영어어문교육, *14*권 **4**호 **2008**년 겨울

Korean Graduate Students' Audiences for Their English Academic Writing: To Whom Do They Write and How?

Hyun-Woo Lim
(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Lim, Hyun-Woo. (2008). Korean graduate students' audiences for their English academic writing: To whom do they write and how? *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *14*(4), 115-139.

The present study investigated first-year graduate students' considerations of audience for their English academic writing and their attempts to accommodate the audience expectations. Eight first-year master's students in English education were interviewed based on their English academic papers before and after an on-line discussion conducted to raise the writers' awareness of audience. Three thematic domains emerged from the data: (a) audience determinateness, (b) the writer's positioning in relation to audience, and (c) audience specification. Under the first domain, three different types of audience including the professor-evaluator as a real reader, audience as an extended self-projection, and textually implied audience were identified. Each type of audience was suggested to influence the different, hierarchical levels of writing. The second domain included two categories: (a) authoritative audience versus friendly/uninformed audience and (b) audience as addressee versus audience as beneficiary. The writers' posited relationships with audiences were suggested to establish differential motivations for writing. The third domain represented the degrees to which the writers have specified representations of audience. Broad and vague idea on audience could result in limited information and simplistic arguments in the text. Based on the study findings and discussions, pedagogical implications are provided.

[audience/English academic writing]

I. INTRODUCTION

If anybody is going to do anything about the teaching of writing, the first priority is going to have to be the rekindling of the sense of audience. Until that's done, nothing else is going to happen. [by James Moffett]

Davidson et al., (1977, p. 298)

A volume of literature in composition and rhetoric has suggested the significant role of the writer's sense of audience in the development of writing ability (Berkenkotter, 1981; Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod, & Roen, 1975; Burleson & Rowen, 1985; Flower, 1979; Piché & Roen, 1987; Rubin, 1984; Rubin, Piché, Michlin, & Johns, 1984). For example, Berkenkotter (1981) suggests that expert writers frequently analyze their audiences, indicating that the increased awareness of audience is an important strategy for an expert writer. Flower (1979) distinguishes the 'writer-based' prose from the 'reader-based' prose in that the former is the modes of inner and egocentric speech, and the latter is the modes of communication with the external audience. Flower suspects that the college students' inability to produce a good writing results from their failure in moving cognitively from 'writer-based' modes to 'reader-based' modes.

Investigations on written texts and composing process have cogently suggested that the writer's sense of audience influence the type of discourse, the content of ideational messages, the extent of elaboration and clarity, and organizational structure of texts (Berkenkotter, 1981; Roth, 1987; Zainuddin, 1995). The empirical studies on audience have further suggested that the writer's constructions of audience reflect his/her relationships with audience, which also exert differential influences on the writing process and product (Hayes, Durham, Brandt, & Raitz, 1990; Kirsch, 1990; Kroll, 1984).

The social views of writing have situated the notion of audience within the discourse community in which text production and dispersion takes place (Park, 1986; Tomlinson, 1992). The studies on graduate students' socialization processes into their academic disciplines have concluded that students' ability to master academic writing styles directly results from their learning of the beliefs, conventions, and values that a given discipline represents (Bazerman, 1980, 1985; Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Berkenkotter, Huckin, & Ackerman, 1988; Dudely-Evans, 1991). These studies suggest that student writers must acquire genre knowledge by participating in the discursive practices of their academic disciplines. Audiences for those student writers, therefore, also need to be conceptualized as aligned with the purposes, genres, and rhetorical contexts of the writers' academic disciplines (Prior, 1998).

Despite the primacy of audience in writing, only a handful of empirical studies have examined the audience issue in second language (L2) writing (Johns, 1993; Mangelsdorf, Roen, & Taylor, 1990; Raimes, 1985; Scarcella, 1984; Zainuddin, 1995). The dearth of research on the topic limits the comprehensive understanding of how L2 writers' sense of audience comes into play in writing. Little research has been conducted to answer how Korean graduate students envision adequate audiences and audiences' expectations when they write *in English* in their academic disciplines.

Thus, the present study aims to examine first-year graduate students' considerations of audiences for their English academic writing and how their conceptualizations of the

writer-audience relationships influence their writing behaviors. Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: What types of audience do first-year graduate student writers consider for their English academic writing?

RQ2: How do first-year graduate student writers conceptualize their audiences' expectations?

RQ3: How do first-year graduate student writers' conceptualizations of audiences and audiences' expectations influence their writing behaviors?

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

This section presents a brief review of literature on (a) theoretical considerations on the meanings of audience, (b) empirical research findings on the audience roles in writing, and (c) student writers' learning to write in their academic disciplines.

1. Audience

The notion of audience has a broad spectrum of meanings (Babin & Harrison, 1999). Classical rhetoricians such as Aristotle and Plato considered the audience as referring to a group of specific, known individuals to whom an orator must adapt. In order to better persuade the audiences, a good orator should accurately analyze their characteristics such as age, gender, social class, and opinions about a specific issue (Aristotle, 1926). In the 1960s, modern composition scholars began to place emphasis on the rhetorical situation and attended to the audience concept as a key component of rhetorical situation. In this vein, Burke (1969) advocates the term of *identification* as expanding the traditional notion of *persuasion*. While *persuasion* was conceived as the writer's explicit, intentional strategies to persuade specific, known audiences, *identification* was described as the writer's semi-conscious processes of "causing the audience to identify itself with the speaker's interest" (Burke, 1969, p. 46).

Ong (1975) is among the first to explore the conceptual meanings of audience, declaring that "the writer's audience is always a fiction" (p. 9). He argues that audience exists only in the writer's imagination. According to Ong, in successful writing, the writer must fictionalize an audience as a role player in relation to the writer himself/herself; the writer casts his/her audience in a particular role by employing various textual cues and the reader takes on the role. Long (1980) extends Ong's (1975) argument, suggesting that the writer's decisions create "a very specific reader who exists only for the duration of the reading experiences" (p. 225). He criticizes that the traditional emphasis on audience analysis only

leads to a lifeless, stereotyped view of readers. Instead, Long ascertains, students writers should be encouraged to create audience of their own accord.

