This month’s WLN, as usual, reflects the variety of issues tutors and directors are concerned with in writing centers. Bill Macauley discusses the history and importance of knowing more about learning styles, both of tutors and students, and he includes examples of how to bring this into tutoring practice. Peggy Johnson reflects on how tutors can more meaningfully perceive their relationships with students.

Jennifer Beattie traces the evolution of her tutoring practices from focusing on grammar to emphasizing higher order concerns and then back to a middle ground that acknowledges the importance of both. Christine Crowe offers strategies for getting students actively involved in the tutorial, and finally, some WCenter listserv writers describe promotional events they hold to let the campus know about their services.

As the semester winds down, this volume of WLN is also coming to a close. The June issue will be the last for this academic year, until next September. If you have announcements for the newsletter, please e-mail them to me by mid-May for the June issue. And keep sending your Web site addresses with a description of what you want to share with others (see p. 9).

- Muriel Harris, editor
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will sound to someone else.” I tried theoretical discussions: “in order for a tutorial session to empower student writers, the student must be actively engaged from the start. If we want students to take ownership of their writing, taking it away from them and making them wait for you to get ready (i.e., read the whole paper) is counter-intuitive because it says the session is about your needs first. Inviting students to tell you what they are concerned about and focusing on particular portions of the paper enables the writer to develop language about writing and to develop critical revision skills.” I provided explicit guidelines for the tutors that included open-ended questions, prioritizing questions/issues, and together making a plan for the session (Macauley, “Setting” 2). I even specified that I wanted all tutors to read the writing out loud to the student. There were other areas of the library to be used if they were embarrassed or disturbing their colleagues’ tutorials. There was no doubt that I had made my wishes clear. Still, I wasn’t getting through. I began to look back for clues.

When we talked about supplies, rather than just pens and paper, returning tutors wanted colored markers, a selection of highlighters, and multicolored Post-It notes. When asked why they needed all of these materials, several tutors responded that they had worked with students who needed something a little more visual—“They do better if they can see it.” The tutors also asked for the scratchpads our Service Center makes from outdated letterhead and discontinued forms. “Students like to write ideas or phrases on them, lay them out, and then try different arrangements in order to see what outline might work best,” they told me.

Students had more than once claimed that, because they were visual learners, they should be able to do something other than write papers. Even though I had my doubts, my office was in the middle of the Education Department and it was easy to ask my colleagues there about learning styles—to find the abundance of systems, scales, and inventories available for investigating them. The tutors and I spent some time talking about the basics of learning styles—verbal, aural, tactile/kinesthetic—and what these indications meant for tutoring. Eventually, I began to wonder if it was only students’ learning styles that could actively shape and inform writing tutorials.

Learning styles help us to consider how student writers are thinking about their work and making their way through writing processes. Learning styles are just as important because they are theoretical frameworks that provide tutors and directors means by which to think deeply about the types of learning that might be privileged or excluded. Theories of intelligences, learning habits, styles, or preferences might also be used to question the epistemologies at work in tutor training, tutoring guidelines, and the development of common practices. Some researchers are responding: “Realizing that many faculty members tend to teach from the vantage point of their own styles fomented over time, the authors suggested faculty varying their instructional styles to accommodate students’ varied learning needs” (Keri 434).

Although the phrases “learning styles” or “multiple intelligences” may be relatively new, one might argue that a desire to understand how the mind takes in and/or processes information is not. ¹ There are many ways to see the history of mind; my selective provenance begins in the fifth century BCE, with Hippocrates. Most are acquainted with Hippocrates’ colorful theory of the four humors. In his view, the dominating humor was “responsible for the temperament (black bile = melancholy; yellow bile = bitterness and inscrutability; phlegm = equanimity, and sluggishness; sanguine = passionate and cheerful)” (“Timeline”). In the first century CE, Quintilian took this idea one step further toward the writing center:

It is generally, and not without reason, regarded as an excellent quality in [an educator] to observe accurately the differences of ability in those whom [s]he has undertaken to instruct, and to ascertain in what direction the nature of
In the thirteenth century CE, Aquinas held that sense perception is an active process rather than passive receiving. Instead of forms (objects) making impressions on the mind like a seal makes an impression onto wax, mind actively ‘scans’ physical reality using the sense organs. Aquinas made no special distinction between sensation and cognition. (“Timeline”)

In the seventeenth century, Hobbes added that thought was based in cause and effect, that one thought can build upon another (“Timeline”). In the eighteenth century, Hume argued that the contents of the mind are built on experience (“Timeline”). By the time we get to the twentieth century, Carl Jung has been able to specify that some people are introverted or extroverted and later thinking/feeling and intuition/sensation (“Timeline”). One might ask why this lineage makes so much sense for our purposes here. Admittedly selective, this lineage sets out a number of important components not only of how we learn but also how we might tutor:

• People differ in how their minds work ( Hippocrates)
• Educators can know and adapt to learners (Quintilian)
• Learning is active (Aquinas)
• Thinking/learning is a process (Hobbes)
• Learning is experiential (Hume)
• Different people interact differently (Jung)

These sound very much like foundational concepts embedded in most tutor training.

The desire to theorize about the what the mind is and does has ranged from humors to parts of the mind, capacities, physical discoveries in the brain, learning differences, learning styles, ways of knowing, and most recently, multiple intelligences. Before long, systems of classification were codified. Tests, such as Myers-Briggs, were devised. By the time Howard Gardner first wrote about multiple intelligences, which seemed absolutely out-of-the-blue for many, more than two-and-a-half centuries of work had been done on how we take in and process information (which Gardner gratefully acknowledges).

Howard Gardner makes a compelling case for his own taxonomy of intelligences and argues persuasively that education must be responsive to them. He also claims that schools should be much more deliberate about addressing the unique learning situations of students, of tailoring instruction and learning to the abilities, needs, and interests of each individual, but with a realistic view: “Clearly, what I am describing is a tall order; it might even be utopian” (11).

No, Dr. Gardner, what you described is a progressive, working writing center.

