This study investigated how U.S. and South Korean graduate students conceptualize and adapt to their audiences when writing an academic paper within their disciplines. Specifically, this study focused on (a) cross-cultural differences by student’s nationality and (b) the qualitative change in student writer’s sense of audience over a semester. This study utilized text analysis, semi-structured and discourse-based interview, and survey method.

With a sample of 19 U.S. and 22 South Korean graduate students enrolled in U.S. graduate programs, a survey measuring the student writer’s disciplinary socialization and disciplinary audience awareness was conducted. A text analysis method was utilized to examine the five interpersonal metadiscourse categories appearing in 82 academic papers. Among the participants, 4 U.S. and 4 South Korean students were interviewed at two time points with a semester interval regarding (a) their conceptualization of and adaptation to audience in the process of writing and (b) their intentions for choosing specific interpersonal metadiscourse items in their papers.
The data analysis suggested cross-cultural differences between the two nationality groups in their conceptualization of and adaptation to audience. Specifically, the U.S. students exhibited a great deal of awareness of audience whereas their South Korean counterparts displayed less prominent evidence of this metacognition. In addition, the U.S. students invested more deliberate effort to improve intertextuality, organization, and clarity as ways to adapt to audience. Compared to the U.S. students, the South Korean students were primarily concerned with minimization of potential misunderstandings and breakdowns in communication due to linguistic and cultural barriers. The U.S. and South Korean students also differed in their utilization of interpersonal metadiscourse items. Overall, the U.S. students employed significantly higher numbers of hedges and boosters than their South Korean counterparts. The South Korean students’ employment of interpersonal metadiscourse suggested possible influences from their first language and different sociocultural schemata on politeness strategy. Pedagogical implications for the teaching of second language writing and suggestions for future research are provided.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The number of international students enrolled in post-secondary institutions in the United States (U.S.) has steadily increased since the mid-20th century. The Institute of International Education (IIE, 2004) reports that during the 2003-2004 academic year, there were 572,509 international students enrolled, which amounts to approximately 4.3% of the total U.S. higher education enrollment. Given that such a large body of international students can be a vital resource to U.S. post-secondary institutions by offering diverse perspectives, it would behoove academic institutions to develop a more in-depth understanding of the unique challenges that international students encounter, and to subsequently provide them with more focused assistance on their academic and professional development. However, there is little research on either the unique challenges that international students encounter, or on the potential benefits that institutional assistance could create for their academic and professional development.

One of the major challenges for international students is their difficulty performing written communication in English (see Silva, 1993). Since students must write in English academically and professionally to obtain grades for class, to complete theses/dissertations, and to publish research, acquiring proficiency in written academic English is essential for international graduate students at U.S. universities.(Bazerman, 1993; Hyland, 2000). Knowing that international students have difficulty with their academic English writing, then, begs the question of what are the specific factors that make it difficult for them. Some research studies on second language (L2) writing suggested that L2 writers have unique challenges addressing
audience in their texts, particularly due to cultural and linguistic differences. For example, L2 writers can be misguided by their native cultural schemata regarding the roles of the writer and the reader (Hinds, 1987); they may have difficulty building up a common ground with the reader appropriately in their texts due to their paucity of information about the expectations of U.S. readers (Scarcella, 1984); or they might be cognitively so overburdened by expressing their ideas in English that they can hardly afford to rhetorically engage the reader in their texts (Raimes, 1985). Fox (1994) similarly concluded that many international students experience frustration with their ability to communicate coherently in English, probably due to the culturally diverse schemata for coherence and integrity of a text (Connor, 1996a; Purves, 1988). In addition to the cross-cultural differences, the challenges of English academic writing become even more arduous for international students given that they need to acquire the appropriate voices, relevant arguments, and prescribed discourse conventions that their academic disciplines endorse (Bartholomae, 1985; Bizzell, 1986; Intaraprawat & Steffensen, 1995).

What the aforementioned studies exploring either cross-cultural factors or socio-contextual factors in academic writing suggest is the importance of individual writers’ cognition of the writing context, of which the fundamental dimension is writers’ conceptualizations of audience (Bakhtin, 1986; Nystrand, 1990). Specifically, these studies suggest that writers possess a certain schemata regarding how to communicate with the readers in texts; this schemata is culturally cultivated and consequently culturally non-uniform.

From the point of view of writing as a socio-communicative act, the success of writing depends on the degree to which the reader understands meanings in the text and establishes personal and meaningful connections with the text (Nystrand, 1989; Rubin, 1988). Therefore, to a certain degree, writers must adapt their texts to the readers’ expectations and needs (Meyer,
and/or send signals to readers about what audience roles to inhabit (Long, 1980, 1992). These adaptations and signals pertain to writing purposes, discourse types, persuasive strategies, and also specific lexical choices. A large volume of literature has been devoted to the concept of audience in composition. Particularly, a large portion of the literature has suggested the significant association of writers’ audience awareness and their writing competence (Berkenkotter, 1981; Britton, Burgess, Martin, & McLeod, & Rosen, 1975; Burleson & Rowen, 1985; Flower, 1979; Flower & Hayes, 1980; Kroll, 1985; Piché & Roen, 1987; Rubin, 1984; Rubin, Piché, Michlin, & Johnson, 1984).

Despite the prominence of audience in writing in general, only a handful of empirical studies have addressed the audience issue in L2 writing in particular (e.g., Connor, 1987; Hinds, 1987; Johns, 1993; Mangelsdorf, Roen, & Taylor, 1990; Raimes, 1985; Scarcella, 1984; Zainuddin, 1995). The dearth of empirical research on the subject is an obvious limit to understanding how L2 writers conceptualize audience and address it in writing, particularly when teachers attempt to identify rhetorical targets for international students’ writing (see, for example, Ramanathan & Kaplan, 1996).

A Sense of Audience

Based on Piaget’s (1926) cognitive developmental psychology, early research on audience postulated that audience awareness is the writers’ ability to recognize the presence of readers with diverse perspectives (Rubin, 1984). That early research also suggested that writers’ audience awareness develops across the life span, and positively influences the writing quality (Beach & Anson, 1988; Britton et al., 1975; Cowie, 1983). Acknowledging the effect of contextual factors other than age on writers’ audience adaptation, some composition researchers proposed the socio-cognitive model of writing by integrating cognition theories with socio-
contextual factors, such as the topic, genre, and audience type for writing (Kroll, 1985; Piché & Roen, 1987; Rubin, 1984; Rubin et al., 1984; Rubin & Rafoth, 1986). In this model, writers choose particular roles for themselves based on their inferences of the roles that readers would take on. Thus, writing competence is attributable in large measure to writers’ abilities to conjure up concrete, dynamic representations of audience, and engage in dialectical thinking of diverse reactions of audience.

Of particular interest, among the early research are studies that focused on syntactic and stylistic markers as reflections of writers’ audience sensitivity (Crowhurst, 1978; Crowhurst & Piché, 1979; Rubin & Piché, 1979; Smith & Swan, 1978). These studies suggested that writers manipulate linguistic and rhetorical devices differentially for different audiences. Writers’ choices of linguistic and rhetorical devices would reflect their understanding of audiences (Krause & O’Brien, 2000). Since audience adaptation is ultimately textually realized, textual analyses of linguistic and stylistic features are useful methods for examining writers’ conceptualization of audience. Therefore, among its several data sources, the present study engages in a textual analysis of linguistic features in authentic academic papers written by student writers in their academic disciplines.

Process-based composition research studies (see, Cooper, 1974; Emig, 1967, 1971; Perl, 1979) also suggested that writers’ conceptualizations of audience influence the ways that they construct texts. By utilizing think-aloud protocols, several of these studies found that writers’ mental representations of audience guided them to choose the type of discourse, the content of ideational messages, the extent of elaboration and clarity, and organizational structure of texts (Berkenkotter, 1981; Roth, 1987; Zainuddin, 1995). Discourse-based interviews are one way of eliciting verbal protocols to shed light on writers’ in-process stylistic decisions (Odell &
Goswami, 1984; Odell, Goswami, & Herrington, 1983). Accordingly, this study will utilize a discourse-based interview to explore for/to whom student writers intend to write their academic papers, and how they utilize linguistic devices to address those audiences.

Recently, the social view of writing has expanded the context for writing beyond the topic, audience, and genre for writing to the broader socio-cultural milieu, including the communities in which student writers are embedded (Bizzell, 1982; Bruffee, 1984; Myers, 1989). This social view emphasizes the role of socio-cultural contexts in assigning meanings and values to linguistic expressions. It suggests that writers must acquire a sense of what a given discourse community considers as prominent issues, relevant arguments, and appropriate linguistic choices (Bizzell, 1982; Swales, 1990). In this vein, Bizzell (1982) argued that problems experienced by poor writers are not due to cognitive deficiency, but to their unfamiliarity with discourse community conventions. Similarly, Swales (1990) underscored the knowledge of genre, “a shared system of value and of knowledge,” as a necessary condition for becoming an expert member of a discourse community.

Composition researchers who examined graduate students’ socialization processes into their academic disciplines likewise concluded that students’ ability to master academic writing styles directly results from their learning of the beliefs, conventions, and values that a given discipline embodies (e.g., Bazerman, 1980, 1985; Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Berkenkotter, Huckin, & Ackerman, 1988; Dudely-Evans, 1991). These studies suggest that student writers must acquire genre knowledge by participating in the discursive practices of their academic disciplines. Audiences for those student writers therefore also need to be conceptualized as aligned with the purposes, genres, and rhetorical contexts of the writers’ academic disciplines (Prior, 1998).
It should be noted that international students have brought their own integral socio-historic experiences from their native cultures to the U.S. academe. As Casanave (1995) suggested, international students’ previous literacy practices influence their modes of participation in their academic disciplinary practices, and consequently, their academic writing. Particularly for South Korean academic discourse practices, there are research studies that suggested cross-cultural differences in writers’ schemata of text coherence (Choi, 1988) and text unity (Lautamati, 1987) between U.S. and South Koreans. Acknowledging cross-cultural differences in literacy practices between U.S. and South Korean students, it is hypothesized that U.S. students and South Korean international students would conceptualize their audiences and utilize audience adaptive strategies differentially.

**Metadiscourse**

*Metadiscourse* is a general term for grammatical and lexical devices that make the writer-reader interaction in texts more obvious (Abdi, 2002; Barton, 1993; Crismore, 1983, 1990; Hyland, 1999, 2001a, 2001b, 2004; Kuo, 1999). Metadiscourse “help[s] our readers organize, classify, interpret, evaluate, and react to such material” (Vande Kopple, 1985, p.83). Thus, metadiscourse devices are textual manifestations of writers’ attempts to reach their audiences (Abdi, 2002). Hyland (1999, 2004), a leading scholar in genre studies and research on academic writing, also related certain interpersonal metadiscourse devices to writers’ attempts to engage audiences in texts. Specifically, he proposed five categories of interpersonal metadiscourse devices that signal writers’ efforts to manage interactions with readers. These include (a) Self-mentions, (b) Hedges, (c) Boosters (or Emphatics), (d) Attitude markers, and (e) Relational markers (or Engagement markers). He argued that these metadiscourse features serve writers in revealing writers’ involvement in the topic (self-mentions), their attitudes and judgments to
propositions (hedges, boosters, attitude markers) or soliciting agreement from readers and crafting solidarity with them (relational markers). Thus, this study will utilize this integrative coding system of interpersonal metadiscourse for audience.

Critical Summary

Based on the state of the current literature, it is apparent that future research needs to more adequately address the role of audience awareness in L2 writing of advanced international students. First, most theories of writing in general, and of audience awareness in writing in particular, were developed on the basis of L1 writers. This reliance on L1 data creates uncertainty regarding their application to L2 writing context. In a similar vein, Silva, Leki, and Carson (1997) argued that the current mainstream composition studies need to broaden its perspective and accommodate research on writing in English as a second language or in languages other than English. They further pointed out that particularly “Asian, African, or Middle Eastern writing or rhetorics (p. 400)” had been neglected from the mainstream composition studies. It seems that the role of audience for L2 writers would differ from that for L1 writers because, unlike their L1 counterparts, L2 writers have different literacy practices from their native culture, language barriers, and the paucity of information about U.S. culture. Thus, I argue that researchers need to further expand the audience research to L2 writing context.

Second, regarding the conceptualization of L2 writers’ audience, I assert that no single theoretic stance can fully answer the questions of what a sense of audience means to L2 writers and further, how they use this concept in their academic writing. I maintain that both cognitive and social views of writing are needed to understand and to answer these questions regarding sense of audience, especially across cultures. For example, the cognitive view can help to explain what audience means to L2 writers because it reflects not only their cognitive abilities to
recognize diverse perspectives of readers but also what they think of as pivotal characteristics of an interpersonal relationship with readers for writing. In addition, the cognitive framework allows that L2 writers’ linguistic and stylistic choices for writing reflect their concept of audience. On the other hand, the social view emphasizes the role of socialization processes into academic disciplines. By these socialization processes, student writers come to understand specific modes of discourse or genre conventions endorsed by their academic disciplines. Thus, L2 writers’ sense of audience develops concomitantly with their U.S. academic socialization. The prominence given to socialization processes warrants investigations of how/whether L2 writers’ audience adaptation changes over time.

Purpose of the Study

The present study aims to explore how U.S. and Korean graduate students differentially experience academic writing in their disciplines. Specifically, I examine the cross-cultural differences between U.S. and South Korean students in their audience conceptualization and adaptation in academic writing. I also examine how audience conceptualization and adaptation of these writers from two cultures change as they participate in discursive practices of their academic disciplines. These inquiries will contribute to an in-depth understanding of written communication in a cross-cultural context, and advance educational assistance for L2 international student writers’ academic and professional developments.

Specifically, the present study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What are some differences between the ways that U.S. and South Korean graduate students conceptualize and adapt to audiences in their academic writing?
2. What are some ways in which U.S. and South Korean graduate students’ conceptualization of, and adaptation to, audiences change in conjunction with their participation in disciplinary socialization practices over two consecutive semesters?

3. What are some differences between the ways that U.S. and South Korean graduate students deploy interpersonal metadiscourse markers in their academic writing?

4. What are some ways in which U.S. and South Korean graduate students’ deployment of interpersonal metadiscourse markers change in conjunction with their participation in disciplinary socialization practices over two consecutive semesters?

To answer these questions, the study utilizes both a pre-post design (academic writing samples from two consecutive semesters) and a between-group comparison design (U.S. versus South Korean graduate students). This mixed design illuminates (a) disciplinary socialization experiences of U.S. and South Korean students in their academic disciplines, and (b) cross-cultural differences between U.S. and South Korean students in utilizing the concept of audience in academic writing. This study also adopts multiple methods in addressing its questions: text analysis, semi-structured and discourse-based interviews, and survey methods.

Ultimately, this study aims to provide useful guidance for L2 writing teachers and other mainstream instructors who seek to help international students produce academic writing acceptable to their academic fields. It also aims to contribute to the development of theories of L2 writing by helping to integrate social as well as cognitive aspects of audience awareness.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

After all, the utterance of the person to whom I am responding is already at hand, but his response (or responsive understanding) is still forthcoming. When constructing my utterance, I try actively to determine this response. Moreover, I try to act in accordance with the response I anticipate, so this anticipated response, in turn, exerts an active influence on my utterance. When speaking I always take into account the apperceptive background of the addressee’s perception of my speech: the extent to which he is familiar with the situation, whether he has special knowledge of the given cultural area of communication, his views and convictions, his prejudices, his sympathies and antipathies – because all this will determine his active responsive understanding of my utterance. These considerations also determine my choice of a genre for my utterance, my choice of compositional devices, and, finally, my choice of language vehicles, that is, the style of my utterance. (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 95)

This chapter will present a review of the literature on audience in written communication. Specifically, the advancement of the concept of audience will be discussed by reviewing the composition literature from the cognitive views (i.e., the cognitive developmental framework, a sociocognitive model of writing, and the process-based writing) and from the social view (i.e., social constructionism). A review of the second language (L2) writing literature on audience will follow. Then, a review of the literature on student writers’ disciplinary socialization will be presented. Finally, metadiscourse text analysis and its use in audience research will be discussed.
A Historical Review of Audience

Audience has a broad spectrum of meanings depending on theoretical approach. Generally, the concept of audience refers to a group of living people who actually read a text, but it also refers to a writer’s mental construct for imagined, ideal readers. The development of theoretical and research frameworks in composition and rhetoric has refashioned the meaning of audience. For example, classical rhetoricians such as Aristotle and Plato considered the notion of audience as referring to a group of specific, known individuals to whom an orator must adapt. In order to better persuade those audiences, according to Aristotle, a good orator should accurately analyze their characteristics such as age, gender, social class, and opinions about a specific issue (Aristotle, 1926). In the 1960s, modern composition scholars began to place emphasis on the rhetorical situation and attended to audience as one component of rhetorical situation. For example, Burke (1969) advocated the term of identification as expanding the traditional notion of persuasion. While persuasion was understood as the writer’s explicit, intentional strategies to persuade specific, known audiences, identification was described as the writer’s semi-conscious processes of “causing the audience to identify itself with the speaker’s interest…” (Burke, 1969, p. 46). However, the notion of audience has become the center of composition theory and research under the influences of two theoretical perspectives: The cognitive developmental theory and social constructionism.

Cognitive Views

The cognitive views of writing represent the psychological approach to composition and rhetoric. Since cognitive developmental psychology (Piaget, 1926) gained influence in composition studies, composition researchers postulated audience not only as living individuals who read the text, but also as writer’s mental projections of those readers (Babin & Harrison,
Given this conceptualization, an emphasis was given to the writer’s cognitive ability to recognize the presence of readers and analyze their diverse perspectives. Thus, advocates of cognitive developmental perspective attempted to verify that writer’s audience awareness develops with age (Beach & Anson, 1988; Britton et al., 1975; Cowie, 1983; Rubin & Piché, 1979). For example, with a sample of 500 students aging from 11 to 18, Britton and his colleagues (1975) found that the developmental trend of writing competence progresses from egocentric writing, to writing for a definite other (e.g., teachers), to writing for a broader scope of audiences, and to writing for indefinite audiences. Similarly, Cowie (1983) analyzed writers’ senses of self and others reflected in papers written by fourth to seventh grade students. Her analyses suggested that young writers’ senses of audiences develop from egocentricity, to showing emotional sensitivity to self, to showing vague awareness of others, to showing emotional empathy to others. Beach and Anson (1988) explored how ninth-, twelfth-graders, college students, and graduate students adopted different writing strategies in order to persuade their readers. The results indicated that different age groups used different writing strategies; while college and graduate students initially focused on establishing a common ground for arguments with the readers, the younger participants directly stated their opinions and supporting arguments. Overall, this line of studies suggested that writing competence, in terms of audience adaptation develops as a function of cognitive maturation.

Of particular interest are studies which focus on syntactic and other stylistic markers as reflections of writers’ audience sensitivity. Some researchers further explored the developmental trends in syntactic complexity and stylistic aspects of writing in terms of interactions among writers’ cognitive maturation (age), audience types, and discourse modes (Crowhurst, 1978; Crowhurst & Piché, 1979; Rubin & Piché, 1979; Smith & Swan, 1978). For example, Crowhurst
and Piché (1979) examined syntactic complexity demonstrated by sixth- and tenth-graders when they wrote for two different audiences: best friend and teacher. They found significantly greater clause length in writing for teacher than for best friend, but no other significant syntactic variations associated with different audiences. Rubin and Piché (1979) investigated the syntactic and stylistic strategies adopted by fourth-, eighth-, and twelfth-grade students and expert adult writers in their persuasive writing. The participants were asked to write for three different audiences: high intimacy audience, intermediate intimacy audience, and low intimacy audience. Results of this study suggested statistically significant effects of both age and audience construct on syntactic complexity and persuasive strategy.

Taken together, the literature suggests that writing competence is strongly influenced by writers’ abilities to recognize audience characteristics; the degrees of writers’ audience awareness are reflected in their managements of linguistic/rhetorical devices in terms of their audiences. Furthermore, the literature suggests that text analysis with a focus on linguistic and stylistic features could be a useful method to assess writers’ sensitivity to their audiences.

In audience analysis, the cognitive developmental perspective has been very influential, especially to those who studied the link between beginning writers’ poor composition and their lack of audience awareness. For example, Shaughnessy (1977) attributed basic writers’ inaccurate use of grammatical features (e.g., ambiguous pronoun references or predicates disjointed with subject) to their egocentric assumption that “the reader understands what is going on” (p. 240). Flower (1979) also attributed college students’ poor writing to their failure in moving cognitively from ‘writer-based’ mode to ‘reader-based’ mode. She distinguished ‘writer-based’ prose as the egocentric, inner speech mode from ‘reader-based’ prose which she described as the mode of communication with others beyond the self as a reader, and argued if writers are
aware of audiences and simultaneously accommodate the anticipated responses of those audiences to the text, they can produce the ‘reader-based’ prose.

Some composition researchers attempted to build a socio-cognitive model of writing by integrating cognition theories and contextual factors (e.g., Kroll, 1985; Piché & Roen, 1987; Rubin, 1984; Rubin et al., 1984; Rubin & Rafoth, 1986). Particularly, Rubin (1984) proposed a socio-cognitive model of writing development with five dimensional components: (1) Subskills, (2) Coordination of perspectives, (3) Content domain, (4) Content stability, and (5) Audience determinateness. The essence of this model is that audience awareness is a specific area of social cognition operating in written communication, and strongly influences overall writing performance. It is noteworthy that due to the lack of an instrument directly measuring social cognition, few empirical studies have investigated the direct relationship between social cognitive abilities and writing competence.

A number of researchers attended to the role of audience in the composition process itself (e.g., Berkenkotter, 1981; Raimes, 1985; Roth, 1987; Zainuddin, 1995). Of particular importance is their argument that the writing process, not written products, should be the target of scholarly inquiry, and researchers should explore how audience awareness operates in “real-time” during the process of writing. These process-based studies have suggested that writers’ cognitive projections of audience guide their writing strategies. More specifically, writers’ mental representations of audience were found to influence their choice of discourse types, their ideational messages, the extent of proposition elaboration and clarity, and the organizational structures. The process-based studies also suggested that expert writers differ from novice writers in the degree to and the manner in which they consider audience in the process of writing (Berkenkotter, 1981; Flower & Hayes, 1980; Perl, 1979). Specifically, novice writers were found
to be oblivious of audience external to the writers’ own minds and did not consider writing as a rhetorical transaction, and consequently took account of audience infrequently. For this reason, Berkenkotter (1981) asserted that heightened awareness of audience is a strategy of expert writers.

Taken together, these process-based research studies refashioned the notion of audience as no longer a static representation but an evolving process operative in the writer’s mind at every phase of writing (Roth, 1987). For the process-based writing researchers, audience refers to more than writers’ mental projections of readers or socio-cognitive abilities to take perspectives; it also refers to writers’ inventions of potential readers or reader roles. The findings of these studies have important implication for audience research in that they underscore (a) the influence of writers’ cognition on their writing outcomes and (b) the presence of individual differences in writers’ mental projections of audience. This framework has the potential to be used in investigating the qualitative changes of writers’ audience conceptualizations.

In sum, the cognitive developmental, socio-cognitive, and process-based frameworks of composition research cogently suggest the significant role of audience awareness in writing competence. From these cognitive views, audience refers to not only a group of specific, individuals; it also refers to (a) writers’ mental representations of readers, (b) their socio-cognitive inferential abilities to recognize diverse perspectives, and (c) their inventions of potential readers or reader roles for their own texts. In the process of writing, writers choose particular roles for themselves based on their inferences of the roles that readers would take. Quality of writing is significantly affected by writers’ abilities to conjure up concrete, dynamic representations of audience, and engage in dialectical thinking of diverse perspectives and reactions of audiences (Zainuddin, 1995).
Social Constructionism

Social constructionism represents the transition from the psychological approach to the sociological approach of composition and rhetoric. However, social constructionism carries within its umbrella broad influences from multiple philosophical origins (see Hruby, 2001). In this section, I use the term of social constructionism mainly in reference to the sociological approach to composition research, as distinguished from the cognitive psychological approach.

Discourse Community and Audience

Social constructionism has its philosophical root in Kuhn’s (1962) The structure of scientific revolutions and Rorty’s (1979) Philosophy and the mirror of nature (Babin & Harrison, 1999, p. 239; Bruffee, 1984). According to Casanave (1995), for instance, the central metaphor of social constructionism, discourse community is indebted to Kuhn’s (1962) description of scientific communities. Kuhn portrayed science disciplines as communities where scientists share scientific knowledge in terms of theories and methodological procedures. Based on this shared knowledge, scientists communicate with each other and produce new knowledge. As in Khun’s portrayal, social constructionists used the metaphor of community to explain the nature of knowledge as a community-generated artifact (e.g., Bizzell, 1982; Bruffee, 1986).

Bizzell (1982) defined the notion of discourse community as a group of people who “share certain patterns of language-using, thinking conditioned by historical, cultural circumstances” (p. 219). One’s voice cannot be heard outside of a particular discourse community. Therefore, one must be socialized into particular types of discourse that a given community sanctions. As Kress (1989, p. 7) defines the term, discourse is comprised of “systematically-organized sets of statements which give expression to the meanings and values of an institution.” In this vein, Bruffee (1986, p. 774) declares, “Social constructionism
understands reality, knowledge, thought, facts, texts, selves, and so on as community-generated and community-maintained linguistics entities.”

Based on this theoretical perspective, the social constructionists find fault in the cognitive views of writing. They argue that cognitive views consider a text merely as the writer’s internal representation; as a result cognitive views ignore social contexts assigning certain meanings and values to the text (e.g., Bizzell, 1982). For example, in her critique of the cognitive view of writing process (e.g., Flower & Hayes, 1981), Bizzell (1982) argued that the cognitive view of writing process fails to take into account social contexts, or more precisely, discourse communities which allow writers to recognize problems and their potential solutions. Bizzell further emphasized that texts cannot be brought into being without affiliations with a particular discourse community. When one writes, he/she is always doing it for a certain communicative purpose, which is defined and understood only within a particular discourse community. Related to the concept of audience, when given a writing task, the writer conjures up a specific audience who belongs to the discourse community where the given writing task is produced and will be interpreted. In this view, Bizzell argues that poor writers’ problems are not from their cognitive deficiency but their unfamiliarity with discourse community conventions.

In short, for social constructionists, all language use is social and collaborative in nature. The reality and knowledge is generated by the consensus of language users on the community basis. Audience is an essential factor in writing because writers must anticipate and respond to what their discourse community members consensually expect. In this sense, Bruffee (1984) advocated collaborative techniques such as writing workshops and peer tutoring in the teaching of composition. Thus, social constructionists’ notion of audience is inevitably related to the discourse modes that a particular discourse community sanctions.
Bakhtin’s Dialogic Social View, Genre, and Audience

Bakhtin’s (1981, 1986) dialogic social view could provide a theoretical framework for the notion of audience (Phelps, 1990; Schaub, 1995). Drawing on the Bakhtinian dialogic view of writing, for example, Nystrand (1990) argued for the reciprocal, dialogic exchanges between the writer and the reader to be at the center of written communication. He believed that it is the dialogic nature of communication that regulates one party (writer/speaker) to work in relation to the other (reader/listener). Particularly in research with the emergent writers, Nystrand underscored the importance of investigations into writers’ assumptions of and adaptation to their audiences, “In understanding what young writers are doing, it is not enough to track the development of written forms, norms, and textual features, it is essential also to consider what these writers are doing in terms of readers, or in terms of what they assume about their readers; that is, to study writers in their full social context” (1990, p. 13).

In the Bakhtinian dialogic view, the basic unit of speech communication is not sentence or proposition, but utterance. Bakhtin claimed that every utterance is fundamentally dialogic because it is saturated with dialogic overtones reflecting precedent utterances of other people as well as with anticipation of subsequent responses from other people (addressees).

For speech can exist in reality only in the form of concrete utterances of individual speaking people, speech subjects. Speech is always cast in the form of an utterance belonging to a particular speaking subject, and outside this form it cannot exist.

(Bakhtin, 1986, p. 71)

Bakhtin asserted that it is addressivity that distinguishes an utterance from other units of language such as words, phrases, and sentences; utterances are “sedimented by traces of their sociohistoric use, indexed in the immediate situation, addressed to anticipated responses, imbued
to varying degrees with individuals’ situated intentions and accents, and actively and reactively constructed by recipients” (Prior, 1998, p. 20). In this sense, text is a system of utterances addressed to potential readers; in the composing process, the writer continually takes into account the socio-historic background of potential readers and responds to potential readers’ anticipated responses; and thus, the socio-historic backgrounds of potential readers are manifested in text (Schaub, 1995).

Phelps (1990) further emphasized the importance of connecting Bakhtin’s two notions, addressee and speech genre, in rethinking audience. Phelps stated,

It is important first because it makes audience a discursive concept in a sense other than the inscription of a virtual reader in a semiotic space, thus connecting the writer’s image and textual representation of audience to the lived world of potential readers. This provides a referential dimension to audience, otherwise possible only in the situation where anticipated readers are concretely known or co-present. Further, we now see that to direct utterance toward a possible answer is not merely to anticipate a particular response, but to address a collective and its language as stylized voices representing common interests and values, as these might express themselves in typified rhetorical situations. (pp. 168-169).

Specifically, Bakhtin declared that particular spheres of human activity and communication develop “relatively stable types of utterances (p. 60),” so called, speech genres. Each sphere of communication has its own speech genre determined by its specific conditions, such as communication purposes, participants, and thematic unities. Thus, when we speak or write, we do so within a particular speech genre. If one does not have command of genres applied to a particular sphere of communication, then, he/she can hardly communicate in that
sphere. *Speech genres* are generic, typical forms given to us, not created by us; however, they are varied, flexible, and changeable enough to reflect speakers/writers’ individualities. For example, as students have better command of academic genres, they are better able to express their own subjectivities within the genres.

Bakhtin also underscored that people’s choices of genres and styles of utterances are determined by their constructs of addressees and their anticipated responses, and that their constructs of addressees determine a speech genre. In turn, the speech genre guides the writers with its typified contents and rhetorical tools. When the writers work within a genre, they continuously refer to such typified representations of addresses (*the address*). However, the writers simultaneously select particular representations of addressees, and thus challenge such typified, stable nature of genre. In this view, the understanding of genres becomes important in theorizing audience in written communication. It should be noted that despite the discursive nature, in Bakhtin’s theory, audience does not disappear but becomes more vigorously present with in a genre. As Phelps (1990) aptly noted, “Because Bakhtin takes as his original setting not semiotic space but everyday life … he begins with a firm sense of the concrete subject and of utterance as a willed, purposeful, and bounded activity. As dialogism multiplies and complicates this situation, such subjects do not disappear within heteroglossia and intertextuality, but remain vigorously present, active persons who engage in discourse events one at a time, although the simultaneous and historical concatenation of human conversations gives any such event endlessly dialogic overtones” (p. 169).

