

WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM: AN ASSESSMENT

ISAIAH SMITHSON AND PAUL SORRENTINO

A 1985 article by C.W. Griffin concludes that “the WAC movement is a success” (403). Griffin’s conclusion is based on a survey of colleges and universities that have instituted writing-across-the-curriculum programs. Recently, we completed an assessment of an extensive writing-across-the-curriculum workshop offered in 1980 to faculty at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; our assessment consisted of surveys of both faculty and their students, and it is one of the first to judge the long-term effects of writing across the curriculum. The Virginia Tech surveys corroborate Griffin’s conclusion. They show most teachers continuing to use writing as a mode of teaching even five years after the Workshop’s completion, and they show students to be strongly affected by their teachers’ training in writing-to-learn methodology. However, they also suggest a disturbing problem inherent in some writing-across-the-curriculum programs—lacking the administration’s support, some teachers pay a high price for the success of writing across the curriculum.

THE 1980 VIRGINIA TECH FACULTY WRITING WORKSHOP¹

The Virginia Tech Faculty Writing Workshop was a typical writing-across-the-curriculum workshop: it trained teachers from a variety of disciplines to use writing as a means of teaching their disciplines. The Workshop met five hours a day, five days a week, for five weeks. It was team-taught by four members of the English Department. The Workshop’s eighteen “students” came from fields such as architecture, horticulture, agronomy, veterinary biology, engineering, mathematics, curriculum and instruction, vocational-technical education, computer science, and psychology. These peo-

ple were drawn to the Workshop by their interest in using writing to teach, by a promise of help with their own scholarly writing, and by a \$1,800 tax-free stipend intended to compensate them for their lost summer teaching pay.

The Workshop sought to help the participants improve their professional writing and to help them develop practical writing-to-learn methods. During the shorter afternoon sessions, we worked in small groups or one-on-one to improve the participants' professional prose, believing that making teachers more aware of their own writing problems and insecurities, and resolving some of them, would make them more effective as they worked with their students' writing problems. Like Tony Magistrale, we discovered that a contributing factor in much of the poor writing done by students in non-English classes is the "*kind of writing they are asked to produce,*" rather than the "*amount*" (152). Therefore, in the mornings the four of us taught the participants how to develop audience-awareness exercises and how to use invention techniques. We also taught them classical and modern theories of arrangement and revision. We introduced them to Kenneth Bruffee's work on collaborative learning and gave them plenty of experience working in peer groups and organizing peer groups for their prospective students. We included extensive work in designing and evaluating assignments that required multiple drafts. We illustrated the value of beginning some classes with freewriting so as to center students' minds on the hour's topic, ending some classes with brief writing to help students lock in the period's information before moving on to another class, and ending some weeks with writing intended to sum up the students' progress for the week. We also included sketches of classical rhetorical theory, an introduction to word processing, and surveys of modern grammar and usage. (Listening to four English teachers argue about grammar and usage is enlightening for non-English teachers; they are surprised to find how liquid are the "rules" of English.) And we had Nancy Sommers present a mini-workshop on revision, Elaine Maimon present another on evaluation, and Donald Cunningham present a third on technical writing. In effect, through various hands-on experiences, we taught the participants writing-as-process methods. In turn, they showed us how to apply these techniques in their particular fields—how to translate writing as process into writing across the curriculum.

