The GMAT Analytical Writing Assessment: Opportunity or Threat for Management Communication?

Priscilla S. Rogers
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Jone Rymer
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

Instituted as a regular part of the GMAT in October 1994, the Analytical Writing Assessment (AWA) has the potential to serve as a diagnostic tool in MBA programs. This article describes the new test and reviews the uses of the AWA scores and essays that have significant ramifications for management communication. It concludes by suggesting why it is vital for communication instructors to become involved in decisions about how to use the AWA results.

INSTITUTED AS A REGULAR PART of the Graduate Management Admission Test (GMAT) in October 1994, the Analytical Writing Assessment (AWA) can have a significant impact on management communication programs in graduate schools of business. Originated by the Graduate Management Admission Council (GMAC) and strongly supported by MBA program administrators (Bruce, 1993), the AWA was designed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) as a test of analytical writing. Now graduate business schools are determining how to use both AWA scores and essays.

Whether the AWA represents an opportunity or a threat to management communication programs in business schools is an open question. The AWA presents an opportunity for management communication in schools where communication faculty become knowledgeable about the new writing test and active in decision making about the results, but the AWA may threaten management communication programs in schools where communication faculty ignore it. Certainly, well informed communication faculty should influence favorable outcomes in many schools. However, the potential power of

Authors' Note: We contributed equally to this article and have listed our names in alphabetical order.

Business Communication Quarterly, Volume 59, Number 2, June 1996, pages 70-85

the GMAT writing test to alter management communication, transforming it into something approaching remedial writing should not be underestimated.

The purpose of this article is to explore issues regarding the use of the GMAT Analytical Writing Assessment (AWA) that are consequential for management communication in MBA programs. The article is based on the results of our critical study of the AWA (Rogers & Rymer, 1995a & 1995b), experience with management writing assessment, and preliminary findings from our GMAC-supported research on the use of the AWA for diagnostic purposes (Rogers & Rymer, 1996, in press). In this article we describe the new test, including its evaluation and the results schools receive, and review uses of the AWA scores and essays that have ramifications for management communication. We conclude by suggesting reasons why it is necessary to become involved to insure that the AWA represents an opportunity rather than a threat for management communication.

What is the AWA?

The Analytical Writing Assessment (AWA) is a direct test of writing, that is, a performance assessment that requires applicants to produce whole discourse or complete texts rather than to give short answers about a piece of writing or short paragraphs in response to test prompts. As a direct test of writing, the AWA contrasts sharply with indirect tests like the standardized Verbal section of the GMAT which, in addition to questions on reading comprehension, requires test-takers to answer multiple-choice questions about syntactical usage, preferred diction, and correct grammar and punctuation. In contrast, the AWA measures all these sentence- and word-level language skills, as well as a test-taker's ability to develop and organize ideas by requiring the composition of a complete piece of writing with a beginning, middle, and end. (Correlations between direct and indirect writing tests vary widely but are typically modest[Breland, Camp, Jones, Morris, & Rock, 1987].)

For the AWA, test-takers compose two essays in an hour (30 minutes for each). Both essays require analytical writing—one analysis of an issue, the other analysis of an argument (referred to as the issue essay and the argument essay.) No specialized knowledge is necessary to complete these essay tasks; rather, the topics are intended to be

fully accessible to test-takers with any undergraduate background, although the questions permit drawing from business experience. (For example, one issue question asked test-takers to respond to a statement concerning whether the ideas of a nation are reflected in its advertising.) By allotting only 30 minutes for the composition of each essay, the AWA tests first-draft writing—that is, writing without time for reflection, revision, or careful editing. Nevertheless, within the constraints of a timed test, the AWA provides the test-taker with the opportunity to complete not one but two separate analytical writing tasks, thereby improving test reliability (White, 1995).

Under the auspices of ETS, the AWA essays are evaluated holistically—that is, every essay is read and assessed for its overall quality as a whole piece of discourse. At least two evaluators (experienced college writing instructors, some from business schools, but currently most from English departments) assess the effectiveness of each essay based on the mandated AWA criteria. Trained to apply these criteria holistically, these evaluators give a single overall score to each essay without marking any individual features.

