EIGHT

Writing Components, Writing Adjuncts, Writing Links

JOAN GRAHAM

Writing to learn is a readily reversible phrase: It names a way of learning to write. When students engage in learning new concepts and information, articulating questions, insights, problems, and possibilities, their activities amount to the generation of content for writing. And writing well inevitably depends in some degree on content, on what a writer has to say.

Often writing teachers want to focus on content concerns, to strengthen students' ability to generate and manage new thoughts—but their teaching contexts have made such a focus difficult to achieve. In a traditional, freestanding writing class, considerable time must be spent discussing a subject for writing and defining as well as possible the audience and purpose that writing should serve. Yet despite much effort students may perceive writing course assignments as mere exercises, rather than as writing occasions of value in themselves. In so far as writing subjects seem arbitrary, readings or activities to develop subjects seem thin, or writing purposes seem artificial or vague, students are likely to make only shallow investment in the content of what they write.

It is partly the need for better opportunities to teach writing as engagement in inquiry that has led to new curriculum arrangements and new course designs. Innovations are addressing the

traditional organization of academe, which has separated writing instruction from the contexts and occasions where students need to write. Writing teachers have always had instructional time and expertise to offer, but the inquiry contexts they could create have often been weak. Subject discipline teachers have always created strong inquiry contexts but they have had little or no time for writing instruction and may have lacked expertise. New, deliberate integration of teaching scenes is an opportunity to strengthen the impact of instruction on both sides. Although the most common WAC activities stress the use of writing to serve learning in a subject discipline, the emphasis is also being reversed: Subject discipline courses are helping students learn to write via writing components, writing adjuncts, and writing links.

These departures from the freestanding writing course all put writing instruction in the context of students' study in particular lecture courses. The disciplines represented by lecture courses are important frames, but the focus is on immediate experience—on the questions and purposes that define individual courses as they unfold. Typically, writing instructors sit in on their students' lecture classes and treat them as discourse communities, developing writing activities that capitalize on the readings, conceptual frameworks and problems that students share.

All the designs for integrating work on writing with subject discipline study dramatize the importance of writers' contexts and so are fundamentally related. Such designs might be said to vary according to the amount of instructional time each makes available, and the "place" where work goes on. First would come writing centers, where students get optional, individual consultation with tutors on work in progress for any course (see Harris, this volume; Hilgers and Marsella); then would come writing fellows programs, in which designated tutors provide required consultation for all students in a particular lecture course as they prepare essay drafts (see Haring-Smith, this volume). Next there is a shift from consultation to instruction as additional academic credit recognizes additional class time devoted to writing concerns. Distinguishing consultation from instruction is a little misleading, because consultation as a basic feature continues, students meeting with writing teachers to discuss ideas and drafts when a lecture course has a distinct writing component or when it is accompanied by an adjunct or a link. But class meetings are

added in these cases. Class meetings give students the opportunity to see and learn from each other's written work, and they allow for a wider range of writing issues and activities—all, of course, making use of shared materials and experiences from a lecture class.

The terms *component, adjunct,* and *link* are not used across institutions in fully consistent ways, but I am adopting these terms because in many cases they do represent a considered choice, and they help me make some important distinctions here. Writing components are least autonomous, as the label suggests. Components are typically part of a core program or course: Core courses with a distinct writing component carry more credit than regular lecture courses, but the writing component is not a separate course. Writing adjuncts and writing links are separate courses, attached to lecture courses but not part of them. Both adjuncts and links are in some cases optional, in other cases required. But adjuncts and links are different from each other in credit weight— different in a way that has substantive consequences as well as political effects. An adjunct typically meets half as much time and carries half as much credit as the lecture course it accompanies, whereas *link* indicates a writing course that matches a lecture course, meeting an equal amount of time and carrying equal credit weight.

Integrated writing instruction of some type is potentially valuable in a wide variety of contexts—for basic writers or for honors students, with general education courses or with majors' courses, involving discipline faculty in greater or in lesser degree. But successful integration requires administrators' patience, writing teachers' interest, and a design that will serve well-considered aims.

Among the questions to be answered:

1. Should components or adjuncts or links be developed? At what level? Will they be optional or required? How will they relate to existing institutional requirements?
2. If components are chosen, will existing lecture courses be modified or will new courses be designed? Similarly if adjuncts or links are chosen, will they be companions to existing lecture courses? Or will lecture courses be modified or new courses be designed?
3. Who will the writing instructors and the discipline lecturers be? How many will be needed to begin, and how will they be selected? What

incentives will be offered? How much preliminary training will be needed? Ongoing support?

4. How much interaction will be required between writing instructors and discipline lecturers as courses are taught? Who will manage course coordination? Who will be responsible to whom for what?
5. How will students learn about integrated writing instruction—what it is, where to find it, how to register?
6. How will components or adjuncts or links be evaluated?

Because initiating integrated writing instruction may require many decisions, it is common for programs to start small. It is also common for integration designs to change, new patterns displacing or adding to the originals. Initial decisions cannot be made piecemeal for they are related to each other—and also to the problems and priorities of institutions. Such larger forces also underlie program expansions and changes. Of course a simple list of questions cannot suggest these things, so I am going to describe some particular institutions' plans and experiences with program development.

