Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie

DW/R Discourse and Writing/ Rédactologie

Individual and Collective Self-Efficacy for Teaching Writing in a Multidisciplinary Sample of Canadian Faculty

Kim M. Mitchell

Volume 34, 2024

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1113825ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.31468/dwr.1039

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

Canadian Association for the Study of Discourse and Writing

ISSN

2563-7320 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer cet article

Mitchell, K. (2024). Individual and Collective Self-Efficacy for Teaching Writing in a Multidisciplinary Sample of Canadian Faculty. *Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, *34*, 127–156. https://doi.org/10.31468/dwr.1039

Résumé de l'article

Background: Teacher self-efficacy can be defined as the confidence teachers hold about their individual and collective capacity to influence student learning. While many faculty assign and assess student writing as part of their course activities, they often perceive the act of writing as separate from rather than complementary to their teaching of subject matter content. This paper will report on the combined findings of two large survey studies of 385 faculty at Canadian universities, polytechnics and colleges. The purpose of the study was to assess faculty individual and collective self-efficacy for teaching writing.

Methods: Data was collected from faculty via an electronic survey distributed by email or social media (Twitter). Faculty responded to the Individual and Collective Self-Efficacy for Teaching Writing Scales. They also responded to open-ended questions asking them to relate how they felt about their abilities to guide student writing.

Results: Participants' average age was 49.9 years with 14.5 years of teaching experience. Participants reported their individual self-efficacy for teaching writing at 77.2% while feeling that their departments as a whole were only 60% confident at teaching writing. Higher individual self-efficacy for teaching writing were found in faculty who were in combined research and teaching positions, PhD prepared, with prior formal education in teaching writing, and with 20 or more years of teaching experience. No statistically significant findings were observed with the Collective Self-Efficacy scale. From the qualitative survey data three themes were identified: 1) Blaming and lamenting; 2) Is teaching writing our responsibility? 3) Hopeful efforts and recognitions.

Conclusion: Overall, the data is rife with narratives of blaming students and institutions for student inability to write and faculty questioning their role as writing instructor. These narratives drown out the narratives of faculty who have a passion for teaching writing. Future research should focus on the development of formalized workshops to support faculty teaching writing and changing their attitudes toward the developmental and disciplinary shared responsibility of writing instruction in higher education.

Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie
Volume 34, 2024
http://journals.sfu.ca/dwr

Article

Individual and Collective Self-Efficacy for Teaching Writing in a Multidisciplinary Sample of Canadian Faculty

Kim M. Mitchell
University of Manitoba

Abstract

Background: Teacher self-efficacy can be defined as the confidence teachers hold about their individual and collective capacity to influence student learning. While many faculty assign and assess student writing as part of their course activities, they often perceive the act of writing as separate from rather than complementary to their teaching of subject matter content. This paper reports on the combined findings of two independent surveys totaling 385 faculty at Canadian universities, polytechnics and colleges. The purpose of the study was to assess faculty individual and collective self-efficacy for teaching writing.

Methods: Data were collected from faculty via an electronic survey distributed by either email or social media (Twitter). Faculty responded to the Individual and Collective Self-Efficacy for Teaching Writing Scales. They also responded to open-ended questions asking them to relate how they felt about their abilities to guide student writing.

Results: Participants' average age was 49.9 years with 14.5 years of teaching experience. Participants reported their individual self-efficacy for teaching writing at 77.2% while feeling that their departments as a whole were only 60% confident at teaching writing. Faculty were found to have higher individual self-efficacy for teaching writing when they were in combined research and teaching positions, were PhD prepared, had prior formal education in teaching writing, and had 20 or more years of teaching experience. No statistically significant findings were observed with the Collective Self-Efficacy scale. From the qualitative survey data, three themes were identified: 1) Blaming and lamenting; 2) Is teaching writing our responsibility? 3) Hopeful efforts and recognitions.

Conclusion: Overall, the data are rife with narratives of blaming students and institutions for students' inability to write and faculty questioning their role as writing instructor. These narratives drown out the narratives of faculty who have a passion for teaching writing. Future research should focus on the development of formalized workshops to support faculty teaching writing and to change faculty members attitudes toward the developmental and disciplinary shared responsibility of writing instruction in higher education.

Introduction

The importance of writing in higher education to academic performance and future careers is readily acknowledged (Zhu, 2004); however, very few faculty report receiving formal education about writing (Sword, 2012). As a result, faculty often claim they lack the specialized knowledge to perform this important role (Anson, 2015). While many faculty assign and assess student writing as part of their course activities, they often perceive the act of writing as separate from rather than complementary to their teaching of subject matter content (Duncheon & Tierny, 2014; Leggette, 2015; Zemliansky & Berry, 2017). Interviews with faculty about their experiences with student writing are also often replete with faculty blaming the student for their poor performance (Basgier & Simpson, 2020a). The prevalence of this attitude is alarming, given that faculty attitudes toward writing in the classroom have a strong impact on student writing self-efficacy and subsequent valuing of writing (Mitchell et al., 2023; Pratt et al., 2021; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2006). Additionally, writing ability is frequently mentioned as a top desire of employers who hire college graduates (Thonney, 2023).

In previous studies, faculty have been reported to lament poor student writing, yet paradoxically, they are observed to make very little effort to provide opportunities for students to write regularly in order for writing improvements to transpire (Jenkins et al., 1993; Moon et al., 2018; Zhu, 2004). Time constraints, heavy workloads, large class sizes, lack of resources such as teaching assistants, research obligations, and lack of rewards are implicated as systemic reasons faculty are reluctant to include writing in their courses (Basgier & Simpson, 2020b; Hardré, 2012; Moon et al., 2018; Shellenbarger & Gazza, 2020; Thonney, 2023). Boice (1990) outlines five primary reasons why faculty avoid making their courses writing intensive. These include the extra work needed to grade assignments, an already full classroom schedule, students disliking writing assignments, not feeling expert enough to assign writing, and not enjoying writing themselves. Even when faculty do assign discipline-specific content writing, they are constantly balancing their tight course timelines within

a context where students arrive with vastly differing levels of writing proficiency (Hampton et al., 2022). Additionally, faculty will fail to see the value of writing as learning if they perceive their courses to be about factual information (Boice, 1990).

Much has been written to dispel the myth that writing can be reduced to a basic skill which is mastered at the high school level (Basgier & Simpson, 2020b; Duncheon & Tierney, 2014; Moon et al., 2018; Zhu, 2004); however, Locke and Johnston (2016) contend that many high school teachers are also reluctant to view themselves as writing teachers. Various faculty attitudes about writing instruction can be noted in the literature. Zhu (2004) identified two prevailing beliefs held by faculty regarding their role in writing instruction. First, that writing instruction should be provided by writing or language experts only and disciplinary teachers, not being experts, should bear no responsibility. Second, writing instruction should happen in a partnership between content faculty and writing teachers. Hampton et al. (2022) identified two additional prevailing attitudes among their faculty participants. Writing was seen as either a gatekeeping activity used to "weed" weak students out of the program, or – and in better alignment with sociocultural perspectives – it was viewed as a developmental learning process. Likely, the most significant barrier to the use of writing assignments in content courses are faculty's misaligned beliefs that writing is a universal skill rather than a developmental process that changes from discipline to discipline and course to course (Basgier & Simpson, 2020b). While the sociocognitive perspective that writing is a disciplinary act with benefits to identity development and disciplinary genre knowledge is an established stronghold of common knowledge among writing scholars, this belief system has had sparse uptake in disciplinary faculty, in particular in STEM (Jenkins et al., 1993; Moon et al., 2018; Stroumbakis et al., 2016; Zemliansky & Berry, 2017; Zhu, 2004) and health learning contexts (Hampton et al., 2022; Mitchell, 2018; Shellenbarger & Gazza, 2020). Basgier and Simpson (2020a; 2020b) argue that recognizing the developmental nature of writing ability is a threshold concept, meaning once the threshold is reached by faculty recognition becomes irreversible.

