "voice as dialogic" (Tardy, 2012) and on the notion of "transpositioning of identity" (Li & Lee, 2024), the present study argues that the construction of voice from these vantage points can allow the generation of identity not as a bounded, fixed and immobile construct, but rather as a "liquid" and "transposable" one (Bauman, 2012; Li & Lee, 2024). To address this issue, the following research questions are formulated:

1. What authorial strategies did the manuscript author employ to construct his authorial voice in his textual realization as responses to the manuscript reviewers' comments?
2. Did these authorial strategies reflect his transpositioning identity as a manuscript author?

Findings of this study can expand and enrich the perspectives of the existing research on voice, and can also usefully contribute to the existing insights into the construction of identity in academic writing.

Voice and its aspectual dimensions

It is important to note at the outset that voice is variously defined by scholars, depending on which schools of thought they align with. Ramanathan and Atkinson (1999), for example, viewed voice as related to ''the ideology of individualism'' (p. 46), averring that ''the core notion underlying this social practice seems to be that, as individuals, we all have essentially private and isolated inner selves, which we give outward expression to through the use of a metaphorical 'voice''' (p. 47).

However, for Matsuda (2001), the idea of voice is not solely limited to the ideology of individualism. He instead broadens the definition of voice by integrating the personal and individual perspective into social perspective. For him, voice refers to "the amalgamative effect of the use of discursive and non- discursive features that language users use, deliberately or otherwise, from socially available yet ever changing repertoires (Matsuda 2001, p. 40). In writing, the discursive features may encompass both form (e.g., sentence structures, organization, the use of transition devices, word choice) and content (e.g., the choice of topic and specific examples, argumentative strategies), while the non-discursive ones include the

margin used in writing, the use font and letter size, and the use of paragraphs and quote, amongst others (Matsuda & Tardy, 2007). Matsuda and Tardy (2007), however, have warned that voice is not restricted to certain discursive features only. It can also be conceived as "the reader's impression derived from the particular combination of the ways in which both discursive and non-discursive features are used" (p. 239).

Critically appraising the distinct ways voice is conceptualized and used in writing research, Tardy (2012) reconceptualizes voice in terms of three important dimensions: (1) individual aspects of voice, (2) social aspects of voice, and (3) voice as dialogic. The first aspects highlight the unique, personal and inherent nature of voice as belonging to a specific individual. It is a type of voice that typifies expressionistic school of thoughts in composition and writing studies. Through individual voice, a writer may produce a written product with a highly distinctive dictions, sentence structure, and syntactical styles, and express his feelings about a certain topic. It is "voice as a kind of imprint on a text" (Tardy, 2012, p. 35).

The second aspects emphasize the inextricable link of social aspects or social interaction where a writing is produced, and the construction of writing identity in and through social practices (He, 2023; Qi & Zhao, 2023). Writing is seen as embedded with the social forces that shape it and are shaped by these forces. As writing is social-bound, there is a possibility that a writer ensemble a multiplicity of voice in constructing a text, which can be realized in the use of stance and engagement in writing (see for example Hyland, 2008). Voice as a social aspect is therefore socially conditioned, and is not produced in a socially vacuum world.

Finally, the third aspects underscore the import of integrating the writer, social context, as well as the readers. Tardy (2012) argues that while the writer and social contexts are interconnected in a text production, the role of readers cannot be summarily dismissed because "it is the reader's impression – which occur within a social setting –that identify voice" (p. 40). More recently, Mhill (2023) views dialogic aspect of voice as "eclectic view of authorial voice through both individual and social lenses" (p. 9). As such, the construction of a text is a result of a complex and dynamic interplay and interaction among individual, social, and reader.

