DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 458 611   CS 217 733

AUTHOR   Millard, Thomas L.
TITLE   Moving beyond the Rhetoric: Developing Writing Competency
                for Global Changes in Higher Education.
PUB DATE   1997-11-00
NOTE   22p.; Paper presented at the International Conference of the
                International Council for Innovation in Higher Education
                (15th, Kobe, Japan, November 2-6, 1997).
PUB TYPE   Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Critical Thinking; Educational Change; Global Approach;
                *Higher Education; *Student Motivation; *Thinking Skills;
                *Writing Assignments; *Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS   Writing Contexts

ABSTRACT
                This paper is a "how-to" paper for promoting writing and
critical thinking skills. Intended to be practical in providing timely and
helpful strategies for fostering analytical thinking and effective writing
among college students, the paper is offered as a useful resource for
classroom instructors seeking fresh new ideas and approaches for motivating
and promoting excellence in student performance. While the paper may give the
appearance of a response to current criticisms of higher education for its
(alleged) failure to produce graduates who can write coherent sentences or
who are seemingly ill-equipped for the workplace, it had its beginnings in
the 1970s and thus predates current concerns. Since traditionally assigned
topics or themes for writing assignments were insufficient to engage student
interest in creative thinking and writing, a different approach for writing
assignments was prescribed--students were to write essays and not
research-focused papers. Embedded in this approach were the following broad
objectives and goals: (1) enhancing students' awareness of writing; (2)
encouraging them to write "term papers" for refereed professional journals;
and (3) making such efforts a single educative experience they could
appreciate as enjoyable and/or rewarding. A number of factors contributed to
the success of the program over the years, and one that stands out is that
students find credibility in a writer's efforts when they know that he or she
has been published. (Contains 11 references.) (NKA)

ED 458 611

MOVING BEYOND THE RHETORIC:
DEVELOPING WRITING COMPETENCY
FOR GLOBAL CHANGES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Thomas L. Millard, M.A., M.S., Ed.D.
Graduate Professor of Education and Social Work
Montclair State University
Upper Montclair, New Jersey   07043

1

Presented at the 15th International Conference of the International Council
for Innovation in Higher Education (ICIE), in cooperation with Seiwa College,
November 2-6, 1997, in Kobe, Japan.

17 733

2

MOVING BEYOND THE RHETORIC:
DEVELOPING WRITING COMPETENCY
FOR GLOBAL CHANGES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Thomas L. Millard
Graduate Professor of Education and Social Work

This is a "how to" paper for promoting writing and critical thinking skills. It is intended to be a practical paper--one that provides timely and helpful strategies for fostering analytical thinking and effective writing among college students.

The paper is offered as a useful resource for classroom instructors seeking fresh new ideas and approaches for motivating and promoting excellence in student performance.

While this paper may give the appearance of a response to current criticisms of higher education for its [alleged] failure to produce graduates who can write coherent sentences or who are seemingly ill-equipped for the work place where the ability to think creatively and communicate same are critical job necessities, our effort predates current concerns, having its beginning in the mid-1970s.

The Heritage and the Vision

In the first quarter of this century, John Dewey described learning as a form of doing (Dewey, 1916 and 1938). Dewey's point was that learning is not a matter of passive regurgitation of memorized facts, but rather involves what he terms "reflective thinking," an intellectual process which begins with a puzzling thought and is resolved [inductively] through the construction of a hypothesis and the drawing of a conclusion.

In Dewey's conception of education, the learner is a problem solver (reflective thinker) where the emphasis is on the process itself and not on the solution or conclusion.

Among the many critics of that period, Alfred North Whitehead perhaps captured the essence of the argument for educational reform in his belief that education becomes meaningful when students are able to make sense of ideas for themselves so that their learning transforms every aspect of their daily life (Whitehead, 1913).

And in the context of today's world, Kovach (1988, p. 37) gives a similar view when she states ". . . the desired outcome of education is an [encompassing] understanding which goes beyond knowledge." To be sure, the social function of higher education is to provide growth-promoting opportunities; opportunities that promote global and social awareness out of which emerges the truly educated person, one who is comfortable in his/her existence, who understands (at least to a functional degree) the physical world, the social environment and the moral forces that give form, depth and meaning to our sense of wholeness and self-hood.