COMPONENTS: UC SAN DIEGO

Integrated writing instruction began at UC San Diego's Third College in the fall of 1991. The new program, titled "Dimensions of Culture," makes writing a key component in a three-quarter sequence of core courses, the sequence to be required for all 600 freshmen. This concept for curriculum reform has been awaiting attention for some time, and now a strongly interested provost is helping to implement it (Cooper).

Previously, Third College offered a first-year composition course and also writing adjuncts attached to 12 sophomore-level general education courses. Faculty believed, however, that choosing among 12 courses—the menu approach to general education—did not ensure a common intellectual experience for incoming students. They believed that a newly designed, unified core course sequence would allow students to gain that common intellectual experience, and as an additional benefit, writing-to-learn strategies could be developed more systematically for a core course sequence than for 12 separate courses for which frequent changes in faculty and

teaching assistants were involved. Now that writing instruction has been placed in the context of students' common core course sequence, Third College no longer offers a separate composition course.

Each quarter, the core course involves three discipline lecturers and enough teaching assistants (TAs) to lead small discussion and writing sections. The intellectual approach and continuity of the three-quarter core course was planned by a faculty committee chaired by Michael Schudson, a professor in the communication department. Faculty lecturers in each quarter develop a common syllabus and select readings and films. In 1991-92, faculty came from five departments: communication, political science, history, anthropology, ethnic studies, and literature.

The role of writing in the core courses is at first limited. During fall quarter, students hear three lectures and participate in one discussion section each week. Although they write journal responses to course readings, no class time or course credit is allowed for work with writing because of a special University of California rule: Mandatory first-quarter freshman courses cannot involve writing "instruction" because some entering students will not be eligible, i.e., they will not yet have passed the basic requirement known as "Subject A." Winter and spring quarters bring full implementation of the core course writing component. Students participate in two section meetings each week, and the core courses carry six credits per quarter instead of the usual four.

Charles Cooper and Susan Peck McDonald coordinate the core program, hire and supervise TAs, lead a weekly TA seminar, and work closely with faculty lecturers to develop paper topics for core courses in winter and spring. The TAs who lead winter and spring sections are given released time in the fall, so they can read course materials for the coming quarters, attend the seminar in which materials are discussed, and help develop section activities. Lecturing faculty provide consultation in the seminar, which is designed to give TAs from seven departments (as of 1991-92) their own common intellectual experience. The TAs also gain some insight into writing pedagogy, and ways that writing can further learning. In the sections TAs lead, students address frequent, brief writing-to-learn assignments and write essay exams; students also write papers, conferring with their TAs as they produce drafts and revisions.

As for what students write about, the core lecturers focus on large social issues, like justice and diversity. Each of the three faculty members working with the core course in a given quarter lectures to a class of about 200 students, and all three classes have the same syllabus and readings. But it remains to be seen exactly how alike the classes are, given that one lecturer might be a historian and another an anthropologist. The core sequence is intended to be interdisciplinary, but as classes struggle with ways of defining problems and ways of evaluating evidence, disciplinary perspectives will almost certainly have some effects—and those effects may become evident in the writing students produce. It is common that, when writing instruction is integrated, both writing specialists and subject discipline lecturers learn from the experience, and such learning may be especially important in this case.

In programs that offer writing instruction in companion courses (i.e., adjuncts or links), the signs of disciplinary perspectives in lecture courses are usually exploited as discovery tools rather than effaced. But it takes time for writing students to recognize, employ, and reflect on the purposes and methods of a discipline course, and the time available in an adjunct is quite limited. Adjuncts have proved valuable in a number of ways, but partly because these classes have so little meeting time, they have tended to produce less lasting satisfaction than links. Changes have been under way for some time in the UCLA adjunct program, for example, and changes are expected soon in the UC Santa Barbara program as well.

ADJUNCTS: UCLA AND UC SANTA BARBARA

At UCLA, writing program faculty have offered a wide variety of adjuncts, two-credit English courses attached to lecture courses in many fields (see Cullen). But the number of adjuncts offered was down to about eight per quarter by 1990-91, less than one-third the number offered when the program was at its height. This reduction results from both negative and positive aspects of accrued experience. On the negative side, the institution has recently had to make many cuts in course offerings not required for graduation; in the writing program, cuts fell on the adjuncts partly

because they are administratively more demanding than other courses. That is, they are harder to schedule, monitor, and evaluate than freestanding courses. Also, staffing adjuncts well is sometimes difficult, for teachers of adjuncts (like teachers of links) must be willing to work with discourses outside their own field. So the special administrative requirements of adjuncts, as well as long-felt frustration with the amount of teaching time they provide, worked against maintenance of many offerings (Strenski).

