1

PM-1 3 1/2"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

**Exploring the Exigencies of Institutional Reading Practices:
A Comparison of Reader Responses in Two Settings**

by

Christine L. Gunn Adam, B.A., C.T.E.S.L.

**A thesis submitted to
The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
Applied Language Studies**

**Department of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
April 1994**

**© copyright
1994, Christine L. Gunn Adam**

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-92946-4

Canada

Name Christine L. Gunn Adam

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Language - Linguistics.

SUBJECT TERM

0290

SUBJECT CODE

U·M·I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS
Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION
General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language
General 0679
Ancient 0289
Linguistics 0290
Modern 0291
Literature
General 0401
Classical 0294
Comparative 0295
Medieval 0297
Modern 0298
African 0316
American 0591
Asian 0305
Canadian (English) 0352
Canadian (French) 0355
English 0593
Germanic 0311
Latin American 0312
Middle Eastern 0315
Romance 0313
Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion
General 0318
Biblical Studies 0321
Clergy 0319
History of 0320
Philosophy of 0322
Theology 0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology
Archaeology 0324
Cultural 0326
Physical 0327
Business Administration
General 0310
Accounting 0272
Banking 0770
Management 0454
Marketing 0338
Canadian Studies 0385
Economics
General 0501
Agricultural 0503
Commerce-Business 0505
Finance 0508
History 0509
Labor 0510
Theory 0511
Folklore 0358
Geography 0366
Gerontology 0351
History
General 0578

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science
General 0615
International Law and Relations 0616
Public Administration 0617
Recreation 0814
Social Work 0452
Sociology
General 0626
Criminology and Penology 0627
Demography 0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0631
Individual and Family Studies 0628
Industrial and Labor Relations 0629
Public and Social Welfare 0630
Social Structure and Development 0700
Theory and Methods 0344
Transportation 0709
Urban and Regional Planning 0999
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture
General 0473
Agronomy 0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0475
Animal Pathology 0476
Food Science and Technology 0359
Forestry and Wildlife 0478
Plant Culture 0479
Plant Pathology 0480
Plant Physiology 0817
Range Management 0777
Wood Technology 0746
Biology
General 0306
Anatomy 0287
Biostatistics 0308
Botany 0309
Cell 0379
Ecology 0329
Entomology 0353
Genetics 0369
Limnology 0793
Microbiology 0410
Molecular 0307
Neuroscience 0317
Oceanography 0416
Physiology 0433
Radiation 0821
Veterinary Science 0778
Zoology 0472
Biophysics
General 0786
Medical 0760

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences
General 0566
Audiology 0300
Chemotherapy 0992
Dentistry 0567
Education 0350
Hospital Management 0769
Human Development 0758
Immunology 0982
Medicine and Surgery 0564
Mental Health 0347
Nursing 0569
Nutrition 0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
Occupational Health and Therapy 0354
Ophthalmology 0381
Pathology 0571
Pharmacology 0419
Pharmacy 0572
Physical Therapy 0382
Public Health 0573
Radiology 0574
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences
Chemistry
General 0485
Agricultural 0749
Analytical 0486
Biochemistry 0487
Inorganic 0488
Nuclear 0738
Organic 0490
Pharmaceutical 0491
Physical 0494
Polymer 0495
Radiation 0754
Mathematics 0405
Physics
General 0605
Acoustics 0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
Atmospheric Science 0608
Atomic 0748
Electronics and Electricity 0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
Fluid and Plasma 0759
Molecular 0609
Nuclear 0610
Optics 0752
Radiation 0756
Solid State 0611
Statistics 0463
Applied Sciences
Applied Mechanics 0346
Computer Science 0984

Engineering
General 0537
Aerospace 0538
Agricultural 0539
Automotive 0540
Biomedical 0541
Chemical 0542
Civil 0543
Electronics and Electrical 0544
Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
Hydraulic 0545
Industrial 0546
Marine 0547
Materials Science 0794
Mechanical 0548
Metallurgy 0743
Mining 0551
Nuclear 0552
Packaging 0549
Petroleum 0765
Sanitary and Municipal 0554
System Science 0790
Geotechnology 0428
Operations Research 0796
Plastics Technology 0795
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and
Research acceptance of the thesis

"Exploring the Exigencies of Institutional Reading Practices: A
Comparison of Reader Responses in Two Settings"

submitted by Christine L. Gunn Adam, B.A., C.T.E.S.L.

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Aviva Freedman", written over a horizontal line.

Aviva Freedman, Thesis Supervisor

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Richard Darville", written over a horizontal line.

Richard Darville, Graduate Studies Supervisor
Linguistics and Applied Language Studies

Carleton University
12 May 1994

Abstract

Social theories of writing and recent reconceptualizations of genre provide the background for this study which compared the reading practices and responses of experienced members of two related communities -- a university business school program and a government financial agency -- with an aim of articulating and exploring some of the social and cultural dimensions which elicit and shape rhetorical activities within those settings. Analysis of respond-aloud protocols revealed that the reading practices and responses of professors in the university and of supervisors in the workplace were markedly different in a number of respects: how the readers situated texts within institutional contexts, how they negotiated through the texts, and how they responded to the texts. Social and rhetorical exigencies which shaped these practices and responses originated in institutional goals and mandates, the specific task environments in which rhetorical activity took place, and the social roles enacted by the readers. The results of this study demonstrate the highly contextualized nature of rhetorical activity in the two settings and explain why writers making the transition from an academic setting to a related workplace often experience difficulty.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my advisor, Aviva Freedman for her support and guidance during the research and writing process. I am grateful to her for providing me with meaningful and valuable opportunities to participate, to listen, to speak and to learn.

I am indebted to Graham Smart for allowing me to conduct secondary analysis of some of the protocols he has collected and analyzed in the government financial institution under study in this thesis, thus permitting me to accomplish the comparative aspect of the study. Graham also provided me with important input about the workplace setting by responding both to my questions as well as to an earlier draft.

Thank you to Peter Medway for his useful comments on earlier drafts; to Susan Donaldson, Nancy Bélanger and Susan Swiggum for their time and assistance in preparing me for my defense; and to Wendy Magahay, my constant source of friendship, moral support and the occasional cup of coffee.

It is important to me that I acknowledge the love and support I have received from my parents who have shown me that learning takes place in many places and at any age. Their enthusiasm in seeking out new opportunities to learn about the world makes them the best role models a daughter could ask for.

Finally, my love and gratitude go to my husband, Mark who has been my rock through this entire process. I am truly blessed.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vi
1. Introduction - Why Readers?	1
2. The Context of the Study	5
Chapter overview	
Emerging social views of written discourse	
Genre and discourse communities	
Bakhtin and Brandt	
Conclusion	
3. The Study	27
The focus of the study	
The orientation of the study	
Respond-aloud protocols	
Setting	
Participants	
Collection of protocols	
Initial coding	
Creation of categories	
Presentation of findings	
4. Exigencies which Shape Readers' Practices and Responses	41
Chapter overview	
The institution	
Goals of the institution	
Lexicon	
The task environment	
Initiation of the text	
"Revisability" of the text	
Reader-writer roles	
Conclusion	

5. The Exigencies made Manifest	66
Chapter overview	
Protocol one - Government financial agency	
Protocol two - Carleton University	
Conclusion	
6. Discussion	93
Chapter overview	
Addressing the questions	
Conclusion	
7. Conclusion	107
Bibliography	111
Appendix A: Protocol One - Government Financial Agency	121
Appendix B: Protocol Two - Carleton University	126

List of Tables

TABLE	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
I	Participants - The Academic Setting	36
II	Participants - The Workplace Setting	37

Chapter One

Introduction -- Why Readers?

"Business uneasy about education." (Financial Post, March 5, 1993)

"Give job applicants literacy tests, bosses told" (Toronto Star, August 9, 1993)

"Schools fail business, probe told" (Toronto Star, October 13, 1993)

In recent years, it has not been uncommon to encounter complaints in both the media and from the business community at large that universities are not preparing their graduates for the writing they will have to do in the workplace (Andrews and Sigband, 1984; Aldrich, 1982; Gilsdorf, 1986). Accompanying these complaints are the voices of recent university graduates, frustrated and disoriented by the inadequacy they often feel as they attempt to write in their new jobs (Anson and Forsberg, 1990; Bataille, 1982; Bednar and Olney, 1987; Faigley and Miller, 1982; Radar and Wunsch, 1980).

These complaints perplex us because they do not resonate with what we know about writing at the university: we know that students do write a great deal and on subjects similar to those in their chosen fields of work. We also know that they write well enough to graduate from academic institutions. At the same time, the explanations offered for this phenomenon tend to be ill-formed ("students are illiterate," "they don't know grammar," "they can't get to the point"), often because public understanding of rhetorical competence is relatively unsophisticated, and because disciplinary and professional understanding of the rhetorical competence necessary within their own contexts is only now beginning to reach any kind of elaboration.

The reaction of the academy to these complaints has taken two paths. The first has been a pedagogic reaction to offer "communication courses" -- often designed in conjunction

with managers and other representatives from the workplace (Casaris and Lemon, 1985; Couture, 1985; Feinberg and Pritzker, 1985; Tebeaux, 1985). These courses typically focus on the symptoms of the problem -- textual organization, grammar rules, and spelling -- and are often limited by their being situated within a university context. The second reaction has been the increased focus of the research community on the social contexts which elicit and shape rhetorical activities in both academic and non-academic settings -- with an aim of better understanding the root causes of the writing difficulties encountered by recent university graduates as they enter the workforce.

The purpose of this study is to articulate and explore some of the social and cultural dimensions which elicit and shape rhetorical activities in academic and non-academic settings. In particular, I will do so by probing the responses of expert readers in the two contexts. The participants in the study -- professors at a university and supervisors in management positions at a government financial institution -- fill authoritative roles which require that they read and respond to texts produced by others. The two settings -- the School of Business at Carleton University and a major government financial institution -- were selected because of their writing-intensiveness, and because of the explicit emphasis and value they place on written expression as a means of accomplishing their institutional goals. At first glance, the writing produced in these two settings appears to be similar in its length, its subject matter, and its orientation toward analysis.

Emerging social theories of writing provide a theoretic framework for this research. Within this framework, the study of genre has become central. Carolyn Miller (1984) proposes that we view genre as a recognizable, typified response to rhetorical situations which those involved construe as being recurrent. By relying on the notion of recurrence in rhetorical situations, Miller's reconceptualization of genre allows us to consider the rhetorical activities which surround the text -- how it is initiated, the social roles it implies,

the social motives which elicit it, and the composing and reading practices which it entails -- as constituents of that genre. Miller claims that we are able to recognize a rhetorical situation as being recurrent, or as being of a particular type, through the social motives, or exigencies, which shape and constrain it. John Swales (1988, 1990) locates genre within the "discourse community" -- any group of people which creates and uses specific written genres in response to their own recurrent rhetorical situations and in order to accomplish their common goals.

Study of the responses of experienced members to texts written within a particular discourse community should thus be able to identify some of the exigencies which shape its genres. Examining the practices and responses of readers who fill authoritative roles within particular settings, and whose roles require them to directly or indirectly communicate the norms of the communities to novice writers, furnishes a window onto some of the socially-constructed exigencies which define and characterize those communities, their recurrent rhetorical settings, and their characteristic genres. This research attempts to explore the genre knowledge of the readers in these settings by addressing the following questions:

- Are there differences in the reading practices and responses of experienced members in the two settings?
- If there are, what is the nature of those differences?
- What do these differences reveal about the social motives (exigencies) which elicit and shape genres within the two settings?
- How do these exigencies shape the practices and responses of readers to particular genres within those settings?

While the traditional focus in writing studies and instruction has been on the writer and how she shapes her text in anticipation of the response of potential readers, this thesis proposes that an investigation of how the reader responds to texts can complement the traditional focus on the writer. Increased understanding of the exigencies which shape rhetorical practice in different settings should allow us a fuller picture of the nature of the difficulties experienced by some university graduates as they face the task of writing at work.

Chapter Two

The Context of the Study

Chapter overview:

Evolving social theories of writing within the emerging academic field of composition studies provide the most appropriate context within which to situate this study. Increasingly over the past fifteen years, writing theorists have turned to scholarship in fields as diverse as anthropology, sociolinguistics, sociology, rhetoric, education, philosophy, and literary studies to gain insight into the complex social realities which draw on and are shaped by written discourse. At the same time, writing researchers have applied an equally diverse range of methods to an ever-growing number of settings, enriching their understanding of how written discourse operates within a variety of academic and non-academic contexts. The resulting accounts of written discourse point to the important ways in which readers and writers respond to and shape both their rhetorical activities as well as the contexts in which those activities are situated.

Research into the nature of genre, and its embeddedness in the rhetorical activities of specific communities of language users, has become a central area of inquiry within composition studies. This research, with its focus on the socially-constructed nature of rhetorical activity and the interdependence of writers and readers, provides a number of insights into how communities use language, into the ways in which novices enter these communities, and into the roles played by other members of the community in such initiation. It is from this background of scholarly literature that we gain access to an increasingly rich account of how readers respond to what they read and how that response is shaped by the contexts in which they conduct their literate activities.

In this chapter, I discuss some of the more recent theory and research which have contributed to social views of writing. I then examine how reconceptualizations of genre, and the connection of genre to the notion of the discourse community, have contributed to our understanding of the social nature of written discourse. Finally, because of the specific pertinence they afford this research, I focus on the work of M.M. Bakhtin and Deborah Brandt, who, in different ways, provide useful perspectives on how a study of readers can contribute to our understanding of genre and the social context inherent in literate activities.

The scholarly literature reviewed in this chapter provides two important focal points for this research. First, accounts of the complex interaction among writers, readers and texts have led to a rethinking of the nature of rhetorical activities as events which shape, and are shaped by, their social contexts. Second, increased attention to writing which is elicited and shaped outside of academic contexts has resulted in enriched disciplinary understanding of rhetorical activities whose goals are neither epistemic nor evaluative. As a consequence we are able to explore the nature of reading within both academic and non-academic settings to examine how readers' responses within those settings are shaped by a range of social and rhetorical factors.

Emerging social views of written discourse:

The reflexive nature of the field of composition studies is evidenced in the recent number of reviews of the field's birth and growth over the past three decades. Berlin (1984, 1987); Faigley (1985, 1992); North (1987); and Nystrand, Greene and Wiemelt (1993) provide overviews of the development of modern (or post-modern) theory about, and research into, the ways in which people conduct literate activities. Although these surveys differ in their terminology and the precise dates within their chronologies, they all agree that the study of written discourse has progressed from the analysis of a traditional canon

of literary texts in conventional composition courses; to the study of the individual cognitive processes involved in the production and reading of texts (e.g. in the work of Flower, 1979; Flower and Hayes, 1980a, 1980b, 1981a, 1981b; Matsushashi, 1981; Perl, 1979; Pianko, 1979); and more recently, to a social investigation of literate activities which draws on multiple settings, including the school classroom, the home, and the workplace (see discussion below).

The gradual way in which this shift has taken place can be illustrated by examining the changes in the conception of the reader or audience in the research and theoretic literature. Kroll (1984) provides a useful discussion of three theoretical perspectives on the reader or audience which influenced composition studies in the previous decade: he calls these the "rhetorical perspective," the "informational perspective" and the "social perspective." Kroll's "rhetorical perspective" involves an active writer "analyzing the audience" in order to adapt his message so that it will be well received by a passive audience, the "target receiver."¹ Kroll's "informational perspective" emphasizes the reader as a more active information processor. This view holds that if writers are aware of how readers process texts, they can encode their messages in ways that will be most easily received by the reader. In contrast, the "social perspective" sees writing as fundamentally social and the reader as a "constructive participant" in communication" (p.181). Using a Piagetian model of social development, Kroll argues that the developing writer progresses from the production of egocentric texts to the recognition of writing as social interaction, requiring that texts be adapted to real readers.

¹A number of Flower and Hayes' studies (1980a, 1980b, 1981a, 1981b) examined the ways in which writers shape their texts in anticipation of specific audiences. They found that the writer's vision of the reader for whom she writes and the needs of that reader were primary considerations in her writing plan, resulting in a recursive process of accommodating those needs into the content of her text. The writer was thus seen as creating meaning for the reader, making sure that her ideas would be clear. This exemplifies a common theme in writing theory and research at the time - the reader as a passive "participant" in the meaning-making process.

A question that Kroll and others (Ong, 1975) raise is whether the audience is real or whether the audience is a "fictionalized" entity that the writer creates through the manipulation of written discourse. These questions are addressed by Ede and Lunsford (1984) in their distinction between readers as "addressed" or "invoked" by writers of texts. The view that an audience is addressed by the writer, corresponding to Kroll's informational perspective, "emphasize[s] the concrete reality of the writer's audience...shar[ing] the assumption that knowledge of this audience's attitudes, beliefs, and expectations is not only possible [via observation and analysis] but also essential" (p. 156). Ede and Lunsford's "audience invoked," on the other hand, emphasizes the writer's fictional construction of an audience through the provision of "semantic and syntactic ... cues for the reader -- cues which help to define the role or roles the writer wishes the reader to adopt in responding to the text" (p. 160). Ede and Lunsford conclude by proposing that we view the relationship between the writer and the reader as a synthesis of the two perspectives, allowing for the writer's ability to move between knowledge of readers, real or anticipated, and their ability to produce texts that "embody or give life to their conception of the reader" (p. 167). In recognizing both the writer and the reader as important components in a rhetorical situation, this integrated view also, accounts for the many complexities inherent in the social context in which the text operates.

What becomes evident in the studies reviewed here is their focus on the writer and how she manipulates her text to deal with potential readers -- fictionalized or real, addressed or invoked. Studies of actual readers reading non-literary texts had yet to be undertaken; however with a deepening understanding of the interdependent relationship among readers, writers, and texts, writing studies began to take a broader view of readers and their roles within a broad range of settings. It is the intertwining of the reader, the writer, and the text which becomes a central theme in emerging social views of writing.

Since the early 1980's, composition studies has slowly but surely shifted its focus to the role of the social context in shaping literate activities. The result has been an increasingly broad perspective of what written discourse entails in the specific social communities in which texts are written and read. Faigley (1985) discusses how previous conceptions of the "reader" and the "audience" restricted our understanding of the ways in which literate activities take place within social contexts. Declaring the need for a more comprehensive view of the ways in which texts are read and used within these contexts, Faigley asserts that "... a researcher of writing who takes the social perspective must have some way of defining and describing that society in terms broader than the traditional rhetorical conception of audience" (p. 236).

During this period, writing scholars have begun to move beyond a focus on the individual as a construer/maker of meaning toward one which reconceptualizes literate activities as those in which meaning is negotiated and expressed among participants (writers and readers) in an interactive exchange through and among texts. This new perspective on writing is due in part to the application of social constructionism to composition studies (Bruffee, 1986; Rorty, 1979). It also arises out of, and encourages, research into the specific social contexts in which writing occurs. Studies into the contexts of literate practices -- in academia, the workplace and the community -- have pointed to the ways in which literate interaction is a result and a reflection of the values and expectations of the community in which it takes place. Recent studies on the nature of writing have focused on the role of the social environment in the production of meaning -- meaning which is created by the writer in response to social contexts, interpreted by the reader whose expectations are shaped by socio-cultural experience, and mediated by the text.

Faigley (1985) discusses how the research orientation which has followed from a social perspective differs from prior writing research, particularly as it pertains to the conception of the reader:

Researchers taking a social perspective study how individual acts of communication define, organize, and maintain social groups. They view written texts not as detached objects possessing meaning on their own, but as links in communicative chains, with their meaning emerging from their relationships to previous texts and the present context. The social perspective, then, moves beyond the traditional rhetorical concern for audiences, forcing researchers to consider issues such as social roles, group purposes, communal organization, ideology, and finally theories of culture. (pp. 235-6)

And, indeed, a social orientation to writing research has furthered our understanding in regard to many of the issues Faigley identifies. Shirley Brice Heath's (1983) comprehensive investigation of literate practice in three Appalachian towns has demonstrated the degree to which the acquisition of literate skills is situated within, and determined by, the values and practices of the community at large. Numerous studies point to the importance of written discourse in the development, maintenance and reform of group identity and organization (Berkenkotter, 1990; Doheny-Farina, 1989; Freed and Broadhead, 1987). Within the context of this study, however, one of the most significant aspects of a social orientation to writing research has been its need to explore the social roles which are learned, enacted, and fulfilled through literate practice in various organizational and learning contexts. Studies such as those by Smart (1992, 1993) and Winsor (1989) indicate the inherent links between the actions of readers and writers and how these actors perceive that their actions will fulfill certain social needs and goals.

In addition to the ways in which it has expanded our understanding of the nature and role of the reader, a social orientation to writing research has also led to research in non-academic settings -- sites of rhetorical activity which had been previously overlooked. Because of the earlier focus on the individual writer, and not the context in which and to which she responded, there was little need for writing research beyond the classroom walls. However, with a recognition that research into literate practice can supply an account of the social and cultural factors which determine the acquisition and use of written discourse, researchers turned their attention to the multitude of community and workplace settings in which there existed a rich potential for re-examining some of the traditionally-held notions of texts and their enveloping rhetorical activities. Research into workplace writing described in edited collections (Bazerman and Paradis, 1991; Kogen, 1989; Odell and Goswami, 1985; Spilka, 1993) and monographs (Barabas, 1990; Bazerman, 1988; Doheny-Farina, 1992; Yates, 1989) provides insights into the ways in which institutional values, activities and norms shape and are shaped by the literate activities of members of those communities.

Similarly, research into the nature of academic writing has shifted its focus from the individual student writer to the contexts in which that writing operates. Writing research in academic settings has focused on how the institution of the university shapes the ways in which writing is elicited, composed and responded to. Investigations of writing in the university (Berkenkotter, Huckin, and Ackerman, 1991; Freedman, 1987; Herrington, 1985; Schwegler and Shamon, 1991; Walvoord and McCarthy, 1990) have examined how students in specific disciplines acquire and use the discourse of that discipline and how this enables both the production and acquisition of knowledge and learning.

Genre and discourse communities:

This theoretic shift toward the social has been accompanied by a reconceptualization of genre as social action in response to recurrent rhetorical situations (Miller, 1984). It has also led us to consider the ways in which communities develop and use particular genres in response to their own recurrent rhetorical situations and in order to accomplish the goals of those communities.

a) genre

Central to social theories of writing has been the need to reconceive our understanding of the nature of genre. Traditional approaches defined genres as text types (both oral and written), characterized by regularities in textual features. Because of its focus on the text itself and not on the actions of the people who produce and use them, this conception of genre seems limited in the context of increasingly elaborate social theories of writing.