Ideally, what should emerge out of opportunistic conditions is the well-rounded individual capable of evaluating the circumstances of time and place, in which thematic tensions are expressed, even to the extent of challenging how disparate conditions can be improved for the commonweal.

As best we can tell, we are witnessing a new appreciation within the higher education community of the significance and necessity of paradigmatic shifts in methods of instructions and philosophy that promises a broader psychological, sociological and educational experience for the individual.

Challenges and Opportunity

Arguably, when unpleasant numbers of graduates fail to acquire the skills necessary for success in modern American society, the plaint of educational effectiveness cannot be ignored.

While there may be some questions about where to fix the blame, is it always the student? Can it be everyone's at fault and no one is to blame?

More to the point, it may be that [in these rapidly changing times] those who wish to teach more effectively will need to take cognizance of which end of the instructor-centered, student-centered continuum requires some reparative work. But fixing blame is not so important as meeting the challenge in stretching students' capabilities; to move them beyond the edge of current performance levels for those unrealized potentials in creativity and new learning.

For in the final analysis, the professoriat is responsible for the educational performance of students. And that performance, in turn, is dependent on the imbuing conditions for maximizing students' emotional drives (e.g., inquisitiveness, self-confidence and self-direction, motivation and creativity) for the learning experience and the commitment we make in fostering optimum awareness of [unrealized] potentials.

To be sure, any efforts at moving "away from the traditional view of a college education as primarily an intellectual coming-of-age towards one that recognizes higher education as a continuing engagement with new knowledge and understanding throughout one's life" would add, as Whitehead (1913) suggests, "greatness to character" to the student, the institution and society.

And, in so doing, institutions of higher education will improve their image as "shakers and molders" of young people broadly educated and capable of functioning in an increasingly interdependent world.

Perhaps the most specific and comprehensive expression of what is expected [of higher education] has been articulated by John Gardner (1961). He frames the issue this way:

"Our kind of society demands the maximum development of individual potentialities at every level of ability . . . an approach to excellence and a conception of excellence that will bring a whole society to the peak of performance" (pp. 74, 132-133).

Teaching and Student Involvement

Any thoughtful educator is concerned with nurturing students' physical and mental investment in learning.

In this connection, Alexander Astin, in his text Achieving Educational Excellence (1987), offers some timely advice when he states "the amount of student learning and personal involvement associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement . . . ." and "the effectiveness of any educational policy or practice is directly related to the capacity of that policy or practice to increase student involvement" (p. 136).

While institutional attributes influence teaching outcomes (Weimer, 1990) because they help determine the resources available for teaching, we can, perhaps, gain a better [conceptual] understanding of student involvement and participation from the three general stages of learning as framed by Whitehead. The first stage he suggests is characterized by pleasurable activity which provides the motivation to engage in the process of discovery; the second is discipline and the acquisition of essential skills; and the third is, again, characterized by elation, the elation that flows from the use of these skills in enlarging one's understanding (Kovach, 1988).

As can be seen, what Dewey, Whitehead, Astin and other critics of higher education have been advocating in one form or the other is simply this: students learn best when what they are to learn is intrinsically interesting to them and are accorded respect in the learning process.

All this is to say that students are internally motivated to learn, which is an extension of the natural drive toward self-actualization.

Precisely in this context, it should be noted, learning is viewed, comprehensively, as the understanding and integration of [new] insights which shapes and forms one's own uniqueness and self-hood; and secondly, learning experiences have both cognitive and affective outcomes, the quality depending on those measures promoting students' active involvement (i.e., attitudes) and student perception of the ideas to be learned are important and, therefore, relevant.

The long-term benefits sought in this instance are performance-driven behavior extending beyond the period of formal instructions.

Rationale and Assumptions: Background and Development

With the above as background, the balance of this paper will report on the writer's effort in actualizing students' unrealized potentials in critical thinking and writing.

As stated earlier, the project began in the mid-1970s out of concern for the quality of student term papers, which we deemed less than satisfactory.

Like Cuddy (1985, p. 40), we found too many student papers ". . . disorganized and without a clear focus (or thesis); the writing style grammatically defective" and with "vague, incoherent sentences for what passed as paragraphs; and . . . no sense of evidence to support the statements being made."

