THE WRITING LAB

– FROM THE EDITOR –

This issue of *WLN* begins with Joe Essid's account of confronting a very real and growing problem of how changing priorities of institutions can threaten the writing center's existence. Essid's response was to consider—and act on—the need for curricular change and integration of the writing center he directs into the new programs. He concludes with a close look at their programmatic assessment.

To lighten the mood and stave off misunderstandings, Steve Sherwood and Pam Childers suggest that we consider the advantages of encouraging humor and laughter in the writing center.

Also included in this issue are two book reviews, the first a review by Suzan Aiken of Dawn Fels and Jennifer Wells' book on high school writing centers. Emphasizing the importance of context, Aiken also calls attention to chapters that are appropriate for college-level writing centers. In Daniel Lawson's review of an essay collection on supporting faculty writing, he focuses most closely on the chapters particularly relevant for writing centers—how centers can and should be involved with facilitating faculty writing.

Our Tutor's Column essay in this issue, by Ashley Moore, reflects on a student response most tutors will recognize: the writer's sense of "early closure," of being done once there's a draft in hand.

Finally, for those of us journeying to the CCCC conference in Indianapolis, in March, I look forward to continuing these conversations at the IWCA Collaborative. See you there, and safe travels!

✦ *Muriel Harris, editor*

EXTENDING AN ALTERNATIVE: WRITING CENTERS AND CURRICULAR CHANGE

✦ *Joe Essid*
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA

When our Writing Center staked its reputation and perhaps its survival on a proposal to change our first-year curriculum, we entered territory that would have been unthinkable to those in our field a few decades ago. Writing center directors and peer tutors may not like it, but the climate now is very different from the salad days of the 1980s, when scholars such as Tilly and John Warnock argued "it is probably a mistake for centers to seek integration into the established institution" (22). In both the United States and EU nations, we face curricular change driven by emerging technologies, administrative fiat, austerity programs at the national level, American state-house "quality assurance," local institutional assessment, and even outsourcing to private firms. In today's universities, focused on measurable outcomes and fiscal solvency, unless one has an ongoing and secure source of funding, it would be foolhardy not to seek such integration.

Consider what can happen to our programs. In 2006, John Harbord's successful writing center at Central European University in Budapest, in potential competition with departmental writing instructors for institutional support, only survived thanks to "the support of influential faculty, the appropriate use of statistical evidence to support our case," and the Writing Program Award for Excellence at the Conference on College Composition and

Communication. The pressures on campuses also threaten programs long allied with writing centers; Martha Townsend used a strategy like Harbord's to save the campus WAC program at her institution, the University of Missouri, even as well-respected programs such as the University of Michigan's English Composition Board got dismantled (45-46). We have journeyed far, and over rough terrain, since Stephen North changed our field with his 1984 manifesto, "The Idea of a Writing Center." At that time, U. S. higher education still reeled and benefited from the cultural upheavals of the '60s and '70s. Experimentation was not only possible but demanded. Faced with a different reality today, our centers cannot pretend to dwell in a halcyon past.

Our program's role in curricular change, grounded in campus realpolitik, provides a starting point for others seeking autonomy in difficult times. In our case, claiming that writing instruction during the first year could be done better meant that we were no longer, in North's terms, an alternative to the classroom. North himself rethought this position in 1994, with "Revisiting 'The Idea of a Writing Center.'" In it, he calls for us to abandon a "delicate and carefully distanced relationship between classroom teachers and the writing center" (16). That abandonment becomes inevitable when a center and its staff voice their opinions about the messy business of an undergraduate curriculum. For directors, this suggests lots of new and challenging work; for peer tutors it means something very different. Striving for excellence with writers becomes no longer ethically correct but also essential to a program's survival. Tutors also become ambassadors to newly attentive faculty, administrators, and boards of trustees.

A CENTER'S CENTRALITY AND MERGER WITH A WAC PROGRAM

The term "writing center" holds rhetorical power not lost on stakeholders in campus debates about curriculum and student development (McQueeny 16-17). At the same time, an idea by our long-serving Writing Program Director, the late Greg Colomb, may guide writing centers as well. He proposed leveraging an institutional "franchise" for writing programs to shape curriculum. "Franchise" may call to mind a fast-food outlet, but Colomb argued not for blandness but instead a limited mandate that "conveys the right to use a public property or perform a public function; it does not convey ownership" (23). Our center's public function has long been assisting student writers as they struggle with the demands of the academy.

For two decades, we performed this function by employing undergraduate Writing Consultants in both North's ideal center, where tutors talk to writers, and in a WAC program. Using techniques pioneered by Tori Haring-Smith at Brown and Thomas Blackburn at Swarthmore in the 1980s, our "Writing Fellows" worked in individual courses, about 40 sections annually (Hickey). Along the way we discarded the terms "tutor" and "Fellow" for "Consultant," to have a capitalized title that, on our campus, accrues the sort of ethos one associates with "Professor" or "Director." Our Consultants have been the public face of writing assistance and recruiters of new Consultants. All the while, in partnership with the Director, they must retain the good will of faculty. Any successes and mistakes they or the Director make reflect upon the entire program.

HOW OUR MODEL WORKS

Consultants dedicate between 45 and 60 hours per semester reading first drafts, at least twice, for about 15 writers in a single section, usually a course for first-year or second-year students. These writers may seek additional help at the Writing Center, as do many others not in a WAC class. For WAC, however, we urge faculty to make the meetings mandatory and to bring Consultants to class at least a few times when assignments get discussed. A few faculty do not, and enforcement with tenured colleagues is difficult. Violators simply do not get Consultants again. Consultants in classes respond with written commentary using techniques acquired in a semester-long training course. They hold one-to-one meetings, and then writers revise before submitting final drafts to faculty. These practices help our program by "forming social alliances and finding new identities" (Murphy and Law 140). As Director, I began to find myself

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

talking more about writing with faculty in Dance or Biology than I ever did in the Humanities departments that had once sent the most students to the Writing Center. As students from these new departments become Consultants, they provide knowledge of the rhetorical strategies and forms of writing common in fields not heavily represented in years past. In the best cases, partnership with a faculty member has turned a Consultant into a "knowledgeable writing specialist" playing a role in faculty development, as Rita Malenczyk and Lauren Rosenberg describe in their article. As in their center, our Consultants "participate in pedagogical conversations along with first-year instructors" (6) during faculty workshops and personal meetings. The Director intervenes when needed to resolve logistical advice or interpersonal conflicts between faculty, writers, and Consultants. These arrangements served us well when radical change arrived.

NEW LEADERSHIP, NEW CURRICULUM

Our new president, an award-winning teacher and historian who boldly stated that he planned to teach first-year students, challenged us to make our curriculum for them "innovative." With some trepidation, and sure to alienate some old friends, our Writing Center staked its professional reputation on the side of the President's call. A first goal involved looking for models, beyond composition, that could strengthen writing instruction during the first year. A second goal involved finding incentives for faculty across the curriculum to teach in a new program. It helped expedite matters that I, the Writing Center Director, also ran the first-year composition program. In meeting with Writing Consultants and WAC faculty, we noted how our old curriculum, focused on a Core Course with much emphasis on close reading and a great deal of writing, offered little writing instruction. Meanwhile, our first-year composition course, taught by adjuncts, had long been slated for major revisions, if not elimination.

