All Theses and Dissertations

2017-03-01

Faculty and EAL Student Perceptions of Writing Purposes and Challenges in the Business Major

Amy Mae Johnson
Brigham Young University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd

 Part of the Linguistics Commons

www.manaraa.com

Faculty and EAL Student Perceptions of

Writing Purposes and Challenges

in the Business Major

Amy Mae Johnson

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Norman W. Evans, Chair
Grant T. Eckstein
K. James Hartshorn

Department of Linguistics and English Language

Brigham Young University

ABSTRACT

Faculty and EAL Student Perceptions of
Writing Purposes and Challenges
in the Business Major

Amy Mae Johnson
Department of Linguistics and English Language, BYU
Master of Arts

Over the last 50 years, research has explored the writing assignment types and purposes found in undergraduate courses, including discipline-specific writing for the business major, which is one of the most popular fields of study for international students in the U.S. Many studies have explored faculty perceptions of writing challenges students exhibit when writing for business; however, few studies have compared both faculty and student perceptions of student writing challenges. The purpose of this study was to investigate business faculty perceptions of the writing challenges exhibited by students for whom English is a second or additional language (EAL) compared to EAL perceptions of their own writing challenges. This study utilized parallel surveys distributed to faculty and students in Accounting, Finance, and Management in one undergraduate business school. Students self-selected as being a native English speaker (NES), an EAL, or having more than one primary language (multilingual or ML). Results of the study indicated statistically significant differences across faculty, EAL, and ML perceptions of developing arguments as an important purpose of business writing. No statistically significant differences were found, however, across all three populations in regards to perceptions of the student challenges of business writing.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee for their ineffable support in the process and completion of this thesis: Dr. Norman Evans for inviting me to be part of the research group that led to the formation of this study and for patiently and sincerely mentoring me throughout the MA TESOL program; Dr. Grant Eckstein for sharing his irreplaceable experience in teaching business writing; and Dr. James Hartshorn for performing statistical magic for the success of my research. My gratitude also extends to the individuals who piloted the student survey and gave me invaluable feedback, the Marriott School who graciously allowed me to survey its faculty and students, and the participants of this research without whom none of this would have been possible. Special thanks goes to my parents, Michael and Sandra Snyder, who taught me the importance of education; my late mother-in-law who ecstatically supported my pursuit of a master's degree at BYU; and my cohort who laughed and cried with me and pushed me to be better. Finally, my sincerest gratitude goes to my husband, Clint Johnson, for believing in me before I believed in myself.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

PREFACE

This thesis was prepared in accordance with MA TESOL program guidelines as a manuscript to be submitted to the *Journal of Second Language Writing* (*JSLW*). This journal was selected because, as its name indicates, it publishes research exclusively based on second language writing unlike other journals in language teaching and learning which typically publish research from several skill areas. The audience of *JSLW* may find this thesis manuscript informative of current concerns within second language writing and may inform future research into similar topics of interest. Manuscripts submitted to *JSLW* must be prepared according to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, Sixth Edition* and contain between 7,500 and 10,000 words including references, tables, and figures. This thesis manuscript was prepared in accordance with these requirements and contains 7,784 words.

Other target journals to which this thesis manuscript may be submitted include *English for Specific Purposes* (*ESP*) and *TESOL Quarterly*. While neither journal is exclusively dedicated to second language writing research and audiences for these journals are not entirely comprised of those interested in writing pedagogy, these journals include readers who may be interested in current topics surrounding English for Academic Purposes writing and discipline-specific writing. The length requirements vary between these two alternative journals; articles submitted to *ESP* must contain between 6,000 and 10,000 words, whereas articles submitted to *TESOL Quarterly* must have fewer than 8,500 words.

1. Introduction

Faculty perceptions of undergraduate student writing has been a topic of interest for over 50 years. Many studies have identified the types of writing tasks students must complete and the purposes of such tasks for writing across university courses (see Bridgeman & Carlson, 1984; Hale, Taylor, Bridgeman, Carson, Kroll, & Kantor, 1996; Horowitz, 1986; Kroll, 1979; Melzer, 2009). More recently, however, interest in writing within the disciplines has increased and spread to second language writing studies. Given the influx of international students majoring in business, business writing is a discipline of particular interest for TESOL scholars. The Institute of International Education (2016) has reported that more international students are studying in U.S. colleges and universities than ever before, with the greater part of these international students coming from countries that have official languages other than English, making most of the international students persons for whom English is a second or additional language (EAL). By and large international and immigrant students gravitate toward a limited number of majors determined largely by the cultural values, immediate needs for income, and English proficiency of students (see Johns, 2001). Historically, the majority of international students have studied business and management, and only in the last school year of 2015 to 2016 has engineering surpassed it as the most popular field of study. It is likely that business and management will continue to be one of the top choices of majors for international students as English remains the *lingua franca* of international business (Nickerson 2005).

Business faculty and researchers agree that effective communication is a critical skill for undergraduate students to develop (see Bacha & Bahous, 2008; Hyland, 2013; Nelson, Moncada, & Smith, 1996; Nickerson, 2005; Vásquez, 2013; Zhu, 2004a), yet recent studies have

determined that faculty perceive undergraduate student writing as being the weakest language skill, particularly the writing of EALs (see Bacha & Bahous, 2008; Hartshorn & Evans, 2014; Hartshorn, Evans, Egbert, & Johnson, 2015; Jackson, 2005; Johns, 1981). In an effort to help English for Academic Purposes (EAP) programs better prepare EALs, some studies have looked at the assignment types, purposes, and conceptual activities typical in business programs (see Bacha & Bahous, 2008; Canseco & Byrd, 1989; Currie, 1993; Zhu, 2004b). Business faculty have also been surveyed in an effort to identify faculty treatment of EAL student writing and the common challenges EAL students exhibit in their business writing (see Hyland, 2013; Lewis, McGrew, & Adams, 2002).

Examining EAL student perceptions of their own business writing is important as these perceptions give insight into student understandings of the expectations business faculty have of writing. This insight allows curriculum designers and teachers to adjust EAP writing courses to better prepare students for discipline-specific writing as it reveals features of writing that may need more attention in the EAP classroom. Furthermore, student perspectives are important because student views of what they believe they are learning and what they need to learn directly influence their receptiveness to learning (Horowitz, 1987 as cited by Leki & Carson, 1994). Few studies, however, have investigated EAL student perceptions of writing for their business courses. The present study aims to address the gap in research of EAL student perceptions of business writing.

2. Literature Review

Instructors across disciplines, including those in business, often perceive the receptive English language skills of listening and reading as being more important for undergraduate student success than the productive language skills of speaking and writing (Bacha & Bahous,

2008; Hartshorn & Evans, 2014; Hartshorn et al., 2015; Jackson, 2005; Johns, 1981). However, employers in professional business settings value productive language skills, at times, more than receptive skills (Nelson et al., 1996; see Nickerson, 2005 for discussion of research regarding productive skills in business English). In an effort to prepare students with the productive skills necessary, many business programs in the U.S. require students to complete business communication courses. These courses, which address many aspects of communication, are viewed by some as generally focusing more on oral communication than written communication (Vásquez, 2013). Business professionals perceive this as problematic as it results in employees being underprepared for writing in the workforce where employees are expected to "write well and 'get it right' the first time, with little supervision" (Vásquez, 2013, pp. 99). The writing may have a direct impact on employees' individual careers and the companies they work for as "poor writing skills reflect negatively not just on the person who wrote the message, but also on the company as a whole" (Vásquez, 2013, pp. 103). Employers consider writing a crucial component of workplace success, yet scholarship shows business instructors may value it the least of undergraduate language skills.

