WLn

A JOURNAL OF WRITING CENTER SCHOLARSHIP

wln

Table of Contents

From the Editor

Muriel Harris

This issue should remind us of how varied our interests are and how often we have to rethink the constantly changing issues we confront. Julie Prebel considers the impact of mandatory reporting policies when writing center staff learn about sexual violence through a student paper or tutorial conversation. Institutions and new federal laws require such reporting, but how do such reporting mandates invade a writer's privacy? And how do the requirements and adherence to them affect tutorial relationships or writers' willingness to seek our help?

Beth Hewett provides an extensive review of WriteLab, software to help students write. Discussing the software's potential and current limitations, she expresses hope for the future role artificial intelligence may play in "reading" and "responding to" student writing. Along with questions and concerns, Hewett details an optimistic view of WriteLab that may prove important to writing centers.

Daniel Lawson also raises many questions; he explores huge holes in our scholarship about the affective dimension of tutoring and shares a study of our literature on affect to indicate what we have and have not explored.

In the Tutors' Column, Jessica Jones, Lauren Becker, Alyssa Riley, and Bridget Draxler also touch on an area we often overlook: tutors' lives after, and beyond, the writing center.

Truly, our world is highly complex with more questions than answers. So keep thinking, writing, and sending your scholarship to *WLN*!

Confessions in the Writing Center: Constructionist Approaches in the Era of Mandatory Reporting

Julie Prebel

Occidental College
Los Angeles, California

INTRODUCTION

I met Abby when she scheduled a senior year writing center appointment to work on her personal statement for a law school application. Abby wanted help connecting her personal experiences to her academic interests and career plans, but her trajectory from undergraduate student to law school applicant was complex and painful, and her approach to writing the narrative was unique and perhaps risky. In her first paragraph, Abby disclosed that she had been raped her first semester of college. While I sought to help Abby develop the exigence of her statement, I also faced a dilemma. Under a new set of Occidental College requirements for all faculty, most staff and administrators, and some student employees, Abby's disclosure meant I had to report her rape to the college's Title IX office, even though Abby chose not to report the incident herself.[1]

This anecdote foregrounds a current challenge in writing center work: how does the mandate to report disclosures of sexual misconduct complicate writing center consultations that are based on a constructionist paradigm? Especially in recent years, attention to college campus sexual assaults and demand for greater transparency about sexual violence statistics and accountability to survivors of sexual assault have increased. Colleges and universities have also adopted and more stringently reinforced policies requiring employees to report sexual misconduct or gender-based harassment incidents that students share with them. In compliance with legal directives, institutional reporting mandates apply to any employee with supervisory or leadership responsibilities, and writing center personnel are likely not exempt from these mandates.

Writing center work frequently involves a willingness to talk about the self and deeply personal experiences, including

trauma. In Andrea Lunsford's definition of a constructionist writing center, such interactions, "informed by a theory of knowledge as socially constructed," allow "power and control" to be "negotiated and shared" (97). However, reporting mandates, a form of institutional discourse, may inhibit the open dialogue between writing center consultants and students and may undermine a student's sense of autonomy.

Acts of student disclosure, or what Foucault terms *confession*, bind writing center consultants and students to conventions of discourse, particularly the discourse about what constitutes "institutional knowledge." Foucault describes the confession as enacting a power relationship between the "confessor" and the "interlocutor" who has the "authority…to judge, punish, forgive, console, and reconcile." This relationship is marked as much by the "power [which] reduces one to silence" as by a dialogic intimacy in the "transmission of confidences" (61-62). Foucault's explanation of how confessional acts can be disempowering for the confessor suggests a way to understand how mandatory reporting can change writing center social dynamics. Instead of a center described by Irene Clark and Dave Healy as "well positioned to question the status quo" by providing a "place where students can experience some distance from" institutional authority, the center—and consultant—is more in consensus with the institution than in collaboration with the student (253).

SOCIAL CONTEXTS: HOW MANDATORY REPORTING REACHED WRITING CENTERS

In 2014, the U.S. Department of Education-Office for Civil Rights (OCR) issued *Questions and Answers on Title IX and Sexual Violence*, which detailed what the institutional obligations are to respond to sexual violence and how Title IX protects students. It also defined which school employees should be designated as responsible employees, or "mandatory reporters." This *Q & A* document followed the OCR's April 4, 2011, "Dear Colleague Letter," which explained a school's responsibility to "respond promptly and effectively to sexual violence against students in accordance with the requirements of Title IX" (*Q & A*, i). The *Q & A* document defines a "responsible employee," mandated to report all acts conveyed by students of sexual violence and harassment, as any employee having the "authority to take action to redress sexual violence; who has been given the duty of reporting incidents of sexual violence or other misconduct by students to the Title IX coordinator or other appropriate school

designee; or whom a student could reasonably believe has this authority or duty" (15). This mandatory reporter definition also aligns with the 2013 Association of Title IX Administrators (ATIXA) guidelines for colleges, which endorsed casting a wide net in defining responsible employees to avoid taking a "selective approach" that "may create confusion and risk" for the institution (*Mandatory Reporters Policy*, 1). Under these OCR and ATIXA guidelines, all faculty and most professional staff are designated mandatory reporters, including some student employees in supervisory positions over other students, such as resident advisors. These recommendations stem from federal and state laws related to reporting sexual violence and discrimination, especially under Title VII, which focuses on sexual harassment in the workplace; Title IX, which prohibits gender-based discrimination including sexual assault; and the Clery Act, which promotes campus safety through transparency about crime statistics on or near college campuses.

Many schools have adopted these OCR and ATIXA recommendations for designating mandatory reporters, and very few employees are considered confidential advisers. At Occidental, for example, the list of responsible employees includes faculty, coaches, administrators, and resident advisers; only the college's survivor advocate, health center counselors, and the director of religious and spiritual life are exempt from reporting mandates. At Occidental and elsewhere, writing center personnel fit the OCR's definition of responsible employees since we may be in supervisory roles or may be perceived by students who work with us as having positions of authority to offer assistance in any number of ways. Occidental's policies, which appear similar to those at other institutions, also align with the OCR guidelines for what constitutes reportable information: "all relevant details about the alleged sexual violence that the student or another person has shared," with no delineation between information shared orally or in writing (*Q & A*, 16).

These definitions for mandatory reporters and reportable information suggest several concerns that may impact writing center work. Disclosures of sexual assault made in student essays and reflective pieces like personal statements are considered reportable. In this context, we are obligated to report even when a student is describing an incident that has happened much earlier and that the student may not want to report—as was the case in my work with Abby. The mandate to report can thus be

interpreted as a form of textual interventionism, a limit on how individual writers might "own" their texts or develop agency through their writing. Marilyn Cooper connects the development of student agency through writing to the socially constructed writing center, claiming that writing center consultations can achieve "the goal of empowering students as agents of their writing" (341). Cooper clarifies that the achievement of agency in writing is part of a process of "constructing subject positions that negotiate between institutional demands and individual needs" (340). However, an imperative to share with institutional authorities information contained in student texts can constrain writing center interaction and can prove difficult to navigate. The mandate to report, for example, was initially a barrier to effective conferencing with Abby. Her reaction to my disclosure that I would have to contact the Title IX office was silence, followed by her reluctance to continue our conversation; thus, a session intended to focus on helping a student writer develop her text, and perhaps her "self" through this text, was sidetracked by the reporting mandate.

