

Broadening WAC's Reach: A Grassroots Approach Using the Writing Process

Katherine Kirkpatrick

Clarkson College

Broadening WAC's Reach: A Grassroots Approach Using the Writing Process

Although not part of a formal writing across the curriculum (WAC)/writing in the disciplines (WID) program, I nonetheless find myself drawn to the literature for guidance. As the sole English instructor at a 1,000-student health sciences college, I find it helpful to know that I operate in the wake of composition instructors who have had to explore their way through the initial stages of designing a WID course, clearing a path for future instructors. Like me, they learned everything possible about writing in an *other* discipline while staying true to what they knew would make students more comfortable and confident with their writing, despite the assignment, the grade level, or the discipline: namely, the writing process. WAC literature reinforces what I believe and practice; students must find a voice, trust the voice, and realize that the voice will always benefit from revision. Moreover, WAC research serves as fodder when lobbying for a writing center budget and faculty development workshopsⁱ. Though I do not operate within a formal WAC department, I function as a party who regardless utilizes WAC tenets in the classroom and at my institution in order to enable students with the tools they need to further their disciplines' learning and growthⁱⁱ.

To wick the significance of my experiences, I would like to conflate an exploration of a graduate writing course in nursing, which does not operate within a WAC/WID program, with the broader conversation of WAC. Though not discussing one formal program, this blend seeks to enrich the WAC dialogue nevertheless by speaking to the more niched activity of teachers of writing in other disciplines who, due to institution size and breadth, go it alone or close to alone. They must be included in the dialogue because they still aim to help students become more comfortable and confident with their writing, both generally and within the students' academic disciplines, thus deserving of WAC's attention. By exploring the redesign of a graduate nursing

WID course – asking students to write within their discipline's discourse while reinforcing the writing process and managing students' unique obstacles – I hope to address David R. Russell's (2002) call for widening the WAC field without losing its “grassroots” (p. 330) approach. By exploring these everyday efforts of melding WAC and the writing process, I hope to suggest avenues for broadening future WAC research and audience.

WAC/WID in the Health Sciences

Being the sole English instructor at a small health sciences college comes with a unique set of challenges. Most courses, even traditional humanities courses like composition, are encouraged to have a healthcare angle. I have made changes to my learning and teaching to accommodate this approach. For example, I had to learn a new publication style, American Psychological Association (APA), which seemed initially foreign and ambiguous compared to the familiar Modern Language Association (MLA) style that had been my primary format for over a decade. Furthermore, my students' online discussion threads grew exponentially when I assigned healthcare-focused texts; as a result, all of my undergraduate composition students now analyze books and essays, which discuss local and global healthcare topics. Most importantly, drawing off Russell's curricular history of WAC, I seek to ensure that writing is not “marginalized” (2002, p. 329) at the college – that students see the possibilities writing potentiates to expand their learning and voice within their disciplines. Overall, I feel comfortable with these changes. They were minimal enough that I could initiate them without any major course or pedagogical overhauling.

However, when the Master of Science in Nursing (MSN) facultyⁱⁱⁱ asked me to redesign and teach an introductory online scholarly writing course for first-year graduate nursing students, I felt my unique set of challenges become significantly more complex. I had to find a way to

integrate the rudiments of science-based writing, angled toward the practice of nursing, with what I knew to be paramount to graduate writing and academic writing in general: the writing process and its ability to empower students' learning and voice. Ideally, to me, this means writing that progresses from idea and research through drafting, revision, peer review, and repeat as necessary, or as time/deadlines allow – all with a mind to further their field's dialogue. I had my humanities-based writing standards, and they had their science-based writing standards – both rigorous and each with its own set of challenges. I had to find a happy medium.

