

Assessing the Impact of Writing Centers on Student Writing

Prabin T. Lama

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Rhetoric & Writing

Diana George, Committee Co-Chair

Katrina M. Powell, Committee Co-Chair

Paul Heilker

Jim Dubinsky

March 13, 2018
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: writing centers, writing center assessment, writing tutorials, tutoring best practices

© 2018
Prabin T. Lama

Assessing the Impact of Writing Centers on Student Writing

Prabin T. Lama

ABSTRACT

The overall purpose of this study was to assess the influence of writing center tutorials on student writing and to identify tutoring best practices. Writing center scholars have emphasized the need for evidence-based studies to understand how one-on-one tutorials influence student writing practices. Existing studies have addressed this need, for instance, by evaluating tutorial transcripts, by evaluating student perceptions, or by comparing scores on pre-and-post-intervention drafts. This dissertation builds on these approaches by examining tutorial transcripts together with pre-and post-intervention student drafts to trace the influence of writing center tutorials on student revisions. This approach allows for a more comprehensive investigation; it reveals not just what is addressed in a tutorial but also how much of that discussion is reflected in the post-intervention draft. Thus, by examining twenty tutorial recordings along with their pre- and post-intervention drafts in two state universities (ten in each university), the author was able to trace the influence of writing center tutorials on students' post-session revisions and identify tutoring best practices.

The findings show that all the twenty students included in the study followed up on the issues addressed in their tutorials, in some form or the other, in their post-session drafts. By documenting how students make use of their writing center instruction after a session, this study highlights the various ways a writing center tutorial can influence student revisions. In terms of tutoring strategies, the findings revealed that although most of the tutors in the study could identify and speak about global concerns (i.e. development, structure, purpose, audience), many lacked specific strategies to address these concerns effectively. To address this concern, this study identifies tutoring best practices related to global concerns. Furthermore, the findings also revealed that the tutors faced challenges navigating the directive/non-directive continuum of tutoring. To address this concern, this study presents tutoring best practices to demonstrate how tutors can shift flexible between directive and non-directive strategies during a session.

Assessing the Impact of Writing Centers on Student Writing

Prabin T. Lama

GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT

Writing center scholars have emphasized the need for evidence-based studies to develop a deeper understanding of how one-on-one writing center tutorials influence student writing practices. My aim in this study was to examine how writing center tutorials influence student writing and to identify tutoring best practices. To assess how writing center tutorials influence student writing practices, I asked this question: Do students carry over what is discussed in their writing center sessions into their post-session drafts? To assess tutoring best practices, I asked: What tutoring strategies influenced students to revise their drafts?

To examine these two questions, I recorded twenty writing center tutorials in two state universities (ten in each university) and collected the drafts that students brought to their tutorials (i.e. the pre-intervention drafts) as well as the drafts that students revised after their tutorials (i.e. the post-intervention drafts). By comparing the pre-and post-intervention drafts and listening to the tutorial recordings, I was able to determine not just what issues were discussed in each of the twenty tutorials, but also how much of this discussion was carried over by students in their post-intervention drafts. As a result, I was able to demonstrate how students make use of their writing center instruction after attending a writing center session. In other words, I was able to show what aspects of a session students' carried over into their post-intervention draft. My analysis revealed that all the twenty students included in my study incorporated their tutors' suggestions, in some form or the other, in their post-intervention drafts. Thus, I was able to show the various ways in which a writing center tutorial can influence student revisions.

I also used my data to identify tutoring best practices. For instance, my data revealed that although most of the tutors in the study could identify and speak about global concerns in a student's paper (i.e. development, structure, purpose, audience), many lacked specific strategies to address these concerns effectively. To address this need, I examined the tutoring strategies used by the tutors in my study to address such global concerns and identified best practices related to such interventions. I also analyzed my data to examine how tutors use directive (i.e. providing direct instructions or suggestions) and nondirective (i.e. engaging students by soliciting their views) methods of tutoring. Although many writing center scholars and practitioners recommend using a flexible approach to alternate between these two methods depending on the nature of each session, tutors often find it challenging to do so in actual practice. Through my analysis, I identified best practices to demonstrate how tutors can adopt a flexible approach between directive and non-directive tutoring strategies. Such tutoring best practices can be a useful resource for tutor training programs and contribute to the overall development of writing center pedagogy.

Acknowledgements

There are many people that made this study possible. Thank you, Diana, for your continuous support and mentorship throughout the process. Thank you, Prof. Powell, for serving as my co-chair and guiding me through this process. I am indebted to Prof. Heilker and Prof. Dubinsky for their support and guidance. Thank you, Jennifer Lawrence, for giving me the opportunity to share my study with your students in class.

Thank you, Kurt Schick, Kevin Jefferson, and Jared Featherstone, for giving me the opportunity to collect data from your writing center. Finally, I thank all the tutors and students who participated in the study and shared their drafts with me. This study would not have been possible without your participation.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction, Literature Review, and Methodology.....	1
Chapter Two: Dissecting Three Writing Center Sessions.....	20
Case Study One.....	23
Case Study Two.....	44
Case Study Three.....	82
Chapter Three: What Makes Higher-Order Writing Center Sessions Successful? Tutor Strategies for Higher-Order Concerns.....	116
Chapter Four: How Much Help is Too Much Help? Examining Directive Tutoring in Action.....	161
Chapter Five: Discussion and Conclusion.....	181
Works Cited.....	196
Appendix A: Sample Summary Sheet.....	201
Appendix B: Sample Coding Sheet.....	204
Appendix C: Pre-and Post-Intervention Drafts for Case Study One.....	205
Appendix D: Pre-and Post-Intervention Drafts for Case Study Two.....	213
Appendix E: Pre and Post Intervention Drafts for Case Study Three.....	223
Appendix F: Pre-and Post- Intervention Drafts for Unsuccessful Intervention III.....	225
Appendix G: Thesis Intervention Transcript.....	236
Appendix H: Original Thesis, Revised Thesis Statements, and Analyzed Visual	237
Appendix I: Transcript of Paragraph Reorganization Intervention.....	238
Appendix J: Post-Intervention for Successful Intervention II.....	239
Appendix K: Transcript of Paragraph-Thesis Connection Intervention.....	244

List of Tables

Table 1: The Revision Process.....	22
------------------------------------	----

Chapter One: Introduction, Literature Review, and Methodology

Introduction

University Writing Centers are places where faculty tutors, student peer-tutors, and professional tutors help students with their writing through one-on-one writing conferences. The pedagogical assumption behind such one-on-one writing center conferences is that they can help students become better writers because they are student-centered, non-evaluative, and they facilitate collaborative learning through peer tutoring. Thus, there has been a tacit assumption among writing center scholars and practitioners that writing center tutorials help students develop their writing skills.

Supporting this line of thought, scholars have justified the existence of writing centers by pointing out that peer-tutoring is a “form of collaborative learning” (Bruffee, 1984) and that writing centers should not be viewed as a fill-in space for remedial students but a space where all writers at all levels can grow as writers (North, 1984). However, more recently, scholars have argued that there isn’t enough evidence to support the claim that writing center tutorials can help students develop writing skills and have emphasized the need for more evidence-based research to assess the effectiveness of writing center tutorials (Jones 2001; Lerner 2003; Gofine 2012; Niler 2005; Bell 2000).

Furthermore, scholars (North 1984, Bell 2000; Shendel and Macauley 2012) have pointed out that the common assessment measures used by writing centers, such as counting clients, post-conference user satisfaction surveys, and end-of-semester surveys, are not sufficient in explaining the impact writing centers have on student writing. There is, therefore, a need for

researchers to move beyond these common assessment measures to assess the work of writing centers. Such new assessment-oriented research can help university writing centers identify their strengths and weaknesses, improve their practices, and justify their role in the university. In this context, this study aims to assess how one-on-one writing center tutorials influence student writing practices by posing this question: Is there evidence to show that what is taught in writing centers carries over into students' subsequent writing practices? More specifically, my goal in this project is to assess how writing center tutorials influence post-session revisions and to identify tutoring best practices by evaluating tutorial transcripts together with pre-and post-session student drafts.

Literature Review

Scholars have highlighted the need to substantiate the claim that writing center tutorials can help students develop their writing skills. Reiterating Stephen North's 1984 observation in "Writing Center Research: Testing Our Assumptions," Bell (2000) noted that "as the writing center field matures, it has to test its key assumptions, for example that one-on-one writing conferences change students' writing processes" (8). Similarly, in her review of the literature on writing center assessment, Gofine (2012) finds that "the most prevalent reason for writing center assessments is also the simplest one: administrators must assess their centers in annual reports to provide evidence that the centers actually help students" (40). These observations highlight the need to test the common assumption that writing center tutorials influence students' writing processes.

Furthermore, assessment is also important to secure funding for writing centers from administrators. Gofine (2012) observes that many writing center administrators have problems justifying to "upper-level administrators that funding a writing center is a worthwhile

investment” and that it “benefits students and the institution as a whole” (40). Similarly, Bell (2000) suggests that at a time when writing centers at several universities are facing severe budget cuts, the “first thing writing centers [can] do to increase their chances of surviving the hard times is to evaluate seriously” (7).

However, some scholars have argued that assessment should serve “more than a defensive measure” (Gofine 40). Assessment is important to these scholars because they view it as a self-motivated activity that helps create new knowledge (Lerner, “Writing Center Assessment” 61) and allows writing centers to align their work with the university’s mission (Lerner, “Choosing Beans” 1; Schendel and Macauley 58). For instance, Lerner (2003) points out that “the audience for our assessment efforts need not only be those who pull the purse strings” and that assessment research can help writing centers move from “simply defending their budgets” to making “significant contributions to these students, to our institutions, and to the knowledge in our field” (61). Similarly, drawing on the work of Linda Adler-Kassner and Peggy O’Neill, Schendel and Macauley (2012) point out that assessment decisions – what is assessed and how – also reflect how writing centers align themselves with the institution, the field of writing studies and the overall literacy standards of the country (xvii).

Therefore, in addition to substantiating key assumptions and securing funding, assessment also plays an important role in creating new knowledge, strengthening writing center practice, and aligning the contributions of writing centers with institutional goals. As such, instead of approaching assessment defensively, it would be more worthwhile to have a more proactive, self-motivated stance toward assessment.

Another concern is the need to replace traditional methods with evidence-based empirical research to measure the impact of writing center tutorials on student writing. In 1984, Stephen

North observed that writing center research was not guided by formal inquiry and relied mostly on reflections, speculations, and surveys (24-25). Bell (2000) restated North's concern by suggesting that writing centers should conduct more sophisticated evaluations (7). Similarly, Jones (2001) identified that "Only a handful of researchers have attempted to evaluate the performance of writing centers in enhancing student writing skills through the use of empirical study designs" and "even these studies are of suspect validity and limited reliability" (3). In 2012, Gofine restated these concerns: "most assessments employed by writing center administrators - such as surveys and usage statistics - are of limited validity," and there is a need to "develop assessments of high validity" (47).

Along the same lines, Schendel and Macauley (2012) point out that while these traditional methods may be helpful in revealing traffic patterns, demographic details, and student satisfaction levels, they are not helpful in answering more important questions such as "Do writing centers help make better writers? What kind of differences do writing centers make in students' writing? How does the work of the writing center contribute to the university's mission and strategic plan?" (xvi). They also observe that there are "only a handful of published articles that demonstrate continued inquiry that moves beyond speculation" (4).

However, the literature also reveals that writing centers have started progressing from these traditional methods to more systematic assessment studies that have focused either on student perceptions or student texts and have adopted either a qualitative, quantitative, or a mixed-methods approach. The most recent mixed-methods study by Brendtmann et al. (2012) used objective "outcome based" statistical measures, such as cross-sectional comparison, before-after comparison, pooled difference-in-differences, and fixed-effects difference-in-differences, to evaluate the effect of writing center interventions on student grades. They used these advanced

statistical measures to substantiate their qualitative student feedback survey results (115 - 116).

Although the student feedback surveys were positive, their statistical analysis showed no significant effect of writing center interventions on student performance, which was measured by student grades in subsequent writing tasks. Thus, they concluded that subjective student feedback surveys are “only of limited use for evaluating the effectiveness of educational programs” and that objective measures are needed to substantiate such subjective approaches (122). Brendtmann et al., however, acknowledge several limitations of their statistical approach. First, “the impact of WrC [writing center] participation on students’ achievement from other influences on achievement” cannot be separated easily (116). Second, for self-selected participants (as in their study), equal comparison of grades between the group that used the writing center (experimental group) and the group that did not (control group) cannot be made “since participants significantly differ from non-participants with respect to important individual characteristics” (119).

In 1997, Neil Lerner demonstrated the use of quantitative methods to assess the contribution of writing centers to student writing (1). Using SAT scores as a starting measure to “equalize writing center users and non-users,” he conducted a statistical correlation analysis to compare whether students who visited the writing center had better first-semester composition grades than those who did not visit (2). He found that while “most students’ mean grades were quite similar whether or not they came to the Writing Center,” students at the lowest end of the SAT verbal benefited the most. He also found that “students with the weakest starting skills (according to their SAT verbal scores) came to the Writing Center most often and benefited the most” (3).

In 2001, however, Lerner outlined three flawed assumptions of his earlier quantitative study. First, he found no correlation between SAT verbal scores and FYC grades, which distorted his overall logic of using SAT scores to group students into a common starting point. Second, he realized that students' final grades may not be fully reflective of their writing ability because other factors such as "attendance policies, timeliness of assignment completion, effort and motivation" influence student grades (3). Finally, he noted that in reality, grading is not consistent across all FYC sections because different instructors have different grading patterns (3). As result of these flawed assumptions, he clarified that his initial study and other "studies pursuing similar methodology are full of legumes" (3). Therefore, just as with Brendtmann et al.'s study, Lerner's flawed assumptions indicate the limitations of quantitative measures that rely on student grades as an objective measure to determine the impact of writing center interventions on student writing skills.

Another quantitative method applied by some scholars is the pre-and post-test design where student drafts before and after writing center visits are compared to determine the impact of the visit. Gofine (2012) reports that very few writing center researchers have used the pre-and post-test design despite its advantages in evaluating the impact of tutorials on a client's writing process (44). In 2003, Luke Niiler conducted such a study where he collected pre-and post-intervention drafts from students and had three writing center tutors grade them for the following traits: claims, development, organization, citation/format, punctuation, grammar, and spelling (7). He found that the post-intervention drafts received higher scores for each of these seven traits.

Niiler conducted a similar study in 2005 to overcome the shortcomings of his previous study design. His 2005 study focused only on two traits - global and local traits of student essays.

Also, while the old study used tutors to rate the essays, the new one used faculty (13). Just as with the 2003 study, raters in the new study gave higher ratings to post-intervention drafts for both global and local traits (14). However, the inter-rater validity of the new study did not meet Niiler's expectation because one of the raters did not show a significant correlation with the other two raters (14). This points to a possible limitation of pre-and post-test studies - individual raters may not be rating the drafts along the same standards.

Henson and Stephenson also conducted a similar pre-and-post study in 2009 where students were voluntarily divided into two groups: those who agreed to visit the writing center and those who agreed not to (control group). They collected and evaluated first and final drafts of two assignments from both these groups and found a statistically significant improvement between the first and final drafts of those students who visited the writing center when compared with the control group (2).

While these quantitative studies focused on student grades and pre-and post-intervention drafts, most qualitative studies have focused mainly on how students, instructors, tutors, and other stakeholders perceive different aspects of a writing center's work. For instance, Thonus (2001) used "qualitative, ethnographic methodology combining participant observation with informant interviews" to investigate how "tutors, tutees, and course instructors perceive the tutor's role" (62). Similarly, in another qualitative study, Thonus (2002) used interactional sociolinguistics combining conversation-analytic and ethnographic techniques to outline a profile of a "successful" tutorial after analyzing 12 tutorials for features such as "topic introduction, type and frequency of directives and their mitigation, volubility, overlaps, backchannels, and laughter" (110). In yet another qualitative assessment study, Morrison and Nadeau (2003) used

pre and post-grade questionnaire surveys to explore if student perceptions of writing center tutorials changed after their papers were graded (28).

While such qualitative studies have contributed valuable insights, many scholars have argued that more quantitative studies are needed to substantiate the results of qualitative studies and provide evidence for the work of writing centers. For instance, Bredtmann et al. (2012) highlighted the “need for educational institutions to rely on objective measures for evaluation purposes” in addition to subjective measures (122). Carino and Enders (2001) observed that writing center research is dominated by qualitative studies and reasoned that although quantitative measures are not “necessarily a more reliable way to measure complex reality,” they are a good way of substantiating subjective knowledge (83 & 85). Similarly, Gofine (2012) found “minimal use of quantitative methodology, despite the wide acknowledgement that quantitative assessments are necessary” (45), and Niller (2005) observed that “quantitative research is still new to this field” (13).

To address this call for more quantitative research and to achieve a well-rounded balance between qualitative and quantitative findings, the literature points to the importance of mixed-methods studies. Gofine (2012) observes that “Mixed-methods studies might fulfil the stated need of quantitative studies within this field (47). Reasoning that “using numbers alone can be misleading,” Niller (2005) suggests that quantitative analysis should be used “within a richer framework of qualitative analysis” (13). He explains “that statistical analysis enriches the way we describe our work; helps us understand how tutoring impacts the writing process; confirms what we already know through more qualitative means; and helps us communicate what we know to be true about our work to those outside the discipline” (13). Niller also suggests that because “statistical analysis is enormously portable” the writing center field can “complement its

abundantly rich supply of qualitative research with work that can be transferred from one site to another” (15).

Similarly, Donnelly and Garrison (2003) also argue for a mixed-methods approach by reasoning that qualitative methods alone “cannot fully support a rigorous investigation of the affective elements” of writing center work (para. 6). Therefore, many scholars seem to be leaning to the idea that a culmination of both quantitative and qualitative methods is the most appropriate approach to assess the impact of writing centers on student writing.

Regarding the type of theory that should guide writing center assessments, scholars such as Donnelly and Garrison (2003) have turned to the “contextualist research paradigm” posited by Cindy Johanek (2000). Johanek argued for the need to “collapse the qualitative/quantitative dichotomy in composition research and to construct instead a Contextualist Research Paradigm for Rhetoric and Composition” (27) which foregrounds the research context over method, suggesting that the research question and context should determine the method and not vice-versa (209). Donnelly and Garrison (2003) suggest Johanek’s contextualist research paradigm is well-suited for writing center evaluations because it “provides us with the framework for balancing and making sense of the stories and numbers that represent our work” and because it encourages us to look to the “unique context of a writing center to determine methodologies and desired outcomes” (para. 2).

Many composition scholars have also emphasized a localized, contextual approach to writing assessment. For instance, Brian Huot (1996) argues that traditional writing assessment theories and practices do not reflect reality because they ignore the “local context” where both the writing and assessment take place (549-50). He calls for a new theory of assessment based on contemporary assessment practices that “are site-based, practical, and have been developed and

controlled locally” (552). Similarly, Chris Gallagher (2010) observes that “the ‘basic principles’ proposed by O’Neill, Moore, and Huot in their *Guide to College Writing Assessment*—that writing assessment be site-based, locally controlled, context-sensitive, rhetorically based, accessible, and theoretically consistent—are widely echoed in our assessment scholarship” (10).

In addition, some scholars (Bell 2000; Schendel & Macauley 2012) have emphasized small-scale evaluations, evaluations aimed at one aspect of a program at a time, as the ideal way to assess writing centers. Schendel and Macauley (2012) draw on the work of Barbara Walvoord, a nationally known assessment expert, to highlight the importance of having a limited number of assessment goals. They reason that focusing on “one thing at a time...enables more focused and careful assessment” and that “the richness of a successful assessment comes of quality rather than quantity” (31). Similarly, Bell (2000) suggests that “writing centers should conduct a series of carefully limited evaluations which, pieced together after a few years, create a fairly comprehensive picture” (16).

The Focus of My Project

The literature, in short, points to several important issues concerning writing center assessments. First, there is a need for more evidence-based empirical studies to substantiate claims that writing center tutorials can help students develop their writing processes. Second, there is a stated need for mixed-method studies to overcome the limitations of using either a quantitative or qualitative method independently to evaluate the impact of writing centers on students’ writing abilities. Third, there are inherent problems associated with the quantitative methods used to measure the impact of writing center tutorials on student writing as noted by scholars such as Lerner (2001) and Brendmann et al. (2012). Fourth, the literature points to the importance of assessment not just as a defensive measure but also as a self-motivated activity to

create new knowledge, improve existing practices, and to align the goals of a writing center with the university mission. Finally, the literature highlights a contextual approach to writing assessment and points to the importance of small-scale evaluations.

Scholars have tried to address some of these issues by adopting a number of different approaches to assess writing centers. Some have relied on objective measures, such as student grades and pre and post-intervention scores, in their attempt to provide evidence that writing center interventions have a positive impact on students' writing abilities (see for e.g. Lerner 2001; Brendmann et al. 2012; Niller 2003 & 2005; Henson and Stephenson 2009). In addition to these objective measures, some scholars (see for e.g. Thonus 2001; Morrison and Nadeau 2003; Carino and Enders 2001) have relied on the perceptions of students, tutors, and course instructors to assess their attitudes toward writing centers. Finally, scholars have also observed the interactions between tutors and tutees in actual sessions to assess writing center tutorials (see for e.g. Thonus 2002).

My project, however, will take a slightly different approach. Instead of offering objective evidence to show that writing centers can help students become better writers, it will try to uncover the "process of learning that we believe goes on in writing center sessions" (Lerner, "Writing Center Assessment" 71). As such, my project will focus on understanding what happens during actual student-tutor interactions and what students do after these interactions. While an objective study may "offer the kind of evidence [needed] to secure funding from [the] dean," my study will offer the kind of evidence needed to "understand *how* students are interacting with [a] center" (Lerner, "Of Numbers and Stories" 111), and how they are making use of their interactions in subsequent drafts. Furthermore, while some existing studies have examined student-tutor interactions and user perceptions, Lerner (2003) points out that no

writing center studies have explored how students incorporate components of the tutor-student conversations in subsequent drafts (71).

My study aims to address this gap by assessing what takes place during writing center tutorials and how students make use of their writing center sessions in subsequent writing tasks. More specifically, my study examines tutorial transcripts together with pre-and post-session student drafts to assess how writing center tutorials influence post-session drafts. As such, my study assesses the types of issues addressed in a session, the tutoring strategies used by tutors in a session, and the types of revisions students make during and after their sessions. In the end, my goal is to show the influence writing center tutorials can have on student writing practices and to identify tutoring best practices.

Research Questions

My overall purpose, as mentioned above, is to assess how one-on-one writing center tutorials influence student writing practices and identify tutoring best practices so that tutor training programs may be strengthened. To address this purpose, my study posed the following research questions:

1. What kind of evidence is there to show that what is taught in writing centers carries over into students' subsequent writing practices?
 - a. Do students follow-up on the issues discussed in their writing center sessions in their post-intervention drafts?
 - b. Do the changes made by students in post-intervention drafts reflect the issues and concerns addressed in their writing center sessions?
2. If so, what kind of changes do writing center interventions influence in student writing?
 - a. What types of issues are commonly discussed during tutor-student interactions?

- b. Of the issues discussed, which ones, if any, are addressed in post-intervention drafts?
3. What tutoring strategies do tutors use to address issues in writing center sessions?
 - a. Which of these strategies are more likely to influence post-session revisions?
 - b. Which of these strategies are less likely to influence student revisions?
 - c. Do these tutoring strategies point to any best practices?

Methodology

To address my research questions, I designed an exploratory qualitative study within a contextual theoretical framework. A “contextualist research paradigm” posited by Johanek (2000) foregrounds the research context over method so that the research questions and context influence the method and not vice-versa. A contextualist research paradigm is well-suited to writing center assessments because it encourages scholars to “look to the unique context of a writing center to determine methodologies and desired outcomes” (Donnelly and Garrison, para. 2). A contextual framework, therefore, has influenced my decision to allow my project purpose to dictate my methods.

My research purpose and questions call for a qualitative approach because my purpose is to conduct a detailed qualitative analysis of what happens during writing center tutorials and how students make use of their writing center sessions in subsequent writing tasks. In order to explore these issues, it is important to follow a grounded theory approach where the researcher can understand the phenomenon under study through the emerging themes and patterns in the data. Furthermore, a contextual framework also justifies the fact that this assessment was designed and conducted by someone (the author) who has worked in writing centers and is familiar with the unique context of the two writing centers that this study focused on. Thus, a qualitative

methodology based on a contextual theoretical framework best served the specific purpose of this study.

Furthermore, my research approached assessment not as a defensive measure, but as a self-motivated activity that seeks to create new knowledge and improve existing practices. As such, my goal is not necessarily to provide objective evidence to show that writing centers can improve students' writing skills. Rather, it is to try and shed light on the learning process that potentially takes place in writing centers and identify tutoring best practices that may be useful for tutor training programs. In addition, considering the emphasis placed by scholars (Bell 2000; Schendel and Macauley 2012) on small- scale evaluations that focus on one aspect of a program at a time, my assessment philosophy will be guided by this consideration. Instead of trying to focus on multiple assessment issues, my project will focus on the very specific issue of exploring how students follow-up on the issues discussed with their writing center tutors in their subsequent drafts. This question will, in turn, shed light on the ways writing center tutorials influence student writing practices and the tutoring best practices associated with such an influence.

The participants for my analysis were made up of writing center tutors and students in two public universities in Virginia. After getting approval from Virginia Tech's institutional review board (IRB), I recruited fifteen tutors and fifteen students from the first university and twelve tutors and thirteen students from the second. I approached prospective tutors and students in their respective writing centers randomly before their sessions and explained the purpose of my study. Written consent was obtained from the tutors and students who agreed to participate in the study. My data consisted of audio recordings of one-on-one writing center sessions, session

observation notes, and pre-intervention drafts (or drafts that students brought to their session) and post-intervention student drafts (drafts finalized after the session).

I recorded twenty-eight sessions in total. However, I received both pre-and post-intervention drafts from only twenty students (10 from each university) out of the twenty-eight students initially recruited for the study. Thus, my sample size was reduced to these twenty students and their tutors, and my data included audio recordings of twenty one-on-one tutor-student writing center sessions, observations notes for all twenty sessions, and pre-and post-intervention student drafts for all twenty sessions. I observed each of the twenty sessions and took detailed observation notes. In addition, I made audio recordings of all the twenty sessions using my cell phone. Finally, I requested all the twenty students to email me their pre-and post-intervention drafts.

I will now describe my data analysis process. My method of analysis, in simple terms, involved evaluating the session recordings and observation notes to understand the issues addressed and tutoring strategies used in each of the twenty sessions. With this understanding, I compared the pre-and post-intervention drafts to identify how these twenty sessions influenced revisions in the post-intervention drafts.

I began my analysis by reviewing my observation notes and listening to the audio recordings for each of the twenty sessions. Based on this review, I created detailed chronological summary sheets for each session (see Appendix 1 for a sample summary sheet). In addition to providing a detailed chronological summary, these summary sheets also indicated the session agenda, main issues addressed, tutor intervention strategies, and level of student engagement. They also indicated whether revisions were made during the session or afterwards and included my overall impressions. Next, I reviewed the pre-and post-intervention drafts together with the

summary sheets and recordings. I highlighted all the revisions in the post-intervention drafts and reviewed the summary sheets and recordings to examine whether these changes were discussed in the session. This allowed me to identify whether the issues discussed in a session were reflected in the post-intervention drafts or not. It also allowed me to determine whether students made any additional changes to their post-intervention drafts beyond what was discussed in the session.

To show what takes place in writing center sessions and how these sessions influence student revisions, I conducted detailed qualitative case studies of three of the twenty sessions recorded for my study. My summary sheets revealed that all the twenty sessions in my study could be placed into one of these three categories: 1) a session where all the revisions were made after the session, 2) a session where all revisions were made during the session, and 3) a session where revisions were made during and after the session. Thus, I picked one of each type while selecting the three conferences for my case studies. My method of analysis for these case studies involved reviewing the transcripts and pre-and post-intervention drafts to examine how the sessions influenced post-intervention revisions. I analyzed the entire transcripts of the three selected sessions together with the pre-and post-intervention drafts. The case studies, therefore, provide a very detailed description of what transpired in each of the three sessions such as the types of issues addressed in the sessions, tutoring strategies used by the tutors, student attitudes to revisions, and level of student engagement, among others. Furthermore, the case studies also include a detailed analysis of the types of changes that each session influenced in the post-intervention drafts. Thus, the case studies provide a detailed account of not just what was addressed in each session, but also how these sessions influenced the post-intervention drafts. These case studies are presented in chapter two.

My summary sheets revealed a pattern that indicated the tutors were facing challenges in addressing higher-order concerns (HOCs). *The Longman Guide to Peer Tutoring* defines HOCs as “the big issues in the paper that aren’t addressed by proofreading or editing for grammar or word choice” (35). Similarly, *The Bedford Guide for Writing Tutors* refers to global (or higher-order) revisions as “a paper’s overall development and organization” (48). Thus, I considered issues, such as the overall development, organization, coherence, that are not related to grammar or syntax alone as HOCs. To identify best practices related to HOCs, I evaluated the higher-order tutoring strategies used by the tutors in my study. I reviewed the summary sheets to identify interventions related to HOCs and reviewed the recordings and pre-and post-intervention drafts of such interventions. Based on this review, I shortlisted three successful and three unsuccessful higher-order interventions. I selected these six examples because they reflected the other higher-order interventions in my study and because they were the most suitable examples to demonstrate the successful and unsuccessful nature of such interventions. Those interventions that led to higher-order revisions in the post-intervention drafts, I classified as “successful.” Similarly, those interventions that did not lead to higher-order revisions in the post-intervention drafts were classified as “unsuccessful. This analysis of higher-order tutoring strategies is presented in chapter three.

My summary sheets also revealed that the tutors in my study faced challenges balancing between directive (hands-on approach) and non-directive (hands-off approach) approaches to tutoring. I used my data to evaluate this issue further. Of the 20 sessions, I shortlisted transcripts from three sessions that demonstrated instances of directive tutoring and/or non-directive strategies. Analyzing pre-and post-session drafts together with these session transcripts allowed me to determine instances of extreme directive tutoring, instances when a tutor’s ideas and

suggestions made its way word for word into a student's post intervention draft. Similarly, my data also allowed me to determine instances when tutors used the non-directive approach effectively by guiding student revisions without doing the work for the student. I used a coding scheme developed by Mackiewicz and Thompson (2014) to analyze these transcripts (see Appendix II for a sample coding sheet).

Mackiewicz and Thompson (2014) identified the following three broad categories to code writing center conference transcripts: 1) instruction, 2) cognitive scaffolding, and 3) motivational scaffolding. They define instruction as "the directive aspects of teaching and tutoring - supplying solutions or options, rather than supporting or making room for student writers to generate solutions themselves" (5). They define cognitive scaffolding as "a range of strategies that prod students to think and then help them to push their thinking further" (5). Finally, they define motivational scaffolding as tutoring strategies that "focus on student writers' affect" (5). These categories are explained further in chapter four in which I present my analysis of directive and non-directive tutoring strategies.

In addition to this introductory chapter, this study includes four chapters. Chapter two, the next chapter, presents the overall findings related to how the tutorials included in this study influenced student revisions in the post-intervention drafts. In addition to providing the overall findings for the twenty sessions included in this study, it also includes detailed case studies of three sessions. These case studies provide an in-depth look into the issues addressed in these sessions, and they also trace the changes that the sessions influenced in the post-intervention drafts.

Chapter three focuses on the higher-order tutoring strategies used by the tutors included in this study. It presents a detailed analysis of three successful and three unsuccessful higher-

order interventions. Based on this analysis, it outlines best practices for addressing HOCs in writing center tutorials. These best practices can be useful in strengthening existing tutor training programs.

Chapter four presents an analysis of how tutors in this study navigated the directive/non-directive tutoring continuum. It examines instances when tutors used a flexible approach and maintained a good balance between these two strategies. It also examines instances when tutors moved too far along the directive continuum. The examples of directive and non-directive tutoring strategies included in this chapter can be used as training materials to show new tutors what a flexible tutoring strategy looks like in actual practice.

Finally, in chapter five, I discuss the major conclusions and implications of this study. In addition to summarizing the major findings, this chapter discusses the implications of the findings for assessing writing centers, for training writing tutors, and for writing center pedagogy. I also outline possible areas for future research with regards to writing center assessment.

Chapter Two: A Dissection of Three Writing Center Sessions

In this chapter, I will assess how the writing center tutorials included in my study influenced revisions in the post-intervention drafts. More specifically, following an approach recommended by Neil Lerner (2003), I will compare the pre-and post-intervention drafts from my study to assess what aspects of the tutor-student conversations, as revealed by the session recordings, are reflected in the post-intervention drafts. Lerner had recommended that asking the following question would help researchers assess the effect of writing center tutorials on student writing: “Are there components of the student-tutor conversations that get incorporated into a student’s subsequent draft?” (71). Furthermore, Lerner also suggested that such an approach would be “one way to understand not just writing center effects, but the process of learning that we believe goes on in writing center sessions” (71).

A few pre-and post-intervention studies have been conducted by writing center scholars in the past (see for example Niiler 2003 & 2005; Henson and Stephenson 2009), as I had mentioned in the previous chapter. These studies, however, focused solely on quantitative measures, i.e. student grades, to assess the impact of writing center interventions on student writing. While these studies have all reported higher grades for post-intervention drafts and concluded that writing center interventions have a positive impact on student writing, they offer no further details about what actually transpired in the sessions included in their study and how the post-intervention drafts changed. In other words, while they tell us that students received higher-grades for the post-intervention drafts, they do not tell us how. Therefore, some important questions remain unanswered. What types of strategies did tutors employ in the sessions? What types of issues were discussed? Were the discussed issues reflected in the post-intervention drafts? How do the pre-and post-intervention drafts compare, not in terms of grades alone, but in

terms of the types and extent of revisions? Answering these questions will help to substantiate the quantitative findings of the existing studies mentioned above. More importantly, it will tell us what actually happens in writing center sessions and what students do after a session.

The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to shed light on the process of learning that takes place in writing center sessions. My goal is to closely examine the session recordings as well as the pre-and post-drafts from my study so that we may learn more about what happens during writing center interventions such as the types of issues addressed, strategies used by tutors, and revisions made during and after the sessions. In the end, as mentioned above, my goal is to assess whether the issues addressed in the sessions are followed up by students in the post-intervention drafts. This in turn will inform us about the learning process that takes place in writing center interventions. I begin with a brief overview of my overall findings and then present three case studies that present a detailed analysis of the pre-and post-intervention drafts and session transcripts for three sessions. I selected these three sessions because they represent a wide variety of issues and revision processes (i.e. whether revisions were made during session, after a session, or a combination of both) observed in all the twenty sessions included in my study.

Overview of Main Findings

Overall, my results show that all twenty post-intervention drafts did reflect, in some form or the other, the issues addressed in their respective sessions. In other words, the tutor-student conversations influenced changes in the post-intervention drafts in varying degrees. As I will elaborate in my pre-and post-analysis section below, some post-intervention drafts reflected most of the issues addressed in their respective sessions, while others reflected only some aspects of the session discussion. However, for all the twenty writing center sessions, the issues discussed

in the sessions were reflected in the post-intervention drafts in some form or the other. This suggests that all the writing center sessions from my study did influence revisions in the post-intervention drafts.

Before getting into the pre-and post-analysis, I will describe the revision process that resulted in the post-intervention drafts. I evaluated whether the revisions reflected in the post-intervention drafts took place during the session, after the session, or a combination of both.

Table 1 below summarizes my findings in this regard.

Table 1: The Revision Process

Description	No of Sessions
All revisions made after the session	3
All revisions made during the session	5
Revisions made during and after the session	12
Total	20

As we can see in Table 1, in a majority of the sessions (12 of the 20 sessions), revisions were made by students both during as well as after their sessions. Furthermore, we can see that in five sessions, the students made all their revisions during their respective sessions. In other words, they did not revise their drafts any further after their respective writing center sessions. This in turn tells us that in seventeen sessions (85% of the sessions), some form of revision took place during the sessions. In contrast, only three students made all their revisions after their sessions. That means in-session revisions accounted for a substantial part of the revisions reflected in the post-intervention drafts. This also highlights the expectations present-day students have about writing center sessions, i.e. to be done with their revisions during the session itself. The use of laptops seem to have played a big role in facilitating in-session revisions. Most

students came to the sessions with their laptops and made in-session revisions in consultation with their tutors.

The three case studies presented below represent all the three types of sessions outlined in Table 1. I have included one session in which all the revisions were made during the session, one other session in which all the revisions were made after the session, and another session in which revisions were made during and after the sessions. Thus, as mentioned above, these three sessions are a good representation of all the twenty sessions included in my study.

Three Case Studies

As mentioned above, this section includes a detailed analysis of three sessions that closely represent all the twenty sessions included in my study. I will evaluate the session transcripts together with the pre-and post-intervention drafts to trace the influence of these sessions on the post-intervention drafts. What follows is a detailed analysis of each of the three sessions.

Case Study One: Sentence-level Revisions Made in the Session and Higher-Order Revisions made after the Session

Session Length:	30 minutes
Tutor:	Undergraduate Peer Tutor
Student:	Undergraduate Student
Assignment:	Persuasive paper for First-Year Writing Class; four-page completed draft
Session Agenda:	Address professor's comments on the draft
Revision Approach:	Revisions were made during and after the session.
Laptop:	The student had a laptop which he used for in-session revisions.

This first session, which lasted for thirty minutes, took place between an undergraduate student and an undergraduate writing center coach. The student came to the session with a four-

page completed draft of a persuasive paper from his first-year writing class and wanted the tutor's help to proofread for grammar and address the instructor's comments. In his paper, the student was trying to persuade his readers about the benefits of joining the Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets. He had received written feedback from his instructor on the draft and wanted to make sure that he was addressing them.

During the session, the tutor and student addressed both higher-order concerns (issues concerning overall structure and development) as well as sentence-level issues (grammar, punctuation, word choice etc.). Under higher-order concerns, they reviewed the thesis and discussed the need to connect the paper's main arguments to the thesis as well as to justify the thesis in light of the paper's counterarguments. The sentence-level issues discussed included unclear pronouns, parallel structure, and comma usage. While all the sentence-level revisions were made during the session itself on the student's laptop, the higher-order revisions were made by the student after the session. As I will describe below, most of the sentence-level issues (lower-order concerns) addressed in the session were clearly visible in the post-intervention draft. Some of the higher-order concerns, however, were not addressed completely in the post-intervention draft. Furthermore, there were no additional revisions in the final draft, beyond what was discussed in the session.

I call this a student led session because, instead of reviewing the entire paper, the student decided to focus on specific parts of the paper that had his instructor's comments. After discussing the student's main concerns - to proofread for grammar and address the instructor's comments - the tutor and student first reviewed the thesis, which the student had revised based on his instructor's feedback. Next, based on the student's suggestion, they reviewed the second, third, and fourth paragraphs to ensure that they lined up with the thesis. After this, again based

on the student's suggestion, they reviewed the instructor's comments and focused on the final comment that the student was most concerned about. To address this final comment, which questioned how the negative aspects of the Corps included in the paper were related to the thesis, they reviewed the eighth and ninth paragraphs in which the student had talked about some negative aspects of being in the Corps. Finally, with just a few minutes left in the session, the tutor and student discussed ideas to counter the negative aspects to support the paper's thesis. I will now analyze these issues in detail and compare the pre-and post- intervention drafts to assess what aspects of the discussion made their way to the post-intervention draft.

The brief review of the revised thesis began with the student reading the following thesis aloud:

“The Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets is a program that teaches how to develop skills in order to become a leader in both military and civilian environments” (This thesis appears in the first sentence of the second paragraph in both the pre-and post-intervention drafts in Appendix III).

The student then explained (see E1 and E3 below) that the revised thesis was more appropriate than the previous one because it states that the Corps of Cadets can help students become leaders. However, since the thesis was revised prior to the session, I did not have access to the old thesis and hence could not compare the two versions. The tutor agreed with the student's view and suggested that the revised thesis was more specific and that it had a specific argument built into it as all thesis statements should (See E4 and E6 below). The transcript of this brief discussion is presented below:

¹ [E1] S: Because this one (referring to the old thesis) when I say like the leader must like learn how to lead or must learn how to follow quietly. And like this one (referring to the new thesis), I was just saying like how you become a leader

¹ Transcription Key: E1, E2, E3 refer to Exchange One, Exchange Two, Exchange Three, and so forth; T refers to Tutor; S refers to Student.

[E2] T: Got you

[E3] S: So I think, this one fits a little better cause it kind of explains to you what you are doing to develop these skills

[E4] T: Right, that's (referring to the new one) much more specific than this

[E5] S: This is kind of vague

[E6] T: Which I think makes it better and I mean the sort of classic "A thesis has to be something you can argue with" this seems like kind of not really, but that is a lot more like punchy, I guess.

In the above dialogue, the tutor and student are addressing a higher-order concern, the paper's thesis. The tutor agrees with the student's view that the revised thesis is more appropriate than the previous one. The tutor also takes the opportunity to subtly educate the student that a thesis statement should have a built-in argument. Thus, we can see that the tutor agreed with the student's view and also provided two valuable observations regarding a thesis statement: 1) it should be specific and) it should have a built-in argument. After this brief thesis discussion, the student read the second, third, and fourth paragraphs aloud to ensure that these paragraphs were addressing the thesis.

After the student read the second paragraph aloud, the tutor pointed out one small missing detail in the third sentence of the paragraph. The sentence looked like this: "The Corps of Cadets is a senior military college and a world-class leadership development program that has been a significant part of Virginia Tech since 1872." The tutor observed that this sentence did not clearly indicate that Virginia Tech opened in 1872, as shown in the transcript below:

[E1] T: Okay, this sounds good. The only thing that I would maybe change is you say 1872. Is that when the school opened?

[E2] S: Yeah

[E3] T: Okay, I would maybe say like since

[E4] S: Since the school opened

[E5] T: Yeah like since its founding in 1872 or something since you say “opened” in the next sentence but it’s not totally clear that this and this are like the same.

Based on the tutor’s observation in E1, E3, and E5 above, the student revised the sentence on his laptop right away. The revised version in the post-intervention draft looks like this: “The Corps...has been a significant part of Virginia Tech since the school opened in 1872” (see pre-and post-intervention drafts in Appendix III). This revised version, as we can see, clearly reflects the issues addressed by the tutor in the above transcript. It indicates that Virginia Tech opened in 1872 and that the Corps of Cadets was a significant part of the school since the very beginning. After the student made this revision, the tutor also briefly informed the student that the paragraph supported the thesis statement quite clearly. Thus, the tutor addressed the student’s stated concern of ensuring that the paragraph aligned with the thesis statement, and she also helped the student fill in a missing detail.

Moving on to the third paragraph, the tutor pointed out the following issues after the student read the paragraph aloud: a vague pronoun, missing verb, missing Oxford comma, and a spelling mistake. The tutor also briefly suggested that the paragraph supported the thesis. In the fourth sentence of the paragraph, the tutor identified that the pronoun “this” was not specific enough. The third and fourth sentences of this paragraph from the pre-intervention draft looked like this: “When you first get to college you are not in class as often as you were in high school, which gives you the illusion that you have a lot more free time. Most first year college students do not realize this and end up doing poorly their first semester.” The transcript below shows how the tutor and student addressed this pronoun issue:

[E1] T: (Reading the second and third lines) “When you first get to college...Most first year college students do not realize this” Okay so does that seem a little unclear to you?

[E2] S: Yeah

[E3] T: Cause it's sort of, cause you're like, it looks like what you're saying is they don't realize that it's an illusion.

[E4] S: Yeah

[E5] T: Right?

[E6] S: I guess you could say "Most first year college students do not realize most work is done outside of the classroom"

[E7] T: Yeah, that sounds great.

[E8] S: (Typing)

[E9] T: Even "most work in College" maybe

[E10] S: Yeah. (Typing) "most work in College is done outside of the classroom"

In E1, the tutor indicates that the pronoun "this" is not specific enough and asks for the student's opinion regarding this. In E3, the tutor interprets the meaning of "this," which helps the student to come up with the revision in E6. In E9, the tutor makes a suggestion to make the student's revision a bit more specific. Furthermore, E8 and E10 tells us the student is revising his draft as they are speaking. It is interesting to note here that just by pointing out the problem, the tutor was able to help the student address the problem. The tutor pointed to the problem but allowed the student to come up with the revision. The student understood exactly what the tutor was trying to say and independently came up with a revision that addressed the issue quite clearly. In other words, the tutor did not revise the sentence for the student. I will discuss this issue further in chapter four where I explore the question that writing centers have faced over the years: Are writing tutors doing all the work for the students?

In addition to the pronoun issue discussed above, the tutor identified that the eighth sentence in the third paragraph was not parallel because it was missing a verb. The sentence looked like this: "During that time you are not allowed to use any social media, workout, eat at dining halls (unless you get special permission too), or anything that does not pertain to

academics.” The tutor explained that since the above sentence included a list of verbs (use, work out, eat), the student missed a verb in front of “anything” and suggested that “do” should be added in front of “anything” to make the sentence parallel. The tutor also pointed out a spelling mistake (to instead of too) in this sentence. The student made these revisions as they were being discussed. Next, the tutor pointed out the need for an oxford comma in the last sentence of the paragraph (highlighted in both the pre-and post-intervention drafts in Appendix III).

Finally, the tutor briefly suggested that the paragraph supported the thesis statement. However, she did not offer a detailed explanation regarding how the paragraph was linked to the thesis statement. She simply made a statement saying that the paragraph supported the thesis. Therefore, while the tutor did address the student’s higher-order concern of ensuring that the paragraph supported the thesis, she did not dedicate too much time on this issue. All the issues discussed above were revised by the student on his laptop during the session itself, and they are clearly reflected in the post-intervention draft (see third paragraph in Appendix III). Overall, in this third paragraph, the tutor briefly addressed the student’s original concern about making sure that it supported the thesis, and she also showed the student the importance of avoiding ambiguous pronouns, constructing parallel sentences, and using the Oxford comma.

