INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9005816

Writing across the curriculum: A call for pedagogical change in the secondary school

Fowler, Helen Lawson, Ed.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1989

Copyright ©1989 by Fowler, Helen Lawson. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Writing Across the Curriculum:
A Call for Pedagogical Change
in the Secondary School

by

Helen L. Fowler

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
of Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1989

Approved by

Elizabeth A. Bowles

Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser Elisabeth A. Bowles

Committee Members Kelley Griffith

[illegible]

Edwin D. Bell

Lois V. Edinger

March 21, 1989
Date of Acceptance by Committee

March 21, 1989
Date of Final Oral Examination

©, 1989, by Helen Lawson Fowler

FOWLER, HELEN LAWSON, Ed.D. Writing Across the Curriculum: A Call for Pedagogical Change in the Secondary School. (1989) Directed by Dr. Elisabeth A. Bowles. 130 pages.

The purpose of this investigation was to assess the effectiveness of staff development in the form of workshops, which presented writing across the curriculum theory and practice, upon the writing apprehension level and attitudes toward writing of secondary school teachers. A quasi-experimental pretest-posttest, non-equivalent control group design was the procedure utilized in this study.

The Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Test and the National Council of English Opinionnaire were administered as a pretest to two groups of 15 teachers at a rural high school in North Carolina in order to test two null hypotheses dealing with teacher writing apprehension and attitudes toward writing. After one group was exposed to writing across the curriculum theory and practice through a series of 10 workshops, both groups were again administered the Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Test and the NCTE Opinionnaire. An analysis of covariance was used to analyze the pretest and posttest scores, using the pretest as a covariate.

The analysis of data allowed for the rejection of the hypothesis dealing with writing apprehension. The experimental group scored significantly higher than did the control group. The other hypothesis dealing with teacher attitudes toward writing was rejected as a result of a

significant statistical difference in three out of four parts of the NCTE Opinionnaire. Thus, writing across the curricluum theory and practice, presented in the form of workshops, appears to be an effective staff development measure in reducing teaching writing apprehension and in influencing three areas of teacher attitudes. The lessened writing apprehension and altered attitudes perhaps will allow these teachers to be more receptive to their own writing and to that of their students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to extend thanks to Dr. Elisabeth Bowles, my advisor and the chairman of my committee, who graciously provided leadership and guidance before and during the preparation of this dissertation. To Dr. Edwin Bell and Dr. Bert Goldman, a special thanks is extended for their expertise in the area of statistics and for their genuine kindness to me. I would also like to thank Dr. Lois Edinger for her advice and unflagging support and Dr. Kelley Griffith for his assistance and interest.

My heartfelt appreciation goes to the faculty at South Caldwell High School, who gave me enthusiastic cooperation and reassurance. I also would like to thank Brooks Barber, Assistant Superintendent of the Caldwell County Schools, for his approval of this study as a staff development activity, and Earl Bradshaw, my former principal, for his understanding and patience.

I am especially grateful to my devoted friends Myra Dickson and Betty Whitener for their companionship during my entire graduate school career.

My husband Sam and my children Merrill and Stuart have provided continual love and understanding. I will always deeply appreciate their loyal acceptance of this

challenging project. My mother, Mrs. Eldon D. Lawson, has been an ever-present source of encouragement and renewal. Since research represents growth and light, it gives me great pleasure to dedicate this dissertation to her.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

APPROVAL PAGE ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES vii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Background of the Problem 1
Purpose of the Study 4
Significance of the Study 7
Procedures 8
Assumptions and Limitations 9
Definition of Terms 13
Summary 14
Overview of the study 15

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 17

Introduction 17
History of Writing Across the Curriculum 18
Composition Theory 22
Writing to Learn 30
Faculty Attitudes and Behaviors 37
Pedagogical Implications for Educators 43
Writing Across the Curriculum Implementation 47
Role of the English Department 47
Role of Other Teachers 49
Implementation Procedures 53
Summary 58

III. PROCEDURES 59

Introduction 59
Research Methodology 60
Instruments 62
Population and Sample 65
Data Analysis 66
Summary 66

CHAPTER

IV. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS 68

Introduction 68
Discussion of Results 71
Null Hypothesis 1 71
Null Hypothesis 2 73
Summary 77

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 79

Summary 80
Conclusions 82
Implications 84
Recommendations 86

BIBLIOGRAPHY 91

APPENDIX A. Letters Preceding Workshops 98

APPENDIX B. Objectives for Workshops 102

APPENDIX C. Testing Instruments 104

APPENDIX D. Transcript of Workshops 110

APPENDIX E. Letter Following Workshops 129

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE Page

1. Analysis of Covariance for Posttest Means of Control and Experimental Groups 70

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Curricular change in the public schools is often related to and derived from public outcry over a perceived learning crisis. One such crisis occurred in 1957 when the math and science curricula were reorganized after the launching of Sputnik. Thinking the United States was "behind" in the space race, the United States Office of Education poured billions of dollars into math and science departments in order to better educate American students in these areas. The more recent crisis of the 1970's and 80's has revolved around writing, the area in which students are perceived to be deficient. Lee Odell (1980) asserts that "there is a writing crisis. Many students are not accustomed to writing at all; most do not write as fluently, as perceptively, or as correctly as we might wish" (p. 139). Statements such as this have come from countless journal articles, from newspapers and television, from the United States Department of Education, and from parents, teachers, and university professors. According to a recent survey at American University, 78% of the teachers polled thought that writing skills had definitely declined (Bazerman, 1979).

Though there is widespread agreement as to the existence of a writing problem, there is no consensus as to its resolution.

In the United States over the past few decades, the act of writing has become a separate entity from the social (and educational) world (Bazerman, 1979). Writing is writing; reading is reading; thinking is thinking, and so on with speaking and listening. This separation is not natural. The components should overlap, blending together to form a unified whole - the language arts. If indeed the language arts do form a whole, it logically follows that a decline in one area would affect another. Behrens (1978) asserts that the decline in writing may be related to the decline in reading. Bazerman (1979) even goes so far as to denounce modern composition theory for ignoring the connection between what one reads and what one writes. Furthermore, there is an isolation of knowledge from one subject to another; one learns history, biology, English, and math separately. However, this compartmentalization can be reduced through the skills incorporated in an integrated view of the language arts, transcending subject-matter barriers and becoming a matter of holistic learning. In other words, the specialized skills first acquired through the language arts can then be applied to every subject. In addition to poor writing skills and to segregated learning material, teachers decry the lack of learning displayed by

their students. Standardized test scores on tests such as the SAT are down, and many teachers do not feel that students are truly learning subject matter. There appear to be several problems, then: writing skills on the decline, subjects isolated from one another, and reduced learning as perceived by teachers. A possible solution to these problems could be "writing across the curriculum."

In recent years, "writing across the curriculum" has become a beacon for curricular change. This concept simply and clearly describes the notion of incorporating more and diverse opportunities to write in all classes. Underlying this concept, however, must be a theoretical base of writing as a way to improve learning. According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress, the movement came about for the following reasons:

> . . . because children were not writing <u>often</u> enough, that the limited writing they were doing was not <u>lengthy</u> enough, and that the topics they were writing about were not <u>thoughtful</u> enough. (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1986, p. 11)

Any skill infrequently practiced will decline. But "writing," usually synonymous with the teaching of English, is only half of the concept. The other half is "across the curriculum." Peters (1985) states:

> A knowledge of the "mechanics" of writing can certainly be acquired through writing in any subject, and students benefit by being reminded of the details in assignments everywhere. (p. 3)

However, writing across the curriculum is much more than simply writing in every subject. A direct administrative

decree could force all teachers to have students write more. Furthermore, the movement is not just a standard bearer for writing skills and higher criteria, as one would think, because of the prevailing back-to-basics climate (Tschumy, 1982). Actually, the flourishing of the writing across the curriculum movement is rather ironic, for it does not look to the traditional teachings of the past - instead, it is wonderfully comtemporary and looks to the future.

Purpose of the Study

To most people, writing is synonymous with the teaching of English. Because of this belief, the teaching of writing has been generally relegated to the English teacher along with the reams of papers generated by writing activities. Though the time has come to share the responsibility, one would be naive to believe that all teachers are going to embrace enthusiastically the idea of teaching writing. On one hand, they are unused to the idea. The teaching of writing was not stressed in their disciplines when many teachers took methods courses. Once educational methods and philosophies are ingrained, they are difficult to change. In addition, many teachers of subjects other than English are not sure just how to incorporate writing into their curricula. They would certainly need to ask themselves what kind of writing to require and how to evaluate it. Also, in the past, many teachers have themselves been so stringently

graded that their confidence in their own writing is shaky. A high level of writing apprehension would cause teachers to view writing in a negative manner. For these reasons, then, the place to start multi-curricular writing is with the subject-matter teachers in the school. If they are convinced that writing is a versatile teaching tool and an asset to the students, then these teachers may assign writing assignments and perhaps writing will improve. Thus, a teacher's own natural motivation will be the vehicle on which writing will ride - or from which it will fall. Many educators will try a new teaching method if it sounds intriguing or if they are convinced of its worth. They will also cut it mercilessly from their methods repertoire if it does not produce results.

Teachers must be "sold" on the value of good writing. Though there are various techniques for informing teachers of the merits of writing, one excellent method could be through staff development workshops. According to Joan Graham (1983-84), workshops "are . . . an opportunity to spread the basic ideas behind cross-curriculum writing instruction to whole departments . . . " (p. 17). Based upon this view, a series of workshops, further explained in Chapter III, will provide the foundation for this study.

The purpose of this study is to measure the efficacy of staff development in changing teacher attitudes toward

writing as a way of promoting learning. Two null hypotheses will be tested:

1. There will be no significant difference in the writing apprehension posttests of teachers who were exposed to writing across the curriculum theory and practice and teachers who were not exposed to writing across the curriculum theory and practice.
2. There will be no significant difference in the writing attitude posttests of teachers who were exposed to writing across the curriculum theory and practice and teachers who were not exposed to writing across the curriculum theory and practice.

Additionally, the following objectives provide a broad foundation for the study:

1. To ascertain the writing apprehension level and the attitudes toward writing of selected secondary school subject matter teachers.
2. To acquaint selected secondary school faculty members with writing across the curriculum theory and practice.
3. To determine whether knowledge about writing across the curriculum will reduce secondary school teacher writing apprehension and change teacher attitudes.
4. To suggest implications for curricular models and teaching models in the secondary school.

Other related questions will be addressed: How will secondary teachers react to writing across the curriculum theory and practice, which is often perceived to be radical? Will teachers be willing to write and to share their writing? Will teachers be willing to implement writing across the curriculum strategies in their classes? Will they use writing to evaluate student knowledge instead of using objective tests?

Significance of the Study

The review of the literature reveals that many secondary school teachers (with the probable exception of English teachers) do not use writing in their classes. As a result, many students are poor writers. Why are teachers reluctant to have their students write? What can be done to reverse this trend? According to Schuessler, Gere, and Abbott (1981), research has demonstrated that teacher attitudes can inhibit or inspire student achievement. Furthermore, they assert that:

> . . . despite the recognized importance of teacher attitudes toward student achievement, researchers have not examined the relationship between teacher attitudes and effective composition instruction. (p. 55)

This project, then, will help to fill a void in current research.

This study is significant in that it attempts to identify one cause of teacher negativism toward writing,

teacher writing apprehension, and then offers a solution to alleviate this apprehension. Also, it isolates some negative teacher attitudes toward writing and, again, offers a solution toward the changing of these attitudes. The solution is to expose teachers to writing across the curriculum theory and practice through a series of workshops, which, in the opinion of Smith (1984), can help to reduce writing anxiety.

If teachers are exposed to positive experiences with writing, it is hypothesized that they will be more likely to shed their prejudices and to try writing in their classes. Through the resulting change in their teachers' attitudes toward writing, students will benefit by learning more. In a broader sense, then, the significance of the study is that it sheds light on an influence on student learning.

Procedures

This quasi-experimental study involved thirty teachers in a rural high school in western North Carolina. The framework for the study was the non-equivalent control group design, involving a pretest, treatment, posttest procedure. After a survey informing the faculty of a series of writing across the curriculum workshops, a total of 15 teachers indicated their interest. These teachers comprised the experimental group. Though these teachers did volunteer for the study, they knew nothing about writing across the

curriculum, the purpose of the study, or the procedures for the study. Because it was not possible to assign teachers randomly to groups, each teacher in the experimental group was matched with a teacher in the control group by subject taught and by years of experience. Two tests were initially administered to each group, the Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Test and the National Council of Teachers of English Opinionnaire, which respectively measure writing apprehension and attitudes toward writing. After one group was exposed to writing across the curriculum theory and practice through a series of 10 workshops, both groups were again admininstered the tests. An analysis of covariance was used to analyze the pretest and posttest scores, using the pretest as a covariate. After the treatment, the results were analyzed and discussed.

A more detailed discussion of research procedures may be found in Chapter Three.

Assumptions and Limitations

Though not verified, the following assumptions have been gleaned from the research and form the underlying truths which have been accepted by the researcher as valid for this study. They provide a solid foundation for and direction to the study. The researcher believes:

1. That, in general, many teachers who have not had writing across the curriculum theory and practice

display writing apprehension and a negative attitude toward writing.

2. That knowledge of writing across the curriculum theory and practice reduces levels of writing apprehension and positively influences writing attitudes.
3. That teachers who are exposed to writing across the curriculum theory and practice increase the amount of writing in their classes.
4. That, once exposed to these concepts, teachers use writing as a way of testing learning.
5. That, when these concepts are applied in the classroom, teachers and students alike are more comfortable with each other, have a better relationship, and, as a result, more learning occurs.

In addition to these broad assumptions, there are some specific premises regarding the workshops. Following is a list of those key assumptions, handed out in 1984 at the Appalachian Writing Project, a local endeavor at Appalachian State University, modeled after the Bay Area Writing Project:

1. That while most teachers in the schools have never been adequately trained as teachers of writing, there are, nevertheless, teachers at all levels - elementary through university - who out of necessity

have learned how to teach students to write and have, through trial and error and in the privacy and isolation of their own classrooms, developed effective approaches to the teaching of writing.

2. That these successful teachers can be identified, brought together, and trained to teach other teachers of writing in project-sponsored workshops conducted in the school districts throughout the school year.
3. That the best teacher of teachers is another teacher - teachers believable as consultants because their ideas and the specific teaching strategies they demonstrate have been developed with real students in real classrooms.
4. That teachers of writing must write themselves; that they need to experience regularly what they are asking of their students; that they need to discover and understand the process of writing they are teaching through their own writing; and that they need to write during inservice workshops, testing new ideas, new approaches, as if - for the moment - they were their own students.
5. That real change in classroom practice is slow; that effective staff development programs are on-going and systematic - programs that make it possible for teachers to come together regularly to

test, try out, and evaluate the best practices of other teachers.

6. That effective programs to improve student writing should involve teachers from all grade levels and teachers from all content areas, that the idea of writing as a way of learning is an idea that teachers across the curriculum and across grade levels find compelling.
7. That what is known about the teaching of writing comes not only from research but also from the practice of those who teach writing.

However, there are cautions of which one must be aware before he or she attempts to implement a writing program such as this. Writing is not the only skill needed in education. Advocates of writing across the curriculum often blow out of proportion the relative position of writing in the overall schema of knowledge. Also, it may not be the most appropriate way of sparking learning in every discipline. Some teachers may have other methods of getting students to learn, methods which are highly effective. Too, the financial aspect must be considered; schoolwide implementation of anything costs money. Evaluation is a final concern. The program needs constant evaluation and reformation. The method of writing across the curriculum is flexible; it needs a flexible framework and flexible personnel as well. There is a danger "that people who

regard themselves as enlightened will become cozily self-congratulatory when there is work to be done" (McLeod & King, 1984, p. 619). In fact, complacency is the biggest danger of all.

Definition of Terms

Except where indicated, the following definitions are those of the researcher.

Audience: the intended reader or readers for a piece of writing.

Discourse: associated with James Moffett, the term is used to designate all communication in the medium of language, oral or written.

Expressive: James Britton's term for writing, close to talk, which conveys the personal feelings of the writer and which allows the writer to think and discover.

Interactive Community: a classroom of writers writing for each other.

Paradigm: the theory underlying an area of learning.