The contemporary theory of genres is largely inspired by Bakhtin’s dialogic social view of writing. In her (1984) article, *Genre as social action*, Miller suggested, “what we learn when we learn a genre is not just a pattern of forms or even a method of achieving our own ends. We
learn, more importantly, what ends we may have … for the student, genres serve as keys to understanding how to participate in the actions of community” (p. 165). Among those who endorse this contemporary genre theory and place much emphasis on the interactivity of the rhetorical choice and social context (Bazerman, 1988; Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Schryer, 1993; Swales, 1990), they provide divergent perspectives of genres and genre pedagogy. Such divergence in view is largely related to the dual nature of genres as both textual forms and situated text-forming processes (see Kamberelis, 1999). Depending on their theoretical perspectives, these scholars emphasize more on either genres as textual forms or genres as situated text-forming processes.

**Genres as textual forms.** A group of genre analysts invested their effort to uncover textual regularities of genres (e.g., Devitt, 1991; Giltrow, 1995; Schryer, 1993; Swales, 1990). By analyzing written products, these genre analysts investigated what a particular academic discourse community considered to be an effective means of argumentation and persuasion (Gopnki, 1972; Swales, 1990), or writers’ internalized knowledge of genres in terms of textual and structural features (Kamberelis, 1999). For example, Swales (1990) posited *genres* as rhetorical systems that belong to a particular discourse community and facilitate sets of common goals shared by the community members.

A genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constrains choice of content and style. (Swales, 1990, p. 58)
As suggested in Swales’ (1990) definition of genres, these genre analysts did not consider community-specific discourses to be merely referring to sets of rules or formulae of textual organization. Yet, they believed that knowledge of those formulaic organization rules and conventional textual features would reveal intricate relations between text and context, and further could benefit students entering into a particular academic disciplinary community. For example, when students enter into a particular discourse community, they need to acquire not only content knowledge, but also the various discourse structures and styles that are specific to their given academic community. This group of genre analysts believe that the study of genres can provide student writers (particularly, L2 writers) with “maps of new territories” and “means for exploration” (Swales, 1990, p. 92). Similarly, Kamberelis (1999) argued that even from Bakhtin’s (1986) view, ignoring the aspect of genres as textual forms is problematic. Drawing on Halliday’s (1985) functional linguistic theory, Christie (1999) also suggested the utility of genre-based instructions in teaching ESL students.

Genres as situated text-forming processes. Another group of genre theorists (Casanave, 1992, 1995; Prior, 1994, 1998), however, oppose the assumption of the existence of core discourse systems that dominates a discourse community (i.e., sharing sets of rules and conventions of language use). They contend that a discourse community is much more heterogeneous than is often acknowledged by those who emphasize textual regularities/stability in genres. Instead, these scholars attempted to redefine the notion “in relation to the situated social practices in which discourse and texts are generated, as well as in relation to the personal histories of speakers and writers and the material and discursive histories of collectives and disciplines” (Kamberelis, 1999, p. 405), and focused on people, rhetorical situations, and institutional contexts.
As an example of empirical research studies within this view of genres as situated text-forming process, Prior (1998) investigated literate activities in two seminars. He observed heterogeneity in students’ texts in response to the same writing assignments, and more importantly, despite such heterogeneity, those texts were altogether aligned to the topics (topics of the seminars) and the contexts (the seminars). Specifically, when the students in the seminars produced writing in response to the final term writing assignments, their writing products were heterogeneous from each other; yet, their texts were all oriented toward the topics discussed in the seminars and institutional contexts (academic seminars). Prior (1998) characterized this phenomenon as an illustration of “how semiotic genres get made in situated activity” (p. 98). Based on this study, Prior concluded that genres are not as fixed structures inherent to social situations, but are constructed by coordinated alignments of texts, contexts, and individual participants’ subjectivities.

In this vein, Freedman (1999) suggested that genres are not abstract, fixed, and unified rhetorical forms inherent to social situations, but are “[individual speakers’/writers’] typified actions in response to recurring social contexts” (p. 764). Thus, Freedman opposed an instructional approach of explicitly teaching students textual regularities of genres. Given complex, dynamic, and boundlessly heterogeneous nature of genres, according to Freedman, it is not only impossible to extrapolate a set of textual regularities from genres but also of little use for L2 students to acquire those genres; rather L2 writing teachers would better help L2 students by attending “to the ways in which texts respond to the complex discursive, ideological, social, cultural, institutional context within which they are set.” (p. 766).

In sum, Bakhtin’s theory, particularly with the concepts, dialogism, addressivity, speech genres, provides a useful theoretical framework for re-conceptualizing the notion of audience
from a psychological to a social construct. More importantly, as Phelps (1990) underscored, Bakhtin’s theory makes audience “simultaneously individual and social” (p. 169). In other words, in Bakhtin’s theory, audience reflects stable, regular relations between rhetorical features and social contexts while it suggests open possibilities for individual writers’ choices in their representations of audience and in their creativities with rhetorical features within a particular genre.

**Audience Research within Second Language Writing**

To extend the discussion of audience to second language (L2) writing, we need explore the unique issues pertaining to the context of L2 writing, such as cross-cultural differences in L2 writers’ audience conceptualization or their competence levels in manipulating linguistic and rhetorical devices for audiences. Below, a brief literature review on audience research within L2 writing is presented. Despite the significant role of writers’ sense of audience in writing, only a handful of empirical studies have specifically addressed audience issues in L2 writing (Connor, 1987; Hinds, 1987; Johns, 1993; Mangelsdorf et al., 1990; Raimes, 1985; Scarcella, 1984; Zainuddin, 1995). These studies were each conducted from one of the following research frameworks: (a) contrastive rhetoric, (b) process-based, and (c) social view. Table 1 presents a summary of this classification.

**Contrastive Rhetoric Approaches in Second Language Writing Research**

Connor (1996b) defined contrastive rhetoric as “an area of research in second language acquisition that identifies problems in writing exhibited by second language writers and attempts to explain them by referring to the linguistic and rhetorical features of the first language.” (p. 233). Over three decades since Kaplan’s (1966) inaugural study, *Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education*, contrastive rhetoric was concerned primarily of the linguistic and
rhetorical features in ESL students’ writing. Hence, many research studies in contrastive rhetoric utilized text analytic methods, developed in text linguistics or written discourse analysis. (Connor, 1996a; Leki, 1991). Based on the theory of L1 transfer, contrastive rhetoric conceptualized foreign-ness or differences manifested in ESL students’ writing as the influences of their mother tongues (L1) (Connor, 1996a).

Table 1

**L2 Audience Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Views</th>
<th>Social View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frameworks</td>
<td>Cognitive Views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>How do writers’ textual adaptations to audience differ across languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Text Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hinds, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scarcella, 1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Connor (1987) and Hinds (1987) investigated cross-cultural differences in writing across languages. These studies attended to inferring writers’ sense of audience from textual features presumably used to address audiences. Specifically, possible cross-cultural differences in writers’ sense of audience are found in Hinds’ (1987) work on “writer responsibility versus reader responsibility.” Based on his typology, Hinds proposed that each language and each culture has different (implicit) expectations or regulations regarding the roles/responsibilities that writers/speakers and readers/listeners adopt for communication. For example, in a language of
writer-responsibility such as English, it is the writer who takes the primary responsibility for effective communication. If there is a communication problem, it is assumed that the writer’s ideas are not clear enough. Thus, English L1 writers learn to provide readers with explicit transition devices, because those devices are landmarks with which readers can follow the writer’s logic through text. Adversely, in Japanese it is the reader who is primarily responsible for effective communication. If there is a breakdown in communication, it is assumed that readers are not attentive to or wise enough to understand the writer’s logic. Hinds’ (1987) typology has important implications for L2 writing research because it suggests that each language and culture may have different norms regarding the audience’s role in written communication and the writers’ schemata about how to adapt to their audience could differ across cultures; moreover, it would be misleading if we consider L2 writers’ lack of audience awareness without appreciating their own cultural norms, such as strong adherence to readers’ responsibility in written communication.

Unlike Hinds’ suggestions, Connor (1987) did not find significant cultural differences in audience conceptualizations when comparing four different countries (England, Finland, Germany, and the U.S.). Utilizing the Persuasive Strategy Scale (PSS; Delia, Kline, & Burleson, 1979), Connor examined the relationship between writing quality and writers’ levels of audience awareness reflected by argumentative patterns in student essays. The results of her study indicated that the measured levels of audience awareness were positively associated with the holistic ratings of those essays, regardless of the writers’ country of origin. Based on the results, Connor suggested that writers’ socio-cognitive abilities are a more important factor than cultural differences to determine the persuasiveness of a text to the reader. However, Connor’s conclusion regarding the lack of cross-cultural differences in audience adaptation appears
premature, because she collected data only from European countries. The cultural differences with respect to argumentation among European writers may not be sensitive enough to reveal cross-cultural differences in audience adaptation.

Scarcella (1984) compared the ways that non-native English speaking (NNES) and native English speaking (NES) writers manipulated textual features in order to accommodate audiences. Specifically, Scarcella explored how NNES writers differ from NES writers in terms of their skills for engaging readers’ attention and establishing themes clearly for readers. Using textual analyses of essay samples by NES and NNES writers, Scarcella identified various types of attention-gathering devices (e.g., cataphoric reference, interrogatives, direct assertions, etc.). The results of her study found two cross-cultural differences: (a) while all the NES writers utilized one or more of these attention-gathering devices, only 58% of the NNES writers used at least one of these devices; (b) while the NES essays contained all types of these devices, the NNES essays heavily relied on direct assertions and historical context. In addition, Scarcella identified several theme-clarifying devices (e.g., explicit statements, pre-sequences, repetition of key words and phrases, etc.). While the NES writers preferred to use explicit statements and pre-sequences, the NNES writers tended to use repetition, paraphrases, and explanations. It merits noting that the clarifying devices the NNES writers used were primarily aimed at laying a common foundation between readers and the writers themselves. The study results have implications for L2 writers: (a) L2 writers’ level of audience awareness guides their linguistic/rhetorical choices in clarifying themes for readers and securing their attention; (b) L2 writers may foreground overly lengthy orientations to build a common ground with readers in the U.S. due to their limited cultural knowledge of the readers as well as textual devices to adapt to their audiences. Therefore, it is suggested that L2 writing teachers need not only instruct L2 writers to be more
conscious of audience but also provide them with the cultural norms and expectations that their audiences are likely to place on writing.

Despite its strength in highlighting a cross-cultural comparison, the contrastive rhetoric approach fails to address the fact that L2 writers’ competence in writing (particularly their conceptualization of and adaptations to audiences) could take developmental courses. For example, Mohan and Lo (1985) suggested that Chinese students’ inability to organize essays in English do not stem from the writers’ cultural backgrounds (i.e., transference from Chinese rhetorical patterns) but are the developmental problems of unskilled writers. They attributed those Chinese students’ poor rhetorical ability to their previous education with English language, and suggested that L2 writing research attended more to L2 students’ previous educational experiences. Therefore, a longitudinal research design that investigates developmental changes in L2 writers’ conceptualizations and adaptations of audience over time could help expand our understanding of L2 writing.

*Process-based Approaches in Second Language Writing Research*

Process-based composition researchers examined how writers’ representations of audience operate in the actual process of writing, typically utilizing ‘think-aloud’ methods. Two such research studies (Raimes, 1985; Zainuddin, 1995) warrant special attention because they scrutinized the effects of various aspects of audience in L2 writing (e.g., levels of audience specification and audience awareness, audience types addressed) on writing processes and products. The findings of both studies were consistent with those of audience research in L1 writing in that L2 writers with higher sensitivity to audience tend to produce better writing. However, both studies failed to find differential effect of audience specification (general vs. specific) on both writing processes and products. Along with these two studies, Mangelsdorf et al.
(1990), which investigated international students’ adaptation to audiences, is also worthy of attention given its attention to the influence of the students’ interactions with their social contexts on their adaptation to audience.

Raimes (1985) focused on unskilled L2 writers’ awareness of audiences in their composing processes. In Raimes’ study, unskilled L2 writers, while being tape recorded, were asked to think-aloud while composing on a given topic. Half of the participants were assigned to a topic with no specification of audience or purpose (Topic A), whereas the other half of the participants were given a similar topic with specific audience and purpose (Topic B). Results of the compose-aloud protocol analyses indicated that the specification of audience and purpose made no distinctive difference to the students’ writing processes and products. According to Raimes, for these unskilled L2 writers, the effectiveness in communication with readers was a rather secondary concern because they were more likely absorbed in expressing their ideas in English. This result is important because it suggests that for unskilled L2 writers, linguistic proficiency levels may diminish the influence of audience awareness on writing processes and its results. Consequently, future audience study in L2 writing need to continue to take into account writers’ linguistic proficiency.

Zainuddin (1995), using a sample of Malaysian international students, investigated how L2 writers’ level of familiarity with a given audience (familiar vs. unfamiliar) influenced the frequency of writers’ uses of audience-related strategies. The participants were asked to write two argumentative essays while engaging in a think-aloud procedure. The results suggested that L2 writers’ familiarity with audience had no distinctive influence on their use of writing strategies. According to Zainuddin, the L2 writers who participated in her study seemed to create idiosyncratic or alternative representations of audience, even when the assigned audience was
not familiar to them. This suggests that audience conceptualization in L2 writing is subject to individual differences, which then warrants further investigation. Future research may benefit from investigating individual differences in L2 writers’ audience conceptualization and adaptation.

Using international student writers, Magelsdorf et al. (1990) replicated previous research by Roen and Willey (1988) that used L1 writers to investigate at which point of the writing process writers maximize the audience-cuing effect (i.e., bringing the writer’s attention to the audience). As a way to elevate the L2 writers’ audience sensitivity, Mangelsdorf et al. gave an audience-prompt questionnaire to the L2 writers at the following time-points: (a) no attention to audience, (b) attention to audience before and during drafting, and (c) attention to audience before and during revising. Though the results did not yield a significant difference across the time points, they still had interesting results. The writing samples of the L2 writers clearly suggested that their sense of audience reflected the values and textual conventions of their discourse community. More importantly, Mangelsdorf et al. (1990) found that the L2 writers constructed their sense of audience based on peer responses to their essays and their own observations to context surrounding their potential audiences, such as newspapers, televisions, and a U.S. university. In essence, Mangelsdorf et al.’s study suggests that L2 writers construct their audiences based on their direct and indirect participation in broad socio-cultural contexts surrounding their potential readers. This then provides evidence that L2 writers’ audience conceptualization reflects their own interactions with people and texts in a given social context.

Social Views in Second Language Writing Research

The social view of L2 writing primarily emphasizes the socialization processes by which L2 writers acquire an adequate sense of audience or discourse modes in a given rhetorical
context (Johns, 1993). Johns’ (1993) study of successful L2 writers’ grant proposals is an illustration of how L2 writers are able to obtain an accurate understanding of specific audiences, and then adapt to them. Specifically, Johns’ interviews with L2 grant writers portrayed the processes by which the L2 writers came to know their target audiences and adapt their proposals accordingly. Given that the L2 grant writers and their audiences belong to the same discourse community, the grant writers began their writing process by attempting to discover whether their proposed research was consistent with the current trends in the discipline. The grant writers also reviewed recently accepted grant proposals and current journals, conversed with other researchers, and talked to members of granting agencies “in the know” via phone calls and e-mails. In this way, they obtained useful tips for an ideal, generalized audience of peer reviewers within the discourse community. Subsequently, the grant writers were able to narrow their conceptualizations of audience to the reviewers in a particular granting agency by reading the reviewers’ recent papers and conference abstracts. In short, in writing a grant proposal the L2 grant writers revealed their keen awareness of how to consider audience throughout the writing processes.

Johns’ (1993) study strongly suggested that L2 writers need to be highly aware of their own purposes for writing, interests/values of real audiences, and appropriate genres for specific rhetorical contexts. Her main argument was that L2 students in general need to learn discipline-specific expectations about the textual and argumentative structures of writing tasks, as did the focal grant writers who participated in the study. In gaining such knowledge, L2 students may have to make a conscious effort to investigate the needs and expectations of real audiences in their disciplines. This is possible only when they immerse themselves in the discursive practices
of a given academic discipline, which is the reason why audience researchers in L2 writing need to pay special attention to L2 students’ socialization processes.

In sum, from the literature review, it appears imperative to understand the social processes by which L2 student writers learn discipline-specific discourse or genres through ongoing interactions with people and texts within their academic discourse communities.

**Disciplinary Socialization**

Social constructionism suggests that knowledge and reality are community-generated and maintained (Bizzell, 1982; Bruffee, 1986; Kress, 1989). Thus, when newcomers are initiated into a discourse community, they need to acquire community-specific discourse or what their fellow community members consider as prominent issues, relevant arguments, and appropriate linguistic choices (Bizzell, 1982). It follows that newcomers of a particular academic discipline such as first-year college students (Bartholomae, 1985) or international graduate students (Dong, 1998; Fox, 1994; Shen, 1989) need to undergo certain socialization/enculturation processes, by which they get access to what their academic discipline expects as norms in terms of contents and structures of writing. The notion of disciplinary socialization is an elusive concept because within one academic discipline, people’s literacy practices are heterogeneous and complex rather than uniform (Bazerman, 1994); yet, a series of studies suggest some common developmental trends that disciplinary members tend to take on (Bazerman, 1980, 1985; Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Berkenkotter et al., 1988; Dudley-Evans, 1991). Specifically, the findings of these studies suggested that students’ mastery of academic writing styles results from their learning the beliefs, conventions, and values endorsed by their academic disciplines.

Berkenkotter and her colleagues (1988), for example, examined the processes by which a first-year Ph. D. student (Nate) mastered the writing styles expected by his graduate program.
The data were collected over an academic year from various sources (e.g., researcher’s interviews with the participant, student’s weekly self reports and writing samples). The study revealed the participant’s struggle with new subject knowledge and unfamiliar rhetorical styles at his initial stage. Specifically, Nate’s writing during his early months in the program suffered from informal register, lack of cohesion and thematic unity, and inappropriate diction. However, at the end of his first year in the program, the participant gained substantial control over the academic writing demanded by the program. In essence, the findings suggested that a novice writer should achieve both declarative (i.e., subject knowledge) and procedural knowledge (i.e., rhetorical and linguistic conventions).

Dudley-Evans (1991) investigated supervisors’ comments on drafts of a Ph.D. thesis. Given that graduate students in the process of writing theses were regarded as apprentice writers, Dudley-Evans assumed that supervisors’ comments on students’ drafts would reflect the conventions of a given academic community. The supervisors’ comments were classified into various aspects of the genre conventions (e.g., content, language). The findings suggested that supervisors’ comments instantiated the existence of a discourse community with community-specific expectations and conventions into which graduate students become socialized.

In investigating the disciplinary socialization process, some studies utilized a sample of L2 student writers (Casanave, 1995; Dong, 1998; Prior, 1998; Riazi, 1997). Casanave (1995) explored how a culturally diverse group of first-year doctoral students are socialized into a sociology discipline. Throughout the 18 month-long ethnographic study, she found that students’ previous literacy practices, personal interests, convictions, and values influenced their disciplinary experience and consequently, the ways that students appear to engage in a given disciplinary practice in a large variety of ways. Based on this finding, Casanave (1995) argued
that the prevalent notion of disciplinary socialization tends to oversimplify the processes of individual students’ responding to their disciplinary experiences and constructing their own writing contexts. Instead, she suggested that the nature of disciplinary writing and socialization should be understood as “highly complex, interactive, and locally situated, and therefore not fully predictable” (p. 86).

Prior (1998, chapter 4) explored student writers’ disciplinary socialization processes along with their personal discursive histories. He reconstructed the trajectories in which two international students (Mai and Teresa) participated in their disciplinary communities. Prior described the drastically different developmental paths taken by these two focal students in their processes of writing theses, starting from their development of research proposals to the finishing of final texts. Though Mai and Teresa were given the same writing assignment (i.e., developing a research proposal for a thesis) and worked with the same academic advisor in the same graduate program, they were involved in different modes of participation. Specifically, Mai was involved in very limited range of interactions with faculty members and peers. She chose her research topic from her advisor’s suggestion and worked on her thesis in isolation. To the contrary, Teresa chose her topic from her own reflection and actively situated it on the line of her own personal/professional career. Consequently, Teresa could develop an authentic purpose of her research – such as communicating with not only her committee but also the educational board in her home country. In addition, Teresa actively sought feedback on her proposal from diverse sources both in- and out of class. Different modes of participation can also be reflected in the final texts of students. In Prior’s (1998) study, the final thesis of Teresa revealed deep intertextuality, thorough analyses, and clear presentations, while Mai’s final thesis revealed large traces of plagiarism. Though Prior did not entirely disregard the influence of the students’
individual personalities or competencies on their modes of participation, he rather emphasized that the students’ relationships with people in the community importantly contributed to such different modes of participation.

Riazi (1997) investigated how four Iranian graduate students acquire disciplinary literacy in their graduate programs in Canada during five months. Riazi reported that when the students were given writing assignments in their graduate seminars, they reconstructed the tasks for themselves. Specifically, the students perceived the tasks somewhat differently from their professors; they also formulated the goals of the tasks based on their own personal, educational, and career objectives. Riazi analyzed the students’ composing strategies and categorized them into four distinctive domains: (a) cognitive strategies (e.g., note-making, use of mother tongue knowledge and skill transfer from L1, inference), (b) metacognitive strategies (e.g., planning, rationalizing appropriate formats, monitoring), (c) social strategies (e.g., getting feedback from professors & peers), and (d) search strategies (e.g., searching and using libraries, using guidelines, using others’ writing as model). Based on the results of her study, Riazi suggested that L2 students’ acquisition of disciplinary literacy involves “an interactive social-cognitive process” (p. 105) in that L2 students utilized cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies interactively and extensively when they produced their academic papers.

Dong (1998) examined some differences between native and non-native graduate students in their thesis/dissertation writing experiences. She conducted a survey of graduate students in science and their thesis/dissertation advisors regarding their perceived influences of the quality and quantity of their advisors’ assistance, social networks, and their linguistic and cultural backgrounds on their thesis/dissertation writing. The results suggested that non-native students have more difficulties in participating in their disciplinary communities than their native
peers. Specifically, due to their lack of social networks and social support systems, non-native students have less opportunities of participating in the disciplinary dialogue and more difficulties of utilizing writing resources. They also have less opportunities of writing for publication due to their linguistic/cultural differences as well as their lack of previous experience of writing a research paper in English. The quality of their working with their advisors was less collaborative and more perfunctory.

In sum, the literature review clearly suggests that student writers (both L1 and L2 students) undergo disciplinary socialization processes by which they acquire a sense of genres or discourse modes privileged in their academic disciplines in order to adequately address disciplinary audience in their texts (Berkenkotter et al., 1988; Dudley-Evans, 1991). Despite their disciplinary socialization, writers construct their own representations of audience and make rhetorical choice based on their situated interactions with social contexts as well as their own previous socio-cultural experiences (Casanave, 1995; Prior, 1998; Riazi, 1997). In addition, non-native students (L2 writers) have different experiences in their disciplinary socialization processes from their native peers (L1 writers) (Dong, 1998), suggesting possible differences in their representations of, and adaptations to audience as well.

Metadiscourse: Discursive Construction of Audience

The social view of written communication suggests that the text is a site where the writer and the reader are engaged in dialogic interactions based on shared interpretive practices. Several researchers have examined discursive manifestations of the writer-reader interaction in texts. For example, they have examined how writers construct their identities in academic essays (e.g., Kuo, 1999; Ivanic, 1998) or how writers express their own affective and epistemic positions with respect to knowledge or propositions in academic texts. Writers do so through stance markers
such as hedge, emphatics, or attitude markers (Barton, 1993; Hyland, 1999, 2000), evaluative markers (Huston & Thompson, 2000; Thetela, 1997), and theme selections (Gosden, 1993). Recently, Hyland (2001a) focused on the ways that writers explicitly address readers. Taken together, these studies suggest that the writer’s competence to manage interactions with the reader is the key factor to effective academic writing.

One can group those discursive devices studied as manifesting the writer-reader interaction in texts under the term of metadiscourse (Vande Kopple, 1985). In the next two subsections, I will introduce the concept of metadiscourse and review recent studies that used metadiscourse text analysis.

The Conceptual Advancement of Metadiscourse

It was Halliday’s (1973, 1975, 1985) semiotic view of language that provided the groundwork for the concept of metadiscourse. Halliday focused on how texts reveal social interactions through linguistic devices. In his theory of functional grammar, Halliday (1985) proposes that meanings are realized through linguistic structures and points to the importance of looking into the function of the linguistic item in a grammatical structure. This functional model of language suggests a predictive relationship between linguistic forms and the social meanings they convey. In other words, the linguistic forms in a text appear to guide the ways that one produces and interprets the text in a given social context.

According to Halliday (1985), the semantic system of human language fulfills three metafunctions: (a) Ideational function, which conveys our experience of the world outside as well as inside us and represents content messages in terms of participants, objects, circumstances, and processes; (b) Interpersonal function, which is concerned with expressing writers’ (or speakers’) attitudes toward the ideational contents and establishing human relationships with
readers (or listeners); and (c) *Textual function*, which organizes ideational and interpersonal meanings into a cohesive, logical unity of discourse.

Vande Kopple’s (1985) work provides a more elaborate notion of metadiscourse. According to him, metadiscourse is “discourse about discourse or communication about communication” (p. 83). More specifically, he wrote,

> On one level we supply information about the subject of our text. On this level we expand propositional content. On the other level, the level of metadiscourse, we do not add propositional material but help our readers organize, classify, interpret, evaluate, and react to such material” (p. 83).

In context of writing, his definition of metadiscourse implies that it is a set of linguistic devices to enable writers to engage their audience in texts purposefully. Based on this conceptualization, Vande Kopple (1985) proposed a comprehensive classification system that contains seven categories: Text connectives, Code glosses, Illocution makers, Validity markers, Narrators, Attitude markers, and Commentary (for more detail, see Vande Kopple, 1985, pp. 83-85). From a methodological standpoint, Vande Kopple’s system, as compared to Halliday’s, can be regarded as an advance because it allows researchers to more definitively classify linguistic devices according to their functions in a given text.

Vande Kopple’s (1985) other contribution lies in his assertion that metadiscourse items should be considered in terms of their rhetorical—that is, audience-related-- functions in the text, an idea that has been well accepted by other researchers in composition. For example, Hyland (2000) wrote that metadiscourse is “an essential element of interaction [between the writer and the reader]” (p.110). Likewise, Abdi (2002) emphasized interpersonal metadiscourse as “an indicator of the attempts made by writers to create an interaction with their reader, reach their
audience and express their own truth-value judgments about the ongoing proposition” (pp. 141-142).

Based on these conceptualizations, it appears that metadiscourse text analysis might be a good candidate to measure the writer’s sense of audience, as manifested by linguistic devices. Using this framework, writers use metadiscourse items in a text to invite audiences into a dialogue when (a) writers let audiences know their own epistemic positions (i.e., the writer’s attitudes toward propositions or knowledge); (b) writers anticipate possible responses and solicit agreements from the readers; and (c) writers establish certain interpersonal relationships with audiences.

**Interpersonal Metadiscourse Text Analysis**

By utilizing a metadiscourse text analysis strategy, Hyland (1999) investigated how L1 writers rhetorically manage interactions with audiences in academic texts. Specifically, he analyzed the use of *stance markers* in 56 research articles published in leading journals in eight disciplines using a classification system including the following five types of stance markers (Hyland, 1999, pp. 103-104).

1. **Hedges** are items such as *possible, might, perhaps* and *believe* which indicate the writer’s decision to withhold complete commitment to an accompanying proposition.

2. **Emphatics** such as *it is obvious, definitely* and *of course*, mark the expression of certainty and emphasize the force of a proposition.

3. **Attitude markers** express the writer’s affective attitude to propositions in more varied ways than evidential items, conveying surprise, obligation, agreement, importance, frustration, and so on, rather simply commitment. They are typically writer-oriented and are most often signaled by attitude verbs (e.g., *I agree, we prefer*), necessity
modals (*should, have to, must*), sentence adverbs (*unfortunately, hopefully*), and adjectives (*appropriate, logical, remarkable*).

(4) **Relational markers** are devices that explicitly address readers, functioning to either selectively focus their attention, emphasize a relationship or include them as participants in the text situation. Relational markers include second person pronouns (*we find here, let us now turn to*), question forms (*why accept 2? Where does this lead?*), imperatives (*consider, recall that, note that*), and digressions which directly address the audience (*this will be familiar to those …*)

(5) **Person markers** refer to the use of first person pronouns and possessive adjectives to present propositional, affective and interpersonal information. The pronoun system is an important feature of stance as writers can present their material or perspectives subjectively (*we believe, my analyses involved*), interpersonally (*we can see from this, let us consider*), or objectively (*it is possible that, the data show*).

The frequency counts of the five stance markers in the corpus revealed a considerably broad use, though the frequency of each marker varied across disciplines. Based on this result, Hyland (1999) argued that writers’ rhetorical management of interactions with audiences is central to persuasive academic writing and knowledge production itself.

As compared to his 1999 study, it is noteworthy that Hyland (2001a) called researchers’ attention to the lack of appropriate research on discursive items by which writers seek to acknowledge the presence of audiences explicitly. He asserted that much of the research studying dialogic relationships between the writer and audience have unilaterally highlighted writer-oriented features (e.g., stance markers, hedges, emphatics, evaluative comments) through which writers manage their authorial images in relation to audiences. From this point of view, Hyland
examined reader-oriented metadiscourse items in academic articles published in the leading journals of eight disciplines, using the coding scheme which includes the following five reader-oriented metadiscourse items (modified from Hyland, 2001a, p. 553).

1. Questions (real and rhetorical)
   - What is it then the Zapatistas want?
   - What would you do in this situation?

2. Inclusive first person, indefinite, and second person pronouns
   - As we can see, their algorithm is practical for solving the problems with up to 35 jobs.
   - Unless your application requires all or most of these advantages you should consider natural gas-fired infrared heating.

