To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Delilah Ferne Conley entitled "The Effects of Audience on the Writing of College Freshmen." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Curriculum and Instruction.

Mark A. Christiansen
Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Thomas K. Lyon

Allison Ensor

Accepted for the Council:

C. W. Minkel
Associate Vice Chancellor
and Dean of The Graduate School

THE EFFECTS OF AUDIENCE ON THE WRITING OF COLLEGE FRESHMEN

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Education
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Delilah Ferne Conley
May, 1992

Copyright 1992 by Delilah F. Conley

All rights reserved

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to
the one who inspired me to do my very
best, my sister, Laverna, and to those
who have encouraged me to use my talents,
my husband, Dr. Thomas A. Conley,
and our dear friends,
Dr. Robert L. and Margaret H. Wilcox.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Most of all, I thank my major professor, Dr. Mark Christiansen, for his guidance, encouragement, and patience. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Dr. Allison Ensor, Dr. Ted Hipple, and Dr. Thomas Ryan, for their guidance, assistance, and friendship over the past three years. My thanks extend also to Dr. Donald Dessart and Dr. Kathleen deMarrais for their help and support. I owe gratitude to Dr. Linda Bensel-Myers and Helen King for their assistance and inspiration. My heartfelt appreciation goes to the two adjunct faculty members at East Tennessee State University who devoted their time and energy to my project, Sharon A. Hart and Carol L. Hitchcock, and to the students who participated in the study. In addition, I must thank the chairman of the English Department at ETSU, Dr. Styron Harris, for giving me three composition classes at the times I requested. A special thanks also goes to Ann Lacava, who always had a smile and an answer. Finally, I am indebted forever to my husband, Thomas, for keeping our computers and our household running.

ABSTRACT

This research attempted to assess the effects of audience on the voice and persuasive processes of college freshmen writers, and to record the changes in students' concepts of their voice and powers of persuasion and the effects of audience specification on students' motivation to write well and perform well in the writing classroom. This study used quantitative procedures, a pretest-post-test design, and qualitative procedures, open-ended questionnaires and the instructor's daily journal of activities and comments, to determine the effects of audience specification (three treatments: class audience, real audience, and imaginary audience) on the writing and attitudes of three classes of college freshmen writers (64 students) at a small university in Tennessee.

The quantitative data indicated that all the groups improved in their voice and persuasive skills, but that the group whose audience was the class improved most. The qualitative data indicated that audience specification affected the students' ideas of themselves as writers, which in turn determined their motivation. The students in the class-audience group were motivated to write clearly on topics in which their peers would have interest and were freed to express their opinions openly. The students in the real-audience group were motivated to turn out a product that would accomplish a real purpose, and they were challenged to get involved in the outside world. The students in the imaginary-audience group were not uniformly motivated; some were able to imagine an audience while some

became confused and others assumed the teacher was the audience.

This study suggests that a variety of specified audiences would work best in the writing classroom, beginning with the class as audience to promote confidence, moving to a more challenging audience inside the academic setting, and then graduating to real audiences outside the academic setting. Above all, this study emphasizes the fact that all student writing, aside from personal journal writing, should have a definite audience; asking students to imagine an audience is not enough to promote audience awareness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1.	Introduction	1
	The Problem	2
	The Purpose	4
	Previous Research	4
	Importance/Need of the Study	7
	Assumptions	7
	Limitations	8
	Delimitations	9
	Definition of Terms	9
	Hypotheses/Questions	10
	Methods and Procedures	10
	Quantitative Study	10
	Qualitative Study	13
	Organization and Time Schedule	14
	Organization of the Study	14
	Time Schedule	14
2.	Review of Related Literature	16
	Conclusions	52
3.	Procedures	56
	Purpose	56
	Method	57
	Participants	57
	Design	58
	Procedures	60
4.	Analyses of Data	94
	Quantitative Analysis	94
	Qualitative Analysis	107
	Changes in Attitude, Group One	110
	Changes in Attitude, Group Two	126
	Changes in Attitude, Group Three	141

CHAPTER PAGE

5. Summary, Conclusions, and Implications 155

Summary 155

Conclusions 155

Implications 158

Implications for Teaching 158

Implications for Research 163

Works Cited 166

Appendix 181

Journal Notes 182

Notes 211

Vita 214

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Student Code Names	59
2.	Raw Scores of Pretest and Post-test	96
3.	Pretest and Post-test Means of Raw Scores, All Groups	100
4.	ANOVA Summary Tables	102
5.	Scheff's Multiple Comparison Test	104
6.	Median Sign Test--Pretest Median	105
7.	Median Sign Test--Post-test Median	106
8.	Comparison of Responses to Second Questionnaire	115
9.	Comparison of Responses to Third Questionnaire, Question 1	119
10.	Comparison of Responses to Third Questionnaire, Question 2	120
11.	Comparison of Responses to Third Questionnaire, Question 3	122
12.	Comparison of Responses to Third Questionnaire, Question 4	125

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		PAGE
1.	Consent Form	61
2.	Pretest Instructions	64
3.	40-Point Evaluation Scale	65
4.	First Questionnaire	67
5.	Assignment 1	68
6.	Assignment 2	73
7.	Response Questions	77
8.	Second Questionnaire	78
9.	Audience Analysis	80
10.	Assignment 3	82
11.	Assignment 4	85
12.	Evaluation Sheet	89
13.	Third Questionnaire	91
14.	Post-test Instructions	93
15.	Bartlett's Test	101

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

During the 1970's the National Council of Teachers of English and the Modern Language Association "called for an increased emphasis on the role of audience in the teaching of writing" (Nugent 296). One of the five competencies named that year by the NCTE was the ability to consider "possible audience (oneself, classmates, a teacher, 'the world')" (qtd. in Nugent 296). During the 1980's the effects of a writer's attention to audience on the process of writing was one of the most researched concepts in the field of writing. Most of the researchers agreed that attention to a targeted audience (an audience separate from that of the teacher) could have a profound effect on the drafting and revising techniques of writers from elementary school through college. On the heels of this research came (1) a flood of textbooks that offered exercises to enhance audience awareness and (2) articles and papers that outlined successful writing assignments and teaching techniques on the subject of audience. A great deal of this published information left writing teachers confused about giving assignments that would duplicate real writer-reader relationships.

In 1990 R. J. Willey, of Barry University, summed up many writing teachers' perceptions of this information:

> Over the last ten years or so the problem of audience in written discourse has been among the central concerns of our field. We writing teachers now have a developing (while sometimes confusing and contradictory) body of audience

> theory and research always within our reach. We know more, we understand more about this complex problem of audience than we ever have before. Yet I often wonder how many of us find ourselves swept into the classroom enthusiastically awash in this body of knowledge, as I so often have, only to discover that we're somehow unable to translate this knowledge into classroom techniques that work, that make a difference in our students' writing. ("Audience Awareness" 20-21)

The idea behind any new approach to teaching writing is that it will make a difference in students' writing--that it will make the writing more real for the student and the teacher, that it will spark interest and fulfillment in young writers, and that ultimately it will make students yearn to improve their writing. Unfortunately, attention to audience has not been the panacea that some had hoped it would be.

Before I began my study, previous research had left me with several questions: What kind of audience will make a difference? Are there adequate audiences within the classroom, or must they be found elsewhere? Who should choose these audiences? Is audience awareness something that is taught, like avoidance of the comma splice? And must students anticipate a response from a targeted audience in order for the benefit of audience to be viable?

After exploring these questions, I directed my study toward ascertaining the effects of audience on the voice and persuasive processes of college freshman writers.

The Problem

Five problems needed to be addressed. First, despite all the research which proves that attention to audience is important, many college instructors whom I know,

especially those who primarily teach literature, still see themselves as the audience for their students' compositions. Others are just as entrenched in the notion that students' peers provide the only real audience necessary.

The second problem, which is related to the first, is the fact that much of the research of the last decade was done in elementary and middle schools rather than in high schools or colleges. A portion of this research centered on comparing younger and older writers and their attention to audience. More research has been needed at the higher grade level, where, I feel, audience should be stressed with all writing except personal journals.

Third, much of the current literature suggests teaching audience analysis and awareness by lecture and exercise rather than by practice of writing for a variety of audiences. Some teachers of composition tend to assume that pretending to target an audience is just as effective as addressing the actual audience.

Fourth, we freely use the term "audience" without a clear definition of the word. To some writers it tends to mean anyone except the teacher, while a few include the teacher as a possible audience. Many of those who advocate audience have accepted the peer group or other student groups as the choice of audience for student writing, while others insist that the audience must be "real," a term which often excludes students. A clear distinction has not been made between a "forced" audience, one which is compelled to read student writing, and a "real" audience, a potential reader who is interested in students' topics yet not obligated to read their writing.

Finally, one question has not been addressed adequately in any of the previous research: must the writer

anticipate sending the written composition to the targeted audience in order for a real audience to have a positive effect on the voice and persuasive language of the finished product?

The Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to assess the effects of audience on the voice and persuasive processes of freshmen writers. Within these boundaries, I expected to see whether the type of audience (class, real, or imaginary) or the purpose of the writing (for a grade or for a response from an audience) makes a difference. In addition, if attention to audience does indeed make a difference, I hoped to discern how students' concepts of their voices and powers of persuasion change (or adapt) as they converse in what many have termed the "discourse community."

In order to improve students' writing, we must provide them with multi-dimensioned rhetorical situations which offer practice balancing all the aspects of writing--purpose, audience, and voice. It was my contention that in order to create this balance, the audience must be such that it makes students responsible for communicating their ideas.

Previous Research

In 1986 George Hillocks surmised that little research had been done on "the role of audience in written communication" (84). But the onslaught of publications on the subject had already begun. In the late seventies and early eighties, Linda Flower and John Hayes said that "good writers" are planners ("Dynamics" 48) who are constantly aware of "their purpose. . ., their sense of audience, and their projected selves or imagined roles" (40). At that time we knew that few of our students were

aware of these forces when they wrote. We wondered if it were possible that academic writing gave students the wrong purpose or the wrong audience. Marion Crowhurst and Gene Piche had already proven that older (high school) students could write differently for different audiences, especially for the purposes of argument ("Audience and Mode" 106). However, their 1979 study used imagined audiences, and the authors admitted, "It is interesting to speculate about differences which might be found if students were writing to real audiences for real purposes" (107). Studies like these sparked my interest in audience.

In the 1980's we (teachers and researchers) called for further research to find out whether we could teach "audience awareness" and "audience analysis" as writing skills. Researchers like C. G. Hays, P. G. Bator, and H. E. Nugent led the way in studies of this type (Hillocks 88,90). In 1984 Barry Kroll postulated that we had developed three "perspectives" about audience and that attention to one of these perspectives alone was dangerous to students' development as writers. Even though he applauded the "rebirth of interest in the concept of audience" ("Writing for Readers" 183), he admonished us to remember the teachings of Wayne Booth, who, echoing Aristotle's words, reminded us that writing is a balance of several elements, and that excess importance should not be placed on any one element (183).

Among the later researchers is Robert G. Roth, who worked with Janet Emig, a respected researcher in composition, at Rutgers University. In 1986 Roth concluded much the same thing that Booth had written some twenty years before--that many elements, including the self, are involved in writing for the purpose of communication ("The Evolving Audience" 47-55).

Because of these researchers and many others, to whom I have given credit, we now have a better sense of the many audiences we must explore in the classroom and of the contexts in which they must be explored. In 1990 Duane Roen concluded that students need to be exposed to varying types of audiences ("Synthesizing" 12). Jude Collins echoed much the same thought when she said that students must have a "clear sense of audience" (51). In "Purpose at Work: The Writing of Professionals and Pupils," she wrote:

> It is not sufficient that the anger be merely expressed; it is important that there be someone who can receive the anger, whether a friend who will sympathize or an enemy who will suffer. Similarly with joy--a considerable part of the pleasure lies in the sharing of it. And of course audience matters in more mundane circumstances as well: if we didn't believe that the milkman would read our note or that our friend would water the plants per instructions, we would see little point in writing instructions. Purpose and audience, then, whether purpose be passionate or detached, are closely related. (51)

The conflict arises when we discuss the sources of these audiences that will provide both variety and clear purpose. Despite all the writers of the past decade who have advocated "real" audiences, many teachers have turned back to the classroom to find suitable outlets, not in the teacher, but in the students themselves. I will discuss the literature related to this trend in Chapter 2.

My research began at this point. Can we ask students to be both writers and sole audiences? Will they eventually come to see this new, imposed role of audience as nothing more than what they saw their writing as before--

a step to a grade? And if we ask students to write only for academic or peer audiences, have we exposed them to sufficiently different writing experiences under sufficiently different conditions?

I am a firm believer in collaboration in the writing classroom. Students can help other students say what they want and need to say, usually better than a teacher can. But students' purposes, and audiences, must be individualized or the delicate balance of writing elements, especially purpose, is lost. I proposed that students can be one type of audience, and they can be reader/editors to help one another through the writing process. But in order to introduce students to the discourse community, we must go outside the classroom. This study confirmed the NCTE's directive that students should be exposed to a variety of audiences, including audiences outside the classroom.

Importance/Need of the Study

This study adds to the small body of research which seeks to distinguish among different audiences for college freshman composition. It sheds light on writing students' concepts of voice and persuasion, in connection with audience, in their own writing. Most importantly, it shows the effect of audience on students' concepts of writing assignments and on their motivation to improve their writing.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were fundamental to this study:

1. I would be assigned three freshman composition classes at East Tennessee State University.
2. These classes would have approximately twenty-five to thirty students.

3. The students would cooperate.
4. At least one of two adjunct faculty members would participate in the study, scoring the pretest and post-test.
5. Students would do their best on the post-test, even though it did not contribute to their grade in the class.

Limitations

Because I taught all three classes, students took the classes at different times during the day. Although students are randomly selected for classes at ETSU (They do not always get the class sections they ask for, and they do not select instructors because the composition classes at ETSU are listed as taught by staff.), they still had some control over the time of day, such as morning or late afternoon. This was a factor that I could not ignore because students with different study habits tend to prefer varying periods. Self-disciplined students tend to take morning or late afternoon classes. This limitation is discussed further in Chapter 4.

In addition, I graded all compositions written by the students for a grade, providing some feedback to all the students. However, the English department at ETSU uses the Harbrace College Handbook, and most of the instructors grade freshman compositions according to the Harbrace scale, which primarily targets main idea, structure/development and mechanics. I adhered to this method of evaluation and attempted to give the same type and amount of feedback to all the students in order to keep evaluation as constant a variable as possible.

My position as an adjunct faculty member at ETSU left me no choice but to teach these classes myself; therefore, I attempted to control as many of the

variables as possible and to remain objective and consistent in my teaching methods and grading practices.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to freshman composition. I specifically requested three classes of freshman composition and expressly requested certain periods during the day. Because freshmen at ETSU who take classes fourth and fifth periods, just before and after lunch, do not do as well as students who take the same classes first, second, third or sixth periods, I asked for and was assigned first, third and sixth periods for the reasons stated in the limitations.

I delimited the study by using one teacher, myself, so that the teaching material would be consistent. Because I graded all compositions except the pre-test and post-test, all students' writings were evaluated in the same manner. Other delimitations were assignments, students' choice of topics, inquiry, persuasiveness, audience adaptation and analysis, and collaboration.

Definition of Terms

Some basic terms are defined as follows for the purpose of this study:

Distant Audience: Usually used to mean "real" audience. However, it is possible to have a distant audience which, in my estimation, is forced, not real.

Real Audience: Real human beings who are not obligated to read a text.

Reader Awareness: Same as "audience awareness."

Reader-Based Plans: Writing plans that have included audience analysis/audience awareness. Another term with a similar meaning is "reader-centered."

Reader-Response: Usually used with peer-group analyses of students' writing and means "feedback."

Voice: In this study the term "voice" will encompass the tone, language and point of view used by the writer to convey a message to the reader.

Other terms appear within this study, with their definitions, as they have become necessary.

Hypotheses/Questions

I used both statistical data (a quantitative study) and a qualitative study. The basic concern of the quantitative study was to ascertain the effects of audience on the writing processes, especially those of voice and persuasion, of freshmen writers. One basic hypothesis and an alternative were formulated and tested at the .05 level of significance:

> Hypothesis: There are no significant differences among the three treatments.
>
> Alternative: There are significant differences between two or more of the three treatments.

The basic concern of the qualitative study was to record the changes in students' concepts of their voices and powers of persuasion as they conversed in the discourse community. The broad question is as follows: How do students progress in their understanding of voice and persuasion as their understanding of discourse community broadens?

A second concern of the qualitative study was the manifestation of the effects of audience on students' motivation to write well (in order to communicate their ideas) and the effects of this motivation on the students' performance in the class.

Methods and Procedures

Quantitative Study

To measure the effects of audience on the writing of college freshmen, I conducted a study using three

composition classes at East Tennessee State University during the fall semester of 1991. All the classes were informed about the study. At the beginning of the semester, all three classes wrote the traditional "diagnostic" essay, which I used as the pretest for this study. The topic was a current controversial issue (Should high-school students be given condoms in an effort to slow the spread of AIDS?). Two unbiased faculty members scored the pretest according to a holistic point scale (details appear in Chapter 3) designed to measure voice appropriateness/consistency and persuasiveness. The pretest was not returned to the students.

The audience was different in each of the three classes. One class wrote for peers. They were told that the class was their audience for all essays written for a grade. They worked together in groups at various intervals to discuss their papers, from the prewriting stage, through the rough draft stage and up to the polished draft stage. Topics for this class, as for all three classes, were current, controversial issues, which the students researched, using library resources. The topics were chosen by the students; however, students were not allowed to write on the pretest/post-test topic.

The second class wrote to real outside audiences and sent the writings to these audiences. They met in peer groups to discuss their papers, just like group one. In some cases students chose particular audiences, such as a member of congress or an animal rights' group; at other times I provided an outside audience, such as a publication. They were encouraged to share with the class any responses from their targeted audiences or

publications (such as a letter to a congressperson) and any resulting feedback.

In the third class, students designated and analyzed target audiences outside the classroom but did not actually send their papers to these audiences. Peer groups remained a constant variable. The groups discussed their audiences as they discussed the progress of their papers, but the audiences remained "imaginary," with no potential for providing feedback.

The classes were taught in exactly the same manner, allowing for differences in student interaction, and assignments (such as letter, editorial, article or essay) were the same (details about assignments appear in Chapter 3). Papers, except the pretest and post-test, were graded according to the same criteria. This aspect of the study is a limitation (see pages 7 and 8), because I graded all papers, thereby giving feedback to all the students.

East Tennessee State University requires that all freshman composition students write a minimum of eight essays (about 40 pages) for a grade, a significant percentage of which should be rewriting. In addition, short, spontaneous, ungraded, uncritiqued writings are encouraged as often as class time allows. Therefore, this study involved the writing of four formal essays, from the prewriting stage to the final draft stage, not including the pretest and post-test.

At the end of the semester, a post-test was given in place of the exam essay, and the students were informed that it was to be written for the purpose of this study. They wrote on the same topic as the pretest and were instructed to write for the same audience or one of the audiences for whom they wrote during the term. The same adjunct faculty members who scored the pre-

test also scored the post-test for voice and persuasion. Neither the pretest nor the post-test affected the students' grades for the class.

Detailed descriptions of population, treatments, data collection procedures, instruments, and results are presented in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.

Qualitative Study

The quantitative study was coordinated with a qualitative study. At three intervals during the fall semester--beginning, middle and end--all students in each class were asked to respond in writing to a questionnaire which contained open-ended questions designed to determine their perceptions of their voices and powers of persuasion in their writing and the process (or processes) they used to write for their particular audiences.

The first set of questions asked students to tell in their own words their ideas of voice, persuasion and audience in writing and to describe any experiences they had had in the past writing for (or to) someone other than a teacher or for some other purpose than a grade.

In the middle of the semester, after students had had experience writing for and discussing their respective audiences, they were asked to describe the process they used, thinking, planning, drafting, and revising, to prepare their drafts for their readers. This was the second question.

At the end of the term, the students were again asked to explain their concepts of voice, persuasion and audience in their own writing. They were also asked to describe the experience of writing for the audience(s) used in this study. This was the third set of questions.

As the semester progressed, two short responses were

added, between the first and second questionnaire and between the second and last questionnaire, to monitor students' feelings about writing for their particular audiences.

In addition, I kept a daily record of all activities, comments, and events which occurred during class time and/or during conferences in my office and which pertained to the study.

All open-ended questionnaires, responses, and journal notes were analyzed to see whether patterns emerged in the different classes. A detailed description of the qualitative study appears in Chapter 3.

Organization and Time Schedule

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 contains an introduction, a problem statement, a statement of purpose, a synopsis of previous research, a statement of importance, assumptions, limitations, delimitations, definitions of terms, hypotheses and questions, methods and procedures, and an organization of the study, including a time schedule.

Chapter 2 contains a review of related literature.

Chapter 3 describes the data-gathering methods and treatments.

Chapter 4 analyzes the data.

Chapter 5 includes a summary, conclusions, implications of the study and recommendations.

Time Schedule

1. The study was designed during the summer of 1991.

2. The data and questionnaires, responses, and notes were collected during the fall of 1991.

3. The analysis of the data and the writing of the report were completed by May of 1992.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In the 1970's the researcher James Moffett said, "If anybody is going to do anything about the teaching of writing, the first priority is going to have to be the rekindling of the sense of audience. Until that's done, nothing else is going to happen" (qtd. in Kirsch and Roen 13).

Before we can understand the relevance of audience to teaching writing, we must first understand what the term "audience" means. The concept of audience emerges from the days of Aristotle and Plato when "classical thinkers" were concerned "with the effects of rhetoric on very REAL, very KNOWABLE audiences" (Willey, "Pre-Classical Roots" 26). The world of business communication and technical writing argues that researchers of composition should not use the term audience. James Suchan and Ron Dulek state:

> An audience is a collective, dynamic presence that provides a SPEAKER with immediate feedback. On the other hand, a reader is a writer-created construct--a set of conceptions existing in the writer's consciousness--that manifests itself in the document the writer has created. Unlike audience, a reader provides the writer with delayed feedback, if any at all. (30)

Even Walter Ong said that "it is really quite misleading to think of a writer as dealing with an 'audience'. . . . More properly, a writer addresses readers. . ." (10). How-

ever, even Ong admitted that he, too, "followed the common practice <of> using the term 'audience'" (10).

Today the words audience and readers are used interchangeably, partly because well-known researchers like Ong have done so and partly because researchers and teachers alike have re-examined Aristotle's directives for persuasive speech and have applied them to the written word. Ong stated the following more than a decade ago:

> . . .Rhetoric originally concerned oral communication, as is indicated by its name, which comes from the Greek word for public speaking. <But> over two millennia, rhetoric has been gradually extended to include writing more and more, until today, in highly technological cultures, this is its principal concern. (9)

And in the world of composition, the term audience has been extended to mean readers, principally.

Many theorists have tried to explain the meanings of audience that concern the writer and the teacher of writing. Ong saw the writer's audience as existing only inside the writer's mind. "If the writer succeeds in writing," he says, "it is. . .because he can fictionalize in his imagination an audience he has learned to know not from daily life but from earlier writers who were fictionalizing in their imagination audiences they had learned to know in still earlier writers. . ." (11). Thomas Willard and Stuart Brown, from the University of Arizona, agree that "the audience of written discourse tends to be fictive because a writer does not receive the constant feedback a speaker gets. . ." (40). Suchan and Dulek echo this narrow viewpoint. "Writers," they say, "must become self-conscious about: 1. their own FIXED concept of. . .absent readers. . .and 2. the role the writer has asked the reader to play. . .as a

result of the writer's fixed concept of the reader" (31). This fixed or fictitious audience is what Walker Gibson called the "mock reader," what Wayne Booth termed the "implied reader," and what John Preston called the "created reader" (qtd. in Thralls, Blyler, and Ewald 48).

Other theorists have defined audience as more than one dimensional. Douglas Park says that "the meanings of 'audience'. . .diverge in two general directions: one toward actual people external to a text. . .the other toward the text itself and the audience implied there" ("Meanings" 160). Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford call these concepts "audience addressed" and "audience invoked" (155). Barbara Tomlinson, associate of the Muir writing program, explains that, although as writers we imagine readers, we also "focus on specific readers. . . with enough power over us to make them emphatically 'nonfictional'" (86). Russell Long, English chair at Tarleton State University, says the relationship between the writer and reader ". . .may be in a constant state of flux. . . . The reader can assume as wide a variety of personae as the writer" ("Writer's Audience" 79).

Barry M. Kroll, who has done research at Iowa State University and Indiana University, looks at audience from a different angle. He proposes that there are three perspectives of audience within the field of composition, "the 'rhetorical,' the 'informational,' and the 'social' perspectives" ("Writing for Readers" 172). The rhetorical perspective relies on an analysis of the characteristics of the audience (173) and looks at "nearly all communication as persuasive in intent" (174). The informational perspective "is a process of conveying information" (176), and the social perspective views writing as "an act of communication" (179).

If audience is so complex a notion, how do writers

develop the sense of audience that Moffett spoke of? The term most commonly used to discuss this sense of audience is "audience awareness." Kroll says that "writers who can decenter their perspective, taking the view of a hypothetical readership, are more likely to display audience awareness than writers who are embedded in their personal view of reality" ("Cognitive" 279). In other words, "The writer who is adept at tailoring a communication is said to have demonstrated 'audience awareness'" (269). James Britton, one of the most quoted names in the field of writing, extolled the importance of audience awareness in The Development of Writing Abilities:

> . . .One important dimension of development in writing ability is the growth of a sense of audience, the growth of the ability to make adjustments and choices in writing which take account of the audience for whom the writing is intended. . . . A highly developed sense of audience must be one of the marks of the competent mature writer, for it is concerned with nothing less than the implementation of his concern to maintain or establish an appropriate relationship with his reader in order to achieve his full intent. (58)

Writing teachers are concerned about audience awareness because, as Trimble put it, a lack of it is the reason "for most bad writing" (qtd. in Kroll, "Cognitive" 269). The writer who has no awareness of audience takes for granted that readers understand the topic and therefore need no explanations (269). For students of writing this assumption is usually perpetuated by the absence of a reader, except for the teacher, who represents to them the god of all knowledge.

The concern for audience awareness in the writing

classroom has led to a great deal of research in the area of cognitive development. Researchers have asked if the ability to conceive of one's audience comes with age or experience. Several studies (Strange 180-81; Cohen and Riel 155-56; Crowhurst, "Sixth-Graders" 19) show that students of at least sixth grade level do have the ability to adapt a piece of writing, such as a letter, to different audiences. Other studies (Bracewell, Scardamalia, and Bereiter 17; Rubin and Piche 311-13; Greenlee 112) indicate that the cognitive ability to perceive of, and communicate with, different audiences improves throughout the high school years.

However, at least two studies (Shapiro, "Finding" 15-22; Hurd 29-32) suggest that college students appear to lack the cognitive maturity that is obviously evident in elementary and high school students. Rhynette Hurd concluded that some college students may have difficulty handling the constraints of audience because they may have no interest in the assigned topic or because their "primary motivation for writing is to complete the requirements for a course" (32). Kroll calls this apparent lack of audience awareness "egocentrism" ("Adapting" 7). Janice Hays, of the University of Colorado, suggests that a sense of audience may be superseded by "matters of style and correctness" ("Effect of Audience" 26).

In an attempt to find out how audience awareness develops, many researchers have chosen to compare the writing processes of experienced and unexperienced writers. They agree that the most prominent characteristic of skilled writers is goal setting. "The good writers were concerned about having a purpose in their writing" (Stallard 216). Not only do experienced writers make plans, but they also replan many times (Flower and Hays, "Plans" 48). Linda Flower and

John Hays say these plans are made during "'episodes'. . . of concentration" ("Pregnant Pause" 242). Researcher and textbook author, Carol Berkenkotter, found periods of concentration in the writing processes of Donald Murray, a noted researcher in the field of composition. Janet Emig called the extremes of these periods "reflexive and extensive poles" (Berkenkotter, "Decisions" 138). An important observation of Berkenkotter's study suggests that, although Murray believed writers consider audience during revision only, Murray himself unconsciously made changes each time he considered his reader. Two decades ago, James McCrimmon's text, Writing with a Purpose, gave this advice to students:

> A writer must think of his reader long before he begins to write, and that concern affects his choice of subject, the tone and organization of his work, the kinds of illustrations and examples he uses, his sentence structure, and his choice of words. Writing is not good or bad in itself, but as it succeeds or fails in getting the response intended. (7)

A decade later Berkenkotter echoed the importance of audience awareness: "Only when he <the writer> begins to discern what his readers do not yet know can he shape his language, structure and information to fit the needs of those readers" ("Decisions" 139).

Of course, the writer who plans with an audience and a purpose in mind spends more time involved in the process of writing, not only planning and revising (Stallard 216), but also solving the problem which the topic generates (Flower and Hays, "Cognition" 29). Linda Flower and John Hays report that in one study, "experienced writers. . .generated up to 60 per cent of their new ideas in response to the larger rhetorical

problem (that is, in response to the assignment, the audience, or their own goals)" (30). Working through the problem with their reader in mind, experienced writers revise more than once. Nancy Sommers says, "The anticipation of a reader's judgment causes a feeling of dissonance when the writer recognizes incongruities between intention and execution, and requires these writers to make revisions on all levels" ("Revision Strategies" 384).