Paradigm shift: the change in theory that comes about when old methods will not solve new problems. The term is attributed to Thomas Kuhn.

Poetic: James Britton's term for artistic writing, the principal aim of which is to create a verbal object.

Process vs. Product: a term used to describe a shifting paradigm, the emphasis being on the process of writing rather than on the finished product.

Purpose: the use that a piece of writing will serve.

Transactional: Jame's Britton's term for writing intended to inform, the language of newspapers and technical reports. It is also the primary language of schools.

Writing across the curriculum: a term used synonymously with other terms such as "cross-curricular writing" and "cross-disciplinary writing" to refer to writing done in all disciplines. May or may not have the same theorectical base as writing to learn.

Writing apprehension: an anxiety about communication which outweighs an individual's projection of gain from the situation (Phillips, 1968).

Writing process: refers to the five distinct stages operating in a supportive classroom climate: prewriting, drafting, revision, editing, and publication.

Writing to learn: theory which asserts that writing facilitates cognitive functions. In this paper, used as the underlying theoretical base for writing across the curriculum.

Summary

This fledgling concept, writing across the curriculum, has a great deal of potential. The review of the literature

will show that it was solidly rooted in composition theory by the group of London researchers who developed the concept and later grounded in subsequent theory by their American counterparts. The primary claim that writing across the curriculum makes is that writing can aid learning, although there are secondary results as well, such as closer relationships between students and teachers and improved writing skills. However, before the techniques can be applied in American classrooms, teachers must be educated to the merits of writing to learn. Also, many factors influence the implementation of a writing across the curriculum program, among them the attitudes of both English and subject-matter teachers and the success of writing workshops, designed both to change preconceived ideas about writing and to offer practical ideas for classrooms. At the present time, writing across the curriculum is much more widely practiced in universities than in secondary schools. However, Tshumy (1982) states that "writing across the curriculum is digging in for a long stay" (p. 63).

Overview of the Study

Chapter II, a review of the literature, is divided into six subsections, beginning with the history of writing across the curriculum, then moving to a discussion of current composition theory and writing to learn, followed by current research on faculty behaviors and attitudes, and

finally narrowing to pedagogical implications for teachers and writing across the curriculum implementation. This chapter, which is quite extensive, forms the theorectical basis for the workshops.

The methodology section, Chapter III, presents an overview of the research population and the procedures for collecting data. Included in Appendix D are detailed accounts of each workshop. In the opinion of the researcher, the extensive detail is necessary for several reasons: it provides a complete record of the treatment and it allows for easy replication of the workshops.

In Chapter IV, the results of the study are presented, discussed, and interpreted. Chapter V concludes the study, places it in perspective to current research, and makes recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature review is divided into six sections, each dealing with a different area of the concept of writing across the curriculum. In order to understand the current status of writing across the curriculum, one must be acquainted with the history of the movement, the focus of the first section. Next, an overview of current composition theory gives depth to the assertion that more expressive writing is needed in every classroom. Addressed in the writing to learn section is the claim that writing can be used as a method for fostering cognitive development. Since the study involves a change in faculty attitudes toward writing, the fourth section reviews the literature on faculty attitudes and behaviors, followed by a survey of pedagogical implications for educators and writing across the curriculum implementation procedures.

History of Writing Across the Curriculum

The historical roots of writing across the curriculum extend at least fifty years into the past. In the late

1930's and early 1940's, the National Council of Teachers of English sponsored a pioneer language across the curriculum study entitled "Correlated Curriculum," which ultimately expressed the fear that language across the curriculum would result in a loss of identity for English, if not its outright death (Tchudi, 1986). Consequently, the idea was largely forgotten in the United States, only to be rediscovered in England in the 1960's. Harold Rosen, Nancy Martin, and James Britton of the London University Institute of Education published in 1966 a paper entitled "Multiple Markings of English Composition." During the research phase for the paper, they realized that the writer's expectations affected how he wrote (Martin, D'Arcy, Newton, & Parker, 1976). During this same period at Leeds University, another researcher, Douglas Barnes, was investigating the importance of talk in the secondary school across a range of subjects (Robertson, 1980). Where the work of both groups converged was in the feeling, yet to be substantiated through research, that many uses of language had been neglected to the detriment of the learning process.

As a result, Britton, Martin, and Rosen set up a research project to look at students' writing abilities across the grades. This ten-year project was funded by the Schools Council in England, and began with a five-year research phase, to be followed by a five-year developmental phase to disseminate the research findings and examine their

pedagogical implications (Tschumy, 1982). Their report is entitled The Development of Writing Abilities 11-18, and was published in 1975. Nancy Martin, in collaboration with three other researchers, offered additional information about the project in her book Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum 11-16, published in 1976. Though the term is used in the title of Martin et al.'s book, Britton is credited with first coining the phrase. In any event, "These two publications have exercised a strong influence in the thinking of teachers about the purpose and value of writing in education . . .", (p.2) according to Pamela Peters (1985), an authority on the status of writing across the curriculum in Australia.

The general recommendations of Britton and his fellow researchers are as follows:

> 1. That to examine learning we have to examine language, to make language visible, rather than leave it transparent and ignore it. Learning happens in the language interactions that are generated in lessons, not in the transmission of information into pupils' heads, with language as the neutral tool for achieving this.
> 2. That this will involve looking at the language of pupil and teacher, and that of textbook and worksheet.
> 3. That teachers will come to respect pupils' language because they will recognize it as a key resource for learning; and will come to a critical awareness of their own language in the process. (Robertson, 1980, p. 16)

Though uncomplicated and seemingly obvious when one reflects on them at the present time, these three ideas had great potential for changing teaching and learning

strategies. It is possible that the work of Britton and others would never have received national attention except for another study which was running concurrently.

In 1972, a report entitled "The Trends of Reading Standards" was published in London. It showed a dramatic drop in the reading and writing abilities of English school-age children (Tschumy, 1982). Margaret Thatcher, at that time Secretary of State for Education and Science, set up a Committee of Inquiry into Reading and the Use of English. The committee, chaired by Sir Alan Bullock, was to investigate the following:

> 1. All aspects of teaching the use of English including reading, writing, and speech;
> 2. How present practice might be improved and the role that initial and inservice training might play;
> 3. To what extent arrangements for monitoring the general level of attainment in these skills can be introduced or improved. (Robertson, 1980, p. 19)

Since James Britton served on the committee, it is not surprising that the message in his book and the subsequent Bullock Report are similar (Tschumy, 1982). The Report, entitled A Language for Life, and published in 1975, devoted six pages to language across the curriculum, with most of the information ultimately narrowed down in Principal Recommendation 4: Each school should have an organized policy for language across the curriculum, establishing every teacher's involvement in language and reading development throughout the years of schooling (Robertson, 1980). It is this recommendation which gave

official sanction to the writing across the curriculum movement.

In the book, Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum 11-16, Nancy Martin et al. (1976) derived four ways of looking at the writing process, all based on the above recommendations. She and her research team hoped to:

> 1. Encourage teachers of all subjects to provide a variety of audiences for their pupils' writing so that they are not so often seen as the teacher-examiner who evaluates whatever the pupils write.
> 2. Encourage teachers of all subjects to provide for their pupils a range of writing purposes (linked to a range of audiences) so that pupils are given more opportunity to express their thoughts.
> 3. Encourage the use of written language as well as spoken for a wider range of thought processes: interpreting, reflecting, thinking creatively and speculatively, as well as recording, reporting, generalizing, and classifying.
> 4. Encourage teachers of all subjects to discuss together how language (spoken and written) can most effectively help their pupils to learn. (p. 34)

Many schools across England took these four ideas and attempted to revitalize their curricula. In fact, another committee was set up to study the schools which had first embraced the policy; this status report can be studied in Irene Robertson's book Language Across the Curriculum: Four Case Studies (1980). In the foreword to that book, Michael Marland, then Chairman of the Schools Council English Committee, reports that:

> Of all of the recommendations of A Language for Life, the apparently easy one, language across the curriculum, has been the most difficult to implement because it involved a total restructuring of every element in the school. (p. 7)

The organization of the school, curriculum planning, learning resources policies, and a one-to-one teacher-pupil relationship are all involved in language across the curriculum, and each aspect is an intrinsic element of every school (Robertson, 1980).

Composition Theory

James Britton, the so-called "father" of the language across the curriculum movement, or as it is called in the United States, writing across the curriculum movement, grounded his work solidly in theory. According to Jean Piaget, there are four stages of cognitive development (Freisinger, 1980). The last stage requires the child to be able "to reason, to formulate by hypotheses, to deduce, to solve problems and make meanings in the abstract . . ." (Freisinger, 1980, p. 162). This last stage, according to Freisinger's explanation, also represents the flowering of mature, logical thought, one measurement of which can be made by reading something that a child has written. Upon reading scores of student papers, Britton and his team found that students were unable to make the jump from concrete into abstract thought. This cognitive deficiency has been noted by many other studies as well (Freisinger, 1980). In simple terms, Britton found that students were seldom asked to speak or write to make meaning out of what they were learning (Stock, 1986). Most of their writing was writing

to inform, when a student writes something for a teacher that the teacher knows more about (Rosen, 1978). Writing of this type includes reports, fill-in-the-blank tests, essays, and term papers. Britton called this type of writing "transactional," and his surveys showed that 63.4% of all writing done in the British public schools was of this type (Hillocks, 1986). Janet Emig, an American researcher who reported her findings in The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders (1971), found the same mode of composition prevalent in American schools (Freisinger, 1980). According to yet another writer, Toby Fulwiler (1980), a leader in the American writing across the curriculum movement and a faculty member at the University of Vermont, the percentage of transactional writing in American schools is 84%. However, the most startling percentage comes from The Writing Report Card (1986), published by the National Assessment of Educational Progress and funded by the United States Office for Educational Research and Improvement, which places at 88% the number of American students reporting in the informative, or transactional, mode (Applebee et al., 1986). If the preference for this type of writing injures cognitive development, as James Britton and others believe, then the decline in writing skills does indeed reflect the overall educational decline earlier alluded to.

Britton has two other categories for writing. One is poetic, or creative, writing. This writing would involve stories, poems, or any other type of writing which expresses feelings in creative form. Britton found poetic writing to be 17.6% in the British public schools, and Fulwiler less than 7% in American schools (Fulwiler, 1980; Hillocks, 1986). While poetic writing might develop a child's creative capacities, it still does not greatly influence his cognitive processes. A third type of writing, which does influence cognitive thought, and which is the foundation of writing across the curriculum, is termed by Britton as "expressive."

Expressive writing, constituting less than 5% of the work being written in modern classrooms, is close to speech and thinking. This type of writing is unstructured and free, the type of writing done in journals, letters, first drafts, and diaries (Fulwiler, 1980). It helps a student to get a grip on the subject matter of his discourse and can be central to the inquiry method of learning. Students who were allowed to write expressively for Britton made comments such as these about their writing:

> Writing, like talking, helps you to understand. . . . It clears my mind to some extent what my view in whatever the subject is. . . . Writing helps me know what I think. (Peters, 1985, p. 2).

According to Randall Freisinger (1980), expressive language leads to open-ended exploration of the subject matter; transactive, to closure. Other researchers as well have

heralded the use of expressive writing. Janet Emig (1971), whose work parallels that of Britton, terms it "reflexive," and Virginia Draper (1979), "formative," but the concept is the same: allowing students to personalize the writing they do to prove their knowledge. Virginia Draper offers the following rationale:

> Between the acts of memorization and analysis, synthesis, application, and evaluation, between the acts of gathering data and taking notes and transcribing an essay, there has to be time for exploration; for tentative beginnings, expansion, playing with ideas, trying out different roles and hearing different voices, for the suspension of accountability in favor of experimentation and flexibility. During this time, these writing activities can serve the student and teacher. (p. 18)

Formative writing offers opportunities for teachers and learners to explore choices, use experience, discuss ideas, communicate frequently, and evaluate formatively (Draper, 1979). One additional point Draper makes is that expressive writing can serve as a beginning point for students:

> . . . in the beginning stages of forming or developing one's thoughts and ideas, certain formalities of standard written English are not of primary importance, and attention to them may impede the fluency which characterizes exploration and (creating) thinking. (p. 4)

Freisinger (1980) agrees, stating that expressive writing and talking are most useful to the writer as exploratory tools at the beginning of a demanding writing task.

One important element of expressive writing is the involvement of self. According to James Britton, "'an essential part of the writing process is explaining the matter to oneself'" (Freisinger, 1980, p. 161). Perhaps

part of the current estrangement that students feel toward writing can be explained in the neglect of the expressive function. In the view of George Hillocks (1986), self-sponsored writing seems to result in greater commitment and concern than so-called school-sponsored writing. Emig, too, writes that "'most good writing begins when the writer addresses oneself. . . '" (Draper, 1979, p. 11). Peter Elbow identifies self-identification with writing as "voice": "'In your natural way of producing words there is a sound, a texture, a rhythm - a voice - which is the main source of power in your writing'" (Draper, 1979, p. 6). It is primarily through expressive writing that one's voice can be heard.

Ultimately, many writers visualize expressive writing as a groundwork for more mature writing. Draper (1979) calls expressive writing "a kind a matrix from which differentiated forms of mature writing are developed" (p. 12). Similarly, Freisinger (1980) points out that "the writer works outward from an expressive phase toward transactional writing, which is the terminal point of a complex, messy, recursive process" (p. 162). Freisinger also asks the question, "What evidence is there to prove that students who engage in expressive writing will produce better transactional writing?" (p. 156). He cites the need for more research as to the educational value of expressive writing, for as yet there is no real answer.

The above-discussed composition theory reflects what rhetoricians term a "paradigm shift." Coined in 1963 by Thomas Kuhn, the phrase describes a change in theory that occurs when old methods will not solve new problems. As explained by Hairston (1983-84), the traditional paradigm was product-oriented, and was derived from classical rhetoric, based on some idealized and orderly vision. This Aristotelian paradigm emphasized:

> The composed product rather than the composing process; the analysis of discourse into words, sentences, and paragraphs; the classification of discourse into description, narration, exposition, and argument; the strong concern with usage . . . and with style, the preoccupation with the informal essay and research paper; and so on. (Farris, 1987, p. 28)

However, this traditional model is not producing results, and faced with the discouragement that arises from an unrewarding task, teachers

> are exhausting themselves trying to teach writing from an outmoded model, and they come to despise the job more and more because many of their students improve so little despite their time and effort. (Hairston, 1984, p. 5)

Gradually, the paradigm has shifted from this product-orientation to an emphasis on process. Farris (1987) contends that "once a new idea takes hold and the time of transition is over, there is no turning back" (p. 28). Donald Murray (1976) asks "What is the process one should teach?" (p. 79), and then proceeds to answer his question:

> . . . It is the process of discovery through language. It is the process of exploration of what we know and what we feel about what we know through language. It is the process of using language to learn about our world, to evaluate what we learn about our world, to communicate what we learn about our world. (pp. 79-80)

Generally speaking, the writing process is divided into five stages: prewriting, writing, revision, editing, and publishing (Upton, 1986). However, Walshe (1987) cautions that the notion of process not be degraded to cookbook steps between a topic and a product. Rather, the large "process" consists of a multitude of smaller processes. In Walshe's (1987) words:

> Writing is never only writing. As deep and careful thinking, it draws on all kinds of resources. Not only on memory but on reading, research and note-making, on talking things over, and on insights that come with waiting, incubating. At its best it is a collecting, connecting, clarifying discovery process. (p. 26)

Farris (1987) further explains the involvement of self in writing: "For the neo-Romantic expressivist, the assumption is that writing shape itself from within and reflects the processes of the individual's creative imagination" (p. 31).

The process-product part of the movement can trace some of its theoretical roots to Dewey. According to Walshe (1987), Dewey felt that one should not overconcentrate on a desired end (or product), should not become an obsessive, impatient end-gainer. Instead, the means (or processes) should be emphasized, because "the product is what process makes it" (p. 25).

The importance of product vs. process cannot be overemphasized. Farris (1987) goes so far as to claim that no other single development has been more influential on research, teaching, and textbook publication than this shift to an emphasis on writing as process rather than product.

