Chapter 2

Survey of Audience Awareness Literature

Part 1  Historical & Theoretical Perspectives on Audience

2.0. Introduction

The concept of audience has become vital to the understanding of written communication theory and pedagogy. Recent research in social constructionist approach to the theories of composition (Bruffee, 1986) has shown that studies of audience are not simply confined to the field of composition, but also this is widely debated in various inter related fields like Literary studies, Reading theory, Education, Cognitive psychology, Philosophy and Linguistics, Speech communication, Rhetoric, Semiotics, Pragmatics, Socio-linguistics, Psychology of group and face to face interactions and a host of other disciplines and sub-disciplines related to the studies of language. Further, it emanates from the broad multicultural perspective that indicates the growth of socially constructed notions. Thus to have a broad, interdisciplinary focus on audience in composition studies, issues and theories related to it have been examined from historical, theoretical and empirical positions. As Kirsch & Roen say ‘current approaches to audience include historical studies of writer’s audience awareness during composing, the relation between audience awareness and syntactic and lexical features, and studies of audience as discourse communities’ (1990:13).

Theories of audience have become increasingly complex and have acquired a variety of interpretations and meanings. The different meaning attached to term audience have made the studies on audience very complex as theorists, researchers, practitioners, empiricists treat audience to different degrees in different ways. Thus there always arises one important question of ‘how to study best a sense of audience in written communication’ (Kirsch & Roen, 1990:14). All these lead to a multiplicity of approaches ‘ranging from historical studies to ethnographies and experimental design’ (Ibid. : 15) based on ‘conflicting epistemologies and
competing paradigms. The methodological diversity of the studies of audience has shown that the field of audience is not influenced by a single research paradigm (Kirsch & Roen, 1990).

2.1 A Brief Historical Survey

2.1.1. Audience Addressed vs. Audience Invoked: Pre-classical roots

Studies of audience have focused on various treatments of ‘audience’ and rhetoric theory in an effort to overcome the conceptual and terminological confusion that has arisen across time. Several recent studies suggest that writers employ a wide range of strategies in conceptualizing their audience while writing. Oppositions such as ‘audience addressed vs. audience invoked’ and intended audience vs. imagined audience as well as terms such as implied audience, unknown audience, extended audience, and universal audience have been used to describe the creativity and flexibility that go into audience construction (Cherry, 1988). However, the study of audience is broadly grouped into two broad categories of audience addressed and audience invoked as given below (Ede & Lunsford, 1984).

Audience addressed: Ede & Lunsford point out that ‘addressed’ (audience) refers to the concrete reality of the writer’s audience (and assumes that) knowledge of this audience’s attitudes, beliefs and expectations is not only possible (via observation and analysis) but essential (Ibid.:156)

Audience invoked: An invoked view of audience stresses that writers are not able to get to know real readers and instead the writer creates ‘fiction’ and provide semantic/syntactic cues for the reader to perform the role(s) the writer wants the reader to participate in the text (Ibid.: 160) and how to relate to and read a given text.

The ‘pre-modern’ rhetoric is seen as falling on the addressed side of the dichotomy.

Pre-classical phase:

The Pre-Socratic philosophers and Sophists laid the foundation of audience addressed/invoked dichotomy. The pre-classical thinkers treated the function of rhetoric based on very ‘real’, ‘knowable’ and easily defined audiences who were understood to be the ‘passive receivers’ (Willey, 1990). The early Pre-socratics held the view that the effect of rhetor’s rhetoric on the audiences depended on the
unreliable sense perception; human beings fail to make use of their hearing senses. Willey (1990) finds Heracleitus considering hearing as the least accurate of the senses and the real audience as willing receptacles and they are often conquered over by the rhetoric for their lack of intelligence. That highlights the agonistic relationship between the rhetor and his/her audience. Heracleitus’s views surfaces in the wake of the definite social structure of Greece, where the educated were in minority. Parmenides’s view on audience is close to that of Heracleitus when he invokes an image of audience while Heracleitus’s tainted prose style demanded an image of audience primarily invoked (Willey, 1990). Parmenides’s choosing the epic form actually invokes his audience into a certain role – to react to and interact properly with the text, at least as Permenides intended (Willey, 1990 : 29). Parmenides’s view differs from that of Herecleitus, since Permenides is producing the actual texts and in doing so he invites the audiences to interact with the texts.

Aristotle calls Empedocles as the ‘inventor of rhetoric’ since one of the Empedocle’s poems shares many of the rhetorical qualities of Parmenides’s poem. Empedocles has addressed his student Pausanias – as a real and knowable audience with whom ‘intended audience is cast into a certain relationship to the writer and his text that they must play to successfully complete the rhetorical act’ (Willey, 1990 : 31). Although like his predecessors, Empedocles too shared a distrust of human senses, knowledge and abilities, but he recognizes that it is only through those senses that we can gain any knowledge and understanding (Ibid. : 32).

Democritus, Heracleitus, Permenides and Empedocles, all these philosophers are dealing with knowable, concrete audiences. This actually laid the foundations for today’s addressed / invoked dichotomy. Democritus discusses the power of rhetoric to effectively persuade the audience, although he too considered the limitations of human capabilities. Nevertheless, he invokes his readers and defines their relationship to himself and to the text and at the same time he is aware of the actual target audience. Nausiphanes also keeps the real audience in mind but relies on his faith in audience’s ability to hear & to learn. While the Sophist Protagoras, an agnostic, believes in the power of rhetoric’s sensation that reduces all knowledge to sensation(Ibid.:35). Also Protagoras is aware of the active audience and the relativity of knowledge (Ibid.:36). Georgia too recognized rhetorics power to affect and persuade an audience. The greatest power of persuasion rhetors can be exerted by the rhetors over their audience, nevertheless the power of rhetoric might be
imbued with certain ambivalent attitudes. Therefore, Georgia invokes his audience into a certain relationship in defense of his arguments.

The preclassical philosophers and rhetoricians considered audience central to their rhetoric paving the way for the classical thinkers.

Classical phase:

The problem of addressing 'the implied' audience (Hirsch cited in Williard and Brown, 1990) has always been a complex one. Unlike the speaker’s individual audience, writer’s audience is always universal. Classroom communication and composition classes usually don’t provide scope or opportunities for the student writers to target a specified audience. Rather they are encouraged to write for some abstraction like 'the educated reader;' (Hirsch cited in Ibid.: 40), who is unlikely to share the writer’s loneliness. Thus the audience for the writer tends to be 'fictive'. Historically speaking, authors had expectations about 'better audiences' or 'pluralistic audiences'. However, the classical conceptions of audience don’t meet the requirements of a heterogeneous and complex society like ours where 'multiciliplities of audience' may figure in the face of cultural diversity. The respective positions of Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Bacon and others underline certain frame of reference in our understanding of the nature of rhetoric or an audience.

Plato questions the primacy of oral communication over the written speech. His choice of dialogue form helps in establishing a speaker – audience nexus, where a good speaker always adjusts his argument for his ‘audience’, while he discredits the relativism of rhetoricians like Georgias and Syracusan where style can win over the substance. Socrates too believed in a systematic, scientific rhetoric depending on the knowledge of target audience and a classification of discourse affecting the ‘souls’ of human beings addressed, that forms certain basis for audience-psychology in speech communications. Nevertheless, while Plato’s understanding of audience was fixed on ‘souls’, Aristotle’s classification of rhetoric, judicial, ceremonial and political, calls for the roles or the decisions listeners have to take such as in a legal debate in deciding a person’s innocence, listeners deciding the city’s course of action in a political debate or oratory skills in a ceremony etc. Thus in Aristotle’s case there are three kinds of audiences and he was of the view that there has to be a science of rhetoric based on universal considerations. So far as rhetoric is
concerned. Plato and Aristotle differ in one very important way: Plato emphasizes on the 'spiritual science' as opposed to the 'verbal art' advocated by Aristotle. Subsequently other rhetoricians have synthesized these two opinions. St. Augustine considers a rhetoric that demands knowledge of people as well as of words (Ibid.:45). And later he prefers to give his view of ‘ethos’; where there is the ‘need to ingratiate the audience’. Also he extends rhetoric to incorporate exposition as well as persuasion within the ceremonial mode of preaching and teaching (Ibid.:46). St. Augustine’s main concern is the effect of style on the audience. He differentiates styles into low, middle and high depending upon the suitability of the listener. But on the whole St. Augustine’s major contribution is the psychological aspect of rhetoric: introducing the understanding and the will and also the issue of Semiotics. Nonetheless St. Augustine is also known originally for putting forth his views on the union of rhetoric and semiotics (Ibid.:46).

