

Situating Reader Stance Within and Beyond the Efferent–Aesthetic Continuum

ERIC J. PAULSON

University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio

SONYA L. ARMSTRONG

Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois

The purpose of this theoretical essay is to encourage critical reflection of the relationship of specific reading events to traditional conceptualizations of reader stance. While conventional models of reader stance are useful for considering many aspects of reading, there are reading events that engender stances that appear to lie outside of the parameters of these traditional conceptualizations. In this article, we identify one such reading event, termed reading-for-the-writer, and analyze the specific point it occupies on an efferent-aesthetic continuum, a continuum that we view as more three-dimensional than linear and that includes both reader stances and writer stances. Through such analyses of specific stances, we conclude with pedagogical implications and research directions that move toward continued discussion of the interconnectedness of reading and writing processes.

Keywords efferent-aesthetic continuum, peer review, reader stance, reading-writing connections, writer stance

Reading is not a monolithic activity. The variety of texts that readers encounter—novels, grocery lists, billboards, web pages, textbooks, blogs, mortgages, essays, and the funny pages, to name a few—all require an act that is considered to be subsumed under the heading “reading,” even though the differences between those texts can be considerable. Related to the differences in text type is the variety of purposes that can drive reading processes; that is, readers read a loan application for different reasons than they read a novel while relaxing on the beach. Of course, differences in purpose are not necessarily dependent on differences in text type. A reader may read the same novel one way for pleasure reading at home, and quite another way if that novel is required for a literature class and he or she is preparing for a test in that class. A given reader with a given text can create multiple readings depending on the reader’s purpose and goals for reading, among other things.

An important aspect of that relationship between text, readers’ purposes, and the variety of readings that can and do take place is the role of reader stance (Rosenblatt, 1978, 2004). A traditional conceptualization of reader stance as a binary continuum with an efferent stance at one end and an aesthetic stance at the other has been useful for understanding several different kinds of reading activities. However, a legitimate question might be concerned with whether *all* reading activities lend themselves to stances that fit

Address correspondence to Eric J. Paulson, Associate Professor of Literacy Education, School of Education, College of Education, Criminal Justice, & Human Services, P.O. Box 210002, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0002. E-mail: eric.paulson@uc.edu

neatly into this efferent–aesthetic continuum. For that reason, it is important for literacy scholars to consider new ways to expand those traditional conceptualizations of reader stance.

Our focus in this theoretical essay is to encourage critical examination of types of reading that do not appear to engender the adoption of classical reading stances as described by Rosenblatt (1978, 2004), Harding (1937), Britton (1970), and others (e.g., Galda, 1990; Langer, 1990; Many, 2004). Specifically, one common type of reading event is focused on in this article: a reading event we call *reading-for-the-writer*, which we describe in detail in what follows. The multiple aspects of reader stance and writer stance that readers adopt during the course of this kind of reading event are analyzed, and the types of stances adopted to achieve the reader’s purpose in a reading-for-the-writer act are described and made distinct from currently delineated reader stances. Through this discussion we propose that this particular reading event—and others not well-served by traditional conceptualizations of reader stance—warrant consideration as specific points on a more three-dimensional efferent–aesthetic continuum that includes both reader stances and writer stances, as opposed to traditional conceptualizations of a seemingly linear and one-dimensional reading-specific efferent–aesthetic continuum.

A Brief Review of Stance

A reader’s stance is a reflection of the reader’s purpose for reading (Rosenblatt, 2004) and involves the reader’s expectations of a particular text and the type of interactions the reader engages in with the text. Stance may also be thought of as the attitude—literal or emotional, for example—a reader adopts in a given reading situation. Rosenblatt (1978, 2004) argued that readers perform different activities for different readings; for her, this includes the efferent (Latin for “to carry away”) stance, which involves a more literal reading with the goal of extracting information, and the aesthetic stance, which is a more emotional reading, with a focus on the journey a reader takes during the act of reading. Although stance is frequently discussed in terms of this efferent–aesthetic binary, Rosenblatt conceived of stance as involving multiple points on a one-dimensional continuum and acknowledged that a reader may adopt different stances during the reading of a single text so that a particular reading event is not necessarily exclusively efferent or exclusively aesthetic (Rosenblatt, 1978, p. 184). Building from Rosenblatt’s conception of a continuum of stances, our viewpoint is that just as reading is not a monolithic entity, neither should traditional conceptualizations of stance be assumed to inform all approaches to, and purposes for, reading.