With advice from stakeholders, I began to study the first-year, writing-intensive seminar programs. They permit faculty from many fields to teach a favored topic that might not be available inside a major's course offerings. Many of our interviewees had shown enthusiasm for just such a change. During our campus visits to other programs, both students and faculty showed us the critical need for intervention during the first year. At Cornell, we learned how anthropologist Keith Hjortshoj discovered "illusions of academic continuity between high school and college" among first-year students (6). A first-year curriculum provides a natural location for dispelling these illusions. Otherwise, students will only continue to "imagine that they are prepared" (Hjortshoj 7). On the other coast, we found that Stanford's

> *"Our program's role in curricular change, grounded in campus realpolitik, provides a starting point for others seeking autonomy in difficult times."*

Hume Writing Center has long employed the phrase "culture of writing" (Stanford). We discovered that in Colomb's terms it is a franchise, albeit a very effective one, employing and adapting to the local setting a set of slowly derived best-practices. Students working in the program marketed it and held workshops. We had only done this sporadically at our Center over the years.

I'd hardly unpacked my bags after visiting other schools when I began e-mailing more colleagues and Writing Consultants to share what they would like in a new curriculum. Consultants wanted connections between the existing first-year courses and the rest of the curriculum. Here the Consultants' remarks closely echoed the concerns of faculty seeking a change from the old curriculum. The concept of first-year seminars found support among senior colleagues eager to teach something new, technologists hoping to see more new-media practices in the classroom, librarians seeking to integrate information fluency into courses, and faculty who had benefitted from working with the Writing Center. Two assumptions guided our lobbying for a revised curriculum. Faculty, even those partisans of the old curriculum, are colleagues of good will. Second, if treated with dignity and respect, all faculty can write excellent assignments and provide effective commentary on drafts. Over the years, it became clear that our faculty know a great deal about writing, even if they would not consider themselves competent to teach writing as a process.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

My Assistant Director and I drafted a proposal for two seminars, one per semester, to replace Core and the composition course. This proposal went before a task force on first-year education and emerged with surprisingly few changes after a full semester of open meetings and debates. As a key element in helping faculty new to writing, we made the assignment of an undergraduate Writing Consultant the default option for every seminar. In the end, it won after two rounds of faculty voting. We had changed the curriculum. What next?

YEAR ONE: RESPONSES AND PLANS

In the first year of this new seminars program, the number of Writing Consultant meetings with writers exploded from 2200 to 4500, and the hours of consultations overall expanded from 1200 to nearly 1900 hours. Writing Center usage that year fell, however, by nearly 50%, though it rebounded in the second year of the seminars program, largely from contacts with a growing number of English-language learners (at the time of writing, these data have not yet been fully studied). To maintain the Center's reputation for quality, our Advisory Board and I tightened requirements for taking the training course and mandated mentoring and non-punitive evaluations for newly trained Consultants. For them, evaluations meant empowerment as well as oversight: Consultants would nominate peers distinguished by their work for the new Consultant-Advisor job, to include both mentorship and leading workshops around campus. All stakeholders in our franchise—faculty, administrators, current and potential Writing Consultants—learned of reasons for any changes. We had always been, in Jane Cogie's terms, "sharers" instead of "seclusionists." This stance, long cultivated by each effective report to faculty about a tutorial, enhanced our position as the "center" for writing and, in Wingate's terms, "a center for academic culture."

Results from the first programmatic assessment of the First Year Seminars (FYS) were positive, with 70% satisfaction from both students and faculty working with the Writing Consultants. Consultants' responses, however, indicate that writers' drafts were less polished than the writers themselves judged them to be. Consultants also suggested several improvements:

- "Give the students or professors the option to evaluate their Consultants." Plans for such evaluations are ongoing at the time of writing.
- Improve logistics for scheduling meetings. One Consultant's response echoed a few others: "Working with a class was a little frustrating because some students scheduled a meeting at the last minute and then got upset when I couldn't meet with them."
- "[Create] a Writing Consultant Twitter page and an official tweeter."
- "Make sure teachers requesting Consultants are interested in actually utilizing them."
- Inform faculty early of Consultants' names and minimum requirements for employing them. As one Consultant noted, "The professor I worked with was eager and receptive to using a Writing Consultant, but he wasn't sure of practical details and how best to incorporate one into the syllabus."

Out of these suggestions, a number of new policies and resources emerged to guide the work of both program directors and tutors elsewhere:

- Making fall-semester assignments early in the summer session, so faculty would have time to integrate the Consultant's work into their syllabi.
- Promoting our Facebook and Twitter sites, as well as working with the FYS Director to be sure faculty know that they will be assigned a Writing Consultant (e-mail and print reminders often vanish without a trace).
- Informing faculty of no-shows by writers. This remains a more difficult area for classroom-based Consultants than for those working in the Center, where we have a consistent policy.
- Refusing to assign Consultants to faculty who did not employ them well. In the second year of the program, several who had been "cut off" then requested Consultants again and, after a short orientation, began to employ them in productive ways.
- Revising the training class. Consultants asked for more practice conferences as well as more attention to ESL and sentence-level revision.

The university's first study of the FYS program compared 56 sections with and without Consultants. Each FYS instructor randomly selected a student and used a four-point scale to score a portfolio of work in five areas: command of grammar, attention to audience, ability to focus, ability to organize, and facility with supporting evidence. Results show that in sections with Consultants, the percentage of writers who "exceeded expectations" (scores of 4) was only 1 or 2 percent greater than in other sections, and these modest improvements happened in finding a focus and addressing audience.

We attribute the lack of statistically significant differences between sections to the novelty of peer assistance and the logistics of making such a shift in the curriculum. In the summer workshops for new FYS faculty, several sessions address designing assignments and giving commentary, but only one short session shared tips for successfully employing Consultants. As a result, as one Consultant noted, "The teacher I worked with [never] really understood what my job as a Consultant was. She also did not encourage her students to work with me." To address tthese problems, in the second year of the seminars I made personal phone calls to more than 80 faculty teaching or planning to teach FYS. These conversations and other communications revealed that while faculty still needed to learn more about the Consultants, only half a dozen colleagues planned to opt out of employing them. Two cited the logistical headaches of employing a Consultant, two their belief that undergraduate Consultants lacked the ability to help, and two the desire to select individual students who needed help and send them to the Writing Center. All of these exchanges were cordial and provided grounds for improving Consultant training.