Researchers were also curious about the behaviors of poor writers. At one point in their research, Linda Flower and John Hays seemed puzzled at the difference between those writers who plan and those who do not. They wrote:

> Perhaps the most interesting fact about reader-based plans is not that some people make them and use them to direct many aspects of their composing process, but that some writers do not. It seems almost axiomatic that if writing is a communicating process, the writer needs to recognize the other side of the equation, the reader. And if writing is a problem-solving process, a writer needs some goal, such as a reader, toward which to plan. ("Plans" 49)

A study which compared skilled and unskilled writers summed up the situation English teachers face each time they ask poor writers to compose:

> The most striking feature of novice writing behavior was an extreme cue-dependency. . . . The novices tended to do little more than the minimum each task required, generating ideas with no explicit planning, organizing old ideas without introducing new ones, and relying

> heavily on the content and wording of the outline to produce their letters. (Atlas 18)

Most teachers assume that poor writers lack the skill or the maturity to think through a problem for the purpose of communicating their ideas. But the previously-mentioned studies concerning cognitive development have proven this assumption untrue. Flower and Hays conclude:

> Our guess is that poor writers. . .possess verbal and rhetorical skills which they fail to use because of their underdeveloped image of their rhetorical problem. Because they have narrowed a rhetorical act to a paper-writing problem, their representation of the problem doesn't call on abilities they may well have. ("Cognition" 30)

However, these researchers believe that "the ability to explore a rhetorical problem is eminently teachable" (31). Nancy Shapiro and others suggest that writing itself is the avenue through which we can teach not only problem solving, but also audience awareness. She poses this question: "Do students at higher levels of intellectual maturity write better BECAUSE they think better, or is it possible that the act of writing itself generates the disequilibrium which leads to cognitive development" ("Rhetorical Maturity" 18). Therefore, rhetorical maturity can be increased by working through rhetorical problems. How can teachers provide exercises that offer rhetorical problems? Donald Rubin and Gene Piche, a noted research team, state, "A composition curriculum should not pitch its exercises beyond students' abilities to induce rhetorical principles, though rhetorical development may be accelerated by the 'developmental pull' of carefully designed disequilibrating experiences" ("Development" 314). In other words, writing assign-

ments that challenge students to solve problems can strengthen cognitive development. Eileen Oliver states, ". . .Assignments should be crafted to provide adequate information about topic, purpose and audience" (231). To this statement Rubin and Piche add, ". . .Sense of audience can be manipulated in an assigned writing task and. . .the resulting adaptation is manifested both in syntactic complexity and in strategy use" ("Development" 313).

What kinds of writing tasks offer disequilibrium (a problem-solving prompt)? Certainly many of the writing assignments handed out in Composition 101 (compare and/or contrast high school and college; describe your favorite place; pretend you are a tennis shoe and give your owner advice) are not cognitively challenging. Marion Crowhurst, working with Gene Piche, found in a study of the effects of "task variables on syntactic complexity" that narrative writing caused "no increase in syntactic complexity over a four-year age span." However, Crowhurst and Piche concluded that "studies of syntactic development . . .should be based on writing which requires subjects to make maximum use of their syntactic skill. The evidence suggests that argumentative writing is one such kind of writing" ("Audience and Mode" 108).

Other prominent researchers agree that argumentative writing increases cognitive development and a sense of audience. Janice Hays recently concluded from one study that "in 'real world' transactional writing, a writer's sense of her readers can be crucial to the effectiveness of her discourse. This sense is especially important in argumentative writing, which presupposes an audience. . . and entails a stronger focus on audience than do other genres" ("Argumentative" 249). She says that adult argumentative writing shows clearly the patterns of audience

awareness at work "at different levels of socio-cognitive development," and adds 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" (264). In another study, Hays, Brandt, and Chantry stated, ". . .Argumentative-writing performance is closely related to writers' levels of intellectual development. . ." ("The Impact" 413). The conclusions of their study, which examined the effects of friendly and hostile audiences on the writing of high school and college students, were these:

> . . .Working with students' argumentative writing, instructors are also working with at least some of their critical-thinking abilities. Results also imply that before students can master logical and dialectical reasoning abilities, they need to move beyond dualistic and multiplistic ones. Attention to writers' strategies with and responses to oppositional readers might well facilitate this process, for it would force writers to explore perspectives and people different from themselves and so loosen their ontological rigidity. (414)

"Audience awareness," then, says Nancy Shapiro, "represents the communicative component of rhetorical maturity . . . . The movement from an egocentric to a decentered perspective should manifest itself in an awareness of alternative points of view" ("Rhetorical Maturity" 16). Only argumentative writing can offer students practice confronting different viewpoints.

Although researchers agree that writing is the only avenue that ultimately leads to an awareness of one's readers, there is much dissention among composition scholars concerning the writing assignments that will

best facilitate audience awareness in the writing classroom. One body of research emphasizes rhetorical planning, while another stresses rhetorical situations.

The "buzz" words in planning over the last decade have been "audience analysis." Most audience analyses involve a heuristic model, a set of questions which lead the writer to concentrate on an intended reader, considering specific characteristics and beliefs. Several heuristic models are available for classroom use, the most popular of which was developed by Fred R. Pfister and Joanne F. Petrick. Carol Berkenkotter advocates the Pfister and Petrick model, which, she says, "encourage<s> writers to construct a hypothetical reader, to explore the reader's attitude toward the subject, and to analyze their relationship to the reader" ("Understanding" 396-97). Linda Carey's recent study that contrasted the planning procedures of expert writers and student writers found "that both the quantity and quality of a writer's initial planning may make a surprisingly large difference in the quality of the final text" (16). She concluded "that less successful writers' emphasis on 'content planning' (as opposed to rhetorical planning) results in texts which are less well adapted to the audience. . ." (17).

Paul G. Bator studied the use of the Tagmemic heuristic, developed by Richard Young, Alton Becker, and Kenneth Pike, with college freshmen and concluded:

> Writers need to expand systematically their recognition and knowledge of role-attributes, personality characteristics, psychological dispositions, etc. They need also to discover heuristic methods for making inferences about their audiences. (114)

Karen R. Durrant and Charles R. Duke, in a study that used Pfister and Petrick's heuristic model and approached

audience from Kroll's three perspectives, determined that audience analysis "appears to benefit students" (172). They concluded:

> From the social perspective, when students start to place themselves in the reader's position (undoing ego-centricity), they provide more details, transitions, and explanations in their writing. Writing for various audiences not only helps students recognize that the needs of one audience differ from those of another but also provides practice in adapting texts to accommodate those needs. From the rhetorical perspective, audience analysis helps students represent a context of situation and offers a starting place, a direction for their writing. And, from the informational perspective, students learn strategies that good writers use to accommodate their audiences. (172)

Many researchers are totally against the use of audience analysis, primarily because they believe it encourages stereotyping. Russell C. Long says that "the analytical approach. . .begins to rely more and more heavily upon the sort of stereotyping that most teachers actively try to DISCOURAGE in other learning situations" ("The Writer's Audience" 74). Long adds that "it <also> distorts many of the decisions facing most writers in most situations" (74). Robert G. Roth, professor of English at Middlesex County College in Edison, New Jersey, argues that it stifles writing. He states:

> Such heuristics assume that writers must settle on a manageable audience definition fairly early in the composing process in order to establish a secure basis for making composing decisions: They will want to know just what point of view,

> interests, and attitudes they must accommodate. To attain such certitude, however, the writer may have to accept a relatively narrow audience definition and may unwittingly exclude many potential readers. . . . Often we write not merely to accommodate a pre-established set of readers, but to discover more about our subjects and our evolving texts so that we can compose a piece that many people will want to read. ("Deconstructing Audience" 182)

In a study conducted by Judith Ann Wootten in which freshmen writers' attention to audience was compared to professional journalists' sense of audience, Wootten surmised the following:

> All of these heuristics seem to create greater audience awareness in composition students, at least to the extent that they learn to play the game of inventing a situation for their writing. Some students probably also learn to outwit the intention by writing first and selecting an audience afterward that suits what they have written. What the reports of success with various heuristic devices for creating audience illustrate is that students can be taught to use the tools the instructor provides. . . . (165)

And Gesa Kirsch, of Wayne State University, adds that writers have different approaches to composing. After conducting case studies of three writers, she concluded:

> In this study, writers' level of expertise had little to do with how much audience was considered and analyzed, a finding that challenges Flower and Hayes' claim that a mark of "expert writers" is the amount of time they spend con-

> sidering an audience (1980). Instead, factors such as self-confidence, authority of the writer . . ., perceived disposition of readers. . ., and one's conception of what the act of writing entails. . .all determine writers' degree of audience awareness. ("Experienced" 226-27)

Some researchers, realizing the drawbacks to heuristics yet keeping in mind that students must become audience aware, offer alternatives to popular heuristic models. Russell C. Long advocates the use of Richard Eastman's "'moral field' approach to audience analysis," which helps the student "move from real, tangible readers to a hypothetical group processing. . .an identifiable, predictable range of attitudes" ("The Writer's Audience" 75). Although he admits that it is useful only with persuasive writing, he states that it teaches students "to recognize and anticipate a range of audience attitudes. . ., <and> forces <him or her> to define his or her own position" (75). Other suggested alternatives include "comparing the discourse produced by one writer for two different audiences" (Davis and Harris 288), "perspective taking" (role playing) (Malloy and Daniels 28), teaching ethnographic skills (Bocchi 8-9), and providing students with actual information about real groups of people (Gaunder 9-10; Black 246-48).

Still another group denounces audience analysis because, they say, it is not useful in the academic classroom and may, in fact, serve as a poor substitute for a genuine route to audience awareness. Most of this group prefer the study of genre and convention to audience analysis. Arthur E. Walzer declares, ". . .Our current approach to the analysis of audience. . .is inappropriate for producing academic discourse" ("Articles" 154). He says, "The inadequacy of. . .the current heuristic, with

its questions about the prospective readers' backgrounds . . ., attitudes. . ., needs. . ., and knowledge. . .is inappropriate for many types of writing" (155). He advocates that instead of analyzing audiences, students should be taught to analyze texts so that they can come to know the language used and accepted within certain genres (156). Other writers refer to the understood language within genres as "writing conventions" or "a conventional register" (Andersen 112). Douglas Park says that "much of the time it is not possible to separate a sense of audience from a sense of genre and convention" ("Meanings" 256). What we need in the way of teaching audience awareness, he says, is "to be able to place specific assignments or tasks of audience analysis within a larger frame of reference. We need to be able to break audience problems down into specific issues, to identify for students the ways and the strategies by which audience contexts exist in different kinds of prose" (256). Walzer's solution to the problems of heuristics is to have students study "specialized journals" ("Articles" 156).

From the theories concerning genre and convention has come another term that is sometimes used to mean a particular audience. This term is "discourse community." Bennett A. Rafoth, Director of the Writing Center at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, explains the term this way:

> Like audience, discourse community entails assumptions about conformity and convention. 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. ("Concept" 140)

Richard C. Freed and Glenn J. Broadhead echo the thoughts

of James A. Reither and Kenneth A. Bruffee when they stress the importance "of enabling students to understand discourse communities' bodies of knowledge, conventions, and strategies" (154). The study of discourse communities is important, they say, because the norms that "define the writer's discourse community, a context that conditions, governs, and constrains, not just the message, but the writer producing it" (162). Not only do they believe that students should study different discourse communities, but they also say that freshman composition itself (academic writing) is a discourse community of a sort whose conventions students must come to understand and duplicate (163-64).

While the debate over audience analysis rages and researchers look for ways to study discourse communities and their conventions, teachers of writing continue to use and recommend audience analysis with some caution. The first caution concerns timing. Douglas Park, who warns that audience analysis "works only for persuasive discourse" ("Analyzing" 478), admonishes that it should not "be seen as a set of all-purpose questions to be tacked on to an assignment to help students invent or identify an audience" (486). Indeed, the biggest problem concerning audience analysis is that heuristic models have become just another exercise that is done either during the prewriting or revising stage of the writing process. "Thinking about one's audience," Rafoth warns, "is a question of WHEN not WHETHER. . ." ("Audience" 286). Duane H. Roen and R. J. Willey echo the advice of Peter Elbow, Linda Flower and others who have advocated that teachers use the audience analysis techniques that are available but do so during the writing process while students are working through problems and making decisions ("The Effects" 83). And

Paul G. Bator states that "audience analysis. . .is important in all components of the writing process" (115). Analyzing audience at any time during the writing process, he says, "can prompt further revision. . .<or> prompt the writer to re-enter the invention component" (116).

A second caution about audience analysis concerns the goals of the writer. Goal setting, after all, is the experienced writer's first priority. Douglas Park states that we should not just help students analyze audiences, but that we must "help them define situations" ("Analyzing" 486). Lisa Ede advocates "purpose-oriented analysis" ("Audience" 142). She quotes Theodore Clevinger who, two decades ago, warned that "instead of initiating the analysis by asking some standard set of questions about audience characteristics," teachers should begin "by asking what about the audience is most likely to be important in light of the speaker's purposes" (142). To these statements Lorraine A. Plasse adds, "Writing instruction should. . .include an exploration of character types. . ., <but> this exploration should take place in relation to the purpose of the writing task as well as its audience" (77).

Linda Flower and John Hayes have long been aware that heuristics are not the sole solution to audience awareness. In 1977 they concluded:

> Heuristics do not offer a step-by-step formula for how to write. They are available, and powerful, but optional techniques for solving problems. . . . Heuristics ask the students to see writing as a communication problem they are setting out to solve with all the strategies they can muster. In practice, perhaps the most remarkable result of using heuristics is that early in the course students develop a conviction

> that writing is an important skill they can in fact master. Obviously, such a conviction is not always one hundred per cent warranted, but in replacing the mystique of talent and the fear of failing with the possibility of an attainable goal, problem solving helps writers draw more fully on the abilities they do have. . . . Having. . .access to. . .heuristics can make the process a lot easier. ("Problem-Solving" 461)

The largest body of research concerning audience in composition has been done, not in the area of rhetorical planning, but in the area of rhetorical situations. Not only have theorists been unable to agree on the best planning methods to teach audience awareness, but they also disagree on the most appropriate audiences to use for student assignments. Most of the controversy centers around the question of whether or not students' writing should remain within the classroom.

The whole notion of making a particular audience part of writing assignments came about when teachers realized that, if no audience was specified in an assignment, students automatically wrote for the teacher. A teacher audience poses an enormous stumbling block to students because teachers are perceived as all-knowing. Not only do students think their teacher-reader knows more about their subject than they do, but they also invariably write for an audience that is more sophisticated and more educated than they, a situation that rarely occurs in the real world of publishing. When students write with only a teacher in mind, their goals are reduced to one--the grade--and their rhetorical concerns are reduced to questions of "rightness" of style and mechanics. In 1973 Peter Elbow, in Writing Without Teachers, summed up why students feel that what they say to a teacher

really doesn't matter. The teacher, he said:

> . . .isn't really listening to you. He usually isn't in a position where he can be genuinely affected by your words. He doesn't expect your words actually to make a dent on him. He doesn't treat your words like real reading. He has to read them as an exercise. He can't hold himself ready to be affected unless he has an extremely rare, powerful openness. (127)

In 1989, Margot Soven found, in a study to determine how college students perceived writing assignments, that teachers can function as audiences for student writing if the writing is not considered a test of the students' abilities. The teacher's attitude, however, determines the success of such writing. The teacher must "<favor> process over product" and be "interested in the assignment as a learning device" (14). Back in 1979, Walker Gibson advocated that a writing teacher should pretend to be a "dumb reader" so that students will not learn to assume that their readers are always above them intellectually (192-95).

But no writing teacher can remain open, interested, or bemused with each of the possible 1,200 drafts that demand a reading each term. Reading students' writing is frustrating, says Susan Miller. ". . .We all experience stress when we read student writing because we hold to conflicting (but unarticulated) values that make us construct AND deconstruct this text" ("The Student's Reader" 26). In order to deal with the stress of this task, Miller advocates that composition teachers "acknowledge the artificiality of class writing and own up to themselves as 'readers' playing multiple roles, one of which is always the teacher for whom students write" (26).

But it is exactly the artificiality of the teacher-

as-reader that has prompted teachers and researchers to ask: how can the relationship between the real writer and the real reader be duplicated in the writing classroom? This question has led to much research at all grade levels in an attempt to find the "perfect" audience for students' writing.

Some researchers advocate having students write for a general audience. After a study of the composing processes of skilled community-college writers, Robert Roth concluded:

> Writing for a more general audience, because it encourages writers to search for varied perspectives, may lead them <students> to explore their material more deeply, while writing for a narrower audience may stifle any tendency to achieve new insights or to find more complex integrations of the material at hand. . . . Frequently, therefore, we want students to address a public audience that in fact cannot be more narrowly defined. ("Evolving" 27)

David Foster says this concept is what "classical rhetoricians," concerned with "oral rhetoric," have always called the "universal audience" (3-5). Yet Roth's study indicates (echoing previous studies concerning cognitive development) that only mature writers can conceive of and address a broad, general audience ("Evolving" 26). And writing teachers have long known that admonitions in English textbooks to "consider your audience" do nothing to develop audience awareness in fledgling writers. Thus, the question remains: what types of audiences will give students the practice they need juggling audience constraints so that they can mature as writers?

Peter Elbow suggests that the answer lies in self as audience. In Writing with Power, he discusses the

"paradox" (178) that an audience creates for the writer. At times, he says, the audience helps the writer decide what needs to be said, but at other times the audience confuses the picture. And, although writing is usually done to communicate with readers, sometimes the writer must speak to the inner self first in order to gain the knowledge of what must be said to others (178-79).

Linda Flower states that "Writer-Based prose. . . eliminates <the> constraint <of taking another's perspective> by temporarily dropping the reader out of the writer's deliberations" ("Writer-Based" 36). This prose is "the writer's homework" (37). Reader-based prose, then, becomes "an extension of our communication with ourselves transformed in certain predictable ways to meet the needs of the reader" (37). Robert Roth says that ". . .we can encourage. . .flexible audience representations largely by helping students discover how writing to validate their ideas in others' eyes helps them to clarify their ideas to themselves--and vice versa" ("Addressing" 8-9). Peter Elbow calls writing for oneself writing in "the desert island mode" ("Closing" 16). To be able to write for oneself, the writer must "turn off the babble of OUTSIDE voices. . .and listen better to quiet INNER voices" (16). In return the writer gets a reader who is trusting, "supportive. . .nurturing" (16) and becomes better able to concentrate on expressing ideas about the subject (4).

Donald M. Murray echoes Isaac B. Singer when he says that teachers should help students to develop their "other self" as their "first reader" ("Teaching" 140). The writer's other self, he says, works as a "monitor" that assists the writer in making rherotical decisions (145). One participant in Roth's study of college writers explained that

writing for herself was more like "'telling myself things I need to remember' rather than keeping a particular audience in mind" (qtd. in "Evolving" 26).

Other researchers denounce this approach to teaching audience awareness. In 1975 Kenneth Jurkiewicz asserted:

> . . .To insist on this kind of rhetorical self-reliance as an exclusive substitute for audience-identification merely for the sake of intellectual morale-building is to invite the raw recruit to march confidently into the dangerous no-man's land of rhetorical solipsism. (175)

Kenneth A. Bruffee explains the difference of opinion over teaching audience awareness as a difference "between <the> cognitive and social constructionist work in composition" ("Social" 784). The cognitive-oriented researcher who believes that "self" is the primary audience for the writer bases this opinion on "the assumption that writing is primarily an individual act" and that writers "use language primarily to express ideas generated in the mind and to communicate them to other individual human minds in the 'social context'" (784). The social constructionist researcher believes that "composition is based on the assumption that writing is primarily a social act" and that writers "use language primarily to join communities <they> do not yet belong to and to cement <their> membership in communities <they> already belong to" (784).

Disagreement also exists, however, among social constructionists who believe that composition students must learn to write with an audience in mind. As stated earlier, this conflict centers on the kind of social community (the academic community or the business community) that best duplicates a genuine writer-reader relationship. Underlying this controversy is the question

of whether or not composition's purpose is to prepare students for academic writing or for occupational writing (Redd-Boyd and Slater 77; Wootten 168). The two types of discourse are, after all, quite different. Theresa M. Redd-Boyd and Wayne H. Slater reported in 1989 that "most secondary and college students" are still writing academic discourse, which "addresses" what these researchers call "OVERHEARERS. . .who are not personally involved with the topic. In contrast," they say, "most on-the-job writing addresses RHETORICAL AUDIENCES," readers who care about the subject and "who might be willing and able to bring about change" (77-78). Those who recognize the falsity of the teacher-as-audience yet feel it is important to promote academic discourse have turned to the "peer audience" within the classroom. And those who feel it is important to prepare students for writing beyond the academic setting have chosen to target audiences outside the classroom.

Janet Emig reported in 1971 that "the most significant others in the private, and often the school-sponsored, writing of twelfth graders are peers" ("Composing" 100). Douglas Park says that ". . .the culture of the classroom can be a pervasive influence on a student's ability to understand an audience" ("Analyzing" 488). And Kenneth A. Bruffee shows "that students can learn through social interaction to internalize and then re-externalize the kind of 'conversation' that defines 'a community of knowledgable peers'" (qtd. in Park, "Analyzing" 488). A study of the effects of audience on the quality of writing of college students, conducted by Edgar Morrison Richardson in 1980, confirmed Crowhurst and Piche's earlier study which concluded that "students write with less syntactical complexity. . .when writing for a close friend (less distant audience) than when writing for a teacher. . ."

(32). These results suggest that students are more relaxed when writing for peers.

Carol Berkenkotter sums up the advantages that researchers have attributed to using the peer audience:

> They <the students> will experience writing and revising for less threatening audiences than the teacher, and they will learn to discriminate between useful and non-useful feedback and to use their awareness of anticipated audience response as they revise. A peer audience then, can help writers learn to negotiate a way between their readers' suggestions and their own imperatives. ("Student" 312)

Donald M. Murray echoes these thoughts when he advises in the second edition of A Writer Teaches Writing: "It is important that writing students read drafts--of others as well as their own--in process" (187). Reading other students' drafts, he says, helps student writers to be aware of clear meaning in their own writing and "begins to diminish the authority of the teacher" (189).

Perhaps the most forceful advocate of peer audience is R. J. Willey of Barry University. He wrote in a recent article for Freshman English News: "I. . .often follow Moffett's advice that <peers offer the most> 'natural audience'" for students' writing ("Audience Awareness" 23). In his own writing classes, he has his students "write their essays for each other--for each other, that is, as representatives of a larger, educated, rhetorically involved community of readers" (23). He believes that peer review can help students acquire "social perspective. . .by giving them every opportunity to write to and for each other and allowing

them the time and atmosphere in which to come to know one another and themselves as readers of expository prose" (24). Duane Roen repeated this idea in a recent paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication. Roen said that writing within the many discourse communities represented by the classroom "may help writers to witness how readers adjust to their texts and the ease or difficulty with which readers make such adjustments. . . . In such a setting, writing and reading become mutually reinforcing, and writers and readers become mutually supportive" ("Synthesizing" 14).

However, several researchers and theorists, even those who suggest using peers as audiences for students' writing, warn that this approach should be used with caution. In a study of ten college writers, Carol Berkenkotter found that "students who write for peer readers as well as their teacher might not necessarily reap the advantages we'd like to imagine" ("Student" 318). She concluded her study with this admonition:

> It is true that peers can offer the writer additional perspectives, support, and, generally, less threatening feedback than a teacher-evaluator. But it is a much more difficult matter to generalize about how writers respond to readers. (318)

In another study of college writers in 1982, Judith Ann Wootten concluded that "this sort of audience <peer audience>. . .tends to become another kind of class exercise as far as the students are concerned; it is one of the activities to be endured in order to pass the course. Thus the in-class peer audience is reduced in value in terms of providing an actual audience" (165). Douglas Park, who has at times praised peer response,

wrote the following warning in his most recognized article, "The Meanings of 'Audience'":

> This practice <publication within the classroom> has obvious powerful effects on how students see the act of writing, but it can be said to provide an audience only in the commonly used sense of external listeners or readers. Students' reading of one another's writing does not provide that crucial ingredient, people rhetorically involved. The student writing for members of the class still has the problem of finding or inventing appropriate rhetorical contexts. In fact, useful as this strategy is, it may also create problems. . . . <Students'> awareness of specific critical readers not sympathetic to the rhetorical situation they wish to create--readers who will not readily become their audience--can be inhibiting and complicates rather than simplifies the problem of dealing with audience. (255)

In 1979 Lisa Ede concluded that the concept of students-as-audience and the "peer-group response" that was popular during the 1970's proved:

> ineffective, largely because the rhetorical situation remains too vague. . . . In most instances, where the teacher retains control over both the topic to be considered and the final evaluation of the essay, the directive <to consider peers as audience> ultimately functions more as an indicator of appropriate levels of diction than as an invitation to reader-based prose. ("On Audience" 293)

Those who see limitations in the use of peer audience usually advocate that students write for "real" audiences.

Here, the term "real" may need some clarification. As stated earlier, Theresa M. Redd-Boyd and Wayne H. Slater define real readers as those who are involved in the writer's subject and "who might be willing and able to bring about change" (77-78). Charlotte Thralls, Nancy R. Blyler, and Helen R. Ewald, all of Iowa State University, attempted to define the term in 1987:

> The real reader is a concrete reality. He or she exists a prioi to the writer's task and consequently determines the writer's purpose, persona, and so forth. A writer who perceives an audience as real tends to conceive of readers, either singly or collectively, as living persons with specific attitudes and demographic characteristics. Thus, the writer's task is to accommodate the real reader by analyzing this reader's needs and deferring to them. (47)

Therefore, a "real" audience can be defined as a reader (or readers) who is outside the classroom, who is interested in the topic, yet who has no obligation to read the students' writing.

Researchers began to consider the use of real audiences for the writing classroom when it became apparent that limiting audience awareness to the classroom was not enough. Carol Berkenkotter wrote:

> Unlike real world writing situations, which confront the writer with a variety of rhetorical situations and audiences with differing needs, school writing demands that the student write for a single authority, the teacher. To this authority, the student must demonstrate HER authority on a given subject. Small wonder that re-

> searchers have found students to be topic bound. School writing stifles the development of audience representation because it precludes its necessity. ("Understanding" 396)

Barry Kroll has also expressed concern that teaching self-expression or relying on traditional academic writing (which is often a form of testing) in the classroom will not teach students to take the reader's perspective. In his article, "Developing a Sense of Audience," he wrote:

> Unfortunately, many school writing programs give only slight attention to the child's emerging sense of audience, perhaps trusting that development of this sense will be spontaneous. Some of these children will manage to acquire audience sensitivity on their own. But many others, crippled as writers, will hobble their way through secondary school and even into college. (829)

Many educators have shared Kroll's concern. Elaine P. Maimon, Professor at Beaver College in Pennsylvania, wrote in 1979, "Somehow student writers must discover the requirements of those absent strangers who will read their messages" (366). Lucille R. Guckes, Associate Professor of Education at the University of Nevada at Reno, wrote:

> A major stimulus for students' writing is the opportunity to share their ideas with others. Every student must continuously have some of his work being used for communication in some manner. . . .Students' communication to others of their perceptions is the only reason for them going through all the steps following the initial <writing> experience. (110)

Much of the concern about audience awareness in the classroom centers on the fact that writing which is con-

fined to the classroom limits experience with different rhetorical situations. Martin Nystrand says that there has been too much attention to academic writing. He states:

> Indeed, writing in the absence of a rhetorical context is not really discourse; it is the bloodless, academic exercise of essay-making, dummy runs and pedagogical artifacts such as the five-paragraph theme--in short, a degeneration of rhetoric. (5)

Chris M. Anson, in a study of freshmen writers at Indiana University, concluded the same:

> . . .We must give students the opportunity to write for a variety of discourse purposes to a variety of audiences; limiting them to artificial practice essays. . .only stagnates students in a performance-based context without the chance to explore the purposes at the heart of all writing events. (24)

Arthur Walzer also believes that rhetorical situation depends on purpose. In "The Meanings of 'Purpose,'" he wrote:

> . . ."Purpose" is a more complex and relative concept than we typically acknowledge when we exhort students to "have a clear sense of purpose." It would make more sense. . .to think of "purpose" in writing not as a single and stable meaning but as a relative term with meanings that vary with particular kinds of rhetorical situations. . . .With regard to our teaching of writing, we should not pretend that "purpose" is a generic, but always see it as relative to the particular social situ-

> ation that the writing course imagines itself serving. (8)

Donald C. Stewart, of the University of Illinois, spells out the advantages of having college students write for at least one paper for publication outside the classroom. First, if the piece goes to a professional publication, the editor will judge it "for its professional worth" (36). The prospect of publication under such circumstances is a powerful motivation (36). Second, an outside audience provides a new challenge, for actual publication means that many people, not just the teacher, will read the paper (37). And third, students try harder for such a challenging audience (37).