3. Directives and adjectival predicates controlling a complement to-clause
   - Note that xylem pressure values are quoted as absolute pressures.
   - A distinction must be made between cytogenetic and molecular resolution.

4. References to shared knowledge
   - The obviously correct relation between these two lengths is a = b.

5. Asides addressed to the reader
   - And – as I believe many TESOL professionals will readily acknowledge – critical thinking has now begun to make its mark, particularly in the area of L2 composition.

In addition to frequency analyses of the metadiscourse items, interviews with experienced researchers from each discipline revealed various rhetorical purposes that writers intended to achieve through specific metadiscourse items. Specifically, the findings suggest that the main rhetorical purposes that writers seek to achieve with audience features are: “soliciting reader
solidarity” (p. 557) and “crafting reader agreement” (p. 563). Hyland suggested that successful academic writing requires writers’ clear awareness of audience and their ability to engage audiences appropriately, particularly in terms of establishing an interpersonal relationship with audience and soliciting a desired response from audiences.

In another of his later works, Hyland (2001b) focused on writers’ *self-mention terms* including *first person pronouns* (e.g., *I, me, my, us,* and *our*) and *self-citations* used in academic research articles. A metadiscourse text analysis revealed that the first person pronouns *we* and *I* were the most frequently used devices in humanities and social science articles. From this finding, Hyland asserted that the strategic use of self-mention helps the writer to construct credible authorial identity and to maintain appropriate interactions with audiences. As per the authorial identity, specifically, self-mention allows the writer to (a) construct the self as a credible, competent colleague in a disciplinary community; (b) claim the ownership or originality for his/her work; and (c) convey the degree of writer’s confidence in their arguments. In the interpersonal aspect, self-mention allows the writer to invite audiences as equal co-participants in the dialogue by presenting himself/herself as a person, and to pledge their views to audiences directly. Hyland concluded that self-mention plays a significant rhetorical role in “mediating the relationship between writers’ arguments and their discourse communities, allowing writers to create an identity as both disciplinary servant and persuasive originator” (p. 223). Therefore, it appears as if researchers should include self-mention markers in the metadiscourse coding system for audience awareness.

Taken together, Hyland (1999, 2000, 2001a, 2001b) underscored the prominence of the writer-reader interaction in academic texts. A series of works by Hyland (1999, 2001a, 2001b) suggested that metadiscourse text analysis is instrumental in investigating writers’ sense of
audience, and it is important to use a comprehensive coding scheme. Furthermore, the categories of interpersonal metadiscourse he used in text analysis provided a useful tool for an audience research. However, his work did not utilize discourse-based interview procedures and thus limits the understanding of what assumptions writers have about their audiences and what writers intended to do with specific metadiscourse items in terms of audience adaptation (Nystrand, 1990).

_L2 writers’ Uses of Metadiscourse_

The important role of metadiscourse in writing was also underscored in L2 writing research (Hyland, 1994, 2004; Intaraprawat & Steffensen, 1995; Richards & Skelton, 1991; Skelton, 1988). For example, Skelton (1988) suggested that L2 writers need to develop their competences to appropriately use hedges in their academic writing in order to communicate with audiences with more subtlety, precision, and discrimination. Similarly, Richards and Skelton (1991) argued that L2 writers’ appropriate use of hedges is a significant factor of L2 writers’ academic writing competence. Some scholars reported unhedged, direct styles of writing as one of the major problematic characteristics of L2 writing (e.g., Hyland, 1994).

Several studies investigated L2 writers’ uses of metadiscourse features in reference to audience awareness. Specifically, Intaraprawat and Steffensen (1995) investigated the relationship between the use of metadiscourse features and writing quality using a sample of L2 students enrolled in a U.S. university. Based on the holistic scores of persuasive essays written by L2 students, the researchers selected six good essays and six poor essays, and analyzed metadiscourse features within the 12 essays based on Vande Kopple’s (1985) seven categories of metadiscourse. The results suggested that the good essays exhibited significantly higher numbers of metadiscourse items as well as a greater variety of types than did the poor essays. One
interesting result was that the good essays had a higher proportion of interpersonal metadiscourse than textual metadiscourse features whereas the poor essays had a higher proportion of textual metadiscourse than interpersonal metadiscourse. In short, the results of Intaraprawat and Steffensen (1995) suggested that proficient writers are more keenly aware of their audiences’ needs/expectations and more actively utilize linguistic strategies for adapting their texts to those audiences. The researchers strongly suggested the necessity of the teaching of metadiscourse forms and functions in helping L2 writers to increase their awareness of audience.

Hyland (2004) investigated metadiscourse features in L2 students’ writing. With a corpus of 240 masters and doctoral dissertations written by Hong Kong students, he analyzed interpersonal metadiscourse features in addition to five categories of textual metadiscourse (transitions, frame markers, endophoric markers, evidentials, and code glosses). The results showed that the doctoral dissertations exhibited a significantly higher number of interpersonal metadiscourse features than did the masters theses, indicating that the more advanced students attempted to engage their audiences and craft their texts to be more reader-friendly. Specifically, the doctoral dissertations included significantly more relational markers and self-mentions than did the masters’ theses. This result suggested that compared to novice L2 writers, advanced L2 writers may express their own voices with more confidence (self-mentions) and also more actively invite their audiences as co-participants into written communication (relational markers). The results also revealed that hedges are the most frequently used among the five categories of interpersonal metadiscourse, amounting for 41% of all interpersonal metadiscourse features. The study also supported the disciplinary differences in the use of interpersonal metadiscourse between social science disciplines and science disciplines as suggested by the previous research on metadiscourse in L1 writing (Abdi, 2002; Hyland, 1999, 2001a).
In summary, L2 writing research studies with a focus on interpersonal metadiscourse also suggested the strong relationship between interpersonal metadiscourse and audience awareness. However, few studies have investigated cross-cultural differences in the use of metadiscourse in relation to audience awareness. One of the rare examples is Muranen (1993) who reported the less frequent use of metadiscourse in economic texts written in Finnish compared to those in English. In essence, a cross-cultural study is strongly called for particularly elucidating the link between writers’ use of metadiscourse and their schemata of writer-audience relationships.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This chapter describes the research questions, the selection of participants and writing samples, the data collection procedures, and the data analyses.

Research Questions

In the most general terms, the present study investigated cross-cultural differences between U.S. and South Korean graduate students attending U.S. universities in their adaptation to disciplinary audiences, especially through their production of interpersonal metadiscourse features in academic writing. This study also examined how those graduate students’ audience conceptualization and adaptation qualitatively changed over time as they participated in discursive practices that socialized them into their academic disciplines. Specifically, I examined interpersonal metadiscourse markers appearing in authentic academic papers that U.S. and South Korean graduate students wrote for classes, conferences, or theses. In an effort to take a close look at student writers’ own perspectives, I also interviewed a subset of writers regarding their audience conceptualizations and adaptation, and their specific intentions in using interpersonal metadiscourse devices.

Based on the literature reviewed in the preceding chapter, the specific research questions investigated this study are as follows.

1. What are some differences between the ways that U.S. and South Korean graduate students conceptualize and adapt to audiences in their academic writing?
2. What are some ways in which U.S. and South Korean graduate students’ conceptualization of, and adaptation to, audiences change in conjunction with their participations in disciplinary socialization practices over two consecutive semesters?

3. What are some differences between the ways that U.S. and South Korean graduate students deploy interpersonal metadiscourse markers in their academic writing?

4. What are some ways in which U.S. and South Korean graduate students’ deployment of interpersonal metadiscourse markers change in conjunction with their participation in disciplinary socialization practices over two consecutive semesters?

Participants

The sample was a convenience sample. Participants were recruited from four universities in the U.S. through the researcher’s informal networks. In order to reduce possible biases resulting from the participants’ knowledge of the specific purpose of the study, they were not told explicitly about the focus. Rather, they were told only that the purpose of the study was to examine cross-cultural differences in academic writing between U.S. and South Korean graduate students in the U.S. All the participants were given an appropriate consent form either via electronically or in person.

The final sample was comprised of 19 U.S. students and 25 South Korean international students enrolled in a variety of graduate programs. To assure some degree of prior socialization into South Korean patterns of discourse, only South Korean students who had graduated high school and college in South Korea were selected as participants. No restrictions were applied to age, gender, or academic majors. Of the 19 U.S. participants, 11 (57.89 %) were female and 8 (42.11 %) were male. The mean age of U.S. participants was 29.58 years, ranging from 22 to 46 years old ($SD = 6.47$). They varied in terms of degree pursued (master’s level = 8, or 42.11 %;
doctorate level = 11, or 57.89 %), and academic major (education = 15, or 78.95 %; humanities = 2, or 10.53 %; social science = 1, or 5.26 %; natural science = 1, or 5.26 %). The mean of U.S. participants’ self-reported GRE verbal scores was 532.73 (valid n = 11; SD = 112.97), ranging from 370 to 770.

Given that three out of the 25 South Korean participants did not submit second writing samples, the data from 22 students were used for the present study. The 22 Korean students consisted of 16 females (72.73 %) and 6 males (27.27 %). The mean age was 30.33 years, ranging from 25 to 35 (SD = 3.10). The South Korean participants also varied in degree pursued (master’s level = 8, or 36.36 %; doctorate level = 14, or 63.64 %) and academic major (education = 10, or 45.45 %; humanities = 5, or 22.73 %; social science = 3, or 13.64 %; natural science = 2, or 9.09 %; engineering = 2, or 9.09 %). The mean of the South Korean students’ self-reported GRE Verbal scores was 583.53 (valid n = 17, SD = 103.68), ranging from 340 to 750. The mean of their self-reported TOEFL scores was 250.27 (equivalent to 600 – 603 in paper-based score; SD = 14.19), ranging from 220 to 270; the mean score of their self-reported TWE scores was 4.72 (valid n = 16, SD = .48), ranging from 4.00 to 5.50. The South Korean participants had resided in the U.S. for an average of 31.41 months (SD = 27.77), ranging from 8 to 97 months.

From the entire participant pool, four U.S. and four South Korean students participated in the interview phases of this study. To aid in comparability, all eight were students at the same major Midwestern university, all were pursuing their doctoral degrees, and all were majoring in educational studies. Demographic information describing the interviewees is presented in Table 2.
Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of the Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>TOEFL (TWE)</th>
<th>GRE Verbal</th>
<th>Months of graduate study completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Gifted Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Ed. Technology</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Language &amp; Literacy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Language &amp; Literacy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haejin</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Ed. Technology</td>
<td>243 (N.A)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanie</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Gifted Education</td>
<td>253 (4.0)</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noorie</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Ed. Philosophy</td>
<td>237 (4.5)</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumie</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Language &amp; Literacy</td>
<td>223 (4.5)</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures

Demographic Survey

Participants were asked to provide the following background information: (a) name, (b) age, (c) gender, (d) nationality, (e) academic major, (f) degree pursued, (g) course work, (h) month and year in which they began their current degree programs, and (i) GRE verbal score, if applicable. The South Korean international students were additionally asked to provide two more pieces of information: (g) self-reported TOEFL and TWE scores; and (h) the duration of their total stay in the U.S.

Survey of Writers’ Disciplinary Socialization and Disciplinary Audience Awareness

In addition to demographic questions, the survey questionnaire consisted of two parts (Appendix B). Part 1 included the following seven questions: (a) number of academic papers written for the semester, (b) average number of citations in their academic papers, (c) amount of reading per week (in pages), (d) the scholarly journals to which they subscribe, (e) the professional associations to which they belong, (f) names of five scholars who contributed to the
field 10 years ago, and (g) names of five scholars who currently lead the field. The questions in Part 1 were intended to assess participants’ degree of immersion in their respective scholarly communities (e.g., amount of reading) and their degree of socialization in those communities (e.g., ability to name leading scholars). Because these items were generally arrayed along different scales (pages read, pages written, authorities cited) no attempt was made to consolidate these scales. In subsequent analyses, they remained seven separate indices.

Part 2 of the survey consisted of ten items, quantified by means of 5-point Likert-type scales. The items were developed by the researcher based on the findings of Berkenkotter, Huckin, and Ackerman (1988), whose frequently cited work studied qualitative changes in the academic writing of a first-year graduate student for one year. For example, in his early writing, the focal student in that research project manifested heavy reliance on first-person pronouns, dense information, and absence of organization. As the semesters proceeded, the student used more cohesion markers (e.g., logical connectives) and reader-based language, and more conformed more to disciplinary writing conventions. Based on these findings, some sample items for the present study are: ‘I pay little attention to organization and cohesion in my academic writing,’ ‘When writing an academic paper, I try to develop my arguments based on the scholarly literature I have reviewed,’ and ‘I make an effort to follow the conventional styles of academic writing in my discipline.’ These items were intended to assess the extent that the participants perceived themselves as addressing the needs and expectations of readers in their disciplines in terms of discourse contents/types and persuasive strategies. In subsequent analyses, several of the items in Part 2 of the survey were combined into a composite index of awareness of disciplinary audiences (see below).
Participants’ academic papers were subject to text analysis of interpersonal metadiscourse items. The current study investigated five categories of interpersonal metadiscourse markers, as identified and defined in Hyland (1999, 2004). According to Hyland, these five markers help maintain interactive and interpersonal relations with academic audiences:

1. **Self-mentions** are comprised of first person pronouns (I, me, my, mine, we, us, our, ours,) and other self-mention terms such as the researcher or the research team, which refer to the author exclusively. Self-mentions are key forms of interpersonal metadiscourse in academic writing because they help writers to construct authoritative, credible, and professional persona, and to establish appropriate levels of interpersonal engagement with their audiences (Hyland 1999, 2001b). Self-mentions also stress the originality of writers’ claims and seek ratification from audiences (Hyland, 2001b; Kuo, 1999).

2. **Hedges** allow writers to anticipate audience skepticism and to express their claims accordingly with precision, caution, and deference (Hyland, 1994, 1996, 1998, 1999). Deference to audiences ensues from a writer’s use of hedges because hedges avoid over-confidence about claims and seek acceptance/agreement from audiences. That is, by hedging their claims, writers make their claims more acceptable to audiences. The category of hedges includes terms like “proximals,” “deintensifiers,” and “perceptuals” (Rubin & Greene, 1992). The specific search items for hedges included about, almost, appear, approximately, assume, believed, (a certain) extent/amount/level, could/couldn’t, doubt, essentially, estimate, frequently, generally/in general, indicate, largely, likely, mainly, may, maybe, might, mostly, often, perhaps, plausible(ly), possible(ly),
presumable(ly), probable(ly), relatively, seem, sometimes/somewhat, suggest, suspect, unlikely, uncertain, unclear, usually, would/wouldn’t, and little/not understood.

3. **Boosters** emphasize force or writers’ certainty about the accompanying propositions. Boosters are sometimes called “intensifiers,” (Rubin & Greene, 1992), “emphasizers” (Silver, 2003), or “emphatics” (Hyland, 1999, 2000). In addition to propositional certainty, the use of boosters allows writers to express their high level of personal involvement with the topics (Chafe, 1986; Hyland, 1998, 1999) as well as invoking intimacy with audiences as co-players (Holmes, 1984). The specific search items for boosters included actually, always, apparent, believe, certain that, certainly, certainty, clearly/it is clear, conclusively, decidedly, definitely, demonstrate, determine, doubtless, essential, establish, evident(ly), in fact/the fact that, find/ found that, indeed, (we) know, it is known that, must (inference), never, no/beyond doubt, obvious(ly), of course, prove, we show, sure, (we) think, true, undoubtedly, well-known, and will/won’t.

4. **Attitude markers** express writers’ stances toward accompanying propositions. Attitude markers may express surprise, preference, importance, agreement, or obligation (Hyland, 1999, 2004). Attitude markers allow writers to signal in what ways they want audiences to respond to given propositions. For example, attitude markers in science research articles effectively persuade audiences by foregrounding information that the writers consider to be important or necessary in order for audiences to agree/accept their claims (Hyland, 1999). The specific search items for attitude markers included ! (exclamation mark), admittedly, I agree, amazingly, appropriate(ly), correct(ly), curious(ly), disappointing(ly), disagree, even x, fortunate(ly), have to, hopeful(ly), important(ly), interesting(ly), like (prefer), glad, pleased, must (obligation), need to (obligation), ought
to (obligation), prefer/preferable, remarkable, significantly, should (obligation), surprising(ly), unfortunate(ly), unusual(ly), and understandable(ly).

5. **Relational markers** function to explicitly acknowledge the presence of audiences and invoke them as participants in constructing knowledge in texts (Hyland, 1999, 2001a, 2001b, 2004). Relational markers are also referred to as “engagement markers” in Hyland (2004). The search items, phrases, or structures for relational markers include (a) the second person pronouns (you, your, yours), (b) first person plural pronouns that were inclusive of readers (we, our, us), (c) asides addressed to readers using dashes or parentheses, (d) questions (e.g., *Do specific teaching methods work better in an online environment?*), (e) directives, which guide audiences to respond to issues in a certain way suggested by writers, including imperatives (e.g., *Let me explain the issue in more detail.*), obligatory modal verbs addressed to audiences (e.g., *The following points should be considered.*) and adjectival predicates controlling a complement to-clause (e.g., *It is necessary to examine reading motivation; It is important to understand this theory.*) Inclusive first person (we) functions as a relational marker because it helps writers to assume shared knowledge, goals, and values with audiences, thus creating solidarity. Similarly, asides addressed to readers can create the effect of uniting writers to audiences by reinforcing their intimate relationship. Questions and directives are counted as relational markers because they solicit agreement from audiences by expressing the writers’ judgments of necessity or importance of the accompanying to-complement clauses, or because they instruct audiences to respond to issues in a certain way determined by the writers (Hyland, 2001a).
Coding of all interpersonal metadiscourse markers in participants’ writing samples was conducted with the assistance of WordSmith 4.0 (Smith, 2004), a text analysis software program. The search items input into the WordSmith dictionary for self-mentions were adopted from Hyland (1999, 2001b, 2004). After running the WordSmith 4.0 program (Smith, 2004) on participants’ writing samples, I reviewed each sample in order to search self-mention terms other than the first person pronouns.

The lexical items input into the search dictionaries for hedges, boosters, and attitude markers were adopted from the list of interpersonal metadiscourse items investigated in Hyland (2000, pp. 191-192). As a slight modification, apparent – which was originally classified in hedges in Hyland’s (2000) list – was excluded in the current investigation given that the item is frequently used synonymously with clear or obvious, rather than in a sense of “appearing as such but not necessarily so” (U.S. Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 2002). In addition, significant(ly) used as a synonym of important(ly), and need to used to as a synonym of should or ought to were added to attitude markers in the current investigation; however, when significant(ly) was used as a reference to statistical significance, it was not counted as an attitude marker.

The search items, phrases, and structures for relational markers were determined based on Hyland (1999, 2001a, 2001b, 2004). As a modification, I excluded a sub-type of “appeals to shared knowledge” of writers’ academic disciplines that Hyland (2001a) had investigated as relational markers. This was done in order to avoid ambiguity arising from judging “shared knowledge” of a discipline and the inability of computer programs to render such judgments.

Any potential overlap in the five categories of interpersonal metadiscourse items was eliminated. For example, all first person plural pronouns (we, our, us) were classified into either
self-mentions or relational markers depending on their usages in the sentential contexts, corresponding to Kuo’s (1999) distinction between “inclusive we” and “exclusive we.” Specifically, first person plural pronouns were classified as self-mentions when the items referred to the authors exclusively (the “royal we” or “exclusive we”), but they were considered as relational markers when denoting both writers and their audiences (“inclusive we”). When we as a relational marker was used as subject of an obligatory modal verb (e.g., we must, we need to, we ought to, or we should), the entire phrase was considered as an imperative and thus was counted as one relational marker. The distinction of whether obligatory modal verbs (must, need to, ought to, should) were used as attitude markers, relational markers, or boosters (in case of must) was made based on the sentential contexts in which those items were located. For instance, an obligatory modal verb, should, when addressed to audience, particularly in conjunction with inclusive we (e.g., we should), was coded as a relational marker, whereas it was coded as an attitude marker when it only expressed the writer’s appraisal of propositional information as conveying obligation (e.g., method instructors should act as a facilitator). As another instance, must was coded as an attitude marker when its sentential context signaled obligation, whereas it indicated the certainty of an accompanying proposition when its context indicated that it was being used as a booster (Hyland, 1998, 2000).

The WordSmith 4.0 program (Smith, 2004) detected the target lexical items, collocations, calculated their frequencies, and showed the sentential contexts in which those items were located. The software program was used to search the predetermined lexical items separately for each of the five metadiscourse categories and for each writing sample. Based on the outputs, the researcher carefully examined each interpersonal metadiscourse marker within its sentential context and decided whether the lexical item should be coded into one of the five categories (i.e.,
self-mentions, hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and relational markers). More scrupulous attention was given to the categorization of first pronouns and modal verbs. To ensure the accuracy of categorization, the process of search and coding for each writing sample was performed twice. The frequencies of interpersonal metadiscourse items per category were entered into a SPSS data file in order to be subject to statistical analyses.

*Semi-structured and Discourse-based Interviews*

Each interview session – conducted with one of four U.S. graduate students or one of four South Korean graduate students--consisted of both a semi-structured interview and a discourse-based interview focused on a specific writing product. The semi-structured interview questions mainly pertained to whether they consciously considered their readers and reader expectations, and how they attempted to engage their readers in their texts. These questions were asked to the interviewees in reference to their writing products. The interview questions were based in part on Wolvoord’s (1986) guide for student writers, some items of which asked the writers to analyze their audiences and audience expectations rather specifically. Some sample questions from a semi-structured interview included, “Did you think about any readers when you wrote this paper?,’” “Did you make any conscious effort to help your readers understand your ideas or become more involved in your topic?,’” and “Did you try to manipulate any words, phrases, or structures to help your readers understand your topic better?” (see Appendix C).

The procedure for the discourse-based interview followed the method outlined by Odell and his colleagues (Odell & Goswami, 1984; Odell, Goswami, & Herrington, 1983), who suggested that discourse-based interviewing is a useful method to probe into the writers’ reasons for making specific choices in their writing. Results of the metadiscourse analysis of interviewees’ writing samples served as the basis for determining the elements included in the
discourse-based interviews. The researcher selected the top three most frequently occurring interpersonal metadiscourse items per category in the interviewees’ papers, and highlighted the first ones among the sentences where each item was located. The question(s) used for the discourse-based interview was “Would you tell me why you used this item (phrase, structure) here?” and complementarily “What if you choose (an alternative item) instead of (the item chosen)?”

As will be explicated in a subsequent section, metadiscourse fell into one of five superordinate categories. Thus, ideally, for one metadiscourse category, a maximum of 12 discourse-based interview questions would have been asked to each nationality group of writers (i.e., the top three most frequent metadiscourse features per category × four student writers). However, actually much fewer interview questions were asked in each of the discourse-based interviews because of the following reasons: (a) in many cases, the actual occurrences of self-mentions (e.g., I, the author, or the researcher) and relational markers (e.g., question, directive, or asides addressed to readers) per paper were not up to three in total, and (b) subtypes of a metadiscourse category were limited; for example, as for self-mentions, no other types except first person singular pronoun (I, my, mine) appeared, and (c) likewise, for the categories of boosters and attitude markers, interviewees’ papers often produced less than three metadiscourse features, and even when one paper produced several attitude markers, only one feature was used more than twice and the rest of them were used only once. For instance, one of the U.S. students’ second writing samples produced only three metadiscourse features in total (one hedge and two attitude markers, but no self-mentions, boosters, and relational markers) from the entire text. In short, given the discourse-based interview procedures, the types of lexical items subjected to the discourse-based interviews were limited and did not vary.
Data Collection Procedures

Collecting Academic Writing Samples

Each participant provided electronic copies of his or her own academic papers written at two different points in time. They were instructed to send the researcher electronic copies of two papers that they had produced for fulfilling class requirements at two different times (i.e., Fall, 2003 and Spring, 2004 or Spring, 2004 and Summer, 2004/Fall, 2004). They were also told that the types of academic papers eligible for study in this project included literature reviews, research proposals, research papers, and critical essays; however, personal journals, bibliographies, or creative writing assignments were excluded, because those genres do not best represent disciplinary-based academic writing. Of the 44 participants at Time 1, three South Korean participants failed to provide their academic papers at Time 2. Of the 41 participants for whom full data sets were available, 28 (68.29 %) provided academic papers written in the semesters of Fall, 2003 and Spring, 2004; 11 (26.83 %) participants’ academic papers were written in the semesters of Spring, 2004 and Summer, 2004, and 2 (4.88 %) participants’ academic papers were written in the semesters of Spring, 2004 and Fall, 2004. The average of the time intervals between participants’ first and second writing samples was approximately 5.09 months (SD = 1.31). The genres of a participant’s two papers could not be controlled to be identical to each other. All papers were written in English. The 82 papers comprising the total sample of academic writing varied in length from 5 to 40 pages, excluding references, appendices, figures, and notes (which were not subject to analysis).

Obtaining Participants’ Responses to the Survey

Among participants, 18 U.S. and 22 South Korean students responded to a survey questionnaire at the time when they provided their second writing samples.
Interviewing

Each of the four U.S. and four Korean interviewees was interviewed twice (resulting in 16 sessions total). The average of the time intervals between the interviewees’ first and second interview was approximately 3.19 months for the U.S. and 1.86 months for the South Koreans. All the interviews but one were conducted within three weeks after they competed writing their respective papers. In the one interview conducted more than three weeks after the paper had been drafted, but the student, a South Korean, was continuing to plan research based on the paper because she intended to use it for her thesis.

I interviewed South Korean interviewees in Korean and U.S. interviewees in English. By allowing the South Korean interviewees to respond in their own native language, I expected that they could produce more comprehensive, accurate descriptions of what they had in mind. Particularly, given that the three of the South Korean interviewees had participated in their graduate programs only for less than a year, it was also suspected that the Korean interviewees might have difficulty in expressing themselves sufficiently in English. Each interview was conducted face-to-face and lasted about an hour. The entire interview session was audio-tape recorded.

For the discourse-based interviews, the interviewees read aloud the highlighted sentences or phrases in their papers (which included the three most frequently occurring interpersonal metadiscourse items per category in their papers). For each highlighted item, they explained their intentions in choosing that particular construction. In the cases where the explanations were incomplete or ambiguous, I asked the interviewees to elaborate their answers. In formulating interview probes, I also avoided suggesting words to help participants complete their thoughts. Instead, I would rephrase the interview question. Some of these discourse-based interviews were
longer than others depending on (a) the length of the writing sample upon which the interview was based and (b) the number of metadiscourse items used in the sample. Usually, about 10 to 20 minutes out of an hour-long interview session were allotted for the discourse-based interview part.

Transcribing

The 16 audio-taped interview sessions were transcribed verbatim by the researcher either in English or Korean. These interview transcripts were subject to further analysis in their original languages. In a few cases small portions of the discourse-based interviews were excluded from the data analysis because of recording failure or inaudibility. Its impact, however, was considered minimal given that no attempt was made to quantify the ideas or themes out of the interviewees’ interview data. After the analysis, some parts of the Korean transcripts were translated into English by the researcher for presentation purposes. Words or phrases expressed directly by the South Korean interviewees in English were marked bold in the transcribed examples presented in Chapter 4. In the discourse-based interview examples, metadiscourse items of interest were italicized.

Data Analyses

Three sources of data were analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative data analysis techniques.

Statistical analyses

To calculate the relative frequencies of interpersonal metadiscourse items, all references, figures, and notes appearing in students’ writing samples were excluded from analysis. The denominator in each case was total number of words in the remaining part of the writing sample. A primary analysis of the metadiscourse data subjected the relative frequencies of the five
metadiscourse categories to a repeated-measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to determine the effects, whether independent or interactive, of writer nationality (U.S., South Korea) and sequence of disciplinary socialization (Time 1, Time 2). The latter of these factors is a repeated measure. Achieving statistical significance in the MANOVA within subjects’ effects was taken as justification for executing follow-up univariate ANOVAs to examine the effects for each of the five categories separately.

For Part 1 of the questionnaire, the primary statistical analysis used a MANOVA test to compare the U.S. and South Korean student groups with respect to each of the following disciplinary socialization variables: (a) the numbers of academic papers that the participants wrote for the semester, (b) the average number of citations they used in their academic papers, (c) the number of pages of reading per week, (d) the numbers of the journals to which they subscribed, (e) the number of academic and professional associations to which they belonged, (f) the naming of up to five scholars who made disciplinary contributions 10 years ago, and (g) the naming of up to five scholars who currently lead the discipline.

For the ten Likert-type scales comprising Part 2 of the questionnaire, the reverse coding of items 2, 3, 6 and 7 was transformed so as to be consistent with the rest of the instrument. A scale reliability analysis (Cronbach’s alpha) was conducted to determine internal consistency of a presumed unidimensional measure of awareness of disciplinary audiences. Items 1, 2, 5, and 8 were found to detract from the overall reliability coefficient. After discarding items 1, 2, 5, and 8, the resulting Cronbach’s alpha reliability for the composite measure of disciplinary audience awareness was .74.

To determine how measured disciplinary audience awareness (Questionnaire Part 2) and various socialization variables (Questionnaire Part 1) contributed to predicting production of
metadiscourse in the participants’ second writing samples, each of the five clusters of metadiscourse features served as a criterion (dependent) variable in (five) separate multiple regressions. Because the South Korean data included information regarding self-reported English language proficiency, the regressions were conducted separately for the South Korean and for the U.S. participants. To determine patterns of colinearity among predictors, prior to running the regressions, zero-order bivariate correlations among (1) the composite disciplinary audience awareness score, (2) the seven measures of disciplinary socialization, and (3) each of the five metadiscourse categories were calculated separately by nationality. For the South Korean students’ writing samples, the following predictors were included in the correlation analyses: (4) length of stay in the U.S. and (5) self-reported TOEFL score. Overall alpha levels for statistical significance testing were set to .05. Based on the correlation results, the four criterion variables were entered into the five separate multiple regression equations: (1) the composite disciplinary audience awareness score, (2) numbers of academic paper written, (3) pages of reading per week, (4) number of current leading scholars named, and (5) the self-reported TOEFL scores. The self-reported TOEFL scores were used only for the South Korean sample.

