

Writing Across the Curriculum

Wright State University
January 2001
Number 21

Using Political Cartoons as the Basis for a Freshman Comp Research Paper: Delineating the Reasons for the Failure of Yet Another Clever Idea

Inside this issue...

CTL winter 2001
workshops
Page 6

Writing in biology classes:
A report to the Board of
Trustees
Page 7

New books on writing in
the disciplines
Page 7

Dealing with plagiarism in
writing intensive courses
Page 8

A short history of the
WAC program, part 2: A
pre-WAC writing intensive
course
Page 10

WAC lunchtime workshops
for winter 2001
Page 12

The following article was originally presented at the annual conference of the Association for the University Regional Campuses of Ohio and was published in the AURCO Journal. This version has been shortened slightly for reasons of space. Martin Kich, Associate Professor of English at WSU-Lake Campus, is the most recent winner of the Board of Trustees' Award for Faculty Excellence.

At the Lake Campus, students are required to complete two courses in English composition. In the second, English 102, the focal assignment is an eight- to ten-page research essay, typically with either an argumentative slant or a topic that requires some sort of interpretive analysis. When the department selected an anthology of political essays as the reader for this course, I was uncomfortable with the choice, for both personal and pedagogical reasons.

Although I have a great many political opinions, they are, in combination, rather—no, very—idiosyncratic. I balk, even, at describing myself as a libertarian. So, although I very much enjoy talking about politics with family, friends, and colleagues, I knew that I would have difficulty doing so in a class of freshman composition students who would expect some sort of readily recognizable coherence in my opinions. And most of them would probably take

considerable pride in describing themselves as Democrats or Republicans, Conservatives or Liberals—all with capital letters.

But I had been amassing collections of political cartoons and of newspaper editorials on political topics; and, after some brainstorming, I believed that I had conceived an imaginative research topic: the students would focus on some of the 300 or so cartoons that had to do with Clinton's various policies and problems, and, working from the premise that it was now the year 2025, they would explain the cartoons to people who were "now" only passingly familiar with the Clinton presidency—if they had any knowledge of its particulars at all.

The treatment would require them to do three things: (1) describe each cartoon, (2) explain its political context, and (3) analyze the cartoonist's or cartoonists' bias. They could choose the number of

continued on page 2

I believed that I had conceived an imaginative research topic: the students would focus on some of the 300 or so cartoons that had to do with Clinton's various policies and problems. . . .

Every time I have described this topic and approach to another teacher, the response has been extremely enthusiastic, even admiring.

cartoons, the number and variety of topics addressed, and the number of cartoonists represented. These choices would then determine the choices available to them in terms of the essay's structure, pacing, and scope of development. And the humor inherent in the material, in combination with the need to analyze the cartoonists' biases, would force students to consider tone very carefully.

Moreover, the timeliness of the topic (along with the binders of editorials that I had gathered and sorted) would minimize the limitations of our small library's sometimes eclectic collection. (This was just before much material became available in full-text through OhioLINK and just before we had full Internet access in all of our computer labs. And both of these circumstances would seem, in theory, to make the topic all the more workable and attractive.) Every time I have described this topic and approach to another teacher, the response has been extremely enthusiastic, even admiring.

Unfortunately, with the exception of several non-traditional students, the majority of the students in five English 102 classes over two quarters pretty much hated the topic. To put it as bluntly as they no doubt did, and may still be doing, it sucked and sucked big time. This presentation will explain why—as far as I have been able to determine—this topic was such an abysmal failure, despite my careful conception of it and my stubborn enthusiasm about its possibilities. (Even after it had not worked the first quarter, I felt that it was too good an idea *not* to work—that all it needed was a little tinkering. About two weeks into the second quarter, I realized that the tinkering

had not been enough—that I was stuck with a loser for another eight weeks and, worse, that my students were catching on to that fact almost as quickly as I was.)

The reasons for the failure of this research topic include, I think, the following misconceptions and/or misperceptions on my part, which may, taken together, illuminate some more limited problem that you may have had with an assignment:

I gave the students too many choices.