Teacher Individual and Collective Self-Efficacy for Teaching Writing

This paper reports on the combined findings of two large surveys totaling 385 faculty at Canadian universities, polytechnics, and colleges. The purpose of the study was to assess faculty individual and collective self-efficacy for teaching writing. Teacher individual self-efficacy can be defined as, "the confidence teachers hold about their individual and collective capacity to influence student learning." (Klassen et al. as cited in Locke & Johnson, 2016, p. 1). Self-efficacy was proposed by Bandura (1997)

to be a function of human agency, or a belief in an ability to take action in order to procure positive outcomes in a desired activity. Self-efficacy is a motivational construct which, when present, means a teacher will be more likely to persist in the face of difficulty (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2006). Scholars profess that teacher self-efficacy holds many benefits in its reciprocal relationship with student achievement. Teachers with high self-efficacy are thought to encourage achievement gains in students, while high student achievement also boosts teacher self-efficacy (Köksal et al., 2018). In this context, teacher self-efficacy beliefs are "self-fulfilling prophecies" (p. 945) that affect teacher mastery of teaching tasks (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2006). Teachers with low self-efficacy and low expectations of student ability are less likely to put forth effort in the preparation and delivery of instruction, thereby not seeing the student achievement gains required to prompt continued effort, which is required to achieve mastery in teaching ability. Teachers with high self-efficacy are more likely to be open to new ideas and trial new teaching methods. Those with low self-efficacy will expect low student performance and student respect before they even start teaching (Pratt et al., 2021). Teachers with high self-efficacy for teaching writing will feel a sense of ownership in their classrooms as well as feel capable as writers themselves leading to their feelings of capability as teachers of writing (Whitacre, 2019).

Individual self-efficacy is also influenced by collective self-efficacy within a teaching unit. Observing collective self-efficacy in a teaching environment is important because, as Bandura (1997) notes, the system in which teachers work is an "interactive social system" (p. 243) where no one works in isolation. While Bandura writes about collective self-efficacy in the context of primary and secondary schooling, there are many attributes that could apply to post-secondary education. The collective nature of school systems means that the teachers within them can have their self-efficacy impacted by factors such as heavy workloads, poor pay, lack of promotional opportunities, and ongoing debates about what should and should not be taught. These same realities exist in higher education. Effective secondary and higher education schools have strong leadership, high beliefs in student capabilities, and give students control over their academic performances. Leaders in strong schools will figure out ways to work around policies that stifle academic creativity. When faculty collectively assess they have power to influence student academic success, student motivation follows (Bandura, 1997).

Models of Faculty Response to Writing

While self-efficacy for teaching has been explored at the middle school and high school level (Köksal et al., 2018; Locke & Johnson, 2016; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2006; Whitacre, 2019), few such studies have been conducted at the post-secondary level. Studies instead have focused on teacher beliefs about writing (Moon et al., 2018; Stroumbakis et al., 2016; Zhu, 2004) or the way teachers conceptualize writing (Basgier & Simpson, 2020a; 2020b). Moon et al. (2018) studied the relationship between STEM instructors' conceptions of writing and their views of it in the classroom. From their data they identified a model of four profiles of disciplinary faculty as teachers of writing. *The traditionalist* did not use writing in their classroom primarily because they didn't see writing as having a relationship to their content. They saw writing as important but something to be taught elsewhere. Their beliefs were that students learned to write (the writing as a skill perspective) rather than that writing could be used to facilitate learning. *Idealists* also did not use writing in their courses but saw writing as fundamental to the learning process. Their reasons for not using writing were attributed to the rigidity of their course material, the lack of support in terms of being supplied with teaching assistants, and large class sizes. *The utilitarian* used writing in their classes but had highly objectivist perspectives viewing writing as a skill separate from content learning. The purpose of writing in their courses was to train students for better communication. *The writer* viewed writing as a process that encompassed student practice as a scientist. They viewed writing as equal to discovery and had attitudes consistent with rhetorical theorists that writing reveals understanding. Profiling faculty as writing instructors is useful to understand epistemological stances of faculty in the classroom which fell along two intersecting continuums of not using writing to using writing and of viewing writing as an act of learning or viewing writing as a skill.

Basgier and Simpson (2020a; 2020b) examined threshold concepts of teaching writing in order to profile faculty as having progressed through various states of liminal thinking with respect to enacting writing pedagogies in the classroom. Threshold concepts startle a learner, ultimately influencing professional identity development. Threshold concepts are ideas that are considered troublesome, transformative, help integrate multiple concepts together and once achieved are irreversible. Basgier and Simpson (2020a; 2020b) discovered their threshold concepts of teaching writing through asking faculty to produce a narrative describing a time when they tried to teach writing and it didn't go as planned. Faculty were asked to describe what they learned and what they

did or wished they had done differently with their pedagogy. One meta concept and two threshold concepts were developed from these narratives:

Meta concept: Effective writing pedagogy involves iterative multifaceted change.

Threshold Concept 1: Student development as writers can be supported through scaffolded interventions.

Threshold Concept 2: Genres can be taught as actions, not (just) forms.

The authors described faculty narratives as falling into three categories. Narratives where faculty described a problem but were unable to see a way forward to solve their problem, instead blaming the students for their inability to write were termed *Roadblock* narratives. *Roadblock* pedagogies were often faculty-oriented pedagogies such as lecturing on a limited topic. Narratives that saw only a partial solution to writing difficulties, initiating or imagining one limited solution to their problem, were termed *Detour* narratives. Faculty with Detour narratives were at the beginning stages of recognizing their own limitations and recognized the disciplinarity of writing but they oscillated between this more enlightened state and blaming students for their failure to successfully implement the writing task assigned. Narratives that were highly reflective about their pedagogy challenges and had enacted multifaceted solutions were termed *Journey* narratives.

If self-efficacy for teaching writing motivates persistence and effort in classroom pedagogy development, then it is likely that faculty attitudes toward teaching writing in the classroom can inform our understanding of different levels of faculty writing self-efficacy. I implemented a study protocol using both quantitative and qualitative methods in order to identify faculty levels of self-efficacy for teaching writing, their collective self-efficacy for teaching writing, and to compare these results with some select faculty demographics including age, discipline, years teaching, type of faculty position (teaching focused or teaching and research focused), level of education and presence or absence of prior education of teaching writing. Faculty were also asked to respond to open-ended survey questions asking them to consider factors in their teaching context that affected their abilities to guide writing in their classes or labs. The questions guiding this research were: 1) What faculty characteristics are related to their self-efficacy for teaching writing? (Quantitative analysis) 2) What can we learn from the attitudes faculty express about their self-efficacy for teaching writing? (Qualitative analysis).

Methods

Described, is a cross-sectional multimethod study which uses the Individual and Collective Self-Efficacy Scale for Teaching Writing (Locke & Johnstone, 2016) in post-secondary faculty. As these are, in practice, two separate scales, I hereafter refer to each scale as the Individual Sale or the Collective Scale. Following ethical approval from the required institutions, participants were asked to complete an online survey. Two independent samples formed the data for this Canadian exclusive analysis: one sample comprised of exclusively nursing faculty (sample 1) and the second with multidisciplinary faculty (sample 2). The two combined study samples resulted in a total sample of 385 faculty.

I used either Twitter posts or email to distribute the survey to eligible faculty who included all faculty who were in a role where they had either assigned or graded student writing at a post-secondary institution. I used different recruitment techniques for the two samples. The nursing faculty sample 1 initially focused on two Manitoba institutions with nursing programs (one research-oriented university and one polytechnic). To increase sample size the study was expanded to all institutions with nursing programs across Canada with faculty names and email addresses posted publicly on their institutional websites. A small portion responded to postings on the social media platform Twitter. Respondents from the nursing sample were from all provinces in Canada except Prince Edward Island. Sample 2 recruited about one third of participants from Twitter posts and the remainder from emails sent via list servs at the two largest universities in the province of Manitoba.

