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ABSTRACT

Research in writing studies has focused on multilingual writers and the rhetorical affinity they gain from shuttling between multiple languages (Lorimer Leonard, 2014; Guerra, 2004). Writing center studies have focused on multilingual writing tutors and have argued the need to use more tutors who are literate in more than one language because they possess skills that can be useful in writing centers (Lape, 2013; Thonus, 2014). However, not much research has been conducted to better understand what literacy practices these multilingual writing tutors develop that make them better equipped in writing center tutoring sessions. This thesis focuses on a case study of a multilingual writing tutor and traces her literacy practices through the collection of a literacy history interview, three video-recordings of tutoring sessions, and a stimulated recall interview in which segments from the sessions are the focus of the interview. The thesis employs New Literacy Studies (Barton and Hamilton, 1998; Heath, 2001) and Canagarajah’s (2013) translilingualism as a lens to identify literacy practices that stem from a multilingual upbringing and the ways they manifest in tutoring sessions.

The findings of this study reveal two main literacy practices that are prevalent in the tutor’s tutoring strategies, empathy and rhetorical attunement. More importantly, the study reveals the complexities of tracing literacy practices across time. Through data analysis, I claim that the participant’s rhetorical attunement may have derived from her multilingual upbringing as many researchers suggest (Lorimer Leonard, 2014; Guerra, 2004). Ultimately, my research also argues that these practices were amplified by other factors in her life that helped foster her rhetorical learning and led to a metacognitive practice. I assert that through her exposure to
rhetorical education in the tutor training course, the Writing and Rhetoric major, and the continual training and practice of tutoring, her rhetorical affinity is developed into a metacognitive practice in which she thinks critically about the moves she is making in her tutoring session, rather than simply reacting to changes in the session; she thinks of the various effects her decisions may have on the learning occurring in the session. The results of this study demonstrate the complexities of tracing literacy practices over time and argue for a less linear approach to tracing literacy practices. By understanding the ways informal and formal education affect the development of those practices, we can better trace those practices from its origin through its progression in order to understand how those practices are enhanced through various domains. Although this study begins to address the literacy practices that are distinct to multilingual writing tutors, it is limited due to the number of participants that took part in this study. More research needs to be conducted to study the literacy practices of multilingual writing tutors.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This literacy study goes beyond academic interest. This research stems from an interest in my own experiences as a multilingual writing tutor. I began tutoring during my undergraduate education at a diverse university, Florida International University (FIU), where most tutors were predominantly multilingual. Due to the predominance of multilingual writing tutors in this location, I didn’t deem my own tutoring practices to be any different from those of monolingual tutors. However, as I began tutoring and engaging in writing center research at a new institution, University of Central Florida (UCF), I began to notice that my own practices differed due to my own experiences shuttling between languages. As a multilingual writer and tutor myself, I have sought scholarship on multilingual writers and their literacy and rhetorical practices to better understand my own abilities as a writing tutor. I was interested in finding whether our experiences during our literacy development affected our literacy later in life, specifically our own tutoring practices. My central research question for this project is: What strategies employed by multilingual tutors relate to literacy practices unique to their experiences as multilingual individuals?

A Case for Researching Multilingual Writing Tutors

The predominance of global outreach programs, such as the University of Central Florida’s Global Achievement Academy (GAA), establishes an urgency for understanding how we approach the acculturation process and the literacy development of these students. Many scholars have begun paying close attention to the internationalization of higher education and
focused on the implications that it will have to composition studies. In “'Internationalization' and Composition Studies: Reorienting the Discourse,” Christiane Donahue argues that U.S. scholars must expand their understanding of writing and become more open to listening to others in order to understand “that our field is not the sole source of writing theory in higher education” (p. 236). Rather, as our composition programs internationalize, international students play an important role in understanding whether our teaching strategies and lessons are understood and truly transferable to other contexts (Zawacki & Habib, 2014, p. 656).

