

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

A collaborative approach to integrating the
teaching of writing into the sciences in a New
Zealand tertiary context.

**This thesis presented for partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English at Massey University**

Lisa Emerson

1999

Abstract

The research question examined in this thesis is: “how can we effectively teach writing in the disciplines?” During the development of the research two subsidiary questions were included: “can writing in the disciplines be taught effectively through the combined expertise of writing specialists and subject specialists?” and “is action research an effective method of empowering academic staff as teachers of writing?” New Zealand universities, to date, have taken a very limited, generic approach to teaching or researching writing in the disciplines. This research makes a major innovation by bringing a writing teacher into collaboration with academic staff from the applied sciences to develop a programme whose objective was to teach the genres and styles of applied science writing to students in that discipline.

The thesis focuses upon three writing projects. All three took place in the Faculty of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences at Massey University between 1993 and 1996 and took their inspiration from the writing across the curriculum movement. Project one involved the development of a Communication in Applied Science paper for first year students. Project two was a departmental writing across the curriculum programme aimed at integrating the teaching of writing into content courses. Project three involved integrating writing into the fundamental pedagogy of a single paper in horticulture. The project teams used action research as a method of developing and evaluating their programme. Action research was chosen as an appropriate methodology because it combines research with practical action, takes place in a real rather than an ideal context, provides a process to implement and monitor change, and allows for effective collaboration and ownership of the project.

The projects have had the following key outcomes. Action research provides a successful methodology for integrating writing into the disciplines. Collaboration between academic staff and a writing consultant can offer a fully viable means of teaching writing in the disciplines. An institutional context of support and

rewards for innovative teaching can enable staff to gain confidence as teachers of writing and understanding of writing in the disciplines. Student attitudes to writing and communication skills become more positive when the genres taught are professionally relevant, the importance of communication is modelled by credible sources, and writing support facilities are available. Finally, writing should be integrated into the pedagogical schema of a course at its inception, rather than being superimposed upon existing courses.

Acknowledgements

To say that I couldn't have completed this work on my own is an understatement, as anyone reading this thesis will immediately appreciate. This was my first venture into conducting research with people and in groups – until now, my research had been largely confined to nineteenth century poetry. Working with groups required quite different skills than those I was used to employing, and the frustrations and the joys of this are, I'm sure, embedded in my text. It is with considerable depth of feeling, therefore, that I take this opportunity to thank those who either engaged in the process with me or supported me along the way.

My first debt is to my supervisors, Associate Professor Russell Poole, Professor John Codd and Associate Professor Robyn Munford. Their perceptiveness and thoughtful assessment of my work was invaluable, and I would especially like to thank Russell for listening to my excited descriptions of my experiences, for venturing his considered opinions whenever I stopped talking long enough for him to do so, and for his courage in stepping, with me, outside the safe bounds of English literature. I'm sure there were times when he wondered exactly what he had let himself in for – but if he did, he never showed it.

I would like to acknowledge the work of a number of people who I consider to be real 'pioneers' in their work with writing at Massey University. Janet Holst and Karen Rhodes have, over the last few years, taken on the challenging job of introducing the study of academic writing into the university curriculum: I have a real debt to both Janet and Karen because, without their work, the questions which started this study would never have been asked. A special thank you to Karen who has always taken such a supportive interest in my work.

Robert Neale and Professor Roly Frean were the earliest pioneers in this field at Massey University. In 1979 I was one of the bemused, hapless students enrolled in the first year of their writing course – it was an experience never to be

forgotten and instilled in me (amongst other things) a curiosity about language which has stayed with me and is, I'm sure, the bedrock of this study.

I have commented in a number of places in this study on the ways in which universities do not support research into writing and on the way staff in learning centres are actively prevented from conducting research. While these conditions do apply at Massey University, I have been very fortunate in the number of senior people who have supported my endeavours. First I would like to acknowledge the three Deans of the Faculty of Business Studies, Professor Ralph Love, Professor Reg Matthews and Professor Rolf Cremer, who allowed me to conduct this research, even though it was outside the bounds of my contract. Mention should also be made of Professor Graeme Fraser who, as Assistant Vice Chancellor (Academic), supported my work while I was employed in the Learning Support Network. I would also like to acknowledge the support of Nicola North, to whom I reported in the Faculty of Business Studies and Malcolm Bowling who, as Head of the Learning Support Network, took an interest in my project and delighted in challenging my ideas.