Measures

The main measurement tool used in the study was Locke and Johnson's (2016) Individual and Collective Self-Efficacy for Teaching Writing Scales which were originally designed and tested with high school teachers. The scales underwent minor wording changes to make the items more post-secondary focused. The original Individual Self-Efficacy Scale is comprised of 25 items with five items per scale domain: 1) orientation competencies (ability to teach text within a context); 2) research competencies (ability to teach inquiry strategies); 3) structural competencies (ability to teach writing structure, planning, and cohesion); 4) textural competencies (ability to teach voice, style, vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure); 5) motivational competencies (ability to foster a writing community, help with goal setting, and model a writing identity). The items on the Individual Scale are presented to participants in a 4-point Likert-type format with response options including 1) not confident at all, 2) not very confident, 3) quite confident, and 4) very confident. The Collective Self-Efficacy Scale

includes seven items which examine how well teachers collectively teach writing within their department and function as a group. The scale acts as a rating of how faculty feel their department is doing, as a whole, to teach writing. The items on the Collective Scale are presented to participants in a 4-point Likert-type format with response options including 1) false, 2) mostly false, 3) mostly true, 4) true. Locke and Johnston (2016) conducted an exploratory factor analysis along with a calibration analysis which reduced the individual self-efficacy for teaching writing scale to 12 items with two independent factors of six items each: pre-writing instructional strategies and compositional strategy demonstration. I analyzed the data using both the original theoretical factor structure and the reduced two-factor structure. Internal consistency reliability scores using Cronbach's alpha were acceptable for each of the subscales and can be viewed in Table 1.

Quantitative Analysis and Results

Quantitative Data Analysis

The quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS (v.27). Descriptive statistics, t-tests for independent samples, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were the statistical tests employed. For the Individual Self-Efficacy Scale, missing data were less than 1%. All missing data on the scale were replaced with the average score of the remaining items for the subscale. Missing data were higher on the Collective Self-Efficacy Scale. The responses in the open-ended text box for the scale provided insight as to why there were blank responses to the Collective Scale. Many participants indicated that they didn't know how to answer the items on the scale or didn't feel comfortable answering questions that judged their colleague's abilities to teach writing because they had not had conversations with their colleagues on these issues or had never observed their teaching. (Note: many participants also made the same comments but still completed the collective self-efficacy scale). If no more than two items were missing from the collective self-efficacy scale the missing response was replaced with the mean of the completed items on the scale. In total 9.9% of the sample had insufficiently completed the Collective Self-Efficacy Scale and their data was not used in any analyses involving this scale. The Collective Self-Efficacy sample was 347 participants.

Locke and Johnson (2016), during their validation of their tool, performed an item response theory (IRT) calibration of the Likert scale used in the questionnaire. There are a number of different pros and cons to performing this IRT analysis even though Locke and Johnson are insistent that the analysis is mandatory. I have elected not to perform this IRT calibration in this study for a number of reasons. In practice not much measurement accuracy is lost by simply summing the items instead of

doing an IRT calibration. The summed scores are much more accessible to implement and explain. In the case of this work, I am simply using Locke and Johnson's tool to perform some simple comparisons between subgroups of the sample making the IRT analysis unnecessary.

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Table 1 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the sample including the mean scores from the Individual and Collective Self-Efficacy Scales divided into subscales: orientation competencies, research competencies, structural competencies, textural competencies, motivational competencies, collective self-efficacy, pre-writing instructional strategies, and compositional strategy demonstration. The sample was 56.6% from heath disciplines, 77.1% female, 52.3% teaching focused, and 53.2% were PhD or ED prepared. Sample 2 was asked if they had received formal education on teaching writing and 63.5% of the sample reported receiving no formal education on the teaching of writing. Participants reported their individual self-efficacy for teaching writing at 77.2% while feeling that their departments as a whole were only 60% confident at teaching writing.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the sample

Characteristic	**Category**	**n**	**%**		
Discipline	Nursing and Health	218	56.6%		
	Arts and Humanities	44	11.4%		
	STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics	43	11.2%		
	Social Science	38	9.9%		
	Education	23	6.0%		
	Business	9	2.3%		
	Law	3	0.8%		
	Other	4	1.0%		
	Missing	3	0.8%		
Gender	Female	297	77.1%		
	Male	74	19.2%		
	Transgender/Non-Binary/Gender Fluid	6	1.6%		
	Prefer not to answer	7	1.8%		
	Missing	1	0.3%		
Rank	Sessional/Adjunct/Non Permanent	48	12.5%		
	Teaching Focused Non-Tenure	135	35.1%		
	Teaching Focused Tenured	18	4.7%		
	Tenure Track Research Stream	55	14.3%		
	Tenured Research Stream	123	31.9%		
	Other	5	1.3%		
	Missing	1	0.3%		

Education	Bachelors	20	5.2%		
	Masters	158	41.0%		
	PhD/ED	205	53.2%		
	Missing	2	0.5%		
Writing Education (only sample 2)	Yes	76	19.7%		
	No	132	34.3%		
	Missing	177	46.0%		
N	**Characteristic**	**Range**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Alpha**
364	Age	0-77	49.91	10.63	
377	Years Teaching	0-48	14.50	9.37	
385	Orientation Competencies	5-20	16.02	3.17	.88
385	Research Competencies	5-20	16.00	3.36	.89
385	Structural Competencies	5-20	15.81	3.36	.88
385	Textural Competencies	5-20	15.25	3.66	.91
385	Motivational Competencies	5-20	14.14	3.66	.87
347	Collective Self-Efficacy	7-28	16.78	4.51	.90
385	Pre-Writing Instructional Strategies	6-24	18.75	3.84	.89
385	Compositional Strategy Demonstration	6-24	18.90	3.81	.87

Quantitative Results

Tables 2 through 7 represent the subgroup analysis performed on this sample of Canadian faculty using either t-tests (two group comparisons) or ANOVA (three group comparisons). Table 2 represents the findings of the t-test comparing teaching-focused faculty with teaching and research focused faculty on all scale domains. All domains showed that teaching and research focused faculty had statistically significantly ($p < .05$) higher individual self-efficacy for teaching writing with small effect sizes detected in most categories except for research competencies where the effect size was medium. Collective self-efficacy was not significantly different between these groups.

Table 3 represents the findings of the t-test comparing participants who reported taking formal writing instruction compared to those who had not. This question was only asked of sample 2 participants. Faculty who reported having received formal instruction on how to teach writing had statistically significantly higher ($p < .05$) individual self-efficacy domain scores than those who did not report this training. Effect sizes for these relationships were small to moderate. Collective self-efficacy was not significantly different between these groups.

Table 4 represents the findings of the t-test comparing participants with Bachelor or Masters preparation to those with PhD/ED preparation. Faculty who reported having a PhD or ED had

statistically significantly higher (p < .05) individual self-efficacy domain scores than those with Bachelor's or Master's degrees. Effect sizes for these relationships were small with the exception of the categories for pre-writing instructional strategies and compositional strategy demonstration where the effect sizes were medium. Collective self-efficacy was not significantly different between these groups.

Because the sample had a large proportion of nursing and health faculty, Table 5 represents the findings of the t-test comparing nursing and health participants to those in all other disciplines in order to assess if there was a distinguishable difference between groups. Faculty in nursing or health disciplines reported statistically significantly higher (p < .05) individual self-efficacy domain scores only in the research and structural competency domains when compared to all other faculty. Effect sizes for these relationships were small. All other domains did not detect a statistically significant difference between these groups.

