NSU Florida
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

Nova Southeastern University
NSUWorks

Communication, Media, and Arts Faculty Articles

Department Communication, Media, and Arts

12-31-2020

Low-Stakes Writing as a High-Impact Education Practice in MBA Classes

Adele Leon

Follow this and additional works at: https://nsuworks.nova.edu/hcas_dcma_facarticles

Low-Stakes Writing as a High-Impact Education Practice in MBA Classes

Adele Leon, University of Arizona

Abstract: Studies examining writing as a High-Impact Education Practice (HIP) have focused primarily on writing in terms of major project assignments, thus directing attention away from the promising high impacts that low-stakes writing (LSW) assignments have on student learning. This study piloted assigning LSW in two MBA classes to test the extent to which LSW assignments align with Anderson et al.'s (2016) study on high-impact writing assignments, and further, how accessible and beneficial LSW assignments are for non-WAC faculty and their curricula. Interview data from this study shows encouraging potential for WAC expansion and recruitment, and student survey data shows a promising relationship between LSW and the HIPs. This study ultimately shows low-stakes writing to function as a HIP, recruitment tool, and resource for correcting misconceptions about assigning writing.

At the end of a seven-week semester, a business professor sits at his desk, careful not to knock over stacks of paper that have been systematically piled into an organized mess. He has submitted final grades, and finally has time to be interviewed about his first time assigning low-stakes writing (LSW) in his MBA leadership courses. The inevitable technical difficulties of video chatting gave me time to recount the less-than-positive assumptions the professor (who I'll refer to as Lee) had initially shared with me about assigning writing. When Lee first agreed to participate in my case study, he was hesitant about assigning LSW tasks because he thought they "felt a little bit too much like just traditional homework." This idea of "traditional homework" having only a small impact on student learning is common, and Lee projected that in our interview when he talked about his expectations for students' tacit knowledge: He associated the LSW prompts I'd designed – from the course textbook – with "conversational knowledge" that he expected his students to already have. Over the next 45 minutes, though, I learned that these small writing tasks had completely shifted Lee's assumptions about the impact that writing can have in a non-writing classroom. I would argue that Lee demonstrated irreversible and transformative change in the context of Meyer and Land's (2003) formative theory on threshold concepts.

These alternative experiences of labor show that while an increase of time *could be* spent reading student work in preparation for class, a significant decrease in time *was spent* probing students to engage in discussion during class. Bridging student labor to instructor labor, writing studies scholars understand that traditional low-stakes writing supports the goals of AAC&U's High-Impact Education Practices [HIPs] (Kuh, 2008) and that practitioners of both writing and other disciplines often assign various forms of minor writing tasks throughout the semester to supplement major projects and achieve writing requirements. Furthermore, relying solely on major projects to engage students in

Across the Disciplines
A Journal of Language, Learning and Academic Writing
https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2020.17.3.02
wac.colostate.edu/atd
ISSN 554-8244

Across the Disciplines is an open-access, peer-reviewed scholarly journal published on the WAC Clearinghouse and supported by Colorado State University and Georgia Southern University. Articles are published under a Creative Commons BY-NC-ND license (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs) ISSN 1554-8244. Copyright © 1997-2020 The WAC Clearinghouse and/or the site's authors, developers, and contributors. Some material is used with permission.

high-impact practices also constrains the reach and recruitment of WAC programs as a whole because high-stakes assignments are intimidating to professors who are not yet comfortable assigning writing.

The Present State of WAC and High-Impact Education Practices

Common activities falling under the umbrella of WAC assignments can be placed into one or more of these three categories: writing-to-learn (WTL), writing-to-engage (WTE), and/or writing in the disciplines (WID) (Kiefer et al., 2000-2018). The key problem with this distinction is that practitioners of all disciplines typically end up thinking of these activities only as supplements used to buttress major writing projects, thereby perpetuating a hierarchical model of assignment types. Often, this model results in students' writing being weighted at a specific percent of their course grade, but without adequate preparation or scaffolding to teach those students how to write formally within that discipline. By extension, this misunderstanding and misuse contributes to the current tendency to equate disciplinary writing to formal writing, which devalues the historic benefits of lower stakes WTL, WTE, and WID assignments. While these assignments typically give credence to the writing-intensive HIPs, writing studies scholars and practitioners are overlooking the limitations these activities place on WAC expansion.

In response, WAC scholars are focusing their research and data around the writing-intensive HIPs by asking questions about which types of writing assignments best serve various curricula. Boquet and Learner's (2016) introduction to a special issue of *Across the Disciplines* contextualized HIPs as practices that have "the potential to create the conditions for student success and the power to see writing across the curriculum...as much more than a value-added curricular requirement" (p. 1). In this issue, HIPs were linked to variations of writing assignments. While the case studies presented in that issue identify unique and beneficial perspectives for highlighting writing's impacts on student success, they also represent a larger gap in WAC literature that shows a failure to recognize the course-level impacts of low stakes writing. By not hypothesizing about high-impact, low-stakes writing, scholars are limiting writing-intensive course models to relying on major projects that intimidate both students and novice writing professors.

The goals of this case study are threefold: to correct those misconceptions by examining the impacts that low-stakes writing assignments can have on courses for both professors and students; to convey alignment of those impacts with those of major writing assignments; and to describe the accessibility of LSW assignments for novice WAC instructors. To better understand low-stakes writing in these contexts, I piloted LSW assignments in two MBA organizational leadership courses at a midsize, midwestern U.S. university. This study therefore set out to assess the effects of low-stakes writing as a pedagogical tool to address some of the research gaps present in Business Management scholarship, focusing on high-impact education practices and consistent assignment design, but extending previous work. I applied past methods to graduate students, narrowing the scope of both writing assignment type and intended impact. In addition, I concentrated more heavily on faculty perception than assessing students' writing, using the following research questions to guide my study:

1. How do low-stakes writing assignments align with the goals of Anderson et al.'s high impact writing practices?
2. How do business faculty understand the impact of low-stakes writing on their courses, and how do their attitudes about assigning writing change?
3. Does the limitation in form and change in function of low-stakes writing assignments from common WAC assignments increase, decrease, or not affect students' self-reported gains in learning?

Conceptual Framework

Prior to the semester this study took place, Lee and I collaborated to determine the content areas that he felt should be addressed in the LSW prompts. Two foundational questions I asked Lee guided the content of each low-stakes writing prompt:

- What content do you anticipate your students struggling with the most?
- What topics would you like your students to engage more deeply?

This process ensured reciprocity for Lee and his students in their participation in my study.

While little empirical data exists on low-stakes writing, this study also seeks to add to writing studies' repertoire of qualitative and quantitative measuring of low-stakes writing. Despite their broad application across disciplines, the variations in and uses of low-stakes writing assignments are surprisingly little-studied within WAC/WID in ways that would produce data relevant to program growth and funding. This does a disservice to writing program administrators whose budget proposals, reports, and grant applications all too often fall on positivism's deaf ears. The difficulty in measuring these assignments has less to do with our anecdotal experiences in seeing the positive effects of LSW in our classrooms, but more to do with the lack of empirical testing of them, which this study attempts to offset. In proposing that we view LSW assignments as tools for recruiting professors outside of the composition disciplines, I believe that the model piloted in the present study can be used to concretely prove the effectiveness of LSW assignments in student success across the disciplines. Viewing writing from perspectives outside of our own field breaks us from the repetition of our echo chambers and any collaborator brings with them the types of uncomfortable questions that drive forward our research and field.