In a seminal article which provides a base for reconceptualizations of genre, Miller (1984) explores "how a [social] understanding of genre can help account for the ways we encounter, interpret, react to, and create particular texts" (p. 151). She redefines genre as a social action in response to recurrent rhetorical situations. The "rhetorical situation" was first described by Bitzer (1968) as

a natural context of persons, events, objects, relations, and an exigence which strongly invites utterance; this invited utterance participates naturally in the situation, is in many instances necessary to the completion of situational activity, and by means of its participation with situation obtains its meaning and its rhetorical character. (p. 5)

While Bitzer did not use the term "genre," he referred to the recurrence of "rhetorical forms" in response to those situations which we identify as comparable. As a result, "a form of discourse is not only established but comes to have a power of its own -- the

tradition itself tends to function as a constraint upon any new response in the form" (p. 13). For Bitzer, a situation is identified as recurrent on the basis of both the material and perceptual factors which characterize that situation. These factors, or "exigencies," provide the motivation for the production of, or response to, the text.

Miller provides a social interpretation of "how genre represents 'typified rhetorical action' in response to recurrent rhetorical situations" (p. 151). While Bitzer and others (Patton, 1979; Brinton, 1981) assert that one identifies a rhetorical situation as recurrent through a recognition of its material and perceptual components, Miller rejects the material dimensions of this explanation. Relying on Schutz's concept of socially-constructed "situation types," she claims that recurrence is a social, or intersubjective, construct; "[w]hat recurs...is our construal of a type" (p. 157). She goes on to enlarge Bitzer's explanation of exigence, arguing that exigence is located in the social and is, in fact, "a form of social knowledge -- a mutual construing of objects, events, interests and purposes that not only links them but also makes them what they are; an objectified social need" (p. 157). The rhetorical situation is thus socially constructed and entails particular exigencies which make demands on both the reader and the writer in their interaction with and through the text.

By situating exigencies within the social, Miller has allowed us to explore genre in ways which extend beyond regularities across textual features. As social motives, exigencies imply roles and practices for those involved in the eliciting, composing and responding to texts. We can therefore broaden our understanding of genre so that it encompasses regularities across composing and reading processes (Paré and Smart, in press), roles enacted by writers and readers, and the contexts in which they take place. She concludes that a study of genres can provide a great deal more than mere description of how solitary writers and readers produce and respond to texts; a study of genre can provide a window

onto the social contexts in which the writing takes place and, consequently, the exigencies arising out of those contexts:

Here is the rationale for the study of rhetorical genres. To base a classification of discourse upon recurrent situation or, more specifically, upon exigence understood as social motive, is to base it upon the typical joint rhetorical actions available at a given point in history and culture. Studying the typical uses of rhetoric, and the forms that it takes in those uses, tells us less about the art of individual rhetors or the excellence of particular texts than it does about the characteristics of a culture or an historical period. (p. 158)

b) the discourse community

The concept of "discourse community" can be particularly useful in understanding the nature of "audience" and the highly intertwined relationships which exist between readers and writers, thereby enriching previously vague notions of the ways in which readers arrive at meaning through their rhetorical activities.

An adequate theory of audience thus needs to balance several concerns: writers, who influence and are influenced by, readers; readers, who influence and are influenced by, writers; and texts, which can over time come to embody the norms of writers writing and readers reading. (Rafoth, 1988, p. 133)

Responding to his own call for a comprehensive framework in which to examine audience, Rafoth (1988, 1990) provides a useful interpretation of the concept of discourse community as an appropriate way to look at the role of readers, or "the audience," in the production of writing. Rafoth proposes that, as sources for current notions surrounding the discourse community, the fields of rhetoric, literary criticism, linguistics all make valuable contributions to the on-going discussions in composition studies regarding the conceptualization of reader. He refers to rhetoric's "argument field," literary criticism's "interpretive community," and linguistics' "speech community." The recurring feature in

these three concepts is the theme of dynamic interaction among texts, readers and writers within a community.² Each of these three concepts points to the influence of a community of language users on both the content and the form of that which is written. They also account for the roles of previous, current and future readers and writers, as well as the intricate means by which a community conducts its activities and expresses its values and expectations. "Discourse community" thus provides a rich framework in which to explore the purposes, activities and social roles inherent in the reading of texts.

Swales (1990) presents the most fully developed notion of discourse community as a construct which provides insight into the "socio-rhetorical" activities of groups. Drawing on already elaborated notions of the "speech community" (Labov, 1972; Hymes, 1972) from socio-linguistics, he offers the "discourse community" as a means of understanding the centrifugal and centripetal forces which separate people into groups -- groups which communicate their norms and values and which conduct their affairs through the appropriation and use of particular forms of written discourse. He offers six defining characteristics of a discourse community:

- 1) tacitly or explicitly agreed-upon common goals;
- 2) mechanisms for intercommunication;
- 3) participatory mechanisms to provide information and feedback;
- 4) the use of more than one genre in the communicative furtherance of its aims;
- 5) a specific lexicon; and
- 6) a reasonable ratio of novices and experts, in order to ensure both the continuance of the group and the transmission of its norms and values (1990, pp. 24-27).

² Although "argument field" and "interpretive community" refer specifically to written language, "speech community" refers to both written and oral language.

Since one purpose of a discourse community is to reproduce itself, by initiating some and excluding others, expert members, in their roles as readers, clearly act in a capacity far beyond that of the passive, ambiguous and limited image conjured by earlier notions of "audience." In fact, expert readers are often responsible for playing a gate-keeping role within their discourse community. Just as social context determines one's role in writing, the reader has a multitude of contextual forces shaping the ways in which she will read and respond to a text. These variables will affect her reading practices, her expectations for the text, and her responses to it.

The usefulness of the concept of "discourse community" is questioned by some who challenge the at once "sweeping and vague" connotations surrounding the term "community." Joseph Harris (1989) points out that the "discourse community" is a problematic term because it is derived by combining two concepts: the concrete "speech community" from socio-linguistics and the more abstract "interpretive community" from literary criticism. Harris questions how it is that "one is always simultaneously a part of several discourses, several communities, [and] is always already committed to a number of conflicting beliefs and practices" (p. 191). It is the lack of consensus which results from an individual's multiple discourse activities which causes Harris to dispute the usefulness of the term "community."

Responding to concerns regarding the potential for conflict because individuals participate in more than one "community," Swales asserts that involvement in a specific discourse community may be peripheral or central at various points in one's life (p. 30). The individual moves in and out of discourse communities and participates in them to varying degrees. This image is most eloquently expressed by Burke in his metaphor for history and the history of ideas (1967):

Imagine that you enter a parlor. You come late. When you arrive, others have preceded you, and they are engaged in a heated discussion, a discussion too heated for them to pause and tell you exactly what it is about. In fact, the discussion had already begun long before any of them got there, so that no one present is qualified to retrace for you all the steps that had gone before. You listen for a while, until you decide that you have caught the tenor of the argument; then you put in your oar. Someone answers; you answer him; another comes to your defense; another aligns himself against you, to either the embarrassment or gratification of your opponent, depending upon the quality of your ally's assistance. (pp. 110-111)

Applying Burke's metaphor to the concept of discourse community is inviting and useful because it not only accounts for the role of those who have experience within the conversation but also acknowledges the lack of consensus which is often present within a group when knowledge, expectations and purposes are shared. Indeed, there are many parlors through which we pass each day -- some in which we feel completely comfortable in our roles, others in which we lurk in the corners and eavesdrop on conversations, and still others in which we shift from foot to foot, wringing our hands, glancing up at the clock, and longing to leave.

Swales' most important contribution in the context of this study is his suggestion that we locate genres within their "discourse communities." According to Swales, discourse communities develop, use and modify written genres in response to the recurrent rhetorical situations they face in the course of conducting their affairs and meeting their goals. Current genre theory attempts to understand the ways in which written genres are embedded within the socio-cultural contexts and activities of readers and writers.

Bakhtin and Brandt:

a) Bakhtin

The writings of Russian literary theorist, M.M. Bakhtin have enhanced our understanding of the social embeddedness of genre and the role of genres (both written and oral) within communities of language users. Defining speech genres as "relatively stable types" (p. 60) of utterances, Bakhtin conceives genre not as a system, but as a "cluster of habits, which imports a needed regularity to communication while still remaining open to the shifting pressures of daily life" (Morson, 89). In "The Problem of Speech Genres," (1986) Bakhtin provides two useful concepts for understanding the nature of genre: the utterance as the analyzable unit of speech and the addressive nature of speech. Recognizing that speech (both oral and written) is always situated within the speech of others, he points to the importance of recognizing the plurality of speakers in order to examine language use as communication.

Bakhtin proposes that we regard the utterance as the analyzable unit of discourse because it "occupies a particular *definite* position in a given sphere of communication" (p. 91, emphasis in original). As a link in a chain of discourse, the utterance is fundamentally dual in nature -- it simultaneously responds to the past utterances while also anticipating future utterances. Words and sentences acquire meaning through the utterance. Bakhtin claims that speakers are able to choose the generic form of utterance which best accomplishes their speech plan (or intention) within the communicative situations in which they find themselves interacting with others.

Essential to Bakhtin's notion of the utterance is that it is at the same time "responsive" and "response-driven." All speech, oral or written, is directed to others. It is this plurality of communicators, and our awareness of it, which shapes the content and form of our

utterances. Inherent in the Bakhtinian notion of the plurality of speakers is the active nature of both the production and reception of speech. Bakhtin reacts to Saussurian representations of listening and reading processes as primarily passive reception leading to understanding. He asserts that listening and reading are, in fact, based on achieving "understanding [which] is imbued with response and elicits it in one form or another."

It is this focus on the plurality of speakers which leads Bakhtin into his discussion of the "addressivity" which is enacted through utterances. Bakhtin points to a general awareness of the presence of "the other" in language as well as the more specific awareness of a specific partner in a specific communicative situation.

But from the very beginning, the utterance is constructed while taking into account possible responsive reactions, for whose sake, in essence, it is actually created. As we know, the role of the others for whom the utterance is constructed is extremely great....From the very beginning the speaker expects a response from them, an active responsive understanding. The entire utterance is constructed, as it were, in anticipation of encountering this response. (p. 94, emphasis in original)

Because speakers/writers anticipate response, we can see how their texts are in fact shaped by an awareness (however tacit) of the addressivity of speech.³ Equally important to Bakhtin's notion of addressivity is the role of earlier utterances, arising out of both oral and literate "conversations," which provide the speaker with a rich store from which to draw as they shape their own utterance.

Each utterance is filled with echoes and reverberations of other utterances to which it is related by the communality of the sphere of speech communication. Each utterance refutes, affirms, supplements, and relies on the others,

³ This goes beyond the reader-based prose described by Flower (1979) for it encompasses past and future utterances - the echoes and foreshadowing of others' voices which shape both what we say and how we say it.

presupposes them to be known, and somehow takes them into account. (p. 91)

The exact nature of this dialogic interaction is determined by the communicative situation, which may be akin to Miller's redefinition of Bitzer's "exigencies." Bakhtin refers to the awareness of the concrete situation (participants and other utterances) and the ways in which this forms a type of generic knowledge. We learn the typical forms of utterances (genres) which are appropriate to the situation. These forms permit the shaping of an utterance so that it meets the speaker's/writer's speech plan and is appropriate to the situation. Genres also permit a degree of predictability for the listener/reader.

b) Brandt

Deborah Brandt's (1990) presentation of literacy as involvement adds to our understanding of the intimate interaction that takes place among readers, writers, and texts. Her argument is that texts do not stand on their own as vessels of meaning, but that they involve a complex interplay among context, reference and meaning which is accomplished through the minute-by-minute activities of writers and readers. Brandt's primary concern is to show that written speech is as contextualized, responsive and social as oral interaction. In Literacy as Involvement (1990), Brandt refutes conventional claims that written expression is somehow less contextualized than oral language (Goody, 1986; Olson, 1977; Ong, 1982; Tannen, 1982, 1985). Brandt asserts that, rather than isolating people, the development of literate abilities results in increased social interaction. "It is not a matter of learning how statements stick together but rather how people stick together through literate means" (p. 6).

Brandt uses a combination of both process (think-aloud protocol) and text analyses to examine the dialogic and intersubjective nature of literacy. Central to her discussion is the

notion of "metacommunicative" ability -- the ability of writers and readers to determine what the unfolding text means and how to accomplish this meaning. She contrasts this to views of the text as a vessel of meaning in and of itself. She asserts that metacommunicative ability will manifest itself in various ways according to the settings in which the writer or reader finds herself and according to the concomitant roles which she is required to fulfill within that setting. The protocols Brandt explores provide a source for examining how it is that

[t]exts are not merely outcomes of reading and writing processes; they are deeply about those processes. Thus the first requirement for understanding texts is understanding that they refer to what people do with them. (p. 5)

The understanding about which Brandt writes is crucial to the present discussion, for surely this understanding is linked to the specific communities in which one reads and writes. Our awareness of how texts operate within our communities, and of how the present text is situated within its context, profoundly affects the ways in which we read and/or respond to that text.

Writers and readers in action are deeply embedded in an immediate working context of aims, plans, trials, and constructions (which themselves are tied to circumstantial and cultural contexts of all sorts). The language that they write and read finds meaning only in relationship to this on-going context -- a context more of work than of words. (p. 4)

Brandt's "context of work" is dynamic and fluid; it is constructed as the text unfolds for the reader. She calls this an "ad hoc" involvement in the text (p. 100) -- one which permits the reader to arrive at meaning. Ad hoc involvement in the text is facilitated by one's metacommunicative ability -- the writer or reader's sense of how to accomplish meaning. In the course of sustaining meaning throughout the reading or writing process,

one may be required to refer to cultural or situational contexts, manage breakdowns in lexical understanding, or negotiate organizational complexity.

Conclusion:

The purpose of the present study is to probe readers' responses to texts as a means of exploring some of the social and rhetorical exigencies which shape writing in an academic and a non-academic setting. To review, the questions to be addressed in this study are:

- Are there differences in the reading practices and responses of experienced members in the two settings?
- If there are, what is the nature of those differences?
- What do these differences reveal about the social motives (exigencies) which elicit and shape genres within the two settings?
- How do these exigencies shape the practices and responses of readers to particular genres within those settings?

This research grows out of a rich, albeit relatively recent, body of scholarship which has increasingly focused on examining the ways in which literate activities provide and reflect both centripetal and centrifugal forces in social interaction. In the remaining pages of this chapter, I summarize the theory and research discussed above, pointing to how it provides an appropriate background for this study. I then review some studies into reader response and into the comparison of academic and non-academic writing in order to demonstrate how the present study builds upon current research which has already addressed some of the questions guiding this research.

A social orientation to writing theory and research provides an appropriate background for this study for the following reasons:

- by moving to a view of the reader as an active participant who influences and is influenced by writers and texts, within the enabling and constraining factors of the rhetorical situation, we are validated in exploring the responses of readers as a means of understanding the contexts in which the writing takes place;
- increased study of literate activities in non-academic settings has pointed to the very different ways in which writing accomplishes social goals and roles in contexts which are not centrally about learning;
- new conceptualizations of genre have revealed that the textual features which are often relied upon to distinguish genres are actually correlates of the social roles, needs and activities which surround them;
- the location of the study of written genres within discourse communities has permitted inquiry into how the norms and values of groups enable and constrain the rhetorical activities of its members;
- Bakhtinian notions of the addressivity of speech indicate the degree to which individual texts act as links between previous texts (both oral and written) and the inevitable response of others; and
- finally, Brandt provides us with a means of examining the moment-by-moment activities of readers and writers as they create and sustain meaning within the unfolding of the text.

The questions which guide this research have been addressed by some of the studies into the practices and responses of readers within specific contexts as well as by those studies which compare academic and non-academic discourse. In reviewing some of this research literature, however, it becomes apparent that there is a need for further research which builds on these two independent lines of inquiry by drawing them together. This thesis research, which is situated within a broader investigation of academic and non-academic discourse, attempts to do so in order to expand our understanding of how readers' responses can illuminate some of the differences between the two rhetorical environments as well as to identify the possible sources of difficulties faced by writers who make the transition from one to the other.

Writing research and theory has looked at readers from the perspective of the writer-informant who addresses and/or invokes (Ede and Lunsford, 1984); is constrained and/or facilitated by (Doheny-Farina, 1989); perceives (Berkenkotter, 1981); fictionalizes (Ong, 1975); and adapts to (Flower, 1979) the reader/audience. Few studies have investigated the ways in which the readers *themselves* react and respond to those texts which they choose to read or are required to read, or at how this reading subsequently shapes the writing. Two studies which do explore the practices of readers are Bazerman (1988) and Smart (1993). Bazerman, in his investigation of reading practices of physicists, explores the ways in which these academics apply both their current knowledge frameworks as well as their research agendas to guide their choice of academic reading material as well as their actual reading strategies. Smart describes the reading purposes and practices of executive members of a government institution whose decision-making roles shape certain reading practices and responses. He then looks at how these readers' activities shape the rhetorical activities of other members of that institution in creating texts, and genres, which meet the executives' expectations as readers.

Studies into the composing processes, textual features, and reading practices in both academic and nonacademic settings have contributed to our understanding of the systemic and social nature of writing. Most of these studies have provided exclusive renderings of either one setting or the other; only a few have examined the ways in which the two rhetorical settings are similar and different. Those which do provide comparative accounts of discourse in academic and nonacademic settings are useful in determining the ways in which institutional factors shape the ways in which writing is elicited, composed and responded to. Doheny-Farina (1989), in his study of a writer who wrote in both academic and workplace settings, found that both settings foster roles in which the writers either preserve the discourse community or seek to change it. It is not the setting itself that determines the types of writing that will be produced but rather the institutional role played by the writer in producing institutionally-based prose. Doheny-Farina views the role of supervisory readers in both institutions (professors and managers) as an integral factor in helping the writer recognize and fulfill her institutional role. Odell, Goswami and Quick (1983) explored how a group of undergraduate students and a group of legislative assistants defined the contexts in which they wrote and how they employed conceptual skills and strategies in producing written discourse. These researchers found that although both sets of writers were aware of their readers when they wrote, the legislative assistants were able to produce much more elaborate scenarios involving previous and future events surrounding texts, the contexts in which they were produced, and the potential response of the readers who would ultimately read them.

Freedman, Adam and Smart (1994) used current genre theory to examine the ways in which the case study method of university discourse both resembled and contrasted with writing in the workplace. In doing so, we compared the social roles, social motives (exigencies), composing and reading practices as well as textual features inherent in rhetorical settings within the two institutional contexts. This thesis research seeks to

expand notions developed in that study by examining readers' responses as a window onto the range of social and rhetorical exigencies which are enacted in the activities of the readers.

In sum, a social orientation to writing research and theory has provided both a solid background and a compelling motivation for exploring the questions which guide this research. Writing studies have increasingly moved toward exploring the very complex ways in which readers, writers and texts interact within specific social environments. Although there has been research into both the ways in which readers approach texts and in how academic and nonacademic writing settings compare, there has been very little research which has exclusively compared how privileged members within different discourse communities read and respond to texts.

In order to obtain greater insight into the difficulties faced by university graduates as they move from writing in an academic context to writing in a work context, it is relevant to explore some of the ways in which the readers in the two settings express and exert their expectations as experienced participants -- participants to whom the novice often looks for guidance in learning the ways to acquire the particular way of saying particular things within a given context.

Chapter Three

The Study⁴

The focus of the study:

The focus of this study is to compare the responses of readers in two settings: the university and a government agency. The responses of experienced members of these communities provide a window onto some of the exigencies which elicit and shape genres within the two settings. The use of respond-aloud reading protocols, as a means of "listening in" on readers' responses, allows us two different views of these exigencies. First, protocols allow us to determine *what* some of the exigencies are in the rhetorical situations which arise out of institutional goals, needs and structures. Second, the protocols provide an account of *how* these exigencies shape the readers' practices, expectations and responses. It is through accessing some of this information about readers' behaviours that we obtain a fuller view of the nature of written genres within the two settings studied.

The academic and workplace settings chosen for this study are both concerned with financial and public management; in fact, they were chosen for this similarity in disciplinary orientation. My purpose in doing so was to examine the extent to which the differences observed in the readers' responses were shaped by socio-institutional factors as opposed to disciplinary ones. The academic setting is the School of Business at Carleton University. Students who wish to obtain a Bachelor of Commerce must successfully complete a

⁴ This thesis research was conducted within the context of a larger study investigating discourse in related academic and workplace settings. As a research assistant for this study, I have been involved in a number of related projects. My participation in projects related to this one has influenced the ways in which I have collected, analysed and interpreted the data in my thesis research. One publication (Freedman, Adam and Smart, 1994) which has come out of this larger study will be referred to in Chapters Three through Five as a means of contextualizing some of the research methods and findings presented in this thesis.

number of "core" courses in such diverse areas as organizational behaviour, finance, private and public policy, accounting, marketing and economics. The corresponding workplace under study is one to which graduates with a Bachelor of Commerce might look for employment -- a major government financial institution.

Analyzing readers' responses through the use of respond-aloud protocols provides insights into their expectations for the writing; it is these expectations that, as Smart (1993) suggests, play an important role in shaping the nature of the writing. These expectations reflect, and are shaped by, the exigencies arising out of the norms, activities and structures of an institution. Studying the responses of experienced members within an institution, particularly those whose roles require them to respond to the writing of less-experienced members, provides insights into the exigencies which shape their expectations. These responses, determined as they are by institutional exigencies, can provide additional saliency to a comparative study of the genres produced in academic and workplace settings which are related by means of their disciplinary orientation.

Given their role within the community, university professors who read student papers have the final word as to whether students are successful in thinking, reasoning, researching, organizing and communicating. Similarly, the manager or supervisor who reads in the workplace can and does shape the writing produced by subordinates within the organization when reading and responding to the texts which are directed to her and which may also represent her. Though perhaps not overtly or consciously, readers in both settings are facilitating the initiation of writers into the discourse community through their own responses to the texts that writers produce.

The orientation of the study:

As I have discussed in the previous chapter, composition studies draws on fields as varied as cognitive psychology, philosophy, the sociology of science, literary theory, anthropology, and socio-linguistics; additionally, research settings include community, school and workplace environments. Consequently, composition studies draws on the strengths of a multitude of research methods, ranging from highly controlled, empirical experiments, such as some of the think-aloud protocol research conducted by Linda Flower and her associates (Flower, 1979; Flower and Hayes, 1980a, 1980b, 1981a, 1981b); to short-term observational research, such as Selzer's observation of an engineer writing (1983); to textual analysis, such as that done by Bazerman (1988); to rigorous, long-term ethnographic studies, one of the most prominent being the research conducted by Heath (1984) into the different literacy practices of three towns in the Appalachians. Perhaps it is due to the relative newness of the field of composition studies that there is so much conscious discussion and debate as to which methodology is most appropriate to, and informative for, the field. Research methods are selected on the basis of the specific questions guiding the researcher(s) and the specific research environment those questions entail. In many cases, a variety of methods are employed in order to gain a fuller picture of how both cognitive and sociological/cultural factors interact in literate activities.