Although this move towards internationalizing universities is an important reason for better understanding multilingual writers, universities have been diversifying for many years as we as a nation diversify as well (Mastuda, 2006). International students are not the only students that need to be acknowledged in our composition classrooms. The diversification of our classrooms is not a completely new concept. Paul Kei Mastuda (2006) has long argued against the “myth of linguistic homogeneity” and asserted “that the dominant discourse of U.S. college composition not only has accepted English Only as an ideal but it already assumes the state of English-only, in which students are native English speakers by default” (p. 637). Therefore, addressing the needs of these students who come to the classrooms with different language backgrounds is also important. To simply categorize multilingual writers as only international students is to oversimplify our own understanding of the vast individual characteristics any one given multilingual writer. We also have a responsibility to children of immigrant and migrant students who bring their own complex language backgrounds to the institution. These students, often referred to as Generation 1.5 students, are children of immigrants or immigrants themselves who attended public schools in the U.S. as children or older and “have more fluency
in English than international students, but their language is not the same as monolingual students” (Rojas Collins, 2009, p.55). These differences in multilingual writers’ educational experiences need to be addressed in order to properly accommodate the variations in their needs.

Due to the prevalence of the internationalization and diversification of higher education the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) (2014) has released a statement on second language writing and writers. This statement urges composition instructors to be open to these students in their classrooms, take action by learning more about second language writer instruction through graduate courses and conferences, and investigate common issues for second language writers. More importantly, they suggest that composition programs in colleges and universities should become familiar with multilingual populations surrounding their areas. These students may matriculate into their local college or university and having a better understanding of their cultural background and language is useful to learning how to properly approach these students (“Statement on Second Language Writing and Writers,” 2014).

Within this context, growing interest in multilingual writing tutors have progressively become a central focus, especially in writing center research, with recent initiatives being made to build Multilingual Writing Centers where “tutors who are literate in multiple languages and skilled as global citizens can work with writers as they construct their voices—linguistically, rhetorically, and discursively—in order to participate in the global exchange of ideas” (Lape, 2013, p.1). This shift in focus on multilingual tutors is due to research indicating that “multilingual tutoring by multilingual tutors may be superior to any other model” (Thonus, 2014, p. 207). The current scholarly research focus on multilingual tutors calls to question what experiences these tutors bring with them into their tutoring sessions. This research has sought to
explore multilingual writing tutors’ strategies in order to find connections between those strategies and their experiences as multilinguals in order to find what makes these individuals unique. The central question of this study asks: What is the relationship between multilingual tutors’ literacy history and their current tutoring practices? To fully answer this question the following questions were developed:

- What early literacy practices can be seen transformed into a tutoring practice?
- What literacy practices are not transformed into tutoring practices?
- Why are certain literacy practices transformed, while others are not? What does this finding reveal about the values placed on certain practices?

**Overview of Study and Conclusions**

My thesis consists of five chapters. The first chapter is my introduction in which I discuss the exigence for this study using current scholarship that helps illustrate the issue being addressed. The second chapter consists of the review of scholarship focused on the topic of this study in combination with an explanation of the theoretical frame being implemented in this study. The scholarship includes scholars from New Literacy Studies, writing center research, and applied linguistics. Chapter three includes the methodology used in order to collect the data for this study. Chapter four and five contain my analysis. The contents of chapter four consists of a description of the three main worlds that are affecting the rhetorical attunement of the participant. The fifth chapter focuses on examples of places in which those worlds intersect and reveal a practice that has been amplified through the various worlds. The sixth and final chapter focuses on the implications my findings, limitations of my study, and contributions to the field.
In this thesis, I argue that in order to fully understand the complex ways in which literacy practices are developed overtime, researchers must avoid studying literacy practices linearly and acknowledge that various types of learning can affect the development of those practices. In other words, what I am arguing is that researchers must acknowledge the various ways informal and formal education affects the development of literacy practices overtime and understand that those occur. This contention is drawn from my case study, which revealed how my participant’s multilingual upbringing facilitated the development of a rhetorical awareness apparent in her language brokering interactions. My study also revealed that it was, through the University Writing Center (UWC) and the Writing and Rhetoric major that the rhetorical attunement became an amplified practice. Specifically, I found this rhetorical attunement is apparent in her tutoring sessions where she uses empathy as a rhetorical approach and demonstrates a rhetorical awareness of her negotiating strategies. These practices worked together to facilitate a dynamic metacognitive practice apparent in her tutoring. In other words, I claim that her ability to feel empathy towards a multilingual writer due to her own similar experiences and her rhetorical awareness derive from her language brokering practices in her multilingual upbringing; however, those practices were amplified through her tutor education and major, where she learned to think rhetorically about her tutoring decisions and always imagine the outcomes of those decisions, which allows for a more critical tutor practice.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