While meeting individual faculty, I remind them that they may mandate how much attention they would like their Consultants to pay to grammar, mechanics, and usage. This creates a potential problem we have not yet resolved. Over time, a program that serves faculty wishes could devolve into a proofreading service. I am reassured that many faculty tell me that they understand the pedagogy of the program, and that writers must be responsible for their own revisions. Yet in such a program linked to the curriculum, we cannot ignore what tenured faculty want. We are, in North's terms, not an alterative but an extension of more than fifty classrooms, a large franchise indeed. And if we want our program to continue, we have to serve this audience of faculty and writers well.

Yes, "serve." I no longer shirk the language of service. I believe that our center's franchise for writing, joined at the hip to the tutorial services, breaks every one of North's commandments that centers not "serve, supplement, back up, complement, reinforce, or otherwise be defined by any external curriculum" ("Idea of a Writing Center" 440). Well, we broke almost all of them. We have modified North's final commandment, so that in the end, we helped to define a curriculum that is not external, but integrated with best practices and pedagogy. ✦

Dedicated to the memory of Gregory Colomb, WAC Pioneer and Mentor

Works Cited:

Colomb, Gregory G. "Franchising the Future**.**" *College Composition and Communication* 62.1 (2010): 11-30. Print.

Cogie, Jane. "In Defense of Conference Summaries: Widening the Reach of Writing Center Work." *Writing Center Journal* 18.2 (1998): 47-70. Print.

Harbord, John. "Saving the Writing Center: A Case Study." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 31.3 (2006): 1-5. Print.

Hickey, Dona. "WAC Program Origins and Rationale." *University of Richmond Writing Center.* n.d. Web. 26 Oct. 2012.

Hjortshoj, Keith. *The Transition to College Writing*. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2009. Print.

Malenczyk, Rita, and Lauren Rosenberg. "Dialogic for 'Their Own Ends': Increasing the Pedagogical Independence of Peer Tutorsi in the Writing Center and the First-Year Writing Classroom." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 36.3 (2011): 6-9. Print.

McQueeney, Pat. "What's in a Name?" *The Politics of Writing Centers*. Ed. Jane Nelson and Kathy Evertz. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2001. 15-22. Print.

Murphy, Christina, and Joe Law. "The Disappearing Writing Center." *The Politics of Writing Centers*. Ed. Jane Nelson and Kathy Evertz. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2001. 133-145. Print.

North, Stephen. "The Idea of a Writing Center." *College English* 46.5 (1984): 433-446. Print.

North, Stephen. "Revisiting 'The Idea of a Writing Center.'" *Writing Center Journal* 15.1 (1994): 7-19. Print.

Stanford University. *Program in Writing and Rhetoric.* n.d. Web. 26 October 2012.

Townsend, Martha. "WAC Program Vulnerability and What To Do About It: An Update and Brief Bibliographic Essay." *WAC Journal* 19 (2008): 45-61. Print.

Warnock, Tilly, and John Warnock. "Liberatory Writing Centers: Restoring Authority to Writers." *Writing Centers: Theory and Administration*. Ed. Gary A. Olson. Urbana: NCTE, 1984. 16-23. Print.

Wingate, Molly. "Writing Centers as Sites for Academic Culture." *Writing Center Journal* 21.2 (2001): 7-20. Print.

✦

ANNOUNCEMENTS

MINING HUMOR IN THE WRITING CENTER: COMICAL MISUNDERSTANDING AS A PATHWAY TO KNOWLEDGE

✦ *Steve Sherwood, Texas Christian University, Ft. Worth, TX and*
Pam Childers, The McCallie School, Chattanooga, TN

An engineering professor asked Steve to critique a grant proposal on fluid dynamics before submitting it to the National Science Foundation. Steve read the proposal and noticed a number of dangling and misplaced modifiers. In an e-mail, he alerted the professor about these "modification problems." Confused by the message, the professor called Steve a short time later. To an engineer, a "modification" is what one does to improve a design.   An engineer with modification problems is in serious trouble, and unlikely to win a grant. Later, they had a good laugh over the misunderstanding, but for a time these inhabitants of different disciplinary cultures failed to communicate. They managed, by exchanging examples from their disciplines, to get on the same page. As members of various disciplines mix, they may fail to make their intentions clear, often because they quite literally speak different languages or because their disciplines differ so dramatically that they do not share assumptions. What a writing center consultant sees as obvious may make little sense to the scientist or businessperson and vice versa.

In a way, those of us who work in writing centers are like tourists visiting other disciplines for a short time before returning home. As generalists, we must understand enough of what the specialists are trying to say to help them build or express their ideas better or more clearly. Both the frustration and beauty of this situation is that we often experience confusion, surprise, and ambiguity as our conceptions come into conflict with the conceptions of our clients. Although the goal of most writing center work is, eventually, to achieve a common understanding, comical misunderstandings can lead to the sharing of laughter, which may help tutor and writer—or director and teacher—build rapport with each other, establish some common ground on which to build further communication, blend ideas from different disciplines in creative ways, and lead to fruitful changes in perspective. In plainer words, misunderstanding can lead through humor to understandings and ongoing multidisciplinary collaborations.

SHARING LAUGHTER TO BREACH SOCIAL BARRIERS

Writing center consultants often confront misunderstandings based on differing expectations, disciplines, languages, or levels of knowledge.   One of our first orders of business—to prevent the wounded feelings or outright hostility misunderstandings can bring—is to relieve social tensions and build rapport with those we serve. In some cases, the use of appropriate, well-timed humor can achieve these goals. After all, as humor theorist John Morreall observes, "When we are anxious about meeting someone . . . , the first laugh we share . . . will be important, for it will mark the other person's acceptance of us" (115-16). When two people laugh together, they tend to see each other in friendly terms—as equals and collaborators.   Morreall claims, in fact, that laughing with someone is a social bonding experience (115-16). As psychologist Rod Martin adds, "Mirth serves important social functions in establishing and maintaining close relationships, enhancing feelings of attraction and commitment, and coordinating mutually beneficial activities" (114), which may include such mutually beneficial activities as writing tutorials.

By way of example, Pam cites a tutorial with a shy and reluctant high school junior, whose history teacher required him to visit the writing center. The teacher told the student, Ollie, that he needed help in understanding the appropriate voice for a history essay. A bit uncomfortable, Ollie read aloud his essay on the causes of war, at one point saying emphatically, "And the President was a blithering idiot." Pam stopped him and said, "Is this an objective statement that you support with details?" "No," Ollie said, "but we all know he was a blithering idiot." Pam started laughing. "I'd have to agree with you on that, but nobody really cares about our opinion." They laughed together, and Ollie not only relaxed but appeared to get her point. His next draft, which he brought to the center voluntarily, read, "Their president failed to see the warning signs of imminent disaster." He and Pam both laughed at this change. Pam said, "And, we know what that means: he was a blithering idiot."