What I saw as a series of choices that branched into other choices much like the directory trees in Windows Explorer, they saw as a Rubik's Cube, in which every choice simply led to another set of choices until they weren't sure what choices they had already made and/or eliminated. They could not grasp the idea that the choices had to be made in a certain sequence or they would have to be made over. If I were to try this approach again, I would limit the choices and take students step-by-step through the process much more painstakingly. Whereas I had originally been afraid of patronizing them, I now know that most of them will not see clarity as condescension.

I very much underestimated how difficult it is to describe a cartoon.

Because the cartoon is an extremely compressed medium, with much meaning conveyed in literally a very few strokes of a pen, it is hard to decide how to frame a discussion of the complexities of its message. The basic point can usually be stated in a declarative sentence, but where

does one go from there? There are fewer natural markers for the writer to follow—fewer inherent structures for the writing to be modeled on.

I very much underestimated the topicality of most political cartoons.

Whereas cartoons are drawn in response to day-to-day events, periodical articles and even newspaper editorials are written in response to events that have developed over a broader timeframe. So, the students had some difficulty in matching their research materials to some of the specific details of an issue or event being addressed in a cartoon. Although I suggested that they replace problematic cartoons with others on much the same topic, most students were reluctant to do so. Initially, I thought they did not wish to “lose” anything that they had already written, regardless of how imperfect it was. But I began to suspect that they saw the same problem lurking in almost every cartoon—that replacing one cartoon with another was tantamount to replacing one ambiguity with another.

I very much underestimated the difficulty students would have in analyzing the cartoonists’ biases.

For them, *bias* is a synonym for *prejudice* or *bigotry*. An element of criticism is implicit in the term and its application. If they agree with a certain political view, they cannot see bias in it. And, conversely, if they disagree with a certain view, they cannot see *any* reason whatsoever why someone might hold it—except perhaps that

that person is somehow morally flawed or intellectually limited. I am, of course, generalizing here, but I was continually “re-amazed”—and I am coining the word to describe this phenomenon—at how often this stereotype proved true among my students.

I very much overestimated my students’ awareness of and interest in current events.

There must be no more isolated soul than a college undergraduate. According to some of my students, they are kept much too busy writing English papers. Some (too many) have opinions that are as shallow as they are fixed. And I’m not making a point about just their preferences here. I got to a point with this assignment that I would have been happy with *any* opinion that showed some depth of awareness and complexity of thought and feeling. Moreover, for some, there is too little difference between a fact and a bald assertion. So when an assignment asks them to distinguish between the two and to analyze the specific implications of a specific example of this distinction at any length, they are genuinely stymied. And an instructor who reflexively distinguishes between a fact and an assertion will have great difficulty explaining the difference when the ready explanation is not sufficient. It is a more complex version of trying to explain how to use a fork.

This politically focused assignment exposed the most basic deficiencies both in my students and in myself as an instructor, making it very difficult for me to correct their deficiencies and to conceal my own.

This politically focused assignment exposed the most basic deficiencies both in my students and in myself as an instructor, making it very difficult for me to correct their deficiencies and to conceal my own.

I very much underestimated the difficulty students would have in analyzing the cartoonists’ biases. For them, *bias* is a synonym for *prejudice* or *bigotry*.

continued on page 4

If I were to try this topic again, . . . I would place more emphasis on the students' completing successive evaluated drafts—perhaps one ungraded but thoroughly commented on draft, a second graded and thoroughly commented on preliminary draft, and then the final graded draft.

I tried to keep reminding them that they were working with cartoons. . . . I was never able to convince many of them that even a cartoon with which one disagrees can be funny.

I very much overestimated my students' senses of humor.