Next, as they moved to the fourth paragraph, the tutor pointed out the following issues after the student read the paragraph aloud: 1) spelling out abbreviations the first time they are introduced; 2) avoiding vague pronouns; and 3) breaking up two independent clauses with a period or semicolon. First, the tutor pointed to the abbreviation “TC” in the first sentence of the paragraph, and she explained that abbreviations should always be spelled out when they are being introduced for the first time in the paper. The student made this revision immediately based on the tutor’s suggestion. Next, the tutor pointed to an unclear pronoun, *they*, as well as a

comma splice in the last sentence of the paragraph. The last two sentences of the pre-intervention draft looked like this: “These are some of the greatest people you will ever meet. Over time you will form lasting friendships with one another, they become a part of your family.” The following transcript shows how the tutor and student addressed these two issues:

[E1] T: Okay so, this “they” is a little bit confusing

[E2] S: Yeah

[E3] T: Umm because it’s the same sort of thing you said before with like the “they don’t know this.” It’s like using this pronoun but it is not like abundantly clear who you are talking about.

[E4] S: Yeah

[E5] T: So I would just say, members of your TC or like your co-cadets or something

[E6] S: Okay, yeah

[E7] T: Umm and then yeah, this first part and second part are both complete sentences, so you would either need a period in there instead of a comma, or a semicolon.

[E8] S: I think a period will probably be better for this one.

[E9] T: Okay

[E10] S: (tries to revise the sentence) Eventually these cadets, eventually these cadets will form, I guess these cadets will (whispers something)

[E11] T: I don’t think you have to worry about making it something like long and more explanatory

[E12] S: Yeah, just trying to think of the right word. Like when you say cadets I mean that could also, I mean no it does say that, I do state that it’s the freshmen cadets so “These cadets will become a part of your family.”

[E13] T: Okay that sounds great

In E1, the tutor suggests that the pronoun “they” is confusing. In E2, she reminds the student that they had addressed a similar issue in the previous paragraph and reiterates her view that the pronoun in question (i.e. *they*) is not specific enough.

It is interesting to observe that the tutor is not simply identifying an ambiguous pronoun but also reminding the student that this is the second time such an issue has come up in the paper. This strategy is useful in identifying patterns in student errors (see Shaughnessy 1979) so that they can be addressed more effectively. By suggesting that this pronoun issue was similar to the one addressed in the previous paragraph, the tutor is making the student aware that this issue could be a pattern that he needs to look out for in the future. The student seems to have understood the problem quite well since he spends some time carefully thinking through possible revisions in E10 and E12, ultimately replacing the unclear pronoun with something more specific: “These cadets will become part of your family.” We can observe, that in this intervention too, the tutor follows the same strategy of pointing out the problem and allowing the student to come up with the revision independently.

Furthermore, we can also see that in E7 the tutor is explaining a comma splice rule, which is promptly applied by the student in E8. Here, the tutor is following the recommended writing center practice of explaining the rules for grammatical errors instead of just pointing them out or correcting them. The student made these revisions promptly, coming up with the revised sentences more or less independently (see the post-intervention draft in Exhibit I to see these revisions). However, what seemed missing in their discussion was the student’s original concern of whether this fourth paragraph was aligned with the thesis or not. The tutor did not comment on this issue and the student did not raise the question as they were discussing this fourth paragraph. Thus, although the tutor identified and addressed some sentence-level issues, she did not address the student’s concern of ensuring that the paragraph lined up with the thesis statement.

So far, the analysis of the three paragraphs and thesis discussion presented above show that the tutor used some effective strategies such as identifying repeat errors, allowing the student to make revisions independently, and explaining grammatical rules. Furthermore, all of the issues discussed, which were mostly sentence-level issues, were revised by the student during the session. As a result, they are all clearly reflected in the post-intervention draft (See Appendix III). However, most of the discussion above focused on sentence-level issues even though the student specifically wanted to focus on the higher-order concern of ensuring that the three paragraphs lined up with his thesis statement. Although the tutor briefly addressed this issue for the second and third paragraphs, she did so only briefly without really explaining how the paragraphs were related to the thesis. In the fourth paragraph, as mentioned above, the tutor did not even address this issue at all. Thus, we can see that compared to higher-order concerns, sentence level issues dominated much of the above discussion. In other words, the tutor seems to have prioritized sentence-level concerns over higher-order concerns.

Now, I will continue with my analysis of the remaining parts of the session. After having reviewed the fourth paragraph, the student suggested that they review his instructor's comments to make sure they had been addressed. Thus, the tutor and student reviewed the comments quickly and focused on the final comment that the student was most concerned about. They had trouble reading the instructor's handwriting, but were able to figure out that the instructor was asking the student to explain how the negative aspects of the Corps included in the paper were related to the paper's thesis. With this understanding, they decided to read through the eighth and ninth paragraphs in which the student had discussed some negative aspects of the Corps.

After the student read the eighth paragraph aloud (see Exhibit 1), the tutor suggested that the paragraph was related to the thesis. Here is what the tutor had to say about this issue:

T: So yeah, it seems like this is in the context of your thesis. You're sort of saying you know these things are not fun or good really, but they like are still teaching your how to be a leader.

If we read through Exhibit 1, we can see that the paragraph, especially the last sentence, is linked to the paper's thesis - the Corps of Cadets helps develop leadership skills. The student is arguing that although the Corps of Cadets imposes strict rules and restricts the freedom of the cadets, these rules are actually meant to develop their leadership skills. Therefore, the paragraph is clearly linked to the paper's thesis. In the transcript above, the tutor has interpreted this aspect of the paragraph quite clearly. Unlike the interventions related to the second and third paragraphs described above, the tutor does not simply suggest that the paragraph is supporting the thesis. Instead, she explains clearly how the paragraph is linked to the thesis. In addition to addressing this higher-order concern, the tutor also pointed out three introductory clauses in the paragraph that needed commas and explained the comma rule for such clauses (highlighted in Exhibit 1). The revised version of this paragraph (see post-intervention draft in Appendix III) does not have any other changes beyond these three comma revisions.

Exhibit 1: Paragraph Eight from the Pre-Intervention Draft

The Corps of Cadets does offer you a lot of benefits, but there are a few negatives about the Corps. First it does take away a lot of your freedom, especially if you are a freshman cadet. There are a lot of rules that are strictly enforced, like a zero alcohol tolerance. As a freshman cadet you will be required to wear the uniform twenty four seven for the entire year until you earn the privilege to wear civilian clothes. In the beginning your head will be shaved if you are a male and you are not allowed to grow it out unless you are given the privilege to do so. You must obey the Cadet Honor Code and follow these rules and many more. As a cadet you are a professional that represents the University and are expected to conduct yourself accordingly at all times. Even when you are not wearing the uniform you still represent the Corps and your actions can have a negative or positive affect in the community. This teaches you discipline, humility and many other traits that are required to be a good, effective leader.

Next, the student and tutor started reviewing the ninth paragraph (see Exhibit 2). After the student read this paragraph aloud, the tutor briefly summarized its main idea as follows:

T: So yeah, all this seems like you're talking about these like restricted freedoms, which you are saying have like benefits, sort of, but they're also like have all these drawbacks. Yeah, so these like the ECQ looks like helps you manage your time but also means you're probably not going to make friends with anyone who is not in the Corps or at least it's very difficult.

Exhibit 2: Paragraph Nine from the Pre-Intervention Draft

Another negative that I have encountered is that the Corps makes it very difficult at times to make civilian friends because a lot of your time is taken up by Corps events. This is where you really have to learn good time management skills. If you are not able to plan accordingly things can pile up a lot quicker than a regular student because you have extra Corps obligations. Making friends outside of the Corps is even more challenging as a freshman because you are not allowed to go out on the weekends with them. On Friday and Saturday nights you will be given passes from your First Sargent to do something with your TC, like go get food as a TC in a 30 minute time period, then come back and stay in the dorms for the rest of the night. That is a typical pass that most freshmen cadets are given. You will be granted a little more freedom based on your performance as you progress through the Corps, but on Sunday nights you are not allowed to go out because you have ECQ from six to eleven p.m.

If we look at Exhibit 2, we can see that the tutor has summarized the main idea of this paragraph quite well. In the paragraph, the student is suggesting that the strict schedule of the Corps makes it difficult for the cadets to socialize with civilians. The tutor then pointed out a confusing sentence in the paragraph, the second sentence, and suggested that this was similar to the pronoun issue that they discussed twice before in the session. The transcript of this discussion is shown below:

[E1] T: Again, you have this sort of like pronoun sort of confusion.

[E2] S: Uh-huh

[E3] T: (reading part of the first and second sentences) "the Corps make it very difficult at times to make civilian friends because a lot of your time is taken up by Corps events.

This is where you really have to learn good time management skills.” So, I guess I am a little confused with why that sentence is in there.

[E4] S: Okay. I am saying like the balance is not only like you have plenty of time but during that limited time you have to do school work.

[E5] T: Right

[E6] S: In that sense you also have to be able to do that, plan accordingly, and if you want to try and make friends, you gotta set some time aside

[E7] T: Got you, okay. So I would even say like, I think the “where” is throwing me off, I would maybe say like “because of this you really have to learn good time management skills.”

[E8] S: Yeah, okay.

[E9] T: Because then you are saying because of like

[E10] S: “This causes you”

[E11] T: Yeah causes something to show like the effect instead of just like “this is where” is just like “this is happening and also the other thing is happening.” But if you want to set up like the reason why

[E12] S: This causes you to have to learn time management skills

[E13] T: okay so “This causes you to really have to learn” yeah

[E14] S: “you to really have to learn good time management skills.”

As we can see, in the above transcript, the tutor is pointing out her confusion in E1 and E3 about the second sentence in the paragraph. After the student explains the intended meaning of the second sentence, the tutor explains her concern more specifically in E7 and E9, explaining that the word “where” was not showing the causal effect between the first and second sentences. She points out the need to show that the second sentence is the outcome of the first sentence. The student picks up on this in E10 and comes up with a revision idea, which is developed in consultation with the tutor through E11, 12, 13, and 14. Since the student made the revision during the session, this intervention is clearly reflected in the post-intervention draft in which the second sentence looked like this: “This causes you to really have to learn good time

management skills.” Once again, we can see that the tutor has explained the issue clearly and pointed out the recurring nature of issues like this in the student’s paper. Furthermore, the tutor’s intervention strategy allowed the student to think through the problem and come up with a solution independently. In other words, the tutor did not revise the sentence for the student.

After, this intervention, the tutor pointed to this next sentence (third sentence) in the paragraph: “If you are not able to plan accordingly things can pile up a lot quicker than a regular student because you have extra Corps obligations.” She explained that it seemed like the student was comparing “things” with “a regular student” and suggested that the student needed to add “they do” after “than” to address this issue. The student understood the tutor’s concern and revised the sentence as follows: “If you are not able to plan accordingly things can pile up a lot quicker for you than a regular student because you have extra Corps obligations.” Thus, they addressed this sentence-level concern in the session itself, which is clearly reflected in the revised draft (see Appendix III for both drafts).

Finally, after addressing the above two sentence-level issues in this ninth paragraph, the tutor addressed the student’s higher-order concern related to the professor’s comment about the need to link the paragraph to the thesis. The transcript below outlines this part of the discussion.

[E1] T: I think he or your professor wants to make sure that you are always coming back to the thesis at the end of your evidence.

[E2] S: Yeah

[E3] T: Umm so yeah, if this is your end, I would maybe add a sentence like this (referring to the last sentence of the previous or eighth paragraph) to this paragraph where you sort of bring it back to like how you learn leadership skills, which maybe is like, you don’t have to say this is fine because it teaches leadership skills also. You can say maybe like umm maybe like it’s not worth it to learn leadership skills like because it’s too restrictive. I mean I am just saying you don’t have to always go back to the Corps is

good. If you're having a paragraph about the negatives you can be like it's unnecessary or something like this.

[E4] S: Or you can say like for people who really want like a diverse social life, the Corps may not be for people like them.

[E5] T: Yeah. So you see how this paragraph ends with this like tie-in (referring again to the previous paragraph).

[E6] S: Yeah

[E7] T: Okay so I would encourage you to maybe think about something like that.

[E8] S: So for people who want a diverse social life, the Corps may not be a right choice for them, or

[E9T]: Right, I would even maybe try to think about like the benefits of leadership that you learn maybe are outweighed by (tutor is interrupted as the front desk staff tells her that her next appointment has arrived)

As mentioned earlier, in this paragraph, the student was arguing that the strict schedule of the Corps makes it difficult for the cadets to socialize with civilians. In E1, the tutor is suggesting that the paragraph needs to be linked to the paper's thesis, and in E3, she is showing the student how this can be done, i.e. by adding a concluding sentence at the end of the paragraph, just as the student had done in the previous paragraph. Furthermore, in E3, she is also explaining that the student does not have to try to justify that everything about the Corps does in fact build leadership skills. In other words, the tutor is explaining that it is okay to be critical about certain aspects of the Corps and to say that such negative aspects do not contribute to leadership skills. Based on this suggestion, the student has come up with a concluding sentence in E4 to link this paragraph to the thesis. In this sentence, the student conveys a disadvantage of the Corps, saying that the Corps may not be suitable for people who prefer a diverse social life. However, we can see that the proposed concluding sentence in E4 is not clearly linked to the paper's thesis (i.e. the Corps helps build leadership skills) because it does not specifically talk

about leadership skills. This is perhaps why, in E5 and E7, the tutor tries to explain one more time that the concluding sentence should be tied to the thesis. The student reiterates his plan, which hasn't changed much, for the concluding sentence in E8. In E9, the tutor tries to show how the concluding sentence can be linked to the thesis, by asking the student to think about how some of the benefits of leadership offered by the Corps can be compromised by the social restrictions imposed on the cadets. At this point, the tutor is interrupted by the front desk staff and the discussion is cut short.

In the above higher-order interaction, we can see that the tutor has pointed out the need to link the paragraph to the thesis, provided a specific suggestion to do so (i.e. adding a concluding tie-in sentence), and also explained how to deal with counter arguments or ideas that run counter to the thesis. However, the student seems to be a bit confused about how to connect his counterarguments to the thesis. In other words, he was having trouble trying to justify his counterarguments in the context of his thesis. We can infer this from the student's proposed tie-in sentences in E4 and E8, which as I have explained above, are not clearly linked to his thesis. Furthermore, even though the student revised these tie-in sentences in the post-intervention draft as shown below, they are still not directly linked to the thesis. Finally, the student's confusion is further evident from the final question that he had for the tutor, which I will also describe below. The revised tie-in sentences looked like this in the post-intervention draft:

“Your social life as freshman will be very restricted, but you will develop time management skills from this. So when you are given more freedom you will be able to balance academics with your social life a lot more effectively.”

The revised concluding sentences presented above are quite different from the one proposed by the student in the transcript above (see E4 and E8). In the revised version, the

student has tried to highlight the benefits of the Corps over its weaknesses. This is perhaps the outcome of the tutor's final suggestions described below. However, we can see that even these two revised concluding sentences do not specifically talk about leadership skills and thus is not clearly linked to the paper's thesis.

Thus, while the student did follow-up on the tutor's suggestion of adding a concluding sentence to link the paragraph to the thesis, his concluding sentences were not well connected to his thesis. It is also important to note that, unlike all the other revisions discussed above, the student added the above two concluding sentences to the paragraph after the session. In other words, this revision was not made during the session. This points to the possible benefits of initiating revisions during the session. I will discuss the benefits of in-session revisions for higher-order concerns in chapter three.

After the brief interruption by the front desk staff, the tutor informed the student that their allotted thirty minutes was over and asked the student if he had any other pressing concerns. The student pointed to the tenth paragraph (See Exhibit 3), in which he was also arguing that the Corps inhibited the social skills of the cadets by limiting their interactions with civilians, and expressed his confusion about how to justify his criticisms of the Corps in the light of his thesis. In his thesis, as mentioned earlier, he was arguing that the Corps builds leadership skills. However, he also had a counterargument in the paper saying that the Corps can inhibit social skills. Thus, he was confused about how to address this contradiction in his paper, again a higher-order concern.

Exhibit 3: Paragraph Ten from the Pre-Intervention Draft

I have found that another factor that makes it difficult to make friends outside of the Corps is the fact that you are intentionally separated from civilians. You are required to wear a uniform everyday, which distinctly shows people that you are a part of the Corps. Most people do not fully understand what the Corps of Cadets is and are intimidated by it, which makes them less likely to interact with you. You are also required to live on campus for all four years with other cadets. There are separate dorms that cadets live in and separate dorms for civilians. Cadets live on the other side of campus far away from any civilian dorms. These are factors that make it hard to have civilian friends, but it is possible to have civilian friends, it just requires extra time and effort. This can inhibit your social skills because cadets only interact with militarized grade A personalities. If you do not try to make friends outside of the Corps it will be harder to interact with civilians. Some behavior can seem perfectly normal to a cadet, but to a civilian it can seem out of place and strange, like sounding off to upper classmen. Sounding off is when a freshman cadet greets every upperclassmen they see with the greeting of the day with name and rank. The purpose of sounding off is to instill confidence in a freshman cadet and to get the freshman to know all the names of the upperclassmen. Regular students have ask me before why we do this because it seems strange to them.

The transcript of this final discussion is presented below:

[E1] S: It's just this one because. Like right here I start talking about like just like how being in a professional environment can inhibit your social skills between regular civilian people, regular people

[E2] T: Okay, got you. Umm yeah so that maybe a time you're like you know maybe it's too strict and it's actually like if you never interact with normal people how are you supposed to be anyone who is in the army maybe umm cause I know the Corps is supposed to be like a general leadership and not just like military. So, maybe something like this. If you want to make it like a tough real criticism, I would talk about how like these negatives maybe even like hurt your ability to become a leader, which is what the whole like point is or what you're saying like the good thing is. But then I mean I think like your professor is saying you wanna, for your persuasive essay, say that the positives outweigh the negatives, like there are some things that make it like not so good, but in general you will be a better leader if you are in the Corps than if you are not. It seems like what you're going for.

[E3] S: Okay

[E4] T: So you feel better about it?

[E5] S: Much better, thank you.

In E1 above, the student is referring to the second last paragraph (tenth paragraph) in which he was pointing out a negative aspect of the Corps, similar to the one he had done in the previous paragraph. In this paragraph too, he was arguing that the Corps did not provide opportunities for cadets to socialize with civilians. Since this discussion took place immediately after the previous discussion, the tutor understood that the student was concerned about linking this negative aspect to the paper's thesis. The fact that the student pointed to this concern again at the end shows that he was having trouble addressing the contradiction between his counter arguments and thesis. In E2, the tutor tries to address this higher-order concern by explaining that the student had two options. Either he could be very critical of the Corps and say that the negative aspects impact the leadership training provided by the Corps, or he could downplay the negative arguments by saying that they were outweighed by the positive arguments. However, considering the paper's thesis, context of the assignment (i.e. persuasive paper), and the professor's comments, the tutor suggests that it would be more appropriate for the student to highlight the positive aspects and downplay the negatives. Thus, the tutor is not only explaining possible strategies to address the student's higher-order concern of making a persuasive argument, but also considering the context of the assignment and the professor's comments to recommend a specific strategy for the student.

In the post-intervention draft (see Appendix III), the student has added the following tie-in sentences at the end of this (tenth) paragraph:

"Even though you are intentionally separated from civilians being in the Corps give you a sense of pride that you are a part of something bigger than yourself. These strange traditions you have to do may seem pointless, but overtime you will realize that they are necessary in developing your leadership skills."

Just as with the previous paragraph, the above two sentences were added by the student after the session. We can see that the student has followed up on the tutor's suggestion of highlighting the positive aspects and downplaying the negative aspects of the Corps. Unlike the tie-in sentences for the previous paragraph, in this case the student has tried to make a more explicit connection to the thesis statement by pointing out that the "strange traditions" of the Corps are "necessary in developing your leadership skills." Here, the student is claiming that the negative aspects, such as being separated from civilians, in fact contribute to leadership skills. However, we can see that the student has not substantiated this claim because he has not explained how these negative aspects contribute to leadership skills. Thus, although the student followed the tutor's suggestion of downplaying the negative aspects of the Corps to support his thesis, he did not offer a clear explanation for this.

While the student did try to address the tutor's higher-order suggestions pertaining to the ninth and tenth paragraphs, his revisions do leave some room for improvement. For instance, the student made an effort to add concluding sentences to both these paragraphs to support the thesis as suggested by the tutor. He also tried to strengthen his persuasive argument by downplaying the negative aspects of the Corps. However, as mentioned in the previous paragraph, his revisions do not clearly address the higher-order issues in question. It is also important to note that the tutor did not have sufficient time to address these concerns as they were addressed at the very end of the session when they were almost running out of time. Even so, the tutor did offer valuable insights to the student regarding strategies for making persuasive arguments, some of which are reflected in the post-intervention draft, as I have explained above. Overall, these two higher-order interventions show that addressing higher-order concerns is more challenging than addressing sentence-level (lower-order concerns) issues. If the tutor had more time, an effective

strategy would probably have been to solicit the student's own ideas to reconcile the contradiction between his counter arguments and thesis. This way, the student would have had an opportunity to think about, and test, his ideas with the tutor. I will present a detailed analysis of tutoring strategies related to higher-order concerns in chapter three.

Overall, my analysis of the first session shows that most of the issues discussed in the session is reflected in the post-intervention draft. All the sentence-level issues addressed by the tutor are clearly reflected in the post-intervention draft. However, these sentence-level revisions were made by the student during the session itself, as they were being discussed. As a result, the student was able to get the tutor's instant feedback and approval on these revisions. Although the student tried to address the higher-order issues discussed in the session, his post-session revisions addressed these issues only partially. The student was not able to get the tutor's feedback and approval on these revisions since they were revised after the session. This suggests that addressing higher-order concerns can be a more challenging task for tutors.

In terms of tutoring strategies, we can see that the tutor dedicated more time to sentence-level issues than higher-order issues. While addressing sentence-level issues the tutor pointed out recurring patterns, allowed the student to make revisions independently, and explained relevant grammatical rules. While discussing higher-order concerns, the tutor provided some valuable suggestions regarding how persuasive arguments can be made and how the main arguments of a paper can be linked to the thesis. However, the tutor did not, probably because of time constraints, solicit the student's ideas while discussing higher-order concerns.

Case Study Two: A session in which all revisions were made after the session

Session Length:	45 minutes
Tutor:	Graduate Peer Tutor
Student:	Undergraduate Student
Assignment:	Rhetorical Analysis of a Visual for First-Year Writing Class; five-page completed draft
Session Agenda:	Thesis statement, implications of the paper, and attention-getting Introduction
Revision Approach:	All revisions were made after the session. The student took notes during the session.
Laptop:	No laptop, student came with a hard-copy of the draft paper.

This was a session between a graduate writing center coach and an undergraduate student who was working on a visual rhetorical analysis paper for her First-Year Writing class. The student came to the session, which lasted for approximately 45 minutes, with a five-page completed hard-copy draft (see Appendix IV). The student wanted to work with the tutor on her thesis, the overall implications or the “so what” aspect of her paper, and her introduction. In her paper, the student was analyzing a visual that portrayed the two main characters from the manga series, Tokyo Ghoul. This draft had been peer-reviewed in class, and the student wanted the tutor’s help to address the issues highlighted by her reviewer. Unlike most of the other sessions in the study, the student did not bring a laptop to this session. So she did not make any revisions during the session. Instead, she took notes and made all the revisions after the session.

Although the tutor addressed both higher-order and lower-order concerns during the session, the overall focus was more on higher-order concerns. Under higher-order concerns, they addressed the paper’s thesis, conclusion, introduction, coherence, and paragraph structure, as well as strategies to make stronger claims. Under lower-order concerns, they addressed issues

such as word choice, active-passive sentences, and editing for conciseness. As I will describe below, all the issues addressed in the session are reflected in the post-intervention draft in some form or the other. Furthermore, the student did not make any additional revisions in the final draft, beyond what was discussed in the session.

Like the previous session, this was also a student led session since the student decided the focus of the session. Instead of reviewing the entire paper, they focused on specific parts based on the student's needs. After identifying the student's main concerns - thesis, overall implications, and making the introduction catchier - the tutor and student first reviewed the thesis. Then, they reviewed the third paragraph to make sure that it was structured logically. Next, they reviewed the analysis paragraphs (i.e. fourth, fifth, and sixth paragraphs) to make sure that the analysis was logical and clearly linked to the thesis. After this, they reviewed the conclusion, and finally toward the end, they reviewed the introduction. I will now present a detailed analysis of the major issues that were addressed during the session and assess the extent to which these issues are reflected in the post-intervention draft.

The thesis discussion began with the tutor reading the student's original thesis statement which looked like this:

Ishida drew this piece in the sequel manga *Tokyo Ghoul:Re*, which shows the dynamic between the two characters present along with themes that encompass the series. This is shown through the colors present in the piece, the positions of the characters and the underlying themes/messages that are common in Ishida's work. (see the pre-intervention draft in Appendix IV)

After reading the thesis, the tutor raised a question related to the thesis which prompted a discussion about the thesis statement as shown in the transcript below:

[E1] T: So what is it about, within your argument, what is it about the colors, positions and the themes, what do you see those as implicating?

[E2] S: The colors are mostly like the contrast because like the black and the white. So I talk mostly about that. And the positions is like how he is making eye contact and looking up. And then, the message is like how to do like kind of the stuff that I talk about.

[E3] T: So in your thesis you, the thesis is kind of where like you wanna give me the “so what” like why should I read your paper. Like okay, so there are different colors, there are different positions, there are maybe underlying themes but like what... why is it worth exploring that or what do you as a viewer that is analyzing this do you see those three different aspects of this piece communicating one main idea?

[E4] S: I guess the main idea is just like umm like their kind of, like how much you can get from their relationship just in this one piece.

[E5] T: Okay, and what about their relationship?

In the intervention above, the tutor poses guiding questions to educate the student about the main purpose of a thesis statement and to help the student to think more clearly about the paper’s main idea. What follows is a detailed analysis of this interventions.

In E1 above, the tutor is asking a probing question to encourage the student to think about the message conveyed by the three main elements of the thesis (the colors, positions, themes/messages) in the context of her argument. In E2, the student responds to the tutor’s question by briefly interpreting the meaning of each of the three elements. In E3, the tutor highlights the main purpose of a thesis statement by explaining that it should give readers the “so what” aspect, or the main idea, of the paper. By using the term “so what” the tutor is trying to revert back to one of the student’s stated concerns of addressing the “so what” aspect of her

paper. In E3, the tutor also extends her initial question (see E1) by asking the student to probe a little deeper into the significance of the three main elements of her thesis and to identify if they are communicating a central idea. Thus, by raising important guiding questions in E1 and E3, the tutor is doing two things. First, she is trying to educate the student that the main purpose of a thesis statement is to convey the main idea or “so what” aspect of a paper. Second, she is trying to help the student think more clearly about the paper’s main idea. In E4, the student seems to be moving toward her main idea which, according to her description, is to show that a single visual can reveal quite a lot about the relationship between the two characters shown in the visual. The tutor raises a follow-up question in E5, asking the student to explain the relationship between the two characters.

The student then refers to the image and provides a detailed explanation about the relationship between the two characters. In short, she explains that the character on the right was “God-like” who has never lost a fight, while the other character was considered to be the “bad guy” because he was half-human and half-ghoul. This is why the God-like character is represented in white and the other character is represented in black, she clarifies. After listening to the student’s explanation, the tutor makes the following suggestion:

[E6] T: So the colors and the positions communicate something about their relationship to one another. So just by me as a viewer looking at this picture, I can get ideas of the two characters’ relation to one and other. So that’s kind of your ‘so what’ right? Why do we even need to care about this picture? Because there is a lot of underlying themes there about how these characters relate to each other.

[E7] S: Okay

[E8] T: And so some of that, I think you got some of those ideas in this first sentence here, but it gets a little bit lost

[E9] S: Yeah that's, sorry didn't mean to interrupt. He said, for this part he said that (referring to reviewers comments in her draft) "present it in a clear way and seems to be hiding." So I think that is what you are kind of at.

[E10] T: Yeah, so how may we be able to pull that out from some of the, like so that it's not hiding anymore?

[E11] S: Umm, I guess if I re-worded it and say like through this stuff that's how he was like able to like exploit the relationship and portray it.

[E12] T: Yeah, yeah.

[E13] S: I'll make a note of this

[E14] T: I was going to say, whatever kind of notes you need to take so that you will understand later. Okay, cool. So that's kind of your main thesis, and I think that that is strong, I mean that gives me the "so what." Why do we need to care about this picture? Because if we analyze it and look at what the picture is communicating about the relationship, then we can better understand the whole story.

The intervention above shows that although the student raised a specific sentence-level concern in her thesis (see E9), the tutor did not address this concern completely. Throughout the thesis intervention, the tutor is more focused on addressing the student's first concern, the "so what" aspect of the thesis, and in the process neglects the student's other concern – the confusion regarding the second sentence of the thesis. As a result, the student's revised thesis has quite a few sentence-level errors. This highlights the importance of responding to students' specific needs and also to keep an eye on sentence-level issues while addressing a higher-order concern such as a thesis statement. I present a detailed analysis of this intervention below.

In E6 above, the tutor is trying to articulate the main idea or "so what" aspect of the paper for the student. The tutor is doing this based on the student's description of her main idea in E4 as well as her explanation of the relationship between the two characters. In other words, the tutor is using the student's own ideas to distill the paper's main idea for the student. This strategy

of helping clarify a student's own ideas through probing questions is a recommended practice of writing center instruction (North, "The Idea of a Writing Center," 1984). Furthermore, in E6, the tutor is also focusing on the paper's rhetorical context by prompting the student to think about her main idea/thesis in relation to her audience. For instance when the tutor says "So just by me as a viewer looking at this picture, I can get ideas of the two characters' relation to one and other," she is trying to highlight the paper's thesis from a reader's perspective. Thus, in E6, the tutor is trying to help the student not only to articulate her thesis more clearly, but also to do so in the context of her audience.

In E8, the tutor points to the thesis statement and suggests that although some aspects of the main idea are reflected in the first sentence, the main idea is "lost" beyond the first sentence of the thesis. The student responds promptly in E9, informing the tutor that one of her peer reviewers had also suggested that her thesis was not presented clearly and the main idea seemed "to be hiding." The tutor then asks the student, in E10, to think about how she might address this issue. Here too, the tutor is following standard writing center practice of encouraging students to make revisions independently after identifying and explaining the problem. This, it may be worth mentioning, shows how my analysis can point to tutoring best practices as they take place during a session. Such revelations in turn can be very useful for tutor training programs as well as writing center assessment initiatives. In E11, the student briefly responds to the tutor's question by suggesting that she needs to "reword" the thesis to show that through the use of various elements, such as the colors, positions, and underlying messages, the author of the visual was able to portray the relationship between the two characters. Considering this statement, it seems that the student had quite a clear understanding of how to go about revising her thesis. In E12, the tutor seems to be satisfied with the student's response, and in E13, the student agrees to make

a note of what they had just discussed. Finally, in E14 the tutor encourages the student to take notes to make sure that she does not forget what was discussed in the session and also suggests that the student's thesis is strong because it conveys the paper's main idea.

Considering the above thesis discussion between the tutor and student, it would be reasonable to expect the student to revise her thesis according to what was discussed in the session. After all, the tutor followed standard writing center practices of clarifying the student's ideas through guiding questions, allowed the student to come up with revision ideas, and provided a detailed explanation of how a thesis statement should convey the paper's main idea. Moreover, the student also seemed to have understood the tutor's suggestions quite well. However, in spite of what seemed to be a fruitful discussion, the student's revised thesis in the post-intervention draft does not clearly reflect either the paper's main idea or what was discussed in the session. Here's what the revised thesis looked like:

Ishida drew this piece in the sequel manga *Tokyo Ghoul:Re*, through the colors present in the piece, the positions of the characters and the underlying messages that are often present in Ishida's work; it shows the dynamic between the two characters present along with themes that encompass the series.(see the post-intervention draft in Appendix IV)

We can see that the original thesis shown below is not very different from the revised one:

Ishida drew this piece in the sequel manga *Tokyo Ghoul:Re*, which shows the dynamic between the two characters present along with themes that encompass the series. This is shown through the colors present in the piece, the positions of the characters and the underlying themes/messages that are common in Ishida's work.

If we compare the two thesis statements, we can see that the student has not made any significant revisions to her original thesis. In her revised thesis, all she has done is switch the

order of the first two sentences of the original thesis and replace the period between the two sentences with a semi-colon. For instance, she has moved almost the entire second sentence from the original thesis (i.e. “through the colors...Ishida’s work) to the first sentence in the revised sentence. Similarly, she has moved parts of the first sentence of the original thesis (i.e. “...which shows...the series.”) to after the semi-colon in the revised version (i.e. “...work; it shows...the series.”). Thus, the student has simply changed the order of the two sentences and kept everything else more or less the same.

We can see that, as she had indicated in E11, the student was trying to convey the idea that the author, Ishida, was trying to show the relationship between the two characters through the colors, positions of the characters, and the underlying themes/messages. However, her revised thesis has quite a few sentence-level issues, making it difficult to understand the main idea it was supposed to convey. For instance, the first sentence has a comma splice and is incomplete, the semicolon is used incorrectly, and the sentence after the semicolon is also incomplete. This suggests that while the student did understand the tutor’s higher-order suggestion that a thesis statement needs to convey the paper’s main idea, she was not able to execute it at the sentence-level. Perhaps, if the tutor had spent some time working with the student on some of the sentence-level issues within the thesis, it would have helped the student to come up with a more effective revision.

If we recall, the tutor did not spend any time on specific sentence-level issues while discussing the student’s thesis statement. Instead, she was focused on the higher-order concern of identifying the main idea of the paper. Furthermore, the tutor did not really address the second issue that the student wanted to work on – that a reader gets lost in the second sentence of the thesis (see E9 above). Perhaps, if the tutor had addressed this issue by trying to identify the

precise cause of this confusing sentence, it would have given them an opportunity to tackle the sentence-level issues of the thesis statement. However, as the tutor did not address this second concern completely, the student was not able to address the issue effectively after the session. This highlights the need for tutors to respond to the specific issues that students bring up during sessions. It also highlights the importance of paying attention to sentence-level issues while addressing higher-order concerns such as a thesis statement.

After discussing the thesis statement, the tutor and student decided to review the third paragraph (see Exhibit 4) because the student wanted to address the peer reviewers' comments regarding the second and third sentences in the paragraph. The student told the tutor that although both her peer reviewers had commented that these two sentences were off-topic, she thought that these sentences were important and needed to be included in the paragraph. The student also explained, in response to the tutor's question, that this paragraph included background information about the Tokyo Ghoul series. The tutor suggested that they read through the paragraph to figure out if the issue can be addressed by reordering the sentences within the paragraph. After the student read the paragraph aloud, the tutor and student talked about ways to address the off-topic sentences as shown in the transcript below:

[E1] T: Okay so we have this general background of Tokyo Ghoul, which is the name of the whole series about him. So at the very beginning of the first one do you get this background of the accident?

[E2] S: Yeah that's like the first chapter.

[E3] T: Okay. Umm so maybe we could move some of this background up before we get into what Ghouls are.

[E4] S: Okay

[E5] T: Like readers get a background of you know he gets this surgery, he gets you know this is why these are transplanted into him

[E6] S: So I guess if I move these two sentences and then I can put this one after and kind of say like why that's a bad thing

[E7] T: Uh huh

[E8] S: Okay (makes a note of this)

[E9] T: And is this eating of humans like is that do you communicate that when you're analyzing this picture?

[E10] S: No

[E11] T: So, maybe that is a little more off-topic. I think the "heightened senses and abilities" still feels like important aspect of the Ghouls to communicate, but the human kind of aspect is not something you are exploring.

[E12] S: I just didn't really know cause I talk about how they're seen as the bad guys, I didn't know like I don't want to say that unless cause that's like mostly the reason why they are seen like that

[E13] T: Okay

[E14] S: So I don't know if that's still

[E15] T: So if we move (skimming the paragraph) "ghoul organs transplanted into him. After getting into an accident. Surgery turned Kaneki into a half-ghoul, but after training he becomes stronger than many other ghouls. The events in the sequel series take place a few years after *Tokyo Ghoul* working for the CCG" and then what if we moved this information about what the CCG is and then within that explanation of what the CCG does you can communicate this

[E16] S: I can say like they hunt ghouls because like

[E17] T: Uh huh

[E18] S: (takes notes) that makes sense

[E19] T: Okay, and then the part about eating humans is directly related to this, why is a ghoul bad, as opposed to just this general description of Kaneki.

[E20] S: Okay

The intervention above highlights a few important issues. First, it shows how a tutor's intervention can successfully influence structural revisions in a student's draft. Second, it shows that students can use a tutor's general suggestion to make specific revision decisions

independently after a session. Third, it highlights the peer-to-peer nature of writing center consultations by showing that students do not necessarily feel obliged to accept a tutor's suggestions blindly during a session. Students exercise their agency and discuss their point of view quite freely during sessions. Finally, it shows that sometimes tutors do intervene directly by providing very specific suggestions. However, the intervention also shows that students use their own discretion while making final post-session revisions and do not always accept their tutors direct suggestions. A detailed analysis of this intervention is presented below.

In E1, the tutor is asking the student if the background information about Kaneki's accident (see the fifth and sixth sentences in exhibit 4) is presented to readers at the beginning of the Tokyo Ghoul series. In E2, the student informs the tutor that this information is presented in the first chapter of the series. Based on this information, the tutor suggests, in E3 and E5, that this background information about the accident should be moved further up in the paragraph to explain why Kaneki needed the organ transplant. In E6, the student agrees to this suggestion and proposes to move "two sentences" (most likely the fifth and sixth sentences since they are about Kaneki's accident and surgery) to the beginning of the paragraph. The student also proposes to move another sentence (most likely the second and third sentences, since they are describing ghouls and were the two off-topic sentences she was concerned about) further down in the paragraph. If we look at the revised paragraph in Exhibit 5, we can see that the student has followed the tutor's suggestion of moving the background information to the beginning of the paragraph. The student has moved the fifth, sixth, and seventh sentences in Exhibit 4 to the second, third, and fourth sentences respectively in Exhibit 5. The student also came up with a specific revision plan (i.e. moving the two sentences up and taking the off-topic sentences down) independently, based on the tutor's suggestion. Furthermore, in the actual revision, which took

place after the session, the student also made some changes that were not discussed in the session. The student moved not just the two sentences (fifth and sixth sentences) as she had indicated in E6, but also the seventh sentence to the beginning of the paragraph. Thus, to address the tutor's general guideline of restructuring the background information, the student used her own discretion to make specific revisions after the session.

In E9, the tutor tries to address the two off-topic sentences (second and third sentences in Exhibit 4) that the student was concerned about in this paragraph by asking the student if her visual analysis communicated the idea that ghouls eat humans. In E11, based on the student's response to this question in E10, the tutor suggests that perhaps the part about ghouls eating humans is off-topic because the student is not really exploring this aspect of ghouls in her analysis. However, the student tends to disagree with the tutor regarding this issue. In E12 and E14, the student suggests that this information is important because it conveys the idea that ghouls are seen as "bad guys." If we look at the revised paragraph in Exhibit 5, we can see that the student has not deleted this information but instead moved it to the sixth sentence in the paragraph. The student, therefore, did not blindly follow the tutor's suggestion. Instead, she tried to convince the tutor why this particular sentence was important for her paper. This shows that in writing center consultations, students exercise their agency and do not feel obliged to accept the tutor's suggestions blindly. More importantly, this also points to the peer-to-peer theory of writing center tutorials which stipulates that tutors are peer collaborators rather than authoritative figures (Bruffee 1984).

In E15, the tutor tries to help the student find a place to move the two "off-topic sentences" to a more suitable place in the paragraph. She suggests that if the fourth sentence in Exhibit 4, which describes that the CCG "works to hunt down ghouls and protect

humans/humanity,” is moved, the student can communicate the two “off-topic” sentences within the context of this sentence. In other words, she is suggesting that the fourth sentence should be moved further down in the paragraph and that the two off-topic sentences should be positioned after it. Here, the tutor does seem to be intervening directly, or in other words, telling the student what to do in very specific terms. It probably would have been more fruitful had the tutor solicited the student’s ideas regarding these two “off-topic” sentence. This way, the student would have an opportunity to think through the problem and come up with a solution. However, the tutor seems to be making the revision for the student in E15. I will present a detailed analysis of such directive tutoring strategies in chapter four.

In E16 and E18, the student seems to be agreeing to the tutor’s suggestion and even comes up with an idea to link the fourth sentence to the two off-topic sentences. In E19, the tutor explains that by making this change, the student can present the negative aspects of ghouls more generally without pointing specifically to Kaneki. If we look at the revised paragraph in Exhibit 5 below, we can see that the student has not followed through on this discussion very accurately. Instead of having the fourth sentence (in Exhibit 4) precede the two off-topic sentences, the student has placed the fourth sentence after the two off-topic sentences (see fifth, sixth, and seventh sentences in exhibit 5). Considering the tutor’s suggestion in E15 and the student’s explanation in E16, it would be reasonable to expect the student to present the sentence about what the CCG does first (i.e. the fourth sentence in Exhibit 4) and then transition into the two off-topic sentences as a way to explain why it is necessary for the CCG to hunt down ghouls and protect humanity. However, the student has not followed through on this idea in the revised paragraph in Exhibit 5. This suggests that students use their own discretion while making revisions after the session and that directive suggestions may not always be followed up by

students. It also suggests, as I mentioned above, that this intervention probably would have been more fruitful if the tutor solicited the student's views on the matter.

Exhibit 4: Third Paragraph from the Pre-Intervention Draft

Tokyo Ghoul is a series about Kaneki Ken and his life after having ghoul organs transplanted into him. Outwardly, ghouls are the same as humans, because most of their differences are due to their biology. They can only eat humans or other ghouls and have heightened senses and healing abilities. The Commission of Counter Ghoul (CCG) works to hunt down ghouls and protect humans/humanity. After getting into an accident, in order to save Kaneki's life, the doctors proceed with a transplant of organs from a ghoul. The surgery turned Kaneki into a half-ghoul, but after training he becomes stronger than many other ghouls. The events in the sequel series *Tokyo Ghoul:Re* take place a few years after *Tokyo Ghoul* and now has Kaneki working at the CCG and was "trained" under Arima. Arima is the best investigator and fighter at the CCG who has taken many ghouls down and the only one to have ever even scratch him, was Kaneki. Their dynamic and relationship is very important to the series in general, but has been more prevalent in *Tokyo Ghoul:Re*, which is where Ishida included this piece.

Exhibit 5: Revised Third Paragraph from the Post-Intervention Draft

Tokyo Ghoul is a series about Kaneki Ken and his life after having ghoul organs transplanted into him. After getting into an accident, in order to save Kaneki's life, the doctors proceed with a transplant of organs from a ghoul. The surgery turned Kaneki into a half-ghoul, but after training he becomes stronger than many other ghouls. The events in the sequel series *Tokyo Ghoul:Re* take place a few years after *Tokyo Ghoul* and now has Kaneki working at the Commission of Counter Ghoul (CCG) and was "trained" under Arima. Outwardly, ghouls are the same as humans, because most of their differences are due to their biology. They can only eat humans or other ghouls and have heightened senses and healing abilities. The CCG works to hunt down ghouls and protect humans/humanity. Arima is the best investigator and fighter at the CCG who has taken many ghouls down and the only one to have ever even scratch him, was Kaneki. Their dynamic and relationship is very important to the series in general, but has been more prevalent in *Tokyo Ghoul:Re*, which is where Ishida included this piece.

After discussing the third paragraph, the tutor suggested that they review the analysis section to make sure “it is jumping back to the thesis.” The student agreed and read the fourth paragraph (see Exhibit 6), the first analysis paragraph, and also pulled up the picture she was analyzing on her phone for the tutor. The student made some minor sentence-level revisions as she read the paragraph. In addition, the tutor and student revised a passive sentence, eliminated some unnecessary words, and restructured a few sentences within the paragraph to improve the overall clarity of the paragraph. The transcript below outlines the “passive sentence” discussion between the tutor and student.

[E1] T: Let’s jump back a minute to this sentence here. (Reading the sentence) “With Arima on the other hand has his head held up and can be assumed to be looking at the sky.” This is, I think we’ve got too many verbs here. Umm “With Arima on the other hand” and then we have no subject for this verb here - “has”

[E2] S: Can I just get rid of that and say “his head”

[E3] T: Yeah.

[E4] S: His head “is held up” or “held up?”

[E5] T: His head, yeah, is

[E6] S: okay, sorry (laughing)

[E7] T: is held up and so this works. It’s in passive voice right now - his head is held up - so how might we be able to make that into active voice?

[E8] S: He is holding his head up?

[E9] T: Umm close

[E10] S: He holds his head up?

[E11] T: Yes, yep that’s right. So with this with “his head is” his head is the one that is doing the action, but his head cannot be the one doing the action. He is the one who is holding his head.

[E12] S: Okay

The intervention above demonstrates how a tutor can create opportunities for students to learn through practice during a session. The tutor identifies a passive sentence, explains the concept of passive and active sentences, and makes room for the student to revise the passive sentence during the session. As a result, the student gets an opportunity to learn through practice. A detailed analysis of this intervention is presented below.

