

# THE WRITING LAB

N E W S L E T T E R

Volume 32, Number 5

Promoting the exchange of voices and ideas in one-to-one teaching of writing

January, 2008

## — FROM THE EDITOR —

This month's issue of *WLN* offers you an interesting mix of topics, including Michael Mattison's account of how he and his tutors use the lens of poetry to offer fresh perspectives as they examine tutorial talk. B. Cole Bennett argues that it is not the writing center's job to politicize students about the power structure involved in learning standard English. Instead tutors should work with students to improve home dialects that do not meet the standards of the academy. Carol Mohrbacher and Wendy Kraglund-Gauthier review *The Writing Center Director's Resource Book* and discuss its value for new directors. And Jennifer Kimball introduces us to using the games of Direction and Twenty Questions in a tutorial to help students organize their papers.

Also in this month's issue is a reminder (on page 8) from Clint Gardner, past president of the International Writing Centers Association (IWCA), about the 2008 IWCA Writing Centers Week, Feb. 10-16. He details the theme his writing center has chosen for their week's celebration. For those looking for ideas to celebrate in February, there were postings last year from other directors describing how they celebrated the week. For subscribers to *WCenter*, their archive is available at <http://lyris.tu.edu/read/?forum=wcenter>, and the IWCA forum postings are available at <http://www.writingcenters.org/board/index.php>. Happy IWCA Writing Centers Week to all!

◆ Muriel Harris, editor

## INSIDE

### *The Poetry of a Consultation*

◆ Michael Mattison ◆

Page 1

### *Student Rights, Home Languages, and Political Wisdom in the Writing Center*

◆ B. Cole Bennett ◆

Page 7

### *Book Review: The Writing Center Director's Resource Book, edited by Christina Murphy and Byron Stay*

◆ Reviewed by Carol Mohrbacher ◆

Page 11

◆ Reviewed by Wendy L. Kraglund-Gauthier ◆

Page 12

### *Tutors' Column: "Playing Around with Organization"*

◆ Jennifer Kimball ◆

Page 14

### *Calendar for Writing Center Associations*

Page 16

## THE POETRY OF A CONSULTATION

◆ Michael Mattison  
Boise State University  
Boise, ID

In 1984, Stephen North suggested that for writing centers to "prove their worth" they would need to describe the talk that occurs between writer and consultant: "what characterizes it, what effects it has, how it can be enhanced" (444). Since that time, many folks have indeed looked closely at such talk (Davis, et al. 1988; Smith 1990; Werder and Buck 1995; Murphy 2006). In the Boise State Writing Center, we have used some of these works to examine our conversations with writers.<sup>1</sup> We record and transcribe selected sessions, and then consider the transcripts in light of one or more of the articles. This past fall, we used Blau, Hall, and Strauss's "Exploring the Tutor/Client Conversation: A Linguistic Analysis (1998) as the lens through which to examine our talk—the essay identifies "three recurring rhetorical strategies": questions, echoing, and qualifiers (22). We looked for those strategies in our transcripts, highlighting them and writing about their possible effects on writers.

Yet we recently came upon another way to examine our talk with writers, and it was due to a "Reese's moment."

Let me explain: when I was growing up, there was an advertising campaign for Reese's Peanut Butter Cups that featured something like the following: a man is walking along the sidewalk, eating a chocolate bar; a woman is approaching from the opposite direction, eating (inexplicably) from a jar of  
*continued on page 2*



Thinking that creating such poems might also be a productive means of analysis for others, I brought in several transcript excerpts to the next meeting with my consultants. I wanted us to try our hands at turning talk into poetry. I did not, however, bring in the tapes. While the tapes reveal the pauses and inflections of a conversation, they can also, I believe, limit initial attempts at interpretation. I wanted the consultants to begin this process by looking at the language from the transcripts and drawing from that alone. This reliance upon the transcripts themselves places me more on Hymes's side of the ethnopoetic notation field, as he suggests there is more to the practice than listening for pauses:

Not only is pause not the only phonic marker of lines; one begins to suspect that lines have a grammatical aspect as well. Perhaps a study of the narratives in terms of the repetition of features other than pause would show an organization into lines, and not necessarily the same organization. Perhaps pause does not so much define lines, as provide a counterpoint to them. (340)

I also, at first, did not ask the consultants to keep the words in order, but simply asked them to create a poem from an extended excerpt of Kim's session.<sup>3</sup> They could pick words at random, and place them however they wanted to on the page. Here is one result:

So  
 Okay  
 Oh, so it's like  
 So  
 So  
 Yeah  
 Yeah,  
     does  
         that  
             make  
                 sense?

Highlighted here are the discourse markers Kim uses: "so," "yeah," "okay." There is agreement expressed, certainly, but "so" can be a verbally forceful means of controlling a conversation, as Black (1998) has pointed out. Also interesting is the final question, a literal reaching across the page towards the writer—Does that make sense? Are we connecting? Kim might be seen as deferring to the writer, being open and helpful. Yet at the same time, that reach is downward, as if Kim is standing above the writer. This poetic representation raises some interesting questions about the power relationship between writer and consultant.

Next I asked the consultants to leave the words in order and craft a poem from another transcript, this one from Laura. Here is the excerpt:

Okay. So talk plain and avoid what you would call kind of complex wording and just kind of say it straight out. Say it how you want to say it. It's not necessarily, you don't necessarily talk casually the same way you're going to write academically. Um. Some of your phrasing fits more into the tone of a more formal academic paper. So, just think about speaking very naturally, how you talk. Think about how you talk. And be yourself.

*“ We can take a narrow slice of a consultation, examine it through a poetic re-working, and then come back to the whole consultation with new insight. ”*

And here is one result:

Okay.  
So talk plain  
and avoid  
what you would call  
kind of  
complex wording

and just  
kind of  
say it straight  
say it how you say it.

It's not necessarily,  
you don't necessarily  
talk  
casually  
the same way  
you're going to write  
academically.

So, just think  
about speaking  
very naturally,  
how you talk.

Think about how you talk  
And  
Be yourself.

Striking is how the last three lines highlight what could be considered contradictory advice—think about how you talk *and* be yourself. If someone is being herself, she's probably not thinking about how she talks. On the other hand, a writer must often work extremely hard to sound “natural.” There is a lot to unravel in these last eight words. Also, the term “casually” is also opposed to “academically” in the third verse, each sitting alone on a line. And, one of the consultants pointed out how the poem seems to emphasize the directive nature of the advice—imperatives (*say, think, be*) that are made more obvious by the short lines.

Here is another sample excerpt, also from Laura:

No, I like the way you've done this. I just think you need some punctuation to offset . . . that's like a run-on. These are crashing into each other; you need the punctuation there to offset the fact that you are defining your two main parts to a sentence. You've got, this acts like a subordinate clause dropped in the middle of your main clause. You could say, “George Kerm states that interjection. . . .” That would stand alone as a sentence. But you have dropped in from his book and you offset such phrases with commas.

And one of the poems created from it:

No, I like the way you've done this  
I just think you need some punctuation to offset . . .  
that's like a  
RUN-ON

These are CRASHING into each other;  
 You need the punctuation there to offset the fact that  
 You are defining your

two main parts  
 to a sentence.