I seek to contribute my narrowed iteration of low-stakes writing as an extension of this WAC/WID model to show one method for assigning and assessing writing as a high-impact practice in business classes and potentially other classes across the disciplines. More broadly, writing studies scholars and program administrators could use LSW tasks as a tool for recruiting faculty outside of our field to get acquainted with assigning smaller writing tasks for engaging students and assessing their learning. It is my hope that LSW tasks can show non-writing faculty that writing can lead to valuable discussion, gains in student learning, and a realization that the labor associated with reading and grading writing is less intensive than the workload put into reading and assessing more valued high stakes assignments like midterm essays. Through these goals, I intend to position LSW assignments as capable of having measurable, positive impacts on both students' self-reported learning and instructor engagement with writing.

Low-Stakes Writing in Business Management Classes

Conversations in business management scholarship have increasingly called for curricular changes to improve student engagement and contextual comprehension of course material external to the classroom (Bloch & Spataro, 2014; Dyer & Hurd, 2016; Pearce & Huang, 2012a; Welsh & Dehler, 2013), but few of these conversations explicitly connect writing to student learning, and even fewer, if any, suggest low-stakes assignments as a feasible solution to curricular issues. For example, practitioners Jone Pearce and Laura Huang (2012a) studied the radically unequal distribution of research in their field's top journals between theoretical and practical. Their analysis showed that "management research is becoming less useful to [management] students" (pp. 259-260), and that actionable research published in their top two journals capped at only 24% in 2010 (p. 252). The impact of this claim resulted in heated responses defending business management scholarship; however, Pearce and Huang (2012b) reiterated the field's need for actionable research by telling readers to "ask themselves how many of the articles report research that they would use in their

classrooms" (p. 300). While my case study does not produce actionable research specific to management theory, it does offer a potential solution to the overall need that Pearce and Huang's (2012a, 2012b) articles point to of more "research that is useful for teaching" (2012b, p. 300).

This debate is reflective of writing studies scholarship on faculty resistance to assigning writing, whether that resistance stems from assumption, past experience, or genuine misunderstanding. Kathleen Daly (2017) wrote a blog post reflecting on her time working for the UW-Madison Writing Center and as Assistant Director of their WAC program. Over her two years as Assistant Director, the most common question she was asked by non-writing faculty was "How do I teach writing without having to cut course content?" That question shows implicit assumption by professors who asked it, that the only way to assign writing in their course(s) is to remove relevant and important material from the course. Daly (2017) concluded that not only were instructors completely separating teaching writing from teaching content, but also that "what many instructors don't realize is that writing can be an integral part of deepening student learning. In writing assignments, students grapple with both content and disciplinary conventions." I argue that low-stakes writing assignments account for these concerns because they both allow students to reflect on course content through writing and result in an increase in student-led classroom discussion, at least in this pilot study.

Methods

This mixed-methods case study was designed in two parts: 1) two Likert scale surveys and 2) a guided interview (Marshall & Rossman, 2014). The surveys provided a quantitative measurement of students' reactions to the LSW tasks in relation to their perceived comprehension of course content. The guided interview was transcribed, analyzed, and coded to gain a detailed understanding of how LSW impacted Lee's courses and his feelings about assigning writing. Next, once the interview had been completely transcribed, it was analyzed and coded using Johnny Saldana's (2016) hypothesis coding method, which relies on predetermined, researcher-generated codes to apply to collected data.

Participants. In fall 2017, student and professor participants were recruited based on a convenience sample. The 31 MBA students made up two sections of a spring 2018 organizational leadership class, and the business management professor (Lee) taught both sections. The students were non-traditional, middle class, majority white, mixed gender population, aged between 23 and 40, and had at least one college-level degree. Lee has a background in industrial and organizational psychology, and a Ph.D. in business management. He teaches both undergraduate and graduate courses in business management, organizational leadership, and human resources management, for which he has received positive evaluations from students and peers.

Low-Stakes Writing Assignment Design. The low-stakes writing assignments for this study were developed from two of Anderson et al.'s (2016) scales for high-impact writing practices: meaning-making writing tasks and higher-order learning activities. To ensure that the LSW prompts could be replicated, I relied on Mark Blaauw-Hara's (2014) study on transfer theory and threshold concepts.

Survey Design. Two surveys were implemented to measure students' self-reported gains in learning through writing, and results were measured based on a 5-point Likert. Measures of success would be indicated by the amount of student responses which aligned with "X" or "Strongly X" responses to correlating questions, where "X" would correlate to an affirmative, for example "agree." To further ensure replication, both surveys developed from Anderson et al.'s (2015) NSSE-based survey, with the first asking student participants about deep approaches to learning, and the second asking about latent constructs (Anderson et al., 2016). The survey responses were self-reported by the students

and administered post-semester. See Appendix B for the survey as presented to the student-participants.

Interview and Coding Design. Lee's responses to interview questions were gained via a recorded Skype session and transcribed by me after the interview had ended. Selected portions of the interview transcripts—the portions directly related to the proposed study—are included for reference. Relying on a semi-structured approach to the guided interview allowed the professor to maintain dominance as primary speaker, and because it was recorded, I was able to extensively review the transcript prior to initial coding. My specific interview process was developed from Seidman's (2013) emphasis on listening more than speaking (pp. 81-96). Succinctly, a semi-structured interview grows from the idea that "There is no recipe for the effective question. The truly effective question flows from an interviewer's concentrated listening, engaged interest in what is being said, and purpose in moving forward" (Seidman, 2013, p. 95).

To begin coding the transcribed interview, my initial method of analysis was discourse analysis, performed through close reading. Beginning with this method for analyzing the interview transcript, I developed and revised a list of code families or groups, each of which consists of more specific codes associated with their larger code family. These initial codes were partially used in my final iteration of the coded transcript – they very closely aligned with specific vocabulary and theories that already existed in the research that informed this study. Thus, building from my initial discourse analysis codes, I began relying on Saldaña's (2016) hypothesis coding method for developing my codes and coding the interview.

This method allowed the codes and their definitions to remain concrete, while the interview itself could be viewed in ways that allowed Lee's insights to sprinkle across multiple codes. This variety could only remain as such if the codes remained a constant, which Saldaña's (2016) coding method enabled. Essentially, with the codes and code families remaining a constant, specific quotes from the interview with Lee could be the variables under assessment.