In the above intervention, the tutor identifies a problematic sentence, the sixth sentence in Exhibit 6, and works with the student to revise it. In E1, the tutor reads the sentence aloud and identifies that the verb “has” is missing a subject. In E2, the student comes up with a suggestion to address this issue. While trying to revise the sentence, the student asks for the tutor’s clarification in E4. The student’s intended revision would have looked like this: “With Arima on the other hand, his head is held up and can be assumed to be looking at the sky.” In E7, the tutor points out that the student’s revision is in passive voice and encourages the student to come up with ideas to convert the sentence into active voice. Here, the tutor is not just pointing out a passive sentence, but also giving the student an opportunity to learn how to convert a passive sentence into an active one through practice. By encouraging the student to come up with the revision in E8 and E10, the tutor allows the student to learn through practice. Finally, in E11, the tutor explains the difference between a passive and active construction. In this exchange, we can observe that the tutor has identified specific problems within the sentence, explained the reason for the problems, and allowed the student to come up with revisions, with the goal of allowing the student to learn through practice. The revised version in Exhibit 7 clearly reflects the issues discussed in this intervention. After working on this sentence, they worked on the overall structure of the paragraph (fourth paragraph) to improve its clarity as shown in the transcript below:

[E1] T: (Reading thesentence of the paragraph) “He looks at the audience to say that although he is the protagonist and has the abilities of a ghoul, he still wants to be seen as normal.” So, “he looks at the audience,” is it worth moving the conversation about the eye up here, right after this?

[E2] S: I think so. That way it could still be talking about the eye contact and then if I end with talking about Arima then it could go about talking a little bit more about his position

[E3] T: Uh huh. Yeah so what might that look like?

[E4] S: I guess I could take out “Also both Kaneki and Arima have their important side showing.” I guess I can take that sentence out altogether and just move, I could move, yeah I could take out this sentence and then move this one to after “he seems normal.” And I could add like another sentence kind of explanation and then go into more of

The above transcript shows that the tutor and student worked collaboratively to restructure this paragraph. The tutor solicits the student’s inputs instead of issuing directives. As a result, the student is engaged in the discussion. This reiterates the peer-to-peer nature of writing center consultations. A detailed description of this intervention is presented below.

In E1, the tutor is reading the fifth sentence of the fourth paragraph (see Exhibit 6). By the “conversation about the eye,” she is referring to the last sentence in the paragraph, more specifically the part that talks about Kaneki showing his ghoul eyes. Thus, the tutor is exploring the idea of moving this information about Kaneki’s ghoul eye from the last sentence of the paragraph to after the fifth sentence. The tutor’s words “is it worth moving the conversation about the eye up here, right after this?” suggests that she is asking for the students input on this idea rather than issuing a directive. In E2, the student engages with the tutor’s question. She not only agrees to the tutor’s proposition but also explains its implications for the paragraph. She reasons that this move will allow her to continue talking about Kaneki’s eye contact after the fifth sentence as well as to focus on Arima’s position at the end. In E3, the tutor asks the student how she might go about making these changes in the paragraph. Here again, the tutor is soliciting

the student's ideas instead of telling her what to do. In E4, the student suggests that she can delete the second last sentence of the paragraph (see Exhibit 6) and move the first half of the last sentence ("Kaneki is showing his 'ghoul eye' which is how he is recognized...") to after the fifth sentence. She also suggests adding another sentence, but it is not exactly clear what the sentence might look like or where it would be added. If we look at the revised paragraph in Exhibit 7, we can see that the student has followed up on these ideas quite clearly. She has deleted the second last sentence and also moved the first half of the last sentence further up in the paragraph (see 5th and 6th sentences in Exhibit 7) where she talks about Kaneki's eye contact. The discussion continued as follows:

[E5] T: So is "important side," is that a term from the series from the Manga?

[E6] S: No, I just didn't know like, I didn't know if I should just like say "important" or like it's like "loosely important." I wasn't quite sure how to term that.

[E7] T: Okay

[E8] S: Because umm and how I said like he it's his "ghoul eye showing" is important and then his one eye that is his "weak spot" which is like important. But I didn't know if I should use a different word to explain that or something.

[E9] T: Yeah. Yeah-yeah. Let's umm so Kaneki looks with his ghoul eye which is a way of me as a reader identifying him as half-ghoul?

[E10] S: Uh huh and also like the other (inaudible)

[E11] T: So "he looks at the audience" you can put "with his ghoul eye"

[E12] S: Uh huh

[E13] T: "eye" and (reading from the paragraph) "still wants to be seen as normal. With Arima on the other hand he holds his head and can be assumed to be looking at the sky. Arima is seen to have God-like abilities, even though his is still a regular human, but his position backs up this sentiment and says he is above the audience." So I think talking about his weak eye showing in conjunction with this analysis

[E14] S: Umm

[E15] T: Go ahead

[E16] S: I think I could say cause like this shows he is above the audience but I could say like having his like weak eye showing is saying like he is still vulnerable.

[E17] T: Yes, perfect.

In the above intervention too, the tutor and student collaborate closely to revise the structure and overall clarity of the paragraph. While the tutor facilitates the discussion by raising probing questions, the student responds to the tutor's questions to come up with revision ideas. A detailed analysis of this is presented below.

Referring to the second last sentence, the tutor, in E5, questions the student about the term, "important sides." In E6 and E8, the student responds to the tutor's question, explaining why she used the term to describe the two characters' eyes. In E9, the tutor acknowledges the student's response and asks for the student's clarification regarding the significance of Kaneki's ghoul eye. In E11 and E13, the tutor reads the fifth, sixth, seventh sentences and suggests some specific sentence-level changes to integrate the discussion about Kaneki's ghoul eyes from the last sentence of the paragraph into the fifth sentence. She also suggests that the student can talk about Arima's weak eye in relation to her analysis of Arima's position. In E14, the student interrupts the tutor to address this suggestion of linking Arima's weak eyes to his position, and in E16, the student explains how she can make this connection. This suggestion is clearly reflected in the last sentence of the revised paragraph (See Exhibit 7). Here again, we can see that tutor and student are engaged in this very collaborative process of thinking through ideas in order work on the structure and overall clarity of the paragraph. While the tutor identifies major concerns, raises probing questions, and offers general guidelines, the student understands the concerns raised by the tutor and responds to her questions to come up with revision ideas. In a way the tutor is playing the role of a coach and the student that of a player as suggested by Leigh

and Zimmerelli in *The Bedford Guide for Writing Tutors* (29). While the tutor is identifying the problem and offering general guidelines, the student is making every effort to follow the tutor's guidelines and address the identified problem. Their discussion continues as follows:

[E18] S: (Taking notes) But this part is saying like his ghoul eye, how could I like umm fit in like that's like how he is recognized in the context of that sentence?

[E19] T: Uh huh. (Reading) "He looks at the audience" with his ghoul eye umm

[E20] S: I guess, sorry,

[E21] T: You're fine

[E22] S: I guess saying like although he is the protagonist, maybe saying something like and shows his ghoul eye, which is like

[E23] T: (Reading aloud trying to revise the sentence) "He looks at the audience to show that although, looks at his audience with his ghoul eye to say that although he is the protagonist and has the abilities of a ghoul, he still wants to be seen as normal. He looks at the audience to say." So, so the main idea that you are pulling from this analysis of his gazing at the audience is that he is communicating he still wants to be normal.

[E24] S: Uh huh and like work like on the same level.

[E25] T: But the fact that the eye that is gazing at the audience is the ghoul eye communicates what?

[E26] S: That like he can't be normal?

[E27] T: Uh huh. So what if we made those into two, two sentences. (Reading aloud trying to revise the sentence) "He looks at the audience to say that umm he still wants to be normal or still wants to be seen as normal but"

[E28] S: Umm with having his ghoul eye make-up like looking at the audience, he doesn't have that option.

[E29] T: Uh huh

[E30] S: So just kind of get rid of the "although protagonist" part?

[E31] T: Uh huh

[E32] S: (Taking notes)

[E33] T: Cool. So how do you feel about that?

[E34] S: I like the paragraph.

Together, the excerpts presented above (i.e. E1 to E34) show that the tutor and student worked in a very collaborative manner as they discussed ideas to restructure the fourth paragraph. The excerpts demonstrate how a tutor can facilitate student revisions without being too directive. They also demonstrate that tutors can create opportunities for students to push their thinking further by asking probing questions and offering general guidelines. What follows is a detailed analysis of E18 through E34.

In E18, the student first takes notes regarding their discussion about Arima's position and eyes. Then she raises a question about the tutor's earlier suggestion regarding the fifth sentence (see E11 and E13). We can infer from E18 that the student wants to also include, in the context of the fifth sentence, the idea that Kaneki is recognized by his ghoul-eyes. As the tutor tries to address this concern in E19, the student interrupts her in E20 and tries to come up with a solution in E22. In E23 and E25, the tutor probes the issue a bit further by asking the student about the main idea behind this part of the analysis about Kaneki's ghoul eyes. As a result, the tutor helps to identify the two main issues related to this part of the analysis – i.e. Kaneki wants to be seen as normal, but he cannot because of his ghoul eyes. Once again, the tutor is only acting as a facilitator here. She did not come up with these two main ideas. Rather, these ideas were included in the paper. All the tutor did was facilitate a process to highlight them for the student. Based on this discussion, in E27, the tutor offers the student another guideline – to consider breaking the fifth sentence into two sentences to convey the two main ideas. The tutor also tries to provide an example of how this can be done. In E28, the student completes the tutor's example from E27, and in E29, she seeks the tutor's approval regarding deleting a few phrases (i.e. "although he is the protagonist" from the fifth sentence. The tutor approves in E 31 and the

student takes notes to document their discussion. The fifth and sixth sentences in the revised paragraph (see Exhibit 7) clearly reflects this discussion. The above transcript shows that the tutor and student worked in a very collaborative manner as they discussed ideas to restructure this paragraph.

Exhibit 6: Fourth Paragraph from the Pre-Intervention Draft

In this piece, Kaneki is drawn on the left and Arima is on the right while they both stand backs to each other. Kaneki is making eye contact with the audience, this could be seen as breaking the fourth wall but it may not be as simple as that. When characters break the fourth wall ~~this~~ ^{it is} they "acknowledge their fictionality" and more often than not used for comedic effect (TV Tropes). While he does make eye contact, it is done in a way that ~~makes it seem~~ Kaneki is resonating with the audience, rather than making a joke out of his existence. He looks at the audience to say that ~~although he is the protagonist~~ and has the abilities of a ghoul, he still wants to be seen as normal. With Arima on the other hand, ~~has his head held up~~ and can be assumed to be looking to the sky. Arima is seen to have God-like abilities, even though he is still a regular human, but his position backs up that sentiment and says that he is above the audience. Also, both Kaneki and Arima have their "important" sides showing. Kaneki is showing his "ghoul-eye" which is how he is recognized and Arima has his eye showing that is theorized to be going blind and his one weak spot. } ^{makes him vulnerable}

Exhibit 7: Revised Fourth Paragraph from the Revised Draft

In this piece, Kaneki is drawn on the left and Arima is on the right while they both stand backs to each other. Kaneki is making eye contact with the audience, this could be seen as breaking the fourth wall but it may not be as simple as that. When characters break the fourth wall they “acknowledge their fictionality” and more often than not it is used for comedic effect (TV Tropes). While he does make eye contact, it is done in a way that seems Kaneki is resonating with the audience, rather than making a joke out of his existence. He looks at the audience to say that although he is the protagonist and has the abilities of a ghoul, he still wants to be seen as normal. Looking at the audience with his “ghoul-eye”, which makes him recognizable in the series, he does not have that option. With Arima on the other hand, he holds his head up and can be assumed to be looking to the sky. Arima is seen to have God-like abilities, even though he is still a regular human, but his position backs up that sentiment and says that he is above the audience. Arima has his eye showing that is theorized to be going blind and his one weak spot, with this he becomes vulnerable.

Next, the tutor and student moved to the fifth paragraph, the second analysis paragraph in the paper (see Exhibit 8). After the student read the paragraph, the tutor and student discussed the paragraph’s main idea and addressed the paper’s coherence by working on a missing link between this and an earlier paragraph. The following transcript outlines this discussion:

[E1] T: So your main idea is that he is, Karma?

[E2] S: Arima

[E3] T: Arima is depicted as “white” in here because he is not ghoul at all and he is like the hunter of the bad people. And, what’s his name?

[E4] S: Kaneki

[E5] T: Kaneki is, fights for the bad, fights against the bad people, but he is also part bad himself, so that’s where you kind of see the black and white distinction. Do you talk about the red at all?

[E6] S: Oh yeah that comes within the next one.

[E7] T: Oh, okay. So this is also color here (referring to another color in the image).

[E8] S: Umm it's a little bit cause that has to do with like the hidden meaning that could be with the red. Do you want me to go ahead and read that one or do you want to still?

[E9] T: Umm, well I wonder so you talk about "God-like" up here, but that doesn't come into your like "black white" analysis. It feels to me like a reader that that would be part of it since you mentioned "God-like" here in the way that they are positioned umm. How does that feel to you? Or do you feel like

[E10] S: No, I feel like that makes sense umm. I guess I could say like when I talk about why he is white, I can say like umm I'm trying to think it could be. Because he, like with his like abilities, god-like abilities, like he uses to hunt down ghouls, I don't know how I could fit that into this sentence.

[E11] T: So Arima's whiteness communicates both his god-like abilities and that he is fighting against the bad guys. Both those things.

[E12] S: (Taking notes)

[E13] T: And as far as word count, because you've already designated ghouls as the bad guys earlier in your paper, I think you can just say "hunted down the ghouls"

[E14] S: Okay

[E15] T: Then you don't have to say "bad guys, which are the ghouls." Save several words there.

[E16] S: So I could say "Arima's white communicates his God-like abilities and how he hunts down the ghouls"

The above intervention demonstrates how tutors can steer the discussion toward important higher-order concerns such as a paragraph's main idea and coherence between paragraphs. Furthermore, it shows how tutors can respond as readers and offer general guidelines to facilitate a student's revision process. Finally, the intervention shows that the tutor and student engaged in a collaborative and fruitful discussion regarding a missing link in the student's analysis.

In exchanges 1, 3, and 5, the tutor summarizes the main idea of paragraph five (see Exhibit 8) in which the student has analyzed the black and white colors used in the visual in relation to the two characters, Arima and Kaneki, depicted in it. In E5, the tutor questions the student about the red color used in the visual. The student responds, in E6, saying that she has analyzed the red color in the next paragraph. In E7, the tutor asks the student about another color in image, and in E8, the student responds saying that she has combined the analysis of this “other color” with the red color analysis. In these exchanges, we can see that by steering the discussion to the paragraph’s main idea and analysis, the tutor is focusing on higher-level (global) concerns. In E9, the tutor raises another important higher-order concern related to the paper’s overall coherence. She identifies a missing link between the fourth and fifth paragraphs, namely the link between the “God-like” abilities of Arima in the fourth paragraph and the association of Arima as “white” in the fifth. Here again, the tutor is not directing the student to make the connection. Rather, she makes it clear that she is responding as a reader, saying that such a connection is what “a reader” would expect. Furthermore, she invites the student to weigh in on the issue rather than directing the student to follow her suggestion.

In E10, the student agrees with the tutor’s view and tries to come up with ideas to make the connection between Arima’s “whiteness” and “God-like” abilities in the sixth sentence of the paragraph (see Exhibit 8). In E11, the tutor summarizes the main idea of the proposed revision to facilitate the student’s revision process. Here again, the tutor is providing a general guideline, as a coach would, instead of revising the sentence word-for-word for the student. In E12, the student makes a note of the tutor’s summary. If we look at Exhibit 8, we can see that the student has circled “white” in the sixth sentence and written “communicates his God-like abilities & fighting.” In E13 and E15, the tutor helps the student weed out some unnecessary words for the

sentence (sixth sentence). Finally, in E16, the student comes up with a tentative revision of the sixth sentence – “Arima’s white communicates his God-like abilities and how he hunts down the ghouls.” In the revised paragraph in Exhibit 9, this sentence is further refined as follows: “Arima is white, which communicates his God-like abilities and duty to hunt down the ghouls.” Thus, the tutor and student engaged in a very collaborative, fruitful discussion regarding a missing link in the student’s analysis, which is clearly reflected in the revised draft.

Exhibit 8: Fifth Paragraph from the Pre-Intervention Draft

When the colors black and white are used, it is common to assume there is some level of good versus evil happening. While that does play a part into this piece, it also has to do with aliases the characters go by. Arima goes by many names in the CCG, one of which is the White Reaper. Once Kaneki starts working with the CCG, the ghouls he hunts down and other characters refer to him as the Black Reaper. There is not much explanation as to why these are their aliases, but it could have to do with the side they are supposed to be on. Arima is white because of his duty to the CCG and hunting down the ~~bad~~ guys in the series, which are the ghouls. Kaneki is then the contrast of that because he is half-ghoul so he winds up in the bad group although he does work ~~so~~ the CCG. On the outside the CCG can be seen as the heroes, *for*

(communicates
his God-like
abilities &
duty)

because they are the ones protecting the humans. Occasionally in the series, characters wonders if the ghouls they are killing are supposed to be the bad guys, even when they are innocent.

Exhibit 9: Revised Fifth Paragraph from the Post-Intervention Draft

When the colors black and white are used, it is common to assume there is some level of good versus evil happening. While that does play a part into this piece, it also has to do with aliases the characters go by. Arima goes by many names in the CCG, one of which is the White Reaper. Once Kaneki starts working with the CCG, the ghouls he hunts down and other characters refer to him as the Black Reaper. There is not much explanation as to why these are their aliases, but it most likely has to do with the side they are supposed to be on. Arima is white, which communicates his God-like abilities and duty to hunt down the ghouls. Kaneki is then the contrast of that because he is half-ghoul so he winds up in the bad group although he does work for the CCG. On the outside the CCG can be seen as the heroes, because they are the ones protecting the humans. Occasionally in the series, characters wonders if the ghouls they are killing are supposed to be the bad guys, even when they are innocent.

After this, the tutor reminded the student that they had about ten minutes remaining in the session and suggested that they review the final analysis paragraph, the sixth paragraph in the paper (see Exhibit 10). After the student read the paragraph, the tutor explained how the student can make stronger claims and reorganized the last two sentences of the paragraph. The transcript below presents the discussion about making stronger claims.

[E1] T: Yeah, so one thing that I am noticing in this paragraph, and some of your other paragraphs as well, umm when you are doing an analysis right, you are saying: I see these things and this is what it means. And sometimes, especially like if this is like your first time doing your analysis of the Manga artwork, it feels kind of weird to take as much like of a stance and say “this means this” right. And it feels more comfortable saying “this could mean this.” Umm, but when you are the one that’s making the analysis right, and when you have pulled all of your pieces of evidence, then part of that analysis is making that like strong statement of like “I see these things” and “this means this.”

[E2] S: Okay

[E3] T: And so some of the statements that you’ve got, “this could be” or “this might be” or “this maybe,” taking some of those out of each of your paragraphs and making those

strong statements - “this is foreshadowing, this means that Kaneki will” - you know something like that

[E4] S: Okay

[E5] T: Umm would be something to, as you read back through, kind of make some of these edits, sort of keep an eye out for making those strong statements and claiming that “I see this and it means this.”

[E6] S: Okay (takes notes)

[E7] T: And I like that you pull other evidence from the rest of Ishida’s work that works really well.

The above intervention demonstrates how tutors can take on a “teaching role.” The tutor not only raises an important higher-order concern, but also teaches the student important concepts such as the role of a researcher, the process of reporting an analysis, and the importance of making stronger claims. What follows is a detailed analysis of this intervention.

In E1 and E3 above, the tutor is addressing a higher-order concern related to making stronger claims while presenting the results of an analysis. Here, the tutor is trying to educate the student about the importance of “taking a stance” to present her analysis more confidently. In E1, the tutor first acknowledges that “taking a stance” can be a challenging task for students who are just getting introduced to research/analytical projects, such as the visual analysis assignment the student was working on. The tutor, then, tries to empower the student by explaining that when a researcher has collected adequate evidence, she/he has every right to take report the findings confidently. In E3, the tutor identifies some of the student’s weaker claims in the sixth paragraph and provides some examples to revise them. Thus, the tutor is taking on a “teaching role” in this intervention. She is not just raising an important higher-order concern, but also “teaching” the student important concepts such as the role of a researcher, the process of reporting an analysis, and the importance of making stronger claims. If we look at the revised paragraph in Exhibit 11, we can see that the student has followed up on the tutor’s suggestion of

making stronger claims in the second and last sentences. Perhaps, the tutor's "teaching role" contributed to these revisions. In E7, the tutor gives some positive feedback regarding the use of external evidence.

After the above discussion, the student was concerned about whether the last sentence in the paragraph was too abrupt. The tutor and student addressed this issue next, which is documented in the transcript below.

[E1] S: (Referring to the last sentence in the paragraph) Does that feel like cut off, kind of too short, or does that kind of end in an okay way?

[E2] T: So (reading part of the last sentence) "foreshadowing, there was one character who had line crossing through her neck in a panel in the story, who would later then be decapitated." So are there any other underlying symbols in, you've got the red coloration, and you talk about the red line, are there any others in the picture? Or those are the main two?

[E3] S: Those are the main two.

[E4] T: Umm so maybe some kind of statement about umm (reads the last sentence in the paragraph aloud) umm (reads the fourth sentence in the paragraph aloud). What if we swapped the order of these two sentences (referring to the last two sentences in the paragraph)?

[E5] S: Umm so it's like giving

[E6] T: Uh huh so it's like giving this is what he has done in the rest of his work and this could mean this in this work.

[E7] S: So put this one after and then have that one come after?

[E8] T: Uh huh

[E9] S: Okay (takes notes)

[E10] T: Okay, does that still feel like it falls off or does that feel more of like a conclusive statement?

[E11] S: I feel like, I like how that went.

The intervention above shows that although the tutor is making a very specific suggestion, she is also leaving room for the student's input by presenting her suggestion in the form of a question. This in turn demonstrates how tutors navigate between directive and non-directive tutoring approaches. A detailed analysis of this intervention is presented below

In E1, the student is referring to her concern with the last sentence in the paragraph. In E2, the tutor tries to probe if there were other analytical components in the image that the student had possibly missed. The tutor's intention behind this question is not quite clear. Perhaps she was trying to determine if an additional layer of analysis could be added at the end of the paragraph to address the student's concern in E1. However, it's hard to tell for sure. In E4, after reading through a few sentences, the tutor makes a very specific suggestion of 'swapping' the position of the last two sentences in the paragraph. Here, the tutor seems to be coming up with the revision for the student by making this very specific suggestion. However, if we look at her language in E4, we can see that the tutor has asked a question and not issued a directive. Thus, although the tutor is making a very specific suggestion, she is also presenting it as a question, inviting the student's view on the issue. Furthermore, by asking "does that still feel like it falls off?" in E10, the tutor is making sure that the student has the final say on the issue. If we look at the revised paragraph in exhibit 11, we can see that the student has swapped the last two sentences as suggested. In chapter 4, as mentioned earlier, I will explore directive tutoring strategies in detail and try to focus on the question of how tutors' navigate the thin line between tutoring and doing the work for the student.

Exhibit 10: Sixth Paragraph from the Pre-Intervention Draft

Ishida Sui often as hidden messages in pieces, as well as foreshadows events a long time before they happen. It is common for the smallest thing to be a piece of foreshadow, which could maybe be present in this piece as well. Where the story is headed now, there is most likely going to be a large climax and fight between Kaneki and Arima. From this piece it can be seen that Arima has red splatters on his clothing, along with a red line going through his neck in the background. This could be a foreshadow to the outcome of Kaneki and Arima's fight, that Arima is the one who will be the one to fall at Kaneki's hand, rather than the other way around. In order to back up this theory and an example of Ishida's foreshadowing, there was one character who had a line cutting across her neck in a panel in the story, who would later then be decapitated.

15
X

Exhibit 11: Revised Sixth Paragraph from the Post-Intervention Draft

Ishida Sui often as hidden messages in pieces, as well as foreshadows events a long time before they happen. It is common for the smallest thing to be a piece of foreshadow, which is present in this piece as well. Where the story is headed now, there is most likely going to be a large climax and fight between Kaneki and Arima. From this piece it can be seen that Arima has red splatters on his clothing, along with a red line going through his neck in the background. In order to back up this theory and an example of Ishida's foreshadowing, there was one character who had a line cutting across her neck in a panel in the story, who would later then be decapitated. This foreshadows the outcome of Kaneki and Arima's fight that Arima will be the one to fall at Kaneki's hand, rather than the other way around.

After reviewing the final analysis paragraph (sixth paragraph), the tutor and student moved to the concluding paragraph (see exhibit 12) and worked on revising the second and third sentences. This discussion is presented below:

[E1] S: I don't know what I was trying to say there (while reading the second sentence in the conclusion)

[E2] T: So let's work that around a little bit

[E3] S: I think I was trying to say that even if people like didn't know what it was about they can still have like an impact on them

[E4] T: Uh huh

[E5] S: I think that's what I was trying to say there

[E6] T: Okay umm so shift this "even" (reads the second and third sentences of the conclusion aloud). Yeah, so this, the first part of this sentence, I think is what feels a little bit mucky. (Trying to revise the second sentence) "Even if the viewer had no prior knowledge about the subject of the piece" what did you just say a couple minutes ago?

[E7] S: Umm it could still have an impact, they could still like umm

[E8] T: And this might be where we want to like take out things from the thesis

[E9] S: So even if they had no prior knowledge of the like subject or of the piece umm with looking at the colors and placements, I guess they would know, through those things they could still like come to a conclusion about what this is about?

[E10] T: Well that's a little general. Our thesis, you said, allows you to come to a more specific

[E11] S: Oh right, about the relationship

[E12] T: Yeah

[E13] S: Yeah, thesis (laughing) okay

[E14] T: (Trying to revise the second sentence) "Even if the viewer had no prior knowledge about the subject of the piece"

[E15] S: (Taking notes) "they can still like see the relationship"

[E16] T: Yeah, yeah.

[E17] S: (Taking notes). And just take out this too (referring to the third sentence in the paragraph).

[E18] T: I think this second sentence (referring to the third sentence in the paragraph) is still necessary but this first one (referring to the second sentence in the paragraph) is kind of re-worked into this.

[E19] S: Uh huh

[E20] T: And I would even put this sentence (referring to the third sentence) before this one (referring to the second sentence).

[E21] S: Okay

[E22] T: So (Reading) “Art has the power to make an impact on the audience and make them think about what they are looking at. Even if the viewer had no prior knowledge of this piece” yeah.

[E23] S: I will probably remember what goes in there (laughing)

The above intervention reiterates how tutors can identify and steer the discussion toward higher-order concerns such as connecting a paragraph to the thesis. It also highlights the collaborative nature of the interaction between the tutor and student, which has clearly influenced the student's post-intervention draft. A detailed analysis of this intervention is presented below.

In E1, the student expresses her confusion with the second sentence, and in E3, she tries to explain what she wanted to say in that sentence. In E6, the tutor identifies the first half of the second sentence as problematic, reads the second half of the sentence, and draws on the student's explanation in E3 to facilitate the revision. In E8, the tutor suggests that this would be a good place to revert back to the thesis. Here again, by prompting the student to connect her concluding paragraph to the thesis statement, the tutor is addressing a higher-order concern. In E9, the student promptly responds to the tutor's prompt, trying to connect the second sentence to the thesis. In E10, the tutor prompts the student to be a bit more specific. And in E11, the student responds with a more specific response. As a result, in E15, the student is able to respond to the tutor's cue in E14 and come up with an idea for the second half of the sentence. Here again, we

can see the tutor and student engaging in a very collaborative and fruitful interaction. The tutor has identified the problem with the second sentence, sought the student's intended meaning of the sentence, provided a guideline by asking the student to draw on the thesis statement, and finally the student was able to come up with a revision idea based on the tutor's guidelines and facilitation. This revision is clearly reflected in the revised conclusion in Exhibit 13. In E17, the student asks if she should delete the third sentence of the conclusion and the tutor suggests, in E18, that the third sentence is still needed. In E20, the tutor suggests that the position of second and third sentences should be switched. Here again, the tutor is making a very specific suggestion. In E22, the tutor reads the second and third sentences in the revised order and leaves the second half of the third sentence for the student to complete. The revised conclusion in Exhibit 13 clearly reflects these suggestions.

In the final few minutes of the session, the student had a question about her introduction. She wanted the tutor's feedback regarding the opening sentence of her introduction, which according to her was her "attention-getter." The discussion between them regarding this issue is presented below.

[E1] S: This beginning piece, so this was like kind of like my attention getter and was kind of like talking about how many copies they've sold. Umm she (referring to her instructor) said to use like a quote from the creator umm. It's kind of off but I do feel like this is interesting, let's show off like how much like popular it is. That's what, like that's where I was coming from, but I don't know if (inaudible)

[E2] T: Tutor: (reads the few two sentences of the introduction). Umm so I think it is, like those are interesting facts, but because your analysis focuses on two particular characters rather than the whole series, I wonder if something specifically about these two characters might work a little bit better as a catch umm or I mean a quote from the author like about Kaneki or like you know what I mean?

[E3] S: Uh huh

[E4] T: Something that from the very beginning I realize like you are focusing on relationships here. Umm does that make sense or does that feel like it would take away from some of the background info that you have going on here?

[E5] S: Umm no. I like that.

The above intervention demonstrates, once again, the tutor's attention to higher-order concerns. The tutor not only addresses the student's concern of having an attention-getting opening sentence, but she also opens up the possibility of linking the opening statement to the paper's main idea. A detailed analysis of this intervention is presented below.

In E1, the student is explaining her concern with her attention-getting opening sentence because her instructor wanted her to use a quote from the author of the Manga Series. In E2 and E4 the tutor addresses the student's concern by suggesting that since the focus of the paper was on the relationship between the two characters depicted in the image, it would be more appropriate to make that apparent to readers in the introduction. The tutor also suggests that the student can use a quote from the creator about one of the characters. Thus, the tutor again is bringing in a higher-order perspective into the discussion. She is not only addressing the student's concern of having an attention-getting opener and including a quote from the creator, but she is going a step further by opening up the possibility of linking the opening statement to the main idea of the paper. And, just like in the past interventions, the tutor is asking for the student's input on the matter instead of directing the student to follow her suggestions. Furthermore, the tutor's suggestions, i.e. to focus on the relationship between the two characters and include a quote about one of the characters, are general guidelines to show the student how different parts of the paper need to cohere to convey the main idea clearly. If we look at the revised introduction in Appendix IV, we can see that the student has followed up on this

suggestion clearly. While discussing the introduction, the tutor also suggests that the existing opening sentence would probably fit in better somewhere in the second paragraph which provides background information about the Manga series. The revised third paragraph (see Exhibit 5) clearly reflects this suggestion too.

Exhibit 12: Conclusion from the Pre-Intervention Draft

italics

Tokyo Ghoul is a widely popular series in Japan, along with the growing manga industry in the United States. Many art pieces tell a story without words or even if the viewer had no prior knowledge of the subject of the piece. Art has the power to make an impact on the audience and make them think about what they are looking at. Ishida Sui has the ability to produce a compelling story, but also a beautiful artwork that combines aspects of that story and events to come in the future, in just one image.

→ take out the "this could be or might be"
→ even if the viewer had no prior knowledge about the piece, they could still see the relationship between the characters.

Exhibit 13: Revised Conclusion from the Post-Intervention Draft

Tokyo Ghoul is a widely popular series in Japan, along with the growing manga industry in the United States. Art has the power to make an impact on the audience and make them think about what they are looking at. Even if the viewer has no prior knowledge about the piece, they could still see the relationship between the characters. Ishida Sui has the ability to produce a compelling story, but also a beautiful artwork that combines aspects of that story and events to come in the future, in just one image

Overall, this case study of the second session shows that most of the issues discussed in the session are clearly reflected in the revised draft. This, along with the fact that the student made all the revisions after the session, indicates that the student understood the issues discussed during the session and was able to address them successfully after the session. The only issue that was not adequately addressed in the revised draft was the thesis statement. Although the student tried to follow up on the tutor's higher-order suggestions, several sentence-level issues compromised the main idea of the revised thesis. All the other issues, both higher-order and lower-order concerns, discussed in the session were clearly addressed in the revised draft. Furthermore, the revised draft suggests that even as the student followed up on the tutor's general guidelines, she used her own discretion while making specific post-session revisions.

In terms of the tutoring strategy, the session transcripts show that the tutor steered the discussion toward important higher-order concerns, such as reinforcing the paper's main idea throughout the paper, focusing on the paper's structure and coherence, and showing the student how to make stronger claims, on many occasions. While dealing with higher-order concerns, the tutor adopted a very collaborative strategy of identifying relevant issues, soliciting the student's views, and offering general guidelines. As a result, the student was engaged in the discussion and was able to come up with specific revision ideas independently. In certain instances, the tutor also used a "learning through practice" approach by allowing the student to put into practice certain concepts such as switching between passive and active sentences. At times, the tutor took on a "teaching role" while trying to explain important concepts such as making stronger claims. Through such strategies, the tutor was able to identify areas of improvement in the student's paper and facilitate a discussion that allowed the student to work her way through these issues. While there were a few instances where the tutor offered very specific suggestions, on the whole

the tutor adopted a very collaborative approach. The tutor's intervention resulted in quite a fruitful intervention, as is evident from the fact that most of the issues discussed in the session was addressed by the student in the revised draft.

Case Study III: Session in which all revisions were made during the session

Session Length:	45 minutes
Tutor:	Undergraduate Peer Tutor
Student:	Undergraduate Student
Assignment/Paper:	Scholarship Essay; One page completed draft
Session Agenda:	Grammar and cutting down words (from 440 to 400 words)
Revision Approach:	All revisions were made during the session.
Laptop:	Student had a laptop that she used during the session to make revisions.

This was a session between an undergraduate peer tutor and an undergraduate student who was working on a one page scholarship essay. The session lasted for approximately 45 minutes, and the student had brought a completed draft of her one-page essay (see Appendix V). The student wanted to focus on grammar and on cutting down her 440-word draft to 400 words. She had brought her laptop to the session and made all the revisions during the session itself. In other words, the student did not make any additional revisions to her paper after the session. The student had worked on this paper with another writing center tutor in the past too.

During the session, the tutor and student addressed both higher-order and lower-order concerns. Under higher-order concerns, they addressed issues such paragraph-level organization and structure, overall clarity of sentences, and strategies to make stronger claims. Under lower-order concerns, they addressed issues such as word choice and editing for conciseness. As I will describe below, all the issues addressed in the session are reflected in the post-intervention draft in some form or the other. Furthermore, the student did not make any additional revisions in the final draft, beyond what was discussed in the session.

In response to the tutor's question regarding how she wanted to proceed, the student suggested that they review the entire paper, proceeding from the first paragraph to the last, just as she had done in her previous writing center session. The student also requested the tutor to read

the paper aloud. After the tutor read each paragraph, they addressed issues within the paragraph before moving to the next paragraph. In the end, they even had time to read through the revised paper one final time. In the first paragraph they worked on sentence length, sentence clarity, and the overall structure of the paragraph. In the second paragraph, they addressed redundant sentences and unsubstantiated claims. In the final paragraph, they addressed redundant sentences. I will now present a detailed analysis of the major issues discussed during the session and assess the extent to which these issues are reflected in the post-intervention draft.

After the tutor read the first paragraph, he asked the student if she noticed any issues in the paragraph. The student pointed out a couple of issues, such as sentence length and clarity, which the tutor and student subsequently addressed. This discussion is presented in the transcript below.

[E1] T: So as I was reading out aloud did you notice any grammatical mistakes or

[E2] S: Umm this sentence (referring to the second sentence), like the that, the that I have focused more on my school work, seemed a little bit long

[E3] T: Okay

[E4] S: Umm run-on. Now “hallmates” so my thing is it says like “hallmate” is a word, but then when you pluralize it’s two different words. I don’t really know and like I prefer it to be one word cause I am cutting words and I don’t know if that’s wrong or right?

[E5] T: I personally feel like “hallmates,” I mean if hallmate is a word obviously the plural should be also a word too

[E6] S: Right

[E7] T: So I personally do not think this should be an error.

[E8] S: Okay

[E9] T: Umm but going back to that sentence (referring to the second sentence), how might you want to cut down the amount of words, but still kind of convey that same idea? (Reading the second sentence aloud) “Through that I have focused more on my school work and started to put together the pieces for what I want to accomplish from my time

here at JMU.” So do you go into detail about what you want to accomplish in later paragraphs?

[E10] S: Umm a little bit

[E11] T: Okay

[E12] S: Yeah I feel so, like later down in here.

[E13] T: Okay, then I guess we’ll get to that later. Then umm what are some pieces of this sentence you feel are strong and necessary vs. what are weak and unnecessary?

[E14] S: “What I want to” is just a lot of words.

[E15] T: Yeah, so how might you want to cut that down so (reads part of the second sentence aloud again)

[E16] S: Umm (trying to revise the sentence) “Through that I have focused umm more on my school work by putting together the pieces to accomplish my goals here at [name of institute].”

[E17] T: Yeah

[E18] S: (Typing the revision)

[E19] T: (Looking at the revision) Yeah, or you can just say “at JMU” cause we already know you are at JMU.

In the above interaction, the tutor and student engaged in a collaborative and productive discussion to make the second sentence of the paragraph more concise. It was the student who identified the problem and the tutor encouraged the student to revise the sentence by seeking the student’s input through guiding questions. In other words, the tutor facilitated the revision process through questions and did not tell the student what to do. Moreover, the tutor also demonstrated how higher-order concerns can be addressed while responding to a sentence-level concern raised by a student. A detailed analysis of this interaction is presented below.

In E1 above, the tutor seeks the student’s feedback regarding the first paragraph (see Exhibit 14). While the tutor is emphasizing “grammatical mistakes,” by adding “or,” he is leaving the option of addressing other issues open as well. The tutor is probably emphasizing

“grammatical mistakes” to address the student’s initial request of focusing on grammar. In E2, the student responds to the tutor by pointing to the second sentence in the paragraph, which she thinks is a long sentence. The student then points to her confusion regarding the word “hallmates” in E4. In E5 and E7, the tutor clears the student’s confusion by suggesting that “hallmates” is correct. The tutor reasons that if “hallmate” is a word then its plural should be “hallmates.” In these two exchanges (E5 and E7), although the tutor offers quite a logical explanation, his words signal that he is not entirely sure of the answer. For example, by using words such as “I personally feel like” and “I personally do not think this should be an error,” the tutor seems to be hedging. He seems to be saying “this is what I think but I could be wrong.” It might have been more productive if the tutor had looked up the word online and come to a more definite conclusion. In the revised first paragraph (see exhibit 15), the student has not followed the tutor’s suggestion and used “hall mates” instead of “hallmates.”

In E9, the tutor reverts back to the student’s earlier question about the second sentence and asks for the student’s input to cut down words from the sentence. He also raises a higher-order concern related to the overall development of the paper by asking the student if she has elaborated on her “planned accomplishments,” included in the second sentence, in subsequent paragraphs. Thus, we can see that the tutor is paying attention to higher-order concerns even while addressing a sentence-level issue of cutting down extra words. After hearing the student’s response in E10 and E12, the tutor focuses on cutting down the sentence by asking for the student’s input by posing a guiding question in E13. In E14, the student responds to the tutor’s question by identifying some unnecessary words, and in E15, the tutor, once again, asks for the student’s input to revise the sentence. The student comes up with a tentative verbal revision in E16 and starts typing the changes on her laptop. In E19, the tutor reviews the student’s revised

second sentence and helps the student to cut down one more word – i.e. “here.” As we can see, the student revised this second sentence as they were discussing it. As a result, this revision is clearly reflected in the revised paragraph (see Exhibit 15).

Exhibit 14: First Paragraph from the Pre-Intervention Draft

Throughout the past academic year I have become more aware of what I wanted to get out of my education. Through that I have focused more on my school work and started to put together the pieces for what I want to accomplish from my time here at JMU. I have changed my study habits in a transition to better by academics. Last semester I stayed in my dorm trying to study with the loud noises of my hallmates and the constant distraction of people banging on my door. This semester I found my niche in the library where I go to study and get my work done almost every day. My teachers' office hours have now become a daily routine in my everyday schedule as well.

Exhibit 15: Revised First Paragraph from the Post-Intervention Draft

Throughout the past academic year I have become more aware of what I wanted to get out of my education. I have focused more on my school work by putting together the pieces to accomplish my goals at JMU. First semester was my wakeup call! I was dissatisfied with my grades because they did not accurately reflect my potential. Since then, I changed my study habits in a transition to better my academics. Last semester I stayed in my dorm trying to study with the constant distraction from my hall mates. This semester I regularly go to the library which enables me to get more work done. My teachers' office hours have now become a daily routine in my everyday schedule as well.

The tutor continues the discussion on the first paragraph by identifying another long sentence:

[E20] T: Okay umm anything after that sentence. (Reads third and fourth sentences aloud). I feel that maybe you can just condense that one sentence (referring to the fourth sentence) into just like a general distraction that your dorm has instead of having specifics.

[E21] S: Okay

[E22] T: Umm cause I feel like adding that specificity is not really necessary. I think you just want to convey the fact that your dorm is not a, a conducive study environment

[E23] S: Okay so umm (Trying to revise the fourth sentence aloud) “With the constant distraction of my hall,” or like “last semester I stayed in my dorm trying to study.” Umm (typing) umm

[E24] T: Or you can say like maybe it was the constant distractions from my hallmates. So that way it’s emphasizing that even if you’re the one studying, people around you aren’t exactly giving you the environment that you need.

In the above intervention, the tutor addresses the student’s initial concern of reducing the paper’s word count. The tutor plays the role of a coach/facilitator by identifying a problem (i.e. a long sentence), explaining the cause of the problem, focusing on the main message, and by offering guidelines to enable the student to address the issue. In other words, the tutor does not simply edit the sentence for the student but facilitates the revision process by explaining the problem and providing guidelines for the student. In the context of this study, such an intervention might be considered successful because the student understood and responded to the tutor’s explanation quite clearly, as indicated in exhibit 15. What follows is a detailed analysis of this intervention.

In E20, the tutor moves on from the second sentence to other potential issues in the paragraph. He reads the third and fourth sentence and suggests that the fourth sentence can be “condensed” by taking out specific details and presenting it in more general terms. The fourth sentence from the pre-intervention draft is presented below:

“Last semester I stayed in my dorm trying to study with the loud noises of my hallmates and the constant distraction of people banging on my door.”

In E22, the tutor justifies why some of the specific details in the sentence may not be necessary by pointing out the main idea of the sentence. The student agrees to the tutor’s suggestion and tries to revise the fourth sentence accordingly in E23. In E24, the tutor offers a

suggestion based on the student's ideas in E23 and also reiterates the main message of the sentence. This discussion is clearly reflected in the revised sentence shown below:

"Last semester I stayed in my dorm trying to study with the constant distraction from my hall mates."

The tutor raised this issue probably to address one of the student's original concerns for the session – i.e. to reduce the word count of the paper. In this intervention, we can see that the tutor played the role of a coach/facilitator. He identified a long sentence, explained why some specific details were not needed, and allowed the student to make the necessary changes. In other words, the tutor did not simply edit the sentence for the student. There could, however, be many other possibilities to revise these two sentences. In other words, the tutor's suggestions are not necessarily the only way, or even the best way, to condense the sentences. However, considering the context of this paper, the tutor's suggestion does address the student's primary concern of meeting the word count limit even though it sacrifices some interesting details.

As the tutor continued reviewing the last two sentences (fifth and sixth sentences) of the first paragraph, they addressed another issue raised by the student, as shown in the transcript below:

[E25] T: (Reads fifth and sixth sentences aloud) Okay.

[E26] S: Does that like flow okay? Cause from the "everyday" to "My teachers" well I don't know like if that ends. Cause my thing is to put beginning and (inaudible)

[E27] T: Yeah umm maybe you could say that "now I regularly attend the library" just like you know taking this "almost every day" and kind of just like adding it in here so that you don't have to get these extra words you know

[E28] S: Umm

[E29] T: Plus I feel like you are trying to emphasize a fact that instead of going to the dorm and doing your homework regularly, now you regularly go to the library.

Emphasizing I think that regularity of going to the library shows this difference in the semesters.

[E30] S: Umm (Trying to revise the fifth sentence) So this semester umm I (typing)

[E31] T: “regularly” so yeah. Cause I feel like when you say you regularly go to the library, I feel like that is already implying that you have found a niche in the library without having to state it.

[E32] S: (Typing) Is saying “This semester I regularly go to the library” enough though?

[E33] T: (Reading student’s revision) “This semester I regularly go to the library to study and get my work done.” Or maybe you could emphasize the fact that going to the library has kind of made a better environment versus your dorm. Kind of that contrast. As we see here you know, your dorm is not kind of a good environment for you to study, so you go to the library now.

[E34] S: Right umm umm

[E35] T: You know why do you go to the library so often? Do you find it is better for you to focus there Do you find you have more resources? Do you find you have an easier time getting your work done?

[E36] S: It’s definitely a lot quieter and it like enables me to be able to get more done in like less amount of time versus always getting distracted

[E37] T: Yeah. So I think it is not enough to just say you know “I found my niche in the library.” You know, we know you found your niche, but we also want to know how does the library help you and why does it help you.

[E38] S: (Typing)

[E39] T: Maybe instead of just “of my work done” “enables me to get more work done” cause I remember you are on a word limit.

[E30] S: Yeah

The above interaction demonstrates how tutors and students can engage in a very fruitful and collaborative discussion. While the tutor identified a long sentence, solicited the student’s views, and offered suggestions to make it shorter, the student raised an important clarifying question which made the discussion more productive. Furthermore, the interaction also

demonstrates how tutors pay attention to higher-order concerns even while addressing sentence-level issues. What follows is a detailed analysis of the above interaction.