This study is fundamentally naturalistic in its orientation, while employing certain techniques more commonly associated with other forms of research. The naturalistic paradigm of research is most often defined by discussing what the traditional, positivistic paradigm, most commonly associated with experiments in the "hard" sciences, is not. The naturalistic paradigm stresses the "naturalness," or authenticity of the research setting and data collection procedures. (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Goetz and Lecompte, 1985) This research was conducted within naturalistic, rather than experimental, conditions. Consequently, there was no manipulation or control of variables, no prediction of

behaviour and no separation of participants from their respective social environments. As unobtrusively as possible, their actions and responses were recorded, with an end to valuing the participants as expert within their local contexts.

Respond-aloud protocols:

Respond-aloud protocols involve having the readers voice their response as they conduct an activity -- in this case, reading through a piece of writing. This may include the readers' comments on any of the following: what they are looking for in the text, elements that they like or do not like, things that surprise them, things that need to be changed, and possibly their evaluations of the text. It also inevitably involves the reader providing a metacommentary on what she is doing ("O.K., now I'll turn to page two.") As the readers are responding aloud, their comments are recorded on cassette tape and any non-verbal behaviour (flipping through pages, re-reading sections, writing comments, checking other documents) is observed and recorded as observational notes. These observational notes, coupled with the text itself, are used for clarification when the taped protocols are transcribed.

This particular method of collecting data is not often identified as being "naturalistic." In fact, protocols are often employed within highly-structured, experimental conditions. Protocol research, which requires participants to voice their thoughts as they conduct an activity, has a strong history in writing studies. Janet Emig's 1971 study, "The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders," initiated an abundance of "composing aloud" studies, conducted mainly with high school and college students. The most prominent researchers to use this method are Linda Flower and John Hayes who, with their colleagues at Carnegie Mellon, have used thinking-aloud as a means for studying writing, reading, and reading-to-write processes (1980a, 1980b, 1981a, 1981b, 1984).

The use of think-aloud protocols in writing research has been subject to criticism -- specifically for its use of experimental conditions, its apparent intrusiveness, and its focus on the individual mind and its lack of consideration of the social context in which written texts are shaped (Croper and Holzman, 1983, 1985; Bizzell, 1982b; Nystrand, 1986). However, the fact that oral protocol research, as a research method, has been a constituent of experimental, cognitive studies of writing and reading does not exclude it from being a useful and productive means of accessing the social realities in which people conduct literate activities. I submit that although researchers have criticized think-aloud research for its lack of attention to the social and cultural context in which the literate activities under study take place, it is in fact possible to use qualitative methods to analyze oral protocols in order to gain access to some of the interpretive processes employed by writers and readers within the social contexts in which they conduct literate activities.

In Literacy as Involvement (1990), Deborah Brandt asserts that

any truly comprehensive and realistic definition of literacy must take into account the actual acts of reading and writing, must take into account, in other words, how literacy is actually accomplished by everyday readers and writers in everyday life. While intrusive and incomplete, oral protocols still provide a singularly rich record of the minute-by-minute accomplishments of written meaning making and thus stand to enlarge existing conceptions of literacy and literate ability. (p. 34)

And again, in a 1992 article in Written Communication, she describes how think-aloud protocols can indeed provide a wealth of information about how writers and readers "do writing and reading" and how a social approach to protocol analysis can provide a useful means by which one can obtain access to the ways in which people do everyday things -- their "know-how." Brandt goes further in her endorsement of a social approach to protocol research by pointing to how such an approach may be able to bridge the gulf

between the cognitive orientation of Flower and her colleagues, what she calls a "little picture" approach, and the socio-cultural, "big picture" stance of researchers such as Nystrand (1986) and Bizzell (1982). The text, its production, and its reception are not located outside social realities or as a consequence of these social realities. In fact, they constitute and create social realities. As a result, in studying literate activities "in situ", we are indeed observing the ways in which a particular group of people are involved with each other in very social acts.

My motivation in using respond-aloud protocols in the context of this research was to obtain a more richly textured view of reader response than that offered by observation alone. By requesting participants to verbalize their response as they read, I hoped that they would make more explicit the often tacit assumptions and expectations which underlie how they read and evaluate such texts. To adapt a metaphor from Peter Elbow (1973), the protocols can be looked upon as the sound track to a "mind-movie" in one's head -- a verbalization which permits a view of some, but certainly not all, of the factors which contribute to one's rhetorical actions.

Setting:

Two sites were studied: the Carleton University School of Business and a major government financial agency. The focus was on readers within each institution who are responsible for reading and responding to writing produced for them by their subordinates: students and employees. As such, readers from the university setting were professors of core courses in the Commerce programme; readers from the workplace were management-level supervisors of other employees.

The workplace is a central agency of the Canadian government which administers national monetary policy. Written texts provide a valuable means by which information is

communicated, analysis is undertaken, and decisions are both taken and administered. Writing is used to build knowledge within the organization and to provide decision-making tools. The composing and reading processes of its employees are highly regularized, revealing the ways in which this community's genres provide a structure to its institutional activities. An important aspect of these regularized practices is the pervasiveness of document-cycling -- the process by which the writer incorporates successive rounds of oral and written feedback from peers and supervisors in the production of a text (Smart, 1985, 1992, 1993).

Because of the economic nature of the workplace selected, the university setting chosen for comparison was the School of Business at Carleton University. Universities require written texts of its students as a primary means for evaluating their achievement, ranking them, and credentializing them. As such, the production and evaluation of student texts is an unquestioned, normal part of the work conducted by members of the university community. In both qualitative and quantitative courses offered by the School, students are required to produce written assignments. Interviews with faculty in the School indicate that they assign writing both to assess student learning as well as to prepare students for writing at work.

Both settings exhibit an explicit consciousness of the value of written expression and its role within the activities of the institution. The academic and workplace institutions under study here inherently require the acquisition of particular written expression in order to move vertically (toward graduation and accreditation, or toward promotion) within the organization. In fact, although the two institutions under investigation differ in their daily activities and corporate mandates, they are similar in the degree to which they use, produce and value written texts.

Participants:

The participants from each of the two settings fill authoritative roles within their respective communities. As such, they have obtained a certain degree of experience within that community and are aware of the exigencies present. At the government agency, the four participants were management-level employees -- department chiefs and managers who report to a higher level of executives. The four participants from the School of Business at Carleton were professors of core courses in the Bachelor of Commerce programme. For both sets of participants, their roles require them to respond to writing produced for them by less experienced members of their communities. This response becomes an important means by which the norms and expectations of the institution are communicated and through which subsequent writing may be shaped.⁵

The four participants (three male, one female) from the government agency all fill managerial positions in which one of their responsibilities is to review and respond to writing produced by others under their authority. In most cases, this reading activity is necessary in ensuring that the text complies with the expectations of the agency as a whole, the specific department and the needs of the manager him/herself.⁶ As will be discussed at length in the presentation of the findings of this research, the manager's role

⁵ Certainly, the response given in the two settings will not, and cannot, be analagous. The response provided by the readers in the workplace becomes part of the process of writing and revising the text. The response of professors in the academic setting is not an integral part of the students' composing processes. In fact, the academic protocols give insights into expectations that have likely been expressed in other ways at earlier points in the course through lectures, course outlines, discussions, and office hours (Freedman, Adam and Smart, 1994).

⁶ There are indeed a number of positions and situations in this institution in which writing is read for purposes other than for review and revision. In these situations, the text is being read by the primary reader. A document may be read to obtain background information for a meeting, to act upon a recommendation, etc. Protocols which represented these situations were not included in the data used for this study because the primary purpose of the study was to examine response which leads to feedback to the writer. In those situations within this institution in which a paper is considered a finished document, the writer will receive no direct feedback from the primary reader which would lead to further shaping of that text.

entails that he produce comments that will lead to revision of a text, usually before it leaves the department under his signature.

The participants from the university were professors (three male, one female) who teach third- and fourth-year, half-credit core courses in the School of Business. Each of these professors had been interviewed two months prior to the data collection in order to determine the types of writing they required of their students, specific due dates, as well as their interest in participating in the study. The courses taught by the participants in the study represent the spectrum of courses a student in Commerce must complete in the course of her studies.

Collection of protocols:

The respond-aloud reading protocols used for this study were collected during authentic reading events in each of the two settings studied. More specifically, the protocols at the university took place when the professors had the task of reading, responding to, and evaluating writing they had assigned in the courses they teach; the protocols from the workplace took place when the participants had to review and respond to documents produced within their department in order to provide feedback for revision. As such, the situations in which the protocols were collected were naturalistic ones, naturalistic in terms of the purpose, setting, roles and activities of the reading event.

The genres responded to in these protocols are characteristic of the genres commonly elicited within these institutions and responded to by the participants. The readers were operating within an arena with which they were familiar: they were familiar with the institution itself, the setting in which the text was elicited, and the players involved. There was no "role-playing" necessary for these readers to participate in the study.

Four different protocol episodes were collected in each setting. I collected the protocols from the academic setting; the protocols from the government agency were provided to me by Graham Smart who has collected reading protocols within the context of his own research and his work as a writing instructor at this government agency during the past decade. The university assignments responded to in the academic protocols were selected to represent the variety of texts and course types that a commerce student is required to complete -- case studies, term papers, and critical analyses of media reports in relation to material presented in the course. The texts responded to in the protocols from the government financial institution are equally representative genres -- summaries of research papers, proposals for increased office automation, analytic papers for publication, and evaluations of programmes. Tables I and II below summarize the readers and the types of documents to which they are responding:

Table I: Participants -- The Academic Setting

Reader	Course Taught	Type of Assignment
Anderson	Business Ethics	Term Paper
Baines	Financial Analysis	Case Study / Term Paper
Corbett	Taxation	Media Analysis
Douglas	Business Policy	Case Study

Table II: Participants -- The Workplace Setting

Reader	Type of Document
Ernst	Summary of research report
Frost	Progress report on project
Gold	Article for publication
Hamilton	Proposal for increased word processing capacity

In both settings, the participants' decision to participate in the protocol collection was voluntary. The professors were asked to call the researcher at the end of term when they had student assignments to grade. The supervisors at the government agency agreed to respond to their employees' written drafts as part of the writing instruction those employees were receiving at the time. The act of responding-aloud while reading was explained to the participants. With the exception of one of the professors who had himself conducted protocol-based research, this process was new to the participants. However, in comparing the volume and content of the resulting protocol transcripts, there did not appear to be any substantive differences between the experienced participant's and those of the others.

None of the readers were given any specific list of instructions to adhere to while they were responding-aloud. They were simply told to voice any thoughts that came to them as they were reading. At times, they were prompted for clarification or reminded to speak aloud. This was done as unobtrusively as possible. They were reminded that people often mumble under their breath when reading and that all they were doing was amplifying this mumbling. In fact, because in both the university and the workplace it is a natural part of the reader's role to respond to what's been written, what they were doing was orally verbalizing some of that response.

Initial coding:

After having taped and transcribed the protocol sessions, I segmented selected protocol transcripts into continuous episodes, or "units of concentration in the [reader's] process" (Flower and Hayes, 1981a). These episodes were then coded according to my own interpretations of what the reader appeared to be "doing" in the protocols. Some examples of the codes which I identified from this process indicate the action-oriented nature of the response which was recorded in the protocols. For almost all of these codes, the first word was a gerund followed by a noun phrase. "Expressing expectations," "making a preliminary evaluation," "summarizing," and "verifying judgement" are some of the more common codes which arose during this initial coding process.

These initial codes are best seen as "descriptors" as they were very rudimentary and descriptive. For this reason, there was a great deal of concreteness in these descriptors as well as a lot of overlap among them (for example "editing grammar" and "correcting error"). In the next round, I began to collapse these codes, particularly those which were highly synonymous, into broader and more abstract categories. I then checked the new categories of codes against the data in the remaining protocols to ensure that they were indeed representative of the entire data field.

Creation of categories:

Three main categories of codes emerged during this process, each subsuming a number of secondary categories. These three main categories -- *Situating the Text*, *Negotiating the Text* and *Responding to the Text* -- provided the most general means by which to examine exactly what the reader was doing, and when, in each of the protocol sessions. Charney (1993) describes a similar process she underwent when categorizing the reading processes of expert and non-expert readers of scientific texts. The usefulness of Charney's categories was the way in which they subsumed particular responses within broader

categories. However, the specific categories which arose out of her data (comprehension comments, evaluations, text structure/genre comments, and global metacomments) were not useful in my analysis since they force one to look at the protocols more as "commentary" than as "reactions to" or "involvement in" the texts. Charney's categories place the reader outside the text and, in fact, outside the reading event itself, "commenting" on what he sees himself doing as he reads.

Within each of these broad categories that I identified, there were also subcategories. For example, codes such as "making reference to the student," and "making reference to the student outline" are located within the category of *Situating the Text* as they are instances of the professor trying to locate how the text relates to his role within the institution and to determine his own expectations for the interaction.

In addition, the identification of these general categories served as a useful means for examining episodes within the protocols. As such, I was able to look for patterns among the episodes I identified. For example, instances of negotiating the text were almost always followed by some kind of response. To be even more precise, when the workplace supervisor expressed some confusion about the logical organization of ideas in a text, what often ensued was a response (usually a judgement, coupled with a written instruction).

Presentation of findings:

Chapters Four and Five present the findings based on the analysis of the protocol data in the two settings studied. In Chapter Four, I examine how the protocols provide insights into the nature of the socially-constructed exigencies which elicit and shape genres within each setting. In doing so, I draw on three aspects of the institutional context in which the reading takes place: the nature of the institution itself, the task environment in which the

text is elicited and shaped, and the roles fulfilled by the reader through the rhetorical situation. In Chapter Five, I analyze how these exigencies actually operate and how enable and constrain the practices and response of the readers as they go about reading texts. I will do this by examining the three broad categories generated during the coding process: *Situating the Text*, *Negotiating the Text*, and *Responding to the Text*.

Chapter Four

Exigencies which Shape Readers' Practices and Responses

Chapter overview:

Before exploring how it is that the exigencies present in the rhetorical situation shape the reading practices and responses of readers in the two settings under study, it is important to ascertain what some of these exigencies are. In fact, it is by examining how the reader reads and responds to texts that we are provided with a window onto some of the social needs and motives of the rhetorical setting. As discourse communities, the two institutions under study embody specific sets of values and norms that are expressed through the recurrent rhetorical activities of their members. By "listening in" on readers who are experienced members in these communities, we obtain a view of some of these exigencies as we witness how these readers are constrained and enabled by certain factors present in their larger socio-institutional environment.

The protocols indicate that exigencies originate from three inter-related aspects of the institutional context -- the nature of the institution itself, the task environment, and reader-writer roles. These factors influence both the reader and the writer and shape the involvement that each has in and through a text. Institutional exigencies arise out of the mandates, needs and structures of the organizations in which people live and work. In order to meet its needs and mandates, each institutional context embraces a multitude of task environments which function within its organizational structures. The task environment refers to the specific situations in which texts are initiated, composed, read, revised and responded to. The roles assigned to readers and writers within institutions are manifested in these task environments and determine their respective relationship in the

involvement of the text. These reader-writer relationships are played out in the literate activities of an organization.

It should be noted that there are no clear boundaries between the categories described above. Furthermore, each affects the others. It is the institution and its goals, needs and structures that determine the task environments in which written texts are elicited and shaped. These task environments in turn define roles for the reader and writer, thus determining their respective relationship through the text. What follows is an attempt to unpack some of the protocol transcripts to see what can be learned about each of these institutional factors independently, while still recognizing that they are highly dependent on each other.

The institution:

An institution, such as a university or a government agency can be seen as a "discourse community" in the broadest application of the term. Each institution is composed of a number of people who use language in recognizable and standard ways in order to ensure the reproduction of the institution and efficiency in the conducting of its affairs. It is the institutional goals, and the role that writing plays in accomplishing them, which enable and constrain the particular ways in which the writing is elicited, composed, read, revised, responded to, and (perhaps) archived. These institutional goals imply various social contexts and roles that are enacted through the rhetorical activities of its members. Certain exigencies arising out of the nature and goals of the institution provide strong shaping factors in the expectations its readers bring to texts.

A particularly useful concept for exploring some of the exigencies shaped by the nature of the respective institutions is Bourdieu's "naturalizing." Bourdieu (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977) points to the tacit means by which institutions define themselves and the work they

do, as well as the means by which they accomplish such things. Consequently, it is necessary to look at both what is said as well as what is left unsaid in the protocols collected in this study as a means of examining the nature of the exigencies present in the two settings. In what follows, I will explore some of the goals of the two institutions under study here and how it is that writing feeds into those goals. In a subsequent section, I will discuss how the use of specific lexicon reflects the nature and goals of the two institutions.

a) goals of the institutions

The university. The institution of the university implies a great deal of common and generally tacit knowledge about the texts written by its students. It is generally accepted that students produce texts for professors in order that their learning in a given course be held up for inspection. Another assumption is that the professor will request papers of his students. These papers will be at his initiation and within a context which he himself will create (including the scope of the topic, the number of pages, the due date, the format, etc.). It would be unlikely, and inappropriate within the setting of the academic institution, to have a student, on her own initiative, produce a twenty-page paper for a professor at the beginning of the semester. This points to a further assumption -- that students usually write either examinations or essays at the end of the semester.

After the professor has read and evaluated a student's paper, that student may choose whether to pick it up from the professor. If she does indeed pick it up, it is her choice again as to whether to read through the comments and whether to keep the paper on file or not. In many respects, the professor's reading and evaluation of the paper provide closure to the rhetorical events surrounding the production and reception of the text. Student papers are usually not kept within the professor's files (beyond a minimum time

specified by university regulations to allow for grievances about grade.), in the departmental office or in university records -- unless, of course, they have in some way broken certain rules laid out by the institution.

Fundamentally, student writing in the university is inevitably, and necessarily, shaped by two factors -- the epistemic goals for the writing and the imperative of evaluation. "It is through writing epistemically and through their relative success at it that students are evaluated" (Freedman, Adam and Smart, 1994). These factors shape both the composing processes of the students and the reading response of the professors.

The primary social motive underlying student writing is epistemic. That is, student writing is governed by the need to show that one knows the appropriate arguments (their warrants, claims and grounds) within the context of the course. It also inevitably means that the student must demonstrate, through her text, what she knows and that she knows (Freedman, Adam and Smart, 1994). The text is an end in itself and is rarely used for any other purpose beyond the evaluation of student learning. Despite the fact that student writing may be represented as something other than learning-based, as in case studies, it is only ever secondarily instrumental (if at all). Recommendations and conclusions in case studies are not intended to elicit specific action, but rather to show that the student can master the kinds of argument appropriate for recommending action (Freedman, Adam and Smart, 1994).

The professor in the excerpt below pauses before beginning to read the first of two student papers. She describes what it is that she will be looking for in the set of student papers.

What I'm going to look for in the assignments...is relevance to the course materials. So to what extent they've been able

to integrate the course material with what they read in the papers? So, I'm going to be looking for references to particular parts of the course material and to the concepts of efficiency and equity. I'm going to look for them to draw [some] kind of diagram that has, you know, some kind of economic maths in it. (Corbett)

Of particular interest here is the degree to which the professor expects the students to apply concepts taught in the course. The student texts arise out of a classroom context in which "efficiency and equity" and diagrams containing economic maths have been defined, demonstrated, questioned, and discussed -- all under the control of this professor. The student papers are now the tangible means by which the professor determines the degree of learning achieved by each individual student.

For this reason, an important, often tacit, rule is that students must produce texts which demonstrate their own ideas and credit those whose ideas and words they borrow. Students must adhere to specified rules for citing others' work, carefully separating that which expresses their own ideas and that which confirms sources that they have relied upon. The purpose here is to determine what it is that the student has learned. In the excerpt below, we see how the need to evaluate the student, and not the text, guides one professor's reading processes:

"I'll certainly compare the two pieces of work [this paper and an earlier one from the same student] and just see how, like the writing style and so on. That will affect my grade. I will not hesitate to give the paper a lower grade than it appears to deserve, just because I'm highly suspicious of plagiarism. And even if I'm wrong, then he should come in and complain and then I get an opportunity to find out a little bit more perhaps." (Anderson)

All this points to the student ownership of assignments produced in the university. As opposed to its role in the government agency studied here, writing in the university was not used to further the institution itself. Student papers are in and of themselves the

display of the students' learning, permitting that learning to be inspected, graded, and ultimately used in the accreditation of the student. Student writing in the university is used to facilitate the institutional function of gate-keeper; students are assessed "in terms of carefully specified criteria and slot[ted]...into categories according to their relative performance with respect to such criteria" (Freedman, Adam and Smart, 1994, p. 208). Observe how this notion of comparative evaluation is reflected in the intricacy of the reading process described by one of the professors:

"O.K., What I do in these is I read them twice -- the entire group. First I order them alphabetically, and then I read them twice -- the whole set. I don't do any marking. I don't even think about marking. And the only reason I do that, or one of the main reasons I do that, is I want to get a sense of the quality I'm supposed to expect. So, I read through them all, and that really tells me the quality of a particular group. And even though I have two sections [of the same course], I put them all together. I don't differentiate between them. And then my second level is then I start marking. But before I do that, while I'm doing this second reading, I'm putting them in piles already. To say, 'Hmm. this has some merit.' Or, 'this is really good.' And at the end of this process, I get maybe six or seven piles, and then I start grading them. Because, it's relative, but I do that before I start actually marking them." (Baines)

The mandate of the academic institution -- to teach, evaluate and rank its students -- results in a particular shaping context for the rhetorical interaction among students and professors. The epistemic and evaluative nature of the writing required of university students acts as a powerful exigence which constrains and enables the professors' reading of their texts. The specific context that has been established in the classroom -- the conversation which has developed among members of that local discourse community -- elicits and shapes a particular type of written discourse which echoes that evolving conversation. The professor has, of course, controlled much of this conversation as well

as the specifics of the writing tasks which rise out of it. She does so to elicit specific types of information from the student -- information which will facilitate her own social role as evaluator of the student's learning. The gate-keeping nature of the university also shapes the ways in which the professor reads student texts. First, the student writing must be differentiated and regarded as an individual effort -- hence the concerns about plagiarism. Second, the student text must be held up against other student texts in order to rank the student along a continuum of student ability to meet the specific criteria the professor has established.

