

sfârșitul săptămânii de lucru pe la conacele situate pe plantațiile de viță de vie din localitățile Păuliș, Miniș, Ghioroc, Cuvin, Covăsânt, Șiria, Gașa, Mâsca, Măderat, Pâncota și Mocrea. „Săgeata verde” a venit în întâmpinarea acestor dorințe ale turiștilor, fiind cel mai sigur și comod mijloc de transport, timp de 86 de ani, neîntrerupt.

### **Bibliografie**

1. xxx Act de concesiune – Ministerul de Comerț al Regatului Ungar –nr. 63611/ III, 1905.
2. A. Szazeves Arad 1834-1934 Arad, 1934
3. Calea ferată Arad – Podgoria – 1906-1913-1983-1991, Arad, 2006.
4. Drecin, I. Monografia satului Cuvin, 1970
5. Dublea, Eugeniu, Orașe din România în imagini, Municipiul și județul Arad, Arad, 1938.
6. Hălmăgean, Gheorghe, Calea ferată electrică „Arad – Podgoria” – O cenușăreasă a căilor ferate, realități și speranțe, manuscris, 1990.
7. Idem, Un precursor al căilor ferate electrificate – Calea ferată electrică de interes local cu ecartament îngust „ Arad – Podgoria”, manuscris.
8. xxx Muzeul tramvaiului electric – Ghioroc. Statistici – Date document.
9. xxx Poze document – Colecția Valea – Em. Puiu.
10. xxx Punctul de vedere al R.A.T.Arad, privind sistarea activității de transport public pe ruta Radna- Pâncota.

## **II. ȘTIINȚE UMANISTE - MULTIDISCIPLINARITATE**

### **WRITER IDENTITY IN ACADEMIC WRITING IDENTITATEA AUTORULUI ÎN LUCRĂRI ACADEMICE**

**Mihnea Voicu ȘIMĂNDAN, BA, MA, CELTA**  
**Teacher Supervisor, Ladprao Bilingual School**  
**Bangkok, Thailand, mihnea\_voicu@yahoo.com**

#### **Abstract**

*Scrierile academice sunt în mod tradițional considerate a fi impersonale, cu un discurs în care personalitatea autorului nu este dezvăluită cititorului. Cu toate acestea, cercetări recente sugerează că există loc pentru a negocia identitatea autorului în scrierile academice, iar astfel, acest gen scriitoricesc nu trebuie despuiat de identitatea autorului. În această lucrare voi explora noțiunea de identitate a autorului într-un articol academic, analizând folosirea pronumelui personal (la persoană înăți, singular și plural).*

*Argumentul meu principal este acela că scriitorii sunt conștienți de identitatea autorului și folosesc în mod eficient acest concept pentru a-și face mesajul mai bine înțeles. Pentru a demonstra acest argument, am aplicat un șablon al identității autorului unui articol despre predarea limbii engleze („Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning” de Bonny Norton Peirce) publicat în „Tesol Quarterly” (1995) și mi-am concentrat studiul asupra modalităților prin care identitatea autorului este dezvăluită prin folosirea pronumelui personal.*

*În final, am discutat implicațiile rezultatelor obținute, concluzionând că din cele 54 de variante ale pronumelui personal (la persoană înăți, singular și plural) folosite în articolul analizat, 20 (37%) cad în categoria „<Eu> ca originator”. În categoria „<Eu> ca cercetător” există 18 (33%) variante ale pronumelui personal (la persoană înăți, singular și plural). Aceasta înseamnă că identitatea autorului articolului studiat este foarte puternică, dar în același timp este bazată pe o cercetare științifică minuțioasă.*

*Când articolul analizat a fost publicat în anul 1995, problema identității sociale în contextul achiziționării unei limbi străine nu a fost dezbătută de mulți lingviști. La scrierea articolului,*

*autoarea a fost nevoită să folosească de nenumarate ori pronumele personal (la persoană înăți, singular și plural). Acest lucru este datorat faptului că, în articolul ei, autoarea a prezentat concepte inedite, bazate pe rezultatele cercetării întreprinse în domeiul achiziționării unei limbi străine.*

**Cuvinte cheie:** *lingvistică, identitatea autorului, pronume personal*

### **Introduction**

In this paper I will base my assertions and discussions on two articles. The first article, which has provided the framework for my study, is written by Ramona Tang and Suganthi John, and is entitled *The 'I' in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun*. It was published in *English for Specific Purpose* (no. 18, 1999, S23-S39). The second article, *Options of identity in academic writing* by Ken Hyland, has helped me construct the rationale and understand the general issues concerned with writer identity. It was published in *ELT Journal* (Vol. 56/4, October 2002, pp. 351-358).