Expanding the Continuum

Although Rosenblatt was not the first to discuss what would be called *stance* in reading—see Harding (1937), for example—her work is essential to any discussion of stance, and has provided a foundation for further explorations of the concept. In fact, Rosenblatt’s concept of an efferent–aesthetic continuum has been revisited and reconsidered numerous times, including by literacy scholars who have suggested that the continuum be modified or expanded. For example, Alexander (1997) has noted the need for a reconsideration of the motivational aspects of an efferent stance, and Lewis (2000) has suggested an expanded view of aesthetic reading. Others have suggested additions to the stance continuum: McLaughlin and DeVoogd (2004) introduced the idea of a critical stance, and Peck (1992) suggested a composite of three models.

Another notable study that expanded the typical view of the stance continuum was Langer's (1990) examination of student reading approaches, which suggested four recursive stances that readers adopt: *Being Out and Stepping into an Envisionment*, *Being In and Moving Through an Envisionment*, *Stepping Back and Rethinking What One Knows*, and *Stepping Out and Objectifying the Experience*. While Rosenblatt's aesthetic and efferent stances have sometimes been associated with particular types of texts—literary and factual, respectively—Langer provided compelling evidence that all four of these stances exist easily in both literary and factual texts, although there are important differences in the nature of the stance across texts and readings. It is possible that what Langer referred to as differences in orientation within a stance, depending on whether the reader's initial decision was to treat the text as either literary or informative (1990, p. 252), could be thought of as a “stance within a stance.” Langer's and others' work offers support for Rosenblatt's point that while texts do provide clues to the reader about what stance to adopt—for example, basic genre knowledge informs us that a poem is typically read aesthetically and a cookbook is usually read efferently—stance is not tied exclusively or directly to particular kinds of texts. In other words, a reader can read a given text aesthetically, efferently, or both.

Distinctions in Stance

In *The Reader, the Text, and the Poem* (1978), Rosenblatt described efferent and aesthetic readings as being as much about the reader as about the text, noting that “the reader performs very different activities during aesthetic and nonaesthetic readings” (p. 23). Her discussion of this idea centered on what the reader attends to while reading, and she made use of William James' ideas of selective attention and how differences in attention to different aspects of potential evocations of the text are what constitute major distinctions between the stances. In essence, it is in this way that a stance both motivates how a reader approaches a text and determines what a reader “gets” out of a reading; that is, in an aesthetic reading the focus is on emotions, and in an efferent reading the focus is on facts (Many & Anderson, 1992). In this view, differences in awareness of different potential evocations of the text are what make one reading different from another reading.

There is an essential connection between reader stance and reading processes in the sense that stance has been characterized as determining how a reader will process a given text (Galda & Liang, 2003, p. 270). Understanding reading processes thus entails understanding reader stance. Our larger focus in this theoretical essay is to encourage critical examination of types of reading that do not fit neatly into descriptions of existing reading stances (e.g., Britton, 1970; Galda, 1990; Harding, 1937; Langer, 1990; Many, 2004; Rosenblatt, 1978, 2004). We do this through an extended discussion of the multi-dimensionality of a particular kind of reading event and the stances readers adopt in order to negotiate such situations. Specifically, one common type of reading event is focused on—described here as *reading for the writer*—during which a reader reads a text to provide feedback to the author of that text.