Nancy Welch's conception of how writing center collaboration can help students "compose [their] experience rather than be composed by it" resonates with Cooper's conceptualization of the relationship between writing centers and student agency (10). Yet for Welch, writing center interactions also enact the means to "reflect on and intervene in the languages, conventions, and belief systems that constitute our texts," and not just to negotiate between competing demands (4). Welch's constructivist approach to writing center work, which she developed in part through conferences with a student writing about workplace sexual harassment, is especially resonant in a mandated-reporting climate. In Welch's conceptualization, writing center interactions are opportunities for students to write about and immerse themselves in social and academic conversations, allowing students to develop critical voices that write against the institution and its conventions. After I had to disclose Abby's rape to the Title IX office, she returned to work on her law school personal statement three more times, and we managed to put Welch's theories into practice during these sessions. Instead of being silenced by the reporting mandate, Abby found a way in her narrative to talk about the unspeakable: both her rape and her criticisms of the institutional discourse that set limits on what constituted an "ideal" text in terms of the conventions for what can or should be said.

Mandatory reporting of sexual assault disclosures raises another concern for writing center work: the potential to revictimize survivors. In their 2009 study of social support systems for sexual assault survivors, psychologists Gillian Mason et al. examined survivors' disclosure experiences and analyzed differences in revictimization rates based on responses to these disclosures. The researchers focused on how "persons in a survivor's immediate and distal environment respond when she discloses her unwanted sexual experiences," and collected data that showed "these responses also affect her risk of revictimization" (59). The researchers' definition of "social support" includes "both formal and informal sources of help" and "types of assistance" survivors might seek through various "interpersonal relationships" (59-60). Writing centers can be seen to function in the ways described by Mason et al. as collaborative and supportive social spaces, and students often view writing center personnel as confidants or allies. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the researchers' findings showed the risk of revictimization is higher with any type of "negative social reactions to rape survivors' disclosures" (60). But the negative reactions may not necessarily be "deliberate attempts to harm a survivor;" they might also include "reactions intended to be supportive but perceived negatively by the survivor" (60). Many students included in the Mason, et al. study reported that even unintended negative responses resulted in their belief that "telling made things much worse" (62). Given the definitions and conclusions of these researchers, a mandate to report sexual assault disclosures made during writing consultations runs the risk of revictimizing survivors. Students visiting the writing center are likely to expect they will engage in positive interactions and will receive positive support. Although we may aim to meet those expectations, an obligation to report disclosures to the Title IX office can result in unintended negative consequences for the student survivor.

CONCLUSION

According to the current OCR guidelines, writing center disclosures of sexual assault are not protected by Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), which covers students' educational records. Although the OCR has not yet updated its 2014 *Q & A* document, they might be softening their position, particularly on reflective writing and settings where our work often takes place. Currently, the OCR excludes disclosures made by survivors at "Take Back the Night" events from mandated

reporting. Part of educating the institution about our writing center work, and the sometimes complex interactions we have with students, might include encouraging our Title IX offices to offer an alternative to mandating provisions for student disclosures that take place in our centers, similar to other exempted events such as "Take Back the Night." In some ways, the issue of how to achieve our writing center objectives while being responsive to institutional policies may ring familiar: is this another example that underscores the challenges of enacting our theories and practices while having to explain ourselves—who we are and what we do—to other entities at our institutions?

1. To protect student privacy, I am not using real names and have removed identifying information about student work.

◆　◆　◆　◆　◆

Association of Title IX Administrators. *Mandatory Reporters: A Policy for Faculty and Professional Staff.* ATIXA, 2013. PDF file.

Clark, Irene L., and Dave Healy. "Are Writing Centers Ethical?" *Longman Guide to Writing Center Theory and Practice*. Ed. Robert Barnett and Jacob Blumner. New York: Pearson Education, 2008. 242-59. Print.

Cooper, Marilyn. "Really Useful Knowledge: A Cultural Studies Agenda for Writing Centers." *The Longman Guide to Writing Center Theory and Practice.* Ed. Robert Barnett and Jacob Blumner. New York: Pearson Education, 2008. 335-349. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*, Vol. 1. New York: Vintage, 1978. Print.

Lunsford, Andrea. "Collaboration, Control, and the Idea of a Writing Center." *The Longman Guide to Writing Center Theory and Practice.* Ed. Robert Barnet and Jacob Blumner. New York: Pearson (2008); 92-99.

Mason, Gillian E., et al. "Social Support and Risk of Sexual Assault Revictimization." *Journal of Community Psychology* 37:1 (2009): 58-72. Print.

Welch, Nancy. "From Silence to Noise: The Writing Center as Critical Exile." *Writing Center Journal* 14:1 (1993): 3-15. Print.

U.S. Department of Education–Office for Civil Rights. Questions and Answers on Title IX and Sexual Violence. U.S. Department of Education, 2014. PDF file.

A Review of WriteLab

Beth L. Hewett

Defend & Publish, LLC

Forest Hill, Maryland

Will educational software like WriteLab replace the human writing assistance offered in writing centers? When such a question has been posed in recent years, writing center directors and tutors have had reason for concern. The good news in this review of WriteLab is that while some of the software's current capabilities should be approached cautiously, writing center educators—whether in onsite or online settings—can be excited about its potential. WriteLab is in its infancy and it has some faults, but it is a good idea in the process of becoming a useful tool. As educators, we would do well to try it out, offer constructive feedback, and consider how to use such software well.

FEAR NOT

In recent history, claims of software that can "read" and "evaluate" student writing, such as that provided by ETS for standardized testing and Pearson's Knowledge Technology group for student learning, have been offered as a means to eliminate the need for human readers and instructors or to ease their time-based burden of reading, commenting, and grading. Writing professionals have tended to object strenuously to those claims, leading to strongly worded position statements that outline the many ways that machines are incapable of imitating the nuanced intellectual work of the human reader and educator (NCTE Position Statement; CCCC Writing Assessment 2C). Despite these legitimate concerns about machine assessment, WriteLab's current configuration and stated goals should not be ethically troublesome for writing center educators.

WriteLab is software that provides automated style-focused response to student writing. Using machine learning and natural language processing (NLP) to respond to student writing, WriteLab focuses on drafting and revising and does

not provide any assessment for grading or evaluative purposes. Writing teachers, tutors, other writing studies professionals, and software engineers collaborated to develop WriteLab, which seeks to help all levels of writers grow more "confident and successful in their thinking and writing. . . . without fixating on 'correctness'" (WriteLab FAQs). The software encourages writers to develop writing self-sufficiency and success. I am excited about its potential to explain some stylistic changes students might undertake, which could allow tutors and teachers to focus more time on each writer's meaning. WriteLab acknowledges that students need insightful human readers, and it has promise as a tutoring/teaching tool for students and as a scholarly research aid for writing studies professionals.

Students using WriteLab can write using the software's text field that provides basic word processing or they can upload digital files for analysis. When students edit their documents, the system automatically saves the changes as a new draft. WriteLab's machine analytics provides feedback by highlighting words and phrases and commenting about style, addressing only one of seven stylistic areas per comment: clarity, cohesion, logic, concision, emphasis, elegance, and coherence. The software offers no surface level corrections or edits (e.g., misspellings, sentence boundary faults). In WriteLab's writing center setting, students can post writing to their institution's tutors for response; in the course setting, they can post to their peers or teachers for additional human-generated response. Hence, in either setting, WriteLab gives affirmative and constructive machine-generated comments about students' writing and provides a text-sharing feature for reader response. In fact, students can receive WriteLab, tutor, peer, and teacher comments on a single draft, enabling what the company calls "cross-collaboration." Because WriteLab can be integrated within existing learning management systems (LMSs), it does not facilitate discussions or offer a Wiki, one-to-one conferencing, or internal email; such features typically exist in the LMS and are unnecessary to replicate. Currently, WriteLab's goals are to encourage writers and teach them something about their writing.