In my present position as Head of the Student Learning Centre, I am also fortunate in both the support of my managers and the encouragement of my colleagues. I would like to acknowledge the active support of Chris Collins, Regional Registrar at the Palmerston North campus, and Murna Thomson, Assistant Vice Chancellor (Services), both of whom encouraged me to spend time with this work during the painful process of completion.

Various people around the university took time to help me in my research. My thanks to Dr Jenny Poskitt, who took the time to read a chapter for a complete stranger. I would also like to thank Gordon Suddaby of the TDU who has had enough confidence in me to let me loose in some of his courses, and who spent time investigating material for me. Thank you to Alison Mildon, who provided me with information on employers' perspectives and shared plans and ideas with me. My thanks to John Muirhead for being the kind of person who never throws anything away.

I would like to thank Professor Robert Anderson, Dean of the Faculty of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences and now Pro Vice Chancellor of the College of Science for his enduring faith in me, and Professor Warren Parker and Professor Ken Milne who allowed me to work in their departments and provided insights and practical support. I would like to thank all the academic staff who engaged in the projects: Ewen Cameron, Peter Coolbear, Ken Crawford, David Grey, Keith Funnell, John Hampton, Evelyn Hurley, Dick Kuiper, Kerry Harrington, Dave Horne, James Lockhart, Kevin Lowe, Bruce MacKay, Marion MacKay, Sam Peterson, Ian Valentine, Eddie Welsh, and Alan Wright.

On a more personal note I would like to thank the following:

- Cliff Studman, for speaking sternly to me when I needed it, and in so doing goading me into completing a final draft.
- Debbie Ormsby, who typed up much of the material I needed while pursuing these projects.
- Julia Sich, who provided the photographs.
- Gloria Slater, for making the link between action research and the writing programme, and spending time introducing me to the concepts.
- Warwick, for making me laugh, for being prepared to talk for as long as I needed to clarify my ideas, and for supporting me from the beginning.
- Jan McPherson, for discussions about action research, and for her many helpful comments and suggestions.
- Peter Mellalieu, for keeping me on track at critical moments, for his thoughts on diagrams and graphical representation, for introducing me to ideas and concepts which have strongly informed my way of thinking and writing – and for his uncontainable enthusiasm.

- Mandy Rudge and Janet Reid, for inspiration, for laughing at me, for their constant reminder that this was “just a PhD” – and for their friendship which is all about celebrating difference.
- Edward and Rose who must have, at times, felt as if they had lost their mother – but who balance my life and make everything worthwhile.
- My parents, Jean and Ellis, and my sister Anne-Marie, who in countless ways have provided practical support and who have tolerated the absence of a daughter and sister for far too long.
- Bruce, who is part and partner of every aspect of my work. The beginning of our story is in these pages – the beginning, I hope, of a life of shared exploration and creation.

I would like to thank everyone who is a part of the wonderful team at the Student Learning Centre. Without their support, humour and diversionary discussions about punctuation, I would never have survived the writing-up process. In particular I would like to say thank you to Joan Fountain, who worked with me at the Business Studies Writing Centre when I was in the early stages of discovery and exploration. Thank you to Chris van der Krogt for being a completer-finisher par excellence. Special thanks also to Grant Harris for reading sections of the text and for all his thoughtful suggestions and his requests for visual representation.

Two members of the Student Learning Centre deserve a special mention. My thanks to Julie Lyons, whose practical skills, colourful use of language, strength of character and capacity to crack the whip when I needed it have made every difference. Thank you, also, to Jackie McDonald, whose perceptiveness, thoughtfulness and wisdom have so often cushioned my falls along the way.