You've got,  
 This acts like a

SUBORDINATE CLAUSE

dropped

in the middle of your

MAIN CLAUSE.

You could say,

"George Kern states that interjection. . . ."

That

would stand alone as a

SENTENCE.

But you have DROPPED in from his book  
 And you offset such phrases with commas.

Note how the consultant-poet has capitalized certain words, and placed them in the middle of the page: RUN-ON, CRASHING, SUBORDINATE CLAUSE, MAIN CLAUSE, SENTENCE, DROPPED. This seems an excellent visual example of how a consultant occasionally tries to work grammatical terms into a session. Such words are, in this example, cushioned by the surrounding conversation, but they still stand out. They still become central to the conversation.

Now, do these poems tell me and my consultants all we need to know about a particular conversation? No, but the poems are excellent starting points for discussion. For instance, I could ask Laura how she thinks writers respond to her use of certain grammatical terms. How might a writer feel about "subordinate clause," "main clause," "run-on"? Or, I could ask the first consultant, Kim, about her use of "so." What does she think of it, especially given Black's categorization of it as a marker of power? And, I do not think these questions would have come to mind as easily if we did not have the poems—it is the poems that illustrated the questions, that made them apparent on the page.

What ethnopoetic notation is, I believe, is a type of thin-slicing, the type of thinking described by Malcolm Gladwell in his book *Blink: The Power of Thinking Without Thinking*—"the ability of our unconscious to find patterns in situation and behavior based on very narrow slices of experience" (23).<sup>4</sup> We can take a narrow slice of a consultation, examine it through a poetic re-working, and then come back to the whole consultation with new insight. The line breaks and spacing give us a different way to consider the talk.

In our early experiments with ethnopoetic notation at the Boise State Writing Center, we have been working as a group to examine a selected excerpt or two, with everyone looking to create a poem from one consultant's conversation. Certainly, though, every consultant could create poetry from one of his or her own sessions, and I plan on asking consultants to do just that beginning this fall. They can use the poems as introductions to more extended examinations of their work with writers.

## NEWS

### CALL FOR PROPOSALS

*Before and After the Tutorial: Writing Centers and Institutional Relationships*

Edited by Robert T. Koch Jr., William J. Macauley, Jr., Nicholas Mauriello & Virginia Perdue

Published as part of the Hampton Press series on Research and Teaching in Rhetoric and Composition.

Few would disagree that the tutorial is the central act of our writing centers. Faculty members from across the curriculum send students through our doors in search of one-to-one mentoring, group work, grammar instruction, and any number of other possibilities. As Writing Center Administrators we take pride in the number of student-contact hours that we log each year. But, what happens *before* and *after* the writing tutorial? What institutional relationships have we developed to help ensure not only that students continue to seek our services, but that faculty, administration, and the local community are aware of what we do? How do we craft our relationships with these various constituencies toward sustainability in our work? xts for our work? Two types of submissions are welcomed:

- 20-25 page chapters
  - 7-10 page narratives of successful or failed writing center relationships
- 2/15/08: initial proposals and submissions due

Please send 500-word proposals or completed manuscripts (MS Word, PC compatible) in an e-mail message *and* attachment together by no later than February 15<sup>th</sup>, 2008 to Bill Macauley at [WMacauley@wooster.edu](mailto:WMacauley@wooster.edu) *and* Nick Mauriello at [nmauriello@una.edu](mailto:nmauriello@una.edu).

For complete timetable, full description of the CFP, and more information, contact Bill Macauley and Nick Mauriello.



### Works Cited

- Black, Laurel Johnson. *Between Talk and Teaching: Reconsidering the Writing Conference*. Logan: Utah State UP, 1998.
- Blau, Susan R., John Hall, and Tracy Strauss. "Exploring the Tutor/Client Conversation: A Linguistic Analysis." *WCJ* 19.1 (1998): 19-49.
- Davis, Kevin M., Nancy Hayward, Kathleen R. Hunter, and David L. Wallace. "The Function of Talk in the Writing Conference: A Study of Tutorial Conversation." *WCJ* 9.1 (1988): 45-51.
- Geller, Anne Eller, Michele Eodice, Frankie Condon, Meg Carroll, and Elizabeth H. Boquet. *The Everyday Writing Center: A Community of Practice*. Logan, UT: Utah State UP, 2007.
- Gladwell, Malcolm. *Blink: The Power of Thinking Without Thinking*. New York: Little, Brown, and Company, 2005.
- Hymes, Dell. "In vain I tried to tell you": *Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1981.
- North, Stephen M. "The Idea of a Writing Center." *College English* 46.5 (1984): 433-446.
- Reigstad, Tom. "The Writing Conference: An Ethnographic Model for Discovering Patterns of Teacher-Student Interaction." *WCJ* 2.1 (1982): 9-21.
- Smith, Anna Deavere. *Twilight*. Los Angeles, 1992. NY: Anchor Books, 1994.
- Smith, Louise Z. "Family Systems Theory and the Form of Conference Dialogue." *WCJ* 10.2 (1990): 3-17; 11.2 (1991): 61-73.
- Sustein, Bonnie. "Culture on the Page: Experience, Rhetoric, and Aesthetics in Ethnographic Writing." *Ethics and Representation in Qualitative Studies of Literacy*. Ed. Peter Mortensen and Gesa Kirsch. Urbana: NCTE, 1996: 177-202.
- Tedlock, Dennis, trans. *Finding the Center: The Art of the Zuni Storyteller* 2nd ed. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1999.
- Walker, Carolyn P., and David Elias. "Writing Conference Talk: Factors Associated With High- and Low-Rated Writing Conferences." *RTE* 21.3 (1987): 266-285.
- Werder, Carmen, and Roberta R. Buck. "Assessing Writing Conference Talk: An Ethnographic Method." *Writing Center Perspectives*. Ed. Byron L. Stay, Christina Murphy, and Eric H. Hobson. Emmitsburg: NWCA, 1995.



At the same time, when one consultant focuses on another's conversation, ethnopoetic notation might say as much about the consultant crafting the poem as it does about the consultant whose words are being rearranged.<sup>5</sup> The practice can serve not only as a critical lens, but also as a critical mirror. What does the author of the "SUBORDINATE CLAUSE" poem think about grammatical terms? How would the consultant who wrote "Think about how you talk / And / Be yourself" handle a similar session? So, another plan for the fall is to have new consultants, before they begin holding consultations, create some poetry from our archive of transcripts and consider how their poetic choices connect to their ideas about writers and writing.

Again, I'm not advocating ethnopoetic notation as an end-all for analysis. Rather, I think such a practice makes for a good entry into further analysis. If consultants have a chance to work with small sections of a transcript in this manner, they could be more ready to examine the whole conversation, particularly if they are given resources that help to describe such talk, such as the articles listed above.

In other words, I think ethnopoetic notation can be an important addition to our analytical repertoire. It offers those of us in writing centers the opportunity to read our words in new ways, building upon North's call to describe the talk between writer and consultant. By changing our words into poetry, we can better see and hear the powerful silences and repetitions that characterize our exchanges with writers, and we can continue to enhance our understanding of the talk that occurs in a writing center.