I used "fear not" as the section header because the software's functional goals clearly are to help students learn more about their writing and to leave the assessment to instructors. Because WriteLab is being developed by fellow rhetoric and composition educators, we have reason to trust that the company is seeking

to find twenty-first century solutions to teaching and tutoring students that match up with ideals the writing studies field holds dear. Adding to their ethos is the work that research expert Les Perelman is doing in pushing WriteLab to do its job well.[1] In a recent post on the WPA-L listserv, Perelman—well known for his criticism of claims that machines can teach or score writing—expressed his support, explaining that he had attended a meeting about WriteLab at the 2014 NCTE conference: "intending to do my usual hatchet job on another badly implemented attempt to use computers to teach writing, but instead I came away greatly impressed with the approach developed by Don McQuade, whom I have respected for decades, and his partner and graduate student, Matthew Ramirez." Since then, WriteLab hired Perelman to "do my worst in trying to break it or elicit inappropriate or confusing comments. When I have done so, they either fix the problem or remove that feature" ("Re: WriteLab"). Frankly, I am encouraged when a well-known colleague does a public about-face regarding an issue on which he has been trenchant because it increases my confidence in the integrity of his—and WriteLab's—intentions. Getting Perelman on board was a smart move on WriteLab's part both for its own ethos and for the improvement of its teaching model.

USE CAUTION

Despite my encouragement to not fear WriteLab, the software currently has significant limitations in the kinds of revision with which it supports students. Hopefully, these problems can be fixed using NLP, which is the key feature that WriteLab offers to assist students.

For this review, I submitted three essays—two of my blogs about grief and one young man's essay that I have permission to use. Most of the comments WriteLab offered the texts regarded "clarity" and "concision," where deleting one word was subtly recommended. I frequently found that following those suggestions would not hurt or especially help the text—sometimes creating a more focused sentence and other times lessening nuance. This attention to word deletion seems to connect with WriteLab's claims: According to the WriteLab FAQ, "After a year of beta testing, we found that students like working in our Concision Module—they prefer tightening their prose over expanding it to fit minimum word requirements." Further, students "have also shown considerable interest in limiting their use of passive verbs, in direct response to the Clarity

Module identifying those verbs." In other words, WriteLab often recommends prose tightening, including recasting passive voice, so it is unsurprising that students might choose such revision changes and that they might appear to be a preference.

Lester Faigley and Stephen Witte's 1981 landmark revision-change research helps in understanding the kinds of changes students may make when they work with WriteLab. Faigley and Witte developed and tested a revision-change taxonomy:

Faigley and Witte's Revision Change Operations

Surface Changes	Text-Based Changes
1. Formal Changes Spelling Tense Abbreviation Punctuation Paragraph Other Format	**1. Microstructure Changes** Additions Deletions Substitutions Permutations Distributions Consolidations
2. Meaning-Preserving Changes Additions Deletions Substitutions Permutations Distributions Consolidations	**2. Macrostructure Changes** Additions Deletions Substitutions Permutations Distributions Consolidations

Chart based on "Analyzing Revision" (408).

Surface changes address what would likely be called local, lower-order changes by writing center staff; the text's overall meaning is not altered by such changes. Formal changes are what tutors and teachers typically are urged by research to ignore but that often are irritating to read and may obfuscate meaning. Spelling and grammar check software can help students address these changes when their proofreading is insufficient. Meaning-preserving change "includes changes that paraphrase concepts in the text but do not alter them." Additions, deletions, and substitutions are fairly common changes while permutations ("rearrangements or rearrangements with substitutions"), distributions ("material in one segment is passed into more than one segment"), and consolidations ("elements in two or more units are consolidated into one unit") are less common (403). Unlike surface changes, text-based changes affect meaning; some are impactful and others not, but generally they reflect global, higher-order concerns. Using the same revision sub-elements, microstructural changes work at the paragraph

level and change meaning locally, sometimes with great rhetorical force. Macrostructural changes can alter the thesis, argumentative reasoning, and details that may entirely change the text's meaning.

In Faigley and Witte's study of inexperienced students, advanced students, and professional writers, the majority of changes writers made (besides spelling) were surface meaning-preserving and were word/phrase additions, deletions, and substitutions. Only the advanced students and some professional writers added, deleted, and substituted text at the microstructural and macrostructural levels (407-8). Interestingly, what Faigley and Witte saw in 1981 appears to be repeated in the results WriteLab offers in their FAQs—that students' primary revision operations are surface meaning-preserving deletions to write more concisely and substitutions of active for passive-voice constructions. These results are not surprising in that WriteLab focuses on stylistic revision changes at the meaning-preserving level. Indeed, WriteLab appears to be designed to promote additions, deletions, and substitutions at the meaning-preserving change level.

Some example WriteLab comments demonstrate how it may encourage word-level deletion particularly. I question how students might read the comments and revise or not.[1] In fairness, please note that I have selected some of the most challenging comments; others were more helpful. In its analysis, the WriteLab software highlighted words as shown in the examples below.

EXAMPLE 1: CLARITY

> **Writer:** "Abraham Lincoln *was* assassinated on April 14, 1865, when Tad was 12 and their oldest son Robert was 22."

> **WriteLab:** *Clarity.* You might experiment with using a verb more descriptive than *was* to explain the action in this sentence. The verb *was* lacks detail or specificity: it could describe almost any action.

This comment about the "be" verb pops up occasionally. Sometime this verb is the appropriate choice. One wonders how to help students see when it is and when it is not.

> **Writer:** "Interestingly, little *mention* is made of the preschool-aged Eddie in discussions of Mary Lincoln's life."

> **WriteLab:** *Clarity*. There is a verb embedded in *mention*. How might using this verb increase or decrease the impact of your sentence?

I was confused about WriteLab's "embedded" (also labeled "hiding" or "hidden") nature of the verb in the noun. When I thought about it, I realized that changing my text to the active voice (*Interestingly, few mention the . . .*) would eliminate the noun form of "mention." Although inexperienced writers might benefit from this comment, they may need human interpretation.

> **Writer:** "You can cut the jeans off above the knee—at the **point** of the hole."

> **WriteLab:** *Clarity*. One of the words you use here (*point*) has a verb form. How might you use this verb to describe the action in your sentence? How would doing so increase or decrease the impact of your sentence?

In this case, the advice was unhelpful; I either needed the noun "point" or to have deleted "point" altogether (*at the hole*). The majority of "clarity" comments the submitted essays received were about verb/noun words. Although some comments were inappropriate, others caused me to rethink the message. Students without a big repertoire might default to simply using the verb form that the comments implicitly recommend.

> **Writer:** "Many of these newcomers have strong traditions and beliefs wich are strict and **are instilled** in thier children."

> **WriteLab:** *Clarity*. *Are instilled* is passive. It emphasizes what is acted upon rather than what is acting. You might experiment with using the active voice.

I wonder whether the student who wrote the essay I submitted to WriteLab would know the active form of this verb and how to make revisions to accommodate it. He *can* click an arrow in the comment to see the *WriteLab Guide*'s explanation and examples. But will he? Also, WriteLab uses suggestive language, which is still common in tutoring pedagogy but not helpful in many cases, including for multilingual students and students receiving advice online through text. I recommend a linguistically direct imperative to encourage the student to enact otherwise implicit advice: *Experiment with using the active voice* (see Hewett 112-29, 183-91). Finally, WriteLab did not flag the misspellings, which

are merely surface formal changes. Realistically, the misspellings will annoy readers even though WriteLab's decision to ignore them is understandable pedagogically.