POSITIVE EFFECTS ON FACULTY ATTITUDES AND TEACHING METHODS

The graduates of the Workshop were substantially influenced by the Workshop, both in their attitudes toward writing and in their teaching practices. This influence was apparent not only immediately after the Workshop's completion, but also five years later. We used two instruments to judge the effect of the Virginia Tech Workshop on the participants: a Faculty Survey and a Faculty Questionnaire. The Faculty Survey lists attitudes and practices having to do with writing, the teaching of writing, and the use of writing to teach; it measures the extent of the faculty participants' endorsement of these views and practices. The Survey poses 33 statements such as the following: "Most professional writers prepare several drafts of everything they write" and "The most important part of instruction in writing involves a review of standard grammar and rules for conforming to conventional spelling." Workshop participants responded on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 indicating "Strongly Agree" and 5 indicating "Strongly Disagree." (Appendix 1 reproduces the complete list of statements and the computation of responses). We administered the Faculty Survey three times in 1980: on the first and last days of the Workshop, and at the end of the fall quarter (after the participants had been able to use writing-to-learn methods for ten weeks). In the spring of 1985, we administered the same instrument a fourth time. The second instrument, the Faculty Questionnaire, allows Workshop graduates to respond in writing to questions about their students' progress and their own problems and discoveries after actually having used writing-to-learn techniques in their classes. We administered the Questionnaire twice, at the end of the fall quarter in 1980 and in the spring of 1985; we revised the 1985 version slightly to allow respondents to reflect over five years of experience. Both the Survey and the Questionnaire were adapted from materials developed by Elaine Maimon.

The participants' responses to the Faculty Survey were encouraging, regardless of when it was administered. The mean score for the responses to all 33 items was 2.16 at the pre-workshop administration, indicating that most of the responses fell within the "Strongly Agree-Agree" categories. We were not surprised that participants entered the Workshop already maintaining attitudes and favoring practices central to writing across the curriculum. Usually teachers who attend writing-across-the-curriculum workshops are already

predisposed to many of its principles and practices, though they cannot always articulate these principles and do not yet use or know all of the practices. More interesting was the post-workshop mean score of 1.77; the participants' level of agreement with the principles of writing across the curriculum increased significantly as an immediate result of their having taken the Workshop, falling more securely within the "Strongly Agree-Agree" categories. Most important were the 1980 and 1985 follow-up mean scores, 1.90 and 1.93, respectively. These indicate that the participants leveled off in their adherence to the values central to writing across the curriculum after a quarter of teaching with those values, that they maintained the same level of adherence over the following five years, and that the level of adherence maintained was significantly better than the pre-workshop level. Thus, their 1985 *attitudes* were still being strongly affected by their 1980 Workshop experience—in spite of the absence of any formal follow-up activities during the years following the Workshop. Since many writing-across-the-curriculum programs lack budgets that allow intensive follow-up, evidence of long-term maintenance of these values is especially welcome.

The participants' 1985 teaching *practices* were also still being strongly affected by their 1980 Workshop experience. The 1980 Questionnaire, circulated after 10 of the participants had returned to teaching for one quarter, included the question, "What writing practices did you employ in your class?" As would be expected, the recent Workshop graduates employed several types of writing, from five-minute summaries to extensive research papers. Less expected were the responses to the 1985 Faculty Questionnaire, the first three questions of which are the following:

1. Do you continue to use writing to teach your subject? If so, what methods, specifically, do you use?
2. If you use fewer methods now than you did during your first quarter after the workshop, which ones have you dropped and how soon after the workshop did you stop using them?
3. If you use more or different writing-to-learn methods now than you did in the first quarter after the workshop, what are the methods and when did you develop them?

Ten of the 13 respondents addressed these questions and only one person had given up writing-to-learn methods. This person con-

cluded, "Each fall I teach five courses which are always completely full. In the winter I teach four courses. I must confess tht grading that many research papers became a real chore. I don't know how you English professors do this year after year. My students wrote research papers for one year after the workshop. I then discontinued the practice." The other 9 continued to use more writing strategies than they had before taking the Workshop five years previously.

POSITIVE EFFECTS ON STUDENT ATTITUDES AND LEARNING METHODS

The participants were not the only people strongly affected by the Workshop. So, too, were their students, who observed their teachers' attitudes and who were the potential beneficiaries of their newly acquired writing-to-learn methods. At the end of the 1980 fall quarter, after the Workshop participants had used writing-to-learn pedagogy for one quarter, we administered a Student Survey. The Student Survey assesses the students' judgment of the extent to which their teachers employed practices taught in the Workshop; it also assesses whether the teachers' employment of these practices generated positive attitudes toward writing among students. The Survey is divided into two parts. Part A asks students to respond "yes" or "no" to 25 items dealing with a teacher's practices; Part B asks students to respond "yes" or "no" to 8 items focusing on the students' attitudes toward writing. Part A poses statements such as, "[Teacher] stressed importance of pre-writing," and part B consists of statements such as "[Teacher has helped me] to see that form and content are inseparable because the way something is said changes what is said." The Survey was taken by 238 students in 10 classes; one class of each Workshop participant who was able to cooperate was surveyed. (Appendix 2 reproduces the complete Student Survey and the computation of responses for the teachers as a group).