Voice and identity

The notion of voice, though distinct from that of voice, is often understood as a component of a writer's identity (Matsuda, 2001). In relation to academic writing, identity is conceptualized by Ivanic (1998, p.23) into four intermingled aspects: (a) autobiographical self, an aspect of identity which depicts a writer's life histories and prior social conditions and which he/she brings with in writing. When coming in touch with new social conditions, this self is affected and mutates into a new identity, (b) discoursal self, another aspect of identity imprinted in the discoursal form. The construction of this identity reflects the values, belief and power of the writer, which can be "heard" from their voice –what they desire to sound, rather than the stance they want to take, (c) self as author, an identity reflected by the construction of a voice – the stances, opinions, and beliefs they wish to convey. This voice is manifested in a varying degree; some writers take a full control of the contents of the writing, claiming authority of them by establishing an authorial presence, while other attribute them to other sources, treating knowledge as impersonal entities, (d) possibilities for self-hood, the envisioned new identity that

a writer may acquire in a new rhetorical situations as a result of the possible clash of autobiographical self and the imposition of other selves which a writer may find at odd with their own self. Due to this clash, a writer is confronted with two options: either to privilege his/her own self or to give prominence to other selves, giving rise to what is called "the patterns of privileging."

A writer's identity may, to a great extent, impinge upon the voice he is likely to produce in writing. Self as author, for example, stresses more on the individual aspect of voice. By contrast, discoursal self and possibilities of selfhood give more weight to the social and multiple nature of identity, and are therefore closely related to the social dimension of voice (Tardy, 2012). Both individual and social orientations to voice are not mutually exclusive, however. Matsuda (2015) explains the interconnectedness of these two perspectives, asserting that "individual users contribute to the creation of social conventions, and social conventions help individuals creates meaning" (p. 149).

Transpositioning of identity

Ivanič's (1998) classic conceptual framework of writing identity has been a useful one in analyzing voice in academic writing. However, the notion of identity captured in this framework is a stable, discrete, immobile, bounded, and fixed one. A writer's identity is compartmentalized into different categories, making its boundaries clear-cut and apparent. Yet, a recent treatment of identity shows otherwise. Drawing on Bauman's (2012) notion of liquid modernity, Li and Lee (2024) conceptualize identity from the perspective of transpositioning, arguing that identity always undergoes constant changes, and is "in flow-and in-flux". As they have expounded:

> Transpositioning thus refers to a processual and iterative shifting of the identity position of an actor-in-communication; that is, the process in which individuals allow their stance with regard to any given proposition to be in flow-and-flux as they interact with others. To be in flow-and-flux means to release oneself (one's self) from given frameworks and habitual patterns of thought, generating possibility spaces in which one develops new routes (compare: roots) of thinking in conjunction with other participants and cultivates an affect of empathy for others (Li & Lee, 2024, pp. 877).

When applied to identity in writing, the concept transpositioning makes us aware that a writer's identity is convoluted, unstable, and unpredictable, and the categories of writing identity expounded above can be overlapped (see also Limpariwhattana & Chamcharatsri, 2025). One's identity, in other words, can fluidly cross boundaries easily to other identities, making the term eventually vacuous and hard to be identified as a real construct.

Human tendency to communicate and interact is not a phenomenon that emerges recently. These symptoms appear in line with the development of human civilization. Whether for the motive of developing power, politics, survival, and slavery; it has been a long time since humans are out of their closest social environment. This is what leads to the movement of people from one region to another, both in the form of individuals/families and in large waves.

Method

This study uses hermeneutic as a form of "relativism's methodology" (Silva, 2005) where reflective interpretation to capture the construction of certain phenomena as accurately as possible. Furthermore, it is dialectic in the sense that the phenomena under investigation are "elicited and refined hermeneutically and compared and contrasted dialectically with the aim of generating one or a few constructions on which there is a substantial tentative agreement" (Silva, 2005, p. 8).

Data sources

Sources of data employed in this study were two kinds. The first data source was taken from the written reviews of manuscripts authored by an advanced Indonesian writer who has published extensively in international top-notch journals. The choice of this advance writer is deliberate for reasons that the type of this writer *vis-à-vis* the novice one has extensive topic knowledge, experience in professional writing, and have a high language proficiency, thus making him able to convey "mature voice," which "represents combined self-reflective, objective, and dialogic writer identity" and leads to advanced developmental stage of "knowledge-crafting" (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2023, p. 164). The data were selected from written reviews of four anonymous reviewers from different indexed-Scopus journals (two reviewers from *Journal of Philosophy of Education* and two others from *Journal of Multicultural Discourses)*. The reviews contain the discursive features only (both form and content), as have been explained above. Though the reviews also have non-discursive features, they are simply not accounted for in the present study because their presence is very few in the reviews. Besides, the manuscript reviewers focused more on the former features than the latter ones.