The bases for Gardner’s ideas, although they have evolved and developed exponentially of late, are as old as our western (intellectual) world; educators have always wanted to know why some students learn better/faster than others, why some “get it” and others do not, why some can paint and others can calculate (and some can do both). These same educators have also been aware for some time that students are not all the same. Beyond those already noted, John Dewey, B.F. Skinner, Janet Emig, Linda Flower—they have all added to our knowledge, but none have really displaced the preceding theories and explained learning (or tutoring or teaching) as a manageable, consistent system of development. This is where a lot of the problems begin; so much has been done that it can be overwhelming.

It is easy to be put off by the proliferation of learning style/intelligence theories, paradigms, inventories, classifications, and applications, but there is at least one very good reason to look further into this area. That reason is simple: several studies have indicated that, when students develop a sense of their own learning styles and apply that information to their studies, academic performance improves and ongoing development in relation to learning styles continues “that upward trend” for an extended period (Burke and Dunn 169). It is that simple: it is very likely that paying attention to learning styles can improve tutors’ and students’ academic performance, provide further insights into writing processes, and enable clearer understanding of the most productive means for learning about writing, for both the tutors and student writers who seek their assistance.

Over the past two years, I have been deliberately and increasingly incorporating discussions of learning styles into tutor training. I began to realize that the training I provided to tutors clearly privileged the verbal, to the exclusion of auditory, tactile, and other learning styles/intelligences. Even though I discussed learning styles with the tutors and made sure that they had a range of tools (highlighters, Post-its, crayons and markers, scrap paper, Tinkertoys), their training focused exclusively on verbal learning. While I was arguing for the importance of learning styles, the guidelines I provided to tutors included upwards of 25 minutes of talk in every 30-minute tutorial. I was sending a very mixed message and, as is so often the case, the tutors very subtly helped me to understand the error in my thinking.

Awareness is a good first step, but no good tutor would allow that to be the end of it. A progressive writing center should invite tutors to understand their own learning styles because those learning styles could shape/influence their tutoring methods. If tutors learned to be more aware of their own learning styles, they might become more sensitive to the learning styles of the students with whom they work. The writing center’s hegemony and accepted
practices would have to be analyzed to avoid privileging one learning style or excluding others. If these objectives are accomplished, the range of tutoring strategies in that writing center would increase; the writing center could accommodate a much wider range of learners; and the tutoring could potentially become even more productive. In effect, that writing center would become a progressive writing center.

Talking with other tutors, directors, students, and colleagues enriches those possibilities. And that’s what we did. With the hope that we could both enable others as well as increase our own repertoire, we proposed a learning-styles workshop for the 2003 East Central Writing Centers Association Conference (Macauley, “Our Little Secret”). The session asked participants to not only consider the learning styles of student writers but to think about them in terms of how tutors worked, how they were trained, and what privileging was occurring within our writing centers.

The workshop was filled with eager, talkative, intelligent, and experienced writing center colleagues. We began with three of the best known learning styles: visual, auditory, and tactile/kinesthetic learners (Vancouver Island Invisible Disability Association). Through discussion, we found that our practices and training generally seemed to privilege the verbal and, almost without fail, excluded the kinesthetic. However, the more we talked, the greater the range of possibilities we saw. Small groups went to work describing, developing, and sharing tutoring practices that would accommodate learning styles other than those already privileged. Each group was then asked to report back to the whole workshop. Here’s some of what those wonderful people came up with:

- **Marcia Halason, Sandra Beligni, Paul Mauch, and Crystal Pierce**

  *Kinesthetic/tactile learners:*
  - Mapping topic sentences with highlighters
  - Cutting and pasting (physically and virtually)

- **Nicole Diederich, Katie Cielinski, Angie Saunders, and Jonathan Cordes**

  *Visual learners:*
  - Look at a sequence of photos and ask the student to write a story to explain them

  *Musical/rhythmic learners:*
  - Mnemonic devices

- **Patricia Pearce, Dawn Reed, and Christina Montgomery**

  *Verbal learners:*
  - Conversation about the topic and goals of the paper

  *Auditory learners:*
  - Tutor reads the paper aloud

- **Stephanie Sheffield, Rosemary Shannon, and Scott Hendrix**

  *All learners:*
  - Inventory/description of the ideal writing space (as diagnostic tool)

  *Kinesthetic learners:*
  - Use art supplies (scissors, construction paper, glue) to “build” a paper

- **Dodie Miller, Cynthia Bandish, and Susan Breckenridge**

  *Kinesthetic learners:*
  - Make lists to use in the session and take away afterward

  *All learners:*
  - Culturally diverse learners call for development of culturally diverse tutoring

- **Angie Cochran, Amy Conger, Kristin Richardson, Laura McDonald, and Caleb Cook**

  *Intrapersonal learners:*
  - Draw out personal examples that relate to the assignment

  *Kinesthetic learners:*
  - Act it out

- **Joshua Oluwaley, Sandra Dullinger, David Capaul, and Beth Hukill**

  *Verbal learners:*
  - Ask writer to translate into different discourse communities

  *Kinesthetic learners:*
  - Journaling together with the tutor

These are a few of the ideas that were written out and left for me. Some may be familiar, but what matters is that we were thinking about them in a new way. That paradigm shift allowed us to think more deeply and deliberately about how we learn, how others learn, and how we can enable both. I found this very exciting. Look what we can do when we work together!

Now, a caution is in order. Options abound in thinking about how best to engage the mind and imagination of tutees. There is compelling evidence that lighting, sound, and mobility are primary considerations in learning (Burke and Dunn). Pollack’s idea that males and females learn differently may seem an essential consideration (Galley). You may find that Kolb’s thinking/feeling dimension (Lawson and Johnson) rings truer in your experience than his categories of assimilator and converger (Terrell). Levine’s proposition that learning differences originate in more neurodevelopmental constructs may provide a paradigm through which to view your tutoring (Gorrell). Plenty of people are advocating a return to more traditional educational strategies, whatever that means. There are plenty of options.

Here is the caution: It is not recom-
mended that learning styles or differing intelligences be understood as tools for streamlining our work. On the contrary, they complicate it because they suggest options rather than control for variables. It is ill-advised to use learning styles in a prescriptive rather than descriptive way. The power and gift of this body of scholarship, at least presently, is in its ability to provide new lenses through which to view and think about learning. These ideas and strategies are not presented so we can label students who seek help from our respective writing centers. Instead, these theories and the practices developed in the workshop are offered as conceptual stimuli. Use them wisely and they will help your writing center to grow and develop diverse resources.