Students were evidently exposed to several techniques basic to writing to learn: 86% of the students responding to the Student Survey said their teachers provided for peer evaluation of drafts (item #17 of Appendix 2); 74% said their teachers "gave clear, detailed writing assignments related to, or within, the subject discipline" (item #5); 69% said their teachers stressed invention (item #7); and 66% said their teachers emphasized audience in their writing assignments

(item #8). Some 87% of the students surveyed noted that their teachers "stressed the importance of writing in the discipline" (item #1).

In addition to the group scores derived for the 10 faculty who participated in the Student Survey, two mean scores were derived for each teacher, one reflecting the students' perception of their teacher's use of the practices taught in the Workshop, and another reflecting the students' attitudes toward writing and writing to learn. Table 1 contains the mean scores derived for individual teachers through analysis of the Student Survey.

The parallels between a teacher's use of the writing-to-learn techniques taught in the Workshop and his or her students' attitudes toward writing are clear. In 8 of the 10 cases, the ratings of the students' perception of their teacher's use of the practices and the ratings of the students' attitude toward writing are the same. It seems that the more students were exposed to writing-to-learn techniques, the more they came to value them. Thus, it is not surprising to find that 60% of the students valued the use of writing as a means of learning about their subject (item #33) and that 52% valued writing itself (item #32). Most teachers assume that their attitudes and behavior strongly affect their students. Still, it is startling to see graphic evidence of the close correlation between what a teacher does with writing and how a student views writing.

Did the participants' methods and attitudes cause their students to become better writers and to learn their subjects more effectively? These are the most important questions. The instruments did not seek hard data on these questions, but they did elicit opinions. With respect to the first question, whether students became better writers, 55% of the 238 students responding to the Student Survey thought they had learned more about the writing process (item #31), and 72% came to "understand that good writing is clear and concise" (item #30). Six of the 10 Workshop participants responding to the 1980 Faculty Questionnaire answered the question, "Did your students become better writers?" Two of them said "yes"; two said "probably"; and two said "hard to tell." One of the participants who replied "hard to tell" said, "I don't think any improvement could be detected in one quarter." Response to the same question on the 1985 Questionnaire was more enthusiastic. Eight of the 11 people responding to the question were positive; two others said they just didn't know. Some of the positive responses were the following:

"They [the students] indicate that procedures I have used with them have helped develop their writing skills"; "I think they are better. I can see the improvement"; and "I hope they are better. Some are getting published."

As for the question of whether students learned their subjects more effectively through writing-to-learn methods, 60% of the students surveyed thought they had learned more about their subjects than they would have had their teachers not used writing-to-learn methods (item #3). The question was put to their teachers also in the 1980 Faculty Questionnaire: "Did your students learn your subject discipline faster or more comprehensively as a result of the writing practices you employed? How can you tell? Five of the 10 people responding to the Questionnaire addressed this question. Four of the 5 said they thought their students had learned more through writing. One participant wrote that her "carefully structured writing assignments yield more comprehensive replies" than previous assignments had; others mentioned that weekly summaries and multiple drafts seemed to improve understanding. When a variation of this question was asked on the 1985 Faculty Questionnaire, the results were similar. Eight of 13 responded to the question: 4 of them said they did not know and/or were not sure how to measure the possible difference; 3 responded positively; and one responded negatively. One of the participants falling into the "don't know" category volunteered, "I have polled them [the students] and *they* feel they've learned more." One of the participants responding positively said, "Better—almost always. I work with students in a program over a 4-5 year period, and I see the improvement (not always perfection) in ability to lay out a clear exposition or argument. They find themselves well prepared for other courses (such as research) that depend upon library skills, fine comprehension, and writing."

