THE WRITING LAB

...FROM THE EDITOR...

When we pause to examine why one-to-one tutoring is so effective, we often note the power of individualizing, working with each student in terms of that student's needs, background, and—among other unique characteristics—mode of learning. This issue of the newsletter includes several articles on multiple intelligences and how they influence the ways we can respond differently to students in terms of how each one learns best. Libby Miles and her tutors help us explore the various intelligences and ways they enter into tutorial dialogue; Denise Stephenson introduces us to using manipulative toys in tutorials, and one of her tutors, Sarah Hochstetler, relates her experiences with incorporating such toys in her work with students. A far-from-unique aspect of these articles is the indication of how directors and tutors collaborate, working together to learn and then to share their insights and knowledge with the rest of us.

Sarah Landis offers a different perspective, from the student's chair in the tutorial, to remind us of what students seek from tutors. Don Foran discusses adding reading assistance in his writing center, and Peter Vandenberg reviews a new book focused on writing centers, *Stories from the Center*.

• *Muriel Harris, editor*

...INSIDE...

Exploring multiple intelligences in the writing center

In the never-ending quest to meet students where they are, the writing center community has begun investigating the implications of multiple intelligence theory (see Gardner 1993). Threads on the WCenter listserv (subject heading, "Theorizing, Reply" in February, 2000, and subject heading, "Learning Styles and Tutoring Styles" in September, 2000), for example, have discussed the implications of how our own learning styles might reinforce only one tutoring style. Other threads and conference workshops have introduced techniques for tutoring with alternative materials such as blocks and sculpting clay. In this context, we began to wonder if we were doing enough in our own writing center to reach students whose most prevalent intelligences were not linguistic; we suspected not, and we set out to do better.

To this end, our staff has embarked on an exploration of multiple intelligences, learning styles, and approaches to tutoring. Each staff member chose one of the most widely accepted intelligences articulated by Gardner: bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, linguistic, logical-mathematical, musical,

and spatial. We suspected we were already working well with linguistically-intelligent students, so we focused our attention on the other six. After researching what each intelligence might entail, we speculated how tutors might recognize it in a writer. Of course, instant "diagnoses" are neither possible (how could something so complex be determined in such a short time?) nor desirable (what if we "diagnose" incorrectly?); we nonetheless found some cues that suggested how we

might guide students through the session. We also found that the appropriate path might diverge from conventional writing center wisdom, so we added caveats. The tentative findings of our explorations follow.

Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence
In general

Students with bodily-kinesthetic intelligence show great skill in using their bodies to express ideas and feelings, and they use their hands to create or alter things. They are hands-on learners who may express themselves energetically and dramatically. They think and learn best when their bodies are in motion—toe-tapping, fidgeting, gesturing, and mimicking. Their instinct is to touch what they see to fully understand it. They like to take things apart and rebuild them. While thinking or working, bodily-kinesthetic learners experience a variety of physical sensations because they are so tactile and because they are so sensitively attuned to muscle and nerve activity. Also known as physical learners, students with bodily-kinesthetic intelligence often excel in sports, crafts, and dancing. They exhibit excellent coordination, balance, and dexterity.

What to look for

Bodily-kinesthetic learners may fidget while reading; when they come into the writing center, they may appear unable to sit still. Because words may have to *feel* right, they may have poor spelling skills. When speaking, these learners tend to imitate others' mannerisms and behavior well, and they may stand very close when speaking or listening. They may bring drafts that appear to have been through the ringer—they have to touch the paper every time they attempt to explain, question, or rework a particular section. Bodily-kinesthetic writers may like to move objects around to remember and learn them because they think in patterns of motion and remember physical actions.

What to do in a session

The goal is to get the student *moving* to stimulate the different tactile capacities. Allow the students time to depict their brainstorming/thinking/writing processes, and offer them different tools and ways to write: colored blocks, large pieces of paper, etc. Encourage them to take sections of their papers and move them around the table, perhaps by standing up.

Caveats

If they are fidgeting or in motion, kinesthetic learners are at risk of being misread as not paying attention, not putting in enough effort, or simply not showing interest. But if allowed to work with "hands-on" materials, kinesthetic learners might take beneficial activities home from the session. Bodily-kinesthetic learners can often bring a new linguistic layer to their writing when allowed to express their ideas in a "hands-on" fashion.

Interpersonal intelligence
In general

Writers who are highly social, who are empathetic and in tune with others' feelings are probably interpersonally intelligent. Interpersonal learners tend to be pragmatic; they are the students who are good at "doing school." They aren't necessarily those students with the best grades, but rather the students with good grades (or better) while excelling in social relationships and interactions with peers, tutors, and teachers.

What to look for

Interpersonal learners are likely to have a keen sense of audience, not only the audience for whom the piece is written, but also the tutor-as-audience. As a result, they are likely to ask, "Do you think this sentence works?" or "How can I achieve 'x' better?" In addition, highly interpersonal writers are probably more attuned to the potential consequences of their writing, including but not limited to grades. These learners often excel in the one-to-one setting, and are likely to be actively engaged in the session—responding to you and your responses. In other words, interpersonal

learners are tailor-made for the typical tutoring scenario.

What to do in a session

A collaborative approach is most important. Highly interpersonal writers do not necessarily have a correspondingly high degree of linguistic intelligence, but they do have a heightened awareness of the effects of their writing. As a result, they are less likely to be satisfied with a very directive style of tutoring. Interpersonal learners will likely want to engage a tutor in a dynamic session which strikes a balance between response and suggestion. It is also likely that more time might be spent discussing the student's text rather than actually working on it, even if the writer is clearly beyond brainstorming. It is important to allow this to happen because interpersonal learners learn through interaction with others, and that involves a lot of talk.

Caveats

The greatest potential traps of working with interpersonal learners spring from the very strengths these writers bring to the center. Interpersonal writers are empathetic and highly perceptive. This can turn into a limitation if the writer is *too* focused on audience response. Be especially watchful for evaluative questions: "do you think my teacher will like it?" or, "how would you grade this?" Similarly, interpersonal learners can become so focused on the response of others that they cannot "see" their own writing clearly. So while they can keep their audience in mind while writing, and are often able to do so with ease, they may also be crippled by what they imagine their audience will think.

Intrapersonal intelligence
In general

Intrapersonal learners generally possess tremendous self-awareness and the discipline to act according to that understanding. Often perceived as shy, anti-social, or loners, these learners simply work best alone. They tend to have high self-esteem and a strong

sense of self-direction; they are independent rather than anti-social and like to work at their own pace. Through self-reflection, intrapersonal learners strengthen their ability to realistically grasp their own strengths and weaknesses, to learn from their failures and successes, and to articulate their feelings.