The second sources of data were the manuscript author's responses to the manuscript blind reviewers of the journals mentioned above. These responses were manifested in the authors' textual realization. In so doing, the strategies for the construction of the author's identities can be textually identified and analyzed from the perspective of transpositioning.

Data analysis

To answer the research questions formulated previously, this study adopts an emic perspective (i.e. insider perspective) in order to untangle the authorial strategies used to construct authorial identity. In keeping with the spirit of qualitative research with an emic orientation, the construction of the identity of the manuscript author was carried out in a bottom-up manner.

A "thematic coding" (Canagarajah, 2011; see also Burke, 2010; Sugiharto, 2024b) was used to analyze the data with the following procedures. First, data were scrutinized carefully. This initial step is called open coding of data to help generate the possible emerging categories which approximate the author's perspectives. In this step, all the data were read and read in order to obtain qualitative information related to the strategies employed by the manuscript author in responding to the written reviews of the manuscript and in constructing their authorial voice as depicted in the texts they produced. The second step is called axial coding that refines categories by reflecting the comparison of data. In this stage, the data were all reviewed and different codes emerged were reflectively compared and

contrasted to the pre-existing categories, and then broke into subcategories in order to be able to identify the "properties of the code" (Burke, 2010, p. 111). The "properties" include, among others, the author's ways to cope with the written reviews, devise authorial strategies for constructing and representing his authorial voice in the texts.

Lastly, categories that have been coded were undergone a final coding which theorizes the emergent categories or themes. All the emergent themes identified as the "properties" were then formulated and theorized. The formulation and theorization of these "properties" utilized both *theory-driven categorization* and *data-driven categorization*. The emergent categories related to the construction of authorial voice were analyzed in light of the theorization of aspectual dimensions of voice as individual, social, and dialogic (Tardy, 2012), and of transpositioning identity (Li & Lee, 2024). In so doing, I was able to identify whether the emergent categories belong to certain authorial strategies and the identities inherent in the construction of authorial voice.

Findings and Discussion

Findings

From the coding of the data, two key major themes of authorial strategies emerged. They include averring to established authority and foregrounding the ecologies of knowledges.

Averring to established authority

One of the authorial strategies that the author employed in responding to the journal reviewers is averring to established authority. It is a customary practice in academic writing to aver to credible and authoritative sources in order to rebut or strengthen an author's argument. This strategy is employed in responding to the following written reviews by two different blind reviewers in two different Scopus-indexed journals as follows:

> *As it is, the two professors interviewed appear to be speaking mostly about (iii) and (ii) and not about (i). For the reader, it's a bit confusing because the paper doesn't seem to be really about linguistic inequalities much of the time. The author certainly needs to explain more carefully how these three issues or forces are connected in practice, and then be clear about the how the evidence provided sheds light on the issues. This means teasing apart – for analytical purposes – linguistic privilege and epistemological privilege.* (Reviewer 1, Journal of Multicultural Discourses)

> *It does feel a little ironic that, for a paper that's trying to decenter Western scholarship, the authors end up using a string of scholars like Pennycook, Thurlow, Latour, Shankar & Cavanaugh, Siragusa & Virtanen, and Thurlow.* (Reviewer 1, Journal of Multicultural Discourses)

> *Although the critique is valid, it ignores the sophisticated response of contemporary responses to these injustices by critical posthumanists*

> *and feminist new materialists.* (Reviewer 2, Journal of Philosophy of Education)

The referees in both journals express their dissatisfaction with the submitted manuscript for reasons that there is a lack of elaboration of the notion of linguistic inequalities and their application in practice and the reliance on literature written by Western scholars (Reviewer 1 of Journal of Multicultural Discourses) and the absence of elucidation of arguments by posthumanists and materialists (Reviewer 2 of Journal of Philosophy of Education). The comments are related to the discursive features of academic writing as they are concerned more content of writing (i.e. the argumentative strategies). In responding to Reviewer 1, the manuscript author conforms to the standard conventions of academic writing by averring to the established authorities as shown in the following textual realization:

> *It is well-established that global academic publishing elevates and privileges knowledge emanating from the Western epistemological paradigm (See Kubota 2020; Bhattacharya, Jiang and Canagarajah 2019; Sousa Santos 2018; Shi-xu 2014 amongst other).* (Excerpt of texts written by the author as a response to Reviewer 1).