Writing to inform is the dominant mode of writing assigned by departments across universities (Bridgeman & Carlson, 1984; Hale et al., 1996; Horowitz, 1986, Melzer, 2009). Outside of English courses, writing assignments generally do not require students to describe personal experience, but rather require synthesis, connecting theory and data, summary, and report writing (Bergmann & Zepernick, 2007; see Horowitz, 1986 for discussion of the seven categories most common in academic writing). Furthermore, no writing assignment type is universally accepted nor universally rejected across disciplines, yet overlap of assignments does exist (Bridgeman & Carlson, 1984; Horowitz, 1986; Jackson, 2005; Saenkhum, 2007; Zhu,

2004b). This ambiguity in assignment types across disciplines has led scholars to investigate discipline-specific writing, particularly business writing.

2.1 Business Writing

Business writing is often perceived by business instructors and professionals as being distinct from academic writing. Where academic writing is thought to take the form of composition courses taught through the humanities with focus on rhetorical devices through multiple drafts, business writing is thought to take the form of *real world* writing with little supervision and complete accuracy (Vásquez, 2013). *Real world* writing is a term often used by business instructors to differentiate between academic writing and business writing. No concrete definition of *real world* writing is given in literature aside from the notion that *real world* writing is done in a business course and is designed to prepare students for writing that will be done in the workplace (Vásquez, 2013, Zhu, 2004b). However, *real world* writing typically shares particular conventions: focus on product rather than process; frequently involves collaborative work; expectations of prescriptive correctness; embraces formulas and templates; values directness and ease of reading; and typically responds to a clear, explicit directive from instructors or corporate hierarchy. These conventions are typified in *real world* business genres such as emails, memos, proposals, and reports.

Overlap between *real world* business writing assignments and academic writing assignments exists (Canseco & Byrd, 1989; Zhu, 2004b). Similar purposes have been found for *real world* writing and academic writing, such as demonstrating knowledge and understanding of concepts taught in courses, applying concepts taught to a variety of situations, and writing to learn rather than being explicitly taught (Currie, 1993; Horowitz, 1986; Hartshorn et al., 2015).

However, business writing also includes genres specific to the discipline such as case analyses, business reports and proposals, design projects, and memos.

Generally, business faculty have perceived EAL students as having weak business writing skills. Although business instructors claim to be more concerned about the content of business writing, grammar is commonly cited as being problematic for EALs (Hartshorn et al., 2015; Hyland, 2013; Jackson, 2005; Saenkhum, 2007). Additionally, some faculty perceived appropriate word choice and tone as being most problematic (Jackson, 2005); others perceive sentence structure, vocabulary, and mechanics as the biggest issues in EAL writing (Bacha & Bahous, 2008); yet other faculty perceived the greatest EAL writing challenges to be English as a second language, clarity, vocabulary, organization, paraphrasing, basic writing skills, synthesizing, concision, mechanics, writing process, and not understanding content (Hartshorn et al., 2015). Not only have business faculty perceived EAL writing as being weak, often due to language issues, faculty have also perceived EAL student writing as not improving much over the duration of a semester or even at the completion of a business program (Bacha & Bahous, 2008; Jackson, 2005).

Compared to native English speaking (NES) student writing, EAL student writing is often more difficult for business faculty to assess. Business instructors in one study indicated faculty "show[ed] differing degrees of leniency" with most instructors indicating "they show[ed] little or no favoritism toward students whose first language [was] not English" (Lewis et al., 2002, pp. 40-41). Amount and type of feedback given to EAL writing also varies from instructor to instructor, with one researcher finding that "in many courses there was no systematic mechanism for supporting students through feedback on written work, although many participants said they often responded informally to email or office hour requests for advice on

written assignments" (Hyland, 2013, p. 248). Moreover, business instructors have differing views of the roles they play in teaching writing. Some view business instructors as play an integral part in teaching their students discipline-specific writing while others expect students to enter the business program ready to apply concepts about writing learned in previous courses, including EAP writing courses (see Hiemstra, 2001; Hyland, 2013; Saenkhum, 2007; and Zhu, 2004a).

2.2 EAP Writing

Where business instructors perceive their role as teaching writing for the *real world*, EAP writing teachers perceive their role as teaching writing for academic work (Saenkhum, 2007). EAP programs are designed specifically to prepare EAL students for the language skills necessary to study higher education at English-medium institutions. EAP programs offer writing courses, but the effectiveness of such courses in preparing students for academic writing has come into question. Leki and Carson (1994) conducted a study of student perceptions of how well EAP writing courses prepared students for university writing. Results revealed that 48% of participants identified the EAP program as preparing them well or very well, with 29% feeling adequately prepared. Only 17% of participants identified their EAP program as not preparing them well or adequately well, with half of the 17% blaming themselves for not taking the EAP writing class seriously or not being prepared for specific technical aspects of writing within their university courses. The remaining 6% identified as not knowing how their EAP program prepared them for the writing in their university course (Leki & Carson, 1994). Despite relatively positive student perceptions of EAP writing courses, other research suggests the preparatory value of EAP writing courses for students going into business may be questionable due to content expectations.

EAP writing assignments appear to focus more on originality and personal experience than the focus of business writing. In a follow-up study, Leki & Carson (1997) identified students who were placed into a University EAL writing class and were concurrently enrolled in a university course that required writing. The results indicated that:

> [i]n writing for [EAL] writing classes these students seemed intensely focused on four maxims: be original, be linguistically correct, be clear, and be engaging. The content had to be intelligible and interesting. However, any content would do, and it did not necessarily have to be correct or accurate. (Leki & Carson, 1997, p. 55)

In the university content courses, on the other hand, participants identified content as being the most important component of writing with little to no expression of self. Participants also identified intertextuality—that is the ability to use source texts within writing—as being much more important in content courses than in the EAL writing courses.

These discrepancies in content of writing assignments is unsurprising as instructors of EAP writing courses have differing views of their roles in preparing students for discipline-specific writing. Some EAL instructors and researchers perceive that it is not possible to teach all discipline-specific writing genres and that experts in the field who are immersed in the disciplines should be the instructors who teach the genres students need (Spack, 1988). Others, however, perceive that EAL instructors should focus on teaching genres that will be assigned in content courses, and instructors can be co-investigators of genres rather than experts in the discipline (Canseco & Byrd, 1989; Leki & Carson, 1994; Zhu, 2004a).

EAL students also have contrasting views of the effectiveness of EAP writing courses. For example, Saenkhum (2007) examined the transfer of knowledge from an EAL writing class to writing in business and engineering. Four of the six students in the research agreed that they

transferred skills from their EAL writing classes, but the remaining two students did not agree. Interestingly, five of the students perceived their EAL writing classes to be more demanding or difficult than their major courses; the remaining student perceived that her EAL writing class had her writing about more general topics (Saenkhum, 2007).