What to look for

The quiet, seemingly shy students who timidly approach the writing center may in fact be the intrapersonal learners. Chances are good that their writing will contain a considerable amount of reflection and feeling. Journal writing is a favorite with intrapersonal learners, and may be their signature style. Though they might not seem very social, once intrapersonal learners start writing or talking about their writing, they tend to be expressive and accurate.

What to do in a session

Although they work best alone, intrapersonal learners can also thrive in a tutoring situation because individualized instruction suits their learning style better than classroom instruction. During a session, these students may benefit from reflective exercises; tutors might ask these students to relate a concept to something in their own lives in order to help them understand it, or they might present students with several options and ask them to choose. Given the time to reflect, intrapersonal learners can comprehend and proceed. If time permits, tutors can also ask students to write or revise a passage during the session, and leave them alone to work on it before addressing it together.

Caveats

Try not to be put off or discouraged by the apparent shyness or anti-social first impression of the intrapersonal learner. Because of their independent nature, intrapersonal learners may seem hesitant during the session; but because of that same nature, they will also most likely take what they learn in

the session, reflect on and possibly even research it, and apply the techniques again outside the writing center.

Logical-mathematical intelligence
In general

Students with dominant logical-mathematical intelligence tend to be very organized. They enjoy finding structures within their writing. They like classifying, playing games, measuring, and definition. They tend to distrust ambiguity and may have difficulty approaching writing projects that require the student to complicate, rather than to simplify and regularize.

What to look for

The student's major will be the first clue; often, those with logical-mathematical intelligence study math, computer science, engineering, statistics, and logic. The presence of a calculator, however, is not the only clue. They may tend to analyze their own writing in terms of cause-and-effect relations, if-then clauses, or other formulaic organizational patterns. Further, they may indicate a willingness to categorize and classify, to test hypotheses, or to infer and generalize. Overall organization is not generally a problem with logical-mathematical learners.

What to do in a session

Students with logical-mathematical intelligence often do very well in planning stages. They like sorting processes and classification, so ask such students to categorize ideas from a brainstorming session. Prompt them with quantifying questions, like "what are the three most important ideas in this article?" Or pose a brainteaser engaging the student's critical thinking skills, like "what chain of events occurs when character X takes this action?" Logical-mathematical writers may complete large papers by writing text "chunks," later combining those chunks with transition words in the same way operations such as square roots, multiplication, and division connect equation "chunks."

Caveats

Students with logical-mathematical intelligence may come to the writing center with unrealistic expectations about closure. They have a complex problem, but they may want a simple process or equation for solving it. Tutors give them nudges or hints, while they want clarity and direction. Although providing hard-and-fast rules aren't generally the norm in many writing centers, logical-mathematical learners seem to prefer working with handbooks and handouts, annotated appropriately to situate the rules within their writing projects.

Musical intelligence

In general

Learners with musical intelligence detect and/or express various musical forms. They show sensitivity to rhythm, pitch, and melody. Their intelligence can take on a creative bent, as in performance skills—a good singing voice or a talent for playing an instrument—or it can take on a more critical bent, as in judgement skills—recognizing when a piece sounds "off," or remembering a particular arrangement. Of course, students with musical intelligence can very well show both creative and critical tendencies.

What to look for

Musical learners exhibit several identifying markers: they often hum or sing to themselves, they frequently listen to Walkmans, they enjoy singing or playing instruments, and they may speak or move rhythmically. If students tap rhythmically on the desk while working, if they speak and write lyrically, and if they appear sensitive to environmental noise (howling wind, falling rain), they may well possess musical intelligence. Even if students approach a tutor without demonstrating any such evidence of musical intelligence, tutors can recognize this learning style in a writer's draft. Fluid sentence construction, coherent paragraph organization, and lyrical language often surface as strengths in the writing of those who perceive musically.

What to do in a session

In a sense, the louder, the better when it comes to working with musical learners. They respond well to background music, and may find soothing rhythms in things not exactly musical—rainfall or a computer's hum, for example. Playing classical or other instrumental music during the session might work. Having either the client or the tutor read the paper aloud is particularly effective. In either case, tapping and playing it back for the writer to critique can enable the writer to better recognize effective and ineffective passages, phrases, and transitions. Tapping or clapping out sentence rhythms can help untangle sentences, and to illustrate concepts such as parallel structure, and devising rhyming pneumonic devices can enable a musical learner to master grammar or spelling rules.

Caveats

Musical intelligence manifests itself so differently from the more traditional learning styles that musically-intelligent students often encounter disapproval; as a result, they may resist showcasing their lyrical talents. On the flip side, some musical learners can over-do the lyrical style and create prose that is too poetic for certain academic assignments. What can most complicate standard writing center practice, however, is the potential for distraction and disruption for other students, and tutors, in the writing center. While playing a CD can be very helpful for the musical thinker, it can also prove too intrusive for other learners.

Spatial intelligence

In general

Spatial intelligence entails a strong sense of visual perception. Visual learners read charts, graphs, and maps more comfortably than prose texts; and they comprehend more from pictures than from words when reading. These learners are sensitive to color, shape, and space, as well as to the relationships among these characteristics. Students with spatial intelligence tend to learn and communicate best through images; and they often enjoy artistic activities, mazes, and other visual puzzles.

What to look for

For the lucky tutor, a student may come to a session with a visual representation of his or her idea. More likely, tutors will have to look for more subtle signs. Visually-oriented students tend to draw or doodle in their notebooks, use metaphors, or explain by moving objects around on the desk. They may have difficulty with assignments requiring formal outlines at the beginning; they are better able to conceive of a project through diagramming, illustrating, or performing. After the ideas are on paper, visual learners may find it easier to create an outline and may then find the outline useful if it is seen as a map of the essay for revision.

What to do in a session

Tutors can help students see connections between their ideas by mapping, diagramming, color coding, cutting and pasting (literally), graphing, using flow charts, or using building blocks. Ask students to illustrate their ideas or thoughts, using colored markers on a dry erase board, or with colored blocks to construct a visual representation of their work. Tutors might use the blocks themselves, to model how to construct the structure of a paragraph or essay.

Caveats

Among the possible difficulties is time; if a student has a paper due the next day, such activities may be seem a waste of time. These strategies might be most successful when there is enough time for to build the paper maximizing the spatial learner's strengths over several visits. Some students may feel awkward about drawing, color-coding, or playing with blocks. Tutors must be mindful of this risk, and encourage the student to try something different to see if it works; if it doesn't, move on.

Conclusion

Our exploration has prompted us to

enrich our tutoring environment in two ways: first, by considering how we might use our existing materials differently; and two, by writing a grant to obtain new materials. As a tentative conclusion to this article, we share with you our shopping list with the hope that your center might benefit from it.