NEGATIVE EFFECT ON FACULTY

The short- and long-term benefits of the Virginia Tech Faculty Writing Workshop are clear. Participants changed their attitudes and teaching methods immediately, and they maintained their respect for and use of writing-across-the-curriculum pedagogy five years after the Workshop. Indeed, according to the Questionnaire, three participants—professors in architecture, engineering, and

education—continued to give presentations on writing across the curriculum at professional conferences in 1985. The participants' students were immediately affected also. To the extent that a teacher's evident attitude toward writing was positive, so too were the attitudes of his or her students. And to the extent that a teacher used writing as a means of teaching, writing was valued by his or her students. Finally, in the opinions of many teachers and students, the students became better writers and learned their subjects more effectively as a result of the teachers' attitudes and methods. The students were not surveyed in 1985; however, since the participants continued to value and use writing in 1985 as they did in 1980, it is probable that their 1985 students were as much affected by these attitudes and methods as were their 1980 students.

It is also probable that the short- and long-term benefits of Virginia Tech's Workshop are replicated by other workshops on other campuses. Art Young and Toby Fulwiler have published their assessments of the writing-across-the-curriculum program at Michigan Technological University (*Writing Across the Disciplines: Research Into Practice*). Their instruments and ours do not test for precisely the same information, but both sets of instruments reveal positive attitude and teaching changes by the workshop participants, and positive attitude and learning changes by participants' students. Those of us teaching writing-across-the-curriculum workshops are teaching the same methodology—writing as a process. It is likely that graduates of any workshops in which writing as a process is well presented will undergo long-term changes in attitudes and practices similar to those documented by the Virginia Tech instruments.

Unfortunately, it seems likely that the one detrimental effect of writing across the curriculum revealed by the instruments will also be shared by other writing-across-the-curriculum programs. The Faculty Questionnaire evoked a fundamental concern of some participants, a belief that the university administration offered too little support of teachers involved in writing across the curriculum. One participant of the Virginia Tech Workshop included the following note on the 1985 Faculty Questionnaire:

My disappointment with the university's response to the program and its goals was thorough. There was no appreciation for any part of the effort at any level of the university—faculty or administration. An outsider would urge you to market the program and its philosophy and gain commitments up front.

But I despair for Virginia Tech. As a former insider, I would urge you to spend your marketing efforts elsewhere. . . .

Another professor included a similar criticism:

The teachers in the Tech Faculty Workshop were wonderful. The university administrators must support the effort if it is to have a chance of succeeding. I see no hope of this happening. As I see it, there are three ways in which a professor is judged at Virginia Tech.

- (1) The most important criterion is how much research money a professor brings in.
- (2) The second criterion is the quality of the professor's research.
- (3) The third criterion is the quality of the professor's teaching.

Until this order is reversed and teaching becomes the most important criterion, people are simply not going to devote the time necessary to improve student writing.

In response to a question asking whether writing-to-learn methods are still being used, this professor replied, "I never became efficient at grading student writing. It literally took hours of my time. I wrote comments on every draft. While I know it was good for my students, it wasn't very good for me."

Admittedly, only 2 of the 13 respondents in the Virginia Tech assessment commented on the perceived lack of support from the administration. However, this same concern appears repeatedly in other discussions of writing-across-the-curriculum programs. Commenting on the program at Michigan Tech, Fulwiler says:

Table 1

Mean Scores From Student Survey for Each Teacher

| Practices (Range: 25-50) | | Attitudes (Range: 8-16) | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 25 | Very positive | 8 | Very Positive |
| 31.2 | Positive | 10 | Positive |
| 37.5 | Midpoint | 12 | Midpoint |
| 43.7 | Negative | 14 | Negative |
| 50 | Very Negative | 16 | Very Negative |

| PROFESSOR | TEACHERS' CATEGORY PRACTICES | STUDENTS' CATEGORY ATTITUDES | TEACHERS' CATEGORY PRACTICES | STUDENTS' CATEGORY ATTITUDES |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Mechanical Engineering | 35.00 | Positive | 10.47 | Positive |
| Computer Science | 39.59 | Negative | 12.77 | Negative |
| Vocational/ Technical Ed. | 29.60 | Very Positive | 8.40 | Very Positive |
| Psychology | 32.22 | Positive | 11.70 | Positive |
| Engineering Science & Mechanics | 31.91 | Positive | 10.73 | Positive |
| Communications | 29.40 | Very Positive | 9.60 | Very Positive |
| Vocational/ Technical Ed. | 30.70 | Very Positive | 10.10 | Positive |
| Mathematics | 37.55 | Negative | 12.99 | Negative |
| Environmental Urban Systems | 29.08 | Very Positive | 10.64 | Positive |
| Political Science | 32.23 | Positive | 11.92 | Positive |
| TOTAL MEAN SCORES | 34.60 | POSITIVE | 11.66 | POSITIVE |