First, as with any exploration, I had to become comfortable with science-based writing. Learning APA style was the easy part. Although my students tend to think that learning APA is the most daunting aspect of graduate writing^{iv}, I feel it is the only (mostly) objective aspect of writing; literally, concrete answers exist in a nice compact manual. Being able to look up an answer is comforting when faced with far more subjective writing actions that do not have concrete guidelines, such as incorporating a new idea or concept into a previously satisfied area of an essay, thus re-synthesizing and re-writing the section. These types of questions have no definitive answer – at least not an answer easily found in a manual. They are the tough questions that require holistic and subjective revision. They are precisely what separate WAC from “grammar across the curriculum,” which McLeod and Maimon (2000) have successfully, and thankfully, omitted as a definition of WAC. Thus, rather than a publication manual (while my students may not concur), the biggest writing challenge that I face with graduate students is the process: taking an initial idea, research, and first written words and turning them into something that is prized and competitive at a graduate and/or professional level. For science-based writing, this means revising for synthesis, succinctness, and to emphasize the significance and rigor of your and/or others' studies. Rarely will students grasp these formidable techniques at first try.

They require revision. They require the writing process: stewing on ideas, bringing them together in the most organized and compelling fashion, and ensuring they speak within and to the discipline's current dialogue.

Process writing pervades the teaching of writing. Composition Studies is teeming with anthologies and rhetoric that promote and describe the writing process and have for some time. In fact, Russel K. Durst notes in his "Writing at the Postsecondary Level" that early proponents of the writing process, like Flower and Hayes, were process advocates because "studies focused specifically on revision, [found], rather predictably, that novice writers made fewer substantive revisions and tended to concentrate on low-level surface changes" (2006/2009, p. 1658). This is also typical of most graduate nursing students, who return to school after working in a clinical setting for several years. They are nervous about writing before the class begins and then hesitant to make substantial revision once they have written a few pages. However, without the process of rebuilding and restoring a piece of writing several times, writing will not surpass a basic or amateur level. It is, according to Durst, answering and applying the tough questions about writing, which have no definitive answers that will forward writing past the amateur level. Answering these tough questions and applying them through revision eliminates the main problems that Durst sees as "novice":

The first-year college student novice writers typically differed from more experienced writers in having a more confused sense of the purpose for writing, little awareness of audience, and a weak or nonexistent overall monitor in charge of determining how and when to deploy particular composing strategies. (2006/2009, p. 1657)

Thus, what separates novice from professional writing is, at least in part, devotion to the writing process – the willingness to ask tough questions about audience and rhetorical strategy and the

willingness to undergo substantial revisions in order to satisfy the answers to these tough questions. Simple APA or “surface” revision does little to ensure writing is on par with graduate or professional work. Teaching the graduate nursing course has shown me that this holds true in writing of practically (if not) every discipline and that the role of the writing process in WAC may need further exploration.

Consequently, while designing the graduate writing course, I worked to ensure that the graduate nursing students utilized the writing process; in fact, I made it the core methodology of the course. However, my use of the writing process could just as easily mirror the definition of writing in WAC, which Russell describes as “the textual ways a discipline carries on its work and (re)produces its ideology” (2002, p. 313). These techniques require written response to the current academic discourse in a researched and revised manner that does not repeat, but instead produces and reproduces ever-evolving views about the field’s practice and theories. McLeod and Maimon further the definition: “to explain something to [a public] audience or to convey information, to model the sort of professional writing tasks students will have outside the academy” (2000, p. 579). Students must realize, especially at the graduate level, that what they write on the page is not marginal to a writing course; it is a joining and furthering of the field rather than a stagnant voice that disappears once they submit the assignment in a classroom. Thus, it cannot be something written in haste, during one two-hour typing frenzy. In these terms, the process of taking an idea and fitting it into a field’s discourse through writing could equally define the writing process and WAC.

To explore this further, I would like to discuss the graduate nursing course from its base to its complications, pointing out nuances that may support this call for a broadening of WAC through everyday efforts of utilizing the writing process in an other discipline. However, I must

stress that research on writing in the health sciences is scarce amongst composition and WAC literature. Brammer, Amare, and Sydow (2008) included a nursing department (among other non-English departments) in their qualitative study, "Teaching Writing Within Interdisciplinary Contact Zones." Their study gives some valuable, if limited, insight into nursing's view and inclusion of writing in a nursing curriculum. They stressed that the nursing program found "good writing" to be "rule-based," "fact-based," and "interpretive/explanatory" (Brammer et al., 2008, Table 1). Noticeably absent was a checkmark in the "process approach" box; though, some further comments from their interviews found a process approach to writing throughout the curriculum (though not necessarily process-based assignments within one class). In addition, I turned to research within nursing education, which elicited more studies and narratives of instructors including process-based writing assignments into curricula.