New Literacy Studies, writing center studies, and applied linguistics have all studied multilingual writers in attempts to better understand their unique abilities. Some of these studies have focused on the rhetorical sensibilities many of these writers’ possess as mediators of multiple languages (Guerra, 2004; Lorimer Leonard, 2014). Others focus on multilingual writing pedagogy and how it fuels the perpetuation of the deficit model when approaching these students’ writing (Canagarajah, 2014; Horner Lu, Royster, & Trimbur, 2011; Otheguy, Garcia, and Reid, 2015; Sayer, 2013). These scholars argue for new approaches to teaching multilingual writers by viewing their ability to communicate in different languages as assets that can be used to develop their rhetorical abilities (Canagarajah, 2014) and their fluency (Otheguy, Garcia, and Reid, 2015; Sayer, 2013). Finally, a host of scholars have focused on the important role tutoring plays in the development of multilingual writers. Condon and Olson, (2016) address political issues caused by the internationalization of universities and the influx of multilingual students and possible solutions for addressing that problem. As many of the previous research asserts, multilingual writers gain certain practices from their acquisition and articulation of various languages. Some scholars have argued that multilingual writing tutors have a special set of skills that make them more adept at tutoring multilingual writers (Lape, 2013; Thonus, 2014). However, the specific skills and strategies these students attain and use in their tutoring practices has not been fully researched.
Previous studies in literacy have focused on the particular skills multilingual writers have due to their unique experiences with language. These studies have focused on the rhetorical sensibilities of multilingual writers, or as Lorimer Leonard (2014) describes it, rhetorical attunement. Lorimer Leonard suggests the complexities that come with speaking different languages and learning how to position those languages in contexts provide multilingual writers with “an ear” or attunement towards rhetoric. She argues “that multilingual writers are not aware of this quality a priori, but come to know—become rhetorically attuned—over a lifetime of communicating across difference” (Lorimer Leonard, 2014, p. 228). Similarly, Guerra (2004) argues multilingual writers enact transcultural repositioning, or “a rhetorical ability that members of our community often enact intuitively but must learn to self-consciously regulate, if they hope to move back and forth more productively between and among different languages and dialects, different social classes, different cultural and artistic forms” (p. 16). Therefore, Guerra (2004) and Lorimer Leonard (2014) have both found that the ability to move between languages and cultures helps develop multilingual writers’ rhetorical skills, even if they may not be fully aware of their abilities. However, it is when these writers become aware of this ability, that their rhetoricity can be further developed and employed (Guerra, 2004). These articles, though not entirely related to tutoring, helps to pinpoint the strengths multilinguals may bring with them to tutoring sessions.

Canagarajah (2014) and Horner Lu, Royster, & Trimbur (2011) argue that traditional forms of teaching language are at odds with the way language functions in the world. It is common for many individuals to learn various languages and language varieties, however, in the classroom many of these other languages and varieties are not accepted. They propose the use of
the translingual approach to deviate from the deficit model where difference is understood as error. The translingual approach attempts to understand the underlying rhetorical and communicative intent behind the difference, rather than assuming an error was made. This approach responds to difference as a resource that can be developed, used, and preserved. Many of Canagarajah’s (2013; 2014) ideas are influenced by Pratt’s (1990) contact zone framework. He argues that contact zone orientation allows the empowerment of students, rather than seeking deficiencies within their knowledge of Standard Written English (SWE). Canagarajah believes “a contact zone orientation would make us treat languages as always in contact, borrowing from each other and influenced by each other, often in ways that are not easy to distinguish” (2014, p. 2).

Other scholars such as Otheguy, Garcia, and Reid (2015), have argued for more inclusivity of language use in pedagogy by advocating for translanguaging. They define translanguaging as “using one’s idiolect, that is, one’s linguistic repertoire, without regard for socially and politically defined language labels or boundaries” (Otheguy, Garcia, and Reid, 2015, p. 297). Similarly, Sayer (2013) argues that code-switching, or switching between languages or language varieties, is not easily accepted within the school setting, especially in English as a Second Language (ESL) classrooms where boundaries between languages exist. He contends that this restriction between the mixing of languages has limited educators and causes them to overlook the potential benefits of mixing both languages. Sayer moves further by arguing that we need to move beyond the idea of code-switching towards translanguaging because it better represents what is occurring in multilingual interactions. The reason why translanguaging is superior is because it acknowledges more than the L1 and L2 languages, but also acknowledges
language varieties and different vernaculars. These multilingual writers have more expansive linguistic repertoires than monolingual writers, thus they are often placed in situations where they must accommodate and suppress many of their language features to accommodate their audience. Although these scholars are arguing against such a suppression, it is in the necessity to suppress their linguistic repertoire that multilingual writers learn the rhetorical abilities outlined by Lorimer Leonard (2014) and Guerra (2004).

