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Texts are described as sites of negotiation, and particularly in an EFL context, writers construct texts in consideration of the perceived needs and purposes. This study explores the relationship between voice and pedagogic practices of a teacher and writing products of students in an EFL writing course at a university in Korea. The data comprise interviews with the teacher, classroom observations, and the collection of nine students’ opinion writing. The findings indicate that the teacher had her own approaches in teaching of writing in English, including three types of voice positioning and a variety of classroom activities, so that students can construct creative meaning-making in writing, which can be identified as an ‘alignment’. However, students’ written texts were little affected by the teacher’s pedagogic practices, showing a pattern of accommodation, which can be explained by a ‘detachment’. That is, most students established similar rhetorical patterns and content to the model paragraph in the textbook rather than creating their own ideas. This study implies that writing teachers need to develop students’ creativity and critical thought through their pedagogical practices by understanding students’ writing experiences in the Korean institutional setting.

I. INTRODUCTION

Research into composition has evolved into showing that the high complexity of the writing process is due to the multiplicity of factors involved in its development, deriving from social and affective sources as well as from cognitive ones (Bizell, 1992; Brand, 1987; Cumming, 1998; Daly, 1985; Daly & Miller, 1975; Flower & Hayes, 1981; Hayes, 1996; McLeod, 1987). Following Brand (1987), the history of the main field of writing can be summarized as follows:
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The field of composition looked first at the what of writing, the product. Over the last two decades, it has added the how of the writing process. It follows that the field looks next at the why of writing, affective content and motivation. Understanding the collaboration of emotions and cognition in writing is both fundamental and far-reaching. (Perpignan, Rubin, & Katznelson, 2007, p. 442)

Researchers in second language acquisition have given considerable attention to the social and affective factors involved in language learning success (Bailey, Daley, & Onwuegbuzie, 1999; Ehrman, 1996; Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986). These factors contribute in a significant way to the process of learning to write in second language (L2) (Carson, 2001; Silva, Leki, & Carson, 1997). My assumption is that not only do these factors constitute significant input to the process of learning to write in English, but that similar factors can also be found as outcomes of this process. The social and affective factors can be also related to Wiemelt’s (1994) view that effective writing and written communication are conceptualized as interactively accomplished processes of contextualization. His view of context as the ongoing, textually mediated and concerted accomplishments of writers and their readers aligns with a family of approaches toward writing and discourse that Nystrand (1986) has characterized collectively as interactionist theory. The central premise of interactionist theories of writing is that meaning is never constructed wholly by individual writers or readers, one working in isolation from the other but rather, is always in some very fundamental respects a mutual accomplishment in a given context.

Contexts are discoverable exigencies that writers need to size up once and for all and then respond to; they exist outside a writer’s text, and their determination by the writer – as some ‘task environment’ (Flower & Hayes, 1981, p. 56). In this sense, as Wiemelt (1994) believes, written texts represent a writer’s encoding of complex, underlying plans and purposes; texts are the material product of those underlying mental processes in terms of the teacher’s pedagogic practices. Students’ final products in the writing classrooms, therefore, are seen as outcome of these various interactions surrounding writing practices.

Texts are described as ‘sites of negotiation’ (McMillan, 2000, p. 149); writers construct texts in consideration of the perceived needs, purposes, and abilities of their readers, and this is helpful to understand students’ products in English as a foreign language (EFL) writing classrooms. To understand learning as a ‘site of negotiation’ (McMillan, 2000, p. 149) is a useful way of exploring students’ written products. This is particularly so in students’ writing in EFL writing classrooms, where most of the students negotiate their meaning-making in the recontextualized position of their writing tasks. Recontextualization takes place when students’ texts are moved into other arenas and used for different purposes. Shifting an opinion from its location in interactional practices with students and their teachers into other educational materials, i.e., assignments or exam tasks, is an
example of the recontextualization of a text (Barton & Hall, 2000).

Teacher voice, practices and their impact on students’ learning can be at the fore of consciousness due to a way of thinking about teacher and student accountability for meeting high standards of achievement in writing classrooms. In this context of increased scrutiny of teacher’s voice and practices, students’ products in the teaching and learning of writing are particularly important to examine because students’ products play a pivotal role in presenting either a positive or negative academic output.

Many studies (Ivanič, 2001; Perpignan, Rubin, & Katznelson, 2007; Wiemelt, 1994) have found a positive correlation between the teacher’s practices and students’ writing output. Research examining the effect of different types of instructional approaches on students’ writing products has also much to contribute to the debate over how best to ensure that all students meet high academic standards. Unfortunately, my understanding of the effects of different types of teacher practices on the development of students’ writing is limited by the fact that relatively few studies have focused on teacher voice and practices that might be related to students’ writing products. This led to skewed results that fail to capture the dynamics of the composition classroom and the developing interaction between the teacher and students (Leki, 1990; Reid, 1993).