Data Analysis

Once the interview was coded via Saldaña's (2016) Hypothesis coding method, I generated coding schemes from predetermined theories and concepts. The code families were developed from four primary sources: Perkins and Salomon's (1988) definition of transfer, Anderson et al.'s (2015; 2016) frameworks for deep approaches to learning (2016) and latent constructs (2015), and Meyer and Land's (2003) theory of threshold concepts. Within each of these code families, I developed more specific codes that derive from the constructs, theories, and concepts' definitions. This section will first show a table of code families with definitions and correlating codes (see Table 1), and then will continue with examples of Lee's responses showing alignment with specific codes from the threshold concepts code family. Table 1 visualizes the code families and their associated codes:

Table 1: Code families with associated definitions and codes

Code Family	Definition	Codes
Transfer	occurs "when knowledge or skill associated with one context reaches out to enhance another...Transfer goes beyond ordinary learning in that the skill or knowledge in question has to travel to a new context" (Perkins and Salomon, 1988, p. 22).	Forward-Reaching Transfer [FRT] High Road Transfer [HRT]
Deep Approaches to Learning	"Students who engage in deep learning are focused not only on substance but also on the underlying meaning of the information" (Anderson et al., 2015, p. 210).	Integrative Learning [IL] Reflective Learning [RL] Higher-Order Learning [HOL]
Latent Constructs	"Latent constructs are theoretical variables (such as intelligence, empathy, and introversion) that can't be observed directly...These constructs are defined operationally by measuring observable behaviors that are proxies for them" (Anderson et al., 2016, pp. 4-5).	Interactive Writing Processes [IWP] Clear Writing Expectations [CWE] Meaning-Making Writing Tasks [MMWT]
Threshold Concepts	"It represents a transformed way of understanding, or interpreting, or viewing something without which the learner cannot progress. As a consequence of comprehending a threshold concept there may thus be a transformed internal view of subject matter, subject landscape, or even world view" (Meyer & Land, 2003, p. 1).	Transformative [TRNS] Irreversible [IRVS] Integrative [INTG] Bounded [BDD] Troublesome [TRBS]

Beginning with the code family transfer, relying on Perkins and Salomon (1988), I produced a definition that I felt aligned well with some of the themes I had seen while transcribing the interview. Perkins and Salomon (1988) explain that transfer of learning occurs "when knowledge or skill associated with one context reaches out to enhance another" and that "Transfer goes beyond ordinary learning in that the skill or knowledge in question has to travel to a new context" (p. 22).

Next, I coded the deep approaches to learning code family, which originated in Anderson et al.'s (2015) NSSE-based study and was repeated in their 2016 HIP-based study. Students engage in deep approaches to learning when they "are focused not only on substance but also on the underlying meaning of the information" (Anderson et al., 2015, p. 210). This type of learning draws upon multiple facets of knowledge creation to develop meaning for students as they further learn and understand course material. The three codes that comprise the deep approaches to learning code family are integrative learning, reflective learning, and higher-order learning, which are defined in Table 6, with interview quotes and further analysis.

Continuing with Anderson et al.'s (2016) study on writing's contributions to student learning, I coded the latent constructs code family, detailed in Table 7. Latent constructs are "theoretical variables (such as intelligence, empathy, and introversion) that can't be observed directly...These constructs are defined operationally by measuring observable behaviors that are proxies for them" (Anderson et al., 2016, pp. 4-5). These unmeasurable data are considered latent constructs, which according to Anderson et al. (2016) can be measured by proxy via the four codes found within this group: interactive writing processes, clear writing expectations, and meaning-making writing tasks.

Finally, I coded the threshold concepts code family with five codes, all of which were chosen as a result of Meyer and Land's (2003) elaboration on what characteristics would qualify something as a threshold concept. They define threshold concepts as something that "represents a transformed way of understanding, or interpreting, or viewing something without which the learner cannot progress. As a consequence of comprehending a threshold concept there may thus be a transformed internal view of subject matter, subject landscape, or even world view" (Meyer & Land, 2003, p. 1). This definition, alongside the rest of their argument, easily refined my chosen codes to the five associated qualifiers developed by the authors: transformative, irreversible, integrative, bounded, and/or troublesome (pp. 4-5). Thus, the code family for threshold concepts is comprised of those five codes all of which have their own associated definitions and examples.

To show how these codes and code families work methodologically with my interview transcript, Table 2 presents the claim I made in my introduction about Lee being irreversibly changed after assigning low-stakes writing, and that his views on assigning writing were transformed. My analysis of the interview transcript showed alignment between what Lee said and the specific definitions for "transformative" and "irreversible" as offered by Meyer & Land (2003).

Table 2: Example interview quotes showing Lee to exemplify TRNS and IRVS codes from the threshold concepts code family

Code	Definition of Code	Examples in Interview
Transformative [TRNS]	"once understood, its potential effect on student learning and behaviour is to occasion a significant shift in the perception of a subject, or part thereof. In certain powerful instances, such as the comprehension of specific politico-philosophical insights...the shift in perspective may lead to a transformation of personal identity, a reconstruction of subjectivity. In such instances transformed perspective is likely to involve an affective component — a shift in values, feeling or attitude" (Meyer & Land, 2003, p. 4).	"So having something like this where it's bite-sized, it's digestible, it's something that they can do, I think it was very useful in terms of how much they thought about the content outside the course."
Irreversible [IRVS]	"Probably irreversible, in that the change of perspective occasioned by acquisition of a threshold concept is unlikely to be forgotten, or will be unlearned only by considerable effort" (Meyer & Land, 2003, p. 4).	"I can't imagine I wouldn't continue doing it [assigning writing]"

Results and Implications

Survey Data

The 8-question survey revealed students' self-reported mastery of meaning-making writing tasks and higher-order learning as a result of low-stakes writing. Survey results showed overwhelmingly positive gains in learning for seven of the eight high-impact writing practices. Tables 3 and 4 show the results obtained from all students in both sections of Lee's organizational leadership classes, totaling 31 responses to each question.

The first set of survey questions (Table 3) was based on meaning-making writing tasks, which "occur when students engage in some form of integrative, critical, or original thinking" (Anderson et al., 2016, p. 5). While a minority of responses indicated little gains in learning how to explain numerical data in writing, at only 41.9% agreeing or strongly agreeing, this result is an outlier compared to the other data, and is consistent with Anderson et al.'s (2015) findings that "...fewer students were asked to explain the meaning of numerical or statistical data" (p. 218). Accounting for responses indicating both "Agree" and "Strongly Agree," 90.32% of students reported that through their low-stakes writing assignments, they effectively summarized course material. Further, an impressive 100% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that through their LSW assignments, they effectively analyzed, evaluated, and argued about something they read from a particular positionality.

Table 3: Students' self-reported responses to meaning-making writing tasks survey questions

In your writing assignments, do you agree that you did the following?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Summarize something you read, such as articles, books, or online publications	0	2	1	7	21
Analyze or evaluate something you read, researched, or observed	0	0	0	6	25
Argue a position using evidence and reasoning	0	0	0	10	21
Explain in writing the meaning of numerical or statistical data	4	5	9	7	6

Broadly, the results of Table 3 suggest that students reported engaging in meaning-making writing tasks that practitioners across the disciplines have cited as relevant and necessary for their students to have practiced in order to be successful in the correlating class. Brockman et al. (2011) analyzed faculty focus-group discussions collected from their large-scale writing assessment study at Central Michigan University. These focus group discussions produced an interesting commentary from non-writing faculty about expectations, writing assignments, and what they value in writing: "two of the most common writing assignments (that is, writing that is generated outside of class over some period of time) are critical analyses and research-based writing" (p. 76). Considering this

information, the students' self-reported results in the present study suggest that while the LSW tasks scored lowest on explaining numerical data, their highest score was representative of the same critical analysis and research-based writing valued by professors at the Central Michigan University.