Table 6 shows the results for the one-way ANOVA examining the categorial difference in individual and collective self-efficacy by participant age groups. Participants were divided into three groups according to their age (Group 1: 35 years or less; Group 2: 36-50 years; Group 3: 51 years or older. All relationships were non-significant with the exception of textural competencies (p = .04) which detected a small difference between groups with a small effect size (eta squared = .02). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the 51 years and older group was significantly higher than that reported by the 35 years and under group (p = .03). The middle age group (36 to 50) did not differ significantly from either of the other two age groups.

Table 7 displays the results for the one-way ANOVA comparing three groups of participants' years of teaching (Group 1: 10 years or less; Group 2: 11-19 years; Group 3: 20 years or more). Motivational competencies and collective self-efficacy were non-significant by years of teaching; however, all other domains showed statistical significances with small effect sizes. In all categories, fewer years of teaching equated with the lowest individual self-efficacy while having 20 or more years of teaching experience resulted in the highest reported writing self-efficacy. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that those with less than 10 years' experience had lower orientation competencies than those with 20 or more years (p = .003). Those with less than 10 years' experience had lower research competencies than those with 20 or more years (p = .002) and those with 11-19 years' experience were lower than those with 20 or more years' experience in the same domain (p = .02). Those with less than 10 years' experience had lower structural competencies than those with 20 or more years (p = .03). Those with less than 10 years' experience had lower textural

competencies than those with 20 or more years (p = .01) and those with 11-19 years' experience were lower than those with 20 or more years' experience in the same domain (p = .04). Those with less than 10 years' experience had lower pre-writing instructional strategies than those with 20 or more years (p = .003). Those with less than 10 years' experience had lower compositional strategy demonstration than those with 20 or more years (p = .01).

Table 2. Independent samples t-test comparing teaching focused to research focused faculty

	Teaching Focused			**Teaching and Research**			**Mean Difference**	**95% CI**	***df***	***t***	***p***	**Partial eta squared**
	n	***M***	***SD***	***n***	***M***	***SD***						
Orientation Competencies	201	15.56	3.17	178	16.51	2.99	-.85	-1.47, -.22	377	-2.67	.01	.02
Research Competencies	201	15.25	3.41	178	16.89	2.98	-1.63	-2.28, -.98	377	-4.93	<.001	.06
Structural Competencies	201	15.13	3.33	178	16.64	3.14	-1.51	-2.16, -.86	377	-4.53	<.001	.05
Textural Competencies	201	14.82	3.74	178	15.76	3.46	-.94	-1.67, -.21	377	-2.52	.01	.02
Motivational Competencies	201	13.68	3.57	178	14.65	3.68	-.97	-1.70, -.24	377	-2.60	.01	.02
Collective Self-Efficacy	176	16.58	4.14	165	17.08	4.83	-.50	-1.46, .45	339	-1.03	.30	.00
Pre-Writing Instructional Strategies	201	18.10	3.83	178	19.56	3.58	-1.46	-2.21, -.71	377	-3.82	<.001	.04
Compositional Strategy Demonstration	201	18.28	3.88	178	19.65	3.50	-1.38	-2.13, -.63	377	-3.61	<.001	.03

Partial eta squared: .01 = small effect size; .06 = medium effect size; .14 = large effect size

Table 3. Independent samples t-test comparing participants who had education on teaching writing and those who did not

	Yes			**No**			**Mean Difference**	**95% CI**	***df***	***t***	***p***	**Partial eta squared**
	n	***M***	***SD***	***n***	***M***	***SD***						
Orientation Competencies	76	16.77	2.72	132	15.34	3.18	1.44	.58, 2.29	206	3.30	.001	.05
Research Competencies	76	17.07	2.80	132	15.43	3.50	1.63	.70, 2.55	206	3.46	<.001	.05
Structural Competencies	76	17.11	2.69	132	15.17	3.51	1.93	1.01, 2.85	206	4.15	<.001	.08
Textural Competencies	76	16.22	3.42	132	14.35	3.92	1.87	.81, 2.94	206	3.48	<.001	.06
Motivational Competencies	76	15.45	3.32	132	13.15	3.73	2.30	1.28, 3.32	206	4.45	<.001	.09
Collective Self-Efficacy	66	16.83	5.02	116	15.96	4.39	.88	-.53, 2.29	180	1.24	.22	.01
Pre-Writing Instructional Strategies	76	19.96	3.19	132	17.92	3.87	2.04	1.00, 3.07	206	3.89	<.001	.07
Compositional Strategy Demonstration	76	19.70	3.52	132	18.16	4.02	1.54	.44, 2.63	206	2.78	<.001	.04

Partial eta squared: .01 = small effect size; .06 = medium effect size; .14 = large effect size

Table 4. Independent samples t-test comparing Bachelor's/Master's educational preparation to PhD/ED

	Bachelor or Masters			**PhD/ED**			**Mean Difference**	**95% CI**	***df***	***t***	***p***	**Partial eta squared**
	n	***M***	***SD***	***n***	***M***	***SD***						
Orientation Competencies	178	15.26	3.26	205	16.68	2.94	-1.42	-2.04, -.80	381	-4.48	<.001	.05
Research Competencies	178	14.87	3.41	205	16.97	2.99	-2.10	-2.74, -1.46	381	-6.43	<.001	.10
Structural Competencies	178	14.69	3.35	205	16.78	3.07	-2.09	-2.73, -1.44	381	-6.37	<.001	.10
Textural Competencies	178	14.62	3.61	205	15.78	3.64	-1.15	-1.89, -.42	381	-3.11	.002	.03
Motivational Competencies	178	13.35	3.50	205	14.81	3.69	-1.46	-2.18, -.73	381	-3.94	<.001	.04
Collective Self-Efficacy	159	16.78	4.23	186	16.78	4.76	-.01	-.97, .95	343	-.02	.99	.00
Pre-Writing Instructional Strategies	178	17.61	3.87	205	19.73	3.55	-2.12	-2.86, -1.38	381	-5.60	<.001	.08
Compositional Strategy Demonstration	178	17.95	3.76	205	19.71	3.68	-1.76	-2.51, -1.02	381	-5.60	<.001	.08

Partial eta squared: .01 = small effect size; .06 = medium effect size; .14 = large effect size

Table 5. Independent samples t-test comparing health disciplines to all other disciplines

	Health Disciplines			**All other disciplines**			**Mean Difference**	**95% CI**	***df***	***t***	***p***	**Partial eta squared**
	n	***M***	***SD***	***n***	***M***	***SD***						
Orientation Competencies	164	16.26	3.01	218	15.90	3.21	.36	-.27, .99	380	1.12	.26	.00
Research Competencies	164	16.46	3.11	218	15.72	3.38	.74	.08, 1.40	380	2.19	.03	.01
Structural Competencies	164	16.31	3.13	218	15.50	3.37	.81	.14, 1.47	380	2.38	.02	.02
Textural Competencies	164	15.49	3.80	218	15.12	3.47	.37	-.37, 1.10	380	.98	.33	.00
Motivational Competencies	164	14.42	3.60	218	13.96	3.64	.46	-.28, 1.19	380	1.22	.22	.00
Collective Self-Efficacy	143	16.87	4.55	202	16.74	4.43	.13	-.84, 1.09	343	.26	.80	.00
Pre-Writing Instructional Strategies	164	19.10	3.62	218	18.55	3.90	.55	-.22, 1.32	380	1.41	.16	.01
Compositional Strategy Demonstration	164	19.27	3.70	218	18.69	3.75	.58	-.18, 1.34	380	1.51	.13	.01

Partial eta squared: .01 = small effect size; .06 = medium effect size; .14 = large effect size

