Appendix A

Survey Results: Writing Fellow and Graduate Writing Consultant Perceptions of Antiracist Pedagogy

Although I had personally observed positive results from the changes made to the educational programs for writing tutors at my institutions, and although I had received many positive comments about the focus of our education though casual comments, required reflections, and midterm and final course evaluations, I also wanted to survey both groups further about their responses to these discussions. I was curious about how much writing tutors may or may not internalize this information and apply it in tutoring sessions. In spring semester 2016, I conducted a survey consisting of a combination of simple ranking questions (with optional essay responses) and responses to three hypothetical scenarios. I received survey responses from 24 of 26 graduate writing consultants (a response rate of 92%) and 26 of 37 active undergraduate writing fellows (a response rate of 70%).

Overwhelmingly, both groups reported that they learned a great deal from the readings about bias and racism and found the readings and activities to be crucial to the understanding of their roles as writing tutors. They also commented that these topics produced new strategies for their practice, revelations in their thinking, and validation of their own experience. When asked about how they were prepared for discussions about race, racism, and bias, there was a notable difference between writing fellow responses and those of graduate writing consultants. Writing fellows pointed to discussions being helpful generally, but tended also to choose a few key activities they felt reinforced the discussions. Graduate writing consultants also pointed to key activities, but were more likely to say things like, “I can’t think of a particular example,” often followed by a description about how “the general culture of our writing center,” “the program

more generally" and "the philosophy of the program in general" contributed to their understanding of their role. In my opinion, this is an ideal situation, in which writing consultants are seeing all of the tutoring practices, activities, readings, and experiences as holistically integrated and interrelated. Building on this, in another open response, graduate writing consultants commented on the fluidity between their training and experiences as a consultant and their own writing and teaching: that being a consultant has improved their own writing, freed up their writing processes, broadened their ideas about "good" writing, and encouraged them to reconsider writing assignments they give as instructors, explain conventions more transparently, and respond to student writing with more understanding.

The survey results were, for me, a powerful validation of the importance of prioritizing antiracist pedagogy and approaches in writing tutor education programs.

Summary: Survey Responses

Q: Did anything (readings, discussion, activities, etc.) from [your initial education or follow-up meetings] make you think about bias or racism in academic writing or about bias in the teaching of academic writing?

	It made me realize something entirely new.	It gave me a new perspective or context for something I already understood.	No, it did not.
Writing Fellows	69%	31%	0%
Graduate Writing Consultants[1]	33%	63%	4%

Q: Did the readings about racism in language and writing feedback (i.e., readings about the myth of "standard" English, bias in writing tutoring/teaching, perceptions about non-native English speakers, etc.) influence your approach to or understanding of your role [as a writing fellow/graduate writing consultant]?

	Very much	Somewhat	Neutral/not	Not much	Not at all

[1] Note the responses to the first two questions are roughly inverted, which makes sense due to experience as well as the fact that many of the graduate students coming from humanities and social sciences study racism and its effects in-depth in their academic work. Also note that due to the numbers involved, 4% = one response.

			sure		
Writing Fellows	54%	38%	4%	4%	0%
Graduate Writing Consultants	42%	50%	8%	0	0

Q: Do you think writing tutor education and training should include discussion of how white supremacy affects the tutoring/teaching of writing?

	It's fundamental	Important but not necessary	Neutral/not sure	Not very important	Should not be included
Writing Fellows	67%	24%	9%	0	0
Graduate Writing Consultants	83%	4%	13%		

Q: Whether or not you have personally discussed race in tutoring sessions, how important was it to you for your own knowledge or comfort in the program to have discussions on these topics included in your preparation as a writing consultant?

	Very important	Important	Neutral/not sure	Not very important	Not important at all
Graduate Writing Consultants[2]	73%	23%	4%	0%	0%

Representative Comments from Open Responses by Writing Fellows

Revelation	"I had not considered how much the discourse of 'appropriate language' in the academy was completely eliding many students' cultural worlds and ways of communication, and making value judgements about different people's ways of communicating in writing. Studying this in the WF course was huge for me."
Revelation, internalization	"[The Young article] taught me two things: 1) this bias against English dialects from POC is real and deep and 2) I, a woman of color, even held it to some extent."
Revelation, internalization	"Before taking the Writing Fellows seminar, I loved to make fun of typos, grammatical mistakes, misspellings, etc. It was a favorite pastime of my family. This is ironic, since my grandfather, a first-generation immigrant from China, writes far from perfectly, but we saw no disconnect between our respect for him and our snobbiness about mistakes in writing. The

[2] Due to an error in my survey design, writing fellows were not asked this question.

