



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

Volume 16, Numbers 4-5

Dec. 1991/ Jan. 1992

...from the editor....

As you'll notice, this is a double issue of the newsletter, a departure offered for several reasons. First, the extra pages allow for some longer articles, and second, the holiday season during December and January leaves us with less time for professional reading. Now you have only one issue instead of two to catch up with during a period of numerous other claims on your time. And third, this is a blatant attempt to hold down costs.

Newsletter expenses have risen at a frightening rate, and since this has to be a self-sufficient publication, we are trying as long as possible to put off the inevitable price increase looming on the horizon. Right now, because of rising costs of printing and mailing, the news-letter has a precarious, touch-and-go existence. So, if you like the occasional double issue of the newsletter, speak up, and we'll try it again some time.

Have a pleasant and happy holiday season. May it include some R & R too!

•Muriel Harris, editor

....inside....

Collaboration, Control, and the Idea of a Writing Center

•Andrea Lunsford 1

Body Language: The Non-verbal Path to Success in the Writing Center

•Sharon Williams 6

Announcements 8

Tutors' Column •Carol O'Flaherty 9

Learning Styles: Issues, Questions, and the Roles of the Writing Center Tutor

•Cindy Johaneck 10

Right Brain Processing and Learning Disabilities: Conclusions Not to Reach in the Writing Center

•Margaret-Rose Marek 14

Labels: Are They Necessarily Evil?

•Mary Jane Schramm 19

Collaboration, Control, and the Idea of a Writing Center

The triple focus of my title reflects some problems I've been concentrating on as I've thought about and prepared this essay. I'll try as I go along to illuminate-or at least to complicate-each of these foci, and I'll conclude by sketching in what I see as a particularly compelling idea of a writing center, one informed by collaboration and, I hope, attuned to diversity.

As you may know, I've recently written a book on collaboration, in collaboration with my dearest friend and author Lisa Ede. Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives in Collaborative Writing was six years in the research and writing, so I naturally gravitate to principles of collaboration.

Yet it's interesting to me to note that when Lisa and I began our research (see "Why Write... Together?"), we didn't even use the term "collaboration"; we identified our subjects as "co- and group-writing." And when we presented our first

paper on the subject at the 1985 Conference on College Composition and Communication meeting, ours was the only such paper at the conference, ours the only presentation with "collaboration" in the title, Now, as you know, the word is everywhere, in every journal, every conference program, on the tip of every scholarly tongue. So-collaboration, yes. But why control? Because as the latest pedagogical bandwagon, collaboration often masquerades as democracy when it in fact practices the same old authoritarian control, It thus stands open to abuse and can, in fact, lead to poor teaching and poor learning. And it can lead-as you know-to disastrous results in the writing center, So amidst the rush to embrace collaboration, I see a need for careful interrogation and some caution.

We might begin by asking where the collaboration bandwagon got rolling? Why has it gathered such steam? Because, I believe, collaboration both in theory and practice reflects a broad-based epistemological shift, a shift in the way we view knowledge. This shift involves a move from viewing knowledge and reality as things exterior to or outside of us, as immediately accessible, individually knowable, measurable, and shareable-to viewing knowledge and reality as mediated by or constructed through language in social use, as socially constructed, contextualized, as, in short, the product of collaboration.

I'd like to suggest that collaboration as an embodiment of this theory of knowledge poses a distinct threat to one particular idea of a writing center. This idea of a writing center, which I'll call "The Center as Storehouse," holds to the earlier view of knowledge just described-knowledge as exterior to us and as directly accessible. The Center as Storehouse operates as an information station or storehouse, prescribing and handing out skills and strategies to individual learners. Storehouse Centers often use "modules" or other kinds of individualized learning materials. They tend to view knowledge as individually derived and held, and they are not particularly amenable to collaboration, sometimes actively hostile to it, I visit lots of Storehouse Centers, and in fact I set up such a center myself, shortly after I had finished an MA degree and a thesis on William Faulkner,

Since Storehouse Centers do a lot of good work and since I worked very hard to set up one of them, I was loathe to complicate or

critique such a center. Even after Lisa and I started studying collaboration in earnest, and in spite of the avalanche of data we gathered in support of the premise that collaboration is the norm in most professions (psychology, chemistry, engineering, technical writing, etc.), I was still a very reluctant convert,

Why? Because, I believe, collaboration posed another threat to my way of teaching, a way that informs another idea for a writing center, which I'll call "The Center as Garret." Garret Centers are informed by a deep-seated belief in individual "genius," in the Romantic sense of the tea in. (I need hardly point out that this belief also informs much of the Humanities and in particular English Studies.) These centers are also informed by a deep-seated attachment to the American brand of individualism, a team coined by Alexis de Toqueville as he sought to describe the defining characteristics of the Republic,