In summary, then, many researchers, beginning with James Britton, have found that transactional instead of expressive writing currently dominates the composition scene. Recent theory is taking the problem further. If one accepts the premise that expressive writing answers a "what" question for writing, researchers are now beginning to ask "why" (Parker, 1985). Composition theory has now turned toward psychology, and the psychological approach to writing does stress that the self is the source of all statements (Bazerman, 1979). In addition, theorists are examining and applying the principles of Bloom's Taxonomy to writing in order to deepen the cognitive element of the writing experience (Schlawin, 1980). James Moffett has developed four modes of discourse which "may be taken up sequentially, in order to encourage the writer to . . . move from personal to more impersonal" points of view (Fulwiler & Young, 1982, p. 10). Modern theorists, having digested this information, have recognized that there has been in the past few years a paradigm shift, a reduction of product emphasis and increased recognition of the importance of the process of writing. This new understanding has resulted in a holistic

approach to the study of writing. Because composition theory has in recent years ignored the connection between reading and writing and self and writing, modern theorists are now calling for a total writing experience, an experience achievable through writing across the curriculum.

Writing to Learn

In order to appreciate fully the learning concepts that would be developed through a writing across the curriculum program, it is necessary to more closely examine the type of learning now evident in American classrooms. Stephen Tchudi (1986) states:

> The majority of school and college teaching still follows the old deductive problem of instructors presenting concepts and having students show mastery of them. (p. 22)

When teachers present these concepts and then solicit the same information from students, the implication is that the students are simply memory banks to discharge to the teacher information that the teacher already knows (Freisinger, 1980). Other studies confirm this current situation. One researcher complained that

> the research gives a picture of . . . placing too much emphasis on the student as a "storage tank" and giving too little attention to the education of the student as a fully functioning human being . . . . (Draper, 1979, p. 12)

Patricia L. Stock (1986) discusses the type of classroom talk, similar to the writing, that was found by Britton.

She explains that the teacher declares the topic and asks about it a question to which he or she already knows the answer; students then try to guess the answer that the teacher has in mind. Stock cites an example from <u>The Development of Writing Abilities 11-18</u> (Britton):

> Teacher: Where does it go before it reaches your lungs?
> Pupil: Your windpipe, Miss.
> Teacher: Down your windpipe . . . . Now can anyone remember the other word for windpipe?
> Pupil: The trachea.
> Teacher: The trachea . . . good . . . . After it has gone through the trachea where does it go then? . . . There are a lot of little pipes going into the lungs . . . . What are those called? Ian?
> Pupil: The bronchii.
> Teacher: The bronchii. . . . That's the plural. . . . What is the singular? What is one of these tubes?
> Pupil: Bronchus.
> Teacher: Bronchus. . . . with "us" at the end . . . . (p. 98)

Stock comments that "it's like asking children to fill in blanks in a teacher's mind" (p. 98). Horrified, she concludes that this talk might produce young people who are capable of nothing more than filling in the blanks.

The current status of writing reflects a similar state. Most student writers, according to Draper (1979), are unaware of "the writer's way of composing," of the process of crafting the product stage by stage. Quite the opposite, many teachers have acted as if the only language activity useful to education were the finished report or essay (Freisinger, 1980). Furthermore, this report or essay was something done after the learning,

> a wholly subordinate activity, at most enabling students to demonstrate the extent of their learning ceremonially as it were, in a prescribed format. (Haring-Smith et al., 1985, pp. 465-66)

This narrow viewpoint has helped frighten students away from writing. THe National Assessment for Educational Progress reports that students' positive attitudes toward writing fall steadily as those students advance in the grades (Applebee et al., 1986).

Perhaps one of the strongest reasons for students' dislike of writing is that the teacher often assumes the role of critic. According to the NAEP, teachers are far more likely to mark mistakes than to show an interest in what students write or to make suggestions for the next paper (Applebee et al., 1986). Likewise, Martin et al. (1976) contend:

> When school writing in all subjects is marked chiefly for accuracy - either of content or form or both - then pupils are constantly in a testing situation where they will take the minimum of risks. (p. 32)

Afraid to make a mistake, children draw back and ignore their own writing voice. The existing status of learning, then, in the public schools appears to be rote, and that of writing, uninspired and inadequate. The alternative, writing to learn across the curriculum, is worth trying.

The term "writing across the curriculum" could mean an action so shallow as simply requiring more writing in every class. However, one viewpoint of writing across the curriculum is, in actuality, writing to <u>learn</u> across the

curriculum, although many times it is still simply called writing across the curriculum. It is the writing to learn element that seems to make the difference in the program's being a success or a failure, for if a teacher embraces the writing to learn concept that is at the heart of writing across the curriculum, his or her philosophical base of teaching perhaps will alter, and any changes he makes toward writing are more likely to be permanent.

One first step toward writing to learn is the acceptance of language as a vital learning tool. According to Pamela Peters (1985), "language is the means by which intuitive knowledge is brought to the surface and used" (p. 1). Patricia Stock (1986) goes so far as to state that any discussion of writing across the curriculum is really an opportunity to explore the relationships between language and learning in the classroom. Language transcends the barriers between subjects. One major article which develops this idea and which appears again and again in the literature is "Writing as a Mode of Learning" by Janet Emig (1977). In the article, Emig "develops a persuasive theoretical argument for writing as a 'central academic process'" (Herrington, 1981, p. 379). Certainly, writing is one of the most readily accessible and powerful means of learning (Newell, 1984).

Weiss (1979) cites Vygotsky, Luria, and Bruner as psychologists whose work has indicated that writing is a

complex act demanding the use of higher cognitive functions. In a study conducted at West Chester State College in Pennsylvania, Weiss found that the concepts students wrote about were clearer than the concepts they did not write about, "powerful evidence in favor of a cross-disciplinary approach to writing" (p. 7). In the introduction to his study, Weiss cites seventeen sources for his statement that writing is a thought-organizing process. One interesting point is made by Walshe (1987), that human beings are natural learners. He cites one writer who states: "'It is the business of the brain to learn - basically the brain does nothing else'" (p. 26). Walshe's philosophy is that

> from kindergarten, children are treated as having an inborn drive to learn, reserves of knowledge worth recalling, and experiences worth articulating with the help of writing. (p. 26)

Statistical studies are now beginning to appear. One such study was conducted by Newell in 1984, presenting quantitative evidence that essay writing does aid learning.

Because of this theory, the teaching of writing and heavier use of writing should take place in every subject in the curriculum (Peters, 1985; Schlawin, 1980). Tchudi and Yates (1983) state that writing about the content of a course has a practical payoff, that the act often motivates reluctant learners and writers and that it teaches thinking. It makes sense that teachers would want to embrace a technique whereby students can master the content of any course. There are dozens of discourse forms for content

writing, many of which teachers need to be made aware so that they can vary their writing activities. One excellent list can be found in Teaching Writing in the Content Areas (Tchudi and Yates, 1983).

The embracing of writing across the curriculum means changing preconceived ideas of how knowledge is obtained. Martin et al. (1976) ask the question, "Is education really about taking on a received body of knowledge. . . ?" (p. 66). They go on, "How much of the information that children are presented with in school becomes a permanent part of their view of the world?" (p. 66). The traditional view is that the teacher possesses the knowledge and passes it on to his or her pupils; Knoblauch and Brannon (1983) flatly condemn this concept as "venerable and deep-seated - and wrong" (p. 467). The Brannock Report puts it this way: "It is a confusion of everyday thought that we tend to regard 'knowledge' as something that exists independently of someone who knows" (Martin et al., 1976, p. 67). Instead, knowledge only exists in the mind of the knower; if he does not know it, then it does not exist for him.

Ruth Tschumy (1982) writes: "Each of us, as learners, knows that the knowledge that has stayed with us is the knowledge that we have personalized" (p. 66). If students are encouraged to relate facts to their own experiences, these facts are reformulated and cemented rather than merely stockpiled on a short-term basis in order to pass an exam.

When students compose their thoughts about new subjects in their own language, in the idioms and metaphors of their own experience, then they truly internalize the material (Stock, 1986). Fulwiler (1980) notes that the type of writing students do makes an essential difference; students must be allowed to write in the expressive mode. The mere act of writing does not guarantee that learning is occurring (Gere, 1985). Expressive writing, or process writing, will eventually result in an improved product (Draper, 1979). However, the improvement of writing is a by-product of writing for learning, not a goal (Knoblauch & Brannon, 1983). This relatively unstructured writing allows the writer to work through a particular theme, subject, or issue, providing at the same time a record of his or her thinking, while the product ultimately becomes available for review (Giroux, 1979).

One of the strongest by-products of writing to learn is the element of discovery writing. The student himself literally discovers knowledge. One student had this to say about writing to learn:

> "I was forced to think about the material thoroughly in order to write a comprehensive page. By doing this, I obtained a greater understanding of the material." (Herrington, 1981, p. 382)

Harold Rosen, a co-researcher with James Britton, makes the statement that "'writing has potentiality for discovery of what you think, and believe, and mean'" (Rosen, 1978, p. 51). Lee Odell (1980), of the State University of New

York at Albany, agrees that writing needs to be thought of as "a process of discovery, a process of exploring. . . ." (p. 140). Odell cites Donald Murray:

> "As writers, we are drawn forward to see what argument comes forth in our essays, to find out if hero becomes victim in our novels, to discover the reason for an historic event in our biographies, to experience the image which makes the blurred snapshot come clear in our poems." (p. 142)

Furthermore, Odell makes the point that through writing we sometimes discover what we do not know as well as what we do know. "Sometimes we write to discover that we do not think. Then we get a sense of what we do think" (p. 143). Finally, through writing we sometimes change our ideas - - we may no longer think or feel as we once did. Writing as a discovery process helps students find out for themselves what they know or do not know, and forces them to connect, even negatively, with subject material. The simplest statement of all comes from C. Day Lewis: "'We do not write in order to be understood; we write in order to understand'" (Diamond, 1980, p. 1). It is this concept which is the very core of writing to learn across the curriculum.

Faculty Attitudes and Behaviors

Studies show that the teacher is without question the key to a successful classroom learning experience (Braun, 1976). If the teacher is positive, supportive, and comfortable with pupils, more learning takes place and

higher achievement results. This intuitive feeling is supported by teacher effectiveness research, which demonstrates that a teacher's knowledge, attitudes, and other characteristics are correlated with his or her classroom teaching process which in turn effects changes in student behaviors and achievement (Cantrell, Stenner, & Katzenmeyer, 1977). This study goes on to state that "an optimizing combination of teacher characteristics for pupil achievement gain may not lie primarily along the authoritarian/non-authoritarian dimension" (p.178). In other words, the teacher must be positive, supportive, and comfortable with pupils. He or she must praise and encourage. In fact, Cantrell et al. (1977) assert that it is possible to link teacher knowledge of behavioral principles and teacher attitude profiles to indices of both teacher classroom process and student learning. Teacher attitude definitely affects student achievement.

Naturally, teacher attitudes about learning also carry over into the realm of writing. Traditionally, writing has been viewed as an important part of the instructional process, but many studies show that teachers lack a conscious approach to the problem of student writing (Zemelman, 1977). Swanson-Owens (1986) expresses her concern that those concerned with effective implementation of writing across the curriculum need to look very carefully at the ways in which such reform efforts interact with the

practical knowledge that teachers possess. Teacher attitude is vital. Robert Blake (1976) maintains that students and teachers alike profit from a close examination of teacher attitudes toward composing in writing. Fulwiler and Young, after a decade of being involved in writing across the curriculum programs at Michigan Technological University, comment:

> It now seems surprising how slowly it dawned on us that if we wanted to measure any effect produced directly by the program we should measure . . . the impact on the faculty first and only later try to measure the impact on students. (Sipple, 1987, p. 50)

Sipple supports this concept of faculty attitude change by pointing out that the only measurable dimension of Fulwiler and Young's work was in the area of faculty attitudes. In her own research, Sipple studied university faculty members' reactions to 45 hour-long seminars as they related to writing assignments in their respective courses. Analysis of the transcripts revealed that teachers who participated in the writing across the curriculm seminars had a larger, more clearly defined repertoire of strategies for planning a variety of writing asignments appropriate for their courses. Additionally, unlike the nonparticipants, the participants used the writing assignments they planned to aid student learning, rather than just to test student knowledge. They also planned the assignments to help students solve particular problems, and integrated the assignments into

what was being studied, so that students would see the relationship between writing and learning (Sipple, 1987).

Davis (1985) hypothesizes that although most faculty would agree that writing promotes student learning, they lack a systematic approach to translating that awareness into practice. Also, teachers are not clear about the role they should assign writing or about the specific intellectual skills that might be developed as a result of teaching writing (Swanson-Owens, 1986). Even when teachers know what goals they want writing to accomplish in their classrooms, such understanding is not always enough since certain instructional practices can undermine those goals. Marshall (1984) reports that the types of instructional support teachers give to writing activities (time they allot, the audience they designate, the extent to which they structure assignments, the emphasis they place on final versus working drafts) are powerful determiners of the value of writing as a mode of learning (Swanson-Owens, 1986).

A subset of teacher attitudes is writing apprehension. One ordinarily associates the term with students who are afraid to write for various reasons: a history of adverse responses to their writing, too much compulsory writing, a tendency toward perfectionism, and so on (Smith, 1984). And there are a number of articles which review the literature on student writing apprehension (Daly & Wilson, 1983; Donlan, 1986; Weiss & Walters, 1980). But what about the

teacher who is apprehensive about writing? At this time, little research has been done on teacher writing apprehension. One study, conducted by Claypool (1980), did involve secondary school teachers. Her hypothesis was that teachers across the curriculum who are highly apprehensive about writing assign fewer writing tasks than do low apprehensive teachers. The hypothesis was confirmed in Claypool's study. Studies designed to reduce this writing apprehension have been conducted by Fox (1980); Fulwiler, Gorman, and Gorman (1986); Raimes (1979); and Weiss and Peich (1980). All conclude that university writing apprehension can be reduced through participation in writing courses, workshops, or seminars. Donlan (1986) concludes that teachers need to be aware of their own writing apprehension as well as that of their students. It makes sense that if teachers were apprehensive writers, they would be unlikely to use writing in their classrooms since, classically, the apprehensive writer avoids both writing tasks and instruction in writing. An important item needs to be emphasized here: the vast majority of these studies have been conducted with university faculty. Donlan (1986) and Smith (1984) point out that few researchers have used secondary classrooms or teachers in their research.

Also, what has not been explored is how attitudes toward writing and writing apprehension interact with the process of teaching. Swanson-Owens (1986) asserts that

outside change agents cannot afford to overlook insider perspectives since improving schools turns on the incentives, attitudes, abilities, and responses of those ultimately responsible for translating reforms into improved educational services for students. One effective way to change teacher attitudes has been through the use of inservice in the form of workshops. In fact, a shift in teachers' attitudes, values and beliefs is listed as one of four desired changes brought about through in-service training (Dilworth, 1981). One of the best models for teacher training in the area of writing is the National Writing Project (NWP). Begun in Berkeley, California, as the Bay Area Writing Project, the NWP emphasizes the growth of teachers as much as improved student writing (Goldberg, 1984). The workshops have proved to be immensely successful, spawning a number of similarly-constructed writing workshops all over the country. For example, in North Carolina, there is the Appalachian Writing Project at Appalachian State University, and others at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, UNC-Charlotte, and Wake Forest University. In fact, the statement has been made that teachers who are trained in the NWP workshops are often transformed (Goldberg, 1984). The Project operates under the following premises about teachers:

1. Teachers must practice the skills they teach;
2. Teachers are excellent teachers of other teachers;

3. Most teachers are intelligent people who want to do a good job;
4. Teachers do not know much about writing but they are eager to learn;
5. Teachers must participate in professional activities (teaching other teachers, developing curricula, attending professional meetings) if they are to grow professionally (Goldberg, 1984).

Sipple (1987) corroborates these assumptions, asserting that writing seminars are an effective way to instruct teachers in the basics of content area writing instruction, and that they improve teacher attitudes concerning writing assignments. In his 1985 dissertation, Davis hypothesizes along the same lines. He believes that encouraging faculty to talk and reflect over an extended period of time about their attitudes and practices frequently results in self-initiated changes in their teaching practices. Ultimately, teachers must change themselves.

Pedagogical Implications for Educators

What does the individual classroom teacher need to know in order to incorporate writing across the curriculum into his or her classroom? First, he or she must create a favorable classroom environment, that is, one which allows time for personal inquiry and exploration and a wider range of language uses (Freisinger, 1980; Robertson, 1980).