After much thought, we concluded students perceived little purpose (educational outcomes) and no inner satisfaction (i.e., great joy or pride; keen pleasure) from term paper assignments, nor do they comprehend [the importance of] writing per se, as embodiments of the educated mind.

Consequently, we took the position that a sense of commitment to what one is writing, the pleasurable activity from which flows the motivation to engage in writing, the feeling of personal competence and mastery, coupled with the paean arising therefrom are unlikely to be experienced by students who perceive writing [term papers] as mundane, pedestrian and uninspiring.

Given this scenario, we concluded traditionally assigned topics or themes for writing assignments were insufficient to engage student interest in creative thinking and writing.

In this connection, Svinicki's comments were supportive. She notes ". . . we often have blind spots about the inherent interest value of our material." She further stated ". . . each time we choose a particular teaching method we are making assumptions about the students' learning styles and skills. Sometimes these assumptions are conscious assumptions and the decisions based on them are deliberate choices; more often, the assumptions are unconscious ones and the decisions are made more by default than by design" (1985, p. 135).

Not content with academic traditions as they relate to teacher-centered decision-making in assignment of topics or themes for term papers, we took the prescriptive view that this [institutional] practice was neither sacrosanct or invulnerable to criticism, ergo, we elected to experiment with a novel and different approach for writing assignments.

Embedded in our approach were the following broad objectives and goals: 1) to enhance students' awareness of writing (and in the process, higher-order thinking) as important lifelong skills by, 2) encouraging them to write "term papers" for refereed professional journals, thereby, 3) making such efforts a single educative experience they could appreciate as enjoyable and/or rewarding.

In essence, we sought to improve the quality of the interrelatedness of writing and thinking by the infusion of new learning opportunities promoting self-directed, independent forms of learning, having outcomes in academic performances clearly linked to students' [unrealized] potentials in writing and critical thinking.

These considerations were "mutatis mutandis" with respect to the vision and realization of one's "gifts" and the meaningful structuration of one's self with the issues, needs and concerns of a changing society.

The rationale, we fashioned, has its roots in the socially sanctioned purpose of higher education, which is to prepare individuals for adulthood and the responsibilities that flow therefrom.

Five core assumptions formed the foundation from which we sought to raise students' academic performances commensurate with their potentials.

Our aim was to raise students' levels of intellectual functioning. These profluent efforts may be viewed as curative and rehabilitative. Its curative aspects were to eliminate factors contributing to underperformance and its rehabilitative aspects to reorganize and rebuild learning patterns; in short, performance attitudes.

Overall, these five assumptions contributed to a sound operational approach for empowering, motivating and nurturing the innate talent and resources of students for skill development in writing and thinking.

These assumptions are as follows:

1. Students can and [will] improve their writing and thinking skills if the assignment is of sufficient interest to capture their attention.
2. Students are more likely to develop their thinking and writing skills if the outcome and challenge is a novel idea.

3. Motivation to learn is intrinsic. The teacher merely needs to create an environment that allows learning to occur.

4. The instructor must believe in his or her students if they are to believe in themselves.

5. Most students will not take risks unless they are "pushed" to do so. Therefore, this is an important aspect of the teacher's role.

Revitalizing the Quest for Learning

Our goals were simple and straightforward: promoting student understanding and appreciation of writing and critical thinking as the sole desideratum by setting high expectations for written class assignments. And these expectations centered on student writing for publication within the framework of course requirements and/or life experience.

Moving from specific to generic requirements, we believed, would open up opportunities for student imagination, creativity and investment of intellectual resources. As we later discovered, and continue to experience, this approach enabled students to experience independent learning opportunities as opposed to the superficiality and generalities that are so characteristic of traditional term papers. In addition, students experienced the effort as a valued part of their learning and shared their ideas, experiences and insights with their instructor and classmates.

The major distinctiveness or break from traditional term papers lies in the fact that students had choices in writing beyond course requirements. This strategy was singularly important to our success, for as stated earlier, students often saw little purpose or value in [teacher-determined] term paper assignments. This approach, then, was an implicit devaluing of traditional writing assignments as commonly practiced in academe.