EXAMPLE 2: COHESION

Writer: "Mary, however, was sent from his room more than once for lack of **womanly decorum**."

WriteLab: *Coherence*. This is an unusual phrase. What relation does *womanly* have to *decorum*? How familiar are readers with this relation? Will they be informed or confused by it?

WriteLab's questions are interesting. I know what I want to convey here and think the context will make sense to *human* readers. Students may need tutors to help them decide whether to keep the phrase or change it (and why). WriteLab counts such authorial ownership as a developmental benefit from using this software, stating on the website that such agency is, indeed, happening. My concern is that tutors might spend too much time parsing Writelab comments for students, time that could be spent more profitably considering higher-order concerns.

EXAMPLE 3: LOGIC

Writer: "The resteraunt makes outstanding buisness."

WriteLab: *Logic*. How does the resteraunt make outstanding buisness?

This question should help the student rethink his odd statement. Analytics-based research should show whether it does prompt new thought/revision. Nonetheless, if the student's focus is not about "how" the restaurant achieves its success, WriteLab, which is unable to assess context, may be sending him down an unhelpful digressive path.

EXAMPLE 4: CONCISION

Writer: "However, immigrants seem to have **much more** stronger family values."

WriteLab: *Concision*. Experiment with reading this sentence with and without *much*. What meaning does *much* contribute to the sentence? Does removing it strengthen or weaken your sentence?

This comment mixes linguistically direct statements (an imperative and a genuine question) with a suggestion (per the rhetorical question beginning with "does"). Such tentative

questioning might seem appropriate in that machines cannot guess at a writer's intention as human readers might. However, WriteLab does not indicate that "much more stronger" is not standard usage. The student could delete "much" and still have "more stronger," prompting an awkward reading. A word-level approach to fluency is a key limitation of WriteLab.

EXAMPLE 5: EMPHASIS

> **Writer:** "Imigrants are what help make **America** be **America**; by being a multicultural society standing united."

> **WriteLab:** *Emphasis.* You make a persuasive appeal by repeating *america*.

WriteLab (which oddly used the lower case for "America") addressed a number of repetitions in this student's essay. Notice how confusing the responses become in the following examples, which are consecutively written sentences.

> "Immigrants are what help **America be Americ**a. They say that America is just a melting pot."

> **WriteLab:** *Emphasis.* You make this phrase intriguing and memorable by repeating *america*.

This text follows.

> "This is what makes our country unique. We have many cultures, many Ideas, and traditions, but all of us have the same **dream**. That **Dream** is the American **Dream**."

> **WriteLab:** *Emphasis.* You repeat this word at the end of both sentences. What rhetorical effect does this have?

This text follows.

> "The same **dream** that keeps Americans in America and immigrants to come here."

> **WriteLab:** *Clarity.* There is a verb embedded in *dream*. How might using this verb increase or decrease the impact of your sentence?

One wonders how this final use of "dream" is different from the others (or the oft-repeated "America") such that WriteLab flags the first ones as repetition with an apparently positive rhetorical result and addresses the final one as a noun with a verb form. What will the student think given the broader context of the paragraph? Although I suspect that there is an NLP-based reason for making this selection—possibly the lack of a verb

in the sentence fragment—the intended lesson escapes me; I believe it will confuse writers.

EXAMPLE 6: ELEGANCE

Writer: "Her first loss of Eddie was somewhat overlooked, and the compounded nature of having two children die in twelve years' time was ignored or treated as less than the cataclysm it surely was."

WriteLab: *Elegance*. The symmetry you create here adds a note of grace to your thought.

This is the only sentence singled out for elegance in the three essays. The sentence has two passive-voice constructions, so given WriteLab's consistent advice to avoid them, I am not certain why the sentence is considered elegant.

EXAMPLE 7: COHERENCE

Writer: "As for her stepmother, few women successfully substitute for a lost mother when they are considered warm and loving; how many fewer women never ***rate*** that ***label*** regardless of their actions?"

WriteLab: *Coherence*. You personify the inanimate object (*rate*) with an animate action (*label*).

This response does not make sense to me. The machine misread the verb "rate" for its noun form.

Despite their sometimes problematic features, these examples suggest that WriteLab can assist students in making stylistic meaning-preserving, surface-level changes. The software rightly leaves human readers to do meaning-intensive work with students, which is one reason WriteLab simultaneously can be helpful to students and not disruptive to the tutoring processes it purports to support. However, if students do not realize they are not receiving advice about correctness and the need for editing and if they are not reminded that making certain stylistic changes in response to WriteLab means that *some* and not *all* revision has been done, their writing likely will not meet the quality levels human readers still expect and WriteLab likely will not have saved them or their readers much time or future effort. More importantly, when writers revise only at word and sentence level, they miss significant meaning-based issues.

To best harness WriteLab's strengths and mitigate its weaknesses, tutors can ask students to show them WriteLab's

comments and discuss their revision choices. Such a discussion opens talk about revision choices, authority, and the need to consider how one's message conveys to human readers. However, this strategy requires clock watching to avoid spending too much time talking about inappropriate WriteLab responses. Tutors can remind students about the necessity to proofread and edit for surface formal changes and then spend the most time considering microstructural and macrostructural meaning-based changes that address message and audience.

Certainly, the WriteLab team should develop their materials to help students think about moving beyond sentences to deeper changes. Although human readers are necessary for helping students with microstructural and macrostructural changes of all types, minimally, the WriteLab team should consider whether and how machine learning and NLP can be engaged to encourage meaning preserving changes that are permutations, distributions, and consolidations. Additionally, it would help for WriteLab to explain to users what it is *not* responding to (e.g., topic focus, organization, supportive detail, etc.).

The example responses WriteLab offered my submissions have some worrisome, irregular features. When I spoke with McQuade, the company's Chief Learning Officer, he explained that the comment phrasing and the *WriteLab Guide* are being revised during the current beta period to develop fluid, clear text with a reader-friendly tone. My brief review demonstrates how some of this work needs to continue. Furthermore, machine learning is developed not only so that humans learn from the computer but so that it learns from humans. WriteLab's comments ask students to tell them which comments are not useful; if a comment is marked "not useful" enough times, eventually it will no longer appear for that student. If writing educators also learn *why* those comments are not useful (i.e., whether the student interpreted the comment differently from its intended meaning, did not believe such changes needed to be made per agency, or was tired of seeing it pop up), then what the machine learns also can teach tutors—provided the WriteLab team is transparent with the data they collect. WriteLab's team can do more, however, and I look forward to seeing it happen. For example, McQuade expressed that machine learning means eventually the comments/examples can be individualized to each student. I hope that WriteLab will teach students using discrete revised example sentences developed *from their own*

writing, which would be especially powerful if the program also would provide several revision choices to teach them what such revisions would look like and to demonstrate the rhetorical effects of making such changes.

GO RAD

Even moving forward cautiously, writing educators can be excited about the potential for using WriteLab in studying student writing and revision. The analytics Writelab can provide about one's students will aid in replicable, aggregable, and data supported (RAD) research—so badly needed in writing center and other writing studies' research. In an email to me, company president Ramirez states:

> Tutors, teachers, and WC directors will have access to analytics for students that share their drafts with them. So if a student is enrolled in a particular course and shares his draft with his teacher, that teacher will be able to view metrics around what decisions the student made about teacher comments, WriteLab comments, and peer comments. This teacher can view these decisions by module, by draft, by student, and by class. A lot of permutations are possible, and we hope that this data will 1) give teachers and tutors material to discuss with students and 2) provide information that can lead to pedagogical decisions in the classroom/tutoring session.