Or, to play off that old candy bar commercial: ethnopoetic notation and writing center transcripts—two great things that go great together. ♦

### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> There are also pieces focused on the talk between teacher and student that are valuable for those in writing centers: e.g., Tom Reigstad's "The Writing Conference: An Ethnographic Model for Discovering Patterns of Teacher-Student Interaction" (1982); Carolyn Walker and David Elias's "Writing Conference Talk: Factors Associated With High- and Low-Rated Writing Conferences" (1987); and Laurel Johnson Black's *Between Talk and Teaching: Reconsidering the Writing Conference* (1998).

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance, Tedlock's *Finding the Center* and Hymes's "In vain I tried to tell you." And Hymes also is mentioned prominently in Lerner and Gillespie's *The Allyn and Bacon Guide to Peer Tutoring*, in their chapter about writing center research. Specifically, the authors mention Hymes's SPEAKING protocol as a means of analyzing writing center talk (pp 131-136).

<sup>3</sup> Though I think it also valuable to analyze what a writer says in a consultation, I was here focused on the consultant's words and so removed the writer's half of the conversation from the page. I also realize that those in fields that prominently use ethnopoetic notation might take issue with my variations on the practice, and I admit that I am twisting the idea to my own ends.

<sup>4</sup> I was prompted to read Gladwell's book after reading *The Everyday Writing Center*, as the five authors (Geller, Eodice, Condon, Carroll, and Boquet) advocate thin-slicing in writing center work. For instance, directors and administrators tend to thin-slice when we overhear snippets of a consultation.

<sup>5</sup> Credit to Joan Mullin for making this point at the 2007 IWCA conference, where I presented on this topic.



## STUDENT RIGHTS, HOME LANGUAGES, AND POLITICAL WISDOM IN THE WRITING CENTER

◆ *B. Cole Bennett*

*Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX*

Last August, Abilene Christian University experienced the grand opening of The Learning Commons, a spanking new facility on the first floor of our previously tomb-like library. The Learning Commons is so named because it seeks to combine all facets of a student's workplace: computer assistance, research librarians, printing and copying facilities, ergonomic workspaces, the ACU Writing Center, and, not insignificantly, Starbucks.

While we knew our traffic would increase dramatically as a result of our new location, we were surprised by the number of new international clients this has brought our way. Our university does not have a large ESL population, but these students have always comprised a disproportionately large percentage of writing center clients. Moreover, ACU has not invested in an intensive English learning program, or any such immersion curriculum; international students who pass the TOEFL are placed in the mainstream curriculum, and those who don't pass take non-credit ESL classes taught by available students from random disciplines. In short, ACU admits students from many countries whose spoken and written grasp of English varies widely, many of whom neither approach fluency nor are able to find much help through the university's scant ESL resources. This sketch is not intended to deride ACU; the administration does not claim extensive ESL resources nor does it try to micro-manage international admissions files. The fact remains, however, that many international students who are not conversant in English find themselves in a bind when they arrive on campus.

In our new site, the writing center's exposure has garnered more of these students than ever, and this fact, combined with an uneven admissions protocol and extraordinarily compassionate tutors, created a troubling situation during the fall of 2006. We had several ESL students who would bring in essays or reader responses, sit with our tutors, and say nothing at all. The papers were virtually unreadable, the writers were unable to communicate their points or answer questions in English, and the tutors were flummoxed and frustrated.

The measures we took to remedy our situation appealed to institutional apparatuses rather than tutoring methods or training. I explained to our tutors that, if a conversation about writing cannot take place with a client, then writing tutoring is not happening, and they should stop such sessions immediately. What those particular clients need is language acquisition assistance, and we are neither trained nor funded to offer it. Moreover, after I explained our position to others in power, our ESL administrators jumped at the chance to hire more language acquisition tutors in their department, and in fact, needed the writing center to refer these students to justify their hiring increases. Thus, the university now maintains resources for both types of ESL student; those whose language skills enable the discussion of their writing, and those whose skills do not.

I recount this anecdote to respond directly to recent publications in our field—particularly John Trimbur's "Linguistic Memory and the Politics of U. S. English," and Bethany Davila's "Rewriting Race in the Writing Center,"<sup>1</sup>—and ultimately to caution against forging a counterproductive path as we seek to assist students from a myriad of ethnic backgrounds. I believe articles of this type misapply the 1974 call to honor a student's particular home language inasmuch as 1) compositionists are being encouraged to privilege a brand of liberal politics over wise pedagogy, and 2) writing tutors are being asked to ignore common-sense linguistic parameters. I wish to argue that writing professionals who recognize such limitations neither violate

## TAKE NOTE

### INTERNATIONAL WRITING CENTERS WEEK

The next International Writing Centers Week will be in its third year in 2008 and will be celebrated February 10 to 16. In the Salt Lake Community College Student Writing Center, we are planning to have a social-justice-related theme to tie with ongoing campus-wide activities for spring semester at our community college. We are still in early planning, however. The general theme we will be working around is “language and racism.” We hope to integrate important anti-racism initiatives into the week.

Clint Gardner  
Past Present of the International Writing Centers Association

students’ language rights, nor inhibit the open-admissions policies that have revolutionized education. Rather, current writing center “best practices” serve students well by helping them get a synchronic foothold on a language of power, and thus enable them to position themselves to make diachronic changes.

In “Rewriting Race in the Writing Center,” Davila wonders why writing professionals tend to profess respect for an ESL student’s home language, but not for the nonstandard dialects of English-speaking students. She argues that, when students of color come for writing assistance whose home dialect is marginalized by the power structures associated with Standard Academic English, the center should not be a “site of assimilation where students learn how to change themselves to better fit the mold of academia” (2). Instead, tutors should spend their time building trust, discussing oppressive power structures of the academy, and considering the other options available to the student beyond academic discourse (2-3). She writes, “When writing centers fail to acknowledge or question the power structure within which they operate, they perpetuate a loyalty to the current system of domination, which can work to eliminate diversity and difference” (2).

I disagree with Davila. I do not believe that a tutor’s failing to engage a non-white, home-dialect-speaking client to question a university’s power structure causes him or her to suffer; in fact, I would consider using session time for these purposes to be impractical, tangential, and a poor use of the client’s time.<sup>2</sup> I do believe, however, that there is a way to address university-wide issues of language and power distribution somewhat through the writing center; more about that in a moment. But I object to Davila’s main argument that, apart from her proposed methods, tutors who regularly help home-dialect writers develop academically-styled essays cause them to “suffer from [an] uncritical validation of academic discourses” (2).

By way of remedy, Davila would have tutors “address race within the tutorial by guiding tutees in exploring the conflict between their primary discourses and those of the academy and to recognize that *no one discourse is naturally better than another*” (2, emphasis added). While no language scholar will argue that Standard Written English (SWE) is inherently more pragmatic to its users than other dialects, I believe that spending tutorial minutes downplaying the authority of the most powerful discourse community in which the writer has voluntarily enrolled is, at best, patronizing. Moreover, I believe we do our clients a gross disservice by sidestepping, even for a moment, their own goals of approaching mastery of a language that has accrued enormous potency, even if such potency has obtained from unbalanced political forces.