Ede and Lunsford (1984) summarize that the traditional discussions on audience are diverged into 'audience addressed' and 'audience invoked.' Yet they criticize both perspectives for oversimplifying the act of making meaning through written discourse. Ede and Lunsford argue that the 'audience addressed' fails to recognize the critical importance of the writer's role and the composing process as the writer's internal dialogue (i.e., the writer-as-reader); the 'audience invoked,' on the contrary, overemphasizes the writer's power and devalues real readers' influences on text.

Beyond such traditional conceptual conflicts in the audience, Park (1986) postulates the audience as being inscribed in the social context for discourse. Park suggests that when writers attend to audience, they actually attempt to know the institution or social relationship of the writer and audience, the discourse function in that relationship, the physical setting for writing, and a set of attitudes and knowledge about the subject matter. This view highlights that the audience concept is related to the discourse modes that a particular discourse community generates and sanctions.

However, such social view of audience tends to fail to adequately recognize the two essential aspects of audience: (a) individual writers' internal processes of constructing the reader for their texts in response to given writing tasks and situations, and (b) a group of living people who actually read a text, and their expectations to the text. As Tomlinson (1990) suggests, even among expert members of a discourse community, the definitions and expectations of good writing are widely heterogeneous and vary. In this vein, Tomlinson brings to our attention the powerful effect of real readers on writing. She suggests that those real readers such as editors, dissertation committees, or grant committees, can exert the powerful authority over the writer. Tomlinson advises the student writers to enlist feedback from varied readers from within- and cross-discipline.

As briefly discussed above, the meanings of audience have been broad yet elusive from diverse theoretical perspectives. Despite its conceptual elusiveness, the role of audience in writing has been supported indisputably.

2. The Roles of Audience in Writing

Examinations of written texts have revealed the writers' conceptualization of audience as marked by syntactic and stylistic markers (Crowhurst, 1978; Crowhurst & Piché, 1979; Rubin & Piché, 1979; Smith & Swan, 1978). These studies suggested that writers manipulate linguistic and rhetorical devices differentially for different types of audience. The writers' choices of linguistic and rhetorical devices can reflect their understanding of audience as well (Hyland, 2001; Krause & O'Brien, 2000). Explorations on composing

process have further suggested that writers' mental representations of audience are not static but multiple and varied, evolving themselves through the phases of writing. The audiences in the writers' minds influence and are influenced by the processes in which they explore the topic, invent new ideas, and evaluate the texts (Berkenkotter, 1981; Roth, 1987).

Specifically, there are some studies that have proposed the writers' projected audience types or the writer-audience relationships as influencing their composing strategies (Hayes, Durham, Brandt, & Raitz, 1990; Berkenkotter, 1981; Kirsh, 1990). In his study with ten expert writers' composing processes, Berkenkotter (1981) suggests that the participants differed in the ways that they conceptualized their relationships with the audiences (e.g., authoritative author versus uninformed audience or subordinate author versus skeptical/hostile audience). The participants utilized different writing strategies in response to the different types of the writer-audience relationship. Similarly, Kirsch (1990) reports that the writers in her study displayed diverse writing behaviors corresponding to their audience representations for their writing. The writer who represented 'skeptical audience' spent significantly more time in evaluating his/her text (31% of the time) than did the writer who represented 'friendly but uninformed audience' (22% of the time). Hayes et al. (1990) also suggest that the writers with 'hostile audience' invested significantly more time in responding to potential challenge from their audience than did the writers with 'friendly audience.'

The interactional effects of L2 writers' audience specification and linguistic proficiency on writing were also investigated. Raimes (1985) examines how the specification of audience and purpose of writing affected unskilled L2 writers' behaviors. The participants were asked to think-aloud into a tape recorder while they were composing the assigned topic. Half of the participants were assigned to a topic with no specification of audience or purpose (Topic A), whereas the other half of the participants were given a similar topic with specified audience and purpose (Topic B). Results of the compose-aloud protocol analyses indicated that the specification of audience and purpose made no distinctive difference to the students' writing processes and products. For these unskilled L2 writers, the effectiveness in communication with readers was a rather secondary concern because they were more likely absorbed in expressing their ideas in English. This result suggests that the writer's linguistic proficiency level may counterbalance the influence of his/her sense of audience on writing.

3. Learning to Write in an Academic Discipline

There are some studies that address the issue of how L2 writers construct their sense of audience. Mangelsdorf, Roen, and Taylor (1990) report that the L2 writers constructed

their sense of audience based on peer responses to their essays and their own observations of the contexts surrounding their potential audiences, such as newspapers, televisions, and a U.S. university. Johns (1993) illustrates how successful L2 writers obtain an accurate understanding of specific audiences and accommodate their expectations. The grant writers began their writing process by attempting to discover whether their proposed research was consistent with the current trends in the discipline. The grant writers also reviewed recently accepted grant proposals and current journals, conversed with other researchers, and talked to members of granting agencies 'in the know.' In this way, they obtained useful tips for an ideal, generalized audience of peer reviewers within the discourse community. Subsequently, the grant writers were able to narrow their conceptualizations of audience to the reviewers in a particular granting agency by reading the reviewers' recent papers and conference abstracts. In short, Johns' (1993) study strongly suggests that L2 student writers need to learn discipline-specific expectations about the textual and argumentative structures of academic writing tasks.

Studies investigating the graduate students' disciplinary socialization process have also provided insight into how graduate students develop their adequate constructs of audience for their disciplinary communities. The findings from these studies have suggested that student writers' mastery of academic writing styles results from their learning of the beliefs, conventions, and values endorsed by their academic disciplines (Bazerman, 1980, 1985; Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Berkenkotter et al., 1988; Dudley-Evans, 1991; Hyland, 2000; Eunpyo Lee & SeungWon Park, 2008). When newcomers are initiated into a discourse community, they need to acquire community-specific discourse, or what their fellow community members consider as prominent issues, relevant arguments, and appropriate linguistic choices (Bizzell, 1982). Dudley-Evans (1991) suggests that the supervisors' comments on drafts of a Ph.D. student instantiate the existence of a discourse community and the community-specific expectations about the content, language, and structure of academic writing. The graduate student has become socialized into those community-specific expectations through his supervisor's comments.