In this study, I examine the teacher’s voice, pedagogic practices and nine Korean university writers’ efforts to negotiate the range of interactional context (teacher-student and student-source contexts) that bear on students’ completion of opinion writing in English. Most specifically I look at the three aspects: (a) the teacher’s identity and beliefs about writing, (b) the ways the teacher interacts with students through her pedagogic practices, and (c) students’ ways of developing their texts. In other words, I explore who the teacher is, what is going on in the classroom, and how students employ their textual resources to account for the writing teacher and her students as the interactional context in a writing classroom.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1. Voice

Most attention in classroom research has been paid to the teacher because it is the teacher who brings effective schooling to the classroom level (Mackenzie, 1983). It is here that reviewers of the field of teacher effectiveness research have been able to write with enthusiasm for the results obtained (Berliner, 1983; Brophy, 1979; Gage, 1975; Rosenshine, 1975). In writing, students’ written discourse is grounded by a shared sense of the teacher’s voice about teaching writing.
Ivanič and Camps (2001) illustrate voice types with examples from the writing of six graduate students in British universities. They define voice as self-representation as an integral element of all human activities. Ivanič (1994, 1995, 1998) particularly argues that the lexical, syntactic, semantic, and even the visual and material aspects of writing construct voice just as much as do the phonetic and prosodic aspects of speech (Cherry, 1988; Clark & Ivanič, 1997). I will apply this framework to speaking of the teacher in this study, which maps onto the ‘macrofunctions of language’ (Ivanič & Camps, 2001, p. 5) that sheds light on the teacher’s voice.

According to Halliday (1985), the language writers use to negotiate and account for any such contextual configuration comprises a corresponding tripartite structure of semantic functions: an ideational function, an interpersonal function, and a textual function. The ideational function of language is concerned with ‘representing’: talking or writing about something. The interpersonal function of language is concerned with ‘interacting’: talking or writing between interlocutors, speaker/writer and hearer/listener. The textual function of language is concerned with ‘text creating’: talking or writing to shape the text. Halliday refers to the expression of ‘voice or identity’ as only part of the interpersonal function of language, but Ivanič (1998) suggests that social identity simultaneously consists of all of the following three aspects: (a) a person’s set of values and beliefs about reality. (b) a person’s sense of status in relation to others with whom they are communicating, and (c) a person’s orientation to language use. These three components will also affect one another as a whole integrated system of identity (Lee, 2003).

In this study, the identity of the teacher will be presented in terms of the three different types of macrofunctions. The teacher demonstrated the strength of her desire to identify some social groups and to disassociate herself from others, and this desire determines her phonetic, syntactic and lexical choice in her speaking.

2. Writing Practices

The notion of practices, as researchers (Barton, 1994; Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanič, 2000; Baynham, 1995; Lea & Street, 1998; Street, 1995) argue, offers a powerful way of conceptualizing the link between the activities of reading and writing and the social structures in which they are embedded and which they help shape. Practices are not just the superficial choice of a word; they bring with them the possibilities that this perspective offers for new theoretical understandings about literacy. This approach is connected with the way the term is used by Clark and Ivanič (1997) who suggest that practices are not just what people do, but what they make of what they do, and how it constructs them as social subjects (Lee, 2003).

As Perry, Donohue and Weinstein (2007) believe, in the educational literature the
relative advantage of one or another type of practice has been a recurrent theme that some have traced as far back as Plato and Aristotle (Jackson, 1986; Weinstein, 2002). They also insist that issues concerning whether students should play an active role in constructing knowledge or whether information should be transmitted to them in prescribed ways have been debated by researchers focusing on learners (Brophy & Good, 1985; Burts, Hart, Charlesworth, & Dewolf, 1993; Stipek, Feiler, Daniels, & Milburn, 1995).

Following Perry et al. (2007), there is a general consensus that two distinct, but related, components of teacher practice are central to a discussion of students' adjustment. The first factor is the social and emotional elements of classroom practice and the extent to which teachers are generally positive and supportive. For example, teachers might carefully observe students' interests and initiative, attempting to find meaningful links between academic learning and students' learning experience, and emphasizing positive social relationships (teacher-students and students-students). The second factor is the instructional and cognitive elements of classroom practice. For example, teachers might engage in frequent interactions with students that are intended to scaffold and guide learning, and provide individual help when needed. In this type of practice, students may be found working on varied and different learning activities that are suited to their developmental level, which allows them to progress from what they know to what they do not know. In sum, when students' personal and social, as well as their instructional and cognitive, needs are carefully attended to it appears that this may provide an ideally supportive social context for learning (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997; Rescorla, Hyson, & Hirsch-Pasek, 1991).