Karl R. Wallace’s study of Francis Bacon’s theory of rhetoric: ‘The Art of Applying Reason to Imagination for the Better Moving of the Will’, stresses on the notion all communication is derived from and is conditioned by the audience. Bacon differentiates between two kinds of audience: those who lack special knowledge and those who already have it. Bacon employs the ‘persuasive discourse’ as used in the sciences that goes with people who have special knowledge and ‘expository discourse’ for those who lack special knowledge. The respective positions of thinkers differentiating between the one and the many audiences are the following:

The One and Many Listeners: Cycle I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plato</th>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Crowd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle</td>
<td>Juror/Politician</td>
<td>Ceremonial audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Upright Christian</td>
<td>Fallen souls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td>Scientist</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, take quite different approaches to the issue of audience. Hobbes makes a distinction between the monarch and his subjects specially when they are led by a person. For the subjects monarch becomes the final authority for appeal and petition and he is responsible to the multitude. On the contrary John Locke takes a dim view of rhetorical figures. Although he does not dismiss rhetoric outright and considers rhetoric useful to the extent that it is helpful in bringing order and clarity, he rejects only the artificial and ornamental aspects.
Locke dismisses the idea of one reader altogether as it is a useless abstraction and puts all the emphasis on the members of the enlighten community (Ibid.:49). George Campbell responding to Locke in his book The Philosophy of Rhetoric detailed his theory of audience by distinguishing ‘the Hearers as Men in general’ from ‘the Hearers, as such Men in particular,’ (Ibid.:49). Campbell treats rhetoric on the level of psychology and refutes Locke’s relativism. He shifts the emphasis from persuasion to exposition and even more on the knowledge of human nature and the understanding of audience psychology. He is considered the founder of the ‘current-traditional’ paradigm in rhetoric instruction (Ibid.:59). His book The Philosophy of Rhetoric heralded a fundamental change in the approach to rhetoric. Campbell is cited as an authority in 20th Century studies of rhetoric and perhaps the first to be emphatic about the communication that transfers meaning from the speaker to an audience he defines discourse as that which has purpose to inform, convince, please, move or persuade. Thus an analysis of the mind of the listener reader became vital to audience centered rhetoric. Further he provided theoretical and practical means to connect discourse to its purpose and its effect on the listeners and readers. In attempting to outline these issues the dominant concepts of communicative acts - analysis and adaptation were enumerated. Audience analysis was rated high as rhetoric became more epistemological and psychological concerning itself with the mind of the listener-reader.

Vico during the early 18th century wanted to look at rhetoric from the point of view of the ancient Roman ideal. The power of rhetoric, according to him, is a mental tool and for to expand vocabulary and increasing the powers of thought that would make a modern person a mental ‘giants’.

The second cycle of ideas is under mentioned with respect to the position taken by the different thinkers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The One and Many Listeners : Cycle 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hobbes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parellels between the Cycle 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campbell is more concerned with the rhetorical theory than Augustine and tends to see the individual audience as an abstraction. However, all these theories offer little guidance to the teacher who wants to talk about audience in a freshman class. *(Ibid.: 52).* Nevertheless a few directions emerge from the above discussions of Plato, Aristotle, Augustine and others. These lessons are that the writer must be representative and should select words that are comprehensible and throws light on the faculty of reason, will, imagination and passions. However, these terms may not be valued from the point of view of cognitive psychology. Further the discussion is useful in the context of speaker making the listener literate in a situation of shared culture. And therefore, 'cultural literacy is necessarily rhetorical, determined by who is addressing whom and to what end' *(Ibid.: 53).*

**2.2. Ong’s hypothesis of fictionalizing audience and other views:**

Audience projection in oral communication as traditionally known is an outcome of rhetoric, particularly in western intellectual tradition. Over the last two decades, rhetoric has been gradually extended to include writing and more often it has been noticed in highly technological cultures *(Ong, 1975).* Historically speaking rhetoric was oral focused and of let, the focus of rhetoric has shifted to writing. This has assigned roles that readers as readers are consequently called on to play *(Ong, 1975: 9)* or the roles imposed on reader by a written or printed text. Further it questions the reader’s roles, be it synchronic or diachronic. Similar to this context Searle & Austin treat illocutionary acts as an attempt to secure hold on audiences, particularly in an oral communication.

audience signifies two meanings. First, the writer imagines an audience cast in some sort of role such as reflective sharers, experience seekers and so on. Second, audience must correspondingly fictionalize itself meaning thereby, a reader has to play the role in which the author has cast him (Ong, 1975:12).

The sense of audience in written communication depends largely on the context in which the writing occurs. Our understanding about the audience depends on the context of oral communication which varies greatly from the written context. In a verbal exchange, the audience is inevitable but for the writer audience is simply further away, in time or space or both (Ibid.: 10). Ong further adds:

Context for the spoken word is simply present, centered in the person speaking and the one or ones to whom he addresses himself and to whom he is related existentially in terms of the circumambient actuality (Ibid).

Only in certain exceptional cases, such as the communication between two deaf persons, written exchanges may serve as the only channels of communication. Ong further states that the writer never fictionalizes his readers individually but he draws on the real social, economic and psychological states of possible readers.

2.2.1. Applying Ong’s ‘Fictive Audience’ in literary discourse:

The process of fictionalizing the readers, as Ong (1975) reports is not simply the problem of what to say but also whom to say it to. Ong cites literary works such as Mark Twain’s The Adventures of Tom Sawyer, Hemingway’s A Farewell to Arms, where the respective authors succeed in their communication through the process of fictionalizing an audience they have in their imagination and also from ‘earlier writers who were fictionalizing in their imagination audiences they had learned’ (Ibid.: 11). Howsoever realistic the situation may be, the narrator puts forth his views through the ‘fictive audience’. TS Eliot’s ‘Tradition and the ‘Individual Talent’ suggests the voice of the poet addressing an audience, ‘the voice of the poet talking to himself or to nobody, the voice of the poet when he attempts to create a dynamic character speaking’. This is viewed by Ong as the built in relationships among these three voices (Ong, 1975). Ong cites the case of Hemingway’s A Farewell to Arms in discussing the reader’s involvement in the first sentence of the story, the river when no rivers occurs in the prior text. Ong tries to justify Hemingway’s literary purpose by compelling the reader to accept the authors views (Jacob, 1989). Ong (1975) has focused on written fictional narrative as a kind of paradigm for the fictionalizing of writer’s audiences or readers. Ong further
adds that the notion of audiences about fictional narrative applies ceteris paribus to all writing. There exists a situation where writers can't communicate orally, he considers the notion that the 'writers audience is always a fiction' he further adds 'the historian, the scholar or scientist, and the simple letter writer all fictionalize their audiences, casting them in a made-up role and calling them to play the role assigned (Ibid.: 17). It is interesting to note that Ong contends, even when the writing is not poetry or fiction but scientific prose he explicates 'how writers use cues to direct readers into fictional roles' (Gragson & Selzer, 1990: 25). But Ong further mentions that certain genres like familiar letter and diary violate his concept of fictionalized audience since the audience appears to be 'simply one clearly determine person, who hardly need fictionalize himself' (Ong, 1975: 19).

2.2.2. Applying Ong's Fictive Audience in Non-literary discourse:

Jacobs (1989) notes that even editorials of a newspaper are a different genre and he cites the case of Zinsser (1980), formerly writer of editorials for the New York Herald Tribune that the reader is a 'collective entity'; and he considers the notion of 'constructed reader' following the presumption of journalism that 'reader knows nothing'; and every reader is a different person, even though the genre is a non-fictional discourse. Such a concept of reader is based on assuming that a group of readers have differing needs for information and as a result of which Zinsser refutes to visualize the great mass audience. Developments in literary criticism during the last decade have attempted to highlight the fact that literary works imply and project an audience. However, Cioffi (1988) has reported research not much less in the same general framework of 'projecting and audience' and deserves further consideration in calling attention to the importance of the roles audiences are cast into a non-fictional discourse. Cioffi attempts to demonstrate 'how composition textbook advertisements, suggest, project and perhaps even create an audience (Ibid.: ). To illustrate the nature of audience - related elements of the advertisement object four features such as context, extrinsic circumstances that the advertisements connotes; genre in terms of the nature of text or object, the advertisement; borrowings or the sources that the advt object draws upon; and reflexivity or image of the viewer mirrored by the advertisement are mentioned in detail. Cioffi attempts to imply and project certain features of viewing audience. As a result of this, the advertisements have a variety of appeals even though it is not
a fictionalized work. He further adds, that ‘advertisement agencies use a ‘scatter-shot’ approach when marketing their text (Ibid.:303), projecting a number of possible audience roles and shape their audience into something new and appealing.

Gragson & Selzer (1990) report research done with regard to Ong’s influential suggestion that writer’s audience is always a fiction. Gragson & Selzer (1990) has called attention to the importance of Ong’s approach to non literary discourse. They raise a vital question ‘Why have the efforts of reader response literary critics such as Ong, Wolfgang Iser (1974), Gerald Prince (1973), Stephen Booth (1969), and so many others not been applied to non literary discourse’ as ‘surprisingly there has not been a systematic application of Ong’s hypothesis about fictional narrative to all writing’ (Gragson & Selzer, 1990: 25). Literary theorists and critics have followed Ong’s suggestion of ‘fictive’ audience in their attempt to do a critical and literary analysis of the ways novelists and creative writers fictionalize their audience- the ways authors observe conventions and provide cues to direct readers in fictional roles. But little scholarship in rhetoric and composition has extended Ong’s approach to non literary works except by those who follow ‘demographic’ approaches to audience to generate data on attitudes, prejudices, habits and knowledge of real readers.

Gragson & Selzer (1990: 27) analyze two pieces of scientific discourse addressed to the same community of readers but that construct radically different fictional roles and tests the usefulness of Ong’s insight of fictive audience or reader response criticism when applied to non literary discourse. Further, they demonstrate how these two pieces of scientific discourse provide cues that encourage implied readers to assume or not to assume particular fictional roles. The two articles under discussion are - John Maynard Smith’s Optimisation Theory in Biology (1978) published in Annual reviews of Ecology and Systematics and S.J. Gould & R.C. Lewontin’s The Spandrels of San Marco and the Panglossian Paradigm: A critique of the Adaptationists programmes (1978) (as quoted in Gragson & Selzer, 1990:23). Gragson & Selzer note that these two authors represent two different schools of thought; they not only differ in point of view, ‘they differ radically in the rhetorical strategies they employ – particularly in the ways these authors chose to constitute their audiences’ (Ibid.:30). A comparison of these two articles demonstrate the
writer's freedom to exercise stylistic choices to enhance their persuasiveness throwing cues that direct implied readers into specific roles.