Finally, and most importantly, I would like to thank all the students who were involved in this project. I would like to be able to name them all, since they were all a part of this process. But since this is not possible, I would like, especially, to

thank the Hort Tech class of 1995. I have never, in my whole teaching career, met a class like this one. They were, in every respect, partners with the teaching team in the pursuit of learning. They were obstreperous, challenging, encouraging and curious, they shared their dreams and passions and frustrations, and they grew beautiful sunflowers. Thank you to Jeanette, Stephanie, the Pauls, Kevin, Andrea and all the team.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iii
List of tables and figures	xiv
 Chapter 1: "This schizophrenic institution": Beginnings	 1
 Section One: Contexts	 17
Chapter 2: Historical context.....	19
2.1 Bachelor of Applied Science.....	20
2.2 Prior approaches to communication.....	22
2.3 The Department of Agricultural and Horticultural Systems Management	24
2.4 The introduction of communication	26
2.5 Department of Plant Science	27
2.6 The positioning of the projects	28
2.7 The inclusion of a writing consultant	29
 Chapter 3: Writing in New Zealand universities	 33
3.1 Overview	35
3.2 Auckland University	39
3.2.1 Student Learning Centre	39
3.2.2 English writing for academic purposes	41
3.2.3 Other initiatives	42
3.3 Waikato University	44
3.3.1 Writing for university purposes	44
3.3.2 The TLDU	46
3.3.3 Other initiatives	47
3.4 Victoria University	48
3.4.1 Student Learning Support	48
3.4.2 English Language Institute	49
3.4.3 Other initiatives	49
3.5 Canterbury University	50
3.6 Lincoln University	53
3.7 Otago University	54
3.8 Massey University	56
3.8.1 Writing: Theory and practice	56

3.8.2 Applied English/ Written Communication	57
3.8.3 Business Studies Writing Centre	60
3.8.4 Other initiatives	63
3.9 Key themes	65
3.10 Tertiary Writing Network	69
3.11 Conclusions	70
 Chapter 4: Teaching writing in the sciences	 73
4.1 The generic writing course	75
4.2 Writing across the curriculum: Alternative approaches.....	79
4.2.1 History	79
4.2.2 WAC: Definitions	82
4.3 Writing in the disciplines: Course structures and approaches	84
4.3.1 Science writing taught within an English department	85
4.3.2 The integrated or de-centralised model	93
4.3.3 The collaborative model(s) of writing instruction	97
4.4 Conclusions	106
 Section Two: Methodological issues	 109
Chapter 5: Action research: Change and collaboration	111
5.1 The emergence of action research	113
5.1.1 Origins	113
5.1.2 Definitions	114
5.1.3 The theme of change	115
5.1.4 The theme of collaboration and ownership	116
5.1.5 The theme of context	117
5.1.6 The combined themes of action and research	119
5.2 Process	119
5.2.1 Planning	120
5.2.2 Action and observation	122
5.2.3 Reflection	122
5.3 Data collection	123
5.3.1 Staff journals	124
5.3.2 Student journals	126
5.3.3 Focus groups	127
5.3.4 Individual interviews of staff	130
5.3.5 Miscellaneous data collection methods	131
5.3.6 Student assignments	131
5.3.7 Written sources of data	131
5.4 Ethical issues	131

5.5 Conclusion	135
Section Three: The projects	137
Chapter 6. Project One: Communication in Applied Science	139
6.1 Cycle 1: Planning	140
6.1.1 Initial planning	140
6.1.2 Style Manual	141
6.1.3 Data collection	142
6.1.4 Curriculum development	142
6.2 The teaching team	145
6.3 Cycle 1: Students	148
6.4 Cycle 1: Action and observation	149
6.5 Observation and reflection	151
6.5.1 Materials	151
6.5.2 Lectures	152
6.5.3 Tutorials	153
6.5.4 Assessment	154
6.5.5 Curriculum	156
6.6 Reflection and planning	157
6.7 Cycle 2: Action and observation.....	158
6.8 Cycle 2: Reflection	159
6.8.1 Operations	159
6.8.2 Curriculum	161
6.9 Cycle 3: Planning	163
6.10 Cycle 3: Action and observation	164
6.11 Cycle 3: Reflection	166
6.11.1 Content	168
6.11.2 Delivery	168
6.11.3 Assessment	169
6.12 Key themes	172
6.12.1 Writing themes	173
6.12.2 Action research	180
6.13 Conclusions	186
Chapter 7. Project Two: Teaching writing within a departmental programme.....	189
7.1 The origins of the project	190
7.2 The research team	190
7.3 Planning	194
7.3.1 Objectives	196
7.3.2 Planning for action	198