Using the two articles mentioned above as guidelines, I will identify, analyze and discuss the writer identity in *Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning* by Bonny Norton Peirce. This article was published in *Tesol Quarterly* (Vol. 29, No.1, Spring 1995). I had two central aims when looking at the article subject to research: (1) to determine if the writer uses the first person pronoun in her writing; and (2) to determine the roles that are behind these first person references. The

findings are highlighted in *Results of Analysis* and *Discussion* of the present paper.

### **Terminology**

Recent research has emphasized that disciplines have different views of knowledge, different research practices, and different ways of seeing the world. Thus, academic writing is not the uniformly faceless prose that it is often thought to be, but it displays peculiarities between fields of study. All these differences are reflected in diverse forms, arguments and expressions, including the writer identity. By 'writer identity' we understand the use and/or the absence of first person pronouns, both in the singular and plural forms (e.g. *I, me, mine, we, us, our* and *ours*). The extent to which authors can intrude into their texts and mark their personal involvement by using first person pronouns, clearly varies between disciplines.

Generally, writers in the 'hard sciences' and engineering prefer to downplay their personal role to highlight the issue of their study. The preferences for joint authorship in the sciences and engineering explains the greater use of plural forms in those disciplines. By using fewer author pronouns, writers in the sciences adopt a less personal style in order to help strengthen an impression of objectivity by subordinating their own voice to that of their results.

In 'soft knowledge' domains, such as humanities and social sciences the arguments and assertions are less precisely measurable and clear-cut than in the 'hard sciences'. Thus, the presence of the writer identity is more obvious, and a personal stance can help promote an impression of confidence and authority. For this reason, writers use the first person pronoun when they are presenting their claims and bottom-line results. Writers also intrude into the text to link themselves with their main contribution.

Thus, we can say that effective academic writing depends on appropriate language choices, and that the 'writer identity' refers to the various ways the writers employ their personal perceptions in different contexts.

### **Rationale**

Traditionally, academic writing had been considered as being dry and impersonal. This kind of writing involves an objective exploration of ideas that transcend the individual. Numerous textbook and style guides advised the writers to leave their personalities aside, and subordinate their views to rigid conventions of anonymity. However, recent research has shown that academic writing is no longer regarded as distant and impersonal, but as a genre where the writer's presence

is felt more and more significantly. Thus, the issue of how writers create identities for themselves in their academic writing has become once again the subject of research.

### Method

In this section, various ways in which the first person pronoun may be used in academic writing are presented. Research has shown that not all instances of 'I' are exactly alike, and that a degree of power wielded by authorial presence is to be noted through a particular instance of use of the first person pronoun. The following categories are based on Tang and John's research, and include: *'I as the representative*, *'I as the guide*, *'I as the architect*, *'I as the recounter of the research process*, *'I as the opinion-holder* and *'I as the originator*.

*'I as the representative* can be identified with the first person pronoun, usually in the plural form 'we' or 'us'. These personal pronouns can refer to: something general, as in *It resulted in the language we know today.* (*we* = people); a smaller group, as in *We know that Romanian is a Latin language.* (*we* = linguists); and a particular state of affair, as in *The goods we have today reflect many centuries of development.* The examples above show the fact that the first person pronoun reduces the writer to a non-entity, because the reader does not find out anything about the person who writes the lines.

*'I as the guide through the essay* can be better understood if we think of the essay as a 'new language lesson' and the writer as the 'teacher' during the student's presence in class. Using this metaphor, we can see the role of the guide as being the person who shows the reader through the essay, much as a teacher teaches the students the new lesson. The guide locates the reader and the

writer in time and place, presents the readers the main points of the essay, and concludes his/her findings. Verbs of perception (e.g. *see*, *note* and *observe*) are usually clear references that the first personal pronoun (usually in its plural forms of *we* or *us*) has the role of the 'guide'.

*'I as the architect* is usually realized by the usage of the first person singular, 'I'. The writer is the person who writes, organizes, structures and outlines the material in the written paper. There is not a clear-cut difference between 'I' as the guide and 'I' as the architect, but it is useful to have in mind the fact that 'the guide' merely seems to show the reader through an already existing terrain, while 'the architect', as the words suggest, creates a structure in the writing process.

*'I as the recounter of the research process* describes or recounts the various steps of the research process. These might include reading source texts, interviewing subjects, collecting data etc. Material process verbs or 'doing' verbs (e.g. *work*, *read*, *interview*, *collect*), frequently used in the past tense, signal the presence of 'I' as a recounter of the research process.

*'I as the opinion-holder* can be found in the instances where the writer shares an opinion, view or attitude with regard to known information or proved facts. Verbs of mental processes of cognition (e.g. *think*) usually are an indicator that the writer takes the position of the 'opinion-holder'.

