
Teaching writing in the sciences: Effectively incorporating writing instruction into existing courses Binyomin Abrams Senior Lecturer, Department of Chemsitry abramsb@bu.edu April 29, 2013



Teaching writing in the sciences

©2013, Binyomin Abrams

Intrinsic Connection Between Doing Science and Writing Science

When all the students in the class obtain the same results to an activity, and there is only one scientifically acceptable outcome, the learners quickly realize that they must somehow generate, copy, or paraphrase the knowledge claim that is desired by the teacher. Thus, writing in this genre can easily become a rote activity, especially when the students have no opportunity to determine the appropriate methods for the investigation, ways to display the data, or new meanings for the data.

--Carolyn Keys. "Revitalizing Instruction in Scientific Genres: Connecting Knowledge Production with Writing to Learn in Science." *Science Education* 83 (1999).

[I]t may be helpful to understand disciplinary ways of doing and the connection to knowing and writing by looking at an illustration of a concrete form of doing: laboratory experiments. A lab experiment is designed to engage students in a particular way of doing by which they will learn about the scientific concept of the lab and also how to apply an empirical mode of reasoning about the physical world. Thus, the lab experience is a way of doing that is directed toward a way of knowing. It is primarily in writing the lab report, however, that doing becomes knowing. . . . It provides an opportunity for students to reflect on the relationship between the lab and the scientific concept of the lab and to frame the doing of the lab in the structure of scientific reasoning.

--Michael Carter. "Ways of Knowing, Doing, and Writing in the Disciplines." *CCC* 58.3 (2007).

In our view, successful inquiry-based writing requires three modifications to the inquiry lab. First, lab courses should give students practice in forms of writing actually used by scientists. Second, writing tasks must be aligned with the activity of the lab so that students have something meaningful to say. And third, student writing must have a real audience.

--Cary Moskovitz, David Kellogg. "Inquiry-Based Writing in the Laboratory Course." *Science* 332 (20 May 2011).



3

Teaching writing in the sciences

©2013, Binyomin Abrams

Multiple Considerations and Challenges to Developing and Implementing a Writing-Intensive Chemistry Class

Pedagogical

- Need to theorize relationship among learning goals: content instruction, mastery of laboratory techniques, and writing
- What principles should govern pedagogy and assignment sequence?

Institutional and Curricular

- Who "owns" the course?
- What is the relationship to the firstyear writing requirement (2-sem sequence of writing seminars)?
- What will CH111/112 "count" for?
- What is the relationship to other chemistry courses?

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Disciplinary: pieties, provincialisms, and skepticisms


- Scientists: "Do we (you) really care about writing, like we say we do?"
- Humanists: "Are they (you) really qualified to teach writing, as we are?" "Will it (the class, the writing) look like what I teach?"

Practical

- Scale?
- Workload for students, teachers?
- Staffing and division of labor?
- Funding?
- Sustainability?

4

CH111/CH112 Course Structure Standard, honors-level first-year chemistry course sequence 4 credits per course Lecture (3 hrs), discussion (1 hr), pre-lab lecture (1 hr), and lab (4 hrs) Students take WR100/WR150 (required first-year writing courses) concurrently "Track-skipping" forbidden (into parallel intro-chem courses 101/102, 109/110) Types of assignments in lab portion of the course Post-lab questions (5 in fall, 2 in spring) Formal lab reports (5 in fall, 4 in spring) Capstone project (team-based research project in spring semester) Total assignments in fall: 10 Total assignments in spring: 6 + Capstone project



aching writing in the sciences ©2013, Binyomin A								
	Enrollments, Staff, and Costs							
	Year 0 08-09	Year 1 09-10	Year 2 10-11	Year 3 11-12	Year 4 12-13			
Student enrollments	57/49	76/65	88/80	58/48	86/76			
Number of WAs	-	5/4	9/8	6/5	9/8			
Number of course TAs	2/2	2.5/2	2.5/2	3.5/2.5	4/3			
Cost of program (total)	-	\$ 4,000	\$ 22,000	\$15,000	\$ 22,500			
Cost (per student)	-	\$ 28	\$ 130	\$ 142	\$ 139			
Total writing hours/ student	20/20	20/20	20/24	15/22	10/20			
Approx. pages of writing	55/50	55/50	45/45	25/35	15/30			
BOSTON UNIVERSITY					7			

Year 0 (2008-09) Assignment Sequence: Baseline, Standard Lab Assignments Formal lab reports for every other lab (~5 per semester) Students receive a five-page "Basic Guide to Writing Lab Reports" No explicit, in-class writing instruction ~20 hours, ~50 pages per student/semester

Year 1 (2009-10) Assignment Sequence: Follows Conceptual Logic of Scientific Content Meetings with writing assistants were optional Instruction was all done in-class (pre-lab lecture), i.e. no handouts No new writing assignments, no fewer writing assignments – all work was done on the existing lab reports Final approval for the three-year pilot in Spring 2010

Cumulative Lessons Learned Year 1 – Follows Conceptual Logic of the Scientific Content Need revision. Mandatory, one-on-one writing instruction is preferable. In-class instruction is insufficient

Teaching writing in the sciences

©2013, Binyomin Abrams

Based on Lessons Learned, We Defined Formal Program Structure

- Students receive writing instruction in lecture
- Handouts help students to develop their skills and guide their writing
- First-drafts of papers sent to writing assistants and to course TA's
- Writing assistants make comments on drafts and return to students,
 Course TA's grade the technical merits of the first drafts
- Students read comments and then conference with their writing assistant
- Final drafts, based on comments and the conference, are submitted to the writing assistants

An unexpected challenge: Orchestrating delivery of feedback and grading on technical aspects of papers and on writing.