Casanave (1995) and Prior (1998) suggest that L2 writers' modes of participation into a discourse community influence their appropriation of the community-specific discourse. Casanave (1995) explores how a culturally diverse group of first-year doctoral students are socialized into a sociology discipline. The 18 month-long ethnographic study reveals that the students' previous literacy practices, personal interests, convictions, and values influenced the modes of their participations into the discipline and as a result, their disciplinary academic writing tasks. Prior (1998) reconstructs the trajectories of two international students' participating in their disciplinary community over time. The two focal students (Mai and Teresa) showed drastically different developmental paths in their processes of writing theses. Specifically, Mai was involved in very limited range of

interactions with faculty members and peers. She worked on her thesis in isolation. In contrast, Teresa actively sought feedback on her proposal from diverse sources both in- and out of class. Different modes of participation were reflected in the final texts of students. The final thesis of Teresa revealed a deep intertextuality, thorough analyses, and clear presentations while Mai's final thesis revealed large traces of plagiarism.

In sum, these studies suggest that L2 writers' modes of participation into a discourse community and relationships with people importantly contribute to their socialization into the community-specific discourse, which enables the writers to assess their readers and reader expectations for a given writing task.

III. METHODOLOGY

1. Participants

Eight graduate students voluntarily participated in the study. They were all female, majoring in English education. They had just completed their first semester in a graduate program. During the semester, they took a course with the researcher and submitted a literature review paper as part of their course requirement. The course was a graduate seminar in which students explored major theoretical perspectives and research traditions in L2 learning and teaching. In order to reduce possible biases resulting from the students' knowledge of the study purpose, they were simply informed that the current investigation concerned English academic writing. Overall, the ages of the participants ranged from mid. 20s to early 30s. Their English proficiency levels, as reflected by TOEIC scores, were all advanced. They had taught English in various institutional settings in Korea. The participants' background information is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Participants' Background Information

Name	Age	TOEIC	Post-College Academic Experiences	Post-College English Writing
Sammy	26-30	951-990	ELP	None
Yoona	NI	NI	ELP; studied in an U.S. college	business letters/emails
Mirae	26-30	NI	ELP; studied in an U.S. college	None
Byul	26-30	900-950	ELP	None
Jean	31-35	900-950	None	None
Yeon	26-30	951-990	ELP	None
Aerin	21-25	951-990	ELP	None
Namu	26-30	951-990	None	business letters/contracts

Note. NI indicates 'not identified'; ELP refers to a short-term English language program; a pseudonym is used for each participant to preserve her anonymity.

2. Data Collection Procedures

The data collection procedures for the current study included (a) text-analyzing reader-oriented metadiscourse items in the students' writing samples, (b) conducting 1st interviews, (c) inviting the students in an on-line discussion, and (d) conducting 2nd interviews. Each procedure is detailed in the following.

1) Text-Analyzing Reader-Oriented Metadiscourse Items in the Students' Academic Papers

The eight pieces of literature review comprising the total sample of academic writing for the current study varied in topic but all concerned the issues in English language teaching including English immersion program, English grammar teaching, and learner motivation. In order to examine the ways that the participants' considerations on audience are manifested through textual devices, an initial text analysis was performed to search reader-oriented metadiscourse items suggested by Hyland (2000). According to Hyland (2000), the five categories of reader-oriented metadiscourse items serve to maintain the interactive and interpersonal relations between writer and audience in text. Table 2 presents the five categories and examples from the students' papers for each category.

TABLE 2

Reader-Oriented Metadiscourse Categories and Examples (adopted from Hyland, 2000, p. 553)

Metadiscourse Items	Functions	Examples from the students' papers
Questions	Solicit agreement from audience	*Then what was the limitation of the study?*
Inclusive first person, indefinite, and second person pronouns	Create solidarity with audience Evoke a shared sense of knowledge, goals, and values	At this stage, *we* may assume that NESTs have a great advantage for teaching the target language culture.
Directives and adjectival predicates controlling a complement to-clause	Directly appeal to audience for the importance or necessity of a certain argument	*(M)uch attention should be given to those who lack an appropriate educational support.*
References to shared knowledge	Create credibility by relying on shared knowledge, goals, and values	**The obviously correct relation between these two lengths is a = b.*
Asides addressed to the reader	Emphasize intimacy with audience	*And – *as I believe many TESOL professionals will readily acknowledge* – critical thinking has now begun to make its mark...

Note. * indicates that the example was drawn from Hyland (2000) because none was found in the current study data.

To utilize results of the metadiscourse analysis as the basis for the 1st interviews, the researcher highlighted the sentences including reader-oriented metadiscourse items in each

student's paper, and wrote a couple of alternative expressions for each sentence in the margin of the paper. To ensure the accuracy of categorization, the process of search and coding for each writing sample was performed more than twice. Table 3 presents the results of the metadiscourse analysis and related information on the student papers.

TABLE 3

Metadiscourse and Other Information on the Students' Writing Samples

Participant	Total Words	Citations	Questions	We/You	Directives	Shared knowledge	Asides addressed
Sammy	3721	48	1	0	0	0	0
Yoona	3467	17	0	1	4	0	0
Mirae	3527	22	1	10	1	0	0
Byul	2785	17	4	1	0	0	0
Jean	3364	39	2	8	0	0	0
Yeon	2565	14	0	2	1	0	0
Aerin	4238	35	3	0	0	0	0
Namu	2978	46	3	0	0	0	0

Note. Total words = the number of total words in the paper; citations = the number of citations used in the body of the paper.

2) Interviewing about the Participants' Considerations on Audience

Each interview session consisted of both a semi-structured interview and a discourse-based interview. The semi-structured interview questions included (a) Did you consider any readers when you were planning, drafting, and revising this paper?, (b) What did you think the readers would expect for your paper?, and (c) What did you do to accommodate the readers' expectations in your writing? Subsequently, the discourse-based interviews (Odell, Goswami, & Herrington, 1983) were conducted to probe into the writers' audience considerations underlying their textual choices. Based on the sentences including reader-oriented metadiscourse items in each student's paper, the interview questions included (a) Why did you use this word/phrase/structure here?, (b) To whom did you address this phrase/sentence?, and complementarily (c) How do you like if this sentence is replaced by this alternative one? Each interview was conducted face-to-face in Korean and lasted about 40 minutes to an hour. The entire interview session was audio-tape recorded and transcribed verbatim for analysis.