In addition, in responding to the comment related to Western scholarship in the article, the author feels it necessary to include them as theoretical bases to situate the author's research context along with the insights generated from local scholars. The author's insistence on preserving the Western scholars' insights, and hence rebutting the comment of reviewer 1, can be seen in the following excerpts:

> *This viewpoint also encompasses how we perceive language in connection with individuals, objects, and locations (Pennycook 2018). First, concerning the visible and invisible elements of language, our relationships–expressed through both verbal and nonverbal communication – often reveal crucial aspects of social worlds that may not be immediately obvious (Siragusa and Virtanen 2021).* (Excerpt of texts written by the author as a response to Reviewer 1)

As for the comment from Reviewer 2, the author employs a similar authorial strategy. The following textual realization exemplifies this strategy:

> *In their "Thesis on Feurbach" (from the German Ideology) Marx and Engels, as quoted in Shankar and Cavanaugh (2017, p. 1) postulate that 'The production of ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness, is a first directly interwoven with the material activity and the material intercourse of men, the language of real life'. This implies the coexistence and inseparability of both humans and non-human beings.* (Excerpt of texts written by the author as a response to Reviewer 2).

The authorial strategy employed in responding to different reviewers depict an identity of self as author where knowledge is treated as impersonal and detached. For example, the use of such expression of *It is well-established that* in the first text

clearly implies the author's awareness of detaching himself from the knowledge as intricately embedded with the social milieu. Thus, the reliance on textual borrowing from other sources testifies to this treatment of impersonality and detachment of knowledge. In displaying self as author identity, the author is well cognizant that the voice constructed by the two the manuscript blind reviewers can be perceived as the embeddedness of writing as a social construct (Tardy, 2012).

However, despite the cognizance of developing social voice in his writing, the author also establishes his authorial presence as can be seen in sentence *This implies the coexistence and inseparability of both humans and non-human beings* in the second text above. We can infer here that the presence of authorial voice means that the author does not totally relinquish his individual voice, but represent this individual voice as "an author's explicit intrusion into a text to convey a personal assessment on what is being written about" (Hyland, 2012, p. 145). We can also argue in this specific case the author makes inference from the arguments of the authorities he averred and attributed to. As such, the social conventions in the form of attribution (i.e. a standard convention in academic writing) helps this individual author create meaning (i.e. his own inference from the arguments he attributed to). From the analysis we can deduce that the author exhibited an aspect of identity, but at the same time slip into other aspects. Thus, the locus of voice here emanates from both individual and social (Matsuda, 2015; Tardy, 2012;). From the perspective of transpositioning of identity, we can argue that identity in academic writing is not monolithic (Hyland, 2002), but always undergoes constant changes and is always "in flow-and in-flux" (Li & Lee, 2024) in the process of knowledge production in academic writing genre.

Foregrounding the ecologies of knowledges

Elevating the ecologies of knowledges is another theme that recurs in the data. Ecologies of knowledges acknowledge that knowledge has never been unified entities, but is always diverse, consisting of many bodies of knowledges (see Sousa Santos, 2018). This strategy was employed by the author to respond to the reviewers who either asked for the author's positioning about the topic and about other insights (i.e. "ways of knowing") generated by other epistemologies (Reviewer 1 of Journal Multicultural Discourses*)* or called into question the novelty of the topic (Reviewer 1 of Journal of Philosophy of Education). These comments are clearly related to the discursive features of writing.

> *I would like to encourage the authors to do a much stronger, clearer job of positioning themselves as people authorized – culturally and intellectually – to speak about the Dayak people and their sacred practices.* (Reviewer 1, Journal Multicultural Discourses)

> *I also like the heuristic of "language materiality" and find it very useful, but there might be other material epistemologies or "ways of knowing" which help decolonize things better.* (Reviewer 1, Journal of Philosophy of Education)
> *The rest of the article then mentions scholars writing on language rights, and globalization, without truly engaging, in any real theoretical or empirical manner, what these really mean. Essentially, there is*

> *nothing new that the author has brought to the table because what is said are things we already know, said by many others, with evidence to boot!"* (Reviewer 1, Journal of Philosophy of Education)