Gardner concludes that: “Choice is therefore inevitable and one of the things I want to argue is that the choices we make for ourselves, and for the people who are under our charge, might as well be informed choices” (10). Considering learning styles enables those informed choices. As tutors, we can use learning styles to think more deeply about our students’ learning needs. Tutors and directors can interrogate and develop a deeper sense of how their own learning preferences shape tutoring practices. Directors can examine the hegemony their training, resources, and writing center community provoke by asking questions about what styles and intelligences might be privileged, ignored, or addressed. Learning styles create options. “The more you know...”

William J. Macauley, Jr., et al.
Mount Union College
Alliance, Ohio

Note
1 For a terrific overview of how the mind has been viewed and understood over the centuries, visit “Mind Navigator” at <http://www.thebigview.com/mind/>.
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Existentialism in the writing center: Tutors’ search for meaning

It was her eyes. They grabbed my attention the moment Ashley committed to working as a peer tutor in our small, private Midwestern university writing center. It wasn’t the shade of color or unique shape that struck me as much as the look of anxiety and uncertainty that stared back at me, a glance of desperation that seemed to say, what am I getting myself into? She had been highly recommended as a writing center tutor by two of her professors, who had spoken glowingly of her quick insight and superb writing capabilities. But it was clear that her willingness to work as a peer tutor was more of a response to those professors’ recommendations than a genuine desire to help students who sought out someone authoritative to go over their papers with them. Ashley, a shy third-year student who felt more comfortable embracing books than human relationships, stood before me afraid of the struggle to learn beyond her limits.

Ashley’s feelings of fear were not hers alone; most beginning writing center tutors experience similar emotions as they take on a role they are unfamiliar with. Virtually every new peer tutor echoes the words of Kate, a senior English major involved in myriad college activities: “When I was offered a position as a tutor in the writing center, I was very nervous. I wasn’t sure if I’d have the requisite knowledge to help people with their writing. How do we make dialogue about writing the central issue of tutoring rather than the issue of being “good enough,” of upholding a role as an authority figure that follows a standard of correctness?

Like many student writers, new peer tutors like Ashley, Kate, and Joe fear that they don’t have the requisite knowledge to help people with their writing. How do we make dialogue about writing the central issue of tutoring rather than the issue of being “good enough,” of upholding a role as an authority figure that follows a standard of correctness?

An existential discovery of tutoring is vital to helping tutors change their perception of themselves from figures of helpful authority to people of compassion and comradeship. Using the work of Viktor Frankl, I have learned that an examination of the tutoring experience as a meaningful human interchange is necessary because without this examination, writing center practice can be limited to the roles that tutor and writer fulfill rather than be regarded as a valuable intimate connection shared between human beings. Training tutors to take a critical stance toward tutoring practice using an existentialist approach is one method for them to gain an awareness of the dignified human interaction involved.

Existentialism

Existentialism is a term that has not been addressed in writing center circles, but I believe it can appropriately be situated in a writing center setting. The psychologist Viktor Frankl, in Man’s Search for Meaning, defines existentialism as finding meaning and a sense of responsibility in one’s existence, especially as it relates to situations of suffering. Frankl writes, “This uniqueness of purpose in life distinguishes each individual and gives a meaning to her existence” (101). I believe that to discover this purpose in the act of tutoring, writing center tutors must reflect on the question, What is meaningful in the work that I do? For writing center tutors, existentialism involves recognizing the significance of their unique role in the development of their own and other human beings’ efforts to realize their potential.

This potential can be achieved through several paths, Frankl suggests: by creating a work or doing a deed; by experiencing something or encountering someone; and by the attitude we take toward unavoidable suffering (11). While all three areas of existential discovery can encompass writing center practice to certain degrees and in varied circumstances, I believe Frankl’s paths of doing a deed and encountering someone most aptly apply to the relationship between tutors and writers, most notably because tutors are in a position of guide and colleague who offer their insight and knowledge to those who seek it; tutors are willing and capable of “doing a deed” in the experience of “encountering someone.” Frankl’s argument suggests that tutors can discover meaning and purpose through the act of tutoring and that this discovery can enhance their own and others’ lives. Using an existentialist framework, writing center
work extends beyond the piece of writing at hand to encompass the human connection in the act of tutoring.

Understanding the meaningful human connection that can occur between tutor and writer is crucial to writing center pedagogy, especially because there is a power hierarchy inherent in the tutoring conference that is based upon the educational divide that exists between tutors and writers. Nancy Grimm says that in general, student writers who utilize writing center services have marginalized status in the academic arena. These students, who are in a vulnerable position and typically feel marginalized because of their perceived or actually inadequate writing ability, regard themselves as less competent than their peers and therefore less “worthy” as students. Writing center tutors, on the other hand, are esteemed for their writing capabilities and have found success in the field of writing. This imbalance in writing ability (perceived or actual) between tutors and writers can result in tutors and/or writers who place tutors in positions of authority where they are granted the freedom to take charge of a writer’s work or of the tutoring conference (McAndrew & Reigstad), thus maintaining a division between the tutor as expert and the writer as ignorant. This imbalance of power can result in repression of the student writer’s personal and academic growth (Grimm). Jean Vanier suggests that this division can result in the reduction of relationships rather than the fostering of relationships, and when this occurs, writing centers cannot provide a meaningful intimate human experience that dignifies the needs of both the tutor and the writer.

Frankl states that reflecting on the meaning and responsibility of one’s life is the primary way to develop as full human beings who are capable of regarding themselves as worthwhile individuals. He calls the outcome of this reflection “love.” Frankl writes, 

Love is the only way to grasp another human being in the innermost core of his personality. No one can become fully aware of the very essence of another human being unless he loves him. By his love he is enabled to see the essential traits and features in the beloved person; and even more, he sees that which is potential in him, which is not yet actualized but yet ought to be actualized. By making him aware of what he can be and of what he should become, he makes these potentialities come true. (134)

Frankl suggests that we are able to participate in the growth and development of another human being only when we have established an intimate human connection with that person.

