



# WRITING LAB NEWSLETTER



Vol. VII, No. 9 (May 1983)

Recently, a journal editor asked for a description of the WRITING LAB NEWSLETTER, a task which left me groping unsuccessfully for a few succinct phrases to characterize the newsletter. On one hand our group is diverse in that we teach in high schools, community colleges, universities, adult education centers, and even personnel training facilities in industry. Geographically we are spread out over all fifty states, Canada, Central America, and countries on other continents.

Yet we all seem to share common concerns such as training tutors, finding materials, and expanding services; and we seem particularly interested in reading descriptions of each other's labs. "My best source of new ideas," says one reader of these descriptions. Perhaps another reader described the newsletter best when he wrote, "The newsletter is our lab's most valuable asset because it serves as our communication link to others in this corner of the profession." Obviously, we owe a hearty thanks to all the authors of newsletter articles for performing this valuable service!

While this month's issue focuses on tutor training and peer tutoring, forthcoming issues next year will contain articles on the use of error analysis in writing labs, videotapes for tutor training, writing contests in the lab, the writing lab library, a survey of peer tutoring programs--and more. So, stay tuned.... And keep sending your articles, announcements, reviews, names of new members, and \$5 yearly donations (in checks made payable to Purdue University) to me:



Muriel Harris, editor  
WRITING LAB NEWSLETTER  
Dept. of English  
Purdue University  
West Lafayette, Ind. 47907

## PEER TUTORS AND THE BENEFITS OF COLLABORATIVE LEARNING

Over the past several years, when I've asked the peer tutors I train and supervise to describe the benefits they think they derive from tutoring, the answer, whether in conversation or in the tutors' logs, is invariably the same. The tutors say the greatest benefits are the satisfaction of helping their peers and the way tutoring helps them learn the subject matter at hand more thoroughly. What I try to do is push the tutors another step, to see that they are learning because they are helping their peers. To put both parts of the equation together, I would say that the most important benefit peer tutors gain is that they become more effective learners by becoming collaborative learners.

Now the benefits tutors derive from their experience in tutoring depend in large part on the role they play in a tutoring program. I supervise peer tutors in a range of disciplines--math, business, nursing, the social sciences, music, as well as writing and literature. What I find is that to the extent students serve as adjuncts to the classroom, administering drills, remediating, and so, they are really not peer tutors but lab aides, operating as someone else's agent, as part of the academic hierarchy. And to that extent, they are cut off from the source of collaborative learning, the spontaneous mutual aid of student culture. The promise of peer tutoring is that it draws on this source, to do work and to bring peer influence to bear on learning.

In this regard, the collaborative learning that takes place in peer tutoring is nothing new. It is grounded in peer relationships inside and outside of the classroom, the shared status of being undergraduates. Peer

tutoring formalizes and builds upon the unofficial study groups, the self-help circles that students have always formed. Large, introductory, and required courses in particular seem to unionize students to study and learn together voluntarily.

What is new, I think, is extending these forms of collaborative learning to writing. I remember, for example, studying with dormmates for the Western Civ course all of us were required to take in our freshman year, but I have no recollection whatsoever of working collaboratively on freshman comp. If Western Civ was seen as a collective problem permitting a collective response, writing was apparently an individual problem, private and displaced from the informal network of mutual aid. Peer tutoring in a writing center is an attempt to overcome the isolation of writing by channeling this spontaneous mutual aid toward the task of writing. What I am suggesting is that if one of the sources of peer tutoring is located in the folkways of student culture, it takes conscious action to mobilize peer influence in writing. It doesn't seem to emerge naturally, as study groups do, but in fact requires an organized form, the writing center, and the interest of writing professionals in socializing the process of learning to write. This convergence of the spontaneous mutual aid rooted in student culture and of the growing professional consciousness of the importance of peer response, group inquiry, and collaborative learning defines the peer tutor's role in developing a social context for learning and writing.

To understand the kind of learning that takes place in such a context and the way in which it differs from other forms of learning, it is worthwhile looking at the conversation that occurs in study groups and peer tutoring. The first thing to notice is that the talk is not the language of instruction, imparting information from a professional authority to auditors. The information is already there, brought by both tutor and tutee, and the talk between them concerns how to interpret that information, to find its significance, and to make it meaningful. What peers do, whether in study groups or in tutoring, is to compare their understandings, verifying, modifying, or rejecting their original comprehension in light of a peer's response.