Certainly, a complex set of variables has given rise to academic prose; but it seems the field of Composition/Rhetoric must always characterize such variables with too heavy a hand. John Trimbur, in making a case for “post-colonial linguistic ambivalence,” argues against a rose-colored historiography of language in America when he states, “the Founding Fathers’ laissez-faire policy amounted not so much to linguistic tolerance . . . Rather its very covert nature virtually guaranteed the inevitable Anglification of language in the United States through the workings of labor relations, the market, and civil society” (577). The reader cannot miss the left-leaning political timbre within Trimbur’s argument; it’s not meant to be merely historical, but, similarly to Davila’s claim, to suggest a kind of purposeful hegemony enacted by one group toward others. However, even here, where Trimbur seeks to champion the cause of marginalized dialects and to vilify privileged varieties of English for reaching their position, he begins his own counterargument through his choice of terms. For I would argue that “labor relations, marketplaces, and civil societies,” neither coalesce nor alter quickly, or even always maliciously, and when changed at all, are changed *diachronically*, not *synchronically*—terms I will address below.

I wish now to turn directly to the CCC publication “Students’ Right to their Own Language.” This resolution was revolutionary, challenging many widely-held beliefs about the cognitive abilities of students



whose home language or dialect was not Standard American English (SAE), and highlighting linguistic and social-epistemic truths to teachers of language, such as, “Reading, in short, involves the acquisition of meanings, not the ability to reproduce meanings in any given surface forms” (7). Moreover, elements of writing process theory were stated clearly: “If we can convince our students that spelling, punctuation, and usage are less important than content, we have removed a major obstacle in their developing the ability to write” (8).

I call attention to a portion of this resolution that addresses non-standard dialects directly: “If we name the essential functions of writing as expressing oneself, communicating information and attitudes, and discovering meaning through both logic and metaphor, then we view variety of dialects as an advantage. In self-expression, not only one’s dialect but one’s idiolect is basic” (8). As one who embraces many expressivistic strategies in the composition classroom, I eagerly concede the value of tapping all a student’s resources as he or she enters the invention or prewriting stages for an essay. However, as drafts move through revision in my classroom, I require that all writers move their texts toward a style that is audience-appropriate, which usually moves toward SWE as essays become more academically formal. The “Students’ Right” resolution states it this way:

“We should begin our work in composition with (students) by making them feel confident that their writing, in whatever dialect, makes sense and is important to us, that we read it and are interested in the ideas and person that the writing reveals. Then students will be in a much stronger position to consider the rhetorical choices that lead to statements written in EAE” (15).

To my thinking, this is neither new nor radical resolve; this is rhetoric. Teaching students to create discourse that affects an audience is precisely what we do, and the arena in which we do so normally regards SWE as the language of power. To avoid moving writers toward facility with the rhetorical choices of power in their lifeworld is to deny them access to the avenues of change. Respecting our clients, both in person and voice, is a given; but an adult learner who walks into a writing center seeking a focused response on an academic essay to be submitted in SWE should get just that—not an unsolicited lecture on the politics of discourse.

It’s tempting to move now toward discussions of Richard Rorty and “normal discourse,” but I will instead move to Elbow’s Appendix essay in *Writing Without Teachers* to more plainly reinforce what I’m saying here. As Elbow uses linguistic theory to explain his impetus for having written his chapters on the writing workshop, he enters into a brief explanation of the “speech community,” stating, in sum, that speakers will ultimately make meaning only in ways that the larger speech communities will accept. When a speaker (or writer) uses language that does not build meaning with the hearer (or reader), he or she remains unheard, and must adapt to build meaning accepted by the speech community to gain currency. And, although Elbow is quick to point out that such positioning is the result of varying power struggles, with speech subcommunities vying to be heard, his guiding point is that the larger speech community acts as a stabilizing force for language, with subcommunities providing fluidity among smaller groups of language users.

I would extend Elbow’s point, then, that our best use of time as writing center personnel is not to continually remind speech subcommunities of power differentials, nor to artificially inflate their view of their dialect’s position relative to Standard Written English, nor to point out the horrors of the university for having been complicit in developing and subscribing to a certain common discourse. Perhaps such discussions would be more appropriate in other academic contexts. Rather, I believe tutors should spend time educating clients on the merits of their being able to adroitly employ many variations of language, where audience appropriate, such that they gain power among many overlapping communities, and especially, at this synchronic moment of Western history, SWE. In the academy, as in much of the world right now, this is the language of power, and I believe we fail to serve writers who seek to improve a text if we spend tutorial time confirming how university structures marginalize them. I feel this can

# TAKE NOTE

## WATSON CONFERENCE

### Call for Papers

Thomas R. Watson Conference  
 “*The New Work of Composing*”  
 October 16-18, 2008.  
 Louisville, KY.

What is the new work of composing in the midst of the rapidly changing technologies and communicative forms that characterize contemporary life? We invite proposals for any topic related to the conference theme, including

- \* how do new technologies change the ways we understand the work of composing;
- \* how does access, materiality, or economics affect composing within and outside the university;
- \* what are relations between new and old media; between textual, visual, and aural modes;
- \* what are our responsibilities as teachers, scholars, practitioners; where do we locate disciplinary identity.

We welcome scholarly papers and new forms of scholarship, including videos, sound essays, installations. We encourage you to think creatively about the new work of composing.

Deadline for Submissions: MARCH 3, 2008

For guidelines on submitting proposals, please consult our Web site <[www.louisville.edu/conference/Watson](http://www.louisville.edu/conference/Watson)>. For more information, please e-mail us at [watson@louisville.edu](mailto:watson@louisville.edu), or call us at 502-852-0504.

### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup>While this essay responds to just two publications (Davila and Trimbur), these texts can be viewed as part of a recent spate of similar scholarship, such as “Training on the Cutting Edge,” by Dobbins, et al, *Praxis* 1:2 (Spring 2004); “Community Building in Online Writing Centers,” by Beth Godbee, *Praxis* 2:2 (Spring 2005); and especially a Fall 2007 CFP for a special issue of *Praxis*, entitled “Diversity in the Writing Center.” Possible applications of the theme include “Issues of power, and authority relating to race, gender, class, etc. in tutorials,” and “Questions of dialect in tutees’ writing” (see <<http://projects/uwc.utexas.edu/praxis>>).

<sup>2</sup> I wish to vociferously acknowledge the power differential at work in university settings, and I do understand that those students whose home discourse communities are farthest away from the academy have more ground to cover than those nearer; social-epistemologists have made this case for years, as have linguists. This essay seeks a pragmatic solution to this situation.