Writing center practice

Frankl’s stance of love seems idealistic for tutoring sessions that last an average of thirty minutes, but the love that Frankl describes is an attitude that must be embraced rather than an emotion that is felt. Kincheloe and Steinberg refer to the attitude of love for humanity as empathy, or “the ability to appreciate the anxieties and frustrations of others” (43). In writing center practice, this implies that tutors are able to fully identify the discourse needs of writers only if they are empathetic toward writers as unique human beings, which allows tutors to see the possibilities of the writer and of the work she produces.

This relational element defined by the qualities of collaboration and unity is especially necessary when we consider many of the writers who seek out tutoring services. People involved in writing centers often see students who walk through the doors, often feeling insecure about their work. They enter a space that is risky—because it calls them to reveal sometimes the most in-

secure parts of themselves. This sense of risk is brought into the tutoring conference, and the degree to which it is alleviated depends greatly upon the relationship of collaboration between tutor and writer. Bonnie Sunstein calls writing centers “temporary reflecting places” (10) that provide student writers with a safe space where they are regarded as equal participants.

But while scholarship describes writing centers as places of protection and community, this characterization is a goal rather than a condition that we can assume just exists; the work we do in writing centers is not in a place of safety or in a place of equality because we say it is so or because writing centers have the potential to be so. And this is where we risk limiting the work done in writing centers. When tutors regard the writers they tutor as objects of pity or charity because of the writer’s marginalized status rather than regard them as friends, colleagues, and fellow human beings, we connect not as people, but through the roles we play. This role identity can mask an underlying effort to assimilate those who are marginalized to a white, middle-class standard that erases the voices of those who are different.

Yet despite the fragile position of relationship that is central to tutoring practice, tutoring handbooks in general provide little insight into tutoring relationships beyond that of establishing rapport with writers. While research in writing center pedagogy describes the act of tutoring as collaborative, a focus on comradeship or the development of empathetic relationships appears absent from writing center texts.

Existentialism in writing center practice

This lack of focus on interpersonal relationships in writing center environments, I believe, limits the opportunity for tutors to learn how to create a more meaningful connection with writers.
This meaningful connection can be accomplished by guiding tutors in adopting the praxis of reflection and action. Reflection, in Pat Belanoff’s words, leads to a “changed concept of one’s actions and the actions of others, which leads to a change in individual and group action” (416). The act of tutoring must occur both individually (reflection) and collectively (action) so that ultimately, tutors see as much dignity and value in the literacy and life experiences of others different from them as they see in their own.

In tutor training sessions, tutors become aware of these differences when they view film clips of tutoring/mentoring situations, such as those found in My Fair Lady, Educating Rita, and A League of their Own. Issues of power hierarchy involving position, gender, and age, as well as concepts of self-esteem and self-transformation, become central to discussion about cultural views of tutoring and how those views deviate from or are similar to practices in the university setting.

Tutors also become aware of differences in literacy and life experiences between themselves and student writers when they reflect upon their own lives. More often than not, tutors tell stories of strong family bonds, warm-hearted friendships, and a contented lifestyle far removed from situations of hostility, victimization, loneliness, and inadequacy. Tutors continue the act of reflection by discussing moments in their lives when they have experienced vulnerability or situations of varying degrees of oppression. Getting in touch with these emotions can help tutors to better empathize with students who see themselves as inadequate writers. When tutors remind themselves of their human range of emotions and experiences, they more clearly understand their place in the wider community. Reflecting on the human connection of suffering is central to the concept of existentialism, Frankl suggests. When tutors discover their place in helping to alleviate that human suffering found in the writer’s sense of inadequacy, they discover meaning and purpose in the act of tutoring; this sense of purpose continues to develop as tutors are given opportunities for silent reflection, private journal writing, and an ongoing discussion of these reflections in a community setting, either through electronic or public conversations with other tutors.

By taking an existentialist approach, tutors have the opportunity for self-reflection that can result in changes in perspective. Through reflecting on her tutoring experiences, Ashley was able to understand how writing is central to identity. She says,

I have come to see that a writing style is an extremely individual component of one’s being, and exposing this personal style to another party’s critique can leave a person feeling vulnerable and easily hurt. I try to keep that concept at the forefront of my mind during tutorials in order to ensure that I show respect—and never derision—for whatever work students bring with them. I try never to dictate rules or standards to a student but instead try to make the tutorial an interactive discussion of her or his work between us.

Ashley’s words reveal a discovery of the genuine needs of the writer whom she regards as a colleague and fellow human being rather than the author of a particular written text; she keeps the central focus of the tutoring conference on the individual rather than on the written discourse. These values parallel Joe’s, who finds that “the chance to have input and gain insight into another person’s writing is a meaningful opportunity” that allows him and the writer to work “to become understood in a world of misunderstanding.”

**Conclusion**

Ashley is still a shy third-year student who feels more comfortable embracing books than human relationships. Kate continues to squeeze tutoring into an over-scheduled social calendar. Writing still takes second place to Joe’s passion for biology. But all of them are no longer afraid of their own inadequacy in the tutoring session because they see their work as having a purpose that brings about deeper human connections. Take, for example, the tutoring experiences of Kate, who writes:

I try to make the tutorial an interactive discussion of his or her work between us. It is through establishing this interaction that I feel a true connection can occur between the student and me. This connection necessitates going beyond the words and punctuation marks on the paper to the student’s ideas and beliefs. My favorite tutoring sessions are those with students who have a genuine interest in improving their writing and who engage in conversations about their writing with me. I always feel as though a genuine relationship has been made after such sessions as these. A sense of trust and comfort begins to develop, which is vital to the success of the work done in the writing center.

Existentialism gives tutors insight into their own identity as well as the identity of the student writer and shapes a unified tutoring conference. When tutors discover that their work has meaning and relevance, academic divisions inherent in the roles of tutor and writer are minimized because the power hierarchy has been dismantled; tutor and writer share a common humanity, which grants the opportunity for both tutors and writers to help each other when they become caught in the insecurity of their struggle to surpass their limits in becoming more fully human.