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

OPENING COMMON GROUND THROUGH HUMOR

Once we, as writing center directors, overcome the initial strangeness and tension of meeting someone from a different background, we can begin the business of trying to communicate clearly. Beyond overcoming social barriers, sharing the pleasure of laughter can lead, in spite of other differences, to a temporary meeting of the minds. As linguists point out, misunderstandings on some level are the norm for humans seeking to communicate. During conversations, Barry Blake says, "Language is often ambiguous and relies on the hearer or reader using clues from the context to work out the intended meaning" (130). Problems occur when the speaker and hearer lack a common context. When contexts collide, misunderstandings may cause frustration, but the apparent absurdity of conflicting interpretations may also cause laughter and motivate a tutor and writer to attempt to resolve their conflict. As Martin says, "By simultaneously expressing opposite meanings, the humorous mode provides a shared conceptual framework that embraces contradictions, rather than avoiding them, and thereby enables people to negotiate otherwise difficult interpersonal interactions" (115).

What often happens during a writing tutorial is either a meeting of the minds or, intentionally or not, a demonstration that such a meeting of minds is not occurring. In such cases, the tutor and writer experience a crisis of misunderstanding that both feel motivated to overcome. Sometimes, admitting to ignorance or confusion—at the risk of appearing less credible—can be an important first step in resolving this crisis. Once, for example, while reading through a student's biology thesis, Steve had no clue what the author meant by "the atmospheric mercury burden of macroinvertebate taxon in Texas ponds." In fact, as he told the student, the only words he felt sure he understood were "Texas ponds." When Steve asked for an explanation, the student gave a condescending laugh. "I'm talking about the atmospheric mercury absorbed by various types of macroinvertebrates, such as dragon fly larvae, which are a major food source for the top predators in the ponds." The student laughed again, perhaps enjoying himself at the expense of a nonscientist. "Oh," Steve said and wondered aloud why the student was using the singular "taxon" instead of the plural "taxa" when referring to multiple species of pond dwellers. The student frowned for a moment, laughed again, and admitted he thought "taxon" was the plural form. Once they both understood the terms and had shared a laugh, they actually made some progress on the thesis.

BLENDING IDEAS IN CREATIVE AND USEFUL WAYS

Using humor to take the first step onto common ground with those in other disciplines is important because it may lead to a second step: the fusion of the tutor's and student's minds in creative and productive ways. This type of creative fusion fits nicely into theories of social construction, as applied to writing center work by Kenneth Bruffee, who argues that "what we experience as reflective thought is organically related to social conversation" (5). As it happens, both humor theorists and researchers who study creativity point to the usefulness of forging of connections among incongruous people, objects, or ideas (Menon 53, 55). The simple blending of incongruous objects to form a third with the traits of both can lead to a creative, useful, and sometimes funny synthesis. In fact, one researcher notes in the history of scientific innovation "a widespread pattern of combining something with its 'inverse' to form a single invention. The claw hammer joins the nail-driving mechanism with the nail-removing mechanism. The pencil with eraser combines marking and unmarking functions" (Perkins 133). Such a synthesis of opposites might include the microwave-refrigerator combinations many college students now have in their dorm rooms. For others that combine creativity, utility, and humor, consider the beer-distributing hard hat, the umbrella hat, or the beanie with a solar-powered propeller. Incongruity theories of humor bear a remarkable similarity, in concept, to Arthur Koestler's mechanism of "bisociation," a process by which scientists, writers, and artists combine unrelated objects, characters, or ideas to generate new and perhaps valuable syntheses.

Much the same process can occur when the minds of a tutor and writer meet. Thanks to their differences in experience, perspectives, and disciplines, their conversations will likely involve the blending of incongruous

ANNOUNCEMENTS

INTER-REGIONAL CONFERENCING

From a number of vantage points over the years, I have seen wonderful relationships and collaborations among writing centaurs and writing centers. Our conferences are always celebrations of our professional communities and the unique centers within them. Meanwhile, it can sometimes feel as though we are working in isolation, that we can't easily meet with others. I am particularly aware of these challenges now because my current regional stretches, basically two-to-three states wide, all the way from the Canadian to the Mexican borders. Folks in this region and in many others have been creative in building accessible communities through moving conferences around within regionals, sub-regional conferences, directors' days out, video-linked meetings, nearby conferences and organizations, organizations whose work can be related to writing centers, and who knows how many more ways (I would love to hear about more of these solutions, too). We are nothing if not adaptive and determined collaborators.

In light of these efforts, I would like to suggest that we think more about cooperative conferences in which two or more wc regionals meet together or, perhaps, with the WPA regionals and CWPA. Yes, IWCA, WC regionals, and NCPTW have been collaborating for many years. Why not extend that model to other organizational conference sharing? Greater access, saves money, cross-pollinates, gets our work out there. It might take greater coordination work, but the results, I suspect, will be well worth it. If that weren't so, neither IWCA nor NCPTW would have continued the practice for so long. If you are interested in this idea, please let me know. I am, particularly (though not exclusively) interested in the writing-related organizations in and around the RMWCA and Pacific Coast.

Thanks, Bill Macauley, U. of Nevada, Reno, NV, <wmacauleyjr@unr.edu>.

ideas, and some of these blends may be both creative and useful. One day, for instance, a student came to Steve for help with a research project that involved solving, and writing a paper on, an authentic ecological problem. With a desperate expression, the student said, "I've been up all night trying to think of a topic, and I've got nothing good to write about."

From a short interview, Steve learned the student's family owned a ranch in West Texas. "Is there anything unusual about your ranch that you could write about?" The student shook his head. "It's a standard operation, like all the other ranches in West Texas." Steve thought for a moment. "Too bad you don't raise exotic livestock, like emus or ostriches." The student hesitated. "Well, we do have a buffalo herd, but lots of people have buffalo herds." Steve laughed at the incongruous notion of buffalo ownership as an everyday occurrence. "Aren't there problems the buffaloes pose for your cattle? I remember reading about diseases the buffaloes in Yellowstone give to cattle on ranches that surround the park." "No because we keep the cattle herd on the south side of our mountain range and the buffalo on the north side." Steve looked at the student. "What do you mean by 'our'? Do you have your own mountain range?" With a shrug, he said, "A small one." His family owned a chain of mountains near Van Horn, Texas. "Let me get this straight: Your family has its own herd of buffalo and its own mountain range, and you have nothing good to write about?" This time, the student laughed. "Well, I guess maybe I do." He eventually wrote about adapting his family's livestock operations to the topography of the ranch, focusing on both the prevention of disease and the impact of the buffalo on plant life. His writer's block occurred perhaps because his familiarity with the ranching operation prevented him from seeing how extraordinary it was. The fusion of his knowledge with Steve's outsider's perspective helped him see the possibilities in a topic neither would have arrived at on his own.

PROMPTING CHANGES IN PERSPECTIVE

To think creatively or understand a joke, V.K. Krishna Menon argues, we must experience a shift in perspective, and with this shift comes the chance for surprise as the blending of apparently unrelated ideas "fits in or not with the context of our experience from the altered view-point" (55). Such a change in perspective may cause us to experience a mild, often pleasant shock of discovery or reevaluation. As D.H. Monro says, "The most distinctive thing about humour is that it involves a change of standpoints or attitudes" (225). After all, laughter brings about "the abrupt dissolution" (147) of one attitude and propels the laugher toward another. Monro adds: "The mind is as it were wound up ready to proceed in a definite direction: it is suddenly wrenched off its path [by laughter] and turned in a different direction" (147).