The government agency. The government financial agency studied here exerts entirely different exigencies, many of which, once again, are implicit, "naturalized" understandings held, and unquestioned, by those within. The strongest assumption, strong in the degree to which it remains unquestioned by those involved, is that written texts are an integral part of the decision-making process (Smart, 1985, 1992, 1993). Writing in this institution, even that which seems most similar to "academic" writing, is always praxis-oriented (Freedman, Adam and Smart, 1994). Written texts justify, communicate, facilitate and archive decisions. The value placed on the text as a decision-making tool also accounts for the permanence of texts which are archived to form an institutional, decision-making history. In the excerpt below, the reader explains why she requested a progress report for a project -- even though such a procedure had not been required previously:

"The purpose of writing the note is that, since this is a project which is required, there is no formal report structure in place to assess whether or not the work is going according to plan or budget within the time frame. It could easily be just what I call a 'sleeper' and it reminds me a little bit like a glacier, as it's something we have to do and everybody kind of forgets about it. But if you look at the years it takes, the length of time it takes, and the money it takes -- it's huge. And we also have a finite timeline because at some point, at an identified point in time, we

have to be ready to produce these [notices], so it's very important that we do keep to schedule. ...It's important to me that the [agency] understand what we're doing, why we're doing it, what are our time constraints..., the kind of implications..., and to give them a progress report on the project." (Frost)

The interesting fact here is that, even though there was currently "no formal report structure in place," Frost is able to anticipate the need for one, given certain institutional activities such as "budgets" and "finite timelines" which form particular types of constraints within which the agency operates. The progress report she has requested will become part of the decision-making history of the agency, one which can show the project's interaction with other institutional activities at that point in time.

The instrumental use of written texts in this government agency extends even to those produced in the research department -- the most "academic" of the agency's departments. As opposed to writing produced by the university student, the writing produced by members of this department must lead to decisions, which in turn lead to institutional action. Texts are not valued in and of themselves, but are looked to for the institutional action they entail. In the protocol excerpt below, a supervisor in the research department reviews a summary report of a larger project undertaken within the department:

"The last section is on prospects for future research, and the author goes through several suggestions here which in and of themselves are of interest. The one thing that strikes me at this point is, other than the sentence in the very first paragraph of the paper when the conclusions are given, there's no other place where the results of the various approaches are brought together by the author to be massaged in terms of the best judgement at this point of where we stand on this point. Again this comes back to the point that it's a paper for management that is to represent our current state of knowledge and that this line of research is very difficult in that there's this unobserved variable that we're trying to measure. But I think the audience we're aiming this for would be particularly keen to receive our collective wisdom in terms of how we interpret all these

results -- so it's more the judgement from a policy perspective that needs to still come out of here." (Ernst)

The reader here is not concerned with what the writer, or even the department, has learned in the course of this research project -- except in how it affects the activities of the institution as a whole. The management-level reader who will ultimately read this summary is interested in an interpretation of the results aimed toward possible policy implications for the agency itself.

Because so many of the exigencies emerging from the institutional context are tacit, it follows that what the readers, as experienced members within the settings, do not say while reading the texts can also provide insight into how the institution itself shapes certain expectations. Consider what is not explicitly said in the following excerpt from the financial agency:

"I'd like to see a comparison vis-à-vis other departments. Surely anybody who receives this report and is going to make a decision on it is going to have to do so. It's really important that Joe get some of the statistics in place."
(Hamilton)

There are certain unstated assumptions at work here which relate directly to the institution itself. The most crucial seems to be the fact that whoever reads this does not have time to produce a comparison with other departments. The second is that there is potentially a multiple readership of this text and that the writer should consider how the text may be used by any of the potential readers, at any point in time. The text has a life beyond the immediate rhetorical setting. Another assumption is that Joe must use "statistics" in order to back up his request. This emphasis on numbers so permeates the organization that when they are not "in place" the text itself is not "in place" within the organization. Simple descriptions of the experiences of those affected are not considered valid warrants to support its recommendations.

Unlike the writing in the university, written texts in a workplace such as a government agency have an extended institutional existence. They continue to be read and consulted by an indeterminate number and range of future readers within the agency, and for a variety of purposes. Furthermore, as opposed to university writing, texts gain validity, power and value in their intertextuality -- their ability to refer to and synthesize other texts produced within the department or the agency as a whole. "[W]orkplace writing is resonant with the discourse of colleagues and the ongoing conversation of the institution. The etiquette for citing is complex and political, but the fact of such intertextual borrowing is a reality and a perceived good" (Freedman, Adam and Smart, 1994, p. 210).

The paramount concern in the workplace is for the best text possible -- a text which accomplishes certain institutional action. The decision-making nature of writing in the agency entails that texts must be action-oriented; conclusions and recommendations must provide policy implications. Because of the accountability inherent both from within and without the government agency, texts must document and accurately reflect the decision-making history of the institution. The process of document-cycling up and down the institutional hierarchy illustrates the multiple and future readership of these workplace texts.

b) lexicon

Inherent in both institutional contexts, indeed in any institutional context, is the specialized use of lexicon. The use of language serves as a means by which an institution, or discourse community, coheres, excludes, and conducts its affairs in an efficient manner. The acquisition and use of its specialized language are important means by which a novice attains acceptance in a community, for language use is a manifestation of certain ways of seeing and talking about the world. The following excerpt illustrates what occurs when a student has not acquired the appropriate language in a paper on animal rights:

"[reading from student text] ...adorable little puppies. The use of adjectives, you know, like 'adorable little puppies' -- does that add to the argument -- that they're adorable or not adorable?" (Anderson)

Throughout the reading of this paper, the professor refers to how it looks like "journalistic writing" and uses "the inside jargon...[of] the animal rights group." It is evident that what is expected of the student within the institutional context of the university is a lexicon which is stripped of its emotive value. The student is evaluated according to his ability to produce a reasoned, well-organized, and well-researched argument -- not one that appeals to emotions or pathos.

A salient contrast to this is the same professor reading a paper by "the best student in the class:"

"[reading] As radical as they may sound, Stallman's ideas should not be disregarded. Again, a double negative, you know. And usually that's something that's never handled very well, but somehow, I seem to follow very well with his. And that's also the way you have to talk -- maybe you don't have to talk that way -- but you often have to. Ethicists, proper ethicists, do that a lot in their...logical arguments....So I'm very pleased to have someone here who has that simple *but essential way of talking about things*." (Anderson)

This student has fulfilled the professor's expectations, and the expectations of those who represent the discipline of business ethics. His use of the double negative illustrates not only an ability to manipulate language but also identifies him as being able to control the "essential way" of using discourse within this discipline.

As stated earlier, different sub-groups within any discourse community may use language in subtly different ways as a result of the activities they find themselves conducting. Consequently, language use will vary within an institution. For example, the academic

institution expresses the discipline-specific language of fields as diverse as aero-space engineering, women's studies, and political economics. Those fields in turn subsume sub-disciplinary language which may even narrow down to the level of the individual course section in which the professor and students have created a specific context for language use. Indeed, university classrooms are the sites of richly contextualized conversations. The writer's ability to refer to this context will facilitate the reader's involvement in the text.

This range of language use is also true of the workplace where employees in different departments will commonly use language in specific ways to refer to aspects of their work. In the workplace, however, the use of the more specialized language of a specific context is not always appropriate in the goings-on of the institution as a whole. Unlike university writing, it is often the case in the workplace that the writer, as a member of a sub-community within the institution, must write from within that specialized community to a readership which concerns itself with the operations and decision-making of the larger community. Observe what occurs in the following excerpt:

"... it is still rather technical -- ETFP is a term that's not defined. It's the sort of use of technical jargon that for an audience which is management would immediately cause them some difficulty." (Ernst)

What this exemplifies is how the structure of an organization determines expectations for language use. Because a management-level reader (in this case a level above the current reader) does not spend his workday conducting research, he is not necessarily familiar with terminology relevant to the work of those in positions which do. He may not even want to learn that terminology, for his position within the organizational structure requires him to read reports in such a way that he can make policy decisions -- and no more.

In summary, by examining what is said and unsaid in the protocols, we gain insight into a number of exigencies arising from the goals of the institutions themselves. The financial agency studied here elicits, enables and constrains the writing and reading processes of its employees in a number of ways. Institutional ownership of its written texts, and their public and continued existence beyond the initial collaborative drafting and revising which takes place between writers and their supervisors, requires that they be shaped in particular ways in order that they can be read by a multiple and indeterminate readership, be used as decision-making documents, and reflect accessible use of numbers and language for the potential readership. In contrast, the learning-oriented and evaluation-based nature of student texts entails different reading practices and responses and is manifested in such phenomena as student ownership of texts, the situatedness of texts within a context of classroom discussion, and the limited lives of texts beyond their moments of evaluation. In the rhetorical situations observed in both the academic and workplace settings here, the use of specific lexical items confirms the contextualized use of language necessary in order to accomplish institutional goals. Recognizing that institutional goals imply particular activities and social roles, the observations outlined above will provide a framework for examining the exigencies which are determined by the task environment and reader-writer roles.

The task environment:

Within an institution, certain tasks must be performed in order that its work be carried out and its mandate fulfilled. Decisions must be taken, grades must be awarded, formulae must be learned, numbers must be crunched, people must be paid, and so forth. All of these tasks entail the use of language; most require the production and use of written documents. The mandate of the institution will determine these tasks, but each must be performed within a local context -- by real people with real roles. The task environment refers to the specific circumstances within the institution in which a text is elicited,

composed, responded to, revised and evaluated. Readers in both the university and workplace settings come to a reading event with a number of expectations which are shaped by certain characteristics of the task environment. The two characteristics of the task environment which I will discuss here are a) the source of the text (who initiated it) and b) the degree to which the reader views the text as being "revisable."

a) initiation of the text

One significant factor in the task environment relates to whether the reader initiated the writing. This affects the degree of control the reader has on the ultimate shape of the text and the extent to which she can modify her expectations when the text does not meet the expectations. The more control the reader has over the initiation of the writing task and over the setting of parameters, the more flexibility she can exert in responding to texts which do not meet those specifications.

In the academic setting, it is the professor's prerogative to set the task. He decides the scope of the subject the students may write about, including potential topics, the amount of time available to complete the task, the length of the text, and its value in relation to the final grade for the course. These specifications are usually expressed (and rarely negotiated) during course lectures as well as on either the course outline or the respective assignment sheet. Consequently, when the professor goes to read the paper, he can expect certain things because he has, for example,

"...told them in the class what I'm expecting. I've said to them, 'Write it as a case: explain to me the situation, give some background, show me some analysis.'" (Baines)

The onus here is on the student to adhere to these expectations. Although the student may have some license in determining the precise topic of her paper, she is still required to present it according to the specifications of the professor. We can assume that if, for

example, she felt that a video production might better illustrate her topic, this would be unacceptable because of the guidelines that have already been established. These guidelines, or specifications, also provide the professor with a useful tool when it comes to the reading and evaluation of student papers. In each of the protocol episodes from the university setting, the professor is observed referring to either a course outline, an assignment sheet, a marking grid, or a breakdown of writing characteristics for each possible assigned grade.

The initiation of a text in the workplace may come about in a number of ways. It may, for example, be that a higher-level manager has requested a summary report and the writer's manager is reviewing it before it is sent out of the department:

"I'm looking for a summing [up] of a larger research paper that lays out for a management audience the purpose of the research work -- what had been involved and what are the conclusions we can draw from that." (Ernst)

On the other hand, the reader, as manager, may have asked her employee to write a progress report for her and that will ultimately go out to a larger audience under her signature:

"My concern and my desire in having Isobel prepare a note was to have a note primarily for [James Richardson]...I think informally in giving this to [James] I would set out some reporting process so he could be updated. He is not asking for this -- it's my assessment that it's the kind of thing that they ought to have." (Frost)

In either case, in this workplace context, the reader is not in control of the task environment in the same way as the professor. Regardless of whether or not it was the reader who initiated the text, the readers in this study are all reading texts which must move higher within the institutional hierarchy. As such, these readers are bound by the

particular needs, activities, and structures of those placed higher within the institution and by the institution itself.

Furthermore, the workplace reader often has more at stake in the successful production of the document than does the university professor. Because this reader will have her name attached to the document when it is sent up through the hierarchy of the agency, she often finds her institutional role intimately tied to the rhetorical action of the text. She is both a negotiator in the creation of, and a responsible player in the ultimate approval of, the text (Freedman, Adam and Smart, 1994). Consequently, the workplace readers in this study must act as "surrogate readers," anticipating the responses of the primary readers who will ultimately read the text. If the workplace writer does not meet the expectations in producing a text for the primary reader, the text must be revised. Hence, the reader is implicated as a collaborator in those revisions. Contrast this with the professor who, though he controls every detail of the expectations for the text, will rarely suffer consequences if his expectations are not met by the student writer. In fact, the professor "needs" some students to meet his expectations less well so that he can achieve an acceptable range of grades for the course (Freedman, Adam and Smart, 1994).

b) "revisability" of the text:

A reader's awareness that the text can or cannot be revised following the reading event will ultimately shape the ways in which that text is read and responded to. In general, academic papers are received in a final draft form, with much of the interaction surrounding the ideas having already taken place in the evolving conversation in the classroom. The workplace texts responded to in this study are read at varying stages in the composing process and with the aim of providing feedback for further revision. The fact that the readers in this study are responding to texts at very different times in the

composing process necessitates distinct types of involvement in the reading process and specific types of response to the texts themselves.

Professors almost always receive final drafts of student papers -- final in that the papers will not be revised based on reader feedback.⁷ It is the finality of the draft and the awareness that the essay will rarely (and need not) be revised based on his feedback, which results in a great deal of negotiation on the reader's part to determine how he is to be involved in the text and how, consequently, he is to evaluate the student writer.

In the protocol excerpt below, we see how the reader is willing to modify his expectations for a student paper which does not meet the exigencies which the professor himself determined in assigning the task. Rather than dismissing the student essay as inappropriate, and therefore unreadable, he is overwhelmed by his institutional duty to read the entire student text and grade it as fairly as possible. When the reader does not find the text meshing with the task which he has crafted, he is still obliged, within his institutional role, to attempt to use it as a basis of student evaluation:

"It's too big a subject. Her writing is highly condensed. It's well done...This is the kind of writing you expect for a briefing report to some big-shot. I used to do things like that for the government and like every phrase you weigh carefully, and it's gotta be inside of a page 'cause they won't turn the page, flip to the second page...I'm gonna have to, the criteria are gonna have to be a little bit different. But that's O.K. I don't mind that." (Anderson)

He then sets the paper aside to be read later. What is interesting here is that the reader is willing to change his criteria for evaluating the paper, not because he is a "good guy," but because his role within the university unquestionably requires him to grade papers and to

⁷ The drafts are not necessarily "final" in that the writer has drafted the paper a number of times. It may be that much of the drafting came in the form of questions in class and office hours with the professor or teaching assistant.

do so within a certain time frame. Certainly, the fact that this paper is being read at the end of term compels him to attempt to read the paper once again, modifying the criteria he has himself created (as he is, of course, quite entitled to do).

When the same situation arises in the workplace, the reader is quite aware that there exist opportunities to revise the text so that it conforms to the task environment and the genres appropriate to it. Consider the following as a contrast to the previous protocol excerpt:

"I'm not really sure what he's doing here. It's also perhaps more complex than one is going to want to put it in the final form for the reader. I think perhaps one can simplify it. I'm not sure one has to go into quite the detail that one's got here. You see, that's just too complex for this. It's an additional subtlety that's not really necessary at this point. What we're trying to do is introduce much more broad brush concepts." (Gold)

The implicit assumption here is that the text can be revised. Consequently, the reader shapes his reading practices so that he can ascertain the meaning that others might arrive at, rather than on the meaning he himself takes from the text. The task environment in which this text has been produced, and is now being read, permits the reader to read it in a very different way from the academic example provided earlier. In fact, the task environment quite explicitly dictates that a text is to be revised or the reader will "not let it out of the department." The text is not seen as being "finished" until it has met the expectations of the intermediate reader who will allow it to be read by the primary readers. As a consequence, the reader is enlisted as a collaborator in the revision process for the text.

The task environment which surrounds the production and reception of a text provides a number of exigencies which shape the ways in which its readers respond to it. The degree of control that the reader sees herself having over the initiation and particular of the

writing task will determine how much control she feels that she has in modifying her expectations for the text when actually reading it. Those genres which entail a readership beyond the initial reader-writer interaction under study here will allow for less flexibility in altering the expectations for the texts produced. This reduction in flexibility for adjusting the "rules" of the genre, and the awareness that there exists an audience beyond the intermediate reader, lead to a collaborative revision process between the reader and the writer geared at producing a text which meets those outside expectations.

Reader-writer roles:

As mentioned earlier, the institution itself defines roles that readers and writers assume within a task environment. These roles determine not only what each person reads and writes, but how and for what purposes. The social and cultural context in which one finds oneself participating in literate activities has a significant role in how one will indeed conduct them. Readers and writers do not act as isolated beings producing and consuming texts. They conduct these activities to fulfill certain exigencies inherent in their roles and inherent within the institutional context which defines their roles. Their roles do not exist independent of the rhetorical activities in which they are involved; their roles are manifested in the actual reading and writing of the texts.

The roles undertaken by readers will vary from situation to situation -- even within the same institution. Within the specific reading contexts studied here, however, the roles are relatively constant. The professor reads from her role as evaluator and assessor of learning. The dual-role played by the workplace readers in this study compels them to act as both surrogate readers for upper management as well as collaborators in ensuring the best possible text.

The professor's primary role in reading student texts is that of evaluator. His task is to determine what the student has learned, how that compares with the achievement of other students and where the student should be made aware of short-comings. Although the professor may create other roles for himself to facilitate student writing ("Pretend you're writing to someone who knows nothing about this subject.") or to make the task seem more applicable to "real life" (case studies), his role is always based on the evaluation of the learning exhibited in the texts (Freedman, Adam and Smart, 1994).

This evaluator role results in particular reading practices centred around the assessment of what is in the text and, to some extent, how it is being communicated. The over-riding goal is to determine what the student has learned and to do so in as objective a manner as possible. In the protocol excerpt below, the professor points out how his role as an evaluator will determine how he will read a set of student essays.

"I want to make it a very objective process and I have breakdowns. This is like ten things that I want. And I want to say, 'How many methods they used?' -- because I want them to use four methods. And if they use only two, they get five out of ten. How they calculated discount rate in this case? Well they did a good job -- five out of five... It is as quantifiable as you can get, except we have an 'overall' [category] which is my overall qualitative feel about their ability to write a thing like this." (Baines)

Although university professors may differ in the degree to which they have a specific marking grid to follow when reading their students' work, they are nonetheless guided by their roles as evaluators. The professors in this study do not expect their students' papers to be used in any other way after they have read them. They are the end readers of the students' work. They are also inherently more knowledgeable than the students with respect to both the content of the texts and the manner in which they should be written.

Accordingly, their concerns are not just that the students get the calculations and methods of analysis correct, but also that they use forms of expression that are appropriate within the setting. The professor quoted below reacts to the unconventional use of a memo format for the executive summary of a case study produced by a group of students.

"This is an aberration from what I'd normally expect. They're obviously trying to get my attention. It would have been fine if they'd developed this just a little bit further. As it is, it's just headings." (Douglas)

Note that the professor does not question the effectiveness of the "aberration;" he is more concerned that he is unable to adequately fulfill his role as evaluator because the students have not adequately fulfilled his requirements.

The roles of the workplace readers in this study are primarily anticipatory, intermediate ones which require them to interpret how primary readers of texts (often senior managers) will ultimately read them. Whereas the professors in the university setting are expert on both the content and academic structure of the texts they are reading, the workplace readers in this study do not necessarily know the details of the content that they are reading about. They are, however, more knowledgeable about the context in which a text will ultimately be read and used by the primary reader. As such, their primary role is to negotiate the text with the writer so that it meets the needs of the primary reader and, consequently, of the organization. The text is not the effort of an individual writer but a collaborative accomplishment of the intermediate reader and the writer. The reader in this case negotiates the task between the writer and the primary reader, and participates in the fulfillment of that task -- in part because she has a stake in the production of the best possible text. The intermediate reader probably has a much clearer picture than does the writer regarding how the text will be used, as is evident in the excerpt below.

"...but I think the audience we're aiming this for would be particularly keen to receive our collective wisdom in terms

of how we interpret all these results. So it's more the judgement from a policy perspective that needs to come out here." (Ernst)

An intermediate reader also has a richly developed vision of scenarios which may take place while, or after, future readers read the text. It is because of this knowledge of what primary readers do with texts and how they use them to fulfill their own roles within the agency that the intermediate reader is placed in the a dual-role of both surrogate reader and collaborator. This is evident as the reader in the extract below envisions possible events unfolding if Nelson is given the text as is, without a complete set of statistics.

"...the only kinds of things it really needs to bolster that are these kinds of comparative statistics. You see the problem too is that even if we were only sending it to Nelson, he would have an *impression* of what those statistics would be for other departments. But supposing that his impression is off by five percent -- by presenting only your own [statistics], you're going to get screwed." (Hamilton)

The reader in this selection moves back and forth between how the primary reader will interpret the text and how the writer must revise the text so that certain possibilities in that scenario can best be avoided.

Another aspect of the reader-writer relationship is the degree to which the reader is familiar with who the writer is and what she has produced previously. This is most striking as each of the readers observed in the university setting spent some time before actually reading a student paper to determine precisely who the writer was, perhaps where she sat in the class, how often she spoke, and what she had previously submitted. The following comments are each extracted from the beginning moments of Professor Anderson reading three different student papers:

"This one would be kinda like a problem student. A problem student who tries but just has a language difficulty.

Now, I presume that he might have asked someone to edit it."

"This should be an excellent paper. It's the best student in the class. He speaks better than most people write."

"So, he sits in the back there. He doesn't talk a lot, but he seems to have his eyes open and [to be] paying attention."

A pattern emerges as the professors begin to read the papers after having formulated a picture of who the writer is and what can be expected in the text. If, for example, the professor has expectations that a paper from a "bright student" will be fluent, coherent and well developed, each time he finds evidence of such qualities, his expectations are reinforced and his depiction of the student is strengthened. Likewise, when a student is suspected of plagiarizing, the professor's reading activities are centred around finding evidence of, and thus confirming, his expectations.

In the protocols from the workplace studied, however, there are no indications of the reader trying to conjure up a mental picture of the writer and his previous work. Once again, we come upon an instance where what is left unsaid is of relevance in determining the exigencies which shape the expectations one has for a text. Within the discourse community of this workplace, there is no place for allowing work to be shoddy or off-base because of the writer's previous work or participation in other aspects of the work environment. "[T]here is no forgiving of inadequate texts because of the halo effect from the rest of the employee's work (although the overall perception of an employee's value to the agency may not be profoundly affected by one inadequate piece)...." (Freedman, Adam and Smart, 1994, p. 207). What is of importance is how the present text fulfills its objective, as interpreted by the manager reviewing it. The writer is expected to perform within his role as a member of the agency. What is expected is a text which addresses the exigencies of the rhetorical situation.