Other researchers add that without a real audience, many audience analysis exercises are useless. Douglas Park states:

> . . .At its most basic the issue of audience in writing instruction is one of social development and maturation--of student writers learning to see themselves as social beings in a social situation. Only in such a context can the art of rhetoric and of audience analysis have any real meaning or force in our teaching of writing . . . . In fact the only way to have an audience analyzable in the detail we usually envision when we speak of audience analysis is to have a situation for writing that includes a concrete setting for publication. ("Analyzing" 487)

To this Paul G. Bator adds, "Writing addressed to real audiences, is one way of directing students to apprehend the need for making inferences about their writing audience" (114).

What kinds of audiences offer writing opportunities

outside the classroom? Jane Blystone suggests local newspapers, contests, and collaborations with students in other school districts (14). Walter C. Prentice adds that "distant friends, community officials, <and> media personalities" (79) provide possible readers. Sandra Neuhauser suggests using letters to companies (1-4). And some teachers suggest that audience awareness is enhanced even more when students write for the same purpose but to different audiences (Schwartz 63; Wildeman 6; Gaunder 10).

A few words must be said about the notion of using students in other classes or students in other schools as audiences. This practice is growing in popularity because it seems to offer the ideal situation for writing. Students write for peers, yet they do not see their audience and, therefore, must rely solely on their words for communication. Many teachers who write about their experiences with distant peer audiences call this audience "real" because the students' writing goes outside the classroom; and, indeed, most studies involving distant peer audiences, which are usually comprised of a younger group and an older group exchanging letters, report positive results. However, because these peers are also students and therefore required to read the writings and because they may not have the same concerns as those sending the letters, the distant peer audience does not have the characteristics of a real audience as defined on page 42 of this text. It should be seen, rather, as a step between the peer-group response and a real audience.

Many teachers may shy away from requiring students to write for real audiences because of the problems real audiences pose. For teachers, the process is time consuming. For students, says Eleanor Parks Gaunder, the

prospect causes fear and an apprehension that the student might not have an accurate image of the audience (9). In addition, as Judith Ann Wootten wrote in 1982, ". . .There is no objective data to support the claims that writing for publication improves student writing" (168). Furthermore, writing for outside audiences could ". . .turn students into commercial writers, and. . .de-emphasize academic discourse" (168). Wootten countered these claims by adding:

> However, these methods <actual writing situations> attempt to teach students something about writing as it most often occurs in the wider world, and they also provide students with a foundation for writing all varieties of discourse, including academic discourse. (168-69)

Concerning the latter charge, Lisa Ede said:

> . . .The strategy of having students address a particular audience every time they write does not deprive them of practice in writing to the two most popular audiences, their teacher and a general audience. In fact, it may better prepare them to perform successfully in these situations. (qtd. in Wootten 169)

Much like Susan Miller, R. J. Willey proposes that teachers just face up to being their students' audience and use the only tool available to them that has been proven to enhance audience awareness--peer review. In an article he co-authored with Duane H. Roen and Michael A. Rogers in 1986, he asserted, ". . .We know that no matter whom we try to get our students to write for, our power to assign grades to their writing makes us the only audience that really matters to them" (8). Others have voiced this what's-the-use attitude, to which Hugh Rank,

of Sacred Heart University, once retorted:

> . . .This answer is unsatisfactory; certainly it could reduce a year's effort in writing to nothing but an irrelevant classroom ritual, unconnected to the real world of the student's personal motives or to the realities of our bomb-and-ghetto milieu. (405)

Willey is the professor and researcher who voiced his confusion over the enormous amount of research that has been done on audience in writing. In his recent article, "Audience Awareness: Methods and Madness," he states, "Our students, it seems, often find our talk about audience just so much abstract madness" (21). Willey is obviously cognitively oriented and favors academic discourse, for he quotes Les Perelman as saying, "The institutional context predominates over any real sense of authentic purpose and actual audience" (21). Willey concludes:

> What our students need. . .is experience as writers of and as an audience for. . .institutional prose, and having them explore the demographics of so-called "real" audiences in so-called "real" writing assignments isn't helping them much. (21)

Here, Willey echoes the sentiments of Douglas Park, who asserted that student writers have a more difficult job of analyzing their audiences and making rhetorical decisions because they "must somehow imagine or invent an audience in a situation where no audience naturally exists" ("Analyzing" 479).

Perhaps the key to understanding these authors' concepts of students' difficulties with audience lies in the phrases, "so-called 'real' audiences," and "Imagine or invent," and in the clause, "where no audience naturally

exists." The audience they speak of is an "invoked" one (Ede and Lunsford 174), not an "addressed" one (170). As stated earlier, this kind of audience is created in the mind of the writer. Charlotte Thralls, Nancy R. Blyler, and Helen R. Ewald explain the difference between real readers (actual people) and implied readers:

> The implied reader. . .is not a living person external to the text but exists as an abstraction to be shaped within the text. This implied reader is a mental construct or role which the actual reader is invited to enter, even though the characteristics embodied in that role may not fit perfectly his or her attitudes and reactions. In sum, when the reader is implied, the writer invents and determines the audience within the text. (47)

The difference between real and implied readers (addressed and invoked), say Ede and Lunsford, is that writers must adapt their texts for real or addressed readers (170). When no real readers exist, however, writers provide "cues" that ask (invoke) readers to play roles (174). These researchers warn that Walter Ong's view that all readers are fictionalized is too narrow because, for some writing, actual readers do exist and do place limitations on the writer (179). They further assert that for too long we have ignored the fact that "speaking and writing are. . .both rhetorical acts" (176), and for too long we have blindly accepted Ong's restricted notion of audience (175).

Teachers have, indeed, taken the advice of researchers such as Carol Berkenkotter, Peter Elbow and Douglas Park, who have advocated that writing assignments be planned with the hypothetical or "'intended' readers" in mind (Berkenkotter, "Understanding" 397).

Douglas Park, who has advocated both audience analysis and publication of student writing, also suggests that "the most obvious way to define a situation for writing is to pose hypothetical cases" ("Analyzing" 487). Most audience analysis seems to revolve around the "rhetorical case method" (Berkenkotter, "Understanding" 396). Unfortunately, most teachers who use hypothetical cases alone assume that their students are getting good practice writing in "real" situations.

Certainly, we want students to be able to write well enough to invite readers to enter their texts, but first they must possess the skills needed to create the "cues" that Ede and Lunsford spoke of. They must know enough about audiences in general to be able to fashion roles that a number of varied readers can fit into. Therefore, they must have some experience addressing a variety of real audiences.

When teachers ask students to invent and then analyze "fictional" audiences, yet see no difference in the students' writing than when the students write traditional academic papers, it is easy to imagine how these teachers can conclude, as R. J. Willey does, that the only audience students recognize is the teacher. After all, if teachers are students' only available real audience, all their writing will naturally contain cues that invite teachers, and no one else, to enter their texts. After a study at a Pennsylvania university in 1987 which examined the persuasive writing of college students, Elizabeth Odoroff stated:

> Some teachers who have attempted to overcome the limitations <of students' perceptions> have tried "pretend as if" writing assignments to attempt to become something other than evaluators. . . . However, in their attempts they have come to

> realize that students still perceive them as evaluators no matter whom they pretend to be or who they ask students to imagine they are. If teachers evaluate student writing, students perceive teachers to be the primary audience even if teachers ask students to write to other audiences. (82)

Odoroff did conclude that it is possible for teachers to be perceived as "something more and different" than evaluators (82). However, as Doris M. Quick, in a study of the persuasive writing of writers at different levels, points out:

> . . .Under proper conditions, hypothetical audiences allow writers to tap into a richer store house of knowledge than does writing to non-audiences as one does in academic writing. However. . ., it is then only fair to respond as though one were that hypothetical principal or shopkeeper or whatever. No fair grading the paper as old Miss Jones with red pencil in hand. (88)

Such a game would, of course, become tiring, both for the teacher and the students. Therefore, it is important that some assignments "provide actual audiences. . . <which will> remove the student. . .from a hypothetical writing situation where an audience that can be analyzed exists, and most importantly, where actual readers can complete the communication triangle" (Wootten 172). Lisa Ede stresses "a more audience-centered approach to writing" ("On Audience" 291) and advocates that students be able "to create their own context, their own rhetorical situation" (294) and have "a realistic means of publication" (295).

In a fairly recent study, Theresa M. Redd-Boyd and Wayne H. Slater examined the effects of three types of audiences (unspecified, imaginary, and real) on the persuasive writing of college students at a large university. They found that an assigned audience, especially a real audience, increased students' motivation (95), "elicited more audience-based strategies" (96), and "helped <them> write more persuasive essays" (96). Their findings were these: specified audience had more of an effect on the students than on the students' writing; the imaginary audience had little effect; those who had no real audience tended to see the teacher as the audience; and across all groups, those students who said they thought about their audience had more convincing arguments (97). Redd-Boyd and Slater concluded that the type of audience assigned and the writer's awareness of this audience are important, but how the writer feels about the reader and the topic are more important (99).

Conclusions

There is no one perfect method for teaching audience awareness. What has been established through research is that experienced writers are cognitively aware of their readers; therefore, teaching or stressing audience in the writing classroom is extremely important if students are to mature as writers.

We can teach audience awareness partly by offering challenging writing experiences--assignments that compel students to tackle many rhetorical problems. By far the most challenging type of writing is argumentative or persuasive writing. Researchers believe that argumentative writing enhances audience awareness as it sharpens critical-thinking skills. Wayne Booth, the most passion-

ate spokesperson for the merits of argument in writing, sums up how, through problem solving, it creates the balance inherent in mature writers:

> The common ingredient that I find in all of the writing I admire--excluding novels, plays and poems--is something that I shall reluctantly call the rhetorical stance, a stance which depends on discovering and maintaining in any writing situation a proper balance among the three elements that are at work in any communicative effort; the available arguments about the subject itself, the interests and peculiarities of the audience, and the voice, the implied character, of the speaker. (153)

Another proven method for enhancing audience awareness is audience analysis; the most popular form of audience analysis uses one of a number of available heuristic models, sets of questions concerning the intended audience. This method has received much criticism because it is believed to produce stereotyping. But heuristic models are only one way of concentrating attention on the audience at varying stages of the writing process. The point that most researchers make is that the different methods available for helping students to set goals, including goals for audience, should be examined and put to use when and where they will do the most good. Audience analysis is like any other teaching tool--careful planning and variety lead to interest and, thus, to learning. Peter Elbow reminds us that as we teach goal-setting, using any method that will lead to audience awareness, we must do so in light of three elements: "The nature of the audience. . .the temperament of the writer. . .<and> the nature of the writing task" ("Closing" 17). Once again we are reminded that

writing is a balancing act, and so is the teaching of writing. Ultimately, says Russell C. Long, the goal of any pre-writing that deals with audience should be that one day students will ask not, "who is my audience?" but rather, "who do I WANT my audience to be?" ("Writer-Audience" 225).

Finally, we can teach audience awareness by assigning audiences or leading students to choose an audience each time they write. Here, again, there seems to be no one perfect type of audience. But two things have been established: (1) if students are not given an impetus to think of a particular audience as they write, they will automatically write for the teacher; and (2) researchers agree that a variety of audiences, as well as a variety of rhetorical situations, is best for increasing a mature sense of audience. In a study of college freshmen and audience awareness, conducted in 1979, Harold E. Nugent concluded:

> . . .Beginning college writers need to be exposed to a variety of audiences, ranging from self to wider, unknown audiences. . . . Freshman composition students have a strong, conditioned inclination to stay with the familiar audience, the teacher. . . . <Therefore>, the need exists for structured opportunities for students to write to a variety of audiences for a variety of purposes. . . . Because the students are individuals, possessing different backgrounds capable of relating effectively to one audience and less effectively to another, the teacher has a number of responsibilities in helping the beginning college writer. (297, 299, 300-301)

Rachel Spilka, of the University of Maine, concludes that the teaching of audience awareness must be accomplished

by way of a balance of theories and pedagogies:

> If we teach single theories, we might fail to introduce students to the complexities of rhetoric. . . . Our students might not recognize until they enter their professions that all communication tasks lie along continuums, between objectivity and subjectivity, or between fictionality and "reality." If we focus our teaching on single theories, we risk blocking off valuable avenues of inquiry for our students, or not encouraging students to pursue them. . . . We can try to include in our courses not just one method of teaching audience awareness, but a variety of methods. (147-48, 152)

All of the methods discussed here have flaws because, while one method may work for one student or one class, it may not produce the same results for another student or class. Some methods are better than others, however, in particular circumstances and with particular pedagogical needs. It is our job as teachers to know what methods work best to increase audience awareness and when to use them.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

During this study, I collected two sets of quantitative data. I used a pre- and a post-test (writing samples), which were rated according to a scale of my own design and which I analyzed with analyses of variance to determine the effects of audience on the voice and persuasive strategies of freshmen writing. I also used qualitative research, consisting of questionnaires completed by the students at intervals before, during, and after treatment, and of my own journal notes (records of each day's activities and events relative to the study), in order to determine the effects of audience on the motivation and writing processes of college freshmen writers.

Purpose

My study focused on the effects of audience specification. The primary purpose of the study was to assess the effects of audience on the voice and persuasive processes of college freshmen writers. To this end, I posed a basic hypothesis and an alternative:

> Hypothesis: There are no significant differences among the three treatments.
>
> Alternative Hypothesis: There are significant differences between two or more of the three treatments.

The secondary purpose of the study was to record the changes in students' concepts of their voice and powers of persuasion and to record the effects of audience on

students' motivation to write well (in order to communicate with others) and to perform well in the writing classroom.

Method

In order to add to previous research which attempted to determine which audiences are best for the writing classroom, my study combined quantitative and qualitative techniques. The quantitative procedures measured the effects of the different treatments (different audiences) on writing performance, while the qualitative procedures revealed how the students perceived different audiences (how they perceived their abilities to communicate with different audiences) by examining their attitudes toward assignments. Thus, the study included both product and process measures.

Participants

A total of 64 freshmen (27 male, 37 female) from East Tennessee State University (enrollment: 11,711) participated in all phases of the study. The students were enrolled in three sections of the beginning freshman composition course, which is required of all students on the campus. Eighty three students were originally enrolled in the three sections, but thirteen students withdrew during the term for varying reasons, two failed the course because of excessive absenteeism and nonparticipation, two declined to participate in the study (did not sign consent forms), and two were disqualified from the quantitative part of the study because they wrote about the pre- and post-test topic to fulfill one of their class assignments (even though they were asked not to do so). Of the 64 freshmen who did participate fully, 89 percent were between

the ages of 18 and 25, while the remaining 11 percent were between the ages of 25 and 40. All were Americans; 9 percent were Afro-American or Hispanic. Since no student's name was to be used in the study, each student who participated chose a code name with which to be identified for the study (see Table 1, p. 59).

Since this study was designed to conform to the English curriculum at East Tennessee State University, the students wrote all the assignments for a grade (pre- and post-test excluded).

Two English instructors (adjunct faculty members at East Tennessee State University) participated with me in the study. I taught all three sections of the freshman composition course, and I collected all the data for the study. I secured and trained two female adjunct faculty members, who had taught the beginning freshman composition course in the past, to rate the pretest and the post-test for voice and persuasive strategies. They had no contact with the students other than reading and evaluating the writing samples; code names were used on the post-test papers to minimize the chance that one of the raters might remember a name in conjunction with the student's handwriting.

Design

The quantitative experiment employed a pretest-post-test design with one independent variable and eight dependent variables. The independent variable was assigned audience with three treatment levels (class, real, and imaginary). The dependent variables were (1) teaching methods, (2) assignments, (3) students' choice of topics, (4) inquiry, (5) persuasion, (6) audience adaptation and analysis, (7) evaluative feedback, and (8) collaboration. No specific audience was named for the pretest. For the post-test, students were told to write for the audience,

TABLE 1: STUDENT CODE NAMES

Group 1 Class Audience	Group 2 Real Audience	Group 3 Imaginary Audience
Alphree	Akbar	Ace
Bambi	AL	Al Cabone
Bob Smiley	Alpha	Alex
Boxcar Bill	Barry	Blondie
Cleopatra	The Boss	Brooks
Daffy Duck	Chris	Bubba
Foxfire	Cole	C.C.
Huey	Coley	Cacalaca
Lady	Emily	Cissy
Leo	Ice Cream Man	Corda
Madonna	JJ	Dean
Magic	Logan	Elvis
Manson	Marie	Hang-Man
McDonald	Marilyn Monroe	James Bond
Mouse	Melanie	Mr. Mojo
Princess Leia	Michael Jordan	Pineapple
Roger Rabbit	O'hara	Rated R
Space Cadet	Penn	Reducer
Spanky	Rose	Sprite
Vincent Sofine	Taco Bell	Taterbug
Witness	Tommy	Texas
	Trisha	

or one of the audiences, used during the semester for assignments.

Randomness of assignment to sections was automatic since freshmen at East Tennessee State University have little choice of the section of freshman composition they will enter (advisors usually choose the sections) and since composition instructors are not named in class schedules (sections are listed as taught by "staff").

The qualitative data consisted of three questionnaires, administered before, during, and after the treatments, and two short responses, one written after the second assignment and one written before the last assignment. In addition, I kept a journal of each day's activities, events, and comments.

Procedures

After all the students reviewed the general syllabus for the course and read and signed consent forms in order to participate in the study (a state regulation--see Figure 1, p. 61-62), they were ready to write the pretest essay, which I called a diagnostic essay to the students simply because the word "test" startles students. The topic for the pretest was: should high-school students be given condoms in an effort to slow the spread of AIDS? To prepare for the essay, all the students read an article by Dr. Robert C. Noble, "There Is No Safe Sex," which appeared in the April 1, 1991, issue of Newsweek. I chose this topic because I knew it was of interest to teenagers and because, at the time, it was not so publicized a topic as to prompt students to write on it for a class assignment. In fact, I admonished students with each subsequent class assignment that they were not to write on this topic. All students

Read Carefully Before Signing

This class will be part of a doctoral study. At the beginning and end of the semester, you will be asked to write an essay that will be assessed for the purpose of calculating changes in your writing. Also, at three points during the semester, you will be asked to respond in writing to a questionnaire containing questions about writing.

This study will not affect the manner in which the class is taught. It will not affect your grade in the class. None of the essays that you write for a grade will be used in the study, and your name will not appear in the study. However, you have the right to decline to be part of the study and to seek another composition class. There will be no penalty for refusal to participate or for withdrawal.

Two unbiased instructors, Sherry A. Hart and Carol L. Hitchcock, will rate the essays and, therefore, will have access to your names and writing. They will maintain your confidentiality by keeping the papers either in their locked office or at their homes. Afterward, the papers will be kept at the instructor's home in a locked file cabinet.

The study has been approved by the chairman of the English Department. However, if you want more

Figure 1. Consent Form

information about the study before you sign, contact the instructor, Delilah F. Conley.

If you have no objections to being part of the study, please sign below in order that the study may comply with Federal regulations governing educational research:

Name:_____**date:**_____

Figure 1. (continued).

received the same instructions for the pretest (see Figure 2, p. 64), and all students had 55 minutes to write the response. The pretest did not affect the students' grades for the course, and the papers were not returned to the students.

The raters looked for two basic elements in the students' essays, voice and persuasive strategies, and nothing more. Voice was broken down into three components: tone, language, and point of view. Basic persuasive strategies were considered to be facts, quotes, examples, predictions, and answers to opposition. These elements were rated on a scale totaling 40 points (see Figure 3, p. 65).

To train the instructors to rate the essays, I gave them samples of writing containing appropriate and inappropriate tone and language and consistent and inconsistent point of view. I also gave them samples of writing containing logical examples of persuasive strategies and illogical examples of persuasive strategies. For explanations of these stragegies, I used Evergreen: A Guide to Writing, third edition, written by Susan Fawcett and Alvin Sandberg and published by the Houghton Mifflin Company in 1988 (133-34). For samples of writing, I used The Norton Sampler: Short Essays for Composition, edited by Thomas Cooley and published by W. W. Norton and Company in 1979, Telling Writing, by Ken Macrorie (1970), student writing samples I have collected over the years, and letters to editors of various newspapers.

After the raters had studied the samples and the scale, the three of us met to discuss each point on the scale and to rate several practice essays, for which I used published essays from the before-mentioned sources.

At the next class meeting following the pretest,

INSTRUCTIONS:

After carefully reading the attached, opinionated essay by Robert Noble, plan and compose a formal response that includes:

1. A clear statement of the problem as you see it;
2. Your own opinion about what must be done to help stop the spread of AIDS among teenagers;
3. Clear reasons for your opinion;
4. and a convincing argument.

Feel free to use information from the article, along with your own knowledge, to promote your argument.

*Please do not write on this sheet. Use regular notebook paper to write your composition. Put your name at the top of the paper, but please DO NOT put the name of class or the period. When you are finished, fold your paper lengthwise. Turn in both your composition and the instructions.

Figure 2. Pretest Instructions

Student's Name_____

VOICE:

_____ Score 1 to 5 points if the tone of the paper is consistent with the student's statements about the subject and the chosen point of view.

_____ Add 1 to 5 points if the point of view is consistent.

_____ Add 1 to 5 points if the language contributes to the argument and fits the point of view chosen and the apparent feelings of the student.

_____ Add 1 to 5 points if the voice, overall, is strong and consistent. Add points here only if all three above are strong 4's or 5's.

PERSUASION:

_____ Add 1 to 5 points if the student has used one or more persuasive techniques.

_____ Add 1 to 5 points if the arguments given are logical and ethical.

_____ Add 1 to 5 points if the argument is fully developed with adequate details.

_____ Add 1 to 5 points if the argument, overall, is strong and potentially convincing. Add points here only if all three above are strong 4's or 5's.

GRADER COMMENTS:

Figure 3. 40-Point Evaluation Scale

all the students responded in writing to the first questionnaire (see Figure 4, p. 67), which revealed the students' concepts of audience and their past experience writing for an audience.

During the following weeks, all three classes worked on writing assignment number one, which was a persuasive letter (see Figure 5, pp. 68-70). I chose a letter as the first graded assignment in hopes that such direct writing would put the students at ease somewhat. Duane H. Roen states that "for many of our students. . .personal letter writing is an appropriate beginning place" ("Writing Assignments" 33). I designed all four writing assignments according to certain composing principles I hold to in all my teaching of composition.

I will pause here to explain these principles because I believe that, if audience is to make a difference in students' writing, these principles must be at work, to some degree, when students write academically.

My ideal goals for student writing are self-expression (voice) and effective communication (audience). The ability to use language effectively comes through balancing all the important aspects of writing--purpose, audience, voice--simultaneously. And I believe the key to this balance in the writing classroom lies in the writing assignments we give. James Reither says that "writing is clearly a more multi-dimensioned process than current theory and practice would have us believe" (143). Therefore, the assignments we give should be multi-dimensioned (multi-purposed) also.

First, in order to be multi-purposed, assignments must be flexible. We should certainly give students direction, but if their writing is to have personal voice, they should write about subjects that are important to them. Mike Rose says that in order to challenge students,

First Set of Questions:

1. Describe how you see your role (job) as a writer when you write something that someone else will read.
2. Relate some of the experiences you have had writing anything that someone other than a teacher would read (either out of school or in school).
3. Tell about some examples of writings you have written for others that you enjoyed writing. Explain why you enjoyed writing them.
4. Describe a particular piece of writing you wrote that you hoped would persuade someone to do something. Tell how you felt about this writing as compared to other things you've written.
5. Explain what you think the term, "writer's audience," means.

*Please do not write on this sheet. Use regular notebook paper and number each response.

Figure 4. First Questionnaire

Instructions for Class-Audience Group:

Write a persuasive letter addressed to our class or a group within our class concerning a controversial issue you would like to see resolved.

STEPS FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT:

1. Analyze your audience and decide your purpose. What do you want these students to do or think?
2. Get the facts about your topic. This is the purpose of the periodical articles we are gathering. You will turn in any article you have used with the rough draft; this directive may mean that you will turn in an article twice, once as an assignment and again as a means of checking your information. However, you will not be limited to the information in the assignment articles.
3. Participate in the required prewriting exercises and workshops in class.
4. Write an adequate, well-developed draft which shows comprehension of the subject, research, and a well-thought-out purpose.
5. Turn the draft in on time.
6. After a workshop and/or conference, redraft the letter.
7. Turn the final draft in on time.

Figure 5. Assignment 1

Instructions for Real-Audience Group:

Write a persuasive letter to an authority, such as a governor, a congressperson, or a member of the United States Supreme Court, concerning a controversial issue you would like to see resolved.

STEPS FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT:

1. Target and analyze your audience.
2. Get the facts about your topic. This is the purpose of the periodical articles we are gathering. You will turn in any article you have used with the rough draft.
   However, you will not be limited to the information in the assignment articles.
3. Participate in the required prewriting exercises and workshops in class.
4. Write an adequate, well-developed draft which shows comprehension of the subject, research, and a well-thought-out purpose.
5. After a workshop/conference, redraft letter.
6. Turn both drafts in on time.
7. After correcting mistakes on the final draft, rewrite it neatly (you may wish to type this draft) and turn it in with a separate, addressed, stamped envelope for mailing.

Figure 5. (continued).

Instructions for Imaginary-Audience Group:

Write a persuasive letter to an authority, such as a governor, a congressperson, or a member of the United States Supreme Court, concerning a controversial issue you would like to see resolved.

STEPS FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT:*

1. Target and analyze your audience.
2. Get the facts about your topic. This is the purpose of the periodical articles we are gathering. You will turn in any article you have used with the rough draft.
   However, you will not be limited to the information in the assignment articles.
3. Participate in the required prewriting exercises and workshops in class.
4. Write an adequate, well-developed draft which shows comprehension of the subject, research, and a well-thought-out purpose.
5. After a workshop/conference, redraft letter.
6. Turn both drafts in on time.

*Mailing the letter is not required

Figure 5. (continued).

we must create "a motivating and meaningful context" for their writing (332). In other words, the topic "must generate from issues and experiences that centrally involve the student" (332). Roen agrees that "writing assignments. . .need to allow students to write about topics with which they are familiar and in which they have some interest" ("Writing Assignments" 33). Winston Weathers adds that "style has something to do with freedom. . . . Style is reduced, unable to exist in totalitarian environments" (188). Studies concerning audience sometimes require participants to write on the same topic. However, for a writer's relationship to the audience to be authentic, the writer must care about the topic.

The second aspect of a multi-purposed assignment is genuine inquiry--research. Research "ground<s> <students'> writing in reading and inquiry," a step which Reither considers vital to the writing process (144). Students use "not only experience-and memory-probing activities, but also inquiry strategies and techniques that. . .enable <them> to search beyond their own limited present experience and knowledge" (144). This inquiry, at some point, ceases to be research for an assignment and becomes a search for answers.

Closely related to the first element is number three: assignments should "help students to define rhetorical problems" (Roen, "Writing Assignments" 35). Certainly we should give students practice with all writing perspectives, but persuasive writing works best to encourage personal voice, genuine inquiry, and audience awareness.

Finally, multi-purposed assignments must allow time for the writing process (Roen, "Writing Assign-

ments" 36; Pianko 17). Thoughts, research, beginnings, plans, rough drafts, feedback, and revision all take time.

All the writing assignments written by students in this study (for a grade), therefore, required the students to choose a topic or approach, research the topic (with the exception of writing assignment two, for which research depended on the thesis--see Figure 6, pp. 73-75), and persuade a particular audience. In addition, collaborative workshops were held in each class after each rough draft was written. I used collaboration with the real-audience group and the imaginary-audience group, as well as with the class-audience group, because, if the class-audience group changed their concept of audience as a result of the course, I wanted to make sure that the change came about because of the idea of audience they had in their heads and not because of feedback from peers alone. Thus, all the students got feedback from me and from their peers (a dependent variable).

Writing assignment one (see Figure 5, pp. 68-70) asked the students to write a letter concerning a controversial issue with local, national, or world importance. Group one wrote letters to the students in their class. Group two wrote letters to an authority (such as a congressperson) and sent the letters. Group three pretended to write letters to an authority but did not send the letters. In each class the students worked together in groups, and all students were required to use at least one piece of information gathered during their research.

The second writing assignment (see Figure 6, pp. 73-75) involved a specific reading assignment, "The Lottery," a short story by Shirley Jackson. All the groups were instructed to write either about the story

Instructions for Class-Audience Group:

Write a literary essay about "The Lottery" that will be read by our class.

STEPS FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT:

1. Analyze your audience and decide your purpose. What unique insight can you share with the class concerning the story--something they may not have considered?
2. Participate in the required classroom activities October 2 through October 11, 1991.
3. Write a draft that develops and proves your purpose.
4. Turn the draft in on time. The tentative date is October 14, 1991.
5. After a workshop and/or conference, redraft the essay.
6. Turn the final draft in on time. The tentative date is October 23, 1991.

Figure 6. Assignment 2

Instructions for Real-Audience Group:

Write a literary essay about "The Lottery" for publication in The Mockingbird.

STEPS FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT:

1. Analyze your audience--the students and faculty of East Tennessee State University--and decide your purpose. What unique insight can you share with others who have read the story--something they may not have considered?
2. Participate in the required classroom activities October 2 through October 11, 1991.
3. Write a draft that develops and proves your purpose.
4. Turn the draft in on time. The tentative date is October 14, 1991.
5. After a workshop and/or conference, redraft the essay.
6. Turn in the final draft on time. The tentative date is October 23, 1991.
7. Prepare two neat copies for submission to The Mockingbird. Submission date for The Mockingbird is November 1, 1991.

