1990

ESL Composers' Sense of Audience

Kate Mangelsdorf, *University of Texas at El Paso*
Duane H Roen
Victoria Taylor

Tomlinson, B. (1986). Characters are coauthors: Segmenting the self, integrating the composing process. *Written Communication, 3,* 421-448.

Tomlinson, B. (1988). Tuning, tying, and training texts: Metaphors for revision. *Written Communication, 5,* 58-81.

13

ESL Students' Use of Audience

KATE MANGELSDORF
DUANE H. ROEN
VICTORIA TAYLOR

The concept of audience in composition and rhetorical studies has reflected changing views of the nature of communication in the process of making meaning. Aristotle's (333 BC/1954) *Rhetoric* implies an antagonistic relationship between rhetor and audience, with the rhetor analyzing the characteristics of his audience, self-consciously developing a certain persona, and manipulating language in order to persuade the audience toward a particular perspective. For instance, Aristotle writes that "the orator must . . . make his own character look right and put his hearers in the right frame of mind" (p. 90).

Although some scholars (see Lunsford & Ede, 1984) have suggested that this competitive rhetor-audience relationship as depicted in the *Rhetoric* does not accurately reflect the complexity of Aristotle's view on language, the idea of the writer's shaping aspects of text—language, mode, argument, and stance—to influence an audience outside the text persists in modern times. However, the nature of the rhetor-audience relationship has now shifted. Burke's (1950) definition of rhetoric reflects this change: "the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols" (p. 43). This definition assigns language the mediating role between the observer and the observed, and between the writer and the audience. Furthermore, Burke's perspective assumes a dialogical rather than antagonistic relationship between communicants in a process of sharing and identifying commonalities; to use Burke's words, "in acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes that make them consubstantial" (p. 21).

Another modern way to view writing as a process of shaping text for an audience is to focus on cognitive and developmental aspects of communication. An influential researcher in this area is Linda Flower, whose concept of writer-based prose offers an explanation of how, and under what circumstances, writers attempt to accommodate their readers:

Writers do not simply *express* thought but *transform* it in certain complex but describable ways for the needs of a reader. . . In *function*, Writer-Based prose is a verbal expression written by a writer to himself and for himself. It is the record and the working of his own verbal thought. In its *structure*, Writer-Based prose reflects the associative, narrative path of the writer's own confrontation with her subject. In its *language*, it reveals her use of privately loaded terms and shifting but unexpressed contexts for her statements. (1979, p. 20)

Transforming writer-based prose into what Flower calls reader-based prose involves the writer's understanding of the needs of the rhetorical situation, including, naturally, audience. The writer shapes her text to accommodate these needs, which might involve changes such as making implicit connections explicit, providing adequate context and background knowledge, and developing a suitable stance and tone for the situation (Flower & Hayes, 1980).

Current textbooks' advice to students on audience reflects this emphasis on shaping text to accommodate an audience outside the text. For instance, Hairston (1986) asks that students consider these questions about their audience: "Who are my readers? What is important to my readers? What do my readers already know about this topic? What attitudes will my readers have on this topic? Why are they reading? What questions will my readers want answered?" (p. 88). However, in this textbook, *Contemporary Composition*, Hairston also points out that a writer's audience is often not easily identifiable:

When writers write for readers who are less familiar to them, . . . they have to use more thought and imagination to analyze their audience. What they do—and what we all do to some extent when we write for people we don't know well—is to create their readers. . . . (p. 84)

The word *create* implies a post-structuralist view of audience as something constructed by writers in the text, and then constructed again by readers unraveling the text.

In this view of an invoked audience, the idea of shaping text to accommodate readers necessitates an emphasis on the creation of meaning. Meaning is not made by the writer pouring molded ideas into the "empty vessel" of the reader's mind; instead, the reader provides, "resources for the writer's thinking" in a dialogical process (Gage, 1984, p. 163). In other words, instead of the reader's imposing limitations that the writer has to overcome with carefully thought-out strategies and words, the writer, the writer's image of the reader, and the actual reader collaborate to construct, interpret, and generate knowledge.