There was also a quite different, positive reason for cutting many adjuncts: in a certain sense, their work was done. At UCLA, adjuncts were used deliberately as a way to raise discipline faculty consciousness about writing issues and to cultivate better use of writing in teaching across the curriculum. Writing teachers who offered adjuncts came to know well the materials and aims of the discipline lecture courses essential to their own work, and so they were exceptionally well prepared to serve as writing consultants to their lecturing colleagues. The use of writing in many lecture courses has been influenced by the faculty interaction that came with past adjuncts—and the effects continue, although adjuncts themselves may have disappeared.

Some effects of adjuncts are, in fact, a physical presence. In-house guides to writing in several disciplines were produced by collaborating teachers, and they are widely used. Codifying faculty methods of using writing in teaching, the guides derived directly from the adjunct experience—neither discipline faculty nor English faculty could have written them alone. The guides are also an influence now in the wider academic community: The guide to writing in sociology, for example, is in its second edition, published by St. Martin's Press.

As I've suggested, some adjuncts do continue to be offered at UCLA, but as of winter 1992, they carry four credits—in effect, they have become links. Among the adjuncts (links) that continue are those accompanying certain lecture courses in sociology, for which majors in the field must satisfy a requirement by taking one. The move to increase credits was made because UCLA's first experiment with four-credit adjuncts (links)—part of a special program for transfer students—was such a success.

The Transfer Intensive Program (TIP) is for students who have fulfilled the UCLA composition requirement, but whose transition to UCLA study will be aided by some concentrated work with

analytical reading and writing. The program makes available four-credit, upper-division writing classes in conjunction with a specified lecture course on the general education list. The program also provides designated counselors who are familiar with the needs of transfer students, and the counselors stay in touch with TIP writing instructors.

Finally, UCLA's adjunct experience is contributing in various ways to new offerings in writing pedagogy and in preprofessional programs. For example, the new Community Educator Project (CEP) is intended "to interest nontraditional students in careers in education." Designed by representatives of three units—the Academic Advancement Program, Writing Programs, and the Field Studies Office—CEP consists of a year-long sequence of specially designed composition courses that are "adjuncted with" fieldwork. CEP students study the "social and personal impact of education," engaging in various activities that foster reading, writing and critical thinking skill. Furthermore, they apply what they learn and make their own observations by working as tutors for elementary and secondary students in several area schools. Connecting writing instruction with this fieldwork is a powerful way to help students articulate, analyze, and evaluate what they see.

Experiences with writing adjuncts at UC Santa Barbara in some ways overlap with those at UCLA, but in other ways they are distinct. The Santa Barbara program is only about half as old, having begun in 1985, but it expanded very rapidly to offer adjuncts with lectures in 22 departments in just two years. At present, the program offers 15 to 18 adjunct classes per quarter for a year total of about 50 (Zimmerman).

Writing instructors have usually held only part of their appointment in the adjunct program, but Santa Barbara has had more opportunity than UCLA to select teachers specifically for adjunct work. On the other hand, interaction between adjunct teachers and discipline lecturers has been much less a feature of the Santa Barbara program. Although there have, of course, been cases where writing teachers played a consultant's role, the Santa Barbara situation virtually required that this be a matter of individual teachers' tastes and opportunities, not a programmatic expectation. While at UCLA it was assumed that adjuncts should influence lecture courses, at Santa Barbara assurances were needed that lecture courses would *not* have to change.

Of course, many probably made good use of writing already. To find lectures with which to place adjuncts, director Muriel Zimmerman began by simply calling undergraduate program secretaries in various departments and asking which department faculty members were known to assign a lot of writing in their courses. Discipline lecturers were usually happy to have adjuncts arranged, for they seemed a practical, intellectually rigorous kind of instruction, and the association of two classes could be expected to enhance students' motivation.

After five years of mainly positive experience, however, changes are coming as all Santa Barbara writing programs are reorganized. It is likely that the change for adjuncts will be a quite straightforward strengthening: Their credit weight will be doubled as these courses are, in effect, made into links. It was apparent to some when the program began that two-credit adjuncts could not make full use of the opportunities that paired courses present, for the adjuncts would meet for only an hour and 15 minutes a week. But that arrangement was what was politically feasible at the time, and it was a way to make a start. Now, besides broadly inclusive changes in the organization of writing programs, new upper- and lower-division writing requirements are being put in place. More resources are being made available, too: Those resources will allow new four-credit adjuncts (effectively links) to be developed as an appropriate way to fulfill requirements. In addition to those for upper-division students, approximately 10 classes for freshmen will be piloted in fall 1992.

LINKS: UC DAVIS, UNC AT CHAPEL HILL, AND UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Among schools that already have writing link programs in place are the University of California at Davis, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the University of Washington. The program at UC Davis is an activity of the Campus Writing Center, and it offers about 15 classes per quarter. Links accompany lectures in a variety of disciplines but all at the upper-division level, and students who take them must already have satisfied a lower-division writing requirement. The links do considerable work

with academic styles and with documentation issues in particular disciplines; they also regularly make real-world assignments.