### Works Cited

- Conference on College Composition and Communication. *Students' Right to their Own Language*. Spec. Issue of *CCC* 25 (1974).
- Davila, Bethany. “Rewriting Race in the Writing Center.” *Writing Lab Newsletter* 31:1 (September 2006): 1-3.
- Elbow, Peter. *Writing Without Teachers*. NY: Oxford UP: 1978
- Redd, Theresa M. and Karen Schuster Webb. *A Teacher's Introduction to African American English*. Urbana, Ill: NCTE, 2005.
- Trimbur, John. “Linguistic Memory and the Politics of U.S. English.” *College English* 68:6 (July 2006): 575-588.



easily be seen as condescending to clients who already know this, and who ultimately seek to control the discourse of power in the present moment, who can then work themselves to enact diachronic change in history in their own way.

Earlier, I intimated that I would have suggestions for writing centers to indeed address the distance between SWE and the home language of many of our students. I do indeed have some, but they do not concern the face-to-face tutoring session; rather, in our roles as writing liaisons between students and faculty, and as members of WAC committees and composition directorships, we should look for ways to make small, local contributions that will eventually add up to diachronic change over time. For example, in my role as WC Director, I am often called upon to consult with departments, curricular committees, and individual faculty to design or revise writing assignments to fit specific rhetorical goals. Often, I become a consultant to those very goals as well. In these local situations, I can work to expand the types of writing these professors ask for in their classes—assignments that perhaps call for perspectives, contrasts, voices, politics, and/or even samples of a student’s home dialect.

Imagine a political science professor who asks for advice on a writing assignment intended to introduce students to public deliberative discourse. If her students are to write letters or proposals to state representatives, I can suggest that she encourage them to analyze and directly address the educational access difficulties experienced by members of minority groups, and then to write for two audiences—first, the state rep, and second, a local newspaper or neighborhood newsletter. They might even read and analyze Trimbur’s article above to address historical language inequalities. Such an assignment would call for audience awareness at multiple levels, and students of color who want to use non-standard dialect to more emphatically persuade various readerships could do so. Both the subject matter and parlance of such an assignment give students with non-standard home dialects a voice in the public realm.

I believe this viewpoint is most accurately pinpointed, according to NCTE’s synthesis of Keith Gilyard’s work, as biddialectalist. That is, I would argue that “while AAE is not linguistically inferior, . . . SWE is a prerequisite for success in academic and professional settings” (Redd and Webb 55). Indeed, academic and professional readers are just two of several audiences to which students might want to appeal; in the end, they need to be able to reach any chosen audience with an appropriate ethos such that their message is seriously regarded. Many such rhetorical situations will require navigation within SWE, the language of power, an ability I believe all writers should have if we intend outcomes such as productive citizens, critical readers and writers, contributors to universal quality of life, and so forth (typical outcomes across university mission statements). Surely, this is what the “Students’ Rights” resolution ultimately intended: access and facility by all students to discourses of power, not primarily to the meta-arguments that contribute to such access.

In sum, I wish to caution writing professionals, who do enact valuable research into studies of unbalanced literacy acquisition, educational Marxism, student power, and other worthwhile endeavors, to not direct our teaching and tutoring efforts too far afield in the politics of hegemony and power-mongering within current university settings, but to instead focus more on the daily empowering of students—from all cultural backgrounds—so that their own critical notions of what it means to live as a citizen can be capably voiced and heard. In this way, they can truly pursue diachronic societal change in ways they, themselves, judge worthwhile.◆

## BOOK REVIEW

Murphy, Christina, & Stay, Byron L., Eds. *The Writing Center Director's Resource Book*. Erlbaum: Mahwah, NJ, 2006. ISBN: 0-8058-5608-0 (\$49.95, 472 pp.)

◆ *Reviewed by Carol Mobracher, St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, MN*

Two years ago, as a brand new writing center director, I began reading everything I could find on writing center theory, history and practice. The journals, *Writing Lab Newsletter*, *Writing Center Journal*, and a few anthologies like *Writing Centers in Context: Twelve Case Studies* and *Administrative Problem-Solving for Writing Programs and Writing Centers* helped satisfy the administrative part of my search. What I noticed is that few book-length works focused specifically on writing center administration. When I attended the 2006 4 C's in Chicago, I perused the newly released hardback edition of *The Writing Center Director's Resource Book*, edited by Christina Murphy and Byron L. Stay, at the publisher's fair. Because the book seemed relevant to the challenges I was facing, I immediately added it to my growing library. The book addressed some niggling administrative issues, so I was delighted to comply with Muriel Harris' request to review the book.

The book's two-part arrangement is logical and broad enough to fill some gaps other books have overlooked. It begins, as most academic works do, with historical and theoretical grounding and then moves on to more practical matters in the second section. The author-directors, represent writing centers open to all levels of students, as well as centers more narrowly focused on undergrads, grads, or developmental students. Because of these diverse contexts, the authors present a range of perspectives on administrative issues such as strategic planning, the director—assistant director relationship, and ethical responsibility.

Part I, "Writing Centers and Institutional Change," divided into four subsections, addresses historical issues like Neal Lerner's "Historical Representations of Writing Center Directors," as well as currently relevant issues like writing center location, the multi-campus writing center, and assessment. Part II, "Writing Centers and Praxis," addresses daily operational matters such as plagiarism, staffing with professional tutors, tutor training, and working with students with disabilities. Many of the *Resource Book's* essays are directly relevant to my own directorship in a writing center at a medium-size regional liberal arts college. Recently, demographic and political changes have forced me to look for resources addressing developmental tutoring and the politics of location. These topics are taken up by Dennis Paoli in "Tutoring in a Remedial/Developmental Learning Context" and by Joan Mullin, Peter Carino, Jane Nelson, and Kathy Evertz in "Administrative (Chaos) Theory: The Politics of Writing Center Location."

Paoli's essay restates familiar theoretical and ethical objections to remediation as he recounts tutors' challenges in helping developmental students pass a mandatory writing skills test. Although he offers few methodological suggestions, Paoli recounts the heartbreak felt by students as they see struggling writers fail, and wisely advises writing center directors to "help them [tutors] find value not in success but in the act of helping" (177). "Administrative (Chaos) Theory: The Politics of Writing Center Location" includes the narratives of three directors, each located in a different geographic and administrative location. Peter Carino's narrative perfectly frames my current situation as the director of an English department based writing center. Carino rightly suggests that the primary disadvantage is budget inconsistency, maintaining that "all writing centers, wherever they are located, must be resilient . . . while never forgetting that little can be done without the proper support" (228).

Jane Nelson and Kathy Evertz describe a hybrid writing center with two directors and two locations—one in the English Department and one in the Center for Teaching Excellence, which was created to meet the demands of a general education program called University Studies. This university studies model is

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Associate Writing Center Director Michigan State University

Michigan State University is seeking an Associate Director (AD) for its Writing Center. The AD position is a one-year, annual year position in the Academic Specialist system with an expected term of five years. Annual renewal contingent on performance reviews, program need, and availability of funding.

**Qualifications:** An MA in Rhetoric/Composition, English, or English education (PhD preferred): knowledge of current writing/writing center theory; experience working in a writing center (administrative experience in a writing center or writing program preferred); experience working with NNS of English; ability to develop websites, digital presentations and desktop publishing; and experience teaching writing (online a plus). Michigan State University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution. Persons with disabilities have the right to request and receive reasonable accommodation.