2.3 The Need to Examine Faculty and EAL Student Perceptions

The few studies that have examined both business faculty and EAL student perceptions of EAL writing have reported a gap between teacher and student perceptions. Bacha & Bahous (2008) found that students believed they were more proficient and improved more in their business writing than faculty perceived. In contrast, Hiemstra (2001) found that students believed they improved less than faculty perceived, perhaps due in part to the difficulty EALs had in objectively assessing their own writing. Furthermore, business and engineering EAL students perceived their instructors as not caring about grammar, whereas the instructors admitted they emphasized content but that grammar was important. Clearly, these studies reveal that business faculty and EAL students have different perceptions of business writing, which is potentially problematic as it may indicate that EAL students are not understanding teacher expectations. These differences in perceptions may not only affect the university writing and grades of EAL students but the employment and career opportunities after graduation as well. As few studies examine student perceptions, much more research is needed so as to better understand and address these academic and professional needs of EAL students.

3. Research Purpose

The purpose of the present study was to examine perceptions of business faculty and their undergraduate EAL students of the challenges EALs exhibited when writing for business courses. The following were the research questions used to guide this study:

1. How prepared do faculty perceive their undergraduate accounting, finance, and management EAL students to be for the writing that is needed for graduate study and professional work?

2. What are the purposes of writing within undergraduate accounting, finance, and management courses as identified by faculty? Do undergraduate EAL students within the respective majors perceive similar purposes?

3. What are the greatest writing challenges faculty perceive their undergraduate accounting, finance, and management EAL students exhibiting? How does this compare to undergraduate EAL student perceptions within the respective majors?

4. Methodology

The present study was conducted at a private research university with an enrollment of nearly 30,000 students. International students accounted for 6% of the university population and came from 120 different countries. The present study focused on undergraduates in the business school, which had an undergraduate enrollment of approximately 2,100 students, of which roughly 8% were international (Marriott School, 2016b). The business school housed five undergraduate majors: accounting, information systems, finance, management, and recreation management. As information systems and recreation management were categorized in fields other than "business, management, and related support services" by the Institute of International Education (2016), they were excluded from the present study. The three remaining majors were included in the study.

For undergraduate admission into the business school, students must have earned a minimum grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 in prerequisite business courses as well as written an essay on a topic determined by the major. Three prerequisite courses were required of all

applicants, with each major requiring one to two additional prerequisite courses. TOEFL scores were not taken into consideration for admission into the business majors, although EALs must have received a minimum score of 80 on the TOEFL iBT to be admitted into the university. The business school recommended students interested in applying to one of their programs take a first-year writing course their freshmen year and a specific advanced communication course their sophomore year (Brigham Young University, n.d.). While not strictly required of business students to complete admission requirements, these courses were prerequisites for other business courses and many students completed them before applying to the business school.

Minimum requirements for admission to the business school were often exceeded as a limited number of students were accepted each year. For example, 723 applicants applied for the management program at the end of the 2014-2015 school year but only 431 received offers of admission, making the acceptance rate 59.61%. Accounting and finance, which did not receive as many applications as management but were still competitive, had acceptance rates of 79.80% and 56.40%, respectively (Marriott School, 2016a).

4.1 Participants

Participants for the present study were drawn from students and faculty in the business school.

4.1.1 Faculty participants. All accounting, finance, and management faculty who taught courses in the three majors were invited to participate in the present study. Faculty were informed that the survey would focus on one undergraduate course they had taught. Email addresses for both full-time and part-time faculty were collected by visiting the department websites. A total of 62 faculty were invited. Six accepted the invitation and completed the study, four taught in accounting, one taught in finance, and one taught in management (see Table 1),

making the response rate 9.68%. Although faculty participation was lower than desired, considerable research is available concerning business faculty perceptions of student writing (see Bacha & Bahous, 2008; Currie, 1993; Hartshorn & Evans, 2014; Hartshorn et al., 2015; Hyland, 2013; Lewis et al., 2002; Melzer, 2009; Saenkhum, 2007). Therefore, the faculty responses from the present study will be viewed in conjunction with results from previous studies.

The teaching experience of the participating faculty is unknown. Demographical questions were limited to allow for greater anonymity of responses. Faculty may or may not have had EAL teacher training, and even with such training faculty may not have been aware of who among their students were EALs, which previous research indicates may be a challenge for faculty (Andrade & Evans, 2007).

4.1.2 Student participants. All undergraduate students admitted into accounting, finance, and management majors as of January 2016 were invited to participate in the present study. This included both native (NES) and non-native speakers of English; however, responses from EAL students and students who identified more than one primary language (multilingual or ML) will be analyzed in the present study, with responses from NESs included in the discussion for future research.

Admission into accounting, finance, and management majors typically commences the third or junior year. Participants who indicated they were freshmen or sophomores were excluded from the study. All student participants had completed at least one semester in their major. A total of 1,493 students were invited to participate, of which 6% were international students. Ninety students completed the study, 54 juniors and 36 seniors, of which 31 were majoring in accounting, 18 were majoring in finance, and 41 were majoring in management (see Table 1), making the response rate 6%. Of those who completed the survey, 77 indicated English

was their primary language (NES), nine indicated English was not their primary language (EAL), and four indicated they had more than one primary language in addition to English (ML).

Table 1

Participants According to Major

Major	Faculty	EALs	MLs	NESs
Accounting	4	3	3	25
Finance	1	1	0	17
Management	1	5	1	35
Total	6	8	4	77

4.2 Data Collection

Data collection took place during February 2016. Faculty were sent an email through Qualtrics online survey software inviting them to take a short survey in regards to the writing skills of their nonnative English speaking undergraduate students. Faculty were informed that participation was voluntary and they could choose to leave questions blank. In an effort to collect more faculty responses, a total of three invitations were sent over the course of three weeks to faculty who had not completed the survey.

Students were sent one email from the business school inviting the students to take a short online survey. In an effort to collect more EAL responses, a second invitation was sent to international students through the university's international student services office. The invitations included a link to the Qualtrics survey. Students were informed that participation was voluntary, responses were anonymous, and they could choose to leave questions blank.

4.2.1 Faculty survey. The faculty survey utilized in the present study was an adaptation of an instrument developed by Hartshorn, Evans, Egbert, and Johnson (2015). The 2015 research was a national study of faculty perceptions of disciplinary reading and writing expectations and challenges for upper division EAL students studying in one of the five most common international student majors: biology, business, engineering, computer science, or psychology.

Survey questions from Hartshorn et al. (2015) regarding reading, non-business writing, and institutional support for EAL students were eliminated from the present study, as the aim of the current research was to examine faculty perceptions of EAL business writing at one institution. Additional questions that did not appear in the original instrument regarding group and individual writing as well as exhibiting audience awareness were included, as these are important to business writing. A total of five questions were eliminated and five questions were added, making the survey in the present study a similar length to the original survey instrument.