The UC Davis program would like to add lower-division links with general education lectures, so that students would begin to experience the ways discourse communities vary as part of their fundamental instruction in writing. At present, general education courses are supposed to be writing intensive, but discussion sections provide only small opportunity for writing instruction, and TAs who lead sections need more training. The Campus Writing Center is playing an increasing role in departments' TA training programs, and training with respect to writing is made as discipline and course specific as possible. But more needs to be done. Development of lower-division writing links is part of the long-term plan, because that could contribute not only to the curriculum but to TA training as well. New writing-focused workshops to help prepare "the new professoriate" have already begun, and one-unit adjuncts are being considered as companions to some graduate courses (Palo).

The writing link program at the UNC Chapel Hill is relatively new, and it has set out deliberately to address TA training in the context of course development. The origins of the program are in the work of an ad hoc committee of the faculty council, which was asked to look into WAC in the mid-eighties. That committee identified two contexts of concern: medium-size classes, where lecturers interacted directly with students, and large classes where students' contact was mostly with TAs. Then, in 1987, UNC Chapel Hill received from the Ford Foundation a Dean's Grant in Literacy and the Liberal Arts. Grant funds were used to begin addressing needs in the two contexts already identified. Workshops were made available for faculty teaching medium-size courses, and a new program was created to pair large lectures with writing links (Lindemann).

The large lectures are an integral program element, for they are offered by discipline faculty willing to serve as team leaders—teams being composed of TAs in the discipline who will lead discussion sections and also TAs from English who will teach writing links. The design is like the one at UC San Diego in two ways: Lectures are created as program elements rather than simply chosen from existing curriculum, and all students who take

program lectures also take writing concurrently. The designs are different in two ways as well: The UNC Chapel Hill lecture courses are discipline defined rather than interdisciplinary, and Chapel Hill provides links with lectures (equal meeting time, equal credit weight and separate grades) rather than components of lectures (less proportional time and no separate status as a graded unit). It should also be noted that UC San Diego will be offering a course sequence, whereas the UNC Chapel Hill courses last one semester.

So far, Chapel Hill lecturers in sociology, history, psychology and philosophy, geography, and astronomy have developed introductory courses for this program, although competing demands on faculty time have allowed no more than five of the courses to be offered in a given semester. Each lecture course is accompanied by 4 or 5 writing links, so the total number of links offered at a time is about 20. The English TAs who teach the links usually have some background, perhaps even an undergraduate major, in the lecture discipline. These TAs are selected by writing program administrators on the basis of applications and interviews. Writing assignments made in the links might include case studies, literature reviews, data problems, or analyses of primary documents as well as essays on ideas or events—students work in whatever genres are appropriate for a given discipline.

Preparation for fall lecture courses and writing links begins with week-long workshops held each year in May. The workshops are convened by the discipline faculty members serving as team leaders—people interested in offering freshman courses and sensitive to writing/learning issues. Both TAs who will lead discussion sections and TAs who will teach writing links take part in the workshops; faculty and TAs receive stipends for this period of concentrated planning work. The teams also meet periodically during the semester in which they teach, but what is crucial is the shared experience of the initial workshops.

As a curriculum feature, Chapel Hill's writing links are highly successful, and as a training occasion for future faculty both in English and in the disciplines they are obviously of great value. There would seem to be just two important limitations to the design: First, it requires discipline faculty willing and able to offer appropriate freshman courses and serve as team leaders. Given the many competing demands that faculty face, the number of lecture and writing link teams may never be large. Second, the

May workshops are expensive. But the demand for this kind of integrated instruction is obvious. According to former writing program director Erika Lindemann, freshmen who entered in the fall of 1988 learned about the new courses from a notice in the registration materials they were sent. Included in those materials was a card to be returned immediately if a student wanted to be enrolled in a lecture and writing link set. Requests would be granted in the order received until enrollment limits were met, and the program designers simply had no idea what the response would be. As it turned out, of 3,200 cards sent, 3,000 were returned. Almost the entire incoming class wanted writing instruction in the context of lecture course study. Some students returned their cards by Federal Express.

Although the number of links currently offered hardly meets the demand, the new courses are influencing old offerings, helping to bring changes in the freshman English program as a whole. Jim Williams, the current program director, has redefined the focus of the two semester-long general composition courses. The concept of writing communities now underlies both, the fall course immersing students in writers' contexts outside of academe, the spring course turning to the major divisions inside academe—writing in the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities. This sort of generic WAC is, as Williams says, a compromise. It cannot provide the rich context of a link, but it can alert students to issues of perspective and help them learn to read critically. The links have also had a subtle effect on basic pedagogy. The general composition courses now incorporate more individual conferences between teachers and students, and encourage students to make more holistic evaluations of each other's written work: The model for these readily adaptable activities has been the writing links (Lindemann).

The wider influence of link course practices has become evident at the University of Washington too, although such influence took longer to develop. That is partly because what is now one of the oldest, largest link course programs began very small and grew slowly for several years before there was much contact between writing link teachers and those teaching traditional freshman composition.

The UW program originated in a series of conversations between a writing teacher and a historian in 1975. Both were frustrated,

for it seemed that an opportunity for powerful teaching lay between them, and neither could reach it. They decided that linking courses would be worth a try. But the writing teacher would have to go into the context created by a *large* history lecture course to find a pool of students from which to draw a writing course enrollment, because the link would be optional, a modest experiment in course design.