**Salary & Benefits** (<<http://hr.msu.edu/hr-site/Benefits/>>): The annual-year salary is nationally competitive and commensurate with qualifications and experience.

**To Apply:** Please send (1) a cover letter explaining your interest in and qualifications for the position, (2) a curriculum vita, (3) a scholarly writing sample, and (4) name, email address and phone number of three references to Trixie G. Smith, Director, The Writing Center, 300 Bessey Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1033, or faxed to her at 517-432-3828, or emailed to [smit1254@msu.edu](mailto:smit1254@msu.edu). Review of applications will begin January 2, 2008, and will continue until the position is filled.  
**Start Date:** July 1, 2008, or earlier, depending on candidate availability.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Coordinator for Writing Tutors and Testing Massachusetts Institute of Technology

To work with the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) group in the Program in Writing and Humanistic Studies. Will coordinate the Writing Tutor Program for communication-intensive subjects in the humanities, arts, and social sciences and co-direct the freshman essay evaluation. Duties include producing reports and development materials related to the CI-H program; collaborating with the WAC director and the director of technical communication to produce materials related to other WAC programs; and participating in the daily administration of the WAC Program. Will work under the supervision of the WAC director and the administrative officer of the Program in Writing and Humanistic Studies. Will report to the head of the program.

Requirements: a minimum of a master's degree in the humanities, arts, social sciences, or education; and substantial teaching experience, preferably in teaching writing, speaking, or both. Administrative or supervisory experience required, preferably in an educational setting. Must be able to work effectively and collaboratively with a diverse group of faculty, administrators, and instructional staff.

Interviews will begin in early January 2008, and the position will start Feb. 1, 2008 at the latest. Apply online at: <<http://sh.webhire.com/servelet/av/jd?ai=631&ji=2136261&sn=|>>.

currently being examined at my own institution. The advantages as seen by the authors are steady funding for the university studies location and increased visibility across disciplines. Simultaneously, their original location appears to be losing its strong bond with the English department because of divided loyalties and reduced writing center dependence on the department. Joan Mullin's writing center does not depend on the English Department for space, staffing, or budget. She finds that she has more autonomy when it comes to hiring grad, undergrad, professional, and adjuncts than the English Department, which must hire by committee. Also because she is closer to the source of funding, her reporting lines are clear and her communication bold as she builds relationships with upper administration. The disadvantages, as she sees it, are a frequent change in administration and isolation from peers, and she advises, "[I]solation can, in times of great stress, despite partnerships, leave one standing without protection" (232).

Other pieces also prove relevant including "Examining Writing Center Director—Assistant Director Relationships" by Kevin Dvorak and Ben Rafoth and "Preserving the Rhetorical Nature of Tutoring When Going Online" by Lisa Eastmond Bell. Dvorak and Rafoth's essay addresses a problem I have wrestled with since the beginning of my directorship—what ethical guidelines to follow in supporting our graduate assistant director in her professional development, without taking advantage of our power differential. This article motivated me to draw up a clearer position description and to do so in collaboration with our assistant director. Lisa Eastmond Bell's essay narrates her experience in wrestling with tutoring in an online environment. Her experience in starting an online tutoring service mirrors my own. Like me, she decided to change tutoring platforms to a venue that allows synchronous dialogue. Nonetheless, shortcuts are often taken, as tutor input becomes more directive, and "tutors . . . 'cut to the chase' leaving out discussion, which should be the heart and soul of the tutorial" (355). She acknowledges that although online tutoring is not an ideal approach to facilitating learning, it is here to stay and we must learn to work with it. She further urges experimentation with software and guidelines for rhetorical structure.

While *The Writing Center Director's Resource Book* is not comprehensive, it offers a diverse menu of administrative subjects from which to choose. Most essays are delightful narratives relating experience from which a new director can take his or her own lessons. My only criticism is the paucity of essays concerning multiculturalism. Although Margaret Weaver's essay, "A Call for Racial Diversity in the Writing Center" is both inspired and inspiring, I would have liked to have seen a few more essays of this sort, particularly a piece that focuses on recruiting a culturally diverse pool of tutors. ♦

♦ *Reviewed by Wendy L. Kraglund-Gauthier, Saint Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia Canada*

In 2002, I began as an instructor with the Writing Centre at Saint Francis Xavier University (StFX) in Antigonish, Nova Scotia, Canada. With an undergraduate degree in English and an Education degree and experience teaching adult learning and literacy, I admittedly did not know much about the theory and practice behind writing centre work. I did know I was excited to join a team of professionals who were eager to work for our newly-expanded centre. I also knew I wanted to learn more about the field of writing centre work to improve my own practice. In 2003, I began my Master of Adult Education degree and conducted a research project to study a select number of Canadian undergraduate writing centres and define success nationally and assess success locally. I dove into the literature, reading whatever I could find on writing centre theory, practice, and assessment. Although I have finished my thesis, I am not finished learning "all there is to know" about writing centres. When Muriel Harris asked me to review editors Christina Murphy and Byron L. Stay's *The Writing Center Director's Resource Book*, I jumped at the chance.

### OVERVIEW OF THE TEXT

The 39 chapters are divided into two main parts: "Writing Centers and Institutional Change" and "Writing Centers and Praxis." Submissions come from directors of post-secondary and graduate writing centres on large and small campuses across the United States. The variety of these submissions underscores the situ-



ational differences of individual centres. However, as the authors describe their individual perspectives on writing centre theory and practice, their pragmatic approach works to provide important insight into the similar successes and challenges facing many writing centres. More than just another “how-to” guide to tutoring, this book blends an appropriate amount of theory and reflection with practical advice.

Part I contains 22 chapters and includes submissions which provide important historical context for current practice and approaches of writing centre management. Authors describe strategies for negotiating the demands of academic institutions and offer commentary and advice for directors as they work with campus stakeholders. Comprising 17 chapters, Part II deals with writing centre ethics, tutor training, and electronic instruction. The final four chapters are case studies which give detailed description to issues including negotiating space and place in the minds, buildings, and budgets of academia. Some authors have included appendices of helpful resources, including Pamela Childers, who provides six on the process of strategic planning. Rounding off the text are contributing authors’ biographies and indices by author and by subject.

### RELEVANCE TO MY OWN PRAXIS

I reviewed this text not from the perspective of a current writing centre director, but as a writing centre staff member who envisions a directorship in the future. After carefully reading each chapter, I now have a better sense of the issues facing directors as they work to keep their centres a priority item in the thoughts and actions of their stakeholders. For the present, my current role has been informed by the material presented, and I am confident I can improve my own practice as a writing centre instructor on a small campus of only 5200 students.