William Reynolds (1980) describes a favorable writing environment as one in which children feel comfortable and at ease with their efforts, without fear of censure.

In addition to environment, a teacher must understand something about the theoretical role of audience. George Hillocks (1986), editor and author of the NCTE's Research on Written Composition, notes that only a few studies have examined the role of audience, a surprising finding when one notes the important role that it is given in contemporary rhetorical theory. Perhaps a simplified definition of audience and its role is examined by Bazerman (1979):

> Description of the social context of writing begins with the observation that each piece of writing is directed towards an audience; moreover, each written statement is a social act with respect to that audience. The writer is trying to do something to, for, or with that group of people brought together as audience: that something may be rousing to action, entertaining, showing solidarity, reinforcing opinion, demonstrating competence, exhibiting sensibility, sharing perceptions, unburdening one's spirit, adding to the common stock of knowledge, or any other act that can be performed through language. (p. 6)

Draper's (1979) view of audience is that of a helpful guide:

> The audience, no matter who it is, should be concerned with assisting the student to clarify, form, shape, and develop by commenting upon the interesting, challenging, and positive aspects of communication, by asking questions, by offering suggestions and resources for the student's further investigation. (p. 4)

The clearest explanation of audience is detailed by Nancy Martin et al. (1976), who point out that children will change their writing according to their audience. They give the example of a letter written three times: once to a

newspaper, then to a friend, then to an acquaintance. Though all may be about the same subject, the tone will vary because of the perceived differences in audience. Furthermore, they cite Britton's explanation of audience categories:

1. Child (or adolescent) to self
2. Child (or adolescent) to trusted adult
3. Pupil to teacher as partner in dialogue
4. Pupil to teacher seen as examiner or assessor
5. Child (or adolescent) to his peers (as expert, co-worker, friend, etc.)
6. Writer to his readers (or unknown audience)

A point to be noted is that "perhaps writing for an examiner audience always has an element of constriction about it. . . ." (Martin et al., 1976, p. 69). In addition, "what pleases the teacher is apparently of major importance to these pupils. After all, he can be judge, jury, and hangman - and there is no appeal" (Martin et al., 1976, p. 13). Since most school writing is, indeed, transactional, the major audience is the teacher. If he or she is a critical audience, immeasurable harm can be done to students, both in terms of self-concept and writing limitation. Martin et al. note:

> The power of the teacher was dramatically illustrated by the recollections of some of the students who could remember clearly how a single remark by a particular teacher influenced their feelings about writing for months - even years - afterwards. Sometimes the effect seemed beneficial, sometimes not, but either way it seems that teachers may often underestimate the effect that their opinions can have on their pupils. (p. 15)

Furthermore, no matter how creative the assignments, if the teacher treats the resulting writings as unimportant, or merely samples of writing, then the students begin to resent having to write (Herrington, 1981). What, then, is the role of teacher as audience? The teacher can make a conscious effort to provide students with a noncritical audience. But how does this affect evaluation? Once teachers embrace writing across the curriculum, they must still give students a grade.

Tchudi and Yates (1983) offer seven methods of evaluation, only one of which is testing: peer revision, testing, pass/fail, mini-conference, publishing, oral reading, and a writing portfolio. According to Anne Herrington (1981), a teacher should evaluate in terms of a limited number of criteria which evolve from the task, purpose, and audience of an assignment. Rather than writing for an examination, students could write dialogues, stories, interviews with authors, and so on. Another suggestion is for tests to be short essay rather than short answer and multiple choice (Reynolds, 1980). Most researchers realize that the ability to write a good examination is crucial to academic success and success beyond schooling (Gere, 1985). But the examination question should encourage synthesis rather than recitation (Gere, 1985). And if a student feels comfortable with his teacher as audience, he is bound to learn more and write more fluently. It makes sense for the

teacher to try to create a situation where students can produce their best writing and where they display their content knowledge as fully and as clearly as they are able (Gere, 1985).

Writing Across the Curriculum Implementation

Role of the English Department

The English department is vital to the schoolwide implementation of a successful writing across the curriculum program. Because writing has traditionally come under the auspices of the English department, it seems to follow naturally that English teachers would take the lead (Culp, McCormack, & Smith, 1987). According to Irene Robertson (1980), the role of the head of the English department is of the greatest importance and he or she is uniquely placed to encourage a writing across the curriculum policy. In fact, in one school featured in Robertson's (1980) case study, the department head's lack of interest and understanding resulted in the failure of the policy.

Interesting, here are two viewpoints: the English department's view of itself and the outsiders' view of the English department. Many English teachers regard their commitment to the subject as literary, rather than written (Peters, 1985). Too, English teachers can be somewhat defensive when it comes to trying something new. In the mid 1970's, the news media discovered that Johnny couldn't

write. Magazines and newspapers drew attention to the problem - blaming TV, parents, and, especially, English teachers (Haring-Smith, 1985). It is understandable that English teachers do not want to be blamed again. Tchudi (1986) also refers to the blame that English teachers suffered through as a result of the elective movement, which supposedly led to a decline in educational standards. He goes on to absolve English teachers from blame and calls on them to provide educational leadership wherever it is needed. Feeling defensive, however, is not the main emotion of English teachers. Most language arts teachers wholeheartedly support writing across the curriculum, but not for theoretical reasons; English teachers are tired of the burden of teaching all of the writing.

It is futile to complain about the fact that English teachers have a heavy burden to bear. If writing across the curriculum is to take hold, the fact remains that these same English teachers may have to "sell" the rest of the faculty on the merits of writing as learning. Tchudi and Yates (1983) have some suggestions specifically for English teachers:

> That English teachers broaden their scope to include at least one content-area writing project each semester, thus demonstrating that the English faculty cares about student writing in other subjects.
>
> That English teachers use informal writing daily in their classes to reinforce and develop writing skills and to convey the idea that writing is an important tool for everyday use.
>
> That English teachers learn about the content-area writing demands that their students face in order to

> know accurately what their students are expected to do in other classes.
>
> That English teachers evaluate writing in terms of its content and substance, not just the quality of its language. (pp. 74-75)

These are concrete suggestions that can be practiced by departments of English before the overall implementation of a writing across the curriculum program.

Role of Other Teachers

Naturally, teachers in subjects other than English also feel strongly about this issue. Mary King, (McLeod, King, Knoblauch, & Brannon, 1984) of the University of Akron, asks why English teachers look to other departments to promote learning through writing. Furthermore, she delivers a scathing reprimand of English departments:

> Many members of English departments do not believe that writing can be taught, do not believe students can learn to write or even that they can learn at all, do not understand the generative process in writing, and do not value a generative relationship with students. (p. 617)

Though angry and strong, King's comments do contain the basic feelings of many other subject matter teachers. A large number of other teachers regard writing as the province of the English department and look askance at any effort to broaden the writing throughout the entire curriculum.

Provided that an English department will take the lead, exactly what role can and should other subject matter teachers play in developing writing across the curriculum?

Fulwiler (1981a) notes that other teachers' understanding of writing has not been translated into classroom practice. Other teachers are afraid of writing and unconvinced of its necessity. Tchudi (1986) bluntly says that when we invite colleagues in other disciplines and fields to teach writing, we are in fact calling for nothing less than a revolution. Robertson (1980) agrees, noting that many people presented with evidence of a school's language problems will be angry rather than grateful. Some of the anger may derive from the recollections of bad writing experiences that they themselves had (Schlawin, 1980). Finally, some are afraid that writing will take away from their course content (Schlawin, 1980). They feel that they are already swamped by curricular pressures and wonder how they can take on the additional burden of writing instruction (Smith & Bean, 1980). Pressures like these can kill a budding writing across the curriculum program before it even gets started.

Indeed, why should a non-writing teacher sponsor expressive writing activities? Draper (1979) gives four reasons:

> 1. Because we have reason to believe that these writing activities will produce better writing.
> 2. Because these activities give the teacher an opportunity to interact with the student during the learning process in ways that are satisfying to the teacher, providing support, motivation and assistance.
> 3. Because these writings cue the teacher to students' interests and problems.
> 4. Because these activities create and support conditions necessary for effective learning. (pp. 12-13)

If the lessons taught in writing classes are not repeated and emphasized in students' other classes, those lessons will be useless (Fulwiler, 1981b). But other teachers cannot be simply told; they must be convinced by reasons such as the above.

It is time to unify all teachers on the issue of writing as learning. Fulwiler (1981b) asserts that there is a wealth of knowledge about writing within the pool of teachers who do not teach writing. In fact, Winterowd (1986) is convinced that any other type of teacher can make a good writing teacher if that person is a competent writer and if he wants to become a competent writing teacher. Perhaps another role of the English department would be to show other teachers just how much they already know and how to put that knowledge into classroom practice (Fulwiler, 1981a). Tchudi and Yates (1983) go so far as to say that there are certain advantages that other subject matter teachers possess over English teachers: there are no preconceived notions about how writing must be taught. Also, students do not view other teachers in the disciplines as they do English teachers; they might feel more free to express themselves for a teacher whom they do not perceive as "hung up on correct language." (Fulwiler, 1981b, p. 27).

Just as Tchudi and Yates (1983) make suggestions for the English teacher, so do they make some for subject teachers as well. The following are policy statements that

would foster writing across the curriculum for non-English teachers:

> That subject teachers assign at least one good, solid content-writing project each semester.
> That subject teachers cultivate the use of informal writing on a regular basis by having students keep journals, diaries, notebooks, logs, etc.
> That subject teachers build excellence into criteria for evaluation of writing in their courses.
> That subject teachers take responsibility for clearly stating the specific conventions of writing in their disciplines so that students know exactly what they must do to write successfully for a specific teacher of a particular subject.
> That subject teachers supply the English faculty with one piece of writing for each course indicative of the student's best writing. (p. 75)

English teachers and subject teachers must work together. Ordinarily, teachers of the same discipline interact educationally with each other, rarely with other teachers. "Generally speaking, we have as little idea of what our colleagues are doing and experiencing on the job as the 'point rider' on a cattle drive did of the 'drag rider'" (Cummings, 1982, p. 414). This segregation cannot exist if writing across the curriculum is to flourish. The establishing of writing as a means of communication and as an instrument of thought is transdisciplinary (Winterowd, 1986). Since the learning value does indeed transcend the disciplines, all disciplines must aid in the implementation of writing across the curriculum. Toby Fulwiler expresses his feeling that the job of improving students' writing is too complex, too time-consuming, to be undertaken by any one course or any one discipline (Odell, 1980). The NAEP

confirms this point of view: since students have so much difficulty absorbing and expressing abstract ideas, all educators should be concerned, not just teachers of English (Applebee et al., 1986). Writing across the curriculum cannot exist without full faculty support.

Implementation Procedures

The implementation of writing across the curriculum may come about through school choice or through administrative decree. For example, the school board in Brookhaven, NY, mandated Policy #6146: "Composition shall be an integral part of all subject areas of the curriculum from kindergarten through grade twelve" (Reynolds, 1980, p. 83). Faced with such a decree, the school had no choice but to implement a hasty writing across the curriculum program. Or, on the other hand, a school may be led by an innovative principal who decides that writing across the curriculum makes sense and calls on his teachers to broaden their use of writing. The point is that the decision to implement may come with teacher approval and input or it may come from "on high," without much warning.

The first step is in the school's adopting a writing across the curriculum policy, hammered out and agreed upon by the people who will implement it (Tchudi and Yates, 1983). Once a policy is in effect, what is still needed is a writing coordinator who can direct its implementation and

through whom all ideas can filter (Peters, 1985). Donlan (1986) calls for a survey to be administered among the faculty to see who is the most interested in the idea and to see what kind of writing is already in progress. Next, he advocates the formation of a writing committee, under the leadership of the coordinator, and composed of teachers of all disciplines, who would be the subject-area leaders. Donlan's article gives detailed information about this writing committee. Once the key people have been established, there are numerous ways that one can implement writing across the curriculum. Some ideas are as follows:

> . . . consultations among faculty, informal workshops, formal seminars, voluntary "faculty development" activities, team teaching, course pairings, course clusters of special training for writing teachers to serve particular areas of a discipline, or of reciprocal training for content teachers to give writing courses in their departments. (Donovan & McClelland, 1980, p. 134)

Other excellent suggestions come from Tchudi and Yates (1983):

> - Include parents in the planning, letting them express their concerns about the quality of their children's writing.
> - Start a pool of lesson plans and teaching ideas in the content areas as a catalyst for reluctant or cautious teachers.
> - Treat writing as a focus for in-service training for a year. Bring in writing consultants from a university or another school district and have them work on a long-range basis, helping develop the program, not simply making one-time presentations and departing.
> - Issue press releases on the concern for literacy to notify the community of the school's commitment.
> - Set up an annual school writing awards program.
> (p. 76)

The Fall, 1984, issue of the Arizona English Teachers' Bulletin (Fleming, 1984) has some other practical suggestions for implementation, as do Spanjer and Boiarsky (1981). There are even computer programs available, though they are mentioned only briefly in the literature. One is WANDAH (Writing Aid and Author's Helper); another, Camelot (Roueche, Baker, & Roueche, 1986); and one, Plato. All three programs help edit students' writing.

Realistically, anyone interested in promoting writing across the curriculum must realize that the practical problems of implementing a study at the secondary school level are numerous (Peters, 1985). Many schools which have tried the concept have been unsuccessful:

> It comes as no surprise to find that many schools drawing up a language across the curriculum policy have no coherent idea of what it should contain. (Tschumy, 1982, p. 63)

Therefore, it is vital that a knowledgeable person be responsible for the program, either at the school or central office level. Also, the program must be based on solid theory and research (Donovan & McClelland, 1980).

This research shows that perhaps the most effective way of implementing a writing across the curriculum program is through a series of workshops. An excellent article on this method is "Cross-Disciplinary Writing Workshops: Theory and Practice," by Randall Freisinger (1980). According to the author, the workshop staff 1) must possess consummate rhetorical skill, 2) be sympathetic to the concerns of

colleagues from other disciplines, and 3) must operate from a solid broad-based theoretical background. Diplomacy is important, too, for the subject of the workshop is basically challenging the prevailing teaching-learning model (Freisinger, 1980). Many other authors address the workshop topic, also. Among them is Toby Fulwiler, who has been a leader in the American writing across the curriculum movement. Workshop information can be found in Dittmer, 1986; Fulwiler, 1980; Fulwiler, 1981a; Fulwiler, 1981b; Haring-Smith, 1985; Nochimson, 1980; Reynolds, 1980; and Rose, 1979. Many of the workshops last for two days and all contain varying degrees of similar activities. One activity is the presentation of the theoretical base from which writing across the curriculum is derived; another asks workshop members to share writing problems that they have encountered in their students' papers; still another activity involves expressive work, written and shared by the teachers in the workshop; often, an evaluation section is included where teachers discuss grading techniques; and finally, many times the teachers brainstorm to discover activities that all can use.

Almost as diverse as the number of articles on workshops is the amount of information on writing activities. The activities run the gamut. Stock (1986) advocates the use of letterwriting; Cummings (1982), the writing idea bank; Draper (1979), free writing; Schlawin

(1980), interviews; and a host of others including note-taking, thank-you notes, and word problems. But the most frequently mentioned activity that is associated with writing across the curriculum is the journal. Championed by Toby Fulwiler, this expressive writing tool can be used at all ages and in any subject. Journals can be graded or ungraded, can be used to record any type of information, can be private or public. Because the amount of journal information is extensive, it is best to recommend Toby Fulwiler's article "Journals Across the Disciplines" (1980) and the articles by Draper (1979), Lehr (1980), Pradl and Mayher (1985), and Schlawin (1980). Truly, journal writing could in itself be the topic of an entire literature review. However, no discussion of writing across the curriculum would be complete without mentioning the type of writing most associated with it. The workshop coordinator would want to stress journal writing and then consult other sources for activities specifically geared to different subjects. Model units and suggestions for teaching writing in the content areas can be found in numerous sources. The point is that the prepared workshop leader needs to have plenty of suggestions when a teacher from a particular discipline wants to know what type of activities to use. Journal writing is generic, it is true, but there are many other activities that would be appropriate for one field and not for another. The more activities to which a teacher has

access, the more likely he is to continue having students write.