I tried to keep reminding them that they were working with cartoons. Perhaps I sometimes mistook boredom for dead seriousness. Moreover, I was never able to convince many of them that even a cartoon with which one disagrees can be funny. Some of the most viciously partisan cartoons contained outrageous caricatures of Clinton, making him all nose and chin like some sort of cross between W.C. Fields and Jay Leno. I had to laugh even if I disagreed with the premise of the cartoon. Most of my students seemed to lack the same flexibility. (I admit this reticence may be their credit, for I am still a sucker for ethnic jokes, even some that are politically incorrect. My students, to their moral credit and emotional cost, seem actually to *think* before they laugh at anything with a political or social edge.)

To make matters more difficult for me, they were sometimes extraordinarily literal-minded. To give just one illustration, a cartoon appearing at about the time of the Winter Olympics pictured Clinton careening on skis among trees marked *Whitewater*, *Paula Jones*, *Filegate*, *Vince Foster*, etc. One student remarked that he didn't understand the cartoon; although he knew Clinton was an avid golfer and jogger, he could not find any references to his skiing. My explanation that the skiing was simply a topical connection to the Olympics did not satisfy this student, who seemed to want to be reassured that there was a record somewhere of Clinton's having taken to the slopes at least once.

I had anticipated that my students would try to label me as a Clinton-lover or a Clinton-hater, but I had not anticipated how quickly they would come to a conclusion on the matter and how fixed their opinions would remain no matter what I said later that might reasonably have been expected to modify their first impressions.

I never could figure out how I could talk about the cartoons without making myself part of the issue—without my opinions distracting the students from the real issues. I had initially been worried about “imposing” my opinions on the students; I had been afraid that they would parrot what I said in class when I have absolutely no special credentials for addressing political issues. But the opposite actually proved to be the problem. More than a few students too quickly defined my political biases and then let that become an issue—let that become a rationalization for not trying to address pointed problems with focus, structure, and development that I might highlight in their approaches as I reviewed brainstorming, outlines, and partial drafts.

Most of the cartoons I collected had been published in the *Lima News*, which is a very conservative newspaper.

I hadn't foreseen that this apparent one-sidedness would be a major problem because I thought that the alternative or “liberal” view would be implicit in what the

cartoonists were attempting to ridicule. In fact, I thought having cartoons that reflected one political view might serve two paradoxical purposes: first, it would force students to focus thoughtfully on the one political view and not allow them simply to sort the cartoons into “liberal” and “conservative” piles; second, I thought it might force them to see the considerable range of views to which the term “conservative” is often attached (and, in this respect, the exercise would have been just as effective if the cartoons had originated in a very liberal newspaper). Instead, the liberal students tended simply to dismiss the cartoons as something akin to propaganda, and the conservative students embraced them as if they were straightforward statements of truth. Neither group seemed to be able to infer—to “reconstruct,” as it were—both the strengths and weaknesses of the views targeted in the cartoons.

Finally, I had not anticipated that my students would be unable to synthesize the three major parts of the writing task.

To me, there seemed such a natural progression from describing the cartoon to explaining its point to analyzing the cartoonist’s bias that I was very much surprised when I received papers in which very brief descriptions of the cartoons were followed by lengthy and loosely focused discussions of the historical background and then extremely perfunctory comments on the cartoonists’ biases. If I were to try this topic again (but why would I want to?), I would place more emphasis on the students’ completing successive evaluated

drafts—perhaps one ungraded but thoroughly commented on draft, a second graded and thoroughly commented on preliminary draft, and then the final graded draft. In this manner, I could lead at least some of them toward a workable synthesis of their analytic purposes and their research materials.

Interestingly, when I mentioned to students in my 300-level advanced composition class that I was writing about this experience, some of the students who had been in my 102 classes audibly groaned at the memory but seemed surprised that I recognized just how unsuccessful the assignment had been. It suddenly struck me that the chasm between us and our students is sometimes much broader than the space between our desk and theirs. No matter how much they hate the approach taken in a particular class and no matter how much they question its pedagogical validity, many students seem to assume that the teacher is satisfied with it. They don’t seem to recognize that we are often as deeply troubled by our failures as we are by theirs or as they are by their own. Everything that I have remarked on in this report was at least touched on in some student evaluations—except for the fact that I was very self-conscious about the almost total failure of an approach into which I had invested a great deal of time, thought, imagination, and energy. The students did comment on how hard I seemed to be trying to get my points across, but they never seemed to equate the effort with the thrashing of a drowning man who is hastening his drowning with the effort in his thrashing.