The chapters in this text serve to stimulate thinking about how Canadian writing centres are positioned, and in particular, how the StFX Writing Centre is situated on our campus. Carl Glover’s chapter on “*Kairos* and the Writing Center” and Stephen Ferruci and Susan DeRosa’s chapter on “Mapping Writing Center Ethos” are informative examples of how writing centres have evolved as places of learning and research. Part of this evolution includes the struggle to change the erroneous label of remedial centres — an issue discussed by Stephen Ferruci and Susan DeRosa. For me, this issue is of particular interest since I am responsible for facilitating our Academic Program of Excellence program, a mandatory non-credit course for students on academic probation. Ironically, many of my students who have academic difficulties do so not because they lack the academic ability, but because of personal issues. Also, many come to my class with ineffective or non-existent study skills because they did so well in high school. Ferruci and DeRosa reiterate how writing centres are seen as fix-it shops — places of remediation. This very characterization may be what prevents the “good student in high school” from seeking academic support before it is too late to apply learning techniques to crucial assignments. Paula Gillespie, Brad Hughes, Neal Lerner, and Anne Ellen Geller’s chapter describing the Writing Center Summer Institute inspires thoughts about the possibility of a Canadian Institute, a potential undertaking of the newly formed Canadian Writing Centre Association (CWCA). At the very least, it provides rationale for funding a pan-Canadian contingent to cross the 49th parallel and join our American colleagues for opportunities to learn and reflect on all that it is to be working within and from a writing centre context.

Just as learning and writing evolve, so too do the activities and mandates of writing centres. Pamela Childers’ and Kelly Lowe’s chapters on strategic planning are important pieces to remind all stakeholders of the magnitude of maintaining current and future focus on our activities. Their contributions underscore the importance of planning forward-thinking activities, and not just at new program start-up. However, frustration can be found in the amount of time and energy spent talking and planning, rather than in actually following through on strategic plans. Valuable insight can be gained from staff members and from students who frequent our centres, but it is then up to directors to carve time in their busy schedules to work on the follow-through.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Writing Center Coordinator Warren Wilson College

Seeking a coordinator with the vision and ability to help recreate our Writing Center as an active hub for writing on our campus—a Center that serves students and faculty, individuals and classes, traditional and new media. The ideal candidate will have an earned PhD with experience in Writing Center theory and practice as well as experience with peer tutoring and pedagogy; ABD considered. In addition, the ideal candidate will have a demonstrated ability to connect with a broad constituency of students and faculty from all disciplines; publications and conference presentations writing center theory and practice; experience with variety of writing (expository, creative, scientific, media); evidence of effective teaching; experience with second-language learners.

The ideal candidate will have an earned PhD with experience in writing center theory and practice as well as experience with peer tutoring and pedagogy; ABD considered.

This is a full-time, continuing position in an extended contract system providing a salary commensurate with experience, and beginning July 1, 2008. Review of applications will begin immediately and continue until the position is filled. Interested candidates should submit a cover letter, curriculum vitae, graduate transcripts (unofficial copies accepted), and contact information for three references to Dr. John Casey, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, Warren Wilson College, PO Box 9000, Asheville, NC 28815-9000, or send to [academic@warren-wilson.edu](mailto:academic@warren-wilson.edu).

More information: <<http://www.warren-wilson.edu/~humres/positions.php>>.



Likewise, Jeanne Simpson's chapter on "Managing Encounters with Central Administration" underscores the necessity of understanding the constraints placed on academic administrators as they try to allocate ever-shrinking budgets fairly. From her perspective as a current administrator with experience in writing centre directorship, Simpson provides practical advice and commentary on working with administrators to secure funding and academic stability, a task which "requires a realistic understanding of the values, functions, and responsibilities of administrators" (p. 200). The power of politics cannot be underestimated in writing centre negotiations of place and space.

Part II's series of chapters on tutoring contain information ranging from launching, funding, assessing, and certifying programs. These are important chapters to revisit as directors negotiate the evolution of their own centres. For example, authors Muriel Harris (chapter 28) and Carol Peterson Haviland and Marcy Trianosky (chapter 29) discuss the importance of training and evaluating from the respective perspectives of directors and tutors. Reading reflections from tutors serves to underscore the delicate balancing act directors perform to achieve a smoothly functioning program. Tutors desire critical feedback and want their directors to be empowering and supportive, not micro-managers. Because of the context within our own writing centre operates, I would have appreciated the inclusion of more information on directing writing centres staffed by professional instructors on continuing contracts. Although certainly not the norm, more writing centres, especially in Atlantic Canada, are employing people with multiple degrees, in particular, Bachelor of Education teaching degrees. Herein lays the potential of designing writing centre programming from a learning context rather than from an editing one. As discussed by Steven Strang (chapter 27), the dynamic of operations in these centres is different — turnover is minimal and directors have the added advantage (or detriment) of working with seasoned instructors who have a clear sense of the current and changing institutional culture.

Rapid technological advances are changing the way we view writing, discourse, and the very nature of learning itself. Unfortunately, it does not appear that many writing centres are changing sufficiently to meet the needs of their new student communities, due in no small part to the parameters set by the institutions themselves. Lisa Eastmond Bell's essay narrates her experience in wrestling with tutoring in an online environment. This chapter is particularly relevant as the number of distance and on-line courses available to Canadian students increases. Many writing centre personnel come to their management positions through academic channels rather than from business ones. Directors who are charged with the task of "managing" the finances and operations of their centres will find the information in this compilation particularly useful. As they learn to negotiate within an administrative context, the distinct managerial themes woven through the expected essays on writing centre history and identity provide important context and stimulate thought of ways to implement effective action plans. Rather than be ensconced in the director's office, this text should also be accessible to writing centre tutors to stimulate discussion and critical reflection on praxis. ♦

## TUTOR'S COLUMN

### PLAYING AROUND WITH ORGANIZATION

♦ *Jennifer Kimball, University of Missouri-Columbia, MO*

As tutors we frequently read papers that seem to lack focus, or structure, or both. Often these papers are disorganized because writers get bogged down in their ideas and can't see a guiding framework for their writing. That's where we come in. Helping writers with organization, though, isn't simply a matter of tidying up their papers; instead, tutors need to engage writers more deeply with the ideas they present in their texts in order to create focus. Tutors can help writers organize by showing them *new ways* to think about their work. For instance, word games like Directions and 20 Questions can give writers a different perspective on their ideas and arguments, and can help writers find a logical organization scheme that considers audience and purpose.

Writers don't simply transmit their ideas and arguments into their readers' heads; instead, readers form their own ideas and conclusions based on what they have read. Tutors can demonstrate this by playing Directions, a game in which one person leads another through a simple task with a series of commands that must be followed exactly. Problems arise when the leaders skip steps that seem obvious to them but aren't to the followers. If, for example, the leader explains how to fold a paper airplane, but forgets to tell the follower to take the paper out of a notebook first, the whole notebook gets folded. Playing this game shows writers how their ideas might become confusing and their papers disorganized when they leave out crucial steps in their ideas. Once I worked with a student who was writing a paper on how board games teach children various skills and values. Since we were already thinking about games, the session was especially playful and relaxed. Though she had the start of a good, creative paper, the writer consistently skipped steps, making it hard for me to understand her analysis. I suggested that she pretend that I was a reader who had a hard time following her arguments/directions, and only made the connections and followed the steps she specifically stated, just like a player in Directions. As she read the paper a second time, when she reached the part of her paper where she discussed gender roles she exclaimed, "I'm skipping a step! I just give examples, but then I

(continued on page 15)

(continued from page 14)

don't connect them back to real life, and that's why you get lost." As we continued going through the paper, she identified other areas that needed more explanation, and she rearranged some of her ideas to make connections clearer.