These instructional and social dimensions of teacher practice are consistent with social-constructivist theories on how to best promote students' learning and development (Vygotsky, 1987). In contrast, a different type of approach might emphasize teacher presentation of material, rote learning, and instruction that is whole-group and less individualized. With such instructional practices, the goals and expectations of the teacher are more likely to drive instruction and learning activities. The teacher's practices will be dealt with in this study, focusing on what is going on in her writing classroom, which provides a deeper understanding of the students' writing products as the output of the classroom activities directed by the teacher.

3. Products

Products here refer to any "outcome" as written texts in an EFL writing course, which describes the learning that can be expected by the teacher who carried out the course, insofar as we see learning as an ongoing and continuous process. The view of outcomes of writing courses is based on a view of learning that includes affective and social changes as well as cognitive ones, as expressed by learning theorists such as Hilgard (1948), Lewin
(1964), and Rogers (1969). According to Lewin, changes in the cognitive structures of learners can be due to two different types of forces: "one resulting from the structure of the cognitive field itself, and the other from certain valences (needs and motivations)" (p. 83). The recognition of these two types of forces leading to change drew attention to the intrapersonal aspect of learning. In turn, Rogers recognized and promoted the interpersonal (or social) forces and their interaction with the intrapersonal. He suggests the view, "[t]he student is on his way ... to becoming a learning, changing, being" (p. 115). Katznelson, Perpignan, and Rubin (2001) believe that it is precisely change in the students' "being" which are among the most interesting changes observed over a semester of writing instruction.

As Connor (2004) mentions, the change has been affected by two major developments, namely an expansion of genres under consideration and a move to emphasize contexts of writing. First, there has been an increase in the types of written texts, i.e., essay, report, article, grant proposal, etc., writing that are considered to be the purview of second language writing around the world in terms of the purposes. In addition to the expansion of genre, the field has moved to emphasize the social situation of writing. Today, writing is increasingly regarded as being socially situated; each situation may entail special consideration to audience, purposes, and level of perfection. The expectations and norms of discourse communities or "communities of practice" (Wenger, 1998, p. 167) may shape these situational expectations and practices. Social construction of meaning as dynamic, socio-cognitive activities is a term used to describe this approach to texts. Instead of analyzing what students' texts mean, studies seek to understand how students construct meaning, focusing on the questions "What do students' texts talk about? And how do texts come into being?" These two reasons have motivated scholars of intercultural rhetoric to adjust and supplement research approaches in their work (Connor, 2004).

Hyland (2000) outlines that writing as the outcome of social interactions: "[...] rhetorical action should be seen as situated in the historically-specific assumptions that community members make about reality and the ways they seek to influence that reality through writing" (p. 132). Hyland admits that such situated writing has been studied through ethnographies that have focused on particular writers, and has provided valuable understanding about the ways writers negotiate immediate writing situations. However, according to Hyland, such situation-specific descriptions will still need to be understood as socially and institutionally constituted, because writers use strategies that have been socially and institutionally stratified.

I adopt the similar position to Hyland in this study. From analysis of students' meaning-making in their texts, I will highlight the importance of recognizing and facilitating the students' active process of meaning-making in their writing.
III. METHOD

1. The Teacher and the Writing Course

This study was conducted in an optional EFL writing classroom at a university in Korea. The teacher of the classroom was a female in her forties, who studied English literature, novels, and had been teaching English writing for four years. She was chosen because she had developed her own approaches with specific voice and self-representation in teaching English writing. She was willing to participate in the study and to be interviewed to talk about her beliefs about teaching English writing and revealed her voice as self-representation. She was interested in teaching and research on the writing in English in the Korean context.

The investigation took place in an English writing course entitled “Basic English Composition” as an optional subject in the first semester of the academic year 2005. The course was designed for those who were from non-English majors at the university. The purpose of the course was to provide beginning learners who needed fundamental knowledge of writing in English with paragraph-level work, i.e., describing, narrating, stating reasons and examples, and expressing opinions. This course was opened twice a week in a two-hour and a one-hour session for 15 weeks.

2. The Students

The writing classroom has thirty-two students who all came from a variety of academic disciplines such as engineering, law, psychology, education, and geography. They were mostly freshmen, 21 students (66%), 6 sophomores, 2 juniors, and 3 seniors. The class was made up of 15 male students and 17 female students. Their ages ranged from nineteen to twenty-seven. Out of the students five students had been in English-speaking countries either for traveling or studying. According to the teacher, the students represented a wide range of English writing proficiency, i.e., around 4 as excellent, 21 as intermediate, and 7 as poor.

3. Procedure

There were three types of data collection in this study: interviews with the teacher, classroom observations, and collection of students’ written texts. In order to examine the teacher’s voice as self-representation about teaching EFL writing, two interviews were established. The teacher’s office was secured for the interviews, and the questions were mainly focused on the nature of EFL writing, on the learning and teaching of EFL writing, and the views on the prospects for EFL writing in Korea. Next, the classroom observations
were one of the main elements to look at how the teacher’s own voice comes up with her pedagogic practices in the real classroom. A total of seven sessions were observed during four weeks, and all the classroom discourse was carefully obtained in a tape recorder with the permission of the teacher. Lastly, students’ writing products were collected to examine how they established their meaning-making.