Additional support for the notion that humor rooted in incongruity can lead to an audience's shift in attitude comes from proponents of the theories of cognitive balance and cognitive dissonance. As Martha Cooper and William Nothstine argue, we tend to feel uncomfortable when we confront situations involving incompatible ideas and "we naturally move (consciously or unconsciously) to reduce this unpleasant experience of tension by changing our attitudes or behaviors, thereby reestablishing equilibrium" (69). When our most cherished ideals come into conflict, we are most likely to experience cognitive dissonance. To resolve this conflict, we may change our attitude or perspective, perhaps by coming to see our ideals as no longer in conflict, or laugh at the incongruity, thus relieving our tension.

Cognitive dissonance may occur when tutors work with students whose first language is not English. Pam met Oscar, a high school sophomore from China, when his English teacher suggested he visit the writing center. Oscar said, "I am used to getting good grades, and my teacher said I need to talk with you." Oscar's assignment was to write a fictional piece describing a situation he wished were real, and he had written about a football game in which he single-handedly prevented a winning touchdown by the other team. As Pam soon discovered, Oscar's paper was stilted and lacked the emotional gravity for which he was striving. The descriptions of his actions were confusing, so Pam asked him to describe them aloud. She worked with him on some translation problems but also asked him to return after school when no one else was in the

writing center. He feared he would be late for football practice, but Pam assured him she would contact the coach to get his approval. When Oscar came back after school, Pam stood up with the paper in hand and began reading aloud and performing the actions as Oscar described them in his paper. Within minutes, he went from tense and serious to laughing aloud as he watched her make moves no football player would ever make. With each revision he made, Pam performed the action he described until he finally cried, "Yes, that's it! I'll see if they can use you on the football team." Oscar became a loyal client, returning with each new writing assignment to share what he had learned and what he wanted to know more about when it came to his writing process.

At Steve's writing center, his tutors often have misunderstandings with business majors because these two groups have different assumptions about what is important, how the world works, the purpose of an education, and the purpose of a writing center. These differing assumptions also sometimes cause misunderstandings between Steve and business professors. Two years ago, for instance, a business professor called to complain that she had sent her students to the center for help with a paper and nearly all of them returned with errors still in their papers. "They would complain," Steve said, "since we don't try to correct all their errors.""Well, what good are you then?" the professor asked. Frustrated with having for twenty years explained the mission of the center to this and other professors, Steve nearly lost his temper. Instead, he laughed and said, "I think we do a lot of good!" His laughter appeared to unnerve the professor, opening up a momentary space for communication that a show of anger might have closed. In that space, he explained that his tutors used each student's paper as a teaching tools, with the goal of helping him or her become a better writer. Steve asked if she agreed her students would learn less about writing if his tutors merely fixed errors—sanitizing papers so that, in her own words, she "wouldn't have to read a bunch of crap"—than if they tried to instill in her students some longer-lasting lessons and let them fix most of their own errors. He also said he saw the center's primary mission as helping students, not making grading more fun for professors. Grudgingly, the professor said she understood his point but still thought the center could do a far better job than it was doing. In spite of the rocky start to the conversation, they ended the call on friendly note.

Humor is not always the most appropriate response to confusing situations that arise in writing center work. An ill-timed or inappropriate joke may bring frustration, anger, tears, and further complications, and tutors don't want to offend the people they're supposed to help. The great Roman orator Cicero, citing Aristotle, offered advice to orators on how to use humor appropriately, and some of this advice could apply to contemporary writing center work. Cicero urged orators to use wit sparingly, spontaneously, and "with a delicate charm and urbanity" (*De Oratore* I. v. 17). In doing so, he said, the orator should remain conscious of his or her dignity, draw primarily on self-deprecation and irony, which Cicero called "a choice and clever way of speaking" (*Brutus* lxxxv. 292), remain sensitive to circumstance, and use wit not merely to entertain but to achieve a valid rhetorical purpose (*De Oratore* II. lxi. 247). Above all, he urged orators to practice restraint in their jesting to avoid offending audiences and coming across as buffoons (II. lix. 238-39). By keeping such advice in mind, writing center practitioners can use humor properly—to get past the inevitable conflicts in meaning that occur between scholars in different disciplines or from different cultures, to build rapport and establish common ground on which to generate ideas or change perspectives, and to move toward mutual understanding. ✦

Works Cited

Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Peer Tutoring and the 'Conversation of Mankind.'" *Writing Centers: Theory and Administration.* Ed. Gary A. Olson. Urbana: NCTE, 1984. 3-15. Print.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Brutus. Orator.* Trans. G.L. Hendrickson and H.M. Hubbell. Loeb Classic Library. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1939. Print.

---. *De Oratore, Books I-II.* Trans. E.W. Sutton and H. Rackham. Loeb Classic Library. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1942. Print.

Cooper, Martha D., and William L. Nothstine. *Power Persuasion: Moving an Ancient Art into the Media Age.* 2nd ed. Greenwood: Alistair, 1996. Print.

Martin, Rod. *The Psychology of Humor: An Integrative Approach.* Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2007. Print.

Menon, V.K. Krishna. *A Theory of Laughter, with Special Relation to Comedy and Tragedy.* London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1931. Print.

Monro, D.H. *Argument of Laughter.* Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 1963. Print.

Morreall, John. *Taking Laughter Seriously.* Albany: SUNY P, 1983. Print.

Perkins, David N. "Creativity: Beyond the Darwinian Paradigm." *Dimensions of Creativity.* Ed. Margaret A. Boden. Cambridge: MIT P, 1994. 119-42. Print.

✦

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Director (TT), Writing Resource Center U of North Carolina, Charlotte

UNC Charlotte invites applications for Director of the Writing Resources Center (WRC) in the University Writing Programs (UWP), a tenure-track appointment at the rank of assistant professor in the Department of English. Applicants must have an earned doctorate in rhetoric and composition, or a related field, and a record of research publication. Experience in writing center tutoring, teaching, and administration required, with the ability to work effectively and professionally with faculty, staff, and students. The Director will work with graduate and undergraduate tutors, teach tutor theory and pedagogy, and have the opportunity to teach first year writing, composition theory, and to develop new courses. We seek candidates whose expertise might include visual rhetoric, new or digital media, genre studies/CHAT theory, World Englishes, ELL, and/or e-portfolios. This is a 9-month faculty position with significant reassignment for administrative duties plus an additional 10th month for summer.

For additional information about the Writing Resources Center, visit <wrc.uncc.edu>. Apply on-line at <jobs.uncc.edu>. Include a letter of application, your curriculum vitae, and three references. The search committee will begin reviewing applications March 10, 2014 and recruitment will continue until the position is filled. AA/EOE.