3) Inviting the Participants to an On-Line Discussion to Raise Their Audience Awareness

The researcher set up an on-line discussion for the students on the issues regarding (a) To whom should you write when you write in English for a graduate course? and (b) What

expectations would the readers have for good academic writing and what should you do to accommodate their expectations in your texts? This on-line discussion was aimed to raise the participants' consciousness of audience for their writing. Each participant responded to the questions in Korean more than twice. The researcher also participated in the discussion by adding comments, requesting a clarification/elaboration for their responses, and raising questions. The discussion continued for a week. Upon completing the on-line discussion, the researcher asked each student to decide on the adequate scope of and images for audience for her original paper. Then they were also asked to revise parts of their papers in the ways that they could engage their decided audience the most effectively.

4) Interviewing about the Participants' Decided Audiences and Partial Revisions

Each student, again, was interviewed about her decided audiences and revisions of her original paper. The 2nd interviews were conducted to examine the effects of the students' raised awareness of audience on their textual adaptations. The interview questions included (a) Who did you decide as the most adequate readers for your paper and why did you decide so? and (b) Why did you change this word/phrase/structure? Each interview was also conducted face-to-face in Korean and lasted about 20~30 minutes. The entire interview session was audio-tape recorded and later transcribed verbatim for analysis.

3. Data Analyses

The 16 interview transcripts (eight participants, each interviewed twice) were analyzed to identify themes or core ideas recurrent in the data. As suggested by Merriam (1998), and Miles and Huberman (1994), researcher developed themes and categories from the interview data. Through repeated, comprehensive perusal of the entire interview transcripts, the researcher sorted out the responses which were most relevant to the writers' conceptualization of, and adaptation to, audience, which are the focus of the current investigation. Subsequently, each student's interview responses for each time point were separately analyzed in order to compare possible patterns and regularities in themes from each other. Then, by cross-checking the initial themes from each students' responses, the researcher constituted a master list of themes across the entire data set. Finally, the researcher developed categories to describe the themes. In this process, the researcher continually referred back to the raw data to ensure that her conclusions accurately reflected the information from the data. In discussing the results of data analyses, parts of the original verbatim transcripts were translated into English for the presentation purpose.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Three main themes on the writers' considerations on and adaptations to audiences emerged from the analyses of the interview data: (a) audience determinateness, (b) the writer's positioning in relation to audience, and (c) audience specification. These three main themes are closely interrelated to each other and thus, the discussion on each theme should be read in reference to the others.

TABLE 4

Domains and Categories of the Korean Students' Considerations on Audiences

Domain/Theme	Category	Content
Audience Determinateness	Professor-Evaluator	A real reader; represents the discipline-specific expectations on the arguments and structures.
	Extended Self-Projection	Invoked readers; establishes real purposes and motivation for writing.
	General, Indeterminate Audience	Textually implied readers; guides the writers to utilize general textual devices for audience adaptation.
The Writer's Positioning in relation to Audience	Authoritative Audience versus	Creates the writers' motivations to demonstrate their knowledge, depth of thinking, and English writing skills.
	Friendly/Uninformed Audience	Creates the writers' motivations to provide useful information for and educate audience
	Audience as Addressee versus	Those to whom the writer addresses her arguments in the text.
	Audience as Beneficiary	Those whose interest the writer intend to serve through writing
Audience Specification	Broad/Vague	Vague notion of audience and audience expectation; the writer generates limited content materials.
	Specified/Clear	Clear, specific notion of audience and audience expectation; the writer generates rich content materials and consider audience needs from multiple angles.

1. Audience Determinateness

'Audience determinateness' is Rubin's (1984) term indicating that "the audience lies along a continuum ranging from a single determinate other to a generalized other" (p. 237). An inquiry into the participants' initial considerations on audience revealed that all eight participants had considered multiple audiences for their writing. When asked whether they had thought of any readers for their writing, five participants (Byul, Sammy, Aerin, Namu, Yeon) reported having considered the professor-evaluator, the writer herself, and/or indeterminate people who might have interest in the subjects of their papers. The rest three participants (Yoona, Jean, Mirae) responded that they had considered the professor-

evaluator only as the reader. However, a careful examination of the participants' responses as well as their uses of the reader-oriented metadiscourse items suggested that all eight participants had unwittingly presumed the presences of more or less determinate audiences for their writing. Overall, the audiences emerged from the participants' responses were identified as the following three types in terms of its determinateness: (a) professor-evaluator as a real reader (determinate other), (b) audience as an extended self-projection (intermediate determinateness), and (c) general, indeterminate audience (non-specified audience).

1) Professor-Evaluator as a Real Reader

At the 1st interviews, all eight participants affirmed their awareness of the presence of the professor-evaluator as a real reader. Yet the degrees to which each participant considered the professor and her expectation differed from one another. Specifically, five participants (Aerin, Yeon, Mirae, Jean, Byul) stated that they had been consciously aware of the presence of the professor and had deliberately considered her expectations on the given writing task. For these five participants, the professor-evaluator served as a leverage to demand a high quality of argument and structure of their papers.

(1) Yeon, 1st interview:
Thinking of [the professor] gave me a headache ... I worried if [she] might regard my paper as so poor. ... I thought that the professor would care the most about whether the paper would reveal my in-depth of thinking on the subject.
(2) Mirae, 1st interview:
Since this is a final term paper. ... I thought that the professor would want to see how much knowledge I had acquired during the semester.
(3) Jean, 1st interview:
(In consideration of the professor's expectations), I tried to make my paper sound more academic ... I revised words and structures in more academic ways. ... I made the topic and the content well connected with each other, ... included sufficient references ... maintained the focus of the subject throughout the paper.