Reading-For-The-Writer Reading Events

One fairly distinctive, although very common, reading event involves a reader examining a writer's text with the goal of providing some form of feedback to the author. Indeed, this event is most prevalent in educational contexts—from grade school (e.g. Martin, Segraves, Thacker, & Young, 2005) to university undergraduate (e.g., Paulson,

Alexander, & Armstrong, 2007) and graduate classes (e.g. Hammett & Collins, 2002), and across the disciplines (e.g. Herrington & Cadman, 1991), students are likely to engage in some form of reading-for-the-writer reading event regularly. Teachers, too, when they read their students' papers with the goal of suggesting areas to be improved, are reading for the writer (e.g. Furneaux, Paran, & Fairfax, 2007; Hunt, 2002). Similarly, professional writers and scholars participate in this activity frequently, both formally (e.g., an editor or reviewer's feedback on a manuscript submitted for publication) and informally (e.g., a colleague's suggestions on an early draft). Beyond these education-specific contexts, this kind of reading event frequently occurs in other professional and personal situations, from a co-worker reviewing a memo for a colleague before sending it out, to a family member looking over a recently drafted e-mail message.

Reading-for-the-writer activities can take on a wide variety of different forms depending on the situation, including type of text, context, purpose for writing, purpose of feedback, and the writer's expectations. It may be as simple as being casually asked, "could you read this and tell me what you think," or it could be more structured and involve formal written feedback for the writer. For example, in many classroom settings, students often read their classmates' papers in pairs or small groups, with a guiding worksheet or with points to be discussed, and with an emphasis on editing for surface-level errors or an emphasis on more holistic matters. In the field of composition, much scholarship has been devoted to exploring such classroom-based peer-review situations (for an overview of this scholarship, see Armstrong & Paulson, 2008). In scholarly publication situations, reviewers' comments are usually anonymous and returned to the author with an editorial decision regarding acceptance. No matter what the situation, though, a few generally accepted attributes of this activity can be identified: a reader is asked to read and respond to someone else's writing, usually with the goal of providing commentary or suggestions for improving the writing.

Generally, this kind of reading activity requires readers to first read through the text to get the gist of the writer's content before rereading with the purpose of offering commentary to the writer. This two-fold reading process is particularly evident in the field of composition, both in terms of how instructors read and respond to students' essays and how students read and respond to each others' essays. An example of the former is found in Hunt (2002) where an instructor's supervisor gave the advice "to read papers through once with her pen still, and then to make a limited number of comments" (p. 81). Examples of student-to-student reading and response abound, especially in textbooks designed either to instruct students directly or advise instructors on how to structure reading and responding sessions (e.g. Axelrod & Cooper, 1993; Lunsford & Bridges, 2002; McWhorter, 2000; Raimes, 2002; Ramage & Bean, 2000). For example, Axelrod and Cooper (1993) describe such a process: "Read the essay through quickly to get a sense of its argument. . . . Now read the draft again, this time noticing any words or passages that contribute to your first impression, weak ones as well as strong ones" (p. 151). Even though all of this typically happens during a single reading event, these are two very different kinds of reading: the first is basically an orienting reading, and the second is an advice-giving reading.

In general, during the first reading, the reader typically reads with the dual purposes of becoming familiar with the content, purpose, and situation, and generally understanding the writer's message. Following this, readers will often read the text again, this time examining the text for instances in need of commentary. During this second reading, readers are not reading for overall understanding or enjoyment, but rather with the purpose of providing some writerly feedback for improving the text. While these two readings are clearly

driven by two very different purposes, and therefore motivate readers to adopt two very different stances, a unique aspect of these readings is that they occur within a single reading event and involve the same text.

One example of this kind of reading event is most commonly found in classroom settings. While there are as many ways to structure such an activity as there are names to describe it—peer review, peer editing, peer critiquing, peer revising, and peer workshoping, to name a few—one of the most traditional, and perhaps most typical, approaches is to ask students to read a classmate’s essay and provide feedback and suggestions for revising the essay prior to submitting for a grade. Because this kind of reading event—in particular, the classroom activity typically referred to as “peer review”—is so prevalent as a *writing* tool, most of the scholarly research attention has been paid to it within the field of composition. For example, much research has examined instructional support for such activities (e.g. Simmons, 2003). However, this reading-for-the-writer reading event is common, well-delineated, and lends itself to discussions of stance and investigations of the kinds of stances that are adopted when someone is reading another’s writing with the primary purpose of providing feedback on the writing. In fact, we would argue that this kind of attention is needed in order to fully appreciate the interconnectedness of reading and writing processes. For that reason, we have examined this as a *reading* event with the goal of situating it within a workable concept of stance.