Book Review

Fels, Dawn, and Jennifer Wells, eds. *The Successful High School Writing Center: Building the Best Program with Your Students.* New York: Teachers College P, 2011.

✦ *Reviewed by Suzan E. Aiken*
Saginaw Valley State University
Saginaw, MI

The edited collection of essays in *The Successful High School Writing Center: Building the Best Program with Your Students* provides a complex view of context, and the book supports the consideration that a variety of factors create a "successful" writing center. The individual chapters of the book deliver a perspective from nine different writing centers—high school writing centers and some high school writing centers that have collaborations with universities. Readers from secondary and post-secondary writing centers will enjoy the multiple viewpoints, ideas, and suggestions but should also consider the ways that context can shape theory-to-practice writing center operations. This text is for readers who want to develop ideas that apply best to a specific context and who want to hear about the theoretical framework, the research, and the methods that resulted in the practice. As a former junior high and high school teacher and as the coordinator of a college writing center, I see the complex differences and similarities between the contexts of secondary and post-secondary teaching and learning. I appreciated the diverse ideas and diverse contexts because I am a reader who intentionally seeks out applicable ideas rather than applicable solutions. Essentially, sharing what we know and how we know it is the means by which the book hopes to support future writing centers. The unifying themes connecting chapters in *The Successful High School Writing Center* are site-based writing center research, the practices and artifacts of writing centers, and the value of having a writing center to support literacy education.

In Cynthia Dean's chapter, "Revising and Rewriting Roles," she considers the complexity of the role of peer tutors in a high school writing center. Dean's collected research centers on the identity of student writers, the transition of student-to-tutor, and the articulation of that identity (by the students) as the tutor's relationships with teachers changed (53). She points out that she reviewed models of learning and assessment and the ways student tutors would fit in to those models before starting the writing center. I noted similarities in Dean's research findings and the results that I've seen in our tutor training, and reflecting on Dean's research also helped me contemplate ways to modify and improve our tutor training next fall—even though the context of a high school is very different than a university. So, the book is useful for readers who are seeking concrete, applicable strategies for their high school writing centers and also for readers who are interested in considering other contexts and the ways those contexts create successful, research-based practice.

Another writing center model is presented in Jennifer Wells' chapter, "Integrating Reading into the High School Writing Center." Wells shares her hope that she has created "a model of a high school writing center that works for us, and that may work for other schools as well" (79). The chapter features a very specific schedule which lays out the day-to-day operations, some assessments for their writing center, and how the center fosters literacy education using multiple teaching and learning strategies. Wells admits, too, that their writing center has a "way to go," and that many secondary schools do not have full-time persons staffing the writing center, acknowledging the benefits and drawbacks of their context (91). The essay's focus on use of time with the use

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

of strategies revealed how writing centers can meet the changing level of student needs and students' own changing schedules. Additionally, the book, by virtue of supporting the idea and the usefulness of writing centers, articulates an argument for the value of a writing center at the high school level to support literacy education.

The collection of essays also tackles the ongoing challenges that writing centers face. Katherine Palacio's chapter, "Change I Can See," not only shares the process of starting the writing center, but also discusses how she maintains the ongoing operation of the center through her own research. Palacio, collaborating with a university writing center, acts on her plans to change attitudes about writing at a high school with more than seventy percent second-language learners (20). Focusing her own research on the site of the writing center, Palacio suggests that writing center programs can "help increase confidence with writing" as well as "help students increase their skill with writing" (26). Her model may help other writing center professionals consider the importance of relationships and self-efficacy when writers are bilingual or non-native speakers. Dawn Fels' essay considers writing center evaluation and how research can help focus writing center evaluation on literacy practices (115). Fels includes questions for writing center administrators so that they can better articulate the contributions of writing centers to literacy education and school accreditation (121). Site-based research results helped Fels demonstrate to state auditors that their site was not a failing school (128). Rather than rely on outside influences to determine the support or use of the writing center, they used site-based research to provide the necessary evidence. Chapters such as these also demonstrate the uses of a writing center and the benefits of practitioner research and context-centered research to a writing center. Conducting such research can benefit the writing center and contribute to these ongoing conversations.

In her chapter, Jennifer Wells points out that "[s]tarting any new program at a high school is like building IKEA furniture without instructions" (79). I laughed aloud. When I worked at a rural Michigan high school, each day challenged me to find new methods for teaching and learning. Secondary school teachers are aware that a new situation can make even a tried-and-true lesson or project feel unusual or unfamiliar, so we modify lessons or projects based on context. Writing center directors and administrators, whether at the secondary or post-secondary level, can also appreciate context. Since *The Successful High School Writing Center* provides multiple research-based strategies using multiple perspectives in multiple contexts, the theory-to-practice essays thus provide a variety of useful ideas. With ten contributing authors, nine distinctive chapters, and several examples in the appendices, the book offers concrete strategies and examples as well as opportunities to think through the rich ideas and consider ways to modify those ideas to apply to different contexts. As this book reveals, context is key, and understanding context can make all the difference to a successful writing center.

✦

Book Review

Geller, Anne Ellen and Michele Eodice, eds. *Working with Faculty Writers*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2013.

✦ *Reviewed by Daniel Lawson*
Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, MI

Changing definitions and concepts of textual production have coincided with an ever-increasing pressure on faculty to publish. Extending support for faculty writing has consequently become perhaps more important than ever. Fortunately, *Working with Faculty Writers* (*WWFW*) provides an invaluable resource for those interested in developing initiatives to reach faculty members and invite serious talk about the role faculty writing plays in the university. It also represents an advance in the research on faculty productivity and writing. Consisting primarily of case studies on faculty writing support efforts, writing groups, and issues surrounding faculty writing, *WWFW* offers numerous examples of innovative programs and collaborations for faculty writing assistance. Writing center directors and staff will find the book worthwhile, for as Geller points out, "With the writing across the curriculum, writing to learn, writing in the disciplines, and communication across the curriculum movements, programmatic structures tended to coalesce around writing centers as sites for universal writing support" (9). Indeed, this book extends previous work done on the writing center's role in faculty writing support: for example, Ellen Schendel's *Writing Lab Newsletter* article "Retreating into the Center" is incorporated into a larger study on assessing faculty writing retreats. *WWFW* is thus a great tool kit for assisting writing center staff as they consider whether to start such a program, how to assess it, and ultimately how to connect faculty with the pedagogy and practices that work so well in our centers.