The criteria guiding the AWA evaluators are implicit in the AWA Scoring Guide, which describes characteristics one can expect to find in essays at each scoring level. These implicit criteria ask evaluators to assess an essay in five key areas:

1. critical analysis of the issue or the argument;
2. development of support through reasons and/or examples;
3. organization of the material logically;
4. facility in language (for example, syntax, diction); and
5. control of the conventions of standard English (grammar, usage, and mechanics).

The AWA criteria, reinforced by the ETS evaluator training and monitoring, focus on assessing analytical writing abilities. Accordingly, in scoring the issue essay, evaluators are to look for "a cogent, well-articulated analysis of the complexities of the issue and ... mastery of the elements of effective writing" (GMAC n.d., p.10); in scoring the argument essay, evaluators are to value the ability of the test-taker to identify and articulate the logical fallacies in the argument presented in the test question, an expectation that is described

in the AWA directions: "Your job here is to analyze and critique a line of thinking or reasoning" (GMAC, 1994, p. 347).

Each essay is scored on a 6-point scale (with 1 being low) by at least two independent evaluators. As in all carefully conducted large-scale writing assessments that strive for good interrater reliability, evaluators do not know the scores given by other evaluators. If evaluators' scores are discrepant (more than 1 point apart), the essay is assessed by additional independent evaluators until sufficient agreement is reached. (Interrater reliability on well-managed tests like those run by ETS is typically at about 95% agreement [Cherry & Meyer, 1993; White, 1994, 1995].) Evaluators' individual scores are then averaged to determine the holistic score for each essay. To produce the final AWA score that appears on a test-taker's GMAT report, the averaged holistic scores on each of the two essays are averaged again. Consequently, the AWA score represents an average of the averaged holistic scores on a test-taker's two essays rounded to the nearest half-point interval on the 6-point scale. Schools receive an applicant's GMAT Report with only the final AWA score; scores on the individual essays are not provided. (For example, a 4.0 on the issue essay averaged with a 3.0 on the argument essay would result in a final AWA score of 3.5, which is the only score the school would receive.) In the GMAT Report, a GMAT-using business school automatically receives an applicant's AWA score and reduced photocopies of both essays. Currently, the essays are handwritten; however, the GMAT is being computerized so that eventually the AWA essays will be word-processed.

How Should the AWA Scores Be Used?

GMAC intended that schools use the AWA scores not only to provide new information on MBA applicants for the admissions process but also to identify matriculating students who may need additional training in writing (GMAC, n.d). Indeed, a systematic review of the essays (Rogers & Rymer, 1995b) and statistics for the first full year of test administration(October 1994 through June 1995; $N = 197{,}368$) suggests that the AWA scores do provide preliminary information for making diagnostic decisions, particularly the very high and very low scores. At the top, applicants receiving AWA scores of 5.0 and above (15% of all test-takers from the first three test administrations) demon-

strate fairly strong mastery on the AWA criteria and probably need no further work in analytical writing. At the bottom, applicants with AWA scores of 3.0 and below (25% of all test-takers) demonstrate numerous, severe deficiencies and probably need remedial work in writing. If applicants with AWA scores at the very low end are accepted as MBA students, their AWA essays warrant a careful review to determine the nature of their needs and the kind of help that would equip them to perform successfully in graduate school. Although the AWA scores clearly differentiate students with very strong analytical writing abilities from those with very weak abilities, the scores, as might be expected, provide less sharp distinctions among the majority of test-takers in the middle range—the 58% of test takers who are clustered at the three middle scores, AWA 3.5-4.5. (The mean is 3.8, *SD* .9; 70% are awarded AWA scores ranging between 3.0 and 4.5.)