Tutors and tutees work collaboratively to arrive at a shared language. Collaborative learning is a process of reaching consensus on the language needed to solve problems, to deal with the task at hand. This is not official, academic language, the terminology of grammar, usage, and style, but an approach to it, a transitional language used to acquire fluency in academic language. The language peers generate consensually goes beyond the discrete and static information given to disclose knowledge as an active construction, created by mutual assent. The learning that takes place is social and interactive rather than atomized and directed exclusively toward performance for an evaluator. And because of this, the tutee is as likely as the tutor to supply the language necessary, the language that consolidates learning.

Peers not only learn together. Just as important, the language they generate helps them to know that they are learning--a critical step in turning information into knowledge. Behaviorist learning psychology, of course, stresses the need for immediate reinforcement of correct learning behavior. Programmed texts, computer assisted instruction, and self-paced modules all rely on the use of feedback to confirm the learner's recognition of correct responses from frame to frame, page to page. Peer tutoring provides feedback, a reader for the student writer. But it also provides a new dimension to learning, a form of social organization that activates the energy of the peer relationship to do work collaboratively. Peer tutoring organizes fellow students in a conversation that creates the conditions for learning, a collaborative exchange that shifts the initiative and responsibility from teacher to learner. It's not just that peer tutors are less threatening than instructors because the tutors are less identified with academic authority. This is true but more important the peer relationship makes another kind of authority possible, the authority that collaborative learners invest in the knowledge they have put into words, the authority they invest in each other. The demand made of peer tutors (as well as the major benefit of collaborative learning) is not simply to explain something--what are subjects and verbs, similes and metaphors--but to explain something to someone, to arrive at an understanding based on mutual assent.

This certainly helps the tutors learn to write. Their sense of audience and purpose is often quite acute, shaped as it is by dialogue with their peers. But the demands and rewards of peer tutoring also contribute to the tutors' education in a wider sense. Students who become peer tutors are as a rule highly skilled academic performers--they are independent learners, they get good grades, they know how to "psych out" a course, they are used to pleasing their instructors. Peer tutoring gives them the opportunity--in fact requires them--to step out of this role of performer, a role created by the social dynamics and prevailing reward structure of schooling. By collaborating with their peers, tutors begin to see learning and knowledge as more than individual achievements. Learning becomes for them the product of social and collaborative interaction. And this ability to work and learn collaboratively is a highly marketable skill these days. As K. Patricia Cross says, "When schools took their present form, self-sufficiency and independence were virtues that had survival value in a pioneer society. Today, survival may be related more to one's ability to cooperate with others than to go it alone."<sup>1</sup>

The benefits of peer tutoring, then, may challenge some of the traditional goals of liberal education, in particular the emphasis placed on autonomy and self-sufficiency. Ken Bruffee did an interesting study of a class of peer tutors at Brooklyn College, using Douglas H. Heath's Perceived Self Questionnaire to test tutors at the beginning and the end of a semester.<sup>2</sup> The results are tentative but fascinating. They indicate that in most areas of social, intellectual, and emotional maturation tested by the questionnaire the peer tutors showed real growth. In two areas, however, autonomy and attitude toward oneself, the scores went down. Bruffee argues, "What from one perspective looked like students who had become somewhat less autonomous and self-confident, looked from another perspective like students who had become somewhat less cock-sure they were always right, students who had become better prepared to consider other people's feelings, opinions, and needs along with their own." This is a powerful conclusion, in part because it suggests that peer tutors not only develop and mature but also that they change--that their perceptions of themselves, their peers, and the process of learning change as a result of tutoring. And in this sense, the peer tutors take a step toward

transcending the traditional notion of learning as an autonomous performance measured by an external authority-- toward an awareness that learning and knowledge, as Bruffee says, "emanates instead from ourselves in thoughtful collaboration with others."

John Trimbur  
Community College of  
Baltimore

1. Accent on Learning (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 124.
2. "Collaborative Learning: The Educational Dimensions of Peer Tutoring," unpublished.



#### APPLYING LEARNING PRINCIPLES IN DEVELOPMENTAL WRITING

In its fourth year of offering the developmental writing student a lab course consisting entirely of one-on-one instruction, Mt. Hood Community College has an enviable record. From two-thirds to three-fourths of the students who enroll in Writing 10, Basic Writing Skills, successfully complete the course. Considering that these are students whose standard score was below 45 in the Comparative Guidance and Placement Program, who did not complete high school, or who failed previous writing courses, Writing 10's record is impressive.