What Do Graduate Nursing Students Write?

I was fortunate to be able to draw from many excellent sources when I asked myself this very question. Admirable sources exist, and I share with my students the list I accrued when I set out to learn the field's dialogue^v. To define science-based writing in general, it revolves around evidence-based practice (EBP). Health science professionals perform various studies in order to garner data/evidence, which they use to answer their focused questions. Graduate nursing students follow a specific, standard structural formula for their explorations. Students create a patient/population, intervention, comparison intervention, and outcomes (PICO) problem statement. The PICO is the formula with which they join their scholarly dialogue. As a formula, it is, well, formulaic. However, from experience, healthcare topics are as numerous and diverse as any professional dialogue, even with the standardized PICO formula. **Add examples here.**

As with most writing instruction, it is usually a matter of teaching students how to narrow down the elements of their focus/PICO until they have an idea, which they are able to explore thoroughly within the assigned parameters. PICO statements are often much too broad on first write. **Example here, as well?** Encouraging students to narrow down their PICO is, ironically, about as difficult as asking students to look broader in order to probe the complexities of a literary analysis. It runs parallel to their resistance to revision. They are afraid they will not have enough to say in the required pages, as they are afraid they will not be able to get the words or the meaning back once they have hit the backspace button. Students seem anxious about writing, and this shows in their distrust of their own abilities to hold a discussion. In short, they seem afraid to rely on their own words to explain/explore an issue.

Without exposure to the writing process, students do not receive the tools or philosophy to develop a piece of writing. To a certain extent, this means they have never fully developed a complicated idea – pushed it to its limits and brought it back^{vi}. This amateur quality shows most intensely in the anxiety that otherwise capable and confident students associate with writing.

The Students

Accompanying this level of anxiety is the lack of significance that graduate nursing students tend to place on writing. I received the following email from one graduate student in the first week of the course:

I have a HUGE anxiety about this class as I am 42 years old and have been R.N. for 19 year and have a hard time following this. My attitude plays a part as I have seen so many horrific things in my career that what is important in life and what isnt has been molded by this. To me how I put down my knowledge on paper isn't as important as my

knowledge. If you're in the hospital your going to want a nurse who knows how to utilize their nurisng knowledge not how you write it on paper.

I give a few leniencies here to spelling, etc. due to the nature of students' writing in email (another topic for another time). Instead, an individual who seems like she has many, many excellent experiences to share, discuss, and analyze is clearly on the defense going into the course. Not only does this comment smack of anxiety, it defines writing in nursing as useless. Furthermore, it defines writing as completely marginalized from "nursing knowledge." This is antithetical to every writing-to-learn discussion that has permeated WAC for decades. Yet, it shows how foreign the concept of the writing process and its goals are to students and, to some extent, to other disciplines. This student took one look at the course's methodology that requires them to discuss one PICO in writing throughout the course in various progressive assignments and, seemingly, freaked out. I know this seems an extreme case, and while it is up there, it is not an isolated event. This general constituency exemplifies an audience that has no concept of – or at least no idea of how to wield – the purpose or power of writing, and this audience is bigger than I originally thought.

On the other hand, one of the greatest pleasures of teaching graduate nursing students is their knowledge of and passion for nursing. Since an acceptance requirement for the program is two years' clinical experience, all students – similar to the student in the previous email – are entrenched in the field. They arrive with much first-hand practical knowledge complicated by many questions about best practice. These questions create excellent fodder for their PICOs. Throughout the semester, students write meta-cognitive questions with each assignment. Thus, early in the semester, when I ask them to explain their reasoning for choosing their PICO, they discuss common and frequent questions their colleagues ask one another on the job. Which is the

best intervention for a particular healthcare scenario, like peripherally inserted central catheters or atrial fibrillation? These topics gain significance from their contemporary relevance and direct effect on patient safety. Students are passionate about finding answers to these questions and arrive in class with current knowledge in these areas.