The students were asked to submit three pieces of paragraph writing as coursework in accordance with the teacher’s lesson plan for the semester. The first assignment was to describe a paragraph about describing a person who is important to you with 200 words. For the second assignment, students were required to compare or contrast two kinds of things or events such as, i.e., (a) living in a dormitory vs. off-campus accommodation; (b) watching the same work in a movie vs. in a book with 250 words. The third was to write personal opinions about a newspaper article about two criminals with 300 words. Students were asked to submit one piece of opinion writing as the last assignment of the course on the following task:

Write your opinion after reading the following newspaper article.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Is Justice?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO MEN WERE PUT TO DEATH last week in the United States for murders that they had been convicted of committing many years ago. Billy Bailey died in the first hanging in Delaware in fifty years. It was twenty years ago that he murdered an elderly couple after breaking into their home. John Taylor, a child rapist and murderer, was shot by a five-man firing squad in Utah. Polls show that 70 to 80 percent of U. S. citizens favor capital punishment. Many believe that people who commit horrendous crimes deserve to die brutally in return for the brutality that the inflicted on their victims. Others protest the barbarism of the death penalty, be it by lethal injection, electric chair, firing squad or hanging. While there were many people who supported the two deaths that took place last week, there were also many protesters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adopted from Lee, Younghwa, 2003, p. 195)

There was no prompt in the above task to help negotiate between the teacher who assigned the task and students who produced the response to that task, and to make explicit to the students exactly what they were expected to write.

In this study, particularly the last assignment was focused as it could be the most output made by the students during the course. With the permission of the teacher, 12 pieces of writing were chosen from three different groups, i.e., advanced, intermediate, and low levels, in terms of the grades of the previous two writing tasks and mid-exam. All of the students' writing were numbered from 1 to 12 so that they could be easily recognized for analyzing.
4. The Frameworks for Analysis

At the starting point, for the analysis of the teacher voice I used some of what the teacher said in the interviews by adopting the structure of language suggested in some studies (Halliday & Hasan, 1985; Ivanić, 1998; Ivanić & Camp; 2001). These language functions include the three semantic functions (or metafunctions): the ideational function, the interpersonal function, and the textual function, as earlier explained. In doing this, the following three aspects of the teacher were consisted of: (a) set of values and beliefs about EFL writing, (b) sense of her relative status in relation to others with whom she is communicating, and (c) orientation to language use. These three components affect one another as a whole integrated system of teacher voice.

For the classroom observation, an ethnographic approach was used, focusing on what is occurring and how processes and components of processes actually exist in the natural environments. More specifically, the purpose-driven interaction between the teacher and students in an immediate ‘context of situation’ (Halliday & Hasan, 1985) was focused to characterize the teacher’s pedagogic practices.

In order to analyze the twelve students’ writing products, a pattern of ‘Claim/Opinion-Reason’ was developed from Hoey’s (2001) ‘Claim-Response’ pattern which had basic components such as Claim, Reason for claim, Denial, Correction, and Reason for Correction. This perhaps does not represent all the options. That is, a(an) Claim/Opinion may be denied and then corrected with or without Reason being given for the Claim, the Denial or the Correction. A(an) Claim/Opinion may also be affirmed, in which case a Reason will characteristically be given for the Affirmation, or the Affirmation will reveal itself to have been a feint and be followed by a Denial. Based on this speculation, the ‘Claim/Opinion-Reason’ pattern was built up, since all of the twelve students’ texts in this study clearly included a(an) Claim/Opinion required, Reason for the Claim/Opinion, and Support for the Reasons.

In analyzing the students’ texts, the clauses/phrases ‘I think’, ‘I believe’, ‘I am in favor of’, ‘I agree/disagree that’, ‘in my opinion’, ‘in my view’, can be the signals of Claim/Opinion that arguments are being expressed. The transition signals such as ‘first, second, third, and finally’ can identify Reasons. The opening expressions ‘for these reasons’, ‘therefore’, or ‘in conclusion’ can be categorized as Affirmation, which take the role of Support for the Reasons.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section considers three issues in order to address the research questions. The first issue focuses on the characteristics of the teacher voice. The second issue is to see the
types of pedagogic practices the teacher deploys. The last one is to examine how students construct their writing.