Unlike the five participants above, the rest three writers (Namu, Yoona, Sammy) took a more relaxed approach to the presence of the professor. They made only limited effort to accommodate the professor's expectations. For these writers, the existence of the professor seemed as extraneous to the real business of writing.

(4) Namu, 1st interview:
All I did for the professor was to make my writing a bit more succinct ... because she would not need a detailed explanation.
(5) Yoona, 1st interview:
Since the professor must have read various papers, I thought she would understand it even when I am a little vague in my paper.

Previous studies on graduate students' disciplinary socialization have suggested that the students' academic supervisors represented for the students the discipline-specific expectations on argumentative and textual structures (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Dudley-Evans, 1991). At least for the five participants in the current study, the presence of the professor also influenced them to consider some important aspects of disciplinary academic writing. However, because that the participants had just completed their first semester in a graduate program, their conceptualizations of the professor's expectations were not fully developed enough to reflect the disciplinary values and norms.

2) Audience as an Extended Self-Projection

At the 1st interviews, five participants (Sammy, Yeon, Namu, Aerin, Byul) reported having written for the writer herself and/or some potential readers who might have interest in the subjects of their papers. This type of audience is what Ede and Lunsford (1984) refer to as 'audience invoked.' Of interesting is that this type of audience somewhat reflected the students' own current statuses, career experiences, and aspirations. For example, Sammy described her audience as "just English teachers... those who are first-year TESOL master's students *like me*." Similarly, Yeon explained her audience as "those who want to become balanced bilinguals ... *like me*." Even Byul, who was the most explicit about her intention of having writing to/for English teachers, described her 'English teachers' as closely reflecting her own backgrounds and aspirations (i.e., an English teacher who had been teaching adult learners and who had interest in teacher quality).

In this sense, this type of audience seems more or less a projection of the writer's own self or her extended self. The audience as an extended self-projection seems to function to help the writers generate content material and make a decision on what information they should or should not include in their papers. Byul's remark below suggests a differential audience function between the professor-evaluator and the audience as an extended self-projection.

(6) Byul, 1st interview:

The professors are likely to evaluate the paper for how well organized it is and how clearly it delivers the information. ... English teachers? ... They will care about the content ... they will read the paper because they need some information for themselves.

There should be raised an important question as to whether and how adequately the audience as an extended self-projection represents the target academic disciplinary community. If the writer's envisioned audience fails to represent his/her target discourse community members, his/her written product will also fail to reflect the target community-sanctioned discourse. In fact, the four participants' descriptions of their audiences included 'English teachers' (Sammy, Yeon, Byul) and 'graduate students' (Sammy), but none of expert members of the participants' disciplinary community such as teachers-researchers, other professors, curriculum developers, journal reviewers, or the discipline of English education. When probed further into their conceptualizations of the most adequate audiences for their writing in their discipline, all eight participants included some expert members of the discipline such as thesis committee members, other professors, researchers and scholars in English education. The participants' remarks below suggest that they managed to reach the concept of 'discipline' and 'disciplinary audience' but they still felt distant from those audiences.

(7) Sammy, 1st interview:

I might have to consider the thesis committee members as readers when I write my thesis. But I'm just a beginner student. So I guess I haven't reached that stage yet.

(8) Mirae, 1st interview:

Wouldn't the professor be the most important? ... Yet when I write a thesis, I think I should include other researchers and scholars as my readers.

The novice graduate students seem to constitute their audiences primarily based on their current statuses, interest, needs, and previous experiences. The students' conceptualizations of audience are likely to evolve into their disciplinary members as they themselves have acquired the disciplinary community memberships (Berkenkotter, Huckin, & Ackerman, 1988; Casanave, 1995; Dudley-Evans, 1991; Prior, 1998).

At the 2nd interviews following the on-line discussions regarding adequate audiences and audience adaptation strategies for academic writing, four participants (Mirae, Sammy, Jean, Aerin) counted professionals in English education as their audiences. However, their partial revisions on their drafts did not reveal any visible evidence for their deliberate attempts to accommodate those disciplinary audiences. This indicates that the writer's raised consciousness on the disciplinary audience itself does not necessarily guarantee

his/her successful textual manipulations for audience adaptation. Or it is also possible that the participants' revisions were made only partially, which was not sufficient enough to reveal the writers' efforts to adapt to their audiences.

3) General, Indeterminate Audience

The participants' explanations about their uses of reader-oriented metadiscourse items in their papers revealed their considerations of another, more abstract type of audience, so called, general, indeterminate audience. For example, when asked about to whom she intended to direct a rhetorical question in her paper, Jean answered, "just readers, I guess. … I had no specific intention to address this question to the professor. … Well, this is a paper and there is supposed to be someone who reads it." Jean's remark taps into the writer's implicit understanding of the socio-communicative nature of writing. Even when the writer does not have specific information about his/her audience, the writer can produce a relatively coherent prose because the writer can suppose a general, indeterminate audience (Kirsch, 1990). The existence of this general, indeterminate audience is most often implied in the text through the writer's use of cohesion/coherence markers and interactive structures (Thrall, Blyler, & Ewald, 1988). The examples (9) and (10) suggest that how the notion of general, indeterminate audience is textually implied in the students' writing samples.

(9) Yeon, 1st interview:

Metadiscourse item from the writing sample: *As we looked through the literature review, it is not recommended to focus on Form ~*

Researcher: Whom did you refer to as '*we*' here?

Yeon: It's more like people in our field ... well, it's just 'readers,' I guess, those who have examined [the topic] along with me through this paper.

(10) Namu, 1st interview:

Metadiscourse item from the writing sample: *Will the shift in the government's policy result in an improvement in students' communicative competence?*

Researcher: To whom do you think you addressed this question?

Namu: I just thought this question would help those who were reading my paper better understand what I tried to say … I guess I was thinking of 'readers' here.

As suggested by Thrall, Blyler, and Ewald (1988), the writers' implicit notion of general, indeterminate audience seems to guide them to employ various textual devices such as attention gathering and textual coherence. For example, the participants reported having used a rhetorical question to gather audience's attention (Sammy), to highlight her main

argument (Mirae), and to make a coherent transition from the introduction to the body (Jean).