The roles which the reader fulfills in reading and responding to the text, and the ensuing relationship between her and the writer, provide particular exigencies on the rhetorical setting. The academic reader's role is inherently evaluative; he is required to determine the student writers grasp of course materials and ability to express them. Although he may try to fabricate other roles for both him and the writer (such as in case study writing), the relationship between the two of them is always that of evaluator and evaluated. The demands on the workplace reader to ensure that texts which are produced in his department address institutional norms and needs necessitate that he enact a dual-role. He must put himself in the place of the primary reader of the text to anticipate that reader's potential response to the text as it is now. Additionally, he becomes implicated as a collaborator of future drafts of the text by coming up with ways in which it should be revised to better meet the exigencies of the rhetorical situation.

Conclusion:

Certainly, many of the findings presented in this chapter are not surprising.⁸ They do, however, provide a necessary framework within which we can explore the actual reading practices and responses in Chapter Five. It is the exigencies outlined above which define and shape the rhetorical situations we are about to examine more closely. These exigencies will determine the distinct ways in which the readers in the two settings situate, negotiate and respond to the texts they read. Because genres can be differentiated by the reading practices they entail, it is relevant to examine what it is that shapes those reading practices when conducting a comparative study of genre. The exigencies present in the institutional context result in not only particular text types to address its needs but also the specific composing and reading practices which surround those texts. The readers in this

⁸ They are, however, typically unacknowledged in public discussion and pedagogic practice.

study provide a particular perspective on these exigencies -- for as experienced and authoritative members of their respective communities they embrace these socially-constructed exigencies and express them through their actions.

Chapter Five

The Exigencies made Manifest

Chapter overview:

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the ways in which the exigencies arising out of the institutional context shape the particular reading practices and responses of the readers in the two settings studied. In order to do so, a protocol episode from each setting has been selected for closer analysis. As experienced readers within their respective settings, these participants embrace and express the socially-constructed exigencies which both enable and constrain their actions within these rhetorical situations. It is through an investigation of the moment-by-moment unfolding of a rhetorical situation that we gain further insight into how the socio-cultural context shapes the readers' involvement in, and response to, the text.

The protocols will be examined in the following way: First, the context in which the reading event is situated will be described. Then I will provide an analysis of the rhetorical situation by breaking down the protocol into the three broad categories generated in the coding and categorization process of analysis. These categories, *Situating the Text*, *Negotiating the Text*, and *Responding to the Text*, are described in what follows.

Implicit in all of the categories described below is the expression of expectations. As was shown in the preceding chapter, these expectations are shaped by the exigencies present in the socio-cultural context in which written genres are elicited, shaped and responded to. Expectations are expressed in various ways in the protocols, providing insight into the complex of exigencies which shape the reader's response to the text as well as the practices they draw on to involve themselves in the text. As such, the categories below often blend into and overlap each other. This intricacy illustrates the complex ways in

which involvement among readers, writers and texts develops within the context of socially-constructed exigencies.

a) Situating the text: Looking at how, and when, the reader situates the text within a broader context provides insight into why the reader reads and responds to the text in particular ways. This category of codes refers to the comments made by the readers which demonstrate their attempts to determine a) how the text is currently placed within a complex of social structures and activities and b) how it may influence future events. Implicit in the former is the motive which drives the production and the reading of the text. This arises out of the needs and activities of the institution, but also incorporates the local activities of departments and classrooms. In this way, it is enveloped in a conversation which is taking place among the participants. Also implicit here is the reader's understanding of who the writer of the text is, what his or her role in the institution is and what that implies as to what should be in the text, how it should be written, and how it is to be responded to.

The latter category -- the impact of the text on future events -- refers to those comments which indicate that the text will have a life after the reading event. These will vary from the future activities of the writer him- or herself, to the activities of other potential readers within the institutional context. Recognizing, too, that the reading event unfolds over time, this category also accounts for the comments the reader makes to himself about what to look for further down in the text, thus situating himself within the text.

b) Negotiating the text: The codes in this category consist of the readers' actual processes of preceding through the text. Brandt (1990) refers to this as the

"metacommunicative" ability of the reader. She defines this as the ability to know what one is supposed to do next -- how to sustain the reading event. It must be noted that the reader's negotiation of the text, and the meaning that results, is interspersed within, caused by, and results from, both the ways in which the reader situates the text and how he responds to it. This illustrates the degree to which the processes of constructing meaning are dependent upon a number of exigencies, derived from the context in which the writing was produced, the context which the writer establishes for the reader, and the reader's purpose for reading and responding to the text.

Codes in this category include both the physical orientation and re-orientation to the text (skimming, order of sections read, and so forth) as well as the cognitive grappling with what is present in the text and how it is organized. As such, these codes include both expressions of confusion over content and organization (often resulting in re-reading and referring to titles or earlier portions of text), as well as ease of reading (often manifested in skimming the text). This category accounts for the ways in which meaning is accomplished through a process which lies between the entities of the reader and the text, and which is constrained and enabled by the socio-cultural context in which the reading takes place.

c) Responding to the text: This category of codes is comprised of those which indicate a reaction to the text (or rather, to the meaning the reader negotiates with it). Response to the text encompasses both a) positive and negative reaction to what is presented and how it has been presented (i.e. the specific language used), as well as b) comments about how the text could or should be modified to more closely meet the expectations of the reader and thus address the exigencies of the rhetorical situation.

The former set of codes refers to reactions to what is present in the here-and-now meaning of the text. This may be expressed as agreement or disagreement with fact or opinion, reservations regarding a claim, as well as approval or disapproval with textual organization and use of language. What may or may not follow this response is the latter category of codes -- a prescriptive directive (usually accompanied by a written comment on the text itself) intended to indicate to the writer that a change is necessary in order to meet the exigencies present in either this rhetorical situation or future ones. These responses vary depending on the degree to which the reader expects them to be immediately attended to by the writer. They may serve to formulate revision-based commentary for future drafts, or they may provide evaluative remarks to explain or justify a grade assigned to a text.

What follows is an analysis of one protocol transcript from each setting -- the major government financial agency and Carleton University's School of Business. These two protocols were chosen for closer analysis for two reasons. Firstly, and for practical reasons, they are of similar length. Secondly, they both are provided by respondents who were identified as being particularly natural, and comfortable, with responding-aloud as they were reading. In order to facilitate the reading of this chapter, relevant excerpts of the transcripts will be used when required. The transcripts in their entirety can be found in Appendices A and B. Line numbers following each excerpt indicate its location in the protocol transcript. Underlined portions of protocol excerpts indicate that the reader is reading aloud from the text.

Protocol One -- Government Financial Agency

The context:

In this reading protocol episode, John Hamilton (Chief of the International Department) is reading a paper he has requested one of his employees write in order to justify additional word processing capacity in the department. Before beginning to read the paper, he states that he is looking for a "tightly-reasoned case" that will point to the immediate need for the word processor.⁹ The purpose of this reading episode is to review what the writer, Arthur Cunningham, has produced so far and to provide feedback for further revision. This paper will ultimately be read by Carl Nelson who is an assistant chief in another department that is responsible for allocating word processors, and possibly by Jim Dole, chief of that department. These are primary readers whose response to Cunningham's paper will be a decision as to whether or not the International Department does indeed need an additional word processor.

Hamilton's reading practices are characterized by his dual role: he is at once both reviewer and collaborator. In his reviewer role, he places himself in the position of the primary reader, envisioning how that person will read the text. In his collaborator role, he seeks out possible revisions which will modify the picture he sees arising out of the present text so that it is most effective for the primary reader. This dual role also implies two separate texts: the here-and-now of the present text and the ways in which that text accomplishes a particular rhetorical action, and the envisioned revised text with its envisioned rhetorical settings.

⁹ It should be noted here that the "word processor" referred to in this protocol is a physical machine and not a software program.

This dual role as reader results from Hamilton's institutional role. He is required to ensure that both the factual and persuasive aspects of the paper are convincing before he lets the paper out of the department. The review procedure requires that Hamilton become an interpreter of institutional norms and activities for the writer. Many of the revision-based comments he makes are directly related to scenarios he foresees resulting in future readings of the text by the primary readers. His concern is for the rhetorical action of the text; he is therefore implicated as a collaborator in the production of a text which will accomplish the purposes he has set out for it.

Needs which arise out of the institutional environment (the need for more word processing capacity to ensure the efficient operation of his department), as well as his institutional role (as department chief) shape the rhetorical situation, both enabling and constraining his reading of the text. So, Hamilton's involvement with the text precedes and follows his actual reading of it. His expectations arise out of his own and his department's needs. Presumably, many of these expectations would have been expressed to Cunningham when he was initially given the task; however, the expectations themselves are neither met nor denied until the actual reading of the text Cunningham has produced. It is through the minute-by-minute interaction among the reader, the writer and the text within the rhetorical situation that these expectations, as well as new ones, are manifested.

i. Situating the text:

Almost half of the content of this protocol shows Hamilton occupied with determining how Cunningham's paper is situated within a particular context. Hamilton continually refers to both the situation which has led to the text as well as to how the text could be interpreted, and therefore must be changed. In this way, the text is seen as an integral link between the established structures and practices of the agency and envisioned scenarios resulting from Nelson's reading of the text.

In his comments which situate the text, he is reacting not only to the content of the paper, but also the degree to which the format and language used is institutionally relevant and consistent. When the text matches these expectations, we see Hamilton's response: "This is very much the approach we like to see in analytic reports." (22-23) As a shaping factor in his expectations, the institution of the government agency and all of its implied organizational structures, values and demands, is a permanent entity against which Hamilton reads, and responds to, Cunningham's paper.

Another way in which Hamilton situates the text is temporally. He reacts not only to institutional structures, but also to prior and foreseen events surrounding the paper. Though he does not refer to previous conversations with Cunningham regarding the content of the paper, it is implied that Cunningham ought to be somewhat expert in this area, perhaps even more cognizant than is Hamilton himself as to the impact of the current situation regarding word-processing needs, having conducted the relevant research. What Cunningham may not be aware of, however, is how the paper will be read by others. He may not even know what it is that Hamilton plans to do with it. It is Hamilton who must mediate between the meaning he constructs from the text and the scenarios he wishes to see as a result of its being read by Nelson.

Before beginning to read, Hamilton refers to the purpose of the paper. He is looking for a "tightly reasoned case" (3) which will explain to a management audience why, though the International department is capital constrained, it is in immediate need of increased word processing capacity. In the initial section of the paper which provides some description of the current agreement held between the Research and International Departments for the sharing of word processing tasks, Hamilton expresses concern that what the writer has written gives the impression that the current situation is satisfactory. In attempting to

situate the text within a particular frame of reference, he comes up with an actual example which demonstrates that what Cunningham has written provides the wrong impression.

"And that is, there are times for example when I will require that something be done on the word processor -- this typically happens around Annual Report time, during speeches or at other times. They'll often be short pieces, but we know they're going to be [printed] a hundred times, and they often have to be done within a twenty-four hour deadline." (31-34)

In referring to a particular instance which proves that his department does indeed run into difficulties in sharing word processors, Hamilton attempts to bring the text closer in line with what he needs it to do. Here we see him reviewing the text in order to measure how effectively it acts as a link between the realities of the current situation and the action he wishes it to impart. In order to do so, he is required to draw on his own previous experience in producing documents which need to be word processed.

Additionally, Hamilton must have an awareness of how the text will be read by the primary readers. This is evidenced in the following excerpt:

"And I'm not sure about the "August '85." This is a pressing problem and we'd like to see a solution immediately. If you give them August '85, they'll start thinking about it in '85 -- and we might get a solution by December." (58-61)

Hamilton's keen sense of how those who will ultimately read the paper function, how they react to texts, and how quickly they do so, also provides him with means of temporally situating the paper Cunningham has produced within a series of likely events. As such, we see the reader here in his surrogate reader role, interpreting for the writer the contexts in which the text will ultimately be used. It is the reader who is the expert in this regard, but his role compels him to pass on that information to the writer in order that Cunningham might produce a better paper. In doing so, he is clarifying the exigencies which shape his interpretations, expectations and intentions for the text.

In the following excerpt, we see another example of Hamilton situating the here-and-now of the current text within possible reading situations by management:

"I think he's left himself open to several logical criticisms. One, the whole question of why it is that we can't cut down existing secretarial staff, particularly that one of the alternatives suggests implicitly that we will cut it by sending them to spend additional time elsewhere. That's got to be tightened up." (97-100)

Interesting here is that Hamilton states that "he" (Cunningham) is 'leaving himself open to criticism, when it's quite evident that what is implied is "we" -- especially seeing that Hamilton later states that he will not let the paper out of the department until Cunningham has revised the text so that it shows why the other alternatives are not plausible. In this case, we see another example of the reader's role coming into play. Beyond his role as a surrogate reader for the primary audience, Hamilton's role within the agency entails direct responsibility for texts which are produced in his department. It follows then that, as much as he is determining how a primary management reader will read and respond to Cunningham's paper, he is comparing it to a much more ideal paper with a particular type of reading event taking place at a management level. As such, the comments he makes lead to particular revision-based comments which must be incorporated into the paper before he allows it to go any further through the agency's hierarchy.

What has become evident in the analysis of how Hamilton situates this paper is the degree to which he looks to future events -- how the text will be read, how it must therefore be changed, what actions will be undertaken through the rhetorical action of the text. The paper itself is situated between Hamilton's perceived need for increased word processing capacity and the management reader who has the authority to enact the recommendations of the Cunningham' paper. The inability of the text to set certain events in motion (i.e. the

acquisition of more word processors) could result in an inability for the department to do its tasks as efficiently and effectively as possible. What results then is the implication of Hamilton as a co-writer, or collaborator, in the production of the text. For him not to do so would have disastrous consequences in light of his role within the agency.

ii. Negotiating the text:

Hamilton's negotiation through the paper written by Cunningham is characterized by his efforts to take on the stance of the primary reader, determining the context the paper establishes for the reader and the meaning that primary reader will ultimately construct from within that context. In doing so, his primary concern is for places in the text where what is written and what is intended are not the same thing. He is acutely aware that the primary reader may not be able to infer what is intended and that the paper must therefore be revised. He also reads for the flow of the argument, measuring it against "the approach that we like to see in analytic reports" (23) in the agency. Finally, because Hamilton is embedded in the work context in which the paper is written, he is attentive to instances in Cunningham's paper where there is missing or incomplete information.

The initial moments of Hamilton's reading of the text provide an example of how his negotiation with the content of the paper is enveloped in concern for how it will be read by others:

"The first thing that strikes my mind is that it's a request for additional word processing (wp) capacity. Is that the appropriate word? Should it be stronger?" (4-5)

He questions whether the word "request" in the title is a strong enough indication of what the paper is about. This immediately alerts us to the ultimate purpose of the text. Note here that he does not respond as to whether he feels the word is strong enough or not. Rather he is visualizing the primary reader -- the one who will ultimately decide the

strength of the argument put forth. Later on in the reading episode, Hamilton finds that the language used is "wishy-washy" and does not strongly convey the meaning intended.

In addition to reading to determine the persuasiveness of the language used, Hamilton also must interpret how the primary reader is being given metacommunicative cues as to how to read the text, and how the reading that results permits the reader to arrive at particular conclusions. This results in Hamilton determining where the intentions of the writer do not match the meaning he arrives at through reading the text. We see this in the following excerpt in which Hamilton attempts to interpret some of the writer's intentions:

"What he presumably means is that the word processing work is very similar -- that I would agree with, but that's not what it says." (15-17)

Because a context has been established between the reader and writer through the text, the reader in this case is able to determine when something within the text does not match what is intended given the context. What is key here is that it is important to Hamilton that the text does not say what the author intended, not that he is able to determine what the writer actually meant and then carry on. Because of the particular socio-institutional context in which this text acts, what is intended is never as important as what is actually said.

As an experienced member of the institutional community, Hamilton is able to recognize when the paper does and does not meet the exigencies which elicit and shape its genres. These genres entail particular reading practices. When the paper meets with Hamilton's expectations for the genre, he does not struggle to determine how it is that the primary reader will interpret what is in the text. This excerpt comes after a skimming of the first page of the paper:

"OK -- I agree with the first paragraph. It defines the problem. I find the first page and the introduction to be what I'm basically looking for. There's a good statement of the problem and where the paper is going." (5-8)

Here we see ease of reading enabled by an ability of the text to meet the reader's expectations. What becomes evident is that the ability of the text to meet his expectations (which are, in fact, proxy expectations for Nelson, the primary reader), his reading is facilitated. It is not necessary for him to question how the text is telling him how to read it. It is interesting to note here that Hamilton states that the first page is what he is "basically looking for." It is obvious here that Hamilton is not looking for particular information for himself, but what he is looking for is particular content and presentation that will accomplish his aims when it is read by Nelson.

At the same time, Hamilton is acutely aware of what is missing in the text because of his own embeddedness within the context out of which the text arises. Consequently, he knows when "there's one other thing that this paper is missing" and that "that's a point [that] could be brought out here."

"I didn't find the graphs very useful because they only tell me what the International Department's doing. OK -- this gets into the whole issue of "What is the case in International? Is it a good case or a bad case? I don't know. Presumably Nelson has these statistics, but this report is going to be read by others than just him -- and that's a major hole in it. You've got to have those kinds of comparisons in place." (115-120)

Hamilton's negotiation through the text is not guided by an "authentic" reading of a paper proposing increased word processing capacity in the International department, but rather by an "anticipated" reading of that document. His reading practice is, in this way, facilitated by a certain amount of role-playing, putting on the role of the management reader of the text. As such, he reads looking for how that primary reader is being

communicated to, not how he himself is. What becomes evident to Hamilton as he continues to read through the paper is that, though it is relatively easy to determine what the text means, there are problems with what the paper means in so far as it does not prioritize alternatives in a way that Hamilton needs them prioritized to best meet the needs of his department.

iii. Responding to the text:

Hamilton's response to Cunningham's text is characterized by editing or revising directives based on his agreement, disagreement, and reservations with what information is presented and how in the paper. This points to the nature of this text as a document which must function within an institution and must reflect the institution itself. It also supports the notion that the reviewer's reading practices are guided by the revisability of the text. With each instance of disagreement or reservation comes a comment about what will have to be done to amend either the content or form.

Hamilton's response is based on the meaning he arrives at as a result of his involvement in the text. He holds up this meaning against his expectations -- expectations which he has not solely for the paper, but for the rhetorical situation in which the paper will be read by the primary reader. These expectations indicate a number of factors which shape the rhetorical setting in which this reading of the paper takes place. There are institutional factors -- the fact that the department is capital constrained, the fact that arguments must be supported by numbers and not anecdotal evidence, and the fact that the department may appear to have more secretarial staff than it requires. It is also shaped by the context immediately surrounding the initiation, production, and reading of the text -- Hamilton himself has asked that the paper be written, the situation the paper addresses needs to be rectified as soon as possible, Hamilton will not pass the paper on to higher management until he feels it will be read by that audience in such a way that the case is seen to be

"tightly-reasoned" and will lead to the action it recommends. A final factor shaping Hamilton's expectations are the respective roles played by Cunningham, as writer, and by himself, as reader. Hamilton is, in fact, a collaborator in the production of the best paper possible. Cunningham is assumed to have obtained factual information as to the word processing situation within the department. Hamilton has a vested interest in, and is responsible for, papers which leave the department under his signature.

Hamilton responds on many levels to the meaning he constructs from the text. Primarily, he questions the persuasiveness of what is written. This is evidenced in his reaction to the content presented, the organization of the paper, the use of statistics, and the precision of the language. Each time Hamilton raises a concern about one of these areas, he generates a possible means of rectifying it. Of primary importance to Hamilton, manifested in his surrogate reader capacity, is the way in which the paper will be read by others. What is evident in the excerpt below is Hamilton's attention to the persuasiveness of the text he is reading. We see him not only summarizing what he has read, but also assessing how it could be read, and assessed, by others.

"Page 11, 'The Recommended Solution.' OK -- I guess my reaction is there's one alternative stated as the favoured alternative, and there really is an impression that all five of these are possibilities that would work; and I don't believe that's the case; there's no question of ordering here. I think it has to be made clear that sticking with our present system isn't a viable alternative. I think that basically there has to be something in here about why the other alternatives won't work." (65-71)

What Hamilton appears to be doing is holding up the paper to his view of how he thinks Nelson will read it. Because the "Recommended Solution" section contains the crux of the paper's argument, his attention is drawn to how the primary reader will read this part of the paper, and the meaning he sees that primary reader taking from the text. In this way, he is concerned with how the text accomplishes the acts of reading -- how it indicates to

the reader how that reader is supposed to read. It is not relevant to ask at this point if the primary reader will be aware of what the writer's intentions are; the point is that it is possible, from what is in the here-and-now of the text, to come to the conclusion that all of the alternatives that Cunningham presents appear to be viable. In this way, the text is indeed embedded within a framework of practical action.

Further on, we see Hamilton's response reflect a recognition of the complexity of the task he has set for Cunningham, as well as the degree to which this text is embedded in culture of the institution. We also are witness to how the functions of the institution are played out in the roles assumed in composing the text. Once again, Hamilton is constructing meaning not only out of the text, but out of the text he anticipates will replace it.

"The other point that can be brought in here is that, because staff is constrained -- well it's difficult I guess how to play this -- but the fact that we have to send operators to another department exacerbates the problem -- I guess you could argue that two ways. One, that that's a bad thing, but on the other hand it clearly demonstrates that we have excess capacity here in terms of secretarial -- so I guess he'll want to give some thought to how he wants to play that, but I can see that as an argument that'll cut both ways and that Nelson will think of. So, he's got to come down one way or the other on that point -- would you be in a position to give up a secretary or half a secretary? It's that kind of argument, so he better deal with it." (48-56)

It is clear here who is the writer of the text; even though Hamilton sees that a point that could be brought into the text, and the potential intricacies of doing so, it is Cunningham who will "deal with it" and not him. Hamilton's collaborator role is interrupted for the time being; Cunningham is the one who must produce the changes. This also points to way in which Hamilton's reading practices reflect and reinforce the power roles he and Cunningham occupy within the agency.

Another instance in which the power relationships between reader and writer are played out in this protocol episode is seen in the following episode where, once again, Hamilton not only responds to an aspect of the text which is lacking, but also determines what needs to be done to rectify it.

"OK -- then we talked about the operators working in other departments on a regular basis; this gets back to the point I made initially: there are some problems with the arrangement with the Research Department and its not just a question of capacity -- and I think I will like to see some more development of that point in this paper." (26-30)

What is important to notice here is that when Hamilton says "I will like to see some more development of that point in this paper," he is not implying that it would be an agreeable addition. This is not a hypothetical change; rather, he is reacting to the ideal text he is envisioning and the rhetorical situation in which it will be used. The underlying assumption here is that Cunningham will indeed have to go back and develop that point further.