Peggy Johnson
Saint Mary’s University
Winona, MN
What’s new and/or interesting on your Web site?

WLN invites writing center folks who want to share some special feature or new material on their OWL to let us know. Send your URL, a title, and a sentence or two about what you want to share, to the editor (harrism@cc.purdue.edu).

• Hamilton College

Last June, I hosted an end-of-the-year faculty lunch for anyone who wanted to join in. A bunch of us sat around lamenting the lamentable state of student writing and wishing we could do a better job of alerting students to the most common writing errors. The group tossed around silly ideas and came up with a plan for a campus education campaign that we named “The Seven Deadly Sins of Bad Writing.”

This year, I have written a new poster each month highlighting a specific common error. A few hundred copies are printed, on brightly colored, 11x17 paper, adorned with devil clip art. The writing tutors hang up copies all around campus, in such unexpected places as the hockey rink, bathrooms, weight rooms. . . . With the completion of the seventh sin, we will have the full spectrum of rainbow colors represented. PDF’s of the posters are on our Web site. The posters been a huge hit! Students even read them—and like them—and look forward to the next month’s! The poster have turned out to be a friendly, light-hearted way of emphasizing common errors.

You can print out (white) copies at <http://onthehill.hamilton.edu/academics/resource/wc/sins/>. No color, but you get the sense of what we are doing.

Who says learning can’t be fun!

Sharon Williams, Hamilton College (swilliam@hamilton.edu)
Pencil lead streaked my desktop and stained my cramped fingers as I scrawled out the last of twenty lines reading, “Grammar rule #7: Two complete sentences combined by a coordinating conjunction require a comma before the conjunction.” I had spent the last forty-five and a half minutes diligently copying seven other such rules twenty times each and was silently praying that this would be the last. Every day, after grading our work from the previous day, our English teacher would identify which errors were present in our papers and require us to complete this tedious task of copying the rules we had broken. Every day we dreaded coming to class. She obviously thought that this was the recipe for making better writers, adhering to the old school philosophy of good grammar = good writer.

As a result of these daily grammar-rule-copying sessions, I became convinced that grammatically error-free writing was the one and only sign of a good writer. I also became a master at finding comma splices and the like and quickly fixing them. In essence, I became a mean, lean, grammar-editing machine. When I signed up for Writing 500 (in my junior year of college), I thought this was the quality that would make me a good writing tutor. I was a good writer because I had mastered the intricacies of English grammar; therefore, sharing this wisdom with those who had yet to learn it would improve their writing. What I didn’t know at the time was that grammar hadn’t been what was getting me such high marks and praise on all my papers (although it didn’t hurt), but my indoctrination had been so thorough that I couldn’t even recognize that all along I was a “good” writer for other reasons.

Writing 500, in combination with Writing 351, opened my eyes to the concept of writing as a process, as well as to the importance of something called Higher Order Concerns (HOCs). Imagine my surprise when my Writing 500 teacher explained that these concerns were to be the focus of tutorials long before grammar was ever to be raised as an issue. Suddenly, the world of writing as I knew it came crashing down around me. Furthermore, I wondered if and how I could be an effective tutor according to this view.

I can remember how hard it was during some of my initial tutorials to fight the editing urge. My writing hand literally itched to correct comma splices and such! There were times when I had to tell myself over and over again to focus on the HOCs we’d discussed in class: Does the paper follow the assignment guidelines? Is the organization clear? Does the student need to elaborate more on such and such?

Then came what I have come to refer to as “The Ronnie Incident.” Ronnie was a freshman who came into the Writing Center, asking for help with grammar. “Great,” I thought to myself, “this is right up my alley.” I read through his paper, searching for grammatical mistakes. However, much to my dismay, I found none; Ronnie, apparently, had as good a grasp on English grammar as I did. Yet, I also noticed that his paper had no point; it was awful! He just rambled on and on about nothing in particular, circling back repeatedly to topics he’d already discussed and jumping around within paragraphs enough to make my head spin. I couldn’t believe it. Here was a perfectly correct paper, grammatically speaking; but it was quite possibly the worst thing I had ever read! As I began to address those HOCs I had become so familiar with in tutorial training, I couldn’t help but question the good grammar = good writer equation I’d held so fast to for so long. “Could it be,” I wondered, “that grammar has nothing to do with the quality of writing?” The shock of it all was almost enough to make me give up on grammar forever.

Fortunately, “The Ronnie Incident,” was followed shortly by the “Tara Tutorial.” Tara was another freshman writing student who came into the Center during those early days. As I began reading her paper, I was so startled by the number of grammatical errors in the introductory paragraph that I almost stopped reading to begin a mini-lecture on punctuation. However, I forced myself to trudge through to the next paragraph, leaving only a few checkmarks in the margin. By the time I made it to her third and fourth paragraphs, I was still startled—but not by her grammatical errors.

Now, I was startled by the intensity of emotion she portrayed in this short Writing 101 narrative. I got so caught up in her personal story that I no longer noticed the misplaced modifiers and misused semi-colons. Upon finishing the paper, I found myself asking her questions about her story, about specific points and connections between them. For once, these questions were not forced; they came naturally, and it felt good. The tutorial continued that way until I realized we had only five minutes left. As we wrapped up the session, I told her that she still had some grammatical issues to work out and invited her to make another
appointment. Then, as I filled out the tutorial report form, I asked her how she felt about the paper. She responded by telling me that it had served as an emotional outlet for her and had helped her come to terms with issues in her life she had previously been unable to resolve. I was amazed; we both had positive feelings about this paper, and I hadn’t even said a word about the grammar. Tara proved something that my Writing 500 and 351 teachers had been saying all along: Writing can be a means of self-discovery, emotional release, and problem-solving, and in such writing, grammar really is a low priority compared with development, clarity, and unity.

The combination of these two tutorials, “The Ronnie Incident” and the “Tara Tutorial,” within such a short span of time, lead me to some temporary and false conclusions about the importance of grammar to “good” writing. Suddenly, I thought grammar had no relevancy to good writing. My definition of good writing became “writing that promotes discovery of self, serves as an emotional outlet, or aids in problem-solving for life issues.” Grammar did not factor into this definition at all. I found myself not just reserving grammar for last consideration in tutorials, but also consciously avoiding the issue altogether. However, as I said, this definition and the tutorial style I adopted along with it were short-lived; when Tara returned to the writing center with a revision of that first draft, I was forced once again to re-evaluate my idea of what constitutes “good” writing.