Maynard Smith's approach to fictionalize the audience of non literary discourse relics on highly 'conventional cues that prompt readers into a highly conventional roles' (Ibid). He assigns the reader scientific role. Smith sticks to the reference system of the Council Of Biology Editors Style Manual (Ibid.:31). Gragson & Selzer (1990) quote Prince (1973) in stating that the implied reader always 'knows the tongue and the languages of the narrator' (p.10). Smith follows the shared beliefs, common knowledge and vocabulary of the Biological sciences and certain stylistic devices such as passives, nominalization, resorting to awkwardly impersonal constructions such as 'it is assumed'; 'are to be interpreted'; 'some assumption must be made'; 'it is necessary to specify'; 'one reason for writing this review'; 'one can say'; 'the suggestion emerged'. He writes this article and schools his readers in the domain of conventional signs and in the ethos of science. Smith is careful to use language and style scientifically neutral and dispassionate and puts his readers in a scientific, referential frame of mind, and creates the persona of a conventional Biologist and considers his reader as a 'conventional subordinate' (Gragson & Selzer, 1990:30).

By contrast, Gould & Lowontin fictionalize their audience into a very different role. They constitute their readers as more than members of a particular scientific discipline and invite their readers away from disciplinary specialization and assume their readers into a cosmopolitan, urbane self. This is achieved through wit and wordplay, irony and sarcasm and emphatic sentences. The approach is humanistic and they want to cast their readers into another image – the skeptical, inquisitive, unconventional colleagues Gragson & Selzer (1990). Gould and Lowontin choose rhetorical questions, imperatives, dashes, exclamations, to create interest, to infuse flesh and blood, to involve the readers in a broader framework (Ibid.:37).

In effect, the rhetorical choices of Smith & Gould and Lowontin differ, and at times it is the same but both of them deal with 'fictional readers', the readers in the text (Ibid :42). None of them deal with actual readers and in reality the readers may not be Smith's 'conventional subordinate' nor the 'skeptical colleagues' as created by Gould and Lowontin.
One final point to be made here is that Gragson & Selzer (1990) establish the view of Ong’s assertion that ‘the historian, the scholar or scientist and the simple letter writer all fictionalize their audiences casting them in a made up role and calling on them to play the role assigned (Ong, 1975:17). At the same time Gragson & Selzer ask:

How are roles created for implied readers? What specific signals tip readers off about the roles they are expected to play? And how can an emphasis on the active writer as fictionalizer be reconciled with the fact that readers are active themselves – that they might resist a particular role instead of assuming it? In other words, if reading is a process of negotiation, what are the specific terms of that negotiation? (1990:43).

Answer to these questions can, in turn, lead to the improved understanding of meaning in varied forms of discourse such as The Origin of Species; computer manuals, scientific articles and so forth and finally it would empower inexperienced writers following the line of enquiry initiated by Ong and his ideas applied by Gragson & Selzer (1990) to fashion language carefully.

2.3. Long’s view of Writer - Audience relationship

Most often students writing in classroom are instructed to focus on audience. Students do bring in the ‘real’ audience keeping in mind the teacher who monitors their performance. Inculcating audience sensitivity to classroom composition has never become the legitimate domain of written communications skills except that the likes and dislikes and rough demography of the instructor concern has been the point of instruction (Long, 1990: 73).

Long (1980) pushes this idea further as he suggests:

writers create roles or identities for readers within texts. These roles are assumed only for the duration of the reading process and do not have to coincide with roles that readers play in ‘real’ life or even when reading other publications, Long proposes. His argument has immediate consequences for the teaching of writing: Instead of analyzing readers’ beliefs and back ground-knowledge, beginning writers need to learn how to produce textual cues that will lead readers to assume a desired identity or role (Kirsche & Roen, 1990:16).

2.3.1 Analytical Approach to Audience Analysis

Analytical approach to ‘audience reading’ or ‘analysis’ (Long, 1990) produces stereotype results but not significant results. It does not really help the writer to track down the different roles specific readers have to play while reading the texts. Although these roles have less to do with the analyzable characteristics of the
Specific readers/audience available to the writer before the reading act begins. Analytical approach does not help the writers in coping with the ‘problem of addressing such widely disparate audiences (Ibid. : 74). Analytical approach to audience in terms of emphasizing the pre-writing information and psychological analysis of the personality does not yield accurate analysis Long predicts that such information would paralyze the writer starting a writing project. Long feels that availability of information like the audience consists primarily of white, middle class may not be certain vital questions and similar is the case of identifying audience taste in terms of political religious or moral preferences or general interest of the group (Ibid)

2.3.2. Moral Field Approach to Audience Analysis

Long (1990) cites Richard Eastman in Style: Writing and Reading as the Discovery of Outlook (89-100). He outlines the moral field approach to audience analysis. This approach is limited to the persuasive discourse on controversial issues. The strength of this analysis lies in ‘moving the real, tangible readers to a hypothetical group processing---- in relation to this particular topic—an identifiable, predictable range of attitudes’ (Long, 1990 : 75). The moral field analysis broadly maps out the hopes, fears of the audience, strength and weaknesses in processing the text they are writing. What emerges from this discussion is that besides avoiding stereo typing audience personality, it recognizes and anticipates a range of audience attitudes on the part of the writer. Further, it helps the writer to reconstruct the different positions, ways and views though done informally to target the range of attitudes concerning the audience. Nonetheless the moral field analysis can’t make a clear distinction among pre-reading audience, reading audience and post-reading audience. Also it doesn’t offer advice for the writer attempting to deal with non-controversial topics or non-persuasive writing. There are practical and theoretical objections to this approach.

2.3.3. The Basic Communication Model

Long (1990) mentions a simplified version of the basic communication model derived from the general field of communication theory which is based upon A.E. Darbyshire’s (1971) work (p.15 as quoted in Long, 1990), as represented below:
Fig.1 - Basic Communication Model - first model.

The writer transferring any information does it into a symbolic code (encoding stage), which would be either spoken or written. This would be received and decoded as the message by the audience. The selected code must have two major identifiable features. First, it must be appropriate to the purpose of communication and second, the sender must make sure that the selected code must be intelligible to the receiver (Long, 1990: 77). What communication theorists feel is that exact decoding of the message is not possible because of certain human variables like personal connotations, interruptions or distractions, idiosyncracies / eccentricities of various sorts that may interface with the exact communication done. Though this model may be beneficial for the beginning writer, nonetheless, the dynamic possibilities of audience interaction do not figure in the first model.

2.3.4. Writer’s Simultaneous Connections – model.

Fig.2 Writer’s Simultaneous Connections – model.

This model is derived from Kinneavy’s (1971) A Theory of Discourse. The interactive relationship between writer and topic is an outcome of wide ranging issues and feelings: topic familiarity, strong feelings of the topic, neutrality of the topic, a range of attitudes, other notions about topic (Long, 1990). Yet writing reality is that writer may discover and change as the writing progresses; known as discovery process. A writer – topic relationship is quite a dynamic since during the course of writing a writer may change his position, revert to the original position
and what seems as fixed, stable, static relationship may turn into a shifting and
dynamic one. So is the case of writer—audience relationship which is quite in a
state of flux and dynamism. Writer may assume the status of knower (text book
writer) as equals or superior. Hence, the relationship may be potentially dynamic
between the writer and audience. The audience-topic relationship also illustrates
the reader's changing states in relation to the topic dealt with. Long (1990) says that
reader can assume as wide as a variety of personae as the writer. This concept of
reader flexibility defies the conventional notion that ‘audience has one and only one
identifiable set of characteristics. That virtually misleads the writer to a limited
position. What long feels is that reader has the capacity to assume different
personae and can bring many attitudes to the text. Further he selects an attitude that
feeds into the cues given by the reader (Long, 1990 : 80). The pre or post reading
experience indicates that reader or audience’s stance is not based on fixed set of
characteristics. Thus ‘created audience’ as opposed to the fixed audience exists not
only in written language situations but in all forms of communications. Readers
have to read the different figures of speech such as hyperbole, sarcasm, irony, or
satire depending upon the cues in a given piece of writing. That leads to the
assumption that readers participate or share a wide range of roles created by the
writers in terms of the given cues in the text. The important consideration is that
the reader must recognized the cues that can lead him to successfully encounter the
text. Long (1990) that cues are system specific. The audience-topic-writer triangle
in fact affects the audience cue system from one mode to another. The audience cue
system in an oral discourse differs quite significantly from that that of written
discourse. The audience cues may figure in the text by beginning with a
paradoxical statement or curiosity or rhetorical questions and so on. That ‘may cue
readers to the tone of the subject matter – playful, thoughtful, serious, outraged’
(Ibid. : 82). Hemingway does this in A Farewell to Arms by forcing the reader into
a moral intimacy. The other audience cue available to writers may occur in the
form of diction, syntax, punctuation options, paragraph structure, interlocking
structures and the structure of the whole (Ibid.:83).

To conclude, says, Long, ‘the audience like significance of topic is created by the
writer, and to accomplish this creation successfully, the writer must understand the
nature of the reading act and the cues upon which readers depend to give them their identity'. (Ibid.:84). Long then concludes that his position has immediate implications 'for the teaching of writing: instead of analyzing readers' beliefs and background knowledge, beginning writers need to learn how to produce textual cues that will lead readers to assume a desired identity or role (Kirsch & Roen, 1990:16).