In the present study, the survey questions fit into four categories: course background information; EAL student preparedness for graduate and professional work; importance, purposes, and challenges of writing in the discipline; and feedback, revisions, and other comments. With the exception of the optional final question asking faculty to include any other comments, all survey items were objective in nature and were completed by selecting pre-set options which included writing a number, specifying an *other* option, dragging a lever, or ranking according to a Likert scale.

4.2.2 Student survey. The student survey for the present study was largely parallel to the faculty survey. Some additional demographic questions were added to better understand the students' standing in school and primary language. Alterations were made to make the language of the survey consistent and to provide students additional parenthetical explanations in order to increase understanding of terminology utilized in the survey.

One question became problematic for students, however. A question in both the faculty and student surveys asked participants to rank the importance of the four language skills in their discipline-specific courses hierarchically using a 4-point Likert scale (*not important*, *somewhat important*, *important*, *very important*). While this question was effective in the original study of

Hartshorn et al. (2015) and with the faculty in the present study, this question proved to be problematic for students in the present study. Several students wanted to select multiple language skills as *very important* or *important*, but the design of the question did not allow them to do so. For this reason, this question will not be analyzed or discussed in the present study; however, other research is available discussing the importance of the four language skills in university courses (Bacha & Bahous, 2008; Harthsorn & Evans, 2014; Hartshorn et al., 2015; Jackson, 2005; Johns, 1981).

4.3 Data Analysis

Participants for the present study were permitted to leave questions on the survey unanswered. As such, the total number of responses for a given question did not always equal the total number of participants. In order to accurately represent the results of the present study, the total number of participants who answered the questions were included and represented by *n*.

After data were collected from participants, responses were categorized according to one of four classifications: faculty, NESs, EALs, and MLs. Results were analyzed, verified, and reviewed in Microsoft Office 365 ProPlus Excel and SPSS version 23. Descriptive statistics of mean, median, and mode were utilized as were one-way ANOVAs to compare the responses from the four classifications of participants to determine statistical significance.

5. Results

Results of the surveys indicated that no statistically significant differences were found in regards to faculty perceptions of EAL language skill preparation for graduate and professional work as well as the faculty, EAL, and ML perceptions of the writing challenges these students experience. Statistically significant differences were found, however, in perceptions of developing arguments as a business writing purpose.

5.1 Faculty Perceptions of EAL Preparation for Graduate Study and Professional Work

Analysis of faculty perceptions of EAL language preparation for graduate study and professional work was conducted, and the one-way ANOVA results revealed no statistical significance of perceptions across language skills and within the two contexts (see Table 2). This finding may indicate that faculty in the present study perceive their EAL students as being equally prepared in the English language skills to engage in graduate and professional work. Previous research, however, suggests that this was often not the case and that writing was frequently regarded by faculty and employers in other studies as being the weakest of the language skills (Bacha & Bahous, 2008; Hartshorn et al., 2015; Johns, 1981; Vásquez, 2013). As small sample size makes generalizing the findings of this study problematic, the research questions of the study remain in need of additional research.

While the present study showed no statistical difference of faculty perceptions of EAL preparation of English language skills, the standard deviations of faculty responses suggest a great amount of variability among faculty perceptions, particularly in regards to writing (see Table 2). No outliers were present in the data; rather, faculty responses made up a continuum of perceptions ranging from *somewhat disagree* to *strongly agree* with EAL language skill preparation for graduate study and *somewhat agree* to *strongly agree* with preparation for professional work. The variability of responses suggests that faculty differed in perception of their student writing skills more than any other language skill. Teaching experience, student demographics, course objectives, assignment types, and teacher values are a few factors that may have influenced faculty perceptions in the present study. With higher participation rates, responses may have been less varied, yet it is expected that faculty perceptions would change from teacher to teacher as perceptions are subjective in nature.

Table 2

Faculty Perceptions of English Skills Needed for Graduate and Professional Work

	Graduate Study			Professional Work		
Language Skill	*n*	M	SD	*n*	M	SD
Speaking	6	5.33	0.52	6	5.33	0.52
Reading	6	5.17	0.75	6	5.33	0.52
Listening	6	5.17	0.75	5	5.00	0.55
Writing	6	4.83	1.17	6	4.83	0.98

Note. Faculty answered question based on a 6-point Likert scale of *strongly disagree*-1, *disagree*-2, *somewhat disagree*-3, *somewhat agree*-4, *agree*-5, and *strongly agree*-6.

5.2 Faculty and Student Perceptions of Business Writing Purposes

A one-way ANOVA showed statistically significant differences across levels of importance for the writing purposes across the four populations, $F(3,89) = 4.38$, $p<0.006$. While most writing purposes were not statistically significant from one group to another (see Table 3), faculty perceptions of the importance of developing arguments differed significantly compared to EAL perceptions ($p<0.022$, $d = 1.865$) and ML student perceptions ($p<0.017$, $d = 2.586$). EAL and ML students appear to have perceived developing arguments as being *important* to business writing, with means of 3.44 and 3.75, respectively, whereas faculty appear to have perceived developing arguments as being only *somewhat important*, with a mean of 2.00 and $n = 4$. Results from Hartshorn et al. (2015) also indicated that across five majors, faculty perceived developing arguments as *somewhat important* with a mean of 2.35.

These findings may signify that faculty and students in the present study largely agreed upon the relative importance of business writing purposes, with the exception of developing arguments. It is conceivable that with more participation from faculty, EALs, and MLs more purposes would have been statistically significant, especially when taking into consideration that EAL and ML mean scores for many writing purposes were generally higher than faculty mean scores (see Table 3).

Table 3

Faculty and Student Perceptions of Important Business Writing Purposes

	Faculty			EALs			MLs		
Purpose	*n*	M	SD	*n*	M	SD	*n*	M	SD
Analyze Info.	5	3.60	0.55	8	3.88	0.35	4	3.75	0.50
Think Critically	5	3.60	0.55	9	3.33	0.71	4	3.50	0.58
App. Knowledge	5	3.20	0.84	9	3.33	0.87	4	4.00	0.00
Solve Problems	5	3.20	1.30	9	3.56	0.53	3	3.00	1.00
Dem. Knowledge	5	3.05	0.76	9	3.00	0.71	4	3.50	1.00
Syn. Knowledge	5	3.00	1.41	9	3.33	0.71	4	3.75	0.50
Com. Effectively	4	3.00	0.00	9	3.56	0.73	4	3.75	0.50
Dev. Genre Skills	4	2.75	1.26	9	2.78	1.09	4	2.50	1.29
Com. w/ Teacher	5	2.60	0.55	9	3.00	0.87	4	3.25	0.50
Reinforce Learn.	4	2.50	1.00	9	2.78	0.83	4	3.00	0.82
Clarify Thoughts	4	2.50	0.58	9	3.22	0.83	4	3.25	0.96
Report Info.	5	2.40	1.14	9	3.11	0.78	4	3.00	1.41
Dev. Writing Sks.	4	2.00	0.82	9	3.00	1.12	4	2.75	0.96
Dev. Arguments	4	2.00	0.82	9	3.44	0.73	4	3.75	0.50
Show Aud. Awar.	4	2.00	0.82	9	2.89	0.78	4	3.00	0.82
Evaluate Work	4	1.00	0.00	9	2.33	0.87	4	2.50	1.29
Other	-	-	-	1	2.00	0.00	2	3.50	0.71

Note. Faculty and students answered questions based on a 4-point Likert scale of *generally not part of class*-1, *somewhat important*-2, *important*-3, and *very important*-4.