Certainly, there are differences among essays at the middle scoring levels, but, in contrast to the very high- and very low-scoring essays, mid-scoring essays provide no clear-cut distinctions. Rather they represent a wide variety of strengths and weaknesses. (Some essays may reveal ESL problems, while others may reveal problems with critical analysis and basic logic.) Yet it is in this middle range of scores (AWA 3.0 or 3.5 to 4.5) that business school personnel are designating diagnostic cut-off scores to facilitate evaluative and placement decisions, including requirements that students obtain further work in writing. Such decisions may inappropriately label students as "good writers" and "poor writers." For example, if a student with an AWA score of 4.0 (see the sample AWA essay in Figure 1) enters an MBA program with a diagnostic AWA cut-off score of 4.5, he or she could be required to take a remedial writing course; whereas, if this same student entered a program with a cut-off of 3.5, he or she could be exempt from such a course. Standards should vary at different schools, of course, but as one can see, placing the student who wrote the 4.0 essay in Figure 1 in a course emphasizing remedial writing problems would not be appropriate. This student, however, could clearly benefit from training in organizing strategies (the main proposition "what is not stated or implied in the ads..." is buried in the second paragraph) and in argumentation and logic (the first paragraph is full of unsupported claims and more warrant is needed for the exam-

Advertising is truly an indicator of trends or a "sign of the times". Ads in print and on radio or television are successful if they are topical and appeal to issues that are important to the audience that is targeted. However, advertising is not an accurate yardstick for the many aspects of issues that may be most important. They instead, are simplified messages of larger issues, condensed to get a persuasion across in a brief period of time. (This includes print as well, for when reading a magazine, how much time is really spent on ads vs. flipping right to the next article?)

For example, recent television messages for the upcoming Gubernatorial election in November for the State of Michigan have focused on education. To someone from another country, it may appear that there is very little to discuss-education is a good thing. However, what is not stated or implied in the ads is that education represents so much more of our State. It is the tip of the iceberg that leads to questions and evaluations regarding unemployment, the economy, health and religious issues (such as pregnant teens), etc. A simple ad regarding a politician's stance on public schools may actually be a statement on his feelings about abortion.

But the important thing to remember is that in order to fully understand an idea, one must be aware of all aspects of the idea. Advertising for this reason, simply does not allow for this on a broad scale. As attention spans for Americans grow shorter with each generation, the amount of information put into an ad must be condensed. Therefore, it is very difficult to fully understand the full impact of a 30 second ad for Bran Flakes during "Roseann".

In addition, advertising is not a matter of discussing, as much as highlighting. In a commercial, you know Bran Flakes are good for you, But you do not have the opportunity to ask if the box is made of recycled paper or if the company that makes Bran Flakes, intended for good health, also manufacturers cigarettes. And the advertisers do not want you to discuss it, they want a subliminal message that will make you pick up their product, the next time you shop or vote.

Thus, a catchy phrase, a nice tune, or a pleasant visual may sell a product or an idea, but does not indicate all of the many aspects behind the singular item for sale.

Figure 1. Transcription of AWA Essay Scored 4.0

ple in the second paragraph)—components of writing that might be ignored in remedial training.

Implementing curricular decisions for students on the basis of the AWA scores is highly problematic, even if schools adhere to GMAC's

directive to conduct a careful study of the AWA Scoring Guide and review sample essays at all levels so that decisions can be based on local standards for performance in the MBA program. The AWA scores are holistic; that is, they subsume all the particulars of writing performance under a single rating of overall quality, a rating that was never intended to be a tool for diagnosing writing problems (White, 1995). Consequently, essays awarded the same holistic scores can and do differ substantially in those strong and weak features that contribute to the evaluators' overall quality judgments. For example, the AWA Scoring Guide describes issue essays receiving an AWA 4.0 as presenting a "competent analysis of the issue, demonstrating adequate control of the elements of writing" (GMAC, n.d, p. 14), but a review of the Guide in conjunction with the sample essays scored as 4.0 reveals that there is great diversity in the specific components that are considered "competent."

If the cut-off is at AWA 3.0 and below, the variety and range of writing needs is still great. For example, the AWA Scoring Guide states that a 3.0 issue essay is "a competent but clearly flawed analysis of the issue, demonstrating some control of the elements of writing." But the flaws may be various. An essay may be "vague or limited in developing a position on the issue," or "poorly organized," or contain "occasional major errors or frequent minor errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics," and so forth (GMAC, n.d, p. 10). Under these scoring criteria, one AWA issue essay that scored a 3.0 could be relatively well organized with few errors in English usage, yet fail to present a clear position and provide only abstract reasons as support; another essay receiving an AWA 3.0 could be poorly organized, lacking essential transitions and contain frequent errors, yet take a clear position on the issue and use some support, such as a personal example.