That first experiment was highly instructive: It made clear, for example, that in a well-defined, resource-rich context for writing, one should make just a few paper assignments and cultivate the thinking called for by each, rather than moving rapidly from one paper assignment to the next as was common then in freestanding composition courses. The link situation made conferences exceptionally productive, and students responded in very practical ways to each other's work. Also, class time could be well used: There was no need to spend it motivating students or making assignments credible, and lecture course readings would reward, for writing instruction purposes, much more examination than they got in the lecture course itself. Lines between reading, writing, and critical thinking tended to disappear.

So more experiments were made, involving a few more writing teachers and a few more discipline lecturers. Writing teachers were paid through the Office for Undergraduate Studies, a now-extinct administrative unit that supported curriculum innovations. The links brought logistical problems, and course design problems too—but the opportunities they offered were overwhelmingly attractive. So program development was pursued, and with the help of a 1977-79 grant from the Fund for Improvement of Secondary Education (FIPSE), a pattern of offerings was regularized. The link course program, known at the UW as the Interdisciplinary Writing Program (IWP), functioned as an independent administrative entity under the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences until 1984, then became a semiautonomous operation within the Department of English.

This institutionalizing move has brought increased interaction between administrators and teachers in the freshman composition program and those in the IWP. Virtually all teachers in the traditional program continue to be TAs, however, while the IWP has seven core faculty members—people hired specifically for IWP work. In addition, four English TAs with experience in the traditional program now hold IWP appointments each year: They are

selected for two-year, staggered terms. And TAs from other disciplines are taking an increasing part. Some departments have recently received extra TA appointments for graduate students to teach writing links; those graduate students join IWP core faculty experienced in their discipline for small course-development seminars during the first quarter in which they teach.

All new IWP teachers, whether TAs or core faculty, from English or from other disciplines, take part in a week-long fall workshop before the term begins. This common experience is essential because links put writing teachers in a situation that in one way or another is new for all. The workshop concentrates on two major issues: How to develop a writing course that is constantly responsive to, constantly capitalizing on, its context and how to play a link teacher's role.

Both issues have to be considered in terms of the UW's particular kind of link program. Except for a few honors links, all IWP courses accompany general education lecture courses, some of which are also relevant to majors; the lecture courses all have very large enrollments—from 100 to 500 students. A given lecture class might be accompanied by one to four link classes of 20 students each. Except in the Honors Program, links are always optional, but they are a popular way to satisfy writing requirements. In 1991-92, the IWP offered 22 to 24 classes each quarter: About 1,500 students took writing links during the year.

Many of the lecture courses accompanied by links require one or two papers of some kind, and lecture course writing assignments become joint assignments—required in the links as well. Additional major assignments as well as many smaller assignments must be designed for link students. The primary text for link classes is the writing that students produce; links also make use of lecture course readings for rhetorical and critical analysis, and may employ additional, brief readings from the discipline.

If, for example, a lecture course assigns only an introductory textbook, students will need to see something of how textbook statements were arrived at, how methods of investigation are related to conclusions, perhaps how different theories might be evaluated as explanations in a given case. If a lecture course assigns primary documents, say the diaries of colonists or Vietnam veterans, the problems and opportunities implicit in readings will be quite different. If a lecture course assigns independent

library research, on the basis of which students must formulate causal questions about events— reading/writing activities will be different again. Writing link students are encouraged to identify the functions of statements in readings and lectures and to see disciplines as sites of ongoing investigations and arguments. Designing exploratory and analytical activities for link students makes a considerable demand on writing teachers.

However, as the above may suggest, lecture courses at the UW are not necessarily changed at all by the presence of writing links. Sometimes faculty planning sessions and/or interactions between link teachers and discussion section TAs *do* bring changes, but this occurs only as individual personalities and circumstances permit. Regardless of the degree to which link teachers act as consultants, they must be prepared to learn themselves from lecture contexts, increasing their understanding of disciplinary perspectives and watching for ways to employ lecture course problems and strategies for their own teaching purpose.

Several of the points Chris Thaiss makes (this volume) about the nature of general education courses are highly relevant to link teachers' opportunities and roles. For one thing, because the goals of general education courses tend to be broad, they offer much room for experiment with writing assignments. Making writing instruction available in general education contexts is particularly important too, for as Thaiss points out, beginning students often lack confidence, and they know little about the discourse communities they are entering. Also they often assume that compiling and reciting facts is all they need to do, and large lectures easily encourage a passive, alienated stance. Furthermore, because students may enroll in general education courses simply to fulfill requirements, they may not reflect on what they learn or try to connect course learning to anything else in their experience. Fragmentation both within courses and between courses is all too often what is expected, and also what results.

Writing links help change this situation. By offering writing instruction in the context of students' study, they promote active engagement and the integration of learning. IWP teachers identify in certain ways with their students' experience, and in their classrooms they often play a sort of master-learner role. Legitimizing and helping to refine students' questions, at times exposing their

own uncertainties and working with students to identify alternatives, they teach partly by modeling engagement in inquiry.