*'I as the originator* can be found in academic writings where the writer advances his/her own ideas in the paper. It is thus understandable that when the writer is 'the originator' the ideas presented are new. The usage of "I" as the originator gives the writer the opportunity to claim his/her authority, and express some form of ownership over the written work.

### Results of Analysis

Using the method described above, I have identified all the instances of writer identity in *Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning* by Bonny Norton Peirce (*Tesol Quarterly*, Spring 1995). For the sake of better organization, my results and discussion will be split into the following conventions: (1) the first section of Bonny's study (pp.9-13) will be referred to as **Part 1: The Introduction**; (2) the second section entitled "THE STUDY: IMMIGRANT WOMEN AS LANGUAGE LEARNERS" (pp.13-14) will be referred to as **Part 2: The Study**; (3) the third section entitled "THE THEORY: SOCIAL IDENTITY, INVESTMENT, AND THE RIGHT TO SPEAK" (pp. 14-18) will be referred to as **Part 3: The Theory**; (4) the fourth section entitled "THE ANALYSIS: IDENTITY, INVESTMENT, AND LANGUAGE LEARNING" (pp. 18-25)

will be referred to as **Part 4: The Analysis**; and (5) the final section entitled “THE IMPLICATIONS: CLASSROOM-BASED SOCAIL RESEARCH” (pp. 25-28) will be referred to as **Part 5: The Implications**.

| Part            | I as Rep | I as Guide | I as Arch | I as Rec | I as OH | I as OR | Total     |
|-----------------|----------|------------|-----------|----------|---------|---------|-----------|
| 1               | 0        | 0          | 1         | 2        | 3       | 4       | 10        |
| 2               | 0        | 0          | 1         | 5        | 0       | 0       | 6         |
| 3               | 0        | 0          | 4         | 5        | 2       | 5       | 16        |
| 4               | 0        | 0          | 2         | 2        | 2       | 5       | 11        |
| 5               | 0        | 0          | 0         | 4        | 1       | 6       | 11        |
| <b>Subtotal</b> |          |            |           |          |         |         | <b>54</b> |

**Table 1:** Distribution of first person pronouns across the article of research:

### Discussion

It is easy to notice in Table 1 that none of the five parts of Bonny’s article have any instances of *‘I’ as the representative* and *‘I’ as the guide*. From this I can understand the fact that the author does not intend to play a passive role in her article. Already a member of the academic community (a postdoctoral fellow at the Modern Language Center, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Canada), the author does not need the acceptance of the linguists community. What she intends to do in the article is to bring the topic of her research to light and present her findings and conclusions. In order to achieve this she does not have to use the writer identity as the

representative or the guide.

Out of a total of 10 instances of the first person pronoun used in *Part 1: The Introduction* four of them (40%) fall into the *‘I’ as the originator* category (for examples see *Appendix*). The reason that stands behind this fact is that *Part 1: The Introduction* is where the author expresses the novelty of her research. She succeeds in presenting her ideas though the usage of such phrases as *propose, take the position, argue and support*. It is also important to mention that there are three (30%) instances of *‘I’ as the opinion-holder*, which means that she expresses opinions of someone else’s views in order to build the theoretical background of her study. The instances where *‘I’* stands for the architect (10%) and for the recounter of the research process (10%) make out of Bonny’s first part of the article a proficient way of building up and recreating the backdrop of research. Thus, *Part 1: The Introduction* contains all the necessary elements to make its message clearly understood.

Out of a total of 6 instances of the first person pronoun used in *Part 2: The Study* five of them (83%) fall into the *‘I’ as the recounter of the research process*. This is only natural due to the fact that this part of Bonny’s article deals with the presentation of her research, which meant collecting data from diaries, questionnaires, individual and group interviews, and home visits. She makes use of such phrases as *I helped teach, I invited, I based my research questions, etc.*, which only highlight the fact that she underwent through all the necessary academic demands when doing her project.

In *Part 3: The Theory* the total instances of the first person pronoun used are 16. The number of first personal pronouns that express *‘I’ as the recounter of the research process* and *‘I’ as the originator* is equal, i.e. five instances (31%) each. This can be explained by the fact that what the writer does in this part is to present her new theory based on the research she has previously done. It is important to mention that there are four (25%) instances of *‘I’ as the architect* which only help the writer to build the discourse she needs in order to sustain her ideas. This part has the highest percentage (30%) of usage of first person pronouns in the whole article, thus being the center and most important part of her research.

Out of a total of 11 instances of the first person pronoun used in *Part 4: The Analysis* five of them (45%) fall into the *‘I’ as the originator* category. This is due to the fact that this section analyses her findings. The other instances of writer identity present in this part are equally shared

by uses of 'I' as the architect, as the recouter, and as the opinion holder in a percentage of 18%. These are used skillfully by the author in order to create a believable presentation of her opinions.