Qualitative analyses

The 16 interview responses (four South Korean and four U.S. interviewees, each interviewed twice) to the semi-structured interview questions (the interviewees’ overall perception of academic writing, audience conceptualization and adaptation, and previous writing experiences) were analyzed to identify themes or core ideas recurrent in the data. In analyzing the interview transcripts from the U.S. students, a computer software program, QSR N6 (QSR International Pty. Ltd., 2002) was utilized to facilitate coding and recoding. QSR N6 consists of a document system, which is able to accommodate the whole documentary data, and a node
system, which assists the researcher with the iterative coding processes. In the iterative coding process, the researcher codes the data according to initial categories with free and tree nodes, relates the categories, and develops increasingly relevant and specific categories for the data. Because the QSR N6 program does not support languages other than English, I analyzed the interview transcripts from the South Korean students with the assistance of a conventional word-processing program.

The analysis process was inductive in the sense that I developed themes and categories from the interview data rather than imposing a pre-determined structure on the data (Creswell, 1998; Seidman, 1998), and the process was also closely based on the procedures for analyzing semi-structured interview data suggested in Schlosser, Knox, Moskovitz, and Hill (2003). Initially, through comprehensive perusals of all the interview transcripts I sorted out the responses to the interview questions which were most relevant to the writers’ conceptualization of, and adaptation to, audience, that is, the focus of the current investigation. The interview questions included (a) did you think of any reader(s) while you wrote this paper? If you did, whom did you think of, and why?, (b) did you make any conscious efforts or strategies to help your readers understand your ideas or become involved in your topic?, and (c) did you try to use any words, phrases, or structures to help your reader(s) understand your paper? Then, the interview data were divided into four subsets based on the interviewee’s country of origin and the point in time for interview: (a) U.S. responses at Time 1, (b) U.S. responses at Time 2, (c) South Korean responses at Time 1, and (d) South Korean responses at Time 2. The four subsets of interview data were analyzed separately from each other in order to explore similarities and differences in themes or core ideas that emerged from the interview responses. By utilizing either QSR N6 or the word-processing programs, I repeated coding and recoding processes until I
identified the themes (i.e., core ideas) of each utterance given by the individual interviewees in response to the interview questions above. Then I developed categories to describe the themes. In this process, I continually referred back to the raw data to ensure that my conclusions accurately reflected the information from the data.

The 16 interview responses to the discourse-based interview questions (their intentions in choosing specific metadiscourse items) were also divided into the above four subsets on the basis of the interviewee’s country of origin and the point in time for interview. Each response to a discourse-based interview question was sorted into the interpersonal metadiscourse category of the writing passage upon which that question was based. For example, if the question given to an interviewee regarding his/her reason for using *perhaps* within the sentence was, “Perhaps a student will identify his/her competency by [hi/her] social interactions with [his/her] peers,” the interviewee’s response was sorted into hedges. Thus each response was sorted into one of the five categories of metadiscourse utilized in this study. I constructed themes (i.e., core ideas) for individual interviewees’ responses pertaining to their rationales for using specific metadiscourse items in each metadiscourse category, and then compared the themes across the four data sets. However, the comparisons in the themes for the writers’ rationales for using metadiscourse items across the four data sets could not be examined for every interpersonal metadiscourse item in the interview data because the interpersonal metadiscourse items of interest were not identical across neither the interviewee nationality groups nor the across the point in time for interview.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents results of the data analyses derived from the (1) academic writing experience survey, (2) interpersonal metadiscourse items in writing samples, and (3) semi-structured, and (4) discourse-based interviews. First, (a) disciplinary audience awareness and (b) audience adaptation strategies reported by the U.S. and South Korean students were investigated in order to answer Research Question 1 (RQ1: What are some differences between the ways that U.S. and South Korean graduate students conceptualize and adapt to audiences in their academic writing?) and Research Question 2 (RQ2: What are some ways in which U.S. and South Korean graduate students’ conceptualization of, and adaptation to, audiences changes in conjunction with their participations in disciplinary socialization practices over two consecutive semesters?). Data from both the survey instrument and the semi-structured interviews were related to these questions.

Next, students’ production of interpersonal metadiscourse markers in their academic papers was examined in order to answer Research Question 3 (RQ3: What are some differences between the ways that U.S. and South Korean graduate students deploy interpersonal metadiscourse markers in their academic writing?) and Research Question 4 (RQ4: What are some ways in which U.S. and South Korean graduate students’ deployment of interpersonal metadiscourse markers change in conjunction with their participation in disciplinary socialization practices over two consecutive semesters?). This latter section not only compared Korean and U.S. students in their production of metadiscourse features, but also ascertained the relation
among measured disciplinary audience awareness, self-reported adaptation, and metadiscourse feature production.

Disciplinary Audience Awareness and Self-Reported Adaptation Strategies

Research Questions 1 and 2 pertain to cross-cultural differences in, and socialization effects on, (a) disciplinary audience awareness and (b) self-reported adaptation strategies. The results of descriptive analyses of the semi-structured interviews and statistical analyses of the survey are presented respectively.

Results of the Semi-structured Interviews

This section presents results derived from the semi-structured interviews with the four U.S. and four South Korean interviewees. They were all interviewed twice, with a semester interval, regarding their awareness of audiences and their deliberate efforts to adapt to audiences in writing their academic papers. The purpose of these interviews was to elucidate writers’ metacognitive conceptualizations of audiences, and their assessment of the needs/expectations of audiences. Based on the results of these analyses, it was evident that most of the graduate student writers were conscious of their audiences and deliberately attempted to address audience needs/expectations. Some differences in writers’ assessments of audience needs/expectations by nationality were also identified. Not many changes in audience awareness across time were evident, however. The results are reported on a domain by domain basis, where domains correspond to the primary lines of questioning in the interviews. Within each domain, categories of responses that emerged from the two interviews with each of the four U.S. students are presented first. Next, categories of responses from the two interviews with each of the four South Korean students were illustrated. Table 3 summarizes results for both the U.S. and South Korean student cases across the first and second interviews.
Table 3
Domains and Categories of U.S. and South Korean Students’ Awareness of Audience and Self-reported Adaptation Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Content/Category</th>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The writer’s awareness of reader(s)</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>- Strongly affirmed</td>
<td>A, D, L, M</td>
<td>H, S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Slightly affirmed</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Disavowed</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>- Strongly affirmed</td>
<td>A, D, L, M</td>
<td>H, N, S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Moderately affirmed</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Disavowed</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reader(s) whom the writer envisioned in writing</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>- The professor/the committee members</td>
<td>A, D, L, M, D</td>
<td>H, N, S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Editorial or review boards of journals/conferences</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The intended readership to whom writers attempted to address their papers (e.g., policy makers)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Other readerships that the writer thought of sporadically or evoked for particular parts of the texts</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- None</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>- The professor/the committee members</td>
<td>A, D, L, M</td>
<td>H, S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Editorial or review boards of journals/conferences</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The intended readership to whom writers attempted to address their papers (e.g., policy makers)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Other readerships that the writer thought of sporadically or evoked for particular parts of the texts</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- None</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writer’s strategies of adaptation to indeterminate audiences</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>- Provided credible/useful information supported by the literature</td>
<td>L, M</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Organized (e.g., section breaks)</td>
<td>A, D, M</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Maintained clear and straightforward writing styles</td>
<td>D, M</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Established clear logical transitions/textual coherence</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Used academic, formal language</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Edited the paper from a reader’s point of view</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Avoided possible miscommunications resulting from ungrammatical, unconventional use of language</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>J, N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- None</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>H, S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
### Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Content/Category</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The writer’s strategies of adaptation to indeterminate audiences</td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>- Provided credible/useful information supported by the literature</td>
<td>D, L, M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Presented the research method procedures clearly so that future researchers could replicate them</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Organized (e.g., section breaks, a sequential presentation)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- APA style</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provided definitions for technical terminologies and developed arguments on a step by step basis for non-disciplinary readers</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writer’s specific tactics of adaptation to determinate audiences</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>- Developed content reflecting audience members’ common experiences (e.g., questions/examples/perspectives)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Included ideas/terminology/references favored by their professors</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Chose non-technical verbiage understandable to non-disciplinary readers (e.g., husband)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Adopted the reader’s (professor’s) guidelines for writing/assessment</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Avoided miscommunication arising from cultural barriers (e.g., provided additional information/explanations to benefit cultural outsiders)</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>N, S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Solicited the reader’s (professor’s) attention by expressing the writer’s sincere interest in and commitment to the topic</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Chose the topic of interest or familiar to the reader (professor)</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>- Developed contents reflecting audience members’ common experiences</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Included ideas/terminology/references favored by their professors</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Avoided miscommunication/irrelevance stemming from cultural barriers (e.g., made arguments applicable to people from various cultures)</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Adopted the reader’s (professor’s) guidelines for writing/assessment</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. A, D, L, and M indicate the four U.S. writers, Amy, David, Lisa, and Mary, respectively; H, J, N, and S indicate the four South Korean writers, Haejin, Jeanie, Noorie, and Sumie.*
The Writer’s Awareness of Readers

This domain, the writer’s awareness of readers, represents writers’ consciousness of their own cognitive processes regarding audience in writing (i.e., metacognitive awareness of audience). When questioned about whether they were consciously thinking of their readers while writing their academic papers, U.S. and South Korean students’ responses fell into three ordinal categories: (a) strongly affirmed, (b) slightly affirmed, and (c) disavowed.

U.S. students at interviews 1 and 2. All four U.S. students across the two interviews strongly affirmed that they were aware of the reader(s) while writing academic papers. They regarded audience consideration as an essential part of the writing process. They maintained that the very purpose of writing was to benefit, persuade, satisfy, and exchange experiences with the reader(s). For example, a U.S. student, Mary stated,

Example 1

Mary (interview 1): Why I considered readers? Well, I think it’s a reflection of what I think. Um, when I try to gather information, you know, it’s for the benefit of readers besides myself; I learned a lot from writing a paper but I [mainly] consider it for readers.

South Korean students at interviews 1 and 2. Unlike the U.S. students, the four South Korean students exhibited no consensus regarding their audience awareness. In contrast to the unanimous response of the U.S. students, only two South Korean students (Haejin and Sumie) at the first interview strongly affirmed their awareness of the reader(s). Another student, Noorie, affirmed her audience awareness only to a slight degree. She reported having thought of readers “not much … but a little.”

Example 2

Noorie (interview 1):

Interviewer: Did you think about any reader or readers when you wrote this paper?

Noorie: … (silent)
**Interviewer:** Either before or while you were writing this paper?

**Noorie:** … Not much, but I thought a little. (…) Most of all, these people are foreigners.

Jeanie altogether disavowed that she had thought of any readers during her writing, although in retrospectively reflecting on her paper she displayed a keen awareness that greater audience awareness might have resulted in greater intelligibility.

Example 3

**Jeanie** (interview 1):

**Interviewer:** I’d like to ask you if you thought of any reader or readers when you wrote this paper.

**Jeanie:** No, I hardly thought of any readers when I wrote the paper. But later when I turned in the paper and presented it in class, I thought, uh, it would have been better if I had written the paper more intelligibly. After all, I didn’t write it for myself to read; I did it for other people to read. Well, I still don’t know how to write better though. But frankly, I didn’t think of any readers when I wrote this paper.

At the second interview, the three Korean students – all except Jeanie – strongly affirmed that they considered reader(s) when they wrote. Jeanie still did not spontaneously report that she had anticipated readers’ needs. Even upon prompting, the closest she could come to a sense of audience was to respond that she attempted to fulfill the assignment guidelines promulgated by her professor.

Example 4

**Jeanie** (interview 2):

**Interviewer:** Did you think of any readers when you wrote this paper?

**Jeanie:** I don’t think I did.

**Interviewer:** … What about your professor?

**Jeanie:** Yes. It is the professor who is the most considered.

**Interviewer:** Did you also consider your professor when you wrote this paper?
**Jeanie:** When I wrote it … the professor gave us some guidelines that included some questions like how clear the research problem is, and so on. So I tried to follow the guidelines in my writing.

*The Audiences Whom the Writer Envisioned*

This domain, the audiences whom the writer envisioned, reflects the types of readerships that writers took into account as their audiences during the processes of writing their academic papers.

*U.S. students at interview 1.* At the first interview, all four U.S. students responded that they had thought of their professors during the processes of writing. Three of them also noted that they had taken careful consideration of other possible readers. For example, David tried to address what journal editors would expect from a manuscript for publication, because his class planned to combine each student’s paper and submit them to a journal. Lisa, although she envisioned her primary reader as her professor, recognized a multiplicity of readerships. While she decided to include in her paper certain professional jargon and technical terms for the sake of her professor, she still speculated how it would sound to “someone who wanted to read [her paper] from the outside” of her class, such as her husband (“It isn’t solely for the professor, […] I want it so that as my husband reads it, he will understand what I am working on.”).

Amy was unique in that she envisioned the readership to whom she intended to ideally address her paper as her “true audience,” and negotiated conflicts between the actual reader of the paper (i.e., her professor) and the “true audience.” She explicitly stated that she had constructed her paper to be addressed to teachers, teacher educators, and policy makers in science education. As a result, she felt challenged by the situation in which her professor was not her “true audience.”
Example 5

Amy (interview 1): Um, it was kind of interesting for this one because the instructor for the class who is going to be reading it does not have background in science education. However, my purpose was [for the paper to be] more for those who do have somewhat of a background in science education. So it was kind of challenging because I couldn’t assume that the instructor as an audience knew things about science education, but the true audience, you know, who if I were to publish this, you know, do the research and publish in the future, that audience would be a little, would be different. And so um I kind of debated which way to do it. Mostly I looked at the audience of not the instructor but the people who do have general background in science education, and preparing teachers in science education.

U.S. students at interview 2. At the second interview, the four U.S. students stated that they had consciously thought of their professors while they were writing their papers. Similar to their first interview, they also noted that they had considered other potential readerships. For example, Mary reported having also envisioned attendees at a conference to which she would have submitted for presentation as potential audience, and considered how her paper would have sounded to those attendees. Amy decided on a different readership than her professor as her target (or true) audience (i.e., young students who are to be given a lesson about the topic). Amy’s reconceptualization of her audience resulted in conflicts between her professor’s demand for sophistication and in-depth discussion of the topic, and her delivery of simple, informal style and pedagogical content for her “true” target audience. It is likewise interesting to note that David reported that he sporadically evoked a more diverse readership than just his committee during his writing processes, even though he had primarily considered what his committee members would have expected to see in his research paper. For example, David stated,

Example 6

David (interview 2):
Interviewer: So, are [your committee members] the only ones who you thought of? Was there anyone else?  
David: Well, I don’t know, I think, in some ways, the ways that I described it, is, that’s good point, maybe I also intended it part of the way that one of my committee members told me to really think about. It was to think of writing for someone who was gonna use this tool that we used. So what would you do, you know, how would you describe so that they would understand what you are doing, and then they could replicate if they wanted to, or they can use what you did to improve their own use of this tool… so I did think of them sometimes as I was writing um specially methodology, tried to make it very clear this is what we did, this … this is the kind of content we have, screen chart in there, so yeah.

South Korean students at interview 1. Just as all the U.S. students had indicated at their first interviews, three of the South Korean students – all except Jeanie – reported having thought of their professors (their instructors for the classes or their committee members for their preliminary exams) primarily as the audiences for whom they were writing. However, unlike the U.S. students, Sumie and Noorie noted that they had no readerships in mind other than their professors. That is, they did not consider multiple audiences. For example, Sumie stated,

Example 7
Sumie (interview 1):
Interviewer: Did you think of any reader or readers while you were writing this paper?
Sumie: The reader is, of course, the professor.
Interviewer: Is there any other readers that you thought of except your professor?
Sumie: Not really. This is not what I really want to use later or publish anywhere.

Only Haejin, who had the intent to expand the paper into her doctoral thesis, occasionally thought of those who were interested in the same discipline and topic as hers; however, she gave primary consideration to her committee members.

Example 8
**Haejin** (interview 1): Actually, because this is a preliminary paper, I presume, I thought of the committee members. I think I had the three committee members in mind, and then, because this could be developed into my dissertation, I also thought of people in our field who were interested in [my topic].

*South Korean students at interview 2.* At the second interview, Sumie reported thinking of her professor as the sole reader for her paper. Haejin considered reviewers for a conference to which she would submit the paper for presentation. Haejin stated that she had made inferences about the qualities of prototypical reviewer-audiences on the basis of her academic advisor, but she was not certain if she had maintained her consideration of this readership throughout her writing processes.

Example 9

**Haejin** (interview 2): As this is for the conference, I think I thought of its reviewers. And when I thought of the reviewers, I thought that those who are at a similar level as my academic advisor would review my paper. I did think of them. But I didn’t keep thinking of them throughout the process of writing the paper. Just, I had a general sense of who would read this.

Interestingly, at her second interview Noorie indicated that she had attempted to construct a valid, meaningful audience for her writing, based on her conceptualizations of writing in her discipline, and also based on her cultural background. She noted that the line of questioning at the first interview for this study had led her to think of possible audiences for her writing. She subsequently decided upon the “general public” as the audience for her paper.

Example 10

**Noorie** (interview 2):

**Interviewer:** Did you think of any reader or readers when you wrote this paper?

**Noorie:** I did, since you said that last time. So I think I tried to move in a slower pace in my writing, and explain things more easily.

**Interviewer:** Who did you think of as your reader or readers?
Noorie: I really thought about it … and I thought I wanted to write in the way that even those who are not scholars, you know, general public, for example, a mother who raises a kid at home, could read this paper and feel ‘Ah, this is a important matter!’ … And I also stopped for a couple of times to think, as a Korean who studies in the U.S., what am I writing about?; and to whom is this relevant, Americans or Koreans? … So I thought I should make the content in my paper applicable to everybody, regardless of specific cultural backgrounds.

Interviewer: Why did you decide the scope of readers like that?

Noorie: I have thought and also learned that knowledge and scholarship should not be academians’ sole possession; it should contribute to the general society. … So I thought I should write in the way that whoever reads a paper, he or she can comprehend it and get some benefit from it.

The Writer’s General Strategies of Adaptation to Indeterminate Audiences

This domain, the writer’s general strategies of adaptation to indeterminate audiences (Rubin, 1984), represents the strategies that writers reported having utilized to engage audience, but with no reference to specific, determinate readers. Particularly, the categories of this domain pertained to writers’ effort to refine generic textual elements (e.g., organization, coherence/cohesion, unity, etc.) and endorse community-based knowledge/values (e.g., intertextuality, APA style).

U.S. students at interview 1. Five categories of this domain, general strategies of adaptation to indeterminate audiences, emerged from the first interview with the U.S. student writers (see Table 3). As for the first category, two U.S. students (Lisa and Mary) reported having attempted to provide credible and useful information in their papers in an effort to engage readers. Specifically, Lisa emphasized the magnitude of her effort in integrating her arguments or ideas with the existing research literature. Mary indicated that it was the quality of information she had gathered that would help her paper engage her readers.
Example 11

Mary (interview 1): I mean, trying to make it sound as if I am credible. What I am talking about, you know, is based on someone I read, so (...) I think from just the readings that I gathered, you know, cites that I did, just saying that they have proven this, therefore, this should be, or .... Yeah, I think just in the literature that I reviewed.

For the second category of general strategies of adaptation to indeterminate audiences, three U.S. students (Amy, David, and Mary) reported having attempted to organize their papers into subsections so that readers could understand the papers easily. For example, Mary stated that she had organized her paper “in a way that the reader could follow it and find what’s interesting.”

For the third category of general strategies of adaptation to indeterminate audiences, two U.S. students (David and Mary) reported having attempted to deliver information clearly and straightforwardly as a means of audience adaptation. Specifically, David tried to present the research procedures and results straightforwardly without biases, and also pointed out the unique findings for readers.

Example 12

David (interview 1): Straightforward and um, clear reporting, well part of it, I think, sort of integrity like, this is what happens, this is the information you got. I just present it clearly. Here’s what we’re looking for, here are the questions we’re trying to answer and here some responses we got. This is what we got for this answer. Trying to just report it to them without biases, I guess, without analyses, without biases, especially in the result section.

The remaining two categories of general strategies of adaptation to indeterminate audiences were endorsed by only a single U.S. student (Mary). Mary reported having used academic, formal language in her paper (“I clearly stated it without using um elaborate wording,” “this doesn’t use everyday language for professional readers.”), and also having edited her draft
from a reader’s point of view by reading it a few days after she wrote it up (“When I finish the paper, I put it down and come back to it, and read it again as the reader”).

**U.S. students at interview 2.** The second interview with the U.S. student writers, which occurred about three months after the first, produced four categories for the domain of general strategies of adaptation to indeterminate audiences. One category was endorsed by the three U.S. students (David, Lisa and Mary). They all reported having attempted to include sufficient references in their papers for their readers and to provide credible and cohesive arguments or ideas supported by the literature. The other three categories were endorsed by only a single U.S. student (David). David stated that he had tried to deliver clear descriptions of his research procedures and provide suggestions for better implementation. These descriptions were intended to assist the audiences (i.e., when he had evoked teachers or researchers) who might want to use the same instruments as his or replicate his study in the future. In addition, David reported adapting to audiences by having attempted to (a) make smooth transitions between sentences and paragraphs, and (b) maintain APA style throughout the paper.

Example 13

**David** (interview 2): I tried to do things like make smooth transitions featuring ideas, smooth transitions between paragraphs, and wanted to include enough references and citations to back up in the literature review, and also focus on APA style since they were most concerned about that. I went through after… [P]retty much wrote it and then I went back kind of couple of hours to try to make sure everything was APA comparable, I think those things [were] for the committee members.

**South Korean students at interview 1.** From the first interview with the South Korean student writers, two categories for the domain of general strategies of adaptation to indeterminate audiences emerged. One category was endorsed only by a single student (Noorie). Noorie
reported that she adapted to her audience by attempting to construct logical and cohesive arguments without employing too many explicit transition adverbs or connectors.

Example 14

Noorie (interview 1): I often used some transitional adverbs such as ‘however,’ in this paper because I wanted to express sentential relationships such as contrast or …, but I had been taught not to abuse them. My academic advisor in Korea once suggested that I relied on transitional words too often in order to make up for weak or loose logic in my statements. (…) So I tried not to use transitional devices, if possible. I mean, I tried to make sentences self-evident by and for themselves.

Another category of general strategies of adaptation to indeterminate audiences was identified in two Korean writers’ (Jeanie and Noorie) responses. They both reported having been mindful of whether the English in their papers would sound natural, and attempted to avoid awkward expressions or grammatically incorrect sentences. Jeanie even deleted a chunk of passages out of her early draft because she was uncertain of its communicability to native English speaking readers.

South Korean students at interview 2. At the second interview with the South Korean students, occurring about two months after the first, four, general strategies of adaptation to indeterminate audiences, were identified. None of the four strategies was endorsed by multiple respondents. Specifically, Haejin had attempted to include more recent references in her paper in order to gain acceptance from conference reviewers (“I searched more recent literatures and included them in my paper”). Sumie reported that she had organized her experiences and observations in a sequential way in order to help readers easily understand them (“I revealed my experiences in a sequential order, from what I thought about [the topic] at the start, then to what I realize and get interested in, and finally to what my experiences in a Korean language school were like”). As for the remaining two categories for the Koreans’ adaptation of indeterminate
audiences, Noorie reported having provided definitions for discipline-specific technical terms. She tried to deliver her arguments on a step-by-step basis as a way to help her audiences (i.e., general public) easily follow her paper. Noorie further reported that she had become conscious of different cultural orientations between her audiences and herself, and speculated about the relevancy of her arguments to people with different cultural backgrounds. Thus, she attempted to construct her arguments to be “applicable to everybody, regardless of specific cultural backgrounds.”

It was notable that all four South Korean students indicated that they had not attempted to manipulate stylistic or textual aspects of writing in order to engage audiences. They stated that they felt incompetent to do so with respect to English language proficiency, and also could not afford the time to deliberate about textual alternatives. For example, when asked if they had ever chosen or changed words, phrases, or structures in their papers to engage their reader(s) more effectively, Noorie and Sumie stated respectively,

Example 15
Sumie (interview 2): I hardly did. To do that, you have to have considerable knowledge of words, you know, vocabulary, rhetorical expressions, and so on. (…) This is English, and my English words and expressions are limited. So, I usually use easy expressions that I could use the most correctly. I am afraid that I will just end up with inaccurate sentences after a lot of effort in trying out effective expressions. I’d rather use grammatically proven sentences.

Example 16
Noorie (interview 2): I think that the structures or sentences in my paper are not so good … but I also think this is my limit, or the level where I currently am. I feel as if my writing were written by a little child; I basically enumerate things in my paper. Nevertheless, I don’t think I could do anything about it for now. (…) It takes a lot of time in both reading and expressing in English. Yet, I have to fill in a certain number of pages
within a certain amount of time. So to generate the content itself and to express the
content in whatever ways is of my primary concern. I have no room for trying out
awesome or more persuasive writing.

*The Writer’s Specific Tactics of Adaptation to Determinate Audiences*

The domain, the writer’s specific tactics of adaptation to *determinate audiences* (Rubin,
1984), represents categories of writers’ adaptive tactics for those whom writers evoked as
specific, tangible individuals. The writer’s general strategies of adaptation to indeterminate
audiences – discussed in the immediately preceding section of this dissertation – pertain to
writers’ effort to facilitate information processing (e.g., clarity, coherence, organization, etc.) and
endorse community-based knowledge/values (e.g., intertextuality, APA style). In contrast, the
writer’s specific tactics for determinate audiences reflect writers’ interpersonal appeals to
individual readers based on individualized knowledge of the readers’ preferences, experiences,
or dispositions with respect to specific issues. For example, if a writer started with a
controversial issue in his/her text based on his/her knowledge that elementary school teachers
(audiences) could easily establish personal and meaningful connection with the issue in their
daily experiences, the writer was utilizing adaptive tactics for the determinate audiences. From
the interviews with both the U.S. and South Korean students, it was evident that the student
writers had employed various rhetorical, persuasive tactics to facilitate communication with
determinate audiences whom the writers perceived as specific, tangible individuals.

*U.S. students at interview 1.* Three categories for the domain of adaptive tactics for
determinate audiences emerged from the first interview with the U.S. students. Two U.S.
students (Amy and Lisa) reported having used specific audience-adaptive tactics with particular
audiences in mind. Amy reported having started her paper with an example which she had hoped
her audiences (i.e., teachers and policy makers in science education) would have related to their
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own experiences. By reflecting “pretty common experiences” of teachers in science education, the example Amy included in her paper was intended to help those teachers vividly realize the nature of the problem Amy was addressing. She also introduced a well-known government report which had once raised much discussion in the field of science education.

Example 17

Amy (interview 1): I tried to engage them by providing an example of um what the problem is, and hopefully the readers then could see themselves in that example, and then as they read, think what if I had an experience like this, or I had a content class with my method class, you know, maybe that would have made better for me. So I tried to relate to their experience because it is pretty common experience. (…) Oh, well, I guess, by, I started it off with the U.S. Department of Education report that they did into the year 2002 about math and science education. And that got a lot of press review when it came out, and so I started with that to kind of capture the audience well.

The other two categories of adaptation to more specific, determinate, audiences were illustrated in Lisa’s responses. Specifically, she reported that she had deliberately used certain words or phrases that her professor used in class, and also cited the articles or the books that her professor recommended in class or she knew her professor liked. She further carefully searched references which were not only relevant to the topic, but also, (perhaps more importantly), relevant and understandable to her professor.

Example 18

Lisa (interview 1): Because [my professor] uses certain phrases, she uses certain words all the time. You know, so that those words are important to her as far as this class is concerned, so I tried to include that kind of phrasing. (…) I do include, for the instructor, I do include things in it that she uses in class all the time.

Example 19

Lisa (interview 1): Uh, the authors of the books, um, the people who have written the articles, uh I know that one of these is very much a favorite of [her professor] (…) So I
tried to have … information of her books. (…) [W]hen I look for um like cites or things that were referenced articles, referenced journal articles, um I look at the, what’s most relevant information for what I want to say, and what is gonna be relevant to my instructor also, so was understandable to her.

Not only did Lisa attempt to appeal to her professor, but also she wanted to make her paper understandable to her husband, who often gave his editorial feedback on her papers. With her husband in mind, Lisa included narration with non-technical and rich descriptions.

Example 20

Lisa (interview 1): But I want it so that as my husband reads it, he will understand what I am working on. You know, so that’s how I choose some other verbiage that I use. (…) If someone else were to read this, I want them to be able to understand what I am talking about.

*U.S. students at interview 2.* At the second interview, the three U.S. student writers (Amy, and Mary) responded that they had used specific tactics to adapt to determinate audiences. In particular, Amy reported having attempted to make connections between her topic and what she conceptualized as audience needs and interests. She attempted to figure out what young students (i.e., her “true” audience) would be interested in and what she as a teacher could help students learn about the female scientist she was writing about.

As for the final category of specific tactics of determinate audience adaptation, Mary noted that she had cited articles or books advocated by her professor as a means of eliciting that specific professor’s interest and agreement.

Example 21

Mary (interview 2): Oh, probably, one of the books I’ve used is [author name]. I listed him on my questionnaire. He is in here a lot, and is a really close friend of [her professor]. (…) She will agree with this, or that’s not why I wrote it. I mean I agree with all of that, you know. But um I guess I had that influence.
South Korean students at interview 1. From the first interview with the South Korean student writers, five categories emerged for the domain of specific adaptations to determinate audiences. Sumie reported having attempted to follow her professor’s guidelines for a writing assignment or its assessment (“[The professor] gave us a list of guidelines, and I wrote it with the idea that he would grade the paper based on the guidelines. So I considered the professor mostly in that regard.”).

The second category was endorsed by two Korean students (Noorie and Sumie). They reported having been conscious of possible communication breakdowns caused by cultural barriers. They therefore made deliberate efforts to fill in possible gaps in information in their papers. For example, Sumie added supplementary information to the parts of her paper related to the South Korean society because she assumed her professor had little knowledge of South Korea (“[B]ecause the professor is not a Korean, I tried to write it in more detail and added more explanation when I wrote the parts relating to Korea.”). Similarly, Noorie provided a long, detailed explanation for a concept, ‘Soo-Shin’ from the Korean philosophy, which is widely known to Korean people (“[M]y professor and classmates] would not know about the ‘Soo-Shin’. So I really had to think of how it would sound to those who would come across the term for the first time. So I explained and explained … so I gave a long explanation about it.”). She stated that she had to think of how to communicate the concept to her U.S. readers who would never have heard about it before.