This view of rhetor-audience interactions, however, does not mean that textual strategies play no role in the construction of meaning. Allusions, references, textual conventions, and other devices for influencing meaning are used by writers to deliberately invoke a particular kind of dialogue with the reader. In turn, and as a continuation of that dialogue, readers will respond to and modify the text in their own ways, in what Rosenblatt (1988) has called a "to-and-fro interplay between reader and text" (p. 4). Iser (1976/1986) describes this process in these words:

If we view the relation between text and reader as a kind of self-regulating system, we can define the text itself as an array of sign impulses (signifiers) which are received by the reader. As he reads, there is a constant "feedback" of "information" already received, so that he himself is bound to insert his own ideas into the process of communication. (p. 368)

Thus, the rhetor-audience relationship is dynamic and indeterminate without being chaotic. Texts stabilize meaning but do not control meaning. As Ede and Lunsford (1984) summarize the process, "Writers conjure their vision—a vision which they hope readers will actively come to share as they read the text—by using all the resources of language available to them to establish a broad, and ideally coherent, range of cues for the reader" (p. 167).

To fully understand writer-audience interactions, more than the influence of the text needs to be discussed, for language never occurs in

a vacuum. Social context clearly will influence all aspects of text construction and interpretation—in fact, all writing and reading activities can be studied as elements of a particular society's world view. In this social constructionist perspective, "a writer's language originates with the community to which he or she belongs. We use language primarily to join communities we do not yet belong to and to cement our membership in communities we already belong to" (Bruffee, 1986, p. 784). A writer's relationship with her reader, and vice versa, will be formed in large part according to the community to which she belongs. A writer or reader who wants membership in another discourse community will have to learn the roles of a writer and reader that are expected in that community. As Bartholomae and Petrosky (1986) write of Basic Writers:

> A classroom performance represents a moment in which, by speaking or writing, a student must enter a closed community, with its secrets, codes, and rituals. . . . The student has to appropriate or be appropriated by a specialized discourse, and he has to do this as though he were easily and comfortably one with his audience, as though he were a member of the academy. And, of course, he is not. (p. 8)

Students outside the academy need to learn to play the expected roles of writer and reader, to be able to address and invoke what is considered an appropriate audience, and to take on the characteristics of a projected audience as they read. It is to be hoped, however, that such role-playing will not simply be an exercise in assimilation. Ideally, such socialization processes should lead students to develop their own voices—so that ultimately, as Elbow (1987) advocates, students can "close their eyes" to their audience as they write. Rather than becoming someone they're not, students can become "more themselves, the people they are continuing to become" (Ritchie, 1989, p. 171).

At some point in the beginning of their school careers, all students are outside the boundaries of the academy. However, students who are on the margins of the mainstream culture, because of class, ethnicity, or gender, have particular problems succeeding in the university system—if they even make it there in the first place. For example, the high school dropout rate for Mexican-American and Puerto Rican students is close to 50% (Jusenius & Duarte, 1982, as cited in Cummins, 1989). Blacks and Hispanics lag behind whites in percentages of students attending college ("Blacks and Hispanics," 1987).

Even the label given students who are on the outside of the dominant culture reflects their marginality, as it is an example of the mainstream culture's naming, and thus to an extent controlling, the "other" group. Freire (1987) asks, "Do you see how ideologically impregnated the term 'minority' is? . . . When you refer to 'minority' you are in fact talking about the 'majority' who find themselves outside the sphere of political and economic dominance" (p. 125).

Nevertheless, students who are traditionally called "minority" students (Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American) are attending U.S. colleges and universities in increasingly large numbers. By 1986, 18% of all students enrolled in institutions of higher education in the United States came from this group. Among students in two-year colleges, 47% of those enrolled were classified as "minority" students ("Trends in Minority Enrollment," 1988). Although not all "minority" students have English as a second language, clearly these statistics indicate that a significant segment of higher-education students come from backgrounds where Standard Edited English may not be the dominant language. Another group of students attending U.S. colleges and universities consists of international students, who during the year 1985-1986 numbered approximately 230,000 ("Profiles," 1988). These students, who may well have been part of an elite group in their native countries, often have difficulties adjusting to the academic norms of U.S. universities, especially the demands of English-language academic discourse.

