

Original text:

A lot of the data points between the 2013 report and the 2017 data are similar; most respondents are in the engineering or “other” category (oftentimes, “other” means they fulfill two or more roles at the company). Also, a hefty percentage of our respondents, almost 62%, work for companies with more than 500 employees; that is up from 57% working for companies with more than 500 employees in the 2013 data. Also similar was that approximately 62% of respondents indicated that a technical, business, or science writing course was taken in college, up only slightly from 60% in the 2013 report.

A notable difference was that the number of respondents who were required to take a technical, business, or science writing course went up from 51% in 2013 to 87% in the 2017 data. Another notable difference is the metric about writing being important to a job. In 2013, 91% of respondents said that writing was either “very important” or “essential” to their job. In 2017, though, only 75% indicated that writing was “extremely” or “very important.” Some of this variance could be that the 2013 metric gave the options “Essential,” “Very Important,” “Not Very Important,” “Unimportant,” and “Irrelevant.” However, in 2017, the metric options were “Extremely Important,” “Very Important,” “Moderately Important,” “Slightly Important,” or “Not at all Important.” While that’s a slight shift in language, the change from “Not Very” to “Moderate” opened a new avenue. In this respect, 94% of 2017 respondents indicated that writing was at least moderately important to their job, which is much closer to the 91% reported for the 2013 study. In short, what we can take from each of these studies is that writing/written communication continues to be important in technical, business, and scientific contexts.

In a related topic, 86.5% of respondents in 2013 said that their writing was important to their career advancement, while 91% of the 2017 respondents said that writing was at least moderately important to their career advancement. As in the previous example, the metric options were different, but we can still draw the conclusion that writing and the quality of writing are indeed important to career advancement.

Revised text with added table:

Many of the data points between the 2013 report and the 2017 data are similar; most respondents are in the engineering or “other” category (oftentimes, “other” means they fulfill two or more roles at the company). As can be seen in Table 1.1, there are also similarities between the numbers of respondents who work in companies with over 500 employees, who indicated that a technical, business or science writing course was taken in college, and who indicated that writing was important to their career advancement.

Some notable differences were between the percentages for whom a technical, business, or science writing course was required, and the metric of those who indicated that writing was important to their job. Some of the variance in indicated writing importance could be due to variations in the metric. The 2013 metric gave the options “Essential,” “Very Important,” “Not Very Important,” “Unimportant,” and “Irrelevant.” However, in 2017, the metric options were “Extremely Important,” “Very Important,” “Moderately Important,” “Slightly Important,” or “Not at all Important.” While that’s a slight shift in language, the change from “Not Very” to “Moderate” opened a new avenue. See Table 1.1 for details.

Table 1.1 Compared results of the 2013 report and 2017 data	2013 Report	2017 Data
Work in Companies with More than 500 Employees	57%	62%
Took a Technical, Business, or Science Writing Course	60%	62%
Stated that a Technical, Business, or Science Writing Course was Required	51%	87%
Indicated that Writing was “Very Important” or “Essential” in 2013 OR “Extremely” or “Very Important” in 2017	91%	75%
Indicated that Writing was at Least Moderately Important	91%	94%
Indicated that Writing was Important to Career Advancement	86.5%	91%

Figure 8.2. Revising Text into Tables.²

² Kalani Pattison, “Revising Text into Tables,” 2020. Licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) license. Derived from Jason Swarts, Stacey Pigg, Jamie Larsen, Julia Helo Gonzalez, Rebecca De Haas, & Elizabeth Wagner, *Communication in the Workplace: What Can NC State Students Expect?* (Raleigh: North Carolina State University Professional Writing Program, 2018). <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pMpVbDRWIN6HssQQQ4MeQ6U-oB-sGUrtRswD7feuRBO/edit#heading=h.n2a3udms5sd5>. Licensed under a Creative Commons [Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) License.