In other words, any diagnostic cut-off score on the AWA scale will group together students with writing problems that vary widely in type, severity, and frequency. An absolute cut-off score could also pigeonhole some test-takers who did less well on the AWA because the test is discrepant with their recent work experience or expectations for a management admissions test. Some test-takers, for example, lack recent experience writing academic essays, as our AWA assessment consultations show (Rogers & Rymer, 1996). Despite the amorphous nature of such a group of students, a school could insti-

tute a policy assigning all students who fall on the wrong side of the cut-off line to a uniform writing requirement, and because of the obvious surface errors in some low-scoring essays, this course could easily be specified as a remedial writing course.

It is unlikely that assigning all students below an AWA cut-off score to a single requirement would meet students' needs. The AWA scores alone do not identify students' particular problems, nor do the scores group students with similar deficiencies. Holistic scores given the AWA essays reflect overall writing ability and represent different strengths and weaknesses among writers at each scoring level. Students with fairly adequate English language abilities may be stigmatized by being assigned to remedial work with those having severe deficiencies, including international students with ESL problems. It would be extremely difficult to serve students with such diverse needs in a single course, even if it is highly individualized in a small-group format and taught by someone with expertise in ESL and a range of other problems, like those evidenced in the 4.0 essay in Figure 1.

On the high side of a diagnostic cut-off, some schools—perhaps under pressure from students who are quick to exploit a system that permits testing out of MBA requirements—could grant students with high AWA scores waivers for management communication. Using AWA cut-off scores in this way, however, assumes that the AWA, an academic essay-writing test, is a test of concepts that are central to managerial communication. As we observed in a recent critique of the new test, "the AWA does not evaluate key attributes of management communication competency, such as the ability to persuade, to be sensitive to the needs and expectations of others, and to negotiate between dissonant perspectives" (Rogers & Rymer, 1995a, pp. 359-360). To be sure, using AWA scores as waivers for management communication requirements demonstrates a misunderstanding of what management communication training provides. It also would disserve MBA students and tend to associate management communication programs with remediation rather than with professional components in the MBA.

In sum, the AWA scores provide some useful preliminary information (see Table 1), but for diagnostic purposes business school personnel must evaluate the AWA essays. Whereas the AWA scores identify those students with strong analytical writing abilities (AWA 5.0 to 6.0)

and those with weak skills who are likely to be at risk in undertaking their MBA written assignments (AWA 1.0 to 3.0), the scores alone are insufficient to make wise placement decisions even for those students. The scores are most suspect, however, in discerning who are the needy among those whose scores lie in the middle range (AWA 3.5 to 4.5). Diagnosing students' writing problems requires a local evaluation of the AWA essays to target those students likely to be at risk in the specific MBA program in which they are enrolled, and to classify them by types of deficiencies so that their needs may be met and met effectively.

Table 1
AWA Scores as Threat or Opportunity

Scores as a Threat	Scores as an Opportunity
Set absolute standards, labeling students as "good writers" or "poor writers."	Indicate numbers of matriculating students with major and minor writing deficiencies requiring diagnostic evaluation.
Impose uniform writing requirements on students with widely differing needs.	Identify students whose severe deficiencies suggest remedial work in analytical writing.
Assign inappropriate remedial training to students with higher level writing problems.	Indicate students whose AWA essays warrant evaluation for making diagnostic decisions.
Eliminate management communication for students with expertise in academic writing.	Identify students whose expertise suggests no need for further work in analytical writing.
Gain acceptance as a sufficient measure without review of the AWA essays.	Provide preliminary information facilitating diagnostic evaluation of the AWA essays.

How Should the AWA Essays Be Used?