Figure 6. (continued).

Instructions for Imaginary-Audience Group:

Write a literary essay about "The Lottery" that could be considered material for The Mockingbird.

STEPS FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT:

1. Analyze your audience--the students and faculty of East Tennessee State University--and decide your purpose. What unique insight can you share with others who have read the story--something they may not have considered?
2. Participate in the required classroom activities October 2 through October 11, 1991.
3. Write a draft that develops and proves your purpose.
4. Turn the draft in on time. The tentative date is October 14, 1991.
5. After a workshop and/or conference, redraft the essay.
6. Turn the final draft in on time. The tentative date is October 23, 1991.

Figure 6. (continued).

or about any topic which the story inspired them to write about. The first group wrote essays for the class. The second group wrote essays for submission to The Mockingbird, East Tennessee State University's campus (student-written) literary publication. The third group pretended to write for The Mockingbird. Peer groups remained a constant variable; students met in groups to discuss their rough drafts and audiences.

When the second assignment was nearly finished, all the students wrote a brief, "gut-level" response to questions about the audiences they had written for thus far (For a list of the questions, see Figure 7, p. 77) and their reactions to the course in general. After the second assignment, all the students completed the second questionnaire (see Figure 8, p. 78), which asked them to describe the processes they used--thinking, planning, drafting, and revising--as they prepared one of the previous assignments.

At this juncture in the semester, the group work changed in all three classes. Several students in each class had expressed to me a concern over having to evaluate other students' papers within groups. They said they welcomed the ideas and feedback they got from the other students but that they did not feel comfortable giving other students advice face-to-face. Consequently, for the remainder of the semester, the group work continued, but, when students read their peers' papers, they did so anonymously, using their code names so that I alone could identify them.

I also added another exercise to the students' writing process at this juncture. For the last two writing assignments, along with prewriting, researching, and planning, all the students wrote out an

Respond Briefly to the Following:

Class Audience: In a short response, discuss how you feel about writing your papers for our class as opposed to writing straight academic essays for the teacher or targeting audiences outside our classroom. Tell how you feel about the class overall thus far.

Real Audience: In a short response, discuss how you feel about writing your papers for real outside audiences as opposed to writing straight academic essays for the teacher or the class. Tell how you feel about the class overall thus far.

Imaginary Audience: In a short response, discuss how you feel about writing your papers for fictitious outside audiences as opposed to writing straight academic essays for the teacher or the class. Tell how you feel about the class overall thus far.

Figure 7. Response Questions

Second Question:

Describe as fully as you can all of the thinking processes you went through (all the planning and re-planning stages) as you wrote either of the last two papers for this class (the letter or the literary essay). How did you get started? Explain how you decided what you needed to say. Describe the thoughts you had about your reader as you planned. What problems did you have? Tell what helped you move forward at each stage of the writing. How many times did you rewrite and for what reason? And how did you feel about this assignment when it was finished in relation to having someone else read it?

Figure 8. Second Questionnaire

analysis of their audiences, using a set of questions which I adapted from Fred Pfister and Joanne Petrick's Heuristic Model and the Tagmemic Heuristic Model (For heuristic, see Figure 9, pp. 80-81). Students in all three classes were instructed to skip any question that did not pertain to their audience or to the topic on which they were writing.

Writing assignment number three (see Figure 10, pp. 82-84) proved to be the most enjoyable for all the students because they wrote about campus issues, such as inadequate parking and budget cuts. Group one expressed their opinions and offered solutions in letters to their class, while group two sent letters to the campus newspaper, the East Tennessean, or to administrative officials; and, of course, group three pretended to target a campus audience, such as the East Tennessean. Research was required with this topic. Most students used information obtained through interviews, telephone calls, surveys, and/or the campus newspaper.

Between assignments three and four, students again wrote short responses concerning their audiences and the class work (see Figure 7, p. 77).

Writing assignment four was the toughest assignment of the semester. The students not only had to write about another local, national, or world issue (different than the topic used for assignment one), but they were also required to document information from two different sources (see Figure 11, pp. 85-87). This requirement had nothing to do with my study; rather, it was a curriculum requirement designed to introduce students to documentation and prepare them for the research paper required in the subsequent composition class. For this last assignment, group one wrote an essay for their class, while group two wrote an essay for submission to News-

ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS THOROUGHLY AND THOUGHTFULLY

1. Describe the audience.
   - A. What do my readers have in common with one another? Consider age, environment, economic status, educational experience, cultural experience, and religious and ethical values.
   - B. How is this group different from similar groups? What features make this group unique?
2. What is the group's relationship to my topic?
   - A. How much does this group know about my topic?
   - B. What is the overall opinion of this group (to the best of my knowledge) about my topic?
   - C. What information could I gather that would add to what this group already knows?
   - D. What are this group's prejudices concerning my topic?
3. What is my purpose in writing to this group?
4. Some or all of this group feel differently than I do. How can I persuade them to take another look at the situation without turning them off to my idea?
   - A. How much does this group know about me, and what are their attitudes about me as a writer?
   - B. What shared experiences and/or beliefs can I use to bridge the gap between us?

Figure 9. Audience Analysis*

C. What role do I need to play (like student, innocent bystander, professional, victim, authority on the subject, or concerned human) so that I gain their interest and trust?

D. What tone will fit my attitude about the topic and my role and will also excite in my readers the emotions I want them to have without making them angry and without deceiving them by misdirecting their emotions?

E. What devices can I use that will keep them interested (like stories, startling statistics, quotes from people they esteem, clever metaphors, and thought-provoking predictions) without straying from the topic or sounding illogical?

5. What methods of development will best fit my topic considering the information I have and the devices I have chosen to persuade this group? Choose all that are appropriate: argument, cause, classification, comparison, contrast, definition, description, effect, example, narration, process.

*Adapted from the Pfister-Petrick Heuristic Model for audience analysis (Wooten 161), the Tagmemic Heuristic for audience analysis (Bator 100), and an audience survey (Odoroff 99).

Figure 9. (continued).

Instructions for Class-Audience Group:

Write a persuasive letter to the editor (similar to one you might write for the East Tennessean) about a problem here on campus. Your readers will be our class.

STEPS FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT

1. Target and analyze your audience. Decide your purpose. What do you want this audience to do?
2. Get the facts about your topic. Use the East Tennessean, local newspapers, and/or interviews with faculty or students. You will turn in this information on October 28, 1991.
3. Participate in the required prewriting exercises and workshops in class.
4. Write an adequate, well-developed draft which shows comprehension of the subject, research, and a well-thought-out purpose.
5. Turn the draft in on time. Have the first draft ready on November 4, 1991. Turn the rough draft in on November 6, 1991.
6. After a workshop and/or conference, redraft the letter.
7. Turn the final draft in on time. The tentative date is November 18, 1991.

Figure 10. Assignment 3

Instructions for Real-Audience Group:

Write a persuasive letter to a member of our administration or a letter to the editor of the East Tennessean about a problem here on campus.

STEPS FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT

1. Target and analyze your audience. Decide your purpose. What do you want this audience to do?
2. Get the facts about your topic. Use the East Tennessean, local newspapers, and/or interviews with faculty or students. You will turn in this information on October 28, 1991.
3. Participate in the required prewriting exercises and workshops in class.
4. Write an adequate, well-developed draft which shows comprehension of the subject, research, and a well-thought-out purpose.
5. Turn the draft in on time. Have the first draft ready on November 4, 1991. Turn the rough draft in on November 6, 1991.
6. After a workshop and/or conference, redraft the letter.
7. Turn the final draft in on time. The tentative date is November 18, 1991.
8. Turn in a polished draft and an addressed envelope. There is no need for postage.

Figure 10. (continued).

Instructions for Imaginary-Audience Group:

Write a persuasive letter to a member of our administration or a letter to the editor of the East Tennessean about a problem here on campus.

STEPS FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT

1. Target and analyze your audience. Decide your purpose. What do you want this audience to do?
2. Get the facts about your topic. Use the East Tennessean, local newspapers, and/or interviews with faculty or students. You will turn in this information on October 28, 1991.
3. Participate in the required prewriting exercises and workshops in class.
4. Write an adequate, well-developed draft which shows comprehension of the subject, research, and a well-thought-out purpose.
5. Turn the draft in on time. Have the first draft ready on November 4, 1991. Turn the rough draft in on November 6, 1991.
6. After a workshop and/or conference, redraft the letter.
7. Turn the final draft in on time. The tentative date is November 18, 1991.

Figure 10. (continued).

Instructions for Class-Audience Group:

Write a persuasive article for our class similar to articles written for Newsweek's "My Turn" column about an issue that is important to you and about which you want to speak out.

STEPS FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT

1. Target and analyze your audience. Decide your purpose. What do you want this audience to do?
2. Get the facts about your topic. You will be expected to locate and turn in copies of two articles on your topic. You will also be expected to use information from two sources and to document these sources.
3. Participate in the required prewriting exercises and workshops in class.
4. Write an adequate, well-developed draft which shows comprehension of the subject, research, and a well-thought-out purpose.
5. Turn the draft in on time. Due dates for the first two rough drafts will be announced.
6. After a workshop and/or conference, redraft the article.
7. Turn the final draft in on time. The tentative date is exam day.

Figure 11. Assignment 4

Instructions for Real-Audience Group:

Write a persuasive article for Newsweek's "My Turn" column about an issue that is important to you and about which you want to speak out.

STEPS FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT

1. Target and analyze your audience. Decide your purpose. What do you want this audience to do?
2. Get the facts about your topic. You will be expected to locate and turn in copies of two articles on your topic. You will also be expected to use information from two sources and to document these sources.
3. Participate in the required prewriting exercises and workshops in class.
4. Write an adequate, well-developed draft which shows comprehension of the subject, research, and a well-thought-out purpose.
5. Turn the draft in on time.
6. After a workshop and/or conference, redraft the article.
7. Turn the final draft in on time. The tentative date is exam day.
8. Turn in a polished draft and an addressed envelope with a cover letter.

Figure 11. (continued).

Instructions for Imaginary-Audience Group:

Write a persuasive article for Newsweek's "My Turn" column about an issue that is important to you and about which you want to speak out. Mailing the article is not required.

STEPS FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT

1. Target and analyze your audience. Decide your purpose. What do you want this audience to do?
2. Get the facts about your topic. You will be expected to locate and turn in copies of two articles on your topic. You will also be expected to use information from two sources and to document these sources.
3. Participate in the required prewriting exercises and workshops in class.
4. Write an adequate, well-developed draft which shows comprehension of the subject, research, and a well-thought-out purpose.
5. Turn the draft in on time. Due dates for the first two rough drafts will be announced.
6. After a workshop and/or conference, redraft the article.
7. Turn the final draft in on time. The tentative date is exam day.

Figure 11. (continued).

week's "My Turn" column and group two pretended to write a "My Turn" essay.

Since all the students received feedback from me each time they wrote a rough draft, my comments needed to be as consistent as possible and conform, whenever possible, to the curriculum guides and texts used in the course. Therefore, with each rough draft I returned to the students, I gave them a checklist of positive and negative aspects of their papers. The items for this checklist (see Figure 12, p. 89-90) determined their grades and were gleaned from the _Harbrace College Handbook_ folder, which each composition student at East Tennessee State University is required to purchase and use. Naturally, I found many occasions on which I was forced to write comments and/or suggestions at the side or bottom of the sheet, but I made a sincere effort to give the same type and amount of feedback to all three classes in order to keep evaluation as constant a variable as possible.

While assignment four was in the rough-draft stage, all the students wrote responses to the third and last questionnaire (see Figure 13, p. 91), which was designed to show changes in the students' ideas and attitudes about writing for an audience.

Finally, at the end of the semester, the students wrote an essay to be used as the post-test (the students referred to this essay as "the second diagnostic essay" because they could not grasp the meaning of the word "post-test"). We followed the same procedures with the post-test as we did with the pretest and used the same topic. After reading Dr. Robert Noble's essay, students wrote again on the subject of handing out condoms to high-school students. This time they were instructed to persuade a particular audience. Group one wrote

PAPER UNDER CONSTRUCTION STUDENT'S NAME_____

Strengths of Paper: Good organization____

Effective beginning____

Effective ending____

Adequate development____

Effective transition____

Effective paragraph structure____

Effective sentence structure____

Good grammar/punct. usage____

Problems with Organization and/or Development:

Purpose unclear____

Poor planning____

Inadequate development____

Weak beginning____

Weak ending____

Weak paragraph structure____

Poor transition____

Weak sentence structure____

Poor sentence variety____

Requirement not met____

Problems with Grammar and/or Punctuation:

Awkward fragment(s)____

Comma splice(s)____

Run-on(s)____

Non-Agreement of subject & verb____

Figure 12. Evaluation Sheet

Awkward verb tense shifts____

Shift(s) in point of view____

Problems with commas____

Other punctuation problems____

Problems with pronouns____

Problems with apostrophes____

Problems with capitalization____

Word usage____

Spelling____

Documentation problem____

As is, organization & development would receive _____.

As is, grammar & punctuation would receive _____.

Comments:

Figure 12. (continued).

Last Set of Questions:

1. Compare and contrast the writing you have done for this class with writing you have done in the past (both in school and out of school).
2. Describe how your opinion of yourself as a writer has changed after writing letters and essays that others will read.
3. Explain how you will consider your "audience" in future writing (both in and out of school) as a result of writing to persuade readers for this class.
4. Discuss your positive and negative feelings about the experiences you have had writing for an audience as part of the assignments for this class.

*Please do not write on this sheet. Use regular notebook paper and number each response.

Figure 13. Third Questionnaire

to the class, while groups two and three were instructed to write to one of the audiences to whom they had written during the semester (For instructions, see Figure 14, p. 93). The post-test did not count toward the students' grades, and the papers were not returned to the students.

I must note here that the topic of handing out condoms to high-school students became a very heated topic during the semester because of "Magic" Johnson's announcement that he had been infected with the HIV virus and because of the New York school system's decision to hand out condoms. At one point I thought that I might have to use another topic for the post-test, especially when I learned that two students had written on the topic for their fourth assignment. However, all the students had had the same opportunities to hear about the new developments concerning the topic. Therefore, I disqualified the two students who had violated the writing conditions and kept the condom issue for the post-test.

During the entire semester, I kept a log (see Journal Notes in the Appendix), in which I recorded all major classroom activities, notable class behavior, and all comments made by students--in class, before and after class, and during conferences--that pertained to audience, the assignments, or the study. I also recorded any available information that indicated students' motivation, such as the number of conferences, the number of drafts written for one assignment, extra research, phone calls about papers, and students' attitudes toward the class and/or the assignments.

A discussion of the statistical results of the pretest and post-test scores and of the findings of the qualitative data follows in Chapter 4.

Instruction for Group One:

After reading the opinionated essay by Robert Noble, plan and compose an essay response that argues your opinion, using the persuasive techniques you have learned this semester. Your audience is our class, as always. Feel free to use information from the article, along with your own knowledge of the subject, to promote your argument. Please use regular notebook paper. Put your code name at the top of the paper; do not put your name or the class period anywhere on your paper.

Instructions for Groups Two and Three:

After reading the opinionated essay by Robert Noble, plan and compose an essay response that argues your opinion, using the persuasive techniques you have learned this semester. Address your composition to one of the four audiences you wrote for this semester; choose the audience you feel most comfortable writing for. Feel free to use information from the article, along with your own knowledge of the subject, to promote your argument. Please use regular notebook paper. Put your code name at the top of the paper; do not put your name or the class period anywhere on your paper.

Figure 14. Post-Test Instructions

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSES OF DATA

In this chapter I present the results of both the quantitative data and the qualitative information I collected during the study.

The quantitative data consisted of pre- and post-test writing samples, which were evaluated by two unbiased raters for voice and persuasive strategies. To analyze this data, I used analyses of variance, with an appropriate multiple-comparison procedure where applicable. As a precautionary measure, I also applied a nonparametric test of significance to check the results.

The qualitative research consisted of three open-ended questionnaires and two short responses, completed by the students in all three classes, and of my journal notes. In order to evaluate the information qualitatively, I extracted from the students' answers all the statements that were of consequence to the study, recorded the number of times each particular statement was used, and compiled percentages for each group. I then compared these findings with the statements I had made in my journal.

The results of both research methods follow.

Quantitative Analysis

The purpose of the quantitative study was to assess the effects of audience on the voice and persuasive processes of college freshmen writers. In order to test

the effects of three treatments (three types of audiences --class, real, and imaginary) on the writing of three freshmen college groups, I formed a null hypothesis and an alternative hypothesis, as follows:

> Hypothesis: There are no significant differences among the three treatments.
>
> Alternative: There are significant differences between two or more of the three treatments.

My sample consisted of three beginning freshmen composition classes at East Tennessee State University. I taught these classes, randomly assigning the groups to the three treatments. Random assignment to the groups was assumed since freshmen at this university are, for the most part, assigned to freshmen composition classes by advisors and have no choice of instructors. Group one, to which I assigned the class audience, met at 8:00 a.m. for fifty-five minutes of instruction three days a week. This group contained twenty-one participants (9 male, 12 female). Group two met at 10:10 for fifty-five minutes of instruction three days a week. This group consisted of twenty-two participants (7 male, 15 female), and they sent their papers to real audiences outside the classroom. Group three, to which I assigned imaginary audiences, met at 1:25 p.m. three days a week, for fifty-five minutes of instruction, and contained twenty-one participants (13 male, 8 female).

The raw scores I used for computation were gathered through the use of a pre- and a post-test, writing samples which were generated from the same topic (should high-school students be given condoms in an effort to slow the spread of AIDS?) and which were rated by two unbiased instructors in order to establish interrater reliability (see Table 2, pp. 96-98). Correlations of scores by the

TABLE 2: RAW SCORES OF PRETEST AND POST-TEST

STUDENT:	RATER 1 PRETEST	RATER 1 POST-TEST	RATER 2 PRETEST	RATER 2 POST-TEST
CLASS-AUDIENCE GROUP				
Alphree	18	19	17	18
Bambi	13	35	11	31
Bob Smiley	20	14	25	15
Boxcar Bill	5	17	12	12
Cleopatra	25	11	20	15
Daffy Duck	21	30	21	25
Foxfire	12	14	17	16
Huey	12	25	17	29
Lady	22	21	20	21
Leo	25	20	23	21
Madonna	16	25	18	28
Magic	13	12	13	13
Manson	15	21	19	17
McDonald	23	24	27	27
Mouse	17	24	26	25
Princess Leia	18	20	19	19
Roger Rabbit	16	35	19	33
Space Cadet	9	24	14	23
Spanky	26	23	19	27
Vincent Sofine	5	21	9	19
Witness	27	29	27	32
Totals:	**358**	**464**	**393**	**466**

TABLE 2 (continued).

STUDENT:	RATER 1 PRETEST	RATER 1 POST TEST	RATER 2 PRETEST	RATER 2 POST-TEST
	REAL-AUDIENCE GROUP			
Akbar	27	14	25	19
AL	12	11	15	10
Alpha	14	23	15	18
Barry	18	15	17	14
The Boss	11	15	12	18
Chris	11	17	12	16
Cole	12	12	13	9
Coley	14	12	15	16
Emily	30	30	30	32
Ice Cream Man	3	10	4	9
JJ	23	20	23	18
Logan	16	19	18	20
Marie	24	23	18	25
Marilyn Monroe	23	23	25	22
Melanie	15	16	15	16
Michael Jordan	13	18	15	13
Penn	18	13	18	14
Rose	16	25	16	26
Scarlet O'hara	9	8	10	7
Toco Bell	24	12	23	15
Tommy	10	14	13	19
Trisha	5	12	8	17
Totals:	348	362	360	373

TABLE 2 (continued).

STUDENT:	RATER 1 PRETEST	RATER 1 POST-TEST	RATER 2 PRETEST	RATER 2 POST-TEST
	IMAGINARY-AUDIENCE GROUP			
Ace	16	9	17	12
Greg	15	17	12	13
Alex	26	19	25	18
Blondie	14	17	15	18
Brooks	6	13	15	17
Bubba	7	22	10	18
C.C.	6	27	8	29
Cacalaca	11	24	14	25
Cissy	19	22	21	19
Corda	18	31	10	27
Dean	21	20	23	23
Elvis	22	22	21	20
Hang-Man	13	31	21	27
James Bond	14	12	10	12
Mr. Mojo	17	17	17	16
Pineapple	11	14	15	11
Rated R	18	17	11	19
Reducer	30	27	31	32
Sprite	11	21	17	21
Taterbug	17	24	16	21
Texas	20	15	18	16
Totals:	**332**	**421**	**347**	**414**

two raters on the pretest were .79, .96, and .75, and the post-test were .90, .87, and .88. These are high; therefore, I was confident in using the means of the raw scores (for mean scores, see Table 3, p. 100) for the purposes of analysis.

Since my purpose was to test the effects of more than two treatments and since the groups were unequal in size, I chose to use a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for k independent samples. In order to test the assumption that the variances of the groups were equal (and therefore the assumption that I could use a parametric test), I employed the Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variances for k variances. I applied the Bartlett's test to the pretest variances and the post-test variances. In both cases, I found that the critical table value of chi square (df = 2) was larger than the chi square value I obtained ($p > .05$) using the Bartlett's test (see Figure 15, p. 101). Therefore, there was no reason to believe that the variances of the populations were not homogeneous. I then proceeded with the analyses of variance.

I performed two analyses of variance, one on the pretest means and one on the post-test means, in order to test the significance of the differences among the means of the pretest scores and among the means of the post-test scores. The null hypothesis for both assumed that there would be no significant difference among the means. Alpha was set at .05.

After calculating the One-Way Analysis of Variance for the pretest means, I constructed an ANOVA summary table (see Table 4, p. 102), which shows that the F ratio was .634. Consulting an F table, I found that the value of F required (df = 61) is 3.15 ($p > .05$). Therefore, I

TABLE 3: PRETEST AND POST-TEST MEANS OF RAW SCORES, ALL GROUPS

PRETEST			POST-TEST		
1	2	3	1	2	3
17.5	26	16.5	18.5	16.5	10.5
12	13.5	13.5	33	10.5	15
22.5	14.5	25.5	14.5	20.5	18.5
8.5	17.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	17.5
22.5	11.5	10.5	13	16.5	15
21	11.5	8.5	27.5	16.5	20
14.5	12.5	7	15	10.5	28
14.5	14.5	12.5	27	14	24.5
21	30	20	21	31	20.5
24	3.5	14	20.5	9.5	29
17	23	22	26.5	19	21.5
13	17	21.5	12.5	19.5	21
17	21	17	19	24	29
25	24	12	25.5	22.5	12
21.5	15	17	24.5	16	16.5
18.5	14	13	19.5	15.5	12.5
17.5	18	14.5	34	13.5	18
11.5	16	30.5	23.5	25.5	29.5
22.5	9.5	14	25	7.5	21
7	23.5	16.5	20	13.5	22.5
27	11.5	19	30.5	16.5	15.5
	6.5			14.5	

PRETEST:

$n1 = 21$ $\quad n2 = 22$ $\quad n3 = 21$

$s^2 1 = 29.92$ $\quad s^2 2 = 41.66$ $\quad s^2 3 = 30.86$

$$HO: s^2 1 = s^2 2 = s^2 3$$

$$X^2 = \frac{(21 \times 29.92) + (22 \times 41.66) + (21 \times 30.86)}{64}$$

$$\ln x (21 + 22 + 21) = 205.79$$

$$- (29.92 \ln x 21) + (41.66 \ln x 22) +$$

$$(30.86 \ln x 21) = 225.44$$

$$205.79 - 225.44 = -19.65$$

Table X^2, df = 2, .05 = 5.99 > -19.65

POST-TEST:

$n^2 1 = 40.48$ $\quad s^2 2 = 30.92$ $\quad n^2 3 = 32.62$

$$HO: s^2 1 = s^2 2 = s^2 3$$

$$X^2 = \frac{(21 \times 40.48) + (22 \times 30.92) + (21 \times 32.62)}{64}$$

$$\ln x (21 + 22 + 21) = 226.83$$

$$- (40.48 \ln x 21) + (30.92 \ln x 22) +$$

$$(32.62 \ln x 21) = 226.39$$

$$226.83 - 226.39 = .44$$

Table X^2, df = 2, .05 = 5.99 > .44

Figure 15: Bartlett's Test

TABLE 4: ANOVA SUMMARY TABLES

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square
		PRETEST	
Between	43.42	2	21.71
Within	2090.44	61	34.27
TOTAL	2133.86	63	F = .63 *
		POST-TEST	
Between	321.58	2	160.79
Within	2111.35	61	34.61
TOTAL	2432.97	63	F = 4.65**

*p > .05 **p < .05

accepted the null hypothesis that the pretest means were not significantly different.

The One-Way Analysis of Variance for the post-test means revealed an F ratio of 4.65. The value of F required ($p < .05$, $df = 2, 61$) is the same as with the pretest, 3.15. Since the F ratio was larger than the value of F, I rejected the null hypothesis. There was a significant difference between two or more of the post-test means (see Table 4, p. 102 for a summary).

A Scheffe's Multiple Comparison Test indicated that only one significant difference existed, between the mean for group one and the mean for group two (see Table 5, p. 104 for comparisons).

I checked my results using a nonparametric test, the Median Sign Test for a multisample case. I found the value of chi square for the pretest to be 4.18 (see Table 6, p. 105 for calculations). The value of chi square required for significance ($df = 2$) is 5.99 ($p > .05$). The observed value falls below this number, confirming the findings of the ANOVA. The pretest means were not significantly different.

The value of chi square for the post-test, according to the Median test, was 6.87. This observed value was greater than the required value for significance, 5.99, and therefore reinforced the results of the ANOVA (see Table 7, p. 106 for calculations).

I concluded that the three groups were relatively comparable, in the skills of voice and persuasive strategies, at the beginning of the study. By the end of the semester, however, the groups were different. Although it is evident by the sums of the pre- and post-test scores (see Table 2, pp. 96-98) that all the groups improved in the above skills, the Scheffe's test shows a significant difference in the post-test mean scores of groups

TABLE 5: SCHEFFE'S MULTIPLE COMPARISON TEST

	F	F^{1}	$\bar{x}$
Group 1 vs. Group 2 :	9.18*	6.3	$\bar{x}_1$ = 22.14*
Group 1 vs. Group 3 :	1.56	6.3	$\bar{x}_2$ = 16.70*
Group 2 vs. Group 3 :	3.13	6.3	$\bar{x}_3$ = 19.88*

* $p < .05$

TABLE 6: MEDIAN SIGN TEST--PRETEST MEDIAN

X^2 TABLE

	+	-	
Sample 1	14	7	21
Sample 2	9	13	22
Sample 3	8	13	21
	31	33	64

O	E	(O - E)	(O - E)^2	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
14	10.17	3.83	14.6689	1.44
7	10.83	-3.83	14.6689	1.35
9	10.66	-1.66	2.7556	.26
13	11.34	1.66	2.7556	.24
8	10.17	-2.17	4.7089	.46
13	10.83	2.17	4.7089	+ .43
				4.18*

*p > .05

TABLE 7: MEDIAN SIGN TEST--POST-TEST MEDIAN

X^2 TABLE

	+	-	
Sample 1	14	7	21
Sample 2	6	16	22
Sample 3	11	10	21
	31	33	64

O	E	(O - E)	$(O - E)^2$	$\frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$
14	10.17	3.83	14.6689	1.44
7	10.83	-3.83	14.6689	1.35
6	10.66	-4.66	21.7156	2.04
16	11.34	4.66	21.7156	1.91
11	10.17	.83	.6889	.07
10	10.83	- .83	.6889	+ .06
				6.87*

*$p < .05$ (significant at 5%)

one and two. Based solely on the post-test scores, it could be concluded that the class-audience group improved the most and that the real-audience group improved least.

An explanation of the qualitative findings follows in section two of this chapter, and a discussion of the implications of the results appears in Chapter 5.

Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative study involved three questionnaires and two short responses, written by the participating students, and a journal log, in which I recorded daily events and comments. Responses to questions are reported here in percentages, which overlap because students gave more than one answer in most instances. Students' comments appear herein as they were written.

I administered the first questionnaire (see Figure 4, p. 67) on Wednesday, September 4, 1991. In response to the first question, "Describe how you see your role (job) as a writer when you write something that someone else will read," the most frequent responses from group one (class audience) were, "Keep the reader's interest" (29%) and "Write correctly and neatly" (29%). Of this same group, 24% of the students said their job was to inform the reader; 19% to entertain the reader; 10% to write clearly in order to get their points across; and 10% to present themselves to the reader. None mentioned "influence" or "persuasion."

This group's experience writing for others (question 2) varied. Sixteen students (76%) mentioned creative pieces that they had allowed others to read. Ten (48%) said they had written letters to people in the community, both business letters and friendly letters. Two (10%) students had written for their high-school newspapers,

and two (10%) had been active in speech and/or drama. Only one student had written solely academic papers.

In response to question three, "Tell about some examples of writing you have written for others that you enjoyed writing," 95% of the students mentioned creative pieces (poetry--48%) and/or friendly letters. However, none of those who had a positive response was able to say why the writings were enjoyable.