Shopping list
• Round tables
• Computers
• Colored, pencils, pens, markers
• Dry Erase boards
• Scissors/paste/tape
• Multi-colored Post-It notes
• Graph paper
• Tape recorder and microphone
• Audiotape Erasers
• Building and/or locking blocks of various sizes, colors, and shapes
• Lincoln Logs, TinkerToys, and/or Legos
• Sculpting clay dough
• Magnetic letters
• Magnetic Poetry/magnetic word kits
• Metal walls, boards, or file cabinets for magnets
• Textured rhythm sticks and "lummi" sticks
• Music CDs

In a short time, we have noticed that we pick up on student cues differently than we used to. "The essay doesn't feel right" now prompts us to consider strategies geared toward a bodily-kinesthetic learner, such as cutting and pasting sections of text on large sheets of paper for moving around. "I just can't see it" suggests more visual strategies, like using multi-colored building blocks to represent parts of the argument. If you already have round tables for walking around with physical learners, or computers for playing musical CDs, or colored pens and pencils for coding different parts of a spatial learner's essay, we encourage you to consider using them differently. And if you are intrigued by any of the other items in our shopping list, or if you think of others we didn't, try to squeeze some room into your budget to purchase a few. We would love to hear how it works, and we hope to share the results of our continuing exploration into facilitating writing through multiple intelligences in the Writing Center.

Libby Miles, Mary Gormley, Christine Fox Volpe, Claire Roche, Elaine Hays, and Stevens Amidon
University of Rhode Island
Providence, RI

——————————————

Works Cited

Armstrong, Thomas. *Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1994.

Gardner, Howard. *Multiple Intelligence: The Theory in Practice*. NY: Basic Books, 1993.

WCenter Archives. [http://lyris.acs.ttu.edu/cgibin lyris.pl?enter= wcenter&text_mode=0&lang=english].

South Central Writing Centers Association

Call for Papers
February 22 -23, 2002
Clear Lake, Texas
"Explorations in Alter Space: Balancing the Traditional with the Transformational"
Keynote Speaker: James Inman

We are interested in exploring those new "alter" spaces that are becoming increasingly common in writing center work. How can we integrate the many changes—technological, pedagogical, and cultural—that are transforming instruction without losing those valued traditional elements that define us?

Please submit one-page proposals for twenty-minute individual presentations or for ninety-minute panel presentations, roundtable discussions, or workshops, with your name, address, affiliation, and email address to: SCWCA Conference, c/o Chloe Diepenbrock, Box 77, University of Houston-Clear Lake, 2700 Bay Area Blvd., Houston, TX 77058. Phone: 281-283-3356 (office); 281-283-3360 (fax); e-mail: Diepenbrock@cl.uh.edu. Deadline for proposals: Postmarked, faxed, or emailed by November 1, 2001. Questions about proposals to Dagmar Stuehrk Corrigan (corrigan@dt.uh.edu) or Chloe Diepenbrock (diepenbrock@cl.uh.edu).

Constructive toys: More than a good time

You walk into a classroom where a conference session is in progress. On the floor sit several women varying in age from early thirties to mid-sixties. Around the room men and women sit at desks or stand at tables. Their hands manipulate sets of building toys, like Legos. As they work, several tutors mill about the room. They stop and talk with the builders. They ask them: What does the red block mean? Why is this side of your building so much larger than the other side? What's the significance to the circular pieces you've created? The room is abuzz with conversation and laughter.

If you weren't at "The Fun of Touching Paragraphs" presentation at the National Writing Centers Conference in Bloomington, Indiana, this scene may sound like the twilight zone. The concept of adults advancing their writing process by building toy structures seems a bit silly. To think that this technique would work in a university is even more bizarre. And yet, our initial findings at Grand Valley State University suggest that playing with constructive toys provides a physical metaphor for writing that encourages student writers to consider and reconsider the form their ideas take. For many students who find writing difficult and abstract, the toys create a playful atmosphere where right and wrong disappear and abstract ideas are manifest concretely. Assigning meaning to the pieces and moving them around in the structure encourages students with strong kinesthetic, spatial, and visual intelligences to make use of these talents in the writing process.

Teaching tutors the technique

To introduce the use of manipulatives, I took the toys to meetings with all of my tutors. I had the tutors brainstorm topics for papers. Then I had them form into groups of three and

pick topics. Each group got a different kind of toy. For the next 15-20 minutes I let them work on building a paper on their topic. I gave them little instruction other than suggesting they make a model of their ideas and pointing out that they could take a few notes if they needed to remember what certain parts represented.

The most typical scenario involved a couple of group members fingering the toys as they started talking about the topic. Suddenly, one person would take charge and establish a modeling principle, such as specific colors representing either certain points or particular structural elements for the piece. For example, anything blue in the project might refer to the ocean, or more abstractly, the blue might be agreement among characters. An example of a structural principle might be a series of yellow connectors that separate the two sides of a compare/contrast essay.

Once an initial principle was established, negotiation would take center stage as group members refined and developed further modeling principles. At this stage, the building became part of the thinking. No longer were the tutors coming up with possible ideas solely out of their heads, but rather the act of putting pieces together was instrumental in the generation of ideas. For example, a toy with only two connections might constrain the number of points to be made or how points in the paper were to be linked. Or the way the toy was used might expand the structure, so a desire to make the model colorful might lead to adding more ideas than the typical three supporting paragraphs.

I did this with five different groups of tutors. In each case, I was amazed at how quickly the activity got underway, at how little time it took to get a

"draft" done, at how much fun they had while they were doing it, at how little resistance there was, and finally, at how the act of building influenced their thinking.

Toys offer learning beyond mere child's play. As witnessed in Sarah Hochstetler's "Tutors' Column" in this issue (pp. 9-10), early skepticism about the use of toys developed into a passion for tutoring and learning among several of the GVSU tutors.

Introducing toys

While several of us are in love with the toys, we find the most difficult aspect of using them is introducing the toys to the uninitiated. There's a fine balance to be struck between explaining toy use so that writers can find ways of expressing their thoughts through this building process and giving too much direction which inhibits the diverse creative possibilities. After a few experiences where students tried to "follow our directions" or figure out what we wanted, we decided to err on the side of too little information. This can be frustrating for tutors who sometimes have trouble keeping the directions minimal. But the advantages outweigh the difficulties.

So how does a tutor introduce the toys? If the student is at the brainstorming stage, the tutor talks about building a paper, saying that there is no right or wrong way to do it. She suggests that the student try to model what he wants to say by putting the toys together in some meaningful way. She says that each piece will probably be assigned a meaning—by color or shape or size. She points out that he can take the toys apart and put them back together a different way if he finds that what he started doesn't work. She has him select a set of toys. And finally, the tutor points out that when the student is done building they will discuss what he's done. This sets up

an expectation that the tutor will help the student see how this helps with the writing of the paper if that isn't clear to the student.