Next, Table 4 shows responses to the second set of survey questions, and was based on higher-order learning activities, which Anderson et al. (2016) developed from "previously established indicators of learning and development already measured by the NSSE survey" (p. 6). These questions also fall under Anderson et al.'s deep approaches to learning constructs, indicating that students who participated in these low-stakes writing assignments showed significant positive engagement with the mental activities associated with their coursework through writing. Table 4 shows that 96.77% of all students reported that they either often or always practiced in-depth analysis of their coursework; 87.09% either "Often" or "Always" synthesized and organized their ideas into more complex interpretations; 83.81% reported that through their low-stakes writing assignments, they made judgements about material either often or always; and finally, 100% of respondents indicated that they often or always applied course concepts to practical problems and/or in new situations.

Table 4: Students' self-reported responses to higher-order learning activities survey questions

During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities?

	Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Always
Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	0	1	0	10	21
Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	0	1	3	10	17
Making judgements about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	0	0	5	8	18
Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations	0	0	0	10	21

These self-reported results also align with Brockman et al.'s (2011) focus group discussions, specifically those discussions about values: "Second, faculty comments suggest that professors value

intellectual risk taking. As such, they want students to use writing assignments as venues to explore complex questions or issues and, most importantly, to challenge themselves intellectually when they write" (p. 77). Because the highest reported scores for higher-order learning are aligned with applying theories and concepts to new or practical situations, LSW tasks align with success in this measure and faculty who value intellectual risk taking from their students' writing. Thus, even without the major assignment pressures of a multi-page research essay, low-stakes writing assignments support the learning expectations of faculty beyond writing courses.

Students' Self-Reported Gains in Learning from Low-Stakes Writing

An initial objective of this study was to determine if the limitation in form and change in function of low-stakes writing assignments from common WAC assignments would increase, decrease, or not affect students' self-reported gains in learning. The data presented in Tables 3 and 4 suggest that simplified and modernized low-stakes writing assignments allow students to achieve gains in learning consistent with the wide-range of writing assignments assessed in previous studies (e.g., Anderson et al., 2015, 2016; Elder & Champine, 2016; Hendrickson, 2016; Herrington & Stassen, 2016; Thaiss, Moloney, & Chaozon-Bauer, 2016). By extension, this finding has important implications for developing writing assignments that are consistent in form, as Blaauw-Hara (2014) suggests in connection with transfer, and as Anderson et al. (2015) suggest in connection with students engaging deep learning strategies (p. 220). While preliminary, this data does suggest a positive correlation between low-stakes writing assignments and the intended result of their function to support students' high-impact learning. The implications of these results further suggest alignment with Anderson et al.'s (2016) goals for their HIP-based (Kuh, 2008) writing practices.

More directly speaking toward my third research question about the impact of low-stakes writing assignments on students' self-reported learning gains, (these results show that assigning LSW tasks to students—in any discipline and at any level can increase their self-reported gains in learning. While I cannot directly conclusively claim that these positive results were produced by the LSW intervention because Lee and I were not able to administer a pre-semester survey for the pilot class or compare the results with previous classes, based on Lee's commentary in our interview and the optimistic student survey data, I feel confident that a comparison could be tested in the future and its results would show an increase in students' self-reported gains in learning.

Interview Data

The interview with Lee lasted roughly 45 minutes, and explored his overall experiences assigning low-stakes writing in his two spring 2018 organizational leadership MBA courses and how his attitude about assigning writing changed as a result of LSW. Lee had decided to assign four LSW assignments in place of a four-page midterm to meet his departmental writing requirement, so because Lee and I had agreed to set the LSW assignment page limit at one page per assignment, his students would still be producing the required amount of writing set by the business department. Lee's thoughts about how LSW could positively impact him were multifaceted, ranging from departmental benefits to his pedagogical approaches to teaching graduate classes.

Because Lee and I had designed to writing prompts based on his course textbook (Noe et al., 2015), I asked about how the LSW writing prompts compared to the existing textbook reflection/application questions found at the end of each chapter. His response was refreshing for me as a WAC advocate: he said that these co-created writing prompts were much better than the textbook's questions because "with textbooks, a lot of it [the content the textbook questions are asking about] doesn't apply." Lee explained that the required textbook was too generalized for his students' specializations and that such textbooks don't exist for a majority of his MBA classes. The reason this insight is so important for WAC studies is because it shows that low-stakes writing, when created in collaboration

with the professor of a non-writing dominant class, can better serve the individualized needs of students than traditional textbooks can.

Another highlight of our interview was Lee's response when I asked him if he would feel comfortable continuing to assign LSW based on textbook material. First, Lee made a connection to the ways that low-stakes writing tasks can benefit his broader work environment:

> For accreditation purposes, yes. So when our accrediting bodies come in and they want to know what content we've covered in our MBA courses, I think these reflection questions are a perfect example for me to give to whoever the accrediting review team is and say, "Hey listen, we're touching the stuff inside the classroom, we're touching it outside of the classroom."

Then, Lee continued to more directly answer my question, saying, "I'd continue [assigning LSW] based on textbook information. It just helps them engaged with the textbook material so much, as well as just keeps us on track as an MBA program, *so I can't imagine I wouldn't continue doing that*" (emphasis added). Now, not only have LSW tasks surpassed the textbooks in Lee's MBA courses as effective learning and engagement tools, they have also earned a spot in the hypothetical programmatic requirements for accreditation. Overall, Lee reported that he enjoyed reading the responses, and that "the whole process was pretty simple to just pick up and take care of." The interview with Lee confirmed many positive experiences about assigning low-stakes writing that are discussed below, showing the hypothesis coding (Saldaña, 2016) results and correlating tables.

Coding Data

This section continues with Tables 5-8, which detail each code family's specific codes, their definitions, and example quotes directly copied from my transcribed interview with Lee. They also feature one highlighted quote that I later elaborate on in detail to support my rationale for assigning it to the specific correlating code. The coded interview produced multiple examples for all codes.

Table 5 shows the two codes developed from the transfer code family, which extend from Perkins and Salomon (1988) and include only forward-reaching transfer and high road transfer. Perkins and Salomon (1988) explain that forward-reaching transfer happens when "one learns something and abstracts it in preparation for applications elsewhere" (p. 26). High road transfer is similar, in that it "always involves reflective thought in abstracting from one context and seeking connections with others" (Perkins & Salomon, 1988, p. 26). The two can be differentiated in that forward-reaching transfer involves a person's active preparation for applying one concept to another context, whereas high road transfer does not require such active preparation, only reflection. Finally, low road transfer "reflects the automatic triggering of well-practiced routines in circumstances where there is considerable perceptual similarity to the original learning context" (Perkins & Salomon, 1988, p. 25). Blaauw-Hara (2014) describes this type of transfer as more simplistic knowledge that could be memorized and is discipline-specific (e.g., MLA citations) (pp. 354-5).

As we can see, when Lee said, "So teaching this course as compared to last semester, where I did not use any of the writing prompts, I found a lot deeper discussion," he responded to my research question of "How do faculty understand the impact of low-stakes writing on their courses, and how do their attitudes about assigning writing change?" I coded that statement as an example of Lee demonstrating high road transfer because it shows that his knowledge about how assigning writing to meet the departmental writing requirement had worked in the past (midterm essay) as opposed to the piloted method (several LSW assignments). This showed Lee's new recognition that writing can be used as a tool to initiate class discussion, in addition to meeting departmental requirements.

This shift in knowledge shows that Lee gained a new contextual understanding of how assigning writing can work in his classroom.