As Geller explains in the introduction, the purpose of "this collection is to make certain readers know that many in higher education have developed productive writing programs for all faculty (and future faculty)" (2). Geller, Eodice, and the other authors in the book have anticipated many questions about faculty writing support. Part 1, "Leadership and Locations," provides answers about who provides assistance for faculty writers and where such assistance would be housed (and, as Geller astutely points out, whose budget pays for it). Each of the chapters offers ways of envisioning and implementing the partnerships necessary to establish a successful faculty writing program, and what a viable site for these programs might look like. In Part 2, "Writing Groups/ Retreats/Residencies," the authors explore the collaborative nature of faculty writing, looking at ways in which writing communities can be fostered: through facilitating and participating in faculty writing groups, cultivating faculty writing retreats, or other initiatives. Here readers will find examples of how these communities work in different institutional contexts and how to assess their effect. Finally, Part 3, "Issues and Authors," collects essays on the concerns that often circulate around writing in the university. The writers in this section grapple with several questions: Who are faculty writers, and what are the communities they operate in? What are the contexts surrounding the act of writing as faculty? What role does institution-type play in how faculty writing is enacted and assisted?

Although all of the chapters are potentially of interest to writing center staff, several are specific to the writing center. For example, in "The Idea of a Faculty Writing Center," the authors draw upon literacy studies to picture faculty writing centers as a locus for literacy communities and as a way to avoid re-inscribing remedial notions of writing center work. This chapter will no doubt help those seeking to make the writing center a place for faculty writing support without inviting the stigma that may come of such support. In "Assessing the Effects of Faculty and Staff Writing Retreats," Ellen Schendel, Susan Callaway, Violet Dutcher, and Claudine Griggs share the results

of a study of the writing retreats they coordinated. Their assessments find these retreats "have immediate impact on participants, and a great potential for lasting impact" (160). The chapter offers models and issues to heed, including balancing the workload such retreats have for participants and organizers.

Two chapters in Part 2 address the role writing centers can play in facilitating successful faculty writing groups. Angela Clark-Oates and Lisa Cahill's "Faculty Writing Groups" draws on Shirley Brice Heath's concept of literacy events. They argue that writing centers provide a third space to help faculty members identify the codes and customs necessary to function as insiders in the literacy community of the academy and to interrogate and disrupt those customs. "Developing a Heuristic for Multi-Disciplinary Faculty Writing Groups" examines a writing group at a Research I university. Writing center practitioners will find this chapter encouraging as it highlights the reciprocal relationship that faculty writing groups can have with centers, emphasizing the peerness such partnerships can engender: centers can help faculty members consider both their writing and the way their students go about writing. Further, hosting these groups at the center can help make faculty aware of how their students might utilize the writing center.

Although the book draws from several different milieus and subfields, writing center practitioners will no doubt find many of the pedagogical underpinnings of the book familiar. The over-riding themes among the chapters are of collaboration and reflection, of pairing lived practice with theory and research. Geller, Eodice, and company have drawn together a collection of pieces that can act as a springboard for both practical and programmatic ends as well as further research. One striking feature of the book is how careful its authors are about claiming what has "worked" in their case studies. A common refrain echoing across chapters is the idea that what is presented is not universally applicable, that there is no blueprint or template that works across contexts. Rather, the authors contextualize their studies adequately enough for readers to imagine how those efforts might work in other environments. As the editors make clear, assessing local need is key to successful programs, and need will vary between (and often within) institutions. The pieces in the work are also realistic about many of the common obstacles to implementing and sustaining meaningful support, whether a lack of resources, faculty attrition, or the time required. Despite these cautions, the sheer amount of inventive work on faculty writing contained in the book is inspiring. At several points while reading the book, I found myself furiously scribbling down ideas to propose to colleagues at my institution as well as directors at other centers. Moreover these data-driven studies, all carefully assessed, can provide advocates at the local level with evidence of the viability and effectiveness of a variety of faculty writing support measures.

Given the diversity of the contributors' backgrounds and sites of practice, one can hope that audiences unfamiliar with writing center pedagogy will be exposed to our work through its inclusion in the book. As one of Geller's stated purposes for *WWFW* is to raise awareness about the variety of programs proliferating in higher education, it may help foster the sorts of collaborations described in its pages and encourage other stakeholders to seek out the writing center. As Eodice points out, "In turning toward and forming communities, faculty of all types can together consider some of the pressing questions of the coming years in regards to publication, intellectual property, knowledge repositories, academic labor, and the digital commons" (296-297). *Working with Faculty Writers* provides a wealth of resources, considerations, and research for fostering these sorts of communities and addressing these questions. Writing centers in a variety of situations will doubtless find it useful, whether to identify ways to plug in to existing faculty writing programs or to start such from whole cloth. Highly recommended.

✦

ASIAN WRITING CENTERS SYMPOSIUM

March 8, 2014
Tokyo, Japan
Hosted by J.F. Oberlin University
"Building Bridges with Writing and Writing Centers"

The Symposium is being held in conjunction with the Writing Centers Association of Japan. Registration is free. For further information, contact Tom Gally: <cwpgally@mail.ecc.utokyo.ac.jp>. Conference website: <sites.google.com/site/wcajapan/>.

TUTOR'S COLUMN

"BUT I'M ALREADY DONE!": EARLY CLOSURE AND THE STUDENT WRITER

✦ *Ashley Moore*
Winthrop University
Rock Hill, SC

Arguably the most frustrating type of tutorial is one in which the student believes that he or she has "finished" the assignment when, in fact, the paper is incomplete. While the assignment may require additional work, the student sees it as finished; this is often referred to as "early closure." A tutorial in which the student has reached early closure is frustrating to both the tutor and to the student because each is looking at the writing process in a different way. I will argue that the understanding of writing as a linear process is the leading cause of early closure in student writing; therefore, changing student thinking about the writing process is the key to keeping early closure at bay.

HOW CAN TUTORS SPOT EARLY CLOSURE?

When a student brings a draft into the writing center, it may not be apparent at first that he or she is experiencing early closure; however, it will become more obvious if the student seems uninterested in revising the paper or does not seem to understand why he or she should return to the assignment and "do more work." In a survey I conducted of 51 Winthrop University students, the participants were asked, "At what point in your own writing process do you typically feel that you have finished the assignment?" The results of my survey consisted of a variety of responses, but the majority of students (roughly 35 percent) gave answers related to the completion of rough drafts and meeting length requirements, such as "As soon as I finish the rough draft" or "When it meets the page/word requirements and a conclusion has been written." It is possible that a student who seems very anxious about concerns such as length requirements (rather than quality of content) may be having issues with early closure; similarly, a student who has only written one draft but believes the assignment to be complete is likely experiencing early closure as well.

Some students may view the purpose of revision as "improving" their writing through minor changes such as word choice or punctuation errors in order to make the writing easier to read and comprehend. In the survey I conducted, one student answered that he or she feels that an assignment has been completed "once the paper is completely written" and that "After that point, the time spent editing is just what's making the paper better." This statement reflects what many students likely believe about revisions: they are helpful, but not required in order for the original writing to be successful. These minor changes are actually editing, rather than revising, and will not resolve bigger concerns such as organization or lack of a solid thesis statement. As a tutor, I have seen many students come into the writing center and ask someone to "look over" their work for "grammar," but they are not concerned about making any big changes to their writing. Most of the time, the students were sure that they were "revising" their work, just as their professors requested.