Reading-For-The-Writer as a Distinctive Reading Event

The distinctive reading event that occurs during a reading-for-the-writer activity described here provides a good example of the need to consider the utility of traditional conceptualizations of stance in explaining and informing many aspects of reading. Because the overall stance involved in this kind of event is a more social, multi-layered transaction, it becomes difficult to situate this kind of reading event in the efferent–aesthetic continuum as it is typically conceived since Rosenblatt generally focused on the *individual’s* transaction with a text.

Prominent among the purposes for reading for a writer is the idea that there are widely understood assumptions about the outcome since readers are ultimately expected to *do something* with the information they glean during the reading of others’ texts. In other words, the reading context during reading-for-the-writer activities carries with it a high level of responsibility for the reader because of assumptions of the kind and depth of feedback the reader is expected to provide the author of the text.

Rosenblatt has acknowledged that readers come to *texts* with such widely accepted assumptions (Rosenblatt, 1978, pp. 170–171); in addition, it is clear that readers come to particular *reading events* with such assumptions. In a reading-for-the-writer situation, for example, there seems to be an unspoken contract between writer and reader, a contract that affects both the purpose and the process in reading. This may be, at least in part, a result of the proximity of reader and writer in, for example, a typical classroom-based peer-review session.

Two Readings, One Reading Event

In a reading-for-the-writer event, as described earlier, readers accomplish their purposes by adopting appropriate stances while moving through the text. Our argument is that such a reading-for-the-writer reading event, taking place, for example in the context of peer-reviewing a classmate’s essay, is influenced by two distinct stances based on different

reading needs implicit in the overall activity. Each stance results in a different reading of this text; these two stances produce two *readings* within one reading *event*. We refer here to the two readings generated by the two stances as (1) the *familiarizing* reading, when the reader reads the text through to understand the structure and content of the text, and (2) the *advising* reading, when the reader reads the text while offering responses, critiques, and suggestions about the text to the author. Both readings take place during the same continuous reading event, with the same text—what changes during this reading event is the reader's stance.

Description of the Stances in Reading for the Writer

Within a reading-for-the-writer reading event the reader will typically read the same text more than once, but from different perspectives: a familiarizing stance and an advising stance. When sharp distinctions are made between two stances—such as the ones we are making here—the differences are often related to Rosenblatt's well-known continuum of aesthetic and efferent stances. Indeed, those stances play an important role in most reading contexts, with the distinction between aesthetic and efferent stances defining the differences in stance in many situations. Of the two readings that take place in a reading-for-the-writer reading event, the *advising* reading is clearly more aligned with an efferent stance than is the familiarizing reading, implying that because of the demonstrable differences between the two readings, the *familiarizing* reading must be on the aesthetic side of the equation. However, it is difficult to imagine readers in a reading-for-the-writer reading event approaching the familiarizing reading strictly aesthetically since part of the overriding purpose includes efferent needs eventually, as at some point the reader is expected to provide the author with comments and suggestions about the text. Nevertheless, the difference between the two readings of a text within the reading-for-the-writer reading event implies that if we are to use Rosenblatt's delineations of stance, some expansion of those ideas is needed in order to appropriately situate this kind of reading event.

In a sense, both the familiarizing and advising readings are efferent in that the reader's underlying purpose in a reading-for-the-writer reading context is to eventually help the author improve his or her text. However, if the familiarizing and the advising readings are both to be conceived of as falling at the efferent end of the continuum, they are clearly at different ends of the efferent spectrum. More important, if these are both efferent readings, then the efferent end of the aesthetic–efferent spectrum is large indeed—so large that referring to everything within that end of the spectrum as *efferent* is disingenuous. Actually, because the purposes of the familiarizing reading seem to be to gain an understanding of the text and to get a sense of how eventual/potential readers will read and understand the text, it seems much closer to an aesthetic reading than does the advising reading, where all reading is much more aligned with the purpose of offering critiques and suggestions.