At the very time we initiated our writing-across-the-curriculum program, with the strong encouragement of our deans and academic vice president, these very same administrators were encouraging higher standards for tenure and promotion, asking for more research, more publications, and the generation of more external money. Over the past six years these competing movements have actually pushed faculty at our university in opposing directions, suggesting that they spend more time assigning and evaluating student writing, on the one hand, while asking them to research and publish more of their own work on the other. Mixed messages. One colleague in mechanical engineering wearily described himself in a double bind: the better his teaching, which included lots of workshop ideas, the further behind he fell with his own research, and

the less recognition he received from his department or profession. (242)

Fulwiler concludes his discussion of this problem with a quotation from a Michigan Tech professor that sounds much like the reply of the Virginia Tech professor who had given up writing-to-learn methods:

I have been, as you know, an enthusiastic supporter of student writing assignments, but to be honest, I'm souring. It's taken a lot of time and I feel it's not rewarded. Hence I have decided that next year I won't spend so much time 'teaching'; I am going to spend those 30 hours of student conference time doing my own writing. I agree it's valuable for them . . . it's just not so for me. (242)

James Kinneavy mentions the same problem in his review of the advantages and disadvantages of writing-across-the-curriculum programs which entail training non-English faculty. He says:

At my university, it was clear that many departments did not want to take on the responsibilities of teaching writing because of the time it takes to correct, grade, and assess compositions. Busy assistant professors or even professors do not feel that such a commitment of their time would be rewarded by the university's promotion and merit system. Promotions and merit follow on scholarship, teaching, and service—usually in that order. And assigning and correcting themes do not fit neatly into any of these categories without extensive readjustments. This objection, a serious one, probably obtains more in the institutions that insist on a "publish or perish" reward system. I don't see it in small liberal arts institutions. (15)

Perhaps Kinneavy's disclaimer is justified; perhaps teachers involved in writing-across-the-curriculum programs at small schools do not find themselves in the same "double bind" mentioned by the Virginia Tech and Michigan Tech teachers. However, Griffin's article claiming the writing-across-the-curriculum movement to be a success notes the same drawback, but offers no similar disclaimer. The final paragraph of Griffin's article in the following:

Our next task, I think, is to address this issue: where do we go from here? How can we help the graduates of our

workshops sustain their enthusiasm over the next five, ten, or twenty years. And how can we guarantee the survival of writing-intensive courses. Will their presence continue to rest largely on the energy and good will of our colleagues or can we find more concrete supports—graduate assistants to grade papers; expanded credit to four or five hours instead of three; and/or released time and credit toward tenure and promotion for the teachers of these courses. The first act is now over; what do we do for the second? (403)

What do we do for the second? Those of us involved in writing across the curriculum need to acknowledge that teaching through writing does require increased time and effort. When Ellen Nold describes the writing-across-the-curriculum program at Stanford's School of Engineering, she distinguishes between "normals" and "nuts." The "normals" are the Engineering professors willing to allow tutors to help out with writing assignments used in their sections; the "nuts" are the Engineering professors who are willing actually to do the work themselves. (The "nuts," incidentally, are paid extra for their teaching.) Nold does not intend the terms "normals" and "nuts" disparagingly, but her facetious categorization highlights a truth of writing across the curriculum: teaching and evaluating through writing requires more time and work than do teaching and evaluating depending largely on lectures and multiple-choice tests, and teachers employing writing-to-learn methods are taking on more than the "normal" workload. And, the time required for this deviation from the normal conceptions of teaching must be taken from teachers' research, from their applying for grants, from their academic service, and from their personal lives. It must first be admitted that some writing-across-the-curriculum programs do "rest largely on the energy and good will" of the teachers committed to them.