2.4. Audience Research: The Social Context of Writing

2.4.1. Discourse Communities: The Social View of Writing

Recently a lot of reservation and debate have been generated about the exact definition of discourse communities. For some theorists discourse communities are typically defined in terms of loosely organized groups of individuals whose use of discourse is governed by tacit and generally accepted 'rules' for text production and function and who agree upon the meanings attached to these uses and functions', and this clearly meant that 'the introduction of discourse communities to composition studies was seen as a way to inject the social world into any theory of writing' (Chin, 1994:452). Further this line of research has led to the view that 'the current social perspectives on writing and disciplinary enculturation are generally grounded in theories of discourse communities' (Prior, 1994:483) and henceforth the field of writing research has been further extended with the emergence of the notion of the discourse communities (Bazerman, 1988; Swales, 1990, 1993 as qut. in Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). Over the last decade, 'the notion that writing, reading and knowledge are socially situated in and regulated by discourse communities has directed theoretical and empirical attention to literate practices in specific social context (home, school, work and public)' (Bizzell, 1982; Heath, 1983; Nystrand, 1982 as qut. in Prior, 1994:484). The notion of discourse community which includes the network of writers, readers, texts and social contexts helps in reinforcing the purpose in writing, particularly in academic setting. This notion of discourse community creates an awareness of the social context of writing and as a result of this view writing research has shifted its emphasis from the cognitive to the social, political context of writing (Bizzell, 1982) and finally structured into a socio-cognitive dimension. Another way to put this is to say that writing is informed by the larger community whose representatives they are (Nystrand, 1989). But the key feature of all definitions of discourse communities is the view that they transcend
local boundaries of space and time (Harris, 1989). As Grabe & Kaplan (1996) note the idea underlying the academic discourse community is that students need to initiate themselves into the academic discourse community they wish to join. The discourse community refers to community of scholars who both discuss and write about ideas and circulate information relevant to their professional interests. The discourse community is a powerful construct since it is able to identify factors influencing writers and how writers are informed by their sensitivity to the rules of discourse production within these communities (Chin, 1994). The idea of discourse community has provided theoretical foundation to the rhetorically based view of context and research has focused on the ways in which culture or discourse community define and shape the context of views (Ibid.: 451). This is actually represented in terms of reader-writer interactions (Ibid). Although, various interpretations exist regarding discourse community, most commonly held view is that ‘it is an idea of language as a basis for sharing: shared expectations, shared participation, commonly (or communally held ways of expressing) and unlike the notion of audience it compels one to consider the broader social and political implications of language’s role in conformity and diversity, participation and exclusion’ (Rafoth, 1990: 140). Further Rafoth (1990) adds that, there exists variety, conflict and anti conventionalism in most actual discourse communities.

2.4.2. Discourse Community, Speech Community and Interpretive Community: Descriptive and Explanatory Adequacies

As discussed above, the description of discourse community entails variety, conflict and anticonventionalism. Furthermore there are theorists who have begun to call the vagueness of community into question, such as Bazermann on ‘Some difficulties in characterizing social phenomena in writing, Bizzell on ‘What is a Discourse Community’; Herzberg on ‘The Politics of Discourse Community’; and Swales on ‘Approaching the Concept of Discourse Community’ (Harris, 1989: 21). Thus before looking at specific features of discourse communities it may be useful to enquire into this concept in relation to speech Community in Socio Linguistics, Interpretive Community in literary theory. In the 1980’s both literature and composition sought to understand the increasing influence of social variables into writing: and interpretative community as well as discourse community became key
issues, paralleling socio linguistic interest in speech community (Nystrand et al. 1993).

The theory of discourse community extended Hymes's (1974) theory of speech communities to textual production and reception. (Prior, 1994) and share certain parallels with speech community. A discussion of discourse community without considering the definition of speech community would be incomplete although speech community and discourse community belong to different traditions. Bloomfield as well as many other linguists considered the definition of speech community 'as a group which interacts by means of speech'. But this definition is limited by only applying the linguistic criteria and has ignored the social variations (Rafoth, 1990), especially when Labov (1972) in Socio linguistic Patterns has claimed that it is both discontinuous and multidirectional. Other problems also arise such as extra linguistic features in terms of mutual intelligibility, size, prestige. Thus the commonly accepted criteria for defining language cannot be treated as a yardstick to define speech community (Rafoth, 1990). Hence the problem of identifying speech community may be useful in our understanding of discourse community. Hymes (1974) has defined speech community as community sharing knowledge of rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech. Such sharing comprises knowledge of at least one form of speech and knowledge also of its patterns of use (Ibid.:51). Further community-based notions of discourse community view a 'language' as a collection of situated codes and rules of use ... constituted by occupation, ethnicity, social affiliation and so on (Prior, 1994:484). Walvoord and McCarthy (1990) consider 'writing like speaking a social activity that takes place within 'speech communities' and accomplishes meaningful social functions ... (as quoted in Prior, 1994:485). Hence the newcomers to a community learn the rule of speaking or writing gradually by interacting with competent members. Thus classroom itself is considered as an arena of discourse community where the students master the ways of thinking and writing which is 'both the means of discipline based socialization and the eventual mark of competence' (Walvoord, 1990:21 as quoted in Ibid.:485). Speech community, however, is usually described as something like a world-view discipline or profession and it refers more specifically to groupings like neighborhoods, settlements, classrooms (Harris, 1989).
Further, compositionist treatment of discourse communities was directly inspired by Stanley Fish's discussion of the role of interpretative communities in reader response and also from the sociolinguistics concept of speech communities (Harris, 1989). Fish and others, used interpretive as a term communities a term in theoretical debate. It refers not so much to specific physical groupings of people as to a kind of loose dispersed network of individuals who share certain habits of mind. Fish (1976) explored the premises of reader-response criticism elucidating the role of 'informed reader', this actually underpinned the theoretical conceptions of Interpretive community. In addition to these perspectives, 'interpretive community is made up of those who share interpretative strategies not for reading in the conventional sense but for writing texts, for constituting their properties and assigning their intentions. In other words, these strategies exist prior to the act of reading and therefore influence the shape of what is read rather than, as is usually assumed, the other way round' (Walvoord and McCarthy 1990). Fish wanted to stress on reader’s socialization by teaching them appropriate, common interpretive strategies. Fish's analysis is basically the same as that of Kuhn’s (1970) view on scientific revolutions in which Kuhn notes that scientists’ observations, hypothesis, and problems are largely shaped by the disciplinary conventions or paradigms they operate under or scientists' behaviour is said to reflect the adopted paradigms of their scientific communities: that is, established social conventions. In other words it goes in agreement with Durkheim's (1966) concept of social fact (see the discussion of social fact in chapter 3).

Most theories while using the terms discourse communities or interpretative communities indicate the shifting, tangible tendencies of these terms to foreground the conflicting, varied, heterogeneous elements being included and refuse to assign a definite, fixed notion of these terms. Swales (see Harris, 1989) has defined discourse community as the common space shared between, its members are replaced by a discursive ‘forum’ and their one-to one interaction is reduced to a system ‘providing information and feedback.’

2.4.2.1 Discourse communities as a function of Genre

Despite limitations on the descriptive adequacy of discourse communities, recent studies and discourse analysis support the view that the dynamics of discourse communities are the properties of genre. Faigley (1985) has drawn our attention to
how discourse communities might be identified and defined and how they shape the form and content of specific texts. Swales (1990:23-7) makes a strong case for understanding the functions of genre in terms of the discourse communities and outlines 6 criteria for identifying the features of a discourse community:

1. A discourse community shares common public goals, even if the private goals of individual members are distinct. Stating public goals of groups serves a real function: 'it creates the illustration of agreement by allowing members to interpret the stated goals in their own way' (Cooper 1989:212)

2. The discourse community is a forum for discussion and debate; discourse communities must have interaction among their members. These mechanisms may include meetings, correspondence, newsletters, etc.

3. Discourse communities will provide feedback and information to members through various participatory mechanisms. A major function of newsletters, journals, conferences is to support members with useful resources which match their interests and needs.

4. Discourse communities, as they interact, will develop discourse expectations and discourse genres as norms by which interchange regularly occurs. These genres will become norms for the community and may also become conservative in nature.

5. The discourse community develops along with a regularized set of genre expectations a specific set of terminology and specialized vocabulary. Community specific abbreviations, acronyms, and references will become commonly used.

6. The discourse community must have enough members to discuss matters of importance to a wider group and to generate content expertise.

Cooper (1989:216-19) not only defines the discourse community but also points out certain drawbacks of the theory and guide for writing instruction:

'Knowledge, power, success are seen to flow from the community automatically to those who before their apprenticeship lacked any relevant cognitive or social abilities....We may wish to see the writing class in a foundational way, as a stable discourse community, one that validates interests, our values, our status, our way of life, automatically. But we also concerned that our students—all of our students—become effective writers, learn how to enter into discourses, which may not be the same thing as the foundational notion of joining a discourse community as a neophyte....claiming that a foundational notion of discourse communities should guide our teaching of writing can only be seen as cynical and self-serving. And it is far from clear that students want to—or should want to——join any of these communities we are creating for ourselves...If we insist that students adopt what we see as the values of our communities (our values), we will effectively withhold power within academic discourse from all students who come from different generation, a different ethnic background, different race, a different sex, a different economic class'.
Donary- Farina (1992) identified specific features of a discourse community as the 'actions, beliefs, habits, language, rhetorical practices, and stylistic conventions that are tacit and routine for the members' (p.296 as quoted in Chin,1994:452). The discourse community extends beyond the knowledge of conventions, norms and acquires a potential for reflecting upon language's social and political uses (Rafoth,1990). It moves into the social arena of politics, economics and power. Faigley(1985 ) outlines the functions of discourse community

The key notion is that within a language community, people acquire specialized kinds of discourse competence that enable them to participate in specialized groups. Members know what is worth communicating, how it can be communicated, what other members of the community are likely to know and believe to be true about certain subjects, how other members can be persuaded and so on (Ibid.:238).