In responding to Reviewer 1 (Journal Multicultural Discourses), the author refutes the comment by simultaneously constructing his discoursal self and self as author by foregrounding his ecologies of knowledges with which his social life are embedded, thus projecting himself as the one who is more knowledgeable about the topic he wrote than the reviewer. This strategy thus refutes the comment that "there is nothing that the author has brought to the table." Consider the following textual realization written by the author:

> *As I belong to this suppressed community (the cultural members of the Indigenous Dayaknese), I have cultural experience and critical consciousness in our theorization of the materiality in this local community. I therefore feel obliged to explore "their long-standing historical experience of cultural autonomy." Because I situate our exploration in a local and specific site of a suppressed community, our theorization is inspired by a "placed-based politics," which acknowledges "territorial ecologies – assemblages of ecosystems, places, and communities" (Escobar, 2017, p. 163).* (Excerpt of texts written by the author as a response to Reviewer 1 of Journal Multicultural Discourses)

> *In essence, whereas the established pragmatist philosophical traditions such as those from Deweyan and Jamesian provide a useful conceptualization of a philosophical practices at the global level, Dewantara's local philosophy may contextualize conduct or action in a much more nuanced fashion in a specific locality, and may even decenter these well-established traditions in light of local identities and ideologies.* (Excerpt of texts written by the author as a response to Reviewer 1 of Journal of Philosophy of Education)

The use of personal pronoun *I* indicates the individual aspect of voice, demonstrating that the author himself acts as *knower* of the knowledge he generates from his rich ecologies of knowledges (i.e. Dayaknese communities and Dewantara's Javanese philosophy). It is apparent here that the attitude markers use such as *feel obliged* (see Hyland, 2012) provide evidence that the construction of this identity reflects the values, belief and power of the writer; that is his authorial self (Ivanic, 1988; see also Wu, 2025). Yet, at the same time the author also projects another type of identity: self as author. Undeniably, the production of the texts above is the production of the self of the author (Hyland, 2010). The stance he uses in the texts implies his control of the content of the text and his authority indicated by the use personal pronoun *I* as an authorial presence.

Interestingly, despite this individual aspect of voice, the author attributes his authority and control of knowledges from a specific ecology to the source he quoted (i.e., Escobar, 2017) and acknowledges contributions of foreign philosophers such as John Dewey and William James, thereby treating knowledge as impersonal

entities. In doing so, we can see here another dimension of voice as social. It is obvious that in responding to the blind reviewers the author constructed multiple identities – being an individual and social simultaneously.

Author's adeptness in shuttling between the acknowledgement of authorities such Dewey and James can be attributed not from his wide reading of these philosophers, but very much springs from his enactment of "…a processual and iterative shifting of the identity position…" (Li & Lee, 2024, p. 877). This buttresses the argument that identity in writing is always in flux, multiple, and unpredictable, which stands in stark contrast to the modernist perspective of identity as a unitary and stative entity.

Discussion

The authorial strategies revealed in the findings provides strong evidence that both individual and social voice merged convolutedly in tandem, and that they shape the very agency and identity of the author. It is important to highlight that the author, as has been revealed above, didn't exhibit just one aspect of identity, but slipped into other aspects of identity in a simultaneous way. This finding complicates the simplistic notion of identities in writing as a stable, categorial, compartmentalized and easily identified trait. Identities in writing are thus not easily categorized, as they may overlap and multiply in the process of meaning making and negotiation. In other words, identities "is not fixed but performative" (Lee & Jenks, 2021, p. 115), but are always in state of "in flow-and in-flux" (Li & Lee, 2024). Because they are performative, it stands to reason to link identities to ideologies in literacy, especially in academic writing. The ideologically loaded writing practices where one can exert greater latitude to display authorship in academic writing contest the idea of "autonomous view of literacies" in which writing is considered devoid of the social and political contexts where it is produced and whose interest it serves (Szundy, 2021, p. 218).