1. The Teacher’s Voice

The voice of the teacher is crucially related to not only the beliefs and philosophies underlying her teaching of writing but also her students’ writing products. She was extremely interested in the teaching of writing in English as she willingly volunteered to be a candidate when I was looking for the teacher as participants in this study. I used some of what she said in the interviews to shed light on her voice by adopting three types of positioning that operate simultaneously: “ideational positioning”, “interpersonal positioning”, and “textual positioning”, as presented in Table 1. The first column presents the three kinds of positioning in voice. The second one shows the relevant evidence for each of the positioning. The last column introduces her ideational, interpersonal, and textual positioning which emerged from the discussion between her and the researcher during the interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of positioning</th>
<th>In relation to</th>
<th>Nature of voice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideational positioning</td>
<td>Nature of writing in English</td>
<td>(i) Creative ideas and opinion (ii) Autonomy of writing (iii) Accumulated experience and knowledge (iv) Literature = imagination = writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning and teaching of writing in English</td>
<td>(i) Focusing on content (ii) Metalinguistic aspects: cultural variance (iii) The trust between teacher and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reality of EFL writing in Korea</td>
<td>(i) Complaint about current English language education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal positioning</td>
<td>Relationship between the teacher and students</td>
<td>(i) Positive interaction (ii) Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual positioning</td>
<td>Ways of using spoken Korean language</td>
<td>(i) Conjunctions and relatives (ii) Literature-related lexis (iii) Long speech with a number of sentences (iv) Presentation of an article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Ideational positioning

“Ideational positioning” consists of her particular values and beliefs about three issues: (i) the nature of writing in English, (ii) the learning and teaching of writing in English, and (iii) the reality of EFL writing in Korea. Ideational positioning goes beyond just having
particular interests and associating oneself with particular issues, as Ivanič and Camp (2001) suggest, to encompass also taking particular stances towards them. Values, beliefs, and preferences are enacted by choice of experience and the history of her own life. For example, she is self-confident in her views in choosing why she argues specific issues. Her own background related writing may have been influenced by the fact that writing is a tool to express oneself to the community s/he belongs to. Her following comments\(^1\) show this:

Graduate students in science and engineering need to learn writing in English. When I proofread their papers to be presented for a conference, their English is absolutely terrible. So an English writing course for research should be open to these students.

When I studied in the U. S., it was so hard for me to get an “A” grade. At that time I really wanted to know what other students’ quality was like. In this sense, to show others’ work is important.

The above comments can be evidence how the teacher’s ideational positioning can arise. That is, her personal experience explains why she extends her interest and perspectives on writing to include academic writing and how to evaluate and utilize students’ products on her writing course. She actually applies this consideration in the second excerpt to the ‘workshop’ in her classroom, which will be discussed in the proceeding section, pedagogic practices.

2) Interpersonal positioning

The interpersonal function of voice, as defined earlier, is concerned with a person’s interaction with others. In order to identify the teacher’s interpersonal positioning, interviews, classroom observations, and private discussions were comprised. The teacher believed that powerful communication and interaction between the students themselves and between the teacher and students were necessarily essential elements in a writing classroom. She tried to achieve these interactions through a workshop which included a discussion of a piece of writing with the whole class, and her extremely polite speech that was rarely found in the Korean educational environment where most relationships between the teacher and students tended to be authoritative and teacher-centered. Her views about interpersonal interaction are revealed in the following extracts:

\(^1\) All of the comments and excerpts in this study were translated from Korean into English.
During the workshop, a volunteer will be unhappy at first when other students criticize his/her piece of work. But one s/he can overcome this, it will eventually be a great help for the next piece of writing with creative ideas.

My polite talking toward students is related to the reliance between students and myself in the classroom. They are university students, so they should be respected and I personally need to respect them, I think.

The above comments provide evidence of her interpersonal positioning identified as ‘positive interaction’ and ‘respect’. This enables that it can be clearly recognized that interaction between the teacher and students is entirely there, since a classroom lesson is an ‘arena of human interactions’ (Prabhu, 1992, p. 230) — not only the pedagogic interactions but also inevitable interactions which occur simply because human beings are involved. The teacher attempts to establish this kind of interaction between the teacher and students and between students and students.

3) Textual positioning

Before examining the teacher’s textual positioning, it is useful to mention ‘context of situation’ as defined by Halliday and Hasan (1985) in order to understand the language, Korean, uttered by the teacher and how it works, and what the teacher does with it. The ‘context of situation’ is the immediate environment in which a text is actually functioning. This notion is here used to explain why certain things have been said by the teacher on particular occasions, and what else might have been said that was not.

In communicating, the teacher showed different kinds of textual positioning, using lexis relevant to literature, her discipline, a number of conjunctions, and relatives. She in general tended to form long sentences in which these three components are mixed together. The following talk demonstrates her textual positioning with explicit views about writing in English:

...because literature is an education for imagination, and creativity is from the imagination. Thus, education of literature itself originates from humanities.... To express myself with language is important to live a successful life.