If the student already has a paper, the tutor would follow a similar explanation, but would ask the student to build the paper being worked on. The tutor would stay away from suggesting that the student show the introduction and each body paragraph, which when explained, don't usually lead to much insight since most students use the common terminology of intro, first point . . . conclusion. Instead, the tutor might suggest that the student create the model based on the ideas in the paper.

Usually it only takes fifteen to twenty minutes for a student to build a paper, whether from scratch or modeling one already written. This would leave time even in half-hour tutorials for discussion and notetaking.

Varied uses

One benefit of not providing specific models is that by not setting up this artificial limitation, students are more free to branch off and do wildly different things. Let me offer three such examples:

1) Students may build models that resemble some aspect of the paper's content. One student built a large man out of Zoobs for a paper on body builders. (Zoob pieces are all similar: two-inch long plastic tubes of different colors with varying connector ends.) His initial model of the man seemed to primarily represent the paper structure: he described the head as the introduction and the body as the paper. But then he picked up a second type of toy, the Coinstruction set, and built a muscle mass which explained one of the points of his paper in fine detail. (Coinstruction is a brand name of a manipulative that is a set of connectors used with coins or metal washers.) The second model represented the muscles he would discuss in his paper and led him to de-

velop some of the points he wanted to make about those muscles.

2) Students may construct a narrative for their toy creations, much like children do while playing. But as a student tells the narrative, aspects of the intended paper come to life. For example, a student has built two human figures. When asked about them, she says that one is a healthy person and the other is a person with cancer. She moves the people across her desk and the healthy one stays the same, but the one with cancer picks up more and more cells which she demonstrates by adding pieces as the figure moves. The student explains that cancer is actually abnormal cell growth. She continues to move the figures and describe things that happen to cancer patients which do not happen to healthy people.

3) Students may examine their writing process. "One student used K'Nex to illustrate the chronological movement of his paper—'This is January, when I started; this is February: etc.' Then he dropped one of the marbles from the top of the structure and said, 'This is how it's going now.' The marble of course went to May—paper finished." (Thanks to Meg Carroll who sent me this example over e-mail after attending our workshop in Bloomington.)

These are only a few of the diverse ways students use the toys. If we show students examples, they are likely to imitate ours. And that's exactly what we don't want. If we are vague, they follow their own internal building principles which help them discover connections in the material for their assigned writings. Unlike the constraints many students feel about writing with all of its rules, leaving this an open and creative exercise allows freedom to develop their structures in whatever way their thinking works. Different think-

ing can produce wildly varied, yet valuable results.

Discussion

We've found that at least as important as leaving the prompt open, is the need to discuss both what they've created and how they did so, the process and the product. When a student stops building, the tutor asks the student what he's done. Sometimes that one open question leads to enough information from the student that the only thing the tutor does is ask follow-up questions as they emerge.

Other times, when students don't offer a full description of the meaning of what they've done, we find that questions directed toward the actual building and its creation elicit information about the paper topic that helps a builder/writer develop her thinking further. Tutors ask: "Is there any reason for every other block being green? Why is the circle you've made disconnected from the rest of what you've built? Tell me about this long extension. How did you come up with this part?" Some of this questioning may happen during the building process, especially if the student seems stalled.

When builders explain what they've done, they may suddenly recognize that they've built elements which express their ideas more fluently than they'd imagined. Their unconscious choices made while putting the toys together now reveal nonverbal intelligences, like spatial and kinesthetic. While the builders/writers may not have been consciously aware of the organization or connections they created, once these features are verbalized in discussion they are available to the writing process.

Don't forget to write

In addition to building and talking, it's vital that notes be taken. This might occur during the building, but for most, a few minutes at the end of the discussion is the best time to move from the physical 3-D world into written expression. Some may even want

to make drawings of their structures.

Others will want to capture ways of organizing their ideas or terminology that have come to them while building and talking. A student might say, "I used the silver block to remind me that it took courage to walk into the water the way the woman did in the *Awakening*. Silver is metal, right? And they say it takes metal to do something courageous." Using the word "metal" that way might come to a student because of the availability of the silver Lego block. Making a note about metal representing courage might help the student find a way to use this metaphor in her paper.

In some cases, it can even be useful to have a note-taker for someone while discussing the project. This is especially important for those with language-based learning disabilities who access language through the building and need someone to capture that language for them so they have the words and phrases when they move to drafting the paper. (For more on using such techniques with LD students, see articles by Linda Hecker and Karen Klein.) Taking notes can be useful for other students as well. It may not be as necessary, but it can reduce stress and make movement into the actual writing of the paper easier if someone has taken notes while the student has been casually talking about their ideas.

Why play?

Brain-compatible learning "shows that emotions drive learning" (Upton 11). So how students feel about writing is important. When it comes to any learning task, the more fun it is, the more likely students are to stick with it. If they are more confident they can succeed, they will experience less stress as they work. Many students who come to the writing center have seen the blood-red ink on their papers for years. They don't feel confident because they realize all the little errors teachers will see: punctuation, spelling, word choice, awkward phrasing, sentence fragments and run-ons. But play can diminish such feelings. "Play reduces the stress of anticipating success and failure" (Sylva 71). In *The Physical Eloquence and Biology of Writing*, Robert Ochsner says:

> Simply put, language play makes writing an enjoyable task, and if we enjoy doing something, that satisfaction becomes its own reward. Moreover, quality of writing improves. Students who enjoy writing will practice often, and their work will have a meaningful objective: personal excellence. Thus play becomes its own purpose. (34)

While Ochsner refers to linguistic play, he explores the biological basis of human expression. He says that not only does language come from our bodies but "play seems to originate spontaneously, as a biological activity" (33). What better way to perform language play than by physically manipulating toys? Besides capitalizing on two biological drives—to play and to communicate—toys can diminish inhibitions about writing and give students a sense of control over the process. Not to mention that they broaden the spectrum of intelligences available to the writer. Toys add kinesthetic and spatial intelligences to verbal intelligence. (See Howard Gardner's work on multiple intelligences.)

Add toys today

For many writers, the experience of working with the toys is both serious and fun. Serious because it helps them advance some aspect of their writing process, but fun because the experience itself is enjoyable. It's this combination of seriousness and fun that makes the use of constructive toys one of the best techniques I've found to tutor writing.

Toys return us to the joys of childhood when expectations were low and learning was all part of the game. If you add toys to your writing center, you won't be disappointed.

Denise Stephenson
Grand Valley State University
Allendale, MI

Works Cited

Gardner, Howard. *Frame of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. NY: Basic Books, 1983.

Hecker, Linda. "Walking, Tinkertoys, and Legos: Using Movement and Manipulatives to Help Students Write." *English Journal*. October, 1997: 46-52.

Klein, Karen, and Linda Hecker. "The Write Moves: Cultivating Kinesthetic and Spatial Intelligences in the Writing Process." *Presence of Mind: Writing and the Domain Beyond the Cognitive*. Ed. Alice Glarden Brand and Richard L. Graves. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1994.