	idea that any writing was good, as long as it clearly communicated what the author wanted to say, was a revelation to me."
Strategies	"The fellowship made me think more about non-controversial ways to confront these issues and figure out ways to make academics more equitable for all. [...] Essentially, I find myself thinking a lot more about barriers to success/entrance for various groups of people and simple ways to positively impact these situations."
Strategies	"I think the most important thing the training did was to call our attention to the issues of race and racism that we might encounter in student papers. Because of this, I was more attuned to these questions and prepared to talk to students about how they chose to address it."
Relation between antiracist theory and tutoring practice	"What prepared me best was that while I was thinking about racial discussions outside of my writing fellows training already, I wouldn't have been brave enough to know that these kinds of thought was also welcome IN the session and the program. Thus, what prepared me most was seeing Kristina and other students model that racial discussions were welcome and really relevant to writing tutoring."
Validation	"It gave me the words to the frustration I've experienced"
Validation	"I think the reading about the myth of standard English was the reading that helped me label my own experiences with learning about English."
Validation	"[The Williams article] showed me that even when your peers or people of authority ridicule or deny your accounts of racism, that doesn't make you less entitled to feel hurt or angry; the denial makes their opinion/perception wrong, not yours. I remember this piece whenever I am experiencing something that I instinctively know (most) other people won't believe."

Summary: Scenarios & Responses

In addition to asking about writing fellows and graduate writing consultants to reflect on their preparation in regard to topics of race, racism, and bias related to writing, they were also asked to respond to three hypothetical scenarios based on real-life examples. Before discussing the responses, I want to acknowledge two complications in the way these were presented and included. First, I made a deliberate decision not to state the race or gender of any of the three hypothetical students or to ask the race of the tutors, even though the races of the individuals

involved are obviously major factors. My reasons were that there is no way to know for sure without asking what race a person identifies with, and I wanted to see what might result from not stating the race. However, looking back I think I should have stated the races of the students, even if I acknowledge it is an assumption; after all, I am relatively sure the tutors made these assumptions anyway. One writing fellow did point out that the race of the writer would affect their responses to the students, and I was surprised more tutors did not point this out. The other complication is that a few tutors (both groups) also pointed out that it is much easier to analyze a scenario on paper than it is to react in the moment, and that it's easier to describe what they would like to think they would do than what they might actually do. Undoubtedly this is the case! Yet it seems worthwhile to practice thinking through these scenarios.

Scenario #1: You are meeting with a student in a community health course. The paper assignment is to research a public health problem, identify an affected population, and propose an intervention to address the problem. The student has written about a public health problem that more seriously affects a population of color than white populations, and the student has listed racial discrimination as a factor, but in discussing the paper you believe the student has greatly simplified the effects of racism on the population discussed in order to allow the suggested intervention more easily fit the problem. Additionally, there seem to be assumptions made about education levels of the population, as well as their background knowledge of the health problem discussed, that are not supported by any supplied data. Do you address this with the writer? If so, what would you focus on, what would your approach be, and how would you bring this up? If not, why would you avoid the topic?

In the first scenario, a student writer has two problems that could be addressed: they are simplifying the effects of racism to fit a public health solution they have proposed, and they are making assumptions about the population (a racial minority) they are focused on. These two problems are very common for introductory community health papers at my institution. Very generally speaking, both writing fellows and graduate writing consultants tended to handle the situation as a conversation, using established writing tutoring strategies such as asking questions,

focusing on evidence and logic, dramatizing the presence of a reader, attending to the student's responses, validating the good parts of the paper, recognizing the messiness of writing about complex topics, etc. However, there were distinctive nuances between the two groups' approaches.

Most distinctly, while asking questions was an important strategy for both groups, the way they expressed this was different:

Strategies for Scenario 1:

Graduate writing consultants	**Writing Fellows**
Start off by asking questions (21); specifically used some variation on the phrase "I would start by asking the student questions," gave examples of what questions they might ask; ask the student to explain or clarify, ask why and how questions, and ask probing questions	ask for some kind of clarification (5)
Directly or explicitly voice their concerns (6), but only after lengthy session of questions and discussion, in order to emphasize a point or push the student to a realization.	ask the student to explain an idea further (3)
	have student explain where their sources came from (3)
	specified a particular question or task they would ask the student to do (3)

Graduate writing consultants overwhelmingly (21 of 23) started off by asking questions, and described multiple strategies and types of questions within the same response. By contrast, while asking students about their papers ranked high on the strategies writing fellows would use, they were less likely to use the exact phrase "I would start by asking the student questions" and did not use multiple tactics. As a result, graduate writing consultant questions appeared to be more

probing and in-depth, whereas many writing fellows' questions seemed to be somewhat more task-oriented or to get the student to realize something specific rather than a more general problem with the paper. Graduate writing consultants were also more likely to use multiple strategies in their answers and try different techniques (if this didn't work, then I would do this, etc), as well as to more thoroughly imagine what moves the conversation might make. This difference is probably due to experience, but one underlying factor could be that writing fellows read the papers in advance and therefore are more likely to come into the session with an agenda in mind, even though we emphasize remaining open to input and change based on the student's response.