Table 6. One-Way ANOVA for participant age

	35 and Under			**36-50**			**50+**			***df***	***F***	***p***	**Partial eta squared**
	n	***M***	***SD***	***n***	***M***	***SD***	***n***	***M***	***SD***				
Orientation Competencies	29	14.62	3.22	154	16.10	3.08	181	16.00	3.08	2, 361	2.89	.06	.02
Research Competencies	29	14.62	3.62	154	16.16	3.13	181	15.90	3.39	2, 361	2.65	.07	.01
Structural Competencies	29	14.62	3.87	154	16.03	3.19	181	15.58	3.30	2, 361	2.43	.09	.01
Textural Competencies	29	13.55	4.40	154	15.12	3.73	181	15.37	3.34	2, 361	3.20	.04	.02
Motivational Competencies	29	13.10	3.93	154	14.36	3.68	181	13.90	3.51	2, 361	1.70	.18	.01
Collective Self-Efficacy	26	17.42	4.31	142	17.10	4.40	181	16.43	4.47	2, 332	1.15	.32	.01
Pre-Writing Instructional Strategies	29	17.17	4.05	154	18.81	3.76	181	18.71	3.75	2, 361	2.38	.09	.01
Compositional Strategy Demonstration	29	17.31	4.37	154	19.03	3.57	181	18.80	3.73	2, 361	2.61	.08	.01

Partial eta squared: .01 = small effect size; .06 = medium effect size; .14 = large effect size

Table 7. One-way ANOVA by participant years of teaching experience

	10 Years or Less			**11-19 years**			**20+ years**			***df***	***F***	***p***	**Partial eta squared**
	n	***M***	***SD***	***n***	***M***	***SD***	***n***	***M***	***SD***				
Orientation Competencies	149	15.45	3.03	104	15.89	3.38	124	16.71	2.92	2, 374	5.69	.004	.03
Research Competencies	149	15.49	3.18	104	15.64	3.81	124	16.84	2.81	2, 374	6.61	.002	.03
Structural Competencies	149	15.30	3.38	104	15.79	3.28	124	16.35	3.20	2, 374	3.41	.03	.02
Textural Competencies	149	14.72	3.60	104	14.91	3.77	124	16.05	3.37	2, 374	5.20	.01	.03
Motivational Competencies	149	13.57	3.51	104	14.27	3.86	124	14.56	3.49	2, 374	2.71	.07	.01
Collective Self-Efficacy	131	17.15	3.91	95	16.00	4.67	114	17.00	4.84	2, 337	2.05	.13	.01
Pre-Writing Instructional Strategies	149	18.07	3.62	104	18.55	4.23	124	19.59	3.43	2, 374	5.73	.004	.03
Compositional Strategy Demonstration	149	18.34	3.61	104	18.65	4.12	124	19.64	3.45	2, 374	4.41	.01	.02

Partial eta squared: .01 = small effect size; .06 = medium effect size; .14 = large effect size

Qualitative Analysis and Findings

Qualitative Analysis

Three open-ended questions were also asked in one or both of the surveys:

1. Participants were asked in a closed-ended question if they had taken any formal education in writing instruction (yes/no). They were asked to expand upon this response: If YES: please describe the courses or workshops you have taken. If NO: how did you learn to teach the writing assigned in your classes or labs? (Sample 2 only)
2. The following question was placed following the Individual Self-efficacy for teaching writing scale: Please use the space provided if you have any specific comments about how you feel about your abilities to guide students with their academic writing. (Sample 1 and 2).
3. The following question was placed following the Collective Self-Efficacy Scale: Please use the space provided if you have any specific comments about the above items. (Sample 1 and 2).

The open-ended questions were analyzed thematically. Open-ended question 1 was analyzed independently to understand what faculty reported as ways they learned to teach writing. In the case of this question, the responses were coded and then counted for their frequency. Questions 2 and 3, which were the open-ended questions that each respectively followed the Individual Self-Efficacy Scale for teaching writing and the Collective Self-Efficacy Scale for teaching writing, were analyzed together. The data was downloaded into Microsoft Word and read multiple times. Inductive coding was used to chunk the data into manageable units while considering the entire narrative text through use of coding in the margins of the document (Bhattacharya, 2017; Cho & Lee, 2014). The codes were then combined into three emerging categories: 1) Lamenting and blaming; 2) Is teaching writing our responsibility? 3) Hopeful efforts and recognitions.

Analysis of Question 1: How did you Learn to Teach Writing?

After responding yes or no to if they had taken formal courses on how to teach writing, the sample 2 participants were asked to provide details of the courses they had taken and, if they hadn't taken any courses, they were asked to describe how they learned to teach writing. These responses were categorized and counted and appear in rank order in Table 8. Note that participants often described more than one source of knowledge for how they learned to teach writing.

Table 8. Responses to how did you learn to teach writing?

Frequency of Response	Category	Representative Quote
50	Trial and Error or just from experience teaching writing	"I figured it out as a went along"
46	Workshops or conferences	"Workshops on course assignments; workshops on scaffolding writing assignments; on assessment; on composition instruction and assessment."
42	Took entire courses	"Writing and journalism courses in university"
39	From past experience being a student	"From being a student for over twenty years. I paid attention in class."
37	Have an entire degree or certificate related to teaching writing	"My Master's degree and PhD both focus on writing"
30	Mentorship from other experienced faculty	"I learned from my previous mentors and my current peers what instructions and feedback are most helpful to the students."
24	Read books or sought out their own resources	"I read about it after realising that writing was seen as an assumed 'basic' skill that we didn't teach. But I thought that was silly – why would writing knowledge and skill not need to develop as mathematical, scientific, or theoretical knowledge would. So I went looking for books and articles about the same kinds of problems."
19	From working as a teaching assistant or tutor	"As an undergraduate, I worked as a tutor in my college's writing center"
7	Feel they haven't learned to teach writing	"I don't know how to teach writing. I wing it"

Analysis of Questions 2 and 3: Emerging Categories

Category 1: Lamenting and blaming

Participants, in reflecting on their own capabilities for teaching writing in the context of having just answered the questions of the Individual and Collective Self-Efficacy Scales, the vast majority of the narratives supplied in the optional comment boxes were highly negative toward their work-life context, structural issues in academia, and the students themselves. Broadly, faculty felt students wrote poorly and certain types of students were most likely to bear the burden of these complaints. For example:

> I have always required a written assignment in all the courses I have taught over the years. I feel it is very important that this continues as the students we get in first year have exceptionally very poor writing skills coming out of high school. They are very lacking even in basic spelling

> and grammar. This has been a consistent shift over the past eight years that I have taught. The other struggle we have are a very high number of international students with exceptionally poor writing skills coming into the programs.

In a context faculty felt was rife with poorly prepared writers, complaints about lacking time to teach and evaluate writing were the most prevalent. For example:

> The major barrier to guiding students with their academic writing is time and resources. My institution does not have tutorials, and I do not get assigned teaching assistants. As such, it is impossible to provide high-quality writing instruction.

Time as a barrier was often presented in tandem with mentions of large class size, lack of rewards, and dependency on receiving a teaching assistant which was not guaranteed to be provided. Time was also intertwined with work-life issues that blamed departments or the institution for the challenges faculty faced such as not providing tutorials or having policy rules they felt limited the flexibility of the kind of writing assignments they were able to develop in their courses. For example:

> One of the ways I would like to use in the classroom is a sequenced assignment in which they submit a series of assignments that walk them through the process of thinking through an argument, gathering and organizing evidence, drafting, revising, citing, and proofreading. Unfortunately, that's very difficult to do while adhering to the current Senate requirements for a W designation. I consider the current regulations to be dated and unhelpful. Simply producing a designated word count does not guarantee that they have learned anything about writing.

This faculty member felt that the description of W (writing specific) courses at their institution could be clearer. With clearer guidelines, instructors would be obligated to provide better writing instruction to students beyond requiring them to produce a prescribed word count. Similarly, lack of entrance standards were implicated for the poor quality of writing that faculty observed in their assignments,

> It's not always clear to me what my role should be in bringing all students to a certain skill level vs. what should be the role of entrance standards.