Ochsner, Robert S. *Physical Eloquence and the Biology of Writing*. Albany: State University of New York, 1990.

Sylva, Kathy. "Play and Learning." *Biology of Play*. Ed. Barbara Tizard and David Harvey. Lavenham, UK: Lavenham, 1997. 59-73.

Upton, James. "Brain-compatible Learning: The Writing Center Connections." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 23.10 (1999): 11-12.

$\mathcal{T}$UTORS' COLUMN

A *Toy Story*[1]: One seasoned tutor's account of learning through others' toy structures what she had been trying to teach all along

Of course, as an English major, with four years of tutoring writing under my belt, I am an extraordinary writer. My experience as a learner has peaked and my ability to compose rich and concise works has plateaued. Being just a breath away from writing perfection, I never would have thought that a box of multi-colored toys would truly begin my writing journey.

When the director of the Grand Valley State University Writing Center, Denise Stephenson, brought that now sacred box to my tutor meeting, I'm sure I smirked and rolled my eyes. Here I was trying to conduct my weekly gathering with a small group of new tutors and "the boss" arrived with some toys. Denise has always been one for contemporary and alternative ideas, ("Sarah! You must try this new herb for that cold!"), but toys in conjunction with writing? I'll humor her, I thought.

Less than fifteen minutes later, I had modeled an essay I was working on in a theory class. I had literally fashioned my paper out of blocks, into a tangible, three-dimensional structure, using toys one would find in a primary classroom. I looked around the room in disbelief. My fellow tutors had created the most amazing physical renditions of papers. Geoffrey had built a bicycle wheel out of long and connectable Zomes, with the center as the main point of his essay and the spokes extending outward as his many supporting points. He further explained that the "tire" portion represented his thought process in writing, which in this essay brought his ideas "full circle."

My Lego model was a more structural representation of my essay. I used a silver Lego as my thesis and built down. The second layer of blocks from the top were red, to symbolize the attention-grabbing purpose of my introduction. The next layer was green and the following blue, then black. These layers, the green, blue, and black, represented my three main points. Finally, the bottom layer was red again, to show that I re-stated the ideas from my introduction and ended my essay on an exciting note.

I was hooked. What first struck me as a juvenile approach to writing is now my fiery passion. I took our slowly growing collection of toys to one of the classes in which I tutor. These freshman composition students gave me the same look I gave Denise as I explained, just as vaguely, to "build." But they too chose a toy and built their papers. As with all instructional approaches, not everyone "got it" or really saw the merit of this new perspective on writing. For those who did, the results were even better than what appeared during the tutor meeting. Neon-colored toys were arching across desks, blocks were locked together in organized color schemes and students were talking. Yes, talking. They were eager to actually share their realizations about their own writing. To someone who has tutored in over a dozen freshman composition courses, this was as rare as a semester of perfect class attendance. The toys had broken down the walls of anxiety. The students were not afraid to share their ideas. The experience was similar to watching a child eagerly show a building block creation to her parents. I couldn't keep them quiet—and that was the joy of it. I saw students develop the ability to look at their papers from another perspective.

I had reached the top. I saw that exposing these and other writing students to toys created amazing writing results. So we took our show on the road. My new crusade was to sell the toy idea to others in education. Denise, I, and a handful of other tutors took to the conference scene to help others "touch paragraphs" by building their papers. As expected, not everyone liked the idea. There were some teachers of writing who shook their heads with negativity and still others who were just plain combative to the idea. But again, those who built with abandon were wide-eyed with the final results. "Come see my paper!" were the cries from across the room. We had successfully opened new eyes to the toys.

I could go no further in my tutoring greatness. We had brought more people onto our side. Our methods were catching on and people were writing from a new frame of reference. Then I looked again. I saw how the toys had changed me as a writer. It wasn't until the end of about six months of preaching the goodness of toys that I saw how I had grown. My very first meeting with the toys began my journey, but I had just become aware of it.

Back in the fall, when Geoffrey had built the tire of Zomes, I was dumb-

founded that he didn't use a block to represent his thesis. I thought I was way ahead of the game with my silver Lego, when in fact I was behind. In my writing I had a tendency (and sometimes still do) to focus only on the structure of the piece. I would labor over the perfect introduction: a catchy opening line, a brief sentence or two to support my idea and a smooth transition. My toy paper reflected this need for structure. I focused on the size and color of paragraph three instead of the arguing point or overall message. I also avoided reflecting on my writing style. Noting that my paper had come "full circle" would only be shown through matching block shapes or colors, never a verbal realization that my actual writing was moving forward. When I finally saw that my physical structure could branch out, so could my writing. It was a breakthrough for me as a writer to see that a block-by-block structure was not the best way to build.

It was at this point I realized that there are many different methods of writing. I gleaned this from seeing others' toy structures. By seeing that Geoffrey wrote and built differently than I did, many new possibilities in writing opened up. We had each taken a different approach to building our pa-

pers from Denise's vague instructions: "Build a structure to symbolically represent your paper." Although we each took alternative ways of interpreting her instruction, we were each able to achieve the same goal of seeing our papers in a different light from where we started and from each other.

I had always been a strong advocate of Legos for building my papers. This goes back to my need to focus on structure. How can you get any more structured than with an organized set of three sizes of blocks? Stacy, another tutor who loved the toys and spread the word at conferences, showed me the benefits of using other sets of toys for building. We would playfully argue over which was better, my Legos or her Benders, which went in every direction and invited odd structures. I stood by my Legos and she her Benders, until I saw that her structures (again) had more to them than the simple outline of an essay. I challenged my architectural self, and thus my writing style, and gave the Benders a whirl. Soon I had quite a model. Like the many waves of composition students and conference goers, I was excitedly calling others over, "Hey! You've gotta see this!" I had broken my personal mold of building, which would

be later shown, in my writing. The Legos, by nature, had been limiting me, and now I was ready to try something new.

After all this time of introducing others to a new method of growing as writers, I had ignored the lessons. It took watching tutors younger than me and some with less tutoring experience to "see my writing in a new way," just as I had been lecturing to freshman for months. Geoffrey's wheel and Stacy's Benders helped me see what I had been trying to show others, that using toys to build a paper involves a new writing perspective, an invitation to stray from the norm, and tools with which to grow as a writer.

Sarah Hochstetler
Grand Valley State University
Allendale, MI

───────────

[1] The movie title *Toy Story* draws emphasis to the fear of trying new things. When the movie first came out, many people didn't support it because it didn't use traditional animation. Often I hear similar responses to the idea of toys in the classroom. It's too new of an idea and doesn't follow traditional classroom writing methods. Ideas and concepts shouldn't be dismissed just because they're contemporary.