In E26, the student raises a concern regarding the transition between the last two sentences of the paragraph. The tutor responds, in E27, by showing the student how the fifth sentence (i.e. the second last sentence) can be made more concise. Here again, the tutor seems to be addressing the student's stated need of reducing the paper's word count. In E29, the tutor interprets the student's intended message in the fifth sentence and explains how his suggestion in E27 will help to convey this message. Here again, we can see that the tutor is going a step further by focusing on the main idea of the sentence. In E30, the student tries to revise the fifth sentence on her laptop based on the tutor's suggestions. In E31, the tutor further explains his suggestions from E27 and E29, reasoning that going to the library "regularly" conveys the same idea as having "found a niche in the library." In E32, the student raises a question while revising the sentence. Her question implies that she is not completely convinced by the tutor's suggestions pertaining to this sentence. Or in other words, the tutor's suggestions have not aligned with the student's intended meaning for the sentence. This shows that students actively engage with tutors while addressing a concern. It shows that they participate and share their views instead of passively accepting the tutor's suggestions.

In E33, the tutor responds to the student's concern by suggesting that the benefits of studying in the library versus the dorm should be contrasted. He follows up on this suggestion, in E35, by asking the student to answer some probing questions. Here, we can see that the tutor is addressing a higher-order concern. He is not just focused on cutting down words, but also trying to identify how this fifth sentence can be linked to the previous sentence in the paragraph. The student responds to these questions in E36, outlining some of the benefits of studying in the

library. In E37, the tutor further explains the main idea of the sentence and how it can be conveyed. As the student starts typing the tutor's suggestion, the tutor makes a specific suggestion, in E39, to address the student's concern voiced in E32. If we look at the tutor's suggestion in E39, we can see that the tutor has used the student's ideas from E36 to come up with the phrase "enables me to get more work done." In E36, the student had responded to the tutor's question by stating that studying in the library "enables me to be able to get more done...distracted." Thus, in E39, the tutor echoed this idea. The revised fifth sentence in Exhibit 15 clearly reflects this discussion. This intervention, therefore, was also successful. The intervention was productive and interactive because while the tutor raised important questions to help the student think about the main idea of the sentence, the student made the discussion more productive by raising important follow-up questions. As a result, they were engaged in a very productive exchange of ideas which helped them to successfully revise the fifth sentence.

Next, they moved to the second paragraph. After the tutor read the paragraph aloud, they worked on the overall structure and clarity of the paragraph by focusing on issues such as redundant sentences, sentence length and clarity, and making stronger claims. This interaction between the tutor and student is presented in the transcripts below:

[E1] T: So here is a few things I noticed. Umm I feel like some of the sentences are not necessary. Sometimes we don't need the background, so like (reading parts of the third and fourth sentence) "I then took the initiative to talk to my advisor to see what steps I could take after discussion" Maybe you could just start off with umm "After discussing with my advisor" you know, you then declared umm the double major.

[E2] S: Umm

[E3] T: Do you see how you know talking about the fact that you talked with your advisor kind of implies that you took the initiative already?

[E4] S: Yeah. Umm so (typing) umm (trying to revise) “after discussion with, after discussion with” umm so this sentence (referring to the third sentence) should just come out?

[E5] T: Yeah. Cause do you see how this kind of already implies this sentence without this sentence being there?

[E6] S: Yeah

[E7] T: Umm so you’re getting the same point across, you are just not reiterating it so much. So (reading fourth sentence and part of the fifth sentence) “After discussing with my advisor we came to a conclusion that it would be feasible to declare a double major. To be a marketing and CIS”

[E8] S: See that is repetitive, having double major both times, but I don’t know how to like (trying to revise) “To major in both marketing and CIS”

[E9] T: Maybe you could just say “After discussing with my advisor we came to the conclusion that umm it would be feasible to declare a double major in marketing and CIS”

[E10] S: (Typing)

In the excerpt above, the tutor provides specific solutions to the concerns being addressed. As a result, the student did not get a chance to contribute her ideas and learn through the intervention. This points to the need for tutors to involve students in the issues being discussed by soliciting their views through questions, or in other words, through cognitive scaffolding.

In E1, the tutor points out the issue of redundant sentences within the paragraph, immediately after having finished reading it aloud. Pointing to the third and fourth sentences in the paragraph (see Exhibit 16), he suggests that the third sentence can be eliminated by making a minor revision to the fourth sentence. He also provides an explanation for this suggestion: the third sentence contains background information that is not needed. Here, we can see that the tutor has identified a problem and also come up with a solution by telling the student delete the

third sentence and start the fourth sentence with “After discussing with my advisor.” In other words, the tutor did not give the student an opportunity to try and address the problem. For instance, if the tutor had asked for the student’s input after pointing out the problem, the student would have had a chance to think through the issue and come up with a solution. In the process, she would have had an opportunity to learn, through practice, how to present ideas concisely.

In E3, the tutor further explains how the same meaning can be conveyed by eliminating the third sentence. In E4, the student tries to revise the fourth sentence based on the tutor’s suggestion and verifies if the third sentence should be deleted. The tutor, in E5, confirms the removal of the third sentence and explains, once again, why it should be removed. In E7, the tutor continues his explanation from E5 and moves on to the next sentence by reading the revised version of the fourth sentence and the first few words of the fifth sentence, at which point the student interrupts the tutor with a concern. In E8, the student is concerned that “double major” is repeated in both the fourth and fifth sentences (see Exhibit 16), and she even tries to come with a revision for this : “To major in both marketing and CIS.” In E9, the tutor offers a suggestion to address the issue. Here again, we can see that the tutor is providing the solution, or coming up with the revision, without allowing the student to work toward a solution. The student was trying to get to a solution in E8; however, the tutor disregarded the student’s idea by providing a very specific revision suggestion in E9. In both of these instances where the tutor made specific revision suggestions, the student missed out on a learning opportunity.

In their book, *Talk About Writing*, Jo Mackiewicz and Isabelle Thompson point out that cognitive scaffolding plays an important role in the learning process of students in one-on-one writing conferences. They define scaffolding as “teaching a student to determine an answer to a question, to correct an error, or to perform a task, without telling the student the answer or doing

the work for him or her” (17). Based on this concept of scaffolding they have defined cognitive scaffolding as “a range of strategies that prod students to think and then help them to push their thinking further” (17). Thus, in these two instances, we can see that the tutor forestalled the cognitive scaffolding process by providing specific solutions to the concerns being addressed. As a result, the student lost an opportunity to engage in, and learn through, the cognitive scaffolding process. If we look at the revised paragraph (see Exhibit 17), the tutor’s suggestions described above are clearly reflected in the third sentence. However, as described in the analysis above, the revision decision was largely influenced by the tutor.

Exhibit 16: Second Paragraph from the Pre-Intervention Draft

I also realized this year that I am interested in more than just marketing. With my COB 204 class I quickly took interest in the content of computer programs and information. I then took the initiative to talk to my advisor to see what steps it would take to add CIS as a second major. After a discussion, we came to the conclusion that it would be feasible to declare a double major. To be a marketing and CIS double major is going to take a lot of extra work and summer hours to accomplish, but I know with my motivation and constant drive I can achieve this goal. I have continued to work with my advisor to fit Antwerp into my four year plan. The COB study abroad program in Antwerp was something I knew I wanted to strive for even before I started my journey at JMU. Although, to be able to graduate in four years and get into the Antwerp abroad program I am going to have to work harder than ever before. First semester was my wakeup call, but being driven to accomplish my goal in a set amount of time and with good grades is going to set me apart from other business majors.

Exhibit 17: Revised Second Paragraph from the Post-Intervention Draft

I also realized this year that I am interested in more than just marketing. With my COB 204 class I quickly took interest in the content of computer programs and information. After a discussion with my advisor, we came to the conclusion that it would be feasible to declare a double major in marketing and CIS. Through self-motivation I know I can tackle extra credits per semester along with summer hours to stay on a four year graduation track. Knowing my desire to attend the COB study abroad program in Antwerp I have actively been working with my advisor to fit it into my four year plan. By taking the knowledge from my majors and applying it to the business world I strive to set myself apart from other future candidates.

After addressing the third and fourth sentences, the tutor continued the conversation as follows:

[E11] T: Okay so then we can take this part out (referring to the first few words of the fifth sentence). So then how might you want to rework this sentence (referring to the fifth sentence) after that

[E12] S: I am trying to think of something else umm “In achieving this goal or goal umm in striving, in striving to achieve this umm”

[E13] T: Umm maybe you can say “Through my motivation and constant drive I know I can” or maybe “through extra hours, extra work, summer hours and my motivation, I know I can achieve this goal.” Maybe you can just kind of list out like you know these are my qualities I know that I have that will allow me to achieve this goal, or these are the things I will have to do to achieve this goal. Cause remember you’re also kind of showcasing yourself as a person and what you can do in order to achieve the goals you’ve set up for yourself.

[E14] S: Right umm (typing)

[E15] T: I also have another question.

[E16] S: Yeah

[E17] T: Is motivation and constant drive the same thing or different?

[E18] S: It can be similar

[E19] T: Okay. I only asked just because of the word count. And you know if one is similar to the other, it will make sense just to keep one of them.

[E20] S: Right (Typing)

[E21] T: “Through my self-motivation”

[E22] S: (Typing) “Through self-motivation”

[E23] T: I think it’s okay.

[E24] S: (Reading revision) Through self-motivation umm

[E25] T: Now will your extra work be done this summer or throughout your, throughout like your

[E26] S: Well in a normal umm scenario most people take between 15 and 16 credits a semester. I would either take summer hours plus maybe 16 or 17 credits per hour, per semester umm

[E27] T: So maybe you want to emphasize that large amount of credits you have to take in addition to the summer hours instead of just saying “extra work” cause “extra work” is pretty vague and so the reader is left to wondering “well what do you mean by extra work?”

[E28] S: Umm

[E29] T: Generally with scholarship essays, the more specific you can be about yourself the better idea the reader has about you know who you are, what your motivations are, and how you can accomplish your goals. And so the prompt is, you know, why you are qualified, right?

[E30] S: Right

[E31] T: So, you don’t want to give vague statements. Cause anyone can write those things right?

[E32] S: Uh huh

[E33] T: You want to be very specific to yourself and why you, you know, as a CIS, marketing double major can accomplish these things.

[E34] S: (long silence, probably thinking about how to revise the sentence)

[E35] T: So (reading revision) “Through self-motivation” no

[E36] S: I don’t, I don’t know how to word this

[E37] T: Okay. What are you trying to say?

[E38] S: Like I want to keep in like I want the self-motivation part of it

[E39] T: Okay

[E40] S: I also want to keep in like doing extra credit hours per semester along with summer hours

[E41] T: Okay so maybe umm “Through self-motivation I know I can tackle, you know, these extra credits I will have to take and the extra summer hours, which will kind of advance my, you know, college career or keep me on track.” Is that what you are trying to say?

[E42] S: Yeah. Cause another thing like, like we said, I definitely want to stay on the four-year track, so keeping in track will work.

[E43] T: Yeah

[E44] S: (Typing)

[E45] T: (While student is typing) I like that you put “per semester” cause it emphasizes, you know, it’s ongoing.

[E46] S: Yeah. (Quickly reads what she has revised so far and continues typing)

[E47] T: Maybe emphasize like “graduation” cause that’s like the end goal: “four-year graduation track.” So that way the reader knows, you know, like you have a goal you are setting up.

[E48] S: Umm I like that

The above excerpt shows that a seemingly simple task of revising a single sentence can entail quite a complex intervention, creating opportunities for students to apply writing concepts that are discussed during a session. It also shows that cognitive scaffolding used in combination with explanation and instruction can be an effective strategy in stimulating student learning as well as fostering fruitful tutor-student collaboration. A detailed analysis of the above interaction is presented below.

In E11, the tutor seems to be moving toward the process of cognitive scaffolding by seeking the student’s input to revise the fifth sentence so that it fits in with the revised fourth sentence. In E12, the student thinks of some revision ideas, and in E13, the tutor offers some sample revision ideas and explains the importance of emphasizing personal qualities that will help the student in achieving her goals. Here, in addition to engaging in the student’s revision effort in E12, the tutor is also providing a guideline (i.e. to focus on personal qualities needed to achieve goals) to facilitate the revision process. In other words, the tutor is not making the revision decision for the student, but providing some revision examples and also a guideline to facilitate the revision process. In E15 through E19, the tutor and student discuss whether

“motivation and constant drive” mean the same thing. The tutor raises the issue, but, once again seeks the student’s view regarding it. Based on the student’s response in E18, the tutor makes a suggestion, in E19, to resolve this issue. And, in E20 through E24, the student and tutor implement this change in the paper. We can see that the tutor offers suggestions (E21) and provides feedback (E23) as the student makes the changes on her laptop. This process looks collaborative in the sense that both tutor and student are actively engaged in the revision process. The student is not simply following the tutor’s suggestion but also using her own judgement to make editing decisions. For example in E22, the student edits the tutor’s suggestion in E21 by getting rid of “my.” And in E23, the tutor approves this change. This shows how in-session revisions are made, with the tutor and student both engaged actively in the process.

In E25 through E33, the tutor and student discuss the importance of avoiding vague statements. The tutor identifies a vague term (i.e. extra work) in the sentence and raises a probing question, in E25, to address the issue. Based on the student’s response in E26, the tutor explains, in E27, how the student can address this issue. Furthermore, in E29, the tutor explains the importance of providing specific information in the context of this particular assignment, i.e. a scholarship essay. Here, the tutor is taking on a “teaching role” by trying to educate the student about the main goal of a scholarship essay/personal statement and highlighting the importance of specific information in achieving that goal. Thus, in E25 through E33, the tutor identified a problem, asked for clarifying information from the student, used the student’s response to address the problem, and educated the student about the main goal of personal statements. This strategy of using probing questions to identify the student’s intended meaning is a recommended writing center practice (see for instance, Gillespie and Lerner 2008; Leigh and Zimmerelli 2010) which the tutor has employed effectively in this interaction. This strategy is also an example of

cognitive scaffolding, as the tutor allowed the student to think through her vague description to make it more specific.

In E36, the student declares that she doesn't "know how to word this," pointing to the difficulty she is facing in revising the fifth sentence based on the ongoing discussion. The tutor responds, in E37, by asking the student to explain what she is trying to say. Here, we can see that the tutor is once again using cognitive scaffolding by asking the student to clarify what she wants to say. Based on the student's responses in E38 and 40, the tutor offers a suggestion in the form of a loosely constructed sentence in E41, which ends with another question seeking the student's clarification. If we look closely, we can see that the tutor's E41 suggestion is also based on the entire discussion between the tutor and student regarding the fifth sentence, right from E11 through E40. Further, the tutor has not provided a specific revision suggestion, but a loosely constructed sentence to facilitate the revision process, which helped the student to work on it further. In E42, based on the tutor's suggestion, the student identifies another point to include in the sentence (i.e. to emphasize four-year track). Finally, in E44 through E48, the student types out the revised fifth sentence, with the tutor offering feedback and suggestions. If we look at the revised fourth sentence below, we can see that it reflects the discussion from this session quite clearly:

"Through self-motivation I know I can tackle extra credits per semester along with summer hours to stay on a four year graduation track."

We can see that the student has followed up on the tutor's suggestion from E41. However, we can also see that the revised sentence does not look exactly the same as the tutor's E41 suggestion. This means that as the student revised the sentence in E44 through E48, she used the tutor's suggestion to craft a sentence that expressed what she wanted to convey. In other

words, the student did not blindly follow the tutor word-for-word. Instead, she worked through the tutor's suggestion to express her ideas more clearly. For instance she added specific details such as "per semester" and "four-year graduation track" to convey the main idea of the sentence more clearly. This also demonstrates that the student understood, and hence applied, the tutor's earlier suggestion (see E25 through E33) about the importance of providing specific information. Furthermore, even as the student was typing the changes, the tutor was still collaborating and supporting the effort by providing positive feedback (E45) and offering suggestions (E47), which points to the collaborative nature of the session.

Overall, this discussion regarding the fifth sentence (E11 to E48) was collaborative and fruitful since it facilitated, and is clearly reflected in, the revised sentence above. This intervention shows how a tutor can identify multiple issues, both global and local, even while dealing with a single sentence (for instance sentence structure, need for specific details, redundant phrases, goals of a personal statement). This intervention also shows how a tutor can apply cognitive scaffolding as well as instruction/explanation to enable students to address a problem. Furthermore, it also shows that combining cognitive scaffolding with "instruction" can be an effective strategy in facilitating student learning. Lastly, this intervention demonstrates that even a seemingly simple task of revising a single sentence actually involves quite a complex and detailed intervention which can create opportunities for students to learn and apply important concepts related to writing.

After the student revised the fifth sentence, the tutor moved to the next two sentences, the sixth and seventh sentences, of the paragraph. The discussion pertaining to these two sentences is presented below:

[E49] T: (Reading the sixth and part of the seventh sentence) " I have continued to work with my advisor to fit Antwerp in my four year plan. The COB study..." Maybe you

could combine those two sentences together umm kind of start off with the, kind of start off with the interest you've had with the program before hand

[E50] S: Uh huh

[E51] T: And then maybe work your way into like, you know, you've actually taken the steps to get into that program. You see like the flow of events that happens?

[E52] S: Yeah. So umm (trying to think of revision idea) umm

[E53] T: (Reading the seventh sentence) "The COB study abroad program in Antwerp was something I knew I wanted to strive for even before I started my journey at JMU."

Okay umm

[E54] S: Do I need "even"? (Typing) Umm so (Typing) I feel like "to be able to fit" but that's also a lot of words.

[E55] T: Yeah

[E56] S: Do you think "to fit" is okay?

[E57] T: Yeah "to fit" is fine. Umm I feel like maybe we could also maybe cut down this sentence a little bit

[E58] S: This one?

[E59] T: Yeah. Do you see how wordy it is like (reads the seventh sentence aloud)

[E60] S: So the umm, so here's a question. Do I, because I am talking to like the College of Business, like they know like their program, I don't know if I can take Antwerp out of here cause I mention it here, or if I should mention it in the first sentence and I don't necessarily need to mention it

[E61] T: Maybe you could just combine the two. Maybe you could say "Knowing that I always wanted to attend the Antwerp study abroad program comma, I have actively been working with my advisor to fit it into my four-year plan."

[E62] S: I like that umm so

[E63] T: So the reason I say that is because it kind of showcases like your interest in it and then the motivation you've, or the active participation you've taken into getting to that goal.

[E64] S: So (typing)

[E65] T: "Knowing my interest or my passion or my desire"

[E66] S: (Typing). (Reading the revised sentence) “Knowing my desire to attend the COB, the COB study abroad program in Antwerp, I have actively been working with my advisor to fit it into my four-year plan.”

[E67] T: Does that kind of fit better with what you were going for?

[E68] S: Yeah. I like that

[E69] T: Okay. (Reads the next, eighth, sentence) I feel like you’ve already kind of stated that in previous sentences, so either maybe add in new information or I would just take it out.

[E70] S: We can take it out. It will help in my word count.

The above excerpt shows how the tutor not only influenced the issues discussed but also provided a very specific revision suggestion, which made its way, almost word-for-word, into the revised draft. As a result, the student missed out on the benefits of cognitive scaffolding because she was not given a chance to contribute her ideas. This points to the importance of allowing students to participate in the revision process, instead of tutors telling students exactly what to do. What follows is a detailed analysis of the above interaction.

In E49 and E51, the tutor is suggesting that the sixth and seventh sentences (see Exhibit 16) can be combined and also trying to explain how this can be done. In E52 and E54, the student is trying to revise these two sentences by focusing on specific words such as “even” (seventh sentence) and “to fit” (sixth sentence). Here the student seems not to be responding directly to the tutor’s suggestion of combining these two sentences. Instead, she seems to be focused on cutting down extra words from each of these sentences. This is further evident in E56, where the student asks for the tutor’s view regarding the use of “to fit” in the sixth sentence. In E57, the tutor responds to the student’s question briefly and diverts the discussion to the length of the seventh sentence. Here, the tutor also seems not very attentive or responsive to the student’s concerns. The tutor is more focused on editing the length of the seventh sentence. In

E60, the student raises another concern regarding the repetition of “Antwerp” in both these sentences. The tutor responds, in E61, by reverting back to his initial suggestion (see E49) of combining the sixth and seventh sentences and also by providing a very specific revision example, solving the issue for the student. In other words, once again, the tutor has forestalled the cognitive scaffolding process by making a very specific revision suggestion. Instead of asking for the student’s input regarding how these two sentences can be combined, the tutor combines the two sentences for the student. In E62, the student seems happy with the tutor’s suggestion, and in E63, the tutor explains the reason for his E61 suggestion. Perhaps, if he had provided this explanation/instruction first and allowed the student to combine the sentences based on that explanation, the student would have an opportunity to benefit from cognitive scaffolding. In E64 and E66, the student types out the revision, with the tutor helping out by suggesting possible words. If we look at the revised sentence below, we can see that most of it is just a replication of the tutor’s suggestion from E61.

Knowing my desire to attend the COB study abroad program in Antwerp I have actively been working with my advisor to fit it into my four year plan.

Overall, the above intervention shows that the tutor identified a problem (i.e. redundant sentence) and addressed it by making a very specific revision suggestion. As a result, the student did not get a chance to work through the problem and come up with a solution, and the tutor’s suggestion made its way, almost word-for-word, to the revised draft. However, we can see that the student’s original idea conveyed in the two sentences (sixth and seventh) are retained in the revised (combined) sentence above. Thus, although the tutor combined these two sentences into a single sentence, the revised sentence retains the student’s original idea. In other words, the tutor did not write new content or contribute new ideas for the student. As mentioned previously,

I will present a detailed analysis to explore the extent to which tutors contribute their ideas and language to student drafts. The tutor and student continue their discussion with the tutor identifying another redundant sentence, in E69. This time the tutor gives the tutor gives the student a choice of adding new information or deleting the eighth sentence altogether. Here, the tutor is giving the student a choice and not making the revision decision. In E70, the student decides to delete the eighth sentence.

After addressing the sixth and seventh sentences, the tutor moves on to the last sentence of the (second) paragraph. This discussion between the tutor and student is presented below:

[E71] T: Okay (Reads the last sentence of the paragraph) Okay “umm how do you want to accomplish these things? I feel like you know every college student wants to graduate in a set amount of time with good grades, but what makes it unique for you?

[E72] S: “in how I want to accomplish them?

[E73] T: uh huh

[E74] S: Well, umm I...in the sense like...I don't know if this is any different but like...I don't wanna just slide by, by like getting the grades or like doing...for me..it's one thing with my GenEd but for my actual college classes or COB classes, knowing and learning and understanding information is what's actually is going to help me get the job. So I feel like everyone...I don't really know

[E75] T: No I think that's good. I think you know even with people in you know certain majors they just want to cruise by but you are saying you want to know and understand and be able to reproduce what you've learned in a real world, you know, setting.

[E76] S: yeah, but I meant like, yeah

[E77] T: I think that's what sets you apart then. Is the fact that you are trying to understand all of this material so that you can use it later on you know in the real world versus you know you just gonna have to learn and that's it.

[E78] S: (Typing)

[E79] T: Maybe “but taking my knowledge from the major or taking”

[E80] S: (Typing)

[E81] T: So I feel like, umm you know when sentences have “but,” it kind of negates whatever was here before. Umm maybe because you are trying to emphasize the fact that it was your wake up call right?

[E82] S: Yeah

[E83] T: So maybe you could say “and” or umm “furthermore” you know words that add more substance to the fact that it was your wake-up call

[E84] S: Right so “First semester was my wake-up call” umm

[E85] T: I mean I also think “by taking” works as well

[E86] S: Okay. I will try that (reads the sentence aloud and starts typing)

[E87] T: So does that kind of work better for you?

[E88] S Uh huh “First semester was my wake up call” umm I do think I need something here though. I don’t like the flow of that

[E89] T: Okay

[E90] S: (Reading) “First semester was my wake up call” umm I can just highlight that. I will come back to it later

[E91] T: Okay

The above excerpt shows how the tutor solicited and channelized the student’s own ideas to address a higher-order concern. Furthermore, it also shows that the tutor did not go out of his way to fix the paper for the student. A detailed analysis of the excerpt is presented below.

In E71 above, the tutor identifies a weak claim in the last sentence (see Exhibit 16) and asks two guiding questions to help the student think about her ideas related to the claim. In E74, the student responds with her ideas for the claim, suggesting that she takes her College of Business (COB) classes seriously because the knowledge she gains from them will help her get a job. In E75 and E77, the tutor interprets the student’s ideas from E74 to justify the student’s original claim. In E75, the tutor interprets the student’s view that she wants to apply her academic knowledge in the real world. In E77, the tutor links this idea to the student’s original claim, showing the student how her claim can be presented in a more credible way. Using this

justification, the student revised the original claim during the session itself under the guidance of the tutor as can be seen in E78 through E89. In these exchanges we can see that the tutor supports the student through prompts (E79, E83, & E85) and suggestions (E81) as the student types out the revision. In E88, the student is not satisfied with her existing revision, and in E90, she agrees to “come back to it later.” Although the revised version of this sentence looked as follows in the post-intervention draft, at this point the revision was not yet complete:

By taking the knowledge from my majors and applying it to the business world I strive to set myself apart from other future candidates.

The above intervention was successful because it promoted a revision of the student’s original claim. In this intervention, the tutor successfully addressed a higher-order concern, i.e. making stronger claims. Instead of offering his own suggestion, the tutor solicited, and channelized, the student’s ideas to address the issue. In other words, he helped the student clarify her own ideas, which is a recommended strategy for writing tutors (see Gillespie and Lerner 2008; Leigh and Zimmerelli 2010). The tutor also collaborated with the student, as she was typing out the revision, by providing suggestions and prompts. Furthermore, even as the student was not completely satisfied with the revision, the tutor did not insist on completing it or try to revise it for the student. Instead, he agreed to the student’s idea of highlighting and coming back to it later. In other words, the tutor did not go out of his way to fix the paper for the student. Part of the above transcript has also been analyzed in Chapter 3, in which I evaluate successful and unsuccessful higher-order tutoring strategies.

After addressing the second paragraph described above, they moved to the final paragraph. The tutor read the paragraph aloud and they worked briefly on breaking up the last sentence and taking out the first sentence of the paragraph. The tutor suggested that the last

sentence can be separated into two sentences based on the student's comment that it was too long. The tutor suggested taking out the first sentence after the student asked the tutor if anything needs to be changed or added to the last paragraph. Further, the student asked the tutor if the word "extracurriculars" was correct, and the tutor replied that it was fine. Finally, the student questioned the tutor whether it was appropriate to address the Associate Dean, Ms. Molly Brown, within the text itself, as she had done in the final paragraph. The tutor suggested that it was fine. Besides these issues, the tutor provided positive feedback, telling the student that she did a good job explaining why she "needed the scholarship financially." The tutor, referring back to the one of the student's main concerns, also questioned the student about the current word count and the student responded saying she was well within the 400 word limit of the assignment. If we compare the concluding paragraphs in the pre-and post-intervention drafts (See Appendix V), we can see that there aren't many changes between the two drafts, besides the minor revisions to first and last sentences discussed above.

After addressing the final paragraph above issues the tutor asked the student about how she felt about her essay. This discussion is presented below:

[E1] T: Overall do you feel more prepared or better about your scholarship essay?

[E2] S: (Laughing) Absolutely

[E3] T: Awesome

[E4] S: Umm (inaudible) the first one that I did, I didn't think it was that bad and then like when I did it, when I was here yesterday working with another person, she definitely like made me see something that I had to change and then like going back over it again like it definitely helps. And it's nothing like what I first wrote which is good because usually my first drafts are not.

[E5] T: That's what's a first draft

[E6] S: (Laughs) Okay. I like this

The above excerpt conveys the student's perception of her writing center sessions. E4 tells us the student had worked on this paper the previous day with another tutor too. In E4, the student also conveys the idea that the writing center benefited her writing process. The student clearly mentions how her previous writing center consultation "made [her] see something that [she] had to change" in her draft and that her paper is now "nothing like what [she] first wrote." She also acknowledges that her first drafts are not very good. Thus, the student is acknowledging that the writing center helped her focus on her writing process because her initial draft went through a series of revisions as a result of her writing center consultations. Moreover, by saying that the consultations "made her see" what needs to be changed, the student is indicating that her previous writing center tutor did not "fix her paper," but instead enabled her to revise her paper by pointing to potential issues with the draft. In other words, through the tutor's help, the student was able to address what needed to be changed in her draft.

The student's acknowledgement that her writing center consultations helped her focus on her writing process indicates the type of complementary role writing centers can play in supporting classroom writing instruction. Indeed, for invested students, such as the student in this session, writing center consultations can play an important role in facilitating their writing processes. The student came to the writing center two times to work on the same paper. As a result, she was able to revise her paper through multiple drafts, which clearly addresses one of the 2017 WPA Outcomes for First-Year Composition - to focus on the writing processes of students.

After this, the tutor asked if the student wanted to read through the revised draft one more time. The student agreed to this proposition. The tutor then suggested that they address the last sentence of the second paragraph, which the student had highlighted earlier. This part of the discussion is presented below:

[E1] T: So (reading the highlighted sentence) "By taking the knowledge from my majors and applying it to the business world I strive to set myself apart from other business majors." Okay.

[E2] S: Business and business is also repetitive.

[E3] T: Sure, yeah. Umm

[E4] S: Umm

[E5] T: Maybe you could say “and applying it professionally”

[E6] S: Umm (trying to revise) “strive to set apart from” umm

[E7] T: Maybe, I feel like, umm, you talk so much about, you know, your major here, but here you talk more about, you know, the changes you made throughout the semester. So I feel like maybe it will make more sense to take “First semester was my wake-up call” and putting it up here.

[E8] S: Okay

[E9] T: As you say here (referring to third sentence of the original first paragraph), you know, “I have changed my study habits in transition to umm, you know, be better at my academics”

[E10] S: Okay, umm

[E11] T: I mean, do you feel that, do you feel?

[E12] S: Yeah I do. Cause I think with this sentence, like “By taking” is an okay way to lead into the sentence without the first half of it. And I am trying to think of the word but can’t think of it, but I want to do something where it’s (reading the highlighted sentence) “By taking the knowledge from my majors and applying ot to the business world I strive to set myself apart from other future” like the people that I will be up against, but I can’t think of the name.

[E13] T: Candidates

[E14] S: Future candidates, okay (typing).

The above excerpt highlights the collaborative and shared decision making process

between the tutor and student. There are two instances in the excerpt that highlight this. First, the student did not feel pressured to accept the tutor’s suggestion and was able to contribute her ideas freely. Second, even as the tutor made a specific suggestion, the student was given the final say in the issue. A detailed analysis of this interaction is presented below.

After the tutor reads the highlighted sentence aloud (E1), the student points to a repeated word in the sentence (E2). The tutor makes a suggestion to address this issue (E5), and the student tries to think of another revision option for the sentence (E6). Here, we can see that the

student did not blindly accept the tutor's E5 suggestion. While the tutor was suggesting a replacement for "business world" the student seemed to be trying to replace "business majors" with another word or phrase. If we look at E12, we can see what the student had in mind – she wanted to replace "business majors" with "other future people" that she will be up against. However, she could not come up with a suitable word for "people." The tutor helps her out by suggesting "candidates." This points to the collaborative and shared decision making process in writing center consultations. While the student brought up the issue of the repeated words, and the tutor offered a suggestion, the student did not feel obliged to accept the tutor's suggestion. Instead, she revised the sentence as she saw fit, with the full cooperation of the tutor. The revised last sentence of the second paragraph clearly reflects this discussion:

By taking the knowledge from my majors and applying it to the business world I strive to set myself apart from other future candidates.

In E7, the tutor suggests that the lead-in to the highlighted sentence – "First semester was my wakeup call" – can be moved to the first paragraph, explaining that the move would be appropriate because the first paragraph talks about the changes the student has made through the semester. In E9, the tutor points to the third sentence of the original draft (See Appendix V) to support his suggestion. In E11, the tutor asks for the student's input on this issue. Here, we can see that although the tutor provides a direct suggestion (E7), by advising the student to move the lead-in sentence to the first paragraph, ultimately, he also encourages the student to weigh in on the issue (E11). The tutor, is therefore, not directing the student to follow his directions blindly, but soliciting the student's views on the issue. In E12, the student not only agrees with the tutor's suggestion but also explains why she thinks the tutor's suggestion will work. Thus, even as the tutor came up with the initial suggestion to move the lead-in sentence to the first paragraph, the

tutor allowed the student to make the final call by soliciting her opinions. In the revised draft (see Appendix V), the student has moved this lead-in sentence to the first paragraph, as discussed with the tutor.

The tutor and student continued the discussion as follows:

[E19] T: (Reading) “First semester was my wakeup call!” How is it, like what happened that made you want to change your study ways and habits?

[E20] S: My grades (laughing)

[E21] T: Okay, umm. Maybe you could say, I guess you don’t want to outright say “I had terrible grades.”

[E22] S: I mean, I wouldn’t say I had terrible grades, especially compared to like most of the other people that I talked to, but it wasn’t up to par with: a) with what I am used to - now I know I can’t have like my 4.0 GPA that I had in high-school

[E23] T: Okay, I think you should work with that. You should say, you know, umm the grades were not up to par with my own qualifications.

[E24] S: Uh-huh

[E25] T: You know, cause you hold yourself in high regards, and it shows that, you know, you wanna, you wanna have your grades reflect your, you know, who you are as a person.

[E26] S: Uh-huh. Umm (typing)

[E27] T: You can say, you know, “as I was not satisfied with my”

[E28] S: (Typing) Umm (typing) “To high regard” or is that not the right word?

[E29] T: Umm (reading) “First semester was my wake-up call as I satisfies with my grade”

[E30] S: (Laughing) okay (reading revision) “First semester was my wake-up call” umm

[E31] T: Maybe you can say “dissatisfied with my, with umm” Well it has to be in the past tense cause you’re talking about, you know, in the past.

[E32] S: Right. (Reading revision) “This semester was my wake-up call umm dissatisfied with my grade because I hold myself to a higher”

[E33] T: Well you are dissatisfied with your grades because they weren’t up to your standards, right?

[E34] S: Yeah (typing)

[E35] T: Or maybe you can say “they did not meet my standards or they”

[E36] S: (Typing) Umm I don’t like the word for it though

[E37] T: Okay. “First semester was my wake-up call. I was dissatisfied with my grades because they” or maybe you could say they did not accurately reflect who you are, they did not accurately reflect your standards, or umm

[E38] S: (Typing)

[E39] T: or however else you might want to feel the need to say it.

[E40] S: Right (reading revision) “First semester was my wake-up call. I was dissatisfied, dissatisfied with my grade because they did not accurately “umm (typing) umm (typing)

[E41] T: I like that and maybe say like “since then” cause then you’re saying, then you’re implying you know, after that semester you’ve taken those changes.

[E42] S: I like that

[E43] T: Alright

In the above except, the tutor identifies a missing detail in the student’s draft and tries to address it through cognitive scaffolding i.e. by asking the student to explain the gap. However, as they worked on composing a sentence, based on the student’s response, to address the issue, the student seemed to be relying heavily on the tutor for specific words and phrases, and the tutor seemed to getting too involved in composing large chunks of the student’s sentence. As a result, the newly composed sentence (see below) reflects the tutor’s language to a large extent. This points to the need for tutors to be mindful of not crossing the line between tutoring and doing the work for the student. A detailed analysis of the above interaction is presented below.

In E19, the tutor uses cognitive scaffolding by asking the student to explain why she wanted to change her study habit. Here, we can see that the tutor identified a missing link in the existing draft and used cognitive scaffolding to help address the missing link. In the original draft (see Exhibit 14), although the student had mentioned that she wanted to change her study habits,

she had not explained the reason for this change. The tutor is trying to address this gap by asking the student to explain the reason that motivated her to change her study habits. Based on the student's response (E20 and E22), the tutor suggests ways to address the issue (E21, E23, and E25). In E26 through E43, the student and tutor are engaged in composing a sentence to fill the missing link described above. The student is typing, and the tutor is making suggestions, helping the student to compose the sentence. This process led to the drafting of the fourth sentence of the first paragraph in the final draft:

I was dissatisfied with my grades because they did not accurately reflect my potential.

If we look at E26 through E40, we can see that the above sentence reflects the tutor's language substantially. In other words, the student seemed to be relying on the tutor for words and phrases. Although the student was contributing her views, there were instances when she was expecting the tutor to supply exact words and phrases for the sentence (E32, E34, E36, E38, & E40). Furthermore, the tutor did not hesitate to compose large chunks of the sentence during the joint revision process (E27, E31, & E37). Although the tutor did tell the student ultimately to compose the sentence the way she saw fit (E39), by that point the tutor had almost already supplied quite a lot of words for the sentence. This raises questions about how far a tutor should go while revising student papers, which is an issue I will analyze in detail in Chapter 4, as mentioned earlier.

Next, the tutor read the revised essay aloud one final time. They made some minor changes such as deleting sentences that they had already discussed earlier. Finally, the tutor gave the last five minute call and asked the student if she had any final concerns. Acknowledging that they worked mostly on "content," the student asked if the tutor noticed any "glaring grammatical errors" that stood out in the draft. The tutor suggested taking out "Through that" from the second

sentence of the original first paragraph (see Exhibit 14) and reemphasized the importance of concise writing in scholarship essays. He said the student was doing fine in terms of grammar. The tutor also advised the student to read it aloud to a friend one more time.

Conclusion

Overall, this session showed how the tutor used effective strategies such as soliciting and channeling the student's ideas to address unclear sentences and ideas in the draft. We also saw that when the tutor combined cognitive scaffolding with instruction and explanation, the intervention was more effective because it stimulated student participation and fostered tutor-student collaboration. Furthermore, the tutor also demonstrated how higher-order concerns can be addressed while responding to sentence-level concerns raised by a student.

However, there were some instances where the tutor offered specific revision suggestions that made its way, almost word-for-word, into the student's draft. During such instances, the student missed out on the benefits of cognitive scaffolding as she was not able to contribute her ideas. This points to the need for tutors to engage students in the revision process, instead of telling them exactly what to do. Although this is a recommended writing center practice, the tutor did deviate from this recommendation a few times. Furthermore, since the tutor demonstrated both effective (i.e. soliciting student ideas) as well as ineffective tutoring strategies (offering suggestions that are too specific), it is plausible to expect seasoned tutors to get carried away in the discussion and deviate from standard practice. This in turn points to the need for writing center directors to focus on this standard practice while training new tutors as well as during refresher training for existing tutors.

On the part of the student, the session showed that an intervention can be more productive when students raise questions and are engaged in the discussion. The student not only

raised questions but also questioned the tutor's suggestions at times. As a result, the tutor and student was able to address issues effectively. Furthermore, the student was actively typing revisions as the discussion was taking place. However, even though the student was engaged in the session, there were instances where she relied on the tutor for specific words and phrases and where she accepted the tutor's suggestions without much deliberation on her part. Here again, was a student who was highly engaged, but at the same time, could passively accept, and even rely on, the tutor's suggestion. This further points to the need for tutor's to combine cognitive scaffolding (i.e. solicit student input) in addition to providing suggestions and explanations.

Finally, in terms of the pre-and-post drafts, we can see that most of the issues discussed in the session are reflected in the post-intervention draft. One unique aspect of this session was that all the revisions were made during the session. The student did not make any further changes to the paper after the session. As such, during the session, the student got many opportunities to apply some of the concepts that were discussed in the session itself. Furthermore, she responded to the tutor's cognitive scaffolding questions readily probably because of the immediate potential benefit it offered her in terms of having an improved draft. Considering these observations, in-session revisions do seem to offer certain benefits in stimulating student engagement and learning. In this regard, it may be worthwhile for future studies to consider the following question: Do in-session revisions offer more opportunities for cognitive scaffolding, and hence are more productive for stimulating student learning?

Chapter 3: What Makes Higher-Order Writing Center Sessions Successful? Tutor Strategies for Higher-Order Concerns

In the previous chapter, I examined the pre-and post-intervention drafts to determine the extent to which writing center tutor-student conversations make their way into students' revised drafts. In this chapter, I will examine the intervention strategies used by tutors to address higher-order concerns (HOCs) in an attempt to identify higher-order tutoring strategies that work and that don't work. The need to address higher-order concerns (HOCs) has long been recognized as an important aspect of writing center consultations. *The Longman Guide to Peer Tutoring*, to name one very common source, includes this suggestion for writing tutors: "one of the most important things you can do as a tutor is to deal first with...higher-order concerns" (35). It defines higher-order concerns (HOCs) as "the big issues in the paper that aren't addressed by proofreading or editing for grammar or word choice" (35). Similarly, *The Bedford Guide for Writing Tutors* refers to global (or higher-order) revisions as "a paper's overall development and organization" (48). Such an emphasis on HOCs reinforces the idea that there is a deeper layer to revision, one that goes beyond sentence-level issues. It shows that writing centers value such higher-order revisions, and it also implies that writing center tutors should be able to address such issues. However, while both these tutoring guides acknowledge the importance of HOCs, they offer only general suggestions to help tutors address such concerns.

The Longman Guide suggests that tutors should consider the following questions while addressing HOCs: Is the assignment being addressed? Is there a need for a thesis? Are the arguments supported by evidence? Is the paper organized? Is the audience being addressed? Does the paper show appropriate levels of critical thinking? (35). Similarly, *The Bedford Guide's* suggestions to address HOCs are mainly focused on "asking questions and talking with the writer

about his or her paper's audience, topic, content, and structure" and ensuring that the writer's verbal description aligns with the actual paper (48). While, as I noted earlier, these suggestions offer general guidelines, they do not offer tutors much in terms of more specific higher-order tutoring strategies. For instance, what can tutors do, beyond asking questions and talking about the writer's ideas, to help a student reorganize a completed draft? What steps can tutors take during the session to make it easy for students to follow-up on HOCs after the session? Will simply talking about ideas and asking questions, provide sufficient guidelines for students to initiate and complete higher-order revisions? Thus, while the importance of HOCs has been widely accepted and recognized within writing centers, I would argue that there is a need to identify specific strategies that can help tutors address such issues effectively.

In addition to the need for specific tutoring strategies, my findings highlight the extent to which tutors face multiple challenges while dealing with HOCs. First, dealing with HOCs is in itself a challenging task, considering their complex nature. For obvious reasons, working on HOCs, such as organization or development, involves a different level of complexity than helping a student revise a couple of sentences for grammar, word choice, or clarity. Second, the students in my study did not show a very favorable attitude toward higher-order revisions. Most of the students were reluctant to make higher-order revisions, especially when they came to the writing center with drafts that were almost complete. Third, the tutors did not follow a consistent strategy to address HOCs. Different tutors used different strategies, and while some strategies were successful, others were not so successful. To address these challenges and to identify more specific higher-order tutoring strategies, it is important to understand what actually goes on in writing center consultations that address HOCs. How do tutors address HOCs during their sessions? Do they follow the recommended guidelines of the tutoring guide books? How

successful are tutors in helping students address HOCs? Do students follow-up on HOCs discussed in their sessions? These are some questions that can help shed some light on how HOCs can be addressed effectively by tutors.

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze tutor intervention strategies for HOCs and identify the best practices associated with such interventions. As such, I will use the pre-and-post student drafts as well as the session recordings from my research to conduct a detailed analysis of the higher-order intervention strategies used by a selection of the tutors in this study. I will attempt to uncover the tutor intervention strategies, skills, and behaviors associated with successful as well as unsuccessful higher-order interventions. It should be noted that “successful higher-order interventions,” in the context of my study, means those interventions that led to higher-order revisions in the revised student drafts. In other words, a higher-order intervention is “successful” when a student’s post-intervention (or final) draft reflects the HOCs addressed during the intervention. Similarly, a higher-order intervention is “unsuccessful” when a student’s final draft does not reflect the HOCs addressed in the intervention. In the end, my aim is to identify the best practices of higher-order interventions so that existing tutor education and/or training programs can be strengthened to help tutors address higher-order concerns effectively.

First, I begin with a detailed analysis of some of the unsuccessful higher-order interventions in my data set. This will be followed by an analysis of some successful higher-order interventions. Finally, I will conclude by identifying the best practices and strategies that can be used by tutors to address HOCs in their sessions.

Unsuccessful Higher-Order Interventions

I open with three examples of what I would consider unsuccessful higher-order interventions (i.e. interventions that did not result in significant revisions in the post-intervention drafts) in this

section. The first two unsuccessful higher-order interventions took place in a session between an undergraduate student and undergraduate tutor. In this session, the student was faced with the task of reading two articles and writing a one-page response for each article. As such, she came to the session with two semi-finished responses, one for each article. This 34 minute session was essentially divided into two mini-sessions because the tutor and student spent the first 19 minutes on the first response and the remaining 15 minutes on the second response. The first unsuccessful higher-order intervention analyzed below pertains to the first response, while the second intervention pertains to the second response. The student's main concerns, according to what she told the tutor, were to get ideas to analyze the articles and expand both her responses.

The third unsuccessful intervention took place in a session between an undergraduate student and undergraduate tutor. In this case, the student was working on a research paper in which she was required to address the following question: Should employers be required to provide birth control insurance coverage for women employees? In order to successfully complete the assignment, she had to take a position on this topic after reviewing both sides of the issue. In the four-page draft she brought to the session, she had taken the position that employers should provide birth control coverage to women employees. The student came into the session with a four-page draft and wanted to add two more pages. She was concerned that her position was not presented objectively. What follows is a detailed analysis of the three unsuccessful higher-order interventions.

Unsuccessful Higher-Order Intervention I – Student needing ideas to take a position on an issue.

In the first unsuccessful higher-order intervention described below, the tutor responds to the student's HOC of taking a position on the issue of whether the Catholic Church should have the authority to restrict women's use of contraceptives. As mentioned above, this first unsuccessful intervention took place in a session in which the student was working on two article responses. More specifically, the first intervention took place in the first 19 minutes of that session, during which the tutor and student worked on the first article response. The first article was titled "Catholic Leaders Say Zika Doesn't Change Ban on Contraception," and the student had already drafted a four-paragraph response to this article before coming to the session (see Exhibit I). Towards the beginning of the session, the student describes this first article and explains her main concerns as follows:

[E 1] S: Okay so this is the first one and it is pretty much like talking about how like, you know the Zika virus?