"The only kinds of things it really needs to bolster that are these kinds of comparative statistics. You see the problem too, is that even if we were only sending it to Nelson, he would have an impression of what those statistics would be for other departments, but supposing that his impression is off by five percent -- by presenting only your own you're going to get screwed." (123-127)

Note here that, once again, he places himself in the role of Nelson. He then switches back to his collaborative role, in stating that comparative statistics are required in order to bolster their case. We see once again the complexity of Hamilton's response to the text -- how he is required to take on a dual-role in reading the text in order to fulfill both his own institutional role as Department Chief as well as his own agenda for the acquisition of more word processing capacities.

Protocol Two -- Carleton University

The context:

In this protocol episode, Professor Anderson is reading one of the student essays out of a pile of thirty-five which sits before him in his office at the university. He is a professor for a fourth-year course in Business Ethics, a course which is required for all students completing a Bachelor of Commerce with Honours. There are thirty-five students in the course which meets for three hours a week during the thirteen-week semester. The essays which he is reading and evaluating were submitted during the last week of classes. This is the first time he is reading essays from this group of students. Assignments earlier in the course consisted of short answer questions which were marked by teaching assistants.

For this essay, the students were requested to write a maximum of fifteen pages outlining how an individual industry or company has dealt with particular ethical issues. The students were asked to use material from the course lectures, guest speakers, and the text book to apply to their chosen topics. The essay has a value of thirty percent of the final grade. Students were required to submit an outline of their essay four weeks before the essay was due; Anderson had responded to these outlines, recommending sources to consult, as well as ways of narrowing or broadening their focus. These outlines with his comments were to be attached to the essay upon submission.

Anderson's purpose for reading this essay is to evaluate the student who has written it. There is a strong connection between what the text represents and who the student is. The student holds authorship of the essay. The professor's role is to assess the nature and quality of learning through the text the student has produced. There are no illusions here. He is quite aware of this role, and equally, that the student is aware of who he is writing to.

This particular reading episode is situated within a somewhat complex process of reading a series of student essays. First, Anderson reads the first four or five essays to get a sense of the range. These essays are given tentative grades. He then continues through the pile of essays, grading them based on the range he has sensed from an initial reading of the first set. He then returns to that first set of essays which he then re-reads and confirms the grades. Throughout the entire process, he is writing notes on the essays -- comments to both himself (things to look for later) and well as notes to the student. The complexity in the reading event points to the need to establish an objective means of assessing the set of essays relative to each other. It is an iterative process of reading a number of texts of the same genre. In fact, the nature of the genre of the academic essay usually entails that the reading process will be iterative in order to assess one static text relative to a number of others. Unlike the iterative process witnessed in the workplace, this iterative process is not a process of response and revision between reader and writer in order to produce a superior text.

The student essay Anderson is reading in this protocol episode is written by Colin Taylor, a student Anderson acknowledges as "the best student in the class." Taylor has written an essay entitled "Software Piracy: Is it Ethical?" Taylor is not a full-time student in the Bachelor of Commerce programme. He takes time off from his job to take the Business Ethics course in order to complete a degree at another institution. Although Taylor is not a Carleton student, he has sat through the course and has participated in the discussions. As such, he is indeed a member of the community formed during the thirteen weeks

In describing how Anderson situates, negotiates, and responds to Taylor's text, we will see how the institution of the university, the context established in the course, Anderson's control over the initiation of the text and his evaluator's role all shape these actions.

i. Situating the text:

Anderson situates the text in a number of ways which emphasize two major exigencies shaping the rhetorical situation and his expectations for the text. First, the text is seen as a cumulative point in the student's learning in the course. The student is being evaluated relative to the other students in the course. In this way, the text is situated according to past learning and past events in the classroom as well as to the present of the other students' essays. There is no future vision for the text. This essay will not be revised; nor will the student write other essays in the course. The second aspect which becomes clear as Anderson situates the text is the degree to which it is a "writer-based" text (Freedman, Adam and Smart, 1994). The primary concern for Anderson is what the essay reveals about the student. It is in no way an institutional document in the ways that the previously described paper from the government agency is. The outcomes of the reading event have the most relevance for the writer himself. As we examine how it is that Anderson places Taylor's essay within a context and how that context develops, we will learn more about how these two exigencies within the rhetorical situation serve to shape the reader's expectations.

In this excerpt Anderson begins by paraphrasing an example Taylor provides "to show that the ethical considerations [regarding software piracy] are quite complex." (61)

"Then he says that a user pirates Word Perfect, saying that they would never pay three hundred dollars because, you know, they would just never pay three hundred dollars. That's what it costs. So, they're really not hurting anybody because they wouldn't have had their money anyhow. O.K.? And then the next thing is supposing they didn't pirate Word Perfect, perhaps they would buy Letter Perfect for one hundred and fifty dollars. And then goes to show that you have to think of what are the alternatives. Now that's something that I stress very much. Don't judge things until

you've looked at the alternatives. Compared to what? So this is a bad whatever -- compared to what? So, you know, this guy has done a number of things that I expected fourth-year students to do." (61-70)

Anderson demonstrates here the need to make a connection between what has been written and what he has stressed in his lectures. Taylor's ability to do so demonstrates his having learned what was taught as well as his competence as a fourth-year student. In this instance, Anderson is situating the text within a context of the classroom. He is highly aware that it is he is the audience being addressed. He is not concerned with how others might read that example, or perhaps even whether the example is valid. The fact is that the student has demonstrated an ability to manipulate concepts which were discussed in the course. The fact that Anderson is also paraphrasing Taylor's example is telling. It demonstrates that he is able to determine what Taylor's intentions are. His doing so shows the embeddedness of the text in a conversation within the course.

Anderson identifies Taylor's use of the example as an indication of what fourth-year students should be expected to do. Here we see the tie back into the university as an institution. The assumption here is that as students progress throughout their degree programmes they should be able to assume more critical stances in the development of their arguments. It is interesting to note here that Anderson is not reacting to Taylor's knowledge of content; rather, he is impressed with his ability to look at alternatives -- one of the things that Anderson expected fourth-year students to do.

In addition to his references to the institution and the course environment, Anderson is also very aware that he is being written to by a particular student. Although he has not previously read essays from this group of students, he is able to identify who they are and their participation in the course through the use of labeled snapshots arranged according to the class seating plan. This practice has enabled him to become familiar with the

students' names. Each student's participation in the course is an important factor in how Anderson formulates his expectations for his or her essay. Hence, when Anderson first picks up Taylor's essay, he immediately situates it within the oral interaction which has transpired in class:

"This should be an excellent essay. It's the best student in the class. He speaks better than most people write." (1-2)

In the following excerpt we see how this student is, in fact, able to transfer his oral abilities into his writing.

"See and there's something about this kid's style because he often does this turn-around and -- As radical as they may sound, Stallman's ideas should not be disregarded. Again, a double negative, you know. And usually that's something that's never handled very well, but somehow, I seem to follow very well with his. And that's also the way you have to talk -- maybe you don't *have* to talk that way -- but you often have to. Ethicists, proper ethicists, do that a lot in their arguments, their logical arguments. And I actually feel I'm not very good at those sorts of things, so I'm very pleased to have someone here who has that simple but essential way of talking about things." (82-90)

What is interesting here is not that Anderson is situating the text within the discipline, but rather that, as a result of his own involvement in the text, he is able to situate the student within the discipline. Anderson is situating this essay, and hence the student, within the language of ethics as a whole. In fact, this is the only point in the protocol in which we have any indication, vague or otherwise, as to how this text could be read by anyone other than the professor.

ii. Negotiating the text:

Anderson's actual negotiation within the text is driven by two factors. First, he has certain expectations for what will be written, based on his own instructions to the students in

setting the assignment. This brings us to the degree of control that Anderson, as professor of the course, has over the construction of the assignment and, perhaps more importantly, over the degree to which he will actually attend to the criteria he has set out when he goes about reading the students' essays. Second, his awareness that Taylor's text is a stable entity forces him to invest a certain amount of time and energy in determining exactly what the student's intentions are. He is therefore centrally involved in determining how he is being written to and what it is that he should be taking away from the reading episode.

My first point deals with how Anderson's expectations for Taylor's essay are, in part, shaped by the nature of the task he has set for the students. These expectations are, however, tempered by the fact that it is within his role to modify the criteria he sets up. In assigning an "essay," both he and the students are able to make certain assumptions about what essays, as a genre, entail. The following set of excerpts provides some insight into how Anderson characterizes such a genre:

"He's learned a little bit about proper formatting and structuring. Every second page he has a "chapter" -- "chapter one" -- ambitious I guess." (3-4)

"Rebuttal of arguments. Well, I would say that it looks just like a big long string of talk, and he should either have numbers or subheadings or underline. He should have said at the beginning how many rebuttals he was going to make " (76-79)

"Mainly, he's quoting people from the industry which is fine, but these are not textbooks. These are individuals who've given talks or written essays, and that's fine." (80-82)

(after reading concluding paragraph of the essay) "You know, if it's as good as I think it is, you need a better summary than that to get full marks " (95-97)

2 of/de 2

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISION™ RESOLUTION TARGETS

Let us review some of the assumptions which Anderson expresses here about what an "essay" entails. First of all, he expects the essay to have proper "formatting," which may include sub-headings, underlining or numbering. At the same time, he remarks at the "ambitious" use of chapters in Taylor's essay. This is obviously an aberration from what one would expect in a fifteen page student essay. Additionally, he reviews the references Taylor has used. Although he finds that Taylor is quoting people from the industry (and not from textbooks), he concludes that this is acceptable because they are sources who have given talks or written essays. This points to the value placed in the university on academic-type references. Finally, we see an expectation in the fourth excerpt that the concluding paragraph provide an adequate summary of the arguments presented in the body of the text. These expectations guide Anderson in how he reads, what he looks for and where he looks for it.

It is interesting to note that even though Taylor's essay does not always meet with Anderson's expectations, it does not necessarily follow that the text is negatively evaluated. Rather, Anderson modifies his reading strategies. His role in the reading necessitates that he maintain involvement in the text, and hence with the writer. The fact that Anderson is himself the end-reader, the one who is being written to most directly, compels him to sustain the reading event and work through the short-comings present in the text. In order to do so, he is entitled at times to modify some of his criteria, some of the exigencies present in the rhetorical setting in order to accomplish his primary purpose - to evaluate the student. Anderson's struggle to determine how he is being written to is evidenced in the two excerpts which follow. Observe the amount of attention paid to what is being established as a context in which the writer and reader will operate.

(After reading "chapter" on ethical behaviour) "Well, it's good. It's very careful. Defines ethical behaviour -- maybe he should have defined unethical behaviour. That may be a problem later. Starting with the first rule from Plato --

smart kid, you know. We're back to, OK, defines twelve billion dollar a year losses -- loss to society -- somewhere he said that Plato has said these things (flips back through essay). I didn't think he mentioned that. Oh yes, there it is (on page five) -- one, two, three. Plato offers these rules (back to page eight) Now he's quite didactic, factual stuff -- good." (36-41)

"Teach. Teach? Come on! Teach is the system administrator Oh, OK it should be properly capitalized as a system. Teach is the systems administrator for a residential health-care company in the Southeast. Or no, no, it's a person -- who he hasn't actually referred to before, but suggests he has (flips back through the last few pages) I'll catch that later." (50-54)

In determining the context in which he is being requested to read and work within the established references, Anderson flips back and forth through the text. He does not question Taylor's structuring of the text, but attempts to work within it. He is attentive to the fact that this is the student's writing that he is reading and embodies a great deal of the student's learning in the course. As such, signs that the student understands what he is writing often seem to over-ride concerns for whether the student is presenting those ideas according to the criteria the professor has established. In fact, this is an instance of where the text itself acts as an exigence on the rhetorical setting, constraining and enabling how the reader responds to it.

iii. Responding to the text:

Anderson's response as he reads the text is reflective of the evaluative nature of both his reading purpose and his role. His response shows him reacting to matters of both content and structure. Consequently, we see comments like: "very good statement of problem," (8) "he's not very good at titles," (17) "I'm not certain that that's absolutely what he ought to be saying there," (26) and "that's half a page, you know -- that's good." (74) What is important to note here, however, is that these comments do not lead to revision

instructions. Rather they serve to build an overall picture of the student's grasp of the content and his ability to communicate it.

This brings us back to Anderson's role -- he is an evaluator. As he himself states in the middle of this protocol episode, "I do concern myself with [whether they have] learned what I thought I was teaching them." (33-34) In no way does he see himself as a collaborator in this text. His collaborative role ended before the reading of the text -- it was accomplished during class time, through his office hours, and on his response to the essay outline. Now, his task is to determine the degree to which the student has benefited from his collaborative efforts. He does not come up with suggested revisions -- except to say that Taylor "could have" or "should have," but not that he "will have to."

The following excerpt shows Anderson moving among expectations, summation, and evaluation. At this point, Anderson is responding by both predicting what will come next as well as evaluating what he has just read. His response serves as a means by which he works himself into the context by determining what the writer is encouraging him to do in his reading. Consequently, he responds to both content and structure.

"two illegal copies -- good -- problem. Very good statement of problem. What will he do with the essay? (Reads, turns to page 3) He's giving me the why this happens. Now, that could be important, but ethically it's not important. Oh, OK, he's just showing that it's different than stealing other things because they still have the original. You know, you just have a copy. They don't even know that you made a copy... but we all know that. We all have word processors! He spent a whole page on it. First describing why people do it and then saying 'Well, it's not like other things' which is a good point." (8-15)

Here we see once again the very complex interplay among the ways in which Anderson situates the text, negotiates through it and responds to the meaning that he arrives at. This

is evident in the ways in which he swings back and forth between positive response ("very good statement of problem"), predictions ("what will he do with the essay"), reservations ("that could be important, but..."), summarizing ("he just showing that..."), negative response ("we all know that...he spent a whole page on it"), summarizing ("first describing...then saying..."), and positive response ("which is a good point.") We see him alternating between means of negotiating the text and his evaluation of it. Once again, the text becomes an exigence which shapes Hamilton's expectations and strategies in reading and responding to it.

Later on, Anderson's response is based more directly on assessing the essay from within this context.

"That's interesting to see. He knows what he's doing when he reverses himself and says now I'm going to rebut the arguments of those who say that (it's) not unethical... There's three negatives of something there, but I can understand it. I mean, often double negatives are a stopper, but he's managed to get -- I mean, it's not really a negative, but he's going to rebut the arguments of those who say that piracy is *not unethical*. And yet, I understand it. Hmm, I don't know if that's just me or him!" (laughs) (44-50)

To respond to Anderson's final statement: it is due to the mutual accomplishments of the reader and the writer through the medium of the text which has permitted this understanding at this moment in the protocol. Taylor has been able to construct a context within the text which allows Hamilton, as reader, to be able to know how he is being communicated to -- what he is being told to do. The language in the portion of the essay to which Anderson is responding is very much about "what is going on here" -- what the communicative enterprise in which the writer and the reader are enveloped actually involves.

Conclusion:

The two protocols presented here point to some of the significant ways in which the practices and responses of readers in the academic and nonacademic settings are shaped by profoundly different sets of institutional and rhetorical exigencies. The ways in which these readers situate, negotiate and respond to texts confirms the very different socio-cultural contexts which elicit and shape written discourse.

Chapter Six

Discussion

Chapter overview:

The findings presented in Chapters Four and Five make it possible to propose answers to each of the questions which guided the research and which were posed in the Introduction. The respond-aloud protocols have furnished us with a window onto some of the exigencies which elicit and shape genres within each of the two settings. Similarly, the protocols offer detailed, moment-by-moment accounts of the processes by which readers accomplish meaning through the activities of reading.

In this chapter, I address each of the questions which motivate this research, referring back to the findings presented in the two preceding chapters. In doing so, I point to some of the emerging contrasts between the rhetorical situations in the two settings, demonstrating how these contrasts extend our knowledge of genre. I also provide some interpretation of these findings through the theoretic literature which frame this research -- in particular, the works of M.M. Bakhtin and Deborah Brandt are most pertinent here.

Addressing the questions:

- **Are there differences in the reading practices and responses of experienced members in the two settings?**

The simple and obvious answer is yes; this is significant for two reasons. Firstly, the writing produced in the two settings often appears to be similar on a textual level. Written discourse in this government agency and in a university business program includes similar disciplinary content, evidenced in both its substance and its lexicon. The writing at the

government agency is often characterized by its similarity to academic discourse -- in its length and its orientation toward analysis. Likewise, writing in the School of Business is often based on "real world" contexts -- analysis of real events, case studies based on real events, application of theoretical constructs to real events. Given these textual similarities, it is significant that the rhetorical activities surrounding texts in the two settings -- in this case the reading practices -- are markedly different.

Secondly, because the rhetorical practices surrounding these texts differ, the findings confirm much of the theoretic and research literature which points to the inherent role of the socio-cultural environment in the production and reception of texts. By examining some of the social roles, motives, and purposes which are accomplished through the rhetorical activities of groups, we are able to understand the source of some of the differences between writing in the university and the workplace. In what follows, I briefly point to some of the emerging contrasts between the reading practices and responses in the two settings studied.

Texts are read at different points in time and for different purposes. Reading in both settings is determined by institutional timetables. In both the government agency and the university, there are particular divisions of time (e.g., semesters, quarters) with their corresponding texts (e.g., term papers, quarterly reports). The primary difference between the two settings is that the reading of student writing in the university is defined by that time segment. At the end of the semester, the course is over. The reading and grading of student texts marks the completion of a segment in the students' academic program. In the workplace, however, written texts are not solely elicited based on established institutional timetables. Formal procedures for reporting on institutional activities at certain points in the year provide a particular degree of stability and predictability to the organization as a whole; however, much of the writing in this agency is elicited in response

to unforeseen factors, such as changing economic realities which entail policy decisions and administrative matters which must be addressed. Consequently, although the workplace reader is able to predict to a certain degree the documents he may read in a week, much of what he will read remains determined by local, unpredictable circumstances.

The university professor's purpose in reading the texts is to determine student achievement in the course and to rank that achievement relative to other students'. For the workplace readers studied here, their purpose for reading employee texts is to ensure the production of the best possible text. Consequently, they read to determine where the text does and does not meet certain institutional expectations; in those instances where it does not meet those expectations, the reader provides revision-based feedback for the writer to incorporate in a subsequent draft.

The processes of reading texts are different. A significant difference between the reading practices in the two settings is the degree to which the reader is willing to work with the text as is. The university professor reads a student paper to determine what it reveals about the student's learning in the course. Consequently, he is obliged to examine the text from beginning to end, ascertaining what it reveals about the student; however, if the text does not match with the student's performance in class, the professor may question whether the text is an appropriate indicator of that student's academic achievement. Thus the reading process in the university is characterized by the reader's attempts to determine what the writer's intentions are, recognizing that the text might not always reflect those intentions. It is the learning exhibited in both the text and in the classroom which is the paramount concern, not the text itself. Hence, the reading processes of the university professors studied here are characterized by a retrospective shifting of focus from the reality of the text to the classroom context, and back again.

By contrast, it is the text itself which is the utmost concern of the workplace reader. The workplace readers in this study, as "intermediate" readers, are charged with the responsibility of ensuring that papers which ascend through the institutional hierarchy facilitate institutional needs to make decisions and operate in an efficient manner. The workplace reader must therefore take on a dual role in reading texts which are written by the employees she supervises. First, she must act as "surrogate reader," reading the text as though she were the primary reader -- usually a member of management. As such, she is required to determine where the writer's intentions do not meet what is present in the text. In those instances, the workplace reader enacts a second role -- that of collaborator. Within this role, the reader determines how the text must be revised so that it does reflect the intentions of the writer (and, by implication, the reader herself, and her department).

Texts are responded to in different ways. In both settings studied, readers respond orally and in writing to what they read; however, the purposes for this response, and the relationship between this response and the roles fulfilled by the readers in responding, are significantly different. In the government agency, the readers respond to texts by providing feedback for future revisions. These readers are not only familiar with the contexts in which the texts may be read and used higher up in the institutional hierarchy, they are also ultimately responsible for texts which go out of their department (usually under their signature). The texts produced by the employees these readers supervise represent them. Consequently, the readers' response to what they read reflect the vested interest they have in the production of the best possible text.

The university readers render evaluative responses to the texts they read. This response takes on two forms: the grade itself and discursive comments. In general, the discursive comments serve to justify or explain the grade. The professors are aware that the

response they write on student texts will not be used directly by the student for revision. In fact, the reader's response to the text marks the completion of the rhetorical activity. Consequently, the response often relates back to aspects of the course or refers to sources which the student might have referred to. Once again, we see how the reading processes of the academic reader are shaped by a continual referencing back to a context which was established in the classroom.

- **If there are differences in the reading practices and responses of experienced members in the two settings, what is the nature of those differences?**

To answer this question, we need to turn to an exploration of how these differences are operationalized in the act of reading. The precise nature of the differences between the experienced readers in the academic and non-academic settings studied are most clearly viewed through an analysis of the moment-by-moment activities of the readers. Chapter Five provides specific, detailed accounts of two readers' responses to texts; in what follows, I draw on the work of Deborah Brandt to interpret some of the findings presented in that chapter and to discuss some of the contrasts which emerge from those findings.

Working from an understanding that literate activity is highly social and contextualized, Brandt (1990) examines how this context is achieved in the temporal sequence of reading and writing events. Brandt points out that texts by themselves do not produce or respond to context; it is the moment-by-moment active production and reception of these texts by real participants which permits the text to become a factor, perhaps even an exigence itself, within a highly contextualized interaction between reader and writer. Readers, within their roles, read not only to have the text make sense, but also (and for Brandt, more importantly) to determine how to make what they are doing make sense -- to keep the literate process going.

The ways in which this metacommunicative activity actually unfolds are, in part, visible (audible) in the respond-aloud protocols where we listen in on readers in the everyday practices of reading. Though sharing some general characteristics, the practices and expectations reflected in the two settings here exhibit important differences in how the textual language of these institutions accomplishes their respective social realities -- as well as how the social realities of the institutions accomplish their various textual languages and the practices which surround them.

The university protocols indicate a very powerful "immediate working context" in which the reader arrives at meaning. The evaluative nature of the reading situation necessitates a precise type of involvement in the reading. The processes by which the writer and reader work together through the text -- how the reader perceives that he is being addressed by the writer, and how he arrives at meaning through the act of reading -- will ultimately determine the student writer's grade. The reader is not reading for any purpose other than to evaluate the text (and, as a consequence, the student writer). Consequently, the involvement of the reader takes on a specific form. He first must determine who the writer is, recalling that student's participation in the classroom context. This perception of the student results in particular expectations which guide much of the reading.