Tara’s revised draft turned out to be a wonderful self-expression narrative, but it remained riddled with grammatical errors. I found myself unable, as a reader, to ignore the mistakes now; they were clearly affecting the readability of the paper and my understanding of it. Hesitantly, at first, I jumped into issues of sentence structure, dangling modifiers, and misplaced punctuation. Having just come to terms with my “new” definition of writing, I was more than a little reluctant to address grammatical problems; but I had to because they were problems. After Tara and I worked out these issues, I contemplated how this tutorial should be factored into my growing definition of “good” writing. I wondered, “Where exactly does grammar fit? How important is it?”

Late that night, I had a eureka moment. I realized that while Tara’s second draft had fit right into my new “self-discovery” model of writing, it was inappropriate for her purpose because the grammatical problems made it hard for the reader to understand and benefit from her narrative. “Aha,” I thought, “I forgot about the reader!” A light bulb flashed triumphantly in my mind. I now had to factor the reader into my “good” writing equation. In my journal, I wrote this down to try to clarify my own ideas on what makes writing “good”: (self-discovery/emotional release/problem-solving/relating life experience) + (correct use of grammar for the sake of readability and understanding by reader) = good writing. The act of writing in my journal made me think about this further. The audience is what makes grammar important. The type of audience indicates the level of correctness a work should have. My journal, for instance, is for my eyes only; therefore, because I understand what I have written, grammar makes no difference in readability. Tara’s second draft would have been a wonderful journal entry; but because her teacher and classmates were additional audiences, she needed proper use of punctuation, modifiers, and word choice. The ringing of bells accompanied the light bulb in my head. Finally, I had it!

I have come a long way from that lead-streaked desktop of my earlier days. Yet, today I remain somewhat of a staunch grammarian. I still see comma splices from a mile away and often have to resist the urge to correct them on student papers; I often have to suppress my inner editor during tutorials no matter how badly my writing hand itches to make corrections. My own personal journal remains error free. I still believe that good grammar is a key to good writing; it provides clarity and understanding for the reader. However, I now know that it is only one of many keys. In order for writing to be effective (or what I have previously been calling “good”), it must do a number of things for both reader and writer. It must involve some form of self discovery, learning, emotional release, or problem solving in order to be “good” for the writer; however, to be “good” for the reader, it must also be clear and easily readable (which both can come from, among other things, appropriate use of grammar). As a result, helping students to achieve effectiveness both for themselves and their readers is the primary goal I have set for myself as a tutor.

I approach my tutorials much differently now than I did when I first embarked upon the tutoring journey. I force myself to put grammatical issues on the back burner, turning down the heat. There, I let them simmer until they are ready to be addressed. In the meantime, I focus my attention to other issues, namely, those HOCs I’d learned to discuss in Writing 500. My style has, as a result, become more conversational and natural. Furthermore, my realizations about grammar’s place in the tutorial, as well as in “good” writing, have helped me make strides in my own personal writing endeavors. Saving grammar for last has lifted a humongous burden from my shoulders. I find myself experiencing writer’s block far less often, as I have adapted my own writing process. Not worrying about where the comma should go during my initial writing stages (prewriting/drafting) allows me greater freedom in my writing; it has helped me to produce work that would have otherwise been impossible. Obviously, my attitude towards what constitutes “good writing” has changed a lot over the years, but I am certain now that those changes are only for the best.

Jennifer Beattie
Winthrop University
Rock Hill, SC
Strategies for tutoring the passive student

We all know that the true function of the writing center, hence, the writing center tutor, is to produce better writers, through collaboration, not just better papers. However, most students who enter a writing center expecting help with their papers are not usually expecting to sit down and chat with a tutor. They tend to see the tutor as their superior, not their peer. Consequently, students who come to our center for help consider me their teacher’s peer who is expected to have all the answers. Instead, I require them to work for their answers.

Questions like, “Can you just look this over and tell me what’s wrong with it?” are counteracted with inquiry rather than solution. Frequently, the student would prefer to just hand me their essay and get it back all marked up in red ink— a perfectly understandable expectation given the customary method of assessment most students have been subjected to throughout their academic careers. Many of the students who visit our center are focused on the textual problems in their writing rather than the writing process itself; they are working in the present and are not usually interested in learning for the long term. The task of finding ways to convince students to buy into our philosophy of tutoring can be difficult, particularly when working with passive students. Some of the strategies that I have found helpful in my effort to involve passive students in the tutorial are summarized here.

To begin with, I discovered my key to a successful session is to draw the unsuspecting student into conversation with open-ended questions right from the start. As a result, the writer is forced to take part in a discourse and thus inject his or her own voice into the writing. In order to gain the student’s attention and cooperation, it is essential for me to establish this approach at the onset of the conference.

This can be accomplished by the tone that is set in the initial greeting. How a tutor initiates the interaction will set the tone for the entire session. For instance, when I greet the student with a friendly, upbeat welcome and begin the dialogue with questions that are not immediately focused on the writing, the student begins to see me as a peer rather than their superior or teacher. Creating small talk about anything that is appropriate at the moment puts the student at ease. It is important to incorporate direct, open-ended questions into this dialogue so that the student is required to respond with more than a yes or no answer.

When meeting students for the first time, I might ask about their nationality based on their last name. This can lead us into a discussion about their country of origin— a subject with which they are most familiar and generally eager to discuss. For example, in a recent session I inquired about the origin of a student’s last name, and he responded by asking me if I’d ever been to Antigua. I admitted that the closest I’d been was Puerto Rico, and this led us into a brief discussion about how beautiful the Caribbean Islands were and how I would love the land of his birth. Having this conversation set the student at ease for further dialogue relating to his writing assignment. On another occasion, I encountered a student who was determined to remain passive and retorted with very brief, matter of fact responses to my initial introduction. His attempt to turn my attention away from small talk only made me more determined to find a common ground. I noticed his Yankee baseball cap—something I could relate to. In my effort to solicit more than a simple yes or no response, I refrained from asking “So, are you a Yankees fan?” or “Do you like the Yankees?” Instead, I carefully inquired: “So, who’s your favorite player on the Yankees?” This led us into a discussion over whether Jeter, Soriano or Williams was better.