In contrast with the AWA scores, the essays themselves offer a unique and multifaceted resource for diagnosing student needs. Even though the AWA elicits one type of academic writing—"essayist literacy," characteristic of undergraduate writing in many disciplines (Farr, 1993)—the essays can reveal much about a student's critical thinking, analytical writing, language knowledge and skill, as well as his or her values, personality, creativity, and originality. Moreover, the AWA

essays reveal a test-taker's ability to apply some of the rules and conventions of standard English covered by the multiple-choice questions in the GMAT Verbal section.

Unfortunately, although the AWA essays are a valuable resource for diagnosing students' particular deficiencies, schools may regard reading the essays as too costly—especially those schools whose students may need help the most. Analyzing the AWA essays for diagnostic purposes is a formidable job. The issue and argument questions change with each GMAT test administration, for example, so local evaluators must become acquainted with the AWA questions used for all relevant test administrations, as well as a range of papers responding to each question. (No essay can be judged fairly out of the context of other essays written for the same questions under the same constraints.) Complicating the analysis further is the fact that the scores on the individual essays are not reported; therefore school personnel must study the AWA Scoring Guide to determine possible reasons a particular essay received a particular score. Finally, since no record is made of an essay's specific weaknesses during the holistic evaluation process, local reviewers also must evaluate specific components of the essays to determine which aspects are problematic and likely to inhibit performance in their MBA program.

Failing to exploit the essays, however, would represent a lost opportunity to profile the analytical writing abilities of matriculating students, helping them, as they begin their MBA studies—a key moment in their academic careers—to understand some of their writing deficiencies and ways they can improve. In fact, ignoring the essays as a diagnostic tool entails risks, partly because of the value applicants tend to assign to their GMAT scores. If AWA scores are left uninterpreted, students will make their own judgments regarding the scores' meaning. According to our research, students with low AWA scores may conclude that they are poor writers who will not perform well in their MBA studies (Rogers & Rymer, 1995c, 1996), and the belief that this label is accurate might influence their performance (see Pajares & Johnson, 1994). As one Wayne State student with a high overall GMAT score commented about his AWA score of 3.0: "I thought I was an okay writer, but this test was a real wake-up call."

Lack of analysis of the AWA essays, or misguided review, could have negative ramifications not only for individual students but also

for management communication. In some settings, initial analysis of the AWA essays by business school personnel has focused on textual matters, with evaluators expressing concerns that even top-scoring essays were "not very good" or were "full of errors." Business school personnel who have begun to review the AWA informally as part of the admissions process often need guidance to understand how they should examine the essays. Most need to develop realistic expectations for first-draft, timed-writing under pressure, recognizing that even the best essays will not be perfect. Particularly, they need to appreciate reading student writing for meaning, rather than hunting for errors. They need to accept the notion that the AWA is a test of analytical writing—writing that is the means for developing complex, critical ideas, as well as the vehicle for communicating those ideas to others.

Analysis focused on lower level textual comments, such as style preferences, usage, and errors in grammar and mechanics, is a reductionist, misleading perspective on the AWA, a view that management communication specialists must counteract. By its very nature, "the AWA challenges the low level skills orientation toward writing reflected in most MBA curricula" (Rogers & Rymer, 1995b, p.482). But without leadership dedicated to exploiting the advantages of the AWA, this new resource could be used as a tool for counting errors in standard English rather than as a test of ability to analyze and express ideas in writing.

Rather than simply dismissing the AWA as a test of academic writing with only partial relevance to management communication, a view with which we sympathize and partly share (Rogers & Rymer, 1995a), management communication faculty can use the essays to begin building a bridge between the academic and managerial worlds. Currently, for example, we are developing tools to use the AWA essays for diagnosing individual problems students are likely to have in their MBA writing assignments, tools that might be used in small classes, workshops, or individual consultations (Rogers & Rymer, 1996). These tools would enable a dialogue with students about such significant issues for their MBA work as the ability to interpret MBA writing tasks, to write coherent and appropriately organized case analyses, and to assert and support claims by developing relevant evidence. The essays could even be treated as part of a portfolio of writing perfor-

mances in students' graduate education in management (a concept we are piloting), thereby permitting the comparison of academic writing with managerial genres. The point is that instead of allowing the essays to be misconstrued as a representation of MBA writing, management communication faculty can contextualize the essays in their own MBA programs, using them comparatively to introduce students to writing genres and competencies they will need for the graduate study of management.