Not only do the Writing 10 students usually succeed in mastering basic writing skills, they also usually enjoy learning them. Typical comments taken from student course evaluations are: "Feel better able now to take on the wild world of English. Enjoyed the course."

"This class was very helpful to me. I thought I knew a lot about writing before I started, but his class opened a lot of unopened doors. It has helped me understand writing and at the same time made it fun. I like working at my own speed yet having friendly instructors nearby to help me out."

"My best spent \$63 of the year."

"I always thought I hated writing, but after this class it made it more enjoyable for me."

Of course, not everyone finds it fun: "It sure hasn't been fun and I thought I would never get out of this and would have to drop but I maid (sic) it. Thank God."

Mt. Hood's writing lab integrates techniques and approaches found to be successful in other lab programs:

1. The lab is easily accessible allowing privacy without cramping. It is quiet, bright, and cheerful with resource material conveniently stored for students and instructors.

2. Students attend the lab four scheduled hours weekly. Many students lack even basic habits such as capitalizing the beginning of sentences. Some do not know how to form cursive b's and y's. Others have seldom written complete sentences. Acquiring these writing skills is similar to learning to play a piano. A piano student progresses faster by practicing half-an-hour daily than he does by practicing four hours once a week. Therefore, students are scheduled for no more than a two-hour block twice a week and are encouraged to schedule one-hour blocks four times a week when possible.

3. The student learns at his own pace. Each who regularly attends receives a satisfactory grade. If that student does not complete the objectives of the course in one term, he receives three credits for the course with the stipulation that he reregister the following term to complete the course. Few students have neglected to do this.

4. Students write entire sentences as they study specific skills, thereby strengthening sentence sense, spelling, and punctuation. Writing complete sentences also exposes students to varieties of sentence patterns and subordination devices.

5. Each student has a visible record of his progress in a personal folder where his assignments, completed work, and test scores are kept. He can easily compare his diagnostic test score in a writing area such as punctuation with his test score after studying that area.

6. The lab is set up for instructors to use over-the-shoulder instruction. Thus, instructors can advise the student while he is writing as recommended by Shaughnessy in

Errors and Expectations. This prevents students repeating mistakes throughout an exercise and prevents frustration when the final paper is reviewed.

7. The writing lab instructors have been chosen for their diversified skills--instructors who are sensible about language and sensitive to students, respecting the oral articulation of the student and listening carefully before responding to questions. They communicate their interest in each student through greeting him by name, monitoring his work, and responding to his progress. The writing lab also strives to find instructors who have commonality of philosophy. Extreme varieties of approaches in lab writing can cause confusion for students and can produce dissension among staff.

8. The resource materials and the supplementary assignments are consistent in terminology with the course text. Mt. Hood uses Feinstein's Programed Writing Skills, which is "simple in its presentation of concepts and lively in its use of humor" according to a recent curriculum committee study. Instructors avoid using intimidating grammatical terms, yet they respond enthusiastically when asked questions such as, "Is the subjective case the same as the nominative case in my mother's grammar book?"

9. At least one instructor for every ten to twelve students allows the individual attention needed by the beginning writer. Each section is limited to thirty students. This provides the student with assistance usually as soon as requested. The wait is seldom as long as three minutes.

10. The student is given a sense of continuity of the basic writing skills into the standard college courses. He is advised to take another course immediately following completion of Writing 10. Usually he is ready to take Writing 120, the preparatory course for college composition, or English 28, the communication skills course required for vocational programs. A small number of students--usually foreign students or disadvantaged students--require extra practice in composition. For them, Mt. Hood offers Writing 20, another lab course based on the same learning principles as Writing 10. Regardless of which course will meet the student's need, he is urged to take it the next term.

In Mt. Hood's Writing 10 lab, the student

receives help when he needs it. He practices writing frequently for short intervals during a ten week term. He corrects mistakes immediately without being penalized. He regularly experiences success as he writes. He works closely with instructors who respect him. Applying these established learning principles has resulted in a successful developmental writing program.

Patricia Hangartner  
Mt. Hood Community  
College

---

---

### A READER ASKS...

As a director of a new writing center, I am seeking ideas, materials, and advice in areas of hand-outs for students and tutor training.

I will arrange to pay postage on any large envelopes and promise prompt response to any communications.