This brief opening interaction can lead to a smoother transition into the writing. This is not to say that all students are receptive to my initial approach. Occasionally, I will encounter students who refuse to let go of their passive stance. In this situation, it is important for me to respect their preference to disengage from casual discourse; nevertheless, my methods of tutoring remain steadfast when it comes to discussion of the writing. Even the most passive students must be made to understand that we cannot assist them with their writing if they are not willing to take ownership of their paper.

Regardless of whether my attempts at an opening discussion are successful, my questions will shift to inquiry about the assignment. Some students will prefer that we jump right into a review of the written work; however, requiring them to discuss the aspects of the assignment adds to the efficacy of the tutoring session. In keeping with a line of open-ended questioning, I will ask a student to explain what the assignment is, when it is due, how many pages and sources are expected, etc. I have learned to resist the urge to take the assignment sheet from the student and read it. While this tactic may be more work for the tutor, it forces students to take an active role in the dialogue while they are reinforcing their understanding of the teacher’s requirements. Finally, it is time to turn the attention to the written work.
At this point in the session, there are a number of tactics that a tutor can employ to encourage dialogue with even the most passive student. For example, I will ask students to explain in their own words what is written or what they intend to write, making certain that the student is following the guidelines of the assignment. If the assignment calls for a textual analysis of a particular essay, I will ask the student to relay the story to me that he or she is analyzing, once again requiring the student to actively participate in the session. When a completed assignment needs review, I begin by asking what in particular the student would like us to focus on during this session. Here too it is important to resist taking the paper and simply reading it and offering suggestions. I try to keep in mind that students often have difficulty articulating their needs.

Even when students request that we just look over the entire paper and tell them what is wrong, it is beneficial to respond with more questions. I will ask them to tell me what they think they do well and what they are having trouble with in their composition. This usually gets students thinking and talking about the writing process and helps to narrow the focus of the session. If they express difficulty with formulating a thesis or a conclusion, I ask them to explain the function of both in their own words. If they are still having difficulty, I will help them turn to a writing reference guide for clarification.

I make a point of steering the focus to rhetorical issues before addressing sentence level errors. We can attend to some lower order concerns as we read through the paper; however, it is more advantageous to keep my questions centered on issues that affect the outcome of the writing. If a student has difficulty with my approaches to the session, it may become necessary for me to explain my role as a tutor. Students need to understand that my job as a tutor is to help them with the writing process so that they will become better writers. Most importantly, they need to understand that I cannot edit their writing.

Whether the concerns are higher order or centered on grammar and sentence structure, we will inevitably turn our attention to the written work. At this point, I will usually ask the student to read the work aloud. When employing this approach, I have the student pause at intervals to discuss the content; for example, if a sentence is unclear, I might ask, “Can you explain what you are trying to say in this sentence?” Then, turning back to the paper, I will ask how the written words differ from what the student just said. In this way, I am requiring the student to do the thinking and revision, thus maintaining their own voice in the writing. Another approach is to have the student listen as I slowly repeat a sentence that needs correction. This is especially helpful to non-native speakers who have difficulty proofreading their own work and tend to read the incorrect words correctly. These strategies can enable students to become active learners. Asking direct, applicable, open-ended questions throughout the session reinforces the collaborative discourse, and as a result, the student is taking ownership of the work and I am taking on the role of the student’s guide to good writing.

We resort to a guide when we need directions; however, we still maintain responsibility for completion of the undertaking. This same principle should extend to the tutoring conference. As peer tutors, we must utilize approaches that assist students with the process of writing and revision and ultimately make them better independent writers. By asking questions about the assignment, by listening to what the student says and repeating it back, we are in effect fostering a discourse and providing a safe space for students to produce in. It is only then that we become someone different from their teacher. This is not to say that teaching does not or should not take place in the tutoring conference; however, we must be cognizant of the extent of the teaching we allow ourselves to render. We should make it clear that our function is to assist our students with the methods they are taught in the classroom for the expressed purpose of helping them become better writers. Assisting them beyond this may cause us to integrate our own voice into the student’s work. Consequently, it may become necessary for us, as tutors, to compartmentalize and set aside our own personal ideology in order to remain focused on helping students improve their writing skills. Only then will we be recognized as peer tutors, and not as substitutes for the student’s teachers.

Christine Crowe
Stony Brook University
Stony Brook, New York

Secondary school writing centers listserv

To join the secondary school writing centers listserv <sswc-l@lists.psu.edu>, contact Jon Olson, IWCA President. He explains that you merely need to ask to be put on. He notes that the instructions say something like “Send a message to writingcenter@psu.edu and put ‘subscribe sswc-l’ in the subject line.” When he receives that message, he will add the person to the listserv.

For further information, contact Jon Olson at jeo3@email.psu.edu.
Voices from the Net

Writing center promotion week

On WCenter, the listserv for those who work in writing centers, contributors described various writing center promotion weeks. Numerous ideas were shared, some of which are excerpted here, for those who missed the conversation or are looking for suggestions for promoting their own center.

Date: 29 Jan 2004
Subject: Writing Center week
Hi, everyone. Here at CBU our Writing Center has undergone a total redecoration project set to be completed by the end of next week. We think this will be a splendid time to promote the Writing Center with more force, so we’re planning a Writing Center promotion week for the week of Feb. 9. Our plans right now are fairly simple. At the beginning of the week—during lunch—we’ll have an opening reception with cookies, etc. Then for the rest of the week we’ll keep refreshments in the Writing Center. We’ll probably distribute balloons, flyers, etc. across campus. With that in mind, I’d love to gather the following information from you.

Have you held such a week before? If so, what did you do? I’m particularly interested in knowing what small writing centers at small schools did.

What did you call the week? Right now we’re calling it “Discover the Writing Center,” but that sounds so First Year Orientation.