Unlike Storehouse Centers, Garret Centers don't view knowledge as exterior, as information to be sought out or passed on mechanically. Rather they see knowledge as interior, as inside the student, and the writing center's job as helping students get in touch with this knowledge, as a way to find their unique voices, their individual and unique powers, This idea has been articulated by

The **Writing Lab Newsletter**, published in ten monthly issues from September to June by the Department of English, Purdue University, is a publication of the National Writing Centers Association, an NCTE Assembly, and is a member of the NCTE Information Exchange Agreement. ISSN 1040-3779

Editor: Muriel Harris, Dept. of English, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907 (317-494-3723)

Donations: The newsletter is an informal publication with no billing procedures. Yearly donations of \$10.00 (U.S. \$15.00 in Canada) are requested to cover costs of duplicating and mailing. Please make all checks payable to Purdue University and send to the editor. Prepayment is requested from business offices.

Manuscripts: Recommended length for articles is eight to twelve double-spaced typed pages, three to four pages for reviews, and one to two pages for the Tutors' Column, though longer and shorter manuscripts are invited. Please enclose self-addressed envelopes with return postage clipped (not pasted) to the envelope. The deadline for announcements is 45 days prior to the month of issue (e.g., Aug. 15 for the Oct. issue).

Please send all articles, reviews, announcements, comments, queries, and yearly donations to the editor.

many, including Ken Macrorie, Peter Elbow, and Don Murray, and the idea usually gets acted out in Murray-like conferences, those in which the tutor or teacher listens, voices encouragement, and essentially serves as a validation of the students' "research." Obviously, collaboration problematizes Garret Centers as well, for they also view knowledge as interiorized, solitary, individually derived, individually held.

As I've indicated, I held on pretty fiercely to this idea as well as to the first one. I was still resistant to collaboration. So I took the natural path for an academic faced with this dilemma: I decided to do more research. I did a lot of it.

And to my chagrin, I found more and more evidence to challenge my ideas, to challenge both the idea of tutors as Storehouses or as Garrets. Not incidentally, the data I amassed mirrored what my students had been telling me for years: not the research they carried out, not their dogged writing of essays, not me even, but their work in groups, their collaboration, was the most important and helpful part of their school experience. Briefly, the data I found all support the following claims:

1. Collaboration aids in problem finding as well as problem solving.
2. Collaboration aids in learning abstractions.
3. Collaboration aids in transfer and assimilation; it fosters interdisciplinary thinking.
4. Collaboration leads not only to sharper, more critical thinking (students must explain, defend, adapt), but to deeper understanding of others.
5. Collaboration leads to higher achievement in general. See for example, the Johnson and Johnson analysis of 122 studies from 1924-1981, which included every North American study that considered achievement or performance data in competitive, cooperative/collaborative, or individualistic classrooms. Some 60% showed that collaboration promoted higher achievement, while only 6% showed the reverse. Among studies comparing the effects of collaboration and independent work, the results are even more strongly in favor of collaboration. Moreover, the superiority of collaboration held for all subject areas and all age groups. See Kohn's "How to Succeed Without Even Trying."

6. Collaboration promotes excellence. In this regard, I am fond of quoting Hannah Arendt: "For excellence, the presence of others is always required." Collaboration engages the whole student and encourages active learning; it combines reading, talking, writing, thinking; it provides practice in both synthetic and analytic skills.

Given these research findings, why am I still urging caution in using collaboration as the idea of the writing center I now advocate?

First, because creating a collaborative environment and truly collaborative tasks is damnably difficult. Collaborative environments and tasks must demand collaboration. Students, tutors, teachers most really need one another to carry out common goals. As an aside, let me note that studies of collaboration in the workplace identify three kinds of tasks that seem to call consistently for collaboration: high-order problem defining and solving; division of labor tasks, in which the job is simply too big for any one person, and division of expertise tasks. Such tasks are often difficult to come by in writing centers, particularly those based on the Storehouse or Garret models.

A collaborative environment must also be one in which goals are clearly defined and in which the jobs at hand engage everyone fairly equally, from the student clients to work-study students to peer tutors and professional staff. In other words, such an environment rejects traditional hierarchies. In addition, the kind of collaborative environment I want to encourage calls on each person involved in the collaboration to build a theory of collaboration, a theory of group dynamics.

Building such a collaborative environment is also hard because getting groups of any kind going is hard. The students', tutors', and teachers' prior experiences may work against it (they probably held or still hold to Storehouse or Garret ideas); the school day and term work against it; and the drop-in nature of many centers, including my own, works against it. Against these odds, we have to figure out how to constitute groups in our centers; how to allow for evaluation and monitoring; how to teach, model, and learn about careful listening, leadership, goal setting, and negotiation—all of which are necessary to effective collaboration.