Summary

The writing across the curriculum movement is rooted in the research conducted in England by Harold Rosen, Nancy Martin, and James Britton. Two of their conclusions, that most school writing is to inform and that writing is a way of expressing learning, have influenced current composition theory in the United States. Furthermore, there has been a paradigm shift in the teaching of writing, an emphasis on process rather than on product, but many secondary teachers are not aware of these developments in composition theory. In addition, the attitudes of teachers toward the teaching of composition have a tremendous influence on the students and on their writing practices. In order to influence these teacher attitudes, inservice in the form of writing across the curriculum workshops has proved to be effective. Before a total writing across the curriculum program can be implemented, however, English teachers and subject-matter teachers must come to an agreement on implementation procedures. The rewards of a successful writing across the curriculum program are many: teachers who are more comfortable with writing, students who enjoy an increased chance to express themselves, and the possibility of increased learning in all areas of the curriculum.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study was designed to determine the effect of staff development in the form of workshops consisting of writing across the curriculum material on the writing apprehension levels and attitudes toward writing of selected secondary school teachers. Though ethnographic research alone may have provided a sufficient indication of writing apprehension change and attitude change, a blend of naturalistic and rationalistic inquiry was the final choice of procedures. The framework for the study was a classic quasi-experimental one. Labeled the nonequivalent control group design, this method requires a pretest-posttest procedure, with one group receiving a treatment (Campbell & Stanley, 1966). Within this quantitative framework lies the qualitative component, a series of workshops. The recording and reporting of the workshops are subjective and a genuine attempt was made not only to present the actual step-by-step procedures of the workshops (See Appendix D) but also to interpret the reactions of the faculty members to the material.

This chapter is a description of the research methodology, instruments, and target population of the study.

Research Methodology

In the spring of 1988, the teachers at South Caldwell High School in Hudson, North Carolina, were informed that there would be a writing across the curriculum staff development program at the school in the fall. If they were interested in participating in this type of inservice project, they were asked to notify the researcher. Because this was a staff development activity, the central office agreed to pay participants a $140 stipend and to issue three CEU's of renewal credit. State guidelines mandated 10 workshop sessions of three hours each in order to meet the CEU requirement. Ten teachers responded in the affirmative, but there was additional interest, and the central office gave permission to fund five more teachers when school started. These 15 teachers comprised the experimental group. The control group consisted of 15 teachers selected from the remaining faculty, who did not participate in the workshops.

The researcher administered two tests to each group as a pretest: the Miller-Daly Writing Apprehension Test and selected items from the National Council of English Writing Opinionnaire, referred to as the NCTE Writing Opinionnaire.

The treatment for the experimental group consisted of 10 workshops composed of writing across the curriculum theory and practice. Taught by the researcher, all of the material covered in the workshops was subjective and was designed to acquaint teachers with writing as a tool for learning. Modeled after the Bay Area Writing Workshops, which are described in the review of the literature, these workshop sessions stressed teacher involvement in the writing process. Learning about writing across the curriculum theory and practice, the teachers applied practical strategies as well, writing in journals and sharing their writing with each other. The workshops were designed to enable the teachers to experience the frustrations and the joys that student writers experience, and they were led to understand the benefits of a noncritical audience. From the plethora of available workshop information, the researcher organized and grouped the material so that the workshop members would gradually develop their understanding of writing to learn. Theory was mixed with practice for two reasons: 1) many of the teachers had never dealt with composition theory, and 2) the researcher believes that theory is more meaningful when an opportunity is made for its application. Following is a listing of the workshops, a detailed summary of which may be found in Appendix D:

Workshop 1 - Pretests administered. General introduction.

Workshop 2 - Introduction to writing across the curriculum.

Workshop 3 - Writing across the curriculum theory - expressive writing.

Workshop 4 - The writing process.

Workshop 5 - Subject matter presentations.

Workshop 6 - Elements which affect the writing process (purpose and audience).

Workshop 7 - Evaluation and scoring.

Workshop 8 - Writing as learning.

Workshop 9 - Designing writing assignments.

Workshop 10 - Posttests and evaluation.

After the 10-week treatment period, both groups were posttested with the pretest instruments. Quantitative outcomes were writing apprehension levels and changes in attitudes toward writing.

Instruments

The two tests selected as pretest and posttest instruments were the Miller-Daly Writing Apprehension Test and the NCTE Writing Opinionnaire. The Daly-Miller test is a well-known measurement of general anxiety about writing. Used in much writing apprehension research, the instrument measures an individual's inclination to respond favorably or unfavorably toward writing situations, thus providing information on an attitude that dynamically affects the way

people view writing. The Daly-Miller test is composed of 26 questions, the answers to which are recorded on a five-point Likert-type scale. Scores range from a low confidence level of 26 to a high confidence level of 130. Thus, an increase in the confidence score represents a decrease in the level of writing apprehension. Such statements as "I avoid writing" and "I never seem to be able to write down my ideas clearly" measure the degree of anxiety which people attach to writing. The reliability of the instrument, obtained by a split-half technique, is high. In this case, the top half of the test was compared with the bottom half. Corrected for attenuation, the obtained reliability was .940. Test-retest reliability of the instument was .923 (Daly and Miller, 1975). The predictive validity of the test is also high. In a study conducted to establish the predictive validity of the instrument, significant differences (F = 14.78, df = 2/173, $p < .05$) were found to support the hypothesis that individuals with high levels of writing apprehension tend to view their occupations as having significantly less required writing than do their counterparts with low anxiety about writing. Smith (1984) affirms the validity of the test:

> The Miller-Daly test strongly correlates with lesser-known measures of writing apprehension. This correlation clearly suggests that the tests measure a discrete attitude. Daly's and Miller's work validating their instrument allows us to accept their construct with confidence. (p. 4)

The other test, also used as a pre- and posttest, is a variation of the National Council of Teachers of English Opinionnaire (1971). There are a total of 37 statements toward which subjects express their reactions on a five-point Likert-type scale. The statements are grouped under four categories which broadly measure four teacher attitudes toward instruction in composition: 1) Attitudes toward the instruction of the conventions of standard written English (Standard English); 2) Attitudes toward the development of the student's linguistic maturity (Linguistic Maturity); 3) Attitudes toward defining and evaluating writing tasks (Defining and Evaluating); and 4) Attitudes toward the importance of student self-expression (Student Self-Expression). Scores for Parts I, II, and III of the test range from 10-50, while the scores for Part IV range from 7-35. High scores for Part I indicate the concern for the importance of standard English in the instruction of written composition. High scores for Part II indicate the degree of concern for the development of students' growth as writers. High scores for Part III reflect the amount of emphasis on formal evaluation techniques, and for Part IV, the amount of realization of the importance of student self-expression. Using Cronbach's Alpha, the scales were tested for homogeneity. The obtained reliability for each part is as follows: Part I, .72; Part II, .73; Part III, .74; and Part IV, .70. Furthermore, items in the scales

were derived from a theoretical base reflecting a concern for construct validity. Another concern for construct validity as supported by a multi-trait approach to validation was emphasized in the design of the scales. The degree of convergent and discriminant validity was investigated by correlating responses to an item with a score based upon all the other items in the scale (Schuessler et al., 1981). Schuessler et al. (1981) state:

> The results of the statistical analyses of the data from the Composition Opinionnaire and the ensuing scales suggest that valid and reliable scales of four teacher attitudes toward instruction in composition were developed. (p. 60)

Furthermore, these researchers claim that the number of scales developed is more representative of the range of teacher attitudes than scales developed in previous studies.

These two tests were chosen because they are both well-constructed, valid, reliable instruments which measure writing apprehension and teacher attitudes toward writing.

Population and Sample

The sample for this study was selected from the total faculty population at South Caldwell High School in Hudson, North Carolina. The school employs a total of 75 teachers and is located in a middle-class, rural section of Caldwell County. The experimental group was composed of 15 teachers who had expressed a need for or an interest in a writing across the curriculum workshop. The control group was

chosen from the remaining 60 teachers, carefully matched to the experimental group by subject taught and by years of experience. The mean of the number of years of teaching experience for the experimental group was 18.06, while the mean for the control group was 18.33. The experimental group consisted of 12 females and three males; in the control group there were 10 females and five males. Every attempt was made by the researcher to match the groups as closely as possible.

Data Analysis

An analysis of covariance was performed on the pretest and posttest scores from the writing apprehension test and from the NCTE Opinionnaire, using the pretest as a covariate. These data were then reported and discussed.

Summary

A sample of thirty teachers was selected to determine their level of writing apprehension and their attitudes toward writing. The quasi-experimental design called for a pretest-treatment-posttest procedure for one group of 15, and a pretest-posttest procedure for the other.

The treatment for the experimental group consisted of 30 hours of staff development in the form of workshops presented by the researcher. The material in the workshops

was primarily writing across the curriculum theory obtained from the literature, material to which the teachers could subjectively respond.

The instruments used were chosen because they measured degrees of writing apprehension and attitudes toward writing. An analysis of covariance was performed on the pretest and the posttest scores, using the pretest as a covariate. Analysis of the data will be reported and interpreted in Chapter Four.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Introduction

Data were collected in this study in order to investigate the effectiveness of staff development in reducing teacher writing apprehension and in changing teacher attitudes toward writing. Of a group of 30 high school teachers, who represented 11 teaching fields, all were pretested with the Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Test and the NCTE Opinionnaire. Half, or 15, then volunteered to attend a series of 10 writing workshops where the teachers were exposed to writing across the curriculum theory and practice. At the conclusion of the workshops, all teachers were posttested with the same instruments. The study considered the effect of the independent variable, staff development in the form of writing across the curriculum workshops, on the dependent variables, writing apprehension and attitudes toward writing. This latter dependent variable included attitudes toward the instruction of the conventions of standard written English, attitudes toward the development of the students' linguistic maturity, attitudes toward defining and evaluating writing tasks, and attitudes toward the importance of student self-expression.

Since previous research indicates that high levels of teacher writing apprehension affect student writing, it is important to investigate measures which may influence those levels. Thus, one of the purposes of this study was to investigate the effect of writing across the curriculum workshops in reducing teacher writing apprehension.

The research literature indicates that other influences on students are the attitudes that teachers hold toward writing. Positive teacher attitudes toward writing are likely to affect student writing in a positive manner. Therefore, another purpose of the study was to investigate the effect of writing across the curriculum theory and practice on teacher attitudes toward writing.

In order to examine these purposes, two null hypotheses were formulated. Using the SAS computer package, an analysis of covariance was performed on the posttest scores using the pretest scores as a covariate. A summary of the results is presented in Table 1.

The remainder of this chapter will provide an analysis and discussion of the results of the study. Because the workshops figure predominantly in the discussion, a full account of each workshop can be found in Appendix D.

Table 1

Analysis of Covariance for Posttest Means of Control and Experimental Groups

Test	Group	Pretest Means	Posttest Means	F	df	p
Daly-	C	85.60	84.53			
Miller	E	81.67	90.47	10.45	2,27	.0032*
NCTE						
I	C	33.67	33.60			
	E	33.40	30.40	2.04	2,27	.1651
II	C	36.33	37.47			
	E	37.87	39.93	4.86	2,27	.0362**
III	C	27.20	27.80			
	E	25.47	22.20	13.19	2,27	.0012*
IV	C	19.40	20.53			
	E	21.33	24.27	7.38	2,27	.0114**

* $p < .01$

** $p < .05$

Discussion of Results

Null Hypothesis 1

1. There will be no significant difference in the writing apprehension posttests of teachers who were exposed to writing across the curriculum theory and practice and teachers who were not exposed to writing across the curriculum theory and practice.

Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Test

An analysis of the Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Test data indicates that the treatment was successful in reducing writing apprehension at the $p < .01$ level of significance (See Table 1). Therefore, the first hypothesis was rejected.

Half of the statements on the Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Test express fear of writing and lack of confidence in writing. For example, one statement deals with fear of evaluation: "I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated." Another states bluntly, "I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them." Writing across the curriculum theory and practice are designed to lessen fear of writing. Workshop participants learned the theory of writing across the curriculum, i.e., that all writing does not have to be evaluated, that writing is an ongoing process, that the product is not necessarily an all-important end, and that

expressive writing has a place in every class in the curriculum. It appears that the information reduced the fear and apprehension with which the teachers viewed writing. When the teachers learned that their writing was not to be evaluated, that prewriting and revision are as important as the final paper, and that they could write down their thoughts as they flowed, then it appears that these teachers relaxed and enjoyed the workshops (See Appendix D). The writing across the curriculum workshops provided writing practice which was important, also. The teachers wrote in journals and shared their writing with one another, using peer conference groups at first, and later, whole group sharing. They learned firsthand how much difference a noncritical audience can make because the group enthusiastically supported each other's work. Thus, the writing practice provided by the writing across the curriculum workshops apparently had an important effect on the posttest answers to the negatively worded test statements. There was also a favorable effect on the other half of the test, the positively worded statements.

One example of a positively worded statement is "It's easy for me to write good compositions." Others are "I like to write down my ideas," and "Writing is a lot of fun." Writing across the curriculum will enhance positive feelings about writing. If, for instance, a person scored "Writing is a lot of fun" with a 3 (Uncertain), then after the

laughter and comraderie of the workshops, he or she might be more likely to give the statement a 1 (Strongly Agree). The workshops were designed to boost morale and boost confidence. The significant findings attest to the fact that this approach was successful.

Null Hypothesis 2

2. There will be no significant difference in the writing attitude posttests of teachers who were exposed to writing across the curriculum theory and practice and teachers who were not exposed to writing across the curriculum theory and practice.

NCTE Opinionnaire (Part I)

Scores for Part I of the NCTE Opinionnaire reveal no statistical difference between C and E posttest scores (See Table 1). The null hypothesis relating to teacher attitudes could not be rejected.

This part of the Opinionnaire was on the importance of standard English in the instruction of written composition. The ten questions measured teachers' attitudes on grammatical correctness and traditional form. For example, one item reads, "Students should not be allowed to begin sentences with 'and,' 'or,' 'for,' or 'but.'" Another states that "Students should be required to prepare written outlines before they begin writing expository papers." It is difficult to conjecture just why attitudes did not change

on this part of the test. Since most of the teachers did not teach English, perhaps the emphasis on grammar and form, traditionally important to English teachers, was considered by them to be irrelevant or unimportant.

NCTE Opinionnaire (Part II)

Posttest scores for the control and experimental groups were statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level (See Table 1).

This part of the test measured teacher attitudes toward the development of students' linguistic maturity. One area addressed was that of the teacher-pupil conference. Teachers in the workshops had learned that the teacher-pupil conference is a valuable teaching method and that it also can foster close teacher-pupil relationships. Another area measured by the test was the value of different teaching approaches for factual writing as opposed to imaginative writing. This, in fact, comprised the very heart of the workshops - a recognition of different types of writing and the subsequent adjustment of grading. To a great degree, this part of the Opinionnaire dealt with the process of writing. One statement read, "Students should often 'talk out' their compositions prior to the writing." Before the workshops, subject-matter teachers possibly had not given much thought to the writing process.

NCTE Opinionnaire (Part III)

Like the second part of the Opinionnaire, data from this part were also statistically significant, $p < .01$ (See Table 1).

The major emphasis in this section of the NCTE Opinionnaire was on evaluation, a topic highly stressed in writing across the curriculum theory and practice. In this test, as the importance placed on evaluation decreased, the score decreased accordingly. Therefore, the decrease in the mean reflects a corresponding decrease in the importance of evaluation, one of the theoretical premises of writing to learn. One statement, which read "Successful writing is achieved only if all themes are carefully corrected by the teacher," is the very antithesis of writing across the curriculum, which advocates that there are many types of successful writing and that there are many types of writing which do not need grading at all. Another item stated that "Grades are the most effective way of evaluating compositions." One of the activities in the workshops involved teachers assigning a subjective grade to the same paper. The expected happened: there were many differing grades. After the discussion which followed the activity, the teachers realized that subjective grading was not always fair. This interaction about evaluation likely had an effect on the teachers' attitudes.

The concept of a critical audience was also indirectly addressed in this section with the statement, "Every error on a student's composition should be indicated." During the workshops, the ineffectiveness of marking every error was discussed, both in terms of research and of the damage to the student's ego.

This section, particularly, dealt with many of the concepts of writing across the curriculum. That is probably the reason why this section produced the greatest statistically significant difference between the adjusted means of any section of the NCTE Opinionnaire.

NCTE Opinionnaire (Part IV)

Scores for this section of the NCTE Opinionnaire reveal that they were statistically significant at the .05 level.