To learn the roles of their new discourse community, ESL students (both American and international) need practice in shaping their discourse for their audience so they can use appropriate cues for their readers. Systematic analysis of English-language text features is particularly important for second-language writers because of the different ways cultures express and interpret meaning. Hinds (1987) has claimed that "in Japan, it is the responsibility of the listener (or reader) to understand what it is that the speaker or author had intended to say" (p. 144). Because of this perception of the communication process, transition devices in Japanese texts are less frequent and more subtle than in English-language texts (p. 146). Thus, a Japanese student learning to write in English would benefit from instruction in the expectations of English-language readers—in this case, that readers will anticipate that the text will explicitly connect one idea with the next.

Another way to enable ESL (and native-English speaking) students to both address and invoke their audience can be found in collaborative learning techniques, such as peer tutoring and editing. Mittan (1989) and Zamel (1982) have suggested using these activities, in conjunction with multiple revisions and student-teacher conferences, to help students "adopt another's frame of reference" and to remind students that their teacher "is truly not their only reader" (p. 206).

Collaborative learning techniques can also help students who need to enter the university discourse community to "experience and practice the kinds of conversation valued by college teachers" (Bruffee, 1984, p. 642). This conversational experience enables students to role play orally what they need to do as they write: to dialogically communicate with a respondent while meeting the expectations of social context. Moreover, if the conversations of students become the focus of the classroom, the power of the teacher can be legitimately questioned, thus granting authority to students whose voices are not generally valued.

The effectiveness of collaborative learning techniques became particularly noticeable to the three of us when we attempted to replicate with ESL students an experiment that focused on helping native English speakers address the needs of their audience as they wrote an essay. The earlier study, conducted by Roen and Willey (1988), examined the point or points in a student's writing process at which knowledge of the audience more strongly affects composing, as well as how this knowledge changes students' texts. Each of 60 native-English speaking university freshman composition students was randomly assigned to one of three treatment conditions: no attention to audience, attention to audience before and during drafting, and attention to audience before and during revising. The treatment consisted of these four questions, to which the students in the drafting and revising group responded:

1. Make a list of those things your readers most likely already know about your topic.
2. Now list those things that your readers probably don't know, but which they will need to know in order to understand your essay.
3. Briefly explain how you decided what your audience's prior knowledge or lack of prior knowledge was about your topic.
4. Now take a few moments to really consider your answers to points 1, 2, and 3 above. Now that you have focused on these concerns, how will you adapt your essay to accommodate your readers?

Kate Mangelsdorf, Duane H. Roen, and Victoria Taylor

Students' original and revised essays were scored holistically for overall quality. Results indicated that the essays from the revising group were significantly higher in overall quality than the essays from either the control group or the drafting group. Roen and Willey (1988) concluded that this result indicates that instructors can intervene in writing processes to increase their students' awareness of audience; such an intervention might be most helpful during revising when the students do not have so many other cognitive demands, such as the need to explore ideas and organizational strategies, which usually dominate earlier in writing processes (Flower & Hayes, 1980).

We attempted to replicate this study with 45 international students enrolled in the first-semester regular-track ESL composition course at the University of Arizona. As with the Roen and Willey (1988) study, we randomly assigned each student to one of three treatment conditions: no attention to audience, attention to audience before and during drafting, and attention to audience before and during revising. Again, students' original and revised essays were scored holistically for overall quality.

Our results, however, differed considerably from the results in the Roen and Willey study. The holistic evaluations indicated that all of the students made significant improvement in their writing, but no one group improved significantly more than another (see Table 13.1). We realized after we had conducted this study that it had been contaminated in that we hadn't successfully controlled an important confounding variable. Specifically, from reading the students' responses to the four audience questions, we learned that the collaborative learning techniques incorporated in ESL writing instruction had enabled these students to deal with the issue of their audience better than the single treatment of the audience questions. Although the audience treatment we gave to the students was not significantly effective, the qualitative data we collected from the study (the students' responses to the questions on audience and their original and revised essays) have given us valuable insights into the way the students' sense of their audience evolved throughout their writing processes. This evolution included creating roles for their audience in their essays as they themselves took on the roles of writers in the discourse community of their classrooms. In the remainder of this chapter, we will examine the students' responses to the audience questions and the ways the students revised their papers in light of their responses.