[E 2] T: uh-huh

[E 3] S: Okay so the Catholic Church is still saying like people in Brazil and those countries should not be using contraceptives to prevent pregnancy even though the virus is spreading and causing deformities in like children

[E 4] T: uh-huh

[E 5] S: And so, I have explained all that, but I don't really know what else to analyze. I have talked about how much power the church should have in deciding things like this. And like the World Health Organization even said that these women should be able to

have access to contraceptives umm but I just need a little bit more but I don't know what else to say.

[E 6] T: To talk about?

[E 7] S: Yeah

As we can see, in the dialogue above, the student briefly summarizes the article in E1 and E 3 and highlights her main concerns in E 5. In E5 the student explains that she has summarized the main points of the article and needs ideas to add “a little bit more” to her response. The student’s original response (see Exhibit I below) shows that she has summarized the main ideas of the article in the first three paragraphs. In the fourth paragraph, the student starts analyzing the arguments raised in the article by questioning the authority of the Catholic Church to decide whether women should be allowed to use contraceptives or not. The student’s explanation in E5 about the Church’s power and the World Health Organization refers to this analysis in the fourth paragraph. We can see that the fourth paragraph ends with a question: “Should the church have the ability to go against what the World Health Organization recommends for the safety of women and children simply because of religious beliefs? Thus, when the student tells the tutor that she “just need[s] a little bit more” and “I don’t know what else to say” in E5, she is indicating that she needs help answering this question she has set-up in the fourth paragraph. Essentially, the student wanted to conclude her response by arguing that the church should not go against the safety of women, and she needed the tutor’s suggestion to present this argument convincingly. This is a higher-order concern since it is related to the development of an idea or argument.

Exhibit 1: Pre-Intervention /Original Draft Brought to the Session

In the article “Catholic Leaders Say Zika Doesn’t Change Ban on Contraception” by Laurie Goodstein, the topic of whether or not contraceptives and abortion should be allowed to prevent the spread of the Zika virus, and to allow mothers to abort babies who could be diagnosed with microcephaly caused by the virus is discussed. The issue is that in the Catholic church, both contraceptives and abortion have been frowned upon since 1968 when Pope Paul VI issued the papal encyclical *Humanae Vitae* which says that “artificial contraception [is] forbidden because sexual intercourse must always be open to procreation”. However, now with the spread of the Zika virus, many people in Latin American countries are calling for the church to change its mind and allow the use of contraceptives at the very least in order to prevent pregnancy and the possible spread of the virus through sexual intercourse.

Despite all the risks that come with not using contraceptives in countries such as Brazil, the Catholic church remains steadfast in its decision to be against their use and the use of abortion. Church officials and representatives are pushing for families to use “natural family planning methods” which involves a woman tracking her period and knowing what times she will be fertile. However, this method is proven to not be as effective as birth control pills or condoms, and because of this, many believe that these methods should be allowed and supported by the Catholic church.

As a result, the Catholic church is losing followers in Latin American countries, where many believe that both abortion and the use of contraceptives should be permitted. Since the church has so far refused to change its mind, saying that if anything, the Zika virus “presents an opportunity for the church to recommit itself to the dignity and sacredness of life”, many Latin American Catholics are leaving the church to join Evangelical or Pentecostal groups.

While reading this article, one may begin to question and think about how much influence the Pope and Catholic church should have in deciding whether it is moral or not to allow women to use contraceptives or receive an abortion, especially in a time where there is an outbreak of a disease that causes birth defects. While the church continues to disagree with the use of contraceptives and abortion, the World Health Organization stated that “women should have full access to a range of contraceptive options, as well as ‘safe abortion services to the full extent of the law’ to help prevent the spread of Zika to other adults, and to possible future babies. Should the church have the ability to go against what the World Health Organization recommends for the safety of women and children simply because of religious beliefs?

The student sample is, in the context of this study, less important than the tutor’s response, the tutor’s attempt at addressing the higher-order concerns presented by this situation. The transcript of this discussion between the tutor and student is presented below:

[E1] T: Which parts of your paper would be supportive evidence for saying like the church has no right to do this?

[E2] S: Umm (pause) I guess saying like that their method isn't proven to be effective and like risks come with it. And umm also that the World Health Organization is like saying that contraceptives should be used in like especially in like Latin American countries that are being affected.

[E3] T: So I think one thing to say here is make clear statements that say things like umm 'the church's order has a lot of negative effects for women such as these.' And so make it very like sort of reorganize these things so they have this very clear flow where you sort of summarize what's happening and you say like umm Zika is causing a lot of problems, people want to be able to use birth control, the church isn't allowing it, people are leaving the church. So like that's your summary, which is essentially what you do have at the beginning already. And then after that umm go into like what the negative effects are, why it's so important, why people are so willing to leave the church because of these negative effects. Does that make sense?

[E4] S: yeah

[E5] T: and so changing this...not necessarily changing the content but changing the structure so you're very clearly answering these questions you've posed and more clearly supporting your thesis.

[E6] S: Okay.

[E7] T: Does that make sense? Is it helpful?

[E8] S: Yeah. T: It does? S: yeah T: okay

The student’s post-intervention (or revised) draft in Exhibit 2 tells us that the student did not follow up on the tutor’s advice in E3 and E5 above. In her revised draft, the student has just added four sentences to conclude the fourth paragraph but has not followed up on the tutor’s suggestion of “changing the structure” of her paper. In other words, the student did not re-organize her paper. The first three paragraphs as well as the first half of the fourth paragraph in Exhibit 2 are exactly the same as the original draft in Exhibit I. Thus, the student did not re-organize her original response as suggested by the tutor. Instead, she simply did what she had wanted to do all along – respond to the question she had posed in her fourth paragraph. Therefore, we can classify the higher-order intervention presented above as “unsuccessful” because it did not lead to significant revisions in the student’s post-intervention draft. If the student had changed the organizational structure of her original draft to reflect the suggestions made by the tutor, this intervention could have been considered successful.

There may be a couple of factors that contributed to this failed higher-order intervention. First, the tutor’s suggestions in E3 and E5 above are not directly addressing the student’s need. While the student wanted to add a few concluding ideas to her paper by making a specific argument – the church should not go against the safety of women and children, the tutor’s suggestion was essentially asking the student to reorganize her entire paper. Since the student had already drafted most of her response, and all she wanted was to add a few concluding lines, she did not bother to restructure her paper as suggested by the tutor. Furthermore, the tutor’s instruction to reorganize the paper suggests that the tutor did not really know how to respond to the student’s need. The tutor did not have strategies to elicit a more complete argument from the student, who was stuck and did not know what else to say. In such a situation, the tutor could have tried to elicit ideas from the student, instead of asking her to reorganize the paper.

Second, the tutor's suggestions are long and they do not include any specific revision guidelines for the student. In E3 above, the tutor offers quite a long explanation of how the student should reorganize her entire paper to convey the idea that the church should not go against the safety of women. Since the student was not taking notes, we can see that it will be difficult for the student to remember, let alone follow, the tutor's long suggestion. Furthermore, although the tutor is making a higher-order suggestion to help the student reorganize her existing response (see Exhibit 1), she does not explain what the student should do to specific sections of the paper to address the overall structure of the paper. In E3 and E5, the tutor is telling the student what to do in very general terms, without really pointing to any specific organizational problems in the existing draft. When dealing with a HOC, such as reorganizing the overall structure of an existing draft, a more useful strategy may be to examine specific paragraph-level changes that can in turn address the overall structure of the paper. If the tutor had, for instance, reverse outlined the existing draft, it would have been easier to address the structural issues by examining the potential issues in each paragraph. This way, the student would have probably left the session with a more concrete idea of how to go about reorganizing her paper. Without specific revision guidelines, we can see how the tutor's suggestion in E5 of "not necessarily changing the content but changing the structure" can fall on deaf ears.

Third, we can observe that the tutor is doing most of the talking, especially from E3 onward. In E5 above, the tutor is essentially telling the student what to do. However, a standard recommended practice of writing center tutors is to encourage students to talk about their own ideas instead of taking over the session by telling them what to do (see for example, Brooks; North "The Idea of A Writing Center"). Thus the tutor seems to be ignoring this standard tutoring practice. Furthermore, as I mentioned above, the student was not taking notes through

this interaction, which may be another possible reason why she did not follow up on the tutor's suggestions.

Finally, we can also observe that the revision process was not initiated during the session. This intervention was limited to a verbal exchange between the tutor and student, with the tutor providing a long suggestion to the student. Perhaps, if the tutor had initiated the revision process in the session itself, it might have given the student a head start and increased the possibility of her completing the revision after the session. The revision process can be initiated in many ways during a session. For instance, as mentioned above, the tutor could have worked with the student to reverse outline the existing draft. Then they could have identified specific paragraph-level changes needed to address the overall structure of the draft. Based on this, the tutor could have asked the student to prepare a new outline that would serve as a revision guide later. Better yet, the tutor could have asked the student to elaborate her ideas in E2 and compose her concluding argument (i.e. the church should not go against the safety of women) during the session itself. In E2, the student expresses her ideas to address the question she had raised in her fourth paragraph. Thus, following the standard writing center practice of encouraging students to talk about their ideas, the tutor could have probed this issue further and encouraged the student to articulate her own ideas more clearly. The tutor could have then asked the student to compose a response to the question during the session itself. This way, the student's stated concern of responding to the question would have been addressed directly. If we look at her post-session draft (see exhibit 2), we can see that the student has added four sentences in an attempt to respond to the question she was trying to answer. My point is that since the student wanted to respond to this question, the tutor's intervention would have been more effective, if she had focused on this specific need by allowing the student to work on this response during the session itself.

Exhibit 2: Post-Intervention /Revised Draft

In the article “Catholic Leaders Say Zika Doesn’t Change Ban on Contraception” by Laurie Goodstein, the topic of whether or not contraceptives and abortion should be allowed to prevent the spread of the Zika virus, and to allow mothers to abort babies who could be diagnosed with microcephaly caused by the virus is discussed. The issue is that in the Catholic church, both contraceptives and abortion have been frowned upon since 1968 when Pope Paul VI issued the papal encyclical *Humanae Vitae* which says that “artificial contraception [is] forbidden because sexual intercourse must always be open to procreation”. However, now with the spread of the Zika virus, many people in Latin American countries are calling for the church to change its mind and allow the use of contraceptives at the very least in order to prevent pregnancy and the possible spread of the virus through sexual intercourse.

Despite all the risks that come with not using contraceptives in countries such as Brazil, the Catholic church remains steadfast in its decision to be against their use and the use of abortion. Church officials and representatives are pushing for families to use “natural family planning methods” which involves a woman tracking her period and knowing what times she will be fertile. However, this method is proven to not be as effective as birth control pills or condoms, and because of this, many believe that these methods should be allowed and supported by the Catholic church.

As a result, the Catholic church is losing followers in Latin American countries, where many believe that both abortion and the use of contraceptives should be permitted. Since the church has so far refused to change its mind, saying that if anything, the Zika virus “presents an opportunity for the church to recommit itself to the dignity and sacredness of life”, many Latin American Catholics are leaving the church to join Evangelical or Pentecostal groups.

While reading this article, one may begin to question and think about how much influence the Pope and Catholic church should have in deciding whether it is moral or not to allow women to use contraceptives or receive an abortion, especially in a time where there is an outbreak of a disease that causes birth defects. While the church continues to disagree with the use of contraceptives and abortion, the World Health Organization stated that “women should have full access to a range of contraceptive options, as well as ‘safe abortion services to the full extent of the law’” to help prevent the spread of Zika to other adults, and to possible future babies. Should the church have the ability to go against what the World Health Organization recommends for the safety of women and children simply because of religious beliefs? The simple answer is no; the Catholic Church cannot put the safety of its followers at risk due to a religious belief because it has tremendous consequences if it does. Another matter that the church needs to take into account is the fact that they are losing followers already from these policies, leaving only 70% of adults in Latin America identifying as Catholic, when it used to be 94% identifying this way. The potential to keep followers, and protect their health should be incentive enough for the church to change its policies on contraception and abortion, especially during an outbreak spread through sexual intercourse. However, if it is not, one institution should not have the ability to denounce the use of contraceptives or abortion if it benefits others and can help prevent the spread of the Zika virus.

Unsuccessful Higher-Order Intervention II – Tutor explaining how to respond to an assignment rubric and restructure a paper

As mentioned earlier, the second unsuccessful higher-order intervention described below took place in the same session as the first unsuccessful intervention described above. However, the second intervention took place during the second half of the session, and it dealt with the student's second article response. This particular session had a number of difficulties already built into it. With only fifteen minutes remaining, the student and tutor still had to address the student's response to a second article. It should be noted that my analysis of higher-order interventions is in no way limited to this session alone. However, the higher-order interventions of this particular session do offer a good way of understanding what happens in a number of higher-order interventions in my study that were not very successful. The tutor and student spent the remaining 15 minutes of the 34-minute session on this second article response. The student's second response was for an article titled "Catholic Church's Hold on Schools at Issue in Changing Ireland," which was about the Catholic Church's role in influencing religious discrimination in Irish schools. As with the previous paper, the student had already drafted a three-paragraph response and needed ideas to expand her paper (see Exhibit 3). The tutor began this second half of the session by asking the student to explain the thesis of her response. The student explained her thesis as follows:

[E1] S: The next one is about the Catholic Church in Ireland.

[E2] T: Alright. So did you, do you think you have a thesis here?

[E3] S: Umm (laughter) I guess like my thesis is that the Church shouldn't be allowed to or like that religion should not have an influence on who gets to receive an education in Ireland.

[E4] T: Okay

After listening to the thesis in E3 above, the tutor asked the student to further explain the reasons behind her thesis, and the student provided a long explanation to support her view that religion should not intervene in matters of access to education in Ireland. This strategy of asking the student to think about and elaborate her thesis is a good one because it gives the tutor a good idea of the student's position and chain of thoughts. Here the tutor seems to be following the recommended writing center practice of asking the student for a brief overview of the main ideas of the paper at the outset. Next, the tutor asked the student to start reading her response. After reviewing the first two paragraphs, the tutor referred to the assignment rubric and made a higher-order intervention to help the student identify and respond to the main questions raised in the article as well as to re-structure, or frame, her response in a more logical way.

Exhibit 3 Pre-Intervention/ Original Draft Brought to the Session

The article “Catholic Church’s Hold on Schools at Issue in Changing Ireland” by Douglas Dalby questions the idea of whether or not Ireland should start to become more secular as a country. The article talks about how Irish schools have the ability to deny students entry based on religion—specifically if they are of Catholic faith or not. This is being called the “baptism barrier” since many schools will admit children baptized in the Catholic Church over children who have not been baptized at all, or who belong to a different religion. While Ireland does offer Educate Together schools, schools that are inclusive of all religions, “nearly 97% [of schools] are church owned” meaning there are very few Educate Together schools. Also, there are extremely long waiting lists at these schools since many parents of unbaptized children try to send them there, and most will not get in. As a result, parents will also still apply to Catholic schools, and if their children do get in, like Eva Panicker did, they have to sit through religion classes that only focus on Catholicism, even though in her case, she was Hindu.

This story brings about the question on whether or not Ireland needs to become more secular and remove the church from local schools so that all children have an equal opportunity to get an education. Many are signing a petition to do exactly that. For those who have immigrated to Ireland, or are just not religious, they believe that there needs to be a separation between church and state, especially in schools, in order to provide equal opportunities and to allow more religious freedom in the country. When you look at secular countries like America, many still believe there is religious discrimination in some places, but it does not have as large of an affect as it does in countries like Ireland, where children can get denied from elementary schools, based on their religion or lack-there-of.

This story is important because it addresses how religion, or rather religious preference, is getting in the way of children receiving an education and how this is affecting the citizens of Ireland. Because children can be denied a place in schools based on religion, and many non-religious schools have extremely long waiting lists, they are going without an education. This means that Ireland is going to have a huge problem as these children get older because they will not be educated if schools continually deny them because they are not Catholic or because the waiting list is too long for them to ever make it into the school. On a more drastic side, the ability to deny students based on religious factors could also cause possible uprisings against the Irish government by those who have been affected by the law, and by those who feel that Catholicism is being pushed onto them or their children just so that they can receive an education if they believe in another religion, such as Eva Panicker’s family.

What follows is an analysis of this higher-order intervention. The discussion between the tutor and student related to this intervention is presented below:

[E1] T: well one thing that was very clear in the rubric is that your professor wants you to say how those questions are answered.

[E2] S: okay.

[E3] T: So how what questions are raised and how that question is answered umm begin by saying “that the article’s content supports that these umm that children being denied from elementary schools is a problem and needs to be fixed. And the article proposes several ways that people have been trying to fix it.” Do you see how that is different than saying that the article raises this question?

[E4] S: yeah

[E5] T: And then saying things that were in the article?

[E6] S: yeah.

[E7] T: because you are providing a framework for it. So you are guiding your reader by telling your reader that this is what you should be gaining from this summary.

[E8] S: yeah

[E9] T: so like I said, like the other one right, you got the content and then what you sort of need to do is ...put it in a framework, build something around it that makes it clear what your purpose is, what your points are, where the thesis lies, what the main idea of the paper is umm and how those questions are answered.

[E10] S: okay

[E11] T: yeah

In E1 above the tutor is trying interpret the assignment rubric for the student. The tutor is explaining that the student needs to identify the questions raised in the article and explain how those questions are answered in the article. This is what the tutor is referring to when she says “So how what questions are raised and how that question is answered” in E3. Thus, the tutor is interpreting the assignment rubric for the student by explaining how the article needs to be analyzed. However, immediately after this, the tutor provides a template-like verbal example to

show how the student can set up her introduction to address the assignment rubric. This is expressed by the tutor in E3 when she suggests that the student should begin her response by saying “that the article’s content supports …trying to fix it.” While this seems like a good template for the student’s introduction, the revised draft in Exhibit 4 does not reflect this suggestion. In fact, the first two paragraphs in both the original (Exhibit 3) and revised drafts (Exhibit 4) are exactly the same. This could be because, as with the previous unsuccessful intervention, the tutor simply made this verbal suggestion without actually initiating the student into the revision process during the session itself. For instance, if the tutor had stopped after making the suggestion in E 3 and asked the student to revise the introductory paragraph, it is possible that the tutor’s suggestion could have led to some changes in the student’s draft. However, simply offering verbal advice without initiating the student into the revision process does not seem to be effective in helping students deal with HOCs.

The tutor continues her intervention by suggesting that the student needs to reorganize her response by “providing a framework for it” (see E 7). In E9 she reiterates the need for reorganization by suggesting that the student needs put her content “in a framework” and “build something around it” to make the purpose, thesis, and main ideas of her response clear as well as to explain how the questions raised in the article are being answered. We can see that this suggestion is rather ambiguous. By telling the student to reorganize her existing content by putting it “in a framework” and by building “something around it” the tutor doesn’t seem to be helping the student at all. This is substantiated by the fact that the student did not make any organizational changes in her revised draft (see Exhibit 4). As we can see, the only change in the first three paragraphs between the two drafts (Exhibit 3 and 4) can be seen in the last sentence of the third paragraph of the revised draft (Exhibit 4), where the student has deleted “such as Eva

Panicker's family." This intervention may have been more successful, as I mentioned in my analysis of the first unsuccessful intervention above, if the tutor had provided more specific revision guidelines and initiated the revision process during the session itself. For instance, the tutor could have asked the student to reverse outline the original draft, highlighted the specific changes needed in each section of the draft based on the reverse outline, and helped the student develop a revised outline.

The only revision we can observe in the revised draft in Exhibit 4 is the addition of background details to describe "Eva Panicker," and the addition of a new example, "Reuben," in the new fourth paragraph. These additions are not related to the intervention described above. Instead, they were the result of the tutor's suggestion toward the end of the session asking the student to provide more background details for the character, Eva Panicker. The last two sentences added in the new fourth paragraph seem to be concluding sentences that the student composed without any input from the session.

Considering the fact that the student did not reorganize the first three paragraphs at all, we can conclude that the tutor's higher-order intervention aimed at restructuring the student's response was not successful. This intervention displays almost the same drawbacks as the first unsuccessful intervention. Both interventions, along with several others from my study, show that when tutors simply talk about higher-order revisions without offering any concrete revision strategies, it becomes difficult for students to follow up on such suggestions because they do not leave with a concrete revision plan and will most likely not remember the long verbal descriptions of the tutor. The tutor's higher-order suggestion of providing "a framework" for the existing content (see E7 and E9 above) is too general and does not give the student any specific guidelines. Throughout the exchanges in E3, E5, E7, and E9 above, the tutor is making general

suggestions for the student to reorganize her entire paper. However, it is important to note that the student was interested in expanding her paper and not necessarily re-organizing it. We can also observe that the tutor is doing most of the talking and describing what the student needs to do. The student is neither participating actively in the discussion nor taking notes. Furthermore, this intervention did not initiate the revision process during the session. As a result of all these factors, the tutor's higher-order suggestions did not get translated into the student's final draft.

Exhibit 4: Post-Intervention/Revised Draft

The article “Catholic Church’s Hold on Schools at Issue in Changing Ireland” by Douglas Dalby questions the idea of whether or not Ireland should start to become more secular as a country. The article talks about how Irish schools have the ability to deny students entry based on religion—specifically if they are of Catholic faith or not. This is being called the “baptism barrier” since many schools will admit children baptized in the Catholic Church over children who have not been baptized at all, or who belong to a different religion. While Ireland does offer Educate Together schools, schools that are inclusive of all religions, “nearly 97% [of schools] are church owned” meaning there are very few Educate Together schools. Also, there are extremely long waiting lists at these schools since many parents of unbaptized children try to send them there, and most will not get in. As a result, parents will also still apply to Catholic schools, and if their children do get in, like Eva Panicker did, they have to sit through religion classes that only focus on Catholicism, even though in her case, she was Hindu.

This story brings about the question on whether or not Ireland needs to become more secular and remove the church from local schools so that all children have an equal opportunity to get an education. Many are signing a petition to do exactly that. For those who have immigrated to Ireland, or are just not religious, they believe that there needs to be a separation between church and state, especially in schools, in order to provide equal opportunities and to allow more religious freedom in the country. When you look at secular countries like America, many still believe there is religious discrimination in some places, but it does not have as large of an affect as it does in countries like Ireland, where children can get denied from elementary schools, based on their religion or lack-there-of.

This story is important because it addresses how religion, or rather religious preference, is getting in the way of children receiving an education and how this is affecting the citizens of Ireland. Because children can be denied a place in schools based on religion, and many non-religious schools have extremely long waiting lists, they are going without an education. This means that Ireland is going to have a huge problem as these children get older because they will not be educated if schools continually deny them because they are not Catholic or because the waiting list is too long for them to ever make it into the school. On a more drastic side, the ability to deny students based on religious factors could also cause possible uprisings against the Irish government by those who have been affected by the law, and by those who feel that Catholicism is being pushed onto them or their children just so that they can receive an education if they believe in another religion.

The effect is already able to be seen. Eva Panicker, a four year old Hindu student who was actually accepted into a Catholic school, “knows everything about Jesus but is being taught nothing about [her] religion”, greatly upsetting her parents. Another child, Reuben, “was rejected from nine local schools...because he was not baptized” and is forced to delay his education. Reuben is not the only child who faces a delay in education, or the possibility of not receiving one, there are many others, and eventually this will create a problem for Ireland in the future as these children reach adulthood and don’t receive an education. However, if Ireland changes its policies and becomes more secular, it not only would make many people currently living in the country very pleased, but it would also put an end to a potential problem in the country’s future. Also, there is no proof that education is affected by religion, and therefore, no use in denying children entry into a school based on religious beliefs.

Unsuccessful Higher-Order Intervention III – Student needing ideas to present her argument objectively

This third unsuccessful higher-order intervention took place in a session between an undergraduate tutor and undergraduate student. The session was originally scheduled for 30 minutes but it ended up lasting for 40 minutes. The student was working on a research paper that required her to present two sides to an issue objectively. Her paper was about whether employers should be required to provide birth control insurance coverage to female employees, and she had to assess the views of religious supporters who were against contraceptives as well as the views of those who supported contraceptives. The student had drafted a little over four pages and needed to add about two more pages. She was concerned that her position in the above debate, that women employees should be provided birth control coverage by their employees, was not objective enough. The student explains this at beginning of the session as follows:

[E1] 2 .49 S: So what she like definitely stressed was like making sure like when you are saying like the two sides that you are very like objective. So I don't know like, for the side that I am not writing for, I am not sure if I am being objective.

[E2] T: Being objective (T says this at same time as the student)

[E3] S: So I don't know

In E1 above, the student is explaining that her instructor expects both sides of the argument to be very objective. She is also concerned that her argument for her position in the debate is not objective enough. She was essentially trying to convince the religious side that employers should provide birth control insurance coverage to female employees. After the above dialogue, the tutor and student read through the student's four-paragraph draft and made some sentence- level as well as paragraph-level organizational changes. The student had a laptop and

was making most of the revisions during the session itself. By the time they finished reviewing the draft, the session had exceed its 30-minute schedule by about six minutes. The higher-order intervention presented below took place during these very last minutes of the session. We can see that this is a higher-order intervention because the student was looking for ideas to present a rebuttal to the religious supporters. In other words, she wanted the tutor's suggestions to help her present her position convincingly to the religious side. This intervention is presented below:

[E1] S: The next part I will have to do is like the compromise...that's apparently where I put like my opinion in and like you're supposed to like make the other side think about...right so I would try to make the religious side

[E2] T: consider the argument

[E3] S: yeah

[E4] T: Okay, so you can't use any "I" right?

[E5] S: uh mmm

[E6] T: One way you could go into that is to say something like "According to so and so of whatever institute edu" education wow, umm "contraception is relevant or contraception reduces unplanned pregnancies by so and so, and contraception reduces abortions by so and so" So you can then say "the religious organizations at its core are trying to avoid abortions of unplanned pregnancies"

[E7] S: yeah

[E8] T: you know, effectively what contraception is doing is that.

[E9] S: yeah.

[E10] T: Another way you can do it is to liken the argument to something else. So if somebody told me "I don't think women should use epidurals because when the first

woman had a child God did not give her an epidural so why should women use epidurals”

So you can say, you can liken it to hmm well “when God did the first surgery, when he took out Adam’s rib, he put Adam into a deep sleep.

[E11] S: yeah.

[E12] T: So that in a way was anesthesia. So it’s just a way to, you can liken it to something else.

[E13] S: yeah

If we refer to the students original and revised drafts in Appendix VI, we can see that the revised draft does not clearly reflect the tutor’s suggestions from the above intervention. In E1, “The next part” that the student is referring to is the end of her original draft, the part that she has yet to add. She essentially wanted to persuade the religious side to accept her position. In E6, E8, E10, and E12, the tutor is offering higher-order suggestions to help the student present her argument persuasively. We can see that in the revised draft, the student has added two and a half paragraphs at the end to complete her paper. This section is highlighted in blue on pages five, six, and seven (See Appendix VI). This revision, however, does not clearly reflect the tutor’s higher-order suggestion. Therefore, we can conclude that the tutor’s higher-order intervention was not successful.

This intervention was also not successful for many of the same reasons pointed out in the previous two interventions. In E6 and E10, the tutor responds to the student’s concern raised in E1 by telling the student what to do. As with the previous two unsuccessful interventions, the tutor offers long verbal suggestions explaining how the student should present her argument without offering any concrete revision guidelines. It probably would have been more effective, for instance, if the tutor had tried to identify the student’s ideas to address this concern. This

way, the discussion would have focused on the student's ideas instead. The tutor then could have asked the student to make a note of the main discussion points so that the student could expand on them after the session. Instead, what we observe in the above exchange is the tutor doing most of the talking, explaining how she (the tutor) would go about making the argument. Having worked as a writing center tutor, I have often found myself falling into such a trap of telling students what I would do instead of asking them to talk about their own ideas. In the previous two unsuccessful interventions too, the tutor fell into this trap of offering a long verbal suggestion which did not prove to be very useful for the student.

What Do These Unsuccessful Higher-Order Interventions Tell Us?

Some common characteristics of all the three unsuccessful interventions described above were that the tutors were doing most of the talking and providing long suggestions, specific revision guidelines were missing, the revision process was not initiated during the session, students' concerns were not directly addressed, and the students were not actively engaged in the discussion.

In all three interventions described above, tutors made general suggestions explaining how they would address a higher-order concern, instead of asking the students to talk about their own ideas. And for all three interventions, the students did not follow up on the tutors' suggestions. This indicates that verbal suggestions alone are not enough in helping students address HOCs.

We also observed that the all three tutors did not point to specific sections in the existing drafts or offer specific revision guidelines while addressing HOCS. For instance, as mentioned in my analysis, these tutors talked about a higher-order concern related to an existing draft without really explaining how specific sections of that draft should be revised to address the HOC being

discussed. Moreover, besides offering verbal suggestions, the tutors did not provide any concrete revision guidelines, such as an outline to help with reorganization or an action plan with a list of issues discussed in the session, for students to fall back on after the session. This suggests that simply talking about HOCs without addressing specific sections of an existing draft and without offering concrete revision guidelines is not an effective strategy to address HOCs.

Another common characteristic for all three interventions was that the revision process was not initiated during the session. In all the three interventions, the tutors simply talked about the higher-order concern in question without actually initiating the revision process in the session itself. As mentioned in my analysis, students can be initiated into the revision process during a session in many ways such as by asking them to create a reverse outline, by allowing them time to write down their ideas, or by having them take notes of the main discussion points and develop a specific revision plan. Perhaps if the tutor had worked with the student to reverse outline the student's responses in interventions I and II or if the tutor had encouraged the student in intervention III to write down some of her own ideas to strengthen her argument, these students may have been in a better position to make higher-order revisions after the session.

We also observed that in the first two interventions the tutor did not address the student's concerns directly. In both these interventions, the tutor asked the student to restructure both responses; however, all the student wanted to do was expand her responses by adding a few more sentences. In the third intervention too, the tutor told the student what to do without giving the student a chance to talk about her own ideas. This indicates that when tutors try to address issues that do not align with student needs, students will be reluctant to follow up on such issues.

Finally, the students were not actively engaged in the discussion in all the three interventions. They were not actively participating in the discussion nor were they taking notes. They did not ask too many questions and allowed the tutors to go on speaking. This shows that they were not engaged actively. And when students are not engaged, as we can tell from the three interventions, it is less likely that they will follow up on the suggestions of their tutors. Another important revelation offered by these interventions is when students have an almost-complete-draft, they are reluctant to follow up on higher-order revision suggestions that require them to re-write or re-organize a major part of their draft, as was the case in the first two unsuccessful interventions.

In addition to the three interventions analyzed above, the other higher-order interventions in my data set also displayed some of these common characteristics. For example, there was session in which a tutor discussed the student's existing thesis statement and made some helpful suggestions to help the student revise her thesis. The student was working on a visual rhetorical analysis paper. The tutor explained the purpose of a thesis statement clearly and helped the student identify the missing links in her existing thesis. However, in spite of this seemingly successful intervention, the student did not make any substantial revisions to her thesis statement in her revised draft. I would argue that if the tutor had initiated the revision process during the session and encouraged the student to revise her thesis as they were discussing it, the student's revised thesis would have been more in line with the tutor's intervention. Furthermore, the student would have had the opportunity to develop a thesis statement under the guidance of the tutor and in the process gained some valuable insights about composing a thesis statement. The transcript of the tutor's intervention as well as the student's original and revised thesis is presented in Appendix VII.

Similarly in another session, as the tutor and student were reading the student's draft, the tutor made a higher-order suggestion of re-organizing a paragraph. The tutor identified some repeated information in the paragraph in question and suggested that the student should reorganize the paragraph to present the information more sequentially. The tutor even asked the student if she wanted to make this revision during the session or if she wanted to make a "mental note" and do it after the session. The student agreed to make a mental note indicating that she would revise it after the session. However, the student did not make any changes to that particular paragraph. This shows that perhaps the student was not interested in making the higher-order revision or that she did not remember the tutor's suggestion and thus could not follow-up on it after the session. In any case, this points to the need for tutors to initiate higher-order revisions, wherever possible, during the session itself, and it also points to the need for tutors to encourage students to write down specific higher-order suggestions. Furthermore, the fact that the student did not follow up this intervention also reinforces the idea that students are reluctant to make higher-order changes when they already have a more or less complete draft.

The transcript of this intervention is presented in Appendix VIII.

Successful Higher-Order Interventions

The first two successful higher-order interventions analyzed below are taken from a session between an undergraduate student and undergraduate tutor. The student had a two-paragraph draft and a detailed outline for a paper that was due the next day (see Exhibit 5). She had to read two articles and write a response paper that required her to analyze the main characters in the two articles. She needed ideas to compose the rest of the paper. The session was 40 minutes long. The tutor and student spent the first 20 minutes reviewing the two introductory paragraphs that the student brought to the session. During this time they addressed two higher

order concerns – they revised the thesis statement and added analytical details to the second paragraph. The first successful higher-order intervention presented below is related to the thesis discussion and the second intervention to the analysis discussion. The tutor and student spent the remaining 20 minutes of the session discussing the student’s ideas for expanding the paper. The student’s detailed outline, which included a structure as well as ideas for the remaining unwritten paragraphs of the paper, helped them to engage in a structured discussion throughout the session.

Successful Higher-Order Intervention I – Thesis Revision

As mentioned above, the first successful higher-order intervention described here is related to the thesis statement discussion. This intervention can be considered “successful” because it resulted in significant revision of the student’s original thesis. As explained in detail below, the tutor not only explains the need for specific details in the original thesis, but she also initiates the revision process during the session itself. The student’s original thesis, which can also be seen in the first paragraph in student’s original draft (Exhibit 5), looked like this:

Specifically, the Prodigal Son is a parable about unconditional love and forgiveness between a father and his two disrespectful and undeserving sons; but to understand this message, we have to analyze the cultural norms of the Middle East in Jesus’ time which can be seen through the actions of these three characters.

However, the revised thesis, which can be also be seen in Exhibit 6, looks like this:

Specifically, the Prodigal Son is a parable about unconditional love and forgiveness between a father and his two disrespectful and undeserving sons; but to understand this message, we have to identify the irresponsible, defiant actions of these three characters that break the respectful, traditional cultural norms of the Middle East in Jesus’ time.

We can see that the revised thesis is more specific because it clearly describes the actions of the three characters as well as the cultural norms of the Middle East. Since the student was required to analyze the characters of the two assigned articles, by defining the actions of the three characters, the revised thesis seems to have addressed this need quite well.

Exhibit 5: Pre-Intervention /Original Two-Paragraph Draft

Prodigal Son Essay

When analyzing biblical literature, readers often interpret the stories through a spiritual lens and neglect the cultural/historical context which is essential to understanding the Christian message and especially Jesus' parables (teaching stories). Specifically, the Prodigal Son is a parable about unconditional love and forgiveness between a father and his two disrespectful and undeserving sons; but to understand this message, we have to analyze the cultural norms of the Middle East in Jesus' time which can be seen through the actions of these three characters.

Starting the parable, we see the younger son's blatant disrespect to his father. He asks for his portion of the inheritance early—something only to be discussed after the death of the father, by asking early, the son is essentially telling his father, "I wish you were dead" (citation). This was considered extremely rude and consequently, the young son would not only dishonor his family by severing ties with his older brother and father, but also face public shaming by the Jewish community. Not only does the son ask for the inheritance early, but he then asks to turn his share into physical money which furthers the dishonor—this meant a complete separation from his family and community. As a result, the younger son moves quickly to leave the Jewish culture. Unfortunately, he quickly squanders his money and ends up working for a Gentile where he becomes a pig herder (very taboo to Jews as pigs were "unholy" animals, this job made the son the lowest of lows). Then, a famine hits the country and cripples the food supply, with this, the son

What follows is a detailed analysis of the tutor's intervention that resulted in the above revision. The transcript below shows how the tutor began the intervention:

[E1] T: We don't want to say just the cultural norms of the Middle East and the actions. So we want to say, we want to identify that cultural norm or what is the cultural climate of the Middle East.

[E2] S: okay

[E3] So that can be something as simple as using an adjective like “conservative” umm or you can go more in-depth and maybe paraphrase some of the language that they use, that the articles use. And then we want to describe the actions of the characters a little more

[E4] S: Right (typing) Take the language (typing)

[E5] T: And what that will do is it will kind of create this consistency throughout your paper where umm when you reference the article later on, your readers will go “Oh that’s what they are talking about”

From the above discussion, we can see that the tutor has identified the need for specific details in the thesis statement. In E1 and E3 the tutor not only points out the need to be more descriptive about the “cultural norms” and “actions of the characters,” but also gives a specific example of how this can be done. E4 indicates that the student is invested in the conversation as she is actively typing out the tutor’s comments. Furthermore, in E5, the tutor is pointing to the importance of a thesis statement and helping the student understand how describing the “cultural norms” and “action of the characters” in the thesis, will serve as a guiding theme for the rest of her paper. This intervention, however, does not end here. The transcript below shows how the tutor and student continued this discussion:

[E1] T: So when we say, we want to identify the cultural norms of the Middle East which can be seen through the actions of these three characters

[E2] S: Well I guess like that’s kind of opposite because like they are going against the normal and that’s why it’s like special and they literally do the complete opposite of everything they’re supposed to do.

[E3] T: okay umm so one of the ways we can tweak that sentence so that it matches what you told me is if we move, if we flip the order in which you talk about the culture of the

Middle East and the three sons or the three characters. So you say umm “but to understand this message we have to identify” and then you give that adjective that says like the “blank character” or the “blank actions of these characters and the ways that they” you can say umm any sort of adjective or word that gives the idea of like undermining or breaks free from the cultural norms.

[E4] S: And (as she is typing) “so we have to identify the” so like if you said like “the actions of these three characters that break the cultural norms?”

[E5] T: umm

[E6] S: kind of somewhere along in there

[E7]T: yeah

[E8] S: okay (continues typing)

In the above interaction we can see the tutor and student are both actively engaged in the conversation. In E2, the student explains the intended rationale of her thesis which is slightly different from her original thesis. This is promptly addressed by the tutor in E3, where the tutor provides specific guidelines for the student to revise her thesis accordingly. The tutor’s technique of saying “blank character” and “blank actions of these characters” serve as an effective template for the student to revise her thesis. We can also observe that the student is making revisions as they are speaking. This is indicated in E4 through E8 where the student is typing the revisions during the session itself. Ultimately, this intervention resulted in the revised thesis, which was completed during the session itself.

The above higher-order intervention (represented by both the first and second transcripts) was successful because it resulted in the student’s thesis being actually revised. Unlike the unsuccessful interventions where the higher-order interventions did not make their way into the

students' final papers, the results of this intervention are clearly reflected in the revised thesis. So what are some of the possible reasons that make this intervention successful? Firstly, the tutor identifies a specific issue with the thesis and offers specific revision guidelines for the student. The tutor did not offer a long general description of what needs to be done, but instead pointed to a very specific higher-order issue and provided equally specific guidelines for the student to follow-up on the issue. Second, the student is highly engaged as can be seen from her typing actions as well as her active participation in the conversation. Third, the revision process was initiated during the session where the student actually collaborated with the tutor to revise her thesis. The revision was also completed during the session.

Successful Higher-Order Intervention II – Adding Analytical Details

In this second successful intervention taken from the same session as the one above, the tutor helps the student to add some analysis into the second paragraph of her original draft (see Exhibit 5). As mentioned above, this second intervention also took place during the first 20 minutes of the session. As can be seen in the transcript below, the tutor points to a specific sentence in the student's two-paragraph draft and provides specific guidelines for the student to include some analytical details.

[E1] T: if we go back to your paper, when we talk about how he leaves the Jewish culture

[E2] S: um huh

[E3] T: that's a good place to include a couple lines of just pure analysis

[E4] S: okay

[E5] T: of what this looks like in terms of the first son's character and what that umm

how that upsets the cultural norms

[E6] S: okay

[E7] T: umm...and then you can start a new paragraph with the “Unfortunately he squanders his money”

[E8] S: okay

In the above exchange, the tutor identifies the need for a higher-order revision by pointing to a specific point in the student’s paper. For example, in E1 and E2, the tutor identifies the need for more analysis at a very specific place in the student’s paper. This specific place the tutor is referring to is the fourth sentence in the second paragraph of Exhibit 5: *As a result, the younger son moves quickly to leave the Jewish culture.* The tutor also explains what this analysis should entail in E5, by telling the student that she needs to analyze what the son’s departure says about his character as well as how the move goes against the Jewish culture. It is also important to note that these issues raised by the tutor are closely linked to the student’s thesis – i.e. the behavior of the characters and the cultural norms of the Middle East. Furthermore, in E7 the tutor also addresses the issue of organization by suggesting a paragraph break. In the transcript below, we can see how the student picks up on this conversation to double check that she has understood the tutor’s suggestion:

[E1] S: So (reading the sentence from her paper) “quickly” “moves quickly to leave the Jewish culture” and so we’re talking about why that’s significant?

[E2] T: Yeah, so you can, I mean when you’re talking about the Jewish culture, the Jewish culture is in the Middle East, you know they’re sort of the same thing at this point in time umm so you can kind of describe what the Jewish culture looks like

[E3] S: okay

[E4] T: and talk about the ways that the son’s actions go against that

[E5] S: (S starts typing as T is speaking).

[E6] T: Yeah, and that could look like probably about 2 or 3 more sentences and I think if you have much more than that, at least in this paragraph, this paragraph is going to look really long

[E7] S: yeah (typing)

[E8] T: and really heavy.

[E9] S: yeah (typing)

In E1 above, the student asks the tutor a question to make sure that she is following the tutor's 'analysis' suggestion. The tutor responds to this question in E2 and E4 with specific guidelines to help the student add the analytical details. The tutor clearly explains what the student needs to do to add analytical details – describe the Jewish culture and explain how the son's actions went against that culture. This is followed up by the tutor with some more specific suggestions in E6, where the tutor specifies that the additional details should not exceed three sentences. We can also see that the student is actively typing the tutor's suggestions as they are having this conversation.

We can see that this higher-order intervention (represented by the first and second transcripts) was successful because it is clearly reflected in the student's revised draft. The student has followed up on the tutor's suggestion by adding two sentences to explain the relationship between the older son's actions and the cultural norms of the Middle-East. This can be seen in Exhibit 6 which presents the first three paragraphs of the student's revised draft (see Appendix IX for the entire revised draft). If we look at the second paragraph in Exhibit 6, we can see that the student has added two sentences at the exact same spot recommended by the tutor to explain what the son's departure means in the context of the Jewish culture. We can also see that

the student started a new paragraph (see third paragraph in Exhibit 6) to describe how the son squandered his money and became a pig herder, as recommended by the tutor.

This intervention shares many characteristics with the first successful higher-order intervention. Here again, the tutor was able to point to a specific point in the student's paper while addressing a HOC. In addition, the tutor offered very specific guidelines to the student, which is probably why the student was able to follow up on this issue after the session. The student demonstrated a very high level of engagement by asking questions as well as taking notes on her laptop.

Exhibit 6: First Three Paragraphs of the Revised Draft

When analyzing biblical literature, readers often interpret the stories through a spiritual lens and neglect the cultural or historical context which is essential to understanding the Christian message and especially Jesus' parables (teaching stories). Specifically, the Prodigal Son is a parable about unconditional love and forgiveness between a father and his two disrespectful and undeserving sons; but to understand this message, we have to identify the irresponsible, defiant actions of these three characters that break the respectful, traditional cultural norms of the Middle East in Jesus' time.

Starting the parable, we see the younger son's blatant disrespect to his father. He asks for his portion of the inheritance early—something only to be discussed after the death of the father. By asking early, the son is essentially telling his father, "I wish you were dead" (Hultgren, 73). This was considered extremely rude and consequently, the young son would not only dishonor his family by severing relational ties with his older brother and father, but also face public shaming by the Jewish community. Sons did not simply defy their fathers. But it goes farther, not only does the son ask for the inheritance early, but he then asks to turn his share into physical money which furthers the dishonor—this meant a complete separation from his family (physical on top of emotional separation) and he rids himself of his portion of the family farm (Bailey, 165). As a result, the younger son moves quickly to leave the Jewish culture and escape inevitable community humiliation. By leaving, the younger son is telling society that he wishes his father was dead, he does not want to practice traditional Judaism, and that he will not return. This is a sharp contrast to responsible and faithful members of the Jewish community who respect and care for their Elders (especially through taking possession of the family farm) and who fervently honor Judaism (Bailey, 165,168).

The younger son quickly squanders his money by living foolishly and unfortunately, soon after, a famine hits the country which cripples the food supply. With this, the son finds himself completely destitute and ends up working for a Gentile where he becomes a pig herder. This job was exceptionally taboo in the eyes of Jews as pigs were "unholy" animals, and thus, the son would be ranked among the lowest of lows. The younger son longs to eat the wild carob that the pigs eat (which is not only unfit for humans, but provides very little nutrients- not nearly enough to survive on). Shortly thereafter, the son finds himself homeless, hungry, and in extreme poverty (Bailey, 170-173). With nothing to lose, the son decides to return home and beg for forgiveness from his father (Hultgren, 77). At this point, the son is making a bold move – he's trying to reintegrate into the culture he so desperately ran away from. Coming back now would not only be shameful, but would force the son to confront the community, his brother, and his father (all ties he severed earlier in the passage). To compensate, the son plans to fall on his knees and beg for forgiveness from his father in hopes of working on the family farm as a hired servant (the lowest, most dishonorable occupation in the Jewish community) (Bailey, 176-177). Typically, sons were the right hand of the father and were expected to carry on a family's legacy, especially through the family farms, to become a productive member of Jewish society (Hultgren, 77). To leave society the way the younger son has, shows a stark contrast to the traditional father/son relationship of the time, dishonors his family, and now, the son is returning-- when he feels the physical pain of hunger, homelessness, and poverty; needless to say he has nothing to lose.