Perhaps my enthusiasm for WriteLab rests in my excitement about its potential contributions to research and how this tool—created and used by experts in our field—can assist an important research agenda. We simply know too little about the features of contemporary student writing and revision—onsite or online—and we must learn more to help twenty-first century students write (and read) better. We should learn from the analytics being asked of the system and then pose new questions to the WriteLab team. *What does the software identify as common features of student writing? How do students at various levels make revision changes? How can we support students in making microstructural and macrostructural meaning-based changes?* Additionally, WriteLab's analytical capabilities can be harnessed for a fraction of human labor costs; what once was counted and analyzed manually now can be done by machine, a fact that supports RAD research in the cash-poor humanities. As I have said before (Hewett and Warnock; Ehmann and Hewett), it is time to use automated, machine-based writing analytics to our advantage. WriteLab enables us to give it a try.

Frankly, despite the concerns I have expressed here, I think WriteLab is timely and viable, and writing centers should test it thoroughly with the understanding of what the software is intended to do and not with fear about how it might be used. We need to take hold of machine learning and direct it toward humanistic writing goals. We can use WriteLab ethically by harnessing its current strengths for students and exploiting its weaknesses by training tutors in helpful language choices and fruitful higher order feedback. Finally, we can collaborate with WriteLab to improve its product, benefitting all.

1. Some weeks after this article was completed, Les Perelman announced on the WPA listserv that he was no longer affiliated with WriteLab for reasons that included his own "personal constraints."

2. Because clarity comments were most varied and frequent, I provide multiple examples of them.

❖ ❖ ❖ ❖ ❖

Conference on College Composition and Communication Committee on Assessment. "Writing Assessment: A Position Statement." NCTE, Nov. 2014. Web. 1 Oct. 2015.

Ehmann, Christa, and Beth L. Hewett. "OWI Research Considerations." Hewett and DePew. 517-45.

Faigley, Lester and Stephen Witte. "Analyzing Revision." *College Composition and Communication* 32. 4 (1981), pp. 400-14. Print.

Hewett, Beth L., and Kevin Eric DePew, eds. *Foundational Practices in Online Writing Instruction.* Perspectives on Writing. Fort Collins, Colorado: WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor P. Web.

Hewett, Beth L. *The Online Writing Conference: A Guide for Teachers and Tutors*. Boston MA: Bedford/St. Martins, 2015. Print.

Hewett, Beth L. and Scott Warnock. "The Future of OWI." Hewett and DePew. 547-63.

National Council of Teachers of English. "NCTE Position Statement on Machine Scoring." NCTE, April 2015. Web. 1 Oct. 2015.

Perelman, Lester. "Re: WriteLab." *WPA-L Archives*. Arizona State University. 5 Aug. 2015. Web. 17 Sept. 2015.

-----"WriteLab." WPA-L Archives. Arizona State University. 25 Oct. 2015. Web. 26 Oct. 2015.

Ramirez, Matthew. "Re: Following Up On WriteLab Analytics." Message to Beth Hewett. 17 Sept. 2015. E-mail.

Streeter, Lynn, Jared Bernstein, Peter Folz, and Donald Deland. "Pearson's Automated Scoring of Writing, Speaking, and Mathematics." Pearson, May 2011. Web. 1 Oct. 2015.

WriteLab FAQs. *WriteLab.* WriteLab. Web. 1 Oct. 2015.

Metaphors and Ambivalence: Affective Dimensions in Writing Center Studies

Daniel Lawson

Central Michigan University
Mount Pleasant, Michigan

In "Training Tutors in Emotional Intelligence: Toward a Pedagogy of Empathy," Noreen Lape discusses the ambivalence of writing center tutor training manuals regarding emotion, finding in them a tendency "to prepare tutors for encounters with distressed writers by defining or categorizing the problem types and suggesting how to approach them" (2). This is problematic because, as Lape notes, "without theories and concrete strategies for responding to emotions in a session, some tutor training manuals employ a rhetoric that may place new tutors in a defensive position—on alert, waiting for the inevitable problem person to arrive" (2). Unfortunately, this problem is not confined to the pages of tutor training manuals alone.

In this essay, I extend Lape's survey into the other literature that would most likely circulate among writing center practitioners. I examined the archives of the two most prominent journals in our subfield, *The Writing Center Journal* (*WCJ*) and *The Writing Lab Newsletter* (*WLN*), to see how emotion and affective dimensions have been discussed in the context of the writing center. My findings echo Lape's: just as with tutor training manuals, these journals "concentrate far more on cognitive than affective skills" (2). And, like the training manuals Lape discusses, those articles that address emotion most directly focus almost exclusively on either disruptive behaviors associated with emotion or on what may be considered negative affective dimensions (such as anxiety or anger). I also examine the prevalence of metaphorical language in discussions of emotion and how that language has framed the way emotion has been conveyed. Finally, I explain that although some strands of the focus on negative affective dimensions linger, over time a more positive sense of emotion has begun to emerge in the literature, a sense that examines what emotion has to offer writing center sessions. This newer

sense is encouraging for those interested in studying the role emotion plays in the writing center, because there is a dearth of discussion about the affective dimensions of writing center work in these journals. In fact, in the decades of each journal's existence, there have been only a few pieces that deal directly with the subject.

METHODS AND THE WORK OF METAPHOR

I examined the archives of *WCJ* and *WLN* for a few reasons. Following Perdue and Driscoll's rationale for examining *WCJ* to understand the state of writing center research, I chose *WCJ* "because it is the only peer-reviewed professional journal with article length-manuscripts in the field. It represents a growing body of scholarship and research about writing centers and therefore offers an excellent representation of the kinds of research published within writing center studies" (12). Similarly, I chose *WLN* because of its practitioner orientation and influential status in the field. As Michael Pemberton points out, "the changes that have taken place in one have quite often been reflected by or been a reflection of changes that have taken place in the other. For this reason, then, the *WLN*—perhaps more so than any other resource—provides a unique window into the evolutionary process that has made the writing center community what it is today" (23). Thus, the archives of these two journals demonstrate larger trends regarding emotion and affective dimensions in writing center studies.

I searched the archives of *WCJ* (up to issue 34.1) and *WLN* (up to issue 39.9-10)[1], reading each issue and identifying articles devoted specifically to emotion or some affective dimension in the writing center. To define "emotion" or "affective," I used categories of affect derived from the Specific Affect Coding System (SPAFF). Originally designed for observing emotional behavior in the context of marital conflict, the SPAFF has since been used for "coding interactions among children, their parents, and their peers...and even to therapy situations" (Coan and Gottman 267). These codes consist of the more obvious affects such as anger, sadness, and fear as well as what may be considered less obvious affects such as humor, validation, and enthusiasm. In short, if an article's primary focus dealt explicitly with either emotion or with some affective dimension that corresponded with a SPAFF category, I examined it for its method and stance toward emotion or a given affect.[2]

In *WCJ*, three articles meet this criterion: Bizzaro and Toler's "The Effects of Writing Apprehension on the Teaching Behaviors of Writing Center Tutors" [EE-N], Richard Leahy's "When the Going is Good" [CI-P], and Steve Sherwood's "Humor and the Serious Tutor" [CI-P]. Bizzaro and Toler's article is an empirical piece focusing on apprehension. Leahy's and Sherwood's articles examine the potential benefits of positive affective dimensions. The last two articles are examples of conceptual inquiry— library-based research of the kind conducted by scholars in the humanities. Each draws on other fields to bolster arguments about the potential benefits of positive affect (Leahy) or humor (Sherwood) in the tutorial.