Thanks you,

Louise Smith  
English Dept.  
NVCC-Loudoun  
Sterling, VA 22170

---

---

### WHAT A PEER TUTOR IS NOT

For the past four years, I have served as coordinator of the Writing Resources Center, a drop-in tutorial service at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. One of my responsibilities as coordinator is to teach a credit-bearing course designed to train the graduate and undergraduate tutors who staff our writing center. I also tutored along with that staff, primarily to convince them that I had more than a nodding acquaintance with the problems confronting writing tutors. And I encouraged my colleagues on the English faculty to demonstrate their support for our center by volunteering some of their time as tutors. Recently, however, I have begun to question the wisdom of faculty participation--as tutors--in a service which promises to provide its clients with an intelligent, sympathetic, and non-threatening audience against whom they could measure their writing effectiveness.

My reservation about mixing faculty with

peer tutors is based on the premise that college-age writers are often more receptive to the opinions of their peers than to the remarks made by faculty tutors. When I show a tutee how his or her writing is wordy and how it might be revised, my comments are greeted with yawning indifference, passive-aggressive acquiescence and head-bobbing ("Yes; Yes; I know; Right; Yes; Uh-huh; Uh-huh," etc.), or open hostility ("Get off my case, will ya!"). When peer tutors offer the same criticism and advice, their comments are listened to, often with considerable attention. James Moffett has shown that the "significance of the responder influences a writer tremendously" and, for many adolescent writers, the most significant responders to their work are their peers.

Because they meet particular psychological and social needs, peer tutors have an advantage over faculty tutors in gaining student confidence and establishing rapport. The social contract between peer tutor and writing-center client is markedly different than that between faculty tutor and client. And that difference may depend not so much on what peer tutors are, but rather on what they are not.

While peer tutors need to be competent, reasonably sophisticated writers, they clearly are not professionals. As Ken Bruffee points out, "tutors' mastery as writers is not expected to precede their work as tutors, but to grow with it." That is, peer tutors are still amateurs actively engaged in the process of learning to improve their own writing. The same might be said for faculty tutors (the process is never wholly mastered). But we are not perceived as learners by our tutees, who imagine that major academic and commercial publishing houses are constantly vying for our every written word. (Oh, that it were true!).

Because they share some uncertainty about writing with their tutees, peer tutors are less intimidating and more easily perceived as genuine collaborators in a learning effort. Their novice status causes tutees to expect peer tutors to work together with them on a writing problem rather than taking the problem over. Hence, when a peer tutor says something like, "Let's try rearranging the structure and see what happens," the remark is seen as genuine. When a faculty tutor says it, the remark may be perceived as a patronizing gimmick ("This teacher already knows what's going to happen. Why's he

playing games with me?"). Moreover, because peer tutors are not viewed as writing experts--as professional editors or ghost writers, the expectations of their clients and the faculty who refer them are comfortably diminished. Since both tutee and tutor are seen as engaged in a learning process, pressure on the tutors is relieved; they need not feel accountable for working miracles with clients (as some faculty tutors, wanting to demonstrate their competence to their own peers, might feel compelled to do).

Just as the fact that peer tutors are not experts works to their advantage, so too does the fact that they are not seen as teachers of English with all the concomitant stigma that vocation carries with it. (If you doubt that such a stigma exists, just recall the embarrassed reactions you get when you tell people what you do for a living. You know your colleagues in physics and history don't get those reactions.) Most tutees will concede that writing is a transaction with other people. But, in their minds, English teachers do not fit into the category of "other people." We are alien beings, hatched full grown from the pages of the Harbrace Handbook, red pencil in hand, predisposed by genes and training to approach writing in a way that no normal person would. We are perceived always as evaluators, judges, censors. In the eyes of our tutees, when English teachers read literature, they look for "hidden meanings"; when they read student writing, English teachers look for no meaning, but devote themselves to ferreting out squinting modifiers, comma splices, bifurcated propositions, and whatever spare marginal space will allow for an occasional frag or awk. Such a perception is fostered in part by the jargon we English teachers use to talk about the language our students have been using all their lives. Many writing center clients believe that we use that jargon as a weapon to intimidate them, to keep them in their place. To them, real people--meaning anyone who does not teach English--do not use that jargon and get along just fine in life. And, since students recognize that English teachers are a decided minority in the world, they ultimately learn to take most of what we say with a healthy chunk of salt.