Martin Kich
English
Wright State Lake Campus

I never could figure out how I could talk about the cartoons without making myself part of the issue—without my opinions distracting the students from the real issues.

It suddenly struck me that the chasm between us and our students is sometimes much broader than the space between our desk and theirs. . . . They don’t seem to recognize that we are often as deeply troubled by our failures as we are by theirs or as they are by their own.

Center for Teaching and Learning Workshops

Winter 2001 General Faculty Development Offerings

“Electronic Classroom Orientation”

Led by Robert Frey, Classroom Services Coordinator, CTL, and Phillip Combs, Computer Systems.
Thursday, January 4, 9:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. in 219 Allyn Hall.

“How to Handle Violations of Academic Integrity” Luncheon

Led by Gary Dickstein, Director, Judicial Affairs, and Robert Adams, Associate Professor, Political Science.
Thursday, January 11, 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m. in E156A Student Union.
Lunch will be provided.

“From Experiment to Reality: Learning Communities at WSU” Luncheon

Led by Catherine Queener, Learning Communities Coordinator, University College, and a panel of WSU faculty, staff, and students.
Friday, January 19, 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m. in E157 Student Union.
Lunch will be provided.

“Internationalizing the Curriculum--Pushing the Rock Upwards” Luncheon

Led by Doug Nord, Professor of Political Science/Executive Director, University Center for International Education.
Wednesday, January 24, 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m. in W169B Student Union.
Lunch will be provided.

“Conversations with Teaching Awards Recipients” Luncheon

Monday, January 29, 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m. and
Tuesday, February 27, 11:00 a.m. -1:00 p.m.
both in E156A Student Union.
Lunch will be provided.

“Tools for Teaching Book Group” Luncheon

Led by Tim Wood, Professor of Biological Sciences.
Wednesday, February 21, 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m. in E157A Student Union.
Lunch will be provided.

“Control, Conflict, and Courseware: Intellectual Property in Online Education” Videoconference

Thursday, February 8, 2:30 p.m.-4:00 p.m. in the Television Center, Studio B.

**To register for these workshops, call the CTL at x3162.
See the CTL web site <<http://www.wright.edu/ctl/workshops/index.html>> for additional offerings.**

Writing in Biology Classes

A Report to the Board of Trustees

When the Wright State Board of Trustees met on campus in October, the public portion of their meeting included a discussion of WAC. One of the participants was **Dr. Linda Ramey**, an Assistant Professor in the College of Education and Human Services. Although Dr. Ramey has taught both upper-level writing intensive (WI) courses in Education and WI sections of Biology 105, 106, and 107, her comments were mostly about her experience in using writing in the biology classes.

She began by acknowledging the wide range of writing abilities of our students. Her aim is to start where the students are presently in terms of writing skills and help move them further along in strengthening those skills. “Not every student is going to be a Thoreau,” she said; rather, her goal is to assist them in communicating their thoughts in a clear, organized fashion, with correct grammar, spelling, and punctuation as an important additional concern.

She described a number of different kinds of short writing assignments she has used. The mid-term and final exams always included essay questions because, she said, those answers let her see how students understood the course material more clearly than would a test that was exclusively multiple choice. At times, she would ask students to take five minutes to answer a question at the end of class. There the most important aim was to generate an informal flow of ideas—an instance of using writing to stimulate thinking. In the course of her GE classes in biology, she often assigned three impromptu essays to be written during class and sometimes finished out of class. She also asked for a more in-depth research paper on a student-chosen topic related to the course material.

With all of this writing, she emphasized planning and revision. “I tell my students that the writing process is often 90% thinking—jotting down notes, organizing their

thoughts on the topic—and 10% writing and editing,” she said. When a paper is unsatisfactory, students are given a grade of “r” and asked to rewrite it. While she gives them guidance for revision, she does not put red marks for every problem with a comma, period, typo, and so on. As she says, *they* need to learn to edit more carefully and take the time to read over their work.