5.3 Faculty and Student Perceptions of Business Writing Challenges

No statistical significance was found for perceptions of business writing challenges across faculty, EAL, and ML student populations. The lack of significance may indicate that faculty and students had no difference in perceptions. This is unlikely, however, as previous research has found that faculty are not aware of the conceptual activities a writing task requires which may challenge EAL students (Currie, 1993). Additionally, EAL students may overestimate their writing skills (Bacha & Bahous, 2008), underestimate their writing skills (Hiemstra, 2001), or misconceive teacher expectations (Saenkhum, 2007). This study's research question regarding student perceptions of business writing challenges is in need of further investigation as the findings of this study may not be generalizable.

Table 4

Faculty and Student Perceptions of Business Writing Challenges

	Faculty			EALs			MLs		
Challenges	*n*	M	SD	*n*	M	SD	*n*	M	SD
Vocabulary	4	2.75	0.50	9	2.44	1.01	4	3.00	1.41
ESL	4	2.75	0.96	8	2.13	0.84	4	2.00	1.41
Clarity	5	2.60	0.55	9	2.22	0.97	4	3.00	0.82
Concision	4	2.25	0.96	9	2.44	0.73	4	2.25	0.50
Mechanics	4	2.25	0.50	9	2.11	1.05	4	1.25	0.50
Grammar	5	2.20	0.84	9	2.22	1.09	4	1.50	1.00
Organization	4	2.00	0.82	9	1.89	0.93	4	2.25	0.50
Crit. Think.	5	2.00	1.00	9	2.33	1.12	4	2.25	0.50
Genre	4	2.00	0.82	9	2.11	0.93	4	2.00	0.82
Not Un. Cont.	5	2.00	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Basic Wri. Sks.	5	1.80	0.84	9	1.67	0.71	4	1.75	0.96
Writ. Process	4	1.75	0.50	9	2.00	0.71	4	2.00	0.82
Synthesis	4	1.75	0.50	9	2.22	1.09	4	2.25	0.50
Time	4	1.75	0.96	9	2.22	0.97	4	2.75	0.96
Irr. Content	4	1.50	0.58	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paraphrasing	4	1.50	1.00	9	2.44	1.24	4	1.25	0.50
Citations	4	1.25	0.50	9	2.33	1.00	4	1.25	0.50
Motivation	4	1.25	0.50	9	2.22	1.09	4	2.50	0.58
Content	-	-	-	9	2.44	0.88	4	2.00	0.82
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note. Faculty and students answered question on a 4-point Likert scale of *not a challenge*-1, *somewhat challenging*-2, *challenging*-3, and *very challenging*-4.

Interestingly, the mean scores of writing challenges for all participants did not exceed

2.50, with the exception of two challenges identified by ML students (vocabulary and clarity).

These means suggest that writing features were perceived at most as *somewhat challenging*. Yet,

like writing purposes, EAL and ML students had higher mean scores for many writing

challenges, implying that with more participation more statistical significance may have been

found.

6. Discussion

Three notable findings from the present study are deserving of further discussion.

6.1 Faculty Perceive EAL Students as Somewhat Prepared for Writing

Business programs recognize the need to prepare students for professional work as they

value *real world* writing over academic writing. Some faculty have even consented that writing

is more important outside of academia than within it (Bridgeman & Carlson, 1984), yet research has consistently shown that faculty perceive EAL students as being least proficient in writing than the other language skills (Bacha & Bahous, 2008; Hartshorn et al., 2015; Johns, 1981). In the present study, faculty *somewhat agreed* EAL students were prepared for business writing in graduate study and professional work, but the variability of perceptions was high.

Both business faculty and professionals indicate that EAL students need to be better prepared for writing in business. The writing produced may be owned by a company or organization, "some of which may be proprietary or confidential information that must be protected," and if EAL employees produce poor writing it will reflect poorly on the employee and on the company (Vásquez, 2013, p. 103). A company's reputation and an EAL employee's career may depend on the writing produced. Scholars recommend EAL instructors, which includes business faculty and extends to EAP writing teachers, explicitly teach the differences between academic and *real world* business writing in order to better prepare EAL students for professional employment (Vásquez, 2013).

6.2 EAL and ML Students Perceive Developing Arguments as More Important than Faculty Perceive

The only business writing purpose that was statistically significant in the present study was developing arguments. EAL and ML students perceived this purpose as important, whereas faculty did not. It is unclear as to why this discrepancy exhibited, but two explanations are conceivable.

First, EAL and ML students may not have interpreted writing assignments for business courses in the way business faculty intended. For example, Currie (1993) examined business assignment sheets for conceptual activities and found that "students were expected to record

answers from the text, to narrate in response to a series of guiding questions, and to present a full

academic argument. None of the course handouts, however, explicitly mentioned these

requirements" (p. 111). Without explicit mention of requirements or purposes, students may

misunderstand the most important purposes of writing in their business courses, such as

perceiving developing arguments being important when it is not.

Second, EAL and ML students may have perceived writing purposes as overlapping or

not being mutually exclusive. Many U.S. faculty "value 'critical thinking,'" and "'critical

thinking is cultural thinking'" (Atkinson, 1997 as cited by Johns, 2001, p. 152). Students may

have compared the writing purposes needed in the U.S., which can be more persuasive in nature,

with writing purposes from their native country, which may be less persuasive. As such, EAL

and ML students may have assumed that developing arguments was an important purpose as it is

often valued in Western academia

Misunderstanding the purpose of business writing assignments may have long-lasting

consequences. For example, if EAL students perceive that business writing should be

argumentative, they may complete their undergraduate business writing assignments—and later

occupational business writing tasks—with the purpose of persuasion in mind. This is problematic

as business writing often values collecting and presenting information in a direct, succinct, and

objective manner to superiors or those who make decisions utilizing the information. If EAL

students cannot recognize when they need to simply collect and communicate information rather

than use information persuasively, they may be misunderstanding the central purpose behind

much of business writing. For this reason it is important for business faculty to be explicit about

the purposes of writing assignments within their course, particularly in regard to objective and

critical engagement with information.

6.3 Faculty, EAL and ML Students Perceive Writing Challenges as Somewhat Challenging

Despite the present study being void of statistically significant differences across faculty and student perceptions of writing challenges, previous research has indicated that there are often discrepancies between faculty and student perceptions in the difficulty of writing tasks (Bacha & Bahous, 2008; Hiemstra, 2001; Saenkhum, 2007). More research is needed to explore the differences in perceptions.

It is difficult for business faculty and EAP writing instructors to address EAL writing challenges if faculty and instructors are only aware of a limited portion of challenges. On the other hand, if students do not receive feedback to help them overcome their challenges, they may have similar outcomes as described previously regarding misunderstanding writing purposes; EAL students may continue to exhibit challenges which will in turn affect their grades and potentially job offers and career opportunities. The stakes are high for EAL students.