This language suppression is also relevant to writing center research. In “Multilingual Writers, Multilingual Tutors: Code-switching/mixing/meshing in the Writing Center,” Kevin Dvorak (2016) found that many of his tutors were using code-switching as a tutoring strategy, but were doing so covertly due to fear that this strategy was not a typically accepted mode of teaching multilingual writers. However, he found that “developing a contextualized understanding of code-switching as a tutoring pedagogy is especially valuable because an increasing number of multilingual students and tutors, particularly those who speak English and Spanish, are populating our writing centers” (Dvorak, 2016, p. 103). He found that within his own writing center, many multilingual writing tutors find code-switching and code-mixing to be a preferred pedagogical tool when tutoring multilingual writers.

According to Condon and Olson (2016) the prevalence of global development programs has been met with some tension in writing centers and universities as a whole. They discuss their own writing center and the realization they had regarding the ways in which their practices were perpetuating the racist and xenophobic attitudes prevalent in the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL), where a growing population of Asian students was emerging. They argue that in not asking multilingual students their needs and assuming what they needed, they were inherently
taking an assimilationist stance, therefore, marginalizing those who spoke World Englishes, rather than SWE (Condon and Olson, 2016, p. 32). Through this realization, they worked to rebuild a place where linguistic diversity was not a challenge, but an attribute. The tutors composed a book in four chapters: collaboration, linguistic and rhetorical theory, agency, and redefining success. This book was later used in writing center tutor course and in training meetings where tutors revised and rewrote sections to better assist their tutees. However, through this process, it became apparent that by helping multilingual writers assimilate, the tutors were inadvertently privileging certain forms of Englishes and thus privileging certain cultures and races (Condon and Olson, 2016, p. 41). Noreen G. Lape (2013), argues that a possible solution to these tensions may be the promotion and development of Multilingual Writing Centers (MWC) to support the growing numbers of international students caused by the “internationalizing of academia” (p. 2). MWC work with the goal of creating “global citizens” who view language through a translingual approach, which values heterogeneity, multiculturalism, and students’ rights to their own language” (Lape, 2013, p. 5).

This focus on the importance, need, and relevance of multilingual tutors is discussed by many writing center studies scholars like Terese Thonus (2014). She argues in “Tutoring Multilingual Students: Shattering the Myths” that the long held idea that Native English Speaking (NES) tutors are better at tutoring multilingual writers has been disproved. Not only is that belief a myth, but Thonus (2014) argues “multilingual tutoring by multilingual tutors may be superior to any other model” (p. 207). However, little research is available regarding the reasoning behind this assertion.
As demonstrated in the studies above, multilingual writers carry with them a host of skills with their linguistic repertoire. However, researchers have found a growing need for multilingual tutors and thus it is essential to investigate what makes these students different from monolingual tutors (Lape, 2013; Thonus, 2014). With this in mind, this thesis will extend previously undertaken studies on multilingual writers and tutors by exploring the distinct experiences some multilingual writing tutors have had due to their position as mediators of multiple languages throughout a lifetime and ask how these experiences inform their tutoring practices. This tracing of their practices will be employed through the lens of literacy practices and events.

Theoretical Framework

The tracing of multilingual writing tutor practices will be employed through the lens of literacy practices and events as understood in new literacy studies in order to make connections between literacy practices that stem from experiences of multilinguals and how these practices inform their tutoring strategies. According to Barton and Hamilton (1998), literacy practices are understood to be “the general cultural ways of utilizing written language which people draw upon in their lives” (p. 6). Practice is socially constructed; therefore, they must be understood as it relates to communities and domains in which they are developed. Therefore, in order to study practice, literacy events can be studied to better understand the underlying practices being valued. Literacy events, as discussed by Heath (2001) and Barton and Hamilton (1998), are those activities in which texts play a role. These are observable activities in which texts are central to the conversation and actions occurring. Therefore, in order to identify the literacy practices
unique to multilingual writing tutors, I studied writing center tutoring sessions as literacy events in order to reveal whether or not those strategies used are related to the literacy practices stemming from their experiences as mediators of multiple languages.