The other three categories of deliberate adaptation to determinate audiences were endorsed by only a single respondent each (either Noorie or Sumie). Specifically, for the fourth category, Noorie reported having chosen the topic for her paper out of consideration for her professor. The fact that her professor was also her academic advisor influenced her to choose a
topic related to her professor’s areas of interest. Conversely, Noorie’s awareness of her professor being less informed of philosophical heritages of South Korea (i.e., her origin of culture) also motivated her to choose a Korea-related topic.

Example 22

**Noorie** (interview 1): Well, since I came to the U.S., I have felt that my professor knew too little about me and my country even though he has been really welcoming and kind to me and other Asian students. For example, he would be skeptical if there were some famous scholars in Korea or even if there were ever any research in the area of educational philosophy in Korea. So I feel that I have to let him know of the facts about Korea. Somewhat, this influenced me choosing the topic of this paper, as well.

For the remaining two categories of the South Koreans’ specific tactics of adaptation to determinate audiences, Sumie noted that she made a deliberate effort to clearly explain how to get access to the research cited in her paper, because her professor had emphasized the issue in class. Furthermore, she reported having attempted to solicit her professor’s attention by explicitly revealing strong feelings in her paper. In her paper, Sumie expressed her strong motivation for the research topic, affective responses to various issues (e.g., “I am afraid …”), as well as details for her own cultural background. She stated that she had wanted the professor to see an inevitable connection between her topic and herself, a female international student from South Korea, who possessed sincerity and social consciousness.

**South Korean students at interview 2.** At the second interview, about two months after the first, only one category of specific tactics of adaptation to determinate audiences emerged from one Korean student’s (Jeanie) response. As noted earlier, when prompted by the interviewer, Jeanie stated that she attempted to follow her professor’s guidelines for the writing assignment.
This section presents the results from the survey of 18 U.S. and 22 South Korean students, which reflected (a) the amount and types of disciplinary activities and (b) disciplinary audience awareness during the time-interval between their first and second writing samples. The survey consisted of seven questions to measure writers’ disciplinary socialization (i.e., Seven Measures of Writers’ Disciplinary Socialization) and the composite of six Likert-type items to measure writers’ awareness of disciplinary audiences (i.e., Composite Measure of Writers’ disciplinary Audience Awareness). The main purposes of the data analysis were three-fold: (a) to examine cross-cultural differences between the U.S. and South Korean student writers in their disciplinary socialization, (b) to examine cross-cultural differences between the U.S. and South Korean student writers in their disciplinary audience awareness, and (c) to examine the relation between the writers’ disciplinary socialization and their awareness of disciplinary audiences.

Measures for Writers’ Disciplinary Socialization

Because one South Korean student failed to respond to all the seven questions in the disciplinary socialization measure, 18 U.S. and 21 South Korean students’ responses were submitted to statistical analyses. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 4. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine whether the U.S. and South Korean students differ on the seven dependent variables of disciplinary socialization (i.e., papers per semester, citations per paper, pages of reading per week, journal subscriptions, association memberships, scholars who contributed to your field 10 years ago, and scholars who currently lead your field). The overall multivariate effect for nationality was not significant, Wilks’ $\Lambda = .68, F(7,31) = 2.11, p = .072, ns$, partial $\eta^2 = .32$. Given the non-significant result, no further univariate t tests on each question regarding disciplinary socialization were necessary.
However, it is worth noting on Table 4 that the within group variances appear to be quite large, suggesting that the participants in this study were truly experiencing very different academic demands.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of the Seven Writers’ Disciplinary Socialization Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>U.S. (n = 18)</th>
<th>Korean (n = 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papers per semester</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations per paper</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>13.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>9.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages of reading per week</td>
<td>177.53</td>
<td>127.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108.04</td>
<td>107.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal subscriptions</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association memberships</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars who contributed to your field 10 years ago (max. = 5)</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars who currently lead your field (max. = 5)</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. *p < .05; Data from one (out of 19) U.S. student and one (out of 22) South Korean students were excluded because of missing data.

Composite Measure of Disciplinary Audience Awareness

Six Likert-type items in the survey were retained as a measure of students’ awareness of their audiences (see Chapter 3). With reverse-keyed items (i.e., items 3, 6, and 7), higher scores represented more sensitivity to disciplinary audiences. Means and standard deviations of the six individual items and their composite variable are presented in Table 5. An independent samples $t$ test was conducted to examine the mean difference between the U.S. and South Korean student writers on their composite scores of disciplinary audience awareness. The result indicated that the U.S. students exhibited significantly higher levels of disciplinary audience awareness than did the South Korean students, $t(38) = 2.25$, $p = .03$, partial $\eta^2 = .12$. 
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Table 5

*Means and Standard Deviations of the Six Likert-type Items of Disciplinary Audience Awareness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>U.S. (n = 18)</th>
<th>Korean (n = 22)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I pay little attention to organization and cohesion in my academic writing.</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have a clear sense of what academic writing in my discipline should look like.</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I start sentences with the word, “I” in my academic writing.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I write about my personal belief and life experiences in discussing the significance of my topic of my academic papers.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. When writing an academic paper, I try to develop my arguments based on the scholarly literature I have reviewed.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I make an effort to follow the conventional styles of academic writing in my discipline.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Composite Score | 25.17 | 3.01 | 23.09 | 2.81 | 2.25* |

*Note.* R denotes reverse-keyed items; *p < .05; Data from one (out of 19) U.S. students was excluded due to missing data.

**Relation between the Writers’ Disciplinary Socialization and Their Awareness of Disciplinary Audiences**

To examine the relation between writers’ disciplinary socialization and their disciplinary audience awareness, two separate sets of bivariate correlations were calculated, for the Korean and for the U.S. groups respectively (see Table 6). For neither the U.S. nor the South Korean students were composite scores of disciplinary audience awareness significantly associated with any of the seven measures of the writers’ disciplinary socialization. Furthermore, for South Korean students, neither self-reported TOEFL scores nor duration of sojourn in the U.S. was associated with the composite measure of disciplinary audience awareness.
Table 6

*Bivariate Correlations between Writers’ Disciplinary Socialization and Disciplinary Audience Awareness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. (n = 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>-.51*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Korean (n = 22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The numeric from 1 to 10 denote the names of variables on this table; 1 = number of papers written per semester, 2 = citations per paper, 3 = pages of reading per week, 4 = journal subscriptions, 5 = association memberships, 6 = Scholars who contributed to your field 10 years ago, 7 = Scholars who currently lead your field, 8 = Self-reported TOEFL scores [for Korean students only], 9 = Duration of sojourn in the U.S. [for Korean students only], 10 = Composite scores of Disciplinary Audience Awareness; *\(p \ < .05\).*

To explore the relation between the measures of disciplinary socialization and the number of semesters participants had been enrolled in their graduate programs \((Semester)\), bivariate correlations were conducted separately for the U.S. and South Korean students. For the U.S. students, only the number of journal subscriptions revealed a significant positive correlation with the number of semesters of enrollment \((r = .56, p = .02)\). For the South Korean students, the number of citations per paper and the number of association memberships were positively associated with the number of semester of enrollment \((r = .69, p = .00; r = .44, p = .04,\) respectively).
Additionally, to examine the relation between disciplinary audience awareness and *Semester*, bivariate correlations were conducted separately for the U.S. and South Korean samples. For the South Korean students only, *Semester* and their scores on disciplinary audience awareness were significantly associated ($r = .47, p = .03$). A bivariate regression also supported the conclusion that the South Korean students’ length of enrollment (*Semester*) accounted for 22% of the variance in their composite scores of disciplinary audience awareness, $R^2 = .22, F(1, 20) = 5.66, p = .03$. For the U.S. students, *Semester* was not significantly associated with their composite scores of disciplinary audience awareness ($r = .02, p = .94, ns$).

**Writers’ Production of Interpersonal Metadiscourse Features**

Research Questions 3 and 4 involve cross-cultural differences in, and socialization effects on, the relative frequencies of the five interpersonal metadiscourse categories (*Metadiscourse Frequency*: self-mentions, hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and relational markers) appearing in the U.S. and South Korean students’ academic writing samples. In addition to these quantitative indices, writers’ intentions in utilizing specific interpersonal metadiscourse items (*Metadiscourse Intention*) were derived from the discourse-based interviews of four Korean and four U.S. interviewees. Qualitative analyses of these discourse-based interviews were likewise directed at addressing Research Questions 3 and 4.

**Relative Frequencies of the Five Interpersonal Metadiscourse Features in Writing Samples**

This section presents results pertaining to relative frequencies of five interpersonal metadiscourse categories appearing in the U.S. and South Korean students’ academic papers. The main purpose of the data analysis was three-fold: (a) to examine differences by the writers’ nationality (*Nationality*) in *Metadiscourse Frequency*, (b) to examine differences by the period of enrollment (*Time*) in *Metadiscourse Frequency*, and (c) to investigate the relation between
production of each of the five types of metadiscourse features (*Metadiscourse Frequency*) and discourse socialization and disciplinary audience awareness, separately for Korean and U.S. writers.

**Descriptive Analysis**

The relative frequencies of the five interpersonal metadiscourse features appearing in the 19 U.S. and 22 South Korean students’ academic writing samples were calculated by denominating the raw frequencies of metadiscourse categories by the number of the total words in a paper. Means and standard deviations of the frequency data are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

**Means and Standard Deviations of the Relative Frequencies of the Five Interpersonal Metadiscourse Features by Nationality and Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>U.S. (n = 19)</th>
<th>Korean (n = 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-mentions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boosters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude markers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational markers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total words per paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3030.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3785.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* The means are reported as relative frequency per 1,000 words; three out of 25 South Korean students’ writing samples from semester 1 were excluded from the data analysis because of missing data.

A univariate 2-way ANOVA was conducted to examine any significant difference based on *Nationality* and *Time* on the total numbers of words per paper. The results indicated no
Effects of Writer Nationality and Time of Enrollment on Production of Metadiscourse Features

To test the effects of writer nationality (Nationality: U.S. versus South Korean) and point of time in disciplinary socialization (Time: Time 1 versus Time 2) on the relative frequencies of the five interpersonal metadiscourse categories, a repeated-measures MANOVA was conducted. Writer nationality was the between-subject variable and the Time was the within-subject variable. The results indicated an overall, statistically significant multivariate effect for writer nationality, Wilks’ Λ = .61, F(5, 35) = 4.50, p = .00, partial η² = .39.

Table 8

Results of the Follow-up T Tests between 19 U.S. and 22 Koreans on the Relative Frequencies of Five Metadiscourse Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-mentions</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hedges</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boosters</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude markers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relational markers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The follow-up t tests revealed statistically significant differences between the U.S. (M = 14.55, SD = 1.12 for hedges; M = 3.21, SD = .31 for boosters) and South Korean student writers (M = 8.77, SD = 1.04 for hedges; M = 2.28, SD = .29 for boosters) on the relative frequency of hedges, F(1, 39) = 14.31, p = .00, partial η² = .27, and boosters, F(1, 39) = 4.73, p = .04, partial η² = .11, but not on the relative frequency of self-mentions, attitude markers, and relational
markers (see Table 8). Neither the multivariate main effect for Time nor the multivariate interaction effect (Time by Nationality) was statistically significant, Wilks’ $\Lambda = .78$, $F(5, 35) = 1.98$, $p = .11$, partial $\eta^2 = .22$ for Time, and Wilks’ $\Lambda = .84$, $F(5, 35) = 1.35$, $p = .27$, partial $\eta^2 = .16$ for the interaction effect.

**Writers’ Disciplinary Socialization and Disciplinary Audience Awareness as Predictors of Metadiscourse Frequency**

Bivariate correlations were performed separately for the U.S. and South Korean students in order to examine the relations between the writers’ self-reported measures (e.g., Disciplinary Socialization and Disciplinary Audience Awareness) and Metadiscourse Frequency appearing in the writers’ academic writing samples. Given that the writers’ self-reported measures were obtained when they submitted the writing samples at Time 2, bivariate correlations were calculated among the seven measures for Disciplinary Socialization, the composite scores for Disciplinary Audience Awareness, and Metadiscourse Frequency across the five categories appearing in their second writing samples only. For the South Korean students, their self-reported TOEFL scores were also included in the correlation analysis. The correlation results are presented in Table 9.

For the U.S. students, the results indicated there was a significant negative correlation between the writers’ Disciplinary Audience Awareness and the frequencies of self-mentions (e.g., *I, the researcher*) in their papers, $r = -.61$, $p = .01$, indicating a higher level of Disciplinary Audience Awareness was associated with less production of self-mentions. They also revealed a significant positive correlation between the numbers of papers written per semester and the frequencies of hedges in their papers, $r = .48$, $p = .04$, indicating that the amount of writing was directly associated with production of hedges.
Table 9

Bivariate Correlations between Writers’ Disciplinary Socialization, Disciplinary Audience Awareness, and Relative Frequencies of Five Metadiscourse Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. (n = 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Variables | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10    | 11    | 12    | 13    | 14    | 15    | 16    |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| South Korean (n = 21) |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |

**Note.** The numeric from 1 to 15 denote the names of variables; 1 = Papers per semester, 2 = Citations per paper, 3 = Pages of reading per week, 4 = Journal subscriptions, 5 = Association memberships, 6 = Scholars who contributed to your field 10 years ago, 7 = Scholars who currently lead your field, 8 = Self-reported TOEFL scores [Koreans only], 9 = Duration of sojourn in the U.S. [Koreans only], 10 = Composite scores of Disciplinary Audience Awareness, 11 = Self-mentions, 12 = Hedges, 13 = Boosters, 14 = Attitude markers, and 15 = Relational markers; \( p < .05 \); the data from the participants (i.e., 18 U.S. and 21 Korean students) who both responded to the surveys and submitted their writing samples at Time 2 were used.
For the South Korean students, the results indicated that the frequencies of self-mentions were positively associated with the self-reported amount of reading per week, \( r = .64, p = .00 \), and negatively related to the TOEFL scores, \( r = -.58, p = .01 \). The frequencies of relational markers were negatively associated with the number of the current leading scholars in their fields whom the students named, \( r = -.66, p = .00 \).

Subsequent regression analyses were performed separately for the U.S. and South Korean students in order to determine the extent to which Disciplinary Socialization and Disciplinary Audience Awareness predict Metadiscourse Frequency. Along with the composite scores of Disciplinary Audience Awareness, the Disciplinary Socialization variables showing significant correlation results across Nationality (i.e., numbers of papers written, pages of reading per week, number of current leading scholars named, and self-reported TOEFL scores) were entered into the regression equations. The self-reported TOEFL scores were used only for the South Korean students. The results of the simultaneous multiple regressions are presented in Table 10.

For the U.S. students, the results of simultaneous multiple regression analyses revealed that none of the model combining four predictors (disciplinary audience awareness, numbers of paper written, amount of reading per week, and numbers of current leading scholars named) was significant across the five criterion variables (self-mentions, hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and relational markers); for instance, the regression model were not significantly predictive of self-mentions, \( R^2 = .46, F(4, 13) = 2.80, p = .07 \).

For the South Korean students, the regression analyses results revealed that the overall model combining the five predictors (disciplinary audience awareness, numbers of paper written, amount of reading per week, numbers of current leading scholars named, and TOEFL scores) was significantly predictive of two criterion variables (self-mentions and relational markers).
Table 10

Simultaneous Regression Analysis Predicting Disciplinary Audience Awareness and Disciplinary Socialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>U.S. (n = 18)</th>
<th>South Korean (n = 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>$F(4,13)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-mentions</td>
<td>Audience Awareness</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papers written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leading scholar named</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOEFL scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>Audience Awareness</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papers written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leading scholar named</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOEFL scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boosters</td>
<td>Audience Awareness</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papers written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leading scholar named</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOEFL scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude markers</td>
<td>Audience Awareness</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papers written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leading scholar named</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOEFL scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational markers</td>
<td>Audience Awareness</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papers written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leading scholar named</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOEFL scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. *$p < .05$. 
Specifically, the model accounted for 65% of the variance in self-mentions, $R^2 = .65$, $F(5, 15) = 5.46$, $p = .01$ as well as 64% of the variance in relational markers, $R^2 = .64$, $F(5, 15) = 5.35$, $p = .01$. Beta weights indicated that a one-unit change in the amount of reading per week as well as the TOEFL scores led to a .48 unit of corresponding change in self-mentions ($\beta = -.48$, $t = 2.76$, $p = .02$) and a -.45 unit of corresponding change in self-mentions ($\beta = -.45$, $t = -2.57$, $p = .02$), respectively. In addition, a one-unit change in numbers of current leading scholars named led to a -.70 unit of corresponding change in relational markers, $\beta = -.70$, $t = -4.45$, $p = .00$.

Additionally, to examine the relation between the number of semesters participants had been enrolled in their graduate programs with their production of metadiscourse features, bivariate correlations were conducted among the number of semesters and five metadiscourse frequencies separately for the U.S. and South Korean samples. For the U.S. students only, the number of semesters of enrollment and the frequency of attitude markers were significantly and inversely associated ($r = -.47$, $p = .046$). A bivariate regression also supported the conclusion that the U.S. students’ length of enrollment accounted for 23% of the variance in their production of attitude markers, $R^2 = .22$, $F(1, 16) = 4.67$, $p = .046$. For the South Korean students, the number of semesters of enrollment was not significantly associated with any of the five metadiscourse categories.

Results of Discourse-based Interviews of Writers’ Uses of Interpersonal Metadiscourse Features

The findings presented in this section derive from the discourse-based interviews regarding writers’ reasons for using specific interpersonal metadiscourse items. Four U.S. students and four South Korean students were each interviewed at two points in time regarding metadiscourse features appearing in their writing samples. The two interviews were conducted a semester apart. The average of the time intervals between the interviewees’ first and second
interview was approximately 3.19 months for the U.S. and 1.86 months for the South Koreans. The purpose of the interviews was to elucidate writers’ sociolinguistic schema in reference to audience adaptations in texts. From the data analysis, it was evident that writers’ uses of interpersonal metadiscourse items were related to their considerations of audience needs/expectations.

The results were structured on a domain by domain basis, where domains correspond to the five interpersonal metadiscourse categories. Within each domain, rationales for metadiscourse use emerging from the interviews with the four U.S. students are presented first. Then, rationales from the interviews with the four South Korean students are presented. Table 12 summarizes results for both the U.S. and South Korean student cases across the two interviews. As noted in Chapter 3, the interview transcripts from the South Korean students were translated in English for presentation here, but were analyzed in Korean. Words or phrases expressed directly by the South Korean interviewees in English are marked in bold type face.

Caution should be exercised in interpreting the results of discourse-based interviews summarized in Table 11. If interviewees’ choice of the top three most frequent features ranged in a full variety of different lexical items, ideally, each column might have reflected the reasons for using 12 different lexical items (the top three most frequent metadiscourse markers × four interviewees). However, as noted in Chapter 3, such an ideal case did not occur in an actual interview; the types of lexical items subjected to the discourse-based interviews were limited and did not vary (see Chapter 3 for the reasons). In addition, in Table 11 the student writer whose name was not listed for a specific rationale does not necessary mean that he/she did not use a metadiscourse feature for that rationale; rather, it means that the metadiscourse feature was not among the top three most frequent markers for that student and thus the student was not
interviewed about it. It is possible that if the discourse-based interviews had queried about less frequent (rather than the top three most frequent) metadiscourse markers, a wider range of rationales would have emerged.

**Relational Markers**

Among the five interpersonal metadiscourse categories, relational markers are the most obviously related to writers’ adaptation to audiences (Hyland, 2001a). The overall purpose of relational markers, as revealed in the discourse-based interview data, represented writers’ efforts to acknowledge the presence of audiences and to invite them as co-participants in constructing knowledge in texts.

**U.S. students at interview 1.** When questioned about their use of one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within relational markers at interview 1, U.S. students reported four different rationales: (1) to craft solidarity with audiences, (2) to establish a common goal with audiences, (3) to provide clarifications or additional explanations, and (4) to directly appeal to audiences for the importance or necessity of their arguments.

One rationale expressed by U.S. students at interview 1 was to craft solidarity with audiences. This was articulated by one U.S. student (Amy) regarding her use of the inclusive first person plural pronoun (*we*). This *we* was coded as a relational marker because it was used mainly to refer to audiences collegially, rather than used as an exclusive self-referent (i.e., referring to the writer exclusively). Specifically, Amy reported having used the inclusive first person plural pronoun, *our*, indicating “all educators” including herself. By using the term *our*, she attempted to evoke a sense of community embracing potential readers with the writer.
Table 11

*U.S. and South Korean Students’ Rationales for Using Interpersonal Metadiscourse Items at Two Points in Time*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Rationale/Content</th>
<th>Writer (Metadiscourse Occurrence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relational markers</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overarching Function:</strong> Relational markers acknowledge the presence of audiences and invite them as participants in constructing knowledge in texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Craft solidarity with audiences</td>
<td>A (inclusive <em>we</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Establish a common goal with audiences (solve the question)</td>
<td>A, L (<em>Question</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and invite audiences as co-participants</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Anticipate audience responses such as ambiguity or opposition and provide clarification or additional information</td>
<td>L (<em>Asides</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Directly appeal to audiences for the importance or necessity of the writers’ arguments</td>
<td>L, M (<em>Directive</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Craft solidarity with audiences</td>
<td>L, M (<em>we</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Establish a common goal with audiences (solve the question)</td>
<td>D, L (<em>Question</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and invite audiences as co-participants</td>
<td>N (<em>we</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Anticipate audience responses such as ambiguity or opposition and provide clarification or additional information</td>
<td>D, L (<em>Asides</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Solicit agreement from audiences (rhetorical question)</td>
<td>D (<em>Question</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Directly appeal to audiences for the importance or necessity of the writers’ arguments</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-mentions</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overarching Function:</strong> Self-mentions create credible voice, stress the originality of the writer’s claims, and seek ratification from audiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Express the writer’s ownership of, or personal commitment to, the text</td>
<td>L, M (<em>I</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Express the writers’ ownership of, or personal commitment to, the text</td>
<td>M (<em>I</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 11 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Rationale/Content</th>
<th>Writer (Metadiscourse Occurrence)</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hedges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overarching Function:</strong> Hedges make writers’ claims more acceptable to audiences by stating them with caution and precision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>Craft audience acceptance for writers’ claim by presenting a proposition with appropriate accuracy</td>
<td>A, L, M (may, would)</td>
<td>H, J, N, S (may, would, assume)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>Mitigate writers’ claim to avoid imposition on audiences</td>
<td>L, M (perhaps, seem,)</td>
<td>N (might)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>Express politeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>Craft audience acceptance for writers’ claim by presenting a proposition with appropriate accuracy</td>
<td>D, M (may)</td>
<td>H, N (may, might, possibly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>Mitigate writers’ claim by acknowledging other alternatives for a proposition</td>
<td>A, L, M (seem, would, might)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>Convey a sense of unexpectedness of a proposition</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>S (could)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boosters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overarching Function:</strong> Boosters negate the possible opposition from audiences by framing a proposition as substantiated by evidence or discourse community consensus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>Negate possible audience opposition to writers’ claim by framing a proposition as proven</td>
<td>A (found)</td>
<td>J (found)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>Emphasize the force of a proposition</td>
<td>A, M (actually, clearly)</td>
<td>H, S (always, clearly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>Negate possible audience opposition to writers’ claim by framing a proposition as proven</td>
<td>D, M (determined, true/truly)</td>
<td>J, H, N, S (in fact, demonstrate, determined)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>Emphasize the force of a proposition</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>J, S (always, never)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 11 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Rationale/Content</th>
<th>Writer (Metadiscourse Occurrence)</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude markers</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overarching Function:</strong> Attitude markers express writers’ affective attitudes to a proposition, encourage influence audiences to respond to the proposition in a certain way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Express writers’ appraisal of propositional information as conveying obligation</td>
<td>A (<em>should</em>)</td>
<td>S (<em>should</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Express writers’ appraisal of propositional information as conveying obligation and also to negate possible audience opposition</td>
<td>A, M (<em>must</em>)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Express writers’ surprise or unexpectedness to a proposition</td>
<td>D (<em>interestingly</em>)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Express writers’ appraisal of propositional information as conveying obligation</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>S (<em>should</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Express writers’ appraisal of propositional information as conveying obligation and also to negate possible audience opposition</td>
<td>L (<em>must</em>)</td>
<td>H (<em>interestingly</em>)</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Express writers’ surprise or unexpectedness to a proposition</td>
<td>A, D (<em>even</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Express writers’ agreement to a proposition</td>
<td>D (<em>appropriate</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* A, D, L, and M indicate the four U.S. writers, Amy, David, Lisa, and Mary, respectively; H, J, N, and S indicate the four South Korean writers, Haejin, Jeanie, Noorie, and Sumie, respectively; metadiscourse items in parentheses represent each of their occurrences.
Example 23

Amy (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** Therefore, improvement must come within *our* teachers.

Amy explained: I guess, [*our* refers to] educators, all educators, myself as the writer, um, the journal that it would have published in...they are all educators as well. The people who are reading it, presumably, are in education, or why would they be reading the paper? Uh, and because of this paragraph that started talking about the U.S. department of Education’s report, that was pointed at all teachers in the U.S. and so it’s kind of community statement, ‘in our’ kind of refers to the community.

Another rationale invoked by U.S. students in interview 1 within relational markers was related to writers’ strategy to establish a common goal with audiences. Such strategies included solving a problematic situation or question and soliciting audiences as co-participants. Two U.S. students (Amy and Lisa) expressed this rationale in explaining their uses of *questions* as one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within relational markers appearing in their papers. By posing a problem or a question to audiences, these students created an atmosphere where they and the audience cooperated to solve a problem or answer questions. For example, Amy reported having established (or identified) a common goal with audiences by employing a question, “what can we do to fix the problem?” She also clearly noted that she treated audiences as co-participants for the entire process of setting up a question and solving it.

Example 24

Amy (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** What can be done to improve efficacy?

Interviewer: Why did you pose a question here?

Amy explained: Because I had done a whole introduction on the problems with efficacy, and so when she would get done reading it, like, ok well here’s the problem, what can we do to fix the problem?, and so it was basically, I was basically stating what I felt the reader would be thinking. So if this is a problem, what can be done to improve efficacy?
Similarly, Lisa stated that she had used a question as an explicit inquiry for audiences. By asking audiences a question, she had invited them to join in the process of solving the problem.

Example 25

Lisa (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** How could she tell the chameleon was happy?

Lisa explained: [I]’s another thing that I am asking specifically to the reader, to make it a more personal interaction with the reader who is doing, who is reading through this. Um, when I asked … this is a question that I asked [her focal student], but I also wanted to ask the reader that. (…) Yeah, you know, how could she tell it was happy, you know? I explained th, I explained what everything looked like, on the page prior to that, I explained what her statement was, and then that’s why I asked her how can you tell. But I also want, wanted to ask the reader how that could happen, because it was already explained, you know. So that’s why I talked to the reader personally instead of just having them be someone who is reading a bunch of information.

The third rationale articulated by U.S. students at interview 1 within relational markers represented writers’ initiatives to provide clarifications or additional explanations to preempt negative audience responses. This was a rationale for one U.S. student’s (Lisa) use of *asides addressed to audiences* as one of her top three most frequent metadiscourse features within relational markers. Specifically, Lisa noted that she had intended to provide a short explanation for audiences by using a parenthesis without distracting audiences’ attention from the mainstream of arguments in the text.

Example 26

Lisa (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** [The focal student] first asked for help through oral speech, exhibiting proper politeness as if I were a guest. (*Knowing her parents, I am sure "please and thank-you" have been practiced frequently in several different environments. Perhaps this is cultural shaping of oral text?)

Interviewer: Why did you use the parenthesis?
**Lisa explained:** Because it has nothing to do with what the rest of the stuff here. (...) and it’s an explanation as to that phrase, but it has nothing to do what else goes on in that. (...)Yeah, footnote, I could have done that, but that draws your eyes away from, that’s directly relevant to the sentence before. And that’s the only reason I put that into there, parenthesis because really it is a short, short explanation. And then I go on.

A final rationale expressed by U.S. informants at interview 1 within relational metadiscourse markers concerned writers’ direct appeal to audiences for the importance or necessity of their arguments or main topic of the texts. This was a rationale for two U.S. students’ (Mary and Lisa) uses of a directive as one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within relational markers. For example, Mary explained that she had employed a directive in order to state the importance of a proposition. In other words, Mary had explicitly asserted to audiences the importance/necessity of her forthcoming discussion about the role of parents’ cultural background in constructing their beliefs of reading motivation.

Example 27

**Mary** (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** *It is important to be aware* that parents’ beliefs can also be shaped by their cultural background.

**Mary explained:** I am just stating it is important that all should be aware, whoever is interested in learning about parents’ beliefs of reading motivation should be aware of that, need to think about culture.

**U.S. students at interview 2.** From the responses of the U.S. students at their second interviews, four different rationales within relational markers emerged. Three of the four rationales overlapped those that emerged from their first interviews: (1) to craft solidarity with audiences, (2) to establish a common goal with audiences and inviting them as co-participants, and (3) to provide clarifications or additional explanations. A new rationale, (4) writers’ solicitation of agreement from audiences, also emerged.
The new rationale, writers’ solicitation of agreement from audiences, was articulated by one U.S. student writer’s (David) use of a rhetorical question, which was one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within relational markers. David described the passage in which the question appeared as a “sale speech.” It seems apparent, therefore, that he intended to utilize this question rhetorically in order to solicit audiences’ attention and agreement to his argument. The following example further illustrates the connection between David’s audience evocation and his use of questioning as a way of audience adaptation. David stated that he had envisioned future practitioners as his audience and posed this rhetorical question to them as a way to solicit their approvals of a new online-based teaching method.

Example 28

**David** (interview 2):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** *What if an expert were able to advise and direct several students at once, and was available any time, and any place?*

**David explained:** I used the question. That was completely my doing. I think I just I mean this sort of the end of the literature review. I kind of wanted it somewhat like speech, somewhat like sale speech. I wanted to kind of … but what if … I also wanted kind of to make it an attention thing. I think also I felt like I could include a question at that point of the literature review because it is a project to write up and because, this I guess was influenced by thinking about future practitioners, instead of a professional audience. So I am addressing that to them I guess.