Student attitudes and behaviours were also to blame for faculty struggles to teach writing. Faculty accused students of not looking at assignment guidelines (“They don’t open the toolbox”), not reading their feedback, and simply not caring about learning to write well:

> While I am confident that I can teach / model / demonstrate most of the listed skills, I am not at all confident that some students, by the time they get to university, are willing to learn them, or,

> in some cases, even capable of doing so. Many of them don't care, and I've never figured out how to convince someone to care.

Student attitudes made faculty feel their struggles to teach writing was something out of their control. One faculty labelled student lack of interest in writing as a part of an anti-intellectualism movement,

> The level of anti-intellectualism is high among our undergraduate students, and our leaders do little to counter this trend.
>
> Or:
>
> It is difficult again to support writing in this environment, where is not a clear message from day one of the importance of intellectualism in nursing.

Related, others noted a general lack of cultural practice within their departments to orient faculty to the teaching of writing as a collective responsibility within the program. Faculty also implicated lack of professional development opportunities and lack of opportunities for sharing strategies and techniques with each other. Instead one faculty member observed, "instructors are left to their own devices to teach in whatever ways they see fit" with the implication that this faculty member felt their colleagues' methods were ineffective.

Ultimately, what resulted was faculty developed a sense of learned helplessness with respect to even offering writing assignments in their courses. Faculty felt that if they weren't going to be supported to teaching writing, if class sizes couldn't be kept to a reasonable level, and if TAs would not be supplied that these conditions were not conducive to their being willing to assign writing. Paradoxical faculty resistance to assigning writing appeared among the faculty members' pervasive narrative that "students can't write:" For example as one faculty member noted:

> Recent students arrive with poor writing skills, yet many faculty remove writing assignments from their courses because they do not want to mark them.

Faculty reported that the writing that was handed in was poor or plagiarized, and concluded from this that writing assignments should be dropped from courses all together. Faculty viewed writing as a skill, rather than a learning opportunity that they could play a role nurturing. As a skill, writing needed to be perfected before students arrived in those faculty members' classrooms so they didn't have to deal with the problem of poor student writing. For example,

> My preference would be that all students have taken a basic writing course before they end up with me.

Overall, the analysis within this theme of lamenting and blaming students emphasizes that work life context, structural and student issues, and lack of time and resources are key contributors to faculty attitudes toward teaching writing.

Category 2: Is teaching writing our responsibility?

Many faculty questioned if teaching writing was part of their role. Role uncertainty was a prevalent narrative of self-efficacy presented by faculty:

> As I have no training in this area, I feel quite uncertain about my abilities and about whether or not it is my job to do this.

Role uncertainty presented an obvious tension between teaching writing or spending time on the content of their courses:

> I feel a tension regarding how much time I spend on writing vs. content in courses, especially courses that are explicitly defined as survey courses and therefore have expectation of covering a certain amount of content. But the students are coming in with surprisingly (at least to me) low writing abilities that need to be redressed.

They also recognized that, "students aren't necessarily receiving this instruction elsewhere." The survey was replete with comments indicating that teaching of writing was something they just did not do, and that teaching of writing belonged in the domain of other specialized courses. For example:

> The University needs to INVEST in such supports, so that instructors and professors can focus on their subjects with their undergraduate and graduate students.

Another respondent said:

> I am also not hired to teach writing skills.

Another respondent said:

> Our role is to provide feedback on writing but not to teach English grammar and writing. Our role is content.

These statements are highly indicative many faculty saw writing instruction as separate from their other obligations in the classroom environment.

Some faculty listed strategies they used in their classrooms to help support student writing. Most of those strategies were superficial such as grammar, style, and word choice teachings, selecting appropriate research sources, or identifying a clear thesis statement. As a result of their superficial views on teaching writing, many faculty saw writing as something that was separate from and acted as an interference to their course content. For example:

> Writing is not a course objective, nor would I know which unit to eliminate to create more room.

In some cases, faculty were as extreme as identifying writing as a skill useless to their students' future careers. For example:

> More and more I feel like my job as a university nursing teacher is to teach students how to do things that have little relevance to them as new graduate nurses. A student who can articulate a written argument may have zero skills in the clinical setting, and I fail to see how that is a "win" for patient care and patient safety.

There was a general lack of recognition that writing was capable of doing more for thinking in their discipline than teaching them good grammar and sentence structure.

There was frequent feedback about the survey itself, stating that the questions on it were not always relevant and that a "not-applicable" option was needed among the response options.

> I'm NOT a teacher of grammar, or of composition, I don't see much of what you are focusing on in this survey as actually part of my job.

This kind of feedback was even more common on the collective self-efficacy scale where many did not answer the questions on the scale at all, or wished they could delete their responses because they simply did not know what other faculty were doing to teach writing. For example:

> I am unable to comment on most of the questions above because my colleagues rarely share teaching strategies or discuss assignment parameters.

In many cases the conversation simply wasn't a topic of discussion within their department beyond complaints about poor writing. Those instructors that did care about writing found when dealing with students, as one faculty member stated:

> I spend a great deal of time disambiguating partial and unhelpful advice students receive about their writing in other classes they take.

Comments such as these further speak to how little disciplinary faculty are engaged in the writing theory and process. Their concern is with their disciplinary knowledge and a lack of concern with writing suggests that they fail to recognize how important writing is to disciplinary identity development and metacognition. The lack of recognition of writing as important to disciplinary identity is one reason why some faculty don't see the teaching of writing as part of their academic responsibility.

Category 3: Hopeful efforts and recognitions

Despite the overwhelmingly negative tone that blamed individuals external to themselves for students' poor writing skills and expressed the desire to shunt writing instruction to other courses and departments, there was some hope from some faculty more familiar with sociociocognitive perspectives on writing. Also in line with the sociocognitive perspective, was these facultys' recognition that rigid writing rules and expectations were also a colonialist stance:

> I would caution us all in applying strict colonialist/western views on what constitutes 'good' writing and expression.

There were a few lone wolf faculty who recognized the value of taking the time to teach writing and embody their own writerly identity. For example:

> I put a lot of effort to show students that I too am a writer, that they are not lesser writers just because they haven't yet graduated, that writers need to write in many styles and voices and that academic writing is not the only or the best style. I use different genres of written assignments for this (eg mini studies, policy briefs, blogposts), using scaffolded steps leading up to the main text. I am never sure though whether they actually realize or use these methods in their private writing life.

Some faculty participants recognized the disciplinary nature of writing and that disciplinarity was represented in the genres of writing as well as the voice of writing:

> I think it is important for nursing students to receive their academic writing instruction from nursing faculty. Too often, 'writing' is delegated to an English department and/or required elective. This limits the opportunity for nursing students to learn how to write effectively, using a nursing voice. I believe nursing students should also have the opportunity to explore various types of writing experiences across their undergraduate program - i.e., not always the traditional academic essay. While there is a need to help our students learn how to navigate multiple-choice test-taking in order to pass their registration exam, this has come at a cost.

As this testimony indicates, the disciplinarity of writing instruction requires that disciplinary, in this case nursing, instructors should be doing the teaching of writing. It also emphasizes the importance of learning the difference between different disciplinary genres that can only be taught within the discipline itself. This testimony also emphasizes how certain disciplines are beholden to professional standards examinations which are multiple choice in format. These kinds of exams can take over the

focus of learning and evaluation in disciplinary programs thereby reinforcing the perception that writing is a secondary activity.