The vulnerable writer

As a writing tutor in training, I was required to visit the writing center with a paper in order to experience a tutoring session from a student perspective. It was not until I visited the writing center with a paper of my own that I was aware of the inherent vulnerability of the writer, any writer—even good writers. Writing is essentially thought made vulnerable; it is the ideas of an individual made accessible to others. Suddenly one's thoughts do not belong exclusively to him or her; they are part of the larger human dialogue, and they are open to evaluation and criticism, acceptance or rejection. It is precisely

in the writing center where writers' "vulnerable thought" makes its debut. Given this reality, I think that perhaps the writing center should be about more than the making of good or better writers. I believe that one of the functions of a healthy writing center is to engage writers in academic conversation, and I think that many students come to the writing center for this reason.

I was disappointed when my own visit to the writing center did not provide this engagement. The tutor read through my paper; she found a few

errors, offered a structural suggestion, and then summed up with "It's a good paper." I had to ask questions to get more out of her: "Does it communicate clearly? Does this part really make sense?" During my observations in the writing center, one of the questions I hear most often asked by students is "Does this make sense?" Behind this question the student is asking is a larger, more fundamental question— "Do you hear me?" The student is trying to establish the two-way communication of academic discourse, and she is asking the tutor whether or not she is coming through loud and clear. What

the student writer needs from the tutor is more than simply assistance in figuring out how to say what it is she wants to say; she also needs the affirmation that she has been heard, and not in any vague terms. I realized that my dissatisfaction with my tutoring session was the fact that I felt I had not been heard; I felt that the tutor had read "good writing," and that was all she saw. I didn't just want help with my writing; I wanted a response to my writing, and I wanted to see how my writing could create a dialogue with others. As the writer, I wanted to talk about what I had written. Based on my observations of other sessions, I see that this is often the case. Many students eagerly delve into the implications of their paper topics, explaining details and elaborating on ideas they don't have room to write on. The tutorial then becomes an academic conversation between the student and the tutor, with the focus for a time shifted away from the writing as a text in need of correction and improvement. Some tutors respond to this with slight annoyance, perceiving it as a time-consuming digression, while others endure it more patiently; the best tutors get caught up in it.

The writer needs not only to be validated in how she writes, but in what she writes. She needs to believe that her act of writing matters, and that what she has to say is heard. I wanted the tutor to notice what I had written and to be curious about what I had to say; at the very least, I wanted her to affirm that she heard what I was saying and not just how well I was saying it. It is not enough that I write well if nothing I write is important to anyone but myself. This is why I believe the writing center must be a place that assists and encourages, but also a place that engages. For many students, the writing center is where the academic dialogue begins, and tutors must remember this and take care not to stifle it.

Sarah E. Landis
Eastern College
St. Davids, PA

Tenure-track Assistant Professor/Writing and Writing Center Director
University of Northern Colorado

Ph.D. in hand or near completion from an accredited institution. Dissertation, publications, or other evidence of preparation in the field required. Evidence of potential for successful teaching required. Writing center experience preferred. Salary and benefits commensurate with qualifications and experience. Teaching duties will include undergraduate and graduate (MA) courses in composition as well as introductory literature classes.

The writing center director's duties (50%) will include administration, supervising tutors, tutoring, liaison work between the writing center and composition classes in the English Department, in the Learning Communities, and in the university. Scholarship and service required.

Complete vacancy announcements posted at http://asweb.unco.edu. Send letter of application and CV (Position #20129) to Joonok Huh, Chair, Department of English, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO 80639. Applications accepted until November 5, or until the position is filled. The University of Northern Colorado is an AA/EO employer and is committed to fostering diversity in its student body, faculty and staff. AA/EO office: Carter Hall 2011.

Calendar for Writing Centers Associations

Feb. 22-23, 2002: South Central Writing Centers Association, in Clear Lake, TX
     Contact: Chloe Diepenbrock, Box 77, University of Houston-Clear Lake, 2700 Bay Area Blvd. Houston, TX 77058. Phone: 281-283-3356 (office); 281-283-3360 (fax); e-mail: Diepenbrock@cl.uh.edu.

April 11-13, 2002: International Writing Centers Association, in Savannah, GA
     Contact: Donna Sewell, Dept. of English, Valdosta State University, Valdosta, GA 31698. Phone: 229-333-5946; fax: 229-259-5529; e-mail: dsewell@valdosta.edu.

Reading well: The key to success in college writing

In my role as director of the writing center at the Evergreen State College, I have had the unique opportunity to interview many students whom faculty have sent to me for rehabilitation. These are students who are at risk of losing credit in one or other of the sixteen-credit interdisciplinary programs for which Evergreen is known and admired.

Since critical thinking is the engine that drives the curriculum, and writing is the vehicle for thought, these students have distinguished themselves by crashing, usually more than once, while attempting to craft college level, thesis-driven, expository essays. After attempting to alleviate some of the anxiety attached to visiting the office of the moral equivalent of a triage nurse, I ask to see the texts that students were attempting to focus on for the seminar paper or linked essay which failed to captivate the student's professor.

In almost every case, the text is either totally bereft of any marking, or, horror of horrors, it is entirely high-lighted, a canvas of fluorescent yellow or green, with nary a squiggle or aster-isk or critical question anywhere in sight.

At this point, I usually grab one of the hundreds of books which adorn my wall, and show the student how, several times each chapter, I have boxed in a thesis or sub-thesis, underlined in two colors a key phrase, written "Here he's universalizing," or "Is this really true? Where's the support for this claim?" or "What is a 'menacing re-cidivist'?" or "See other examples on pages 10, 26, and 51."

Most of the students whose marking of texts is so deficient that, when the times comes for them, at the request of their faculty, to write about an issue or respond to the thesis of a particular au-thor, they are condemned to re-reading the entire text to find something worth writing about, or to searching end-lessly, or more often, futilely, for an idea, a glimmer of which had lodged in their memory when they read without marking, or high-lighted as though everything were important.

I keep copies of short essays on my shelf, like a pharmacist well prepared for flu season, and I dispense an essay to a student and request that she mark the hell out of it ("Get crazy! Really box off the key ideas. Squiggle and as-terisk what's important to remember. Shatter the taboo of writing on the text! Live a little!)

When this therapeutic orgy of text marking has exhausted the student, I ask her what she can tell me about the author's main claim or thesis. I ask what kinds of support the author offers for such a claim. I inquire about what words she should look up in the dictio-nary in order to better understand what is being said. And, I must admit, stu-dents now tend to have a fairly good idea about the text they've desecrated. I see a glimmer of hope in their eyes. They seem almost eager to begin the next class assignment.

We are now ready to discuss listing, free-writing, shaping, and all those things that come *before* drafting a paper.

With luck, the student will return to see me when he or she has a first draft of a paper responding to a well-marked text. It is at this point that I pray the student has read her own paper aloud, perhaps even more than once. That is the next important lesson I feel con-demned to provide.