And they do learn, she said. By the end of the course, their ability to express ideas in writing and to self-edit has improved. She also sees increased motivation and interest in course content, which in turn leads to good class discussions. Both contribute to enhanced student learning overall.

She also identified an unanticipated benefit to using writing in these large classes. It helped her to get to know students—and remember them when she saw them several terms later. As she concluded, “It’s just good teaching.”

~ Joe Law

New Books on Writing in the Disciplines Available in the WAC Office

The WAC office has just received the three most recent volumes in the Short Guide series published by Longman:

Timothy Corrigan, *A Short Guide to Writing about Film*, 4th ed.

Herbert Beall and John Trimbur, *A Short Guide to Writing about Chemistry*, 2nd ed.

Jan A. Pechenik, *A Short Guide to Writing about Biology*, 4th ed.

All three have a 2001 copyright date. Three earlier volumes in this series—on writing in history, art, and the social sciences—are also available in the WAC office.

Dealing with Plagiarism in Writing Intensive Courses

Fall 2000 WAC Workshop Roundup

Leland suggests a number of ways to discourage the downloading of ready-made papers from Internet paper mills

He contends that a blanket “Don’t Plagiarize” rule will probably seem no more significant to students than all the other “rules” they are given: don’t use a dot-matrix printer, use one-inch margins, be sure to indent paragraphs, etc.

This workshop provided a forum for instructors to discuss their concerns about plagiarism in their writing intensive courses and to share their techniques for preventing it.

Participants discussed how they have handled cases in the past and the recent revision of Wright State’s policy for handling plagiarism. The university’s new Academic Integrity policy is available online <http://www.wright.edu/students/handbook/09_05.html>.

In addition to discussing both intentional and unintentional plagiarism among native English speaking students, participants talked about the cultural aspects of plagiarism. Students in some cultures are taught to copy the work of respected figures, usually without citing the work’s origins, to show respect. To learn more about this issue, consult the web site Dene Scoggins developed for teachers of English as a second language <<http://www.cwrl.utexas.edu/~scoggins/esl/>>.

Here are some additional suggestions for discouraging plagiarism, adapted from Steve Reid and John Platt, “Coping with Plagiarism,” in *Composition Chronicle*, December 1998.

- Spend a few minutes of class discussing the topic of plagiarism to be sure students understand what is—and is not—acceptable practice.
- Limit the choices of topic and change the list frequently.

- Don’t accept papers deviating from a clearly specified format.
- Specify the kind of paper you want and provide a copy of your criteria for grading it.
- Require that a certain number of sources be very recent.
- Ask for a working bibliography early in the term and have students note where they found each source.
- Ask for a tentative outline or a draft well before the final version of the paper is due.
- Have students submit notes and all drafts with the final paper.
- Along with the final copy, ask for photocopies of outside sources (or a printed version of downloaded files), with quoted passages highlighted.
- Require a second copy of the paper you can keep on file.

Recently, an inquiry for faculty resources about dealing with plagiarism was posted to the WAC-L discussion group, and it brought a response from Bruce Leland, Western Illinois University, who directed readers to his web site *Plagiarism and the Web* <<http://www.wiu.edu/users/mfbhl/wiu/plagiarism.htm>>. Although the site was last updated on February 22, 2000, it remains quite useful. Leland suggests a number of ways to discourage the downloading of ready-made papers from Internet paper mills, and a number of his ideas will work equally well for preventing more conventional types of plagiarism.

He recommends letting students know that you're familiar with these web sites—and be sure you actually check them out for yourself. Although he mentions only a few such sites himself, he provides a link to an extensive (and recently updated) list of sites compiled by Margaret Fain of Coastal Carolina University <<http://www.coastal.edu/library/mills2.htm>>.