The preference for clinging to ecologies of knowledge, for example, is not a neutral nor value-free choice to construct discoursal self and self as author. This choice reflects a performativity of the author in constructing and producing knowledge through writing practices. This performativity in aligning individual voice and social voice is made possible through the author's interaction with his communities of practice (Peng, 2024) and through his lived experiences in integrating writing with culture (Chen & Zou, 2024). It can be plausibly surmised here that accumulated lived experiences and cultural knowledge of the author can serve as important schemata for him in generating authorial strategies. In essence, there is always an interplay between external social forces and internal individual self (Guan & Xu, 2024) in the generation of authorial strategies in academic writing.

The interplay between external social contexts and internal individual self also provides solid evidence that the author demonstrates his ability in displaying multiple identities in academic writing. This transpositioning of identity, as Li and Lee (2024) have called it, demonstrates the fluid, mobile, and mutable characters of identities in academic writing, and as such renders it possible for writers to have different "options of identity" (Hyland, 2002, p. 351) in practicing academic writing.

Conclusion

From the findings of this study, we can conclude that author's identity is convoluted, unstable, dynamic and liquid. The analyses have shown that the manuscript author is able to exhibit multiple writing identities via the authorial strategies in responding to the comments by the manuscript reviewers, thus demonstrating his adeptness in transpositioning his identities in academic writing. In contrast to the critiques of the relative unimportance of voice in writing as briefly attended to in the introduction, this study finds that voice as an aspect of identity can contribute to our understanding of the ways author constructs his authorial identities in the process of knowledge production in academic writing. Additionally, the insights generated from this study enriches the many perspectives of studies on voice and identity conducted previously by writing scholars.

The clear implications for teaching academic writing are, first, teachers need to raise students' awareness that academic writing is not monolithic, and therefore developing metadiscoursal knowledge in academic writing is of utmost importance to allow students to experiment with different options of identity (Hyland, 2002) in writing. Second, related to the first, teaching academic writing means giving students latitude to shuttle between different identities in a fluid and dynamic manner and to construct and reconstruct voice by virtue of their identities. These two points imply that students are continuously exhorted to develop control and metalinguistic awareness in their experimentation with different identities in writing. Finally, writing assessment needs to include the notion of voice. The design of writing rubrics for assessment especially in the context of teaching English as a foreign language needs to attend to voice conceived as a dialogic construct involving both individual and social.

As the current study focuses on the notion of voice with limited samples, generalization of the findings is not warranted. Future research with more samples of data is needed to further probe authorial voice in academic writing. It is especially important to discover how the transpositioning of identities in academic writing and probably in other writing genres such as literary, journalism, and business writings, amongst others can generate other types of authorial strategies. It is more insightful to discover authorial strategies in these genres by adding more data sources such as deep interviews and stimulated recalls.

References

Bauman, Z. (2012). *Liquid modernity*. Polity Press.

Burke, S. B. (2010). *The construction of identity in the academic writing of Korean ESL students: A qualitative study of six Korean students in the U.S* [An unpublished dissertation]. Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*, 401-417.

Chen, N., & Zhou, C. (2024). Making sense of a new language: Authenticity and semiotics in additional language learning. *Language and Semiotic Studies, 10*(3), 317–342. https://doi.org/10.1515/lass-2024-0021

Guan, J. & Xu, H. (2024). In between the neoliberal reality and the humanities imagination: A narrative inquiry of an English major's identity construction in China. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2024.2410384

He, F. (2021). Identity construction in academic writing of student writers who use English as an additional language: A literature review. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *43*(4), 506-524. https://doi.org/10.1515/CJAL-2020-0033

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2003.08.001

Hyland, K. (2002). Options of identity in academic writing. *ELT Journal,56*(4), 351-358. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.4.351

Hyland, K. (2010). Metadiscourse: Mapping interactions in academic writing. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *9*(2), 125-143. https://doi.org/10.35360/njes.220

Hyland, K. (2012). Undergraduate understandings: Stance and voice in final year reports. In K. Hyland & C. S. Guinda (Eds.), *Stance and voice in written academic genres* (pp. 134-150). Palgrave Macmillan.

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

Ivanič, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice and self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*(1-2), 3-33. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00034-0

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2023). *Developing multilingual writing: Agency, audience, identity*. Springer.

