

INVESTIGATING AUTHORIAL VOICE IN ACADEMIC WRITING COURSE

Destie Noer Rahmatya

noerrahmatiyadesti@gmail.com

English Education Department, University of Swadaya Gunung Jati – Indonesia

Utut Kurniati

kurniaute@gmail.com

English Education Department, University of Swadaya Gunung Jati – Indonesia

Usep Syaripudin

syaripudin.usep@gmail.com

English Education Department, University of Swadaya Gunung Jati – Indonesia

Abstract

Authorial Voice in academic writing is a research topic that aims to determine whether the authorial voice has an impact on the quality of student writing. This research was conducted with a qualitative method. Data analysis in this study uses qualitative content analysis by Kibiswa (2019). The data used in this study are ten student writings when writing an introduction article in the academic writing course. Data collection was carried out through a licensing process by a lecturer in academic writing, namely Dr. Misdi. The results show that the authorial voice has an impact on the quality of student writing, especially in conveying arguments, the stronger their arguments, the better the authorial voice, the more impact on the quality of student writing. The average score is 72.7, which makes it clear that the authorial voice highlighted by students is strong enough.

Keywords: *Authorial Voice, Academic Writing, Writing Quality*

Sari

Authorial Voice dalam penulisan akademik merupakan topik penelitian yang bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah authorial voice berdampak pada kualitas tulisan mahasiswa. Penelitian ini dilakukan dengan metode kualitatif. Analisis data dalam penelitian ini menggunakan analisis konten kualitatif oleh Kibiswa (2019). Data yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah sepuluh tulisan mahasiswa ketika menulis artikel pendahuluan dalam mata kuliah *academic writing*. Pengumpulan data dilakukan melalui proses perizinan oleh dosen pengampu mata kuliah *academic writing*, yaitu Dr. Misdi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa *authorial voice* berdampak pada kualitas tulisan mahasiswa, terutama dalam menyampaikan argumen, semakin kuat argumen mereka, semakin baik *authorial voice*, semakin berdampak pada kualitas tulisan mahasiswa. Nilai rata-rata yang diperoleh adalah 72,7, yang menjelaskan bahwa suara penulis yang ditonjolkan oleh mahasiswa cukup kuat.

Kata kunci: *Suara Penulis, Penulisan Akademik, Kualitas Penulisan*

Received 2022/06/02

accepted 2022/07/02

published 2022/09/02

APA Citation: Rahmatya, D. N., Kurniati, U., & Syaripudin, U. (2022). Investigating Authorial Voice in Academic Writing Course. *Research and Innovation in Language Learning*, 5(3), 27-36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33603/rill.v5i3>.

Introduction

In general, language skills are divided into two, they are receptive and productive. Receptive skill is reading and listening, while productive is speaking and writing. One of the skills that must be mastered is writing as a form of expressing our ideas and arguments against a problem. Writing skills emphasize grammar and give students a freer manner to communicate, arrange, and develop their thoughts.

In academic writing, talking about the concept of voice is a new thing that has not been introduced. Because the emphasis is only on sentence structure rather than voice. It will make students less confident in themselves when they write. . Voice may also make writing for the reader more fascinating and coherent. Because it can increase writers' confidence in how they express themselves in their writing, voice is a crucial component of writing. However, voice in academic writing frequently encounters a few challenges, one of which is the author's limited ability to communicate their ideas in writing due to inconsistencies in the definitions of words used in their source language and target language (Dindy Aruni & Hendriwanto, 2020).

The Nature of writing

For first- and second-language learners, there are certainly differences in the objective, context, prerequisites, and past knowledge of learning to write, all of which affect how a talent is defined. Because ESL learners have a much larger range of goals, backgrounds, needs, and writing-learning experiences than do EFL learners, the concept of writing for EFL learners is different from that for ESL learners. Although it is beneficial to EFL students' education, knowing a second language is not necessary for their long-term academic success. (Weigle, 2002). However, it can be challenging to organize and create thoughts in written language, as well as to transform these concepts into understandable prose. Writing is regarded as the skill that second language learners struggle with the most as a result. Writing as a skill has unique characteristics and

traditions that set it apart from other skills. The distinctions between spoken and written language provide evidence of the disparities between the four language skills.

Authorial Voice

According to Rockford Sansom (2018) Voice includes both an opinion and the freedom to express it. Giving voice frequently refers to presenting a distinctive viewpoint or advocating for concepts and people who are typically silenced or marginalized in some way. Additionally, academic research may (and ought to) offer these voices a chance. Related to Jun Zhao Yingliang Liu (2021), for writers to demonstrate the value and contribution of their thoughts, they need to have an authoritative voice. Zhao (2014) argues that each writer has a unique voice that distinguishes them from everyone else. Every text, according to Dwi Riyanti (2015), always carries a voice that represents the author¹¹. It can be said that authorial voice has truly existed in writing and that it reveals something about the writer.