One of Leland's suggested activities is to go to one of the sites in class and ask students to analyze the faults of a weak paper there. Not only do students learn about writing, he says, but this exercise may help them realize that not everything available for downloading will impress their teachers. Alternatively, he suggests showing students how to use online papers as secondary sources in their own papers—and showing them how to cite electronic sources correctly.

Leland also advises approaching plagiarism as an issue of fair use and intellectual property. He contends that a blanket "Don't Plagiarize" rule will probably seem no more significant to students than all the other "rules" they are given: don't use a dot-matrix printer, use one-inch margins, be sure to indent paragraphs, etc.

The assignment itself can go a long way toward lessening the temptation to plagiarize. If students are engaged with the topic, they're more likely to do their own work. Likewise, a generic assignment ("Write about the electoral college") makes it easier to find a paper ready-made for the situation. Specific requirements, such as the inclusion of required course readings, will also decrease or even eliminate the possibility of finding something suitable from an online

paper mill.

Designing the assignment in several stages is particularly helpful. Looking at drafts, having short individual conferences, and asking for drafts with the final version of the paper are useful strategies for a number of reasons. Though Leland doesn't say so, it seems that the reduction of plagiarism would be just one of several benefits of such an approach. Students would not be able to put off beginning work on the paper—the most common cause of the desperation that often leads to submitting someone else's work—and a better final product should result from the opportunity to reflect on the topic in light of instructor feedback.

For dealing with a paper you suspect has been downloaded from the web, he advises entering key words or a string of words in quotation marks in two or three search engines. To his recommended list (AltaVista, HotBot, and Lycos Pro), we would add Google as particularly good in this respect. Leland does not mention Internet sites for detecting plagiarism, but a number are available. The best known are
<http://www.plagiarism.org>
<http://www.plagiarism.com>
<http://www.canexus.com/eve/>
<http://www.findsame.com>
Only the final site is free, but most of the others offer a free trial. The people we know who have subscribed to the commercial services have found them quite satisfactory.

Incidentally, you might want to follow the link to Leland's home page, which will take you to his useful discussion of evaluating web sources.

~ Joe Law &
Cynthia Marshall

Leland advises approaching plagiarism as an issue of fair use and intellectual property.

For dealing with a paper you suspect has been downloaded from the web, [Leland] advises entering key words or a string of words in quotation marks in two or three search engines.

A Short History of WAC, Part 2

A Pre-WAC Writing Intensive Course

Academic year 2000-01 is the fifth year of the WAC program at Wright State, but the formal implementation of the program in 1996 was the result of efforts begun a number of years before.

The September 2000 WAC newsletter featured a story tracing some of the steps along the way to the establishment of the program. This month's issue continues to look at the early history of WAC, though this time it focuses on a single course developed while discussions of writing in various disciplines were going on around the campus.

The study itself had two objectives: to determine the writing effectiveness of all students at Wright State and, on that basis, to determine if [the authors] could create a course that improves student writing while simultaneously teaching biology.

The course in question, called Writing in the Life Sciences, was developed and taught by Randy Moore, who was at the time chair of the Department of Biological Sciences. One of his concerns was to assess the impact of that course on students' writing, and—together with Joyce Howes (now Assistant Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics)—he reported their findings at a 1990 conference hosted by the Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

His presentation ("Improving Students' Writing: The Content and Impact of a Writing Course in the Life Sciences") raised a number of points that are of more than "historical" interest, and this summary is offered in hopes that readers will find their

observations both challenging and encouraging. My thanks to Joyce Howes for providing a copy of the conference proceedings and allowing me to share their findings here.

They began by describing the need for improved student writing. Along the way, they identified a number of interconnected, self-perpetuating problems that will still sound familiar a decade later—students who associate writing only with English classes and do not see it as a tool for learning; a university rewards system that stresses publication at the expense of teaching (including the time-consuming teaching of writing); professors who do not want to sacrifice research time to grading papers; responses to student writing that do not provide clear directions for improvement but leave students "frustrated and defensive rather than motivated to learn."