The developmental nature of writing, recognized as part of a disciplinary knowledge base to writing scholars, was not recognized by the majority of respondents to this survey except by a small handful of participants who were more knowledgeable about writing theory:

> While I have indicated I am confident in these areas, I want to note that doesn't mean I am confident that I can always convey these concepts to students quickly or easily. As you know, most of the skills being described here take a long time to develop even in courses designed explicitly to teach students to learn them, which is what the first-year English courses at the [institution name] are designed to do. It can often help to have the value of writing reinforced by several different voices, and the skills taught through several different methods. For that reason, I do not rely on my own capabilities alone to teach writing but also draw on other resources (textbooks, colleagues at the Academic Learning Centre, and students and faculty members in my department) to create a learning environment that both acknowledges writing instruction takes time and provides a variety of supports to help students at different stages of the process.

This faculty member displays the belief that writing instruction provided in the classroom represents but a snapshot of the writing instruction needed for proficiency. Writing instruction in their view is a community partnership between content instructors and specialized departments whose role it is to support writing but is not a burden to be borne by those departments alone.

Another faculty member also emphasized the importance of a positive collective mindset for writing instruction:

> Our faculty is certainly more reflective and thoughtful about how to model and coach writing with disciplinary goals in mind than we used to be--or so it seems to me. I don't hear as much "Harrumph--kids these days!" I hear more of "our students need that guidance, need help when it comes to engagement." Establishing rapport, trust, is critical to creating a classroom in which students and teachers can experiment, try out things, even mess up and have a blast doing so. There is more of that attitude around me in my faculty than there was when I began this job. It's great to see and hear.

This data suggests when undergraduate faculty do not put effort into teaching writing the burden of writing instruction is pushed to the next course or the next level. For example:

> That also puts significant burden on our graduate faculty who are then teaching GRADUATE level students how to write an academic paper.

The cycle of a plague of beliefs that students are all terrible writers, that their poor writing is the fault of institutional structures alone, and that it is not the job of content faculty to teach or support writing, drowns out the voices of the few faculty who recognize that writing being developmental means that teaching writing is a collective partnership. These narratives provide hope that it is possible to bring faculty to a state of understanding of the importance of teaching writing in their classrooms.

Discussion

The findings of this Canada-wide survey research indicate that individual self-efficacy for teaching writing (78%) is rated higher in faculty than collective self-efficacy for teaching writing (60%) thereby solidifying writing instruction as an individual choice rather than a collective effort. Subgroup comparisons showed that higher individual self-efficacy for teaching writing was present in tenure or tenure track faculty who frequently have research and teaching responsibilities, PhD/ED prepared faculty, those who reported taking formal professional development on how to teach writing, and participants with 20 or more years of teaching experience. These findings can be explained by the possibility that research focused tenure and tenure track faculty are more likely to have heavy writing programs of their own when compared to teaching-focused faculty. Developing a writerly identity likely speeds up their recognition that writing is disciplinary and developmental (Anson, 2015; Lerner, 2015; Roozen, 2015). As one finding indicated, it is concerning that it takes 20 years of a post-secondary teaching career to develop the highest individual self-efficacy for teaching writing. Faculty ultimately learn through a slow enculturation to their fields (Anson, 2015) which confirms this finding. Most faculty who have not taken formalized courses or entire degrees in writing studies, as this study found, learn to teach writing through tacit enculturation processes such as trial and error, mentorship from senior faculty, and their memories of how they were taught writing during their time as undergraduates. For those who have taken formal education in the teaching of writing, it is comforting that faculty attitudes and confidence in teaching writing might be possible within a well-constructed professional development session.

Similar to past research exploring disciplinary faculty attitudes about teaching writing (Basgier & Simpson, 2020a; 2020b; Leggette, 2015; Moon et al., 2018; Pratt et al., 2021; Stroumbakis et al., 2016; Thonney, 2023), the open-ended responses to this survey were rife with complaints about the quality of student writing, blaming of institutional policy practices for the continued and often perceived to be worsening state of student writing, and blaming student attitudes toward writing as interfering

with their abilities to teach writing in the classroom. Zhu (2004) acknowledges that there are multileveled influences on instructor classroom context including institution, discipline, course, task, and student. These leveled structural influences on writing suggest that faculty observations about structural interferences in their classroom practices are legitimate; however, the pervasive lamenting and blaming of outside influences on their ability to teach writing is indictive of a larger problem in higher education. Faculty will blame everything but their own skill level for the impact it has on student achievement, while other faculty are positive and hopeful demonstrating that it can be done. Therefore, the blaming narratives may be behavior associated with low self-efficacy levels. In this respect, because the open-ended responses of the survey were answered in the context of a self-assessment of self-efficacy for teaching writing, Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy theory, which proposes that teacher self-efficacy is influenced by teacher perspectives of student achievement and leadership quality, is confirmed by the data presented in this research study.

The qualitative and quantitative data also confirm that faculty are not viewing the teaching of writing skills as a goal that needs to be achieved collectively. Lack of faculty collective self-efficacy was evident in the absence of statistical significance of responses to the collective self-efficacy subscale. Collective self-efficacy was not detected as more significant in any particular sub-group of faculty member, but rather collective self-efficacy was reported as poor by most survey respondents. Tellingly, in the qualitative data, many respondents to the survey noted they had difficulty responding to the collective self-efficacy scale because they simply were not aware of what their colleagues were doing to teach writing in the classroom. There were only rare testimonies in the qualitative data of departments functioning effectively as a collective entity. Additionally, many faculty simply did not see writing instruction as part of their job. This shunts the responsibility of teaching writing to writing centres, English departments, and learning centres in the university where they may lack the disciplinary knowledge to support the tacit disciplinary standards that most respondents to this survey neglected to consider as relevant to developmental writing (Anson, 2015). This finding also shunts the teaching of writing to graduate programs for those students who seek out graduate degrees.

While the data collection methods for the present study did not allow for in-depth analysis to identify profiles of faculty attitudes toward teaching writing as was done in the studies by Basgier and Simpson (2020a; 2020b) and Moon et al. (2018), I was able to see in the narratives presented evidence of the faculty types identified in these studies. Most obvious was "the traditionalist" observed by Moon et al. who saw writing instruction as distracting from their content teaching, and

"the utilitarian" who saw writing instruction as important but a skill separate from content learning. "The idealist" was also present in the faculty who would only teach writing under perfect circumstances such as with proper TA assistance. The narratives of hopeful recognition also contained a few faculty who were "the writer" who saw writing as an act of discovery and a part of their own personal identity. The common narrative of blaming and lamenting the quality of student writing is reminiscent of Basgier and Simpson's (2020a; 2020b) roadblock instructors who in their pre-liminal state could only see student lack of writing skill as an intractable problem to be solved by others but not by them.

The findings of this study can also be viewed in terms of threshold concept theory. That most faculty presented narratives of their individual self-efficacy for teaching writing that showed they saw the content of their course as separate from the teaching of writing is evidence that they have not achieved the threshold meta concept of "teaching writing involves recognizing that effective writing pedagogy involves iterative multifaceted change" (Basgier & Simpson, 2020a). That they believe that writing should be mastered prior to entering the classroom is indicative that they have not mastered the threshold concept that "writing is not natural" (Dryer, 2015). Nor have they grasped that "improvement of writing is a shared responsibility" (Anson, 2015). The desire to shunt writing instruction to another course or university service outside their classroom is also indicative that they have not achieved the potential threshold concept that "writing is a disciplinary activity," nor do they view writing as developmental (Anson, 2015). As Anson (2015) notes, there is a mismatch between faculty expectations that students present in their classes with competent writing ability and the notion that the genres of every discipline are unfamiliar to students and, in fact, guarantee that their beginning writing in a discipline will not be ideal representations of these new genres. When one believes that writing is a skill, it is easy to blame the introductory writing classes students may be exposed to prior to their disciplinary courses for not doing their job, because viewing writing as a skill is akin to believing that writing instruction can be accomplished in a single term of coursework (Anson, 2015). In fact, it is likely that most faculty have also not achieved the threshold concepts of being writers for themselves, in particular the meta concept that "writing is an activity and subject of study" (Wardle & Adler-Kassner, 2015). Having said all this, it would not be surprising that faculty who might be well versed in the threshold concepts of their discipline (e.g. chemistry or nursing) might not be well versed in the threshold concepts of writing.