Successful Higher-Order Intervention III – Making a claim stronger

This third intervention is taken from another session between an undergraduate student and an undergraduate coach. The student was working on a scholarship application essay and had come to the session with a three-paragraph draft (see Exhibit 7). She had worked with another tutor previously on this same application. In this session, she was concerned about grammar and word count. She wanted to reduce her 440-word draft to 400 words. The session lasted for about 42 minutes during which the tutor and student reviewed each paragraph and worked on sentence level as well as higher-order concerns. All the revisions were made during the session on the student’s laptop.

In this intervention, the tutor worked with the student to strengthen the following claim in the second paragraph of the student’s essay (the last sentence of the second paragraph in Exhibit 7):

First semester was my wakeup call, but being driven to accomplish my goal in a set amount of time and with good grades is going to set me apart from other business majors. The tutor’s intervention can be considered “successful” because it resulted in significant revision of the above claim. As explained in detail below, the tutor not only identifies a weak claim and encourages the student to talk about it, but he also initiated the revision process during the session itself. The revised claim in the student’s final draft (the last sentence in the second paragraph of Exhibit 8) looked like this:

By taking the knowledge from my majors and applying it to the business world I strive to set myself apart from other future candidates.

We can see that the revised claim is more logically because it clearly describes how the student plans to set herself apart from other candidates – by applying the knowledge from her majors to the real world.

Exhibit 7: Pre-Intervention/ Original Draft

Throughout the past academic year I have become more aware of what I wanted to get out of my education. Through that I have focused more on my school work and started to put together the pieces for what I want to accomplish from my time here at JMU. I have changed my study habits in a transition to better by academics. Last semester I stayed in my dorm trying to study with the loud noises of my hallmates and the constant distraction of people banging on my door. This semester I found my niche in the library where I go to study and get my work done almost every day. My teachers' office hours have now become a daily routine in my everyday schedule as well.

I also realized this year that I am interested in more than just marketing. With my COB 204 class I quickly took interest in the content of computer programs and information. I then took the initiative to talk to my advisor to see what steps it would take to add CIS as a second major. After a discussion, we came to the conclusion that it would be feasible to declare a double major. To be a marketing and CIS double major is going to take a lot of extra work and summer hours to accomplish, but I know with my motivation and constant drive I can achieve this goal. I have continued to work with my advisor to fit Antwerp into my four year plan. The COB study abroad program in Antwerp was something I knew I wanted to strive for even before I started my journey at JMU. Although, to be able to graduate in four years and get into the Antwerp abroad program I am going to have to work harder than ever before. First semester was my wakeup call, but being driven to accomplish my goal in a set amount of time and with good grades is going to set me apart from other business majors.

That is why I am applying for this scholarship. With my rigorous course load and extracurriculars I will not have time for a job, which means no income to save up for abroad and college expenses. I appreciate the time you have taken to consider me as a candidate and hopefully a potential recipient of this scholarship and I hope you, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] can see my potential and drive to take the knowledge and experiences out of the College of Business as it was intended by the professors and you.

What follows is a detailed analysis of the tutor's intervention that resulted in the above revision. The transcript below shows the tutor and student discussing the above claim:

[E1] T: "umm how do you want to accomplish these things? I feel like you know every college student wants to graduate in a set amount of time with good grades, but what makes it unique to you?

[E2] S: "in how I want to accomplish them?

[E3] T: uh huh

[E4] S: Well, umm I...in the sense like...I don't know if this is any different but like...I don't wanna just slide by by like getting the grades or like doing...for me..it's one thing with my GenEd but for my actual college classes or COB classes, knowing and learning and understanding information is what's actually is going to help me get the job. So I feel like everyone...I don't really know

[E5] T: No I think that's good. I think you know even with people in you know certain majors they just want to cruise by but you are saying you want to know and understand and be able to reproduce what you've learned in a real world you know setting.

[E6] S: yeah, but I meant like, yeah

[E7] T: I think that's what sets you apart then. Is the fact that you are trying to understand all of this material so that you can use it later on you know in the real world versus you know you just gonna have to learn and that's it.

In E1 above, the tutor identifies that the student's claim is not strong enough and asks two guiding questions to help the student think about her ideas related to the claim. In E4, the student responds to the tutor's questions by trying to explain her ideas for the claim. She is essentially trying to explain that she takes her College of Business (COB) classes seriously because the knowledge she gains from them will help her get a job. In E5 and E7 the tutor interprets the student's ideas from E4 to justify the student's original claim. In E5, the tutor

interprets the student's view that she wants to apply her academic knowledge in the real world.

In E7, the tutor links this idea to the student's original claim, showing the student how her claim can be presented in a more credible way. Using this justification, the student revised the original claim during the session itself under the guidance of the tutor.

The above intervention was successful since it resulted in the revision of the original claim. We can see that the tutor has used some effective strategies in this intervention. First, instead of offering his own suggestion to strengthen the claim, the tutor asked for the student's input. Unlike the unsuccessful interventions where the tutors offered their own suggestions without asking for the students' views, this tutor channelized the student's ideas to come up with a higher-order suggestion to help strengthen the student's original claim. The tutor used guiding questions to do this. Furthermore, the tutor initiated the revision process during the session. And since the kind of revision required in this case was not very extensive, it was completed during the session itself. The student was actively engaged in the discussion as well as the revision process. All these factors played an important role in the success of this intervention.

Exhibit 8: Post-Intervention / Revised Draft

Throughout the past academic year I have become more aware of what I wanted to get out of my education. I have focused more on my school work by putting together the pieces to accomplish my goals at JMU. First semester was my wakeup call! I was dissatisfied with my grades because they did not accurately reflect my potential. Since then, I changed my study habits in a transition to better my academics. Last semester I stayed in my dorm trying to study with the constant distraction from my hall mates. This semester I regularly go to the library which enables me to get more work done. My teachers' office hours have now become a daily routine in my everyday schedule as well.

I also realized this year that I am interested in more than just marketing. With my COB 204 class I quickly took interest in the content of computer programs and information. After a discussion with my advisor, we came to the conclusion that it would be feasible to declare a double major in marketing and CIS. Through self-motivation I know I can tackle extra credits per semester along with summer hours to stay on a four year graduation track. Knowing my desire to attend the COB study abroad program in Antwerp I have actively been working with my advisor to fit it into my four year plan. By taking the knowledge from my majors and applying it to the business world I strive to set myself apart from other future candidates.

With my rigorous course load and extracurriculars I will not have time for a job, which means no income to save up for study abroad and college expenses. I appreciate the time you have taken to consider me as a candidate and hopefully a potential recipient of this scholarship. I hope you, Ms. Molly Brown, Associate Dean of the College of Business can see my potential and drive to take the knowledge and experiences out of the College of Business as it was intended by the professors and you.

What Can We Learn from these Successful Higher-Order Interventions?

We can draw some conclusions from the three successful higher-order interventions presented above. First, tutors point to specific issues, identify specific intervention points in the paper, and provide very specific revision guidelines for the students. Unlike the unsuccessful interventions, tutors in the successful interventions made very specific higher-order suggestions and pointed to specific sections in the student drafts where revisions were needed. For instance in the first successful intervention described above, the tutor made very specific revision suggestions. Similarly, in the second intervention, the tutor pointed to a very specific section in the student's second paragraph to help the student build in some analytical details. In the third

intervention too, the tutor provided very specific guidelines to help the student strengthen her claim.

Second, instead of offering long drawn out suggestions, tutors engage students in the discussion. This was seen in all three successful interventions. The tutors were not doing all or most of the talking as in the unsuccessful interventions. Instead, they were engaging students in the conversation, allowing them to express their ideas. In the first intervention, the tutor engaged the student by providing a revision template for the student to rethink her thesis. In the second interventions, the tutor engaged the student by pointing to a specific point in the draft, making specific revision suggestions, and by engaging in a two-way dialogue with the student. In the third intervention, the tutor engaged the student through guiding questions.

Third, tutors initiate students into the revision process during the session itself, and for those cases that do not require extensive work, revisions are even completed during the session. This seemed to be a very important factor in determining the success of higher-order interventions. In interventions I and III the revisions were initiated and completed within the session. And, in intervention II although the revision was not made during the session, the student was actively participating in the discussion and writing down the main discussion points. As a result, she was able to follow up on the tutor's suggestions quite accurately. On the other hand, all the three unsuccessful interventions analyzed in the previous section did not initiate revisions during the session. This shows that initiating higher-order revisions during the session is an important factor in determining the success of higher-order interventions.

Finally, the students were very engaged and participated actively in these successful interventions. They actively typed out the tutor's suggestions for those issues that could not be addressed in the session, as in intervention II. They participated in the revision process for those

issues that could be revised during the session, as in interventions I and II. These characteristics were not displayed by students in the unsuccessful interventions. It is possible that the students were not actively engaged in the unsuccessful interventions because the tutors did not address the students' concerns directly. Therefore, it is important to be cognizant of students' need in order to engage them productively in writing center sessions.

These characteristics of successful higher-order interventions were not limited to the three successful interventions analyzed above. They were also observed in some of the other successful-higher order interventions in my data set. For example, there was a session in which the tutor helped the student connect a paragraph back to the thesis statement. The tutor not only identified this higher-order concern, but also initiated the revision process during the session by posing guiding questions for the student. As a result the student was able to connect that paragraph back to his thesis. The transcript of this intervention is presented in Appendix X.

Best Practices for Higher-Order Concerns

The analysis of successful and unsuccessful higher-order interventions presented in this chapter leads us to some best practices that can be useful for writing center tutors. What follows is brief description of best practices that have been drawn from the analysis presented in this chapter.

General verbal suggestions are not effective. The unsuccessful interventions show that long general suggestions are not effective in addressing HOCs. When tutors offered such suggestions without identifying specific points of intervention in the student's paper, students were not able to follow up on the higher-order suggestions. Therefore, providing long verbal higher-order suggestions without offering any plan of action or concrete strategies to address such issues is a practice that should be avoided by tutors.

Specific interventions are more effective. The successful interventions show that the more specific the intervention, the more likely it is to be followed up by students. Thus, simply talking about or making general suggestions about a HOC is not going to help the student at all. A more effective approach is to identify specific sections or parts in the student's paper that need to be revised and provide specific revision guidelines for the student. Thus, instead of saying that the entire paper needs to be reorganized or restructured, a better approach would be to tackle specific sections in the paper that need to be revised to address the overall restructure the paper.

Student interest and need should be prioritized. Another important factor in the success of HOCs is student interest and need. Students in the unsuccessful interventions were reluctant to make higher-order revisions, especially when they had a more or less complete draft. They were also reluctant to follow up on the tutors' higher-order suggestions that did not address their specific needs. For instance, if a student is looking for ideas to add a few sentences to her concluding paragraph, advising the student to reorganize her entire paper will not be a very good strategy. Thus, it becomes important for tutors to recognize and respond to specific needs of the student first.

Revisions initiated during the session tend to be more effective. The successful interventions show that higher-order revisions initiated during the session are more likely to be followed up by the student after the session. This points to the need for tutors to use some session time to get students to actually get started on some of the higher order changes. This way, students would not only get started but also have an idea of how to carry on with such revisions after the session. Thus, instead of merely providing verbal advice in relation to HOCs, it will be worthwhile for tutors to develop strategies to help initiate students into such revisions during the session itself.

Engaged students are likely to lead to successful higher-order interventions. Despite the

generally accepted writing center practice of engaging students in one-on-one writing consultations, both the tutors in the unsuccessful higher-order interventions did not adhere to this accepted practice. These tutors did not implement cognitive scaffolding strategies, such as pumping questions, to solicit the views of the students and facilitate student learning. On the other hand, the tutors in the successful sessions solicited student participation through revision templates and guiding questions. It is therefore important for tutors to develop the skills needed to implement strategies that can engage students in higher-order interventions.

Conclusion

As I had mentioned before, in addition to the four higher-order interventions discussed above, there were many other examples in my study that showed over and over again that tutors could identify HOCs and talk about them but didn't necessarily know how to address them effectively. For instance, my findings indicate that some tutors lacked strategies to implement the widely accepted writing center practice of soliciting student input. This highlights the need to strengthen existing tutor training programs to help tutors address HOCs more effectively. While the above best practices can serve as a guideline for writing center tutors, they are by no means exhaustive or conclusive. Since this study did not distinguish between different types of HOCs, future studies can focus on specific HOCs and offer insights into intervention strategies related to a particular type of higher-order concern. In the meantime, it will be worthwhile for tutors to offer specific revision guidelines, solicit student views, pay attention to student needs, and initiate the revision process during the session, instead of merely providing verbal advice while addressing HOCs.

Chapter 4: How Much Help Is Too Much Help? Examining Directive Tutoring in Action

Back in 2001, Irene Clark made this observation: “The past twenty-five years of writing center scholarship has embraced a non-directive pedagogy, characterizing the ideal interaction between a writing center tutor and a student client as one in which the tutor intervenes as little as possible” (33). This non-directive pedagogy, which is largely based on the premise that a tutor’s focus should be on improving the writer and not the writing (North “Idea of A Writing Center”), emphasizes a minimalist approach that makes the “student the primary agent in the writing center session” (Brooks 2). The tutor, on the other hand, is expected to take on a “secondary role, serving mainly to keep the student focused on his own writing” (Brooks 2). As such, tutors have been cautioned against “imposing their own ideas on a student’s text, talking too much, making changes to the student’s language, and generally having too much influence on the conference” (Clark, 2001, 33). Other scholars (Shamoon and Burns; Blau; Carino) have echoed Clark’s view that non-directive tutoring has been deeply entrenched in writing center scholarship and practice, making it difficult for practitioners to consider alternative tutoring approaches.

In an effort to make way for alternative tutoring practices, scholars (Clark; Shamoon and Burns; Behm; Carino) have argued for a more flexible approach to tutoring. For instance, Clark (1988, 1990, 2001) points out that writing centers adopted the minimalist approach to avoid charges of plagiarism from colleagues in other departments and that such an approach may not always be productive for student learning. She (1988) suggests that it may be more productive for tutors to adopt an active role in “the early phases of the learning process” (7) and “experiment with imitation as a pedagogical method - showing students how to develop examples, write introductions, and vary sentence structure” (10). Similarly, Shamoon and Burns

(1995) have argued that broadening writing center practices to include both directive and non-directive tutoring would result in “enrichment of tutoring repertoires, stronger connections between the writing center and writers in other disciplines, and increased attention to the cognitive, social, and rhetorical needs of writers at all stages of development” (148). Peter Carino (2003) also suggests that peer-tutors should be able to shift flexibly between directive and non-directive approaches depending on the nature of each session; at one moment they may need to exercise their expertise and intervene directly to facilitate student learning while at another moment they may need to step back and allow the student to take charge of the session. However, he observes that due to the emphasis placed by writing centers on the “hands off” tutoring approach, peer-tutors frequently face a dilemma of remaining non-directive even when there is a need for them to be directive.

Therefore, although writing center scholars have been arguing for a more flexible approach to tutoring, in reality, tutors continue to face challenges negotiating between directive and non-directive approaches. In addition to the challenges posed by the emphasis on the “hands-off” approach, navigating these two approaches poses some inherent challenges as well. On the one hand, tutors have to ensure that they do not end up doing the work for the student under the guise of directive tutoring. On the other hand, tutors need to be careful that they do not end up as passive spectators under the guise of non-directive tutoring, expecting students to address all their writing concerns independently. Clearly, there is a need for tutor training programs to address these challenges. A careful examination of the strategies used by practicing tutors to negotiate between directive and non-directive approaches can offer valuable inputs for training new tutors. For instance, such an analysis can provide insights into best practices of a flexible approach as well as document instances where tutors veered off into extreme directive or non-

directive modes of tutoring and the effect this had on student learning. Thus, my purpose in this chapter is to evaluate how tutors negotiate between directive and non-directive strategies and to demonstrate what extreme directive tutoring looks like in actual practice. More specifically, I evaluate the extent to which tutors veer into extreme directive tutoring by supplying ideas and language into student papers, and the potential effects this can have on a student's learning process. Analyzing pre-and post-session drafts together with session transcripts allowed me to determine the extent to which a tutor's ideas and/or language made their way into a student's post-session draft. In addition, I also examined instances where tutors used the non-directive approach effectively by guiding student revisions without doing the work for the student. In the end, the purpose of my analysis is to demonstrate what extreme directive tutoring looks like in actual practice so that tutor training programs can show tutors how to resist moving too far along the directive continuum, as suggested by Corbett (2011).

Scholars have studied directive and non-directive tutoring approaches to address various purposes. For example, Clark (2001) conducted a questionnaire survey to examine if students and tutors differed in their perceptions of whether a conference was either directive or non-directive. She found that "the general tendency was for students to attribute a more significant or 'directive' role to consultants than consultants attributed to themselves" (44) and reasoned that the fact that tutors are trained to follow a non-directive approach could be a justification for this finding. Based on her findings, she argued that "directiveness" should not be considered in absolute terms but as a "continuum, directiveness being a matter of degree, and, to some extent, perception" (35). As such, she emphasized the need to foster "tutor awareness about the directive/non-directive continuum" and to develop "a flexible approach to the issue of tutor directiveness" (46).

In addition to surveying the perceptions of students and tutors, scholars have also used conference recordings and transcripts to evaluate directive and non-directive tutoring approaches. For instance, Carol Severino (1992) conducted a fine-grained analysis of the transcripts of two writing center sessions, involving two different tutors working with the same student, to demonstrate how tutors collaborate with students in peer-to-peer writing center consultations. Her analysis shows that while one tutor used dialogic collaboration (or non-directive tutoring) the other tutor relied more on hierarchical collaboration (or directive tutoring), even as they were working with the same student. While Severino does not suggest that one type of collaboration is better than the other, or point out instances of extreme directive or non-directive tutoring, her findings indicate that in reality, tutors use a mix of both directive and non-directive methods. She also suggests that having tutors view, analyze, and discuss tutorial recordings and transcripts can be useful for tutor training purposes.

Similarly, Corbett (2011) evaluated how tutors negotiated between directive and non-directive approaches, but in the context of course based tutoring (CBT). He evaluated conference transcripts of two course embedded writing tutors. One tutor attended class frequently while the other tutor visited the class only once to introduce herself. Corbett found that the tutor who attended class used a directive approach during one-on-one consultations with the students, while the tutor who did not attend class used a more non-directive approach. He reasoned that, in the context of CBT, it may be worthwhile to encourage a more directive while moving tutors to the classroom, as in the case of the first tutor, and to emphasize a non-directive approach when tutors tutor students outside of class, as in the case of the second tutor. Corbett also suggests that research involving analysis of conference transcripts can be useful for CBT practitioners to show tutors “what methods might be characterized as directive or non-directive in various

circumstances and how to try to resist moving too far along the continuum in either direction, in a variety of situations, in and out of the classroom” (78).

In this study, I extend the work of Severino and Corbett by analyzing conference transcripts together with pre-and post-session student drafts to examine how tutors negotiate the directive/non-directive continuum. While Severino and Corbett have shown us examples of directive and non-directive tutoring, I will extend their work by demonstrating what extreme directive tutoring looks like in practice and the possible effects this may have on student learning.

Of the twenty sessions recorded for my study, I have used transcripts from three sessions which were selected because they demonstrated instances of extreme directive tutoring and/or effective non-directive strategies. I have used a qualitative approach to analyze these transcripts drawing on the coding schemes developed by Mackiewicz and Thompson (2014) who identified the following three broad categories to code writing center conference transcripts: 1) instruction, 2) cognitive scaffolding, and 3) motivational scaffolding.

Mackiewicz and Thompson define instruction as “the directive aspects of teaching and tutoring - supplying solutions or options, rather than supporting or making room for student writers to generate solutions themselves” and subcategorize it into three codes - telling, suggesting, and explaining (5). “Telling” and “suggesting” differ in terms of “tutors’ use of mitigation to soften their directiveness” (5). According to Mackiewicz and Thompson, tutors mitigate their directiveness while “suggesting,” but they do not do so while “telling” (5). Cognitive scaffolding is, as they explain, “a range of strategies that prod students to think and then help them to push their thinking further” (5). They coded eight cognitive scaffolding tutoring strategies including pumping questions, reading aloud, responding as a reader or a

listener, referring to a previous topic, forcing a choice, prompting, hinting, and demonstrating (5). Finally, they define motivational scaffolding as tutoring strategies that “focus on student writers’ affect” (5) and coded five such strategies: showing concern, praising, reinforcing student writers’ ownership and control, being optimistic or using humor, and giving sympathy or empathy. In addition to using these codes to analyze the transcripts, as mentioned above, I also evaluated the pre-and post-session student drafts to determine the extent to which tutor supplied language made their way word-for-word into students’ post-session drafts. First I present my analysis of the extreme directive interventions, which will be followed by an analysis of the successful non-directive interventions. I will conclude with a discussion of my findings.

Directive Intervention One

The excerpt analyzed below is taken from a session between a native English speaking undergraduate writing center tutor and an undergraduate English Language Learner (ELL) student. The student brought a one-page resume to the session and wanted the tutor to help him with grammar. During the 30-minute session, the tutor and student reviewed the entire resume, and the student revised his resume during the session on his laptop, while consulting with the tutor. In this excerpt, they were addressing the following internship job responsibility from the resume:

“Demonstrated energy efficient light bulbs that the company develops to clients and explained the effects of the company products.”

The first intervention presented below demonstrates how the tutor (T1) helped the student (S1) revise this sentence by using both instruction (directive approach) and cognitive scaffolding (non-directive approach) strategies.

[E1] T1: (Reading) “Demonstrated energy efficient light bulbs that the company develops to clients” What if we say, to shorten it and condense it, say “Demonstrated the company’s energy efficient light bulbs to clients”

[E2] S1: (Typing)

[E3] T1: Okay, and you want to say “the company’s” take away that extra space. (Reading revised sentence) “Demonstrated the company’s energy efficient light bulbs to clients and explained the effects of the company products.” So you say “the effects of the company’s products.” So which kinds of effects, environmental impact?

[E4] S1: “Yeah environmental impact”

[E5] T1: okay

[E6] S1: and energy saving

[E7] T1: So what we can do here is we can throw in some positive words, like we can say “and explained the environmental benefits of using the company’s products.” So that’s like you are promoting it, like you’re not just being like this is how it’s done, you’re saying like it’s awesome. You’re showing you are promoting it.

The tutor starts the intervention by reading the student’s sentence aloud (E1), which is a cognitive scaffolding strategy, and by making a suggestion to condense the sentence. The tutor is “suggesting” and not “telling,” because she is mitigating her instruction by using the words “What if we say.” We can see that the student is typing out revisions on his laptop [E2]. The tutor makes two more suggestions: E3 (you want to say “the company’s”) and E7 (So what we can do here is ...company’s products). In addition, she uses a “telling” strategy in E3 (take away that extra space) and an explanation in E7 (So that’s like...promoting it.). In terms of non-directive or cognitive scaffolding strategies, the tutor asks a pumping question in E3 (So what kinds of effects, environmental impact?) and reads another sentence aloud, also in E3. In sum, the tutor has used directive strategies five times (3 suggestions, 1 explanation, 1 direct instruction) and non-directive strategies three times (2 read read-aloud strategies and 1 pumping question). Moreover, while making suggestions in E1 and E7, the tutor essentially composes the

revisions for the student. Although the tutor engages the student briefly through a pumping question in E3, she makes a revision suggestion in E7, without engaging the student any further. She, however, does offer an explanation for this suggestion.

In the interaction that follows, directive strategies dominate:

[E8] S1: (Typing)

[E9] T1: Of the company's products. And then you want to make, yeah, possessive.

Good. (Reading student's revision) "Demonstrated the company's energy efficient light bulbs to clients and explained" hmm

[E10] S1: Of the product?

[E11] T1: Could you just say "demonstrated the environmental benefits of the company's energy efficient lightbulbs to clients?"

[E12] S1: Oh, yes (Typing) So "demonstrated?"

[E13] T1: See what I am saying.

[E14] S1: Yeah

[E15] T1: You could just say "Demonstrated" and then you can, so copy this, "the environmental benefits"

[E16] S1: (Typing) "Demonstrated"

[E17] T1: Uh huh "environmental benefits"

[E18] S1: Of the company

[E19] T1: "Of the company's" Well was it just, did you explain it about all the products or just the light bulbs?

[E20] S1: Lightbulbs.

[E21] T1: Just light bulbs, okay. So "Demonstrated the environmental benefits of the company's energy efficient lightbulbs to clients"

[E22] S1: (Typing)

[E23] T1: And you see how it is so much shorter than what we said, but it says the exact same thing...

[E24] S1: Yes

[E25] T1: And we are being more positive. We are saying... I am showing them the benefits.

[E26] S1: (Typing)

[E27] T1: And you can even say "Promoted the company by demonstrating the environmental benefits" hmm cause its business people. They like promotion, yeah.

[E28] S1: (Typing)

[E29] T1: And you just have to change demonstrated to demonstrating.

The above excerpt clearly shows that the tutor uses more directive/ instructional strategies than non-directive (or cognitive scaffolding) strategies. The tutor makes five suggestions: E9 (And then ...possessive); E11 (Could you just say...clients?); E15 (You could say....benefits); E21 (So...clients). She uses explanation strategies three times: E23 (And you see...same thing); E25 (And we ...benefits); and E27 (cause its...yeah). In terms of cognitive scaffolding/ non-directive strategies, the tutor uses prompting strategies twice (E9 – Of the company's products & E19 – Of the company's); reading aloud once (E9 – Demonstrated...explained); and pumping question once (E19 – Well was it just...lightbulbs?). Thus, in total, the tutor uses eight directive strategies and four non-directive strategies. She has also used a motivational scaffolding strategy – praise – in E9 (Good).

As with the first part half of this interaction, the tutor's suggestions in E11, E15, E21, and E27 offer complete sentence revisions for the student. In E8, the student basically is typing out the tutor's earlier suggestion from E1, as can be inferred from what the tutor reads aloud in E9. In E10, the student is trying to complete this revision by following the tutor's revision suggestion from E7. However, the student seems to be having problems following the tutor's suggestion and coming up with the revision independently. At this point, the tutor provides a complete sentence for the student in the form of a suggestion (E11). In E15, the student receives follow up suggestions from the tutor and quickly types out these suggestions. Here again, although the tutor

engages the student briefly with a pumping question (E19), she does not engage the student any further in the revision process. In E27, the tutor makes another final revision suggestion, which the student promptly types out. Overall, the interaction presented above shows how the tutor used instructional/ directive strategies to essentially revise the job responsibility statement for the student. It also shows the student depending on the tutor's input. The revised statement in the post-session draft clearly reflects the tutor's contribution:

“Promoted the company by demonstrating the environmental benefits of the firm’s energy efficient light bulbs to clients.”

In this case, we can see that the tutor clearly crossed the directive continuum because the revised statement that appears in the post-session draft was essentially composed by the tutor. In other words, the tutor did the work for the student. Perhaps if, she had used more cognitive scaffolding strategies, such as asking pumping questions, offering options and hints, the student could have been more engaged in the revision process. Thus, this example shows that relying too much on instructional strategies, such as suggesting and telling, can spoon-feed as opposed to engage students.

Directive Intervention Two

The excerpt analyzed below is taken from a session between T2, an undergraduate peer-tutor, and S2, an undergraduate native English speaking student who was working on a one page scholarship essay. The session lasted for approximately 45 minutes, and the student had brought a completed draft of her one-page essay. S1 wanted to focus on grammar and on cutting down her 440-word draft to 400 words. As with the previous session, S2 had brought a laptop to the session and made all the revisions during the session itself. In the excerpt below, T2 helps S2 provide additional details to support the following claim in the draft: “First semester was my

wakeup call!” S2 made this claim to explain that she had to change her study habits in the second semester to improve her academic performance. The excerpt below shows how T2 helps S2 identify a missing link related to this claim by using cognitive scaffolding strategies.

[E1] T2: (Reading) “First semester was my wakeup call!” How is it, like what happened that made you want to change your study ways and habits?

[E2] S2: My grades (laughing)

[E3] T2: Okay, umm. Maybe you could say, I guess you don’t want to outright say “I had terrible grades.”

[E4] S2: I mean, I wouldn’t say I had terrible grades, especially compared to like most of the other people that I talked to, but it wasn’t up to par with: a) with what I am used to - now I know I can’t have like my 4.0 GPA that I had in high-school

[E5] T2: Okay, I think you should work with that. You should say, you know, umm the grades were not up to par with my own qualifications.

[E6] S2: Uh-huh

[E7] T2: You know, cause you hold yourself in high regards, and it shows that, you know, you wanna, you wanna have your grades reflect your, you know, who you are as a person.

In this excerpt, T2 uses cognitive scaffolding strategies twice: read aloud strategy (E1 - First semester...call) and pumping question (E1- How is it...habits?). In terms of directive/instructional strategies, T2 uses one suggestion (E3 – Maybe you...grades), one telling strategy (E5), and one explanation (E7). In sum, T2 uses 2 cognitive scaffolding strategies and 3 instructional strategies, which is more balanced than the previous example. Moreover, the student is drawn into the conversation primarily because of T1’s pumping question in E1.

In E1, the tutor uses a pumping question to ask S2 to explain why she wanted to change her study habit. Here, we can see that T1 identified a missing link in the existing draft and used

cognitive scaffolding to help address the missing link. In the original draft, although S2 had mentioned that she wanted to change her study habits, she had not explained the reason for this change. Based on the student's response (E2 and E4), the tutor makes a suggestion (E3), issues a directive (E5), and provides an explanation (E7) to help S1 address the issue. Moreover, T2's two suggestion in E3 is a bit different from T1's suggestions from the previous example as T2 is not composing a sentence but suggesting what S2 should not say. Similarly, although T2 is issuing a directive (i.e. telling strategy) in E5, he is simply reinforcing S2's idea from E4. Thus, in this part of the intervention, T2 has negotiated the directive/non-directive continuum quite well. In the second half of this intervention, however, T2 relies more on directive strategies, as shown below:

[E8] S2: Uh-huh. Umm (typing)

[E9] T2: You can say, you know, "as I was not satisfied with my"

[E10] S2: (Typing) Umm (typing) "To high regard" or is that not the right word?

[E11] T2: Umm (reading) "First semester was my wake-up call as I satisfies with my grade"

[E12] S2: (Laughing) okay (reading revision) "First semester was my wake-up call" umm

[E13] T2: Maybe you can say "dissatisfied with my, with umm" Well it has to be in the past tense cause you're talking about, you know, in the past.

[E14] S2: Right. (Reading revision) "This semester was my wake-up call umm dissatisfied with my grade because I hold myself to a higher"

[E15] T2: Well you are dissatisfied with your grades because they weren't up to your standards, right?

[E16] S2: Yeah (typing)

[E17] T2: Or maybe you can say "they did not meet my standards or they"

[E18] S2: (Typing) Umm I don't like the word for it though

[E19] T2: Okay. "First semester was my wake-up call. I was dissatisfied with my grades because they" or maybe you could say they did not accurately reflect who you are, they did not accurately reflect your standards, or umm

[E20] S2: (Typing)

[E21] T2: or however else you might want to feel the need to say it.

[E22] S2: Right (reading revision) “First semester was my wake-up call. I was dissatisfied, dissatisfied with my grade because they did not accurately “umm (typing) umm (typing)

[E23] T2: I like that and maybe say like “since then” cause then you’re saying, then you’re implying you know, after that semester you’ve taken those changes.

[E24] S2: I like that

In the above excerpt, T2 uses more directive/instructional strategies compared to cognitive scaffolding/non-directive strategies. T2 uses cognitive scaffolding strategies three times: two read aloud strategies (E11 and E19 – First semester...they) and one prompting strategy (E15). On the other hand, T2 uses instructional strategies six times: one directive (E9) and five suggestions (E13, E17, E19 – or maybe...umm, E21, and E23 – maybe say...changes). Thus, directive strategies were used twice as much as non-directive strategies. In addition, T2 also used motivational scaffolding in E23 (I like that) to praise S2.

In the first half of this intervention (i.e. E1 through E7) T2 helped S2 address a missing link in the draft through cognitive scaffolding. However, in E8 through E25, S2 and T2 are engaged in composing a sentence to fill the missing link they had identified earlier. S2 is typing, and the tutor is making suggestions, helping S2 to compose the sentence. This process led to the drafting of the following additional sentence which appeared in S2’s final draft:

First semester was my wake-up call. I was dissatisfied with my grades because they did not accurately reflect my potential.

If we look at E8 through E24, we can see that the above sentence reflects the tutor’s language substantially. In other words, S2 seemed to be relying on the tutor for words and phrases. Although S2 was contributing to the discussion, there are instances when S2 was

expecting T2 to supply exact words and phrases for the sentence (e.g. E14, E16, E18, E20, & E22). Furthermore, the tutor did not hesitate to compose large chunks of the sentence during the joint revision process (e.g. E9, E13, E17, & E19). Although T2 did ultimately tell S2 to compose the sentence the way she saw fit (E21), by that point T2 had almost already supplied quite a lot of words for the sentence. In E23, T2 offers another suggestion, explaining how S2 should transition to the next sentence in the paragraph.

Overall, in this second half of the intervention, we can see that T2 is moving too far along the directive continuum. The fact that T2 used instructional strategies twice as much as cognitive scaffolding strategies contributed to this situation to a large extent. While in the first half of the interaction, T2 negotiated the directive/non-directive continuum quite well, in the second half, T2 made more specific suggestions, essentially composing a large chunk of the additional sentence. Had T2 relied more on cognitive scaffolding strategies, such as pumping questions, hints, responding as a listener, S2 would probably have been more engaged in composing the sentence, instead of relying on T2's suggestions.

Effective Non-Directive Intervention

The excerpt analyzed below is taken from a session between an African American undergraduate student, S3, and a native English speaking undergraduate tutor, T3. S3 was working on an essay about the controversy over President Obama's birth certificate for a first-year writing class and wanted help with the thesis and ideas to expand the essay. Like the previous examples, T3 made revisions during the session on a laptop. In the excerpt below, T3 tries to help S3 to add a few concluding sentences to a paragraph to emphasize the paragraph's main idea. In the paragraph, S3 had given examples of some Republicans questioning the

legitimacy of Obama's birth certificate. Thus, T3 was trying to help S3 conclude the paragraph by explaining what the examples in the paragraph meant.

[E1] S3: So, is it good?

[E2] T3: I think, I think it does, like it is nice to mention

[E3] S3: people that questioned him?

[E4] T3: yeah. Or maybe like adding one more thing, so like I said, I am always going to ask why this is important (laughs)

[E5] S3: Yeah

[E6] T3: So, so people questioned him so like this brought up this issue in general. Umm which you kind of mentioned here, but you're giving examples, so maybe you can tie it all together like

[E7] S3: So (Typing) "This is important because because" probably this shows that like umm he wasn't trusted?

[E8] T3: Uh huh, okay.

[E9] S3: because I am like yeah as soon as like cause when he was the governor, nobody questioned him

[E10] T3: Yeah

[E11] S3: but as soon as he is the president of the United States there are like a whole lot of questions.

[E12] T3: So he wasn't trusted to be the president or to run for president or?

[E13] S3: To, he wasn't trusted for his eligibility cause like see how his mama (inaudible) and the list goes on

[E14] T3: Okay, yeah.

[E15] S3: (trying to compose sentence) "because he," should I say the president? Should I stop saying he? "because"

[E16] T3: Yeah. You've got all these names here, might as well, might as well put in and even say like "because President Obama" or

[E17] S3: Okay let me cause I need more words. I need more words

[E18] T3: (Laughs)

[E19] S3: (trying to compose) "was not trusted by his maids?"

[E20] T3: “By his peers, his colleagues, by like others, naysayers, by”

[E21] S3: His peers. Okay “by his peers” period. So like as soon as like he is, as soon as like, cause when he was the governor, I don’t know like how to put it. Let me just write and we can correct it.

[E22] T3: Yeah, get it out, get it out.

In the above exchange between T3 and S3, the tutor relies more cognitive scaffolding strategies than instructional strategies. In total, T3 uses cognitive strategies seven times: five reader response strategies (E2, E8, E10, E14, E22) and two pumping questions (E4 and E12). On the other hand, T3 uses instructional strategies only three times: three suggestions (E6, E16, and E20). Thus, T3 is relying more on non-directive strategies. This helped create more opportunities for S3 to engage in the discussion as well as the revision process.

T3 sets up topic for the intervention through a pumping question (E4) followed by a suggestion (E6), which prompts a response from S3 (E7). We can observe that in E7, S3 responds to T3’s suggestion immediately by trying to compose concluding ideas for the paragraph. Thus, T3’s pumping question and broad suggestion (i.e. maybe you can tie it all together) played a part, in addition to the student’s own enthusiasm/pro-active nature, in encouraging this response from S3. For instance, if T3 had suggested specific revision ideas for the new sentence, S3 would not have had the chance to engage in the revision process. Similarly, T3’s reader response strategies (E8 and E10) and pumping question (E12) further prompts S3 to continue with the revision independently. In other words, T3 is making room for S3 to continue with her own ideas compose the sentence independently through these cognitive scaffolding strategies. Furthermore, T3 makes specific revision suggestions (E16 & E20) only in response to direct requests from S3. As a result of these strategies, S3 is prepared to compose the concluding lines on her own first, and have it reviewed by T3 afterwards (E21).

Thus, in this first half of the intervention between T3 and S3, we can see that T3 has used the non-directive approach rather effectively. Instead of trying to compose sentences for the student, T3 has been facilitating the discussion and revision mostly through cognitive scaffolding strategies. This, in turn, has created opportunities for S3 to be engaged in the discussion and revision process. The second half of this intervention is presented below.

[E23] S3: (Typing) Can I say “nobody” or “anybody” cause my mom said “don’t say nobody.”

[E24] T3: (Laughs)

[E25] S3: Can I say

[E26] T3: Yeah, you can definitely say yeah

[E27] S3: Anybody? Or nobody?

[E28] T3: Nobody

[E29] S3: Nobody

[E30] T3: Nobody (laughs)

[E31] S3: Yeah cause she keeps (inaudible). (Typing) Questions just started flowing.

[E32] T3: (laughs) They just keep coming in (laughs).

[E33] S3: (Typing)

[E34] T3: Maybe questions about his birth or his birthplace.

[E35] S3: Uh huh (typing)

[E36] T3: Cause people have been just asking, oh why do you wanna run?

[E37] S3: (Typing) period.

[E38] T3: Okay. Nice. So let’s look at this. So, (reading) “Donald Trump also had questioned concerning the President’s eligibility. This is important because President Obama was not trusted by his peers. Because when he was the Governor nobody questioned his eligibility but as soon as he wanted to be the President, questions about his birthplace started coming in.” Okay, this is good.

[E39] S3: Tell me to fix something

[E40] T3: (Laughs) He started, maybe his questions started to occur, they can’t actually come in umm physically.

[E41] S3: Occurring?

[E42] T3: Yeah, sure.

[E43] S3: (Typing)

[E44] T3: Okay awesome. Umm so here, I am trying to think of a way we can, we shouldn't probably start with "Because." Umm you can say "This is because" or "When he was Governor nobody questioned his eligibility" and you can just get rid of the "because"

[E45] S3: (Typing) Okay.

In the above excerpt, T3 uses instructional strategies six times: five suggestions (E26, E28, E34, E40, E44) and one explanation (E36). On the other hand, T3 uses cognitive scaffolding strategies two times: one reader/listener response strategy (E32) and read aloud strategy (E38 – “Donald...coming in.”) T3 also used motivational scaffolding strategies two times in E38 (“Okay. Nice” and “Okay, this is good). Although, T3 has used more instructional strategies in this second half, we can see that most of T3’s suggestions (e.g. E26, E28, E40) are direct responses to S3’s requests. Furthermore, two of T3’s suggestions (E40 and E44) were made after S3 first composed the two concluding sentences. In other words, unlike T1 and T2, T3 did not contribute directly to the composition of the two sentences. T3 stepped back and allowed S3 to take the lead in composing these two sentences. T3 intervened to polish the sentences only after they were composed more or less independently by S3. If we consider both the first and second parts of this intervention between T3 and S3, we can see that T3’s approach was balanced between directive and non-directive approaches since there were 9 instances of cognitive scaffolding strategies and 9 instances of instructional strategies.

The final version of the two concluding sentences looked like this in S2’s post-session draft:

“This is important because President Obama was not trusted by his peers. When he was the governor nobody questioned his eligibility but as soon as he wanted to be the president, questions about his birth place started occurring.”

The first and second excerpts of this intervention clearly point to the fact that S3 composed these two sentences more or less independently. T3’s non-directive approach created opportunities for S3 to contribute her input and engage in the revision process. Furthermore, the student’s pro-active attitude also complemented T3’s non-directive approach. S3 did not wait for or depend on T3 to compose the sentences. Instead, S3 went ahead and made the effort to come up with the sentences on her own. T3’s non-directive approach and S3’s pro-active attitude worked very well together. Thus, this intervention demonstrates how tutors can resist moving too far along the directive continuum by using cognitive scaffolding strategies.

Discussion and Conclusion

The two examples of extreme directive interventions presented above show how tutors can fall into the trap of moving too far along the directive/non-directive continuum. It is possible that tutors get drawn into extreme directive tutoring without really being aware that they are offering too much help. For instance, Clark (2001) found that tutors perceived themselves to be less directive when compared to their students’ perceptions. In other words, she found that students were more likely to perceive their tutors’ directive actions than the tutors’ self-perceptions. This suggests that tutors may be unaware of their own directive actions or of the fact that they are offering too much help. It is therefore, important for writing center training programs to focus on reflective practices so that tutors can be more aware of their own actions during sessions. Furthermore, a student’s attitude and expectations also seem to play an influential role in a tutor’s strategies. For instance, T1 and T2 were highly invested in the

revision process because S1 and S2 were depending on them for revision suggestions. Probably, if T1 and T2 had stepped back a little, as T3 did, S1 and S2 would have been more involved in the revision process. Since T1 and T2 readily complied to S1 and S2's expectations, S1 and S2 lost out on the opportunity to engage in the revision process and learn from it.

The successful non-directive intervention described above, on the other hand, shows how tutors can avoid being too directive. It shows how tutors can engage students in the revision process through cognitive scaffolding strategies and how a balance of directive and non-directive strategies can be achieved. It shows that when create opportunities for students to participate in the revision process by stepping back, students can take a leading role in the revision process. Furthermore, it also shows how a student's pro-active attitude can greatly complement a tutor's non-directive strategies.

The three interventions analyzed in this paper can be useful demonstrations for new and existing tutors to get a glimpse into what extreme directive tutoring looks like and how they can avoid such an approach. While writing center tutor training programs may inform students to adopt a flexible approach, analysis of real examples, like the one presented in this study, can help to demonstrate what a flexible approach looks like in actual practice. Thus, by providing tutors practical insights into navigating the directive/non-directive continuum, such analyses can complement the suggestions of scholars (Clark, Shamoon and Burns, Carino, Behm) who have argued for a more flexible approach to tutoring. Similar studies focusing on the extreme non-directive continuum can be valuable for tutor training purposes.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

My overall purpose in this study was to assess the influence of writing center tutorials on student writing and to identify tutoring best practices. To assess how writing center tutorials influence student writing practices, I asked this question: Do students carry over what is discussed in their writing center sessions into their post-session drafts? To assess tutoring best practices, I asked: What tutoring strategies influenced students to revise their drafts? Writing center scholars have emphasized the need for evidence-based studies to develop a deeper understanding of how one-on-one tutorials influence student writing practices. Existing studies have addressed this need, for instance, by evaluating tutorial transcripts, by evaluating student perceptions, or by comparing scores on pre-and-post-intervention drafts. My study builds on these approaches by examining tutorial transcripts together with pre-and post-intervention student drafts to trace the influence of writing center tutorials on student revisions and to identify tutoring best practices.

This approach allows for a more comprehensive investigation; it reveals not just what is addressed in a tutorial but also how much of that discussion is reflected in the post-intervention drafts. Thus, by examining twenty tutorial recordings along with their pre-and post-intervention drafts in two state universities (ten in each university), I was able to trace the influence of writing center tutorials on students' post-session revisions and, in turn, draw conclusions about the efficacy of writing center tutorials as well as point to some implications for tutor training, writing center assessments, and writing instruction. In this concluding chapter, I will outline my major findings and discuss their implications for tutor training, assessment of writing centers, and writing center pedagogy.

Overall, my study found that in all of the 20 sessions that I assessed, students followed up on the issues addressed in their tutorials, in some form or the other, in their revised drafts. This means that writing center tutorial do influence revisions in post-session drafts. However, instead of simply indicating that writing centers influence student revisions, in chapter two, I have presented a fine-grained analysis of the transcripts of three complete sessions, evaluating the issues addressed in the sessions, tutoring strategies used by tutors, and in-session and post-session student revisions. As a result, chapter two provides a very detailed analysis of what actually takes place in a writing center tutorial and how students incorporate writing center instruction into their post-intervention drafts.

Such a detailed analysis complements the existing quantitative pre-and post-studies, such as the ones conducted by Niiler (2003 & 2005) and Henson and Stephenson (2009), which compare scores on pre-and post-intervention drafts to draw conclusions about how writing center interventions influence student writing. A detailed qualitative analysis of session recordings and pre-and post-intervention drafts can complement the quantitative findings by showing what issues were discussed in a session and how a student's draft changed as a result of that discussion. Thus, while the quantitative studies mentioned above have indicated that writing center interventions resulted in higher scores in students' post-intervention drafts, my qualitative analysis complements their findings by showing the issues that are discussed in a session and the types of revisions that are influenced by writing center tutorials. Together, as suggested by Niller (2005) and Gofine (2012), a qualitative analysis combined with a quantitative analysis can offer a more comprehensive and nuanced assessment of writing center tutorials.