Within and Beyond Efferent–Aesthetic

A connection with Britton's (1970) distinction between spectator and participant stances becomes useful here. With a spectator stance, no real-world action is called for on the part of the reader, which allows the reader the freedom to contemplate actions and attend to the reader's own emotional or other responses to the text; this is related to Harding's (1937) broader concept of the onlooker. Distinct from this perspective of the spectator or onlooker is the participant stance, which involves reading in order to get something done,

where there is an action that will be taken based on information found during reading. One way to think of the difference between stances taken in a reading-for-the-writer activity is to consider the advising reading as a participant stance, where the reader is reading to take some action based on what is found in the text. However, the corollary to participant stance—spectator stance—is not as appropriate when considering the familiarizing reading portion of this reading event since readers are not necessarily responding to their emotional responses to the text and, importantly, are still aware that they will eventually have to take some action based on the text. That is, there is not the same kind of natural dichotomy between familiarizing reading and advising reading as may be found between aesthetic reading and efferent reading, or spectator reading and participant reading; indeed, stances involved in reading-for-the-writer events occupy a distinct area on the stance continuum. Nevertheless, considering spectator and participant stances adds a useful dimension to a depiction of the reading in a reading-for-the-writer event as aesthetic and efferent only.

In fact, depicting the kind of reading that happens in reading-for-the-writer events like the one described here solely in terms of *reading* processes may be significantly limiting. Reading for the purpose of, for example, peer reviewing a classmate's paper involves an understanding that the reader is ultimately *reading* in order to give advice about *writing*. Reading in this context may be a good example of the interconnectedness of reading and writing processes, and the stance taken by readers may more appropriately be conceived of as a cross between reader's stance and writer's stance. Thus, while Rosenblatt's ideas of reader stance as being a continuum of aesthetic and efferent responses have only limited utility in this specific reading activity, connecting these stances with her ideas of writer stance can be much more informative in exploring this particular kind of reading event.

Reading Like a Writer

Rosenblatt (1978, 2004) considered reading done by the author of a text as being distinct from reading done by a reader of the text in a crucial way: in the former, the author is reading the text while in the process of writing, a stance she termed "authorial—a writer's reading" (2004, p. 1381). Authorial reading, or *reading like a writer*, itself is further divided into *expression-oriented* and *reception-oriented* authorial reading stances, each with clear distinctions. Expression-oriented authorial reading involves a focus on whether aspects of the text—as they are actively being written by the author—help or hinder the text in moving toward the author's intended meaning. Reception-oriented authorial reading is that point at which the writer steps back from the text to read it from the perspective of a potential reader. The focus of this stance is to judge whether the text is too idiosyncratic—evoking meaning only for the author, for example—or whether it has the potential to evoke meaning for others as well. Rosenblatt considered expression-oriented authorial reading as generally preceding reception-oriented authorial reading: where the author first writes a text so that it expresses the author's meaning, then the author reads and revises with an eye toward ensuring that the text has the potential to evoke the intended meaning for future readers as well. These two stances, while distinct, are not linear, nor do they exist independent of each other; the author will assume each stance numerous times during the writing of a text. One major difference between the stance adopted in reading-for-the-writer reading events and Rosenblatt's authorial-reading (*reading-like-a-writer*) stances is that in the former, the reader is reading someone else's written text, and in the latter, it is the writer reading his or her own text.

Compounding the issue of where reader stance ends and writer stance begins in reading-for-the-writer events is the fact that the information the readers are dealing with here is not solely a written text, but is also *writing* in and of itself. In a reading-for-the-writer event like classroom-based peer-review activities, readers have as a primary purpose giving the author of the text feedback about the author's writing, not just the text; that is, reading-for-the-writer situations go beyond simply commenting on the quality of the finished product to include critiquing the writer's process, providing advice for satisfying assignment-specific expectations, and making suggestions for revision. In fact, it is clear that the stances of readers in a reading-for-the-writer situation go far beyond that of reader-oriented-only stances and reach into the realm of writer-oriented stances.