It usually takes a little time to become comfortable in a link teacher's role. While experienced writing teachers may be accustomed to enacting more than presenting their expertise—crucial for IWP work—they must learn to exploit an unfolding context that they don't themselves create. Also because they adopt discipline-bound writing purposes and deal directly with issues on which they are not expert, they may feel their authority is jeopardized. But the context is always in some way highly stimulating: Authority anxiety tends to disappear as teachers realize how much they can see that their students, at the outset, cannot—and so identify ways that the context can further writing teachers' aims.

ASSUMPTIONS AND PITFALLS OF INTEGRATED WRITING PROGRAMS

The pitfalls for integrated writing instruction are inseparable from the opportunities. Vulnerability to some pitfalls—or limitations, at least—is a necessary condition for some of the most productive program designs. I will list here some assumptions made by all programs, then compare some key program features to identify the advantages that particular models present.

Assumptions Made by All Integrated Writing Programs

1. The relationship between a lecture and a writing component, adjunct, or link does not represent a split between content and form. In fact, components and links are especially powerful ways to work *against* such a split. It is in order to work against it that, for example, writing instructors commonly sit in on the lectures their students take. Adjuncts are more vulnerable to being perceived as form focused, because they provide so little teaching time, but that is why adjuncts tend eventually either to disappear from a curriculum or to become something more—i.e., components or links.
2. Faculty and graduate students in English can provide valuable writing instruction for students in the disciplines—if they go to the disciplinary contexts where students are working and expect to learn

themselves. Graduate students in the disciplines can also provide valuable writing instruction for students, given appropriate opportunity to learn about writing.

3. What students learn in a given component, adjunct, or link is obviously in some ways context bound—one does not learn to write once and for all, and generic "good writing" is a problematic concept. On the other hand, writing instruction for students immersed in a context does have some carrying power. Most notably, students learn what to look for, how to recognize things that matter when they go to contexts that are new.

Key Features of Integrated Writing Programs: Summary Comparisons

Inclusiveness. The UC San Diego program—a sequence of core lecture courses with writing components—includes all freshmen. Such a plan provides "a common intellectual experience," and it is feasible in UC San Diego's Third College, given that an entering class is about 600 students. It would also be feasible in many other effectively small-college situations, but it probably would not be in large institutions with freshman classes of several thousand.

The North Carolina program at Chapel Hill—several semester-long, especially designed lecture courses accompanied by writing links—will accommodate only a small fraction of the freshman class. But this is an inclusive program in the sense that all the students taking a given lecture course are also enrolled in links.

The adjunct programs at UCLA and UC Santa Barbara and the link programs at UC Davis and at UW are not inclusive in either sense. The adjuncts and links are optional companions to lecture courses, so some lecture course students take writing concurrently but others do not. Lectures are not developed specifically for these programs; the bond between lectures and writing classes is, therefore, not as tight. The advantage of the looser noninclusive structure is flexibility. Links can be arranged with relative ease and can be offered with a wide range of disciplines.

Levels and Special Student Populations. As noted above, the UC San Diego and UNC Chapel Hill programs are exclusively for freshmen. The UC Davis program is for upper-division students, who must already have satisfied a lower-division writing require-

ment. The adjuncts at UC Santa Barbara and UCLA have also been largely for upper-division students, but UC Santa Barbara is making basic changes in its program, and UCLA uses integrated writing instruction in situations other than upper-division adjuncts. These include a long-standing summer transition program for at-risk students, and a new, year-long program that encourages at-risk students to choose education as a professional field. UCLA is also now offering links in a program for upper-division transfer students.

The UW writing links accompany general education courses in many disciplines at the freshman and sophomore level. Overall, about two-thirds of the students who take the UW links are freshmen, but a given class might have mostly sophomores because of the level of the lecture course it accompanies. Students in the Arts and Sciences Honors Program have long been required to take a writing link with one of their core courses, and that pattern has helped break down the once very common faculty assumption that writing courses were essentially remedial work.

Lecture Course Selection. Where lectures are chosen for adjuncts or links rather than created as program constituents, some care must be taken—and of course there will still be surprises. It is often useful to talk early with the member of a department's staff who handles course scheduling: That person will usually know which courses are of an appropriate size, when and how regularly they will be offered, who commonly teaches them, and perhaps something of teachers' interests and styles. The chair of a department's undergraduate curriculum committee may also be a good source of information, but once basic inquiries have been made, it is important for program developers to talk personally with faculty whose courses may be appropriate for links. Of course, such faculty may also seek out a program developer to offer a course and request links, once the possibility becomes known.

In any case, lectures chosen for links should usually be those that students perceive as somewhat demanding. It is an important advantage if a course emphasizes issues or problems, not just mastery of facts (which is why, among general education courses, one called "Introduction to . . ." may be better than one called "Survey of . . ."). It is a further advantage if the discipline lecturer discusses in class some of her discipline's methods of inquiry, and

models the kinds of investigation and analysis that students should engage in by occasionally incorporating them in lecture presentations. The prospect for these things may not be possible to predict, but it may well be possible to encourage.