Here lexical items drawn from the ‘literature community’ are used more than eight times by the teacher when she was asked a question about the direction of writing courses in the future. The lexis imagination, creativity, humanities, language, and life in her comments are positively related to the area of literature. Her another talk is expressed by a
number of conjunctions and relatives:

Many people think *that* those *who* majored in English education or linguistics are able to teach English better than those *who* studied literature, *so* they (universities) tend to choose them, *but* this is quite wrong. I think *that* teachers *who* studies literature are good in teaching English. *However*, there is a very strong tendency *that* teachers *who* are from the area of literature may not be good in teaching English…

The above style of her speaking was the general pattern of linguistic structure that most clearly characterizes her language. She gives an extremely long answer to the researcher’s question, and the answer consisted of 23 sentences expressing complaints about the current policy on employing lecturers in Korean universities. In addition, she wishes to raise a discussion about an ideal policy on English teaching with the researcher who is interested in this field; she encourages the researcher to read her article. It will be interesting to look at how the teacher’s three aspects of positioning in her voice affect her classroom that will be followed.

2. The Teacher’s Pedagogic Practices

During the classroom observations, the seven sessions delivered by the teacher comprised three types of practices: (i) deploying textbook, (ii) workshop, and (iii) conference about students’ written texts, as outlined in Table 2. Out of them, the workshop and conference are here focused on because there existed the significant interactions between the teacher and students in the two activities unlike the practice of employing a textbook in normal Korean university classrooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W + T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>W + T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration (minutes)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20 + 70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70 + 20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note) T: Deploying textbook, W: Workshop, C: Conference

The ‘workshop’ refers to the classroom activity of sharing ideas and discuss on a piece of writing made by a student in the course. In doing this, students were in a more relaxed atmosphere and not shy or anxious to speak in public, as shown in the following excerpt:
Students: (They make noise before commencing the lesson.)
Teacher: I know it’s just after lunch, and you might be sleepy. Today, you’ll be interested in reading someone’s work. (She distributes the whole class an anonymous written text.) Please number the each line in the text and read it, making comments or revising in a more creative way you want. (7 minutes later) Let’s look at the title and first sentence, lines 1 to 3. Are there any comments here?
Student A: The content words in the title should be written in capital letters.
Teacher: Yes, a very good point. You can change open, market, department, and store into capitals.
Student B: In line 10, the sentence needs to be passive.
Teacher: Why do you think so?
Student B: Its subject is an inanimate thing.
Teacher: That’s good, isn’t it? And it would be better if the two sentences in lines 10-11 can be combined, using ‘that’ or ‘which’. This makes the sentence more advanced and creative, I think. You’re doing so well. Anything else?

The teacher tries to make the lesson a comfortable atmosphere, accepting students’ tiredness and the sleep afternoon session. She induces a purpose-driven interaction between the writer and readers in an immediate ‘context of situation’ (Halliday & Hasan, 1985), believing that students are capable of learning by engaging in real or simulated activities involving the reading of ‘real’ text. She normally adopts an ‘indirect influence’ to the management of interaction explained in Flanders’ (1970, p. 120) interaction analysis, in which she praises or encourages student action or behavior so that students can feel confident to raise what they know. This is related to what Wenger (1998) calls ‘full-participation’ (p. 165) of the whole class as insiders in the classroom which represents a community of practice, since all the students are encouraged to make contributions to discussion with their interactions. The overall characteristic of the workshop is consistent with the teacher’s voice type of the ideational positioning in which she emphasized creative ideas, content, and positive interaction between the teacher and students.

The conference refers to a one-on-one dialogue between the teacher and a student about the student’s writing product. The teacher arranged an informal conference in her office in similar stages to a typical sequence, i.e., opening, teacher’s comments with praise or encouragement, reading the text, suggested by Reid (1993). An example of the conference is shown below:
Teacher: Very good. I can guess that you must be wonderful at writing in Korean with your creative ideas. But as for writing in English, you need to study grammar further. (She reads a piece of work with a student.) Please avoid using ‘be’ verbs, if you can, when you write. (She corrects the grammatical mistakes in the student’s work)

Student: (He nods his head.)

Teacher: Your feeling is well expressed here, but the only problem is grammar.

Student: I’ve just come back from the army service. How can I study English grammar?

Teacher: Please try to finish a thin book that starts with ‘verbs’, or attend a grammar course in the language school at the university.

In the above conference, a male student appeals to the teacher to understand his situation and difficulty and asks for some help to study writing in English. What the teacher brought into the dialogue, i.e., the good writer in Korean and the way to study English grammar, shows a ‘horizontal discourse’ (Bernstein, 1996) in which both the teacher and student have freedom to express their praises, problems, and ideas freely. This is different from the situation in typical classrooms in the Korean context where an authority between the teacher and student exists.

3. Students’ Writing Products

Students got scores from the teacher in their returned assignments, but here this is not the main concern. Instead, the text analysis for students’ writing focus on how they constructed their texts in term of rhetorical patterns and content, adopting the Claim/Opinion-Reason pattern earlier explained.