Having acknowledged this problem, those of us concerned with writing across the curriculum need to establish policies with chairs, deans, and presidents *before* the programs are instituted, policies that guarantee released time or salary bonuses for teachers trained in and using writing-to-learn methods, or that stipulate an equivalence between a certain number of classes taught with these methods and publications of a certain length and stature. The first act is now over; studies at Virginia Tech and elsewhere have established that writing-across-the-curriculum workshops have substantial short- and long-term effects, that writing-across-the-

curriculum programs work. The second act should include facing the moral and political problems raised by this valuable pedagogy. Those of us committed to writing across the curriculum should not be in the morally ambiguous position of inviting colleagues to improve their teaching at the risk of their promotions and salaries. Improvement of education should not be predicated on the sacrifice of teachers.

Isaiah Smithson is Director of Expository Writing at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. He has published articles on composition, literary theory, and modern English and American literature.

Paul Sorrentino is an Associate Professor of English at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. He teaches technical writing and American literature, and he has published on American literature.

Appendix 1

Faculty Survey

Responses: 1-5

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------|--|
| 1 Strongly Agree | 3 Undecided | 4 Disagree | |
| 2 Agree | | 5 Strongly Disagree | |

| | PRE-WORKSHOP MEAN | POST-WORKSHOP MEAN | 1980 FOLLOW-UP MEAN | 1985 FOLLOW-UP MEAN |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Since each instructor teaches the language of his/her discipline, to that extent we are all language teachers. | 1.72 | 1.47 | 1.70 | 1.54 |
| 2. The way something is said changes what is said. To an important extent, form and content are inseparable. | 1.61 | 1.35 | 1.30 | 1.25 |
| 3. The most important part of instruction in writing involves a review of standard grammar and rules for conforming to conventional spelling. | 2.61 | 1.53 | 1.90 | 2.31* |
| 4. Instruction in writing is instruction in the composing process. | 1.83 | 1.29 | 2.00 | 1.58 |
| 5. Providing instruction in writing should be the exclusive concern of the English Department. | 1.44 | 1.29 | 1.70 | 1.77* |
| 6. Writing cannot be used to teach concepts in the subject disciplines but only to test if concepts have been learned. | 1.83 | 1.59 | 2.00 | 1.54* |
| 7. The ability to write is unimportant to most students in their future careers. | 1.78 | 1.24 | 1.20 | 1.54* |
| 8. It is more important to give students a chance to write several drafts of a single paper than it is to require them to do several separate written projects. | 2.33 | 1.41 | 2.00 | 2.31 |
| 9. Good writing is difficult for most people. | 2.06 | 1.65 | 1.70 | 2.08 |
| 10. Most instructors, even in English, have some insecurities about their writing. | 2.11 | 1.65 | 1.60 | 1.92 |
| 11. Instructors who have insecurities about their own writing can still help students to write better. | 2.00 | 1.65 | 1.50 | 1.77 |
| 12. Most professional writers prepare several drafts of everything they write. | 2.17 | 1.29 | 1.60 | 1.31 |
| 13. It is possible to use writing to find an idea before one uses writing to express that idea. | 2.17 | 1.71 | 1.70 | 1.54 |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---|------|------|------|-------|
| 14. | Students should be encouraged to brainstorm on paper and then to organize those ideas. | 2.22 | 1.47 | 1.70 | 1.77 |
| 15. | It is a bad idea to have a writing proficiency requirement for graduation. | 4.17 | 4.12 | 4.12 | 4.08 |
| 16. | It is a good idea for faculty to share their own writing with students. | 1.89 | 1.82 | 1.80 | 1.77 |
| 17. | Most skilled writers by the age of 21 are writing as clearly and effectively as they ever will. | 1.78 | 1.41 | 1.60 | 1.69* |
| 18. | Writing that is simple, clear, and concise is good writing in all disciplines. | 2.22 | 1.35 | 1.40 | 1.46 |
| 19. | Every faculty member of a university should be able to help students learn to write within the context of his/her own discipline. | 1.61 | 1.47 | 1.50 | 1.38 |
| 20. | Grades are the most effective way of evaluating compositions. | 2.33 | 2.18 | 2.10 | 2.46* |
| 21. | It is helpful to use trained undergraduate writing assistants to help read and comment on first drafts of student papers. | 2.29 | 1.94 | 1.90 | 2.08 |
| 22. | Writing conferences are important for students in all disciplines. | 2.00 | 1.76 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| 23. | In some courses, writing conferences can be conducted by undergraduate writing assistants. | 2.56 | 2.24 | 2.10 | 2.08 |
| 24. | It is too time-consuming for teachers of diverse disciplines to work together on the teaching of writing. | 2.50 | 2.06 | 2.40 | 2.23* |
| 25. | The instructor should either carefully define the intended audience or have the students do so for every paper he/she asks students to write. | 2.00 | 1.12 | 1.40 | 1.23 |
| 26. | Pre-writing and editing are not essential parts of the writing process. | 1.83 | 1.12 | 1.30 | 1.38* |
| 27. | Drills in grammar and usage, apart from practice in composition, will improve student writing. | 3.39 | 3.53 | 3.40 | 3.38* |
| 28. | In some compositions, the use of the first person pronoun is appropriate. | 1.72 | 1.35 | 1.50 | 1.54 |
| 29. | Students who speak freely and fluently are always good writers. | 1.94 | 1.82 | 2.00 | 2.00* |
| 30. | Standard written English is a conventional code that can be learned by speakers of all dialects. | 2.39 | 1.88 | 2.00 | 2.08 |
| 31. | It is necessary to correct students' speech before they can learn to write better. | 2.61 | 2.59 | 2.90 | 2.69* |