TABLE 13.1: Mean Holistic Scores for Treatments and Versions

Treatment	n	Original		Revised		Marginal
		M	SD	M	SD	M
No Audience Questions	15	3.67	1.76	4.67	1.50	4.17
Questions Before Drafting	15	4.40	1.06	5.00	1.81	4.70
Questions During Revising	15	4.33	1.40	4.93	1.58	4.63
Marginal		4.13		4.87		4.50

Because the classroom context played such a critical role in the results of this study, it needs to be described in some detail. The four teachers involved in the study were experienced second-language composition instructors who used a variety of inventional and collaborative techniques in their classrooms, including brainstorming and free-writing, group tasks to share ideas, peer response work in which students suggested revision strategies, student-teacher conferences, and readings that stimulated ideas and modeled organizational strategies.

The assignment used in this study asked students to write about an aspect of culture that interested them and that they knew well. They were to write to an audience consisting of their classmates and teacher. The students wrote on a range of subjects of their own choice—from music to education to dating to law. They wrote at least two full drafts of this essay, the first one in class and the second one outside of class. Before the first draft, the students read essays on different aspects of American culture, free-wrote personal responses to the essays, and discussed their responses with their peers. They also wrote tentative theses and rough outlines. After the first draft, the students received suggestions for revision from their classmates in in-class peer response groups and in out-of-class conferences with their teachers. During these conferences, the teachers and students discussed the purpose and content of the essays, with the teachers acting as facilitators rather than as evaluators. Suggestions for revision generally emphasized focus and development.

Kate Mangelsdorf, Duane H. Roen, and Victoria Taylor

The 15 students who received the audience questions while drafting their essays, and the 15 students who received the questions while revising, were told only that focusing on several features of their audience would affect their revision. "Audience" and "reader" were not defined for them, nor were they given any assistance by their classmates or teacher. The students' responses reflect the variety of ways "audience" can be perceived.

Question 1 ("Make a list of those things your readers most likely already know about your topic") and Questions 2 ("Now list those things that your readers probably don't know, but which they will need to know in order to understand your essay") seem to direct writers toward addressing an audience outside the text—to imagining what these readers might be like. In their emphasis on audience characteristics, their approach is similar to that of Aristotle in the *Rhetoric*, although Aristotle focuses on the typical beliefs and character traits of an audience, rather than on the informational needs of an audience. By directing attention to writer/audience similarities and differences, the questions can lead to Burke's notion of establishing commonalities between communicants to induce identification and cooperation, or to establishing what Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) have called "an effective community of minds" in which some frame of reference is shared (pp. 14-15). These two questions also reflect a cognitive-development approach to audience, in that students are directed away from writer-based language to language that supplies the stylistic and contextual needs of an audience outside of themselves (reader-based language). In general, these first two questions required students to consider "the range of what most readers are likely to know" as the first step in expressing their concept—or their "metaphor"—of their audience throughout their texts (Park, 1982, pp. 251-252).

The students' responses to these first two questions demonstrate their developing metaphors of their audience, their discovery of their audience (Park, 1986, p. 479). They wrote an average of three ideas per question, some of which were fairly detailed and specific. It seems likely that these questions served as an heuristic that helped students generate more ideas about their topic. For instance, a student who wanted to compare education in Thailand with education in the United States wrote in response to Question 1:

Casualness in a class in the U.S. Showing a lot of opinions in classrooms. Strict classroom usually for everyone. Student's participation is must in

most classrooms in U.S. whereas in Thailand [students] usually don't talk for the whole period. Students lift their legs up, chew gum, drink soft drinks, eat biscuits in classroom here.

In describing what he doesn't need to tell his readers (who are, he's been told, his classmates and teacher), the student is actually listing some of the main points in his paper. This same student wrote in response to Question 2, "In Thailand, we get punished for bringing food or drinks into the classroom. We can't wear shorts into classroom. It is considered to be very impolite. Not even t-shirts should be worn into the classroom." Both this response and the response to Question 1 show that this student pictures his audience as being most concerned with knowing the classroom rules for students, rather than being interested in a more conceptual approach to the topic (such as why these rules exist). This conception of his audience is expressed in the student's first draft, which featured more description than analysis of the topic. (We will discuss the draft later in this chapter.)