7.4 Data collection	202
7.5 Cycle 1: Action and observation	204
7.5.1 11.341 Horticultural Management II	205
7.5.2 11.258 Agricultural Systems II	205
7.5.3 19.152 Agriculture and Society	207
7.5.4 11.251 Farm Management	208
7.6 Cycle 1: Reflection	210
7.7 Cycles 2 and 3: Planning and action	213
7.7.1 11.251 Farm Management	214
7.7.2 19.259 Horticultural Systems II	215
7.7.3 19.258 Agricultural Systems II	217
7.8 Key themes	219
7.9 The researcher's role	222
7.10 Conclusion	224
 Chapter 8: Project Three: Horticultural Technology	 227
8.1 The composition and context of the teaching group	227
8.2 Data collection	236
8.3 Writing to learn/ learning to write	238
8.4 Cycle 1: 1995	240
8.4.1 The journal	241
8.4.2 Group reports	245
8.4.3 In-class exercises	248
8.4.4 Readings	250
8.5 Cycle 1: Reflection	251
8.5.1 Microthemes and journals	252
8.5.2 Reports	258
8.5.3 In-class exercises	259
8.5.4 Readings	260
8.6 Cycle 2: 1996	262
8.6.1 Workbook: Journal, microthemes and practicals	263
8.6.2 Reports	264
8.6.3 In-class exercises	264
8.6.4 Readings	265
8.7 Key issues	266
8.7.1 Culture change: student attitudes towards writing	266
8.7.2 The blending of writing to learn and learning to write.....	267
8.7.3 The impact of the team	268
8.7.4 Benefits to staff: The journal and qualitative feedback	269
8.7.5 Staff difficulties	272

8.8 Broader effects	273
8.9 Conclusions	274
Section Four: Implications for WAC in a New Zealand context	279
Chapter 9: Writing across the curriculum in a New Zealand context	281
9.1 Connecting to the literature: Changes to the curriculum	284
9.1.1 Project one	284
9.1.2 Project two	285
9.1.3 Project three	287
9.2 Staff changes	288
9.2.1 Project one	289
9.2.2 Project two	290
9.2.3 Project three	292
9.2.4 Critical factors	293
9.3 Changes to student attitudes	294
9.4 Institutional issues	298
9.4.1 Student feedback	299
9.4.2 Teaching vs. research	301
9.4.3 Management support	303
9.5 Action research	303
9.5.1 A structured process in a real context	304
9.5.2 Collaborative team	306
9.5.3 A change process which is conducted as research	311
9.5.4 Action research: A conceptual model	311
9.6 The broader implications	313
9.7 Limitations and future directions	320
9.8 Conclusions	321
 Bibliography	 325
Appendix 1: Covering letter and questionnaire	353
Appendix 2: List of respondents.....	365
Appendix 3: List of interviewees.....	367
Appendix 4: Example of section of a focus group transcript.....	369
Appendix 5: Example of individual interview transcript.....	375
Appendix 6: Example of tutorial assessment sheet.....	379
Appendix 7: Example of staff report	381
Appendix 8: Project 1: Timeline	383
Appendix 9: Example of 19.155 tutorial material	385
Appendix 10: Example of mastery test material and test	387
Appendix 11: Project 2: Timeline.....	409

Appendix 12: Project 3: Timeline	411
Appendix 13: Example of in-class structured notes	413
Appendix 14: Two examples of student responses to in-class exercises.....	421
Appendix 15: Example of peer-editing sheet	425
Appendix 16: Examples of journal exercises	431
Appendix 17: Audience-focused writing	441
Appendix 18: Assessment of the sunflower practical	447

List of tables and figures

Table 3.1 Occurrence of North American-style writing programmes in New Zealand universities.	36
Table 3.2 Writing support services offered by learning support/student learning units in New Zealand universities.	38
Fig. 4.1 Collaborative models of WAC	97
Fig. 5.1 The action research cycle (after Zuber-Skerritt, 1993)	120
Fig. 8.1 The sunflower practical.	247
Fig. 9.1 Contextual action research diagram	312
Fig. 9.2 University-based WAC matrix (model 1)	314
Fig. 9.3 University-based WAC matrix (model 2)	317