The study itself had two objectives: to determine the writing effectiveness of all students at Wright State and, on that basis, to determine if they could create a course that improves student writing while simultaneously teaching biology.

[B]ecause most students do not yet understand what constitutes effective writing, merely requiring them to write more will not help them to improve but will reinforce the bad habits they already have.

After a carefully formulated analysis of writing samples from students at all levels, they concluded that the writing ability of juniors, seniors, and graduate students did not differ significantly from that of first- and second-year students. Subsequent discussions with students led them to conclude that students have learned little about grammar and style because lectures about these topics were often "lists of 'rules' that

students viewed as irrelevant.”

Consequently, because most students do not yet understand what constitutes effective writing, merely requiring them to write more will not help them to improve but will reinforce the bad habits they already have.

On the basis of what they learned, Moore and Howes designed a course for biology majors called “Writing in the Life Sciences.” The course, which began with an overview of grammar and style, concluded by examining how to write theses, scientific papers, and grants. Rather than presenting students with yet another list of “rules,” they began by asking students to determine what makes one piece of scientific writing more effective than another, and subsequent discussions built on the student-driven

After a carefully formulated analysis of writing samples from students at all levels, they concluded that the writing ability of juniors, seniors, and graduate students did not differ significantly from that of first- and second-year students.

recognition that “effective scientific writing is accurate, precise, consistent, clear, persuasive, interesting, and free of jargon.” The approach to teaching writing itself was highly pragmatic. As the authors put it, their goal was to help students “learn how to use a few basic techniques to ‘get to the point’ and stay there.”

Moore and Howes measured the impact of the course by analyzing the students’ writing during the first and last weeks of the term. Using several computer programs that indexed “readability” and “interest” features, they found a number of striking—and statistically significant—changes, such as the following:

Feature	Before	After
Readability, by % adults	41	65
Grade level*	17	13
Interest	7	33

* (grade level 17 indicates a reading level appropriate for postgraduate readers; 13 is appropriate for first-year college readers)

Rather than presenting students with yet another list of “rules,” they . . . built on the student-driven recognition that “effective scientific writing is accurate, precise, consistent, clear, persuasive, interesting, and free of jargon.”

In more general terms, the study also indicated that students’ sentences and paragraphs were shorter, changes that Moore and Howes attributed to the deletion of irrelevant sentences and unnecessary words. Additionally, they saw that the course improved the teaching effectiveness of the GTAs who took it, as reflected in the improved “clarity, precision, and understandability” of their handouts and exams.

As far as I can determine, no one at Wright State has yet attempted to replicate this study, but I am aware that a few departments have instituted courses that deal explicitly with writing in that discipline. This would seem an ideal time to follow the lead of these early proponents of WAC at Wright State by measuring our achievement thus far and acting on the basis of what we learn.

~Joe Law

WAC Luchtime Workshops

Winter 2001

Using Journals in Writing Intensive Courses

Wednesday, January 17, 2001

E157A Student Union

12 noon - 1 p.m.

or

Thursday, January 18, 2001

E005 Student Union (Scenario Room)

12 noon - 1 p.m.

Faculty in many disciplines have found journals an effective way to ask students to use writing to learn course content and to enter into the professional fields they have chosen.

Learn how faculty from a variety of disciplines are using journals—including electronic journals—in their classes. Lunch will be provided.

Getting Students to Revise Effectively and Efficiently

Wednesday, February 14, 2001

E157B Student Union

12 noon - 1 p.m.

or

Thursday, February 15, 2001

E157B Student Union

12 noon - 1 p.m.

How much do your comments on early drafts help students

improve their writing? How much do you need to mark to show students what they need to do to improve? How can you ensure that students do more than simply correct the errors you have identified?

Join faculty from across campus to discuss these and related questions. It will be a good opportunity to share what you have learned—and to learn from others. Lunch will be provided.

To register for workshops, contact Joe Law at x2155 or email him at joe.law@wright.edu.

Joe Law, Coordinator
Writing Across the Curriculum
027 Paul Laurence Dunbar Library