Perhaps the most important factor giving new meaning to choice-making is what Rogers (1989) describes as psychological freedom and psychological safety. In the former, individuals must feel free to identify and explore new ideas to perceive things in a different way. Merely telling students they have a choice [in writing assignments] is not enough. This must be communicated in teachers' behavior and attitude, which is receptive to, and supportive of, different and unusual ideas for self-directed study.

Psychological safety is seen as a motivating factor for creative expression. If students are to feel free to express ideas and feelings, there must be an environment in which mutual trust and respect is present. Only in this kind of milieu can students feel comfortable in risk-taking or in expressing creative ideas.

By setting high expectations in writing, these were not [in our judgment] unrealistic expectations, but expectations slightly above the student's current level of excogitating or functioning. We were convinced most students have no idea that deficiencies in critical thinking and writing puts them at risk, both intellectually and occupationally.

In order to accomplish our goals, we needed a rationale enabling students to recognize the value of writing and to perceive it as a core skill in their total educational development. This level of perception, we believed, would trigger similar behavior across the curriculum.

We found a bridging thought in academic preparation and career goals. We rationalized that appreciation of and motivation for developing writing skills could be achieved if we linked such efforts to the idea that: 1) contributing to the extant literature from which one has received his/her academic training is a professional obligation and responsibility, and 2) since every academically-trained individual should, at some point in his/her working life,

11

have something important to report on some aspect of their professional/ occupational experience, cultivation of this attitude and the development of writing skills should be among the priorities in teaching.

Whatever field of practice students are in training for--commerce or industry, science or the arts, philosophy or education, government and statesmenship--challenging them to higher levels of scholarship is, perhaps, the most lasting legacy we can give to our students.

Such a legacy is the only or, at least, the best way to pass on scholarly traditions for insuring not just continuing professional development, but the very future of the discipline as one prepares for the 21st century.

For, indeed, no discipline, be it medicine, law, social work or education, can hope to retain its perdurability in stature, prestige and credibility in the absence of insightful and timely ideas reflecting the changing realities of work and societal needs.

Indeed, critical thinking and discursive writing are all that stands between a mere user of "off-the-shelf knowledge" and those skeptics who would question that knowledge in the marketplace of ideas. When ideas create arguments, they thrive, grow and stimulate other creative ideas. Creating ideas for solutions to increasingly complex political, economic and social issues is probably one of the most important outcomes society has a right to expect from its graduates of higher education.

We Teach to Influence

As a forerunner of things to come, information technology is redefining both the nature and requirement of work. And as we move into the third millennium of our history, the social and technological challenges facing us will be tied to the resourcefulness of higher education in equipping

individuals with the analytical, problem-solving and conceptual tools for the
new millennium.

To sum up, we teach in order to influence both the immediate and future
capabilities of students. Our function, then, is to fire up students'
inquisitiveness and curiosity in all aspects of their learning. Central to
this is critical thinking and writing, two interwoven processes requiring
different yet interrelated and interdependent tasks of a wholistic nature.

If students are deficient in writing and thinking skills, their cognitive
and affective resources will be insufficient as incubators of intellectual
ideas. Moreover, these deficiencies will discourage transition from a passive
learner to an active seeker of new knowledge, thereby blocking in the future
discharge of indebtness and obligations to one's discipline.

It has been said we use but a small percentage of our potential, less
than 25%. And as William James once observed, human beings live too far
within self-imposed limits.

Our project was designed to help students discover and use that untapped
75% so that they can experience their full potential.

Search of the Extant Literature

The program was successful, in part, because writing papers for publica-
tion was an option. We frankly acknowledged, with no disrespect to the class,
the realization that probably most of them lacked the requisite skills for
publication. We insisted, however, they were capable of writing good, short
and simple declarative sentences expressing an idea. And it was this
potential that was to be exploited with creative and imaginative thinking.
Originality was stressed so that focus would be on the individual's capacity
to think through ideas and conceptualize them in a meaningful frame of

reference. In orienting the students to the assignment, they were cautioned, serious writing is always preceded by a search of the extant literature to discover if what one has to say is truly a contribution to the literature. Since the object of written work is to inform, we stress students should know what others before them have said about the same subject. To ignore past contributions, we admonished, is to impair the scholarship of their efforts. Lesson-wise, the students were told when a person says, "I know what I mean, but I can't express it," the individual most likely does not know what he/she means. The individual still has some thinking to do. As the individual begins to pull his/her thoughts together, especially by learning to write in short, simple declarative sentences, the person will clarify his/her own ideas, and for some individuals, this was an excellent method for separating out sense from nonsense for organizing one's thinking.