Don Foran
Evergreen State College
Olympia, WA

Tutor Self-Assessment Tool

If you would like a test to help tutors do some self-assessment of their general tutoring skills, you can request a free sample of the Tutor Evaluation and Self-Assessment Tool (TESAT). Call 1-800-466-2232 or write to

The Cambridge Stratford
Study Skills Institute
8560 Main Street
Williamsville, NY 14221

The test asks the tutor to self-as-sess general tutoring skills such as what they do when greeting a stu-dent, identifying the task, breaking the task into parts, setting the agenda, and so on. The test covers general tutoring skills and is not specifically geared to writing tutors.

Book Review

Briggs, Lynn Craigue, and Meg Woolbright, eds. *Stories from the Center: Connecting Narrative and Theory in the Writing Center.* Urbana: NCTE, 2000, 129 pages. ISBN: 0-8141-4746-1.

Reviewed by Peter Vandenberg (DePaul University, Chicago, IL)

In the Introduction to *Stories from the Center*, editors Lynn Craigue Briggs and Meg Woolbright frame this set of nine short essays as "a collection of rich narratives" in which writers share lived experiences and reflect on them "in terms of current theory" (x). Sensing a lack of story in contemporary scholarship in general, the editors begin with a resistance to what they call "study discourse" in favor of "the language that we use to construct our own lives" (xi). Briggs and Woolbright identify the essays in this volume as "academic narratives," texts that "tangle story and theory inextricably" (xii). The editors divide the contributors' essays into two roughly equal categories: "[o]ne group uses theory as a way to read the story, the other uses story as a way to read the theory" (xii).

That this conspicuously thin postulation is sufficient to secure a contract with NCTE—for a collection of essays that is otherwise as disparate as those in any journal issue—should give all of us pause. In just his second issue as editor of *College Composition and Communication*, Joseph Harris encouraged academic prose "in which writers work to make themselves present in their texts" (*CCC* 45.2, 1994, p. 161). In the seven years since, authors of journal articles and books—in writing center studies and the larger field of rhetoric and composition—have increasingly included personal narrative not simply as a component of their work, but, as Harris has it, "to define and further articulate a critical position, to locate the writer in an ongoing exchange of views and ideas about a subject" (162). One can find evidence of narrative in most journals about the teaching and tutoring of writing, where

attention to the context of teacher-student interaction is unavoidably central to most discussions. And consider the spate of books, already in print when *Stories from the Center* emerged, that have made the telling of stories central: *Teaching Lives*; *Situated Stories; The Personal Narrative: Writing Ourselves as Scholars and Teachers; Narration as Knowledge: Tales of the Teaching Life; Teachers' Reading/Teachers' Lives*; *Coming to Class; Living Rhetoric and Composition: Stories of the Discipline*.

Nonetheless, Briggs and Woolbright's premise reflects a nagging insistence that academic discourse about teaching and tutoring writing resists the telling of stories. I suspect my own experience is similar to that of others who are struggling to keep up with scholarship in writing center studies and the larger field of composition—sometimes you see stories, sometimes you don't. My submission to the editors of one of the books listed above was rejected for "lacking voice"; at about the same time, an essay of mine was accepted by a leading composition theory journal, on the condition that I would revise away the personal narrative with which I began. One could go on with examples and counterexamples, however, much longer than such a discussion would hold interest. Given the increasing appearance of the personal in academic writing, and the well established discussion about its purposes, value, and effects, the scholarship seems to have moved past mere celebration of story toward a consideration of complex questions about it.

If you're becoming impatient with

me already, you may be asking, "What does he mean by *story*?" You may be thinking that something so outwardly "natural" as "storytelling" is precisely the sort of construct not to be taken at face value. You may see narrative, despite its degraded status in the academy, as just another way of ordering experience, no more "honest" or "authentic" than exposition. You may worry, along with Joseph Harris, that the personal too often slides into the confessional (or the radically particular), and therefore fails to serve the purpose of scholarship. You may wonder if any discourse form, favored because it is non-threatening, has enough octane to do the work of social, cultural, or institutional critique. You may fear that an uncritical formulation of "story" risks co-optation by those who would gender textual categories. These are, in fact, precisely the sort of questions and concerns that I scribbled in the margins of the Introduction to *Stories from the Center*, matters to which the editors do not speak, although they have been debated in English studies—in the scholarship surrounding writing center work—for some time now.

Briggs and Woolbright begin—note the book's subtitle—by opposing narrative and "theory" as separate entities requiring *connection*. What they seem to mean by *theory* is not the work of examining the relationships among concepts, definitions, and propositions for the purpose of explaining or predicting, but more simply a kind of writing that doesn't make use of narrative—"exposition" (xi). Such a definition seems to stand in the way of a more complex consideration of "theory"; more important, though, it

obscures a consideration of how narrative might work *as* theory—a central focus of the study of autobiography, a dominant site of inquiry into the personal narrative, for more than a decade. While writing narrative seems to have aided all the authors in working through the problems they define, few of them demonstrate a self-reflexive stance about the function of narrative in their writing. Rather ironically, all nine of the essays in the volume begin with brief, expository introductions that either state a thesis directly or map the text's organization. Except for the contributions by Joseph Janangelo, and Michael Blitz and Mark Hurlbert, the essays do not experiment with or subvert traditional narrative elements; the predominant function of narrative in the volume is to substantiate explicit, argumentative claims. The creative-writing teacher in me found a lot more telling than showing or suggesting here.

Stories from the Center is marketed as a book that "examine[s] the use of narrative in academic writing"; it is, we're told, "a much-needed addition to the literature on pedagogy, writing centers, and composition" (back cover). It seems fair to point out that in terms of defining the function of narrative in scholarly writing, further blurring the basic oppositions set out in the Introduction, or engaging recent theory about narrative, *Stories from the Center* falls short. It also seems fair to point out that some of the essays, although they do relate personal narratives, do not effectively engage current scholarship or move thinking forward in the areas they address. Consider, for example, Patricia A. Dunn's "Marginal Comments on Writers' Texts," which, seemingly frozen in time, culminates in an argument against the five-paragraph essay and "the routine circling in red of 'they' after a singular subject" (39). Or Janice M. Wolff's "Tutoring in the 'Contact Zone,'" which misreads Mary Louise Pratt's description of "autoethnography" as a fledgling appropriation of dominant discourse

rather than the crafty, parodic subversion of oppressive language that Pratt describes ("Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession 91*. New York: MLA, 1991. 33-40). Wolff eventually appropriates Pratt's idea of the "safehouse" to describe the writing tutorial not as the intellectual space Pratt envisions, "where groups can constitute themselves as horizontal, homogeneous, sovereign communities" (40), but a more manageable scene for reproducing the sort of writing the tutor can recognize as praiseworthy. Pratt's essay, published in 1991, is perhaps the most often-cited recent work in English studies, yet Wolff references nothing written after its publication. Lacking attention to the many *Writing Center Journal* articles in the middle 90s that question the writing center's potential to escape the larger institution's legacy of oppression—articles cited elsewhere in this volume—Wolff's narrative, like Dunn's, remains disconnected from theory.