During a reading-for-the-writer reading event as described earlier, the first portion, which we have termed the *familiarizing* reading—where readers read the text for a general sense of the structure and content—readers may well have chosen a stance described as spectator or aesthetic in general makeup while they read the text to experience the author's message. As discussed earlier, this cannot be considered a complete description of the stance in a reading-for-the-writer event because readers are aware that eventually they must do something with the information they found in the text, which, of course, implies a participant and efferent stance. Participant and efferent types of stances are identifiable in that portion of the reading-for-the-writer event we have labeled the *advising* reading, where readers are engaged in providing feedback to the text's author while reading the text.

Clearly, readers in a reading-for-the-writer activity are engaged in writers' authorial-reading stances to some extent. The familiarizing reading seems to link strongly to elements of Rosenblatt's reception-oriented authorial reading where the purpose is to read the text from the perspective of the reader, not the writer, while still checking that the text responds to the needs of the writer. There are even stronger links between the advising reading and an authorial reading stance. Because a primary goal of the advising reading is for readers to ultimately help authors improve their writing, the stance adopted during this aspect of the reading event includes the intention of offering suggestions and advice for revising the text on a number of levels. In this sense, the advising reading is a straightforward expression-oriented authorial reading, with one significant exception: Rosenblatt intended expression-oriented authorial reading to be descriptive of the *writer* reading his or her own text, not the *reader* reading a text authored by another. Nevertheless, this does move us toward understanding the stances assumed by a reader engaged in reading to review a writer's text as being both reader-based and writer-based at once. In fact, we might even conceive of this unique combination as involving expression-oriented or reception-oriented reading-for-the-writer stances.

Lastly, it may also be useful to think of these stances as being further broken down; first, the purpose of reading-for-the-writer events, like common classroom peer-review exercises, demands that a reader adopting a reception-oriented stance take on the perspectives of both a general reader as well as an evaluating reader. In other words, a reader acting as a peer reviewer needs to address questions like "How will a general audience receive this text?" as well as "How will the teacher who is evaluating this text receive it?" Likewise, the expression-oriented stance requires the reader to attend to not only how clear the message is to a broader readership, but also to do so with a specific rhetorical situation in mind (a particular assignment prompt, with specific goals and objectives, linked to a particular class).

In general, aspects of reading processes connect strongly to aspects of writing processes; this has been articulated well by Tierney and Pearson (1983), who incorporated

accepted elements of writing—like planning, drafting, aligning, revising, and monitoring—into a model of reading. What is evident in the kind of reading that goes on during a reading-for-the-writer activity is that the stances adopted by the reader include both reader-specific stances and writer-specific stances. In fact, it may be a misnomer to label any stance as *specific* to either reading or writing since the overlap can be considerable. This is one reason we have described the types of reading done in the context of a reading-for-the-writer event as involving more specific reading-for-the-writer stances that build on Rosenblatt's concept of the efferent-aesthetic continuum and others' revisions to her model.

Concluding Thoughts

Essential to an appreciation of reading processes is recognition of the role of reader stance. The relationship of reader stance to specific, well-delineated reading events is important to understanding the myriad purposes, expectations, and approaches readers employ during these reading events. Traditional conceptualizations of reader stance are useful for considering many reading events. In this theoretical essay we have addressed the question: what about those reading events that do not promote stances within the parameters of the traditional efferent-aesthetic binary? We have identified one such reading event, termed reading-for-the-writer, and the specific point it occupies on a three-dimensional efferent-aesthetic continuum that builds upon traditional models of reader-specific stances by including *both* reader stances and writer stances. Our conceptualization of the continuum as three-dimensional is meant to break away from a more uni-dimensional, left/right and up/down-only model in which a reader's stance is either *more* or *less* of something; that is, more aesthetic and less efferent, or vice versa. Much like a wave, which includes left/right, up/down, *and* back/front orientations, in a multi-dimensional stance continuum, different aspects of reading (and writing) purpose and focus work in concert before, during, and after reading. It is when a particular combination of those different aspects of reading coalesce around a particular reading event that we can identify that combination as a particular stance.