Table 2
AWA Essays as Threat or Opportunity

Essays as a Threat	Essays as an Opportunity
Get ignored because reviewing them is a formidable job for diagnostic purposes.	Reveal performance on a full range of components indicating analytical writing ability.
Focus attention on surface errors, especially minor nonnative errors, rather than significant, high-level writing problems.	Differentiate between nonnative students with severe analytical writing deficiencies and those with only minor ESL errors.
Emphasize remedial training for students with major deficiencies while overlooking those with other significant needs (for example, critical analysis, logic, and content development).	Diagnose students with various analytical writing deficiencies for appropriate placement in writing programs.
Replace local MBA assessments of management writing that are more relevant to management education.	Provide a bridge facilitating students' transition from academic to management writing.
Impose an inappropriate type of academic essay writing as the standard for MBA education.	Encourage the development of local criteria for competent writing performance in MBA programs.

Why is the AWA Important for Management Communication?

Our discussions with program directors and management communication faculty from a variety of business schools have revealed unsettling possibilities that may result from the new GMAT writing test, as the following scenarios suggest.

MBA programs with no required communication course could now institute one motivated by AWA evidence of student need.

Although that sounds like a real opportunity for management communication, a new required course created on the basis of low AWA scores could readily be envisioned as a remedial, noncredit offering for international students struggling with English and for native speakers from disadvantaged backgrounds, in other words, a course far different from management communication.

MBA programs with a required communication course could find this course threatened. Administrators could assume that students who score high on the AWA have demonstrated sufficient communication ability and, therefore, should be exempt from a management communication course; or they could assume that all students who score low on the new test have remedial needs that should be met by reformulating the management communication course as a remedial offering. Current budget concerns at many schools, coupled with misconceptions about the nature of management communication as a field, make the latter possibility more likely.

MBA programs with long-standing management writing assessments could find their local testing programs eliminated by the new GMAT writing test. MBA administrators could view the AWA as a sufficient and cost-effective replacement for local managerial writing assessments, especially if they find reasonable correlations in the tests' results. Replacing local tests with the AWA would be a loss since management-writing assessments are more relevant to MBA writing and to writing in the workplace.

None of these scenarios is unrealistic; all are under consideration or have already been adopted at some business schools. For management communication faculty at schools where decisions are still in process, it is critical to recognize that the AWA scores and essays are flowing into schools' admissions offices and that these results represent an imperative for action.

Among management communication faculty, there have been various responses to the AWA. Some have dismissed the AWA because it is irrelevant to teaching business and management communication; others have helped MBA admissions personnel interpret the AWA scores and essays; still others have not yet decided whether or how to respond to the new writing test. We believe that ignoring the AWA or playing a marginal role in business school decisions about the AWA is unwise.

Management communication faculty must be aware of the alternatives for responding to the AWA and work inside their own business schools to influence the decisions regarding the new test. As more and more students enter MBA programs with AWA scores and essays attached to their GMAT reports, school administrators can be expected to use these new test data to make decisions and to formulate plans, some of which will have far-reaching implications for management communication. Participation in this decision making requires becoming informed about the AWA, ready to answer questions about the new test and to help interpret the AWA results in the context of local MBA offerings, including management communication curricula. If the new GMAT writing test is appropriately interpreted and used, it can provide much of value, including preliminary data regarding students' writing abilities, data which can be used to enhance and even to promote management communication.

In previous articles (Rogers & Rymer, 1995a & b) we have questioned the relevance of the AWA to management education. The AWA—an academic essay—does not test managerial writing. And although analytical writing is a component of MBA writing, as well as managers' workplace writing, research suggests that an individual with strengths in one type of writing may not transfer all those abilities to another type (Langer, 1992; Witte & Cherry, 1994). Moreover, it will be several years until local validity studies can determine if the AWA predicts abilities needed for MBA course work. Yet, despite its drawbacks, the AWA is a highly visible endorsement of writing as a critical competency for management education that provides new information on students' abilities, information useful to management communication. To dismiss it outright ignores its value and could be viewed as support for the notion that writing is *not* central to management education or to management in organizations.