Once students research these topics and find evidence-based answers to their questions, they become more excited about their writing; they have something to say. Eyres, Hatch, Turner, and West (2001) discuss instructor roles in graduate nursing students' writing. They emphasize that encouraging students to become a part of nursing's academic dialogue manifests in students' willingness and eagerness to write. According to Eyres et al., "They [students] aren't asking for editing; they are asking for socialization into the scholarly community" (2001, p. 155). Most, if not all, nursing students possess an underlying desire for professionalism and advocacy for patient safety. If instructors grant them an opportunity to indulge these interests, writing in their discipline serves as an entryway to the professional community rather than a necessary academic chore.

Zorn, Clark, and Weimholt (1997) further emphasize the significance of introducing students to nursing's scholarly dialogue and the difference it makes in student writing – and students' interest in writing in general. They designed a nursing writing course "to enhance each student's development as a nurse scholar – a professional who can generate, integrate, disseminate, and use knowledge" (Zorn et al., 1997, p. 245). Their course, which relied on the writing process, "writing assignments...arranged in a cumulative sequence – with each assignment more difficult, more complex, and based on work done in previous assignments" (Zorn et al., 1997, p. 245), introduced students to nurse scholarship, but it also made students write and revise continuously in the course. For example, they asked students to use the same

information to compose two essays, each to a different audience; this forced students to perform much more substantial revisions, including point-of-view and tone, and to determine which pieces of information to highlight for each audience. This goes well beyond surface revision – well beyond APA. It exemplifies what Durst (2006/2009) earlier mentioned as “deploying composing strategies” that address the holistic purpose of a written text, which help a student elevate their writing to a professional/academic level.

As an instructor, then, my objective is to help students find that they have something to say, teach them how to create appropriate focused questions relevant to the field's current dialogue, and introduce them to the science-based style of writing that comprises their field's academic conversation. Then, not only are they knowledgeable and passionate about their subject, they feel a part of their scholarly community and comfortable speaking within it. In short, they become more motivated, confident writers – individuals who are able to participate in and further their field's discourse through writing – individuals who recognize the purpose and power of writing and feel more comfortable wielding it.

The Course

Similar to Zorn et al. (1997), the graduate writing course I redesigned, “Essentials of Scholarly Writing,” also focuses on the writing process: continuous writing throughout the term, all of which builds on previous assignments. Moreover, I continually emphasize the importance of each assignment and objective to nursing's academic dialogue. I would like to preface that “Essentials of Scholarly Writing” is a required one-credit course that serves as a pre-requisite to practically every other course in the program. Thus, it is usually one of the very first classes that students take and is, in a sense, a gateway course.

To overview the course briefly, students begin with an introduction to the basics and progress to a discussion of plagiarism^{vii}. Then, students receive an introduction to focused questions/PICOs and create one of their own; this constitutes their topic throughout the course. They find a few primary, unfiltered EBP sources. Then, they synthesize the information into a small (I call it miniature) literature review. This takes us through midterm of a 15-week course. During the second half of the term, students use all of the previous assignments to create a 10-page evidence review. Students submit the evidence review in stages. Each submission includes a revision of previous sections and an additional section. The total evidence review, then, receives instructor comments a minimum of five times; plus, students submit it to two peer review threads in weeks 11 and 14. This enables students to discuss the same PICO and research, while writing and revising in response to instructor and peer prompts, throughout the semester.

Much research discussing writing in nursing curricula stems from an article by Allen, Bowers, and Diekelmann (1989), titled “Writing to Learn: A Reconceptualization of Thinking and Writing in the Nursing Curriculum.”^{viii} In their discussion, Allen et al. define illiteracy as “cognitive deficits,” which “have clear nursing implications” (1989, p. 6). They stress the amalgamation of writing abilities and nursing knowledge attainment in a collaboration that culminates in a student who learns knowledge through writing rather than separately teaching writing skills and nursing skills.^{ix} Thus, while “Essentials of Scholarly Writing” parallels Zorn et al.’s (1997) earlier mentioned course, which covered “such matters as sentence structure, literature searches, and [APA]” (p. 245), I like to think that “Essentials of Scholarly Writing” also tackles larger, more subjective matters: namely, cognitive capabilities. Ensuring students meet cognitive capability objectives throughout the course shows that students can learn things like APA and active voice, but then move far past them – that they are able both to handle style

and grammar and, as Allen et al. mandate, “to select appropriate information and defend its integration into patient care” (1989, p. 6). This objective melds cognitive capabilities in nursing with holistic revision in writing. It makes students better writers and better nurses.