In *WLN* twenty-four pieces met this criterion: twenty articles and four Tutor's Columns. Only one article (Paul Ady's "Fear and Trembling at the Center") was based on empirical evidence [EE-N]. Of the rest, ten could be loosely described as conceptual inquiry, and like Sherwood's and Ady's articles, they often borrow theory or terminology from other fields to urge a change in practice or perceptions about that practice. Nine based their main assertions on anecdotal evidence. Eleven of the *WLN* articles focused on negative dimensions of emotion or its disruptive effects: five focused on the positive, emphasizing emotion's value; and the remaining four were neutral or ambivalent. Of the four Tutor's Columns, all focused on the disruptive or negative dimensions of emotion (fear, anxiety, sadness, anger, etc.) and were largely anecdotal. In short, there is not much in the way of scholarship on affective dimensions in writing center work, and what there is focuses primarily on the negative aspects of emotion—little of which based on empirical evidence. Also, much of that literature on emotion used metaphors with negative connotations to describe it.

This use is problematic because, as George Lakoff and Mark Johnson explain, "Metaphors may create realities for us, especially social realities. A metaphor may thus be a guide for future action. Such actions will, of course, fit the metaphor…. In this sense metaphors can be self-fulfilling prophecies" (156). In my examination of figures and metaphors, I rely on Lakoff and Johnson's definition of metaphor as "understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (5). Examining casual language about a topic can thus reveal how attitudes are informed by and perpetuate the metaphor and the paradigm it enables. Accordingly, such an examination in

discussions of emotion in writing center literature can reveal how we "live" emotion in the center—how we perceive, perform, and respond to it.

AMBIVALENCE AND METAPHOR

One of the prevailing themes throughout many of the articles posits emotion and reason as oppositional binaries that guide the subject in contrary ways, drawing on a variety of metaphors to describe emotion. According to this trope, emotion disrupts the ostensibly intellectual work of the session (Barnett [CI-A]; Dukes [CI-N]; Ware [CI-N]) or inhibits the Word/Logos or objectivity (Baker [AE-N]; Barnett [CI-A]; Major & Filetti [CI-A]; Mills [AE-A]). "Difficult" (or "problem") and "emotional" writers are often synonymous in this conception (Ware [CI-N]; Walker [CI-N]; Sherwood, 1992 [CI-N]). Not all of these articles equated emotion overall as disruptive, but rather focused on the role emotion (or a facet of emotion) played in disrupting a session. For example, in 1981's "Writing Lab as Crisis Center," Thomas Dukes shares an instance of a tutoring session with a young woman "held up by her need to vent her feelings" (4) [CI-N]. The metaphors informing this construction posit emotion as steam or heat, and the session a vehicle headed in a direction but held up by an overheated engine. To address this, Dukes recommends borrowing questioning methods from crisis centers to defuse student emotions before the session can truly begin. Here, reason and the verbal alleviate the pressure of the unspoken, of feeling.

The binary between reason and emotion in other articles can be seen in other metaphors as well. For example, in "The Reading Aloud 'aaahhhaaa,'" Kim Baker writes, "Having Lisa read to me enabled her to shift from emotion to reason as she concentrated..." (13) [AE-N]. According to this metaphor, reason and emotion are two mutually exclusive states somehow distinct from the subject, who in turn can "shift" between the two (a problematic if seemingly commonsensical position). As Baker explains, one of the benefits of her approach is that "having tutees read their own work out loud encourages independence and what many writing teachers refer to as 'owning your writing'" (13). This metaphor posits writing as something owned and authorized by writers by dint of reason. Writing here is not an ontological, heuristic, or inventional/discovery-oriented process but rather a product—that is, it produces a product that can be owned or reclaimed.

Discussions of emotion in the articles also often draw upon metaphors that render emotion as an object external to the psyche. That is, emotion has been posited as a possession in the same way that baggage, tools, or weapons, are: as something that can be directed and occasionally harnessed. Gillian Jordan, for example, discusses humor (when "used judiciously") as "an effective learning tool" (8) [AE-P]. Gayla Mills describes how for some indifferent writers, the act of going to the center is merely a task to be checked off a list, but asks, "what about for the others, the ones who *drag* their emotions through the door?" (10, emphasis mine) [AE-A]. Emotions—at least, negative emotions—are constructed here as a burden that can be discarded, but only if the subject so chooses.

Similarly, Sherwood ("Fear and Loathing") describes working with a student who, disapproving of Sherwood's suggestions, began to display his frustration affectively and overtly [CI-N]. Sherwood writes, "When my attempts to disarm him had failed, and fearing I might end the tutorial in a headlock, I suggested we continue the session another time" ("Fear and Loathing" 12, emphasis mine). This metaphor also manifests in Tracy Hudson's 2001 Tutor's Column titled "Head 'em Off at the Pass: Strategies for Handling Emotionalism in the Writing Center" [AE-N]. She shares an instance of how one of her strategies successfully "handled" emotionalism, stating, "This example shows how the tutor's actions *disarm* the student" (10, emphasis mine). In this conception, emotionalism is a weapon and the session a combat—at least until the weapon is removed from play. Seen together, these two instances from Sherwood and Hudson demonstrate how metaphors can be perpetuated and also the consequence of their use: all four of the Tutor's Columns take on the defensive stance toward emotion Lape warns about in tutor training manuals, and more, Hudson's column reproduces the very metaphor Sherwood used to continue to frame emotion in primarily negative terms. In short, the tutors producing these columns may internalize the metaphors practitioners and scholars use to describe emotion, and those metaphors may inform the stance they adopt in their sessions and in their discussions of sessions.

The general lack of scholarship on the affective and emphasis on the negative dimensions of emotion thus convey a certain unease or ambivalence about the subject. Unfortunately, such ambivalence can occlude the potentially generative work

that affective dimensions such as validation, humor, and even frustration perform in the tutorial. As researchers in fields such as cognition and psychology have shown, affective states are bound up in—and sometimes inseparable or indistinguishable from—cognitive and metacognitive processes (Barrett; Frijda). Similarly, work on student learning has demonstrated that affective states also play a role in problem-solving by adjusting cognitive processes (Clore and Huntsinger; D'Mello et al). So rather than being inherently disruptive or the opposite of reason, emotion actually plays an integral role in cognition.

Fortunately, other ways of understanding emotion are emerging in the literature. For example, in recent articles such as Lape's "Training Tutors in Emotional Intelligence" [CI-P], Wilson and Fitzgerald's "Empathic Tutoring in the Third Space," [CI-P], and Sherwood and Childers' "Mining Humor in the Writing Center" [CI-P], emotion is posited as an alternative way of knowing. In this sense, emotion offers another way to comprehend the world, one which can disclose certain truths that reason alone cannot. As Sherwood and Childers assert, "comical misunderstandings can lead to the sharing of laughter, which may…lead to fruitful changes in perspective" (6). Wilson and Fitzgerald draw upon this metaphor when they argue that "Although we must continue to acknowledge the professor as the audience of most of our tutees' papers, we believe writing centers must also empathize with the audience of essay prompts—our tutees—because they have much to teach us and the faculty" (11). Here, empathy and emotion open conversation and make critique available, evening out power structures. In particular, Wilson and Fitzgerald are interested in the role empathy plays in identifying biases (ethnocentric or heteronormative, for example) that might otherwise be rationalized, normalized, or otherwise rendered unavailable for commentary. Empathy thus acts as a way to both know the emotions of the tutee as well as one's own feelings and biases. Moreover, this knowledge can lead to agency. For example, drawing on psychologist Daniel Goleman's concept of emotional intelligence, Lape argues, "In light of the writing center mantra, empathy leads to self-efficacy in much the same way as better writers create better papers" (6). Unlike disruptive senses of emotion, this sense of emotion does not configure or conflate it as dependence or leading to dependence. Instead, fluency with emotion is necessary for independence.