Table 5: Transfer family codes with definitions and quotes from interview with Lee

Code	Definition	Examples in Interview
Forward-Reaching Transfer [FRT]	When "one learns something and abstracts it in preparation for applications elsewhere" (Perkins & Salomon, 1988, p. 26)	"training for soft skills - communication being one of them" "a lot more discussion focused on their workplace behaviors as opposed to me having to create an example or create a scenario for them." "So having those reflections in place, my students were coming up with examples and teachable moments themselves, which makes my life infinitely easier and makes the class way more applicable. That was the best thing."
High Road Transfer [HRT]	"High road transfer depends on deliberate mindful abstraction of skill or knowledge from one context for application in another" (Perkins & Salomon, 1988, p. 25). --OR-- "high road transfer always involves reflective thought in abstracting from one context and seeking connections with others" (Perkins & Salomon, 1988, p. 26)	"come to class with more targeted questions" "But having these reflections, I ended up with a lot more student-generated teaching material because they come to class and say, 'you know I was doing that reflection, it reminded me of how - you know - I was dealing with some 1099s...'" "I found a lot deeper discussion," "Having something like this where it's bite-sized, it's digestible, it's something that they can do, I think I was very useful in terms of how much they thought about the content outside the course."

Next, the deep approaches to learning code family produced three codes: integrative learning, reflective learning, and higher-order learning. Originally, Anderson et al. defined deep approaches to learning as happening when "Students who engage in deep learning are focused not only on substance but also on the underlying meaning of the information" (2015, p. 210). Anderson et al. (2016) implemented these scales in their follow-up study because they were "previously established indicators of learning and development already measured by the NSSE survey" (p. 6), supporting my research into how well low-stakes writing aligned with the HIPs (Kuh, 2008). While coding for this code family, I realized how often specific quotes could apply to multiple codes and code families, so I decided that it would be in the reader's best interest to see the subjectivity of this particular qualitative coding method its availability for researcher interpretation. Table 6 shows examples of these codes revealing themselves through quotes from my interview with Lee, along with detailed definitions offered by Anderson et al. (2016).

As a high impact writing practice, low-stakes writing produces positive results that align with Anderson et al.'s goals for writing-intensive HIPs:

> Against the background of this emphasis on the single strategy of "more is better," we were interested in finding out whether certain generalizable principles could be discerned for using writing to enhance learning and that therefore would enable faculty in any discipline to gain the maximum benefit from the writing they incorporate in their courses. (2016, p. 4)

Table 6: Deep Approaches to Learning family codes with definitions and quotes from interview with Lee

Code	Definition	Examples in Interview
Integrative Learning [IL]	"...concerns the students' engagement in combining ideas from various sources, such as including diverse perspectives in coursework, using ideas from different courses in assignments or class discussions, and discussing course concepts with either faculty members or others outside of class" (Anderson et al., 2016, p. 6)	"supplemented the textbook material" "these writing prompts put them in situations they hadn't been in before" "But having these reflections, I ended up with a lot more student-generated teaching material because they come to class and say, 'you know I was doing that reflection, it reminded me of how - you know - I was dealing with some 1099s...'"
Reflective Learning [RL]	"concerns students' self-examination of views on a topic, understanding the perspectives of others, and learning that changes the way they understand an issue" (Anderson et al., 2016, p. 7)	"forced them to think about what they would do if they were confronted with different issues" "it forced them to confront issues that otherwise they wouldn't have or that otherwise would not have come up organically in class."
Higher-Order Learning [HOL]	"concerns how much students say their coursework emphasizes analyzing experiences and theories, synthesizing concepts and experiences into more complex relationships, making judgments about the value of information, and applying learned concepts to practical problems" (Anderson et al., 2016, p. 6)	"a lot more discussion focused on their workplace behaviors as opposed to me having to create an example or create a scenario for them." "So teaching this course as compared to last semester, where I did not use any of the writing prompts, I found a lot deeper discussion" "So I mean again, a lot of it came out as 'well you know I was...I was thinking about this the other night, I was writing about this and it made me think of A, B, C, and D.'"

This is to say that Anderson et al. (2016) were seeking to understand ways in which writing could enhance learning without simply assigning more of it—which often results in students' writing with the goal of "render[ing] correct answers in simplistic prose" (p. 4)— – and whether that enhanced learned could also enable faculty in various disciplines "to gain the maximum benefit from the writing they incorporate in their courses" (p. 4). Table 6 above shows LSW tasks to have met these goals. For example, when Lee said that the low-stakes writing tasks led to "…a lot more student-generated teaching material because they come to class and say, 'You know I was doing that reflection, it reminded me of how—you know—I was dealing with some 1099s...'," he is asserting that these small

writing assignments successfully led students to a personalized understanding of the course material through writing, as opposed to "correct answers" that Anderson et al. (2016) cite.

Further, Lee seemed to have gained "maximum benefit from the writing" (Anderson et al., 2016, p. 4) he incorporated into his course, as seen through his comparison between two semesters: "So teaching this course as compared to last semester, where I did not use any of the writing prompts, I found a lot deeper discussion." This simultaneously shows LSW to have benefitted Lee to a notable extent, although the notion of "maximum benefit" remains unknown. This response also indicates that Lee's attitude toward assigning writing changed positively after having assigned low-stakes writing tasks, which contributes to writing studies' knowledge of how faculty understand the impact of LSW on their courses and how their attitudes about assigning writing change.

Continuing with Anderson et al. (2016), I created codes for the latent constructs code family, which is explained as variables that cannot be directly observed, but that are "defined operationally by measuring observable behaviors that are proxies for them" (p. 4-5). Three codes were also produced from the latent constructs code family: interactive writing processes, meaning-making writing tasks, and clear writing expectations. When coding for this family, I finalized my decision to assign single quotes with multiple codes. During initial rounds of coding, I was unsure if I would continue this because with too few repetitions, the quote might either not be relevant, or my coding method could have been inaccurate for this study. However, repetition became an expectation due to the flexibility in interpretation that qualitative coding promotes. Table 7 shows coded quotes from my interview with Lee in the latent constructs code family.

Anderson et al.'s (2016) scale for meaning making writing tasks was foundational in my process for keeping each low-stakes writing prompt high-impact. These types of writing tasks could include "asking students to apply a concept learned in class to their past experience, relate knowledge learned in another class to knowledge in the current class, support a contestable claim with evidence, or evaluate a policy, practice, or position" (p. 5). Learning course material through writing—either supplemental to rote memorization as a study method or not—showed a noticeable change in how Lee's students discussed and thought about their course content. After clarifying that Lee had weighted the low-stakes writing assignments at 10% of his students' overall grades, I asked him how they had initially responded to the introduction of LSW into their course, and Lee said:

> I think every single student, their initial responses were "well of course I think about it. I think about this all the time." But then having them sit down and do it, there's a difference between having it in your mind and thinking about it purposefully, and this gave them a structure to think about the content in a purposeful manner. And I you know, again, 99% of feedback I've received has been "hey this made me think of something at work, this was, I'm glad I did this."

This quote is unique in that it can appeal to multiple codes, code families, and portions of each of my driving research questions. In conjunction with Anderson et al.'s (2015, 2016) goals for writing-intensive HIPs, Lee's attention to writing purposefully and his implication that students were gaining from that practice highlights the impact that writing can have on student learning, even when students believe that they "think about this [content] all the time" already.