It likens back to Hairston's (1982/2009) discussion of the evolution of process writing. She describes the need to probe students' thought patterns as they write because students will rarely be able to write, even in process writing, “moving smoothly in one direction from start to finish” (Hairston, 1982/2009, p. 448). Hairston states that students “both skilled and unskilled” (1982/2009, p. 448) develop their thoughts *as* they write. Thus, making graduate nursing students focus on one PICO throughout a semester of writing and, sometimes literally, forcing them to re-analyze what they've written; re-consider their purpose, the topic's significance, and their audience; and revise previous sections accordingly serves as a means to think more critically about what they're saying and how it is presented in their writing. Hairston's discussion pre-dates but reinforces Allen et al.'s (1989) call for students to learn through writing. Their similarities, despite their different disciplines, show the importance of WAC to academic discourse and knowledge attainment.

To encourage students to think about this, since it is an online course and I cannot call on students in class, they answer metacognitive questions (in green font to differentiate them from the rest of their text) with each major assignment and each section of the evidence review. For instance, one “green” metacognitive question asks, “How did you attempt to stress the significance of your topic in your introduction?” These green questions are less formal and serve a two-fold purpose. They allow me to make sense of students' thought processes, which can be unclear in initial drafts lacking precise organization, subtopics, and relevance, and they allow students to contemplate their own thought processes to determine if thoughts and meaning are

delineated and clear in black and white. Many times, I am confused after reading their draft but have an “aha” moment after reading their answers to the green questions, enabling much more productive revision suggestions from me and much more productive holistic revisions from them.

Including critical thinking is nothing new to nursing curricula. The National League for Nursing (2007), the governing organization of nursing's major accrediting body, lists critical thinking skills as one of the key “achievements” of nursing education, even providing a separate critical thinking pre-board exam for nurse educators to distribute to students. Therefore, while process writing and its encouragement of/reliance on students' critical thinking are paramount in composition studies, it also receives support from the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC) (2008). The NLNAC requires the following of a Master's program: “The curriculum is designed to prepare graduates to be information literate and to practice from an evidence-based approach in their advanced practice role” (2008, Standard 4.3). While “literate” here takes on a less literary role, it still seems an easy match to Allen et al.'s (1989) call for nursing knowledge through writing to reduce students' cognitive deficits. Critical thinking is necessary for learning. Writing serves as the perfect gateway for graduate nursing students to stretch and eventually realize fuller cognitive capabilities, and this seems to hold true no matter the discipline.

Ensuring the course addresses accreditation objectives is mandatory in a health science college, but I think a better measure of the course may stem from the students who take it. In general, student feedback is encouraging. In course evaluations, students respond most positively to the course's methodology: the writing process. One student wrote,

I like how our essay was done in “chunks” and at the end of the semester we had a polished, completed essay. It was fun to learn the different components of the essay that way instead of cramming the whole paper at once for one assignment!

Students seem to enjoy the writing process because it eliminates the stress of a daunting assignment that they feel ill prepared for when beginning the course. The process allows students to write, receive feedback, revise previous areas, and move forward. It takes the anxiety out of writing. If they are not entirely happy with what they have written, they receive the feedback that gives them the knowledge to address it. Instead of submitting a 10-page essay, which they know has troublesome areas but are unsure of how to address them, they receive help with their writing as they write, promoting their writing and their knowledge.

One of my greatest motivations for teaching the course comes from student comments that reflect this increased knowledge and decreased anxiety. Two students replying to the statement, “The course challenged me to apply critical thinking skills and encouraged high performance,” wrote, “The instructor pushed me hard to write a great paper, writing is one of my biggest weaknesses” and “The course was hard and a lot of work, but I can write so much better now.” These comments serve as wonderful impetus for me to continue using the writing process in the course. Both students seem to have a high level of anxiety associated with their writing (one explicitly calling it a weakness and one alluding to her previous discomfort with her writing), but both students seem to recognize that a rigorous, knowledgeable approach to writing results in essays of which they can be proud.