CONCLUSION

Before concluding, I wish to assert that I do not intend to denigrate the work of the authors I analyze. Rather, much of the emphasis on the disruptive elements of emotion in these texts comes from a desire to account for and help others address disruptive behaviors in the center ethically and mindfully. However, my examination demonstrates the need for more empirical work and more nuanced examinations of affect and emotion in the writing center. Even with the emergence of newer and more encouraging ways to conceptualize emotion in the tutorial, we need to study and more adequately articulate the role it plays. If writers characterize an entire range of human experience in overly simplistic metaphors, those very metaphors may limit our ability to meaningfully engage that experience: "emotional" writers will continue to be "difficult" or "disruptive." If, on the other hand, we continue to cultivate and critically examine metaphors as shorthand to positively frame and identify the work of emotion, we may find new and exciting ways of conceiving that work.

1. These issues were current to the date of the writing of this article.

2. When I have cited a text that falls within these parameters, I have included two codes after each in brackets: the first corresponding to the sort of inquiry (CI=Conceptual Inquiry, EE=Empirical Evidence, AE=Anecdotal Evidence) and the second to its stance on emotion or affect (N=Negative, A=Ambivalent, P=Positive).

◆　◆　◆　◆　◆

Ady, Paul. "Fear and Trembling at the Center." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 12.8 (1988): 11-12. Web. 5 March 2015.

Baker, Kim. "The Reading Aloud 'aaahhhaaa': Helping Students Redirect Their Emotion and Reclaim Their Writing." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 24.1 (1999): 12-13. Web. 5 March 2015.

Barrett, Lisa Feldman. "Variety is the Spice of Life: A Psychological Construction Approach to Understanding Variability in Emotion." *Cognition & Emotion* 23.7 (2009): 1284-1306. Print.

Barnett, Robert. "The Invisible Couch in the Tutoring of Writing." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 20.4 (1995): 10-12. Web. 5 March 2015.

Bizzaro, Patrick and Hope Toler. "The Effects of Writing Apprehension on the Teaching Behaviors of Writing Center Tutors" *Writing Center Journal* 7.1 (1986): 37-45. Web. 5 March 2015.

Coan, J.A., J.M. Gottman. "The Specific Affect (SPAFF) Coding System." *Handbook of Emotion Elicitation and Assessment*. Ed. James A. Coan and John J.B. Allen. New York: Oxford UP, 2007. 106-23. Print.

Clore, Gerald. L., and Jeffrey R. Huntsinger. "How Emotions Inform Judgment and Regulate Thought." *Trends in Sciences* 11.9 (2007): 393-399. Print.

D'Mello, Sydney K., Blair Lehman, and Natalie Person. "Monitoring Affect During Effortful Problem Solving Activities." *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education* 20 (2010): 361-89. Print.

Driscoll, Dana, and Sherry Wynn Perdue. "Theory, Lore, and More: An Analysis of RAD Research in *The Writing Center Journal*, 1980-2009." *Writing Center Journal* 32.1 (2012): 11-39. Print.

Dukes, Thomas. "Writing Lab as Crisis Center: Suggestions for the Interview." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 5.9. (1981): 4-6. Web. 5 March 2015.

Frijda, Nico H. "Emotions, Individual Differences and Time Course: Reflections." *Cognition & Emotion*, 23.7 (2009): 1444-61. Print.

Hudson, Tracy. "Head 'em Off at the Pass: Strategies for Handling Emotionalism in the Writing Center." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 25.5 (2001): 10-12. Web. 5 March 2015.

Jordan, Gillian. "Humor in Tutorials." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 15.9 (1991): 8-10. Web. 5 March 2015.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980. Print.

Lape, Noreen. "Training Tutors in Emotional Intelligence: Toward a Pedagogy of Empathy." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 33.2 (2008): 1-6. Web. 5 March 2015.

Leahy, Richard. "When the Going is Good: Implications of 'Flow' and 'Liking' for Writers and Tutors." *Writing Center Journal* 15.2 (1995): 152-62. Web. 5 March 2015.

Major, James, and Jean S. Filetti. "'Type'-Writing: Helping Students Write with the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory." *Writing Lab Newslet*ter 15.4 (1990): 4-6. Print.

Mills, Ayla. "Preparing for Emotional Sessions." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 35.3-4 (2010): 10-13. Print.

Pemberton, Michael. "*The Writing Lab Newsletter* as History: Tracing the Growth of a Scholarly Community." *The Center Will Hold: Critical Perspectives on Writing Center Scholarship*. Ed. Michael Pemberton and Joyce Kinkead. Logan: Utah State UP, 2003. Print.

Sherwood, Steve. "Fear and Loathing in the Writing Center: How to Deal Fairly with Problem Students." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 16.8 (1992): 12-15. Print.

 - - - . "Humor and the Serious Tutor." *Writing Center Journal* 13.2 (1993): 3-12. Online.

Sherwood, Steve, and Pam Childers. "Mining Humor in the Writing Center: Comical Misunderstandings as a Pathway to Knowledge." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 38.7-8 (2014): 6-9. Print.

Walker, Kristin. "Difficult Clients and Tutor Dependency: Helping Overly Dependent Clients Become Independent Writers." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 19.8 (1995): 10-14. Print.

Ware, Elaine. "Crisis Intervention in the Writing Center." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 10.10 (1986): 5-8. Print.

Wilson, Nancy E., and Keri Fitzgerald. "Empathic Tutoring in the Third Space." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 36.9-10 (2012): 11-13. Print.

Tutors' Column: "Vocation in the Writing Center"

Jessica Jones, Lauren Becker, Alyssa Riley, and
Bridget Draxler

Monmouth College
Monmouth, Illinois

Between the ages of 18 and 22, we are faced with an important task: figuring out what we want to do with our lives. There is a lot of emphasis on finding a practical application for our skills and interests, but much less emphasis on finding what we can do that we will find meaningful and fulfilling. This is where vocation becomes part of the equation.

Vocation is, according to Frederick Buechner, "the place where your deep gladness and the world's deep hunger meet."[1] For many of us, the writing center is that place. And, we propose, our work in the writing center can also help us discover what we are called to do next. This essay advocates the writing center as a space for vocational discernment, which can simultaneously help tutors see their tutoring as a vocation and help tutors explore questions about their future in ways that may not be available to them elsewhere.

In 2012, the Monmouth College Writing Center launched a year-long series called "Vocation in the Writing Center." While vocation is sometimes framed as a faith-based calling, we approached vocational discernment as a conversation and as a process of listening to the exchange between an internal voice and a call from our communities. The program included guest speakers, reflection journals, hands-on activities, a personality test, a résumé tutorial, tutor-led discussions, and learning exchanges with vocation-themed courses.[2] From this variety of sources, we were able to define vocation and vocational discernment and discover how vocation applies to our roles as writing center tutors.

Vocation is a life path—not necessarily a specific career or job—that gives our lives meaning and fulfillment. Vocation is, to us, not only the work you are called to do, but also the person you are called to be. And, importantly, vocation is neither static nor

bound to a specific career. For example, some of us may be called to help children, but we could fulfill that calling as teachers, social workers, or daycare providers. Or, we might serve children through volunteer activities in our communities. There is more than one path that can satisfy a vocation, and we might find different expressions for a calling at different points in our lives. Inversely, one career path might fit different callings for different people. For instance, tutors in the writing center are drawn to this work for different reasons: a desire to help others, a love for language, or an aptitude to work collaboratively with others. Discovering why we tutor, can help us discern our vocation.