2.4.3. Pedagogical Implications

Although the discussion has largely centered on the theoretical problems, the issue of discourse community has a direct bearing on teaching practices, particularly raising audience awareness and to make students more conscious of the links between language, identity and power. Composition practioner /theorists such as Bizzell (1986a,1993) Batholomae (1985) and others use the notion of interpretative community or discourse community in characterizing college composition instruction as a process socialization into the academic print community. Bizzell (1982) sees the notion of discourse community as useful in enabling students to bridge one discourse community with another and finally making transition into an academic discourse community. Further it is helpful in making students learn how to make arguments in an academic community. As Bizzell puts it:

how to do intellectual work of significance to the community, and hence, to persuade readers that you are a worthy co-worker' (1982:282).

In considering these issues Bartholomae and Petrosky (1986 as quoted in Grabe &Kaplan,1996:110-111) design a tertiary-level first-year writing syllabus and the essential features of the course are:

-the content theme of the course growth and change in adolescence;
-the requirement that all students participate in extended discussions of the readings and the writing assignments—dialogue and exchange being seen as a crucial part of community building;
Thus, Bizzell notes that teaching of writing involves more than knowledge of grammar and spelling rules, it also involves knowledge of prevalent attitudes toward preferred forms, linguistic features that mark group identity, and conventions that can be violated (1982:224). Chase's (1988) investigation of a writing classroom focuses on student’s accommodation, opposition and resistance to the writing curriculum. Bizzell (1982) too notes that the concept of discourse community is used not only to describe ‘a group who have decided to abide by language – using rules (p.226), but to consider curriculum as a way of thinking and assigning values to the material world and also learning the ways of political and social lesson. Giroux (1983) finds the role of discourse community in structuring ‘classroom experiences that give students the opportunities not only to affirm their own experiences but also to examine critically the ways in which they have become part of the system of social reproduction’ (quoting Rafoth, 1990:149).

2.5. Audience-Authorship Interaction: Reconsideration of the Dialectic View

2.5.1 The Dialogic Interaction: An Introduction

In outlining the dialogic approach to language, Bakhtin places the greatest emphasis on utterances in which two are meant to be heard as interacting, as termed by him ‘double voiced words’. Pearce (1994) explains the dialogic principle as a channel of communication that can only function through the interaction of two people. As Volosinov has observed:

A word is a bridge thrown between myself and another. If one end of the bridge belongs to me, then the other depends on my addressee. A word is a territory shared by both addressee and addressee, by the speaker and his interlocuter (p.86 as quoted in Pearce 1994:2).

The dialogic principle is explicitly Marxist to the extent that it is based upon a social contract between speaker and addressee. All utterance whether spoken or written is produced from within a concrete sociohistorical context and is therefore comprehensively ideological. Rather the utterance is most acutely and distinctively
social in its orientation towards an addressee or audience. (Phelps, 1990 : 168). Bakhtin dismisses an analysis that would undermine the sociohistorical, ideological context of production as well as the context of production. Bakhtin locates ideological utterance as the central guiding principle of discourse, whether it exists in the form of political rhetoric, artistic language, or everyday language exchange. As Pearce has observed:

Language is thus everywhere imbricated with assymmetrics of power. There is no neutral utterance; language is everywhere shot through the intentions and accents; it is material, multiaccentual, and historical, and is densely overlaid with the traces of its historical usages (1994:11)

Volosinov in his Marxism and the Philosophy of Language (1929) develops the notion of dialogic context to propose a new theory of language. This theory rejects both what he refers to as the 'individual subjectivist' (neo Kantian) and 'abstract objectivist' as advocated by Saussurean Schools of language and argues instead that all individual speech acts exist as a function of dialogue between their participating subjects (Volosinov, 1929 as quoted in Pearce, 1994 : 39). With this turn to contextual positioning the emphasis is on the performative function of language: the speech act or utterance. Bakhtin considered it as a 'the fundamental unit of investigation'. At this point we have to distinguish utterance from Saussurean notion of Parole. Parole is basically a spoken utterance while Bakhtinian utterance is not associated exclusively with the spoken word, since it can be spoken or written. (Pearce : 1994). Volosinov makes an important observation in stating how utterance is not an exclusively spoken phenomena.

Dialogue, in the narrow sense of the word, is, of course, only one of the forms — a very important form to be sure — of verbal interaction. But dialogue can also be understood in a broader sense, meaning not only direct, face-to-face, vocalized verbal communication between persons, but also verbal communication of any type whatsoever. A book, i.e. a verbal performance in print, is also an element of verbal communication. It is something discussable in actual, real-life dialogue, but aside from that, it is calculated for actual perception, involving attentive reading and inner responsiveness, and for organized printed reaction. Moreover, a verbal performance of this kind also inevitably orients itself with respect to previous performances in the same sphere, both those by the same author and those by other authors (p. 95 as quoted in Pearce, 1994 : 41)

Bakhtin emphasized the specificity of language in terms of 'concrete' and in particular Volosinov records the force of this specificity in the following paragraph:
The linguistic consciousness of the speaker and of the listener-understander, in the practical business of living speech, is not at all concerned with the abstract system of normatively identical forms of language, but with language speech in the sense of the aggregate of possible contexts of usage for a particular linguistic form. For a person speaking his native tongue, a word presents itself not as an item of vocabulary but as a word that has been used in a wide variety of utterances by co-speaker A, co-speaker B, co-speaker C and so on, and has been variously used in the speaker's own utterances. A very special and specific kind of orientation is necessary if one is to go from there to the self identical word belonging to the lexicological system of the language in question - the dictionary word (p.70 as quoted in Pearce. 1994: 40).

2.5.2. Heteroglossia and Intertextuality: A Brief Introduction

Heteroglossia

Voloshinov in Marxism and Philosophy of Language (1929) undertakes a powerful critique of the abstract objectivism of Saussure's theory of language. The basis of his critique is the recognition that language is a social process; language is utterance emerging from concrete social communication not from any abstract objective system of language. In this book Voloshinov talks about 'utterances' which existing in and as social interchange, form the arena of struggle between different social groups who produce different 'evaluative accents' so as to reflect different ideological themes or meanings for their utterances. While acknowledging the invariability or instability of sign, Volosinov adds that 'multiplicity of meaning' has to be judged according to 'multiaccentuality'. Bakhtin considers language not as singular and monolithic, but as plural and multiple: language is marked with various evaluative accents. Thus it leads to the formation of socio-ideological languages closely tied up with the material and social conditions and with the contexts of their production i.e. their heteroglossia. Infact this is a dialogic interanimation of socio-ideological languages (Waugh & Rice, 1995). Bakhtin deals in his Discourse in the Novel in terms of a special understanding of language that combines dialogue with a new concept i.e. heteroglossia. As Morson & Emerson adds:

Language is said to be composed of countless Languages, each the product of a particular kind of experience (e.g. of a profession, ethnic group, social class, generation, region) and each with its own way of understanding and evaluating the world (analogous to a genre). Again it is not formal markers (dialects) but senses of experience that are important. We all participate in numerous 'Languages of heteroglossia' each of which claims a privileged view of a certain aspect of experience. But we all also experience the competition of these languages. We come to view on aspect of experience, which we are accustomed to treat in one 'language' through the 'eyes of another'(1994: 66).
Heteroglossia is closely associated with the concept of dialogue. Emerson & Holoquist define heteroglossia as:

The base condition governing the operation of meaning in any utterance. It is that which ensures the primacy of context over text. At any given time, in any given place different than it would have under any other conditions: all utterances are heteroglot in that, there will be a set of conditions - social, historical, meteorological, physiological that will ensure that a word uttered in that place and at that time will have a meaning they are functions of a matrix of forces practically impossible to recoup, and therefore impossible to resolve (1984:428).

Heteroglossia represents the character of living discourse whereby unifying ‘centripetal forces’ (the systemic and generic aspects of language) struggle with ‘centrifugal forces’, principles of difference, flux, disunity, particularity (Phelps, 1990:165).

Intertextuality

Intertextuality is an important structuralist concept that has been referred to (Kristeva, 1969: Culler, 1975 as qut. in Berkenkotter, 1990: 199) the assumption that every text takes shape as a mosaic of citations, every text in the absorption and transformation of other texts. The notion of intertextuality takes the place of intersubjectivity and the notion of intertextuality issues from Bakhtin’s notion of dialogicality in which each ‘text’ – that is, each sign or system of signs, achieves meaning as part of a greater whole. The text takes its meaning in a socially constructed and historical way, with each text derivative of and interpreted to a prior text or set of texts (see Smagorinsky & Coppock, 1994). Phelps (1990) cites James Porter’s remark on intertextuality as a notion which is used to ‘collapse distinctions among author, text, language and context’ (Ibid.:161). Porter (1986) discusses the principle of intertextuality as the co-dependence and interpenetration all texts, such that they not only belong to a large intertext but are actually constituted by bits and pieces of one another – traces of language, belief, ideology, the voices of ‘others’ (as qut. in Phelps, 1990:161). Porter further specifies intertextuality – as both alterability – the repeatability of all language utterances within others and this he adds for the young writers ‘to appropriate, imitate, internalize, and rework the intertext of a discourse community in order to speak as author in it (as cited in Phelps, 1990:161-162). Phelps (1990) further says that both writers and readers can experience intertextuality as strong undercurrents through which they can weave new, or at least personal meanings and positions. The current
discussion of intertextuality and dialogic discourse, all point toward intellectual and social processes of enculturation in which individuals acquire shared ground for communication (Prior, 1991).