Therefore, a qualitative analysis, such as the one that I have developed in this study, involving pre-and post-session drafts and session recordings can be an effective method to

complement quantitative assessment measures. In the future, it may be useful for writing center scholars to replicate such a qualitative method to assess the influence of writing center tutorials on student revisions. Furthermore, including tutor and student interviews to this qualitative method can provide additional insights. For instance, interviewing students after reviewing the session recordings and pre-and post-intervention drafts can provide additional insights into students' revision decisions as well as perceptions of their writing center sessions. Similarly, interviewing tutors can provide additional insights into the tutoring strategies used by the tutors.

In addition to serving as a useful assessment method, my fine-grained analysis of the transcripts and pre-and post-drafts demonstrates some widely held beliefs about writing center pedagogy, thereby substantiating these beliefs to a certain extent. Writing center scholars and practitioners, for instance, have long contended that peer-to-peer writing center tutorials are student-centered and conducted in a collaborative setting where students and tutors discuss ideas and make decisions collaboratively. Kenneth Bruffee's seminal 1984 article, *Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind'*, contributed significantly to this line of thinking by arguing that peer tutoring facilitates collaborative learning by creating opportunities for students to converse with their tutors as equals and learn the discourse valued by the academic community. However, scholars, such as Trimbur (1987), have also questioned the possibility of true collaboration between tutors and students arguing that peer tutors cannot take on the dual role of a "peer" and a "tutor" at the same time. While, it is beyond the scope of my study to take up the argument over whether writing center tutorials should be collaborative or not, my analysis does contribute to this discussion by indicating what collaborative pedagogy looks like in actual writing center sessions.

In chapter two, for instance, I have described in detail how tutors and students collaborate in actual sessions and the effect this can have on student learning. I have demonstrated multiple instances where tutors and students were engaged in a collaborative process of thinking through issues and making revision decisions. While the tutors identified relevant concerns, asked guiding questions, and offered general guidelines, the students were engaged in the discussion and played an active role in making revision decisions. Furthermore, students contributed their ideas freely and did not feel pressured to accept the tutor's suggestions. There were also instances where the tutors helped students see the missing links in their papers by simply responding as a reader. My analysis, therefore, demonstrates the collaborative nature of writing center tutorials. The tutorials described in my analysis show how the simple act of engaging in a conversation with a tutor can benefit student writers, as pointed out by Ben Rafoth (2010). My analysis shows how students were able to clarify their ideas and improve the overall clarity and focus of their papers, often by simply engaging in a conversation with their tutors. Thus, my analysis demonstrates the collaborative nature of writing center consultations. The best practices related to collaborative learning in writing center tutorials can have implications for teacher student conferences as well peer review activities.

Another widely held belief among writing center scholars and practitioners is the idea that writing centers help writers with all aspects of their writing, including organization and structure, thesis and development, purpose and audience, and grammar and punctuation, as opposed to simply proofreading or editing their papers. In other words, writing center tutorials help clients with both global issues, also known as higher-order concerns (HOCs), and sentence-level concerns. My analysis substantiates this claim as my findings show that HOCs were addressed by tutors in seventeen of the twenty sessions that I examined. My analysis in chapters

two, three, and four demonstrates many instances when tutors identified and/or steered the discussion towards HOCs such as revising thesis statements, making stronger claims, taking a position on an issue, focusing on the overall structure and coherence, or interpreting and responding to the assignment prompt, to name a few. There were also instances where students raised questions related to HOCs in their papers. Furthermore, some tutors also demonstrated how HOCs can be addressed while responding to a sentence-level concern raised by a student. Overall, a good mix of HOCs as well as sentence-level concerns were covered in all the seventeen sessions in which HOCs were addressed. As a result, the students were involved not just only on sentence-level issues but also had the opportunity to discuss and address some important HOCs in their papers. It should be noted, however, that many tutors in my study did face some challenges while addressing HOCs. I will describe this in more detail below where I discuss my findings and implications related to higher-order tutoring strategies. Nevertheless, most tutors were able to identify and/or steer the discussion toward HOCs. This clearly substantiates the idea that writing center consultations go far beyond proofreading or editing.

Another finding from my analysis was that the writing center consultations I examined also involved some amount of instruction on the part of the tutors. For instance, chapter two reveals instances where tutors took on a “teaching role” to explain important concepts such as taking a stance, making stronger claims, or identifying the difference between active and passive voice, to name a few. Furthermore, some of the tutors also made students aware of their recurring grammatical errors and provided instruction related to the relevant grammatical rules for such repeating errors. This shows that writing center tutorials do include some amount of instruction in that tutors draw on their expertise to explain important writing concepts to students.

Some scholars, such as Lori Salem, have critiqued writing center pedagogy on the ground that it is too non-directive or minimalist, an approach where students are expected to do all the work and the role of the tutor is relegated to that of a facilitator. In a recent interview published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Lori Salem argued that writing centers were not serving the needs of marginalized students because minimalist tutoring approaches were designed to meet the needs of mainstream students. While, I will discuss my findings and implications related to directive/non-directive tutoring strategies in detail below, the very fact that tutors take on a “teaching role” during tutorials, as demonstrated in chapter two, indicates that writing center tutorials are not as non-directive or minimalist as claimed by some scholars.

My analysis also revealed that sessions were more productive in cases when the students were highly engaged in the discussion. Students who were highly engaged in a session, such as by taking notes, revising during the session, asking questions, or responding to the questions raised by their tutors, carried more of their session discussion into their post-session drafts than those students who were not as engaged. My analysis, particularly in chapter four, also demonstrated that cognitive scaffolding strategies used by the tutors, such as asking guiding questions, responding as a reader, played an important role in engaging students in a session. Cognitive scaffolding, as I had described in chapter four, refers to all those strategies that prod students to push their thinking further.

On the other hand, when tutors relied more on suggestions and instruction, the students were less engaged in the session and did not always follow up on the tutor’s suggestions in their post-session drafts. This points to the importance of cognitive scaffolding approaches in increasing student involvement in a session, which in turn plays an important role in the overall productivity of a session. Thus, it would be useful for tutor training programs to pay special

attention to cognitive scaffolding skills. Furthermore, since the level of student engagement in a session seems to be a reliable indicator of a session's effectiveness, it would be worthwhile for tutors to be aware of this important indicator while conducting sessions. For instance, when a tutor is aware that a student is not engaged in a session, the tutor should take that as a sign that the session is not working out very well. And, more importantly, the tutor should be able to address the situation through the use of cognitive scaffolding strategies.

Another interesting observation from my data was that many students were involved in revising their drafts during the session itself on their laptops. As I mentioned in chapter two, in 17 of the 20 sessions from my study, some form of revision took place during the session. In other words, in-session revisions accounted for quite a substantial part of the revision reflected in the post-session drafts. These in-session revisions point to several advantages for writing center tutorials. First, as I will describe below where I discuss my findings related to tutoring strategies for higher-order concerns, revisions initiated during the session for a HOC was more likely to be followed up by students after the session. Second, in-session revisions allowed tutors to use a "learning through practice" approach by allowing students to practice the concepts immediately after they are discussed in a session. Students had the opportunity to apply a concept discussed in a session, such as switching between active and passive sentences, by actually making the revision under the guidance of the tutor. Therefore, in-session revisions seemed to play an important role in fostering student learning.

Third, most of the students came into the session with their laptops, seemingly with the expectation that they would revise their papers during the session itself. And, as I mentioned above, a majority of students did revise their papers during the session. What this shows is that since most students arrive for a writing center session when they are still in the process of

drafting a paper, not when they are done with the process, they are highly motivated to continue with their writing process. Encouraging or creating opportunities for in-session revisions, therefore, can be an effective strategy to leverage such a situation where students are inclined to readily work on their papers. In other words, tutors have the opportunity to intervene when students are, in most cases, in the process of drafting their papers. And in such a situation, in-session revisions can create opportunities for cognitive scaffolding. For instance, tutors can scaffold student's writing process not only through guiding questions, but also by creating opportunities for students to actually work on their papers during the session. In this regard, exploring the relationship between in-session revisions and cognitive scaffolding could be something that could be addressed by future writing center researchers.

In chapter three, I examined the tutoring strategies used by the tutors in my study to address HOCs and identified tutoring best practices related to HOCs. While writing center handbooks, such as the *Longman Guide to Peer-Tutoring* and *The Bedford Guide for Writing Tutors* highlight the importance of addressing HOCs, they offer only general suggestions for tutors to address such concerns. For instance, as mentioned in chapter three, *The Bedford Guide*'s suggestions to address HOCs are mainly focused on "asking questions and talking with the writer about his or her paper's audience, topic, content, and structure" and ensuring that the writer's verbal description aligns with the actual paper (48). Thus, while the importance of HOCs has been widely accepted and recognized within writing centers, tutors receive very little specific instruction to help them address HOCs, other than to ask questions and listen to students. Furthermore, my analysis in chapter three revealed that although most of the tutors in my study could identify and talk about HOCs, they faced challenges when it came to addressing HOCs effectively. In chapter three, I tried to address this issue by identifying specific strategies that

could be useful in addressing HOCs in a writing center tutorial so that existing tutor training programs may be strengthened.

My analysis revealed four best practices for addressing HOCs: 1) General Verbal Suggestions Are Not Likely to Lead to Higher-Order Revisions; 2) Specific Interventions Are More Likely To Lead To Higher-Order Revisions; 3) Student Interest and Need Should Be Prioritized; and 4) Revisions Initiated during the Session Are More Likely to Be Followed Up. The higher-order interventions from my study suggest that general verbal suggestions are not effective in addressing HOCs. Students were not able to make higher-order revisions when tutors offered lengthy verbal suggestions without offering a specific revision plan, such as an outline to help with reorganization or a revision plan with a list of specific issues discussed in the session. Many tutors in the study resorted to offering long, general suggestions while addressing HOCs, which did not prove to be very useful for the students. This implies that tutor training programs should highlight the importance of developing specific revision plans, as opposed to offering general verbal suggestions, while addressing HOCs.

The successful interventions from the study also suggested that the more specific the intervention, the more likely it is to be followed up by students. Thus, simply talking about or making general suggestions about a HOC is not going to help the student at all. A more effective approach would be to identify specific sections or parts in the student's paper that need to be revised and provide specific revision guidelines for the student. Thus, for example, instead of saying that the entire paper needs to be reorganized or restructured, a better approach would be to tackle specific intervention points in the paper that need to be revised to address the overall structure the paper. This suggests that tutors should be trained to be as specific as possible, in

terms of identifying specific issues at specific points in the paper and offering specific revision guidelines, while addressing HOCs.

My analysis revealed that student interest and need should be prioritized while addressing HOCs. Although student interest and need have long been emphasized in writing center instruction, my study revealed that recognizing and responding to student needs is especially important while addressing HOCs. Many students in the study were reluctant to make higher-order revisions that were not aligned with their specific needs. Students were particularly reluctant to make higher-order revisions when they had near-complete drafts. For example, as I have demonstrated in chapter three, when a student has a specific need to add a concluding paragraph to a near-complete draft, it is highly unlikely that this student will respond to the tutor's suggestion of restructuring the entire paper. It is, therefore, important for tutors to be cognizant of student needs while addressing HOCs. Tutor training programs should emphasize the importance of responding to student needs, especially when addressing HOCs.

Finally, another common characteristic of successful higher-order interventions was that revisions initiated during the session were more likely to be followed up by students after the session. This points to the need for tutors to use some session time to get students to actually get started on some of the higher-order revisions. This way, students would not only get started but also have an idea of how to carry on with such revisions after the session. As mentioned earlier, creating opportunities for in-session revisions when students are in the process of writing a paper can be an effective method to scaffold a student's writing process. Thus, initiating higher-order revisions during the session, can be an effective strategy to address HOCs and tutor training programs can benefit by emphasizing this.

While the four best practices identified above can serve as a guideline for writing center tutors, they are by no means exhaustive. Since my study did not distinguish between different types of HOCs, it may be worthwhile for future studies to focus on specific HOCs and offer valuable insights into a particular type of higher-order concern.

In chapter four, I examined the directive strategies (i.e. providing direct instructions or suggestions) and non-directive strategies (i.e. engaging students by soliciting their views) used by the tutors in my study to demonstrate how tutors can maintain a flexible balance between these two strategies. Although writing center scholars have argued for the need for tutors to maintain a flexible balance between directive and non-directive tutoring strategies, in reality tutors face challenges doing so. Writing center scholars (for e.g. Irene Clark, Peter Carino, Shamoona and Burns) have suggested that peer-tutors should be able to shift flexibly between directive and non-directive methods depending on the nature of each session; at one moment they may need to exercise their expertise and intervene directly to facilitate student learning, while at another moment they may need to step back and allow the student to take charge of the session.

However, as Peter Carino points out, in reality, peer-tutors frequently face a dilemma of remaining non-directive even when there is a need for them to be directive. This is because even as actual practice demands flexibility, a majority of tutoring guidebooks and earlier writing center scholarship (for e.g. Stephen North, Jeff Brooks) emphasize non-directive tutoring. There is, therefore, a need for tutor training programs to develop training materials that can demonstrate what a flexible approach looks like in actual practice.

I address this need in chapter four by examining how tutors in my study negotiated the directive/non-directive continuum. More specifically, I have presented instances when tutors in the study used extreme directive methods, such as supplying ideas and language into student papers, and the effect this had on the conference. I have also presented instances when tutors used a more flexible approach to guide student revisions. My findings revealed that when tutors used extreme directive methods, they forestalled the learning process of students. In such cases, instead of engaging in the session to contribute their own ideas, students relied more on their tutors to come up with revision ideas and suggestions. Conversely, when tutors used a balanced approach between directive and non-directive strategies, more learning opportunities were created for students. In such cases, students were more engaged in the session, contributed revision ideas actively, and responding positively to their tutor's scaffolding strategies.

The examples of directive and flexible tutoring interventions presented in chapter four can also serve as a teaching/training tool for tutor training programs. They can be used to demonstrate what extreme directive tutoring looks like in actual practice which can in turn serve as a general guideline for tutors to avoid moving too far along the directive continuum. Similarly, they can also be used to demonstrate what flexible tutoring looks like in actual practice which can in turn serve as a general guideline for tutors to use a balanced approach. Using actual session recordings to demonstrate what flexible and extreme directive tutoring look like in actual writing center sessions can be very effective in complementing the theoretical arguments made by writing center scholars for a balanced approach between directive and non-directive strategies; In addition to reading about the need to be flexible, tutors can get a first-hand demonstration of what a flexible approach looks like in actual practice.

While I have presented three examples of directive/non-directive interventions in chapter four, more demonstrations can be developed in the future covering different directive and non-directive scenarios. For instance, in my data set I did not come across instances where tutors used extreme non-directive strategies, although there were quite a few instances of extreme directive strategies. Future studies could, therefore, focus on identifying and documenting instances of extreme non-directive strategies, which could also be a useful training tool for tutor training programs. Moreover, in the event that future studies also fail to identify instances of extreme non-directive strategies, it may be worthwhile to examine the implications of such a finding. Could such a finding mean, for instance, that writing center tutors do not resort to extreme non-directive measures after all? This in turn could be an indication that writing center practice has moved away from the deep rooted non-directive approach of the past.

Another contribution of chapter four is that I have demonstrated the use of the coding scheme developed by Mackiewicz and Thompson in their 2014 book “Talk About Writing: The Tutoring Strategies of Experienced Writing Center Tutors.” One of the goals of their book, as stated by them, was to develop a coding scheme that can be used by other writing center researchers to analyze tutorial transcripts. They wanted to provide a framework of analysis for researchers by classifying tutorial talk into the following three categories: instruction, cognitive scaffolding, and emotional scaffolding. As I have described in chapter four, instruction refers to “the directive aspects of teaching and tutoring - supplying solutions or options, rather than supporting or making room for student writers to generate solutions themselves” and includes three codes - telling, suggesting, and explaining (5). Cognitive scaffolding refers to “a range of strategies that prod students to think and then help them to push their thinking further” and consists of eight codes including pumping questions, reading aloud, responding as a reader or a

listener, referring to a previous topic, forcing a choice, prompting, hinting, and demonstrating (5). Finally, motivational scaffolding refers to tutoring strategies that “focus on student writers’ affect” and includes five codes: showing concern, praising, reinforcing student writers’ ownership and control, being optimistic or using humor, and giving sympathy or empathy (5).

I used this coding scheme developed by Mackiewicz and Thompson to code the transcripts from my study in chapter four. As a result, I was able to identify and describe directive strategies in terms of the cognitive scaffolding codes developed by them. Similarly, I was able to identify and describe non-directive strategies in terms of their codes for instruction. Furthermore, I was also able to demonstrate what a balanced approach looks like in terms of the number of cognitive scaffolding codes as well instruction codes present in an intervention. As revealed in my findings, an intervention was more balanced between directive and non-directive strategies when cognitive scaffolding and instruction codes were more equal than when they were more unequal. Thus, in chapter four, I demonstrated how Mackiewicz and Thompson’s coding scheme can be used to examine the directive/non-directive continuum theorized by Clarke (2001).

To conclude, I have attempted to assess the influence writing center tutorials have on student writing by examining session recordings together with pre-and post-intervention drafts. My findings show that in 17 of the 20 sessions, students followed up on their writing center discussion in their post-session drafts. My study provides a detailed qualitative analysis of the types of issues addressed by tutors in a session, the tutoring strategies used by the tutors, and the types of revisions students made as a result of their writing center consultations. It also serves as a novel qualitative method to assess writing center tutorials, which can complement existing quantitative methods. In addition to offering a detailed account of what transpires in writing

sessions, my analysis also substantiates certain widely held beliefs of writing center practitioners such as the collaborative nature of writing center consultations and the belief that writing center consultations extend beyond proofreading and editing. Some of the other notable findings were: tutors used some amount of instruction during consultations, sessions in which students were more engaged were more productive, and in-session revisions offered opportunities for scaffolding students' learning process. Additionally, I also identified best practices for addressing HOCs and demonstrated how tutors can adopt a balanced approach between directive and non-directive tutoring strategies. These findings have direct implications for tutor training programs, writing center assessments, and writing center pedagogy.

Works Cited

- Behm, Richard. "Ethical Issues in Peer Tutoring: A Defense of Collaborative Learning." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1989, pp. 3-12.
- Bell, James H. "When Hard Questions Are Asked: Evaluating Writing Centers." *Writing Center Journal*, vol. 21, no. 1, 2000, pp. 7-28.
- Blau, Susan. "Issues in Tutoring Writing: Stories from our Center." *The Writing Lab Newsletter*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1992, pp. 1-4
- Bredtmann, Julia, Carsten J. Crede, and Sebastian Otten. "Methods For Evaluating Educational Programs: Does Writing Center Participation Affect Student Achievement?" *Evaluation & Program Planning*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2012, pp. 39-49.
- Brooks, Jeff. "Minimalist tutoring: Making the Student Do All the Work." *Writing Lab Newsletter*, vol. 15, no. 6, 1991, pp. 1-4.
- Bruffee, Kenneth. "Peer Tutoring and the 'Conversation of Mankind'." *Writing Centers: Theory and Administration*. Ed. Gary Olson. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1984. 3-15.
- Carino, Peter. "Power and Authority in Peer Tutoring." *The Center Will Hold*. Ed. Michael Pemberton and Joyce Kinhead. Logan, Utah: Utah University Press. 2003.
- Carino, Peter, and Doug Enders. "Does Frequency of Visits to the Writing Center Increase Student Satisfaction? A Statistical Correlation Study--or Story." *Writing Center Journal* vol. 22, no. 1, 2001, pp. 83-103.
- Clark, Irene Lurkis. "Perspectives on the Directive/Non-Directive Continuum in the Writing Center." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 22, no. 1, 2001, pp. 33-58.

- Clark, Irene Lurkis. "Maintaining Chaos in The Writing Center: A Critical Perspective on Writing Center Dogma." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1990, pp. 81-93.
- Clark, Irene Lurkis. "Collaboration and Ethics in Writing Center Pedagogy." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1988, pp. 3-12.
- Corbett, Steven J. "Using Case Study Multi-Methods to Investigate Close(r) Collaboration: Course-Based Tutoring and the Directive/Nondirective Instructional Continuum." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2011, pp. 55-81.
- Donnelly, Emily, and Kristen Garrison. "Tapping Multiple Voices in Writing Center Assessment." *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, vol. 7, no. 4, 2003: Web
- Gallagher, Chris W. "Assess Locally, Validate Globally: Heuristics for Validating Local Writing Assessments." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 34, no. 1, 2010, pp. 10-32.
- Gillespie, Paula, and Neal Lerner. *The Longman Guide to Peer Tutoring*. 2nd ed., Pearson Longman, 2008.
- Gofine, Miriam. "How Are We Doing? A Review of Assessments within Writing Centers." *Writing Center Journal*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2012, pp. 39-49.
- Henson, Roberta, and Sharon Stephenson. "Writing Consultations Can Effect Quantifiable Change: One Institution's Assessment." *The Writing Lab Newsletter*, vol. 33, no. 9, 2009, pp. 1-5.
- Huot, Brian. "Toward a New Theory of Writing Assessment." *College Composition and Communication*, 1996, pp. 549-566.
- Jacobs, Rose. "What's Wrong With Writing Centers" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 16 February 2018. The Chronicle Interview.

Johanek, Cindy. Composing Research: A Contextualist Paradigm for Rhetoric and Composition. Logan: Utah State UP, 2000. Print.

Jones, Casey. "The Relationship between Writing Centers and Improvement in Writing Ability: An Assessment of the Literature." *Education*, vol. 122, no. 1, 2001, pp. 3-10.

Leigh, Ryan, and Lisa Zimmerelli. *The Bedford Guide for Writing Tutors*. 5th ed. Bedford/St. Martins, 2010.

Lerner, Neal. "Of Numbers and Stories: Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment Research in the Writing Center." *Building Writing Center Assessments that Matter*. Ellen Schendel and William J. Macauley Jr. Boulder, Colorado: Utah State University Press, 2012. 108-114.

--."Writing Center Assessment: Searching for the 'Proof' of Our Effectiveness." *The Center Will Hold: Critical Perspectives on Writing Center Scholarship*. Eds. Michael A. Pemberton and Joyce Kinkead. Urbana: NCTE, 2003. 58-73.

--. "Choosing Beans Wisely." *The Writing Lab Newsletter*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2001, pp. 1-4.

--. "Counting Beans and Making Beans Count." *Writing Lab Newsletter*, vol. 22, no. 1, 1997, pp. 1-3.

Mackiewicz, Jo, and Isabelle Kramer Thompson. *Talk about writing: The Tutoring Strategies of Experienced Writing Center Tutors*. Routledge, 2014.

Morrison, Julie Bauer, and Jean-Paul Nadeau. "How Was Your Session at the Writing Center? Pre-and Post-Grade Student Evaluations." *Writing Center Journal*, vol. 23, no. 2, 2003, pp. 25-42.

Niler, Luke. "The Numbers Speak: A Pre-test of Writing Center Outcomes Using Statistical Analysis." *The Writing Lab Newsletter*, vol. 27, no. 7, 2003, pp. 6-9.

--. "The Numbers Speak Again: A Continued Statistical Analysis of Writing Center Outcomes."

Writing Lab Newsletter, vol. 29, no. 5, 2005, pp. 13-15.

North, Stephen. "Writing Center Research: Testing Our Assumptions." *Writing Centers: Theory and Administration*. Ed. Gary Olson. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1984. 24-35.

North, Stephen. "The Idea of A Writing Center." *College English*, vol. 46, no. 5, 1984, pp. 433-446

O'Neill, Peggy, Cindy Moore, and Brian A. Huot. *A Guide to College Writing Assessment*. Utah State University Press, 2009.

Rafoth, Ben. "Why visit your Campus Writing Center?" *Writing spaces: Readings on writing*, edited by C. Lowe & P. Zemliansky, West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press, 2010, pp. 146-155.

Schendel, E. and Macauley, W. J. (2012). *Building Writing Center Assessments that Matter*. Boulder, Colorado: Utah State University Press.

Severino, Carol. "Rhetorically Analyzing Collaborations." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 13, no. 1, 1992.

Shamoon, Linda K., and Deborah H. Burns. "A Critique of Pure Tutoring." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 15, no. 2, 1995, pp. 134-151.

Thonus, Terese. "Triangulation in the Writing Center: Tutor, Tutee, and Instructor Perceptions of the Tutor's Role." *Writing Center Journal*, vol. 22, 2001, pp. 59-82.

--."Tutor and Student Assessments of Academic Writing Tutorials: What is "Success"?" *Assessing Writing*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2002, pp. 110-134.

Trimbur, John. "Peer Tutoring: A contradiction in terms?" *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 7, 1987, pp. 21-28

Appendix A: Sample Summary Sheet

Case 7: Summary Sheet

Tutor: undergraduate; ESOL specialist

Student: Undergraduate student

Session Outline: **Introduction (0 to 0.44)** – S explains peer review feedback on her thesis. **Paragraph one (0.44 to 4.44)** – comma, adding details, sentence clarity. **Paragraph two (4.44 to 6)** – capitalization, sentence length; **Paragraph three (6 to 7.18)** -adding details, capitalization; **Paragraph four (7.18 to 13.34)** – word choice, comma, specific references, connection between ideas; **Paragraph five (13.34 to 19.20)** – adding details; **Paragraph six (19.20 to 31.07)** – comma, specific reference, connection between ideas, incorporating analysis/opinion; **Paragraph seven (31.07 to 36)** – comma, adding missing explanation; **Paragraph eight (36 to 37.30)** – plural, possessive comma, missing detail; **Discussion of additional paragraphs not yet written (37.30 to 47)** – T and S talk about possible ideas to expand/continue the paper, reference to thesis, drafting of new paragraph; **Conclusion paragraph (47 to 55.40)** – composition of concluding paragraph.

Agenda: Thesis statement (mentioned specifically at the beginning) and adding content to meet 5 page-limit (became apparent as the session progressed).

Major Issues Discussed: Lower order: Possessive comma, sentence clarity, sentence length, incorrect capitalization, word choice, comma usage, specific references/details

Higher order: adding missing details, logical connection between ideas, incorporating opinions/analysis, brainstorming ideas to develop content (additional paragraphs, including conclusion); referring back to the thesis in the end;

Issues discussed reflected or not in final version: yes

Any additional changes in final draft beyond what was discussed in the session: Yes, there is one new paragraph just before the conclusion. The student had mentioned that she would see her professor the next day. Therefore, it is possible this new paragraph is the outcome of that meeting. Or maybe not because this has not been verified.

Level of student engagement: Very high, both in identifying issues and making revisions.

Follow up/revision plan for student: Nothing specific. T suggested that the paper answered the thesis questions and responded well to the prompt. There was the need that S had to expand her paper to meet the 5 page requirement.

Revision made during session? Most revisions made during the session, including the composition of two additional paragraphs.

Introduction 0 to 44: S explains that her peer review partner told her that the thesis should not be in the form of a questions. T suggests they go through it. S starts reading the first paragraph.

Analysis Points:

Paragraph one (44 to 4.44) : possessive comma; adding details (stepdad is Indonesian) ; revising sentence for clarity – changing the thesis from a question to a sentence <s taking initiative in pointing out doubts, making changes, and deciding the need for change>

Paragraph two (4.44 to 6): capitalization of President (S identifies the need); editing the last sentence to make it shorter (student identifies problem and T helps make revision, S makes changes in laptop)

Paragraph three (6 to 7.18) : adding additional detail (here too the student takes initiative to point to and resolve the problem “which is why he addressed the situation”; T points out “invitees” does not need to be capitalized.

Paragraph four (7.18 to 13.34): word choice “scandal vs situation,” comma usage (raised by T), specific details (that? Raised by T), establishing a connection between two ideas 10.50 to 13.34 MAY NEED TO TRANSCRIBE THIS (raised by T but S actively makes revision with T’s support. T does not revise the sentence, rather allows student to make the revision)

Paragraph five (13.34 to 19.20): adding missing details to make sentences/ideas clear and complete (S plays an active role in pointing out issues and making revisions)

Paragraph six (19.20 to 31.07): comma (T raises); specific detail (“birth certificate controversy vs controversy” identified and resolved by S); establishing a connection between two ideas (raised by T “these issues were happening at the same time”); missing detail (before what? Raised by T); Incorporating student’s own opinion/analysis (T raises this issue by asking a leading question “why is it important”) [MAYNEED TO TRANSCRIBE THIS REVISION PROCESS - @ around 26.5.] <s makes revision independently with T just helping out at different points>

Paragraph seven (31.07 to 36) : comma (T raises); adding missing connection/explanation (T raises leading questions “Why is this important?” and S makes revision more or less on her own)

Paragraph eight (36 to 37.30) : plural (“these sources”); possessive comma; missing detail (to verify what?); short discussion of how to extend paper to meet page requirement;

Discussion of additional paragraphs not yet written (37.30 to 47): S needs to expand and conclude the paper to meet the word count. T provides some suggestions while S takes notes. T raises questions of why it is important for the President to go to different media houses. This helps S to formulate her next paragraph – to tell Americans that he is an American citizen. S types out the next paragraph in her laptop. T refers back to the thesis to make sure they are answering. She says they’ve addressed the issues in the paper and suggests they need to come back to the thesis now at the end. She also suggests an idea for the conclusion – to conclude about where the issue stands now and that people don’t complain about it anymore (S takes notes) S keeps working on the new paragraph (para 9) based on the present discussion with T. T makes a suggestion for the final sentence of the paragraph through some leading questions – what happened as a result of the president addressing the issues through media and houses and what resulted from this? (S & T composing an entire paragraph with discussion and leading questions from tutor) Student complains about needing to reach 5 pages and that she cannot think anymore.

Conclusion paragraph (47 to 55.40): S suggests they focus on the conclusion (which is not yet written). S starts typing out some sentences and T suggests to get out all the ideas and lets S compose the sentences herself (T ‘s strategy of minimum yet helpful intervention seems effective; she is not doing the work for the student but encouraging S to compose her own

sentences and express her own ideas). T helps S polish the sentences after S comes up with the initial content. T makes specific suggestion about the last sentence (just because the President's parents is not a US citizen does not mean he was not born in the US). S says she is going to talk to the professor tomorrow and that she cannot think and write anymore. T says she likes the compare and contrast and that S has answered most of the questions already and that she also doesn't know how to expand or what else to say. S says that she is fine. T says she has answered the thesis and the prompt too. T tells S that she(S) wrote all of it and that she (t) only asked questions.

IMPRESSIONS

The student is highly engaged in identifying problems with her paper and in making revisions. T does an excellent job of allowing S to come up with own revisions. T's strategy of minimum yet helpful intervention seems effective. She does not provide phrases or compose sentences for S during the revision process. Instead, she asks questions and lets S do most of the revisions herself. T only intervenes to make the student aware of missing links and details, but allows the student to do all the work. This strategy seemed very effective in this session not just because of T's strategy but also because S was highly engaged and independent. S did not expect to be spoon fed by the T and T did not intervene too heavily. As a result, they were able not only to revise unclear sentences but also were able to compose two entirely new paragraphs during the session itself.

This type of 'minimum intervention' strategy does seem to be very effective and something that should be emulated by other tutors too. Too often, as observed in some of the other sessions and also from my own experience, tutors get caught in the trap of making revisions for the student. We find ourselves getting carried away and feeling compelled to break the silence by coming up with sentences/phrases/words/ideas for the client. Perhaps the strategy demonstrated by this tutor, can help to keep others in check. This strategy needs to be emphasized during tutor training programs and also needs to be assessed from time to time to ensure that it is being implemented in actual sessions.

As with most other sessions, S made changes on her laptop and most of the revisions (including two new paragraphs) were made during the session. Thus, the session was quite productive. There was also a new paragraph in the final version that was not discussed in the session.

Appendix B: Sample Coding Sheet

Intervention 1 – Part 1 (Clip 1)

[E1] T1: (Reading) “Demonstrated energy efficient light bulbs that the company develops to clients” What if we say, to shorten it and condense it, say “Demonstrated the company’s energy efficient light bulbs to clients”

[E2] S1: (Typing)

[E3] T1: Okay, and you want to say “the company’s.” Take away that extra space. (Reading revised sentence) “Demonstrated the company’s energy efficient light bulbs to clients and explained the effects of the company products.” So you say “the effects of the company’s products.” So which kinds of effects, environmental impact?

[E4] S1: “Yeah environmental impact”

[E5] T1: okay

[E6] S1: and energy saving

[E7] T1: So what we can do here is we can throw in some positive words, like we can say “and explained the environmental benefits of using the company’s products.” So that’s like you are promoting it, like you’re not just being like this is how it’s done, you’re saying like it’s awesome. You’re showing you are promoting it.

- 5 Directive strategies (3 suggestions [E1, E3, E7], 1 explanation [E7], 1 direct instruction [E3]) [Blue]
- 3 Non-Directive strategies (2 reading, 1 question) [Green]
- Tutor revises for student (E1 & E7)

Appendix C: Pre-and Post-Intervention Drafts for Case Study One

Pre-Intervention Draft for Case Study One (all sentence-level issues discussed are highlighted)

It was late August and there were approximately twelve of us lined up against a wall in Torgersen Hall, standing at parade rest, staring at a small book called the Guidon. Our feet were ten inches apart with our right hands holding the Guidon about six inches from our faces. Our left arm was behind our backs with the back of our hand resting on the small of our backs. We were all bald and wearing a white V-neck T-shirts with tan khaki pants. I had no idea who these guys were standing next to me and I was not about to find out anytime soon. There were two junior cadets walking back and forth in front of us asking us questions about the Guidon. At the time I was terrified and could barely speak, let alone tell these two cadets Guidon knowledge. I did not know it then, but that was the beginning of my journey as a cadet and the development of my leadership skills.

The Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets is a program that teaches how to develop skills in order to become a leader in both military and civilian environments. Anyone who is in the college decision making process should take the time to consider joining the Corps of Cadets. The Corps of Cadets is a senior military college and a world-class leadership development program that has been a significant part of **Virginia Tech since 1872. When the school first opened it was** called Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, with all students being cadets. The Corps of Cadets was only 132 strong at the time, with only one battalion formed from two companies. The Corps is now over a thousand strong with three battalions and thirteen companies. The Corps is a four year commitment that puts a person in a military environment twenty four hours per day, seven days a week, focusing on developing “practical, ethical, and leadership skills.”

There are many benefits in the Corps that you will never find in any regular college experience. A main problem with many first year college students is time management. When you first get to college you are not in class as often as you were in high school, which gives you the illusion that you have a lot more free time. Most first year college students do not realize **this** and end up doing poorly their first semester. A freshman cadet has a very different experience their first semester. Speaking from personal experience, the Corps forces you to focus on your academics by having mandatory study hours called ECQ. ECQ stands for “Evening Call to Quarter” and is in place from seven to eleven p.m. every day of the week except Fridays and Saturdays. During that time you are not allowed to use any social media, workout, eat at dining halls (unless you get special permission **too**), **or anything** that does not pertain to academics. I know it does not sound like a lot of fun, but it helps you organize yourself, develop time management skills, discipline **yourself** and create a bond that brings you closer to the other freshman in your training company.

One of the most important things you gain from being in the Corps are the friendships that you form with the other freshman in your TC. When you are in the Corps you are put in a company with approximately 70 to 80 people. Most of the people who make up the company are sophomores, juniors and seniors. The rest of the company is made up freshman and it is called your TC or training company. These are some of the greatest people you will ever meet. Over time you will form lasting friendships with one another, they become a part of your family.

I remember the first time during new cadet week when I was given permission to talk to my buddies. Our Cadres were training us at the time and they gave us a thirty minute lunch break where we could sit down and talk to one another freely. I had been training with my fellow cadets for the last few days without saying a word to them. Honestly, at the time I was not even able to tell you most of their names, but when we sat down and started talking to one another you could tell that we had each other's back. We knew that we were all in this together and that the only way to get through it was by helping each other. My fellow cadets are the main reason I was able to make it as far as I have, because they are always there to help me when I need it most. I know that I can always count on them. This is a big advantage when starting off in college, because it is difficult to meet new people. The Corps allows you to interact with people easier, because as a TC you spend a lot of time together and you learn how to deal with different types of people, with many different personalities, coming from many different backgrounds.

In every senior military college you will be taught the basics of being a leader. Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets teaches you that and so much more. It instills in you the motto "Ut Prosim – That I May Serve." Being a leader means that you are going to serve others and the Corps of Cadets unique program allows you to do just that. What makes the Corps of Cadets different from other senior military colleges is that you are able to interact and get involve with the Virginia Tech's civilian student body. This allows you to volunteer and give back to the community, really embodying what Ut Prosim means. A good example of this was when I volunteered to be a team captain for the Big Event. The Big Event is a student run community service project during the spring semester. Each year thousands of students volunteer and complete over one thousand service projects in the surrounding areas of Blacksburg, Christiansburg and New River Valley. My role was to assemble a team of eight or more students and complete the service project given to us. The project my team completed was to go into a small, local neighborhood in Blacksburg and help out this local community with various gardening project. We helped with weeding, digging and so much more. It may not sound like a lot of fun, but it was a very rewarding experience and I plan on volunteering next year.

When you are no longer a freshman you will be given leadership positions throughout your four years. The first real leadership position you are able to attain comes when you become a sophomore. You will become a Fire Team Leader and you will be put in charge of a small group of freshmen cadets. You are responsible for the freshmen under your command. You will have many responsibilities as a FTL, including accountability, inspecting rooms and uniforms, passing leave slips up the chain of command, and much more. When you become a junior and a

senior you will have an opportunity to be in many more leadership positions. These leadership positions enable you to take on as many responsibilities you feel you are able to handle.

The Corps of Cadets does offer you a lot of benefits, but there are a few negatives about the Corps. First it does take away a lot of your freedom, especially if you are a freshman cadet. There are a lot of rules that are strictly enforced, like a zero alcohol tolerance. As a freshman cadet you will be required to wear the uniform twenty four seven for the entire year until you earn the privilege to wear civilian clothes. In the beginning your head will be shaved if you are a male and you are not allowed to grow it out unless you are given the privilege to do so. You must obey the Cadet Honor Code and follow these rules and many more. As a cadet you are a professional that represents the University and are expected to conduct yourself accordingly at all times. Even when you are not wearing the uniform you still represent the Corps and your actions can have a negative or positive affect in the community. This teaches you discipline, humility and many other traits that are required to be a good, effective leader.

Another negative that I have encountered is that the Corps makes it very difficult at times to make civilian friends because a lot of your time is taken up by Corps events. This is where you really have to learn good time management skills. If you are not able to plan accordingly things can pile up a lot quicker than a regular student because you have extra Corps obligations. Making friends outside of the Corps is even more challenging as a freshman because you are not allowed to go out on the weekends with them. On Friday and Saturday nights you will be given passes from your First Sargent to do something with your TC, like go get food as a TC in a 30 minute time period, then come back and stay in the dorms for the rest of the night. That is a typical pass that most freshmen cadets are given. You will be granted a little more freedom based on your performance as you progress through the Corps, but on Sunday nights you are not allowed to go out because you have ECQ from six to eleven p.m.

I have found that another factor that makes it difficult to make friends outside of the Corps is the fact that you are intentionally separated from civilians. You are required to wear a uniform everyday, which distinctly shows people that you are a part of the Corps. Most people do not fully understand what the Corps of Cadets is and are intimidated by it, which makes them less likely to interact with you. You are also required to live on campus for all four years with other cadets. There are separate dorms that cadets live in and separate dorms for civilians. Cadets live on the other side of campus far away from any civilian dorms. These are factors that make it hard to have civilian friends, but it is possible to have civilian friends, it just requires extra time and effort. This can inhibit your social skills because cadets only interact with militarized grade A personalities. If you do not try to make friends outside of the Corps it will be harder to interact with civilians. Some behavior can seem perfectly normal to a cadet, but to a civilian it can seem out of place and strange, like sounding off to upper classmen. Sounding off is when a freshman cadet greets every upperclassmen they see with the greeting of the day with name and rank. The purpose of sounding off is to instill confidence in a freshman cadet and to get the freshman to know all the names of the upperclassmen. Regular students have ask me before why we do this because it seems strange to them.

Overall the skills and the experiences that you gain from the Corps of Cadets cannot be obtained through a regular college experience. It is a path that most people are not willing to take, but for those who are willing to be a part of the Corps of Cadets the benefits and advantages will far exceed the difficulties and place you on a path for success upon graduation. It requires a lot of sacrifice and is not easy by any means. However, what you learn from this program will stick with you for the rest of your life and throughout your careers. That is why it is worth joining the Corps of Cadets and should be something that every high school senior considers.

Work Cited

"Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets." [Http://www.vtcc.vt.edu/index.html](http://www.vtcc.vt.edu/index.html). 2016 Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Web.

Post-Intervention Draft for Case Study One (all revisions discussed are highlighted)

It was late August and there were approximately twelve of us lined up against a wall in Torgersen Hall, standing at parade rest, staring at a small book called the Guidon. Our feet were ten inches apart with our right hands holding the Guidon about six inches from our faces. Our left arm was behind our backs with the back of our hand resting on the small of our backs. We were all bald and wearing a white V-neck T-shirts with tan khaki pants. I had no idea who these guys were standing next to me and I was not about to find out anytime soon. There were two junior cadets walking back and forth in front of us asking us questions about the Guidon. At the time I was terrified and could barely speak, let alone tell these two cadets Guidon knowledge. I did not know it then, but that was the beginning of my journey as a cadet and the development of my leadership skills.

The Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets is a program that teaches how to develop skills in order to become a leader in both military and civilian environments. Anyone who is in the college decision making process should take the time to consider joining the Corps of Cadets. The Corps of Cadets is a senior military college and a world-class leadership development program that has been a significant part of Virginia Tech since the school opened in 1872. When the school first opened it was called Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, with all students being cadets. The Corps of Cadets was only 132 strong at the time, with only one battalion formed from two companies. The Corps is now over a thousand strong with three battalions and thirteen companies. The Corps is a four year commitment that puts a person in a military environment twenty four hours per day, seven days a week, focusing on developing “practical, ethical, and leadership skills.”

There are many benefits in the Corps that you will never find in any regular college experience. A main problem with many first year college students is time management. When you first get to college you are not in class as often as you were in high school, which gives you the illusion that you have a lot more free time. Most first year college students do not realize that most work in college is done outside of the classroom and end up doing poorly their first semester. A freshman cadet has a very different experience their first semester. Speaking from personal experience, the Corps forces you to focus on your academics by having mandatory study hours called ECQ. ECQ stands for “Evening Call to Quarter” and is in place from seven to eleven p.m. every day of the week except Fridays and Saturdays. During that time you are not allowed to use any social media, workout, eat at dining halls (unless you get special permission to), or do anything that does not pertain to academics. I know it does not sound like a lot of fun, but it helps you organize yourself, develop time management skills, discipline yourself and create a bond that brings you closer to the other freshman in your training company.

One of the most important things you gain from being in the Corps are the friendships that you form with the other freshman in your training company (TC). When you are in the Corps you are put in a company with approximately 70 to 80 people. Most of the people who

make up the company are sophomores, juniors and seniors. The rest of the company is made up freshman and it is called your TC. These are some of the greatest people you will ever meet.

Over time you will form lasting friendships with one another. These cadets will become a part of your family.

I remember the first time during new cadet week when I was given permission to talk to my buddies. Our Cadres were training us at the time and they gave us a thirty minute lunch break where we could sit down and talk to one another freely. I had been training with my fellow cadets for the last few days without saying a word to them. Honestly, at the time I was not even able to tell you most of their names, but when we sat down and started talking to one another you could tell that we had each other's back. We knew that we were all in this together and that the only way to get through it was by helping each other. My fellow cadets are the main reason I was able to make it as far as I have, because they are always there to help me when I need it most. I know that I can always count on them. This is a big advantage when starting off in college, because it is difficult to meet new people. The Corps allows you to interact with people easier, because as a TC you spend a lot of time together and you learn how to deal with different types of people, with many different personalities, coming from many different backgrounds.

In every senior military college you will be taught the basics of being a leader. Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets teaches you that and so much more. It instills in you the motto "Ut Prosim – That I May Serve." Being a leader means that you are going to serve others and the Corps of Cadets unique program allows you to do just that. What makes the Corps of Cadets different from other senior military colleges is that you are able to interact and get involve with the Virginia Tech's civilian student body. This allows you to volunteer and give back to the community, really embodying what Ut Prosim means. A good example of this was when I volunteered to be a team captain for the Big Event. The Big Event is a student run community service project during the spring semester. Each year thousands of students volunteer and complete over one thousand service projects in the surrounding areas of Blacksburg, Christiansburg and New River Valley. My role was to assemble a team of eight or more students and complete the service project given to us. The project my team completed was to go into a small, local neighborhood in Blacksburg and help out this local community with various gardening project. We helped with weeding, digging and so much more. It may not sound like a lot of fun, but it was a very rewarding experience and I plan on volunteering next year.

When you are no longer a freshman you will be given leadership positions throughout your four years. The first real leadership position you are able to attain comes when you become a sophomore. You will become a Fire Team Leader and you will be put in charge of a small group of freshmen cadets. You are responsible for the freshmen under your command. You will have many responsibilities as a FTL, including accountability, inspecting rooms and uniforms, passing leave slips up the chain of command, and much more. When you become a junior and a senior you will have an opportunity to be in many more leadership positions. These leadership positions enable you to take on as many responsibilities you feel you are able to handle.