The reading and the expectations of the reader, as professor, are entrenched in both macro- and micro-institutional contexts. Firstly, in order to evaluate, the reader is required to read the whole paper to determine what the student has learned (as it is manifested in the meaning which ensues from the text). The student has, we must remember, written this essay for the professor to evaluate -- and for him to evaluate all of it, not just parts. The evaluation is the anticipated response, as well as the point of closure for the text. Secondly, because the text represents a "public social reality" shared between

reader and writer, the reader must be able to identify and use references which situate him in the "here-and-now" of the practical actions and accomplishments of reading. This is a highly intersubjective and contextualized process which extends beyond the actual reading event to the context in which the reader and writer, within their respective roles, have previously interacted. And this is where we, as eavesdroppers on the reader's attempts to arrive at meaning, can learn about this social context. The professors' references to lecture content and discussions in the classroom are not accidental -- they are instances of how these readers attend to the public context of the text.

In contrast to the professor's focus on what the text is telling her to do and to the emerging context which develops as she proceeds through the student essay, the reader in the workplace setting has an "ad hoc" involvement in the text which is focused on how the future readership of the text will attend to that context. This requires the workplace readers in this study to have an acute understanding of the reading processes of those primary readers. The exigencies which arise out of the broader institutional context -- multiple and future readers, an emphasis on facts and numbers, and the decision-making orientation of the paper -- as well as the fact that the paper will go through a number of revision-based iterations before the primary reader receives it, allow the reader to suspend the meaning and exigence of the present text and to focus on future, ideal versions of the text. When the workplace reader attends to the present text, it is to determine how it meets the institutionally-driven exigencies which shape the written expression of the agency. Where it does not, the reader does not attempt to determine how he can sustain his reading of the text, as is; rather, he identifies means by which the text can be revised to meet institutional needs and goals.

- **What do these differences reveal about the social motives (exigencies) which elicit and shape genres within the two settings?**

Chapter Four presents the possible exigencies which elicit and shape rhetorical activity in the two settings. The nature of these exigencies can be illuminated with the help of Bakhtin's notion of the responsiveness of the utterance. The responsiveness inherent both in the texts to which the readers respond and in the readers' responses to these texts is indeed determined by the exigencies already identified. It is the nature of the institution, the task environments it necessitates, and the social roles it entails which underlie the responsiveness of the interaction which takes place in and around its texts.

By drawing on Bakhtin's notions of the responsiveness of the utterance, we see one of the most salient differences between the reading responses in the two settings studied -- as well as the institutional exigencies which create such differences. The roles enacted by the participants in these literate interchanges, and the institutional context in which they take place, entail specific, "generic" responses. The readers are not free to respond in other ways, as other types of readers, or they would be denying the institution and thereby re-defining the reading situation -- acting within other constructions of exigencies (other socially constructed situations).

The readers in this study demonstrate different kinds of awareness of the addressivity of the communicative act in which they are involved. On the academic side, we observe the professors' acute awareness of the responsive nature of their reading tasks. In fact, these reading activities are explicitly responsive -- this being defined by the academic institution to which they belong. The academic reader's response is, of course, responsive in two ways. Firstly, it is response intended to evaluate learning. The utterance to which the professor is actively responding has been elicited and shaped exclusively for, and in

anticipation of, his evaluation. Secondly, the professor's response is to a large part shaped by his expectation that the student text will respond to the classroom context.

Within each of the academic protocols, we witness the professor explicitly looking for references in the student texts to comments made in class as well as for signs that the student has read particular assigned readings. More specifically, the professor may look for echoes of his own voice (comments he has made about the suitability of essay topics, biases he has in regard to methodology or ideology), as well as for echoes of the voices of others (articles or books he recommended, invited speakers). What is clear is that the dialogism which is fostered within the academic setting is expected to be reflected in the student text. Student writing is highly contextualized in this way. Not only must he demonstrate his own learning, he must also show how his learning "fits" within the evolving conversation of the classroom.

The responsive nature of the reading observed in the supervisors at the government agency manifests itself in very different ways. Simply put, the response of these readers is explicitly anticipating further response -- response from both the writers of the text and from the primary readers of the text. Once again, we see the readers' response shaped by their institutional roles. The surrogate reader/collaborator dichotomy played out by these readers is a direct result of their roles within the institution. The reader simultaneously shapes his response so that it may be heeded by the writer in revisions and so that these revisions may shape the text, as an utterance, into one which will entail a particular type of response from another participant -- the primary reader. Once again, we see the important role played by the power relationships between the participants. The supervisor, as reader shapes his response in one way that requires, without question, a particular response by the writer. He is also, at the same time, required by his institutional role to ensure that the text itself is the best possible and serves the nature of the institutional goal at hand.

Looking at this from the viewpoint of exigencies, or what Bakhtin calls the "concrete situation," these workplace readers, in shaping their own utterances are not only bound and enabled by these exigencies but also enact them.

The reader in the workplace has a very different notion of what his response means for the writer than does the professor. The former expects that his response will be incorporated into the text. As a consequence, the response we hear in the protocols is not dissimilar from the comments he writes on the paper itself. It is for this reason that he reads the paper once and with pen in hand. He reads, simulating the reading practices of the primary reader who he acknowledges has little time and is looking for particular arguments -- presented in the way that they are most commonly presented at the Agency. When the text does not meet his expectations (those he anticipates coming from the primary reader), his response is accompanied by a written annotation, a crossing-out, a directive. When the text does meet the expectations he anticipates, he simply continues to read. There is no necessity for a written response, even a check-mark or "good" in the margin; this points to the reader-based (primary reader) nature of this discourse. These readers are not concerned with who the writer is, except that she be able to write in such a way that the immediate task be accomplished. There is no "halo-effect" from previous work or other participation around the office (Freedman, Adam and Smart; 1994). The chief concern is to shape the text in such a way that it demands a specific response. This is a shaping of institutional thought/discourse in a very rhetorical way in order to achieve particular goal.

- **How do these exigencies shape the practices and responses of readers to particular genres within those settings?**

The nature, or source, of particular exigencies appears to be most evident in the specific ways in which they influence specific reading practices and responses. The exigencies arising out of institutional goals and activities shape the ways in which the readers in this study situate the texts they are reading. The task environments which elicit and pattern writing determine many of the ways in which readers carry out the activities of negotiating meaning from the text. Finally, readers' response to the texts they are required to read is determined by the social roles which are enacted by and through their rhetorical activities.

Institutional Goals -- Situating Texts The specific mandates and goals of institutions provide distinct and powerful exigencies which shape the ways in which rhetorical activities are elicited and enacted. The instrumental nature of writing in the workplace and the epistemic nature of writing in the university are direct results of the goals and values which define these institutions. As such, the reading processes and responses of managers and professors are both enabled and constrained by these institutional goals. The ways in which the readers in this study situate texts within complex social activities and scenarios provide us with valuable insight into how the nature of the institution provides a number of rhetorical exigencies.

While the workplace reader situates the text within the on-going conversation of the workplace, his primary concern is to anticipate the possible response of future readers to the text. The instrumental nature of the writing serves institutional goals of making policy and administrative decisions. Hence, the intermediate reader in the government agency needs an acute knowledge of the contexts in which the text could potentially operate within the institution as well as strategies for revising the current text so that it can best

operate within those contexts. By contrast, the professor reading the student text locates it within a more local, less future-oriented situation. The student text is the culmination of a classroom conversation; as such, the student text takes a position relative to other student texts at the same times as it echoes the conversations which have taken place throughout the semester. The situatedness of the student text within a learning context implies that the professor must read it for the primary purpose of assessing the learning it manifests. The professor does not need to situate the text in any future context of rhetorical activity.

Task Environment -- Negotiating the Text The specific contexts in which texts are elicited, composed, revised, read and archived -- the task environments -- provide particular exigencies which also shape the practices and response of the readers. The degree to which the readers in the two settings are able to exert control over the specifications of texts, and the finality of the texts they receive from writers, are profound shaping influences on the ways in which these readers will proceed in negotiating through the texts.

The complex steps undertaken by academic readers to determine the intentions of the student writer -- the ways in which they struggle to determine what it is that the student is trying to say through the text -- demonstrates the degree to which the finality of the text influences the ways in which professors reads them. Because there is rarely an opportunity to revise student texts and because the professor's role permits him to renegotiate the specifications of the task, she is required to read them to determine what they indicate about the students' learning and not for how the texts themselves meet the specifications she has set. On the other hand, the workplace reader does not have as much latitude in renegotiating the specifications of the text. Consequently, the ways in which he negotiates through it will be based on determining the degree to which it does meet the

rhetorical purpose established for it. In those instances where the text does not meet the expectations established within the task environment, the reader looks for ways in which it must be revised. The fact that the text can be revised requires the workplace reader to identify those parts of the text which do not reflect the intentions of the writer (and the reader). By contrast the academic reader must determine the intentions lying beneath the text and evaluate them, even though the text may, in fact, not fully represent them.

Reader-Writer Roles -- Responding to the Text The readers studied in this research fulfill particular social roles through the rhetorical activities surrounding a text. These roles, though defined by the institutional context, are only realized in the actual involvement that takes place as the reader responds to the text. When we examine the very different ways in which the readers from the two settings studied here respond to the texts they are reading, we see them fulfilling the exigencies inherent in their social roles.

The readers from the government institution execute dual roles in the reading of texts. Because of their acquired experience in dealing with those who will potentially read these texts higher up in the institutional hierarchy and because they are often accountable for texts which are produced by their subordinates, these readers must act as both surrogate readers and collaborators. Their response to the texts they read is thus guided by an institutional need to produce the best possible text. In doing so, these readers not only determine those aspects of the text which deviate from their expectations, but also generate possible revisions for the writer to incorporate into a future draft. The professor also reads student texts to determine the degree to which it meets his expectations and specifications; however, these are more often determined by who the writer is and her previous participation within the classroom context. The professor's institutional role entails that he evaluate the text (and consequently the student who wrote it). His evaluation is only in part determined by institutional norms; the ways in which he

formulates expectations and responds to the student's ability to meet them is to a large part determined by his knowledge of the student and the type of impression that student has given through the classroom context earlier assignments.

Conclusion:

Examining the responses of readers in related academic and nonacademic settings have provided us with some important answers to the questions which guide this research. By exploring not only the nature of the differences between reading practices and responses in the two settings, but also the institutional and rhetorical exigencies which shape those rhetorical activities, we have been afforded a rich view of the ways in which social contexts are implicated in and through written discourse.

Chapter Seven

Conclusion

Let us return now to address the concerns raised in the Introduction -- concerns voiced by both the business community and university graduates that the latter are not adequately prepared by the university for the writing they must do within the chosen careers. These concerns typically focus on superficial issues or symptoms: employers complain that the writers have poor grammar skills, and new employees are disheartened at the endless revisions required in their writing. These concerns, while inadequately formulated, point to an underlying awareness that there are differences between written discourse in the two settings. This study of readers' responses in those settings has articulated many of the underlying and fundamental socio-cultural differences which distinguish their rhetorical activities. Because these differences are so tacit and naturalized, and consequently not readily apparent to those involved, it is understandable that the disjuncture expressed by employers and university graduates, as reported in the Introduction, is often expressed in simplistic terms.

By situating the study of readers in current social theories of writing, we have been able to examine how it is that the social needs, roles and activities which shape and are shaped by rhetorical events in each setting imply very different types of reading processes. A socio-rhetorical understanding of genre has illuminated many of the underlying and fundamental differences between the writing produced and responded to in the two settings. Reconceptualizations of genre which account for the rhetorical activities which surround texts has permitted us to examine the responses of readers in order to draw out some of the differences which underlie written discourse in the two settings.

The two settings studied here -- a university business program and a government financial agency -- provide particular resonance to these findings for two reasons. First, the disciplinary content of the writing produced in the two institutions is similar in both its substance and its lexicon. In writing, both the students and the government employees take an orientation toward "value systems and ideologies that focus on the profit motive and market forces and valorize a rational self-interest model of human behavior, on the one hand, and technico-rational processes, on the other" (Freedman, Adam and Smart, 1994, p. 216). Second, written discourse in the two settings can be seen as comparable because of the writing-intensive nature of the two institutions and the value they place on written expression. Both institutions require analytic approaches in the writing, which often implies that their texts will be of considerable length.

Although the nature of written discourse in the two settings appears similar, written genres arise out of very different social settings and are the result of very different social and rhetorical goals and activities. This study has shown that the practices and response of readers to texts in the two settings do differ significantly; surely the processes of composing and revising them must as well. The same exigencies which constrain and enable readers must do the same for writers. Consequently, it is useful at this point to go beyond the findings of this study of readers to speculate how they might indicate consequences for the writer making the transition from the academic setting to the non-academic setting. In doing so, I will focus on two possible sources of difficulty for the novice writing at work -- the "direction" of contextualization of writing and the nature of the reader's written response.

The findings of this study point to the high degree of contextualization of written language within both settings; however, the precise form of that contextualization is significantly different. Student writing in the university responds *retrospectively* to a context which has

unfolded during course lectures and discussions, office hours, and the reading of texts and other course materials. The student writer is expected to respond to the utterances which have comprised this context. By contrast, the contextualization of writing in the government agency is *prospective* -- anticipating the response of future readers. This is not to say that writing in the workplace is not based on prior utterances. Indeed written texts provide essential links between established policies and practices and future institutional actions; however, the rhetorical situations which shape texts are highly characterized by their future, action-oriented direction. It is possible, therefore, to conjecture that the novice writer in the workplace will encounter some difficulty as she attempts to situate herself within a new context, while at the same time learning that her texts must lead to future institutional action.

Complicating the new employee's initiation into the written discourse of the workplace is the nature of the written comments she receives from the reader, usually her direct supervisor, to the texts she produces. The writer has recently completed at least four years of writing in a learning environment in which the purpose of the reader's written response to her texts was to indicate her effectiveness in participating in the conversation of the course, to judge the degree of learning, to indicate sections which were particularly effective or ineffective, and/or to justify a grade given. These written comments were necessary aspects of the closure of the writing event -- the evaluation; the intention of these written comments would rarely have been to provide directives for future revision. The text the student had submitted was, after all, a "final" draft. Now, the writer must learn to *use* a very different type of written response for a very different purpose. The reader's comments on her written draft are no longer evaluative in nature; they demand a response of their own in the form of specific revisions to the text. Rather than responding to the achievement of learning, these written comments provide useful information about the contexts in which the text will operate within the institution, how others will read it,

and the decisions which it may facilitate. The ability of the writer to use these written comments will provide an essential component to her initiation into the culture of the workplace.

The findings of this study, and the subsequent speculations we can make regarding the source of difficulties faced by writers in transition from the university to the workplace, present us with an entirely different set of questions for further research: Given the highly contextualized nature of literate practice, is it even possible for the university to "teach" its graduates how to write in the multitude of possible workplaces in which they may find themselves? What rhetorical abilities do students learn through writing in the university that are "portable" to other settings? What is the nature of the "learning" that takes place in settings which do not have explicit epistemic goals and mandates?

Bibliography

- Ackerman, J.M. (1991). Reading, writing, and knowing: the role of disciplinary knowledge in comprehension and composing. Research in the Teaching of English, 25, 133-178.
- Aldrich, P.G. (1982). Adult writers: Some reasons for ineffective writing on the job. College Composition and Communication, 33, 284-287.
- Andrews, J.D., & Sigband, N.B. (1984). How effectively does the 'new' accountant communicate? Perceptions by practitioners and academics. The Journal of Business Communication, 21, 15-24.
- Anson, C.M., & Forsberg, L.L. (1990). Moving beyond the academic community: Transitional stages in professional writing. Written Communication, 7, 200-231.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). The problem of speech genres. In C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds.), Speech Genres and Other Late Essays (pp. 60-102) (V.W. McGee, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barabas, C. (1990). Technical writing in a corporate culture: A study of the nature of information. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Bartholomae, D. (1985). Inventing the university. In M. Rose (Ed.), When a writer can't write: Studies in writer's block and other composing problems (pp. 134-165). New York: Guilford Press.
- Bataille, R.R. (1982). Writing in the world of work: What our graduates report. College Composition and Communication, 33, 276-280.
- Bazerman, C. (1985). Physicists reading physics: Schema-laden purposes and purpose-laden schema. Written Communication, 2, 3-25.
- Bazerman, C. (1988). Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

- Bazerman, C., & Paradis, J. (Eds.). (1991). Textual dynamics of the professions: Historical and contemporary studies of writing in professional communities. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bednar, A.S. and Olney, R.J. (1987, December). Communication needs of recent graduates. The Bulletin, 22-23.
- Berkenkotter, C. (1981). Understanding a writer's awareness of audience. College Composition and Communication, 32, 388-399.
- Berkenkotter, C. (1990). Evolution of a scholarly forum: Reader, 1977-1988. In G. Kirsch and D. Roen (Eds.), A sense of audience in written communication (pp. 191-215). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Berkenkotter, C., Huckin, T. N., & Ackerman, J. (1991). Social context and socially constructed texts: The initiation of a graduate student into a writing research community. In C. Bazerman & J. Paradis (Eds.), Textual dynamics of the professions (pp. 191-215). Madison: University of Wisconsin.
- Berlin, J.A. (1982). Contemporary composition: The major pedagogical theories. College English, 44, 765-77.
- Berlin, J.A. (1987). Rhetoric and reality: Writing instruction in American colleges 1900-1985. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Bitzer, L. F. (1968). The rhetorical situation. Philosophy & Rhetoric, 1, 1-14.
- Bizzell, P. (1982a). College composition: Initiation into the academic discourse community. Curriculum Inquiry, 12, 191-207.
- Bizzell, P. (1982b). Cognition, convention, and certainty: What we need to know about writing. Pre/Text, 3, 213-245.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1977). Reproduction in education, society and culture. London: Sage.
- Brandt, D. (1992). The cognitive as the social: An ethnomethodological approach to writing process research. Written Communication, 9, 315-351.

- Brandt, D. (1990). Literacy as involvement: The acts of writers, readers, and texts. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Brinton, A. (1981). Situation in the theory of rhetoric. Philosophy and Rhetoric, 14, 234-247.
- Broadhead, G. J., & Freed, R.C. (1986). The variables of composition: Process and product in a business setting. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Bruffee, K.A. (1986). Social construction, language, and the authority of knowledge: A bibliographical essay. College English, 48, 773-790.
- Burke, K. (1967). The philosophy of literary form: Studies in symbolic action. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Business uneasy about education. (1993, March 5). Financial Post. p. 13
- Casari, J.E., & Lemon, M.M. (1985, October). Communication -- Serious business (But who's serious?): University classrooms that meet business and industry needs. IEEE Professional Communication Society -- Conference Record, 302-306.
- Charney, D. (1993). A study in rhetorical reading: How evolutionists read "The Spas of San Marco." In J. Selzer (Ed.), Understanding scientific prose (pp. 203-231). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Cooper, M., & Holtzman, M. (1983). Talking about protocols. College Composition and Communication, 34, 284-294.
- Cooper, M., & Holtzman, M. (1985). More talk about protocols. College Composition and Communication, 36, 97-100.
- Cooper, M., & Holtzman, M. (1989). Writing as social action. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Couture, B. (1985). Why an English department should join with industry in planning a professional writing program. Technical Writing Teacher, 11, 167-174.
- Devitt, A.J. (1991). Intertextuality in tax accounting: Generic, referential, and functional. In C. Bazerman & J. Paradis (Eds.), Textual dynamics of the professions:

- Historical and contemporary studies of writing in professional communities (pp. 336-357). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Devitt, A.J. (1993). Generalizing about genre: New conceptions of an old concept. Written Communication, 44, 573-586.
- Doheny-Farina, S. (1989). A case study of one adult writing in academic and nonacademic discourse communities. In C. Matalene (Ed.), Worlds of work: Teaching and learning in discourse communities of work (pp. 14-22). New York: Random House.
- Doheny-Farina, S. (1992). Rhetoric, innovation, technology: Case studies of technical communication in technology transfers. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Doheny-Farina, S., & Odell, L. (1985). Ethnographic research in writing: Assumptions and methodology. In L. Odell and D. Goswami (Eds.), Writing in nonacademic settings (pp. 503-535). New York: Guilford.
- Duffy, A. (1993, August 9). Give job applicants literacy tests, bosses told. Toronto Star. p. A1, A18.
- Duffy, A. (1993, October 13). Schools fail business, probe told. Toronto Star. p. A24.
- Ede, Lisa, and Andrea Lunsford. (1984). Audience addressed / audience invoked: The role of audience in composition theory and pedagogy. College Composition and Communication, 35, 155-171.
- Elbow, P. (1973). Writing without teachers. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Emig, J. (1971). The composing processes of twelfth graders. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE.
- Ericsson, K.A.; and Simon, W.A. (1980). Verbal reports as data. Psychological Review, 87, 215-251.
- Faigley, L. (1985). Nonacademic writing: The social perspective. In L. Odell & D. Goswami (Eds.), Writing in nonacademic settings (pp. 231-248). New York: Guilford.

- Faigley, L. (1992). Fragments of rationality: Postmodernity and the subject of composition. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Faigley, L., & Miller, T.P. (1982). What we learn from writing on the job. College English, 44, 557-569.
- Farr, M. (1993). Essayist literacy and other verbal performances. Written Communication, 10, 4-38.
- Feinberg, S., & Pritzker, I. (1985). An MBA communications course designed by business executives. The Journal of Business Communication, 22, 75-83.
- Fish, S. (1980). Is there a text in this class? The authority of interpretive communities. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Flower, L. (1979). Writer-based prose: A cognitive basis for problems in writing. College English, 41, 19-37.
- Flower, L. (1988). The construction of purpose in writing and reading. College English, 50, 528-550.
- Flower, L. (1989). Cognition, content and theory building. College Composition and Communication, 40, 282-311.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1980a). The dynamics of composing: Making plans and juggling constraints. In L. Gregg & E. Steinberg (Ed.), Cognitive processes in writing. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1980b). The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. College Composition and Communication, 32, 21-32.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981a). The pregnant pause: An inquiry into the nature of planning. Research in the Teaching of English, 15, 229-243.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981b). A cognitive process theory of writing. College Composition and Communication, 28, 21-32.
- Freed, R.C., & Broadhead, G.J. (1987). Discourse communities, sacred texts and institutional norms. College Composition and Communication, 38, 154-165.