None of the graduate writing consultants said they would not bring up the topic, although two suggested they might back off and return to the topic later. Three writing fellows, by contrast, admitted there might be a reason they would not bring it up, whether it just depended on certain aspects of the situation or relationship/rapport between the student and the writing fellow, or because a tutor of color might not feel comfortable bringing it up if they felt vulnerable to attack. Overall, it appeared that graduate writing consultants feel more empowered to question the student extensively and seemed to reason that questions would make the student less likely to be defensive than directly addressing the issues, while writing fellows seemed more likely to worry that their relationship with the student might not be able to withstand bringing the topic up. This could be due to a number of factors, including the greater experience and level of authority of graduate writing consultants and the closer peer relationship between writing fellows and their students.

Scenario #2: You are meeting with a student enrolled in a sociology course on urban spaces. The assignment states that anecdotes and personal experience can be used sparingly in the paper in

addition to research. The student you are meeting with has opened their paper with an anecdote about how "we all know" there are "bad" and "good" neighborhoods in cities, and describes how their parents "would always lock the car doors when driving through a colored [sic] neighborhood." This anecdote is not troubled or questioned in the paper, but rather is used to introduce a discussion on urban poverty. Do you address this with the writer? If so, what would you focus on, what would your approach be, and how would you bring this up? If not, why would you avoid the topic?

In the second scenario, the student writer has used a problematic (and unnecessary) anecdote to introduce a paper about urban policy. The anecdote starts with a broad generalization about the audience, uses offensive language, and makes untroubled associations between race, poverty, and danger.

As with the previous anecdote, both groups of writing tutors used established tutoring techniques to address the situation, although the emphasis was different. In contrast to the first scenario, everyone agreed they would address this issue, although there was more of an obvious acknowledgment that the student might take offense and the discussion would need to be tactful. In terms of rapport, several graduate writing consultants talked about trying to determine whether the statements were intentionally racist or not (and generally assumed the racism was unintentional and that the student would want to change it).

Strategies for Scenario 2:

Graduate Writing Consultants	**Writing Fellows**
Ask questions (13)	Focus on the importance of striking the right tone in the introduction and making sure it connected to the rest of the paper (10)
Ask the student what they mean by "we" or the phrase "we all know" (12)	Suggest removing the anecdote as irrelevant, without further suggestions (3)
Directly address the word "colored" used in the paper and explain the historical context and problems inherent to using that word (9)	Relate to the writer by saying their parents did the same thing, but discuss why it was a problem (1)

Directly address the subject, using words such as “tell” or “explain” instead of or in combination with “ask” (7)	Tell the student they were from one of the inner city neighborhoods the writer speaks disrespectfully of (1)
Significant repetition of the word “specificity” used to mean several things: avoiding generalizations overall, not assuming one’s personal experience is universal, and being deliberate with one’s language (9)	
Spend time talking about different ways to introduce the paper (5)	
Ask who the audience was and try to get the student to imagine what a reader with a different experience might think of the anecdote (4)	
Try to determine whether the student was being intentionally or unintentionally racist (3)	

In contrast to the first scenario, although most graduate writing consultants still talked about asking the student questions, they also seemed more likely to explain or tell the student about the problematic nature of the anecdote or the historical context of the words the student uses. The primary concern for graduate writing consultants seemed to be about making assumptions about both the audience of the paper and the implications of the story. Writing fellows, by contrast, might address various aspects about generality versus specificity, logic, objectivity, making assumptions about the audience, and so on, but the unifying factor was the relationship between the anecdote and the rest of the paper. This difference in focus could be attributed to the fact that the writing fellow reads the paper in advance and thus already knows before the meeting whether or not the anecdote relates to the rest of the paper, whereas a graduate writing consultant might end up spending most or all of the session just on the introduction before or without moving to the rest of the paper.