2.5.3. Reviewing the Dialectic View

The social account of audience-authorship interaction grows, from the problems defined by the failures and limits of dialogic framework. Henceforth, this calls for a fresh inquiry into the dialogic view of audience, in order to comprehensively account for the social nature of communication.

The dialogic interaction is viewed as an exclusive, cooperative relation between writer and reader mediated by text (Phelps, 1990). The distinctions between Ede & Lunsford’s (1984) categorization of ‘audience addressed’ or ‘virtual audiences’ (Phelps, 1990) and ‘audience invoked’ (audience as a fiction) terminology have obscured the complexities of issues that confront the notions of audience, ‘a set of functional roles, perspectives, and relationships that can constrain or influence authorial choice’ (Phelps, 1990:156). In addition to this perspective the division of audience into ‘virtual’ and ‘actual’ have considered ‘interactions among actual writers and actual readers as concrete, co-present subjects’ (Phelps, 1990:157). And it does explains the social dimension of authorship fixed into the dialogical interactive mode. Textual transactions have been conceptualized in an ideal image of dyad (e.g. a writer writing alone and reader reading alone, each taking up a textual role to interact co-operatively, reader and writer constitute their discrete roles and identities). Other assumptions of dyadic theory are that this theory expresses a mechanistic view of reality reducible to discrete components and the writer-reader interaction is set in a fixed chronology. Furthermore the writer-reader interaction has been conceptualized as a relatively short time-limited event, basically focalized by cognitive conception.

However, the recent reconsideration of the dialectic view has highlighted the social dimension of authorship. The social dimension of authorship calls for a cooperative enterprise where writers and readers constitute the ‘process of meaning construction as social negotiations potentially conflictual (Phelps, 1990:154). This recent view of composition incorporating the nature of rhetorical transaction has a basis in Bakhtinian phenomena of the heteroglossia and intertextuality. Henceforth it will be useful to consider the social dimension of writing conceptualized not in the
dialogical framework but in the light of a more fully contextualized, polyphonic, conflicting model of communication that involves multiple participants and voices along with situation, setting, institutions and language itself. Further in his description of Dell Hyme's grammar of discourse Phelps (1990) includes five participants and audience is considered in the 'special sense of auditors' who overhear (Ibid.:156) primary discourse events and perform discourse acts. This is particularly important to the act of composing where readers act on cues, construct meaning and respond to the intentions of the utterance. This is beneficial in the sense that it makes an explicit connection between writing and speech as an interdependent activities in actual composing and reading. Thus there is a possibility of concrete interchanges which bring in a broader analysis of the social dimension of writing. The actual exchanges of talk and text in order to draft an exchange meanings reinforces the social processes of writing. The interactions between audience and authorship is built on the notion of context as material world and the world of social experience. It is intersubjectively constructed and explains the phenomena of simultaneity, recursion and the interdependence (Phelps,1990). This is further enhanced by 'social context of continuous mediation and influence on the constructed meanings, the text the author(s) and the audience' (Ibid.:160). Phelps (1990) concludes that extending audience to all text or language i.e. 'other' helps us to perceive audience as pre-textual, co-textual and post-textual.

2.5.3.1 Audience as a function of Bakhtin's 'Speech Genre'

Bakhtin's concept of 'Speech Genre' is closely related to the view that audience is a discursive concept, thus connecting the writer's image and textual representation of audience to the lived world of potential readers (Phelps,1990:169). To explicate the connection between Bakhtinian theory of speech Genres and addressivity, I shall short circuit many of the basic formulations of speech genre that are relevant to the present study. More importantly, the Bakhtinian notion of speech genre is more powerful than the conventional notion of genre in terms of its ideological and socio-historical rootedness. Morson & Emerson (1994) elaborates Bakhtinian theory of genre in which Bakhtin described genre neither as sets of convention nor as hierarchies of devices but as ways of seeing the world (Ibid.: 66). These habits of vision have integrated over centuries and accumulated in the form of 'congealed' experience in interpreting and evaluating the world (Ibid). Bakhtin claim that genre
are special forms of thinking and are intellectually significant. According to Bakhtin genre exist in everyday life as well as in literature and include such forms as private letters, shopping lists and telephone calls. Bakhtin’s concept of genre as socially contextual constructs rather than components of an abstract, synchronic system and their significance exists as a mediation between world and the text.

To conclude, as discussed above, Bakhtin’s concept of speech genre is more powerful in its ideological, socio-historical rootedness than mere formal notions of genre as convention both for the purposes of treating audience simultaneously individual and social (Phelps.1990:169).

2.5.3.2 The social contexts of writing : Bakhtinian Explorations

The discussion of addressivity and social dimension of authorship helps us to understand the communicative and social collaborative / conflictual context. Phelps (1990) has called for recuperating certain notions as heuristics for composition, as summarized below:

1) The concepts of will, work, responsiveness and responsibility in the wake of Bakhtinian theories may be seen as a step to advance the rhetorical definitions of authorship.

2) All variants of addressivity may be encouraged to develop the pluralist concept of audience.

3) The range of virtual and actual participants may be extended to accommodate the interest of addressivity in terms of participants, roles and perspectives.

4) While treating discourse as social, the elements of discourse should be seen in terms of authorial consciousness, language, the object, the addressee, the text structure, analysis or construction of integrative concepts, which is to be further tested through the feedback of teachers and learners, writers and readers.

2.5.4 Social Dimensions of writing : Pedagogical Implications

The implication of the social dimensions of writing suggests that the extent to which writing and speech can be interdependent in actual composing and reading. Thus it would be a characterizing feature of interactionist pedagogy in which we might examine or foster interactions.
Part of the audience analysis suggests the extent to which writing and speech can be interdependent in actual composing and reading. We have neglected important sources of information about this in situations in which we might examine or forster interactions among actual writers and readers as concrete, co-present subjects. In these instances, others continually affect writer's choices regarding text through talk or response about ideas and drafts before the text is 'final'. Examples are interactionist pedagogies in elementary schools, where writers, students and teachers constantly work together over emerging texts; peer reading groups in higher education; collaborative writing, specially in work settings; professional editing as a social process; (Phelps, 1990:158) and teacher response to student writing. Further Phelps (1990) cites situations of contemporary classroom (especially work place where writers and readers read in a continuous dynamic process of language transaction, for which text emerge that bear marks of sustained collaboration and negotiation. From this perspective, Stock & Robinson (1989) add:

These marks reflect the mutual influences of one another's writing and talk: direct responses and suggestions from others while writing is in process; teacher and peer models; conversations paralleling text; cooperatively researched or jointly written work; and most importantly, the creation of a classroom language community with its own idiolect of shared, enriched concepts, issues, arguments, vocabulary, phrases, genres and even voice (as qut. in Phelps, 1990:160)

To recall the views of Porter (1986) on intertextuality of all language utterances, this becomes meaningful or useful for the young writers to 'appropriate, imitate, internalize and rework the intertext of a discourse community in order to speak as authors in it.

2.6 Audience Research: A Post-structuralist Reconsideration

2.6.1 Reviewing the assumptions of Linear Model of Communication:

The linear model of communication represents writers as message senders and of readers as mere decoders of the author's message. It presupposes the audience as the 'other' whom the writer must accommodate or manipulate (Roth, 1990). In addition to this perspective another assumption rests on the belief that an author start with an intended meaning, or 'message' and it remains unchanged till it is 'encoded' in a language. And then the reader recipient 'decodes' this message to obtain the same meaning as the writer intended. And assumptions are also based on a pre-determined audience, the uniformity or fixity of the code so that the message
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remains intact during the decoding process (Ibid). This model of communication does not allow the writers to participate as cooperative makers of meaning; rather, it takes adversary positionings. Recent audience theory offers perspectives on reconceptualization of audience in a significant way. It attempts to give enough scope to the process of invention or revision that enhances the reader’s meaning-making activities and as Roland Barthes says ‘it abolishes ... the distance between reading and writing ... by linking the two together into a single signifying process’ (as qut. in Ibid. : 175). Further Barthes says that writers and readers are seen as collaborators engaged in a ‘single signifying process’ and writers may be their own audiences and audience is constructed, reconstructed as and when they perform the text (Roth, 1990).

Further, J. Derrida questions assumptions about writing built upon this model, which in fact states that thought is more fundamental than language and as discussed above that reality exists unmediated. Derrida, while deconstructing the conventional hierarchal ‘opposition’ and considers language as more fundamental than thought. Roth (1990) cites Vygotsky (1992) in claiming that thought is contingent upon language — ‘Thought is not merely expressed in words, it comes into existence through them’. The fact that the theorists stress on the process of writing and role of revision in the development of meaning making process, reaffirms the growth of thought through the help of written representation. Thus, Vygotsky too following the Derrida, deconstructs the original hierarchy that thought and meaning are primary and language secondary.