Our research started with the *Peer Writing Tutor Alumni Research Project* (PWTARP), directed by Harvey Kail, Paula Gillespie, and Bradley Hughes. *PWTARP*'s shift in focus from tutee to tutor as "student learner" has revolutionized study in the growing field of writing center training and administration. This research has paved the way for thinking about how tutoring and tutor training can be utilized as job preparation, skill development, and generally as a resume booster.

Like the *PWTARP* participants, tutors overwhelmingly agreed that being a tutor helped them to improve their writing and leadership skills, confidence, communication, teamwork, and ability to apply what they know. Students were also able to clearly articulate their personal growth. One respondent to our survey wrote: "As a tutor, one can learn to communicate with others, give constructive criticism, and handle challenging social situations. I have learned a lot about myself."

While previous research tends to focus on strategies for turning tutoring experience into careers, our initiative sought to explore the concept of vocation more deeply and to provide an opportunity for the tutors to find "a life of meaning and purpose."[3] We explored the writing center as a place to not only develop job skills, but also concepts of self-awareness, self-identify, and confidence.

Part of the "Vocation in the Writing Center" program included an Institutional Review Board-approved local and national survey about vocational discernment in the writing center. Current peer tutors were asked questions about their career goals, the effects of tutoring on the development of various skills for these goals, and how tutoring has led to vocational discernment or reaffirmation.

The writing center can serve various roles in students' process of vocational discernment, sometimes confirming tutors are on the right path, but sometimes showing them they belong elsewhere. When asked whether tutoring has helped them to discern their career goals, one tutor, a future teacher, wrote: "I feel like every time I help someone in the writing center I reaffirm that I have made the right decision." Another student commented, "I think that tutoring…has also affirmed that I need to be working with people." For students like these, the vocation series didn't help them find their vocation, but it was still valuable, building a bridge between their current work as tutors and their future careers.

Another tutor "strongly disagreed" that her experiences as a tutor "confirmed for me that I am on the right career path." The "Vocation in the Writing Center" events helped this student to discover that the career she planned to pursue wasn't related to her calling. However, the activities still played a valuable role in her discernment process by reorienting her from a mistaken path.

The students who remained undecided about their career paths also found unexpected value in the vocational discernment activities. For some, learning that there may be more than one career that would make them happy, or learning that vocational discernment is a lifelong process, offered reassurance. One tutor responded after having completed the "Vocation in the Writing Center" program that it "has shown me that it is okay not to have all the answers to what I want to do with my life. It has shown me that I will end up where I need to be."

Working together as a community was vital for the tutors as we began our journey of vocational discernment. We shared ideas along the way amongst the group, and the tutors were able to develop into role models for each other. In addition, the tutors could offer insights to each other about their strengths and abilities; we learned that sometimes others can see things about us that we can't see ourselves. In addition, we talked with guest speakers, some of whom went through several paths before finding their calling in life. One student said, "I feel like talking about it really helps but I don't have very many chances to share my worries with people. Also, I really liked to know that not everyone else has it all figured out yet either."

An unexpected result of our research has been the comfort we have provided many of our tutors in realizing they are not alone

on this journey of vocational discernment. In our research, we learned that tutors—even those who are confident in their future career path—are hungry for conversations about vocational discernment. We learned that vocational discernment is as much about discovering what isn't our calling as what is. We learned that for students whose path is unclear, reassurance for the journey is more important than a roadmap to the destination. And, we learned that vocational discernment is an individual process of reflection that is best done in community.

Our writing center community has benefited from the vocational discernment activities and our research. By seeing how our work in the writing center is both itself a vocation and also part of a longer path of vocational discernment, we have become more intentional and reflective in our work as tutors. In addition, the writing center is uniquely situated to support tutors on our paths of discernment, by offering both hands-on experience and a supportive community of reflection at an important moment in our lives. Our discussions on vocation have reframed the way we view our writers, our fellow tutors, and ourselves. It is a change, we think, for the better.

1. Frequently quoted, Buechner's definition here is taken from Edward P. Hahnenberg's *Awakening Vocation.* Liturgical P: Collegeville MN, 2010.

2. For information about the events, journals, and survey, visit our website <blogs.monm.edu/writingatmc/writing-center/vocation-in-the-writing-center/>.

3. This definition of vocation is taken from Monmouth College's academic programs page, and stems from Monmouth's membership in NetVUE (*Network for Vocation in Undergraduate Education*) since 2010.

◆   ◆   ◆   ◆   ◆

Kail, Harvey, Paula Gillespie, and Bradley Hughes. *The Peer Writing Tutor Alumni Research Project*. U. of Wisconsin-Madison. <www.writing.wisc.edu/pwtarp/>. Web.

Announcements

CFP: *WLN*: The Work of the Writing Center Director
Eds. Susan Mueller, Janet Auten and Alex Wulff. <wlnjournal.org/cfp1.pdf>

CFP: *WLN*: Sharing Common Ground: Writing Centers & Learning Centers
Eds. Hillory Oakes and Steven J. Corbett. <wlnjournal.org/cfp2.pdf>

REQUEST FOR UPDATES: The Writing Center Directory
Directory & Contact for Updates: <web.stcloudstate.edu/writeplace/wcd/>

JOB ANNOUNCEMENTS: <wlnjournal.org/jobs.pdf>
> **Writing Center Directors:** Elon University, Emory University's Oxford College, Lane Community College, University of Pennsylvania
> **Writing Studio Associate Director:** Fashion Institue of Technology

Calendar

National Conference on Peer Tutoring in Writing: Nov. 5-8, 2015
Little America Hotel (Salt Lake City, UT): "(De)Center: Testing Assumptions"
<ncptw2015.org>.

Southeastern Writing Center Association: Feb. 18-20, 2016
Columbus State Univ. (Columbus, GA): "Writing Center Inclusivity"
<www.iwca-swca.org/Conferences.html>.

Midwest Writing Center Association: Mar. 3-5, 2016
Doubletree Hotel. (Cedar Rapids, IA): "Seasons of Change"
<midwestwritingcenters.org/conference/2016/>.

South Central Writing Center Association: Mar. 10-12, 2016
Univ. of Louisiana at Lafayette: "Weaving Words, Knowledge & Action"
<scwca.net/conferences/2016-2/>.

East Central Writing Center Association: Mar. 18-19, 2016
Oakland University (Southfield, MI): Conference site: The Westin Southfield
Contact Sherry Wynn Perdue: <wynn@oakland.edu>.

Mid-Atlantic Writing Center Association: Mar. 18-19, 2016
Drexel Univ. (Philadelphia, PA): "Synergy, Innovation & the Writing Center"
<mawca.org/2016-Conference> **(Proposals Due Nov. 16).**

Northern Californial Writing Centers Association: Apr. 2, 2016
Santa Clara Univ. (Santa Clara, CA): "New Media, New Spaces"
<norcalwca.org/ncwca-conference-2016.html> **(Proposals Due Jan. 31).**

North East Writing Centers Association: Apr. 2-3, 2016
Keene State College (Keene, NH): "Reading Our Past, Writing Our Future"
<http://northeastwca.org/2016-conference> **(Proposals Due Dec. 18).**

Canadian Writing Centers Association: May 26-27, 2016
SAIT (Calgary, AB). <cwcaaccr.wordpress.com>.

European Writing Centers Association: July 8-10, 2016
Univ of Lodz (Poland). <www.writingcenters.eu>.

 WLNjournal

 wlnjournal