As a way of summarizing the domain of audience determinateness, the novice graduate student writers in the current study considered mainly three types of audience, as distinguished based on its determinateness. Interestingly, each type of audience seems to operate on the different and hierarchical levels of writing. Specifically, the professor-evaluator influenced the writers to consider the disciplinary values on argumentative and textual structures; the audience as an extended self-projection helped the writers generate the content material and decide on what information to be included in their papers; finally, the general, indeterminate audience guided the writers to produce a coherent piece of written work through general audience adaptation strategies.

2. The Writer's Positioning in Relation to Audience

The participants' positioning in relation to audience differed in terms of (a) the power or expertise differential and (b) the writing purpose. Two types of the writer's positioning were identified from the data: (a) authoritative audience versus friendly/uninformed audience and (b) audience as addressee versus audience as beneficiary.

1) Authoritative Audience versus Friendly/Uninformed Audience

The distinction between authoritative versus friendly/uninformed audience was made based on the power differential between the writer and audience. For example, the professor-evaluator had more authority over and expertise in the subject knowledge. The writers' motivations for writing in response to the authoritative audience were mainly the *demonstration* of their knowledge and skills through writing. Specifically, five participants (Yeon, Aerin, Byul, Mirae, Jean) reported that they had thought the professor would evaluate their papers for the rich information and the structural clarity.

(11) Yeon, 1st interview:
I thought the professor would see if I had really thought through the subject.
(12) Byul, 1st interview:
I thought the professor would care the most about how well the paper organizes the information.
… So, I tried to write as clearly as possible.

The audience as an extended self-projection was conceptualized as friendly and less informed on the given subjects matters. Specifically, five participants (Sammy, Mirae, Byul, Yeon, Namu) reported that they had considered their audiences to expect to obtain useful

information from their papers. Not surprisingly, the writers' primary motivations for writing in response to their friendly/uninformed audiences were to provide useful information, and persuade and educate them. As suggested by Byul's remark below, the friendly/uninformed audience functions to create more genuine and real communicative purposes for the writers than does the authoritative audience.

(13) Byul, 1st interview:
I had no idea of what to write about until I came to think about 'English teachers' and what information they would need to know.

In short, the friendly/uninformed audience can help the writer establish the genuine, real communicative purpose of writing while the authoritative audience serves as sort of a referee who may judge the quality of argumentative contents and structures. It should be noted, however, that the friendly/uninformed audience may turn out inadequate for disciplinary academic readers (Berkentkotter, 1981). For example, Sammy with no consideration of the professor as a real reader decided to include in her paper several lengthy summaries of empirical studies. She explained that she had figured it would be informative for her invoked audience (i.e., "the graduate students like herself"). Unfortunately, the professor's perspectives on the inclusion of the lengthy summaries were that it was unnecessary and only interrupted the focus of the paper. Similarly, Byul who wrote mainly for 'English teachers' failed to secure the professor's favorable judgment because Byul's paper was evaluated as informative but less argumentative and analytical.

Such conflicts may be resolved when these novice graduate students can conceptualize the disciplinary members including the professor(s) as *collegial* audience. The collegial, disciplinary audiences could serve both as genuine audience and referees.

2) Audience as Addressee versus Audience as Beneficiary

Audience as addressee and audience as beneficiary are distinguished in terms of whether the writer writes *for* or *to* audience. The audience as addressee refers to those *to whom* the writer addresses their arguments in the text. Among the examples of the audience as addresses is the textually implied general audience (all eight writers). On the other hand, the audience as beneficiary refers to those *whose interest* writers aim to serve through writing. Yeon's "those who want to become balanced bilinguals" is an example of audience as beneficiary. The audience as addressee is often identical to or broader than the audience as beneficiary. For Byul, the audience as addressee and the audience as beneficiary were identical (i.e., "English teachers working with adult learners"). In Jean's paper, "nonnative English speaking teachers" was the audience as beneficiary, yet the audience as addressee

("all English teaching professionals") was broad enough to include the audience as beneficiary.

Problems can occur when writers confuse 'beneficiary' with 'addressee.' For example, for Yeon, "those who want to become balanced bilinguals" was, in fact, the people whose interest she aimed to serve by suggesting the importance of grammar in attaining not only oral but also written English proficiency. Yet, the main arguments and focus of Yeon's paper were devoted to presenting effective grammar teaching methods to "English grammar teachers." This confusion resulted in the abrupt shift in the focus of her paper. In Yeon's paper, the introduction develops the rationales for how grammar knowledge can serve "those who want to become balanced bilinguals" and then the remainder of the paper was devoted to presenting more effective grammar teaching methods. As indicated by Yeon's case, when student writers fail to clearly define their positioning in relationship between the subject and audience, they may fail to maintain the focus of their writing.

3. Audience Specification

Audience specification represents whether or not the writers specify their audience adequately. Under this domain, one category of adequate versus insufficient appraisal was identified. At the 2nd interviews, all the participants reported their decisions on their intended audiences. For most of the participants, the audiences they had in mind did not differ much between the two time points of interviewing. Among them, Byul reported that she had specified her original 'English teachers' audience, and this audience specification prompted her to further assess her 'English teachers' audience expectation.

(14) Byul, 2nd interview:
At the 1st interview, I said I always tried to consider my readers… but after the interview, I realized that I should have been more concrete and specific about my readers. I defined my readers more specifically as those English teachers who concerned their interactions with the adult students. That helped me decide what information I should include in my paper.

Similarly, Jean reported that after the 1st interview, she had a more specified notion of her audience. At the 1st interview, Jean reported having considered no readers other than the professor. Upon her own re-reading of the paper, she felt that her paper might be read as if it were written for the general public. Considering that the main argument of her paper concerned 'how the field of English education should view the NNES teachers' professional identity,' she specified her audience as 'the professionals and teachers in English education.' Taken together, as the writers' representations of audience become specified, they can assess the audience's needs and expectations more adequately, which

possibly leads to provide more tuned information and arguments for the audience.