To be honest, however, I still face resistance from one or two students per semester, who have a different idea of what the course should cover. This previous fall, one student wrote, “When submitting written work I expect to be graded on sentence structure, misspellings,

punctuation, APA, content, etc. I do not feel it necessary to rewrite my paper because of writing style.” When I receive these types of comments, it reminds me that introducing students to paths of knowledge attainment through writing is fraught with challenges and stigma. It is eerily reminiscent of the old “grammar across the curriculum,” which McLeod and Maimon (2000) dispelled. It exemplifies that outdated notions of writing and “learning to write” are still alive and well and that the efforts of WAC are still necessary.

As someone who works within a faculty composed of many nurses, I cannot quantify the number of times I have heard colleagues express concern about their ability to write, which they seem to feel most acutely when grading student writing^x. Often, faculty must include an essay in their course due to administrative decisions about accreditation requirements. Faculty may only feel comfortable making surface edits on student writing – much less comfortable making larger subjective comments and much, much less comfortable requiring pre-writing activities that lead up to the essay assignment. If students receive only surface edits during their education with little exposure to the writing process, it is no surprise that some graduate students bring with them the stigma that writing is “fixed” when it is grammatically correct with no APA errors. It reinforces a seeming consensus of WAC^{xi}, which advocates for faculty development workshops on the teaching of writing. For example, at a recent faculty development workshop, we discussed how to tie in the grading of writing and revisions to the objectives of the course more explicitly, so students are more aware of how they are becoming better health science students via writing, making the pedagogy and accreditation more transparent for both faculty and students.

Broadening WAC

The final section of students’ evidence reviews in “Essentials of Scholarly Writing” asks them to explain the best method for further studying and answering their PICO. It allows them to

think ahead, to identify areas that the current studies lack, and to suggest recommendations for future EBPs. Similarly, I would like to share my thoughts on broadening WAC in both future research studies and future audiences.

More studies like Brammer et al.'s earlier mentioned qualitative, interdisciplinary interviews would help to gather evidence regarding which departments require process-based writing and what that writing looks like – whether it is process-based throughout the curriculum and if classes have pre-writing activities or process-based assignments, as well as inquiry into the objectives of the writing assignments. This seems especially important in institutions that do not have a formal WAC/WID department because the gathered data can both illuminate current writing practices and theories and serve as an evidence-based stepping-off point for changes to assignments and curricula. This seems a grassroots approach: starting with qualitative data of department praxis and formalizing it through further studies and small changes into a, even if informal, WAC program.

Furthermore, these non-WAC programs are precisely the audience that would most benefit from a more intimate knowledge of WAC theories and developments. These instructors need the guidance of writing and curricular EBPs in order to offer the best education to their students. Faculties in non-English programs want to feel comfortable teaching student writing, as well as grading student writing. Using process-writing assignments will familiarize more faculties of various disciplines with a sound theoretical-writing base, which students will then receive. In short, WAC needs to trickle down to these audiences with both practice and theory, a trove of which exists in writing process literature, giving these audiences the tools and the reasoning to hone student writing in their disciplines and throughout their curricula.

Making writing an integral part of a students' education from the very beginning of their program and giving them the revisionary skills and theoretical knowledge that the writing process entails will help them to write as professionals in their field. At minimum, it will grant them access to a channel of learning that disciplines can sometimes stigmatize and marginalize as an educational inconvenience that has no real relevance in practice. The type of learning that WAC advocates helps students and faculty to understand the importance and frequency of writing within practice, but it also works to illuminate writing as both an integral component of critical thinking and as a means to, as Russell (2002) claimed, produce and reproduce their disciplines' discourses. Broadening WAC through future research studies and wider audiences may produce a trickle-down effect, empowering more faculty and students with the strategies and the dialogue with which they may explore and defend their ideas with confidence – through writing.