There are few differences among the students’ texts because all of them have few differences in terms of rhetorical patterns, and they share the key elements of the Claims/Opinions, Reasons, and Supports for the Reasons, and Affirmation, which all originate from the page 176 in the textbook used in the writing course. This could happen because students might have learned about how to make the rhetorical patterns in writing their opinions during their lessons with the model writing in the textbook. The very striking feature is that those students adopted similar or the same content as that of the model writing in the same page of the textbook in addition to using the rhetorical patterns. The expressions such as ‘in my opinion’, ‘I am in favor of’, ‘first of all’, ‘second’, ‘third’, ‘indeed’, etc., are repeated in their texts, and this suggests that all of those perceptions originated in the classroom or the model writing. The detailed information included in the nine students’ writing is summarized in Table 3.
Two students (Texts 2 and 8) adopted the phrase ‘Capital Punishment’ from the model writing to entitle their own titles, ‘For capital punishment’ and ‘The capital punishment’. Three students entitled in their ways, and the rest of the five had no titles for their pieces of writing. Most students, except two, adopted the content from the textbook, and they used listing-order transitional signals from one to four. They all share similar ‘strategy knowledge’ (Victori, 1999, p. 544) which includes the same planning of ideas, organization of ideas, and use of resources in their written texts.

### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Listing-order signal</th>
<th>Claim/Opinion</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Support for Reason</th>
<th>Affirmation</th>
<th>Content from textbook</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>For capital punishment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(S3-4) First, they have no right to judge a matter of life and death. It's a God's right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(S10) ...many murders commit crimes without guilty conscience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>'It's not justice'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(S3) According to the report, capital punishment does not reduce crimes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>'It's wrong'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(S12) Sometimes, innocent people deny government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(S2) First of all, they do not think about the result of their crimes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>'The death penalty'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(S5) In addition, capital punishment effect does not make criminal rate low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The capital punishment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(S4) First, we can't deprive their life rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Developed from Lee, Younghwa, 2003)

The following opinion writing is an example of the students' assignments (Text 2), and the whole piece of work is reproduced. Here the ideas or phrases adopted from the model paragraph are underlined.
The Text 2 produced by Student 2:

(Title) For capital punishment

(S1: Claim/opinion 1) I think there should be many debate whether the capital punishment is right or wrong. (S2: Claim/opinion 2) In my opinion, the capital punishment is wrong; here are three reasons that support my opinion. (S3-4: Reason 1) First, they have no right to judge a matter of life and death. It's a God's right. (S5: Reason 2) Second, they should give a chance to the murder for regret and regeneration. (S6: Reason 3) Third, they might execute the man who is innocent. (S7: Support) For example, if we execute the capital punishment to murder and the fact that he was innocent is found out after his death, how can we compensate for his life. (S8: Affirmation) For these reasons, I don't agree to the capital punishment. (S9: Suggestion) I think the penal servitude for life is better than the capital punishment.

Text 2 includes a total of nine sentences, two Claims/Opinions, three Reasons, a Support and an Affirmation, respectively, and a Suggestion which does not appear in the model paragraph. Student 2 uses or reproduces considerable parts from the textbook in establishing the meaning-making for his assignment. That is, the main ideas or text itself such as the title, sentences 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8 came from the model writing in the textbook. This indicates that the meaning-making in Text 2 shows lack of the creative aspects praised by the teacher in the conference mentioned earlier, and this can be related to the mismatch of the teacher's expectation in which she emphasizes the expression of writers' unique ideas.

The discourse approach adopted by the students is likely to concern the assignment context rather than interaction between people. In particular, the seven students tried and reproduced course materials, attempting to 'succeed in the assignment', using the same rhetorical patterns and meaning-making in the model paragraph in the textbook. This indicates students' perception of what higher education learning is about and how they construct what they need to do in order to succeed in the assignment. Element of these perceptions are strongly visible in the students' accounts as they made reference to the role that their course materials played in their assignment. Text 2 is evidence of this. Here what Chase (1988) and I call 'accommodation' can be applied to these seven students. Accommodation refers to “the process by which students learn to accept conventions without necessarily questioning how these conventions privilege some forms of knowledge at the expense of others.” (Ivanič, 1988, p. 92). This might be related to the Korean education system as a socio-political context, in which learning is equated with the memorization of factual information rather than with the development of critical thinking.
or individual creativity, as Lee Younghwa (2003) mentioned.

The two pieces of work (Texts 1 and 9) that did not use the content from the textbook had one Claim/Opinion with four clear Reasons for it (Text 1) or did not include Support for Reason and Affirmation at all (Text 9). Interestingly, the writer of the Text 1 established a very persuasive meaning-making, bringing in the knowledge came from the Bible in order to agree with the death penalty. On the other hand, the content of Text 9 was about the influence of mass media on crimes. These two students produced very different types of texts in which the content was embedded in their own world of interpretation. This indicates that they revealed their own understanding about writing which seemed to be derived from their experiences, thoughts, imagination, and creativity rather than using the knowledge in the textbook, unlike the other seven students.