We made clear, in the initial class meeting, our strong belief that the acquisition of attitudes and understanding of the importance of writing proficiency cannot be left to chance. As Browne and Keeley (1986) observed, critical thinking is more than just a list of skills and dispositions; it is a process that must be practiced. We further stated that in their future employment, written work will be judged primarily on its contents, that is, on the value or quality of the information and ideas it expresses; that careful organization and clear, concise expression of ideas are essential if the intended reader is to grasp full meaning. Thus, the mental processes on which written expressions of ideas depend were reviewed. These included: 1) Generalization: pulling together the common elements that relate specific examples, ideas or instances to one another; 2) Inferences: extracting the meanings that are implied but not stated explicitly; reading between the lines; 3) Analysis: examining parts of the whole, such as causes, effects and

processes; 4) Synthesis: developing ideas into new relationships or contexts; creating, organizing the parts as in a puzzle; 5) Evaluation: making judgments according to a criterion; is it concise, readable, organized? Our message to students emphasized that to be successful in today's world, they will need to develop, if only from an occupational-centered perspective, the rigors of critical thinking and writing. This means: 1) developing the capacity to apply to new context the knowledge gained from classroom learning, readings, life experiences and library research; 2) developing the ability to draw conclusions, as opposed to simply restating or summarizing the works of others; 3) being able to state a thesis clearly and support same with reasoning and evidence; 4) being able to organize the parts of a paper in an orderly sequence, governed by a controlling purpose that is clear to the writer, with paragraphs and subsections containing their own internal organization; and 5) being able to adapt what one writes to the needs and expectations of the intended audience, whether it is one's peers, other scholars in one's discipline or the general public.

Disarming Resistance

At the outset, we recognized students would approach this task in a variety of ways, for example: 1) those students who have the ability to write competently but who might need encouragement to write for publication; 2) those students who lack the intrinsic drive and self-confidence and might, therefore, require some pedagogical assistance, reassurance and ego support; and 3) those students, who for a variety of reasons, would opt for the traditional term paper requirement. We were convinced, ergo, that students would need to be inspired, challenged or nudged into writing a well-reasoned argument with all the confidence that makes it possible. As an aside, we were

convinced that published papers as learning outcomes can be significant indices of student learning. This was an explicit goal.

With respect to students' probable reaction, we anticipated initial resistance, if not outright dismissal, of the challenge to compose articles for professional journals. Our strategy for minimizing or disarming their arguments took the following approach, which proved to be effective.

1. Students were initially oriented on their soon-to-be professional status with all the "rights, privileges and immunities thereunto appertaining," including their future obligation in contributing to the literature of their respective discipline. It was made clear that this is a responsibility all members of a profession assume: that only as the existing body of knowledge undergoes constant review and revision, as new ideas and experience emerge from practice, can the discipline maintain its usefulness, relevancy and credibility.

2. The advantages and benefits of serious writing were discussed in great detail. We noted, for example, the immense pride in seeing one's paper published in important refereed journals alongside those of well-known scholars; the prestige and status accruing therefrom; its value factor in enhancing one's resume; the demonstration of one's ability to pursue doctoral studies. (Several of my writer-students have gone on to earn doctorates.) Lastly, we stressed the equally important role of writing as a significant measure of professional leadership. Publication of one's views, we observed, demonstrates ability to articulate issues, which is an important index of persuasive leadership.

3. For the timid, unsure student, instructional enhancement efforts involved encouraging them to "test the waters" by writing an "op-ed" piece, a short newspaper article or letter to the editor of their local newspaper or to a

news journal (e.g., <u>Time</u>, <u>Newsweek</u>, <u>U.S. News and World Report</u>) in
response to a news article. This approach had a two-fold purpose: 1) as
a result of this "article," the student would feel more self-confidence
and more comfortable with the ensuing demands of a larger, more complex
paper and better able to cope with the rigors of serious writing; and
2) the student would be encouraged to use the published statement as the
basis for a more developed paper with the usual references, footnotes and
bibliography. It should be noted, several students have found this
prescription helpful as a starter, perhaps because it enabled them to
sharpen their understanding of short, concise articles that communicate
ideas. As a tool, it was most effective.