Early closure occurs when students have an attitude of frustration or irritability with the paper. In my survey, one student answered that he or she believes that an assignment has been completed "After it's completely written, but not necessarily after revision. I get impatient towards the end"; another student answered, "The first time that I read through it and it seems somewhat decent. I hate writing papers and would rather just get them over with rather than make them the best that they could be." Writing can be frustrating for students, especially if they feel unprepared for college-level writing courses or do not understand what is expected of them. If a tutor senses that a student is no longer interested in working on the assignment and may be experiencing early closure, it may be helpful to ask the student how he or she feels about the assignment or about the process of writing. The student's emotions may be leading him or her to experience early closure.

HOW CAN TUTORS HELP STUDENTS PREVENT OR OVERCOME EARLY CLOSURE?

One strategy tutors can use when helping a student deal with early closure is to make sure that the student understands the purpose of the assignment, particularly when the student is resistant to revision or additional work on his or her draft. Rai Peterson argues that "college students are capable of appreciating the pedagogy behind assignments," so it may be a good idea to discuss the purpose of the assignment with the student (6). In an interview, a Winthrop University tutor mentioned that she often addresses statements such as, "I don't get this

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

assignment" with questions like, "If you were the teacher, why would you give an assignment like this one?" The tutor described the typical student reaction as, "a weird look, but then they think. And they get it" (Interview). If the student can come up with one possible thing that the professor expects him or her to learn, it may be easier to focus on improving the draft in order to meet the professor's expectations.

One of the most important ways that tutors can help students avoid or overcome early closure is to advocate a nonlinear, revision-based writing process. There are many ways to describe the nonlinear writing process, as shown through research and examples from both professors and writing centers. John Stenzel, an English professor at the University of California–Davis campus, outlines some of his interpretations of the writing process on his webpage, titled "A Few Thoughts on the Writing Process." He reminds readers that "in practice, writing is a messy, non-linear process" and that "good students include the assignment itself in their looping process, making sure they re-read and re-visit the assignment at several points in their process" (Stenzel). He makes sure to stress the importance of revisiting each of the steps several times in order to write successfully without making the process sound too intimidating.

Another important technique when explaining the nonlinear writing process to students is to make the explanation accessible. It may be helpful to use common phrases or "everyday" language rather than more technical writing terms. George Mason University's writing center's "30 Things to Do With Your Essay in the Up Draft(s)," by Shelley Reid is written in an easy-to-understand way with catchy and interesting opening lines. For example, the center suggests that students try to "touch base," or make sure they are fulfilling the assignment, "go for the gut," or get the audience's attention, and "make sandwiches," or enclose a quotation between an introductory statement and an explanation of the quotation's significance. While a student may not understand what the tutor is saying about introducing quotations, for example, accompanying that explanation with an interesting description may help the student recognize the concept being explained.

In my experience as a tutor, I have found that connecting with the student is key. In the past, I have used sports analogies, references to current events, and anything else I could think of to connect the technical terms of writing to the student's world. During one memorable tutoring session with a student majoring in athletic training, I struggled to explain the importance of introducing new ideas within his paper before jumping into quotations and specific facts; his paragraphs did not have topic sentences or transitions, making his paper difficult to follow. After I went through several failed attempts at explaining the concept, he finally understood when I compared topic sentences to the way he would "give someone a head's up" before beginning a new type of motion during physical therapy. It was a strange analogy to me, but it worked perfectly for him because I related a new idea to something he was familiar with.

CONCLUSION

Students tend to begin their college experience without enough preparation to write successfully at the college level; the specific problem may be the way that students view the writing process as linear with a one-way path to completion. As a result, students often write one draft and believe their work to be finished, which we can call "early closure." A better understanding of students' views of the writing process will allow tutors to lead more successful tutorials by changing students' thinking. Armed with information and strategies, tutors can prevent and even overcome and even prevent early closure within a tutorial. ✦

Works Cited

Moore, Ashley. Student Writers and Closure. Survey. Oct. 2012.

Peterson, Rai. *The Writing Teacher's Companion: Planning, Teaching, and Evaluating in the Composition Classroom.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1995. Print.

Reid, Shelley. "30 Things to Do With Your Essay in the Up Draft(s)." *The Writing Center at George Mason University.* George Mason U, 5 Oct. 2009. Web. 20 Nov. 2012.

Stenzel, John. "A Few Thoughts on the Writing Process." *John Stenzel's Home Page*. U of California, n.d. Web. 18 Nov. 2012.

Writing Center tutor. Personal interview. 27 May 2013.

✦

CALENDAR FOR WRITING CENTER ASSOCIATIONS

March 1, 2014: Southern California Writing Centers Association, in Irvine, CA
Contact: Shareen Grogan: <sgrogan@nu.edu>: Conference website: <sandbox.socalwritingcenters.org/2014-tutor-conference/.

March 1-2, 2014: Northeast Writing Centers Association, in Smithfield, RI
Contact: John Hall: <johnhall@bu.edu>; Stephanie Carter:<scarter@bryant.edu>; Conference website: <www.northeastwca.org/2014-conference/>.

March 7, 2014: Mississippi Writing Center Association, in Jackson, MS
Contact: Kathi Griffin : <kathi.r.griffin@jsums.edu; Daniel J. White: <dwhite@mc.edu>; Summer Graves: <summer.e.graves@jsums.edu>. Conference website: <www.jsums.edu/wrightcenter/mswca/>

March 28-29, 2014: East Central Writing Centers Association, in Oxford, OH
Contact: Joshua Kiger: kigerja@miamioh.edu>; Conference website: <writingcenter.lib.muohio.edu/?page_id=3524>.

April 5, 2014: Northern California Writing Centers Association, in Rohnert Park, CA
Contact: Scott Miller: <707-664-4402>, Sheryl Cavales-Doolan: <707-527-4429>, Loriann Negri: <707-664-2629>, and Katie Pinkston and John B. Kincheloe: <707-664-4401>; Conference website: <www.sonoma.edu/writingcenter/nc-wca2014/>.

May 23, 2014: Canadian Writing Centres Conference, in St. Catherine's, Ontario, Canada
Contact: Liv Marken: <Liv.Marken@usask.ca>; Conference website: <cwcaaccr.wordpress.com/2013/12/17/cwcaaccr-2014-conference-registration-now-open/>.

July 19-22, 2014: European Writing Centers Association, in Frankfurt (Oder), Germany
Contact: <ewca14@europa-uni.de>; Conference website: <www.ewca14.eu>.

October 30-November 1, 2014: International Writing Centers Association and the National Conference on Peer Tutoring in Writing, in Lake Buena Visa, FL
Contact: <iwcancptw2014@gmail.com>; Conference website: <iwcancptw2014.com>.

November 7-8, 2014: Middle East/North Africa Writing Centers, in Dubai, UAE
Contact: Nadine Ashkuri <Nadine@cud.ac.ae>; Kathy O'Sullivan <Kathy@cud.ac.ae>.