These shortcomings, however, should not obscure the work of several authors whose essays take on important issues with complexity, sustain the scholarly enterprise in writing center studies, and suggest the potential for narrative within it. Drawing on Mikhail Bakhtin's distinction between "utterance" and "sentence," Laura Rogers and Carolyn A. Statler's essay encourages writing center practitioners to see students' "differences and disruptions" (83) not as negative variation but as indicators of and invitations to a broader context for inquiry. More so than any other essay in the volume, Rogers and Statler's shows the possibilities for both narrating and theorizing when focused on local context. The authors mediate between the generalizing effects of theory and the often radical particularity of narrative to understand and respond to the conditions in which they work.

Blitz and Hurlbert, likening the writing center to the "relaxed stimulating environment" (91) of pre-school and

kindergarten, extend the most familiar of writing center occupations, that of figuring the center as a kind of utopian anti-space for the generation and articulation of ideas and stories, one separated from the inconsequential regimen of form and formula that separate students from their lives outside the academy. Stephen Davenport Jukuri's "Negotiating the 'Subject' of Composition" resonates well with Blitz and Hurlbert's "If You have Ghosts." By exploring the differing subjectivities allowed by the classroom and the writing center, Jukuri is able to write, "in the writing center I am in a better position to *experience* what I believe" (66).

Two very strong essays turn up the corner of the writing center rug. In "Carnal Conferencing," Joseph Janangelo, "pursuing a more candid discourse," relates a classic story of exploitation, sex, power, and technology to uncover the "tension and impulse" (99) of sexuality in the writing center. Borrowing from the critique of liberatory pedagogy and feminist border theory, Catherine G. Latterell pokes at one of the field's most sacred of cows, student-centered or "minimalist" tutoring. Such an approach, Latterell contends, masks issues of authority in the writing center by simplifying relationships between students and tutors, and puts students in vulnerable positions by expecting them to order the situation and sustain the dialogue.

Those teaching tutor-training courses may want to consider adopting *Stories from the Center;* it reflects the field's movement from the relatively smooth sailing of the coach-and-process era toward the tangled bank of post-process theory, where all of rhetoric and composition has begun to disembark. These essays would make jumping-off points for discussion or journal writing; those new to the discourse will appreciate the foothold these narratives offer as they begin living and telling writing center stories of their own.

Books for your resource and reference shelves

New APA edition:

Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 5th ed. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 2001. Softcover edition, $23.95.

This important new edition of the APA Manual contains updates, changes, and additional citation formatting for electronic sources. For ordering and other information (including purchase of a style guide for citing electronic sources that can be downloaded online for $9.95), consult the web site for the book: <http://www.apastyle.org> or phone (800)374-2721.

Books

Carbone, Nick. *Writing Online : A Student's Guide to the Internet and World Wide Web*, 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2000. Softcover edition, $15.16

Contents include chapters on writing online, netiquette, the World Wide Web, electronic mail, mailing lists, usenet groups and web forums, MOOs and chat programs, writing web pages, online research.

Cheville, Julie. *Minding the Body: What Student Athletes Know About Learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2001. Softcover edition, $24.00

Dispelling the myth that language is the sole determiner of thought, Cheville explores the implications of academic settings that ignore or devalue the conceptual significance of the body.

Chisholm, Malcolm. *The Internet Guide for Writers: Use the Internet for Writing, Research, and Information*. Oxford: How To Books, 2001. Softcover. (Order from How to Books, Customer Services Dept., Plymbridge Distributors Ltd., Estover Road, Plymouth, PL6 7Pym, England. E-mail: info@howtobooks.co.uk; web site: <http://www.howtobooks.co.uk>).

Contents include sections on how to set up and connect to the Internet, get connected to others (e-mail, newsgroups, chat rooms, conferencing), surf the web, advanced search techniques, online help (OWLs, online writers' circles, reference sites, translators, online publishing, archives, and information services), netiquette, viruses, hoaxes, frauds, and chain letters.

Pytlik, Betty, and Sarah Liggett, Eds. *Preparing College Teachers of Writing: Histories, Theories, Programs, Practice*s. New York: Oxford UP, 2002. $29.95.

The essays in this collection discuss the contexts, structures, development, practices, and evaluation of teaching assistant preparation programs in writing pedagogy, offering a wide variety of programs and suggestions for what kinds of programs best facilitate learning.

Mastering the topic sentence outline program

Since 1998 our Broward Community College Writing Lab has been field-testing a computer-based program that offers training for the topic sentence outline. The program is rich in examples and exercises, offering 98 outlines in all: 20 interactive model outlines, 57 interactive flawed outlines to analyze, 10 outlines explaining common flaws, and 11 interactive scrambled themes to organize.

The materials are designed especially for easy reading on a monitor, with large fonts, short sentences and words, and color highlighting. Students respond with a mouse click or drag and drop. Feedback is item-specific, and every flawed outline example ends with a corrected re-write.

Our students have responded well to the program and ask for other pro-grams like it. On average, 500-600 students per term use the program for anywhere from 1-4 hours. The author, Dave Shaw, a writing teacher at BCC, is offering the full version free for a one-term trial. He can be reached at dshaw@broward.cc.fl.us.

Marlene Cole
Broward Community College
Ft. Lauderdale, FL

International Writing Centers Association Conference/co-host: Southeastern Writing Centers Association

Call for Proposals
April 11-13, 2002
Savannah, Georgia
"The Art of Writing Centers"
Keynote Speaker: Wendy Bishop

Please use the online submission form <http://iwca.syr.edu/conference>, or send a one-page proposal (about 250 words) for twenty-minute presentations or for ninety-minute panels, roundtables, or workshops to the program chair: Donna N. Sewell, Dept. of English, Valdosta State University, Valdosta, GA 31698. Phone: 229-333-5946; fax: 229-259-5529; e-mail: dsewell@valdosta.edu. Online and faxed proposals are due by midnight (Eastern Standard Time) on Nov. 19, 2001. Proposals sent via postal mail must be postmarked by Nov. 13, 2001.

National Conference on Peer Tutoring in Writing

November 2-4, 2001
Allentown, PA
"Writing From the Center"

To register, contact Linda Miller at 484-664-3316 or lmiller@muhlenberg.edu. Registration forms are on-line at <http://www.muhlenberg.edu/students/writing/index.html>. Registration fees: students $40.00; faculty/administrators $75.00.

THE WRITING LAB
N E W S L E T T E R

Muriel Harris, editor
Department of English
Purdue University
1356 Heavilon Hall
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1356

Address Service Requested