So far as writing requirements go, the link bond is tighter, of course, if at least one assignment is being made in the lecture course, and that assignment becomes joint, i.e., is required in the link course as well. At the UW, at least three-quarters of the lectures accompanied by links do make writing assignments; the rest have links because the perspectives and materials and issues they present make such good writing occasions and because the lecturers are happy to consult with writing link teachers.

Sometimes is necessary to assure faculty who offer large lectures that writing links will not make sizable new demands on them. (If a program developer does not wish to make such assurances, the pool of appropriate lectures will obviously be smaller.) It is partly because links can operate without the contribution of much discipline faculty time that they are so valuable in large, research-oriented institutions, where such time is almost never available. There are just a few essentials: Lecturers must have a conversation or two with link teachers before a term begins so that calendars can be coordinated, and lecture course purposes and readings as well as any joint writing assignments can be discussed. Beyond that, link teachers should find out whether lecturers will have weekly meetings with TAs who lead discussion sections and ask to sit in on such meetings if they are held. Probably nothing more will be necessary, although at some point a link teacher might need to seek a discipline lecturer's reaction or advice on her plans for a link course assignment.

There is, of course, much opportunity beyond what is essential, and link teachers need to respond to whatever the situation provides. It may turn out that discussion section TAs are a very important resource, for they see much more of students than discipline lecturers do, and they may have more inclination to talk over teaching questions. Or it may turn out that a discipline lecturer eagerly seeks writing link teachers' participation in TA training sessions he conducts, and a strongly interacting group is formed. Some relationships will be distant, others close: When lecture courses are chosen from existing offerings rather than created for the program's purpose, writing teachers must live with that.

Staffing Writing Components, Adjuncts, and Links. Two points need to be made:

A. Teachers cannot simply be assigned to classes in integrated writing programs. Some English TAs who take graduate degrees in English will be uncomfortable—feel themselves cramped or compromised—if they must take other disciplines' writing purposes seriously. Other people flourish. Similarly, some teachers in the disciplines are impatient with writing concerns and interact poorly with students. Others are terrific. Teachers in integrated writing programs must be *selected*, and the selection should be based on interviews as well as documents.

B. In programs where lectures are created for the purpose of integration with writing instruction, an all-TA staff for writing components or links is practical (see the discussion of UC San Diego and UNC Chapel Hill). Because there are just a few lecture courses to be dealt with, because lecturers are active and concerned participants in program design, and because teachers with related tasks think of themselves as teams, this staffing pattern can work.

However, where lectures are not created for programs and many different, somewhat unpredictable lecture courses are involved, an integrated writing program must have core faculty—faculty committed to teaching writing, interested in course development, and prepared to practice discourse analysis on the fly.

Both situations and staffing patterns have advantages. In the first case, the strong interaction among lecturers, writing directors, and TAs is likely to produce excellent classes for students as well as satisfying experience for teachers—but the participants are relatively few. In the second case, there is much less concentrated, immediate interaction for teachers, but a much wider exposure of opportunities. In so far as optional writing adjuncts and links are arranged across the curriculum, there is the possibility of wide influence among discipline faculty. There is also a great (almost overwhelming) amount of stimulating experience in disciplinary discourse communities for faculty on the writing side. UW link teachers have found themselves engaged not only in consultation on teaching issues but in analysis of texts produced by their lecturing colleagues, trying to understand, say, the changes made as an article goes from reader to reader and draft to draft. Of course, this doesn't happen all the time, but professional relationships do form, and friendships as well.

TRAINING AND SUPPORT FOR TEACHERS IN INTEGRATED WRITING PROGRAMS

Even for experienced writing teachers some preliminary meetings to explore the implications of context-bound work are important. Contexts offer a great deal to writing teachers, but they often require them to use materials that are new, to think about writing purposes in new ways, to interact with discipline faculty in new ways, and to play a somewhat altered classroom role. Interaction among writing teachers as courses go forward is also valuable for all, but it is essential for writing teachers who are not experienced. Because in integrated writing programs TAs from the disciplines often do some teaching, this matter needs special attention. Perhaps the most common assumption of those who have not taught writing before is that, in class, their primary job will be to present information about writing. When it becomes clear that information *about* writing does not necessarily help students engage *in* writing to good result, they may become very worried about how class time should be spent. They need consultation opportunities while they are teaching, and of course their consultant can expect to learn from them as well, for they are further inside their discipline's perspective.

Increased interaction between discipline TAs and writing faculty who teach links at the UW is being planned as more TAs come into the program. Small seminars during TAs' first quarter of teaching are new. First experiments have involved IWP faculty members experienced with lecture courses in art history and political science, and three to four TAs from each discipline; all members of each seminar concurrently teach writing links.