2.6.2 ‘Otherness’ of Writer’s Words:

Problematising the notion of writer’s audience as it pre-exists the composing and it remains unchanged, reveals certain facts that are significant in many ways. As Roth (1990) states, audience for writers is not limited to such flesh-and-blood groups of people for whom they intend their words. He reaffirms his position by citing Walter Ong’s (1975) idea of writer’s audience as a fiction, which is often a textual entity and inventive activity. Pfister & Petrick (1980:213) too acknowledge that ‘students, like all writers, must fictionalize their audience’. In this regard Park (1982:249) has suggested that audience fictionalizing may be done through ‘a set of suggested or evoked attitudes, interests, reactions, (and) conditions of knowledge’. And much in the same way Dillon (1981) suggests that the fictionalizing a reader is not simply
accommodating actual persons but ‘projecting a self that readers will try on and find agreeable’ (as qut. in Roth, 1990: 179). Furthermore, Viscusi (1983) describes the writer sense of audience as derived from ‘otherness’ of our written words, which is in fact a process of making one’s own voice (as qut. in Ibid.). Similar views are shared by Polany (1958) ‘our own words once written may hold sway over us: they may speak to us and convince us’(P.265 as qut. in Ibid).

2.6.3. Extending the Authorial Dimension:

Barthes (1979) notes that meaning in a text may not be an outcome of author’s labour or identity, rather, the text must be read without the father’s signature (as qut. in Roth, 1990: 180). Readers should be given opportunity to drift away from the authorial dominance and so as to share writer’s control over meaning, which would break down the adversarial writer-reader relationship (as cited in Roth, 1990). This is how Bruffee (1983 says) calls that the writer is engaged in a social process (as cited in Roth, 1990: 181) and the text demands that the reader to be an active collaborator. Traditionally, as Roth (1990) states when a writer, anticipates a reader’s needs, interests or responses, the motive was to fulfill the writers needs. By contrast, the post-structuralists assumption require reader’s responses to share the ‘pleasure of the text’, as Barthes calls it. Thus it is a kind of audience awareness that promotes the ‘gift giving rather than the calculating effects’ (as cited in Roth, 1990: 181). The audience awareness decisions are based on the post-structuralists’ notions such as the ‘giving effect or evoking images in the mind of the reader’ and not based on the notion ‘what I want the reader to get out of it’ which in fact retains authorial dominance (Ibid.: 181).

2.6.4 The Evolving Audience

The post structuralist view of reader as a free agent, as co-author of the text offers certain insightful perspectives such as non-uniformity and unpredictability of audience - unlike the conventional audience-analysis heuristics (Roth, 1990: 182). The notion of multiple, potential audiences or ‘many readers’-self, immediate readers and extended audience or the ‘lowest reader’ and the ‘highest reader’ might alter our conception of audience. Additionally, the post-structuralist linguistics perspectives also throws light on the ‘purpose’ which is also a function of the
evolving composing process. As Roth (1990) puts it ‘now we know that writers often have to write in order to find out what they have to say on a subject, that they develop their sense of purpose as they compose’ (Ibid.:184). This in fact holds true for audience too.

2.6.5 Pre-mature closure: Pedagogic Implications

Writers often face the problem of defining, analyzing and accommodating the intended audience and at times their sense of audience may demand addressing multiple audience including imagined readers who were essentially self projections’ (Roth, 1990:184). Since the notion of pre-mature closure has serious implications for what goes on in the class room, therefore, it is needed that students must be reflective and exploratory as they open themselves to various viewpoints since, writing is viewed as ‘a unique mode of learning’ that leads to reflection (Emig. 1977 as qut. in Roth, 1990 : 185) and student writers will have to be encouraged to struggle against any tendency to limit themselves to a narrow audience.

But giving advise to student writers so as to analyze and accommodate their audiences may be counter productive. It is highly sensitive issue, since sometimes it may be harmful than helpful and may result in the pre-mature closure of the composing process. As Ann Berthoff (1981) has remarked in ‘The Making of Meaning’:

The most difficult aspect of teaching writing as process and of considering it as the result of something that is nurtured and brought along, not mechanically produced, is that our students do not like uncertainty (who does ?), they find it hard to tolerate ambiguity and are tempted to what psychologists call ‘premature closure’. They want the writing to be over and done with (p.22 as qut. in Roth, 1990 : 185).

Therefore, at the pedagogical level, student writers should be motivated sensitively to discover the value of tolerating ambiguities, uncertainties and to avoid ‘premature closure’ and to finally to develop a consistent unfixed sense of audience.

Part II

2.7 Empirical Studies:

Studies on the socially constructed variations of audience have been complemented with a wide variety of sophisticated empirical studies such as case studies, textual analysis, comparative experimental research and protocol analysis.

2.7.1 Empirical response to Reader Response theories: The Scholarly Forum
Carol Berkenkotter (1990) in her article titled Evolution of Scholarly Forum: Reader, 1977 - 1988 gives an account of reader-response theory's rise as reflected in the evolution of constructing an academic forum. This is reflected in the formation of the journal 'Reader' in 1970. The theoretical underpinnings of her study manifest a concern that is directly relevant to 'social Constructionist epistemology' and Rafoth's work on 'discourse communities' (Berkenkotter, 1990). Her study reveals how a journal functions as an instrument of communication in a lively national community and 'how changes of topic and readership occur over time'. Furthermore, the scholarly forums function as a rich source of information about the interaction between writers and their audience in a dynamic social context of certain kinds of discourse, most specifically academic or disciplinary discourse (Ibid.: 192). Berkonkotter discusses the function of forums as 'places' or 'locations' where scientific or academic community conducts discourse. And forums such as 'Reader' reveal the social context of written communication. Recent views on the rhetoric of scientific communication has highlighted the 'the social construction of knowledge i.e. indeterminant, contingent and socially derived as opposed to foundational, cumulative capable of verification or falsification (Ibid.: 189-194). Further the origins of such forums is grounded in the material conditions of academic culture.

The implications of reader-response theories relates to what goes on in the classroom and thereby acknowledging the existence of readers, whether 'ideal', 'implied' or real engaged with the forum functioning as 'a dynamic causal entity in constructing a community of scholars and teachers interested in reader-oriented criticism (Berkonkotter, 1990).

2.7.2 Audience Development: Socio-Cognitive skills

A Socio-Cognitive approach to writing calls for a reader-based writing where the gap between reader and writer can be negotiated through personal reflection (Dipardo, 1990). Brandt (1992) has treated the socio-cognitive issue in a different way - cognitive labels like a writer's 'purpose', 'goal', a 'plan' or 'long-term memory' (Flower & Hayes, 1980) take socially descriptive equivalents like a writer's 'public orientation', 'ways of accounting', 'ways of historicizing' and 'ways of exhibiting understanding' or 'participating in public displays of understanding'. Thus most current theories of the composing process, whether
social or cognitive, explain a writer’s doings and saying in terms of particular readers as well as a writer’s aim of having some particular outcome or effect upon those readers (Flower & Hayes, 1980; Nystrand 1986; Brandt 1990 and others qut. in Brandt 1992: 330). In the general field of human development, a socio-cognitive perspective views intellectual and social growth as multifaceted phenomena. These perspective include cognitive, social, moral, affective and other components. Cognitive functioning has an impact upon social development and social functioning upon cognitive growth. Writing researchers in such perspective are especially concerned with writer’s relationships to their readers and audience adaptation in an area in which social-contextual influences are prominent whether the audience is an actual external group of readers, or an internalized image of prototypical readers (See Hayes et al, 1990: 248-249). While the ability to conceptualise ‘other’ is in part a product of social and cultural experience it is also contingent upon a writer’s level of socio-cognitive development. Writers who have been socialized in the same context but are at differing socio-cognitive levels will differ in how they image and mentally interact with their readers (Kirsch & Roen, 1990: 250). Studies have documented between level of socio-cognitive development and adaptation to varying audience. The higher the level of socio-cognitive development, the higher the incidence of productive audience adaptation and the lower the incidence of unproductive or ‘negative’ audience responses (Ibid: 251).

It also appears from recent research that differences between skilled & less-skilled writers are strongly affected by the socio-cognitive aspects of writing. Collins and Williamson (1984) studies have shown that weaker writers are less able to provide explicit structural information for reader interpretation; that is, less-skilled writers are less considerate of the audience—perhaps because they are less aware of the audience (Hillocks, 1986; Collins and Williamson 1984, as cited in Grabe & Kaplan 1996: 241). Incorporating a socio-cognitive perspective one must also consider socio-linguistics skills which play a role in writing (e.g. audience consideration). Thus research has repeatedly reported on the importance of the writer’s audience analysis in relationship to the writing process and the rhetorical situation. Audience Analysis is described as the methods speakers and writers use to draw inferences about the experiences, beliefs and attitudes of an audience to help make decisions about the organization and content of their work (Ede, 1984 as qut.
Hayes et al. (1990) report that the different levels of socio-cognitive development yield different conceptions of audience. These distinctive patterns of audience conceptualizations suggest that 'no model of audience response in college-level writing can afford to overlook socio-cognitive position as a factor in the college writer’s sense of audience; (Ibid.:264).

2.7.3.1 Audience Awareness in case of Experienced Writers:

Kirsch (1990) presents a three case-studies of experienced writers, and composition teacher’s sense of audience based on protocol research. Kirsch investigates how experienced writer analyze different kinds of audiences and whether specific dimensions of audience, such as age familiarity, specificity and authority, influence writers audience awareness. To put in other words, the objective was to know whether and how audiences with differing degree of authority affect writer’s composing processes. In view of the limitations of comparison group studies, Kirsch (1990) decided to focus on a single group of experienced writers composing
for different audiences, using coding schemes sensitive to audience categories, protocol analysis of the writer's composing styles and interview methods.