Out of a total of 11 instances of the first person pronoun used in *Part 5: The Interpretations*, six (54%) fall in the 'I as the originator' category. 'I as the recouter of the research process' is represented by four (36%) instances of writer identity. This is only normal if we consider this final section of Bonny's article as her conclusions. The conclusions are meant to restate the topic-problem and go through the most important evidence that sustains the writer's own opinions.

### Conclusion

Out of a total of 54 instances of the first person pronoun used in Bonny's article, 20 (37%) fall into the 'I as the originator' category. Instances of 'I as the recouter of the research process' are 18 (33%) in number. This means the writer identity in the article is very strong, but is also based on thorough research. When the article was published for the first time in 1995 the issue of social identity in the context of language learning was not dealt upon by many linguists. That is why, when writing her article the author had to make use of numerous instances of first person pronouns.

What this paper has shown is the fact that each section of Bonny's article made use of writer identity in order to suit her discourse. Probably, Bonny Norton Peirce was not aware of this fact, but her being part of the academic community for a long time has subconsciously influenced the decision she made regarding language use when she wrote her article.

### Appendix

Following are examples for each category of writer identity from Bonny's article. The first person pronouns have been underlined in each example:

#### 'I' as the architect

- "... I drew in particular on Weedon's (1987) conception of social identity or subjectivity." (p.14-15)

- "I will demonstrate below that although it might be tempting to argue that Eva was essentially an introverted language learner..." (p. 16)

- "... I wish to highlight data that addresses the question..." (p.18)

#### 'I' as the recouter of the research process

- "From January to June 1990 I helped teach a 6-month ESL course to a group of recent immigrants at Ontario College in Newtown, Canada." (p.13)

- "I also drew a substantial amount of data from two detailed questionnaires..." (p.14)

- "... my research on immigrant women in Canada develops questions..." (p.18)

#### 'I' as the opinion-holder

- "... a theory of social identity that I hope will contribute to debates on second language learning." (p.12)

- "In my view, the conception of investment rather than motivation ..." (p.17)

- "I suggest that the reason why Martina refused to be silent..." (p.21)

#### 'I' as the originator

- "I take the position that if learners invest in a second language..." (p.17)

- "I wish to argue that Martina's investment in English was largely structured..." (p.21)

- "As Eva continued to develop what I have called an identity as a multicultural citizen..." (p.25)

### Bibliography

1.Hyland, Ken, *Options of identity in academic writing*, in *ELT Journal*, Vol. 56/4, October 2002, pp. 351-358.

2.Peirce, Bonny Norton, *Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning*, in *Tesol Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No.1, Spring 1995.

3.Tang, Ramona and John, Suganthi, *The 'I' in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronoun*, in *English for Specific Purpose*, no. 18, 1999, S23-S39.

## ACADEMICIANUL EMIL POP ȘI ARHEOLOGIA ROMÂNEASCĂ

**Liviu MĂRGHITAN**

**Academia Română, Divizia Istoria Științei**

*Adresa: Calea Victoriei, nr. 125, cod. 010071, sector 1, oficiu poștal 22, București.*

### **Abstract**

*Although the Paleopolinological research was initiated by the prestigious biologist Emil Pop, titular member of the Romanian Academy since 195, and this original type of scientific investigation of the flora from the distant historical times has begun to be an efficient means of information in the framework of archaeological excavations, his name is not mentioned in the specific works and treatises.*

*This omission must be corrected, and the first step in this regard was done in the framework of the scientific research session from Bucharest, the 17 th of May 2007 of the Division of Science History of the Romanian Academy through the following communication.*

**Cuvinte cheie:** *cultură, biologie, investigare, paleopolinologia, arheologie, agricultură, savant.*

Așa cum bine se știe, cercetarea trecutului istoric foarte îndepărtat al omenirii în general și al fiecărui popor în special, au fost și au rămas până în prezent pe cât de tentante, pe atât de pline de felurite greutăți.

Dificultățile multiple, derivate din faptul că unica sursă pentru obținerea de informații pe al căror temei să se formuleze concluzii științifice care să reflecte în mod cât mai fidel aspecte ale existenței umane petrecute cu multe sute de ani mai înainte au fost și au rămas în exclusivitate urmele de cultură materială, au lăsat cale liberă interpretărilor de tot felul.

Astfel, în cele aproximativ două secole și jumătate de cercetări mai mult sau mai puțin sistematice și științifice, atât pe plan științific european cât și național, s-au emis o serie de teorii și s-au creat felurite scenarii ale evoluțiilor pe scara vremii a societății umane, dintre care nu puține erau considerate destul de multă vreme drept adevăruri imuabile și definitiv câștigate de știință.

Însă lucrurile nu au stat chiar așa cum se credea de către generația de cercetători emitentă. Pe măsură ce în căutări erau implicate noi metode de investigare se constata că o seamă dintre mai