I now turn to the final stage to link the three research questions, concerning the relationship among the teacher’s voice, practices, and students’ products. The array of relational findings is represented in Figure 1 by a multidimensional model. This is a recursive model of the teaching EFL writing I observed in the writing classroom, adopting an ‘ecological approach’ (Maguire & Graves, 2001, p. 568). In the model, the two components, the voice and practice, are connected together; I identity this connection as the ‘alignment’.

**FIGURE 1**
The Relationship among Voice, Practice, and Product

The teacher’s thinking and doing, including how she approaches her teaching of writing constructed her own practices, the workshop and conference as the particular activities. The way she teaches EFL writing directly reflects her voice, based on her beliefs about
teaching and learning of writing. Consequently, the classroom implementations which integrate the teacher’s voice and her pedagogical practices lead the teaching of EFL writing to what I call ‘become an implicit knowledge prescribed by the individual teacher. This provides evidence that the relationship between the teacher’s voice and practices in the classroom is categorized in a way of alignment.

On the other hand, detachment is the opposite of alignment and involves a disconnection between the students’ writing products and the former two components, voice and practice. Here, the focus is on how far the teacher’s voice and pedagogic practices affects the students’ written products. According to the teacher, writing in English should be taught to develop creative ideas across time and space and pedagogic practices should be also constructed in this way, as shown in the interviews and classroom observations. However, very surprisingly, the teacher’s attention did not affect her students’ writing products. The nature of students’ written texts is evidence of this. A close textual analysis of the students’ opinion writing demonstrated that most of the students (7 out of 9) simply reproduced the content and used the key elements of the Claim/Opinion-Reason pattern in the model paragraph in the textbook. These findings support the weak relationship between the input (teacher voice and practices) and the output (student products) in the EFL context that I define as the ‘detachment.’

VI. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study was focused on the three issues: firstly, to explore the teacher’s beliefs about teaching and learning of EFL writing in the Korean context; secondly, to observed her pedagogic practices in the classroom; and, lastly, to find any relationship among the teacher voice, practices, and students’ writing products. The teacher intended to encourage her students to generate and formulate ideas into sound and cogent arguments with her three types of voice, i.e., ideational, interpersonal, and textual positioning, and the workshop activity as a pedagogic practice. Interestingly, the primary textual structure and meaning-making produced by the students demonstrated the pattern of ‘accommodation’, as seven students out of nine constructed similar rhetorical patterns and content adopted from their textbook in their opinion writing, showing a lack of creativity.

Of course, analysis of one particular teacher’s voice, practices, and students’ written texts in a single writing classroom does not yield sweeping implications which are generalized to all composition teaching. With a large number of sampling which includes a variety of EFL writing classrooms and teachers, the research would have shown the results that could be generalized to the accounting the teacher and students in English composition classrooms. Nevertheless, it cannot be claimed without a consideration of the
teacher voice, practice and student products, and from which the relationship between these also cannot be explored.

The students in this study tend not to think creatively in their opinion writing (Atkinson, 1997; Fox, 1994; Ramanathan & Kaplan, 1996), and this is not affected by the teacher's intention to let them produce creative ideas. The seven students' writing products are evidence of this; they showed limited ability for critical thought, simply reproducing the textbook, and it appeared that it was a problem for them to generate and formulate ideas into sound and cogent arguments. This is not surprising when we consider that the students have been used to being passive learners before entering a university environment which values independent thinking. Critical thinking in the learning of writing could be related to a 'critical language awareness' (Ivanič, 2001) of why particular discourses and genres are the way they are: the historical and social factors which shaped them and the patterns of privilege among them.

These findings imply that teachers need to develop students' creative and critical thought through writing practices, acknowledging their writing experiences. In order to develop students' creativity, specific prompts for the writing task need to be acknowledged. The writing task set by the teacher seemed to be implicit and personal in orientation in this study. As a result, the students' texts did not display divergence of meaning-making in their wordings. If she had provided, as Pollitt and Hutchinson (1987) argue, more explicit prompts on content and organization in order for the writing tasks to be valid and challenging, and to give the students opportunity to explore new ideas in their opinion writing, the students' responses might have included more creative and interesting content. The pedagogic perspectives on writing tasks argued by Bishop (1992) suggest that genre experimentation rather than genre modeling should form the basis of writing instruction.

Further exploration is needed in order to identify (a) why the students construct their meaning-making the way they do and (b) which kinds of guidelines are useful for students to produce creativity and critical thought in their writing. Given the unidentified reasons for the features of texts and fragmented nature of the task, it is particularly important to explore the ways in which students' learning of writing can be enhanced with different purposes for writing, writing modes, and a number of writing prompts.
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