According to new literacy studies, literacy practices are “understood as existing in the relations between people, within groups and communities, rather than as a set of properties residing in one individual” (Barton and Hamilton, 1998, p.7). Meaning, literacy practices cannot be understood by simply observing the texts one individual produces, rather, it requires understanding the influences that occur outside of the individual that are influencing the individual’s literacy construction. Although literacy is attained through formal and informal domains, these boundaries are not clearly divided and lead to “questions of the permeability of boundaries, of leakages and movements between boundaries, and of overlap between domains” (Barton and Hamilton, 1998, p. 10). Consequently, when tracing literacy practice, it is important to understand the ways in which more than one domain can influence the practices revealed. More importantly, an understanding of the way literacy practice is dynamic and fluid is imperative when tracing practices. Barton and Hamilton (1998) argue that “literacy is historically situated,” which means practices change and develop through time and experiences (p. 12). Understanding practice as dynamic allows to trace practice with an understanding that practice is influenced by both formal and informal learning and training throughout the individual’s life.

Suresh Canagarajah’s (2013) book, Translingual Practice, uses new literacy studies, specifically the unit of practice, to argue that multilingual writers combine their languages and values into English, in turn allowing these writers to develop negotiation strategies that can be applied to further understand how to use other languages and strategies in new situations. The
practice-based perspective focuses on the role practice plays in interactions where language and communication difference must be addressed. It is in the process of using ecological resources to resolve situations of language difference that a practice is revealed. Canagarajah argues that languages are constantly in contact and these moments of contact described by Pratt (1991) as contact zones are “social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power” (p. 34). Canagarajah argues that contact zones are not only a place in which cultures and languages collide negatively, but they are places in which collaborative negotiation strategies are employed in meaning-making. It is in those moments that Canagarajah is interested in understanding how communication functions through the unit of practice. The practice-based perspective focuses on how context shapes an interaction. By observing the “modes of alignment between participants, objects, and resources in the local ecology,” Canagarajah finds how communication functions (2013, p. 27). However, Canagarajah’s approach towards the use of practice as a framework is the key to this project. He understands language as a resource itself and the strategy of mixing languages, then acts as a resource in communicating under contact zones. Therefore, “meaning is socially constructed….Meaning does not reside in the language; it is produced in practice through negotiation strategies” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 40). Therefore, “these strategies are not a form of knowledge…, but a practice, that is, a resourcefulness that speakers employ to deal with unpredictable communicative situations they encounter” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 41).

In this project, I use the unit of practice to trace the literacy practices across time in order to find the ways different informal and formal learning domains have influenced the practices used in tutoring sessions of multilingual writing tutors. By understanding the ways those
domains have influenced changes and developments in literacy practices, I can better understand what those practices may reveal about multilingual writing tutors and what influences their practices.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Overview

This study focuses on one case study of a multilingual writing tutor. The decision to conduct a case study for this project stems from a need to study the literacy practices of the participant as situated in context to better understand the domains in which the literacy practices are developing. Case study research is the best approach when studying emergent research of a situation that is not fully understood because it allows for a more holistic view of the approach and provides “rich detail that can lead to a more complete understanding of some aspect of a person, group, event, or situation” (MacNealy, 2002, p. 184). By focusing on one participant, the study can better focus on the specific ways the participant’s practices are affected by the differing domains in her life. Since not many studies have focused on the literacy practices of multilingual writing tutors, it was imperative to begin with a detailed account of one individual. Although the case study will not lead to generalizations about multilingual writing tutors, it will provide a detailed account into the literacy practices of one individual, which provides insight that can be used for future research.

Another aspect of my methodology that is important to discuss is my research positionality. As mentioned earlier, I am a multilingual writer and was a multilingual writing tutor for many years at two different institutions, including the research site for this study. During data collection, my positionality was an important aspect of my research that I continuously reflected upon. Being multilingual myself afforded me the ability to build a deeper connection to my participant due to our similar experiences. However, during data collection, I
made sure to always separate my own thoughts and opinions to avoid influencing the responses of my participant. Overall, my research positionality provided me with insight into some of the experiences of my participant, which provided me with the opportunity to build a greater personal connection and trust with my participant. This may have provided me with more personal responses that may not have been collected had I not been a multilingual writer.