Peer tutors, on the other hand, are not English teachers; in fact, some are not even English majors. Hence, even when they appropriate the language of academe to talk

about their clients' writing, what they say is more credible, less suspect. When I tell a tutee that his or her thesis is unfocused, I get a "Yeah-Yeah-I-knew-you-were-going-to-say-that;-it's-your-job" look. When a peer makes the same comments, the client is more apt to accommodate his or her writing to the response given. I do warn peer tutors to consider the possible alienating effects of the language they use to discuss student papers. But even when they do use English-teacher talk, they succeed where I do not. In fact, in using that language with their clients, peer tutors help to initiate their tutees into the academic language community. Undoubtedly, this is because these tutors--who are at least moderately successful students--are accessible role models whose language tutees would be more willing to emulate than that of their professors.

Of course it may not be so much the prejudice against us as English teachers that impedes faculty-tutor success, but rather the fact that we are, by profession, teachers. Peer tutors are decidedly not teachers, and it is this fact that contributes most significantly toward their success.

A major factor in any tutor-client relationship is the extent to which the client associates the tutor with institutional authority. Regardless of what our real power is within our institutions, students often invest teachers with considerable authority. And students tend to be either overly dependent upon that authority or resentful of it--or both. From the time a student enters school, the teacher is viewed as a surrogate parent. For a while, the association of teacher with parents is comforting to students. But as they mature, students seek independence, and this search often takes the form of rebellion against parental and, by extension, teacher authority. Once adolescents realize that parents are fallible, they begin to question the legitimacy of any situation wherein a parent adopts an "I'm okay; you're not okay" attitude. When a faculty tutor offers advice, no matter how well-intentioned, a student may regard that advice as parental chastisement. For that student, the roles are clearly drawn: fault-finding parent vs. bungling child. It's a can't win situation and the student is bound to resent it. Just as an adolescent will often perversely ignore or challenge parental authority, so too will a student ignore or challenge the advice of teachers. Or, perhaps worse, a student will become so blindly



applies these skills to content reading. Activities are provided to increase comprehension and to raise the reading level on national standardized reading tests.

International Student Communication Program -- The International Student Communication Program works on writing with the goal of concise, precise sentences developed within the context of the paragraph. Students are also encouraged to work with the Writing Lab.

Basic Math -- Two programs are offered. The first is designed to brush up on math for the G.R.E. and G.M.A.T. tests. The second is to reacquaint students with a broad spectrum of math terms, then review, through brief examples and exercises, math concepts.

Spelling Lab -- The Spelling Lab emphasizes the most applicable spelling rules. Frequently misspelled words are a further concentration. Tests for departments with spelling requirements are also administered, checked, and reported.

"How to Succeed in College" -- A workshop for 150 area high school seniors covering: Learning Style, College Writing, College Reading, Time Management, Memorizing, Note-taking, and Test-taking.

GRE/GMAT Workshops -- Verbal and math skills are reviewed and test-taking techniques are analyzed.

We are part of Intellectual Skills Develop which is a University-wide effort to include proficiency in the intellectual skills as part of the meaning of the baccalaureate degree. This is being done through new requirements in skills courses and through efforts to integrate and reinforce skills development throughout the curriculum.

We want to exchange information on these programs as well as activities that exist or are being developed in other institutions. If you are interested in receiving the first MAASD newsletter, please write to Karen LaRoe, Director, Center for Educational Opportunity, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008.



## CALL FOR PROPOSALS

Proposals sought for "Speaking of English," annual conference for about 100 English teachers in northern western Indiana high-schools and middle schools. The conference will run from about 8 a.m. - 2 p.m. on Thursday October 27, 1983 at Valparaiso Student Union Building, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso Indiana.

Conference participants like fifty minute sessions that touch on both classroom methods and research. Some possibility for workshop sessions exists. Send by June 1st a brief summary or outline of your session and your teaching experience to:

Joyce Hicks, English Department  
Valparaiso University  
Valparaiso, IN 46383

This popular conference is sponsored by The Indiana Council of The Teachers of English and Valparaiso University English Department.