While outside the scope of the present study, information regarding NES student perceptions of writing challenges was collected and may aid future research. Several statistically significant differences were found when analyzing the three student population groups (see Table 5). A one-way ANOVA ($F(2,81) = 16.891$, $p<0.001$) found that *English as a second language* was statistically significant, which was unsurprising considering NES students classified the writing feature as *not a challenge* whereas the EAL ($p<0.001$, $d = 1.52$) and ML ($p<0.014$, $d = 0.836$) students classified it as *somewhat challenging*. Another statistically significant difference was found when comparing NES student perceptions (of the difficulty of vocabulary with ML student perceptions ($p<0.016$, $d = 1.128$), with a one-way ANOVA ($F(1,77) = 9.489$, $p<0.003$). The final statistically significant difference of student perceptions of writing challenges was between NES and EAL students ($p<0.016$, $d = 0.849$) in regards to paraphrasing ($F(1,82) =$

9.163, $p<0.003$). These results indicate that vocabulary and paraphrasing, in particular, warrant additional study.

Table 5

EAL, ML, and NES Student Perceptions of Business Writing Challenges

Challenges	EALs			MLs			NESs		
	n	M	SD	*n*	M	SD	*n*	M	SD
Vocabulary	9	2.44	1.01	4	3.00	1.41	75	1.71	0.79
ESL	8	2.13	0.84	4	2.00	1.41	72	1.13	0.41
Clarity	9	2.22	0.97	4	3.00	0.82	75	2.00	0.77
Concision	9	2.44	0.73	4	2.25	0.50	75	2.28	0.86
Mechanics	9	2.11	1.05	4	1.25	0.50	75	1.48	0.76
Grammar	9	2.22	1.09	4	1.50	1.00	75	1.68	0.74
Organization	9	1.89	0.93	4	2.25	0.50	75	1.99	0.89
Crit. Think.	9	2.33	1.12	4	2.25	0.50	75	2.31	0.92
Genre	9	2.11	0.93	4	2.00	0.82	75	1.81	0.77
Basic Wri. Sks.	9	1.67	0.71	4	1.75	0.96	75	1.37	0.61
Writ. Process	9	2.00	0.71	4	2.00	0.82	75	1.87	0.84
Synthesis	9	2.22	1.09	4	2.25	0.50	74	2.38	0.89
Time	9	2.22	0.97	4	2.75	0.96	75	2.33	1.06
Paraphrasing	9	2.44	1.24	4	1.25	0.50	75	1.57	0.76
Citations	9	2.33	1.00	4	1.25	0.50	75	1.79	0.84
Motivation	9	2.22	1.09	4	2.50	0.58	75	2.55	1.00
Content	9	2.44	0.88	4	2.00	0.82	75	2.44	0.93
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1.50	0.58
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.20	0.71

Note. Students answered question on a 4-point Likert scale of *not a challenge*-1, *somewhat challenging*-2, *challenging*-3, and *very challenging*-4.

6.4 Limitations

Several limitations of this study need to be taken into account. Caution should be used in generalizing these results beyond this study. First, the response rates from faculty, EALs, and MLs were small. The faculty responses were mostly from accounting and finance fields with only one faculty member representing business management. Similarly, more EAL and ML student participation would have been preferable. Second, the survey instrument did not provide adequate space for ML students to indicate which languages were their primary languages. It was assumed that English was one of the primary languages, but this could not be verified. Third, information about faculty teaching experience was not collected and only one open-ended

question appeared in the survey instrument. Finally, follow-up questions clarifying participant responses were not included in the survey and could provide valuable information.

6.5 Implications

Previous research and the present study indicate that more research is needed to understand EAL and ML perceptions of the writing challenges students experience when writing within the business major. Future studies are needed particularly to examine EAL student perceptions but also to examine differences of perceptions among students according to primary language, differences of perceptions between faculty and students, and examination of the causes of differences among perceptions. More research like Leki & Carson (1994, 1997) is desired to consider EAP writing instructor and former EAP student perceptions of the effectiveness of EAP programs in preparing students for business school.

With more research and better understanding of EAL business student perceptions and challenges, business faculty and EAP writing instructors can better identify student needs and struggles and to prepare EAL students for business writing and writing within the *real world*. Business faculty can be explicit about the purposes of writing within their course. Johns (2001) suggested, "the more explicit faculty can be about their assumptions, goals, and expectations, the more their diverse students will understand the language registers and academic cultures in which they are attempting to succeed" (p. 152). Furthermore, while it may not be possible for EAP instructors to teach the discipline-specific features of all the fields in which their students will study, they can better prepare students by helping EALs develop academic vocabulary, assigning group writing, and encouraging discipline-specific genre exploration.

7. Conclusion

The purpose of the present study was to examine business faculty and EAL student perceptions of the purposes and challenges students experience when writing for the business major. No statistically significant differences were found across faculty and student populations in regards to perceptions of business writing purposes, but perceptions developing arguments was statistically significant across populations. Previous research indicates that faculty and students often have different perceptions of business writing purposes and challenges. This gap in perceptions needs more examination, particularly in understanding EAL student perspectives.

EAL students have their own notions of "what good writing is and what roles they should play as writers," and "the gap between what is expected in our academic classrooms and the students' own literacy expectations and experiences may be even greater when those enrolled are linguistically or culturally diverse" (Johns, 2001, p. 150). As more research explores the perceptions of EAL business students, the gap between teacher and student perceptions can be better understood and remedied; both business faculty and EAP instructors will have more information and insight into assisting their EAL students in overcoming writing challenges and helping their students succeed.

References

Andrade, M. & Evans, N. (2007). University instructors' views of ESL students: Implications for training. In G. Poedjosoedarmo (Ed.), *RELC Anthology Series: Vol. 48. Teacher education in language teaching* (pp. 224-249). Singapore: Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Language Centre.

Bacha, N.N., & Bahous, R. (2008). Contrasting views of business students' writing needs in an EFL environment. *English for Specific Purposes, 27*(1), 74-93. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2007.05.001

Bergmann, L.S. & Zepernick, J. (2007). Disciplinarity and transfer: Students' perceptions of learning to write. *WPA: Writing Program Administrators, 31*(1-2), p. 124-149. Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/archives/31n1-2/31n1-2bergmann-zepernick.pdf

Bridgeman, B., & Carlson, S.B. (1984). Survey of academic writing tasks. *Written Communication, 1*(2), 247-280. doi: 10.1177/0741088384001002004

Brigham Young University. (n.d.). Communication in organizational settings. Brigham Young University. Retrieved from https://catalog.byu.edu/management/organizational-leadership-and-strategy/communication-organizational-settings

Canseco, G., & Byrd, P. (1989). Writing required in graduate courses in business administration. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(2), 305–316. doi: 10.2307/3587338

Currie, P. (1993). Entering a disciplinary community: Conceptual activities required to write for one introductory university course. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 2*(2), 101-117. doi: 10.1016/1060-3743(93)90012-R

Hale, G., Taylor, C., Bridgeman, B. Carson, J., Kroll, B., & Kantor, R. (1996). A study of
writing tasks assigned in academic degree programs. *TOEFL Research Reports*, 54.
Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Hartshorn, K.J., & Evans, N.W. (2014). [Disciplinary writing differences, expectations, and
challenges for undergraduate L2 writers.] Unpublished raw data.