Academic Writing

One of the most crucial and challenging competencies to master in higher education is academic writing, especially in highly specialized subjects. Self-efficacy is a factor that has been linked to writing performance and has proven to be a very accurate indicator of students' academic success (Paulina Meza & Mauricio González 2020). One of the most important components of academic courses for English for Academic Purposes (EAP) students is academic writing (Bahmani 2021). Teng (2021) asserts that academic writing is seen as a difficult component for college students. Because students have a limited vocabulary and find it challenging to write in English, the difficulties associated with academic writing may be amplified. Many students end up having difficulty in academic writing because apart from limited vocabulary, the grammar that they have not mastered is a challenge for them. Generally, students will find it difficult to write essays in English. As Rubina Akhtar et al (2019) said, Writing requires both mental and physical effort, making it a composite skill. Students must consistently practice academic writing skills in order to strengthen them and overcome writing obstacles.

Methods

Therefore, after collecting data, the data will analyze using Qualitative content analysis. According to Kibiswa (2019), The research methodology known as qualitative content analysis (QlCA) can be used deductively or inductively. More qualitative research guides present the former method than the latter, and it is extensively employed by qualitative researchers. The researcher will divide into 2 stages to analyze the data, the first stage is to find the authorial voice in each student's writing. The second stage analyzes the quality of student writing using a rubric. After the two steps are done, the writer will compare and match whether the writing that has a good authorial voice will have a high score in the rubric or vice versa.

Results and Discussion

Authorial voice from Anisa Andiani

In her introduction, Anisa is confident in expressing her opinion in explaining the background of her region. Then she also conveyed a good gap where his research would be potential research to be developed in the future.

Authorial voice from Atika Wulandari

In Atika's introduction, he doesn't really highlight the big gap, Atikah also has a strong argument and is supported by quotes from research to strengthen her argument. She can provide feedback on the background of the problem to be studied.

Authorial voice from Dita Salwa Asfia

In Dita Salwa's introduction, she has been able to convey problems related to her research, she is also able to provide responses to problems that occur, but dita does not have a gap that distinguishes her research from previous research.

Authorial voice from Farida Sulistyaningrum

In Farida's introduction, she still takes problems that are common in the world of education, she gives a pretty good opinion on the issue of students' interest in learning English. But once again farida does not have a gap in her research which makes her research with previous research no different.

Authorial voice from Karim Amrullah

In Karim's introduction, he does not give his opinion on what should be done to solve the problems described, he only explains about the problem and the purpose of his research. he also has no gaps in his articles. Karim's authorial voice here is not highlighted well enough.

Authorial voice from Liyana

In Liyana's introduction, he gives a pretty good opinion, but in the rules of writing the introduction, Liyana does not include previous studies so that the argument he gives is not too strong because it does not have a reference. Besides that, Liyana also does not have a gap so that the research he will do still has not found something new.

Authorial voice from Lussy Amalia

In Lussy's introduction, he was able to explain the problem quite well and clearly, and he also explained the focus of his research, but he did not mention the difference between his research and previous research. but it is possible that his research will be potential because the topic he brings is a good topic.

Authorial voice from Putri Maharani

In Putri's introduction, she brought a unique topic about how watching Spongebob movies can increase children's English vocabulary. he also explained the problem quite clearly, but he did not have a gap in his research, but the research design carried out by Putri was considered quite interesting and fun. Here is authorial voice on Putri's article.

Authorial voice from Sabrina Reekha Laela

In Sabrina's introduction, she does give a good opinion on the topic, but she doesn't go into detail about how and what kind of research she will do to address the issue. Sabrina emphasizes her opinions and arguments and is strengthened by previous journals. Sabrina's authorial voice is sufficient, but the rules for writing the introduction are not sufficient.

Authorial voice from Santhy Widyaningrum

In Santhy's introduction, he is good at explaining the topic and giving his opinion on the matter. Then he also has a gap which will greatly affect his research

which makes it more potential. Santhy's authorial voice here is good to see how she writes her opinion which is strengthened by previous journal references.