Among the other three rationales expressed by U.S. students at interview 2 within relational markers, the first rationale was writers’ effort to craft solidarity with audiences. This was a rationale for two U.S. students’ (Lisa and Mary) reasons for using the inclusive first person plural pronoun (see Mary’s explanation below). For example, Mary noted that she had meant to refer to “critical thinkers” (including herself) by employing the first person plural pronoun, *us,* suggesting that she had framed both audiences and herself as a collegial group.
Example 29

Mary (interview 2):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** Wordless picture books allow *us* to define and truly examine the audience because….

**Interviewer:** Who do you refer to as ‘us’?

**Mary explained:** I think me and, I think just … I don’t know, I guess just ‘us,’ including me and everybody else. … Well, I guess ‘us’ is more critical thinkers, you know, when you “define and truly examine the audience,” because that’s what I am gonna be doing.

**Interviewer:** Critical thinkers? What about everybody else?

**Mary explained:** I guess I could’ve, I could’ve, but for the purpose of this paper, maybe, because not everybody is gonna read it, so….

For the second relational metadiscourse marker rationale expressed by U.S. students at interview 2, writers’ strategy for establishing a common goal with audiences and soliciting them as co-participants, two U.S. students (David and Lisa) each used a question. For example, David reported having posed a question as a way to introduce his research purpose to audiences. Though he attributed this strategy to his learning from his class, he went further to speculate that the strategy could garner audience attention and also engage them in a collaborative process of probing the question.

Example 30

David (interview 2):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** Do specific teaching methods work better in an online environment?

**Interviewer:** Why did you choose to put a question in here?

**David explained:** I took a class and they say a good way to start out is just start with a question. That’s along the line that the question encapsulates your central thrusts of what you are gonna talk about in the study.

**Interviewer:** So what effect do you think this question would make on the readers?
David explained: That might be kind of an attention gatherer. That also might, I don’t know, maybe it would make the reader ask themselves that question instead of just you know stating something and having the readers question themselves about it. … I don’t know.

The third rationale within relational metadiscourse marker articulated by U.S. informants at interview 2 was writers’ initiatives to provide clarification or additional explanation to preempt negative audience responses. This was a rationale for one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within this category for two U.S. students (David and Lisa). They utilized this rationale for explaining their production of asides addressed to audiences. For example, David reported that he had intended to provide a clarification in case his audiences might be unclear of what he meant by “aesthetic reasons” in his paper. He set this clarification apart from the remainder of the sentence with a dash.

Example 31

David (interview 2):

Metadiscourse feature in text: However, many students prefer... for aesthetic reasons – because they feel more comfortable in the presence of the teacher – and because they seek…

David explained: I thought it’s kind of clarification, uh, for the aesthetic reason. In case that the reader wasn’t clear of what I meant by “aesthetic reasons,” because they feel more comfortable… That was sort of my explanation for the aesthetic reason.

South Korean students at interview 1. When asked about their rationales within relational markers at their first interviews, two South Korean students reported three different rationales: (1) to craft solidarity with audiences, (2) to provide clarifications or additional explanations, and (3) to directly appeal to audiences regarding the importance or necessity of their arguments. Notably, these rationales overlapped with those found for the U.S. students at both first and second interviews, indicating commonality of these rationales across nationalities. However, two
rationales within relational metadiscourse markers that had appeared in the U.S. discourse-based interviews did not appear in those conducted with Korean students at interview 1. Those U.S.-specific rationales were (a) writers’ strategy to establish a common goal with audience and (b) writers’ solicitation of agreement from audience.

One South Korean writer (Noorie) referred to the rationale, effort to craft solidarity with audiences in explaining her use of inclusive first person plural pronoun *we*, one of her top three most frequent metadiscourse features within relational markers at time 1. However, it is noteworthy that Noorie did not intend to refer to a specific disciplinary community (as had the U.S. students who used this rationale; e.g., “all educators” [Amy] or “critical thinkers” [Mary]). Noorie instead reported having used *we* in reference to “everybody.” By employing this general notion of *we*, she had attempted to expand the readership for her paper to the general public, not any specific disciplinary community. Nonetheless, it is reasonable to infer that this type of *we* was purported to convey a sense of solidarity with audiences; that is why it was coded as relational metadiscourse instead of a self-mention marker.

Example 32

Noorie (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text**: Especially today, *we* see more often such a limit of moral education focused on reasoning training.

**Noorie explained**: [“we” refers to] everybody who would read this paper, and also those who do not read it but have experienced education.

Another rationale within relational markers articulated by a South Korean at interview 1 was writers’ initiatives to provide clarifications or additional explanations as a precaution against audience responses such as ambiguity or opposition. This was a rationale for one South Korean student writer’s (Sumie) use of a metadiscourse type, *asides addressed to audiences*. For
example, Sumie reported having utilized a parenthesis in order to provide supplementary
information for her professor in case he would not have understood.

Example 33

Sumie (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** Behind my transmissive instruction, my students had
done ‘doing gender, class, even race (*in terms of post-colonialism*)’…..

**Interviewer:** Why did you use a parenthesis here?

**Sumie explained:** Because I thought I needed this term, ‘post-colonialism’ to discuss
race in Korean context. But, frankly I have no clear concept of when I should use a
parenthesis. … Sometimes I use it to add supplementary information, which is not needed
but can help my intention clear. … My professor may or may not have a question
[regarding the ‘race’ in Korea] because he doesn’t know well about Korea. If he had a
question, he could see this parenthesis.

A final rationale for using relational metadiscourse expressed by a Korean informant at
time 1, writers’ direct appeal to audiences for the importance or necessity of their arguments,
was articulated by a South Korean student (Noorie) in explaining her use of a directive in her
essay. The modal verb, *should* in conjunction with *we* was coded as a relational marker, not as an
attitude marker, because it constituted a directive. Specifically, in the example below, Noorie had
used a directive in order to directly appeal to audiences regarding the importance of her claim
(i.e., to “deal with the essential power that promotes the human existing”) as an inevitable choice
of action for educators.

Example 34

Noorie (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** If we assume this whole person, in education *we should*
deal with the essential power that promotes the human existing as being in the embodied
world.

**Interviewer:** How did you use “*we should*” here?
Noorie explained: Well … I am saying that in my opinion, this is what we ought to do; this should be an inevitable choice.

The South Korean students at interview 2. At the second set of interviews, three South Korean students yielded four different rationales within relational metadiscourse features: (1) to craft solidarity with audiences, (2) to establish a common goal with audiences and invite them as co-participants, (3) to provide clarifications or additional explanations, and (4) writers’ direct appeal to audiences for the importance or necessity of their arguments. The second of these had not been expressed at interview 1 by the Korean informants, although it had been offered by the U.S. counterparts across both the first and the second interviews. One of the rationales within relational metadiscourse reported by the U.S. students at time 2, i.e., writers’ solicitation of agreement from audiences using rhetorical question(s), remained unreported by Korean students for one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within relational markers.

The one rationale within relational metadiscourse features that emerged for the three Korean students only at interview 2 was writers’ strategy for establishing a common goal with audiences and inviting them as co-participants. This was a rationale for one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within the relational markers given by one student (Noorie) in explaining her production of a question. Noorie clearly demonstrated her consideration of audiences by using a question with the intention to evoke that same question in the readers’ mind.

Example 35

Noorie (interview 2):

Metadiscourse feature in text: Then, how can we enhance a link between moral reasoning and moral behavior?

Noorie explained: The writing would get monotonous if I used declarative sentences only. By posing a question, I thought it would be an effective strategy which could evoke in the reader’s mind the same question, “Uh, how could we do it?”
Brief examples for each of the other three rationales for using one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within relational markers follow. One South Korean student (Noorie) used writers’ effort to craft solidarity with audiences, and to explain her production of the metadiscourse feature \textit{we}. As in her first interview, Noorie reported having used \textit{we} to refer to the “general public.”

Example 36

\textbf{Noorie} (interview 2):

\textbf{Metadiscourse feature in text}: \textit{We} cannot still ensure that there is a dependent link between moral reasoning and moral behaviors.

\textbf{Interviewer}: Who do you refer to by ‘we’ here?

\textbf{Noorie explained}: … general public… they would think this. I said this because I assumed that we, most of us would agree with this.

Another South Korean student (Sumie) explained her production of the relational metadiscourse feature \textit{asides addressed to audiences} by referring to the rationale, writers’ initiatives to provide clarifications or additional explanations by way of precaution against audience responses such as ambiguity or opposition, Sumie reported having added supplementary information, signaled by a dash, in order to clarify what she had intended to convey with “French” for audiences, who might otherwise be “puzzled about why French is a problem.”

Example 37

\textbf{Sumie} (interview 2):

\textbf{Metadiscourse feature in text}: In contrast, I could directly hear about their preference to learning French \textit{-- one of the Western European languages rather than Chinese or Japanese}, and at the same time, their negative perceptions of Mexican American \textit{-- non-white, poor minority}.

\textbf{Sumie explained}: I used to use a dash when I wanted to highlight the information. For example, everybody knows that French is a European language, but without emphasis,
the hidden meaning of French here wouldn’t reveal itself well enough. I criticized their preference to western European culture as influenced by the mono-culturalism in this paper; and readers would know French is a European language. Yet, they could be puzzled at why French is a problem here.

A final rationale for one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within relational metadiscourse production at time 2, writers’ direct appeal to audiences regarding the importance or necessity of their arguments, was articulated by two South Korean students (Haejin and Noorie) in conjunction with their use of directives in their class papers. For example, Haejin reported having actually thought of a specific group of readers and having addressed the proposition directly to them.

Example 38

Haejin (interview 2):

Metadiscourse feature in text: The following points should be considered: …

Interviewer: Who did you have in mind as the subject of “should consider” in this sentence?

Haejin explained: It is me, actually, because I will incorporate these points in my thesis. … Well, but to some degree, I also hoped that anyone who would conduct a similar study to mine would consider these points too. I actually thought of it when I wrote this.

Self-mentions

Self-mentions comprise the second of the five categories of metadiscourse. The purpose of self-mentions is to create a credible voice, to stress the originality of the writer’s claim, and to seek ratification from audiences. In commenting on their utilization of one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within self-mention metadiscourse features in their writing samples, only a single rationale was invoked by both U.S. and South Korean student writers across both first and second interviews. This rationale represented the writers’ expressions of their ownership of personal commitment to the text. Specifically, by employing the exclusive
first person pronoun (*I*), the writers emphasized strong connections between the contents of the text and their own observations or beliefs, as well as indirectly acknowledging the presence of audiences who would listen to what writers are trying to say in texts.

Two U.S. students (Lisa and Mary) at their first interviews endorsed this rationale for self-mentions and one U.S. student (Mary) endorsed the rationale at her second interview. When questioned about the effect of her use of the pronoun *I*, Mary replied that it would “personalize” her text so that readers would “either disagree or agree with [the writer herself],” instead of disagreeing or agreeing with the text. The text, after all, is an impersonal artifact. Mary also noted the occurrence of *I* would bring to audiences a sense of the writer’s honesty and straightforwardness.

Example 39

**Mary** (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** *I* will critically review….

**Interviewer:** Why did you use “*I*” here?

**Mary explained:** I only felt like it is appropriate in the overview what I am going to do with this paper because throughout it was more like I set to inform, uh, so I didn’t, I felt like this was more other people’s work, you know.

**Interviewer:** What kind of effect do you think your use of “*I*” would bring to your readers?

**Mary explained:** Well, Personalizing I think. I mean, I think, they probably are either going to disagree or agree with me, knowing that you know … I think I prefer to see *I* when I read.

**Interviewer:** Why is that so?

**Mary explained:** It’s because it personalizes…, you get more senses of his writing it I think the honesty … instead of using a word that, I think it’s just more straightforward, I guess, but … I don’t know. It can be. I think there’s a fine line between informal and formal. You know, I think it’s nice to meet in middle.
One South Korean student (Sumie) at her first interview and two South Korean students (Sumie and Jeanie) at their second interviews endorsed this same rationale for utilizing self-reference metadiscourse. Similar to their U.S. counterparts for example, Sumie, when questioned about the effect of her use of the pronoun I, explained that she had used I because she wanted her reader to closely understand what motivated her to choose the specific topic and what thought processes she underwent until she delivered a certain idea in the paper. Specifically, she stated, “I wanted the reader to read along with what motivated me to choose this topic, what I had thought in the process of writing this paper, and all those things.” She further explicitly stated that she had made a deliberate choice of using I, and her decision had been influenced by her conceptualization of “the reader and [her] expectations about the writing task.”

Hedges

Among the five interpersonal metadiscourse categories in this study, hedges comprise the third. The overall purpose of hedges is for writers to make their claims more acceptable to audiences by stating them with caution and precision.

U.S. students at interview 1. When queried in interview 1 about their use of one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within hedges in their first set of papers, three U.S. writers offered two different rationales: (1) to gain acceptance for the writers’ claim by presenting a proposition with appropriate accuracy and (2) to mitigate writers’ claims to avoid imposition on audiences. One rationale expressed at the first time within hedges pertained to writers’ efforts to gain acceptance from audiences by presenting a proposition with appropriate accuracy. Three U.S. students expressed this rationale to explain their production of may (Amy and Mary) and would (Lisa). Specifically, both Amy and Mary reported having used may because their assertions would not apply to every individual or every situation. By limiting the
degree of validity in their statements, they had constructed the statements to be more limited and therefore more accurate.

Example 40

Amy (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** Both are math concepts, but one’s ability, and therefore their efficacy, *may* vary for each task.

**Amy explained:** I used *may* instead of ‘will … or does vary for each task’ because especially when you are measuring efficacy, it’s so personal; it changes with every person. And within each person, it changes for every task. But their efficacy might be the same for both, might be different for both. So by saying ‘*may*,’ I am saying that their efficacy in each task could be the same, or could be different. So if I said, if I said, one’s ability and efficacy will vary for each task; that could be incorrect, because it might be the same.

Example 41

Mary (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** For example, children *may* be motivated for a variety of reasons, but much research… .

**Mary explained:** I think, ‘*may be motivated for a variety of reasons.*’ I can’t really speak for everybody so I was just trying to be safe on that one.

Another rationale for one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within hedges expressed by U.S. writers at time 1 was related to writers’ mitigation of their claims or positions to avoid imposition on audiences. Two U.S. students endorsed this rationale for explaining their use of *could* (Lisa, and Mary), *perhaps* (Mary), and *seem* (Lisa). For example, Lisa explained that she had chosen *seemed* over *appeared* in order to express that an accompanying proposition delivered her own speculation on what she observed, rather than any objective description. By acknowledging the subjective nature of the proposition, Lisa had been modest and avoided imposing her statement on audiences.
Example 42

**Lisa** (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text**: [She] *seemed* to be reading the pictures while I read the text.

**Lisa explained**: I guess you can put ‘appeared to be’ [instead of ‘seemed’]. (…) Um, actually they mean the same thing, but when I was writing this, I was thinking of the person that I was. (…) Appeared, when I think about the word, appeared, it means something that is very observable. She appeared to be. This was a sense I was getting from her, it’s a visual observation for me. (…) It wasn’t something that she displayed but you know how when you sit next to someone whose, you sense something. To me, appear to be was too objective, too much an objective observation, I needed something where I was getting a sense, I could put um for between the illustrations, what I read, I sensed that she was reading the pictures. That will, would be the same thing. But I didn’t want to use that many words, so I cut it down to the one word that I thought um would express what I want to do. So that it doesn’t get too wordy and the reader goes, “Here she goes again,” you know. So that’s why I use ‘seemed.’

**U.S. students at interview 2**. U.S. participants at time 2 articulated the same rationales within hedges as they had expressed at time 1. The first rationale for within hedges again involved attempting to gain audience acceptance for the writer’s claim by presenting a proposition with appropriate accuracy. Two U.S. students (David and Mary) reported this rationale for their use of *may* as one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within hedges. For example, David reported having used *may* because the validity of the proposition varied from case to case.

Example 43

**David** (interview 2):

**Metadiscourse feature in text**: Qualitative results show that students *may* have been adapting to a new media . . .
**David explained:** [I used *may*] because I am told that you can’t just say ‘shows this.’ You need to soften this. This indicates this but this may lead to this because you can’t really know anything for sure. (…) Some students may have seen this media before. Some hadn’t, have not. Some of them it would easy for them. Some of them it wouldn’t.

Another rationale articulated by U.S. students at interview 2 within hedges pertained writers’ mitigation of their claim to avoid imposition on audiences. All four U.S. students endorsed this rationale in explaining their use of *could* (Lisa and Mary), *might* (Amy), *seems* (Lisa), and *would* (David) as one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within hedges. Specifically, Amy explained that she had used *might* because she was referring to a mere possibility. By acknowledging the tentative nature of a proposition, Amy mitigated her commitment to the proposition and thus avoided imposing on audiences.

**Example 44**

**Amy** (interview 2):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** Her most recent enterprise is … for all the girls who are, or *might* become, interested in science, math and technology.

**Amy explained:** I was referring to imaginary Ride Bridge’s organization, and it’s for girls and the point of organization is to get either girls who are already interested in science or astral technology or to get girls interested in science and astral technology. (…) If it wasn’t an organization only for girls who were already interested in science and astral technology, then you might have one focus but the focus of theirs is to get girls to be interested in the things. And so they might become, yeah. (…) But it’s those girls who may, maybe they don’t … like science in school experiences, (…) but if they come into those groups and they did think then they might become … because it is not … it is still questionable.

**South Korean students at interview 1.** When asked about their intentions for one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within hedges appearing in the first set of their papers, South Korean students offered three rationales. The first two rationales had also been
offered by U.S. students. It is interesting to note, however, that U.S. and South Korean students differed in their choices of the specific hedge items that they used in conjunction with each rationale. For example, for the first rationale concerning writers’ strategy of gaining audience acceptance for their claim by presenting a proposition with appropriate accuracy, one South Korean student (Sumie) related this rationale to her use of *often*, while the U.S. students frequently used this rationale to explain their production of the hedge *may*. In the example below, Sumie limited her commitment to a proposition (“not always though”) by employing *often* as one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within hedges.

Example 45

**Sumie** (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** [T]he interconnection between gender and race unlike Korean society is *often* articulated and distinguished….

**Sumie explained:** I used ‘often’ because people had been interested in the interconnection between gender and race very much and really often (…) which is not always so though. I wanted to criticize for a lack of research on the interconnection of class and gender by pointing out that there had been a lot of research done on the interconnection of race and gender.

Another rationale expressed by Korean writers at time 1 within hedges represented writers’ mitigation of their claim to avoid imposition on audiences. South Korean student writers used this rationale to explain their use of *assume* (Noorie), *may* (Jeanie), and *would* (Haejin and Sumie) as one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within hedges. For example, Sumie mitigated her proposition by acknowledging the tentative and speculative nature of a proposition. In her own statement below, she reported having utilized *would* because the proposition conveyed her own speculation on the role of a discussion-based instruction, which was not proven yet.
Example 46

**Sumie** (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** I thought that discussion-based instruction *would* provide me with richer information.

**Sumie explained:** ‘would’ means uncertainty … because I don’t know how the discussion-based instruction would go. (…) Well, I feel like ‘would’ delivers my judgment…and ‘could’ seems to be associated with more an objective judgment.

It is interesting that Jeanie explained her use of *may* as warranted by the hypothetical condition of her proposition. See Jeanie’s example below.

Example 47

**Jeanie** (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** [T]he study of students learning preferences based on culture context *may* assist to plan instruction for the gifted and to motivate students to participate in learning.

**Jeanie explained:** [I used ‘*may*’] because this is a hypothetical proposal; and I did not conduct this research. (…) Since I did not conduct an experiment or survey, I don’t know the result for sure. It is just what I think would.

A final, unique rationale within hedges articulated by a single South Korean writer, Noorie, was related to writers’ politeness strategy. Noorie associated her use of the hedge *might* (as one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within hedges) with expressing politeness toward the reader.

Example 48

**Noorie** (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** If we accept this view, we *might* be able to see that our bodies and its movements give meaning to our lives, equally to the other factors.

**Noorie explained:** Ah, I didn’t have to use [‘*might*’] here, it is too polite … ah, really, I didn’t have to use it because I already had this if-clause. (…) I think I needed just either ‘*might*’ or ‘if we accept this view.’ With both, this sentence sounds really awkward. It
sounds as if now even when we accept this view, it is still possible that we do not come to that conclusion. This is not what I really meant.

In the example above, Noorie questioned if she had made her statement too polite by using *might*. This mismatch between Noorie’s real intention and her choice of the particular hedge, *might*, indicated her unfamiliarity with the sociolinguistic functions of specific metadiscourse markers, such as *might*.

*South Korean students at interview 2.* The rationale for one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within hedges, provided by three South Korean students at interview 2, fell into two different categories: (1) to craft acceptance for writers’ claim by presenting a proposition with appropriate accuracy and (2) to convey a sense of unexpectedness of a proposition to audiences. Whereas the first of these rationales had appeared in the interview 1 data, the latter appeared only in the second interview with the Korean students.

The first rationale articulated by Korean students within hedges in their second set of papers concerned writers’ strategy of gaining audience acceptance by limiting the validity of the accompanying propositions to certain cases or time periods. Two South Korean student writers articulated this rationale in explaining their use of the hedges *may* and *might* (Noorie), and *possibly* (Haejin). For example, Noorie reported having used *may* as one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within hedges because the proposition was not intended to convey an absolute truth or a fact, and its validity was still limited to certain cases.

Example 49

**Noorie** (interview 2):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** [H]e dispenses with knowledge-based factors that otherwise *may* deem people either deficient or privileged in this regard.
Noorie explained: [I used ‘may’] because it is a possibility; the most cases will ‘deem people either deficient or privileged,’ but still it is possible that it will not be the case. So, it is a sort of ‘may’ as a possibility!

Another rationale within from Korean students at interview 2 represented writers’ conveying a sense of unexpectedness of their propositions. This was a rationale for a South Korean student’s (Sumie) use of could as one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within hedges. This was the first occasion in which this particular rationale appeared in the data. For example, Sumie reported that by employing could, she had intended to convey a sense that the event happened by chance or unexpectedly.

Example 50

Sumie (interview 2):
Metadiscourse feature in text: I could directly hear about their preference to learning French.
Sumie explained: It is the past tense of can. You know, in Korean expression, you could hear!
Interviewer: You could have said, ‘you heard’!
Sumie explained: Yeah, my American friends pointed out that many times. You know, it is my problem, a problem of my sentences, sort of Konglish. You know, in Korean language, you say, ‘At the moment, I could hear his voice.’ So, I guess, it is a habit that comes from my speaking Korean. I often say, ‘I could hear’ in Korean when I happen to catch information unexpectedly.
Interviewer: Something just happened by chance that you didn’t expect!
Sumie explained: For example, you told me a secret, and I said to other people, “I could hear her secret,” instead of “I heard her secret.” So to speak, it was not what I expected, I just happened to have a chance to know your secret. I think I often use that nuance also when I speak in Korean. … like I said, it’s a habit, and I often use it. … I really wonder if Americans do not use ‘could’ in this context at all.
Boosters

The fourth category of interpersonal metadiscourse, boosters, pertains to writers’ strategies for preempting possible opposition from audiences by framing a proposition as substantiated by evidence or discourse community consensus or emphasizing the force of a proposition.

U.S. students at interview 1. When questioned about their use of one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within boosters in their first set of papers, two U.S. student writers at interview 1 offered two different rationales: (1) to frame a proposition as already proven and (2) to emphasize the force of a proposition. The first of these rationales for using boosters was drawn from an U.S. student’s (Amy) use of intensifying item, found. As shown in the example below, Amy explicitly reported that by using a booster found, she had framed a proposition as a fact. She expected that her readers would be correspondingly influenced by the way she framed the proposition.

Example 51
Amy (interview 1):

Metadiscourse feature in text: Abell and Bryan found that just as teachers have students write their ideas, beliefs, and values…”

Amy explained: I think ‘found’ is a pretty strong one, um, if I said “Abell and Bryan implied that just as teachers have students write their ideas…,” then now, it would seem to me that maybe I don’t trust them as much.

Interviewer: So when you chose ‘found,’ instead of ‘implied,’ did you want to emphasize your trust in their findings?

Amy explained: Yes, yes, I think so. When you use those words, you’re kind of giving value to the findings or to the study, to your readers, and your readers can pick up on which one do you trust more in and um if I would say that they found this and then go on and disagree with it, it would almost not make sense. If I said that they suggest this or they imply this or they something like that, and then want to disagree, it would make
more sense. This is what they thought but this is why I don’t agree, but if you say, they found this, and that it almost implies that’s a fact, so how could you disagree with it?

Another rationale expressed by U.S. students at interview 1 within boosters was to negate possible audience opposition to writers’ claims by emphasizing the force of a proposition. Two U.S. student writers’ (Amy and Mary) endorsed this rationale in explaining their use of actually and clearly as one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within boosters. For example, Mary reported that she had used clearly to “strengthen [her] statement,” which would increase the force of her statement and thus decrease the possibility for audiences to oppose it.

Example 52
Mary (interview 1):
Metadiscourse feature in text: This position fails to … or competency belief that might clearly relate to motivation.
Mary explained: Well, [‘clearly’] emphasizes the statement. (reading the sentence) ‘clearly’ relates to motivation. This is the, it’s just to strengthen the statement, I think.

U.S. students at interview 2. When interviewed about their use of one of top three metadiscourse features within boosters in their second set of papers, two U.S. students offered one rationale: to negate possible audience opposition by emphasizing the force of a proposition. Two U.S. students showed consensus in their reasons that they had used determine (David) and true/truly (Mary). For example, David reported that determine had been intended to convey his forceful assertion regarding the governing role of the instructional objectives in instructions.

Example 53
David (interview 2):
Metadiscourse feature in text: The objectives determine the goal of the instruction…
David explained: objectives they don’t just suggest that, I mean, well, because I wanted to forcefully say that, that’s also expressing an opinion, it’s not just conveying information but it’s also conveying I think, from my point of view, theoretically
objectives are, don’t just suggest the goals of instruction, its’ stronger than that. That objectives drive everything else, dictates they are the beginning of everything else. They are the first ideas of instructions. All instructions should be aligned with the objectives.

Similarly, Mary explained that her use of truly had been intended to emphasize the force of her claim.

Example 54
Mary (interview 2):

Metadiscourse feature in text: Wordless picture books allow us to define and truly examine the audience because…

Mary explained: that I was to really push, truly examine the audience, don’t just examine, you really want to look closely at the audience, so just emphasizing the point.

South Korean students at interview 1. When interviewed at time 1 about the appearance of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within boosters in South Korean students’ first sets of writing, two rationales emerged: (1) to frame a proposition as proven and (2) to emphasize the force of a proposition. These two rationales were the same as those expressed by their U.S. counterparts. One South Korean student (Jeanie) used the first of these rationales in order to justify her use of the verb found (past tense of find). Just as had the U.S. student, Amy, Jeanie reported that she had associated found with “a fact.” In other words, by using found, she had intended to frame the proposition as an already established and validated fact.

Example 55
Jeanie (interview 1):

Metadiscourse feature in text: Clinkbeard (1989) found that gifted students felt greater continuing motivation, stronger effort attributions, and better learning in an individualistic condition rather than in a cooperative condition.

Interviewer: What if you used ‘suggested,’ instead of ‘found’?

Jeanie explained: ‘suggest’ feels like it may or may not be this way. ‘found’ is more like it is a fact, I guess.
The second rationale Korean students expressed at time 1 for one of the top three most frequent boosters pertained to writers’ strategy of emphasizing the force of a proposition; this was drawn from two South Korean student writers’ rationale for using *clearly* (Haejin and Sumie) and *always* (Sumie) in their papers. For example, according to Sumie, she had intended to express that the research topic of her choice was her long-time interest. By employing *always*, Sumie intended to emphasize the magnitude of her commitment to the specific research topic, which would draw audiences’ attention to the significance of that topic.

Example 56

**Sumie** (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text:** Since I study critical pedagogy and multiculturalism the U.S., it has *always* bothered me.

**Sumie explained:** As I told you before, I wanted to express that I have been *continuously* interested in this topic from the beginning of my study in the U.S. It is not something that I made up for this paper. Continuity is the focus of it.

_South Korean students at interview 2._ From the second interviews, the South Korean students reported two rationales for using one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within hedges, which were identical with those from their first interviews as well as identical to rationales expressed in the U.S. students’ interviews. All four South Korean students endorsed the first of these rationales for using one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within boosters in their papers. Specifically, this rationale was used to explain the occurrence of *determine* (Noorie), *demonstrate* (Haejin and Jeanie), and *in fact* (Sumie). Below is an interview example from Sumie.

Example 57

**Sumie** (interview 2):
Metadiscourse feature in text: The myth of model minority … reinforced their belief on self-reliance and whiteness as norm. *In fact*, Korean Americans get a low return on their educational credentials and small compensation for their hard labors.

Sumie explained: I often use ‘in fact.’ In my opinion, … hmm, … when do I use ‘in fact’? I think it is a habit from my use of Korean. I habitually, … I often use ‘in fact’ in Korean. I think I say, ‘in fact,’ when I want to point out that there is something that many people have overlooked. For example, someone stole things and people blame him. … and then I would say ‘in fact, everybody has such inclination for greed, don’t you think?’ … This ‘in fact’ is also, … you see, just before this sentence, I wrote that Korean Americans live in the myth of model minority, and you know, the important thing is that they’ve forgotten the fact that they are also a minority. Without ‘in fact,’ I would have needed a sentence like ‘This means that Korean Americans are also a minority.’ By using ‘in fact,’ here, however, I could do without the sentence. … Well, my professor didn’t understand it, though (laugh).

Interviewer: Did you take the sentence with ‘in fact’ as a fact or apparent reality?

Sumie: Yes I did. It is definitely a fact. But… if I had some objective figures or materials, I wouldn’t have used ‘in fact’ here. … If I had some evidences, I didn’t have to say ‘in fact.’ It is like I am seeking the agreement, ‘it is true, isn’t it?’ sort of thing.

Sumie stated that she had framed the proposition (“Korean Americans get a low return on their educational credentials and small compensation for their hard labors.”) as a fact. Sumie had conceptualized that *in fact* would convey a truth or a fact, which may be overlooked at first, but can not be denied once it is pointed out.