---

---

### ENSURING THE SUCCESS OF A NEW WRITING CENTER PROGRAM

Successfully establishing and continuing the operation of a writing center (or laboratory) will be in a large measure achieved by the university community's being kept informed about the details of the center's operation through unsolicited documentation and reports. The tutorial or workshop effectiveness in improving student compositions determines the success of the program, since the primary focus of any center must be on improving the students' writing abilities. But one must first ensure the survival of the center. In the Writing Lab Newsletter of January, 1981, Professor Gary Brienzo, the director of a writing laboratory which was closed because of budget cuts, stated, as a word of warning, that "regardless of how you measure 'success,' publicize the fact. This may be done publicly or, perhaps more importantly, within the administrative network of your school. To clarify, I mean by 'publicize' more than just word-of-mouth notice and praise; accolades, even from students, sometimes do not speak as loudly as figures submitted to college board members, figures often submitted in unsolicited writing center reports. As a new writing center director who inherited a low student case load, I belatedly learned the importance of 'blowing my own horn....'"



The documentation, reports, and so forth employed in establishing and maintaining the writing center at North Texas State University can be classified under eight headings:

## I. Proposal

- A. Studying the general writing situation
- B. Compiling the information and writing the report
- C. Establishing the writing center
  - 1. Organization and staffing
  - 2. Physical arrangements
  - 3. Cost of operation for the first year

## II. Policies

- A. An autonomous operation directly under the office of the Academic Vice-President, with a paperwork chain-of-command through the Dean of Arts and Sciences
- B. Purpose to help students improve writing skills generally, not to help with specific course assignments
- C. Generally not open to freshman English students, except for special problems and workshops
- D. Attempt to attract students across as broad a curriculum area as possible, both native and international
  - 1. Students in all degree programs and majors encouraged to apply
  - 2. Upper division and graduate students encouraged to apply

## III. Budget

- A. During the first year and a half of operation, budgeting accomplished through the English Department which provided support
  - 1. Physical facilities
  - 2. Released time for the director
  - 3. Xerox and mimeographing facilities
- B. During the second year of operation, a separate budget

established

- 1. Permanency allowed planning and development
- 2. Secretarial reclassification necessitated and achieved
- 3. Some of the released time for the director provided by the University in order not to burden the English Department
- 4. Travel fund for the director established

## IV. Records of day-to-day operation

- A. Scheduling, students and tutors
- B. Student application
- C. Student reminder
- D. Monthly schedule
- E. Suggested assignment schedule
- F. Record of errors
- G. Conferences with professor/ advisor and follow-up
- H. Student evaluation of program
- I. Workshops

## V. Statistical reports

- A. Fall semester
- B. Spring semester
- D. Summer sessions

## VI. Coordination and interest within the University

- A. Liaison with the University Writing Committee
- B. Liaison with departments
- C. Letters

## VII. Publicity

- A. Newspaper coverage
- B. Brochures and posters
- C. Miscellaneous
  - 1. Catalog entry
  - 2. Memoranda
  - 3. Master list of advisors

## VIII. Future plans

- A. Modest growth, maintaining two students per tutor and small workshops
- B. Faculty workshops
- C. Possible use of audio-visual and computer-assisted instruction

The Writing Center at North Texas State University, now in its third year of operation, has helped a number of students improve the quality of their writing. This improvement is evidenced in student responses such as the following:

This tutorial program is excellent for students who need to brush up on writing skills. I thought my writing skills could not be improved until I started writing better under the supervision of my tutors.

It made me realize how much I had forgotten concerning the writing of essays. I feel as though the tutors did an excellent job of guiding me through areas I had weaknesses in.

In my belief, the tutorial program at NTSU is a terrific one, and the reason is simple. When I took the program, I had already failed English 131 twice, but after the sessions, I received an A in 131 and am currently getting the same types of grades in 132. The program worked! All of the tutors who helped me along were of the highest

quality and really cared; the fact that they cared was probably a prime motivation in my drive to success. Although I will probably not be an English major, I can safely say that every tutor I had knew their business. Many thanks for catapulting me from the deep, dark depths of despair to the clouds of ecstasy.

Further evidence is manifested, for example, in the sheer numbers of students helped--in 1981, 542 students were tutored for a total of 2249.5 contact hours of tutoring. I believe that the success of the NTSU Writing Center in helping students to improve their writing skills has only been possible by providing to as broad a spectrum of the university community as possible the details of the writing center's operation through unsolicited documentation, reports, and so forth. As Professor Gary Brienzo concludes, "So, publicize the success you have in your writing center and the good you're doing the students of your college or university. The publicity will help many more people than the writing center staff."

William B. Warde, Jr.  
North Texas State  
University

-10-

WRITING LAB NEWSLETTER  
Muriel Harris, editor  
Dept. of English  
Purdue University  
West Lafayette, IN. 47907