Answers to question four, "Describe a particular piece of writing you wrote that you hoped would persuade someone to do something," revealed that only four students (19% of the participants) had written persuasive letters. Only one of the four said that she felt she had accomplished her goal.

Finally, there were two general responses from the first group to the last question, which asked the students to define "writer's audience." Seventy-four percent of the class felt that audience meant the people they "addressed" when writing, while 20% of the class felt audience was anyone they "invited" to read their writing.

Group two's (real audience) responses to the first questionnaire were not totally different from those of group one. More than half of group two (52%) felt their role as writers was to write clearly in order to get their points across. "Keeping the reader's interest" was the second most frequent response (29%) to the first question, while "influencing and/or persuading the reader" and "informing the reader" were mentioned an equal number of times (19% each). Another response was "entertaining the reader" (14%). One person felt that presenting herself to the reader was important.

Group two's previous writing experiences were somewhat similar to those of the first group. Fifteen students (68%) had written creatively, ten (45%) had written business and/

or friendly letters, two (9%) had written for high-school newspapers, one had edited a church bulletin, and one had been active in speech. However, four (18%) students in this group said they had written for teachers only.

Ninety-six percent of this group said that the writings they had enjoyed were creative pieces (poetry and songs especially) and/or friendly letters. Like group one, they did not explain why. And, like the first group, four (18%) students had written persuasive letters.

Responses to the last question were also divided two ways, as with group one. Sixty-eight percent said that the "writer's audience" was the reader whom the writer "addressed," and 32% said the "writer's audience" was anyone whom the writer "invited" to read the written product.

Group three (imaginary audience) gave answers that were similar to those of groups one and two. Responding to question one, they felt that their roles as writers were to write clearly in order to get their points across (52%), to keep the interest of their readers (24%), to influence or persuade the readers (19%), to entertain the reader (19%), and to inform the readers (14%).

Their previous writing experiences also involved mostly creative pieces and letters. Fourteen (67%) students had written creative pieces (poetry--38%) and/or friendly letters. Two students had had experience writing speeches. Two differences with group three were that (1) more students in this group had written persuasive letters to people or groups in the community (29%), and (2) more students (29%) said they had written only for teachers. However, positive responses from this group centered on creative

writing and friendly letters, as they did with groups one and two.

In response to the last questionnaire, 55% of the students indicated that the "writer's audience" was the reader "addressed" by the writer, and 45% of the students said the audience was anyone "invited" by the writer to read the writing.

Overall, the first questionnaire told me that the majority of the students knew about writing for an audience, but that few of them had had a great deal of experience writing expressly for a particular audience other than a teacher. And, even though more than half the students in all the groups (65%) saw the "writer's audience" as a real person or persons who could be "addressed" by the writer, most of them expressed pride in letting someone else read their work only when they spoke of their creative writing, such as poetry or fiction.

Changes in Attitude, Group One

The class-audience group responded positively to both the collaborative workshops and to the use of the class as the sole audience. During the first third of the semester, I recorded several entries in my journal that indicated this group was attentive and cooperative (see Journal Notes in Appendix, entries for September 13, 20, and 27). Many of my journal entries through the middle of October were void of remarks about this class, mainly because the class ran very smoothly and efficiently.

On October 14, I administered the first short response, which called for a reaction to using the class

as audience (see Figure 7, p. 77) and a reaction to the procedures of the class in general. Overall, 85% of all the responses of the group were positive remarks about targeting classmates as the audience, although most were not yet comfortable enough to put their names on the responses. Three students responded negatively, and three students' answers were not suited to the questions.

Nearly all of the positive responses (one praised the group work) centered on the ability to express opinions to the class members. One student wrote, "I don't feel as restrained with these types of essay writings." Another student wrote the following:

> I feel that I can be a little more open, and I feel that I can put more of myself into the papers I write. Straight essays, to me, seem sort of non feeling--straight-cut, no curves. By that I mean that you can't really totally express yourself.

A third student added, "This class has been a little less stressful than I thought it would be. . . . I like my classmates as an audience because they are going through the same things I am." And a fourth student saw other benefits in the class-as-audience, beyond the immediate feeling of freedom of expression. He stated, "I feel that this 'learning experience' has heightened my ability to express myself in all aspects of my life. . . . And I have been making friends in class, which is also very rewarding."

The negative comments were diverse. One student felt that his potential was not being stretched by the class audience. He wrote, "I prefer writing for targeted audiences or people out of class." Another student felt threatened by the peer evaluations: "I DO NOT like

evalluating, or having my paper evalluated." And a third appeared to be challenged by the class audience: "They make me actually think and that's kind of hard."

The second questionnaire, which I administered on October 23, 1991, contained several questions (see Figure 8) aimed at finding out what was important to the students as they wrote. Nearly half of the participants (45%) said that making an impression on the reader was important, although the impressions they wanted to make differed. Alphree wrote, "I want to disturb them or force them to reevaluate their views." Manson, on the other hand, wanted to write "something original." He stated, "I believe that my paper is unique and, hopefully, will catch the reader's eye." Others simply wanted the paper to be interesting to the reader. Lady said, "I tried to put myself in the shoes of the reader. Would I enjoy reading this paper or would I put it down after reading the first paragraph."

An equal number of students (45%) were concerned about my reaction (the teacher's feedback) to their papers. McDonald said, "My motivation was when I received my rough draft." Bambi echoed the same thoughts: "I got started by asking you <the teacher> how I could improve my paper." And Foxfire added, "What helped me was the grading of the first draft and the student/teacher conferences to help me see what I did wrong and what I needed to do and change."

Forty percent of the participants said that they were conscious of the reader as they wrote. Spanky said, "I was constantly trying to picture the reader(s) in my mind and deciding what I should say and how I should say it to be most effective." Huey said that her main problem "was trying to figure out what the readers thought about the subject and what their views were." Vincent Sofine men-

tioned his readers and indicated that he thought about them from the beginning of the process. He wrote, "I pick an issue that the class as a whole will understand and can relate to."

Another important goal (for 30% of the students) was writing clearly. Bambi said, "I thought of what people would need to know to get a clear understanding of what my point was." And Foxfire wrote, "I would try to write my essay so others could understand what I was trying to say."

Thirty percent of the students also expressed confidence in their writing. Space Cadet wrote, "I actually enjoyed others reading my writing." Witness was especially pleased with the outcome:

> I felt good about my essay and had no problem with other people reading it. It was also gratifying to see that the subject of my topic accomplished what I predicted (at least in part) in my essay.

The peer evaluations were mentioned by 30% of the participants. Alphree stated, ". . .sometimes people can pick up or point out mistakes I can not see because I have read it so many times." And Huey echoed much the same thought: "Having other students read my work help me a lot. Other students are able to see what I do not."

Fifteen percent stated that they wanted to persuade their readers, as Roger Rabbit's response illustrates:

> The reader may have a different point of view so I had to present a convincing argument to persuade them to reconsider their points and maybe even change their view points completely.

Finally, two students said they enjoyed voicing their opinions, and only two did not mention the reader at all.

My impression of these answers was that the majority of the class-audience group wrote with the other students in mind, and that their writing was affected in a positive way by thinking of their readers. Many of them were conscious of the fact that I (the teacher) was also one of their readers, but my comments did not seem to have more impact than those of the other students or the convictions of the writers. A comparison of the class-audience group's answers and the answers of the other two groups appears in Table 8, p. 115.

The second short response, which the students wrote on November 18, 1991, showed a slight increase in confidence and enthusiasm over the first response. Overall, 89% of the reactions were positive. Of these positive remarks, 78% concerned the class-as-audience, and 11% concerned the group work done in class.

Most of the students who praised the use of the class as audience said that writing for the class allowed them freedom to express their opinions. Daffy Duck wrote, "Writing for the class has allowed me to express my opinions more than writing factual papers." Princess Leia said:

> When you're writing for class members, you're not worried about what to write, how to write, or if the commas are in the right place. You can get your point across and then go back and worry about grammar and spelling.

To this, Lady added, "A class audience is easy to express yourself to. The readers are more of your age level and views are seen much the same way." But it was Witness who seemed to sum up what the others tried to say:

TABLE 8: COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE* (See Figure 8, page 78 for question)

Responses	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Highly Positive:			
Was conscious of reader:	40%	43%	33%
Wanted to affect reader:	45%	38%	14%
Wanted to write clearly:	30%	29%	29%
Wanted to persuade:	15%	18%	10%
Stated a goal:		33%	
Positive:			
Felt Confident:	30%	43%	43%
Enjoyed expressing opinion:	10%	18%	5%
Named the reader:	15%	29%	5%
Wanted to please self:		9%	
Least Desired:			
Appreciated group work:	30%	14%	14%
Valued Teacher feedback	45%	9%	19%
Did not mention reader:	10%	9%	14%
Lacked self-confidence:		18%	38%
Could not focus on reader:			14%

*Percentages overlap because many students gave more than one response.

> In targeting classmates, I am able to express myself without feeling restricted (trying to please the teacher and possibly not expressing true convictions).

The next most frequent response indicated that writing for the class made the students more conscious of writing clearly to be understood. Leo wrote, "I have had to learn to write for others, not just myself. I have also had to learn to explain my thoughts in detail so I could reach my peers." Huey also learned to consider others' opinions. She wrote, "Writing for the class makes me think about how the other students feel about the subject." And Witness felt that he could have an effect on others' opinions, as his statement indicates:

> Although I am aware that the teacher is to be included in my motivation for writing, I also feel that by writing for the class I can affect positive change in school and our community.

Others mentioned only the group work in their responses. McDonald wrote, "I find it helpful to read my classmates' papers. It helps me look at my own work more objectively." Magic said, ". . .I get the chance to hear some positive and negative criticism from students, not just professors." And Space Cadet added:

> I'm not as embarassed for others to read my writing as I once was. Their suggestions and comments has helped a lot. . . . It lets us know what opinions the other students have on issues that we write about.

Two students said that writing for peers had not affected their writing. Madonna wrote, "I do not feel

that writing for the class has affected my writing. I would probably write the same way regardless of who I was speaking to." And Bob Smiley said, "I don't think it has changed my writing, it is how I have written in past classes. . . ." However, both of these students added that the class was "fine."

Overall, the group wrote more positive comments on the second response than they did on the first response, and this time they were not hesitant to put their names on the papers.

All students wrote the last questionnaire on November 27, 1991. This questionnaire had four questions that were designed to uncover differences in the students' attitudes toward their writing (see Figure 13 for all the questions). The first question asked them to compare and contrast the writing they did in our class with writing they had done in the past. The class-audience group had varying responses to this question.

Twenty-seven percent said that the writings they had done for our class had allowed them more self expression than writings they had done in the past. Daffy Duck wrote, "The writing for this class has allowed me to express my opinion." Witness stated, "I am thankful and excited to be able to express my true convictions about topics that I am interested in." And Leo said, "I have been allowed freedom to grow and expand myself through writing in this class."

A number of students (23%) said they felt their writing skills had improved. Boxcar Bill said that his paragraph and sentence structure had improved, and Vincent Sofine said that he was now able to express his thoughts in an orderly fashion.

A few students (18%) said that they had not written persuasively before this class. Eighteen percent said they felt persuasive writing to be harder, while 14% said the writing they did for our class was not different from writing they had done in the past. Finally, two students said they had not been accustomed to writing rough drafts before, one student had not done much writing before our class, and one student gave a vague answer. Table 9 (p. 119) shows a comparison of these answers and answers of the other groups.

The second question asked the students to describe changes in their concepts of themselves as writers. The most common response (35%) was that the students now felt more confident about their writing. Boxcar Bill wrote, "I feel more confident as a writer, and have more confidence in my ideas." Space Cadet stated, "I think I more self-confident and less insecure about people reading my essays and letters." And Madonna said, "I feel more confident about how I write when writing about a controversial issue."

One-fourth of the participants felt that they had improved as writers. Princess Leia said that she had "improved drastically in grammtics," and Huey said that she had "become a better writer."

The remainder of the answers varied. Two students said that they were more aware of audience, two said they felt that they could now write more persuasively, two said their opinions about their writing had not changed, two spoke negatively about their writing, one said he had learned to evaluate his own writing, one said she enjoyed writing more, and one gave a vague answer.

A comparison of the three groups' responses to question two appears in Table 10, p. 120.

TABLE 9: COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO THIRD QUESTIONNAIRE, QUESTION 1* (See Figure 13 for question)

Responses	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Highly Positive:			
Writings had purpose:		43%	5%
Audience was real:		38%	
Self-expression improved:	27%	5%	14%
Writing skills improved:	23%	5%	
Writing will help career:		5%	
Writing was fun:		5%	5%
Writing was time consuming:	23%	29%	5%
Positive:			
Made better grades:			14%
Audience was new:			29%
Persuasion was new:	18%		29%
Writing was new:	5%		
Least Desired:			
Rough drafts/conferences:	10%		5%
Writing not different:	14%		
Writing skills declined:			10%
Genre/structure different:			10%
Vague answer:	5%		5%

*Percentages overlap because many students gave more than one response.

TABLE 10: COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO THIRD QUESTIONNAIRE, QUESTION 2* (See Figure 13)

Responses	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Highly Positive:			
Aware of audience:	10%	55%	20%
More confident:	35%	55%	25%
More able to persuade:	10%		5%
More evaluative of own work	5%	14%	
Feel skills have improved:	25%		20%
Positive:			
Now enjoy writing:	5%		
See need to improve:		18%	
Changed approach to writing:		9%	
Least Desired:			
No change:	10%		5%
Vague answer:	14%	9%	14%
Less self-expression:			20%

*Percentages overlap because many students gave more than one response.

The third question asked the students how they would consider audience in future writing as a result of our class. An overwhelming majority (76%) of the class-audience group responded that they were now more aware of audience. Leo wrote, "In future writing, I will consider my audience as to what age range they are, how much they know about the topic I'm writing on, and how I think they feel about my point of view." Roger Rabbit stated, "I will decide what type of audience I am dealing with by observation; then I will decide what type of language, tone, and point of view should be used." Manson gave the following response:

> I used to write just for the teacher (and for a grade). Now, in the writings I do in college, I must visualize my audience. I believe this will help me in the future because with different audiences my writing style should be different.

And Spanky said, "I will be more careful to decide just what the composition of the audience will be and how they will/will not relate to the subject at hand."

The answers of three students (14%) indicated that they expected to write for peers in the future. For example, Mouse stated, "In years to come I will consider my audience to be my peers." An equal number of students (14%) gave vague responses. Two of the remaining answers involved voicing opinions more and improving writing skills.

A comparison of all the students' responses to question three appears in Table 11, p. 122.

The fourth and last question asked the students to reveal both their positive and negative reactions to the class. Most of the responses of the class-audience group were positive. Many of them (30%) had positive

TABLE 11: COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO THIRD QUESTIONNAIRE, QUESTION 3* (See Figure 13)

Responses	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Highly Positive:			
Will consider audience:	76%	86%	72%
Will write for community:		14%	
Will use audience analysis:		18%	5%
Will be aware of my purpose:		5%	
Positive:			
Will use persuasion:		5%	10%
Will voice opinions:	5%		
Will improve skills:	5%		
Will think of broad audience:			10%
Least Desired:			
Will write for peers always:			14%
Will improve grammar:			5%
Vague answer:	14%	5%	10%

*Percentages overlap because many students gave more than one response.

words for the peer evaluations. Foxfire said that the other students had "helped me see what was wrong with my paper and what I could do to make it better." Boxcar Bill wrote, "I enjoy sharing my views with others, and am thankful for the help they were able to provide." And Space Cadet said, "I feel this class was really understanding and patient with each other. They critized each other in a good way."

One-fourth of the participants answered that they appreciated the chance to express their opinions. McDonald said that writing for her peers made "it easier to write and I didn't feel I had to be so formal." Huey said that she, too, could "express my opinion more freely and the students will listen." And Daffy Duck echoed these thoughts by saying, "I liked writing for the class because I could express how I felt about a subject."

Another fourth of the group felt that they had learned to write for an audience. Princess Leia said she learned "to write to an audience so as to make them think about the other side of something." Roger Rabbit stated, "The audience is something for me to target in considering my tone, point of view, language, and possibly the development of my paper." And Spanky added, "This <writing with audience in mind> will most definitely assist me in future endeavors."

One last positive answer concerned the student-teacher conferences.

Eight (38%) of the students gave negative responses. Two students did not like the peer evaluations, two were not comfortable writing persuasively, two were angry because their writing had not improved, one had had trouble expressing opinions, and one said the peer audience was not adequate for all the writings.

Table 12 shows a comparison of all the responses of the groups' answers (see p. 125).

My overall impression of this group's responses was that the majority of the students enjoyed writing for the class because they felt more relaxed and more able to express their opinions. The class-as-audience freed them from the invisible restrictions associated with academic writing.

As I worked with this group during the semester, I made two observations concerning their attitudes toward the class. First, I observed that most of the students in this class were diligent and consistent in their work, and I frequently attested to this fact in my journal notes (see entries for Sept. 20, 30; Oct. 21, 23; Nov. 13, 15, 20, 22, 25; Dec. 4). In addition, as I stated at the beginning of this section, I seldom wrote about this class in my journal, except when routine activities occurred, because the class ran smoothly. Secondly, I felt that these students became friends and were able to interact in a constructive manner, more so than the other classes. I spoke of this observation in my November 4, journal entry (see Appendix). Their comradeship was also evident in some of the responses to questions recorded in this section. I surmise that having the class as an audience made the collaborative work more meaningful.

I made an additional observation about the writing of this group. This group did not distinguish between the genres of writing (such as letters and essays). All of their papers looked alike in structure, probably because their audience never changed (see Appendix, journal entries for Nov. 15 and Dec. 6).

TABLE 12: COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO THIRD QUESTIONNAIRE, QUESTION 4* (See Figure 13)

Responses	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Highly Positive:			
Real audience/real topic:		42%	
A benefit to my career:		14%	
Good responses from audience:		14%	
Self Expression:	25%	5%	
Ability to write for audience:	25%		
Positive:			
Audience was not teacher:			67%
Clear need for improvement:		14%	
New confidence about writing:			19%
Writing was difficult:	10%	36%	29%
Least Desired:			
Peer evaluation not helpful:	40%		10%
Teacher conferences helpful:	5%		
Audience should be voluntary:		9%	5%
Writing did not improve:	10%		
Audience not adequate:	5%		
Expression was difficult:	5%		
Writing still unpleasant:		5%	
Vague answer:	5%		

*Percentages overlap.

Changes in Attitude, Group Two

The real audience group was not quite as cooperative with one another as the class-audience was. However, the real-audience group was more serious about their writing, working much harder than the other classes. In fact, I have never taught composition students who were more dedicated to turning out readable work and improving their writing skills. Most of my journal entries, beginning with the September 20 entry, reflected the fact that the students in this group focused more quickly on their topics and audiences, sought help from me more than the other groups, engaged in revision more than the others, and changed more in their attitudes toward writing. The journal entries (see Appendix) that best showed these changes were those for September 20, October 30, November 27, and December 6.

The first written responses from this group were mostly positive. More than half (65%) said they felt challenged to do a better job; however, many also said they felt a little timid about expressing their opinions to outside audiences. The following quote expresses many of these students' initial concerns:

> Writing to an outside audience seems to be more difficult than that of writing an essay. Perhaps because your under a bit more stress to make yourself appear to be professional. In an essay I feel much more free to express myself and my inner thoughts.

Another student echoed these feelings:

> I enjoy writing to outside audiences but sometimes when we write based on our views, I feel as if my opinion is being graded. I feel that there is less pressure when writing to the

> teacher because she or he will be the only one to grade or read it.

A third student said, "It can get stressful. . .knowing your essay will be judged." And a fourth emphasized how many of these students felt after writing for a real audience for the first time:

> I do not really mind writing for outside audiences. I do feel a little self conscious though. I do not have much experience writing for anyone other than a teacher, so I do not have a lot of confidence.

Many of the students, however, felt that, although the assignments were difficult, the challenge would improve their writing and be of benefit to them in the future. Emily wrote the following:

> Writing papers for a real outside audience rather than straight academic essays is difficult at times, but I feel it provides a much needed challenge. It is important for us to learn how to write for the "real world" rather than just the classroom.

Barry said much the same thing:

> The idea of writing for an outside audience was at first rather difficult for me. I was used to writing only for the grade, and really not for anyone else. I have become used to this way of writing and find, I like better than writing just for a grade. It gives me experience for a later date once out of college. I will need to be able to write a paper or letter once out of college. I'm sure this is great practice.

Several of those who felt a real audience was challenging said they worked harder and cared more about

their writing. One student wrote the following:

> I feel writing for an outside audience makes you take pride in your work. If writing only for the teacher or class, you are less likely to care about your work, because you know them. You want to impress an outside audience.

Coley also felt challenged. He said the followiwng:

> Writing a paper for a large audience to read is challenging and allows you to use more outside information than a paper for just the class or a teacher. . . . So far in this class, writing has of course made the bulk of the class which has kept myself thinking at all times.

A few of the students who responded positively said they liked the class because their writing skills were improving, because they could write more freely, and/or because they were making better grades than they had in the past.

Five students gave negative responses, saying that they would rather write straight academic essays, mostly because they felt intimidated. For instance, one of them wrote, "I would rather write letters or papers directly to the teacher. When I'm writing for outside audiences I feel pressured more." A second wrote, "I would <much> rather a teacher read my writing than the outside world. I HATE to let other people read my writing. I am not an awesome writer. . . ." And a third said, "I would prefer writing straight academic essays for a class assignment because when you have an outside audience it intimidates you to say what you think should be said instead of what you really want to say."

Responding to the second questionnaire (see Figure 8, p. 78), 43% of the participants in this group named their

readers and said they were conscious of their audience as they planned their letters or essays. Melanie explained her process as follows:

> To write my letter to Lamar Alexander I needed to plan my topic for writing him and think of ways to present my case to him on that topic. . . . I needed to come up with some way to persue <pressure?> him into putting more emphasis on education in our country and to help our legislators find ways of putting more funds into it. . . .

Chris struggled with her topic because of her audience, as she explained:

> I was constantly blocked by the fact I did not agree with the act of abortion. Yet I overcome this point; writing this letter will hopefully persuade the Supreme Court not to pass a law requiring teenage girls to have parental consent due to the danger it may cause.

An equal number of students (43%) expressed confidence in their writing. Barry wrote the following:

> The paper really just flowed out of me until the final paragraph so there were no real problems. I did rewrite the paper three times to finally get it the way I wanted it. I love the paper. I think it has a good chance to be picked <for publication>. . . .

JJ found new confidence, as she stated:

> I have always hated writing, probably because it requires too much revealing of inner feelings. This article is probably the only thing I've ever written that I felt good about, because I believed strongly in what I wrote.

Emily said that she "moved forward at each stage of writing easily" because she had done enough research and because she had "conviction of my topic." Chris, after she had finished her letter to the Supreme Court, said she "was convinced I had persuaded the court and would in the future see the result of my letter."

Thirty-eight percent of the participants said they wanted to impress or entertain their readers. AL worked hard at making her letter interesting. She wrote, "I felt my introduction was grasping enough to catch the eye of my audience and I hoped the rest was of interest also." But she was not happy with the rough draft because "it was too much like a 'sermon,' so it was back to the drawing board." Rose also wanted a catchy beginning. "I decided to start the first paragraph with an outrageous question," she said, "in order to get the reader's attention."

One-third of the students were aware of their goals--what they wanted their readers to think or do. O'hara stated, "I knew he was the state governor. Therefore, he had a lot of authority. . . about our society." Cole was very sure about her point. She wrote, "I wanted to get the point across that the story wasn't bad, but that just because you do what everybody else is doing doesn't mean it's right or right for you!" And Tommy was sure she had done enough work to reach her goal. She stated:

> I hoped that my letter could persuade Gov. McWherter about not having an income tax. At first, I did not express facts completely to illustrate the point. As I read the facts and understood it I was able to express my point better. I rewrote my paper two or

> three times to ensure the point I wanted to make. When I finished, I felt very good about my letter and felt it could help to show Gov. McWherter citizens care.

Several students (29%) said they wanted to write clearly and concisely. Emily said, "I felt I needed to be very clear and concise in my arguments." And Marie wrote, ". . .I rewrote it because I couldn't make it express what I wanted to get across to the reader."

Four students (18%) mentioned persuading the reader, using words like "urge," "pressure," and "convince." Four students said that they enjoyed being able to voice their opinions. Four other students expressed a lack of confidence in writing to ouside audiences. Akbar, for example, wrote, "I don't feel that I am personally good enough at writing to send a letter to a congressman. . . . Proffessionals should only have to read proffessional works."

Finally, three students said they were influenced by the collaborative group work, two said they were influenced by the teacher's feedback, two said they wrote to please themselves, and two did not mention audience.

I concluded from these responses that the real-audience group was, for the most part, involved in their topics and that the majority of the students were motivated by getting a particular response from an audience rather than by getting a grade. Like group one, group two seemed to be affected positively by writing for their audiences. A comparison of all groups' responses appears in Table 8, p. 115.

The second written responses from this group showed a marked change in attitude from the first responses. Eighty-five percent of these responses were positive. Some of the students felt the class had been a learning experience thus far. For example, O'hara wrote the following reaction:

> This year is the first time that I have really enjoyed writing for outside audiences. . . . I hope we continue to write more. I think this also helps you to learn more about different things.

Others said they found the assignments purposeful and challenging. Ice Cream Man wrote, "I feel that writing for real, outside audiences has affected my writing by realizing that it is actually written for a purpose." Marie said, "I feel that the assignments we have done have made me work harder on writing because I know a lot of people might read it and it also challenges me to be a better writer." Coley also said that he was challenged. He wrote the following:

> Writing for an outside audience I feel has enabled me to become a stronger writer and thinker. When I know someone will read my work, it makes me work harder and to think things out instead of just throwing them on paper.

Four students felt that the experience helped to prepare them for writing outside of school. Taco Bell stated, "I'll need these skills later on in life." Alpha said, "It is harder to prepare and organize these papers, but I feel that it helps us to enter the world." The Boss wrote, "I am more prepared and have a better idea what its like to write for outside writing. I need to learn more

about writing on my own." And Barry added, "We need that experience, after all, once we leave this class we may not write any more letters for grades but sooner or later we will write a formal letter to someone."

Other positive responses included comments about "keeping focused" and "improving writing skills." Only four students gave negative responses. Two said their writing had not changed, and two felt they weren't ready to write for real audiences.

Group two also responded to the last questionnaire on November 27, 1991 (see Figure 13 for questions). Answers to all four questions reflected overall positive changes in attitude (from the beginning of the semester) and positive effects from the writings.

Comparing and contrasting the writing assignments with writing they had done before, 43% of the students responded that the papers for our class, unlike previous writing they had done, had real topics, real audiences, and real purpose. Marilyn Monroe wrote the following:

> Most of the writing I have done in the past has been for school just like this class, however, the only person that ever read my writing was the teacher. In this class we have written to actual audiences. It was not even like writing for school--there was a purpose besides getting a grade.

AL also noted a difference, as the following statement reveals:

> The writings I have done in this class have been more realistic than in the past. They were on topics of today and to actual people. In the past writings were easier but that's because they did not have to be read by more

> than one person. I feel I have benefitted from the experience of the writings of this class.

And Chris added, "The writing I have done for this class have been of more importance. Because of writing to outside audiences, I have taken more time and put more effort in order to set a good impression."

A similar answer, given by 38% of the students in this class, was that people other than a teacher read their writings. Ice Cream Man wrote, "My class writing have been far different this year than in the past. Before this class, all my writings have just been to teachers, not real audiences." And Akbar wrote the following:

> The writing done in this class is focused toward someone or something which we want to share our views. The only difference with this and past writing is the fact that these are read by someone other than a teacher or classmate."

To almost a third of the class (29%), writing for a real audience was more difficult and time consuming. For instance, Michael Jordan wrote:

> The writings I have done in this class have been much more critical. In the past I have had a specific thing to write about and I gave my views or position. I have not done much writing outside class besides letter, but nothing really formal. In this class the entire process has been left up to me to get done start to finish.

And Trisha agreed that the writing we did was "very difficult."

The remaining answers varied. One student said writing for a real audience was more like writing he would do in his future career. One participant said a real audience allowed freer expression. Another said writing to real audiences was more fun. And a fourth said her writing had improved over past writing.

Table 9 (see p. 119) gives a comparison of the three groups' answers to question one.

In answer to the second question, the majority of the real-audience group said their concepts of themselves as writers had changed. Fifty-five percent said they felt more confident in their writing abilities, and 55% said they were now more aware of audience and purpose. Marie wrote the following answer:

> I think I have become a little better at writing. I'm not as scared about letting other people read my work as I was at the first of the year. I think the essays we have written have made me take a look at myself as a writer and try to find ways of improving my writing.

Coley said, "I feel more confident writing letters and papers now because I can go at my own pace and discover my own mistakes." Chris stated, "As a writer, I feel more confident with my writings. In the future, my audience will play a major role in consideration." And AL wrote, "I have always felt that I was not a creative writer, but. . .I have more confidence in my writings now."

Concerning audience and purpose, Barry wrote this reply:

> I learned that writing is not just for a grade, it must be something more than just grammatically correct. It needs a purpose, a reason,

> and writing these papers has brought my attention to this.