Study Strength and Limitations

The strength of this study is its large sample size and the geographical breath of respondents from coast to coast in Canada. This study was limited by its convenience sampling method. Because of the combined data sets, the sample was heavily weighted in nursing faculty which may mean the findings are weighted to the opinions of faculty in nursing departments. I can, however, report that the open-ended comments were similar in tone and content between the two survey samples.

Recommendations

This study prompts several recommendations for both future research and teaching practice. In light of the finding that formal education in writing pedagogy can enhance faculty self-efficacy for teaching writing, faculty professional development sessions need to be created that focus on busting myths about writing and to especially focus on the ways that writing is developmental and disciplinary. These workshops would be most successful if offered discipline by discipline in a partnership between writing faculty and disciplinary faculty who are interested in writing pedagogy. Working with disciplinary faculty also requires sensitivity to the existing, "it's not my job" beliefs of faculty. This sensitivity will help to develop open-mindedness in faculty to new perspectives on cross-disciplinary writing instruction (Anson, 2015).

The workshops should also focus on helping faculty work through managing time so that the teaching of writing complements rather than takes away from the teaching of content in the course. They should additionally work to re-align faculty thinking away from learning to write to writing to learn so they recognize that smaller scaffolded assignments that build to a larger product are more effective than leaving students to their own devices with involved lengthy projects (Anson 2015). Collective self-efficacy should also be emphasized by incorporating workshop components that crowd-source writing support pedagogies in partnership with writing scholars and experts. Future research could focus on interventional studies testing these workshops or workshop components to assess if there is a detectable change in faculty attitudes and self-efficacy for teaching writing. Broadly, however, this is a complex problem that requires more complex solutions than simple workshops for faculty. Nevertheless, there has not been enough research in this area to be able to being to outline what those complex solutions might be.

Conclusion

Similar to how writing is a developmental process, learning to be an effective teacher of writing as an instructor of disciplinary courses is a slow, career-long, process. The findings of this study confirm that the prevailing faculty belief is that most of the responsibility for student improvements in writing ability lies within the student themselves in their already present interest and motivation. Responsibility for improving writing also lies within writing specialized courses that students may take prior to landing in their disciplinary courses. Threshold concept theory is also an effective lens in which to view the attitudes of disciplinary faculty to writing instruction. Likely threshold concept theory is the key to developing future research in this domain. Presently, the labour of improving student writing remains with those faculty who are already perceived as writing specialists or who are disciplinary faculty with an existing passion for helping students write better and are willing to put in the extra time to both work with students and improve their own capacity for writing support. Overall, this paper recommends that experts focus on the development of workshops for disciplinary faculty that emphasize the developmental and disciplinary nature of writing as a shared responsibility in higher education.

References

Anson, C. M. (2015). Crossing thresholds: What's to know about writing across the curriculum. In L. Adler-Kassner, & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 203-219). Utah State University. https://doi.org/10.7330/9780874219906.c000a

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* W. H. Freeman and Company.

Basgier, C., & Simpson, A. (2020a). Reflecting on the past, reconstructing the future: Faculty members' threshold concepts for teaching writing in the disciplines. *Across the Disciplines, 17*(1). https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2020.17.1-2.02

Basgier, C., & Simpson, A. (2020b). Trouble and transformation in higher education: Identifying threshold narratives about teaching writing. *Studies in Higher Education, 45*(9), 1906-1918. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1598967

Bhattacharya, K. (2017). *Fundamentals of qualitative research: A practical guide.* Routledge Taylor & Francis.

Boice, R. (1990). Faculty resistance to writing-intensive courses. Teaching of Psychology, 17(1), 13-17. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top1701_3

Cho, J. Y., & Lee, E.-H. (2014). Reducing confusion about grounded theory and qualitative content analysis: Similarities and differences. *The Qualitative Report, 19*(64), 1–20.

Dryer, D. B. (2015). Writing is not natural. In L. Adler-Kassner, & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 27-29). Utah State University. https://doi.org/10.7330/9780874219906.c000a

Duncheon, J. C., & Tierney, W. G. (2014). Examining college writing readiness. *The Educational Forum, 78*(3), 210-230. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2014.912712

Hampton, M. D., Rosenblum, R., Hill-Williams, C. D., Creighton-Wong, L., & Randall, W. A. (2022). Scientific writing development: Improve DNP student skill and writing efficiency. *Nurse Education Today, 112*(2022), Article 105334. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2022.105334

Hardré, P. L. (2012). Community college faculty motivation for basic research, teaching research, and professional development. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 36*(8), 539-561. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920902973362

Jenkins, S., Jordan, M. K., & Welland, P. O. (1993). The role of writing in graduate engineering education: A survey of faculty beliefs and practices. *English for Specific Purposes, 12*, 51-67. https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(93)90027-L

Köksal, D., Özdemir, E., Tercan, G., Gün, S., & Bilgin E. (2018). The relationship between teacher's written feedback preferences, self-efficacy beliefs and burnout levels. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 14*(4), 316-327.

Leggtte, H. R. (2015). Faculty define the role of writing in the social sciences of agriculture. *North American Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture Journal,* 104-110.

Lerner, N. (2015). Writing is a way of enacting disciplinarity. In L. Adler-Kassner, & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 40-41). Utah State University. https://doi.org/10.7330/9780874219906.c000a

Locke, T., & Johnston, M. (2016). Developing an individual and collective self-efficacy scale for the teaching of writing in high schools. *Assessing Writing, 28*(2016), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.01.001

Mitchell, K. M. Constructing writing practices in nursing. *Journal of Nursing Education, 57*(7), 399-406. https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20180618-04

Mitchell, K. M., Zumbrunn, S., Berry, D., & Demczuk, L. (2023). Writing self-efficacy in postsecondary students: A scoping review. *Educational Psychology Review, 35*, Article 82. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09798-2

Moon, A., Gere, A. R., & Shultz, G. V. (2018). Writing in the STEM classroom: Faculty conceptions of writing and its role in the undergraduate classroom. *Science Education, 102*, 1007-1028. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21454

Pratt, C., Zaier, A., & Wang, Y. (2021). Foreign language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and perspectives about maintaining their students' interest. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 12*(1), 12-22. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1201.02

Roozen, K. (2015). Writing is linked to identity. In L. Adler-Kassner, & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 50-52). Utah State University. https://doi.org/10.7330/9780874219906.c000a

Shellenbarger, T. (2020). The lived experience of nursing faculty developing as scholarly writers. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 36*(6), 520-525. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2020.04.016

Stroumbakis, K. D. Moh, N. & Kokkinos, D. (2016). Community college STEM faculty views on the value of writing assignments. *The WAC Journal, 27*(1), 142-154. https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2016.27.1.08

Sword, H. (2012). *Stylish academic writing.* Harvard University Press.

Thonney, T. (2023). What community college instructors think about student writing: Results of a national survey about writing across the curriculum. *College Teaching.* https:///doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2023.2208816

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(2007), 944-956. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.003

Wardle, E., & Adler-Kassner, L. (2015). Metaconcept: Writing is an activity and a subject of study. In L. Adler-Kassner, & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 15-16). Utah State University. https://doi.org/10.7330/9780874219906.c000a

Whitacre, M. P. (2019). The importance of teacher self-efficacy in the implementation of a middle and high school science writing initiative. *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education, 7*(1), 78-111. https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/wte/vol7/iss1/4

Zemliansky, P., & Berry, L. (2017). A writing-across the curriculum faculty development program: An experience report. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, 60*(3), 306-316. https://doi.org/10.1109/TPC.2017.2702041

Zhu, W. (2004). 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*(2004), 29-48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.004