Hartshorn, K.J., Evans, N.W., Egbert, J., & Johnson, A. (2015). [Discipline-specific reading and
writing expectations for upper division fourth-year, university ESL students].
Unpublished raw data.

Hiemstra, K.M. (2001). Instructor and student perceptions of what is learned by writing the
business report. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly, 64*(2), 44-54. doi:
10.1177/108056990106400204

Horowitz, D.M. (1986). What professors actually require: Academic tasks for the ESL
classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*(3), 445-462. doi: 10.2307/3586294

Hyland, K. (2013). Faculty feedback: Perceptions and practices in L2 disciplinary writing.
Journal of Second Language Writing, 22(3), 240-253. doi: 10.1016/jslw.2013.03.003

Institute of International Education. (2016). Open doors data. Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/

Jackson, J. (2005). An inter-university cross-disciplinary analysis of business education:
Perceptions of business faculty in Hong Kong. *English for Specific Purposes, 24*(3), 293-
306. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2004.02.004

Johns, A.M. (2001). ESL students and WAC programs: Varied populations and diverse needs. In
S.H. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium:*
Strategies for continuing writing-across-the-curriculum programs (pp. 141-164).
Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/books/millennium/

Johns, A.M. (1981). Necessary English: A faculty survey. *TESOL Quarterly, 15*(1), 51-57. doi: 10.2307/3586373

Kroll, B. (1979). A survey of the writing needs of foreign and American college freshmen. *English Language Teaching Journal*, *33*(3), 219-226. Retrieved from https://oup.silverchair-cdn.com

Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). Completely different worlds: EAP and the writing experiences of ESL students in university courses. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(1), 39-69. doi: 10.2307/3587974

Leki, I., & Carson, J.G. (1994). Students' perceptions of EAP writing instruction and writing needs across the disciplines. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(1), 81-101. doi: 10.2307/3587199

Lewis, S.D., McGrew, L.G., & Adams, C.N. (2002). Assessing business communication assignments of English-as-a-second-language students. *Business Communication Quarterly, 65*(2), 30-43. doi: 10.1177/108056990206500203

Marriott School. (2016a). Applicant information: Admission statistics. Brigham Young University. Retrieved from http://marriottschool.byu.edu/advisement/applying/info/

Marriott School. (2016b). News releases: Fact sheet. Brigham Young University. Retrieved from http://www.marriottschool.byu.edu

Melzer, D. (2009). Writing assignments across the curriculum: A national study of college writing. *College Composition and Communication, 61*, 240-261. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/CCC/0612-dec09/CCC0612Writing.pdf

Nelson, S.J., Moncada, S., & Smith, D.C. (1996). Written language skills of entry-level accountants as assessed by experienced CPAs. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly, 59*(4), 122-128. doi: 10.1177/10805699960500412

Nickerson, C. (2005). English as a lingua franca in international business contexts. *English for Specific Purposes, 24*(4), 367–380. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2005.02.001

Ostler, S.E. (1980). A survey of academic needs for advanced ESL. *TESOL Quarterly, 14*(4), 489-502. doi: 10.2307/3586237

Saenkhum, T. (2007). *Transfer of knowledge from first-year ESL writing classes to writing in the disciplines: Case studies of writing across the curriculum*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 1448819).

Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly, 22*(1), 29-51.

Vásquez, F.S. (2013). Differences between academic and business writing. *Global Business Languages, 18*, 97-106. Retrieved from http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/gbl/

Zhu, W. (2004a). Faculty views on the importance of writing, the nature of academic writing, and teaching and responding to writing in the disciplines. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(1), 29-48. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.004

Zhu, W. (2004b). Writing in business courses: An analysis of assignment types, their characteristics, and required skills. *English for Specific Purposes, 23*(2), 111-135. doi: 10.1016/S0889-4906(02)00046-7

Appendix

Faculty Survey

Dear Marriott School Faculty,

You are invited to participate in this research study of the writing skills of the non-native English speakers in your class. Your participation in this study involves the completion of the following survey. This should only take about 7-10 minutes.

Your participation will be completely anonymous and results will only be reported in aggregate. This survey involves no known risks to you, but it may help educators better prepare non-native English speakers for graduation in your field of study.

You are not required to participate or to respond to any question you prefer not to answer. We will be happy to answer any questions you have about this study.

If you have questions, you may contact Dr. Norm Evans, (801) 422-8472 or norman_evans@byu.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the IRB Administrator at A-285 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; irb@byu.edu; (801) 422-1461.

The completion of this survey implies your consent to participate. Thank you!

This survey will focus on one undergraduate course you teach to undergraduate juniors or seniors in your program.

Which of the following disciplines do you primarily teach in?
❍ Accounting
❍ Finance
❍ Management

Please slide the lever for each of the following statements:
_____ In an average semester, how many students take your section of this course?
_____ Approximately what percentage of the students in your section of this course are non-native speakers of English?

How important are the following language skills for the success of the non-native English speakers in your course?

	Reading	Writing	Listening	Speaking
Not important	○	○	○	○
Somewhat important	○	○	○	○
Important	○	○	○	○
Very important	○	○	○	○

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: By graduation, the non-native English speakers who take my course have the following English language skills needed for

	graduate study in the discipline					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Reading	○	○	○	○	○	○
Writing	○	○	○	○	○	○
Listening	○	○	○	○	○	○
Speaking	○	○	○	○	○	○

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: By graduation, the non-native English speakers who take my course have the following English language skills needed for

	professional work in the discipline					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Reading	○	○	○	○	○	○
Writing	○	○	○	○	○	○
Listening	○	○	○	○	○	○
Speaking	○	○	○	○	○	○

Comparing the language skills of the non-native English speakers you teach in this course with the language skills of the native English speakers, how well prepared are the non-native English speakers for

	Much less prepared	Slightly less prepared	Equally prepared	Slightly more prepared	Much more prepared
graduate study within the discipline	○	○	○	○	○
professional work within the discipline	○	○	○	○	○

Please indicate how important writing is in this course and the approximate number of pages written for the entire course.

	How important is writing in this course?				Approximate number of pages written
	Generally not part of the course	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	for the course
	○	○	○	○	_____

Please indicate the types of writing assignments students may do within your course.

	How important is this type of writing in the course?				Approximate amount
	Generally not part of course	Somewhat important	Important	Very Important	of writing:
Individual writing assignments	○	○	○	○	_____
Group writing assignments	○	○	○	○	_____

To help us understand the importance of writing on your exams, please consider your typical exam and indicate the approximate percentage of your entire exam that is made up of each of the following types of writing:
_____ Short answer
_____ Paragraph
_____ Multiple paragraphs
_____ Full paper
_____ Other

What are the main purposes of writing in your course?

	Generally not part of course	Somewhat important	Important	Very important
Demonstrate knowledge	○	○	○	○
Synthesize knowledge	○	○	○	○
Reinforce learning	○	○	○	○
Report writing	○	○	○	○
Argument development	○	○	○	○
Apply knowledge	○	○	○	○
Discipline-specific development	○	○	○	○
Solve problems	○	○	○	○
Analysis	○	○	○	○
Clarify thoughts	○	○	○	○
Communicate effectively	○	○	○	○
Critical thinking	○	○	○	○
Evaluate others' work	○	○	○	○
Exhibit audience awareness	○	○	○	○
Develop writing skill	○	○	○	○
Communicate with teacher	○	○	○	○
Research writing	○	○	○	○
Collaborative writing	○	○	○	○
Other	○	○	○	○
Other	○	○	○	○

What are the greatest writing challenges faced by the non-native English speakers in your course?