Table 7: Latent constructs family codes with definitions and quotes from interview with Lee

Code	Definition	Examples in Interview
Interactive Writing Processes [IWP]	"...occur when student writers communicate orally or in writing with one or more persons at some point between receiving an assignment and submitting the final draft. The person might be the instructor, another student in the class, a friend or family member, or any other individual or group, such as tutors in a writing center" (Anderson et al., 2016, p. 5).	"I had students comment on the fact that they'd taken care of [the reflections], that they'd enjoyed [writing them]" "But having these reflections, I ended up with a lot more student-generated teaching material because they come to class and say, 'you know I was doing that reflection, it reminded me of how - you know - I was dealing with some 1099s...'" "A lot of it came out as 'well you know I was... I was writing about this and it made me think of A, B, C, and D.'
Clear Writing Expectations [CWE]	"occur when instructors provide students with an accurate understanding of what they are asking the students to demonstrate in an assignment and the criteria by which the instructors will evaluate the students' submissions" (Anderson et al., 2016, p. 5).	"The textbooks are a little too broad to target their careers specifically, so having these types of reflection questions instead, that are focused, but a little bit flexible, I think is much more useful than homework we would give, anyway" "I think if they'd [the prompts] been much more complex… it probably would have ended up hurting discussion instead because I would have been pigeonholing them a little bit too much." "Having something like this where it's bite-sized, it's digestible, it's something that they can do, I think it was very useful in terms of how much they thought about the content outside the course."
Meaning-Making Writing Tasks [MMWT]	"...occur when students engage in some form of integrative, critical, or original thinking" --OR-- "Examples include asking students to apply a concept learned in class to their past experience, relate knowledge learned in another class to knowledge in the current class, support a contestable claim with evidence, or evaluate a policy, practice, or position" (Anderson et al., 2016, p. 5).	"this gave them a structure to think about the content in a purposeful manner." "I think every single student, their initial responses were 'well of course I think about it. I think about this all the time.' But then having them sit down and do it, there's a difference between having it in your mind and thinking about it purposefully… 99% of feedback I've received has been 'Hey this made me think of something at work, this was, I'm glad I did this.'"

The final code family is threshold concepts, which produced five correlating codes based on Meyer and Land's (2003) initial definition of threshold concepts, but also incorporates their (2005) more

recent article linking threshold concepts to troublesome knowledge. According to Meyer and Land (2003), threshold concepts represent "a transformed way of understanding, or interpreting, or viewing something without which the learner cannot progress", which can result in "a transformed internal view of subject matter, subject landscape, or even world view" (p. 1). Together, these two publications produced the following codes: transformative, irreversible, integrative, bounded, and troublesome, which are represented in Table 8.

Most directly offering insight into professors' changed views on assigning writing, this code family shows excitingly positive results. However, one code nearly was excluded: bounded. According to Meyer and Land (2003), a concept can be bounded when its "conceptual space [has] terminal frontiers, bordering with thresholds into new conceptual areas" (p. 5). I asked Lee "Do you feel like you would be comfortable writing your own writing prompts? Or would you feel like you would need, or at least want, a little bit of training or professional development first?" Understandably, Lee replied that he would "rather have some training in it first," which was the only direct statement that I could confidently assign to the bounded code. The future progressive tense Lee used implies that his threshold of comfort with assigning writing is "bordering with threshold in new conceptual areas." Essentially, Lee's comfort threshold about assigning writing grew over our time working together on this study, and as a result, he became curious about and potentially willing to expand the bounds of his pedagogical threshold for using low-stakes writing.

Table 8: Threshold concepts family codes with definitions and quotes from interview with Lee

Code	Definition	Examples in Interview
Transformative [TRNS]	"once understood, its potential effect on student learning and behaviour is to occasion a significant shift in the perception of a subject, or part thereof. In certain powerful instances...the shift in perspective may lead to a transformation of personal identity, a reconstruction of subjectivity. In such instances transformed perspective is likely to involve an affective component—a shift in values, feeling or attitude" (Meyer & Land, 2003, p. 4).	"I basically just turned it into part of my pre-class prep where I would just read everyone's reflection answers" "it felt good. Again, I was very apprehensive about it at first because it felt so basic. But I think that giving them a platform to think and giving them an opportunity to spend time on it really helped." "having something that they can do was very useful in terms of how much they thought about the content outside the course."
Irreversible [IRVS]	"Probably irreversible, in that the change of perspective occasioned by acquisition of a threshold concept is unlikely to be forgotten, or will be unlearned only by considerable effort" (Meyer & Land, 2003, p. 4).	"I can't imagine I wouldn't continue [assigning low-stakes writing]" "Teaching this course as compared to last semester, where I didn't use writing prompts, I found a lot deeper discussion" "students were coming up with examples and teachable moments, which makes my life infinitely easier and makes the class way more applicable. That was the best thing."

Integrative [INTG]	"...it exposes the previously hidden interrelatedness of something" (Meyer & Land, 2003, p. 4)	"these reflection questions are a perfect example for me to give to whoever the accrediting review team is" "I ended up with a lot of student-generated teaching material because they come to class and say, 'that reflection reminded me of how I was dealing with some 1099s...'"
Bounded [BDD]	"bounded in that any conceptual space will have terminal frontiers, bordering with thresholds into new conceptual areas" (Meyer & Land, 2003, p. 5)	"I'd rather have some training in it first"
Troublesome [TRBS]	"may lead to troublesome knowledge for a variety of reasons" (Meyer & Land, 2005, p. 374)	"a solid hour workshop where I can get templates that's easy for me to apply—I could definitely commit to." "it forced them to confront issues that otherwise wouldn't have come up organically in class."

Conclusion

The data presented in this article reiterate the importance of consistency for our students and demonstrate how impactful that same consistency can be for practitioners. Often overlooked in practice, a simplified and expected assignment design, especially for writing assignments, can be the first step in creating a more engaged classroom and lowering the pressures that students and professors place on themselves when talking about writing. More importantly, this study shows how low-stakes writing assignments, as low-pressure writing assignments, allow students to achieve the same high-impact comprehension that is typically only recognized in high-stakes assignments. LSW does not have to be integrated into curricula in ways that promote negative perceptions of writing as "busy work" by students, or "time-consuming extra labor" by professors. To engage those negative assumptions, even by passively ignoring them, perpetuates writing studies' roadblocks in establishing and growing strong WAC programs. The assumption that students in non-writing majors or in their upper-level courses won't buy in to the pedagogical reasons for assigning writing was tested here and, at least for two MBA courses, was proven distinctly untrue. Rather, as seen in Lee's interview responses, low-stakes writing functions in the ways it was designed to: it increased student engagement both in and outside of the classroom, encouraged knowledge transfer, buttressed established curricula, and was accessible for professors who are invested in their teaching.