The students' answers to Question 3 ("Briefly explain how you decided what your audience's prior knowledge or lack of prior knowledge was about your topic. Try to explain how you knew what your audience did or did not know") demonstrate, as do the replies to the first two questions, the students' processes of conceptualizing their audience. They also show the influence that the collaborative classroom techniques had on their ideas about their audience. For example, one student wrote, "How I knew this is . . . through discussion with some [of] my classmates," while another student reported, "I knew my audience's prior knowledge and lack of prior knowledge from my discussion with group 2. I noticed that my colleagues knew some points about my topic, and they weren't aware of other points." In general, the students elaborated on their audience's background knowledge by pointing out such aspects as where one might learn of a specific topic (newspapers, television, their experiences in a U.S. university), as well as the fact that some experiences are universal ("I think they knew what a family offers, from their own experiences with their families"), while other experiences require firsthand observation ("It's necessary to have lived a long time in Germany to be able to speak about this topic"). These types of observations suggest that the students were involved with not just what their audience knew or didn't know, but with the context surrounding their audience as well, such as how knowledge

about a certain topic is formed. Their concept of their audience was becoming richer, encompassing more aspects of the discourse situation.

Question 4 asks how students will "adapt your essay to accommodate your readers." The words *adapt* and *accommodate* emphasize the idea of shaping language in light of the characteristics of an external audience. In general, the students' responses show that they, too, interpreted the question in this way, in that most students answered this question by detailing the various rhetorical strategies they planned to use in their papers. However, many of these planned strategies indicate how, in shaping a text for an external audience, writers are defining certain roles for their readers to play. In many ways, Question 4 is asking, to use Long's (1980) words, "who do I want my audience to be?" (p. 225).

Several examples of student responses to Question 4 will demonstrate the interplay between textual strategies and writer-audience roles. The student who was comparing Thai and U.S. classrooms wrote simply, "I will explain the difference." He was expecting his audience to want only information about a topic. Another student had a more dialogical process in mind: "I must know what kind of people are the readers who will read the essay (general people, educated people) so I can communicate with their ideas." Many students detailed the need to support their points. One wrote, "I will give examples to illustrate my points," while another said, "By compare and contrast and using illustrations to support my thesis." These students who emphasized presenting evidence saw their audience as wanting to be persuaded, as if the discourse situation were a court of law (or, of course, a classroom where a grade was to be given).

Almost all of the responses to Question 4 reflected the standards of the discourse community of the freshman composition classrooms, such as provoking the interest of the audience, writing clearly and directly, and supporting the thesis. These standards are shown in this student's response:

> In my essay I will try to focus on the points that aren't clear in my audiences minds, especially the ones about my society and life in Kuwait. I will describe the problem as it exists exactly to make my audience think about it and feel it. I intend to provide my essay with real examples to attract my reader's attention and to strengthen my topic.

This response shows the student's awareness of the conventions of essay writing, and his knowledge that the audience expects him to

follow those conventions. He plans to invoke an audience who will be interested and concerned about his topic, who will want to learn about his opinion on it, and who will come to be convinced about his perspective. By successfully defining this role for his audience, this student assumes his own role as an effective writer in this discourse community.

Many of the students' revisions demonstrate how the writer-audience interactions they sketched in their responses to these four questions became a part of their essays. For instance, the following is an excerpt from the draft of the student who was comparing U.S. and Thai classrooms:

First, I am very surprised seeing people chew gum or sip drinks in the classroom while the teacher is giving lecture. . . . I guess if we feel comfortable we can concentrate more on what teacher is giving instead of worrying about sitting up straight . . . [which is] usually the code for classrooms in Thailand. . . . There is another thing that I like, is dress code in going to class here in the U.S. . . . This also help because if you feel comfortable with what you wear, that is fine. Dressing up does not help you in your course. That is what I believe.

In this draft, the student is coming to his conclusion as he writes. He traces his feelings about dress codes in the classroom ("I am very surprised") and then concludes that the American informality is better than the Thai formality: "Dressing up does not help you in your course." But he does not seem to imagine his audience as needing to be persuaded of this idea, for he simply states: "That is what I believe." He appears to believe that the audience will passively receive this information rather than question and challenge it.