	Not a challenge	Somewhat challenging	Challenging	Very challenging
Lack of discipline-specific features	◯	◯	◯	◯
Lack of clarity	◯	◯	◯	◯
Poor grammar	◯	◯	◯	◯
Poor organization	◯	◯	◯	◯
Not concise	◯	◯	◯	◯
English is their second language	◯	◯	◯	◯
Poor basic writing skills	◯	◯	◯	◯
Lack of critical thinking skills	◯	◯	◯	◯
Poor mechanics	◯	◯	◯	◯
Vocabulary	◯	◯	◯	◯
Writing process	◯	◯	◯	◯
Irrelevant content	◯	◯	◯	◯
Synthesize	◯	◯	◯	◯
Not understand content	◯	◯	◯	◯
Inadequate citations	◯	◯	◯	◯
Poor paraphrasing	◯	◯	◯	◯
Lack of time	◯	◯	◯	◯
Lack of motivation	◯	◯	◯	◯
Other	◯	◯	◯	◯
Other	◯	◯	◯	◯

How important are each of the following in the writing of your students?

	Generally not important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important
Discipline-specific patterns and structure of the writing with the field	○	○	○	○
Word Choice (Writers use vocabulary accurately to convey meaning with precision)	○	○	○	○
Academic-level Vocabulary (words are academic and less colloquial or conversational)	○	○	○	○
Discipline-specific Vocabulary (Students use the specific vocabulary of the discipline)	○	○	○	○
Linguistic Accuracy (i.e., grammar, mechanics such as spelling, punctuation and so on)	○	○	○	○

Drag the lever to display the most appropriate percentage to complete the statements.
Approximately what percentage of the writing your students submit:
_____ receives your specific feedback for improvement?
_____ may be resubmitted after revisions are made?
_____ may be written by hand?

If you wish, please share any other comments you have about students completing writing assignments for your class.

Would you be willing to share your course syllabus?
○ Yes. Please leave email address or link. _____
○ No thanks.

Student Survey

Dear Marriott School Student,

You are invited to participate in this research study of the writing skills used in upper division classes within your major. Your participation in this study involves the completion of the following survey. This should only take about 7-10 minutes.

Your participation will be completely anonymous and results will only be reported in aggregate. This survey involves no known risks to you, but it may help educators better prepare students for graduation in your field of study.

You are not required to participate or to respond to any question you prefer not to answer. We will be happy to answer any questions you have about this study. If you have questions, you may contact Dr. Norm Evans, (801) 422-8472 or norman_evans@byu.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the IRB Administrator at A-285 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; irb@byu.edu; (801) 422-1461. The completion of this survey implies your consent to participate.

Thank you!

Question 1: What is your major?
❍ Accounting
❍ Finance
❍ Management

Question 2: What is your standing in school?
❍ Freshman
❍ Sophomore
❍ Junior
❍ Senior

Question 3a: Is English your primary language?
❍ Yes
❍ No
❍ I am multilingual (I have more than one primary language)

Question 3b: What language other than English is your primary language?
❍ Spanish
❍ Portuguese
❍ Korean
❍ Mandarin
❍ Cantonese
❍ Other

Question 3c: Please drag the lever to indicate the percentage of English you use OUTSIDE of the classroom.

_____ English usage OUTSIDE of the classroom

Question 3d: If you wish, please explain your response to Question 3c.

Question 5: Please indicate how important you feel writing assignments are in upper division classes within your major and the approximate number of pages required for a typical class.

	In any given semester, how important do you feel writing assignments are in your major classes			
	Generally not part of classes	Somewhat important	Important	Very important
	○	○	○	○

Question 6: Please indicate how important individual and group writing assignments are for your classes within your major.

	Please indicate how important individual and group writing assignments are for your classes within your major				Average number of writing assignments in a typical class within your major
	Generally not part of classes	Somewhat important	Important	Very Important	Write average below
Individual writing assignments	○	○	○	○	_____
Group writing assignments	○	○	○	○	_____

Question 7: How important do you feel these purposes are for writing assignments in your classes within your major?

	Generally not part of classes	Somewhat important	Important	Very important
Demonstrate knowledge	❍	❍	❍	❍
Synthesize knowledge	❍	❍	❍	❍
Apply knowledge	❍	❍	❍	❍
Reinforce learning	❍	❍	❍	❍
Figure out solutions to problems	❍	❍	❍	❍
Report information	❍	❍	❍	❍
Analyze information	❍	❍	❍	❍
Develop arguments	❍	❍	❍	❍
Evaluate others' work	❍	❍	❍	❍
Clarify your own thoughts	❍	❍	❍	❍
Communicate effectively	❍	❍	❍	❍
Communicate with teacher	❍	❍	❍	❍
Develop writing skills	❍	❍	❍	❍
Develop skills in genre (i.e., writing styles typical to your major)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Demonstrate critical thinking	❍	❍	❍	❍
Exhibit audience awareness	❍	❍	❍	❍
Other	❍	❍	❍	❍
Other	❍	❍	❍	❍

Question 8a: What are the greatest writing challenges you face in your classes within your major?

	Not a challenge	Somewhat challenging	Challenging	Very challenging
Organization	○	○	○	○
Concision	○	○	○	○
Basic writing skills	○	○	○	○
Clarity	○	○	○	○
Critical thinking skills	○	○	○	○
Grammar	○	○	○	○
Mechanics (i.e., punctuation, capitalization)	○	○	○	○
Vocabulary	○	○	○	○
Writing process	○	○	○	○
Content	○	○	○	○
Synthesis	○	○	○	○
Genre (i.e., writing styles typical to your major)	○	○	○	○
Citations	○	○	○	○
Paraphrasing	○	○	○	○
Time	○	○	○	○
Motivation	○	○	○	○
English as a second language	○	○	○	○
Other	○	○	○	○
Other	○	○	○	○

Question 8b: If you wish, please explain your responses to Question 9a.

Question 9: How important do you feel each of the following are for the writing assignments in your classes within your major?

	Generally not important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important
Language accuracy (i.e., grammar, mechanics such as spelling, punctuation and so on)	○	○	○	○
Word choice (i.e., appropriate usage of vocabulary to convey meaning with precision)	○	○	○	○
Academic-level vocabulary (i.e., words are academic and less colloquial or conversational)	○	○	○	○
Discipline-specific Vocabulary (i.e., appropriate vocabulary for the discipline)	○	○	○	○
Genre (i.e., writing styles typical to your major)	○	○	○	○

Question 10: Drag the lever to display the most appropriate percentage to complete the statements. Approximately what percentage of the writing assignments you submit...
_____ receives specific feedback from your teacher for improvement?
_____ may be resubmitted after revisions are made?
_____ may be written by hand?

Question 11: If you wish, please share any other comments you have about writing assignments for your classes within your major.