11

Teaching writing in the sciences

©2013, Binyomin Abrams

Year 2 (2010-11) Assignment Sequence: Follows Rhetorical Logic of Scientific Communication

- Assignment order guided by the scientific content
- Meetings with writing assistants now mandatory
- Brief handouts distributed to complement in-class instruction
- Same assignments as previous years

Fall Assignments

Spring Assignments

- 1) Program Description
- 2) Introduction
- 3) Experimental
- 4) Results
- 5) Discussion
- 6) Conclusion

- 7) Abstract
- 8) Research proposal
- 9) JACS Communication
- 10) Lab manual chapter
- 11) Powerpoint presentation

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

12

Cumulative Lessons Learned Year 1 – Follows Conceptual Logic of the Scientific Content Need mandatory, one-on-one writing instruction In-class instruction is insufficient Year 2 – Follows Rhetorical Logic of Scientific Communication Need to help students learn how to write like scientists instead of students Need to provide explicit instruction in "skills" of science writing

Teaching writing in the sciences Year 3 (2011-12) Assignment Sequence: **Follows Craft Logic of Scientific Practice** Training manual developed based on WA questions and comments Skills-based ("craft") assignments (tables/figures, library skills, outlines) Framing the writing exercises in terms of relevant scientific pursuit (motivation vs. objective vs. pedagogic purpose) **Fall Assignments Spring Assignments** 1) Scientific writing 7) Conclusion 2) Introduction 8) Full journal article 3) Library skills 9) Research proposal 4) Experimental 10) Abstract 5) Tables, Figures, and Equations 11) JCE article 6) Results and Discussion 12) Powerpoint presentation BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Teaching writing in the sciences **Cumulative Lessons Learned** Year 1 – Follows Conceptual Logic of the Scientific Content

- Need mandatory, one-on-one writing instruction
- In-class instruction is insufficient
- Year 2 Follows Rhetorical Logic of Scientific Communication
 - Need to help students learn how to write like scientists instead of students
 - Need to provide explicit instruction in "skills" of science writing
- Year 3 Follows Craft Logic of Scientific Practice
 - First-year students, especially in their first semester, cannot put themselves in the role of a scientist
 - "Use it or lose it": Students need to periodically revisit old material



Teaching writing in the sciences Year 4 (2012/13) Assignment Sequence: Follows Multiple Logics, Just-In-Time Learning Less is more – students do not write unnecessary assignments Order of assignments reflects a just-in-time learning approach Explicit instruction on the form and language of scientific writing Later assignments make explicit reference to prior work and learning **Fall Assignments Spring Assignments** 1) Scientific writing 6) The scientific literature and References 2) Figures and equations 7) Introduction 3) "Checklists" 8) Research proposal 4) Results and Discussion 9) Experimental 5) Conclusion 10) Chem. Ed. article 11) Powerpoint presentations BOSTON 16

Teaching writing in the sciences

©2013, Binyomin Abrams

Cumulative Lessons Learned

- Year 1 Follows Conceptual Logic of the Scientific Content
 - Need mandatory, one-on-one writing instruction
 - In-class instruction is insufficient
- Year 2 Follows Rhetorical Logic of Scientific Communication
 - Need to help students learn how to write like scientists instead of students
 - Need to provide explicit instruction in "skills" of science writing
- Year 3 Follows Craft Logic of Scientific Practice
 - First-year students in their first semester cannot put themselves in the role of a scientist
 - "Use it or lost it": Students need to periodically revisit old material
- Year 4 Follows Multiple Logics, Just-In-Time Learning
 - Current year
 - Preliminary feedback indicates higher student achievement in desired areas



17

Teaching writing in the sciences

©2013, Binyomin Abrams


Cumulative Lessons Learned

- Year 1 Follows Conceptual Logic of the Scientific Content
 - Need mandatory, one-on-one writing instruction
 - In-class instruction is insufficient
- Year 2 Follows Rhetorical Logic of Scientific Communication
 - Need to help students learn how to write like scientists instead of students
 - Need to provide explicit instruction in "skills" of science writing
- Year 3 Follows Craft Logic of Scientific Practice
 - First-year students in their first semester cannot put themselves in the role of a scientist
 - "Use it or lost it": Students need to periodically revisit old material
- Year 4 Follows Multiple Logics, Just-In-Time Learning
 - Current year
 - Preliminary feedback indicates higher student achievement in desired areas
 - But we feel pretty good....




18

eaching writing in the sciences				©20	013, Binyomin Abrar			
	Enrollments, Staff, and Costs							
	Year 0 08-09	Year 1 09-10	Year 2 10-11	Year 3 11-12	Year 4 12-13			
Student enrollments	57/49	76/65	88/80	58/48	86/76			
Number of WAs	-	5/4	9/8	6/5	9/8			
Number of course TAs	2/2	2.5/2	2.5/2	3.5/2.5	4/3			
Cost of program (total)	-	\$ 4,000	\$ 22,000	\$15,000	\$ 22,500			
Cost (per student)	-	\$ 28	\$ 130	\$ 142	\$ 139			
Total writing hours/ student	20/20	20/20	20/24	15/22	10/20			
Approx. pages of writing	55/50	55/50	45/45	25/35	15/30			
BOSTON					19			



Conclusions: Beliefs and Questions Open Questions How do we ensure consistency of interactions with writing assistants? How should content and writing be weighted in grading? What metrics can we use to assess retention of learning and transfer to other chemistry courses? How can department achieve vertical integration in chemistry curriculum? How does department reach chemistry students who do not take the writing-intensive intro sequence? Can this model be used effectively without writing assistants?



Acknowledgments Joseph Bizup (Director, CAS Writing Program) Rebecca Kinraide Seann Mulcahy All of the writing assistants