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 32. If students still make errors in grammar and spelling after a composition course, they have not received adequate instruction in writing. | 2.22 | 2.18 | 2.50 | 2.31* |
| 33. Correct and effective writing should be required of all students before graduation from college. | 1.94 | 2.00 | 1.40 | 1.77 |
| TOTAL: | 71.27 (or 2.16) | 58.53 (or 1.77) | 62.82 (or 1.90) | 63.84 (or 1.93) |
| St. Dev. | 8.614 (or .261) | 6.563 (or .199) | 6.886 (or .208) | 9.148 (or .277) |

Number of respondents: 18/Pre-workshop, 17/Post-workshop,
10/1980 Follow-up, & 13/1985 Follow-up.

*Participants responded on a five-point Likert scale, with low values usually signifying agreement; since a few items required high values to signify agreement, the reversed values were accounted for in computation of the totals. These are noted by asterisks.

| | OMITS | YES | NO | MEAN |
|---|-------|-----|-----|------|
| 1. Stressed the importance of writing in the discipline. | 9 | 207 | 31 | 1.13 |
| 2. Used writing to teach concepts in the discipline. | 10 | 150 | 87 | 1.37 |
| 3. Taught writing within context of the discipline. | 11 | 93 | 143 | 1.61 |
| 4. Shared his/her writing with class. | 11 | 123 | 113 | 1.48 |
| 5. Gave clear, detailed writing assignments. | 9 | 180 | 58 | 1.24 |
| 6. Gave instruction in composing process. | 11 | 129 | 107 | 1.45 |
| 7. Stressed importance of pre-writing. | 13 | 161 | 73 | 1.31 |
| 8. Emphasized audience by defining it or having students define it. | 9 | 157 | 81 | 1.34 |
| 9. Emphasized purpose by defining it or having students define it. | 10 | 189 | 48 | 1.20 |
| 10. Encouraged written brainstorming to find and organize ideas. | 11 | 13 | 163 | 1.69 |
| 11. Rewarded originality, freshness, and appropriateness of approach. | 34 | 113 | 100 | 1.47 |
| 12. Stressed importance of organization. | 9 | 91 | 49 | 1.20 |
| 13. Stressed importance of relating thesis, supporting points, and details to audience and purpose. | 12 | 168 | 167 | 1.29 |
| 14. Taught devices for strengthening continuity (such as parallel structures, transitions, etc.) | 11 | 70 | 166 | 1.70 |
| 15. Emphasized use of precise, appropriate vocabulary. | 9 | 143 | 95 | 1.40 |
| 16. Stressed importance of re-writing. | 11 | 175 | 61 | 1.26 |
| 17. Provided instruction on several drafts of papers. | 10 | 115 | 122 | 1.51 |
| 18. Used drafts for individual instruction in conferences. | 14 | 75 | 158 | 1.68 |
| 19. Used peer evaluation of drafts. | 10 | 205 | 32 | 1.14 |
| 20. Gave written comments on drafts. | 10 | 149 | 88 | 1.37 |
| 21. Pointed out grammar, mechanics, and usage errors. | 10 | 152 | 85 | 1.36 |