The data collection methods for this case study included literacy history interviews, tutoring session video recordings, and stimulated recall interviews. The literacy history interviews served as a way of identifying literacy practices unique to the participant. These interviews were used to help select sections of the tutoring video recordings where strategies being used relate back to literacy practices identified in the literacy history interviews. Once the sections were selected, prompting questions were formulated in order to connect the participant’s literacy practices with the strategies apparent in the videos. These prompting questions were then used in the stimulated recall interviews, where the participants and I watched the selected sections of the recordings. A detailed description these data collection methods are described below.

Selecting Participants

My research participant for this study was selected from the University Writing Center (UWC) at the University of Central Florida (UCF), where I myself tutored for about a year. In order to identify at least two participants that would best fit the purpose of this study, I attended the UWC weekly seminars and prepared a recruitment speech in order to explain my study and the participants that qualified for the study. The participants that qualified for this study were
those participants that used multiple languages in multiple facets of their lives because they not only possess the ability to speak multiple languages, but these languages are an important aspect of their daily lives. Although I planned to study at least two participants, I was only able to find one willing participant for this study. An experienced multilingual writing tutor demonstrated interest in the study. The participant was a college senior in the Writing and Rhetoric B.A. program with a minor in Italian, who has been working at the UWC for approximately three years as a tutor. For the purposes of this study, the participant’s name will remain anonymous. The participant will be referred to by the pseudonym, Maggie.

Maggie grew up learning English and Spanish at the same time in her home. She spoke English with her parents and Spanish with her grandmother and caretaker. At the age of three, her father began teaching her Russian, his first language. English and Spanish were the main languages that she practiced during her childhood and the ones she is currently fluent in. Russian was a language she only spoke with her father and relatives and the lack of practice led to lose her fluency in the language. Her Spanish fluency remained because she attended a private elementary school for kindergarten and first grade, where she attended Spanish classes that helped her learn and practice to read and write in Spanish during. Although she attended public schools after her first two years of schooling, she remembers always taking a Spanish course because that was the main second language prioritized by her schools. She studied Italian as a minor in college. Through her studies, she has gained a conversational understanding of Italian.
**Data Collection**

Once the participant was selected, I conducted a literacy history interview, where I asked them about her past experiences as a multilingual tutor and writer. The questions were open-ended questions that elicited her own literacy narrative. I asked the participant about memorable moments involving their literacy development in differing languages and how they perceive those experiences shaping their learning and tutoring practices. The purpose of this interview was to seek an understanding of how certain events in their early life have affected her literacy development and practices. Specifically, I looked to see if the interview uncovered the reasoning behind some of the strategies observed in their tutoring. The interview was fully transcribed and coded for literacy practices prior to conducting the stimulated recall interview. Coding the literacy history interview helped prepare my prompting questions and select segments from their video-recorded tutoring sessions in order to see if practices coded in their literacy history interview was apparent in their tutoring sessions. A list of prompting questions were constructed when I watched the tutoring session videos and identified specific strategies relevant to the practices identified in the literacy history interview. The segments with those strategies were used in the stimulated recall interview.

After collecting the literacy history, I collected tutoring sessions of the multilingual writing tutor’s choosing. This meant that I asked my participant to use the video cameras provided by the UWC to record three tutoring sessions of her choosing. I provided a consent form for the writer being tutored explaining the project and his/her role involvement in the project before each session was recorded. After the participant recorded three tutoring sessions, I watched the videos in order to select specific sections that I found related back to the literacy
history interview. Using these videos, I looked back at the list of prompts I created post transcribing the literacy interviews and added or revised them according to the findings and connections I made from watching the tutoring sessions. I provided the video segments to the participant prior to hosting the stimulated recall interview. Providing the videos ahead of time was a request from my participant because she wanted to be prepared for the interview. Then, I hosted a stimulated recall interview for each participant in which the each participant and I watched the selected portions of both videos and went over the prompts I prepared beforehand. During the simulated interview, I asked the tutor to reflect on some practices they perceived to be present in their tutoring that may be related to their own literacy history. She identified specific strategies that they saw related to their own experiences as a multilingual writer. This interview was voice recorded and later transcribed and stored for coding. The selected portions of the videos used in the stimulated recall interview were transcribed and stored for the purpose of coding at a later period.