We must also recognize that collabora-

tion is hardly a monolith. Instead, it comes in a dizzying variety of modes about which we know almost nothing. In our book, Lisa and I identify and describe two such modes, the hierarchical and the dialogic, both of which our centers need to be well versed at using. But it stands to reason that these two modes perch only at the tip of the collaborative iceberg.

As I argued earlier, I think we must be cautious in rushing to embrace collaboration, because collaboration can also be used to reproduce the status quo; the rigid hierarchy of teacher-centered classrooms is replicated in the tutor-centered writing center in which the tutor is still the seat of all authority but is simply pretending it isn't so. Such a pretense of democracy sends badly mixed messages. It can also lead to the kind of homogeneity that squelches diversity, that waters down ideas to the lowest common denominator, that erases rather than values difference. This tendency is particularly troubling given our growing awareness for the roles gender and ethnicity play in all learning. So regression toward the mean is not a goal I seek in an idea of a writing center based on collaboration.

The issue of control surfaces most powerfully in this concern over a collaborative center. In the writing center ideas I put forward earlier, where is that focus of control? In Storehouse Centers, it seems to me control resides in the tutor or center staff, the possessors of information, the currency of the academy. Garret Centers, on the other hand, seem to invest power and control in the individual student knower, though I would argue that such control is often appropriated by the tutor/ teacher, as I have often seen happen during Murray- or Elbow- style conferences. Any center based on collaboration (which I'll call Burkean Parlor Centers), collaboration that is attuned to diversity, goes deeply against the grain of education in America. To illustrate, I need offer only a few representative examples:

1. Mina Shaughnessy, welcoming a supervisor to her classroom in which students were busily collaborating, was told "oh... I'll come back when you're teaching."
2. A prominent and very distinguished feminist scholar has been refused an endowed chair because most of her work has been written collaboratively,

3. A prestigious college poetry prize was withdrawn after the winning poem turned out to be written by three student collaborators.
4. A faculty member working in a writing center was threatened with dismissal for "encouraging" group-produced documents.

I have a number of such examples. all of which suggest that-used unreflectively or uncautiously- collaboration may harm professionally those who seek to use it and may as a result further reify a model of education as the top-down transfer of information (back to The Storehouse) or a private search for Truth (back to The Garret). As I also hope I've suggested, collaboration can easily degenerate into busy work or what Jim Corder calls "fading into the tribe."

So I am very, very serious about the cautions I've been raising, about our need to examine carefully what we mean by collaboration and to explore how those definitions locate control. And yet I still advocate- with growing and deepening conviction- the move to collaboration in both classrooms and centers. In short, I am advocating a third, alternative idea of a writing center, one I know many have already brought into being. In spite of the very real risks involved, we need to embrace the idea of writing centers as Burkean Parlors, as centers for collaboration. Only in doing so can we, I believe, enable a student body and a citizenry to meet the demands of the twenty-first century. A recent Labor Department report tells us, for instance, that by the mid-1990's workers will need to read at the 11th-grade level for even low-paying jobs; that workers will need to be able not so much to solve prepackaged problems but to identify problems amidst a welter of information or data; that they will need to reason from complex symbol systems rather than from simple observations; most of all that they will need to be able to work with others who are different from them and to learn to negotiate power and control.

The idea of a center I want to advocate speaks directly to these needs, for its theory of knowledge is based not on positivistic principles (that's The Storehouse again), not on Platonic or absolutist ideals (that's The Garret), but on the notion of knowledge as always

contextually bound, as always socially constructed. Such a center might well have as its motto Arendt's statement: "For excellence, the presence of others is always required? Such a center would place control, power, and authority not in the tutor or staff, not in the individual student, but in the negotiating group. It would engage students not only in solving problems set by teachers but in identifying problems for themselves; not only in working as a group but in monitoring, evaluating, and building a theory of how groups work; not only in understanding and valuing collaboration but in confronting squarely the issues of control that successful collaboration inevitably raises; not only in reaching consensus but in valuing dissensus and diversity.

The idea of a center informed by a theory of knowledge as socially constructed, of power and control as constantly negotiated and shared, and as collaboration as its first principle presents quite a challenge. It challenges our way of organizing our center, of training our staff and tutors, and of working with teachers. It even challenges our sense of where we "fit" in! So this idea. More importantly, however, such a center presents a challenge to higher education, an institution that insists on rigidly controlled individual performance, on evaluation as punishment, on isolation, on the kinds of values that took that poetically prize away from three young people or that accused Mina Shaughnessy of "not teaching?"

This alternative, this third idea of a writing center, poses a threat as well as a challenge to the status quo of higher education. This threat is one powerful and largely invisible reason, I would argue, for the way in which many writing centers have been consistently marginalized, consistently silenced. But writing center organizations are gaining a voice, are finding ways to imagine into being centers as Burkean Parlors for Collaboration, writing centers, I believe, which can lead the way in changing the face of higher education.