Emily had a similar answer:

> I think my writing has improve some. After writing for an outside audience, I am more aware of the tone and point of view I use and of the elements needed to achieve my purpose with different audiences.

And Melanie wrote, "I feel that I am able to write for any purpose now with better understanding of how I should proceed depending on the audience I have."

Four of the students (18%) also said their writing skills had improved, three (14%) said they had learned to evaluate their own writing, and two (9%) said they had changed their overall approach to writing. Penn summed up these thoughts with the following statement:

> I have quickly come to the realization that writing is rewriting and rewriting and rewriting. . . . I now know that knowing your audience is everything.

Two students had negative comments about the class. Only one of these, Michael Jordan, said that he felt less confident. He wrote, "I definitely see myself as a worse writer than I had previously thought. It has caused me to try to view it as others would see it, and think in a more general sense."

Table 10 (see p. 120) shows how group two's answers compare to the answers of the other groups.

In response to question three, 86% of group two said they would consider audience in future writings. O'hara wrote, "I will consider them to be very important and hope that they would be interested enough to get into my readings. . . ." Trisha said much the

same thing: "I have learned that considering the audience is a big step in writing. From now on, I will use it to help me write." Coley said, "I will consider who they are, how they stand, and what they know more thoroughly now." And Melanie added, "I will take into account the reader's point of view and use the appropriate tone and voice."

In addition, 18% said they would analyze their audience in the future. Michael Jordan wrote, "I believe this class will help to change my views in that I will have to try to analyze my audience first and start from there with my writing." And AL stated, "I feel I will be able to analize my audience better and will be able to help them understand my writings more."

Three students (14%) went beyond the question and vowed to get involved in community affairs because of their experience. JJ's statement serves as an example:

> I think writing can often make more of an impression than speaking. For one thing it can be read and reread to ascertain the exact meaning. My next "audience" is going to be . . .Division Manager of <a particular> grocery chain. I hope to convince him to adopt a strict no smoking policy for his chain of stores.

There were only three other answers to question three. One student said he would make sure his writing had a purpose. A second said she would use persuasive techniques. And the third gave an answer that was not suited to the question. Table 11 (p. 122) shows a comparison of the answers of all the groups.

When asked to give their positive and negative feelings about the class overall, question four, 42% of the participants said that writing to

real audiences about real topics had improved their writing. Taco Bell reported:

> I was happy when I received a letter from <Congressman> Quillen about my letter. I felt I contributed to his knowledge on my topic. I always found it difficult to find a topic and to express my views, but it does come easier now.

Logan wrote, "It was good to express my views to difficult audiences and, as I said, it's made me more concerned about how I write and I'm a better critic of myself." And Chris said, "In writing to outside audiences, I feel it has improved my writing."

Thirty-six percent of the class said that the work was difficult, as JJ explained:

> Even though I hated some of the writing assignments I also appreciated them. I only hated them in the sense that I had to work hard and think hard, which really was good for me in the end. It's too bad that so many people are allowed, as I was, to glide through school without ever being required to think, but only to memorize. Although I always struggle very hard to write, I do feel good when I manage to complete a piece I feel good about.

And Coley commented, "Positive feeling is that it forces me to think harder before writing, which also leads to my negative feelings when I'm lazy."

Three students (14%) said the experience would help them later in life. For example, AL said that her plan for "becoming a distinguished business woman requires that know how to speak to different audiences." Ice Cream Man wrote that "writing 'real' letters to 'real' people has been very hard, but it will be very helpful

in the future." And Melanie said that she had "benefited from writing for an audience. It will help enable me to do so after school when the situation occurs."

Another 14% of the group said that they enjoyed writing in order to get a real response instead of just a grade. Marilyn Monroe said that she "thoroughly enjoyed writing for a true audience. They will form an opinion about my work based on how they feel and not on what grade it deserves." And Barry wrote, "It made the work worth wild and added a bit of spice to the class."

In addition, 14% of the students said they had realized that they needed to improve their writing. For instance, Trisha said that trying to persuade someone instead of writing for a grade had made her put forth "extra effort to try to make it perfect." And, still on a positive note, one student said that real audiences allowed freer self expression.

Finally, two students complained that sending the writings to the targeted audiences should be voluntary, and one student said he still didn't think he was a good enough writer to have his works read "by a critical thinking audience."

These answers are compared to those of the other groups' answers to question four in Table 12, p. 125.

I made several concluding observations about the real-audience group during the study. Above all, I would have to say that this group was highly motivated--more so than the class-audience group and much more so than the imaginary-audience group. They showed this motivation in three ways. First, they focused quickly on topics and began research faster than the other groups, as my journal entries of September 20,

and October 2 will show (see Appendix). Secondly, they worked harder than any class I have taught since I began teaching in 1978. They were diligent and conscientious about gathering research (see journal entry for Oct. 4), always looking for the most up-to-date information. They sought help from me more than the other students (see journal entries for Oct. 11, 23, 25, 30; Nov. 13, 18, 20, 22, 27; Dec. 6). They were in my office so much that we became very acquainted, and we talked "writing" so much that I felt like their editor/employer instead of their teacher. And they wrote more revisions (sometimes total rewrites without my prompting!) than any class I have ever taught (see journal entries for Oct. 11, 14; Nov. 1, 6). And third, they spoke of their motivation and enthusiasm about writing for real people, both to me and to the class (see journal entries for Oct. 4, 9, 28; Nov. 4, 18; Dec. 2, 9). This motivation was not sudden. In the beginning they were intimidated, as their first responses show. But as their second responses and answers to the last questionnaire attest, they did gain confidence and a sense of purpose for writing.

My second observation was that more of these students made individual improvements, both in their writing and in their attitudes about themselves as writers. Examples of the changes I saw are recorded in my journal entries for November 27 and December 6 (see Appendix). The class as a whole moved away from my influence over their written products. By the end of the semester, they had become independent of the class and the grade, so much so that they could not have cared less about impressing me. My journal entry for December 4 shows my frustration over the fact that this group seemed not to care if they performed well on the post-test. I surmise that, since it

was not written for a real audience, they did not think it worthy of their attention.

A third observation was that this group, as a whole, was more able to change the structure of their writing--to use different genres--than the others. Their letters looked like letters, and their essays looked like essays. They were willing to explore different approaches and perspectives. In addition, they were better able to recognize different structures and different writing techniques, especially voice and persuasion, in others' writings (see journal entry for Nov. 11).

Finally, I observed that this group worked too hard. Sending every paper they wrote to an outside audience, which meant turning in one more draft than the other students in the study (on top of the extra revisions they did), was almost too much for some of these students. When they turned in the last draft of the last paper, a few of them were on the brink of "burn out." But I must say that they reached their full potential as freshmen writers (see journal entry for Dec. 9).

Changes in Attitude, Group Three

Group three wrote for imaginary audiences; in other words, they did not send their writings to their targeted audiences. The qualitative research shows that the effects on the imaginary-audience group were not consistent. Most of the students in this group appeared to stay in a state of confusion about the purpose of their writing. Their lack of cooperation in the classroom, their lack of attention to research, and their lack of concern for their writing told me that targeting imaginary audiences, for this group, was like having no audience at all. Journal entries that show these problems

most plainly are September 18 and 23, October 11, November 1 and 20, and December 2.

Just like group one, the imaginary-audience group did not put their names on the first written responses. This group's responses were a little more diverse than those of the other two groups. Eleven of the students (52%) gave positive responses. Seven of these (33%) said they felt freer to express opinions. For instance, one student wrote the following:

> Writing for outside audiences, I feel like I can say more of what I feel. I may disagree with something and I can give my opinion about it. In writing for a teacher or class, I hesitate to voice exactly what I feel for fear of angering the teacher or classmates. Overall I am more comfortable in writing for an outside audience.

Another participant wrote:

> In my opinion, I like writing for pretend audiences better. When I try to write something for the teacher only, I feel more restricted. By writing to outside audiences, you can write as if you are speaking to people, and more people will read it, therefore at least some of them should understand the writing.

A third student made the following comment:

> I would rather write for a pretend audience than for the teacher/class because you are then not limited to what the teacher/class knows about the subject and don't have to explain terms and other info that would be understood by the directed audience.

And a fourth student said, "I prefer to write for pretend audiences because you can feel more open. Mainly because academic essays are so strict and you have to be more factual than opinionated." Although these responses are positive, it is possible to infer from these answers that, while the students felt freer to speak their mind, they also appeared to feel relieved of their responsibilities to their readers.

Two of the positive responses dealt with focusing on the audience. One of the two wrote the following:

> I like writing for an outside audience better because it gives your paper more direction and purpose. You are more focused as to what you are writing about. It is also seems more realistic to write to a certain audience rather than writing for the teacher.

And the second wrote, "I liked writing to pretend audiences. The pretend audience helped me to keep focused on what I was writing about and who would be reading my papers."

The last two positive responses indicated that the students felt challenged. The first gave this statement:

> I like writing for pretend outside audiences better than for the class. It makes me more nervous to know that somebody is going to be judging my writing. I think I can write more freely for a pretend audience.

And the second wrote this response:

> It has added some variety to my writing. I also believe that the types of writings that we do in this class teach us more about writing because the types of writing in this class are the types of writings that we will actually do in real life.

Forty-three percent indicated that their writing was affected in a negative way or not affected at all. Four of these seemed not to be able to focus on the particular audience they addressed. For example, one student wrote the following:

> I feel that writting for outside audiences is harder to do for the simple fact that I must take in everyones opinions to what I have written. I tend to try to satisfy everyone who would read it. When I am taking a side on a topic I find myself not actually taking the side, because I am trying to satisfy all the readers. I feel like if I was writing to the teacher I could better express myself.

The second stated, "Since our audience is bigger, it makes it harder, for me anyway, to put my words in a way so that I won't offend anyone." A third student wrote, "I don't like to be given an audience because I may not be very familiar with that particular audience. It is difficult to write to someone you don't know much about." And a fourth stated, "I found that sitting down and writing a letter to President George Bush was difficult. I did not know what to say."

The remainder of the answers were negative or showed no effect at all. One student said that he/she would rather write for the teacher or the class. Another wrote, "I would rather the teacher tell us straight who the audience is." One stated, "I like the pretend audiences better than the real audiences." And three participants indicated that they didn't care, stating, "It doesn't matter if I write to a pretend audience or the teacher," "The idea of who is going to read my paper does not bother me," and "Something someone else thinks is of no importance."

In response to the second questionnaire (see Figure 8), 43% of the imaginary-audience group expressed confidence in their writing. Cissy wrote the following example:

> I felt the reader could understand and relate the idea of superstitions to the story. I also thought the reader would enjoy my paper as well as find it interesting.

Rated R was especially proud of his paper, as he related in this statement:

> It's my opinion, but it's a very strong opinion. I feel that this is the best paper I've ever written. I can't explain it but I feel good about getting my point across to my audience.

Dean said that she felt "pretty good about the final draft of this paper and I hope I brought some new points to the study of 'The Lottery.'" And Alex said, "I felt that my letter was written well enough to send to Senator Albert Gore."

On the other extreme, 38% of this group expressed a lack of confidence. For instance, Sprite wrote, "I really do not consider this paper up to my potential. I couldn't quite grasp what I was trying to prove." C.C. stated, "I thought about what kind of reader I was going to address. I had problems expressing my points clearly for the reader." And Taterbug wrote the following:

> It was hard for me to visualize another reader, so I tried extra hard to concentrate on the reader. I wish I could've been more familar with my reader. . . . As far as having someone else read my paper, I feel wierd, because sometimes I have a problem with writing what I am thinking. I would far much rather if I could give it in speech form, instead of essay form.

Thirty-three percent said they were conscious of the reader during the writing process. Al Cabone said he "planned to test my reader intellect by using comparison of the Salem Witch Trails." Hang-Man said, "I knew if I was too harsh my reader may become angry, so I tried to make my point carefully."

Twenty-nine percent wanted to write clearly to be understood. Blondie, for example, said that when she considered the reader, "I tried to think of the examples that would help them to see my view." And Alex reported:

> I thought about how I would make my ideas clear and understandable for my reader. This was one of my biggest problems--trying to figure out how to be percise.

Nineteen percent said they were aware of the teacher as the audience. Elvis said, "I thought about the reader being the teacher who was grading my paper more than what my audience was thinking about my paper." And Ace wrote the following statement:

> Another thought that crossed my mind was that the grade I would recieve would depend on what kind of mood you are in and how well you liked me. I might be wrong but I feel that English is a biased class (nothing personal).

The remaining answers were diverse. Three students expressed a desire to entertain the reader, while three said they had problems concentrating on the reader. Three did not mention the reader, and three said they were influenced by the collaborative work. Two participants said they wanted to persuade their readers, one (Alex) named the reader, and one said she enjoyed expressing herself.

My impression of these responses was that some of the students were able to imagine an audience out-

side the classroom and were positively affected, while others were not able to imagine an audience or realized that I (the teacher) was still their audience, since their writings were not actually being sent to the imagined audience.

The answers to the second response were much more consistent and positive than the answers to the first response and the second questionnaire. In fact, 72% of the responses were positive. Four of the positive answers concerned being conscious of the reader. Brooks wrote the following:

> I think that writing to outside audiences has helped because it give me an understanding of the topic. If I write to a certain audience I know that I have to use information that will interest them.

Bubba made a similar statement:

> I feel writing to outside audiences has helped my writing because if you're writing to someone important then you want your letter to be perfect and professional. This makes you concentrate on it more so it will get their attention.

Corda made a very encouraging response:

> At this point I feel that writing for audiences outside the class has helped my writing skills. I have been able to focus on the audience and actually do the papers as if I were doing them for real.

And Dean wrote:

> . . .For an outside audience I have to write so that they see my view of an issue and my reasoning must be appropriate and persuasive. When using the class as the audience, you usually

> aren't so concerned with getting them to see your point of view in a reasonable manner.

Two of the positive responses dealt with freer expression. Hang-Man said that writing for outside audiences "has allowed me to express what I feel and think without the fear of my teacher disagreeing." And Pineapple wrote, "This helps me to write more freely and opinated more than writing a strict academic paper for a teacher."

Two students felt that targeting audiences outside the classroom would benefit them in the future. Ace wrote the following:

> I believe that by writing these letters to an "outside" audience will help me in the future. I know I will have a lot of letters I will have to write to certain persons whom will evaluate me, to some extent, on how well my paper is written.

And Elvis wrote:

> It is more realistic to write to an audience, because that is what you'd be doing in real life. Once we get out of college, we won't be writing to a teacher anymore, will <we'll> be writing to people who are interested in reading our writing and not just grading it.

Lastly, two students, Blondie and Sprite, felt that writing to audiences outside the classroom helped them to control their emotions when they wrote, and three others were not specific about why they liked the class.

The remaining 28% of the students in this group gave negative responses. Most of those who fell into this category said that their writing had not been affected at all, but one student, C.C., gave a definite reason for his disappointment. He wrote, "I personaly

have trouble writing for outside audiences. I alway try to satisfy all the readers, therefore, I cannot express my personal views on one side."

The fact that these responses were more positive was certainly encouraging. However, the last questionnaire showed an inconsistent pattern once again.

The first question on the last questionnaire asked the students to compare and contrast the writing they had done in the class with writing they had done in the past. Twenty-nine percent of this group said that they had not written persuasively before, and 29% of them said that they had never targeted audiences before. Fourteen percent said that writing for imaginary audiences allowed them more self-expression. For instance, Rated R. said that the class had "allowed me to use my opinions in my papers more than I have in the past." And Hang-Man wrote, "My ideas for writing come more freely in this class. In this class I'm not afraid to say what I feel."

In addition, 14% said that they had done better in this composition class than in high school. Bubba wrote, "The writing is much better now than in high school. You research the topic more and get a better understanding for it, plus better grades." And Ace stated, "I feel that I have done better on the writing in this class compared to the writing I did in high school."

The rest of the answers varied. Two participants complained that they had done better in high school. Al Cabone, on the other hand, said that the writing he had done in our class had a purpose, unlike high-school writing. Corda said this was the first time she had written a literary paper. Sprite said that his writing in our class was "nowhere up to my potential," while

Pineapple said the "writing I have done in this class is easier." One student mentioned that writing rough drafts and having conferences were new ideas, and another felt that the structure of the papers was different. Finally, one answer was not geared to the question.

Table 9 (see p. 119) shows a comparison of the groups' responses to question one.

The second question asked the participants how their concepts of themselves as writers had changed. Twenty-five percent of the imaginary-audience group responded that they felt more confident, partly because of the collaborative work in class. C.C. said, "I feel as if I have improved in my writing considerably. I have almost gotten over my phobia of voicing my opinion." Brooks wrote, "I feel a little more confident than I did. . . . By having other students read the essays, I feel that this kind of takes the pressure off of me." And Ace stated, "I'm not really ashamed of my writing anymore. . . . This <group work> allows me to get other opinions of my paper and also tells me how I can improve my writing ability."

Twenty percent said they were more aware of audience. Reducer said, "I have changed the way I write by being more conscience of the audience and try not to use sexist terms." Dean said, "My writing is more focused." And Cacalaca stated, "I believe I am more concious of making my writing easy to understand. . . . Now that I know other people may be reading it, I'm more careful."

Another 20% of them said their writing had improved. Taterbug said she was "more aware of my & others mistakes." And Bubba wrote, "There's still room for improve-

ment, but with each writing I'm becoming better and better."

And still another 20% of them felt they were less able to express themselves than they were before. Pineapple said, "Now I have to watch what I write because those people could see me on the street and give me their opinion." Sprite wrote, "I voice my opinion alot less than I use to because it makes the reader want to keep reading." And Texas stated, "Now I try to be more neutral when other people are going to be reading my writing."

Fifteen percent of this group gave negative responses. For instance, Al Cabone wrote, "For one thing I am not cut out to be a writer. I make to many mistake, major mistake while writing." And finally, one student felt better able to persuade others, while another student felt that there had been no change in his writing.

A comparison of the three groups' responses to the second question appears in Table 10, p. 120.

Question three asked the participants to explain how they would consider their readers in the future. Seventy-two percent of the imaginary-audience group said they would be conscious of the audience in future writing. Reducer wrote the following response:

> I will consider the audience by trying to appeal to them and try not to make them mad or bored. I will try hard to make them want to finish my paper while also trying to influence them. . . .

Texas said, "I am much more aware of my audience than I used to be." Mr. Mojo stated, "I will keep an open mind try not to upset anyone while trying to be persuasive." Elvis said, "I can be more focused to my audience."

Cacalaca wrote, "I will be sure to include things the audience may be able to relate to. This could make them like the writing better." Bubba said, "I'll try to write about what they want to hear and try to solve the problem for them if need be." And C.C. wrote, "I will consider their feelings as long as they do not overlap and interfere with my own."

The remaining answers differed greatly. Two students said they would think of a broader audience, two said they would use persuasive techniques, and two gave vague answers. One participant said he would use the audience analysis questions, one said she would improve her writing skills, and one said she would pay more attention to grammar.

Table 11 (see p. 122) shows a comparison of the groups' responses to question three.

Question four asked the students to relate their positive and negative reactions to the writing experiences in the class. Sixty-seven percent of the participants said they enjoyed writing for audiences other than a teacher or a class. Blondie said, "I enjoy writing for an audience better than just to a teacher." Texas wrote, "It is easier to write for a pretend audience such Newsweek than writing for classmates." And Dean wrote the following comment:

> I think writing for an audience is a good technique to break writers from writing the standard high school paper. It makes you think & consider how your topic will be taken. It also makes you take your writing more seriously since you are writing for a purpose.

Fourteen percent of the students said they felt good about the writing they had done in the class.

James Bond, for instance, said he "was pleased to find out that I could actually write something and it come out the way I wanted to." And Ace wrote, "Now I am more certain of my ability to communicate through writing."

Three other positive responses dealt with appreciation of the group work in the class and with new pleasure in writing.

Twenty-nine percent of the group said they found it difficult to imagine an audience. Cissy said, "Some of the papers were really hard in targeting my audience." Brooks wrote, "The second assignment on 'The Lottery' I didn't really know what I was writing for or about." And C.C. stated, "I was really uncomfortable writing for an audience. I was afraid to tell exactly what I felt for the absolute fear that I may upset someone."

Finally, one student said she wished the students could have chosen their audiences. A comparison of the answers to question four appear in Table 12, p. 125.

I made four major observations concerning the imaginary-audience group. First, most of the students in this group seemed to stay confused about their purpose for writing. They showed this confusion in three ways. They told me they were confused. After they began the first writing assignment, many of them became uncooperative, even disruptive, in class (see journal entries for Sept. 23, 27; Oct. 2, 7, 9, 11, 14, 18, 30; and Nov. 1, 4, 6, 11, 20). And they were slow to focus on their topics and their audiences. Journal entries for September 20 and November 22 will further illustrate this point.

My second observation was that, while some were able to imagine their audiences, others saw me as their

audience or were unable to imagine an audience at all. Journal entries for September 25, November 27, and December 2, 6 and 9 help prove this point.

Third, the majority of this class was not concerned about their writing. They sought help from me less than the other groups, scheduling fewer conferences with me. They also rewrote fewer times. Some students merely recopied their rough drafts, ignoring my comments and the comments of other students. I am accustomed to writing students' viewing revision as copying, but no one in the other groups did so all semester. Journal entries for September 30, October 21, and November 1, 15, 18, and 20 illustrate this group's lack of concern.

Finally, many of these students showed a lack of attention to research; they were not compelled by their imaginary audiences to be responsible for the information they included in their papers (see journal entries for Oct. 4, Nov. 13, and Dec. 2). They were willing to use any information, even if it was not appropriate or up-to-date, or to make up information, since they were not actually sending their writings to their audiences.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The purposes of this study were twofold. The primary purpose of the study was to assess the effects of audience on the voice and persuasive processes of college freshmen writers. To make this assessment, I analyzed pretest and post-test scores to determine whether three treatments (class audience, real audience, and imaginary audience) would affect the voice and persuasive strategies of college freshman writers. Using statistical tests, primarily analyses of variance, I found that there was a significant difference in the scores, especially between the scores of the class-audience group and the real-audience group.

The secondary purpose of the study was to record the changes in students' concepts of their voice and powers of persuasion and to record the effects of audience on students' motivation to write well (in order to communicate with others) and to perform well in the writing classroom. The qualitative data collected show that audience specification (class, real, and imaginary) has definite effects on students' concepts of themselves as writers and their concepts of their powers of persuasion.

Conclusions

Motivation is the key to improvements in writing skills. Above all, the findings of this study indicate that audience specification has a profound effect on students' motivation to write clearly, to have an effect

on others' thinking, to communicate their ideas, and to get involved through writing.

Both the quantitative results and the qualitative results show that using the class as the audience for students' writing has decisive positive effects on college freshmen writers. Students in this study related that writing for their peers allowed them freer self expression. And as my journal notes indicate (see Appendix), the relaxed atmosphere (created by the feeling that peers are more accepting of opinions) led to better cooperation/participation in the classroom and, thereby, to enhanced collaborative work. This finding was not surprising to me. In an article I wrote for the Tennessee English Journal in 1991, I related an experience I had with a developmental writing class. One of the benefits of the collaborative efforts of the group in the article was "strengthened relationships in the classroom" (20). Just like the developmental group, group one in this study became somewhat like a family.

However, the students' written responses indicate that the class is not adequate as the sole audience for all students for every writing assignment. On the one hand, some students outgrow the class audience, once their self confidence improves, and need a greater challenge than peers offer. On the other hand, some students become too comfortable, too secure, writing for peers, and it may be difficult for them to think of stretching their abilities beyond the classroom.

Real audiences outside the classroom (readers who are not obligated to read or respond) offer the greatest challenge to students and act as the greatest motivator. In the beginning, the students in this study were intimidated by the thought of sending their writing to strangers. But they soon became highly motivated--so

motivated that they became deeply involved in their topics and independent of the classroom (the teacher and the grade).

The results of the two sets of data for this study may appear conflicting concerning group two. However, both the students' comments and my journal notes show consistent motivation on the part of these students. High motivation, of course, carries with it the potential for saturation. Therefore, this study suggests that a real audience is not advisable for all students for every writing assignment.

The most important finding of this study is that imaginary audiences are unpredictable in their effects. The effects of imaginary audiences on group three were inconsistent. This study shows that those who are able to imagine and focus on an audience that doesn't exist have the potential to be motivated just as much as if they were writing for a real purpose. However, for those who are not able to imagine that they are writing something real for real people, an imaginary audience can mean that the teacher automatically becomes the substitute audience or that there is no audience. Either way, the students will be adversely affected or not affected at all. In "Closing My Eyes as I Talk: An Argument Against Audience Awareness," Peter Elbow advocates letting students write privately (17) without an audience to give them freer expression. But this study shows that for writing that is meant to be read by an audience, like persuasive writing, the removal of the audience can be detrimental to students' motivation to write well.

The quantitative data indicate that all the groups improved in their voice and persuasive skills. Of course, whether they improved because of the audience treatment

or simply because of the writing techniques learned in the class is hard to determine. However, no matter by what method or variable the students' writing abilities were affected, the qualitative data firmly indicate that audience specification affected the students' ideas of themselves as writers, which in turn determined their motivation. Group one, the class-audience group, was motivated to write clearly on topics their peers would have interest in and to cooperate in the classroom. Group two was motivated to turn out a product that would accomplish a real purpose. Group three, the imaginary-audience group, was not uniformly motivated; in fact, some of the students in group three showed no motivation. Overall, the findings of this study concur with the findings of Theresa M. Redd-Boyd and Wayne H. Slater (see p. 52 of this text), who also studied the effects of audience specification on the persuasive writing of college students and who concluded that the writer's feelings toward the reader and the topic are highly important.

An additional finding of this study was that the heuristic model (audience analysis), which was added at the middle of the semester, seemed to have no effect on the students' attitudes about their readers.

Implications

Implications for Teaching

This study suggests six implications for the teaching of writing. First, it is clear that the class as an audience is effective for promoting self expression and a collaborative spirit in the classroom. However, R. J. Willey's notion that the class should be the only audience option does not hold true in this study. The class

should be used often, especially at the beginning of a new term, to bolster students' confidence in their ideas and to establish a cooperative atmosphere in the class.

However, Harold Nugent reminds us that peer audiences present their own problems. The very thing that gives peer audiences their advantage--the fact that peers know about the same things and have had similar experiences--also creates their disadvantage, a lack of homogeneity (300). In addition, other studies show that collaborative work in the writing classroom makes writing more comfortable (Reynolds 76), a goal which writing teachers recognize as a temporary one.

Second, more writing teachers need to direct students to write for real audiences--those that are not obligated to read or respond. A real audience presents the biggest challenge (it's risky, even scary) and the biggest motivation. Only a real audience helps students make the distinction between academic writing for a grade and real-world writing for a purpose. It allows students to see that writing is a real activity in which they can engage outside of school. It challenges students to get involved. And it motivates students to produce good writing. Like the class audience, however, it should not be used with every assignment because, where the class audience does not challenge enough, the real audience has the potential to challenge too much in large doses.

I must restate here that a real audience means that students' writing reaches its destination--its audience--so that there is the possibility that the students will receive a response or see their writing in print. At the very least, students should be aware that their writing has the potential of being read by someone outside the classroom. If this study does nothing else to contribute to the research on audience, I hope that it

clears up the confusion between real and imagined audiences.

Many writing teachers have a misconception that imagining is as good as doing. I know teachers who regularly ask students to direct their writing to what they call "real" audiences, but do not provide the impetus to send the writing to those audiences. For instance, recently a colleague of mine phoned me to say that my study had prompted her to consider asking her students to write for real audiences. She went on to say that she had, that very semester, directed her classes to "pretend" they were sending their essays to "real" publications. But when I asked if the students were actually sending the essays, she said, "No. Is that important?" I then regretfully informed her that a "pretend" audience is not a "real" audience.

In a study done with college freshmen in 1979, Harold Nugent found "that the matter of providing a named audience is not sufficient in itself to ensure the desired awareness of and the subsequent accomodation of the reader" (298). Nugent found that "one of the problems in this relationship stems from the adult audience, more specifically the teacher as the named or unnamed audience" (298). As my own study suggests, ". . .the presence of the teacher as audience for twelve years prior to freshman composition courses may result" in a conditioned response on the part of the students (298). My study, however, goes beyond this conclusion by suggesting that an audience that is merely named can actually strip the student of all focus. In my estimation, relying on students' imagination for focus in their writing is a foolish venture. I personally will never again use what Rachel Spilka calls a "simulated rhetorical situation" (150), unless

the students understand that it is preparation for the real thing or unless I give them the potential to make the situation real through publication.

I must add another caution concerning the use of distant peer audiences as the only outside audiences. The exchanging of letters by different classes has become a popular practice because it offers advantages beyond the immediate peer group. However, as I stated in Chapter 2 (see p. 46 of this text), because distant peers are students who are required to read the correspondence and because the genre and topics are restricted, the distant peer audience should not be considered a real outside audience. The problem with using distant peer audiences as a substitute for real audiences is that teachers, again, put limits on student writers because the teachers retain control of the audience and the outcome. Therefore, while distant peers offer a definite audience outside the classroom--and the best practice for later publication--other students should not be the only audience writers explore outside the classroom. Also, those of us involved in research and article writing in the field of composition should be cautious about calling distant peer audiences "real" outside audiences (now the common practice) lest teachers get the idea that having groups exchange letters is as far as they need to go in providing their students with "real" audiences.