Through such an examination and analysis of the stances implicit in a reading-for-the-writer reading event, both pedagogical implications and research directions emerge.

Pedagogical Links

In addition to the theoretical and research-based foci on Rosenblatt's continuum, stance has also been considered in more practical terms, including its relationship to pedagogy (e.g. Karolides, 1992; Many, 1991; Squire, 1994). Squire (1994), for example, argued that educators must provide texts that promote a variety of stances so that the strength in reading literature is not at the cost of little experience with an efferent stance and with informational texts. Another important pedagogical understanding involves the effect that reader stance has on comprehension, which may be couched in general terms of emotional response to the text or in having learned facts about a subject area—Rosenblatt's (1978, 2004) aesthetic and efferent stances, respectively—but can also take on issues of quality of reading. For example, Many (1991) found that students of all grade levels had deeper levels of understanding when taking an aesthetic stance than when taking an efferent stance.

Pedagogically, we are reminded that a reader's stance can have a powerful impact on that reader's ability to successfully and appropriately comprehend a text. Some research

(e.g., Pichert & Anderson, 1977) has demonstrated that it is unlikely that a reader's stance could be effectively altered or amended after the reading event has been completed, making an appropriate stance all the more essential. A mismatch between teacher-expected stance and student-actual stance can portend a mismatch in what is remembered, what is understood, and what is felt to be important with a given text; responding in different ways to a text may require a re-reading of the text from a different stance. The value—and need for explicit purpose—of re-reading may be especially clear in instruction that includes reading-for-the-writer-type activities like those described in this essay. Such activities often involve readers reading and commenting on writing issues ranging from reception-oriented issues (for example, clarity of the argument or claim being posed) to expression-oriented ones (for example, level of specificity for a given audience). Instead of lumping those very different kinds of readings—with very different reading processes—together, it may be more useful to break them down into separate and distinct reading and responding tasks.

In essence, what we are calling attention to here, in a pedagogical sense, is the “reading part” of writing instruction. While often acknowledged by instructors as being integrally related, reading and writing are still apt to be taught separately in some contexts. Our hope is that this discussion of stance contributes to raising awareness of the complex interrelationship of—in this case—reading processes within a writing activity.

On a more practical note, in both reading and writing classrooms, such an approach has the potential to increase the amount of time devoted to reading in a typical reading-for-the-writer event like a student-to-student peer-review session; however the benefits gained in the end—the metacognitive reflection involved in better understanding how purpose and stance connect—would be worth the extra time.

Research Directions

The familiarizing reading and the advising reading both take place within the same reading event with the same text, yet employ distinct stances designed to allow the reader to accomplish specific goals at different stages of the reading event. Empirical research on this kind of shift in stance would be beneficial to educators across the disciplines as it would provide further evidence of the need for classroom discussion of the metacognitive aspects of reading. In terms of learning more about the kinds of stances described here, it is important to consider *how* we explore issues of stance. In general, stance has been determined by what the reader reports about the text, where written or verbal discussion of how the reader felt about the text is assumed to be evidence of an aesthetic stance and discussion of facts the reader learned from the text is assumed to be evidence of an efferent stance (see Becker, 1999; Galda, 1990; Galda & Liang, 2003; Many & Anderson, 1992; Wiseman & Many, 1992). It should be noted that we agree with these assumptions; because reader response is the focus when investigating readers' stance, readers' own reports of what they attended to while reading are useful indicators of their stance. And, there is no reason to believe that readers' responses and reports about their experiences with texts would misrepresent the stance they took while reading the text. However, if we are interested in when and how stance shifts during reading, it makes sense to examine it during actual reading processes instead of only after the textual reading is complete. Additionally, further research needs to focus on other kinds of unique stances, like the one explored in this theoretical essay, to continue to explore the possibilities for situating such reading events in our current thinking about reader stance. Finally, this examination of a reading-for-the-writer stance demonstrates the need for more interdisciplinary scholarship

on reader stance—scholarship that recognizes the interconnectedness of theories and research in the fields of reading, literacy, and composition.