As a summary of the study findings, the current study investigated eight first-year graduate students' considerations on audience for their English academic writing and how their conceptualizations of audience's expectation influence their writing behaviors. In response to RQ1 (types of audience), the study findings suggest that the students considered multiple types of audience for their writing. In terms of audience determinateness, the students conceptualized three types of audience including (a) the professor-evaluator, (b) the audience as an extended self-projection, and (c) general, indeterminate audience. Based on the writer's positioning in relation to audience, the writers' conceptualized audience types were distinguished into (a) authoritative audience versus friendly/uninformed audience and (b) audience as addressee versus audience as beneficiary. Pertaining to RQ2 (audiences' expectations), different audience types were associated with differential audience expectations. Specifically, the professor-evaluator or authoritative audience represented the discipline-specific expectations on arguments and structures of academic writing. This type of audience created the demand for the writers to demonstrate their knowledge, depth of thinking, and English writing skills. The audience as an extended self-projection or friendly/uninformed audience was associated with the expectation on the usefulness of the content material. The general, indeterminate audience guided the writers to utilize general textual devices for clarity, coherence, and attention gathering. Lastly, concerning RQ3 (writers' behaviors), the students reported having attempted to accommodate their audience expectations in their texts. Some evidence from the students' writing samples including the students' uses of metadiscourse items and their decisions on the content materials (e.g., Sammy's lengthy summaries of empirical articles) also suggested the influences of the writers' audience conceptualizations on their textual choices. However, the student writers' raised consciousness on audience through the on-line discussions showed no substantial influence on their revisions of the original papers, indicating that the writer's raised consciousness on audience does not guarantee their successful accommodation of audience expectations in their texts.

V. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Several limitations of the current study should be noted. First of all, the sample size was small. Some selection bias was also entailed since all the participants were highly advanced in their English proficiency levels. Differential findings might be drawn from the student writers with low/intermediate English proficiency levels.

Another limitation pertains to the research design. In this study, no data regarding the audience considerations of native English speaking writers and Korean students with low

English proficiency levels was available. Therefore, this study could not provide empirical evidence regarding how student writers' senses of audience differ depending on nationality and English proficiency levels. In addition, the study findings and discussions mainly relied on the interviews with the student writers because the researcher failed to motivate the participants to revise their original papers sufficiently enough to reflect their updated audience conceptualizations. Only small portion of evidence was drawn from their actual writing samples. Given that the participants' self reports do not necessarily reflect their actual writing behaviors, the links between the writers' conceptualizations of audience and their textual accommodation of audience are established to only a limited extent.

Furthermore, the researcher was the only coder for the interview data. No inter-coder reliability coefficient was calculated, as is typical for qualitative interview data analysis. Yet, the utilization of multiple coders would strengthen the reliability of the data analyses and interpretations. In addition, parts of interview data were translated into English for the presentation purpose in this study. It should be noted that translation inherently bears the risk of impairing some subtle meaning and nuances in the participants' original responses.

VI. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The study findings support the previous research results that the writer's representations of audience are multiple (Roth, 1987) and lie along a continuum from determinate to general one (Rubin, 1984). The present study findings further suggest that each audience type seems to operate on differential aspect of writing. Specifically, the presence of the professor-evaluator can demand discipline-based academic norms on student writing (Dudley-Evans, 1991). However, first-year graduate student writers may not fully appreciate their professors representing the disciplinary values and expectations on given writing tasks. Instructors may help the novice graduate students be more explicitly aware of their expectations on the assigned writing tasks. Direct, yet non-threatening feedback on the students' early drafts or in-class discussion on their discipline-specific expectations on the given writing tasks can be of help (Eunpyo Lee & Seungwon Park, 2008; Tomlinson, 1990). Peer reviews and feedback can also help students raise their awareness on various audience expectations (Prior, 1998; Proschaska, 2005; Tomlinson, 1990).

The audience as an extended self-projection establishes the writer's purpose and motivation for writing. Yet, caution should be warranted for novice student writers overly relying on the audience as a self-projection. Given this type of audience tends to mirror the writers' own developmental statuses, it may fail to inform disciplinary newcomers of the disciplinary community's expectations. The instructors may help their students articulate their envisioned audience and potential differences in their expectations on given writing

tasks between their envisioned audience and expert members of their disciplines.

The study findings also suggest the influential roles of the writer-audience relationships. On the one hand, authoritative audience may serve as a referee who can demand higher quality of arguments and structures, but fail to provide the real communicative purpose for the writer. Friendly/uninformed audience, on the other hand, can establish a more genuine, real communicative purpose for the writer but disservice the writer to engage in an argumentative, analytical mode of writing. It would be of instructive to have the writers to practice articulating to whom they intend to address their arguments,' 'whose interest they could serve by writing,' and 'the relationship between the subject and audience.' The student writers' confusion between potential beneficiaries and their intended audience as addressees might result in the inconsistent focus of their writing. As the writers become clear about their positioning in relationship with audience and subject, their audience is most likely to become more specified and lively.

In closing, the study findings confirm the audience primacy in writing. They further suggest the close connection between the student writer's identity as a discourse community member and his/her representations of audience. This study also calls for an investigation of the writer's perceived relationships with audience as well as his/her level of audience awareness, which could provide insight into the writer's behaviors with a specific writing task within a particular sociocultural context.

REFERENCES

Aristotle, F. J. H. (1926). *The art of rhetoric* (J. H. Freese, Trans.). Cambridge. MA. & London: Harvard University Press.

Babin, E., & Harrison, K. (1999). *Contemporary composition studies: A guide to theorists and terms*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Bazerman, C. (1980). A relationship between reading and writing: The conversational model. *College English*, *41*, 656-661.

Bazerman, C. (1985). Physicists reading physics: Schema-laden purposes and purpose-laden schema. *Written Communication*, *2*(1), 3-23.

Berkenkotter, C. (1981). Understanding a writer's awareness of audience. *College Composition and Communication*, *32*, 388-399.

Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: Cognition/culture/power*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Berkenkotter, C., Huckin, T. N., & Ackerman, J. (1988). Conventions, conversations, and the writer: Case study of a student in a rhetoric Ph.D. program. *Research in the*

Teaching English, *22*(1), 9-44.

Bizzell, P. (1982). Cognition, convention, and certainty: What we need to know about writing. *PRE/TEXT*, *3*(3), 213-243.

Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A., & Rosen, H. (1975). *The development of writing ability*. London: Macmillan.

Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (Original work published in 1950).

Burleson, B. R., & Rowen, K. E. (1985). Are socio-cognitive ability and narrative writing skills related? *Written Communication*, *2*(1), 25-43.

Casanave, C. P. (1995). Local interactions: Constructing contexts for composing in a graduate sociology program. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research & pedagogy* (pp. 83-110). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Crowhurst, M. (1978). The effect of audience and mode of discourse on the syntactic complexity of the writing of sixth and tenth graders. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *38*, 7300A-7301A.

Crowhurst, M., & Piché, G. L. (1979). Audience and mode of discourse on the syntactic complexity in writing at two grade levels. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *13*, 101-109.

Davidson, D., Emig, J., Hipple, T., Huck, C., Lindley, D. A., & Moffett, J. (1977). The future direction of English teaching: An informal discussion. In J. R. Squire (Ed.), *The teaching of English* (pp. 282-308). Chicago, IL: The National Society for the Study of Education.

Dudley-Evans, T. (1991). Socialization into the academic community: linguistic and stylistic expectations of a Ph.D. thesis as revealed by supervisor comments. In P. Adams, B. Heaton & P. Howarth (Eds.), *Socio-cultural issues in English for academic purposes* (pp. 41-51). London: Macmillan.

Ede, L., & Lunsford, A. (1984). Audience addressed/audience invoked: The role of audience in composition theory and pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication*, *35*(2), 155-171.

Flower, L. (1979). Writer-based prose: a cognitive basis for problems in writing. *College English*, *41*(1), 19-37.

Hayes, J. N., Durham, R. L., Brandt, K. S., & Raitz, A. E. (1990). A sense of audience in the argumentative writing of students at three levels of adult socio-cognitive development. In G. Kirsch & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *A sense of audience in written communication* (pp. 248-266). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Peterson Education.

Hyland, K. (2001). Bringing in the reader: Addressee features in academic articles. *Written Communication*, *18*(4), 549-574.

Johns, A. M. (1993). Written argumentation for real audiences: Suggestions for teacher research and classroom practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, *27*(1), 75-90.

Kirsch, G. (1990). Experienced writers' representations of audience: The case of three writers. In. G. Kirsch & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *A sense of audience in written communication* (pp. 318-339). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Krause, K-L., & O'Brien, D. (2000). *Adolescent Chinese writers: Juggling sociocultural influences and writing demands*. Paper presented at the conference of Australian Association for Research in Education, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved September 14, 2004, from http://www.aare.edu.au/00pap/kra00446.htm.

Kroll, B. M. (1984). Writing for readers: Three perspectives on audience. *College Composition and Communication*, *31*(2), 172-185.

Lee, Eunpyo., & Park, Seungwon. (2008). A study of the epistemic modality in college writing. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *14*(1), 45-58.

Long, R. C. (1980). Writer-audience relationships: Analysis or invention? *College Composition and Communication*, *31*(2), 221-226.

Mangelsdorf, K., Roen, D. H., & Taylor, V. (1990). ESL students' use of audience. In G. Kirsch & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *A sense of audience in written communication* (pp. 231-247). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: A source book of new methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Odell, L., Goswami, D., & Herrington, A. (1983). The discourse-based interview: A procedure for exploring the tacit knowledge of writers in nonacademic settings. In P. Mosenthal, L. Tamor & S. A. Wamsley (Eds.), *Research on writing: Principles and methods* (pp. 221-236). New York: Longman.

Ong, W. (1975). The writer's audience is always a fiction. In V. Villanueva, Jr. (Ed.) (1997), *Cross-Talk in comp theory: A reader* (pp. 55-76). Illinois: NCTE.

Park, D, B. (1986). Analyzing audiences. *College Composition and Communication*, *37*(4), 478-488.

Piché, G. L., & Roen, D. (1987). Social cognition and writing: Interpersonal cognitive complexity and abstractness and quality of students' persuasive writing. *Written Communication*, *4*(1), 68-89.

Prior, P. (1998). *Writing/Disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Prochaska, E. (2005). Korean EFL university students' evaluation of peer review

interactions: A social model for evaluating the writing process. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *11*(2), 51-66.

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled writers do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19*, 229-258.

Roth, R. G. (1987). The evolving audience: Alternatives to audience communication. *College Composition and Communication*, *38*(1), 47-55.

Rubin, D. L. (1984). Social cognition and written communication. *Written Communication*, *1*(2), 211-245.

Rubin, D. L., & Piché, G. L. (1979). Development in syntactic and strategic aspects of audience adaptation skills in written persuasive communication. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *13*(4), 293-316.

Rubin, D. L., Piché, G. L., Michlin, M. L., & Johnson, F. L. (1984). Social cognitive ability as a predictor of the quality of fourth-graders' written narratives. In R. Beach & L. Bridwell (Eds.), *Current trends in composition research* (pp. 297-307). New York: Guilford.

Scarcella, R. C. (1984). How writers orient their readers in expository essays: A comparative study of native and non-native English writers. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19*(4), 671-688.

Smith, W. L., & Swan, M. B. (1978). Adjusting syntactic structures to varied levels of audience. *Journal of Experimental Education*, *46*(4), 29-34.

Thrall, C., Blyler, N. R., & Ewald, H. R. (1988). Real readers, implied readers, and professional writers: Suggested research. *The Journal of Business Communication*, *25*(2), 47-65.

Tomlinson, B. (1990). Ong may be wrong: Negotiation with nonfictional readers. In G. Kirsch & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *A sense of audience in written communication* (pp. 85-98). Sage.

Zainuddin, H. (1995). *An exploratory study of eight ESL writers' use of audience and composing strategies across L1 and L2*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Hyun-Woo Lim
English Education, Graduate School of Education
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

270 Imun-Dong, Dongdaemun-Gu
Seoul 130-791, Korea
Tel: (02) 2173-2913
Email: hlim@hufs.ac.kr

Received in October, 2008
Reviewed in November, 2008
Revised version received in December, 2008