A fourth implication of this study is that persuasive writing in connection with a clear, specified audience, does get results. The students in the class-audience group frequently said they wanted to "get <their> point across," and the real-audience group expressed a desire to make their opinions known in

order to effect change in society. A study done in 1987 by John O'Looney concluded the following:

> . . .Writing performance in persuasive compositions is significantly related to a writer's level of moral reasoning development, and that this development is not the same as development in language skills. . . . The implications for teaching composition are plain: writing instructors need to focus on the reasoning or logic that is used to construct essays that do in fact persuade. (157)

Other previous research discussed in Chapter 2 confirms that argumentative thinking develops logic. My study suggests that combining persuasive writing and specified audience is highly beneficial to students' motivation.

The fifth implication of this study concerns using audience analysis as a means of enhancing audience awareness. Adding the heuristic model half way into the semester seemed to have no effect on the students' writing or attitudes in this study. Each group approached the heuristic in the same manner that they approached their audiences. The class-audience group spent more time describing their audience because the audience was visible. The real-audience group treated the heuristic as a class exercise which they wanted to get done in order to get back to the real task, the letter or essay. I surmised that they had already analyzed their audiences as they chose them. Those in the imaginary-audience group who were able to imagine their audiences did take some time with the heuristic; however, those who were not able to focus on an audience were also not able to focus on the specifics of the heuristic. Therefore, I conclude that the heuristic should be used as a teaching tool, but not all the

time and certainly not instead of a definite audience. Audience specification seems to be more effective at enhancing audience awareness than audience analysis alone, a finding which agrees with earlier research (see p. 45).

Finally, this study suggests that a variety of specified audiences might work best for writing assignments, beginning with the class-as-audience to promote confidence, moving to a more challenging audience inside the academic setting (such as other classes, school publications, and school authorities), and then graduating to real audiences outside the academic setting. With such a plan, even the teacher could serve as an audience for particular writings, as long as the purpose is in focus. As Rachel Spilka cautions, it is always best to use a variety of methods to teach audience awareness because "each method has flaws" (149-52). What we must not do, if we want to promote attention to writing skills, is ignore audience awareness. Harold Nugent concluded that "beginning college writers need to be exposed to a variety of audiences" and that "the audience needs to be built as realistically as possible into the writing tasks" (297).

Implications for Research

I would like to see this study duplicated, with two changes, in order to test the outcome with three different groups of students in a different location. The first change should be a redesign of the 40-point scale. It should be narrowed to include one point per item, and the "overall" points should be eliminated. Rater One had these words to say about changing the scale:

> I would narrow the scale (1-3) and eliminate the overall score as somewhat meaningless. Only after I objectified each category (3

> incidents of persuasion techniques earned a "3," for example) could <Rater Two> and I find a common ground numerically.

Rater Two concurred:

> The fourth item (overall voice and overall persuasion) seemed almost to skew the scores in some cases in that a "3" in one of the first three areas would require a "0" in the fourth, but a "4" would allow "3" or "4" in the fourth.

Both raters found the scale to be a valuable tool for assessing persuasive writing when accompanied by examples to keep them focused. Meeting together, in order to make sure they were in agreement about the meanings of the more obscure terms, like "tone," was also helpful, they said.

Secondly, the post-test should be counted as a grade to ensure that all the students put forth an effort to do better. I think that only under these conditions would we see a realistic statistical outcome.

The second implication for research deals with using qualitative research in place of or in addition to quanitative research. It is extremely difficult to get accurate scores when dealing with changes in writing, especially when those changes are subjective. Statistical tests alone do not tell why students improved or why they did not improve. Without a corresponding qualitative study to clarify the quantitative scores, I would not have been able to show why the real-audience group appeared not to improve as much as the other groups when, in fact, they were affected more, in a positive way, than the other students. Qualitative data offer a clearer picture of the reasons students are affected because

such data give us the students' own words. Therefore, studies of this nature should use qualitative research, either alone or combined with quantitative research.

WORKS CITED

WORKS CITED

Andersen, Laurie J. "Sense of Audience or Conventional Wisdom?" Journal of Advanced Composition 7.1 (1987): 112-19.

Anson, Chris. Exploring the Dimensions of Purpose in College Writing. ERIC, 1985. ED 274 964.

Atlas, Marshall. Writer Insensitivity to Audience--Causes and Cures. ERIC, 1980. ED 185 568.

Bator, Paul G. The Impact on Cognitive Development Upon Audience Awareness in the Writing Process. Diss. U Michigan, 1980. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1980. 48106.

Berkenkotter, Carol. "Decisions and Revisions: The Planning Strategies of a Publishing Writer." The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook. 2nd ed. Ed. Gary Tate and Edward P. J. Corbett. New York: Oxford, 1988. 128-39.

---. "Student Writers and Their Sense of Authority Over Texts." College Composition and Communication 35 (1984): 312-19.

---. "Understanding a Writer's Awareness of Audience." College Composition and Communication 32 (1981): 388-99.

Black, Kathleen. "Audience Analysis and Persuasive Writing at the College Level." Research in the Teaching of English 23.3 (1989): 231-53.

Blystone, Jane. Rhetorical Situations: Peace Talks for the War on Attention to Audience in Composition Classroom. ERIC, 1990. ED 321 272.

Bocchi, Joseph. The Collective Concept of Audience in Nonacademic Settings. ERIC, 1988. ED 293 150.

Booth, Wayne. "The Rhetorical Stance." College Composition and Communication 14 (1963). Rpt. in The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook. 2nd ed. Ed. Gary Tate and Edward P. J. Corbett. New York: Oxford, 1988. 151-57.

Bracewell, R. J., M. Scardamalia, and C. Bereiter. The Development of Audience Awareness in Writing. ERIC, 1978. ED 154 433.

Britton, James, et al. The Development of Writing Abilities. New York: Macmillan, 1975.

Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Social Construction, Language, and the Authority of Knowledge: A Bibliographical Essay." College English 48.8 (1986): 773-89.

Carey, Linda, et al. Differences in Writers' Initial Task Representations. ERIC, 1989. ED 310 403.

Cohen, Moshe and Margaret Riel. "The Effect of Distant Audiences on Students' Writing." American Educational Research Journal 26 (1989): 143-59.

Collins, Jude. "Purpose at Work: The Writing of Professionals and Pupils." Use of English 41 (1990): 49-57.

Conley, Delilah F. "Using Group Writing As a Teaching Tool." Tennessee English Journal 2 (1991): 18-20.

Crowhurst, Marion. Sixth Graders Learn from Letter Writing. Eric, 1990. ED 315 776.

Crowhurst, M. and G. L. Piche. "Audience and Mode of Discourse Effects on Syntactic Complexity in Writing at Two Grade Levels." Research in the Teaching of English 13 (1979): 101-09.

Davis, Robert M. and Jeanette Harris. "Discovering Audience and Voice: James Agee Reviews for Highbrow and Middlebrow." Journal of Teaching Writing 5.2 (1986): 287-93.

Dewitt, Clinton. Teaching Audience. ERIC, 1985. Ed 260 458.

Durrant, Karen R. and Charles R. Duke. "Developing Sensitivity to Audience: Connecting Theory and Practice." Teaching English in The Two-Year College 16 (1989): 165-73

Ede, Lisa. "Audience and Introduction to Research." College Composition and Communication 35 (1984): 140-54.

---. "On Audience and Composition." College Composition and Communication 30 (1979): 291-95.

Ede, Lisa and Andrea Lunsford. "Audience Addressed/ Audience Invoked: The Role of Audience in Composition Theory and Pedagogy." College Composition and Communication 35 (1984): 155-71.

Elbow, Peter. Closing My Eyes As I Speak: An Argument for Ignoring Audience. Eric, 1985. ED 261 408.

---. Writing With Power. New York: Oxford, 1981.

---. Writing Without Teachers. New York: Oxford, 1973.

Emig, Janet. The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders. Urbana: NCTE, 1971.

Fawcett, Susan and Alvin Sandberg. Evergreen: A Guide to Writing. 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1988.

Flower, L. and J. R. Hayes. "The Cognition of Discovery Defining a Rhetorical Problem." College Composition and Communication 31 (1980): 21-21.

---. "The Dynamics of Composing: Making Plans and Juggling Constraints." Cognitive Processes in Writing. Ed. L. W. Gregg and E. R. Steinberg. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1980. 31-50.

---. "Plans That Guide the Composing Process." Writing: The Nature, Development, and Teaching of Writing Communication. vol. 2. Ed. C. H. Frederiksen and J. F. Dominic. New York: n.p., 1981. 39-58.

---. "The Pregnant Pause: An Inquiry into the Nature of Planning." Research in The Teaching of English 15 (1981): 29-43.

---. "Problem-Solving Strategies and the Writing Process." College English 39.4 (1977): 449-61.

Foster, David. Perelman's 'Universal Audience' and Writing. ERIC, 1986. ED 270 747.

Freed, Richard and Gleen J. Broadhead. "Discourse Communities, Sacred Texts, and Institutional Norms." College Composition and Communication 38 (1987): 154-64.

Gaunder, Eleanor P. The Evolution of a Research Paper for Multiple Audiences. ERIC, 1990. ED 322 498.

Gibson, Walker. "The Writing Teacher as a Dumb Reader." College Composition and Communication 30 (1979): 192-95.

Greenlee, Marilyn. The effects of Audience on Letter Writing of Fifth-Eighth-, and Twelfth-Grade Students. Diss. U Kentucky, 1990. DA 9021417.

Guckes, Lucille R. "Creation, Composition, Publication: Putting It All Together." Journal of Teaching Writing 5 (1986): 103-12.

Hays, Janice. The Effect of Audience Considerations upon the Revision of a Group of Basic Writers and More Competent Junior and Senior Writers. ERIC, 1981. ED 204 802.

Hays, Janice, et al. "Argumentative Writing of Students: Adult Socio-Cognitive Development." A Sense of Audience in Written Communication. vol. 5.

Ed. Gesa kirsch and Duane H. Roen. London: Sage, 1990. 248-65.

Hays, Janice, Kathleen M. Brandt, and Kathryn H. Chantry. "The Impact of Friendly and Hostile Audiences on the Argumentative Writing of High School and College Students." Research in the Teaching of English 22.4 (1988): 391-415.

Hillocks, George, Jr. Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching. Urbana: National Conference on Research in English, 1986.

Hurd, Rhynette. The Effect of Audience Specification on Writing Anxiety, Performance, and Sensitivity to Audience. ERIC, 1985. ED 269 767.

Jurkiewicz, Kenneth. "How to Begin to Win Friends and Influence People." College Composition and Communication 26.2 (1975): 173-76.

Kirsch, Gesa. "Experienced Writers' Sense of Audience and Authority." A Sense of Audience in Written Communication. vol. 5. Ed Gesa Kirsch and Duane H. Roen. London: Sage, 1990. 216-29.

Kirsch, Gesa and Duane Roen. "Theories and Research on Audience in Written Communication." A Sense of Audience in Written Communication. vol. 5. Ed. Gesa Kirsch and Duane Roen. London: Sage, 1990. 13-np.

Kleine, Michael. "What Freshmen Say--and Might Say--to

Each Other About Their Own Writing." Journal of Teaching Writing 4.2 (1985): 216-33.

Kroll, Barry M. Adapting a Composition to the Audience: The Development of Referential Communication Skills. ERIC, 1979. ED 174 988.

---. "Cognitive Egocentrism and the Problem of Audience in Written Discourse." Research in the Teaching of of English 12 (1978): 269-81.

---. "Developing a Sense of Audience." Language Arts 55.7 (1978): 828-31.

---. "Writing for Readers: Three Perspectives on Audience." College Composition and Communication 35 (1984): 172-85.

Long, Russell C. "Writer-Audience Relationships: Analysis or Invention." College Composition and Communication 31 (1980): 221-26.

---. "The Writer's Audience: Fact or Fiction." A Sense of Audience in Written Communication. vol. 5. Ed. Gesa Kirsch and Duane H. Roen. London: Sage, 1990. 73-84.

Maimon, Elaine. "Talking to Strangers." College Composition and Communication 30 (1979): 364-69.

Malloy, Thomas and James Daniels. Bemused Muse: Teaching Productive Audience for Writing. ERIC, 1986. ED 284 263.

Mancuso, Jean G. Audience Awareness in the Persuasive

Writing of Gifted and Non-Gifted Fifth Grade Students. Diss. Louisiana State U, 1985. DA 8610649.

McCrimmon, James M. Writing with a Purpose. 5th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

McDonald, Kim. "Creating Audience Through Genuine Context." Abstract. Tennessee Philological Bulletin 24 (1989): 70-71.

Miller, Susan. "The Student's Reader is Always a Fiction." Journal of Advanced Composition 5 (1984): 15-29.

Murray, Donald M. "Teaching the Other Self: The Writer's First Reader." College Composition and Communication 33 (1992): 140-47.

---. A Writer Teaches Writing. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985.

Neuhauser, Sandra. Powerful Letter Writing: Students Discover the Power of the Pen(cil). ERIC, 1989. ED 309 413.

Nugent, Harold. The Role of Audience Awareness in the Writing of College Freshmen. Diss. Indiana U of PN, 1979.

Nystrand, Martin. "Rhetoric's 'Audience' and Linguistics' 'Speech Community': Implications for Understanding Writing, Reading and Text." What Writers Know. Ed. Martin Nystrand. New York: Academic Press, 1982.

Odoroff, Elizabeth. The Influence of Writers' Perceptions of Audience on Teacher as Primary and Secondary Audience. Diss. Carnegie Mellon U, 1987. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1987. 8802938.

Oliver, Eileen I. "Effects of Assignment on Writing Quality at Four Grade Levels." English Quarterly 21.4 (1989): 224-32.

O'Looney, John. The Role of Engagement in the Persuasive Writing of 12th Grade Students. Diss. U Georgia, 1987. DA 8800289.

Ong, Walter J. "The Writer's Audience is Always a Fiction." PMLA 90 (1975): 9-21.

Park, Douglas. "Analyzing Audience." College Composition and Communication 37 (1986): 478-88.

---. "The Meanings of 'Audience.'" College English 44.3 (1982): 247-57.

Pfister, Fred R. and Joanne F. Petrick. "A Heuristic Model for Creating a Writer's Audience." College Composition and Communication 31 (1980): 213-19.

Pianko, Sharon. "A Description of the Composing Processes of College Freshmen." Research in the teaching of Writing 13 (1979): 5-22.

Plasse, Lorraine A. The Influence of Audience on the Assessment of Student Writing. Diss. U Connecticut, 1981.

Prentice, Walter C. The Effects of Intended Audience

and Feedback on the Writings of Middle Grade Pupils. Diss. U North Dakota, 1980.

Quick, Doris M. Audience Awareness and Adaptation Skills of Writers at Four Different Grade Levels. Diss. U. New York at Albany, 1983. DA 8325612.

Rafoth, Bennett A. Audience Awareness and Adaptation in the Persuasive Writing of Proficient and Non-Proficient College Freshmen. Diss. U Georgia, 1984.

---. "Audience and Information." Research in the Teaching of English 23.3 (1989): 273-90.

---. "The Concept of Discourse Community: Descriptive and Explanatory Adequacy." A Sense of Audience in Written Communication. vol. 5. Ed. Gesa Kirsch and Duane H. Roen. London: Sage, 1990. 140-51.

Rank, Hugh. "Audience-Directed Writing: Magazines and Personae." English Journal 59 (1970): 405-08.

Redd, Boyd, M. Theresa, and Wayne H. Slater. "The Effects of Audience Specification on Undergraduates' Attitudes, Strategies, and Writing." Research in the Teaching of English 23.1 (1989): 77-108.

Reither, James. "Writing and Knowing: Toward Redefining the Writing Process." The Writing Teacher's Source-book. 2nd ed. Ed. Gary Tate and Edward P. J. Corbett. New York: Oxford, 1988. 140-48.

Reynolds, John F. The Effect of Collaborative Peer

Revision Groups on Audience-Consciousness in the Writing of College Freshmen. Diss. U Oklahoma, 1987. DA 8802900.

Richardson, Edgar M. The Quality of Essays Written for Distant and Intimate Audiences by High and Low Apprehensive Two-Year College Freshmen. Diss. U Cincinnati, 1980.

Roen, Duane H. Synthesizing Current Views of Audience: Notes Toward a Fuller Understanding of Audience. ERIC, 1990. ED 318 018.

---. "Writing Assignments That Work." Journal of Teaching Writing 6.1 (1987): 31-40.

Roen, Duane and R. J. Willey. "The Effects of Audience Awareness on Drafting and Revising." Research in the Teaching of English 22 (1988): 75-83.

Rose, Mike. "Remedial Writing Courses: A Critique and a Proposal." The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook. 2nd ed. Ed. Gary Tate and Edward P. J. Corbett. New York: Oxford, 1988. 318-37.

Roth, Robert. Addressing Unknown Readers: The Expanded Other Meets the Self. ERIC, 1987. ED 281 203.

---. "Deconstructing Audience: A Post-Structuralist Rereading." A Sense of Audience in Written Communication. vol. 5. Ed. Gesa Kirsch and Duane H. Roen. London: Sage, 1990. 175-87.

---. "The Evolving Audience: Alternatives to

Audience Accommodation." College Composition and Communication 38 (1987): 47-55.

Rubin, D. L. and G. L. Piche. "Development in Syntactic and Strategic Aspects of Audience Adaptation Skills in Written Persuasion Communication." Research in the Teaching of English 13 (1979): 293-316.

Schwartz, Helen J. "Writing with the Carbon Copy Audience in Mind." College Composition and Communication 39 (1988): 63-65.

Shapiro, Nancy. Finding a Frame of Reference: Toward an Analysis of Contextual Elaboration in College Writing. ERIC, 1986. ED 270 753.

---. Rhetorical Maturity and Perry's Model of Intellectual Development: A Study of College Students' Writing and Thinking. ERIC, 1985. ED 258 180.

Commers, Nancy. "Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers." College Composition and Communication 31 (1980): 378-88.

Soven, Margot. Agendas for Writing in Philosophy: Conflicting or Complementary? ERIC, 1989. ED 308 509.

Spilka, Rachael. "The 'Audience Continuum.'" The Technical Writing Teacher 14.2 (1989): 147-52.

Stallard, Charles. "An Analysis of the Writing Behavior of Good Student Writers." Research in the Teaching of English 8 (1974): 206-18.

Stewart, Donald C. "A 'Real' Audience for Composition Students." College Composition and Communication 16 (1965): 35-37.

Strange, Rebecca. An Investigation of the Ability of Sixth Grade Students to Write According to Sense of Audience. Diss. Indiana U, 1986. DA 8617066.

Strickland, Robbie. A Case Study Examination of Reader Awareness and the Composing Process of Undergraduate Business Students. Diss. U Georgia, 1984. DA 8411982.

Suchan, James and Ron Dulek. "Toward a Better Understanding of Reader Analysis." The Journal of Business Communication 25.2 (1988): 29-45.

Thralls, Charlotte, Nancy R. Blyler, and Helen R. Ewald. "Real Readers, Implied Readers, and Professional Writers: Suggested Research." Journal of Business Communication 25.2 (1988): 47-65.

Tomlinson, Barbara. "Ong May be Wrong: Negotiating with Nonfictional Readers." A Sense of Audience in Written Communication. vol. 5. Ed. Gesa Kirsch and Duane H. Roen. London: Sage, 1990. 85-97.

Walzer, Arthur. "Articles from the 'California Divorce Project': A Case Study of the Concept of Audience." College Composition and Communication 36 (1985): 150-58.

---. The Meanings of Purpose. ERIC, 1989. ED 303 799.

Weathers, Winston. "Teaching Style: A Possible

Anatomy." The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook. 2nd ed. Ed. Gary Tate and Edward P. J. Corbett. New York: Oxford, 1988. 187-92.

Wildeman, James. Defining Audience Negatively: One Way That Writers Keep Readers from Their Texts. ERIC, 1988. ED 293 152.

Willard, Thomas and Stuart C. Brown. "The One and the Many: A Brief History of the Distinction." A Sense of Audience in Written Composition. vol. 5. Ed. Gesa Kirsch and Duane H. Roen. London: Sage, 1990. 40-54.

Willey, R. J. "Audience Awareness: Methods and Madness." Freshman English News 18.2 (1990): 20-25.

---. "The Pre-Classical Roots of the Addressed/Invoked Dichotomy of Audience." A Sense of Audience in Written Communication. vol. 5. Ed. Gesa Kirsch and Duane H. Roen. London: Sage, 1990. 25-39.

Willey, R. J., Duane H. Roen, and Michael A. Rogers. "Teaching Audience Awareness to Freshman Writers." Teaching English in the Two-Year College 13.1 (1986): 7-11.

Wootten, Judith. Audience-Centered Rhetoric: The Professional Newspaper Journalist and the Freshman Composition Student. Diss. Western Reserve U, 1982. DA 8224705.

APPENDIX

JOURNAL NOTES

August 26

Classes convened. I handed out the syllabus and the consent form for the study. Most of the students in all three classes signed the forms before I finished the explanation of the study. The rolls show that 27 people are registered for the class-audience group, 28 are registered for the real-audience group, and 28 are registered for the imaginary-audience group, with a total of 83 students.

August 28

Today's lesson was sentence structure and basic punctuation errors. Several students came today for the first time. The new students had to be apprised of the requirements of the class and of the study. They received consent forms. I announced the pretest to be written day after tomorrow. Today the class-audience group was responsive and friendly. The real-audience group was attentive and responsive. And the imaginary-audience group was attentive and cooperative.

August 30

All three classes wrote the essay to be used as the pretest. The topic is handing out condoms to teenagers in order to help control the spread of AIDS. The homework assignment is a sentence modeling assignment.

September 2

Labor Day (no classes).

September 4

Sentence assignments were due. I assigned two readings in the texts for next Monday, Sept. 9. We spent a few minutes preparing for a library tour on Friday. For the rest of the period, the students wrote responses to the first questionnaire of the study.

September 6

All the classes met in the library for the traditional tour. I had given the director a list of the writing assignments for the classes, and so our tour guide geared the tour to the sections of the library that would aid the students' research. The assignment for Wednesday, Sept. 11 is to have a topic for writing assignment 1.

September 9

We discussed gathering periodical articles for research and writing bibliographic information. The lesson today was paragraphs, main idea and order. The assignment is a topic sentence handout. All of the classes were attentive and cooperative.

September 11

We continued the lesson on paragraphs, discussing good transition and development. I put the students in groups for the first time (in order to get acquainted) to rewrite faulty paragraphs. The assignment for Sept. 13 is to write a paragraph using one of the specific orders discussed in the writing text. Also, the photocopy of the first article for assignment 1 will be due.

September 13

The students exchanged their paragraphs and attempted to outline each other's paragraphs to determine what order

had been used. Today's lesson was modes. After our discussion of different perspectives, the students made three outlines of their paragraph topic, using three different perspectives. In all the classes the groups were cooperative. I took up the article photocopies and assigned reading assignments 4, 5, and 6 for the following week.

September 16

Today we discussed essay structure, main idea, and planning and organizing. I announced to the classes who their audiences would be. I have waited in order to get to know the students and to let the classes settle down. Waiting allowed me to formulate legitimate-sounding reasons for having them write for their particular audiences. All of the classes are mixtures of older and younger students, and two of the classes have a mix of white, black, and Hispanic, so formulating these reasons took some ingenuity. I told the class-audience group that since our class is diverse, it will offer an excellent audience in itself. I told the real-audience group that since quite a number of them have not chosen majors, they need a challenge to look beyond the classroom to the real world. And I told the imaginary-audience group that they need a challenge, but explained that we will not actually send the writings. Only the real-audience group looked surprised. I half expected many of them to drop the class immediately. Waiting for a little while to announce the audiences proved beneficial because one of the students in the class-audience group transferred to the real-audience group. Had she known the audience of the first-period class before moving into the third-period class, she undoubtedly would have said something in front of the class. I want each class to assume that all my classes are doing the same thing.

September 18

Today's lesson was on persuasive strategies and voice. I put the students in groups by topic (some students usually choose the same topics) to discuss their topics in light of their audiences (two of the classes had to decide the best audiences) and in light of what they have learned from their research. They brainstormed the best persuasive strategies to use with their audiences. The second article photocopy will be due Sept. 20.

September 20

This was a writing workshop day. I checked the students' second article as they worked. The real-audience group was rather talkative, and most of the students stopped working after about half an hour. The pretend-audience group was very disruptive, and few of the students actually worked on their papers (few of them had done the research). Interestingly, many of the students in the pretend-audience group were still undecided about whom to write. I record here the real-audience group's and the pretend-audience group's topics and audiences for comparison. See the following page for a complete list.

September 23

The assignment for today was to have a plan ready for review. Students exchanged plans and gave each other feedback. The lesson today was quoting and paraphrasing. The rough draft of assignment 1 will be due Sept. 25.

Today I noticed the first reaction from students concerning the assignment and audience. When I entered the sixth period class, the imaginary-audience group was noisy. Several groups had formed and had elected a few

TOPICS AND AUDIENCES

Real-Audience Group Topic & Audience	Imaginary-Audience Group Topic & Audience
Censorship/Rep. Quillen	School Funding/Legislature
Censorship/Rep. Quillen	Life Support/Health care Workers
Religious Freedom/Supreme Court	Censorship/Natl. Endowment For the Arts
Date Rape/Supreme Court	Animal Extinction/Activists
Abortion/Gov. McWherter	Environment/Environmentalists
Education/Sen. Gore	Medical Waste/Medical Facilities
Environment/Sen. Gore	Gay Rights/Committee For
Rain Forest/Sen. Gore	Homeless/Congress
Global Warming/Sen. Gore	Environment/People
Soviet Aid/Rep. Quillen	Environment/Protection Agency
Alcohol & Youth/Quillen	Soviet Aid/Congress
Govt. Ethics/TN. Govt.	Drug Testing/Congress
Capital Pun./Gov. McWherter	Dolphins/Tuna Foundation
Education/TN. Legislature	Acid Rain/NAPAP
Parental Concent/Supreme C.	Executions/People of Calif.
Education/Lamar Alexander	Rain Forest/Brazil Govt.
Homeless/Rep. Quillen	Life Support/Sen. Gore
Religion-Schools/Quillen	Radioactive Waste/Public
Censorship/Supreme Court	Recycling/Gen. Public
Waste Oak Ridge/McWherter	Air Pollution/Congress
State Income Tax/McWherter	Dolphins/Tuna Companies
Homosexuality/Rep. Quillen	Animal Testing/NABMR
Homelessness/Local Rotary	Prison Release/Law Makers

individuals as spokespersons. They said, to paraphrase, "We're confused. Please tell us what we're supposed to be doing. Are we writing an essay or a letter? What's the purpose of the letter?" Is this confusion a true reaction to the imaginary audience, or is this a tactic to attempt to get me to put off the rough draft, since many of the students have not chosen a narrowed topic or a specific audience (see previous page) and have done no research? Neither of the other two classes has acted this way.

September 25

All classes worked in groups. Each student read at least two other students' letters and wrote responses to the authors. Rough drafts are due Friday. Corda stayed after class (imaginary-audience group) to discuss her approach to assignment 1. She had decided to write a congressperson, but she couldn't decide what point-of-view to use. Finally, she said, "You mean I can just start out as if I were actually writing the letter for real?" She seemed relieved at this revelation.

September 27

We discussed reading assignment number 7. Then we evaluated student responses (not our students' writing) to an editorial. We rated the responses for voice and persuasive strategies. The assignment for Sept. 30 is reading assignment number 8.

The imaginary-audience group turned in their rough drafts reluctantly. They said again, using Taterbug and Reducer as their spokespersons, that they were still confused about what they had done. They wanted to know that, if they had not approached the letters the way I wanted them to, that it would not count against their grades. I reminded them that the rough-draft grade is only a guide.

September 30

I returned the rough drafts, and students signed up for conferences. Twice as many students signed up in the class-audience group and the real-audience group as did students in the imaginary-audience group. I handed out a copy of the short story, "The Lottery," by Shirley Jackson, and we did an activity designed to make them think about discrimination and "scapegoats."

October 2

We discussed writing assignment 2. The real-audience group will be sending their essays on "The Lottery" to The Mockingbird, our campus literary publication. The associate editor of The Mockingbird came to the real-audience class to give the students instructions for submitting their essays. The imaginary-audience group will pretend to write for The Mockingbird.

We discussed the story. The class-audience group mostly shared that they were shocked by the ending of the story, while the real-audience group was able to get past the initial shock and discuss the story as a piece of literature. The imaginary-audience group did not want to discuss the story at all. They were a bit disruptive as I tried to lead the discussion. I was really disturbed by their behavior because, up until this time, they have been mostly attentive and cooperative during discussions.

After discussions, all the classes wrote down their individual thoughts concerning the story.

October 4

We watched a video of the short story, "The Lottery," and then a ten-minute video about the story. Students then wrote down their thoughts.

The imaginary-audience class was very negative about watching the videos. One student asked, "Why watch it when we've already read it?" Rated R was very disruptive. James Bond did not stay for the freewriting activity; he walked out without saying anything to me.