Clayann Gilliam Panetta, cpanetta@pop.cbu.edu
Christian Brothers University
Memphis, TN

Date: Thu, 29 Jan 2004
Subject: Writing Center week

One of the best promotional things we’ve ever done here at Kent—Stark is to hold an annual “Open House” in late January/early February in the Writing Center and invite not only students, but also faculty and administrators. Since, like most writing centers, we face the continuing challenge of educating (and re-educating) all these parties about who we are and what we do, I always ask my tutors to share their “theory-into-practice” projects from the “Tutoring Writing” course of the previous semester.

The tutors create posters, print and display pages from Powerpoint presentations, and have the actual Powerpoints running sequentially. (We’ve found early spring far preferable to late fall when the projects were actually completed; everyone is simply too exhausted to care much in December.) Late January is typically a slow time in the Center until those first paper assignments hit, and the open house brings energy and attention at a time when we all need it. More importantly, it showcases the very real scholarship my tutors engage in and highlights how seriously they take their work. Many of my tutors get excited again about their projects and go on to present them at the ECWCA conference in April.

Jay D. Sloan
JSLOAN@stark.kent.edu
Kent State University—Stark Campus
Canton, OH

Date: Thu, 29 Jan 2004
Subject: Writing Center Week

This sounds like such an awesome idea. We completely gutted and renovated our writing center at Lansing Community College over the summer and had a grand re-opening halfway through the following semester—once all the new furniture and finishing touches were in place. Ours was just a half-day event. We had an open house with refreshments followed by a presentation by members of the Michigan Writing Centers Association. This brought in people from other colleges in the state, which made quite an impression on our Dean and President. As part of this event, we also had our Dean and President say a few words, which I think is always wise. I’ll send you the flyer we used to promote the event (off list) to give you a better idea if you’re interested in seeing it. . . . Good luck and congrats!

Jill Pennington
penninj@lcc.edu
Lansing Community College
Lansing, MI

Date: Thu, 29 Jan 2004
Subject: Writing Center week

Ours is a larger, general support center that includes a Reading and Writing Center. We try to offer several special events per semester to bring the campus community in to see our center in a social way. Some things we’ve done:

Early Bird Socials: 8:00 to 9:00 a.m. . . . we offer coffee, tea, and doughnuts or similar . . . nice because the center is less busy.
during these times so our staff gives individual/group tours, introduces tutors who aren’t busy with students, etc. Lots of new people show up to start their day.

Cookie Socials: During the busier times in the center, we have some staff resources who offer palm reading, numerology readings, etc. We try to give folks a sense of the environment when everything is buzzing at our tables and the energy it creates. We serve cookies to everyone. These events are very popular. We always need twice as many cookies as we estimate.

Open House: After our remodel we had several of these . . . we made one-sheet fold over programs like at a show and introduced our “cast” of tutors and staff. The program outlined a tour of the center, so folks could view areas on their own or if one of our staff was free we’d walk them through. We posted staff at the door like ushers to hand out programs and greet visitors. Very well received by administration. We had several VIP groups come through with this event.

We also make table tents to put on tables in the cafeteria to advertise our special events. We have an agreement with Food Services management that they’ll leave them up until Friday of the week we put them out, and then their staff disposes of them for us.

Miya Squires
SquiresMi@butte.edu
Butte-Glenn Community College
 Oroville, CA

Date: 29 Jan 2004
Subject: Writing Center week

We held our third annual open house last September, and more people came than ever before. Administrators, faculty, and students from across campus are represented, and the president of the university has stopped in for a look and a visit each and every year.

But the real reason for the Open House is a bit more underhanded than making our presence known. Like many of you, I use every opportunity I can to teach folks how to use the Writing Center. I use this event as an excuse to mail a “personal” letter to every faculty member, staff member with lots of contact with students, TAs, GAs, and administrators across campus. In it, of course, I promote our services, celebrate the accomplishments of our tutors (11 presenting at SCWCA this year!), and—gulp—tell them (much more boldly each year) that writing isn’t about correctness any more than art is about choosing the right brand of paint. Okay, I never say that. I want them to send their students, but I am on a quest here.

I really think this letter (including a copy of our newsletter with articles written about the writing center by our tutors) has made the biggest difference in the way people use our services (and the number of people who use our services). A larger number of students come in earlier in the writing process, often with their writing assignments and other materials. I love learning that fewer students think they need a completed draft as some sort of ticket for writing center services. Maybe this means that the definition of literacy education is changing across campus. But of course I’m really, really proud of my tutors right now, so it may be that time of the semester when I am certain the writing center is moments away from solving corporate greed, world hunger, and violent crime everywhere—perhaps even getting Northern Exposure back on the air.

Shannon Carter
Shannon_Carter@TAMU-Commerce.edu
Texas A&M Commerce, TX

Date: Thu, 29 Jan 2004
Subject: Writing Center week

These are great ideas! At George Mason, we borrow a popcorn machine from the cinema and, for two days, set it up outside our door with free popcorn and wcenter tours for all who come. We tie up balloons, put out our lifesize cutout of trekki Deanna Troy holding an open house sign, and in general try to create a festive feeling. We also raffle off books that have accumulated around the center.

Therese Zawacki
tzawacki@gmu.edu
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA
Academic Assistance Center Director
Newman University

Assistant Professor to design and direct an academic assistance center for improving students’ writing skills at all levels, including international students. Responsibilities will include developing and teaching a course for advanced non-native speakers of English, training tutors to work with students of various skill levels, and conducting writing and grammar workshops and classroom presentations. The successful candidate will have at least a Master’s in English, with experience in individualized instruction, and training and experience in second language instruction.

Newman University, a small, Catholic, liberal arts and professional university committed to teaching and service, encourages applications from women and minorities.

Letters of application, professional resumes, and the names and telephone numbers of five references should be sent to: Dr. B. Lee Cooper, Provost, Newman University, 3100 McCormick Avenue, Wichita, Kansas 67213. Positions begin August 15, 2004. Successful candidates must demonstrate effective teaching skills, commitments to student recruitment, advising, mentoring and faculty service. An active interest in the life of a diverse value-based campus community is essential. Salaries and ranks for positions will be based upon credentials and experience. EOE/AA