As a direct test of analytical writing, the AWA is based on the notion that by composing complete analytical essays, the test-taker reveals some of his or her thinking processes; that is, the test reflects a test-taker's mind at work (see White, 1994, 1995). An AWA score signifies a test-taker's capacity to engage in critical thinking, to analyze and express complex ideas, and to develop and articulate a perspective on them. The AWA also measures the ability to apply language knowledge and skills that, prior to the addition of the AWA, were

measured only indirectly by the multiple-choice GMAT Verbal test, which emphasizes surface textual matters, conventions of usage, and mechanics. In contrast, the AWA evaluates the overall writing quality in which smooth syntax and variety in diction do matter; in which coherent sentences and correct grammar do count; but above all, in which the analysis and articulation of ideas hold center stage. Consequently, the AWA furnishes much fuller, richer information than is available via the GMAT Verbal and, in the offing, presents writing as a complex process rather than a low-level skill.

We believe the real question is not whether to use the AWA results but rather how to use both the scores and the essays. This question is critical, for as our scenarios suggest, the AWA can be misinterpreted, misapplied, and misused in a variety of ways that have negative consequences for management communication. If the AWA is to be an opportunity rather than a threat for management communication, it is important to become involved with the new test so that pitfalls are avoided and the AWA scores and essays are used effectively.

REFERENCES

Breland, H. M., Camp, R., Jones, R. J., Morris, M. M., & Rock, D. A. (1987). *Assessing writing skill: College Entrance Examination Board research monograph no. 11*. New York: The College Entrance Examination Board.

Bruce, G., D. (1993). Attitudes Toward the Addition of an Analytical Writing Assessment to the GMAT: Results of a survey of institutions using GMAT. Santa Monica, CA: Graduate Management Admission Council.

Cherry, R. D., & Meyer, P. R. (1993). Reliability issues in holistic assessment. In M. Williamson and B. A. Huot (Eds.), *Validating holistic scoring for writing assessment: Theoretical and empirical foundations* (pp. 109-141). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Graduate Management Admission Council (n.d.: distributed May, 1994). *The GMAT analytical writing assessment: An introduction*. Santa Monica, CA: Author.

Graduate Management Admission Council (1994). *The official guide for GMAT review*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Farr, M. (1993). Essayist literacy and other verbal performances. *Written Communication, 10*, 4-38.

Langer, J. A. (1992). Speaking of knowing: Conceptions of understanding in academic disciplines. In A. Harrington & C. Moran (Eds.), *Writing, teaching, and learning in the disciplines* (pp. 69-85). New York: Modern Language Association of America.

Pajares, F., & Johnson, M. J. (1994). Confidence and competence in writing: The role of self-efficacy, outcome expectancy, and apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English, 28*, 313-331.

Rogers, P. S., & Rymer, J. (1995a). What is the relevance of the GMAT Analytical Writing Assessment for management education? *Management Communication Quarterly, 8*, 347-367.

Rogers, P. S., & Rymer, J. (1995b). What is the functional value of the GMAT analytical writing for management education? *Management Communication Quarterly, 8*, 477-494.

Rogers, P. S., & Rymer, J. (1995c, June). *The Analytical Writing Assessment.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Graduate Management Admission Council Annual Conference, Toronto, Canada.

Rogers, P. S., & Rymer, J. (1996). *The Analytical Writing Assessment: Using the test for diagnostic purposes.* Graduate Management Admission Council. Manuscript in preparation.

Rogers, P. S., & Rymer, J. (in press). "But what should we do with these essays?" Using the Analytical Writing Assessment for diagnostic purposes. *Selections: The Magazine of the Graduate Management Admission Council.*

White, E. M. (1994). *Teaching and assessing writing.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

White, E. M. (1995). An apologia for the timed impromptu essay test. *College Composition and Communication, 46*, 30-45.

Witte, S. P., & Cherry, R. D. (1994). Think-aloud protocols, protocol analysis, and research design. In P. Smagorinsky (Ed.), *Speaking about writing: Reflections on research methodology* (pp. 20-54). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.