In conference, Penn, from the real-audience group, said he wanted his essay to be chosen for inclusion in The Mockingbird. He had already gone to the library and researched the short story and Shirley Jackson's life, although such research was not required. He stated, "Mine is going to be published. I'm going to make sure."

Texas, from the imaginary-audience group, came to my office upset because her rough draft of writing assignment 1 had received a low speculative grade. In discussing her revision, I suggested that she needed more current information on her topic (the tuna-dolphin issue), since her articles were dated 1987 and since much has changed concerning this issue. She said she didn't think the information she used really mattered since she would not actually be sending the letter.

October 7

Final drafts of writing assignment 1 were due. Students discussed their written thoughts about "The Lottery" in groups, and then we looked at essays previously published in The Mockingbird so that we could have an idea of the literary essay genre. The assignment for the next class meeting is reading assignment number 9.

October 9

We looked at different possible ways to write introductions for essays, and the classes tried three different ways of beginning their essays about "The Lottery." The

rest of the class period was used for planning and writing the rough draft, to which classmates will respond on Friday.

After the real-audience class, Penn approached me about getting his essay published in The Mockingbird. "What can I do to make my essay better?" he asked. "Can I come to you for extra help?"

During the imaginary-audience class, very few students worked on their papers. Rated R stayed in the restroom most of the period. James Bond got up to leave again. I asked him if he was leaving to go to work. He answered that he did have a work shift that began after our class but that he was leaving because we were "not doing anything."

October 11

Groups read and responded to each other's essays. The assignment for Oct. 14 is to turn in rough drafts.

After the real-audience class, JJ asked me to read her first rough draft. She said she was concerned about the amount of time she had been putting into the class. She said she felt she had become obsessed with writing excellent papers (since they will actually be read by people outside the class). AL stayed after class also to get help in pulling her ideas together.

After the imaginary-audience class, I talked to James Bond about walking out of class during workshops. He said he felt he had a right to leave the class when he wasn't getting anything out of it, since it was his money. I reminded him that his participation counts toward his grade for the class. He said, "I left because I wasn't getting anywhere. I'm not getting anything out of this class. I'm not getting any better in my writing."

During the imaginary-audience class, three students went to the bathroom and did not participate.

October 14

Rough drafts were due for assignment 2. We read and graded essays that were written by students from another school. Then the students wrote the first short response.

I informed the chairman of the English Department of the discipline problems I have had with the imaginary-audience group. The chairman was late for a meeting, so he simply said, "Well, it looks like you have everything under control. Keep me informed." I assured him that I will stop the experiment if I feel the students in the class are not going to get the composition essentials they will need for the next writing class.

Penn, from the real-audience group, came to my office to talk about the final draft of assignment 2. He said, "I'm finding out that writing means rewriting and re-writing. I've already rewritten the rough draft three times since I turned it in."

October 16

Today's lesson was logic (reading assignment no. 9). The assignment for Oct. 18 is to read the essays in reading assignment number 10 and evaluate the logic.

October 18

I returned rough drafts of assignment 2, and we discussed assignment 3. We covered reading assignment 10, and we talked about our changing language, especially language affected by the feminist movement, and what it means to keep audience in mind.

I held conferences today to discuss the rewrite of assignment 2. Two students from the class-audience

group and two from the real-audience group needed complete rewrites. I had several walk-ins, students who had not signed up for conferences, including Boxcar Bill from the class-audience group, who came in early to pick up his rough draft because he had missed class Oct. 16.

Two students from the real-audience group, Taco Bell and Penn, stayed after class for conferences.

October 21

We finished discussing reading assignment 10 and brainstormed campus topics for writing assignment 3.

In conferences I had seven students from the class-audience group, six students from the real-audience group (a seventh called to say she could not make her appointment), and one student from the imaginary-audience group. Almost everyone needed to restructure and add development.

October 23

Final drafts of assignment 2 were due. During class students completed the second questionnaire. Students have a sentence-modeling assignment for Oct. 28. For Oct. 30 they are to read and evaluate the essays in reading assignment 11.

After the real-audience class, Rose stayed after the others finished the questionnaire to ask me to look at her final draft of assignment 2. She was still not happy with it. Later, The Boss, also from the real-audience group, came to my office for a second conference before she turned in the final draft.

Two people from the imaginary-audience group were signed up for conferences but did not show. One student from this group, Corda, did ask me to meet her outside my first period class to go over her final draft. She was concerned about her sentence structure.

McDonald, from the class-audience group, came to my imaginary-audience class to write the second questionnaire, so I had to be careful when mentioning audience. Half of the students in this group were late, and several did not show up for class at all.

October 25

Fall break--no classes.

October 28

I returned final drafts of assignment 2. We looked at examples of letters to the editor of the East Tennessean, the campus newspaper, in preparation for assignment 3. Students turned in the sentence assignment.

Madonna, from the class-audience group, stopped by my office to turn in work and chat about her progress.

So far, most of the students in the real-audience group have turned in the letters (assignment 1) to be mailed. O'hara, Marie, and Taco Bell (from this group) made appointments for extra conferences. Rose stayed after class to discuss her fifth draft of the paper for The Mockingbird. Penn stayed to ask about his chances of being published in The Mockingbird. I reminded him that being published is not a requirement of the class. He said he knows this but wants to do his best to get his essay accepted.

The imaginary-audience class was unresponsive and at times loud, unruly, and rude. A small group of "chatty guys" has developed. The leader is Sprite, an intelligent young man who writes well and has a good imagination.

October 30

We looked at more letters to the editor and the student evaluations of reading assignment number 11.

The real-audience group is wearing me out with conferences! Penn called me at home last night and asked me to meet him in my office at 7:30 am to go over his first typed draft. Marie and Trisha came to my office after class. Marie wanted to make her paper "perfect" for The Mockingbird. Trisha said she needed guidance with structure and development; she said she wanted to do a decent job on The Mockingbird entry. Rose came by at 1:00 to have me read draft number eight of The Mockingbird entry.

In class, however, the real-audience group was difficult to manage. They disagreed so strongly with the subject of the reading assignment (surrogate motherhood) that they could not see the writing objectively.

The imaginary-audience class was hostile and unruly today. It was difficult to conduct the class; I felt like I was back teaching in high school.

November 1

Students wrote an audience analysis using a heuristic model as part of their prewriting. The real-audience group turned in entries for The Mockingbird. The assignment for Nov. 4 is to bring in information (article copy or notes) for the campus topic, writing assignment 3.

The real-audience group was rebellious today. First of all, the class began in the midst of chaos. The math instructor who uses my classroom the previous period kept his class overtime for a test, so we lost a few minutes of class. Some of the math students were still in our room when I convened class. Secondly, the only thing on my students' minds was The Mockingbird entry. Some were finishing up the polished draft, some still needed to make copies, and some promised to get the draft to me later this afternoon. Today is the deadline for entries.

Some of the real-audience class have spent so much time typing five or more drafts of their entries (typing was required by the editors of The Mockingbird) that they have not had time to start the campus assignment. It doesn't help that last night was Halloween. When the class finally settled down to do the audience analysis, they wrote half as much as the class-audience students did, and they brainstormed notes instead of paying attention to the questions. Whenever a student came up to talk to me about a topic, the class chatter rose from a whisper to a roar. Several students--those who hadn't finished The Mockingbird entries--turned in scribblings and left. The entire class appears to be "burned out."

During the imaginary-audience class, three students left the class to go to the restroom and did not write an audience analysis. The "chatty group" talked whenever a student came up to talk to me. Two students in this class have indicated that they realize they can use their writings outside the class for real audiences. These students are the only ones in the class who seem to have found their "voices." In fact, the students who seemed to have voices (sounded confident in their writing) in the beginning (James Bond, Sprite, Rated R, and Taterbug) seem to have now lost their voices. Taterbug now complains that she doesn't understand what I want from her, while the three guys have simply given up. They turn in assignments, but they no longer participate in class, and they never come to my office for conferences. I feel guilty that these students are regressing in their writing skills, because I can't help but believe that I have stripped them of their focus by taking away their audience (the teacher).

November 4

We had writing workshops today. The students turned in the information (photocopy or notes) they are using for the third assignment, and I checked it while they worked.

OBSERVATION: About a week ago I noticed that the class-audience group has been greeting me with smiles and "good mornings." At first I thought nothing of it because I always try to greet my classes with "good morning" or "good afternoon." But this group has become quite friendly with each other and with me. They remind me of a developmental group with whom I once used collaborative learning throughout the semester. This developmental group wrote with and for each other, and by the end of the term, they were like family.

Taco Bell, of the real-audience class, was very excited today because she got a reply to her letter to Representative Quillen. I read it to the class, and they were impressed. Concerning assignment 3, everyone was prepared for the workshop (they had researched their topics), except Ice Cream Man, who has been absent because of a personal problem. Penn wanted me to know about his interview concerning protests on campus. He was surprised that he got information he never expected to get.

Several students in the imaginary-audience group still had no topic for assignment 3, so they had nothing to work on during the workshop. However, those students who did have definite topics seemed to be excited for the first time. Reducer said that the campus topic is something they are involved in personally. A few students came up to my desk to talk to me about their topics. I got to talk one-on-one with Reducer, Brooks, Al Cabone, and Alex, who have never come to my office for a conference. Corda, who is one of only two people in this

class who have figured out that they can send their writing for real publication after we're finished with it (the other student is Rated R), says she plans to send her letter to the East Tennessean on her own.

November 6

Today students responded anonymously to each other's papers. Each student who participated read at least two other students' papers and wrote feedback using questions to guide their responses. This was the first time we have tried the anonymous evaluations. Those who participated said they liked it better (for the most part) than group readings because they could say what they really felt on paper better than face-to-face. We tried this approach because several students in all three classes complained that they could not give feedback face-to-face and that they were not getting adequate feedback from others.

Seven people were absent or tardy in the class-audience group. Four people were absent in the real-audience group, and three who were present did not participate. Seven people were absent in the imaginary-audience group; three who were present did not participate.

After class (real-audience group), Ice Cream Man talked to me about his topic because he had gotten a late start. Logan told me that he had written four drafts of his letter from different perspectives, but that a letter in yesterday's edition of the East Tennessean has "blown" his ideas "out of the water." So he said he will have to do another interview and write again. A couple of other students asked if they could direct their letters to administrative officials in order to "get something done."

Just before sixth period, Dean (from the imaginary-audience group) called me at my office and came to inter-

view me for her paper on Carson Hall (a dilapidated building on campus that is still being used for offices). I had suggested that she interview someone who had spent time in the building (I had an office there for three years). Dean is the only student besides Corda who has expressed enthusiasm to me about a paper (the only one from the imaginary-audience group, that is).

During the imaginary-audience class, Rated R would not participate in the evaluations. He wanted me to read his paper instead; he said he didn't trust the student responses. Corda talked to me again after class about her letter to the East Tennessean. She is very excited that she has something to say to the campus.

After this last class, Taco Bell (from the real-audience group) met me at my office to go over her paper again before she writes the final copy of the rough draft.

November 8

I have a bad cold. I have abandoned today's activities, taken up the rough drafts, and dismissed my classes.

The chairman of the English Department called me into his office today. An angry parent of a student had written the president of the university, complaining about my coverage of "sexist" language in my classes, alleging that I have forbidden my students even to use the word "man" in their writings. I explained that the handout I gave the students on sexist language was part of a lesson on our changing language and how it pertains to voice in connection with audience. He and I agreed that this parent and/or student had had a "knee-jerk" reaction, probably because he or she had felt threatened.

November 11

I gave out assignment 4, and we evaluated two "My Turn" articles for voice, persuasive strategies, and logic. The class-audience group responded emotionally to both articles. They said that the first author was selfish and that the second author was just whining.

The real-audience class looked at the voice and content of the articles. They felt the first author had good arguments until she neared the end of her article, where she changed her tone, using negative adjectives that made her appear selfish. They said she should not have changed direction and she should have been more sympathic toward the innocent people she was complaining about. The second author, they said, was too judgmental and did not get to the point until the very end.

With the imaginary-audience class, I prompted with half-a-dozen questions about voice, persuasion, and logic. James Bond compared the main ideas of the two articles, and Mr. Mojo said the second author's logic was faulty, although he couldn't really say why. I could get no one to say anything about voice or persuasive strategies, even when I asked outright.

I gave all the classes copies of two other "My Turn" articles to read at home. The real-audience group began to read them immediately, and ten students commented on one of the articles as they were leaving.

November 13

We studied quoting and paraphrasing again because many of the students are still having trouble citing information. I returned the rough drafts of assignment 3. Most of the students are excited about the campus topic, and the enthusiasm shows in their speculative

grades. Voice in these papers was the best it has been this term in all three classes.

I counted the students who researched their topics (reading, surveying, interviewing) before turning in the rough drafts. Half of the class-audience group (12 out of 24) had done research. Approximately half of the real-audience group (12 out of 25) had done research. And one-third of the imaginary-audience group (8 out of 24) had researched their topics.

There was some activity with the real-audience group today. Michael Jordan announced in class that he had received a phone call from Rep. Quillen's office concerning his letter. The Boss came by my office to discuss improving her rough draft. And Barry came by to apologize for missing class, to pick up his rough draft, and to sign up for a conference to discuss his paper.

November 15

I held conferences all day. In the morning I mostly saw students from the class-audience and real-audience groups. Of the nineteen who signed up from these groups, only three did not show. Bambi from the first group and Emily from the second group left messages that they could not come. Magic, from the first group, came by to change his appointment. Seven of the sixteen who came already had topics for the last assignment, which we haven't actually started yet. Tommy, from the real-audience group, wanted to talk about the letter she received from the governor. Barry said that he has discovered his primary writing problem. He said he writes "around the topic" without ever getting "down to the nitty gritty."

Six people from the imaginary-audience group met their appointments during the afternoon. This is the first time I have talked to some of them face-to-face,

so I consider their coming an improvement. However, they had very little to say, and none of them had given any thought to the next writing assignment.

OBSERVATION: The class-audience group does not seem to distinguish between genres. Their essays and letters all look alike.

November 18

Alpha (real-audience group) had received a two-page letter from the governor, and she gave it to me to read to the class. The governor mentioned that he had received several letters from ETSU students; the whole class seemed impressed that he had noticed.

When I walked into the imaginary-audience class, several students complained that they have no topics for the last writing assignment, even though the first article for this assignment is due day after tomorrow.

I held conferences between classes. All of the class-audience group who signed up for conferences did come, except Manson, who is ill. Two students from the real-audience group, Coley and Emily, called to reschedule. The Boss and Taco Bell, also from the real-audience group, came to see me twice today about their final drafts. Three students from the imaginary-audience group did not meet their appointments, even though they did attend class today. They did not tell me why they didn't come, and they didn't reschedule.

All classes wrote the second short response today.

November 20

I put all the classes into groups to practice quoting and paraphrasing. For this exercise I brought in about 50 magazines--enough that each student had two.

The class-audience group worked quietly and efficiently. Two students asked me questions about citations after the groups were finished.

Half of the real-audience group asked me questions, both while they wrote quotes and paraphrases and while they checked each other's work. They were hesitant about getting into groups, and the students did not sit close to each other. They seem to be either distrustful of each other or independent of each other.

The imaginary-audience group would not work together at all! I had to guide each student through the process individually and then help each one check the others' work. I felt like a kindergarten teacher! It would have been easier to put the examples on an overhead and guide them all through it step by step. This class is simply too dependent on me, yet they won't seek my help outside of class! And I suppose the heavens would fall if they worked together!

November 22

We had writing workshops. I brought two years of Newsweek magazines to all the classes so that students could use them for information and see more examples of "My Turn" articles (we are working on assignment 4).

The class-audience group was quiet and productive.

The real-audience group was productive, but in a different way. Several students browsed the Newsweeks, and some of those who have similar topics got together to share information and sources. I heard comments like, "I have an article on that. You can borrow it--I'm finished with it." This group seems to work more cooperatively when I let them make their own groups instead of forcing them into groups.

When I walked into the imaginary-audience class, Taterbug, who has become the spokesperson for the class, announced, "We don't understand the last assignment." Then several people added, "I don't have a topic," or "I don't know what to write about." When I reminded them that this assignment can be on anything that they feel strongly about, Brooks said, "I don't feel strongly about anything." Needless to say, those who had not chosen topics had also not done any research and, therefore, had no article copies to turn in and nothing with which to work.

November 25

Students evaluated each other's essays. Classes were small today because of registration for spring term. Of those present in the class-audience group, only one student (Spanky has been out sick) was unprepared for the class evaluations. In the real-audience class, two students were unprepared (one, Barry, has been out with the flu). After this class, Penn asked me to stay and read his first typed draft. He said he wanted the rough draft to be as good as possible. The imaginary-audience class was poorly attended.

November 27

Rough drafts of writing assignment 4 were due today. All classes wrote the last questionnaire for the study.

Class-Audience Group: One student has written on the pre- and post-test topic and must be disqualified. Four students have written academic "term papers" (with no purpose, no voice) for assignment 4.

Real-Audience Group: Two girls asked to come to my house over the Thanksgiving holiday to talk about their Newsweek entries. JJ stayed after class to tell me that

she appreciates the class. She said that she had at first resented having to work so hard for the class. But now she's "catching on to what learning is all about." In high school, she said, she had taken classes that she could pass through memorization and testing; she had avoided writing. She said that now she knows that true knowledge is "learning how to find out what you need to know." One student from this class wrote about the pre- and post-test topic and will be disqualified. After class I read Barry's paper, and I surmised that he has finally been able to get to the heart of the matter. Not only has he gotten to the point, but he has really "spilled his guts" in the last paper. He used a phrase in the last paragraph that brought me out of my chair in shock. I was amazed that such a quiet young man could have such a dynamic personality on paper. This is the kind of breakthrough in ethos that makes teaching writing worthwhile!

Imaginary-Audience Group: Five students wrote term-papers (too many sources, no purpose, no voice) for the last assignment.

December 2

I returned the rough drafts. We discussed exam day, and students signed up for conferences.

Rose, of the real-audience group, was excited because she had received a two-page reply from the congressman she wrote. The class passed her letter around and read it. Marie, from the same class, came to my office after class to discuss improvements on her Newsweek entry.

In the imaginary-audience class, we discussed putting too much borrowed material in the papers. Taterbug got upset because she had written a three-page paper and had used seven sources instead of the required two. Twice she

said, "I don't understand what I need to do; you wanted sources!" After class I talked to both Taterbug and Brooks. I asked Taterbug her opinion about her topic and about what she hoped writing the article would accomplish. Then I asked her to reconsider those people who read Newsweek--how much they would already know about the topic and how much she would need to tell them. She replied, "Well, I wasn't thinking about who was gonna read it!"

Brooks had turned in a photocopy of only one of the two articles from which he had borrowed information. I asked to talk to him because I was not able to check his quotes and paraphrases from the second source. He told me that he hadn't turned in the other article because it did not exist--he had made it up. He said, "I figured since I'm not sending the paper to Newsweek that it wouldn't matter what the quote said or where it was from."

December 4

The students are writing the post-test essay, so I am taking this time to write in my journal.

This is the coldest morning of the semester (9 degrees wind chill). When I found my car doors frozen shut at 6:30 am, I knew that many students would be late for class. Nearly half of the class-audience group was late, but they came in quietly and worked up until the end of the period.

Half of the real-audience class was late also, not only because of the cold, but also because of exams being given during second period and because of late registration. Those who came on time, for the most part, have written very quickly (in order to leave to study for other exams, they've said). Most of those who have come

in late have talked while they have worked (talked not about the topic but about exams and registration). Many of the papers I have looked at are less than a page in length. Their flippant attitude will no doubt affect the outcome of the post-test. I don't understand it! These students have worked their pencils to the stubs all semester on the papers they have had to send. But they are "blowing off" the post-test as if it doesn't mean anything. Is it only that this paper isn't going to be graded? Or is it because this paper has no audience and, therefore, no purpose as far as they are concerned?

Imaginary-Audience Group: Several were absent or late, but all wrote quietly.

December 6

We had a productive day of conferences. Beginning at 7:30, the morning was packed with appointments with students from groups one and two. Ten students from the class-audience group met their appointments. Roger Rabbit had written on a dead issue, and we discussed how he might salvage it by bringing it up to date. Bob Smiley had not developed his essay with details. Magic needed another source for his paper; I happened to have a Time magazine in my office with an excellent article on his topic. Madonna needed to rewrite completely; she is one of those who must write in order to "discover" her perspective. Bambi brought her first rough draft for me to read. I had warned Bambi earlier that if she could not show me that she could write a fully developed essay, I could not pass her on to the next composition class. This rough draft was adequate, so I no longer have reservations about passing her. Huey and Foxfire simply needed to revise. McDonald's essay didn't need much work; she mostly came to tell me she has enjoyed the class. She said that

the only writing she did in high-school was about literature, and her high-school English teacher never allowed her to use first person. She was thankful that this semester she has gotten to write about "real issues" and to "express" her ideas. OBSERVATION: I am again aware, after reading these rough drafts, that the class-audience group writes each paper the same way, regardless of whether it is a letter or an essay.

As I talked to Foxfire, a student from the real-audience group came to my door and blurted, "Did you see our letters in the East Tennessean? I couldn't believe they actually put them in!"

I had not had time to read my copy and did not know that five of my students' letters had been published. Foxfire was very wide-eyed; I'm sure she was puzzled by the student's outburst. If this sort of "leak" had occurred earlier in the semester, I would have been concerned. But since the questionnaires and tests are completed, no harm has been done.

Four of my morning conferences were with students from the real-audience group--JJ, Barry, The Boss, and Chris. JJ had already typed a new draft, and so had Barry. Barry was excited that he is now able to express himself. We spent this session on comma splices and subject and verb problems because, Barry says, now that he enjoys writing, he thinks he can learn to polish the mechanics.

After ten minutes for lunch, it was back to conferences. Alphree, from the class-audience group, came early because she was not comfortable with the ending of her paper. She had written about a personal problem that had not been resolved, so we discussed the fact that every writing does not have to have a positive resolution. I reassured her that it is all right to be angry about

a situation and to end a writing with a realistic outlook.

Alpha, from the real-audience group, also came early and had a similar problem with her paper. She had written about a personal problem, but I suspect that she was afraid to speak her mind because, if Newsweek actually were to publish it, loved ones and friends involved might read it. I let her "get it off her chest" to me and then encouraged her to write it as she had conveyed it to me.

My most interesting conference was with Michael Jordan of the real-audience group. When he came in, I asked if he had seen his letter to the editor in the East Tennessean.

He said, "Yeah, and it made me mad."

I asked why.

He said, "I didn't know they were gonna do it. I mean, I didn't think they'd actually print it."

"Well," I said, "you knew that I was going to send them."

"Yeah, but, well, I don't know."

"Have you gotten any comments about it?" I asked.

"Yeah! A bunch of friends called me this morning--woke me up. That's how I found out about it."

"What did they say about it?"

"They liked it. They said I had some good ideas."

Past conferences with Michael Jordan have been short and unproductive. I have usually said, "You need to do thus and so," and he has said, "Yeah, I know, I know. I'll fix it." He has never really listened to me or talked with me. Today, however, he brought his chair to the side of my desk, put his elbows on the desk, and initiated our first real conversation. Instead of my telling him what he needed to do, he told me what he intended to do to make his paper better.

After Michael Jordan's conference, I talked to Melanie and Taco Bell about their rewrites. The rest of the afternoon I spent with students from the imaginary-audience group. Cacalaca had written on a dead issue and needed to rewrite completely. I tried to steer her to a topic that might be of importance to her. Elvis mostly wanted to average his grades for the class. Reducer had used too many sources. Before he came to the conference, he had sketched out a new draft for me to read; the new draft did include his opinion. Taterbug had made no progress. She still could not comprehend why her paper didn't fit her audience (she used seven sources for a three-page paper). "But I worked so hard on this paper," she said. So I asked her to tell me in her own words what the topic meant to her. She presented her position, but she was reluctant to cut any of her sources. Al Cabone had written his best paper yet because he has a personal interest in his topic. Although he has many problems with grammar, he was finally able to develop a full paper. He is a football player and has been sick several times this semester, so I have not been able to help him as much as he needs help. I suggested that spring semester he spend time in the writing lab.

December 9

This was an exam day. I met with the real-audience group and the class-audience group to collect their folders and final drafts of assignment 4.

The real-audience group met at 8:00 am (final exams use a schedule that is different from normal class times). This group also had to mail the Newsweek entries; we had some chaos getting envelopes

stamped and addressed. After class Penn and JJ stopped to say that the real audiences had made them work hard, but that they had learned more about writing than in any other English class they had ever taken.

Later, Penn, Barry, Rose, and The Boss came by to say they would like to get me as the teacher of the next composition. JJ also came by my office to say that she had learned that to write well, she had had to "put work into it." She said that before our class, she would never have imagined writing something that would be read by someone outside of school. Now she plans to get involved in politics when she finishes her degree.

The class-audience group met at 4:00 pm. Several students said good-bye, and some asked if I would be teaching the next composition class. Witness shook my hand and said that he had learned "a lot about writing." Lady stopped to say that persuasive writing had challenged her thinking and writing.

Between the two exam periods, I met with a few students. C.C. and Hang-Man, from the imaginary-audience group, came to see me for the first time. C.C. wanted to know how he could raise his grade in the class. Hang-Man had written an information-filled paper without citations. We discussed making the paper his own, but he said he would probably just take out some of the information and use citations.

December 11

I met with the imaginary-audience group at 1:30. Most of them quietly turned in their papers and folders, after averaging their grades, and left. Several students were tardy. Very few students said good-bye as they left.

NOTES

1. **Audience Addressed/Invoked, page 18:** For further discussion of the history of the concept of audience addressed/audience invoked, see R. J. Willey, "The Pre-Classical Roots" (25-39).

2. **The Pfister and Petrick Heuristic, page 26:** For a look at the model, see Pfister and Petrick, "A Heuristic Model" (213-19).

3. **The Tagmemic Heuristic, page 26:** See Rhetoric: Discovery and Change, by Richard Young, Alton Becker, and Kenneth Pike. For further discussion of the Tagmemic heuristic, see Jurkiewicz, "How to Begin to Win Friends" (173-76).

4. **Arguments Against Audience Analysis, page 27:** See also Suchan and Dulek, "Toward a Better Understanding" (29-45), and Long, "Writer-Audience Relationships" (221-26).

5. **The Moral-Field Approach, page 29:** See Richard Eastman, Style: Writing and Reading As the Discovery of Outlook (89-100).

6. **Analyzing Texts Instead of Audiences, page 30:** See also Helen Rothschild Ewald, The "Model" Reader: Audiences within Genres. ED 269 801.

7. Common Sense with Heuristics, pages 32-33: For another perspective on audience models, see Malloy and Daniels, Bemused Muse: Teaching Productive Audiences for Writing. ED 284 263.

8. Self as Audience, page 37: See also William T. Ross. "Self and Audience in Composition." Freshman English News 13.1 (1984): 14-16.

9. Peer Audiences, page 39-40: For further discussion of peers as audience, see Scott R. Christianson, Julia M. Gergits, and James J. Schramer. "Students As Audience and Discourse Community in Technical Writing Courses." The Writing Instructor 3-4 (1990): 87-100. For information on ways to "publish" student writing within the classroom, see Christopher Burnham. "Teaching Literature through Writing: An Informal Publication Project." Journal of Teaching Writing 5.1 (1986): 91-102.

10. Real Audience possibilities, page 46: See also Kollar and Monroe, "Our Audience is Real," English Journal 73 (1984): 75-79; Schwartz, Sharing Writing on an Electronic Network, ED 299 588; Stoneham, "What Happens When Students Have a Real Audience?" Journal of Teaching Writing 5.2 (1986): 281-86; and Tebo-Messina and Blough, Penpals and Keypals--Networks for Student Writers, ED 321 257. For similar suggestions,

see Adam Frisch, The Proposal to a Small Group: Learning to "See Otherwise." ED 303 796.

11. Multi-Purposed Assignments, pages 71-72: For additional comments on assignments and suggested writing assignments, see David E. Morse, "From Language to Literature and Partway-Back: Writing Assignments Which Work," Language Arts Journal of Michigan 2.2 (1986): 20-25.

12. Heuristic Model of this Study, pages 79, 80-81: See Pfister and Petrick, "A Heuristic Model" (213-220). Also, see Bator, The Impact on Cognitive Development upon Audience Awareness in the Writing Process (100). In addition, see Odoroff, The Influence of Writers' Perceptions of Audience on Teacher As Primary and Secondary Audience (99).

VITA

Delilah Ferne Hibbitts Conley was born in Norton, Virginia, on May 19, 1954. She grew up in Clintwood, Virginia, and graduated from Clintwood High School in 1972. In 1977, she received a Bachelor of Science degree from East Tennessee State University, with a double major in English and journalism. In 1983, she was awarded a Master of Science degree in English from Radford University in Radford, Virginia. Delilah began her teaching career at the high-school level in 1978; and in 1982, she began teaching at the college level. She has taught developmental English and English composition at five colleges and universities, including Georgia State University in Atlanta, Georgia. In the fall of 1988, she was accepted at the University of Tennessee; and in the spring of 1992, she was awarded the Doctor of Education degree.

At present Delilah is teaching composition at East Tennessee State University and enjoying a writing career, publishing fiction, non-fiction, and poetry.