References

- Allen, D. G., Bowers, B., & Diekelmann, N. (1989). Writing to learn: A reconceptualization of thinking and writing in the nursing curriculum. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 28(1), 6-11.
- Boland, M. R. (2007). The stakes of not staking our claim: Academic freedom and the subject of composition. *College English*, 70(1), 32-51.
- Brammer, C., Amare, N., & Campbell, S. (2008). Culture shock: Teaching writing within interdisciplinary contact zones. *Across the Disciplines*, 5. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/brammeretal2008.cfm>
- Durst, R. K. (2009). Writing at the postsecondary level. In S. Miller (Ed.), *The Norton book of composition studies* (pp. 1655-1689). London: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing with power: Techniques for mastering the writing process*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- Eyres, S. J., Hatch, D. H., Turner, S. B., & West, M. (2001). Doctoral students' responses to writing critique: Messages for teachers. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 40(4), 149-155.
- Hairston, M. C. (2009). The winds of change: Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing. In S. Miller (Ed.), *The Norton book of composition studies* (pp. 439-450). London: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. (Original work published 1982)
- Lance, D. M., & Lance S. (2006). Writing-to-learn assignments in content-driven courses. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 28(1), 18-23.
- McLeod, S., & Maimon, E. (2000). Clearing the air: WAC myths and realities. *College English*, 62(5), 573-583.
- National League for Nursing. (2007). *About the NLN*. Retrieved from <http://dev.nln.org>

/testproducts/rnpn_pnachievement.htm#critical

National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission. (2008). *NLNAC standards and criteria: Master's/post-master's certificate programs in nursing*. Retrieved from http://www.nlnac.org/manuals/SC2008_MASTERS.htm

Poirrier, G. P. (1997). *Writing-to-learn: Curricular strategies for nursing and other disciplines*. New York: National League for Nursing Press.

Russell, D. R. (2002). *Writing in the academic disciplines: A curricular history*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Zorn, C. R., Clark, W. J., & Weimholt, C. J. (1997). Educating the nurse scholar for the 21st century: How an interdisciplinary writing course can help. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 36(6), 244-249.

ⁱ Both McLeod and Maimon (2000) and Russell (2002) discuss the importance of writing centers and faculty development workshops in the teaching of writing as necessary supplements to WAC/WID programs.

ⁱⁱ Boland (2007) defines WAC/WID programs as "tool[s]...involving students in the consideration of how particular discourses help create and maintain the terms of work in various fields" (p. 45).

ⁱⁱⁱ Zorn, Clark, and Weimholt (1997) admit that nursing faculty are concerned about "weak" student writing, "but the faculty often lack confidence themselves in scholarly writing, or they perceive a lack of time to help students develop writing skills" (p. 245).

^{iv} Discussing writing assignments in content-driven courses, Lance and Lance (2006) argue that, due to required MLA in most undergraduate courses; students often struggle making the switch to APA. They posit, "More expansive instruction in the APA method should continue throughout students' time in a communication sciences and disorders program" (Lance & Lance, 2006, "Writing Across the Curriculum," para. 4).

^v Among others in the course, I list the University of Minnesota's (n.d.) "Evidence-Based Practice," the Indiana Center for Evidence-Based Nursing Practice (2009), the University of Illinois at Chicago's (2005) "Evidence Based Medicine: Finding the Best Clinical Literature," the University of Texas' (2010) "Academic Center for Evidence-Based Practice," and *American Nursing Today's* (2010) "How to Conduct an EBP Investigation" for students to peruse, as these sources were helpful for me as I learned the dialogue.

^{vi} This is called the Elbow loop, from Elbow's (1998) *Writing with Power: Techniques for Mastering the Writing Process*.

^{vii} Russell (2002) mentions the importance of revisiting plagiarism in WAC due to evolving technologies.

^{viii} Poirrier (1997) in her *Writing-to-Learn: Curricular Strategies for Nursing and Other Disciplines* uses Allen et al.'s (1989) article as one of the theoretical cornerstones for her book's collection of essays (pp. 4-5).

^{ix} Allen et al. (1989) draw on Peter Elbow's *Embracing Contraries – Explorations in Learning and Teaching*.

^x Ibid Zorn et al. (1997, p. 245).

^{xi} Ibid i.