Limitations of this study are primarily found in the student surveys. Most obviously, this data lacks stronger conviction because it was not comparable to a previous sample from the same or similar students within a reasonable timeframe and setting. Additionally, no two student samples from different sections of the same class could truly be compared, though a future longitudinal study might be able to account for this with master's students and/or upper-level undergraduate students. Another limitation associated with the surveys is the deliberate choice Lee and I made to only include the two total categories: the meaning-making writing tasks from Anderson et al.'s (2015; 2016) framework for deep approaches to learning and their (2016) higher-order learning questions from their latent constructs framework. While this study was also limited in its sample size, it is easily

reproducible. Such reproductions have the potential to both completely transform the current, limited uses of LSW, and to irreversibly change the mindsets of instructors who have had negative experiences with teaching and assigning writing. In fact, one unintentional discovery of this study was the finding that LSW can be used as a recruitment tool for WAC administrators and faculty. The accessible nature of LSW assignments can be thought of in terms of creation and integration.

It is known that consistency and simplicity in assignment design are frequently overlooked (Kiefer et al., 2000-2018), but faculty's positive response to redesigning assignment prompts for "brevity and clarity" (Blaauw-Hara, 2014, p. 361) were exceptionally instructive. The low-stakes writing prompts that I created for this study illustrate brevity and clarity, and when asked about feeling ready to design his own LSW prompts, Lee seemed open to the idea after minimal training. That response is encouraging to me because I see the growth and creation of LSW as presenting opportunities for faculty beyond the classroom, with benefits including meeting professional development requirements, building professional networks, and garnering future interdisciplinary collaborations, to name a few. Future research into LSW as a recruitment tool for expanding or creating WAC programs could emerge from a variety of methods used in composition and rhetoric. One example that I imagine successfully employing in the future would combine a version of grounded theory with ethnography, perhaps pairing a graduate student serving as a writing program liaison working with a director of a mathematics program to develop LSW prompts for a required, difficult undergraduate course like Calculus II. The graduate student would be able to keep field notes from meetings with the professor and maybe even conduct interviews with students in addition to the post-semester interview I conducted with Lee. Together, the graduate student and mathematics professor would collaborate to develop LSW questions that satisfy both disciplines' theoretical goals: pedagogical theories being tested or met by the math professor, and research goals and theories being tested by the graduate student.

Low-stakes writing assignments, then, become easily integrated into program and curriculum design. Through training workshops like Blaauw-Hara's (2014), or one-on-one collaboration like my partnership with Lee, faculty are getting excited about assigning writing, and are consequently more willing to integrate LSW into their courses. By extension, this willingness leads to faculty learning about and embracing LSW as a new technique to engage students in their coursework, increase student comprehension, and re-envision their own high-impact education practices. Considering the consistent growth and variations of WAC programs and writing-intensive requirements, the field would surely benefit from further research into the potential for LSW as a substitute for some high-stakes writing assignments.

Appendix A: Assignment Prompts for Dr. Lee's graduate MBA course, Spring 2018

Module 2: Diversity and Law

Chapter 3 - The Legal Environment: Equal Employment Opportunity and Safety

Task: Write a 1-page summary of the two Types of Discrimination (Disparate Treatment, Disparate Impact) as related to hiring practices with an emphasis on challenges faced by organizations and human resources personnel.

Purpose: To practice communicating clearly and effectively through writing, to acquire practical work-related knowledge and skills, to begin developing a personal code of values and ethics, and to better understand people of backgrounds that differ from your own.

Limitations: No more than one double-spaced page, and you may not quote the text directly.

Due Date and Time: March 29 at 10:00 pm on D2L Discussion Board.

Module 3: People and the Nature of Work

Chapter 4 - The Analysis and Design of Work

Task: Choose one of the techniques used to design a job to make it more motivational (e.g., increase skill variety, autonomy, job enlargement, self-management), and write a 1-page analysis of a problem that might result from that approach.

Purpose: To think critically and analytically, to consider complex problems, and to synthesize ideas, information, and/or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships.

Limitations: No more than one double-spaced page, you may not quote the text directly or use any of the real-world examples provided in the book.

Due Date and Time: April 5 at 10:00 pm on D2L Discussion Board

---

Module 5: Motivation and Performance

Chapter 9 - Employee Development

Task: Write a 1-page argument supporting one of the four Approaches to Employee Development (formal education, assessment, job experiences, and interpersonal relationships) as a best approach.

Purpose: To make judgements about the value of information, arguments, or methods, to argue a position using evidence and reasoning, and to gain a better understanding of your own values or beliefs.

Limitations: No more than one double-spaced page, and you may quote the text directly once (for use as evidence in your argument). You may also argue from personal experience.

Due Date and Time: April 12 at 10:00 pm on D2L Discussion Board

---

Module 7: Culture and Total Rewards

Chapter 12 - Recognizing Employee Contributions with Pay

Task: Write a 1-page articulation that describes how one of the three Pay Influence Theories about compensation's effects (Reinforcement Theory, Expectancy Theory, Agency Theory) would be applied to minimize turnover within an organization.

Purpose: To apply theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations, to construct and assess a hypothetical work-related situation, and to explain in writing the significance of qualitative and numerical data.

Limitations: No more than one double-spaced page, but you may quote the text directly only once.

Due Date and Time: April 26 at 10:00 pm on D2L Discussion Board

Appendix B: Post-Semester Student Survey Questions & Responses

The amendments made to the present survey from Anderson et al.'s (2015; 2016) Meaning-Making Writing Tasks scale were minor. Anderson et al. (2015) originally asked participants to identify "In how many of your writing assignments" students practiced the following six types of writing:

1. "Summarize something you read, such as articles, books, or online publications
2. Analyze or evaluate something you read, researched, or observed
3. Describe your methods or findings related to data you collected in lab or fieldwork, a survey project, etc.
4. Argue a position using evidence and reasoning
5. Explain in writing the meaning of numerical or statistical data
6. Write in the style and format of a specific field (engineering, history, psychology, etc.)" (p. 219).

I amended this part of their survey in two ways: first, instead of asking students to report the amount of assignments correlated to each item, I asked students the extent to which they believed they practiced the skills listed in each item, thus instituting the 5-point Likert scale design. This change was made because Lee and I agreed that a simplified survey would benefit both him and his students by 1) eliminating the potential need to use class time for students to complete the survey, and 2) further reduced the additional workload of student participants. Second, I only asked students to report on 4 of the 6 questions from the original list of scale items, removing the items about describing methods and writing in a specific style. This change was made because Lee and I agreed that those two items would be irrelevant for the participating students due to the course content. No deviations were made from Anderson et al.'s (2016) Higher-Order Learning Activities' questions.

Select survey questions from Anderson et al.'s (2016) Meaning-Making Writing Tasks

In your writing assignments, do you agree that you did the following? Please rate 1 – 5, with 1 being Strongly Disagree and 5 being Strongly Agree.					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Summarize something you read, such as articles, books, or online publications	1	2	3	4	5
Analyze or evaluate something you read, researched, or observed	1	2	3	4	5
Argue a position using evidence and reasoning	1	2	3	4	5
Explain in writing the meaning of numerical or statistical data	1	2	3	4	5

Survey questions from Anderson et al.'s (2016) Higher-Order Learning Activities

During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities? Please rate 1 – 5, with 1 being Never and 5 being Always.					
	Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Always
Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	1	2	3	4	5
Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	1	2	3	4	5
Making judgements about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	1	2	3	4	5
Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations	1	2	3	4	5

References

Anderson, Paul, Anson, Chris M., Gonyea, Robert M., & Paine, Charles. (2015). The Contributions of Writing to Learning and Development: Results from a Large-Scale Multi-institutional Study. *Research in the Teaching of English, 50*(2), 199–235. Retrieved from http://nsse.indiana.edu/pdf/presentations/2015/Contributions-of-writing-to-learning.pdf

Anderson, P., Anson, C. M., Gonyea, R. M., & Paine, C. (2016, December 26). How to create high-impact writing assignments that enhance learning and development and reinvigorate WAC/WID programs: What almost 72,000 undergraduates taught us. [Special issue on WAC and high-impact practices]. *Across the Disciplines*, *13*(4). Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/hip/andersonetal2016.cfm

Bean, John. (2011). *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Blaauw-Hara, Mark. (2014). Transfer theory, threshold concepts, and First-Year Composition: Connecting writing courses to the rest of the college, *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 41*(4), 354-365.