- Freedman, A. (1987). Learning to write again: Discipline-specific writing at university. Carleton Papers in Applied Language Studies, 4, 95-116.
- Freedman, A. (1993). Show and Tell? The role of explicit teaching in the learning of new genres. Research in the Teaching of English, 27, 222-251.
- Freedman, A., Adam, C., & Smart, G. (1994) Wearing suits to class: Simulating genres and simulations as genres. Written Communication, 11, 193-226.
- Gilsdorf, J.W. (1986). Executives' and academics' perceptions on the need for instruction in written persuasion. The Journal of Business Communication, 23, 55-68.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goetz, J., & Lecompte, M. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Academic.
- Goody, J. (1986). The logic of writing and the organization of society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haas, C., & Flower, L. (1988). Rhetorical reading strategies and the construction of meaning. College Composition and Communication, 39, 167-183.
- Harris, J. (1989). The idea of community in the study of writing. College Composition and Communication, 40, 11-22.
- Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. (1983). Uncovering cognitive processes in writing: An introduction to protocol analysis. In B. Mosenthal, L. Tamor, & S. Walmsley (Eds.), Research in writing: Principles and methods (pp. 206-220). New York: Longman.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herrington, A. (1985). Writing in academic settings: A study of the contexts for writing in two college chemical engineering courses. Research in the Teaching of English, 19, 331-361.

- Hymes, D. (1972). Introduction. In C.B. Cazden, V.P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom (pp. xi -- lvii). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Huckin, T.N., & Berkenkotter, C. (1993). Rethinking genre from a socio-cognitive perspective. Written Communication, 10, 475-509.
- Kogen, M. (Ed.). (1989). Writing in the business professions. Urbana, IL: NCTE & ABC.
- Kroll, Barry M. (1984). Writing for readers: Three perspectives on audience. College Composition and Communication, 35, 172-185.
- Labov, W. (1972). Language in the inner city. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Lutz, J.A. (1989). Writers in organizations and how they learn the image: Theory, research, and implications. In C. Matalene (Ed.), Worlds of writing: Teaching and learning in discourse communities of work (pp. 113-135). New York: Random House.
- Matsuhashi, A. (1981). Pausing and planning: The tempo of written discourse production. Research in the Teaching of English, 15, 113-134.
- McCarthy, L.P. (1987). A stranger in strange lands: A college student writing across the curriculum. Research in the Teaching of English, 21, 233-265.
- Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as social action. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70, 151-167.
- Morson, G.S. (1986). Introduction to extracts from "The problem of speech genres." In G.S. Morson (Ed.), Bakhtin: Essays and dialogues on his work (pp. 89-90). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Myers, G. (1990). Writing biology: Texts in social construction of scientific knowledge. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

- North, S. (1987). The Making of Knowledge in Composition. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Nystrand, M. (1986). The structure of written communication: Studies in reciprocity between writers and readers. New York: Academic Press.
- Nystrand, M., Greene, S., & Wiemelt, J. (1993). Where did composition studies come from? An intellectual history. Written Communication, 10, 267-333.
- Odell, L. (1985). Beyond the text: Relations between writing and social context. In L. Odell & D. Goswami (Eds.), Writing in nonacademic settings (pp. 249-280). New York: Guilford Press.
- Odell, L., & Goswami, D. (Eds.). (1985). Writing in nonacademic settings. New York: Guilford.
- Odell, L., Goswami, D., & Quick, D. (1983). Writing outside the English composition class: Implications for teaching and for learning. In R.W. Bailey & R.M. Forsheim, (Eds.), Literacy for life: The demand for reading and writing (pp. 175-194). New York: M.L.A.
- Olson, D. (1977). From utterance to text: The bias of language in speech and writing. Harvard Educational Review, 47, 257-281.
- Ong, W. (1975). The writer's audience is always a fiction. PMLA, 90, 9-21.
- Ong, W. (1982). Orality and literacy. New York: Methuen.
- Paré, A., & Smart, G. (in press). Observing genres in action: Towards a research methodology. In A. Freedman & P. Medway (Eds.), Genre in the new rhetoric. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Patton, J. (1979). Causation and creativity in rhetorical situations: Distinctions and implications. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 65, 36-55.
- Perl, S. (1979). The composing processes of unskilled college writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 317-336.

- Pianko, S. (1979). A description of the composing processes of college freshmen. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 5-21.
- Radar, M.H., & Wunsch, A.P. (1980). A survey of communication practices of business school graduates by job category and undergraduate major. The Journal of Business Communication, 17, 33-41.
- Rafoth, Bennett. (1988). Discourse community: Where writers, readers, and texts come together. In B. Rafoth & D. Rubin (Eds.), The Social Construction of Written Communication (pp. 131-146). Norwood, NJ: Ablex
- Reither, J.A. (1985). Writing and knowing: Towards redefining the writing process. College English, 47, 620-628.
- Rorty, R. (1979). Philosophy and the mirror of nature. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schwegler, R., & Shamon, L. (1991). Meaning attrition in ambiguous texts in sociology. In C. Bazerman & J. Paradis (Eds.), Textual dynamics of the professions (pp. 216-233). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Selzer, J. (1983). The composing processes of an engineer. College Composition and Communication, 34, 178-187.
- Smart, Graham. (1985). Writing to Discover and Structure Meaning in the World of Business. Carleton Papers in Applied Language Studies, 2, 33-44.
- Smart, Graham. (1992). Exploring the Social Dimension of a Workplace Genre, and the Implications for Teaching. Carleton Papers in Applied Language Studies, 9, 33-46.
- Smart, G. (1993). Genre as community invention: A central agency's response to its executives' expectations as readers. In R. Spilka (Ed.), Writing in the workplace: New research perspectives (pp. 124-140). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Spilka, R. (Ed.). (1993). Writing in the workplace: New research perspectives. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

- Swales, J. (1988). Discourse communities, genres and English as an international language. World English, 7, 211-220.
- Swales, J. (1990). Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tannen, D. (1982). The oral-literate continuum in discourse. In D. Brandt (Ed.), Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy (pp. 33-54). Norwood, NJ.: Ablex.
- Tannen, D. (1985). Relative focus on involvement in oral and written discourse. In D. Olson, N. Torrance, & A. Hildyard (Eds.), Literacy, language, and learning: The nature and consequences of reading and writing (pp. 124-147). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tebeaux, E. (1985). Redesigning professional writing courses to meet the communication needs of writers in business and industry. College Composition and Communication, 36, 419-428.
- Vygotsky, L. (1962). Thought and language. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Walvoord, B. E., & McCarthy, L. P. (1990). Thinking and writing in college: A naturalistic study of students in four disciplines. Urbana, Ill: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Winsor, D. (1989). An engineer's writing and the corporate construction of knowledge. Written Communication, 6, 270-285.
- Yates, J., & Orlikowski, W. (1992). Genres of organizational communication: A structural approach to studying communication and media. Academy of Management Review, 17, 299-326.
- Yates, J. (1989). Control through communication. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Appendix A

Protocol One -- Government Financial Agency

1
2 The paper is intended to justify an additional word processor with the department. At the
3 present time, the department seems to be capital constrained and what I'm looking for is a
4 tightly reasoned case to prove the point that we need additional capacity and we need it
5 soon. The first thing that strikes my mind is that it's a "request for additional word
6 processing (wp) capacity" -- is that the appropriate word, or should it be stronger? OK --
7 I agree with the first paragraph; it defines the problem. I find the first page and the
8 introduction to be what I'm basically looking for. There's a good statement of the problem
9 and where the paper is going. (Page 2) It could have the impression that the arrangement
10 with the Research Department has been working satisfactorily -- I'm not sure that's entirely
11 true -- there may be some technical problems and I'll be looking at a later point in the
12 memo for something along those lines. OK, looking at the second paragraph where he's
13 talking about the author ratio -- this gets back to the point. (He questions #1) So I wonder
14 a bit about what's going on in that paragraph -- it's a question of the logic of the report. I
15 disagree with the statement at the beginning of the paragraph that the work of this
16 department is very similar to other policy departments -- that is not true; what he means
17 presumably is that the word processing work is very similar --that would agree with, but
18 that's not what it says. (Page 3) OK, I guess what I'd be looking for here, having made the
19 comparison to other departments, would be some comparative figures (with) other
20 departments in terms of what kinds of input pages are going through their system and I
21 don't see that at this point. It's flowing well. I'm looking, first of all, for logical arguments
22 that either re present or not present. I'm not having difficulty in the development of the
23 argument at all. In fact, it's flowing pretty much the way I hoped it would. This is very
24 much the approach that we like to see in analytic reports. The way a logical argument is
25 developed; there seems to be some coherence here. (Page 5) OK, in terms of

26 consequences, I wonder a bit about the ordering, whether he's leading from the least
27 important to the most important. (Page 6) OK, then we talked about the operators
28 working in other departments on a regular basis. This gets back to the point I made
29 initially: there are some problems with the arrangement with the Research department and
30 it's not just a question of capacity. And I think I will like to see some more development
31 of that point in this paper. OK, there's one other thing that this paper is missing in terms
32 of the priorities. And that is, there are times of example when I will require that
33 something be done on the word processor -- this typically happens around Annual Report
34 time, during speeches or at other times. They'll often be short pieces, but we know they're
35 going to be [inaudible] a 100 times, and they often have to be done within a 24 hour
36 deadline. What we basically do then that happens [inaudible] that's a point could be
37 brought out here. OK, page 7 -- departmental requirements. Again it's really a question of
38 wording here -- that "the department would want any solution to satisfy..." "That the
39 department requires" or something a little stronger. This is a little wishy-washy. OK --
40 I'm essentially picking up on the point that any solution must provide the department with
41 the additional capacity which it needs to meet its deadlines, which often involve high
42 priority texts for senior management. Now is that picked up in the section on
43 "consequences?" I'm not sure it is. It's that kind of thing that I'd like to see come out as an
44 important thing. I think you want to have your consequences structured in terms of the
45 order of the solutions that you required satisfied -- that there's a certain parallelism there
46 that might be helpful. I guess there's an assertion that the department is operating with a
47 minimal amount of secretarial support. It may be that somehow that precedent should be
48 raised as an important argument that we've already gone through this once, that we could
49 not reduce our staff, and we're in a similar situation. The other point that can be brought
50 in here is that because staff is constrained, well it's difficult I guess how to play this -- but
51 the fact that we have to send operators to another department exacerbates the problem -- I
52 guess you could argue that two ways. One, that that's a bad thing, but on the other hand it

53 clearly demonstrates that we have excess capacity here in terms of secretarial. So I guess
54 he'll want to give some thought to how he wants to play that, but I can see that as an
55 argument that'll cut both ways and that Nelson will think of. So, he's got to come down
56 one way or the other on that point -- would you be in a position to give up a secretary or
57 half a secretary? It's that kind of argument, so he better deal with it. Again here -- "we
58 believe the ideal solution would be one that would locate..." OK -- I'd rather see stronger
59 language that would say that, not the ideal solution, but the only possible solution is one
60 that does locate... And I'm not sure about the "August '85" This is a pressing problem and
61 we'd like to see a solution immediately. If you give them August '85, they'll start thinking
62 about it in '85 -- and we might get a solution by December. OK, page 9 -- "Alternatives".
63 Five alternatives -- All right. I'm not (sure) alternative one is a feasible alternative. Again,
64 on the second alternative, part of that would involve increasing the secretarial
65 establishment in the department -- If you don't come along on that point, then you get
66 back to the earlier point, why can't you give up a secretary? The third alternative is a
67 viable alternative. Page 11, "The recommended Solution" OK -- I guess my reaction is
68 there's one alternative stated as the favoured alternative, and there really is an impression
69 that all five of these are possibilities that would work; and I don't believe that's the case.
70 There's no question of ordering here. I think it has to be made clear that sticking with our
71 present system isn't a viable alternative. I think that basically there has to be something in
72 here about why the other alternatives won't work, and why we have to get down to the
73 fourth or the fifth. The other thing too that this paper is lacking is any kind of a cost
74 benefit analysis of costs and benefits of doing these various things and it might well be that
75 a table could help that out. But my problem with it is that it defines the alternatives, but it
76 doesn't strongly argue why one as compared to the other; and I really think the thrust of
77 the memo is to give secretary's the impressions that they have a greater choice of
78 alternatives than in fact they do. There's no real attempt to say if we do the various
79 alternatives, what are the costs going to be and compare them -- because essentially the

80 way this thing is going to get determined over there is that they're going to look at the
81 capital costs involved and they're going to apply certain ratios of output statistics relative
82 to their requirements and they're either going to conclude that we need it or we don't, and
83 there are other costs involved in not having that system in place and it's those costs that
84 are relevant to us and they somehow have to come through. The other thing too is that if
85 you're really going to make your case on the basis that International is poorly serviced
86 from the point of view of available word processing capacity, then there have to some
87 supporting statistics that suggest yes indeed, this department is getting screwed or it not
88 getting screwed. And if it is, then that strikes me as a "prima facie" case for more work
89 processing capacity here, and then you can step back into the question of the costs and
90 benefits involved in it. But it definitely needs more of a justification of the preferred
91 alternative not so much in terms of what it does for you, but why the others won't work.
92 That's what anybody who receives this report and makes a decision on it is going to have
93 to do. I'd like to see a comparison viz-a-viz other departments. Surely anybody who
94 receives this report and is going to make a decision on it is going to have to do. It's really
95 important that [Cunningham] get some of the statistics in place. The overall thrust of the
96 paper is pretty good. It takes you through the logical steps of how you get to where you're
97 going and in that sense I think it's a pretty readable paper. I think it has to be explicit
98 (why the other alternatives won't work). I think he's left himself open to several logical
99 criticisms. One, the whole question of why it is that we can't cut down existing secretarial
100 staff, particularly that one of the alternatives suggests implicitly that we will cut it by
101 sending them to spend additional time elsewhere. That's got to be tightened up; that's a
102 key point. If he's going to make his argument on the grounds that other departments have
103 more capacity or we're entitled to more capacity than he's got to prove it. I don't think
104 that [presenting five alternatives neutrally] works. He's really got to do that [be explicit
105 about what the disadvantages and the other alternatives are] I mean, in justifying the
106 preferred solution -- the way it comes out is "Well, we would like -- it would be nice to

107 have -- because of all these other benefits." But what doesn't come through is "Something
108 must be done!" We cannot live with the existing system. That being the case, what are
109 the pros and cons of the various alternatives, and how do you get to the point where you
110 inevitably have to select the recommended solution? Those kinds of things have to come
111 out in this. Otherwise you get the impression, at least on first reading, that "Well, we've
112 got our preferences, but anyone of the five alternatives is a viable alternative," And one of
113 these alternatives is to do what you're already doing, which is sit on your ass and not
114 doing anything about it. And I'm not letting that go out the department that way. I want
115 to have a certain edge to it. I would see this going out with a covering memo saying "We
116 formally request an additional system based on the following premises." I didn't find the
117 graphs very useful, because they only tell me what the International department's doing.
118 O.K. -- this gets into the whole issue of "What is the case in International? Is it a good
119 case or a bad case." I mean I don't know. Presumably [Nelson] has these statistics, but
120 this report is going to be read by others than just him, -- and that's a major hole in it.
121 You've got to have those kinds of comparisons in place. (Graham -- "Who else might read
122 it after [Nelson]?) Well, it may go to [Nelson], but I may send it with a cover letter direct
123 to [Dole], saying "We request this." I really haven't thought totally of the strategy but I see
124 it as essentially a justification standing behind a word processing request. The only kinds
125 of things it really needs to bolster that are these kinds of comparative statistics. You see
126 the problem too, is that even if we were only sending it to [Nelson], he would have an
127 impression of what those statistics would be for other departments, but supposing that his
128 impression is off by 5% -- by presenting only you own you're going to get screwed. You
129 really run a risk there, in terms of nailing this down if you don't bolster it. I think it's a
130 good piece -- tighten it up and finish it up.

Appendix B

Protocol Two -- Carleton University

1 This should be an excellent paper. It's the best student in the class. He speaks better than
2 most people write. (Flips through it) "Software piracy (laughs) is it ethical?" Of course
3 it's not ethical! He's learned a little bit about proper formatting and structuring. Every
4 second page he has a "chapter" -- "chapter one" -- ambitious, I guess. He's not a Carleton
5 student. He has to have a course like this to get his degree from somewhere else. He's
6 working now. He's one of those guys, you know, with the blue suit (Christine: Oh, really.
7 Is this course taught in the evening?) No, he gets time off. (Reads to himself -- mumbles)
8 "two illegal copies" -- good -- problem. Very good statement of problem, what he will do
9 with the paper. (Reads, turns to page 3) He's giving me the why this happens. Now, that
10 could be important, but ethically it's not important. Oh, O.K. -- he's just showing that it's
11 different than stealing other things because they still have the original. You know, you
12 just have a copy. They don't even know that you made a copy. (Me: So is that important
13 in terms of what he's developing?) Ya, but we all know that. We all have word
14 processors! He spent a whole page on it. First describing why people do it and then
15 saying "Well, it's not like other things" -- which is a good point. (to page 5) O.K.
16 "Ethical Behaviour" -- that seems an odd topic, for chapter 2. "...What constitutes ethical
17 behaviour..." He's not very good at titles. Mmm, good. He sets out three rules he got
18 from somewhere which sound pretty good. (Reads further down the page) He's got fine
19 definition. (Reads further and turns page) He makes a distinction. He's looking at society
20 as a whole for software piracy -- not just the Canadian Information Processing Society
21 members who have a different set of standards than you might have for society. So "any
22 action that is harmful to others...(mumbles)...must be intentional and the effects of the
23 action must be known." Well, I like statements like that, but I'll have to check that out
24 later and see that it's really covered everything in those possibilities. "For an action to be

25 considered ethical, it should not be done out of self-interest." Well, he's picked up one of
26 my prejudices. I'm not certain that that's absolutely what he ought to be saying there.
27 (Me: Do you think he's put it in because he picked up one of your prejudices?) He could.
28 I mean, he's the kind of guy who's so committed to the discussions and so on and, to a
29 certain extent, I never know whether he just wants to please me... But, he's a bright guy, a
30 bright capable guy who also just wants to please me very much. (Returns to paper.) "For
31 an action to be considered ethical, it should not be done out of self-interest." Well, that's
32 my claim, but a lot of business ethics people say that long term self-interest is ethical. Ya,
33 but sure it's important to look after yourself... Anyhow, but I do concern myself with have
34 they learned what I thought I was teaching them. (to page 7) (reads, mumbles) "software
35 piracy" Well, it's good. It's very careful. Defines ethical behaviour -- maybe he should
36 have defined unethical behaviour. That may be a problem later. "Starting with the first
37 rule from Plato" -- smart kid, you know. We're back to, O.K. defines \$12 billion a year
38 losses...(to top of page 8) "loss to society"... Somewhere he said that Plato has said these
39 things (flips back through paper). I didn't think he mentioned that. Oh yes, there it is
40 (page 5) -- one, two, three. "Plato offers these rules..." (back to page 8) Now he's quite
41 didactic, factual stuff -- good. (Flips through remaining pages) Well, I would certainly
42 expect him to write a good paper like this, it's a good paper. And, you know, there's some
43 areas of questionable structure. I'm just not sure that, as rigorous as his writing style
44 suggests,...(reads top of page 10) That's interesting to see. He knows what he's doing
45 when he reverses himself and says well now I'm going "to rebut the arguments of those
46 who say that (it's) not unethical. (Me: Is that something that you like to see?) There's
47 three negatives of something there, but I can understand it. I mean, often double
48 negatives are a stopper, but he's managed to get -- I mean, it's not really a negative -- but
49 he's going to rebut the arguments of those who say that piracy is not unethical. And yet,
50 I understand it. Hmmm... I don't know if that's just me or him (laughs). "Teach, Teach?"
51 Come on... "Teach is the system administrator..." Oh, O.K. it should be properly

52 capitalized as a system. "Teach is the systems administrator for a residential health-care
53 company in the Southeast." Or no, no it's a person -- who he hasn't actually referred to
54 before, but suggests he has (flips back through last couple of pages). I'll catch that later.
55 (Reading from quote) "If I like it I'll buy it." "I believe in piracy...(and) I like to borrow
56 something to play with it (and) if I like it, I'll buy it." (reads further and turns page)
57 Sounds fine. Just a lot of usual arguments and it's very expansive to get this stuff
58 developed. You need to realize that even if you eventually do buy it, if you'd bought it
59 sooner, the owners losing something. "If they do no harm..." (reads) That's interesting.
60 (Me: What was interesting?) What's interesting is he has an example. He said "Oh, here's
61 an example to show that the ethical considerations are quite complex." Then he says that
62 a user pirates WordPerfect, saying that they would never pay \$300 because, you know,
63 they would just never pay \$300 -- that's what it costs. So, they're really not hurting
64 anybody because they wouldn't have had their money anyhow. O.K.? And then the next
65 thing is supposing they didn't pirate WordPerfect, perhaps they would buy Letter Perfect
66 for \$150. And then goes to show that you have think of what are the alternatives. Now
67 that's something that I stress very much. Don't judge things until you've looked at the
68 alternatives. Compared to what?? So this is a bad whatever -- compared to what?? So,
69 you know, this guy has done a number of things that I expected fourth-year students to
70 do. O.K. so he developed that (to page 12) "Computer software is generally used to
71 improve efficiency or quality. Computer knowledge is a valuable skill in the job market."
72 O.K. -- he says those who didn't pay for it still have the benefit of having developed a skill
73 and a capacity for using it and that gives them an unfair advantage against other who are
74 honest. Good. That's half a page, you know, that's good. (Reads ahead) What are we
75 talking about here (flips back) Looks like he should have a little, a few sub-headings or
76 something. After awhile, I lose track of what the focus is supposed to be. "Rebuttal of
77 arguments" -- well, I would say that it looks just like a big long string of talk, and he
78 should either have numbers or subheadings or underline. He should have said at the

79 beginning how many rebuttals he was going to make, but he doesn't do that. So maybe it's
80 at the end (flips to end). Mainly, he's quoting people from the industry which is fine, but
81 these are not textbooks. These are individuals who've given talks or written papers, and
82 that's fine. It does give the definition of the alternatives, alternative points of view as well.
83 See and there's something about this kid's style because he often does this turn-around and
84 (page 14) "As radical as they may sound, Stallman's ideas should not be disregarded."
85 Again, a double negative, you know. And usually that's something that's never handled
86 very well, but somehow, I seem to follow very well with his. And that's also the way you
87 have to talk -- maybe you don't have to talk that way -- but you often have to, ethicists,
88 proper ethicists do that a lot in their arguments, their logical arguments. And I actually
89 feel I'm not very good at those sorts of things, so I'm very pleased to have someone here
90 who has that simple but essential way of talking about things.....(mumbles as he reads
91 through final page). (Final Paragraph) "Can software piracy be justified? It is quite
92 probable that some software companies (will overcharge) for their product. However, I
93 believe the old saying 'two wrongs don't make a right' applies here. When someone pirates
94 software, they are effectively stealing the money that the software company would have
95 made. The majority of philosophers agree that theft is unethical..." You know, if it's as
96 good as I think it is, you need a better summary than that to get full marks, but you know,
97 quite probably an A-.

END

0 8-1 1-94

FIN