One final difference, though slight, is about recommendations or solutions to this problem. Although no one thought the anecdote should go unchallenged, three writing fellows said they might recommend removing the introduction rather than changing it in some way. By slight contrast, none of the graduate writing consultants suggested removing the anecdote without any other suggestion (though one person said they hoped the writer would decide to remove it). Instead, they said they would spend time talking about different ways to introduce the topic or different stories they could use. While this would obviously involve removing the anecdote, it would engage the student in a process of revision to more critically examine the stories they tell. Others suggested keeping the anecdote but troubling that experience with insight the student had gained through experience and research. In each of these descriptions, graduate writing consultants were more likely to push the student to reconsider the anecdote more extensively, while writing fellows were more likely to suggest the student just remove the anecdote.

Scenario #3: You are meeting with a student enrolled in a large lecture course on global human rights. The paper assignment is to discuss two or more class texts in relation to each other; the professor has not indicated one way or another their attitude toward the use of personal experience in the paper. The student you are meeting with has brought only the paper assignment, not a draft. When you begin talking with the student, they begin to cry. They say that the material in the course is difficult to deal with on a purely intellectual level, because they have personal experiences of racism and a family history of oppression under a colonial regime. The student describes how they keep trying to write about the material but get stuck because the structure of the paper feels too rigid for what they really want to say. What is your approach with this student? How do you address this situation? What factors are involved in how you address it?

Unlike the prior two scenarios, this one involves a student of color experiencing alienation in the context of an academic approach to a real-life situation. The strategies used by

graduate writing consultants and writing fellows were much more similar in this case than the previous ones.

Strategies for Scenario 3:

Graduate Writing Consultants	Writing Fellows
Validate the students' feelings and listen to them before moving on (15)	Validate the students' feelings and listen to them before moving on (14)
Encourage student to ask professor if including personal experience was allowed in the paper (15)	Encourage student to ask professor if including personal experience was allowed in the paper (14)
Encourage the student to talk out "what they really wanted to say" or to explain, freewrite, or outline what they would write if there were no assignment or restrictions (13)	Encourage the student to talk out "what they really wanted to say" or to explain, freewrite, or outline what they would write if there were no assignment or restrictions (12)
Have the student discuss personal experience along with class material they were most drawn to, in order to figure out ways to write a paper that could address the textual analysis required for the paper while also including the personal experiences the student talked about (15)	Have the student discuss personal experience along with class material they were most drawn to, in order to figure out ways to write a paper that could address the textual analysis required for the paper while also including the personal experiences the student talked about (14)
Repeatedly check in to make sure student comfortable writing about/discussing certain topics (9)	Repeatedly check in to make sure student comfortable writing about/discussing certain topics (6)
Specifically validate the ideas that personal experiences are relevant to class and should be expressed (5)	Specifically validate the ideas that personal experiences are relevant to class and should be expressed (6)
Offer to reschedule or have follow-up meetings (3)	Offer to reschedule or have follow-up meetings (4)
Suggest different outlets for their writing, including student publications[3] (4)	Suggest different outlets for their writing, including student publications (1)

[3] I have mixed feelings about this suggestion. Initially, I was not in favor of the idea, because my hope is that we can make academic writing more expansive, experimental. But realistically, it could be a great suggestion for a student who might not have considered that ways they can speak to a broader audience or who don't feel comfortable bearing the burden of taking a major risk with academic writing. The latter is especially compelling, as students of color tend to bear more of this kind of burden.

Lay out different options for the student to choose from or outline two different papers (5)	Offer to clarify the assignment with the professor or speak to them on the student's behalf (10)

Overall, writing fellows and graduate writing consultants took similar approaches in this situation, and their primary strategies focused on validating and listening to the student writer, followed by working on ways that the writer can reconcile their personal experiences with the material from the class, with an emphasis on reassuring the student that academic writing can include personal experiences. In response to this scenario, writing fellows were more likely than in the other two scenarios to have an expansive set of strategies and to attempt to address the situation in multiple ways. Descriptions of their interactions with this writer were much more empathetic and included more if/then language, allowing them to explore the situation more thoroughly. In this way, writing fellows' responses were more similar to graduate writing consultants' responses than they were in the other scenarios, in that both imagined the interaction thoroughly and had similar strategies.

The only significant difference seemed to be related to the roles and experiences the two groups played. Only graduate writing consultants engaged significantly in broadening the idea of a writing process, by trying such strategies as laying out different options for the student to choose from, outlining two different papers, suggesting the possibility of choosing another topic that was less painful if they wanted to, suggesting that analysis and writing could sometimes be a good way to process difficult situations, or talking about how academic writing is often informed or motivated by personal experience and emotions, even if those were not apparent in the final product. By contrast, several writing fellows offered to clarify the assignment with the professor or speak to them on the student's behalf, which makes sense given that writing fellows clarify

assignments with professors regularly as part of their job and often describe their role as being a liaison between student and professor.