No.	Text	Aspect	Score	Total
1.	The Effect of Cultural Background on Speaking Skill EFL Students in Elementary School in Indramayu. (Anisa Andiani)	Assertiveness	21	78
		Self-identification	20	
		Reiteration of central point	18	
		Authorial presence and authorial of thought	19	
2.	Improving Listening Comprehension through Movies. (Atika Wulandari)	Assertiveness	19	74
		Self-identification	20	
		Reiteration of central point	18	
		Authorial presence and authorial of thought	17	
3.	Students' Problem in Translating text From English to Indonesian. (Dita Salwa Asfia)	Assertiveness	18	70
		Self-identification	17	
		Reiteration of central point	18	
		Authorial presence and authorial of thought	17	
4.	How to increase students' interest in learning English. (Farida Sulistyningrum)	Assertiveness	19	70
		Self-identification	19	
		Reiteration of central point	16	
		Authorial presence and authorial of thought	16	
5.	The effect of the non-native English students'	Assertiveness	19	

	background on the capability in speaking English. (Abdul Karim Amrullah)		70
	Self-identification	18	
	Reiteration of central point	19	
	Authorial presence and authorial of thought	14	
6.	Spatial implications of learning development in academic writing. (Liyana)	Assertiveness	19
			71
	Self-identification	19	
	Reiteration of central point	16	
	Authorial presence and authorial of thought	17	
7.	Factors That Influence Students' Attitudes Towards Learning English as a Foreign Language. (Lussy Amaliya)	Assertiveness	19
			70
	Self-identification	19	
	Reiteration of central point	16	
	Authorial presence and authorial of thought	16	
8.	The effect of watch cartoon "Spongebob" movie in the process of adding vocabulary to student's in junior high school. (Putri Maharani)	Assertiveness	18
			71
	Self-identification	19	
	Reiteration of central point	17	
	Authorial presence and authorial of thought	17	
9.	How to Make Supportive Environment for Students to Become Fluent in English as a Foreign Language. (Sabrina Reekha)	Assertiveness	19
			74
	Self-identification	19	
	Reiteration of central point	19	

10.	The Effectiveness of using Video Games as Tools to Improve Students English Vocabulary. (Santhy Widyaningrum)	Authorial presence and authorial of thought	17	79
		Assertiveness	22	
		Self-identification	19	
		Reiteration of central point	19	
		Authorial presence and authorial of thought	19	

Table 1.

After analyzing the research results from the rubric and all written data, the researcher get some findings that answer the research the questions listed in the chapter one. First, the researcher analyzed the authorial voice of each student's writing. The results can be ascertained that each student has their own authorial voice, they have a strong enough argument to explain why their research is interesting. But there are some things that distinguish it, such as the lack of gaps in student writing so that it distinguishes one writing from another. There are 2 student writings, namely Anisa and Santy, which have gaps in their writings that make their research potential and strengthen their arguments. Based on these findings, it can be said that the authorial voice has an impact on the quality of student writing, the better the authorial voice, the more impact it will have on the quality of their writing. The authorial voice highlighted in this result is at a decent level, in this case the author has the same opinion that with the average score is 72.5, it can be concluded that the authorial voice that is highlighted in the student's writing is indeed not too strong. But this can be overcome with a lot of practice to show the authorial voice in a way that can be found from several accurate sources.

Conclusion & Recommendation

While all students demonstrated a degree of authorial voice, the strength varied, particularly in how well they expressed arguments and identified research gaps. Only a few students, such as Anisa and Santhy, were able to highlight clear research gaps, making their writing more convincing and academically valuable. On average, the students' authorial voice was at a moderate level, with an overall score of 72.5. This

suggests that although students can present opinions and arguments, many still struggle to establish distinctiveness and originality in their writing. Therefore, developing authorial voice through consistent practice, exposure to academic texts, and training in critical engagement with sources is essential to improve the overall quality of their writing.

References

- Dindy Aruni Dhifany Zein, H. (2021). Examining Authorial Voice In Undergraduate Students' Thesis Writing. 157-169.
- Jun Zhao, Y. L. (2021). A developmental view of authorial voice construction in Master's thesis: A case study of two novice L2 writers, 1-15.
- Kibiswa, N. K. (2019 Volume 24, Number 8,). Directed Qualitative Content Analysis (DQICA): A Tool for Conflict Analysis. 2059-2079.
- Mark Feng Teng, C. Q. (2021). Validation of metacognitive academic writing strategies and the predictive effects on academic writing performance in a foreign language context. 167-190.
- RIYANTI, D. (2015). An Exploration of Voice in Second Language Writing. 27- 48.
- Rubina Akhtar, H. H. (2019). A Systematic Review of the Challenges and Solutions of ESL Students' Academic Writing. 1169-1171.
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zhao, C. G. (2014). Authorial Voice in Second Language Writing. 1-6.

Conflict of Interest

Potential conflict of interest, if any, should be reported here during data collection.

About Author

Destie Noer Rahmatya is a student at the English Education Department, Universitas Swadaya Gunung Jati Cirebon – Indonesia. She can be contacted at noerrahmatiyadesti@gmail.com.

Utut Kurniati is a senior lecturer at the English Education Department, Universitas Swadaya Gunung Jati Cirebon – Indonesia. She can be contacted at kurniaute@gmail.com.

Usep Syaripudin is a senior lecturer at the English Education Department, Universitas Swadaya Gunung Jati Cirebon – Indonesia. He can be contacted at syaripudin.usep@gmail.com.