References

- Armstrong, S. L., & Paulson, E. J. (2008). Whither “peer review”? Terminology matters. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 35(4), 398–407.
- Alexander, P. A. (1997). Knowledge-seeking and self-schema: A case for the motivational dimensions of exposition. *Educational Psychologist*, 32(2), 83–94.
- Axelrod, R. B., & Cooper, C. R. (1993). *The concise guide to writing*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Becker, R. (1999). Reader response: Students develop text understanding. *Reading Horizons*, 40(2), 103–126.
- Britton, J. N. (1970). *Language and learning*. New York: Penguin.
- Furneaux, C., Paran, A., & Fairfax, B. (2007). Teacher stance as reflected in feedback on student writing: An empirical study of secondary school teachers in five countries. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 45, 69–94.
- Galda, L. (1990). A longitudinal study of the spectator stance as a function of age and genre. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 24(3), 261–279.
- Galda, L., & Liang, L. A. (2003). Literature as experience or looking for facts: Stance in the classroom. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 38(2), 268–275.
- Hammett, R., & Collins, A. (2002). Knowledge construction and dissemination in graduate education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 27(4), 439–453.
- Harding, D. W. (1937). The role of the onlooker. *Scrutiny*, 6, 247–258.
- Herrington, A. J., & Cadman, D. (1991). Peer review and revising in an anthropology course: Lessons for learning. *College Composition and Communication*, 42(2), 184–199.
- Hunt, D. (2002). *Misunderstanding the assignment: Teenage students, college writing, and the pains of growth*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Boynton/Cook.
- Karolides, N. J. (Ed.). (1992). *Reader response in the classroom*. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Group.
- Langer, J. A. (1990). The process of understanding: Reading for literary and informative purposes. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 24(3), 229–260.
- Lewis, C. (2000). Limits of identification: The personal, pleasurable, and critical in reader response. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 32(2), 253–266.
- Lunsford, R. F., & Bridges, B. (2002). *The Longwood guide to writing* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Many, J. E. (1991). The effects of stance and age level on children’s literary response. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 23(1), 61–85.
- Many, J. E. (2004). The effect of reader stance on students’ personal understanding of literature. In R. B. Ruddell & N. J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed., pp. 914–928). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Many, J. E., & Anderson D. (1992). The effect of grade and stance on readers’ inter-textual and autobiographical responses to literature. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 31(4), 60–69.
- Martin, L. E., Segraves, R., Thacker, S., & Young, L. (2005). The writing process: Three first grade teachers and their students reflect on what was learned. *Reading Psychology*, 26, 235–249.
- McLaughlin, M., & DeVogd, G. (2004). Critical literacy as comprehension: Expanding reader response. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 48(1), 52–82.
- McWhorter, K. T. (2000). *Successful college writing*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s.
- Paulson, E. J., Alexander, J., & Armstrong, S. (2007). Peer review re-viewed: Investigating the juxtaposition of composition students’ eye movements and peer-review processes. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 41(3), 304–335.
- Peck, J. (1992). Reader stance: Whose choice is it? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (42nd, San Antonio, TX, December 2–5, 1992). ERIC Document Reproduction Service NO. ED353574.

- Pichert, J., & Anderson, R. (1977). Taking different perspectives on a story. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69, 309–315.
- Raimes, A. (2002). *Keys for writers: A brief handbook* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Ramage, J. D., & Bean, J. C. (2000). *The Allyn and Bacon guide to writing* (Brief 2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, and the poem*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (2004). The transactional theory of reading and writing. In R. B. Ruddell and N. J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (5th ed., pp. 1363–1398). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Simmons, J. (2003). Responders are taught, not born. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 46(8), 684–693.
- Squire, J. R. (1994). Research in reader response, naturally interdisciplinary. In R. B. Ruddell and N. J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed., pp. 637–652). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Tierney, R. J., & Pearson, P. D. (1983). Toward a composing model of reading. *Language Arts*, 60(5), 568–580.
- Wiseman, D. L., & Many, J. E. (1992). The effects of aesthetic and efferent teaching approaches on undergraduate students' responses to literature. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 31(2), 66–83.