SCHEDULING AND PUBLICITY

For a program using components, scheduling must take into account the extra time required for a course carrying more than the usual amount of credit. For programs with adjuncts or links, writing courses and lecture courses are usually scheduled separately and by different departments. Good exchange of scheduling

information is necessary, and it may be important to include cross-references between writing and lecture courses in students' registration materials. As for times selected for adjuncts and links, the key consideration may be whether they are required or not. Scheduling is flexible when such courses are required, as in the program at UNC Chapel Hill. That program's lecture courses meet in the morning, but the links are in the afternoon when classrooms are easy to find and when other, somewhat analogous courses (like laboratories that accompany science courses) meet. At the UW, however, most links are optional, so they must be scheduled to accommodate students who often work and/or commute. For that reason, UW links are usually the hour after or the hour before the lecture they accompany.

Beyond attention to scheduling and clear registration information, publicity about new offerings may be important. Students usually have had no experience with integrated writing instruction, so they do not anticipate it. Experiments with optional, integrated writing instruction have been made at various schools over the years, but they remained isolated instances either because they were perceived as a passing interest of eccentric faculty or because there seemed to be little student demand. Simply announcing when a term begins that writing adjuncts or links are available is not adequate: Students need to know what such courses are.

UNC Chapel Hill did such a good job of explaining new writing links in its brochure for incoming freshmen that course requests came in a flood. At the UW the program is larger and less compact; links accompany many different lecture courses and they are not exclusively for freshmen, so publicity has been more complicated. Also, the UW's links were, for several years, listed as general studies courses rather than as English courses, so students looking for writing instruction often did not find them in registration schedules. Enrollment then depended a lot on first-day announcements and information distributed in lecture classes where links were attached. But that method is rarely needed now. Links have been listed under "English" since 1984, so they are readily found; links have acquired a strong reputation; and academic advisors—both in the Central Advising Office and in departments—make the links known.

INFLUENCES OF INTEGRATED WRITING INSTRUCTION ON DISCIPLINE LECTURES

Beyond the construction of lecture courses for program purposes, existing lectures are often influenced by writing adjuncts or links. Such influence may be subtle, a matter of gradually changing faculty assumptions about writing and learning. Or it may be quite obvious, as when a lecturer changes the language of writing assignments, makes more or different assignments, requires drafts, holds paper-reading sessions with TAs, and so on. Whether, or how much, writing teachers in adjuncts or links should try to influence lecture courses must be decided with due regard for interacting factors in each case.

At UCLA, part of the purpose of adjuncts has been to influence lecture courses. Adjunct teachers have served as writing consultants. In many respects the result has been good—important changes have been made. But there is one important difficulty: The workload of TAs who lead discussion sections is usually increased by changes related to writing—when, for example, they must respond to students' drafts. If the number of students assigned to each TA is not reduced, TAs may resent changes, even undermine them.

At UW, although link teachers have certainly been influential in some cases, there has been no programmatic attempt to provoke change in lecture courses by having link teachers serve as consultants. This, in many ways, is wasteful. Writing teachers whose own work has brought them into disciplinary contexts are unusually well qualified to play a consulting role. One promising development is that more attention is now being given to TA training across the institution. It is possible that some departments will begin using their large lecture courses more deliberately as occasions for such training. If that happens, consultant roles for writing link teachers will almost inevitably be strengthened, for the large lecture courses with many TAs are the very courses that have links. The prospect for lecture course improvement by focusing on TA training is very attractive, but UW will have to be wary of the workload issues that have emerged at UCLA.

INFLUENCES OF INTEGRATED WRITING INSTRUCTION ON TRADITIONAL COMPOSITION

Changed designs for general composition courses are sometimes clearly responses to the WAC movement, as is the case with the Yale course Linda Peterson describes in this volume. But forces that generated the WAC movement have also been expressed in writing components, adjuncts, and links—and such innovations have become influences in themselves.

As noted above, at UNC Chapel Hill and at UW link examples have helped make conferences on drafts a more significant part of general composition teaching; also the link practice of focusing on students' drafts as whole pieces of purpose-directed work has encouraged general composition teachers to move students engaged in peer review away from a piecemeal style of response. Increased significance of conferencing and more holistic responses to drafts—these changes result from and help to create a renewed respect for the difficulty of students' tasks, and for the texts they produce. Stress on the powerful connections between writing and learning has helped renew interest in what teachers can learn from students' texts—and it has helped weaken the idea that generic good writing, regardless of purpose, can exist. Eventually integrated writing instruction may even help relate personal values achieved by writing to social contexts in which writers work, because integrated instruction reveals students' capacity to be personally engaged even as they produce discourse that is academic.

WORKS CITED

Cooper, Charles. Telephone interview. July 1990; Jan. 1992.

Cullen, Robert J. "Writing Across the Curriculum: Adjunct Courses." *ADE Bulletin* 80 (Spring 1985): 15-17.

Hilgers, Thomas L., and Joy Marsella. *Making Your Writing Program Work: A Guide to Good Practices*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992.

Lindemann, Erika. Telephone interview. May 1990.

MacDonald, Susan Peck. Telephone interview. June 1990; Jan. 1992.

Palo, Susan. Telephone interview. June 1990; Jan. 1992.

Strenski, Ellen. Telephone interview. May 1990; Jan. 1992.

Williams, Jim. Telephone interview. Jan. 1992.

Zimmerman, Muriel. Telephone interview. June 1990; Jan. 1992.