Lee, K., & Ye, Y. (2023). Uncovering the dimensionality of authorial voice in the integrated writing task: A confirmatory factor analysis study. *System*, *117*, Article 103115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103115

Lee, J. W., & Jenks, C. (2021). Ideology, identity, and world Englishes: Toward a heteroglossic framework. In R. Rubdy & R. Tupas (Eds.), *Bloomsbury world Englishes: Ideologies* (Volume 2) (pp. 114-126). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Langum, V., & Sullivan, K. P. H. (2020). Academic writing, scholarly identity, voice and the benefits and challenges of multilingualism: Reflections from Norwegian doctoral researchers in teacher education. *Linguistics and Education*, *60*, Article 100883. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2020.100883

Limpariwhattana, K., & Chamcharatsri, B. (2025). Being and becoming: A revealing glimpse of L2 writer identity through metaphors. *Cogent Education*, *12*(1), Article 2516384. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2516384

Liu, W., & Zhang, Y. (2023). Literature citation and identity construction in linguistic academic discourse. *Heliyon*, *9*(11), Article 22066. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e22066

Tian, Y., & Liu, D. (2024). A bibliometric study of identity construction in English writing for academic purposes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *15*, 149-917. http://10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1499917

Li, A. W. (2024). Bilingual returnee scholars' identity in academic writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *64*, Article 101112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2024.101112

Li, W., & T.K. Lee. (2024). Transpositioning and the liquidity of identity. *Applied Linguistics*, *45*(5), 873-888. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amad065

Matsuda, P. K. (2001). Voice in Japanese written discourse: Implications for second language Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*(1-2), 35-53. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00036-9

Matsuda, P. K. (2015). Identity in written discourse. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *35*, 140-159. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000178

Matsuda, P. K., & C.M. Tardy. (2007). Voice in academic writing: The rhetorical construction of author identity in blind manuscript review. *English for Specific Purposes, 26*(2), 235-249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2006.10.001

Mhilli, O. (2023). Authorial voice in writing: A literature review. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, *8*, Article 100550. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100550

Park, J. Y. (2023). Agency, identity, and writing: Perspectives from first generation students of color in their first year of college. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *57*, 227-247. https://doi.org/10.58680/rte202332353

Peng, Y. (2024). Exploring L2 graduate writers' identity construction in research writing practices: A symbolic interactionism perspective. *Language and Semiotic Studies*, *10*(4), 616-637. https://doi.org/10.1515/lass-2024-0058

Qi, Q., & Zhao, C. G. (2023). Discoursal scholarly identity in research writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing. 62*, Article 101052. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2023.101052

Ramanathan, V., & Atkinson, D. (1999). Individualism, academic writing, and ESL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(1), 45–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80112-X

Szundy, P. (2021). Conflicting language ideologies about what counts as "English" in the Brazilian national common core curriculum. In R. Rubdy & R. Tupas (Eds.), *Bloomsbury world Englishes: Ideologies* (Volume 2) (pp. 213-229). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Silva, T. (2005). On the philosophical bases of inquiry in second language writing: Metaphysic, inquiry paradigm, and the intellectual zeitgeist. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 3-15). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sousa Santos, B. (2018). *The end of cognitive empire, the coming of age of epistemologies of the South*. Duke University Press.

Sugiharto, S. (2024a). Ars Erotica: Sex and somaesthetics in the classical arts of love: Exploring Shusterman's writing identity in the discourse on the art of lovemaking and body aesthetics. *Journal of Language and Literature*, *24*(2), 623-630. https://doi.org/10.24071/joll.v24i2.9700

Sugiharto, S. (2024b). Straddling the personal and the academic: How self in academic writing is constructed in contact zone. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature, 9*(2), 478-504. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v9i2.35964

Stapleton, P. (2002). Critiquing voice as a viable pedagogical tool in L2 writing: Returning the spotlight to the ideas. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *11*(3), 177-190. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00070-X

Tardy, C. (2012). Current conceptions of voice. In K. Hyland & C. S. Guinda (Eds.), *Stance and voice in written academic genres* (pp. 34-48). Palgrave Macmillan.

Wu, Y. (2025). Authorial identity construction through implicit stance-taking in the introduction of research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, *78*(2), 88-108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2024.12.003

Zeng, X., Liu, J., & Bowen, N. E. (2024). A comparative study of voice in Chinese English-major undergraduates' timed and untimed argument writing. *Assessing Writing*, *62*(2), Article 100896. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2024.100896