As with much writer-based prose, this draft contained source material that was later used in the revised essay. This student's revision reflects how the writer's changed concept of his audience was a part of a new perspective of the expectations of his discourse community. As a result of this changed perspective, the essay more closely follows the textual conventions of an English-language composition classroom:

As there is tension in Thai classroom. I find being in there quite uncomfortable. . . . Dressing up does not make much sense to me. I do not think that it help learning in a course. There is a very little chance for someone to concentrate well feeling uncomfortable. After all, students go to school to learn and get educated, not to try to impress people. Moreover, dress code is not the only discomfort Thai students have to experience. Although

there is no sign in writing against sitting crossed-legs or lifting feet up, we all know that it is considered to be very rude not to sit in proper manner. Can you imagine how uneasy one feel for being so tight for a period of time? These are not the conditions I would like to be in for good learning to take place. And I am glad that American classrooms are different in terms of these codes.

This revision illustrates several changes in the way this writer imagines his audience. In the first place, he shows awareness of the expectations that an English-speaking audience will require structural cues, such as explicit transitions between ideas, in order to successfully process the writer's points. Additionally, the writer now invokes an audience who will want to be persuaded, and he uses various techniques to help him achieve this goal. For instance, he attempts to use reasons and evidence to support his points; instead of simply stating that dressing up doesn't help learning, he adds that students go to school to learn rather than to impress people. He also points to common areas of agreement in order to induce his audience to accept his points: "We all know that it is considered to be very rude not to sit in proper manner." He's assuring his audience that he knows that although he's criticizing a strict dress code, this doesn't mean that he and the audience aren't concerned with appropriate behavior. The writer also reaches out to his audience with this rhetorical question: "Can you imagine how uneasy one feel for being so tight for a period of time?" The role that he has created for his audience to play includes feeling sympathy for the plight of Thai students.

When writers alter their conceptions of their audience, they open themselves up to new insights about their topics. (Or, their insights about their topics lead them to different metaphors of their audience—the process can naturally work both ways.) For example, one of the students in this project wrote a draft in which she compared dating in Sweden with dating in the United States. In her draft, she compared in detail the different norms of the two cultures (curfews, sexual relations, and so on), and concluded that "Americans are born and brought up with these rules, but for a Swedish girl coming to America for the first time, it's like a game, never before played." At this point, the role she's envisioning for her audience is someone interested in the effect that these different social norms had on her the first time she came to the United States.

Before revising this draft, this writer answered the four audience questions. Her response to the fourth question shows that she was beginning to see her topic more critically: "I will have to point out the differences between America and Sweden, but also relate this to the different cultures. All traditions and actions do reflect upon the culture of a country." In her revision, she includes this idea about culture by speculating upon the reasons for the differences between dating in the two cultures, rather than simply relating her observations and experiences. For example, she points out that unlike America,

Puritanism never had a great influence on our culture. The Vikings, our ancestors, were hardly what one would call pure. . . . Americans are born and brought up with these rules, which reflect upon their culture and Puritan background.

This revision demonstrates the student's deeper perceptions about the phenomenon she was discussing; she might even be approaching the kind of critical awareness that Freire (1987) asserts should be the goal of education, where "students assume a critical posture to the extent that they comprehend how and what constitutes the consciousness of the world" (p. 49). The invoked audience for this student's revised essay wants to understand why the cultural differences that she is explaining exist, not simply be told that they do exist. This change in her perception of her audience reflects a shift in her perspective toward written communication in this context—she's focusing now on analyzing, questioning, and even challenging cultural norms. Just as the stance of the student comparing Thai and U.S. classrooms became more aggressive toward the reader in his revision, the approach by this student toward her subject is becoming more thoughtful and illuminating.

The importance of the sense of audience in the development of writing ability has been stressed by Britton and his colleagues:

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. (1975, p. 58)

For ESL students, and for all students on the margins of the academy, this ability to interact effectively with their audiences is as important as mastering the grammatical code of a language. Communicative

competence, after all, consists of "that aspect of our competence that enables us to convey and interpret messages and to negotiate meanings interpersonally within specific contexts" (Brown, 1987, p. 199). Gaining communicative competence can involve more than simple assimilation into a discourse community; it can also lead to challenges and transformations of that community. It can mean "working within and against the languages of academic life," as Bartholomae and Petrosky have suggested (1986, p. 8).