So, writing center specialists are a subversive group. But I've been talking far too long by myself now, so I'd like to close by giving the floor to two of my student collaborators. The first-like I was was a reluctant convert to the kind of collaboration have been describing here, But here's what she wrote some time ago:

Dr, Lunsford: I don't know exactly what to

say here, but I want to say something. So here goes. When this class first began, I didn't know what in the hell you meant by collaboration, I thought-hey yo!-you're the teacher and you know a lot of stuff. And you better tell it to me. Then I can tell it to the other guys. Now I know that you know even more than I thought. I even found out I know a lot. But that's not important. What's important is knowing that knowing doesn't just happen all by itself, like the cartoons which show a little light bulb going off in a bubble over a character's head. Knowing happens with other people, figuring things out, trying to explain, talking through things. What I know is that we are all making and remaking our knowing and our selves with each other everyday-you just as much as me and the other guys, Dr, Lunsford, We're all-all of us together-collaborative recreations in process. So-well-just wish me luck.

And here's a note I received from another student/collaborator:

I had believed that Ohio State had nothing more to offer me in the way of improving my writing. Happily, I was mistaken, I have great expectations for our Writing Center Seminar class, I look forward to every one of our classes and to every session with my 110W students [2 groups of 3 undergraduates he is tutoring). I sometimes feel that they have more to offer me than I to them. They say the same thing, though, so I guess we're about even, all learning together, [RS. This class and the Center have made me certain I want to attend graduate school.)

These students embody the kind of center I'm advocating, and I'm honored to join them in conversation about it.

Andrea A. Lunsford
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

Works Cited

Ede, Lisa, and Andrea Lunsford. Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives on Collaborative Writing. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1990.

--. "Why Write...Together?" Rhetoric Review 1.2 (Jan. 1983); 150-57.

Johnson, David W., and Frank P. Johnson. "Learning Together and Alone? Cooperation, Competition, and Individualization." Unpublished paper delivered at the Cooperative Learning Center, U. of Minnesota, n.d.

Kohn, Alfie, "How to Succeed without Even Vying." Psychology Today (Sept., 1986); 22-28,

(Ed. note: This is a reprint of the keynote speech delivered at the 1990 Midwest Writing Cent s Association Conference.)

Body Language: The Nonverbal Path to Success in the Writing Conference

Since the start of the peer tutorial program at Hamilton College's Writing Center in 1987, I have been shaping and reshaping our tutorial training program. Now that our training agenda appears to incorporate all of the essentials, I have begun to consider topics that are secondary but still relevant to turning good writers into good tutors. One of these topics is nonverbal communication, or more specifically, the application of some of the extensive social science literature on nonverbal communication to the specific context of the writing center conference. An intriguing question is how can nonverbal signals be used by writing tutors to affect the outcome of a writing conference?

Nonverbal communication is present in every tutor-writer conversation. Unspoken cues can either support, neutralize, or contradict spoken statements; a tutor's sensitivity to nonverbal cues plays a part in determining the success or failure of a writing conference. If the tutor gives inappropriate nonverbal signals, or the tutor fails to respond to a writer's cues, the open, comfortable atmosphere needed for a successful writing conference may not develop.

During tutor training, discussion and role playing can be used to sensitize tutors to the use of positive nonverbal signals to build and maintain a comfortable atmosphere. Once aware of the power of positive and negative nonverbal cues, the tutor has one more way of setting the tone of the conference and, when necessary, neutralizing negative cues given by the Writer.

The tutor should be encouraged to use nonverbal cues in reaction to the writer's signals. If the writer comes into a conference with an open attitude and projects positive signals, then the tutor needn't spend conscious effort figuring out how to affect the writer's attitude. But if the writer comes in projecting negative cues, then the tutor can employ specific nonverbal tactics as one way of helping the resistant writer feel that the conference can be a productive experience.

I do not mean to overstate the usefulness of nonverbal cues. They are not a substitute for the tutor's positive, welcoming verbal comments; in order to be effective, these cues have to mirror positive spoken statements. In addition, it is crucial to keep in mind that many nonverbal cues are culture- or gender-related; for example, the avoiding of eye contact can have a different meaning depending on a person's cultural background. The tutor should be advised to consider the entire array of cues given by the writer before acting. In other words, one should follow the writer's lead if in doubt as to what is appropriate,

Tutors on my staff have tried to make conscious use of nonverbal cues and have found that the effort is worthwhile. One tutor said that now he always greets writers with opened hand and arm gestures, is sure to smile and establish eye contact, and adjusts his chair at a comfortable conversational angle and distance once the writer sits down. And the good news is that writers respond accordingly.