It is also interesting to note that Sumie would not have used that metadiscourse item if she had objective evidence for her claim, such as figures or reference. Thus it was the absence of empirical evidence to support her statement which led Sumie to rely on the metadiscourse marker, *in fact*, and negotiate with audiences regarding the truth of her statement. As shown in the example above, Sumie believed that the booster, *in fact, would not only to frame her statement as a truth but also convey to audiences her intention such as “it is true, isn’t it?”
As for the second rationale expressed by Korean students at time 2 for using one of the top three most frequent boosters in their papers, writers’ strategy to emphasize the force of a proposition, two South Korean students used this rationale to explain their use of *always* (Jeanie) and *never* (Sumie) for this purpose. For example, Sumie reported having used *never* to emphasize the force of a proposition.

Example 58

**Sumie** (interview 2):

**Metadiscourse feature in text**: The young children have *never* revealed a position as minority … .

**Sumie explained**: I often use ‘*never*’ instead of ‘not.’ I guess it is just my habit. But here, I was emphasizing the fact, the fact itself. It feels to me that ‘*never*’ delivers a more subjective sense than ‘not’ does.

**Attitude Markers**

The final superordinate category of interpersonal metadiscourse features in this study, attitude markers, conveys writers’ affective attitudes to a proposition. Compared to hedges and boosters, attitude markers reflect writers’ affective appraisal of a proposition in more response-specific ways, beyond merely modulating the levels of writers’ commitment to a proposition. For example, attitude markers convey writers’ appraisal of a proposition such as obligation (*should, must, etc.*), surprise (*surprisingly, unexpectedly, interestingly, etc.*), agreement (*I agree/disagree, appropriately, remarkable, and etc.*), or importance/necessity (*importantly, essentially, necessarily, etc.*). Whereas relational markers are related to writers’ seeking audiences’ participations in constructing knowledge in texts, attitude markers tend more to be writer-oriented, expressing writers’ own affective appraisal of a proposition. By expressing their own affective attitudes to a proposition, writers influence audiences to respond to the proposition in a certain way.
U.S. students at interview 1. When interviewed about their use of one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within attitude markers in their first set of papers, three U.S. students produced two rationales: (1) to express writers’ appraisal of propositional information as conveying obligation, (2) to express writers’ appraisal of propositional information as conveying obligation and also to negate possible audience opposition, and (3) to express writers’ surprise or unexpectedness to a proposition. As for the first of these rationales within attitude markers, an U.S. student writer, Amy, articulated the rationale in explaining her choice of the term should. As shown in Example 59, the should used by Amy in her essay was intended to signal obligation in conjunction with the accompanying proposition. By utilizing should, Amy expressed what she believed method instructors ought to do to exercise the best practice. In her statement, Amy further indicated that she had chosen should over must because she did not want to offend readers by making her claim too strong when delivering such prescriptive advice to readers.

Example 59

Amy (interview 1):

Metadiscourse feature in text: Just as we expect elementary teachers to teach, methods instructors should act as a facilitator, encourage their students ....

Amy explained: I see I should have put ‘must’ there. (…) It’s, ‘should’ is just saying that this is why methods teachers, the best practice for method instructors. They should act as a facilitator. That’s the best way to do it.

Interviewer: Why didn’t you choose ‘must’?

Amy explained: Seemed too strong. [trying out the sentence with ‘must’]. ‘must’ just seems too strong there. I mean, it’s not, it’s not an impact statement like before with the other sentence where I used ‘must’ as an impact statement, and it’s not. It just seems too strong in that sentence, um, telling method instructors, you must do, um, it seems just a little too strong.
The second rationale within attitude markers was to express writers’ appraisal of propositional information as conveying obligation and also to negate possible audience opposition. This was a rationale for two U.S. writers’ (Amy and Mary) use of must, one of the top three most frequent attitude markers in their papers. In the example below, the must used by Mary was coded as an attitude marker because it delivered the writer’s assessment of the propositional information as conveying obligation, that is, students’ motivation is a prerequisite condition for their becoming engaged readers. In her own statement, however, Mary further revealed that her intention in choosing must over should was to negate possible audience opposition by intensifying her statement (“to bring more power to the statement”). This indicated that Mary’s choice of must was influenced by both expressing her appraisal of propositional information (attitude markers) as well as intensifying her statement (boosters). This example suggested that sometimes writers’ stylistic choice could be based on two different rationales from two different domains both impinging on the same stylistic option.

Example 60

Mary (interview 1):

Metadiscourse feature in text: In order for students to be engaged readers, they must be motivated.

Mary explained: Why did I use [must]? (reading the sentence) Ah, probably to bring more power to the statement! I guess, I mean, instead of saying ‘should be,’ you know, ‘must’ is a little bit, it’s just an accepted term, you know, for example, accepted position is here that they must be motivated.

As another example of the interaction between attitude rationale and intensifying rationale, Amy noted that she questioned if her proposition could be open to debate even though she had wanted to frame it as one that “has to happen [in a certain] way” (i.e., obligation).
Nevertheless, she had chosen *must* over *should* in order to convey to audiences her appraisal of the propositional information more strongly (i.e., intensifying).

Example 61

Amy (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text**: [T]herefore, improvement *must* come within our teachers.

**Interviewer**: Can you think of any alternatives to ‘*must*’?

**Amy explained**: Um, improvement *should* come! (…) I still like ‘*must*’ better (…) because ‘*should*’ kind of has a connotation like this is what *should* happen, but if it doesn’t, then that’s ok. But ‘*must*’ has no other hidden meaning, it’s just that has to happen this way. If you said ‘*should*,’ then, it would be this is the best way to do it, but it’s not necessarily the way it has to be done. I guess. That’s how I think of it in my head.

A final rationale within attitude markers articulated by U.S. students at interview 1 pertained to writers’ expressing their own surprise or unexpectedness to a proposition. This was a rationale for one U.S. student writer (David) regarding why he used *interestingly* in his paper. David reported that he had used *interestingly* because the research finding was unexpected and even contradicted what had been expected.

Example 62

David (interview 1):

**Metadiscourse feature in text**: *Interestingly*, this does not correlate with the SCQ which indicates that collaborating with others…. 

**David explained**: Well actually, and it was a contrast. In this case, what the teachers said, what we got from the qualitative data did not correlate with what came from the quantitative data, so we got qualitative data from interviews and we got quantitative data from survey. And in this situation, those two did not match. The teacher said one thing in the qualitative and in the quantitative survey said something else. So there was a contrast, I think.

*U.S. students at interview 2.* From their second interviews, three U.S. writers yielded two rationales for producing one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within attitude
metadiscourse markers. The three rationales included: (1) to express writers’ appraisal of propositional information as conveying obligation and also to negate possible audience opposition, (2) to express writers’ surprise with respect to a proposition, and (3) to express writers’ agreement with a proposition. As for the first rationale, writers’ expressing their appraisal of a proposition as conveying obligation and also intensifying their statements, Lisa used this reason to explain her inclusion of the attitude metadiscourse feature must (similar to the U.S. students’ rationales for using the same attitude marker at time 1)

The second rationale expressed by the U.S. writers for using one of the top three most frequent attitude markers in their papers was related to writers’ expression of surprise or unexpectedness to a proposition. Two U.S. students (Amy and David) used this rationale in explaining their use of even. Specifically, by utilizing even, Amy was intending to evoke a sense of surprise or unexpectedness regarding the historical importance given to astronaut Ride’s mission.

Example 63
Amy (interview 2):
Metadiscourse feature in text: When Dr. Sally Ride served as mission specialist for STS-7 on June 18, 1983, it was obviously not the first time Americans had been in space. … It was not even Ride’s first command experience, having served as capsule communicatory…

Amy explained: I was talking about Ride, missile specialist on the State, and it was the first time that America have woman in space. It wasn’t special because Ride has never had experience before; it was special because she was the first woman in space. So it was not even her first command experience …. So it’s end of the sequence. And so you might try to guess like the other readers why would ok not this, not this, not this, nop, this is not … it’s end of the sequence.
A final, new rationale expressed by U.S. writers at time 2 within attitude markers was related to writers’ expressing their agreement to a proposition. One U.S. student (David) used this rationale for explaining his use of appropriate, one of the top three most frequent attitude markers in his paper. Specifically, David explained that appropriate had been intended to express his support for a specific suggestion as a good one among possible alternatives.

South Korean students at interview 1. From the first interview with South Korean students, one South Korean student (Sumie) offered one rationale within attitude markers: to express writers’ appraisal of propositional information as conveying obligation. In explaining her use of should as one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features within attitude markers at interview 1, Sumie explained that she had meant to express how she believed the research ought to be conducted. Her reason for using should corresponded to the U.S. students’ rationale for using the same attitude marker.

Example 64

Sumie (interview 1):

Metadiscourse feature in text: In fact, the way in which middle school girls represent, respond, negotiate, and navigate gender through literacy practices in/beyond the classroom should be examined in much more broad and complex contexts.

Sumie explained: By using ‘should,’ I meant belief. You know, middle school girls would read teen magazines or something like that at home. So you should see the whole picture beyond the classroom. It is not any sort of ethical obligation but a necessity for research that you should see the whole context. So ‘should’ is a very strong necessity.

Interviewer: What do you think of using ‘must’ as “a very strong necessity”?

Sumie explained: ‘must’ feels as if it were not my judgment but obligated by an external condition; but to me, ‘should’ seems to add a little more of my subjective judgment.

South Korean students at interview 2. At their second interviews, two South Korean students offered two rationales for producing one of the top three most frequent metadiscourse
features within attitude metadiscourse markers: (1) to express writers’ appraisal of propositional information as conveying obligation and (2) to express writers’ surprise or unexpectedness to a proposition. The first rationale, expressing writers’ appraisal of propositional information as conveying obligation, was again reported by Sumie in explaining her use of should.

Another rationale expressed by one Korean student (Haejin) at interview 2 for using one of the top three most frequent attitude markers was related to writers’ expressions of their surprise or unexpectedness. Haejin, articulated this rationale in explaining her use of the attitude metadiscourse feature interestingly. Specifically, Haejin reported that she had used interestingly because the accompanying statement was an unexpected finding in her data and thus wanted to direct audiences’ attentions to this unexpected finding. Haejin’s reasons for using interestingly closely resembled those of a U.S. student, David, at his first interview (see Example 62).

Example 65

Haejin (interview 2):

Metadiscourse feature in text: Interestingly, the (…) group showed a greater increase… and control group….  
Haejin explained: Not until this had I found any significant results from my data. Then, this result came out and this was totally unexpected. (…) So I wanted to gather attention to this one. You know, a series of results were found to be not significant; and then, one significant and even unexpected came out. I used interestingly to draw a big attention.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This chapter will discuss the implications and limitations of the results presented in Chapter 4. Specifically, the main purposes and findings of the study will be summarized and discussed in reference to the previous literature. Pedagogical implications for teaching second language academic writing to non-native speakers of English in general, and South Korean graduate students in particular, will follow. Finally, limitations of the study and suggestions for future study will be also provided.

Overview of the Study

The purpose of the present study was to investigate sense of audience within a cross-cultural framework that compared the writing of U.S. and South Korean graduate students enrolled in U.S. graduate programs. Specifically, this study focused on the three essential aspects of audience in writing: (a) metacognitive awareness of audience, (b) audience adaptation strategies, and (c) discourse community socialization. Audience adaptation strategies investigated focused on deployment of interpersonal metadiscourse features (Intaraprawat & Steffensen, 1995). This investigation was based on a review of composition literature integrating cognitive, social, and sociolinguistic perspectives.

The data for this study were compiled by first measuring writers’ metacognitive awareness of audience by mean of a composite score of Disciplinary Audience Awareness. In addition, writers’ self-reports of their deliberate consideration of audience were obtained via interview with a subset of participants. Second, writers’ adaptation to audience was measured by
the relative frequencies of interpersonal metadiscourse markers (Metadiscourse Frequency) appearing in their academic papers. A subset of participants engaged in discourse-based interviews, providing their reasons for using those markers (Metadiscourse Rationale). They also provided self-reports of strategies they utilized to adapt to audience in the writing process. Third, discourse community socialization was measured by seven items reflecting Disciplinary Socialization. Because the impact of socialization over time was of interest, changes in writers’ metacognitive awareness of audience, Metadiscourse Frequency/Rationale, and writers’ self-reported strategies of adaptation to audience were examined at two different points in time, with a semester-interval between them (Time).

Main findings of the study, first, include cross-cultural differences in, and socialization effects on, audience awareness and adaptation strategies. They pertain, particularly to the Research Question 1 (RQ1: What are some differences between the ways that U.S. and South Korean graduate students conceptualize and adapt to audiences in their academic writing?) and the Research Question 2 (RQ 2: What are some ways in which U.S. and South Korean graduate students’ conceptualization of, and adaptation to, audiences change in conjunction with their participation in disciplinary socialization practices over two consecutive semesters?). The present study probes to answers to the Research Questions 1 and 2 in the following four sections: (1) writers’ metacognitive awareness of audience, (2) writers’ adaptation to indeterminate audiences, (3) writers’ adaptation to determinate audiences, and (4) relations between writers’ disciplinary socialization and disciplinary audience awareness. Subsequently, main findings of the study also include cross-cultural differences in writers’ deployments of interpersonal metadiscourse markers, which particularly pertain to the Research Question 3 (RQ3: What are some differences between the ways that U.S. and South Korean graduate students deploy
interpersonal metadiscourse markers in their academic writing?) and Research Questions 4 (RQ 4: What are some ways in which U.S. and South Korean graduate students’ deployment of interpersonal metadiscourse markers change in conjunction with their participation in disciplinary socialization practices over two consecutive semesters?). Answers to the Research Questions 3 and 4 are discussed in the following three sections: (1) differences in relative frequencies of interpersonal metadiscourse categories, (2) writers’ rationales for using interpersonal metadiscourse markers, and (3) relations among writers’ disciplinary socialization, disciplinary audience awareness, and productions among interpersonal metadiscourse markers.

The results of the study, however, revealed little change over a semester’s time in terms of (a) audience awareness and adaptation strategies, and (b) production of interpersonal metadiscourse markers, which pertain to the Research Questions 2 and 4, respectively. It may be that audience knowledge accrues quite slowly. Or it may require the intercession of some key learning event, such as feedback from an editor or critic. At any rate, the design of the present study failed to detect any such growth over a semester’s time. Thus, the main findings of the current study are discussed mainly in reference to the Research Questions 1 and 3.

Audience Awareness and Adaptation Strategies

Writers’ Metacognitive Awareness of Audience

Writers’ self-reports of their own cognitive processes related to audience (i.e., writers’ metacognitive awareness of audience) are important because of the significant relation between metacognitive knowledge and actual writing performance (Devine, 1993; Devine, Railey, & Boshoff, 1993; Kasper, 1997). The semi-structured interview data revealed a great deal of metacognitive awareness of audience among the U.S. interviewees. The U.S. students seemed to have established the schemata (Anderson, 1977) for the notion of audience. Although I
deliberately avoided mentioning the term audience during the interview (instead, I used the reader[s]), three U.S. students (Amy, David, and Mary) by themselves spontaneously mentioned the term. All four U.S. students strongly affirmed their deliberate thoughts about audience in writing. They further reported considering audience as an essential part of the writing process.

In contrast, the South Korean interviewees displayed less prominent evidence of this kind of metacognition. Only two South Korean students explicitly affirmed audience considerations. One South Korean student even disavowed thinking about audience. It is plausible that the less active metacognitive awareness of audience among the Korean writers could be attributed to their non-native English language linguistic proficiency. During their interviews, all four South Korean students expressed concerns regarding their limited English language proficiency (though of course as graduate students at competitive universities, their English proficiency could only be considered low relative to the rigorous language challenges with which they were confronted). No doubt problems with language production can put stress on L2 writers’ cognitive capacities (Raimes 1985), including their capacities for deliberating about audience needs.

A second explanation for the differences in metacognitive awareness of audience between the U.S. and South Korean students may lie in the two groups’ different exposure to the concept of audience itself, that is, differences in earlier rhetorical education. In contrast to the U.S. interviewees, only one South Korean student, Sumie, spontaneously demonstrated prior knowledge of the concept. Sumie was also the South Korean who strongly affirmed her consciousness of audience. Another South Korean student, Noorie’s pattern of response from time 1 to time 2 suggests that once she was exposed to the concept of audience in a meaningful way, she readily adopted the construct. Noorie strongly affirmed her deliberate consideration of audience at her second interview only. Interestingly, Noorie’s heightened metacognitive
awareness was prompted by my interview questions during the first interview, rather than by her disciplinary socialization (see Example 10 for Noorie’s response). This suggests that audience-prompt questions can facilitate writers’ awareness of audience in the writing classroom.

Wolvoord (1986, pp. 52-53; see also Rubin & Dodd, 1987) advocates a very similar procedure for enhancing sense of audience among L1 writers. It should be noted, however, that this sort of exposure to the concept of audience does not uniformly stimulate audience awareness; as another South Korean writer, Jeanie, remained unaware of audience consideration at the second interview even though she was given audience-prompt questions during the first.

A third explanation for the relatively diminished audience awareness displayed by the Korean interviews points to certain cultural factors. In a frequently cited article, Hinds (1987) concluded that in some East Asian cultures such as Japan, readers are expected to take considerable responsibility for identifying the writer’s implicit signals connecting information in a text in order to appreciate the text as a unified whole. This “reader responsibility” paradigm contrasts with the typical Western paradigm, “writer responsibility,” in which the writer is deemed obliged to provide sufficiently explicit cues to disambiguate any differences in interpretation about the writer’s intended meaning. Despite some methodological criticisms on Hinds’ (1987) typology (e.g., Kubota, 1997; McCagg, 1996), no clear empirical evidence for rejecting Hinds’ typology has been forwarded. The cultural explanation regarding norms for writer versus reader investment is in some degree the most theoretically rich account, and therefore satisfying. Behind it lies the entire corpus of contrastive rhetoric scholarship (e.g., Connor, 1996a; Connor & Kaplan, 1987). It should be noted, however, that all four Korean interviewees reported having made little effort towards stylistic rhetorical manipulations as ways of adapting to audience due to their concerns about grammatical conventional uses of English.
Rather, their primary concerns were given to successfully generating and expressing their ideas in a timely manner rather than the rhetorical effectiveness of text (see Examples 15 and 16).

Canagarajah (2002) provides an alternative perspective for understanding the Korean students’ limited investment in adapting their texts to audience, and in the process, diminishes the significance of cultural norms. Canagarajah generally criticizes the L2 writing research trends that have focused on L2 writers’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds for explaining the characteristics of L2 texts (e.g., Connor, 1996a; Kaplan, 1966; Mauranen, 1993). Instead, Canagarajah underscored the influence of the L2 writers’ material, living conditions on their texts in English. He postulated, for example, that the writers’ material condition, such as a lack of time allowed for writing and limited access to material resources (e.g., pen, paper, word-processors, literature, etc.), would restrain the L2 writers from producing multiple revisions of their drafts. Even though South Korean international students are not situated in the deprived living conditions Canagarajah describes, it may be the case that international students, because of the sheer time burdens imposed by reading and writing in a second language and coping in a climate with little material and social support (and in some cases putting in arduous hours assisting in research), may defer audience-adaptation in favor of simply completing their writing assignments by the deadline.

Writers’ Adaptation to Indeterminate Audiences

Both qualitative and quantitative findings converged to indicate high levels of consideration of generalized, indeterminate audiences especially characteristic of the U.S. graduate students. The notion of indeterminate audience (Rubin, 1984, 1998; or implied audience; see Ong’s [1975] argument for fictional audience and Ede and Lunsford’s [1984] discussion of audience invoked) is meant to encompass a broad community of potential readers,
as opposed to a more clearly defined readership or set of known, individual readers. Specifically, at interview 1, all four U.S. students reported having made a conscious effort to provide rich intertextuality, clear organization, straightforward style, and formal academic language in their academic papers as ways of adapting to generalized audiences in writing.

The predominance of self-reported strategies for adaptation to indeterminate audiences among U.S. interviewees does not mean that South Korean participants were categorically unconcerned about such audiences. A South Korean student, Noorie, reported having attempted to write coherently in reference to audience adaptation. Both Noorie and Jeanie reported that they had attempted to avoid possible miscommunications resulting from their ungrammatical, unconventional use of English. Jeanie, for example, even deleted a chunk of passages out of her draft when she was uncertain of its communicability. These self-reported strategies for adaptation to audience are taken as limited evidence of sensitivity to indeterminate audiences. It is important to note that the group-comparison analysis result from Disciplinary Audience Awareness was also in line with the result of the semi-structured interview. Mean scores on the composite variable Disciplinary Audience Awareness (i.e., writers’ sensitivities to discipline-based writing styles, intertextuality, organization, and cohesion), were higher for U.S. students than for their South Korean counterparts.

What exactly does it mean to be sensitive to an indeterminate disciplinary audience? Rubin (1998) posited that writers’ conforming to genre conventions is part and parcel of their adaptation to indeterminate audiences. Similarly, Thrall, Blyler, and Ewald (1988) highlighted the importance of writers’ consideration of internal relationships within a text including cohesion/cohesive devices, textual patterns, and other generic textual elements because this indicates that the writers are “thinking of the reader[s] in an implied sense, as a textual role that
actual readers are invited to adopt (p. 51).” It should be noted that this theoretic position, which subsumes conformity to genre conventions under audience considerations, runs contrary to other positions which emphasize the learning of social conventions over the exercise of social cognition (e.g., Bizzell, 1986; Burleson & Rowan, 1985). In short, the U.S. students seemed to be more keenly aware of the expectations and conventions regarding academic writing, and that is construed here as reflecting awareness of indeterminate audiences.

The different levels in consideration of and adaptation to indeterminate audiences between these two nationality groups may reflect the different levels of the writers’ familiarity with U.S. academic writing conventions. Bizzell (1982) maintained that poor writers’ problems originate from their unfamiliarity with discourse community conventions. Given that South Korean international students had had no experiences within U.S. formal educational systems, prior to their current graduate programs, they would have been far less familiar with general U.S. academic writing conventions than U.S. students. This proposed linkage between audience adaptation and exposure to discourse norms is consonant with the correlations between number of semesters of enrollment in U.S. graduate programs (Semesters of Enrollment) and Disciplinary Audience Awareness. The correlation coefficient was statistically significant for the South Korean students, but not for U.S. students. The amount of shared variance between the two variables was 22% for the Koreans.

The data from the discourse-based interviews (i.e., the writers’ reasons for using specific interpersonal metadiscourse items) are a rich source of information about how Korean and U.S. interviewees construed indeterminate audiences in their writing. When asked about to whom they had addressed such sentences accompanied by questions, directives, or inclusive we appearing in their papers, three U.S. students explained that they had addressed their sentences to
indeterminate audiences, such as “all educators (Amy in Example, 23),” “critical thinkers (Mary in Example 29),” or “professionals in my field and education (David).” Specifically, David elaborated, “I am thinking about sort of general idea of professionals and education. Sort of it’s kind of a haze concept but (…) I guess I mean professionals in my field and education. I think of them as kind of a block of people.” Two South Korean students responded that they had addressed their sentences (accompanying a relational marker) to indeterminate audiences, such as “everybody” (Noorie in Example 32), “general public” (Noorie in Example 36), or “anyone who would conduct a similar study to mine” (Haejin in Example 38). These responses argue that writers entertain clear representations of indeterminate audiences; conforming to genre conventions is not merely a matter of blindly reproducing discourse patterns.

Among all eight interviewees, one South Korean writer, Noorie, conceptualized an indeterminate audience that was not exclusively disciplinary. At her second interview, Noorie explained,

I thought I wanted to write in the way that even those who are not scholars, you know, general public, for example, a mother who raises a kid at home, could read this paper... I have thought and also learned that knowledge and scholarship should not be academicians’ sole possession. (Example 10)

Noorie’s evocation of a more hybrid indeterminate audience may resonate with some characteristics of writing practices in non-U.S. academic communities reported by Canagarajah (2002). Canagarajah noted that compared to native English speaking scholars in the U.S., peripheral region scholars, such as those in Sri Lanka, “attempt to include everyone as the audience for the paper” (p. 115). He further explained that, influenced by the democratic ethos, peripheral scholars are reluctant to make distinctions between the academic community and the
general society; and thus they often attempt to address their professional articles to the wide scope of generalized audiences. The ‘democratic ethos’ of academic communities, mentioned by Canagarajah (2002), also is similar to the reason that Noorie articulated for her audience construction: “I have thought and also learned that knowledge and scholarship should not be academician’s sole possession.” Given that Noorie had completed her master’s in South Korea, it may be the case that her way of constructing indeterminate audiences was influenced by her prior education, or it might have been the case that the less elitist view of audience expressed by Noorie was a perspective that she acquired in her graduate studies in education in the U.S. In any event, Noorie’s case reminds us that the understandings of academic discourse community, the distinctive boundary between academic discourse community and general society, and adequate scope of audience for academic writing all could vary depending on culture.

One U.S. student’s (David in Example 6) and one South Korean student’s (Haejin in Example 38) evocations of audiences are noteworthy. These two writers evoked more specific type of audiences when they were writing specific part of their papers. Specifically, David reported having evoked “someone who was gonna use the tool that we used” as his target audience particularly when he had written about his procedures in his research paper. He added that his evocation of the audience could guide him to provide information with greater clarity. This seems to support the findings of many process-based writing research studies that suggest strong connections between writers’ mental representations of even indeterminate audiences and their choices of persuasive strategies, including the level of clarity in texts (Berkenkotter, 1981; Roth, 1987; Zainuddin, 1995). Similarly, Haejin, reported, while explaining about her use of a directive at the discourse-based interview, that she had conceived future researchers (“anyone who would conduct a similar study to mine” from Example 38) when she wrote the limitations
and suggestions for future research in her paper. Together, the data indicates that both David and
Haejin had created a certain type of indeterminate audience (i.e., not actual, corporeal readers for
their papers) in a specific genre of writing (e.g., research paper) or a specific part of the genre
(e.g., methods). These abilities to imagine a certain type of audience embedded in a certain
component of a particular type of writing genre further illustrates the complexity and subtly of
disciplinary audience adaptation. Finally with respect to sensitivity to indeterminate disciplinary
(or broader) audiences, comparisons of the eight interviews conducted at time 1 with the eight
time 2 interviews revealed very little change in the audience constructs or rationales expressed.

Writers’ Adaptation to Determinate Audiences

Audiences are not mutually exclusive. It is quite common in rhetorical studies to consider
the multiple audiences at play in a given situation (Huettman, 1996; Roth, 1987; Rubin, 1998).
So just as graduate student writers may be considering indeterminate disciplinary (or non-
disciplinary) audiences, so may they simultaneously factor in considerations regarding specific,
corporeal readers. In general, Korean as well as U.S. interviewees identified their
professors/instructors as their primary (but not the sole) audiences, because it was the professors
who were supposed to read their papers. It is important to note that for the writer-audience
relationship, professors may possess powerful authority over grading the students’ papers.
Audience literature has suggested that when the audience has power in evaluating the text, it is of
importance for the writer to be able to adapt his or her text to the audience’s expectations
through a careful audience analysis (Mitchell & Taylor, 1979; Tomlinson, 1990). The U.S.
students (David, Lisa, and Mary) generally recognized their grades as direct results from their
professors’ satisfaction with their texts. South Korean students (Jeannie and Sumie) closely
adhered to their professors’ guidelines for the writing assignments/assessments, presumably because professors are the arbiters of grades.

Although U.S. and South Korean students were primarily concerned with adapting to the same determinate audience (their professors), there were some differences between the ways that U.S. and South Korean students attempted to fulfill their audience needs. Specifically, the U.S. students’ deliberate efforts to adapt to audience was aimed at affirmatively modifying the audience – pleasing, persuading, or appealing to their professors. For example, two U.S. students (Lisa and Mary) deliberately included the words and phrases that they knew their professors liked. Lisa further carefully searched references which were relevant and understandable to her professor. For South Korean students, their strategies of adaptation to determinate audiences were pertinent to their awareness of their audiences having different cultural backgrounds from themselves. As ways of adapting to determinate audiences, South Korean student writers invested their efforts to minimize potential misunderstanding or breakdown in communication. The Korean students aimed to fill in possible gaps in information in their papers. Noorie, for example, provided a long, detailed explanation for a concept from the Korean philosophy because she was uncertain of its communicability to her professor. This also resonates with Scarcella’s (1984) finding that L2 students tend to foreground overly lengthy orientations in their texts to build a common ground with readers partly due to their limited knowledge of the readers’ sociocultural backgrounds.

However, the Korean students’ efforts to adapt to determinate audiences were not limited to merely avoiding communication breakdown. They seemed to further motivate themselves to solicit audiences’ recognition toward their personal interests and unique cultural backgrounds. For example, Noorie was sensitive to her professor’s lack of knowledge about Korea, and so she
adapted him by trying to educate and inform her professor of educational philosophy in South Korea. Sumie was aware that her professor did not know her well as an individual, and so she adapted by trying to provide him with her personal information (i.e., her sincere interests in a specific topic and her convictions in social justice).

In essence, this finding suggests that U.S. and South Korean students differed in their approaches to fulfilling audience needs. U.S. student writers adapted to determinate audiences by constructing targeted arguments or citing favored authorities. Differentially from their U.S. counterparts, South Korean students adapted to determinate audiences primarily to overcome cultural and linguistic barriers between audiences and writers themselves. The Korean students exerted their efforts to avoid being misunderstood and misjudged due to their insufficient English writing proficiency or little comprehension of cultural knowledge. The South Korean students further actively pursued to solicit audiences’ recognitions to their own personal and cultural backgrounds. No distinct change over time in both U.S. and South Korean students’ specific tactics for determinate audience adaptation was detected.