4. Since lectures are the predominant method of instruction, and it is widely
recognized that the educational yield [from lectures] is generally low, we
sought to increase the yield by granting students a wide latitude in topic
selection, including topics indirectly related to course content. Factors
such as student's age, maturity, years of experience, discipline (my
students represent a variety of field, e.g., teaching, health professions,
business and social welfare) and topic interest had to be considered,
giving the heterogeneous makeup of the class and the [unusual] require-
ments imposed on them. In general, we sought to strike a dynamically
important note of inquisitiveness by calling to students' attention
(especially those with years of professional experience) the yet unsolved
problems and issues in their field and encouraged them to re-examine the
fundamental tenets of their discipline.

In this connection, the clinical value of this approach was that it made
more palpable, our assertion that as professionals already toiling in the
"vineyards," there is much they can harvest in conceptual and theoretical

issues culled from "hands-on" experiences. This strategy also helped to
facilitate the breakdown of powerful anxieties and/or frozen attitudes. More
importantly, it helped to persuade those students wavering in their choice
between a term paper or a more substantial paper for publication. As a
further inducement and source of support, we established a working relation-
ship with the university workshop, a remedial program sponsored by the English
Department for assisting students with writing problems.

Essay-Type Articles Stressed

The students were instructed to write essays and not research-focused
papers, demands we considered too time-consuming and perhaps outside the
individuals' level of experience. They were advised to examine the university
library's holding of journals and periodicals and select a journal they felt
comfortable with for submission of their manuscript. They were further
instructed to comply with the journal's editorial requirement and not to
follow the traditional term paper organization and style. We discussed
protocol for submitting manuscripts and the writer using his experience as a
consulting editor to a journal, the juried/review process was explained as was
the appropriate information for the cover letter. They were also forewarned
of possible rejection and the psychological let-down ensuing therefrom. We
spoke at great length assuring the class that the best of authors have
experienced editorial rejection and the writer candidly shared with them, his
experiences at failure. At the same time, we reminded the students that a
rejection was not, per se, a failure, but a lesson in writing, since it is a
common practice for the editor to offer some comments or reasons for the
rejection. In some instances, we reminded the class that rewriting the paper
with the editor's comments or suggestions in mind and resubmitting can often
result in acceptance.

Finally, the class was assured their paper would be graded on the same basis as a term paper. This statement was important lest those students opting for the traditional term paper perceive themselves in a disadvantaged position at grade time.

As an aside, whenever a student sought independent study, we found this an excellent opportunity to tout serious writing. While the student is allowed to fashion his/her own course of study, invariably, we would convince the student that a paper of publishable quality should be an outcome of independent study.

Conclusion and Summary

The effort to raise graduate students' writing to the level of competency was, in large part, attributable to student motivation to learn. We simply created an environment that allowed self-directed learning from conception to actualization. Students were given the primary responsibility for setting learning goals and selecting their learning experiences.

The resulting choice of the students has clearly the character of professionalism as the evidential material suggests. Student papers have been published in such diverse journals as Adult Leadership, NAD Broadcaster, Journal of International Association of Pupil Personnel Workers, Today's Education, The Clearing House, Counseling and Values, The Guidance Clinic, EAP Digest, Cimmaron Review, The Independent School Bulletin, Adult Education, Teacher Paper, N.J. School Board Notes, School Leader, NJEA Review, Journal of Business, Journal of Health Education, Tempo (Journal of the New Jersey Music Educators Association), St. Joseph Messenger and Advocate, Children Today, Senior Citizens World and Journal of Lifelong Learning. We should note that student papers have appeared more than once in several of these journals.