Dealing with the importance of student self-expression, this section of the NCTE Opinionnaire, composed of only seven statements, was congruent with writing across the curriculum theory and practice. For example, one statement read, "Growth in written self-expression depends in part upon a wide range of first-hand experiences." Another focused on the elementary grades: "Composition programs in the elementary grades should be directed primarily at encouraging students to self-expression." Though the teachers did mention that the word "elementary" confused them a bit, they still confirmed the importance of self-expression in writing. In fact, all of the writing

done in the workshops had emphasized the expression of self, so the teachers were quite familiar with this type of writing. In order to give students the freedom to express themselves, teachers must devise a variety of writing assignments, a topic addressed in the statement, "Writing assignments should be more extensive than the specification of a topic or list of topics." Because this section of the attitude test, like Part III, dealt specifically with topics covered in the workshops, it is not surprising that this section was also statistically significant.

Since three of the four posttests on the NCTE produced significant differences between the control group and the treatment group, the second null hypothesis was rejected.

Summary

The data analysis for the first hypothesis confirmed the effectiveness of writing across the curriculum workshops in reducing the writing apprehension level of secondary school teachers. At the present time, there have been few studies conducted at the secondary level on reducing teacher writing apprehension. At the university level, studies have been reported (Fox, 1980; Fulwiler, Gorman, & Gorman, 1986; Raimes, 1979; and Weiss & Peich, 1980). Donlan (1986) has concluded that teachers need to be aware of their own level of writing apprehension. This study adds to the research at the secondary level in the area of reducing

teacher writing apprehension. Rejection of the second hypothesis confirmed the effectiveness of the workshops in changing three of four areas of teacher attitudes toward writing. The study supports the assertions of Fulwiler and Young (Sipple, 1987) who have stated that any pedagogical change must begin with the faculty. Blake (1976), too, has affirmed the need to examine teacher attitudes toward writing. The study also corroborates the work of Zemelman (1977) and Swanson-Owens (1986) who have pointed out the problems of implementing writing across the curriculum strategies. The relationship of the present findings to previously cited research is that the present findings appear to confirm the effectiveness of writing across the curriculum theory and practice as an agent for pedagogical change. The lessened writing apprehension and altered attitudes suggest that these teachers will be more receptive to their own writing and to that of their students.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

According to the review of the literature, a widely-held perception among teachers is that many students do not enjoy writing, that they do not write frequently, and that they do not write well. Since it is doubtful that most students would change their attitudes toward writing or improve their skills in writing on their own, teachers can influence these changes. However, many teachers do not like to write, they are apprehensive about writing, and they view writing in a negative manner. If writing is positively regarded by greater numbers of subject-matter teachers, the writing habits of students could be more likely to change. The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of a series of 10 workshops conducted by the researcher in order to lessen the writing apprehension and improve the attitudes toward writing of selected secondary school teachers by introducing them to writing across the curriculum theory and practice. The rest of this chapter will present a summary of the study, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further study.

Summary

The review of the literature traced the history of writing across the curriculum by examining its British roots and noting the theoretical changes incurred in composition theory. Instead of students writing primarily in the transactional mode as they do in most schools, writing across the curriculum advocates that students write more expressively and personally.

The change from one mode of writing to the other has been termed a paradigm shift, a changing of emphasis from the end-product of writing to the process involved, a procedure often resulting in lessened pressure on the student. In addition to feeling less pressure, students have also demonstrated that writing about the subject material helps them to learn; and the primary reason for increased learning seems to be the involvement of self. When students write their knowledge, they personalize it and make it theirs. Because the teacher is a vital key to a successful classroom experience, it follows that the teacher's attitudes toward writing would be important. According to the review of literature, many subject-matter teachers lack knowledge about writing and are apprehensive as to its use in the classroom. One way to enlighten teachers about writing is through their participation in writing workshops, where they learn about audience and purpose, how to evaluate writing, various types of writing

activities, and where they themselves write and share that writing. Though English teachers are likely to take the lead, teachers from the other disciplines ultimately must share in the teaching of writing.

In the fall of 1988, a total of 30 high school teachers participated in a quasi-experimental study at South Caldwell High School in Hudson, North Carolina. Half of the teachers, who volunteered to participate in the study, represented a wide range of subject areas: home economics, mathematics, drafting, foreign language, English, special education, Marine Corps JROTC, social studies, business, and science. The other half of the teachers were carefully matched to the first group by subject matter taught, years of teaching experience, or both. All of the teachers were pretested with the Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension test, designed to measure levels of writing apprehension, and the NCTE Opinionnaire, divided into four areas of attitudes toward writing. Both instruments have high validity and reliability. Also, both include a Likert-type scale to measure the degree of the response. One of the groups, the experimental group, then participated in 10 weeks of intensive staff development consisting of a series of 10 writing workshops based on the Bay Area Writing Project workshops. The other group, the control group, did not participate in the workshops. After the staff development activities, both groups were posttested with the same

instruments. An analysis of covariance was performed on the pretest and posttest data.

The following questions guided the study:

1. What was the current level of writing apprehension of selected subject matter teachers at South Caldwell High School?
2. What attitudes did these teachers hold about writing?
3. Did knowledge about writing across the curriculum theory and practice derived from the workshops have any effect on the level of writing apprehension or on the attitudes toward writing?

The findings of the study were that knowledge of writing across the curriculum theory and practice did have a measurable influence on the workshop participants' writing apprehension level and on their attitudes toward writing.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were gleaned from the findings of this study:

1. If introduced in the form of a series of 10 faculty workshops, over a period of 10 weeks, writing across the currriculum theory and practice can affect secondary school teacher writing apprehension. The amount of the influence would depend upon the effectiveness of the workshop leader, the techniques

he or she used to present the material, and the initial apprehension level of the teachers.

2. Writing across the curriculum theory and practice can influence the attitudes of secondary school teachers toward writing. While there was apparently no change in the attitude of these teachers toward the instruction of the conventions of standard written English, the writing across the curriculum information was found to influence attitudes toward the development of the student's linguistic ability, an area which places increased emphasis on the recognition of writing as a process, which emphasizes writing as a measure of student intellectual growth and development, and which recognizes different types of writing for different needs. This information about writing across the curriculum also influenced attitudes toward defining and evaluating writing tasks, an area which indicates the teacher's increased realization of the need for creative evaluation and of the lessened importance of traditional grading. Finally, the writing across the curriculum information influenced attitudes toward the importance of student self-expression, an area which recognizes the importance of the student's own "voice" in his or her writing.

Thus, the general conclusion to be drawn is that writing across the curriculum theory and practice, presented in the form of faculty workshops, do indeed provide a positive effect upon secondary school teachers' writing apprehension and attitudes toward writing.

Implications

Though the study involved only a small group of teachers, there are implications that are applicable to other teachers in other schools. However, one must keep in mind certain factors about this study which might limit its generalizability. The researcher was well-acquainted with the people in the study. The closeness generated by years of friendship perhaps allowed for more receptivity and interaction than would have been present if a stranger had conducted the study. Also, just as a teacher makes a difference in the classroom, the workshop leader makes a difference in a staff development activity. In order to attempt to replicate this study, the workshop leader would need to be familiar with writing across the curriculum material.

The implications of the study include awareness of potential problems. Teachers must be educated in writing terminology; for many subject-matter teachers, words such as "linguistics" or "rhetoric" are foreign. Too, there can be problems related to teachers' areas; many people still

regard writing as the province solely of English teachers. Furthermore, some English teachers as well may not welcome what they perceive as invasion into their subject area. Also, most people resist change. The potential for change that writing across the curriculum offers can be exhilarating, but also threatening. Too, how can and should these strategies be implemented into teachers' classes? There are no set guidelines for implementation, and without some specific direction, the original intent can be obscured or even lost. Last, what are the long-term effects of writing across the curriculum? Once the initial enthusiasm has waned, what remains of the original core of information? These potential problems require long-range solutions.

Though there are negative implications, there are positive ones as well. Teachers who have experienced writing across the curriculum theory and practice often form a so-called community of scholars, a closely-knit group who share writing with each other. A rapport develops among these faculty members, an invisible bond resulting from the sharing and interpretation of expressive writing. Often, this closeness fosters an improved environment for writing within the school. Teachers from across the disciplines who regard writing as important can change other teachers' attitudes toward writing. Most important of all is how writing across the curriculum can improve the classroom environment for students. The teacher who has been

influenced by writing across the curriculum theory realizes that various audiences exist, that writing is a process, that all writing does not necessarily need to be transactional, and that writing is a powerful way for students to demonstrate their learning. In other words, writing across the curriculum has the potential to change a teacher's style of teaching.

Writing across the curriculum is not a narrow concept limited to only a few teachers. Instead, it is broad-based, and has the potential to touch every area of a school's curriculum, every teacher, and every student.

Recommendations

Interest in writing has increased in the wake of reports such as A Nation at Risk, the Carnegie Report, and the NEA Report titled An Open Letter to America On Schools, Students, and Tomorrow. As a result, many schools will be investigating their writing programs and will be implementing changes to foster better writing. Writing across the curriculum programs are receiving a great deal of publicity and study as one strategy to increase and improve the writing in an institution. While a writing across the curriculum program can be assessed quantitatively, it also has qualitative overtones which cannot be statistically measured. Therefore, any recommendations for future study should include both types of research.

Writing across the curriculum offers a number of opportunities for further study. One area which needs more exploration is that of faculty attitudes toward writing. The development of a more exact instrument than those currently available may provide researchers an instrument to permit them to pinpoint more closely the relationship between faculty attitudes and student writing. 1

Also, current writing across the curriculum programs need to be studied in order to isolate successful elements common to all. The strengths could then be further developed and improved. Along similar lines, long-term writing across the curriculum programs need to be studied to determine their weaknesses so that those limitations can be addressed before a program is ever begun. Since writing across the curriculum is in its infancy, researchers may learn a great deal from studying pioneer programs.

Too, there is a need to conduct follow-up studies of faculty members who have participated in writing across the curriculum workshops. How well do writing across the curriculum principles learned by workshop participants withstand time? After a specified period of time, do faculty members continue to implement the procedures or have the practices died out?

Further inquiry is needed at the secondary level. Writing across the curriculum is only now filtering down into high schools. If writing across the curriculum is to

reach its greatest potential, study at the university level needs to be adapted and replicated for secondary teachers.

Additional investigation is needed in the area of writing to learn. There is not enough empirical evidence of the influence of writing on learning. Studies should be conducted in this area, both with individual students and with entire classes as well.

Writing across the curriculum needs to be introduced to English teachers. If, as the review of literature suggests, English teachers are to take the lead in writing across the curriculum implementation, they need to be fluent in its terminology and familiar with the theoretical bases which underlie its principles. Generally speaking, at the present time writing across the curriculum has only slightly more meaning for secondary English teachers than for other teachers.

Does writing across the curriculum in fact improve student writing? Though proponents of the concept intuitively think it does, studies are needed in order to know how much and what type of improvement results. Furthermore, additional inquiry could be done with students of teachers who embrace writing across the curriculum. Do the students themselves notice a difference in those teachers who allow expressive writing? Do the students *like* expressive writing? A series of studies could be done with

these students in order to see how writing across the curriculum affects them.

Is writing across the curriculum more adaptable to some disciplines than others? For example, does it more readily fit into humanities courses than into science or math courses? Also, are particular modes of discourse better suited to some disciplines than to others? Writing across the curriculum is broad, and it is easy to generalize; more specific data are needed as to how it relates to separate subjects.

In addition, classroom methods of writing implementation need to be examined. Though many teachers involve their students in writing activities, some of those activities are likely to be more successful than others. There is a need to examine and add to current teaching practices.

These recommendations are by no means inclusive. Since writing across the curriculum is relatively new, the field is open for many types of research and further investigation.

Master teachers have a feel for the elements of good writing as well as an appreciation for the benefits of able, competent expression. The values that writing imparts are values such as discipline, logical reasoning, appreciation, and creativity. These qualities extend far beyond the student, beyond the school, and beyond the community. If

teachers became aware of the infinite possibilities for expansion that writing across the curriculum can generate, then perhaps writing will take its rightful place of importance in all areas of instruction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Applebee, A. N., Langer, J. A., & Mullis, I. V. (1986). The writing report card. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Bazerman, C. (1979). Written language communities: Writing in the context of reading. New York: Baruch College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 232 159)

Behrens, L. (1979). Writing, reading, and the rest of the faculty: A survey. English Journal, 67(6), 54-60.

Blake, R. W. (1976). Assessing English and language arts teachers' attitudes toward writers and writing. English Record, 27, 87-97.

Braun, C. (1976). Teacher expectation: Sociopsychological dynamics. Review of Educational Research, 46, 185-213.

Brostoff, A. (1979). Good assignments lead to good writing. Social Education, 43, 184-186.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1966). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Cantrell, R. P., Stenner, A. J., & Katzenmeyer, W. G. (1977). Teacher knowledge, attitudes, and classroom teaching correlates of student achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 69, 172-179.

Claypool, S. H. (1980). Teacher writing apprehension: Does it affect writing assignments across the curriculum? Northern Kentucky University (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 216 387)

Culp, M.B., McCormnack, L., & Smith, B. (1987). Writing across the curriculum: How English teachers can provide leadership. NASSP Bulletin, 71(501), 64-68.

Cummings, M. G. (1982). The writing idea bank: Investing and sharing our wealth of writing techniques. College English, 44, 417-418.

Daly, J. A., & Miller, M. D. (1975). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. Research in the Teaching of English, 9, 242-249.

Daly, J. A. & Wilson, D. A. (1983). Writing apprehension, self-esteem, & personality. Research in the Teaching of English, 17, 327-341.

Davis, D. J. (1985). Writing across the curriculum: Attitudes and practices of selected faculty. (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 11A.

Diamond, I. M. (1980). Interdisciplinary writing: A guide to writing across the curriculum. Madison: Wisconsin U. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 193 655)

Dilworth, C. B. (1981). Inservice education in English curriculum and instruction. English Education, 13.

Donovan, T. R., and McClelland, B. W. (1980). Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Donlan, D. (1975). How to involve other departments in helping you teach writing. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Chicago, Il. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 145 452)

Donlan, D. (1986). When teacher-researchers compare notes on writing apprehension. English Journal, 75(5), 87-89.

Draper, V. (1979). Formative writing: Writing to assist learning in all subject areas. Berkeley, CA: University of California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 184 115)

Emig, J. (1971). The composing processes of twelfth graders. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Emig, J. (1977). Writing as a mode of learning. College Composition and Communication, 28, 122-127.

Farris, C. R. (1987). Current composition: Beyond process versus product. English Journal, 76(6), 28-34.

Fleming, M., ed. (1984). Writing across the curriculum. Tempe: Arizona English Teachers Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 991)

Fox, R. F. (1980). Treatment of writing apprehension and its effects on composition. Research in the Teaching of English, 14, 39-49.

Freire, P. (1987). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Continuum.

Freisinger, R. R. (1980). Cross-disciplinary writing workshops: Theory and practice. College English, 42, 154-166.

Fulwiler, T. (1980). Journals across the disciplines. English Journal, 69(9), 14-19.

Fulwiler, T. (1981a). Interdisciplinary writing workshops. CEA Critic, 43, 27-32.

Fulwiler, T. (1981b). Showing, not telling, at a writing workshop. College English, 43, 55-63.

Fulwiler, T. (1985). Writing is everybody's business. National Forum: Phi Kappa Phi Journal, 65(4), 21-24.

Fulwiler, T. (1987). Writing across the curriculum: Implications for teaching literature. ADE Bulletin, 88, 35-40.

Fulwiler, T., & Young, A., eds. (1982). Language connections: Writing and reading across the curriculum. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Fulwiler, T., Gorman, M. E., & Gorman, M. E. (1986). Changing faculty attitudes toward writing. In A. Young & T. Fulwiler (Eds.), Writing across The disciplines: Research into practice (pp. 53-67). Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Goldgerg, M. (1984). An update on the national writing project. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 356-357.

Gere, A. R. (1985). Roots in the sawdust: writing to learn across the disciplines. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Giroux, H. A. (1979). Teaching content and thinking through writing. Social Education, 43, 190-193.

Graham, J. (1983-84). What works: The problems and rewards of cross-curriculum writing programs. Current Issues in Higher Education, 3, 16-26.