| | | | | |
|---|----|-----|-----|------|
| 22. Pointed out content errors and/or logical inconsistencies. | 11 | 158 | 78 | 1.33 |
| 23. Emphasized clarity and conciseness. | 10 | 182 | 55 | 1.23 |
| 24. Gave holistic and analytical final evaluation of finished paper (which included comment on mastery of concepts and/or depth of thought as well as on organization, expression of ideas, grammar, and mechanics. | 26 | 100 | 121 | 1.55 |
| 25. In assigning grades, gave weight to mastery of concepts and/or depth of thought as well as to organization, expression of ideas, grammar, and mechanics. | 18 | 145 | 84 | 1.37 |

Part B: Students' Attitudes

I feel that I have benefited from his/her teaching of writing within the context of this subject because he/she has helped me in the following ways:

| | OMITS | YES | NO | MEAN |
|---|-------|-----|-----|------|
| 26. To deal positively with my writing insecurities. | 16 | 72 | 159 | 1.69 |
| 27. To understand that standard written English is a conventional code that can be learned. | 18 | 102 | 127 | 1.55 |
| 28. To see the value of correct grammar and mechanics, of precise usage, and of appropriate organization. | 15 | 147 | 85 | 1.37 |
| 29. To see that form and content are inseparable because the way something is said changes what is said. | 15 | 132 | 100 | 1.43 |
| 30. To understand that good writing is clear and concise. | 16 | 167 | 64 | 1.28 |
| 31. To learn more about the writing process (pre-writing, arrangement, and re-writing). | 20 | 124 | 103 | 1.45 |
| 32. To value writing. | 18 | 118 | 111 | 1.48 |
| 33. To learn more about the subject than I would have if he/she had not used these practices. | 22 | 134 | 91 | 1.40 |

NOTE

¹The Virginia Tech Faculty Writing Workshop was funded for 1980 and 1981 by a grant from the Virginia State Council of Higher Education. The grant proposal was written by Connie Gefvert, then Director of Freshman English, and George Hayhoe. The 1980 Workshop was taught by Lou Middleman, Isaiah Smithson, Paul Sorrentino, and Michael Squires, Director. Art Eastman, Head of the English Department, gave practical and moral support throughout. Short-term assessment of the 1980 Workshop was carried out during the workshop and during the following quarter by Betty Favre, then a graduate student; she was assisted by Robert Frary, Assistant Director of the Research and Measurement Division of the Learning Resources Center, Gefvert, and Smithson. Long-term assessment was carried out in the spring of 1985 by Sorrentino, who collected the data, Frary, who did the calculations, and Smithson, who wrote the present article.

WORKS CITED

- Griffin, C.W. "Programs for Writing Across the Curriculum: A Report." *College Composition and Communication* 36 (1985): 398-403.
- Kinneavy, James. "Writing Across the Curriculum," *ADE Bulletin* 76 (1983): 14-21.
- Magistrale, Tony. "Writing Across the Curriculum: From Theory to Implementation." *Journal of Teaching Writing* 5 (1986): 151-157.
- Maimon, Elaine. "Measuring Behavior and Attitude in the Teaching of Writing among Faculties in Various Disciplines." Paper presented at the Modern Language Association Annual Meeting, 1978.
- Nold, Ellen. "Nuts and Normals: Helping Them Teach Writing across the Curriculum." Paper presented at the Modern Language Association Annual Meeting, 1979. (ED 185 545).
- Young, Art, and Toby Fulwiler, eds. *Writing Across the Curriculum: Research Into Practice*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1986.