Kirsch employs a range of interpretive framework within the protocol analysis. Using the interpretive approach and thinking-aloud protocols, she examines the protocols as texts that were written in a specific socio-political context by individuals with their own histories. The social constructionist view of composition informs Kirsch's range of 'interpretive frame works' that raise questions about communities of writers, context for writing and the history of individual writers (Kirsch & Roen, 1990).

Mortensen's (1990) analyses the performances of three experienced readers conception of audience while confronting the rhetorically challenging texts. Mortenson explains how readers actively negotiate audience or situate themselves with respect to audience while reading a difficult passage of post-structuralist literary criticism. And how they consequently act as readers and leave a verbal record of many of the interpretive decisions they make while reading and writing. Mortenson explores, how these students use interpretive strategies to locate themselves either inside or outside the addressed audience, and how those strategies determine students interpretations and understanding of these texts (Kirsch & Roen, 1990: 19).

Flower & Hayes (1980) have conducted a study on the experienced writers and college freshman, and discovered that the former group flashed out a mental image of their readers while the latter were topic-bound, rather they could not think beyond the content of their essays.

Berkenkotter (1981) investigated whether experienced writers who have formal training in discourse theory would be more flexible in adapting to the needs of the audience than writers in other disciplines who write primarily for narrow speech communities or to what extent audience related considerations guided their rhetorical, organizational and stylistic decisions. The results of her study indicated that there are two other factors that play a decisive role than previous training. These are (1) how the writer perceived the composing task; what is known in Flower & Hayes's (1980) terminology as 'problem representation' which determined the kind of discourse produced and (2) whether the audience was explicitly stated or was implied by the kind of discourse the subject chose (as qut.
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in Berkenkotter, 1981: 390). Sommers (1980) problematizes the lack of theoretical research on revision process and linear model of writing. She conducts a case study examination of student writers as distinguished from experienced adult writers when they rewrite and revise. She examine the role revision played in their writing processes and during this process was redefined as ‘a sequence of changes in a composition-changes which are initiated by cues and occur continually throughout the writing of a work’ (Sommers, 1980: 380). The revision strategies of student writers are ‘teacher-based, directed towards a teacher-reader who expects compliance with rules-with pre-existing ‘conception’. At best students see their writing altogether passively through the eyes of former teachers or their surrogates, the text books, and are bound to the rules which they have been taught’ (Ibid.:383).

By contrast the revision strategies of experienced writers are rewriting, rethinking, restructuring the content and rewriting is a continous and dynamic activity. It is in fact reconceptualizing the argument to find the line or shape of the argument and to make it effective and they constantly chisel and change as they revise (Sommers, 1980). Sommers cites Barthes in defining writing which ‘develops like a seed, not a line’, and like a seed it confuses beginning and end, conception and production. Sommers states incase of the experienced writers rewriting is a ‘constant process’. They have a concern for their readership and imagine a reader (reading the product) whose existence and whose expectations influence their revision process. This reading seems to be partially a reflection of themselves and functions as a critical and productive collaboration ... and demonstrate a complex understanding of their readers (Ibid.:385). Monahan (1984) reports the revision strategies used by eight twelfth-grade writers as they wrote composition for two audiences: teachers and peers. Four of the writers as were classified as basic and four as competent on the basis of holistically scored pieces of writing for a teacher audience. The finding shows that

(a) basic college writers revise more for a teacher audience, while competent college writers revise more when addressing an audience of peers.

(b) The competent writers made a broader range of revisions.

(c) The competent writers revised in extended episodes in which one revision was cued by and related to, an earlier revision, while the basic writers made isolated revisions.
Flower & Hayes (1979) reported that among older writers good writers produced 60% of their ideas in response to a larger rhetorical problem (audience-related goals) whereas the poor writers made 70% of their statements about the topic alone. Furthermore, Roen & Willey (1988) assigned each student to one of three treatment conditions: no attention to audience, attention to audience before and during drafting, and attention to audience before and during revising and examined a concept of audience as central to improving the overall quality of students' writing. Their results suggested that attending to audience is less effective as a drafting strategy than it is as a revising strategy. In another study Cohen & Riel (1989) found the quality of students' writing in two audience conditions: to their teacher for a term assessment and to a distant peer audience to share ideas. The findings of their study suggest that there was significantly higher ratings of the papers written to communicate with peers than those written to demonstrate skill in writing. The results suggest that the development of functional writing environments to contextualize students' work can lead to improvements in the quality of students' classroom writing. More importantly, the study concludes that 'the lack of audience awareness found in school writing may index the slow development of the social-cognitive skills necessary to conceptualize different audiences or it may result from the decontextual approach to writing that is prevalent in classrooms (Cohen & Riel, 1989:143). Mangelsdorf et al. (1990) report on a study that employs an experimental/observational/case study approach to study ESL students' use of audience in writing and were interested in students' responses that revealed the power of the peer group activities. Their study indicated that the 'collaborative learning techniques in corporated in ESL writing instruction had enabled these students to deal with the issue of their audience better than the single treatment of the audience questions' (Mangelsdorf et al. 1990:237). Another important observation that Mangelsdorf et al make 'for ESL students, and for all students on the margins of the academy, this ability to interact effectively with their audiences is as important as mastering the grammatical code of a language. (1990:244). Further, being able to communicate with audiences requires the ability to convey and interpret messages and to negotiate meanings interpersonally within specific contexts (Brown, 1987:199 qut. in Mangelsdorf et al., 1990:245). Further Monahan
(1984) reports that methods used to teach revision and audience awareness may be inconsistent and students may have misconceptions about revision and might be equated with punishment (Emig, 1971; Spear, 1980; Burnette, 1980 as qut. in Monahan, 1984).

2.7.3.2 Audience Awareness in case of inexperienced Writers

Inexperienced or unskilled writers face problems in adapting themselves flexibly to audience needs (see also the discussion on basic or poor writers in the subsection 2.7.3.1). Recent research in and on audience awareness has focused on inexperienced writers, though not in considerable detail. Other studies examine basic writer's sense of audience awareness and its relationship to their revision and audience adaptation strategies. Research has further shown that students rarely get the chance to write for real audiences and purposes (Barrit, 1981; Birnbaum, 1980; Martin, 1977). Researchers who have studied audience as a component of the writing process have found a great deal of emphasis on writing for the teacher/examiner (Applebee, Lehr & Auten, 1981; McTeague, 1980 as qut. in Monahan, 1984:299).

Smith & Swan (1978) found that high school students were less adept at distinguishing audience than were college students (Monahan, 1984:289). Roen & Willey (1988) in their study entitled The Effects of Audience Awareness on Drafting and Revising finally suggest that much of our audience awareness pedagogy may not give students the best advice as to when to attend to audience; ‘many of our texts and rhetorics either limit audience awareness activities to pre-writing or even where audience analysis is also treated as a revising strategy, may unnecessarily embroil students in a complicated cognitive activity before they are ready’. (Becker, 1985; Carderonello & Edwards, 1986; Crews, 1984; Krolln, 1984; Morgan & Vivion, 1987; Packer & Tinpane, 1986 as qut. In Roen & Willey, 1988:83). And in some cases, students might perceive mixed and confusing signals. In addition, ‘scholars (Bracewell, Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1979; Bracewell, Scardamalia, & Bereiter, 1978; Bridwell, 1980 as qut. in Roen & Willey, 1988:76) have demonstrated that revising, in itself, does not guarantee that inexperienced writer’s papers will become better’. And as Bereiter (1980) and Flower (1979) have suggested that inexperienced writers have too many other cognitive demands competing for resources, especially early in the writing process. Furthermore, inexperienced writers ‘tend to revise locally, ignoring the situational constraints’,
and that the resulting ‘inadequate reviewing of extant working drafts often results from poor conception of the audience’s needs and wishes’ (Faigley & Witte, 1981:411 as quoted in Roen & Willey, 1988:76)

Basic writers often succumb to restricted and inefficient revision processes because of the ill-developed sense of audience in writing. Further ‘basic writers approach revision as an exercise in proof reading, retranscribing... and hunt for violations of mechanical property e.g. spelling, punctuation rather than seek opportunities to focus, extend or redirect their texts... are sometimes reluctant to eliminate much text in revision’; also, basic writers experience problems in conceptualizing their readers and ‘fail to use information about their readers when it is available to them’ (Rubin & Cooney, 1990:280-281). As a result of this (Shaughnessy 1977) basic writers neglect to disambiguate pronoun references, leave predicates afloat with out subjects and omit critical details. While studies such as (Rubin, 1984; Murray, 1978; Roen & Willey, 1978 as quoted in Rubin & Looney, 1990:281) have demonstrated that audience considerations bring in the positive development in the written text, Bracewell, Scardamalia & Bereiter (1978) found that audience development may not be a marked feature. As Rubin & Looney (1990) used procedural facilitation to serve as an artificial adjunct to facilitate basic writer’s revision processes, they found no text-level revisions. In this context, ‘advanced writers are more likely to be reader-centred, novice writer’s revision often stops at detection; they may lack a repertoire of alternative linguistic and rhetorical strategies (Rubin & Looney, 1990:289).

To conclude, Mangelsdorf et al (1990:235) suggest the need to assume roles in relation to the discourse community:

ESL students (both American and International) need practice in shaping their discourse for their audience as they can use appropriate cues for their readers. Systematic analysis of English-language text features is particularly important for second-language writers because of the different ways cultures express and interpret meaning.