Hairston, M. (1983-84). The winds of change: Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing. Current Issues in Higher Education, 3, 4-10.

Haring-Smith, T., Hawkins, N., Morrison, E., Stern, L., & Tater, R. (1985). A guide to writing programs: Writing centers, peer tutoring programs and writing across the curriculum. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, and Company.

Herrington, A. J. (1981). Writing to learn: Writing across the disciplines. College English, 43, 379-387.

Hillocks, G. (1986). Research on written composition. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Hollingsworth, H. & Eastman, S. (1988). Teaching writing in every class: A guide for grades 6-12. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

King, B. L. (1980). Two modes of analyzing teacher and student attitudes toward writing: The Emig attitude scale and the King construct scale. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 3934A-3935A.

Knoblauch, C. H. & Brannon, L. (1983). Writing as learning through the curriculum. College English, 45, 465-474.

Kuhn, T. (1983). The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lehr, F. (1980). Writing as learning in the content areas. English Journal, 69(8), 23-25.

Marland, M. (1977). Language across the curriculum. London: Heinemann.

Marshall, J. (1984). Process and product: Case studies of writing in two content areas. In A. N. Applebee (Ed.), Contexts for learning to write: Studies of secondary school instruction (pp. 149-168). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Martin, N., D'Arcy, P., Newton, B., & Parker, R. (1976). Writing and learning across the curriculum. London: Schools Council.

McLeod, S. H., King, M., Knoblauch, C.H., & Brannon L. (1984). Comment and response. College English, 46, 615-620.

Murray, D. M. (1976). Teaching writing as a process not product. In R. L. Graves (Ed.), Rhetoric and Composition (pp. 79-82). Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden Book Company.

Newell, G. (1984). Learning from writing in two content areas: A case study/protocol analysis. Research in the Teaching of English, 18, 265-283.

The North Carolina Writing Program. (1983). Raleigh: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, Division of Communication Skills.

Odell, L. (1980). Teaching writing by teaching the process of discovery. In L. Gregg & E. Steinberg (Eds.), Cognitive processes in writing: An interdisciplinary approach (pp. 139-154). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaun.

Parker, R. (1985). The language across the curriculum movement: A brief overview and bibliography. College Composition and Communication, 36, 173-177.

Peters, P. (1985). Writing across the curriculum in Australia. New South Wales, Australia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 264 742)

Phillips, G. (1968). Reticence: Pathology of the normal speaker. Speech Monographs, 35, 39-49.

Pradl, G.M. & Mayher, J. (1985). Reinvigorating learning through writing. Educational Leadership 42(5), 4-8.

Raimes, A. (1979). Writing and learning across the curriculum: The experience of a faculty seminar. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Minneapolis, MN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 176 327)

Reynolds, W. (1980). Policy 6146. English Journal, 69(6), 83-85.

Robertson, I. (1980). Language across the curriculum: Four case studies. London: Schools Council.

Rosen, L. (1978). An interview with James Britton, Tony Burgess, and Harold Rosen. English Journal, 67(8), 50-58.

Roueche, J. E., Baker G. A., and Roueche, S. D. (1986). Access with excellence. New Directions for Community Colleges, 5, 29-39.

Schlawin, S. A., ed. (1980). Writing right across the curriculum, K-12. Poughkeepsie, NY: Dutchess County Board of Cooperative Educational Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 199 700)

Schuessler, B., Gere, A., & Abbott, R. (1981). The development of scales measuring teacher attitudes toward instruction in written composition: A preliminary investigation. Research in the Teaching of English, 15, 55-63.

Sipple, J. M. (1987). Teacher protocols: A new evaluation tool for writing across the curriculum programs. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 285 150)

Smith, C., & Bean, T. W. (1980). The guided writing procedure: Integrating content reading and writing improvement. Reading World, 19, 290-293.

Smith, M. (1984). Reducing writing apprehension. Urbana, IL: NCTE. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 243 112)

Spanjer, A. and Boiarsky, C. (1981). Improving the teaching of writing in your own school: A staff development program. Atlanta: Georgia State University (ERIC Reproduction Document Service No. ED 214 199)

Stock, P. L. (1986). Writing across the curriculum. Theory into Practice, 25, 97-101.

Swanson-Owens, D. (1986). Identifying natural sources of resistance: A case study of implementing writing across the curriculum. Research in the Teaching of English, 20, 69-95.

Tschumy, R. (1982). Writing across the curriculum - what's in a name? NAASP Bulletin, 66(454), 63-70.

Tchudi, S. (1986). The hidden agendas in writing across the curriculum. English Journal, 75(7), 22-25.

Tchudi, S. and Yates, J. (1983). Teaching writing in the content areas: Senior high school. Washington: NEA.

Timpson, W. M. (1988). Paulo Freire: Advocate of literacy through liberation. Educational Leadership, 46(5), 62-66.

Upton, J. (1986). Write on: Improving learning through writing. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, San Antonio, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 277 010)

Walshe, R. D. (1987) The learning power of writing. English Journal, 76(6), 22-27.

Walvoord, B. (1982). Helping students write well: A guide for teachers in all disciplines. New York: MLA.

Weiss, R. H., (1979). Research on writing and learning: Some effects of learning-centered writing in five subject areas. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 191 073)

Weiss, R. H., & Peich, M. (1980). Faculty attitude changes in a cross-disciplinary writing workshop. College Composition and Communication, 31, 33-41.

Weiss, R. H. & Walters, S. A. (1980). Writing to learn. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, Boston. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 191 056)

Winterowd, W. R. (1986). Teaching composing across the curriculum. Composition Rhetoric: A Synthesis. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

Wolfe, D. & Reising, R. (1983). Writing for learning in the content areas. Portland, ME: J. Weston Walch.

Young, A. & Fulwiler, T. (1986). Writing across the disciplines: Research into practice. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Young, R. (1978). Paradigms and problems: Needed research in rhetorical invention. In C. R. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), Research on Composing: Points of Departure (pp. 29-47). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Zemelman, S. (1977). How college teachers encourage students' writing. Research in the Teaching of English, 11, 227-234.

APPENDIX A

Letters Preceding Workshops

South Caldwell High School
Rt. 3, Box 600
Hudson, N.C. 28638

April 17, 1988

To: Faculty
From: H. Fowler

I have been given permission to conduct a research study next fall at our school. The study will basically be a seminar to acquaint teachers with writing across the curriculum theory and practice. Hopefully, you will learn something about the use of writing in your classes and you might learn something about yourself as well!

I will need 10 teachers who are interested in participating in the study with me. There will be a 30-hour workshop for which you will be given 3 CEU's of credit. Also, you will receive a stipend; at the time, we are talking $140, but I have applied for additional funds to supplement that amount. I plan to finish the workshops by Thanksgiving, and then do the statistical study in the early spring.

To participate, you would need to have an interest in learning more about writing. Also, you would have to be able to commit the time for the workshops and be willing to experiment a little.

If you are interested in participating in the study, please see me or just put a note in my mailbox. I will probably have a brief meeting one day toward the end of the year.

Thank you very much.

Caldwell County Schools
P. O. Drawer 1590
Lenoir, North Carolina 28645

KENNETH A. ROBERTS
SUPERINTENDENT

1914 Hickory Blvd., SW
(704) 728-8407

September 8, 1988

Dear

As you know, the writing across the curriculum workshop has been approved. I am very excited about the possibilities for professional development that may develop for us as a result of the material, and I am looking forward to working with each of you. Since I have not heard anything to the contrary, I am assuming that you will be a participant.

A reminder: the workshop will give 3 renewal credits and a stipend of $140.

See you Tuesday, September 13! (3:30 - Media Center - There will be a snack.)

Thanks,

Helen Fowler

Caldwell County Schools
P. O. Drawer 1590
Lenoir, North Carolina 28645

KENNETH A. ROBERTS
SUPERINTENDENT

1914 Hickory Blvd., SW
(704) 728-8407

September 8, 1988

Dear

I would like to ask a favor of you. As part of my writing across the curriculum workshop experiment, I need a control group to serve as a standard of measurement. You have been carefully matched to a member of the experimental group (by subject matter taught, years of experience, or both). All that would be required of you is to take the two pretests now, and then later, take the posttests.

If you could meet with me for a few minutes on Monday, September 12, at 3:05 in Betty Whitener's room, then I could give the pretests to you. They will only take 10-15 minutes. If you cannot take the tests on Monday, then I will make arrangements with you and administer the tests on another day. Just tell Betty so that I'll know.

I appreciate your willingness to let me use you as part of this study!

Thanks,

Helen Fowler

APPENDIX B

Objectives for Workshops

Objectives for Writing Across the Curriculum Workshop

1. To acquaint selected faculty members at South Caldwell High School with writing across the curriculum theory and practice.

2. To discover whether knowledge about writing to learn will reduce teacher writing apprehension and change teacher attitudes toward writing.

3. To give teachers a number of writing to learn activities which they can use in their own classrooms.

4. To teach strategies for incorporating regular writing into classes in every discipline.

5. To convince teachers that writing is a powerful tool for learning.

6. To discuss the principles of good writing appropriate to a high school community in general and to each discipline in particular.

7. To create a common atmosphere of understanding among faculty about communications instruciton.

8. To generate new ideas for improving the writing, reading, and speaking skills of high school students.

APPENDIX C

Testing Instruments

Daly-Miller Test

Below is a series of statements about writing. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by circling the number that shows whether you strongly agree, agree, are uncertain, disagree, or strongly disagree with the statement. While some of these statements may be repetitious, please respond to all of them; take your time and try to be as honest as possible. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

1 - Strongly Agree
2 - Agree
3 - No opinion
4 - Mildly Disagree
5 - Strongly Disagee

1. I avoid writing.
2. I have no fear of my writing's being evaluated.
3. I look forward to writing down my ideas.
4. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated.
5. Taking a composition course is a very frightening experience.
6. Handing in a composition makes me feel good.
7. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on my composition.
8. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time.
9. I would enjoy submitting my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.
10. I like to write down my ideas.
11. I feel confident in my ability to express my ideas clearly in writing.
12. I like to have my friends read what I have written.
13. I'm nervous about writing.
14. People seem to enjoy what I write.
15. I enjoy writing.
16. I never seem to be able to write down my ideas clearly.
17. Writing is a lot of fun.
18. I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them.
19. I like seeing my thoughts on paper.
20. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.
21. I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course.
22. When I hand in a composition, I know I'm going to do poorly.
23. It's easy for me to write good compositions.
24. I don't think I write as well as most people.

25. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated.
26. I'm not good at writing.

NCTE Opinionnaire

This survey is similar to the one you just completed. However, please note that the values in this test are reversed: 1 = Strongly Disagree instead of Strongly Agree. Please pay attention to this reversal as you complete the test.

1 - Strongly Disagree
2 - Disagree
3 - No opinion
4 - Agree
5 - Strongly Agree

<u>The Importance of Standard English in the Instruction of Written Composition</u>

1. In order to avoid errors in sentence structure, weak students should be encouraged to write only short, simple sentences.
2. High school students should be discouraged from using figurative language because their efforts at metaphor so often produce only cliches.
3. Students should not be allowed to begin sentences with <u>and</u>, <u>or</u>, <u>for</u>, or <u>but</u>.
4. Students should be discouraged from using the first person (I) in their compositions.
5. The English course for senior high school should include a research paper so that students can learn how to use the library and source materials for papers in their own courses.
6. Correct English is established by logical grammatical relationshiops within the language.
7. Students' oral language should be corrected so that the forms will appear in their writing.
8. High school students who are able to consistently write correct English should not be required to do further work in composition.
9. Students should be required to prepare written outlines before they begin writing expository papers.
10. There is little research evidence that knowledge of grammar and usage will produce improvement in student writing.

<u>The Importance of Linguistic Maturity in the Instruction of Written Composition</u>

1. The experience of composing can and should nurture the pupils' quest for self-realization and his need to relate constructively to his peers.

2. The teacher-pupil conference can and should aid the learner in finding his strengths and encourage him in correcting some of his weaknesses.
3. The techniques of writing and documenting a formal research paper should be taught in high school to all college-bound students.
4. Students should have freedom in selecting the topics for their compositions.
5. Differing teaching approaches must be used for teaching factual writing, or objectively oriented writing, and for teaching subjectively-oriented imaginative material.
6. Growth in writing in the elementary school is enhanced by a broad and rich program of literature.
7. Students should often "talk out" their compositions prior to the writing.
8. Able pupils tend to explore different forms and styles of expression and show more variation in quality from one written product to another than do less able pupils.
9. Grading a paper or a course with a single letter grade informs no one as to the values sought, whether those of style, content, mechanical accuracy, or a combination of these elements.
10. Correct English should be required of all students in the high school.

<u>The Importance of Defining and Evaluating Writing Tasks in the Instruction of Written Composition</u>

1. Successful writing is achieved only if all themes are carefully corrected by the teacher.
2. Grades are the most effective way of motivating students to improve their writing.
3. The major obligation of instruction in composition is to help students learn and practice the conventions of standard, educated English.
4. Every error on a student's composition should be indicated.
5. Assignments during the last two years of high school should require primarily expository writing.
6. Rhetoric as it is pertinent to the composition course concerns only the manner of writing, not the matter.
7. Grades are the most effective way of evaluating compositions.
8. Students should rewrite each paper regardless of the number or kind of errors.
9. By the time they leave high school, all students should be able to distinguish clearly among the four forms of discourse: narration, description, exposition, and argumentation.
10. The major purpose of evaluating compositions is to guide individual student growth and development.

<u>The Importance of Student Self-Expression in the Instruction of Written Composition</u>

1. Teachers should write all compositions they assign to students.
2. Compositions written in class should never be given letter grades.
3. Growth in written self-expression depends in part upon a wide range of first-hand experiences.
4. Composition programs in the elementary grades should be directed primarily at encouraging students to self-expression.
5. Writing assignments should be more extensive than the specification of a topic or list of topics.
6. Composition programs in the elementary grades should be designed primarily to help students learn to discipline their writing and develop awareness of accepted standards of good prose.
7. Teachers should correct errors on students' papers.

APPENDIX D

Transcript of Workshops

Workshop I (September 13, 1986)

As soon as the group was assembled, the pretests were distributed, my intent being to get an honest assessment before any information about writing across the curriculum had had a chance to alter anyone's preconceptions. When everyone had finished the two tests, then we were ready to begin. Because journals are very important in my interpretation of writing across the curriculum, I asked the teachers to free write for ten minutes about their conceptions of writing across the curriculum: what is writing across the curriculum, why did I take this workshop, what do I hope to gain from the sessions, do I expect my teaching to change in any way? I deliberately chose this activity before any information had been discussed so that participants could come back to these original journal entries after ten weeks and see for themselves how they had grown.

After the journal activity, we discussed in general what some of their expections were. I then distributed to them the objectives for the workshop (see Appendix B). I showed them a number of workshop fliers which I had collected and I passed them around. It was important that the teachers realize that writing across the curriculum is indeed a national movement and that workshops are being held in dozens of colleges and universities, and in a few high schools. Credibility being established, I spoke for a while

on Upton's (1976) five "warnings" which, in my opinion, are a realistic overview of what writing across the curriculum will mean to the average teacher.

Next, as an introduction to writing across the curriculum, I distributed Fulwiler's (1985) article "Writing is Everybody's Business." This article is written in layman's terms, is easy to read and understand, and yet still covers the basic premises of writing across the curriculum. Dividing the article into sections, I asked two or three people to read the same section and highlight parts that they felt were important. Coming back together, the groups reported on their section. This activity generated a great deal of discussion. People were relating the material to their experiences in the classroom.

After a short break, I asked the teachers to respond on paper to the following sentence: "Students don't write well because . . . ," listing as many reasons as they could think of. Then, I divided the large group into two smaller groups and sent them to opposite sides of the room to discuss their reasons. After 10-15 minutes, we came back together for group discussion. Again, participation was lively and enthusiastic. Although they did not yet know it, many of the reasons that the teachers mentioned are the foundations of writing across the curriculum: critical teacher audience, too many objective tests, and not enough writing in other subjects.

Because I wanted to establish continuity from the very beginning, I made an assignment. Each teacher was to bring to the next session some original writing of his or her own choice.