*Relations between Writers’ Disciplinary Socialization and Disciplinary Audience Awareness*

Overall, no direct relation between writers’ participation in their disciplinary practices (*Disciplinary Socialization*) and their cognitive awareness of disciplinary writing styles (*Disciplinary Audience Awareness*) was evident in these data. However, for the South Korean students, the number of semesters for which they had been enrolled in their graduate programs (*Semesters of Enrollment*) was found to significantly correlate with *Disciplinary Audience Awareness*. The amount of shared variance was 22%. This result suggests that the length of immersion in their disciplinary cultures significantly influenced the South Korean students’ awareness of discourse types and use of persuasive strategies in their disciplines.
Deployment of Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers

Difference in Relative Frequencies of Interpersonal Metadiscourse Categories

Overall, the U.S. students employed significantly higher numbers of hedges and boosters than their South Korean counterparts. The results of the current study may resonate with the arguments from previous studies that inadequate modulation of propositions is a problematic characteristic of texts written by L2 students at Western universities (Hyland, 1994; Richards & Skelton, 1991; Skelton, 1988; Wishnoff, 2000). Specifically, previous research findings suggested that unhedged and direct writing styles are a salient characteristic of L2 writing (Bloor & Bloor, 1991; Gilbert, 1991; Hu, Brown, & Brown, 1982; Hyland, 1994; Richards & Skelton, 1991). Gilbert (1991), for example, argued that even proficient L2 writers typically produce unhedged and direct writing styles. Without appropriate levels of hedging in texts, however, L2 writers often sound too blunt, as if their opinions were indiscernible from facts (Bloor & Bloor, 1991; Hu et al., 1982). Hu and his colleagues (1982) also reported that Chinese writers in English as a second language (ESL) tended to use strong modals more frequently in their texts than native English speaking (NES) writers did; as a result, Chinese ESL writers sounded more direct and authoritative in tones than their NES counterparts. Similarly, in analyzing ESL students’ texts in Hong Kong, Allison (1995) observed that those ESL students often made unwarrantedly strong claims.

The results of the present study, however, contradict some of contrastive rhetoric findings that East Asian writers are more indirect and less likely to impose a point of view on a reader when expressing their opinions (Bloch & Chi, 1995; Harder, 1984; Wu & Rubin, 2000). Particularly, Japanese (Harder, 1984) and Chinese (Bloch & Chi, 1995; Wu & Rubin, 2000) were suggested to prefer a more cautious and indirect style of writing. Hyland and Milton (1997)
argued that culturally preferred writing styles in terms of the degree of hedging or boosting arguments might not be well predictive of the ways that L2 writers utilize hedges or boosters in texts. Rather, they suspected if “Often [L2] students are simply not taught sufficient expressions as alternatives to categorical assertion” (Hyland & Milton, 1997, p. 186). Similarly, Gilbert (1991) argued that L2 writers often misinterpreted L2 writing instructions as suggesting that a direct style of writing is preferred in English academic writing. In examining writing text books in English for Academic Purposes (EAP), Hyland (1994) found that many EAP text books failed to provide L2 students with adequate guides for utilizing hedges. In short, the results of the present study support Mohan and Lo (1985) in that L2 students’ poor rhetorical skills do not necessarily result from the influence from their L1s but could be a developmental problem. Thus, the results of the present study suggest that South Korean international students might need instructional help regarding adequately modulating their arguments by utilizing epistemic metadiscourse devices (i.e., hedges and boosters).

The relative frequencies of hedges and boosters appearing in both U.S. and South Korean students’ papers did not significantly change from one semester to the next. More importantly, even the number of semesters of enrollment in one’s graduate program exerted no significant effect on the relative frequencies of hedges and boosters in both U.S. and South Korean students’ papers. This result suggests that South Korean students’ sense of interpersonal metadiscourse to approach U.S. students’ “norm” may require more than just exposure. Rather, acquisition of native-like metadiscourse patterns may require explicit, formal instruction.

This conclusion regarding the need for explicit training in academic metadiscourse calls to mind the debate, common in the pedagogical literature on English for Special Purposes or EAP regarding teaching and learning genre conventions. One camp, associated with genre
scholars such as Bahtia (1993) and Swales (1990), believes that it is helpful and necessary to dissect genre conventions and teach them explicitly to students. The opposing camp, associated with scholars such as Freedman (1999), believe that writers learn genre conventions implicitly, through immersion in texts representing those genres, and that explicit instruction cannot convey a natural sense of appropriateness. The present results are more supportive of the former camp than the latter.

Additionally, the results of the present study are consistent with those of Hyland (2004) in that hedges were the most frequently used features among the five interpersonal metadiscourse categories. Specifically, Hyland (2004) reported that hedges amounted to 41% of all interpersonal metadiscourse features appearing in L2 students’ theses/dissertations. In the present study, for the Korean students, the proportion of hedges was 46.93% at time 1 and 43.32% at time 2. The Korean students in the present study utilized the slightly higher proportion of hedges at each time than those L2 students in Hyland’s (2004) study. This seems to result from the difference in the types of writing samples examined in the two studies. Specifically, Hyland (2004) examined theses and dissertations from various disciplines whereas the present study analyzed predominantly academic essays written in education, humanities, and social science fields. Thus, it is likely that the Korean students in the current study were at more liberty to use the higher proportion of hedges than those in Hyland’s (2004) study.

Writers’ Rationales for Using Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers

For each of two papers, written one semester apart, interviewees were asked to provide rationales for their use of metadiscourse items. To keep this element of the methodology manageable, they were quizzed about the first occurrence in each paper of the top three most frequent metadiscourse features for each of the five major categories of metadiscourse. Overall,
the results of these discourse-based interviews make it very evident that these graduate students’ deployment of interpersonal metadiscourse in their papers was motivated by a lively consideration of audience.

With respect to rationales for metadiscourse use, U.S. and South Korean students exhibited many more similarities than differences. For example, among the total five different rationales for using relational markers articulated by the eight interviewees at both interview 1 and 2, four rationales occurred in both U.S. and South Korean student writers. Both groups of writers also concurred in their rationales for using self-mentions: to express their ownership of, or personal commitment to the texts. Indeed, the qualitative methods used to analyze the discourse-based interviews do not permit meaningful comparisons between groups. Nonetheless, contrasting South Korean discourse-based interviews with U.S. interviews helps to clarify what is characteristic among the second language learners. There were instances that the South Korean interviewees’ rationales for use of metadiscourse markers reflected (a) influences of Korean as their first language (L1), and (b) politeness strategies.

*L1 Influence*

Among Korean students’ rationales for using hedges, boosters, and attitude markers, some comments suggested the occurrence of classic interlanguage. “Interlanguage” denotes a linguistic system independently existing between L1 and actual L2 (Selinker, 1972). In his theory of an interlanguage, Selinker also postulated that a L2 learner tends to show particular linguistic rules or items in his or her interlanguage, as transferred from his or her L1. One prime example of interlanguage was revealed when Sumie (at interview 2) explained that *could* in her sentence was intended to convey a sense of unexpectedness or surprise. Sumie had written in her paper, “I *could* directly hear about their preference to learning French” (see Example 50). Sumie
herself suspected that her use of could in that instance was under the influence of her L1, Korean language. According to her, in Korean language, the modal verb, in correspondence to could, often conveys a sense of an unexpected opportunity, rather than a result of willful effort.

Regarding her use of could, Sumie further explained,

> For example, you told me a secret, and I said to other people, “I could hear her secret,” instead of “I heard her secret.” So to speak, it was not what I expected, I just happened to have a chance to know your secret. I think I often use that nuance also when I speak in Korean. (Example 50)

In other words, this modal verb, could, was intended to attribute the occurrence of an event to chance circumstance as opposed to personal involvement. The interlanguage explanation is bolstered by Sumie’s allusion to the commonly understood (among Korean students) construct of Konglish.

**Politeness Strategy**

In her first writing sample, Noorie wrote, “If we accept this view, we might be able to see that ....,” When questioned about might as a metadiscourse marker, Noorie wondered if she might have made her statement too polite by using that hedge. Noorie’s understanding of the sociolinguistic meaning of might appears to be related to a modesty or politeness strategy (Brown & Levinson, 1987; also see Crompton, 1997; Myers, 1989). Brown and Levinson (1987) explained politeness strategies in terms of two distinct aspects of face, positive face and negative face. Positive face is carried by (a) expressing the speaker’s positive regard for her interlocutor such as appreciation, complement, or solidarity. It can be argued that all relational metadiscourse (we, would you? or okay?) conveys as sense of social inclusion and therefore constitutes an expression of positive face. Negative face, in contrast, is projected by constraining the other’s
autonomy, by imposing any action or belief on one’s interlocutor. Hedges are one way of avoiding negative face threatening acts, since they give the other an “out,” rather than outright contradicting that other. In Noorie’s example, she was avoiding a potentially negative face threatening act against her reader by mitigating her claim. This mitigation was accomplished by choosing *might* instead of *would*. The hedge counts as a politeness strategy since it permitted audiences to make their own decisions on the truth of her claims.

Related to cross-cultural differences in utilizing politeness strategies, there are some research studies which explained cross-cultural differences in the choice of communication strategies in terms of individuals’ efforts to accomplish communication goals while carefully negotiating certain communicational constraints (e.g., Kim, 1993, 1994). For example, Kim and Wilson (1994) proposed the five conversation constraints as accounting for cultural differences in conversational strategies: (a) Concern to avoid hurting the hearer’s feelings, (b) Concern for minimizing the imposition, (c) Concern for avoiding negative evaluation by the hearer, (d) Concern for clarity, and (e) Concern for effectiveness. Kim (1994) compared the ways that mainland U.S., Korean, and Hawaiian participants perceived the relative importance of the five conversational constraints; the study results found that mainland U.S. participants exhibited greater concern for clarity in information while Korean participants showed greater concern for avoiding hurting the hearer’s feelings and minimizing imposition on hearer. The results of Kim’s (1994) study provide an empirical support for the possibility that the rhetorical patterns or strategies preferred by writers’ native cultures manifest themselves in their L2 texts, and also that Noorie’s deployment of *might* (instead of *would*) was motivated to minimize the imposition on audiences.
Relations among Writers’ Disciplinary Socialization, Disciplinary Audience Awareness, and Production of Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers

Whereas for the U.S. students, none of the indices of Disciplinary Socialization predicted their production of any of the interpersonal metadiscourse features, for the South Korean students, several indices of Disciplinary Socialization did covary with production of certain metadiscourse features. For Korean graduate students, the amount of weekly reading was significantly predictive of frequency of self-mentions. Self-mention metadiscourse, or first person voice, is the subject of great upheaval and changing norms in North American written rhetoric. Typical guidelines/advice for effective writing caution against abusing statements begin with “I” (e.g., I think…, I am going to…, Pellegrino, 2003). However, seemingly contradictory advice is also found elsewhere: “use the active voice” (e.g., “I shall always remember my first visit to Boston,” Strunk & White, 2000, p. 18). For Korean students in this study, more academic reading these participants engaged in, the more first person voice appeared in their writing.

Several alternative explanations for this relation between reading load and first person voice are plausible. One possibility is that the disciplines that require the heaviest reading loads tend to be humanistic in orientation. Humanistic disciplines are also those that are most liberal about use of first person voice. So the correlation may be an artifact of the Korean students’ academic majors. The academic major explanation, however, does not account for the presence of this correlation only among Koreans. One would have expected the correlation to be even stronger among U.S. writers. Another possible explanation for the correlation between reading load and use of first person in writing pertains to South Korean students’ socialization into U.S. academia. Disciplinary reading is perhaps the most potent factor in academic socialization (Berkenkotter et al., 1988). Those Korean students who read the most each week were arguably
becoming the most deeply socialized among their fellow international students – reading being even more important in that regard than number of semesters of enrollment. The breadth of styles and genres to which these students were exposed opened their repertoires to discovery and expression of their own voices.

Curiously, South Korean students’ English proficiency as reflected in their (self-reported) TOEFL scores exerted the opposite effect on this same metadiscourse feature, that is, self-mentions. TOEFL scores were inversely related to relative frequency of self-mentions. This result may resonate with Recski’s (2004) finding that non-native English speaking (NNES) writers (Czech, Brazilian, French, Spanish, Dutch, Finnish) used first person pronouns more than native English speaking (NES) writers. Recski further suggested that NES writers might avoid personal pronouns by utilizing passives or –ing participles where their NNES counterparts use first person pronouns. The conclusion might be drawn that Korean students’ use of first person pronouns is negatively associated with their level of English proficiency.

However, this result seems contradictory to the positive relation between Korean students’ use of self-mentions and their amount of reading. One possible explanation for these contradictory results might be related to Korean students’ previous experiences with English language education in Korea. Given that English academic writing is often considered to prefer impersonal voice, it is possible that Korean students were advised not to use many “I”s from their English writing instructions in Korea. Compared to the students who gained lower TOEFL scores, the higher TOEFL scorers are likely to have been more extensively involved in English language instruction in Korea, thus it is possible that they continue to abide by their lesson regarding not to use many “I”s. If this is the case, it would be important that L2 writing teachers are aware of their students’ previous experiences with English language instruction and help
them unlearn stereotypical conceptions regarding English writing, which they might bring with them from their previous English learning experiences.

**Pedagogical Implications for the Teaching of Second Language Writing**

The findings of the current study have significant implications for teaching L2 writing. They confirm the findings of writing research studies that highlight the role of writers’ metacognitive knowledge of the composing processes and strategies in academic writing performances (Devine, 1993; Devine et al., 1993; Kasper, 1997). From the pedagogical perspective, thus, it is of importance for U.S. educators to facilitate L2 writers’ metacognitive awareness of audience in writing. As shown in several of the interviews of South Korean students, L2 writers can be oblivious to audience, because of constrained conceptual knowledge of audience itself. Thus, teaching L2 writers broad constructions of audience such as multiple audiences and determinate as well as indeterminate others would help them to be more consciousness of audience, and consequently assist them to adapt to the audience of their texts. Although it lies outside the scope of the present study to consider tools for enhancing audience sensitivity, it appeared in several instances that simply asking interview questions regarding audience had that desired effect. Systematic use of audience prompt-questions might very well help L2 writers increase their audience awareness in their writing processes (See Rubin & Dodd, 1987 for audience heuristics for non-native beginning levels writers of academic English).

Encouraging L2 students (indeed, all students) to write for multiple audiences is another promising technique for developing a richer sense of audience. Even with writing tasks in the academic setting, writers often need to write for multiple audiences. For example, they write for multiple professors in such contexts as preliminary examinations or theses. When writers submit their papers to a conference/journal, they need to consider the editorial boards as well as
potential audiences for the conference/journal. Thus, L2 writers would benefit when encouraged to conjure multiple, potential audiences and attempt to negotiate those audiences’ various, often conflicting needs/expectations in their texts.

The results of this study also suggest the important role of writers’ mental constructs for audience (both determinate and indeterminate audiences) in their actual writing performances (Berkenkotter, 1981; Roth, 1987; Zainuddin, 1995). From the perspective of social constructionism, adequate representation of audience should be consistent with what writers’ discourse communities expect in terms of argument structures, persuasive strategies, levels of clarity, and coherent/cohesive devices (e.g., Bizzell, 1982; Bartholomae, 1985; Swales, 1990). Although explicit teaching of genre conventions remains somewhat controversial in L2 composition pedagogy (see Caudery, 1998), results of this present study suggest that it is helpful for graduate students to possess consciously available metacognitive knowledge for projecting an adequate representation of audience (e.g., those who want to replicate the study) in correspondence to certain writing genres (e.g., research papers) or specific parts of a text (e.g., the methods section). Certainly, this genre-based knowledge should be taught as a matter of rhetorical judgment rather than as sets of abstract rules or absolute stylistic targets, an emerging criticism of the use of “learner corpus” techniques for teaching stylistic conventions (e.g., Granger & Tribble, 1998).

Knowledge of audience is insufficient if writers lack the tactical tools for adapting to those audiences in written language. Interpersonal metadiscourse constitutes a set of such tactical tools, and L2 writers need support in learning how to deploy metadiscourse. For example, the finding that the South Korean students used significantly lower relative frequencies of hedges and boosters may corroborate the previous research findings suggesting that due to limited
pedagogical guides in L2 writing, L2 writers often fail to adequately modulate their assertions in texts (Gilbert, 1991; Hyland, 1994; Hyland & Milton, 1997). Thus, L2 writing teachers should facilitate L2 students’ awareness of the importance of appropriately modulating the proposition in a text (Intaraprawat & Steffensen, 1995).

It is likely that international students or L2 writers, in general are not fully aware of various, subtle sociolinguistic functions of interpersonal metadiscourse items. In the present study, Korean interviewees indicated that they were too busy avoiding negative evaluation due to linguistic errors to engage in constructive adaptation via selection of supporting material. In this vein, a number of studies in L2 acquisition investigated instructional methods to increase L2 writers’ pragmatic awareness (e.g., Bouton, 1994; House, 1996; Kasper & Schmidt, 1996; LoCastro, 1997). L2 writers’ increased awareness of pragmatic functions of metadiscourse will contribute to their development in (written) communicative competence (Roberts, 1998; Wishnoff, 2000). Therefore, L2 writing teachers need to provide L2 writers with pragmatic knowledge of what sense metadiscourse features could convey in texts, and of the possible impact of misusing metadiscourse features. Misuse (relative to a native writer norm) is quite likely among L2 writers due to L1 interlanguage influences, differing sociocultural schemata for politeness or other interpersonal intentions, or lack of feature-specific knowledge of sociolinguistic meanings.

Foremost, it is not possible to read through the interview results of this study without being struck by the degree to which South Korean graduate students suffer from communication apprehension and lack of confidence in their English usage. Specifically, in academic writing, South Korean students tend to have severe concerns over grammatical errors, unconventional expressions, and miscommunication. These concerns cause them to limit their rhetorical
ambitions. They typically choose to communicate safely within their relatively confined repertoires of English at the cost of asserting their own unique voices and thoughts (see also Fox, 1994). To avoid exacerbating international students’ insecurities about their writing in English, U.S. instructors are advised to develop more creative ways to provide constructive feedback on the students’ papers. For example, it would help South Korean students if U.S. instructors provide the students with their comments including alternative ways to clarify confusing sentences, organize a paragraph in more cohesive way, or suggest more concrete, specific choices of diction to replace abstract, general terms (see Ferris, Pezone, Tade, & Tinti, 1997).

The challenge for instructors in providing feedback regarding linguistic/pragmatic effectiveness is to avoid hobbling L2 writers’ fluency in English writing. There does seem to be an inevitable trade-off between developing conscious metacognitive habits for rhetorical competence and developing L2 writing fluency (Truscott, 1996, 1999). At very least, L2 writing teachers need to clearly decide their primary goals for any given feedback, focusing either on linguistic accuracy or on writing fluency. From the developmental perspective, L2 writers at the beginning level are likely to benefit more from instruction focusing on developing their writing fluency, whereas those at intermediate to advanced levels (including international graduate students) would be better served by instruction focusing on linguistic accuracy, particularly through correcting linguistic errors appearing in their written work.

Given the significant role of international students’ writing competence in their academic achievement and future career success, institutional support for international students’ development in writing competence is imperative. It would be of help if universities or colleges in the U.S. provide international graduate students with institutional academic assistance such as
offering academic writing courses specifically designed for international graduate students’ needs.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations of the current study should be noted. First of all, although the participants were recruited from multiple universities and across diverse academic disciplines, the sample for this study cannot be considered representative of the population of U.S. and South Korean students enrolled in U.S. graduate programs. No doubt some selection bias was also entailed in obtaining volunteers for this study. Especially since no incentives for participation were offered, only highly motivated students joined the study sample. No doubt some of the findings for international students would be even direr had the participants been less motivated about their writing.

In addition, because of the relatively small sample sizes (i.e., 19 U.S. and 22 South Korean students for their writing samples), statistical power (to detect true differences) was low. With sufficient statistical power, the results might have revealed an effect for time of interview, and perhaps even an interesting interaction between Nationality and Time. The small size of the interviewee pools (four U.S. and four South Korean students, all of whom were majoring in education) is certainly another limitation. Due to the small sample sizes, along with the qualitative methods employed to analyze the interview data, no direct comparisons could be made between U.S. and Korean respondents.

Another limitation pertains to the research design. In this study, no expert assessment of the quality of the academic papers collected was available. Therefore, this study could not provide empirical evidence regarding how each of the three major variables – (a) consciousness of disciplinary audiences, (b) disciplinary socialization, and (c) frequencies of interpersonal
metadiscourse items – actually contributed to the quality of academic writing. One reason why an assessment of writing quality was not even attempted in this study is that standards and criteria for effective writing in graduate-level assignments would be so difficult to specify and agree upon. In addition, the present study relied on participants’ self-reports in measuring the degrees of their disciplinary socialization and disciplinary audience awareness. The use of self-report instruments could be a threat to internal validity because the participants’ subjective perceptions may differ from their actual behaviors.

Furthermore, conclusions that can be drawn from this study are limited by the relatively short time-interval between pre- and post-comparisons. With a semester-interval, it was hard to register socialization effects on participants’ sense of audience and use of metadiscourse. Perhaps if all participants were first-semester international students more dramatic change might have been detectible across the span of a single semester. The longer an international student has been in residence in the host culture, the less dramatic changes will be across a short time period. Some of the participants in the present study had already been in residence in the U.S. for up to more than five years.

Finally, the researcher was the only coder for the interview data. No inter-coder reliability coefficient was calculated, as is typical for qualitative interview data analysis. Computer assisted technology also helped assure a level of reliability in the coding of metadiscourse markers in the writing samples. Nonetheless, the machine coding required human review, for example, of where to place lexical items like “we” that might be self-references or might be relational markers. This human review of the machine coding was conducted solely by the investigator, and it is possible that some degree of human error was thereby introduced.
Suggestions for Future Research on Second Language Writing

Despite the aforementioned limitations, the current study invites several avenues for future research on audience and metadiscourse in the field of second language writing. Information regarding the effectiveness of the metadiscourse choices made by international and U.S. students would help explicate the relations among (a) writers’ senses of audience, (b) their choices of writing strategies, and (c) the effectiveness of their written products. Although it is not likely that one could develop a consistent scoring rubric for the wide variety of writing types collected in this study, it might be possible to assemble disciplinary experts to judge at least the subset of the metadiscourse markers that served as the basis of the discourse-based interviews. Those expert judges could render a reader’s rating as to the appropriateness of the metadiscourse choice, in the context of the entire paper. They might also listen to the interviewees’ responses about each of those markers and render some decision about whether the writer’s intentions had been successfully conveyed.

The sources of change in L2 writers’ sense of audience over time would be another promising research inquiry. By either recruiting the first year graduate students only or utilizing a multiple year-long study, future research could investigate what kinds of social interactions or metacognitive knowledge could further facilitate L2 writers’ audience awareness and bring changes to their choices of writing strategies.

This study also suggests the importance of L2 writers’ awareness and knowledge of metadiscourse features. Particularly, L2 writers’ metapragmatic senses of metadiscourse could be influenced by their L1. However, given that the present study examined South Korean students’ L2 texts, no direct inference could be drawn about South Korean students’ previous literacy practices in L1 based on the characteristics of their L2 texts (Wu & Rubin, 2000). In order to
investigate to what degrees and in what ways writers’ literacy practices in their L1s are transferred to their L2 writing texts, thus, future researchers need to obtain information regarding writers’ literacy practices in their L1s in more systematic ways. As an example, future researchers could examine writers’ deployment of interpersonal metadiscourse features across the three conditions: (a) when international students write in their L1s, (b) when international students write in English, and (c) when U.S. students write in English.

In addition, future researchers are advised to develop a more culturally sensitive system of metadiscourse features when they examine L2 students’ writing samples. Given the metadiscourse system adopted by the current study was originally drawn from native English speakers’ texts (Hyland, 2000), it is possible that the system was not culturally sensitive enough to capture Koreans’ unique ways of utilizing interpersonal metadiscourse features. For example, the Korean students might have devised some unique, interpersonally oriented rhetorical features, beyond those in the current metadiscourse system. Thus, the use of a more culture-sensitive system of metadiscourse features would help the researcher in examining cross-cultural differences or unique characteristics of L2 writers’ texts in terms of their use of metadiscourse features.

Finally, this study indicated a significant association between the amount of reading and frequency of self-mentions for the South Korean student sample. However, linking advanced writers’ styles – either in L1 or L2 – with their reading diets has rarely been accomplished. It would be interesting to ascertain the association between what Korean international graduate students were reading and their heightened deployment of personal voice in their writing. It would be also meaningful to examine why this association does not hold true for the U.S. students, who presumably were reading the same types of texts and the same number of them.
Conclusions

The results of the present study provide empirical evidence for the similarities and differences in the ways that culturally diverse writers conceptualize and utilize the two important constructs in composition: audience and metadiscourse. Regarding the Research Question 1, the results of this study support possible cross-cultural differences in audience awareness and adaptation strategies between U.S. and South Korean graduate student writers. Specifically, compared to their U.S. counterparts, South Korean international students displayed less prominent evidence of metacognitive awareness of audience. This may be explained by previous research findings regarding non-native English language linguistic proficiency (Raimes, 1985), different socio-cultural schemata in conceptualizing writer-audience relationships (Hinds, 1987) as well as utilizing textual devices (Fox, 1994; Scarcella, 1984), L2 writers’ strategies to cope with their situated material conditions (Canagarajah, 2002), or L2 writers’ previous experiences with L1 writing instruction (particularly with degree of exposure to the audience construct). The U.S. and South Korean students also differed in their approaches to fulfilling audience needs. Whereas U.S. student writers adapted to audiences by constructing targeted arguments or citing favored authorities, South Korean students primarily invested their efforts in overcoming cultural and linguistic barriers between audiences and writers themselves. The results of this study also provide empirical supports for generalizing the findings of previous composition research with the samples of L1 writers to L2 writing. For example, the results support the strong relationship between writers’ representations of audiences and their composition strategies (Berkenkotter, 1981; Roth, 1987; Zainuddin, 1995).

In answering the Research Question 3, the results of the present study indicated some differences between the ways that U.S. and South Korean graduate students deploy interpersonal
metadiscourse markers in their academic writing. Specifically, South Korean students employed lower frequencies of hedges and boosters, relative to their U.S. counterparts, which may support the previous research findings suggesting that due to limited pedagogical guides in L2 writing, L2 writers often fail to adequately modulate their assertions in texts (Gilbert, 1991; Hyland, 1994; Hyland & Milton, 1997). The discourse-based interview data in the present study support that both U.S. and South Korean graduate students’ deployment of interpersonal metadiscourse in their papers was motivated by a lively consideration of audience (Intaraprawat & Steffensen, 1995). With respect to rationales for metadiscourse use, U.S. and South Korean students exhibited many more similarities than differences. Nonetheless, there were instances suggesting that South Korean students were influenced by their linguistic and cultural backgrounds such as L1 transference or politeness strategies.

Even though this study has some limitations in uncovering the disciplinary socialization effects on student writers’ changes in terms of the two constructs (the Research Questions 2 and 4), it still provides some evidence for the L2 writers’ disciplinary socialization effects on their conceptualizations of generalized, indeterminate audiences. For the South Korean students, the length of immersion in their disciplinary cultures (i.e., the length of semester enrollment) significantly influenced their awareness of discourse types and use of persuasive strategies in their disciplines. With regards to the disciplinary socialization effects on writers’ production of interpersonal metadiscourse markers, for the U.S. students, none of the indices of their disciplinary socialization predicted their production of any of the interpersonal metadiscourse features. For the South Korean students, however, their amount of reading and TOEFL scores were significantly predictive of their production of self-mentions.
In conclusion, the study provides useful implications for L2 writing instructions such as (a) raising L2 writers’ consciousness of audience, (b) providing them with procedural knowledge of how to adapt to audiences, and (c) teaching L2 writers of metapragmatic knowledge of metadiscourse.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A

Demographic Survey

1. Name
   : ________________________________

2. Age
   : _______ years old

3. Gender
   : ____ Female   ____ Male

4. Nationality
   : ________________________________

5. Current Major (in the U.S.)
   : ________________________________

6. Current status in your program of study
   : ___ Master’s   ____ Doctoral

7. Courses that you took in the previous semester
   : ________________________________

8. Courses that you are taking in the current semester
   : ________________________________

9. Years of stay in the U.S. (if you are international students)
   : ___________ year(s) and ___________ month(s)

10. When did you begin your current degree program?
    : ___________

11. TOEFL score(s)
    : _______ total score     _______ TWE (writing score, if applicable)

12. GRE score
    : _______ total score     _______ verbal score
Appendix B

Survey Questionnaire

Part I

1. How many papers did you write for your classes last semester?
   Among them, how many were major papers, and how many were your reaction to literature?

2. On the average, how many citations did you include in the major papers you wrote last semester?

3. On the average, how many pages did you read each week for your classes last semester?

4. If you subscribe to any journals in your field, please name them.

5. If you belong to any professional associations, local, national, or international, please name them.

6. Please name 5 scholars who contributed to your discipline 10 years ago (i.e., during the years from 1985 to 1994).

7. Please name 5 of the leading scholars in your discipline today (i.e., during the years from 1995 to 2004).
Part II

The following items describe a person’s writing experiences in his/her academic discipline. Some examples of ‘academic writing’ are (a) research proposals, (b) literature reviews, (c) critical essays, (d) research reports, and (e) grant proposals. However, weekly reflection journals, bibliographies, lab reports and creative writing are excluded for the purposes of this research project. Please read each of the following items carefully and fill in the number that you think best describes you in the blank to the end of each item.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Hardly ever</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My academic papers are easy for readers to understand. ________
2. I feel uncomfortable using the special jargon of my discipline in my academic papers. ________
3. I pay little attention to organization and cohesion in my academic writing. ________
4. I have a clear sense of what academic writing in my discipline should look like. ________
5. I try to pack too much information into each sentence when I write. ________
6. I start sentences with the word “I” in my academic writing. ________
7. I write about my personal beliefs and life experiences in discussing the significance of my topic of my academic papers. ________
8. In writing an academic paper, I assume that the audience is not very interested in the topic about which I am writing. ________
9. When writing an academic paper, I try to develop my arguments based on the scholarly literature I have reviewed. ________
10. I make an effort to follow the conventional styles of academic writing in my discipline. ________
Appendix C

Interview Protocol

Part I: Semi-structured interview

1. Please tell me briefly about your paper in terms of topic, course, and pre-set guidelines.

2. What do you like best about this paper in general?

3. Did you think about any readers – either specific individuals or else vague readerships – when you wrote this paper?

4. If you had any readers in mind while writing the paper, (a) who were they?, (b) why did you consider them as your readers?, and (c) how did those readers influence your writing?

5. Did you make any conscious efforts to help your readers understand your ideas or become involved in your topic? If you used any strategies to engage your readers, (a) what were?, and (b) how did those strategies help you with your writing?

6. Did you try to use any words or phrases to engage your reader(s) in your paper or help your reader(s) understand your attitude toward the subject?

Part II: Discourse-based Interview

On completing the questions above, the researcher will ask the participant to read the parts of his/her writing sample highlighted by the researcher on the basis of metadiscourse text analysis.

1. Would you tell me why you used this item here (indicating a specific metadiscourse item in a highlighted part)? Would you still like to use this item here? If so, why?, and if not, why not?, what would be your alternative to this item?