Bloch, Janel, & Spataro, Sandra E. (2014). Cultivating critical-thinking dispositions throughout the business curriculum. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly, 77*(3), 249–265. https://doi.org/10.1177/2329490614538094

Boquet, Elizabeth, & Lerner, Neal. (2016, December 26). Introduction to ATD special issue on WAC and high-impact practices. [Special issue on WAC and high-impact practices] *Across the Disciplines, 13*(4). Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/hip/intro.pdf

Britton, James. *The development of writing abilities (11-18)*. London: Macmillan Education, Ltd., 1975.

Brockman, E., Taylor, M., Kreth, M., & Crawford, M. K. (2011). What do professors really say about college writing? *English Journal*, *100*(3), 75–81. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/EJ/1003-jan2011/EJ1003What.pdf

Burdette, Rebecca, Galeucia, Annemarie, Liggett, Sarah, & Thompson, Melissa. (2016, December 26). The TEDxLSU student creative communications team: Integrating high-impact practices to increase engagement, facilitate deep learning, and advance communication skills. [Special issue on WAC and high-impact practices]. *Across the Disciplines, 13*(4). Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/hip/burdetteetal2016.pdf

Daly, Elizabeth, Taylor, Marcy, Kreth, Melinda, & Crawford, MaryAnn K. (2011). What Do Professors Really Say about College Writing? *English Journal, 100*(3), 75–81. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/EJ/1003-jan2011/EJ1003What.pdf

Daly, Kathleen. (2017, February 28). Not It! Resistance to Teaching Writing Across the Curriculum [Blog post]. *Another word: From the writing center at the University of Wisconsin–Madison.* Retrieved from https://writing.wisc.edu/blog/not-it-resistance-to-teaching-writing-across-the-curriculum/

Dyer, Suzette L., & Hurd, Fiona. (2016). "What's going on?" Developing reflexivity in the management classroom: From surface to deep learning and everything in between. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 15*(2), 287–303. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2014.0104

Elbow, Peter. (1997). High stakes and low stakes in assigning and responding to writing. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 69*, 5–13. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.6901

Elder, Cristyn L. & Champine, Karen. (2016, December 26). Designing high-impact "writing-to-learn" math assignments for killer courses. [Special issue on WAC and high-impact practices]. *Across the Disciplines, 13*(4). Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/hip/elder_champine2016.cfm

Eodice, Michele., Geller, Anne Ellen, & Lerner, Neal. (2017). *The meaningful writing project: Learning, teaching and writing in higher education*. University Press of Colorado/Utah State University Press.

Hendrickson, Brian. (2016, December 26). Studying and supporting writing in student organizations as a high-impact practice. [Special issue on WAC and high-impact practices]. *Across the Disciplines, 13*(4). Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/hip/hendrickson2016.cfm

Herrington, Anne J. & Stassen, Martha L. A. (2016, December 26). Intersections of writing, reflection, and integration. [Special issue on WAC and high-impact practices]. *Across the Disciplines, 13*(4). Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/hip/herrington_stassen2016.pdf

Kester, Jessica, Block, Rebecca, Reinfeld Karda, Margaret, & Orndorff III, Harold. (2016). Improving success, increasing access: Bringing HIPs to open enrollment institutions through WAC/WID. [Special issue on WAC and high-impact practices]. *Across the Disciplines, 13*(4). Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/hip/kesteretal2016.pdf.

Kiefer, Kate, Palmquist, Mike, Carbone, Nick, Cox, Michelle, & Melzer, Dan. (2000-2018). An Introduction to Writing Across the Curriculum. The WAC Clearinghouse. Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/resources/wac/intro

Kuh, George D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Retrieved from https://provost.tufts.edu/celt/files/High-Impact-Ed-Practices1.pdf

Marshall, Catherine, & Rossman, Gretchen B. (2014). *Designing qualitative research*. Sage publications.

McLeod, Susan, & Miraglia, Eric. (2001). "Writing across the curriculum in a time of change," in S. H. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, and C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing Writing Across the Curriculum programs*, pp. 1-27. National Council of Teachers of English.

National Leadership Council for Liberal Education & America's Promise. (2007). *College learning for the new global century*. Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/GlobalCentury_final.pdf

National Survey of Student Engagement. (2007). *Experiences that Matter: Enhancing Student Learning and Success, NSSE Annual Report 2007*. Retrieved from https://nsse.indiana.edu/research/annual-results/past-annual-results/nsse-annual-report-2007.html

Neely, Michelle E. (2017, October 9). Faculty beliefs in successful writing fellow partnerships: How do faculty understand teaching, learning, and writing? *Across the Disciplines, 14*(2). Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/articles/neely2017.cfm

Noe, Raymond, Hollenbeck, John, Gerhart, Barry, & Wright, Patrick. (2017). *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Pearce, Joan L., & Huang, Laura. (2012a). The decreasing value of our research to management education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11*(2), 247–262. https://doi.org/10.2307/23412326

Pearce, J. L., & Huang, L. (2012b). Toward an understanding of what actionable research is. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 11*(2), 300–301. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2012.0130

Perkins, David. N., & Salomon, Gavriel. (1988). Teaching for transfer. *Educational Leadership, 46*(1), 22–32.

Saldaña, Johnny. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Seidman, Irving. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education & the social sciences* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Thaiss, Chris, Moloney, Kara, & Chaozon-Bauer, Pearl. (2016, December 26). "Freeing students to do their best": Examining writing in first-year seminars. [Special issue on WAC and high-impact practices]. *Across the Disciplines, 13*(4). Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/hip/thaisseetal2016.pdf

Trafimow, David, Ruckel, Lindsay M., Stovall, Shelly, & Raut, Yogesh J. (2017). Predicting Faculty Intentions to Assign Writing in Their Classes. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 11*(2), Article 12. https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2017.110212

Voss, Julia. (2016, December 26). "Our door is always open": Aligning literacy learning practices. [Special issue on WAC and high-impact practices]. *Across the Disciplines, 13*(4). Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/hip/voss2016.pdf

Welsh, M. Ann, & Dehler, Gordon E. (2013). Combining critical reflection and design thinking to develop integrative learners. *Journal of Management Education, 37*(6), 771–802. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562912470107

Contact Information

Adele Leon
Ph.D. Candidate
Rhetoric, Composition, and the Teaching of English Program, Department of English
University of Arizona
Email: Adele@email.arizona.edu

Complete APA Citation

Leon, Adele. (2020, December 31). Low-stakes writing as a high-impact education practice in MBA classes. *Across the Disciplines, 17*(3/4), 46-68. https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2020.17.3.02