It should be apparent from the above, the correctness of the decision to permit a wide latitude in subject choice. Student evaluations at semester's end indicated a worthwhile educational experience. One unanticipated, but welcomed outcome, was students' new found respect for published articles. Not only had these students learned to write proficiently and, in the process, raise their self-confidence, they also learned that to write is learning to think. And, perhaps, the most striking instance of success was the affirmation of students to continue writing [for publication] in other classes in lieu of traditional term papers. This was true even for those students whose papers were not accepted for publication. This unique teaching approach has the potential for a new model in student learning outcomes. As the results demonstrate, student publications, as a measure of cognitive learning experiences, are an attractive alternative to the traditional teacher-assigned term paper. One further thought needs to be shared. Obviously, a number of factors contributed to the success of the program. One that stands out is the following: students find credibility in the writer's efforts when they know that he has published. As a strategy, I would distribute copies of my articles, as well as those published by former students. Each year, I would try to publish one or two articles so that my efforts would represent for students, a model, a standard of sorts, for much needed encouragement and support. Thus, the students recognize I would not demand from them what I am not prepared to demand of myself. I am certain this has been an important factor in my success to date.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Epilogue: Some Unanticipated Outcomes

There were a number of unanticipated consequences (or better yet, surprises) that far exceeded our expectations.

Those meriting reporting include the following: one student paper was accepted for presentation at a national conference for educators, while another student paper was a two-part article for a local newspaper and one other student paper accepted for publication was rewritten as a proposal for presentation to her school district, which favorably received her recommendations on curriculum change.

Another student, employed in a large business establishment, received an immediate promotion in personnel as a [direct] result of her paper examining personnel practices in the business/corporate environment.

At least three students that we are aware of went on to earn doctoral degrees as a result of the self-confidence and encouragement gained from this experiment. Currently, one teaches at a major private urban university.

Lastly, we must note, one of our colleagues (Dr. Eileen Smith-Sweet) has utilized our instructional scheme and reports some success in publishable work by her graduate students.

All of the above, we believe, buttress our contention that to "reach for the impossible" in students, we'll need to find genuinely meaningful and useful ways to challenge and inspire them so that they will risk transformation in a way never conceived as possible.

In closing, the question may be asked, "Would the student's talent have reached fruition without this novel educatory approach?" We would respond, perhaps . . . and perhaps not.

But, in any event, we chose not to leave this to chance. We sought fresh and original ideas with the ambition that students would somehow be influenced in performance behavior with respect to unrealized potentials.

REFERENCES

Astin, Alexander W. (1987). Achieving Educational Excellence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, p. 136.

Browne, M. Neil and Keeley, S. M. (1986). Asking the Right Questions: A Guide to Critical Thinking (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Cuddy, Lois. (April 1985). "One Sentence is Worth a Thousand: A Strategy for Improving Reading, Writing and Thinking Skills. The Rhode Island Reading Review, p. 40.

Dewey, John. (1938). Experience and Educator. New York: MacMillan.

Dewey, John. (1916). Democracy and Education. New York: MacMillan.

Gardner, John W. (1961). Excellence. New York: Harper and Row.

Kovach, Barbara E. (May 23-25, 1988). "The Leadership Program: Creating a Learning Environment." Proceedings of the National Conference on the Adult Learner, Vol. II, Columbia, South Carolina.

Rogers, Carl. (1989). "Toward a Theory of Creativity." In H. H. Anderson (ed.) Creativity and It's Cultivation. New York: Harper and Row.

Svinicki, Marilla, D. (October 1985). "It Ain't Necessarily So: Uncovering Some Assumptions About Learners and Lectures." To Improve the Academy, p. 135.

Weimer, Maryellen. (1990). Improving College Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Whitehead, Alfred N. (1913). The Aims of Education and Other Essays. New York: Free Press.

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

CS 217 733

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title:
Moving Beyond the Rhetoric: Developing Writing Competency for global change in Higher Education

Author(s): Thomas L. Millard

Corporate Source:	Publication Date:
Montclair State University	Nov 6, 1997

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ [X]	Level 2A ↑ [ ]	Level 2B ↑ [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please

Signature: Dr. Thomas L. Millard	Printed Name/Position/Title: THOMAS L MILLARD, PROFESSOR	
Organization/Address: Montclair State University	Telephone: 973-895-3342	FAX:
	E-Mail Address: CHAPIN T @ EXCITE, COM	Date: 10/25/01

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)

ERIC