The Corps of Cadets does offer you a lot of benefits, but there are a few negatives about

the Corps. First it does take away a lot of your freedom, especially if you are a freshman cadet. There are a lot of rules that are strictly enforced, like a zero alcohol tolerance. As a freshman cadet, you will be required to wear the uniform twenty four seven for the entire year until you earn the privilege to wear civilian clothes. In the beginning your head will be shaved if you are a male and you are not allowed to grow it out unless you are given the privilege to do so. You must obey the Cadet Honor Code and follow these rules and many more. As a cadet, you are a professional that represents the University and are expected to conduct yourself accordingly at all times. Even when you are not wearing the uniform, you still represent the Corps and your actions can have a negative or positive affect in the community. This teaches you discipline, humility and many other traits that are required to be a good, effective leader.

Another negative that I have encountered is that the Corps makes it very difficult at times to make civilian friends because a lot of your time is taken up by Corps events. This causes you to really have to learn good time management skills. If you are not able to plan accordingly things can pile up a lot quicker for you than a regular student because you have extra Corps obligations. Making friends outside of the Corps is even more challenging as a freshman because you are not allowed to go out on the weekends with them. On Friday and Saturday nights you will be given passes from your First Sargent to do something with your TC, like go get food as a TC in a 30 minute time period, then come back and stay in the dorms for the rest of the night. That is a typical pass that most freshmen cadets are given. You will be granted a little more freedom based on your performance as you progress through the Corps, but on Sunday nights you are not allowed to go out because you have ECQ from six to eleven p.m. Your social life as freshman will be very restricted, but you will develop time management skills from this. So when you are given more freedom you will be able to balance academics with your social life a lot more effectively.

I have found that another factor that makes it difficult to make friends outside of the Corps is the fact that you are intentionally separated from civilians. You are required to wear a uniform everyday, which distinctly shows people that you are a part of the Corps. Most people do not fully understand what the Corps of Cadets is and are intimidated by it, which makes them less likely to interact with you. You are also required to live on campus for all four years with other cadets. There are separate dorms that cadets live in and separate dorms for civilians. Cadets live on the other side of campus far away from any civilian dorms. These are factors that make it hard to have civilian friends, but it is possible to have civilian friends, it just requires extra time and effort. This can inhibit your social skills because cadets only interact with militarized grade A personalities. If you do not try to make friends outside of the Corps it will be harder to interact with civilians. Some behavior can seem perfectly normal to a cadet, but to a civilian it can seem out of place and strange, like sounding off to upper classmen. Sounding off is when a freshman cadet greets every upperclassmen they see with the greeting of the day with name and rank. The purpose of sounding off is to instill confidence in a freshman cadet and to get the freshman to know all the names of the upperclassmen. Regular students have told me before that they think it is strange and pointless. Even though you are intentionally separated from civilians being in the

Corps give you a sense of pride that you are a part of something bigger than yourself. These strange traditions you have to do may seem pointless, but overtime you will realize that they are necessary in developing your leadership skills.

Overall the skills and the experiences that you gain from the Corps of Cadets cannot be obtained through a regular college experience. It is a path that most people are not willing to take, but for those who are willing to be a part of the Corps of Cadets the benefits and advantages will far exceed the difficulties and place you on a path for success upon graduation. It requires a lot of sacrifice and is not easy by any means. However, what you learn from this program will stick with you for the rest of your life and throughout your careers. That is why it is worth joining the Corps of Cadets and should be something that every high school senior considers.

Work Cited

"Virginia Tech Corps of Cadets." [Http://www.vtcc.vt.edu/index.html](http://www.vtcc.vt.edu/index.html). 2016 Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Web.

Appendix D: Pre-and Post-Intervention Drafts for Case Study Two

Pre-Intervention Draft for Case Study Two

Kimberly Davant

Professor L

22 March 2016

WRTC 103

downat?
underlying
friends w/
the relationship

[NOT what they seem]

In 2014, *Tokyo Ghoul* earned the fourth spot on the best-selling manga list in Japan by reaching close to 7 million copies sold and the sequel series *Tokyo Ghoul:Re* sold almost 4 million copies in 2015, which was the end of the first year of publication (Ecumenical news, Anime News). This series was started in 2011, by the mangaka (manga author) Ishida Sui who was born in Fukuoka Prefecture, Japan. There are few known facts about Ishida, including what he may look like (except some small drawings of self-portraits). Ishida has done two other series that are web comics, but the *Tokyo Ghoul* series is where most of the work goes into now. Ishida drew this piece in the sequel manga *Tokyo Ghoul:Re*, which shows the dynamic between the two characters present along with themes that encompass the series. This is shown through the colors present in the piece, the positions of the characters, and potential underlying themes/messages that are common in Ishida's work.

There is no certain date when manga actually began in Japan, but there are a few instances where manga could have taken inspiration from. Thousands of years ago, Japanese workers made small drawings in order to relieve stress and a few hundred years after that, a

combine MC
MC
SC
MC
SC



Buddhist priest made "a series of cartoons on scrolls" that used animals to be used as religious teachings (McCarthy 3). The actual term manga was not used until 1798, and it still was not how it is today, at that time it was used more for satirical purposes. Manga as it is today, started to form during World War II, as organizations for artists in Japan started, like the New Cartoonists Association of Japan and the New Cartoonists Faction Group (History of Anime). In the United States, manga has started to become a big hit and a lot of bookstore shelves have been taken up by these books (Manga and the US). Many American find manga to be a cool new thing, and even though there are cultural differences, there is still interest for them. Manga has the ability to appeal to different groups due to the vast amount of genres to choose from.

Tokyo Ghoul is a series about Kaneki Ken and his life after having ghoul organs transplanted into him. Outwardly, ghouls are the same as humans, because most of their differences are due to their biology. They can only eat humans or other ghouls and have heightened senses and healing abilities. The Commission of Counter Ghoul (CCG) works to hunt down ghouls and protect humans/humanity. After getting into an accident, in order to save Kaneki's life, the doctors proceed with a transplant of organs from a ghoul. The surgery turned Kaneki into a half-ghoul, but after training he becomes stronger than many other ghouls. The events in the sequel series *Tokyo Ghoul:Re* take place a few years after *Tokyo Ghoul* and now has Kaneki working at the CCG and was "trained" under Arima. Arima is the best investigator and fighter at the CCG who has taken many ghouls down and the only one to have ever even scratch him, was Kaneki. Their dynamic and relationship is very important to the series in general, but has been more prevalent in *Tokyo Ghoul:Re*, which is where Ishida included this piece.

In this piece, Kaneki is drawn on the left and Arima is on the right while they both stand backs to each other. Kaneki is making eye contact with the audience, this could be seen as breaking the fourth wall but it may not be as simple as that. When characters break the fourth wall ~~it is~~ they "acknowledge their fictionality" and more often than not used for comedic effect (TV Tropes). While he does make eye contact, it is done in a way that ~~makes it seem~~ Kaneki is resonating with the audience, rather than making a joke out of his existence. He looks at the audience to say that ~~although he is the protagonist~~ and has the abilities of a ghoul, he still wants to be seen as normal. With Arima on the other hand, ~~has his head held up~~ and can be assumed to be looking to the sky. Arima is seen to have God-like abilities, even though he is still a regular human, but his position backs up that sentiment and says that he is above the audience. Also, both Kaneki and Arima have their "important" sides showing. Kaneki is showing his "ghoul-eye" which is how he is recognized and Arima has his eye showing that is theorized to be going blind and his one weak spot.

When the colors black and white are used, it is common to assume there is some level of good versus evil happening. While that does play a part into this piece, it also has to do with aliases the characters go by. Arima goes by many names in the CCG, one of which is the White Reaper. Once Kaneki starts working with the CCG, the ghouls he hunts down and other characters refer to him as the Black Reaper. There is not much explanation as to why these are their aliases, but it could have to do with the side they are supposed to be on. Arima is white because of his duty to the CCG and hunting down the "bad" guys in the series, which are the ghouls. Kaneki is then the contrast of that because he is half-ghoul so he winds up in the bad group although he does work ~~so~~ the CCG. On the outside the CCG can be seen as the heroes, ~~but~~

TS
TS
TS
TS

communicates
his God-like
abilities +
fighting

because they are the ones protecting the humans. Occasionally in the series, characters wonders if the ghouls they are killing are supposed to be the bad guys, even when they are innocent.

Ishida Sui often uses hidden messages in pieces, as well as foreshadows events a long time before they happen. It is common for the smallest thing to be a piece of foreshadow, which could maybe be present in this piece as well. Where the story is headed now, there is most likely going to be a large climax and fight between Kaneki and Arima. From this piece it can be seen that Arima has red splatters on his clothing, along with a red line going through his neck in the background. This could be a foreshadow to the outcome of Kaneki and Arima's fight, that Arima is the one who will be the one to fall at Kaneki's hand, rather than the other way around. In order to back up this theory and an example of Ishida's foreshadowing, there was one character who had a line cutting across her neck in a panel in the story, who would later then be decapitated.

italics
Tokyo Ghoul is a widely popular series in Japan, along with the growing manga industry in the United States. Many art pieces tell a story without words or even if the viewer had no prior knowledge of the subject of the piece. Art has the power to make an impact on the audience and make them think about what they are looking at. Ishida Sui has the ability to produce a compelling story, but also a beautiful artwork that combines aspects of that story and things to come in the future, in just one image.

→ take out the "this could be or might be"

→ even if the viewer had no prior knowledge about the piece, they would still see the relationship between the characters.

Works Cited

- Basilan, Marvie. "Tokyo Ghoul season 3 release date: Series returning summer 2016?" *Ecumenical News*. Ecumenical News, 17 March 2016. Web. 19 March 2016.
- "Breaking the Fourth Wall." *TV Tropes*. n.p, n.d. Web. 20 March 2016.
- Fliss, Charles. "Manga and the United States: New Life to Comics." *Post Bubble Culture*. Genesis Framework, 5 April 2010. Web. 19 March 2016.
- Ishida, Sui. *Tokyo Ghoul:Re*. Vol. 7. Tokyo: Shueisha Inc. 2016. Print.
- McCarthy, Helen. *A Brief History of Manga*. Lewes: Octopus Publishing Group, 2014. Print.
- "Top-Selling Manga in Japan by Series: 2015." *Anime News Network*. Anime News Network, 29 November 2015. Web. 19 March 2016.

Post-Intervention (Revised) Draft for Case Study Two (Revisions Highlighted)

Two Sides of a Coin

“Why is that beautiful things are entwined more deeply with death than with life...?”

Strangely, I thought he was beautiful” (Ishida 96). This quote was said by Arima, who is on the right, about Kaneki, on the left, in the series *Tokyo Ghoul*. This series was started in 2011, by the mangaka (manga author) Ishida Sui who was born in Fukuoka Prefecture, Japan. There are few known facts about Ishida, including what he may look like (except some small drawings of self-portraits). Ishida has done two other series that are web comics, but the *Tokyo Ghoul* series is where most of the work goes into now. Ishida drew this piece in the sequel manga *Tokyo Ghoul:Re*, through the colors present in the piece, the positions of the characters and the underlying messages that are often present in Ishida’s work; it shows the dynamic between the two characters present along with themes that encompass the series.

Manga is a style of comics and graphic novels made in Japan, aimed at all different age groups. There is no certain date when manga actually began in Japan, but there are a few instances where manga could have taken inspiration from. Thousands of years ago, Japanese workers made small drawings in order to relieve stress and a few hundred years after that, a Buddhist priest made “a series of cartoons on scrolls” that used animals to be used as religious teachings (McCarthy 3). The actual term manga was not used until 1798, and it still was not how it is today, at that time it was used more for satirical purposes. Manga as it is today, started to form during World War II, as organizations for artists in Japan started, like the New Cartoonists Association of Japan and the New Cartoonists Faction Group (History of Anime). In 2014, *Tokyo Ghoul* earned the fourth spot on the best-selling manga list in Japan by reaching close to 7

million copies sold and the sequel series *Tokyo Ghoul:Re* sold almost 4 million copies in 2015,

which was the end of the first year of publication (Ecumenical news, Anime News). In the United States, manga has started to become a big hit and a lot of bookstore shelves have been taken up by these books (Manga and the US). Many American find manga to be a cool new thing, and even though there are cultural differences, there is still interest for them. Manga has the ability to appeal to different groups due to the vast amount of genres to choose from.

Tokyo Ghoul is a series about Kaneki Ken and his life after having ghoul organs transplanted into him. After getting into an accident, in order to save Kaneki's life, the doctors procced with a transplant of organs from a ghoul. The surgery turned Kaneki into a half-ghoul, but after training he becomes stronger than many other ghouls. The events in the sequel series *Tokyo Ghoul:Re* take place a few years after *Tokyo Ghoul* and now has Kaneki working at the Commission of Counter Ghoul (CCG) and was "trained" under Arima. Outwardly, ghouls are the same as humans, because most of their differences are due to their biology. They can only eat humans or other ghouls and have heightened senses and healing abilities. The CCG works to hunt down ghouls and protect humans/humanity. Arima is the best investigator and fighter at the CCG who has taken many ghouls down and the only one to have ever even scratch him, was Kaneki. Their dynamic and relationship is very important to the series in general, but has been more prevalent in *Tokyo Ghoul:Re*, which is where Ishida included this piece.

In this piece, Kaneki is drawn on the left and Arima is on the right while they both stand backs to each other. Kaneki is making eye contact with the audience, this could be seen as breaking the fourth wall but it may not be as simple as that. When characters break the fourth wall they "acknowledge their fictionality" and more often than not it is used for comedic effect (TV Tropes). While he does make eye contact, it is done in a way that seems Kaneki is

resonating with the audience, rather than making a joke out of his existence. He looks at the audience to say that although he is the protagonist and has the abilities of a ghoul, he still wants to be seen as normal. Looking at the audience with his “ghoul-eye”, which makes him recognizable in the series, he does not have that option. With Arima on the other hand, he holds his head up and can be assumed to be looking to the sky. Arima is seen to have God-like abilities, even though he is still a regular human, but his position backs up that sentiment and says that he is above the audience. Arima has his eye showing that is theorized to be going blind and his one weak spot, with this he becomes vulnerable.

When the colors black and white are used, it is common to assume there is some level of good versus evil happening. While that does play a part into this piece, it also has to do with aliases the characters go by. Arima goes by many names in the CCG, one of which is the White Reaper. Once Kaneki starts working with the CCG, the ghouls he hunts down and other characters refer to him as the Black Reaper. There is not much explanation as to why these are their aliases, but it most likely has to do with the side they are supposed to be on. Arima is white, which communicates his God-like abilities and duty to hunt down the ghouls. Kaneki is then the contrast of that because he is half-ghoul so he winds up in the bad group although he does work for the CCG. On the outside the CCG can be seen as the heroes, because they are the ones protecting the humans. Occasionally in the series, characters wonders if the ghouls they are killing are supposed to be the bad guys, even when they are innocent.

Ishida Sui often as hidden messages in pieces, as well as foreshadows events a long time before they happen. It is common for the smallest thing to be a piece of foreshadow, which is present in this piece as well. Where the story is headed now, there is most likely going to be a large climax and fight between Kaneki and Arima. From this piece it can be seen that Arima has

red splatters on his clothing, along with a red line going through his neck in the background. In order to back up this theory and an example of Ishida's foreshadowing, there was one character who had a line cutting across her neck in a panel in the story, who would later then be decapitated. This foreshadows the outcome of Kaneki and Arima's fight that Arima will be the one to fall at Kaneki's hand, rather than the other way around.

Tokyo Ghoul is a widely popular series in Japan, along with the growing manga industry in the United States. Art has the power to make an impact on the audience and make them think about what they are looking at. Even if the viewer has no prior knowledge about the piece, they could still see the relationship between the characters. Ishida Sui has the ability to produce a compelling story, but also a beautiful artwork that combines aspects of that story and events to come in the future, in just one image.

Works Cited

- Basilan, Marvie. “*Tokyo Ghoul* season 3 release date: Series returning summer 2016?” *Ecumenical News*. Ecumenical News, 17 March 2016. Web. 19 March 2016.
- “Breaking the Fourth Wall.” *TV Tropes*. n.p, n.d. Web. 20 March 2016.
- Fliss, Charles. “Manga and the United States: New Life to Comics.” *Post Bubble Culture*. Genesis Framework, 5 April 2010. Web. 19 March 2016.
- Ishida, Sui. *Tokyo Ghoul*. Vol. 14. Tokyo: Shueisha Inc. 2014. Print.
- Ishida, Sui. *Tokyo Ghoul:Re*. Vol. 7. Tokyo: Shueisha Inc. 2016. Print.
- McCarthy, Helen. *A Brief History of Manga*. Lewes: Octopus Publishing Group, 2014. Print.
- “Top-Selling Manga in Japan by Series: 2015.” *Anime News Network*. Anime News Network, 29 November 2015. Web. 19 March 2016.

Appendix E: Pre and Post Intervention Drafts for Case Study III

Pre-Intervention Draft for Case Study III

Throughout the past academic year I have become more aware of what I wanted to get out of my education. Through that I have focused more on my school work and started to put together the pieces for what I want to accomplish from my time here at JMU. I have changed my study habits in a transition to better by academics. Last semester I stayed in my dorm trying to study with the loud noises of my hallmates and the constant distraction of people banging on my door. This semester I found my niche in the library where I go to study and get my work done almost every day. My teachers' office hours have now become a daily routine in my everyday schedule as well.

I also realized this year that I am interested in more than just marketing. With my COB 204 class I quickly took interest in the content of computer programs and information. I then took the initiative to talk to my advisor to see what steps it would take to add CIS as a second major. After a discussion, we came to the conclusion that it would be feasible to declare a double major. To be a marketing and CIS double major is going to take a lot of extra work and summer hours to accomplish, but I know with my motivation and constant drive I can achieve this goal. I have continued to work with my advisor to fit Antwerp into my four year plan. The COB study abroad program in Antwerp was something I knew I wanted to strive for even before I started my journey at JMU. Although, to be able to graduate in four years and get into the Antwerp abroad program I am going to have to work harder than ever before. First semester was my wakeup call, but being driven to accomplish my goal in a set amount of time and with good grades is going to set me apart from other business majors.

That is why I am applying for this scholarship. With my rigorous course load and extracurriculars I will not have time for a job, which means no income to save up for abroad and college expenses. I appreciate the time you have taken to consider me as a candidate and hopefully a potential recipient of this scholarship and I hope you, Ms. Molly Brown, Associate Dean of the College of Business can see my potential and drive to take the knowledge and experiences out of the College of Business as it was intended by the professors and you.

Post-Intervention Draft for Case Study III (Revisions highlighted)

Throughout the past academic year I have become more aware of what I wanted to get out of my education. I have focused more on my school work by putting together the pieces to accomplish my goals at JMU. First semester was my wakeup call! I was dissatisfied with my grades because they did not accurately reflect my potential. Since then, I changed my study habits in a transition to better my academics. Last semester I stayed in my dorm trying to study with the constant distraction from my hall mates. This semester I regularly go to the library which enables me to get more work done. My teachers' office hours have now become a daily routine in my everyday schedule as well.

I also realized this year that I am interested in more than just marketing. With my COB 204 class I quickly took interest in the content of computer programs and information. After a discussion with my advisor, we came to the conclusion that it would be feasible to declare a double major in marketing and CIS. Through self-motivation I know I can tackle extra credits per semester along with summer hours to stay on a four year graduation track. Knowing my desire to attend the COB study abroad program in Antwerp I have actively been working with my advisor to fit it into my four year plan. By taking the knowledge from my majors and applying it to the business world I strive to set myself apart from other future candidates. With my rigorous course load and extracurriculars I will not have time for a job, which means no income to save up for study abroad and college expenses. I appreciate the time you have taken to consider me as a candidate and hopefully a potential recipient of this scholarship. I hope you, Ms. Molly Brown, Associate Dean of the College of Business can see my potential and drive to take the knowledge and experiences out of the College of Business as it was intended by the professors and you.

Appendix F: Pre-and Post- Intervention Drafts for Unsuccessful Intervention III

Pre-Intervention draft for Unsuccessful Intervention III

²Changes bring out mixed emotions within people. Depending on how deeply someone feels on a particular change, this can bring out stronger emotions. When The Affordable Care Act came out, requiring private companies to cover birth control methods for their employees, this change brought out heavy emotions. People who were pleased with this change appreciated this effort to make contraceptives more available to women. They believe that making contraceptives more accessible will result in fewer unplanned pregnancies. However, the people who opposed this change, claimed that it overstepped their own religious beliefs. They believe that this act is a form of supporting abortion. This new birth control mandate has caused numerous complaints and protests, including the *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby* case. This particular case went to The Supreme Court and resulted in the government to allow some religious affiliated organizations to not have to participate in The Affordable Care Act. While this act has been in place, there have been numerous studies done that have proven multiple benefits of providing women with birth control. The research and studies collected on this situation have proven to be more powerful than the religious stance on this situation. Religious viewers are allowed to have their own opinion, however, research and facts have opened the eyes of numerous organizations allowing them to see the other side of this idea. Change is hard and causes people to fight for what they believe in. This topic has allowed people to fight for their own beliefs and what they feel is right.

From the eyes of the religious viewers, they believe that providing birth control in a way is providing for an abortion. These nonprofit organizations are usually affiliated with being,

² Text highlighted in Yellow = Issues addressed in the session.

Catholic or Christian. They believe that this mandate takes away their religious rights. They fight for The First Amendment, freedom to practice any religion. The controversy started with one of the most controversial case that the supreme court has had to deal with is *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby*. While The Affordable Care Act had been set in place, Hobby Lobby argued for their religious rights. With this they were able to change the act in their favor. They stated in an article, “The Court’s decision is a victory, not just for our family business, but for all who seek to live out their faith. We are grateful to God and to those who have supported us on this difficult journey.” (<http://hobbylobbycase.com/the-case/the-decision/>). The issue that has been brought up, is that The Supreme Court ruled that by the Affordable Care Act any such organization had to provide insurance that covered contraception plans for women. Hobby Lobby argued that they should not be required to provide this and go against their own beliefs. They argued with The Supreme Court until The Supreme Court allowed for some religious associated businesses to not have to include the birth control in their employee coverage. It is stated in an article, “they will still have to provide minimum coverage that includes everything required by law, except contraception, the likely outcome will be that the portion of their premiums that go toward contraception will be subsidized” (<http://obamacarefacts.com/hobby-lobby-obamacare/>). This fight for their religious rights, now allows for companies to not be penalized for practicing their religion. Religious organizations still feel cheated when it comes to this situation however, is starting to see points from the other side.

From the side of the women, they believe that they should be provided with contraception plans in their employee covered insurance. One of the reasons that they believe this is that by providing forms of birth control to women causes less unplanned pregnancies. It is stated, “The importance of providing access to all forms of contraception is highlighted by the fact that one-

half of all pregnancies in the United States are unintended, which suggests a high incidence of non-use or improper use of contraception” (Mulligan). This availability to birth control allows women to be properly equipped. As well as, it allows women to choose the safest method for their own needs. When it is not available, some women may choose unsafe forms of birth control which increases the likelihood of unplanned pregnancies. This also is found to be a cheaper option to employers than to pay for the unplanned pregnancy and, or, their maternity leave. Another reason that women believe that they should be provided with contraceptives, is because men are provided with male versions of contraceptives. Women had been arguing for this insurance coverage with little success, and then Viagra was made to be included in insurance plans. This was argued as gender discrimination. This gave women another argument to get women’s contraception plans covered on insurance plans as well. The people that fought against this angle, “has come from Roman Catholic groups that oppose birth control and have fought, with mixed success, for exemptions for religious institutions” (Goldberg). Religious organizations were against this addition to the insurance plans. Even though these group opposed this addition, it was studied that most Americans favored insurance companies covering contraception. Women’s stance on the issue comes from the idea of contraception used as a piece of protection and prevention rather than abortion. Religious viewers view the issue as a form of abortion, while women view the issue as a form of prevention. In order to find a compromise between the two, one must look past the issue to see the connections.

Hobby Lobby objects to including contraceptives in their employee’s health insurance because the owners view these forms of birth control as a form of abortion. Women believe that contraceptives should be included in their insurance because it is a form of prevention. As these

two are on complete opposite sides of the spectrum they share similarities. Both of these sides share a mutual concern for economics and morality. It is found that,

Regardless of religion, region, or social class, contraception may be an ordinary part of many a woman's lives for upwards of 30 of her fertile years. The long-acting, user-friendly methods such as intrauterine devices are the most effective, with greater than 99% success rates. But these devices can cost up to \$1000, as much as a month's take-home pay for some low-income women. This may explain why nearly 1 in 3 women in the United States say they would switch to a more effective form of contraception if it were more affordable. Half of the pregnancies in the United States are unintended, which is due to misuse or nonuse of contraception, and half of those unintended pregnancies end in abortion (Charo).

By not covering women's contraceptives, religious organizations are in turn encouraging their female employees to take part in less-effective methods and abortions. Religious viewers have the concern for the morality of a person, however, are not providing something that can help the ethics of the women and their own views. As well as morality, it is also found to be more economically effective for both women and companies. The health article, "Women Saw Large Decrease In Out-Of-Pocket Spending For Contraceptives After ACA Mandate Removed Cost Sharing," found that, "Out-of-pocket spending declined for the two most commonly used, reversible forms of prescription birth control — the pill and the intrauterine device (IUD). The average, adjusted cost for a six-month pill prescription fell from \$33.58 in June 2012 to \$19.84 in June 2013. The out-of-pocket expense for an IUD fell from \$293.28 to \$145.24 over the same time period" (Becker).

Post-Intervention draft for Unsuccessful Intervention III

Choices³

Changes brings out mixed emotions within people. When The Affordable Care Act came out, requiring private companies to cover birth control methods for their employees, this change brought out strong emotions. People who are pleased with this change appreciated the effort to make contraceptives more available to women. Supporters believe that making contraceptives more accessible will result in fewer unplanned pregnancies. However, the people who oppose this change claimed that it overstepped their own religious beliefs. Furthermore, the opposition believes that contraception is a form of abortion. The new birth control mandate has caused numerous complaints and protests, including the *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby* case. This particular case went to the Supreme Court and resulted in the government allowing some religious affiliated organizations to not participate in The Affordable Care Act. While this act has been in place, there have been numerous studies done that have illustrated the multiple benefits of providing women with birth control, opening the eyes of organizations by allowing them to see the other side to contraception.

In 2010, The Supreme Court ruled The Affordable Care Act meant that all organizations had to provide insurance that covered contraception plans for their female employees. Hobby Lobby, a family-held business, argued that they should not be required to provide contraception as it goes against their religious beliefs. Many other organizations, namely religious non-profits, agreed that forcing them to provide contraception takes away their religious rights. They fight for their First Amendment rights, the freedom to practice any religion. The debate started with one of the most controversial cases that the Supreme Court has had to evaluate, *Burwell v. Hobby*

³ Text highlighted in Green = Changes made during the session

Text highlighted in Blue = Changes made and/or additions made after the session

Lobby. Hobby Lobby argued to the Supreme Court and the Court agreed that some religious associated businesses did not have to include birth control in their employee coverage. With this decision, they were able to change the act in their favor. It is stated in the article, “Christians in Conflict over Obamacare”, “The Court’s decision is a victory, not just for our family business, but for all who seek to live out their faith. We are grateful to God and to those who have supported us on this difficult journey” (Phillips). Supporters of contraception coverage, while devastated by this loss, state in Obama Care Facts, “they [organizations opting out of contraceptive coverage] will still have to provide minimum coverage that includes everything required by law, except contraception, the likely outcome will be that the portion of their premiums that go toward contraception will be subsidized” (DeMichele). As this is not a clear victory, religious organizations still feel cheated by this decision; however, they are starting to see points from the other side.

A more liberal perspective believes; women should be provided with contraception plans in their employer-covered insurance. Providing birth control to women results in fewer unplanned pregnancies. "Contraception Use, Abortions, and Births" states, “The importance of providing access to all forms of contraception is highlighted by the fact that one-half of all pregnancies in the United States are unintended, which suggests a high incidence of non-use or improper use of contraception” (Mulligan). This availability of birth control allows women to be properly equipped. Also, it allows women to choose the safest method for their own needs. When it is not available, some women may choose unsafe forms of birth control, which increases the likelihood of unplanned pregnancies. Provision of contraception is a cheaper option to employers than to pay for the unplanned pregnancy and, or, their maternity leave. Another reason that women believe they should be provided with contraceptives is because men are provided with

sexual health drugs. This is argued as gender discrimination. According to the article, “5 sexual health services insurance will cover...for men”, “when it comes to men, and no one has any real complaints about insurance coverage that allows men to continue having sex for non-procreative reasons and despite medical conditions that would otherwise prevent it” (Carpentier). This gave women another argument to get women’s contraception plans covered. The people that fought against this angle states in the article, “Insurance for Viagra Spurs Coverage for Birth Control”, “has come from Roman Catholic groups that oppose birth control and have fought, with mixed success, for exemptions for religious institutions” (Goldberg). Even though these group opposed this addition, most Americans favor insurance companies covering contraception. The religious organizations realized that it is less about access to medicine and more about equality. The liberal stance on the issue focuses on contraception as protection and prevention, rather than abortion.

Hobby Lobby’s owners want to live out their faith through their business without the government interfering. Women want insurance to cover contraceptives. While these two positions conflict with one another in most aspects they share concerns about morality and economics. To discuss morality, it is found in, "The Supreme Court decision in the Hobby Lobby Case",

Regardless of religion, region, or social class, contraception may be an ordinary part of many a woman's lives for upwards of 30 of her fertile years. The long-acting, user-friendly methods such as intrauterine devices are the most effective, with greater than 99% success rates. But these devices can cost up to \$1000, as much as a month's take-home pay for some low-income women. This may explain why nearly 1 in 3 women in the United States say they would switch to a more effective form of contraception if it

were more affordable. Half of the pregnancies in the United States are unintended, which is due to misuse or nonuse of contraception, and half of those unintended pregnancies end in abortion (Charo).

One could argue that by not covering women's contraceptives, religious organizations are in turn encouraging their female employees to take part in less-effective methods and possibly seek abortions. In addition to morality, provision of birth control is more economically effective for both women and companies. The health article, "Women Saw Large Decrease in Out-Of-Pocket Spending for Contraceptives After ACA Mandate Removed Cost Sharing," found that, "Out-of-pocket spending declined for the two most commonly used, reversible forms of prescription birth control and the intrauterine device (IUD). The average, adjusted cost for a six-month pill prescription fell from \$33.58 in June 2012 to \$19.84 in June 2013. The out-of-pocket expense for an IUD fell from \$293.28 to \$145.24 over the same time period" (Becker). This mandate will reduce the out of pocket expenses for women and encourage more women to use birth control. This will improve economic opportunities for women, allowing them to put their money towards more important use. Employers argue that insurance costs will increase due to being required to cover contraceptives, however, a 2000 study by National Business Group found that, "it costs employers 15-17% more to not provide contraceptive coverage, based on direct and indirect costs related to pregnancy" (Pynes). The common ground can be found by looking at this issue from the perspective of prevention rather than abortion.

Religious values are usually strongly held which makes it necessary to reach a compromise. The Supreme Court's decision includes a list of what forms of birth control Hobby Lobby will provide to their employees. Hobby Lobby's health plan pays for, "birth-control pills, vaginal rings, contraceptive patches, and other items to help female employees plan their

pregnancies" (Murdock). What Hobby Lobby does not provide, they claim they will not discourage their employees from using them, they will just not fund them. What these religious viewers and organizations do not see, is these forms of contraception are not only about birth control. It is found in "Religious Freedom and/or Contraception Coverage" that, "Health care-planned pregnancies require contraceptives. The ability to determine the timing of a pregnancy can prevent a range of pregnancy complications that can endanger a woman's health, including gestational diabetes, high blood pressure, and placental problems" (Pynes). Providing contraception is providing basic health insurance. Contraceptives are used in many other ways besides just a prevention mechanism. Although there are numerous reasons for using birth control, the most common is to prevent pregnancies. Studies have found birth control decreases the likelihood of unplanned pregnancies. With an increase of unplanned pregnancies, comes the increase of abortions. Employees should have access to alternatives. It should be the women's choice in whether or not they want to use this alternative. It is also stated, "We do not mandate that you have the service; we mandate that you have access to the service. The decision as to whether you should get it will be a private one, unique to you" (Pynes). This idea leaves the option up to the women and whether or not she wants to use it. The Hobby Lobby decision allows the views of the employer to be imposed upon employees regardless of what the employee believes.

Overall, The Affordable Care Act brought about many discussions on whether female contraception should be covered under their employer health insurance. The two sides of this argument come from: organizations who feel their religious rights are being taken away and by liberals who believe that women should be provided with this coverage and the choice in whether they want to use it. It has been discovered that by providing women with contraceptives, both the women and their employers benefit. For ethical, economic, and health reasons providing women with these forms of contraceptives have more benefits than reasons not. Religious organizations argue that providing birth control is providing abortions. However, by preventing unplanned pregnancies it prevents the need for abortions.

Not offering women the option to have these forms of contraceptives, encourages them to use unsafe methods of protection increasing the chance of having an abortion. Providing women with this option is the safest way to decrease the chance of unplanned pregnancies and to help women have the option of what they want to do.

Works Cited

- Carpentier, Megan. "5 sexual health services insurance will cover... for men." *Raw Story*. RAW EXCLUSIVES, U.S. NEWS, 20 Feb. 2012. Web. 24 Apr. 2016.
- Charo, Alta R. "The Supreme Court decision in the Hobby Lobby Case: conscience, complicity, and contraception." *JAMA Internal Medicine* 174.10 (2014). Web.
- DeMichele, Thomas. *ObamaCareFacts*. Health Network, n.d. Web. 22 Apr. 2016.
- Goldberg, Carey. "Insurance for Viagra Spurs Coverage for Birth Control." *New York Times* 30 June 1999. *Opposing Viewpoints in Context*. Web. 8 Apr. 2016.
- Nearns, Jodi. "Health Insurance Coverage and Prescription Contraceptive Use Among Young Women at Risk for Unintended Pregnancy." Elsevier (2008): 1-5 Web.
- Mulligan, Karen K. "Contraception Use, Abortions, and Births: The Effect of Insurance Mandates." *Demography* 52.4 (2015): 1195-217. Web.
- Murdock, Deroy. "Hobby Lobby Actually Lavishes Contraception Coverage on Its Employees." *National Review: The Corner* (06/20/2014): n. pag. Web.
- Phillips, Rick. "Christians in Conflict over Obamacare." *christianity.com*. JupiterImages Corporation, 2013. Web. 22 Apr. 2016. Web.
- Pynes, Joan E., and Lisa Suprenand. "Religious Freedom and/or Contraception Coverage: Time to Shelve the Disagreement." *Journal of Public Management & Social Policy* 19.2 (2013): 151-67. *ProQuest*. Web. 8 Apr. 2016.
- Becker, Nora V.; Polksy; Daniel. "Women Saw Large Decrease In Out-Of-Pocket Spending For Contraceptives After ACA Mandate Removed Cost Sharing," *Health Affairs*, July 2015, Vol. 34. Web.

Appendix G: Thesis Intervention Transcript

4.15 T: So what is it about, within your argument, what is it about the colors, positions and the things, what do you see those as implicating?

S: The colors are mostly like the contrast because like the black and the white. So I talk mostly about that. And the positions is like how he is making eye contact and looking up. And then, the message is like how to do like kind of the stuff that I talk about.

T: So in your thesis you, the thesis is kind of where like you wanna give me the “so what” like why should I read your paper. Like okay, so there are different colors, there are different positions, there are maybe underlying themes but like what... why is it worth exploring that or what do you as a viewer that is analyzing this do you see those three different aspects of this piece communicating one main idea?

S: I guess the main idea is just like umm like their kind of, like how much you can get from their relationship just in this one piece.

T: Okay, and what about their relationship?

The student then gives a long explanation about the relationship between the two characters. Then the tutor makes the following suggestion:

T: So the colors and the positions communicate something about their relationship to one another. So just by me as a viewer looking at this picture, I can get ideas of the two characters' relation to one and other. So that's kind of your 'so what' right? Why do we even need to care about this picture? Because there is a lot of underlying themes there about how these characters relate to each other.

S: Okay

T: And so some of that, I think you got some of those ideas in this first sentence here, but it gets a little bit lost

S: Yeah that's, sorry didn't mean to interrupt. He said, for this part he said that (referring to reviewers comments in her draft) “present it in a clear way and seems to be hiding.” So I think that is what you are kind of at.

T: Yeah, so how may we be able to pull that out from some of the, like so that it's not hiding anymore?

S: Umm, I guess if I re-worded it and say like through this stuff that's how he was like able to like exploit the relationship and portray it

T: Yeah.

Appendix H: Original Thesis and Revised Thesis Statements

Original Thesis

Ishida drew this piece in the sequel manga *Tokyo Ghoul:Re*, which shows the dynamic between the two characters present along with themes that encompass the series. This is shown through the colors present in the piece, the positions of the characters, and potential underlying themes/messages that are common in Ishida's work.

Revised Thesis

Ishida drew this piece in the sequel manga *Tokyo Ghoul:Re*, through the colors present in the piece, the positions of the characters and the underlying messages that are often present in Ishida's work; it shows the dynamic between the two characters present along with themes that encompass the series.

Appendix I: Transcript of Paragraph Reorganization Intervention

T: Okay, so right here (reads a sentence in the draft) “she was able to persuade others to accept this definition as well,” here’s where you want to talk about what you kind of talk about down here when you say that umm “he showed his superiors the visions and everything” because all that has to happen before he can say this allowed her level of authority. Does that make sense?

S: uh-huh

T: Yeah, so I think this just all kind of a little bit of reworking a little bit

S: okay

T: Umm, yeah, so I would just kind of just go, just go in order instead of kind of explaining and then going into more detail. I would just kind of would switch it around and really just go in order and say that “she started writing it down, people started seeing them, and then she was taken seriously, and then the leadership really came”...and you kind of go into that anyways. I just want to reorder that a little bit. So if you want to you can do that right now or you can make a mental note.

S: Umm, I will make a mental note.

T: Alright.

Appendix J: Post-Intervention Draft for Successful Intervention II

⁴Prodigal Son Essay

When analyzing biblical literature, readers often interpret the stories through a spiritual lens and neglect the cultural or historical context which is essential to understanding the Christian message and especially Jesus' parables (teaching stories). Specifically, the Prodigal Son is a parable about unconditional love and forgiveness between a father and his two disrespectful and undeserving sons; but to understand this message, we have to identify the irresponsible, defiant actions of these three characters that break the respectful, traditional cultural norms of the Middle East in Jesus' time.

Starting the parable, we see the younger son's blatant disrespect to his father. He asks for his portion of the inheritance early—something only to be discussed after the death of the father. By asking early, the son is essentially telling his father, "I wish you were dead" (Hultgren, 73). This was considered extremely rude and consequently, the young son would not only dishonor his family by severing relational ties with his older brother and father, but also face public shaming by the Jewish community. Sons did not simply defy their fathers. But it goes farther, not only does the son ask for the inheritance early, but he then asks to turn his share into physical money which furthers the dishonor—this meant a complete separation from his family (physical on top of emotional separation) and he rids himself of his portion of the family farm (Bailey, 165). As a result, the younger son moves quickly to leave the Jewish culture and escape inevitable community humiliation. By leaving, the younger son is telling society that he wishes his father was dead, he does not want to practice traditional Judaism, and that he will not return. This is a sharp contrast to responsible and faithful members of the Jewish community who

⁴ Text highlighted in Green indicates revisions that were discussed in the session.

respect and care for their Elders (especially through taking possession of the family farm) and who fervently honor Judaism (Bailey, 165,168).

The younger son quickly squanders his money by living foolishly and unfortunately, soon after, a famine hits the country which cripples the food supply. With this, the son finds himself completely destitute and ends up working for a Gentile where he becomes a pig herder. This job was exceptionally taboo in the eyes of Jews as pigs were “unholy” animals, and thus, the son would be ranked among the lowest of lows. The younger son longs to eat the wild carob that the pigs eat (which is not only unfit for humans, but provides very little nutrients- not nearly enough to survive on). Shortly thereafter, the son finds himself homeless, hungry, and in extreme poverty (Bailey, 170-173). With nothing to lose, the son decides to return home and beg for forgiveness from his father (Hultgren, 77). At this point, the son is making a bold move – he’s trying to reintegrate into the culture he so desperately ran away from. Coming back now would not only be shameful, but would force the son to confront the community, his brother, and his father (all ties he severed earlier in the passage). To compensate, the son plans to fall on his knees and beg for forgiveness from his father in hopes of working on the family farm as a hired servant (the lowest, most dishonorable occupation in the Jewish community) (Bailey, 176-177). Typically, sons were the right hand of the father and were expected to carry on a family’s legacy, especially through the family farms, to become a productive member of Jewish society (Hultgren, 77). To leave society the way the younger son has, shows a stark contrast to the traditional father/son relationship of the time, dishonors his family, and now, the son is returning-- when he feels the physical pain of hunger, homelessness, and poverty; needless to say he has nothing to lose.

Looking at the middle of the passage, we see shocking actions from the father as he shows extreme compassion, love, and forgiveness (Bailey, 183). After his younger son severely disrespects him, the father has all the rights to disown, punish, and discard this outsider, but instead he welcomes, protects, and honors him (Bailey, 166; Hultgren, 74). Starting at the beginning of the story, the father grants the request for the inheritance (which he had every right to reject the idea and punish his son for such an outrageous request) without any scolding and even grants his son the privilege of disposition—rights to sell the family land; a very unexpected outcome (Bailey, 165-166, 179).

The father's emotional acceptance turns into physical acceptance when he sees his son approaching from afar. This long walk home would force the son to face the scornful community alone, a just punishment for his disrespect, but the father does the unthinkable—he runs to his son (Bailey 168). To do this, the father would have to hold his robe up and expose his legs (a disgraceful and indecent act as respected men do not run) and the father was sure to draw a crowd. In doing this, the father is taking the humiliation that the son deserves and putting it onto himself which was unnecessary and undeserved (Bailey 181-182). When he reaches his son, he kisses him on his cheeks and orders his servants to clothe the son with, "The best robe", place a signet ring on his finger, and put sandals on his feet—all signs of honor, authority, acceptance, and freedom. With everyone watching this feat, the father was telling the community to welcome his son, just as he was accepting him back into his own home (Bailey, 182-185). These were radical actions compared to letting the son face the consequences of his actions and then beg, on his knees, for forgiveness from his father, which was the standard expectation of the time (Hultgren, 78).

Furthering the astonishing love, the father throws the “lost son” a banquet and slaughters the fatted calf, an event specially reserved for honored guests and one which would invite the whole Jewish community to the family’s estate (proving, without a doubt, that the son was accepted back into the family unit) (Bailey, 186-187; Hultgren, 80). This was drastically different from the cultural norm of making the son work to regain honor and earn a kinship to the family unit. All the punishment and condemnation that the younger son deserved was replaced with compassion, grace, and honest acceptance from his father (Bailey, 187; Hultgren, 86).

At this point, the older brother is brought into the parable. He is walking back to the family home after a long day of working in the fields, when he hears the music and sees dancing. Immediately, he asks what the family is celebrating, but when he learns that his brother has returned and that the banquet is to welcome him into the family unit, the older brother becomes angry and jealous (he even refuses to go into the celebration) (Hultgren, 80). According to Jewish culture, the eldest son was supposed to serve as a host by immediately entering and start to oversee the welfare of the guests—there was no questioning the head of the household; sons simply performed their duties out of sheer respect. The attitude of the older son shows a dysfunctional relationship with his father (Bailey, 193-195; Hultgren 81). Traditionally, the eldest son was supposed to act in ways that clearly depict him as the next head of the family, but in this parable the opposite is clearly shown (Bailey, 195).

While the son is continuing his disobedience and refusing to enter the celebration, the father leaves the party and tries to resolve the issue. The older brother immediately starts to publically argue with his father and complains that no celebration has been provided for him. He claims that he has been more than faithful to his father and openly degrades his father by neglecting to use his title and implying that “your (the father’s) son” was not his brother. Again

this shows a brokenness to the father/son relationship and negates the traditional respect that is assumed and expected of a leader in Jewish culture (Bailey 195-199; Hultgren, 81).

Again, the father shows amazing compassion and grace—breaking the cultural norms and proving that despite how shocking his decisions were, they were just. Neither of the sons deserved nonjudgmental, fair, patient, kind, and loving responses, yet the father showed grace to both of them. He treated them equally despite the different circumstances (one son who physically abandons the father, and one who belittles and degrades him). Both sons disrespected and shamed the father, but the father showed unprecedented love unlike anything Middle Eastern (and especially Jewish) culture would recognize (Bailey 202-203). The father truly exemplifies the message Jesus is trying to convey-- humanity represents the sons and God's love is accurately depicted in the depiction of the father's love; it surpasses all understanding and it shatters cultural norms (Hultgren, 86).

Appendix K: Transcript of Paragraph-Thesis Connection Intervention

T: Okay, so you're saying this issue is present and must be dealt with.

S: uh huh

T: Reiterate why you want to deal with this issue? Because that's going to make the paragraph really strong.

S: So why, so back to the thesis pretty much

T: Yeah, just point it back to the thesis

S: This issue that is present must be dealt with because umm isolated umm people umm I guess will cause an issue in global umm cause a global issue between countries if people are isolated?

T: Yeah, or who have umm very strong ideological beliefs and are not willing to compromise, maybe?

S: Okay, yeah

S: So if they have strong ideological beliefs or are strong against changing, then they would be umm What would that result in?

T: So if they have stronger ideological beliefs?

S: yeah

T: Well if two countries have trouble agreeing, they're not going to be able to compromise as much right?

S: So if I talk about the global issue, would that sort of relate to the thesis?

T: yeah, yeah I mean as long as you connect it back to umm the internet has contributed to this maybe umm cause that's what your thesis is saying

S: yeah

T: umm (reads sentence quickly) yeah as long as you say, you know because of the internet and society's problem with becoming isolated or something like that

S: So could I say "this issue caused by the internet is present?"

T: uh huh yeah.