Finally, by being able to effectively communicate with audiences in discourse communities, students might come to terms with the audience(s) within themselves, and thereby transform themselves. In light of Vygotsky's (1934/1962) theory of development, interaction with others in discourse communities can enable students to develop individually through processes of socialization. This individual growth can be the source of a development of one's own voice. Bakhtin (1934-1935/1981) has further supported this notion: "The prose writer makes use of words that are already populated with the social intentions of others and compels them to serve his own new intentions, to serve a second master" (pp. 299-300). Out of the audiences that surround us, we must learn to make our own voice. In the words of Kenneth Burke (1950), "Only those voices from without are effective which can speak in the language of a voice within" (p. 39).

REFERENCES

Aristotle. (1954). *The rhetoric and the poetics of Aristotle* (W. R. Roberts, Trans.) New York: Random House. (Original work written circa 333 B.C.)

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). Discourse in the novel. In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press. (Original work published 1934-1935)

Bartholomae, D., & Petrosky, A. (1986). *Facts, artifacts, and counterfacts*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Blacks and Hispanics trail whites in college-going rate, study finds. (1987, Dec. 16). *Chronicle of Higher Education, 34*, p. A25.

Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A., & Rosen, H. (1975). *The development of writing abilities (11-18)*. London: MacMillan Education.

Brown, H. D. (1987). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bruffee, K. (1984). Collaborative learning and the "conversation of mankind." *College English, 46*, 635-652.

Bruffee, K. (1986). Social construction, language, and the authority of knowledge: A bibliographical essay. *College English, 48, 773-790*.

Burke, K. (1950). *A rhetoric of motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cummins, J. (1989). The sanitized curriculum: Educational dispowerment in a nation at risk. In D. M. Johnson & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 19-38). New York: Longman.

Ede, L., & Lunsford, A. (1984). Audience addressed/audience invoked: The role of audience in composition theory and pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication, 35,* 155-171.

Elbow, P. (1987). Closing my eyes as I speak: An argument for ignoring audience. *College English, 49,* 50-69.

Flower, L. (1979). Writer-based prose: A cognitive basis for problems in writing. *College English, 41,* 19-37.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. *College Composition and Communication, 31,* 21-32.

Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Gage, J. (1984). An adequate epistemology for composition: Classical and modern perspectives. In R. J. Connors, L. S. Ede, & A. A. Lunsford (Eds.), *Classical rhetoric and modern discourse* (pp. 152-169). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hairston, M. (1986). *Contemporary composition* (4th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 141-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Iser, W. (1986). The repertoire. In H. Adams & L. Searle (Eds.), *Critical theory since 1965* (pp. 360-380). Gainsville, FL: University of Florida Press. (Original work published 1976)

Long, R. C. (1980). Writer-audience relationships: Analysis or invention? *College Composition and Communication, 31,* 221-226.

Lunsford, A., & Ede, L. (1984). On distinctions between classical and modern rhetoric. In R. J. Connors, L. S. Ede, & A. A. Lunsford (Eds.), *Essays on classical rhetoric and modern discourse* (pp. 37-49). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Mittan, R. K. (1989). The peer review process: Harnessing students' communicative power. In D. M. Johnson & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 207-219). New York: Longman.

Park, D. (1982). The meanings of audience. *College English, 44,* 247-257.

Park, D. B. (1986). Analyzing audiences. *College Composition and Communication, 37,* 478-488.

Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation* (J. Wilkinson & P. Weaver, Trans.). South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Profiles: Detailed analyses of the foreign student population, 1985-1986. (1988). Ed. M. Zikopoulos. NY: Institute of International Education. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 297 666.

Ritchie, J. S. (1989). Beginning writers: Diverse voices and individual identity. *College Composition and Communication, 40,* 152-174.

Roen, D. H., & Willey, R. J. (1988). The effects of audience awareness on drafting and revising. *Research in the Teaching of English, 22,* 75-88.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1988). *Writing and reading: The transactional theory* (Tech. Rep. No. 13). Berkeley and Pittsburgh: Center for the Study of Writing.

Trends in minority enrollment in higher education, Fall 1976-Fall 1986. (1988). Washington, DC: Center for Education Statistics. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 297 662.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language* (E. Hanfmann & G. Vakar, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Original work published in 1934)

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly, 16,* 195-209.