Once writers begin to see where they miss steps, they also start seeing ways to direct their readers to follow their ideas. The Directions Game is a way to show writers how easily readers can become lost, and how useful transition language is for guiding readers. Transitions words like "therefore," "however," and "nevertheless" correspond to the little steps that are often forgotten during Directions. Writers can come to appreciate the importance of these connectors by seeing what happens when they are missing. Of course, if writers don't know exactly how their ideas connect, they can't play Directions or write an organized paper. Fortunately, tutors can play another game, 20 Questions, to help writers clarify how their ideas relate to each other. Most games of 20 Questions start with general queries, such as "is it a vegetable?" Tutors should start their games in a similar manner by asking general questions that become increasingly specific. As a tutor I usually start the session by asking the tutee about the class and the assignment before focusing on the writer's specific analysis, argument, or organization scheme. By focusing in through questions, I can find the "right" answer for each session: the particular area the writer is concerned about or needs help with. Here is a scenario for how such a dialogue might go:

*Tutor: What do you want to focus on in particular?*

*Writer: Everything just seems jumbled.*

*Tutor: Do you mean the ideas seem jumbled, or the organization, or something else?*

*Writer: My professor says the paper "restarts a lot."*

*Tutor: So, what does "restart" mean to you?*

*Writer: Just that I keep returning to the same main ideas and stuff.*

*Tutor: All right, what are the main ideas?*

20 Questions can help focus tutoring sessions, and can also help writers focus their papers. In her article "Focus on Focus: How to Facilitate Discussion in a Peer Group," Bithyah Shaparenko, a writing fellow at Pennsylvania State University, posits that writers may only think "sequentially, without constantly reflecting on how each succeeding paragraph adds to the meaning of the text as a whole" (12). Playing 20 Questions gives writers a chance to think about their papers in a different and often non-linear way, letting them play with the way their ideas connect to shape an argument. For instance, I worked with one student who had a plethora of great ideas, many of them worthy of entire papers themselves. However, the ideas seemed haphazardly laid out. As a reader I was often lost and confused, but as I led her through questions about how she thought the various ideas and points related, she started to reshape her paper drastically. The questions gave her a way to talk about her ideas and clarify their connections. The 20 Questions game can also help writers see the questions and ideas readers will take from the texts. Last semester I worked as an assistant tutor with Sharon Emmerichs, an experienced composition instructor. She argues, "By leading writers through questions that their readers will ask, I find it helps them anticipate questions that they may not have anticipated." Readerly questions can be especially helpful for inexperienced writers, and, by leading student writers through these questions, tutors can demonstrate a technique that writers can apply to any future writing.

Tutors can also help writers tackle their assignments by helping them see the writing process itself as a game. Writers may feel that assignment requirements only hinder their ability to construct a meaningful text. However, tutors can help writers see this challenge as a tool for creativity. Tutors can encourage writers to think of assignment requirements as analogous to the rules that give structure to any game. Thus, instead of requirements being restrictions, requirements provide an aid to organization. Alice Trupe, the director of the Bridgewater College Writing Center, suggests that "[the] writer can establish a structure for his paper [by] establish[ing] some goals for communicating with the reader" (69). Tutors can use games to help the writer stop thinking about papers as only assignments, and instead think of them as a way to play with readers and direct them to the writer's destination. When writers are in the throes of the writing process, papers can easily become disorganized. Tutors can use games to show writers new ways to look at their ideas, the connections between their ideas, and the way their ideas further the purpose of the assignment. Games like Directions and 20 Questions can help with organization, and tutors may find that other games have a place in the writing center as well. Tutors can experiment with how best to help writers, and different methods will probably appeal to different tutors, different writers, and different assignments. By helping writers think about their papers in new ways, tutors aid writers in improving their writing process. ♦

#### Works Cited

Emmerichs, Sharon. Personal Interview. 15 Nov. 2006.

Shaparenko, Bithyah. "Focus on focus: How to facilitate discussion in a peer group." *The Writing Lab Newsletter* 29.8 (2005): 11-12.

Trupe, Alice. "Organizing Ideas: Focus is the Key." *A Tutor's Guide: Helping Writers One-to-One*. Ed. Ben Raforth. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 2000. 67-75.



# CALENDAR FOR WRITING CENTER ASSOCIATIONS

**Feb. 7-9, 2008:** Southeastern Writing Center Association, in Savannah, GA

**Contact:** Deborah H. Reese: reesedeb@mail.armstrong.edu; 912-921-2329. Conference Web site: <<http://www.llp.armstrong.edu/swca/swca2008cfp.html>>.

**Feb. 14, 2008:** University of the Western Cape, in Capetown, SA

**Contact:** Fatima Slemming at fslemming@uwc.ac.za or Margaret Robyn at mrobyn@uwc.ac.za.

**March 6-8, 2007:** South Central Writing Centers Association, in Norman OK

**Contact:** Michele Eodice at meodice@ou.edu. Conference Web site: <<http://www.ou.edu/writingcenter/scwca08>>.

**April 11-12, 2008:** East Central Writing Centers Association, in Columbus, OH

**Contact:** Doug Dangler: dangler.6@osu.edu. Conference Web site: <<http://www.ecwca.org>>.

**April 12, 2008:** Mid-Atlantic Writing Centers Association, in Philadelphia, PA

**Contact:** Lori Salem: lori.salem@temple.edu or Dan Gallagher: dagallag@temple.edu. Conference Web site: <<http://faculty.mc3.edu/hhalbert/MAWCA/2008/CFP.html>>.

**April 12-13, 2008:** NorthEast Writing Centers Association, in Burlington, VT

**Contact:** Michelle Cox: michelle.cox@bridgew.edu. Conference Web site: <<http://www.newca-conference.com/>>.

**April 25-26, 2008:** Pacific Northwest Writing Centers Association, in Everett, WA

**Contact:** Ann Harrington: e-mail: aharrington@everettcc.edu; phone: 425-388-9309. Conference Web site: <<http://www.pnwca.org/?q=node/86>>.

**June 19-22, 2008:** European Writing Centers Conference, in Freiburg, Germany

**Contact:** Gerd Braeuer at braeuer@ph-freiburg.de; Conference Web site: <<http://www.ph-freiburg.de/ewca2008/>>.

**Oct. 30-Nov.1, 2008:** International Writing Centers Association/National Conference on Peer Tutoring in Writing, in Las Vegas, NV

**Contact:** Charlene Hirschi: chirschi@english.usu.edu or Claire Hughes: clairehughes@weber.edu. Conference Web site: <<http://departments.weber.edu/writingcenter/IWCA.htm>>.



Muriel Harris, editor  
The RiCH Company  
3238 S. 92nd St.  
Milwaukee, WI 53227

Address Service Requested

PRSRT STD  
U.S. Postage  
**PAID**  
Permit #5654  
Milwaukee, WI