Workshop II (September 20, 1988)

Again, this workshop began with a journal entry. I asked teachers to free write for ten minutes on a topic of their own choosing. We then spent time as a group sharing our journal entries. Though only about one-third of the group read their entry, the atmosphere for Workshop II was established, an environment of warmth and appreciation.

Several of the teachers wondered if we could work with the writing that they had done the previous week for the workshop. It was obvious that they, like students, wanted to share their writing with others. I divided the large group into five groups of three. These groups will be permanent peer conferencing groups. Within the small groups, teachers read their papers to each other and discussed the strengths, _not_ the weaknesses, of each paper. Coming back to the large group, many of the teachers, some with encouragement from their peer editors, then read their papers to us all. This activity was enjoyed by everyone.

For fun and discussion, I distributed Dan Donlan's (1975) Writing Attitude Inventory. Teachers ranked themselves on the scale ranging from 0 (Rejection) to 40

(Committee); this scale represented depth of writing commitment. Most of the scores of these teachers were between 20 and 30, the Support category. Though not an empirical instrument, the Attitude Inventory generated discussion and further advanced the ideas inherent in writing to learn.

After the break, during which the discussion of the ideas on the Attitude Inventory continued, I reconvened the group, giving them Toby Fulwiler's (1987) article "Writing Across the Curriculum: Implications for Teaching Literature." As before, I assigned sections of the article to different people, asking them to highlight important concepts. After we had discussed the article, I asked them to reread the small mention of Paulo Freire and his description of the "banking" mode of education. I told them the biographical facts about Freire and summarized his philosophy, material I had culled from Timpson (1988). Then I distributed pages 57-59 from Pedagogy of the Oppressed (where Freire discusses "banking") and asked the teachers to read the material for next week. I also asked each teacher to create a short writing assignment to be brought in next week.

Important to these workshops is teacher involvement and, like writing to learn, teacher discovery of the concepts inherent to the workshops. To that end, I had previously decided to have the teachers read articles about

writing in their particular discipline. Prior to this workshop, I had placed the teachers in groups of three. For example, I grouped the two Home Economics teachers with the Health Occupations teacher, because certain similarities exist between those two areas. Then, I made five folders, one for each group, and put between six and 10 articles that I had collected in each folder. The articles were specifically geared to the teachers represented in the group and each folder contained different articles. At the end of Workshop II, I distributed the folders and asked each group to prepare a group presentation for Workshop V (three weeks away) on the material in their folder. The presentations could be in whatever form the group decided upon. This way, the entire group of fifteen would have access to a great deal of information on writing.

Workshop III (September 27, 1988)

Today we began with a discussion of Freire's "banking" method of education, carried over from last week. The group essentially agreed with Freire, although several people remarked that ultimately knowledge does have to be deposited (by teaching) and withdrawn (by evaluation). Freire's findings are very similar to those of James Britton, and their philosophies can be compared. This discussion touched on the very core of the theory behind writing to learn, and was lively and spirited.

Next, the teachers wrote in their journals. I asked each to jot down five experiences in his or her life that he or she would like to think more about and write about. This was a prewriting activity which would eventually culminate in individual papers to be published in a class booklet at the end of all the workshops.

I then explained transactional, poetic, and expressive writing, using a chalkboard and posters. To ground this theory, I distributed information from The Writing Report Card (Applebee et al., 1986), a book reporting on a survey by the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Pages 77 and 79 provided statistical evidence of the dominance of transactional writing. The "Additional Findings" and "Reflections" sections (pages 10-13) generated a lengthy discussion and debate because of statements like the following: "A major conclusion to draw from this assessment is that students at all grade levels are deficient in higher-order thinking skills" (p. 11).

Drawing numbers for partners, each group of two was directed to write each other's assignment (last week each teacher was asked to prepare a writing assignment). We reconvened and shared all of the assignments (diverse, to say the least), and part of the writing. The group was gradually becoming accustomed to sharing their writing. Also, they were an appreciative, enthusiastic, supportive audience for each other's work.

Because of the group presentations scheduled for Workshop V, I closed this workshop by giving the groups the last 15 minutes for planning.

Workshop IV (October 3, 1988)

Because last week's discussion of expressive writing was extensive, I began this workshop with the material that we had not had time to cover.

First, we reviewed with pages 115-118 of an article by Bruce Petersen (in Fulwiler & Young, 1982). The material summarizes expressive, poetic, and transactional writing, and reviews the theoretical stance of James Britton. After spending 10 minutes or so on this material, I distributed "An Interview with James Britton, Tony Burgess, and Harold Rosen" (Rosen 1978) and assigned selected parts to be role played. My thinking was that we could simulate a "live" interview. The teachers were good sports, but I could see that nothing really valuable was gained by this activity and I would not do it again. However, they did enjoy the next excerpt, from Michael Marland's <u>Language Across the Curriculum</u>, which contained samples of the three types of writing. This gives an excellent overview and summary.

Workshop IV was to be based on the writing process - prewriting, writing, revision, editing, evaluation, and publication - a process of which I felt sure that the teachers were unaware. I began by breaking the large group

down into their peer conferencing groups, and directed them to critique in a positive manner the writing assignment done during the previous week. After 15 minutes or so, the group came back together and talked on their feelings about having their writing shaped by someone else. I explained the writing process, illustrating with a copy of the interlocked circles from The North Carolina Writing Program (1983). This publication is an excellent resource for material on the writing process. I explained to them the elements of the writing process that they had experienced so far, and we spent some time discussing prewriting activities. Also, I gave them a copy of eight prewriting activities found in Teaching Writing in Every Class (Hollingsworth and Easton, 1988), a book which has an excellent chapter on the writing process. To illustrate one of the eight prewriting activities, I had the teachers cube a paper clip. They enjoyed sharing their perceptions with the rest of the group. Since cubing is an application of Bloom's Taxonomy, I passed out a brief explanation and we talked for a while about thinking skills and writing.

Last, the teachers met for a short while in their groups to discuss the group presentations due next week.

Workshop V (October 10, 1988)

Today we had group presentations. I was not sure just how long these presentations would take since each group had

been allotted 15 minutes and there were five groups. The presentations were based on the three-five articles per person that I had collected for each group. As it turned out, only four groups had time to present because of the discussion generated by each of the presentations. Each person individually presented the articles that I had chosen for him or her, and related the information to the overall writing across the curriculum movement. The group, feeling very much at ease with one another, felt free to interrupt, add, or comment. As a result, the entire three hours were taken up by four of the groups, with the fifth group scheduled to present at the next meeting.

Every teacher knows that he or she never really "owns" material until he or she teaches it. During these presentations, the teachers demonstrated ownership of the material and presented the theories behind writing to learn as if the theories were theirs.

Workshop VI (October 18, 1988)

We began this workshop by finishing the group presentations. One group still needed to present their material. This served as a good introduction to the day's activities because it simultaneously allowed for group participation and review. After the presentation, my intent was to finish up the writing process. We had thoroughly discussed prewriting through revision, but had not really

touched on publication. I had kept informative material on publication gathered at the Appalachian Writing Project, so I distributed two lists of publication ideas, one rather conventional (entitled "Suggested Postwriting Activies") and one very unique (entitled "A Potpourri of Publishing Ideas for Student Writing"). We went over these as a group, commenting and adding as we went along. As a final activity for acquainting the teachers with writing as a process, I wanted them to read from the literature. Accordingly, I distributed an article by Donald Murray (1976), "Teach Writing as a Process, Not Product." Since I used the article at the end of the writing process section, it served as an excellent overview, bringing all of the various components of the process together in summary.

This workshop was supposed to have focused on audience and purpose for the entire time period, but I had gotten behind, probably because of all of the discussion. I decided that I would cover what I could of the material and not carry it over into Workshop VII, which was to be on evaluation, an extensive topic. Also, we had touched on audience, especially, in past discussions. From Martin et al. (1976), I shared page 21, which gives a breakdown of the audiences that Britton found and a statistical analysis of the writing addressed to each. Always wanting the teachers to connect with the literature, I passed out several pages on audience that I had gleaned from Walvoord (1984). The

material was very readable and clear, including sections on "Defining the Audience," "The Real Audience," "The Hypothetical Audience," and "The Teacher as Audience." At this time, I wanted to involve the teachers more directly in audience concepts, so I gave them an exercise in audience analysis (Fulwiler & Young, 1982, p. 65) where they were to read three entries on the same topic and decide what type of audience the writer was addressing. Also, on pages 71 and 72 of the above source, there is an exercise in audience that is very adaptable to any type of class. If time had permitted, I would have had the teachers try this exercise, but since it did not, I simply distributed it and called it to their attention. Last, I gave them a sheet entitled "Responding as an Audience to Your Classmates' Writing," a sheet gleaned from the Appalachian Writing Project that is designed to heighten students' awareness of the importance of audience.

We had finished our group presentations; now I spoke to the teachers about individual presentations for Workshop VIII. All I wanted each one of them to do was to try out a writing activity or activities on a class or two, reporting on the results to the group at large. I felt that we had gathered a great deal of material, had had numerous discussions, and had encountered a large number of potential activities. Also, since I strongly believe that theory must be linked with practice, I wanted the workshop participants

to try out what they had learned, then share their experiences in a seminar situation. The teachers, as usual, were enthusiastic and willing and agreed to do some writing in their classes.

Workshop VII (October 25, 1988)

This workshop started with a wonderful Halloween table filled with delicious refreshments. Everyone relaxed and enjoyed a few minutes of unstructured time, a rare luxury for teachers.

I began this workshop with a 10-minute journal entry based on a quotation by Hugh Prather. The quotation read as follows:

"In order to see I have to be willing to be seen.
If a man takes off his sunglasses I can hear him better."

I chose this topic because I could relate it in several ways to writing to learn.

Following the writing, we discussed the entries. After seven weeks of writing, the various members of the group were glad to share their thoughts, several people relating the entry to writing and to the vulnerability of the position of the writer. A few entries were deep and philosophical, and the fact that these writers felt free to share their thoughts made me realize again just how important an environment of trust can be. This journal

sharing led to a short discussion of the personal journal and how valuable it would be to all of us at a later time if we would record and freeze our present thoughts.

Next, I distributed four numbered samples of student writing on the topic "American children would be better off if every television set in the nation were unplugged for good." I also distributed a holistic grading chart which ranged from 6 to 1. Each workshop participant was to read all of the compositions and give each one a score. After fifteen minutes, I convened the peer conferencing groups, which came to a consensus on each paper. The conferencing was noisy and a little argumentative, for me a good sign.

After each group had mutually decided on the scores, we tallied the scores on the chalkboard. There was wide disagreement on two papers (from one group's 5 to another group's 1), and minor disagreement on the other two (some group's a 3; others, a 2). To resolve the conflict, we studied the holistic grading scales, comparing the papers closely with the evaluation criteria. Ultimately, we got somewhat closer on the 5-1 conflict, but we finally agreed to disagree. However, my point was made. Grading writing is a very subjective process, and one which is not usually based on concrete criteria. Amid noisy discussion, we took a break.

The book Writing for Learning in the Content Areas (Wolfe and Reising, 1983) has a comprehensive chapter on the

evaluation of writing. There are six myths about evaluation that the book listed, then explained. We read and discussed these. Also, the chapter contains a number of evaluation forms suitable for many types of student activities. These are very practical and easily adapted to various assignments.

At the end of this workshop, I felt that the teachers' concepts of evaluation were much broader than they had been before.

Workshop VIII (October 31, 1988)

This workshop being on writing to learn, I distributed copies of "The Learning Power of Writing" (Walshe, 1987). The article naturally fell into five divisions, and I assigned each group a segment. After giving them time to read their sections, I asked each group to informally tell the rest of the groups about their part. As before, the teachers grasped the main concepts, presented them to one another, and then discussed them energetically. This particular article is a good blend of theory and practicality.

After we had finished the article, we began the individual presentations. Each teacher was to have tried out some writing activity (or activities) in his or her class. I think the assigning of writing by subject matter secondary teachers would differ from that by college

professors, because secondary teachers, as a rule, probably use writing less. In any event, the writing assignments were varied and the results, most interesting. For example, one home economics teacher had collected some wonderful reviews of a food lab, and one special education teacher had had her students make a booklet using letters of the alphabet, relating the letter to some aspect of geography, and then writing a paragraph.

Since fifteen presentations took time, and I wanted to give that time freely, the presentations extended until the end of this workshop.

Workshop IX (November 7, 1988)

We had a few individual presentations to finish up from last week. They were varied, and the focus on each other's writing efforts was a good way to begin.

The other home economics teacher had had her child care class create a newspaper; the Spanish teacher's class had read a story on bullfighting and respectively assumed in writing the characters of the matador, the bull, and a spectator; one English teacher tried psychology on a lackadaisical 6th Period: "I am failing because . . ." Mrs. Perry could help me if she would . . ."; the drafting teacher tried a talkless period - all communication was to be done on paper. Reports came in that the students liked to write, that teachers were learning about their students

from their writing, and that the students who had three or more of the workshop teachers would be glad when the workshops were over!

After this interchange, I passed out a segment of Song of Myself (Walt Whitman):

I am the teacher of athletes,
He that be me spreads a wider breast than
My own proves the width of my own,
He most honors my style who learns
Under it to destroy the teacher.

We very briefly discussed it because some of the teachers were puzzled, and then wrote in our journals. The responses were wonderful. The group picked up on the very essence of teaching, about surpassing one's mentor, being able to stand on one's own two feet, and about the future. One teacher mentioned that he wanted his students to be better than he, to write better, to push back the limits of excellence, and to be spurred on to even greater heights of achievement. We also discussed the athlete analogy and Whitman's possible motives for using it.

Because of the booklet that we are going to publish at the end of the workshop, I gave time for peer conferences. Each teacher was to choose a sample of his best writing for publication. Even though we had written together for nine weeks, I could tell that the teachers were a little apprehensive about having their writing published. However,

everyone promised to polish a piece of writing, consult with each other during the week, and turn in the finished product at the last meeting.

The final activity took the entire last hour, but I could see that it could have taken much longer had we had time. During my research last summer, whenever I ran across a practical suggestion for making writing assignments, I had put the article or the reference for the article or book into a special folder. I had accumulated quite a collection, and now I passed out two or three articles or books to each person, instructing him or her to read the material and explain the assignment suggestions to the group. I was the scribe, and made a list of all of the suggestions, to be typed and given to the teachers as a source of practical, implementable ways to incorporate writing into their classes. We ended up with a list of some thirty ideas and an article to be copied in its entirety. Enthusiasm ran high for this particular activity, and everyone seemed to enjoy it.

Workshop X (November 15, 1988)

We started this last workshop very positively. Dr. Emory Maiden, Professor of English at Appalachian State University, visited the group and spoke on the importance of writing across the curriculum. Dr. Maiden directs the Appalachian Writing Project, a seminar I had attended in

1984, which is modeled after the California Bay Writing Project. His presence meant a great deal to me as a source of support, and to the group as an affirmation of what we had been doing. Following his talk, there was time for a brief question and answer session.

After Dr. Maiden left, we began the wrapup. I distributed the list of suggestions we had compiled last week, the article that the group had wanted me to copy (Brostoff, 1979), and various other materials that I had collected but had not given out. All were geared toward the practical implementation of writing in teachers' classes. We briefly looked at each handout in order to fix it in our minds, but being primarily lists, there was not much discussion. Also, I gathered the writing assignments each teacher was to have written for our book.

I then distributed the posttests and asked the teachers to complete the tests carefully, so that the results would be as valid as possible.

One final group interaction remained. After the posttests we all went to a local restaurant to celebrate the end of the workshops and to toast our group's closeness and commitment to writing. It was a fitting finale for an incredibly fulfilling experience.

APPENDIX E

Letter Following Workshops

Caldwell County Schools
P. O. Drawer 1590
Lenoir, North Carolina 28645

KENNETH A. ROBERTS
SUPERINTENDENT

1914 Hickory Blvd., SW
(704) 728-8407

November 15, 1988

To: Members of the writing control group

From: Helen Fowler

Since the writing workshop is now over, it is time for the posttests. Once again, we will meet in Betty Whitener's room, this time on Tuesday, November 22, at 3:05. The tests will take approximately 20 minutes. If you would again take a few minutes of your time, I would certainly be grateful.

The workshops have gone well, and I am interested in seeing the results. However, without your help as a control for the experiment, the results would not be worth anything. So, even though you have only been involved through a testing procedure, your participation has been vital.

Thanks for your cooperation.