Data Analysis Overview

In order to analyze the data I collected from my literacy history interviews, I used literacy practice as my unit of analysis. This meant that I identified literacy practices pertaining to the participant’s own identity as a multilingual writer and her own literacy development. The practice was coded as action involving the interconnection between the text, values, materials, and routine involved. As for the tutoring videos, I analyzed the selected video fragments based on the literacy practices identified in the participants’ literacy history interviews. Meaning, I identified strategies being employed in the tutoring session that were related to the literacy
practices identified in the literacy history interview. Doing so, allowed me to make connections between the participant’s previous experiences as a multilingual tutor and how it informed her tutoring strategies. However, the literacy history interviews were used as a heuristic for this study, but did not determine the only strategies I prioritized in my findings. In other words, the literacy history interviews were approached flexibly because strategies could have emerged in the videos that may not be related to practices revealed in the literacy history interview.

**Coding Scheme**

My initial coding scheme focused on identifying practices the participant discussed in her literacy history interview. The main practices that were identified were then used to code the stimulated recall interviews. There were four practice codes identified in the analysis of the literacy history interview: demonstrating empathy in language learning through similar experiences, language brokering, code-switching, using different tutoring strategies dependent on person, and demonstrating openness to ecological resources. These initial practice codes and corresponding examples are illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1: Examples of Interview Comments and Codes Assigned to Literacy History and Stimulated Recall Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes Assigned</th>
<th>Example Interview Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating empathy in language learning</td>
<td>“Some sort of mutual ground. Like, a place of, uh, of understanding, um, particularly ‘cause, like... Especially in the writing center, knowing different languages means that I know what it means to learn a new language.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes Assigned</td>
<td>Example Interview Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes Assigned</td>
<td>So, when someone else is working on something and they’re learning a language, I’m...it’s more relatable to me, and it’s something that I can understand.” (Literacy History Interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Brokering</td>
<td>“I think I mentioned in the first interview that my dad would bring things to me to look over. So, in those kind of scenarios, I’m not familiar with… I mean, I am now, but I wasn’t then, with the prison system, necessarily, and how writing happens in prisons and things like that. But I had to help him write things in a prison setting.” (Stimulated Recall Interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code-switching</td>
<td>“He told me that he was Peruvian and he had just moved here and he really, like...you know, and, like, I told him that I was Hispanic, and he ended up...we had, like, a couple-minute conversation about it. And he started speaking in Spanish, because it made him comfortable, and I tried to switch off to Spanish, and... Because I, like, I told him, if you need...like, if you need to express your ideas clearly and you can’t in English, feel free to go to Spanish, because I’ll understand you.” (Literacy History Interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating openness to ecological resources</td>
<td>“So, we just went on through the...through the rest of the session and he was talking in Spanish and I was talking in English, and it worked out, and we just, like...he put in all of the ideas in his paper and we were talking about how to word it, but, like, it was mainly idea issues. ” (Literacy History Interview).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The initial practice codes listed in Table 1 were refined once the tutoring sessions were collected and segments of the videos were selected. Those videos led to larger codes that encompass various initial codes as demonstrated in Table 2. As seen in Table 2, the two larger codes are empathy and rhetorical attunement.

Table 2 Initial Codes and Representative Larger Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Larger Codes</th>
<th>Initial Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy as a rhetorical approach</td>
<td>1) Demonstrating empathy in language learning (Empathy through similar experiences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Building community through language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Demonstrating openness to ecological resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Attunement/Awareness</td>
<td>1) Language Brokering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Code-switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Using different tutoring strategies based on person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once these two larger codes were identified, I revisited my literacy history interview and stimulated recall interview and began re-coding the interviews with a new focus on empathy as a rhetorical approach and rhetorical attunement/awareness. Once that process was completed, I began tracing the practices that stemmed from her multilingual upbringing and were still prevalent in her tutoring practices in order to answer my research questions. However, when doing so, it became clear that tracing those practices linearly was impossible due to the many domains involved in the creation and further development of the literacy practices being traced. These new discoveries led me to reorient my focus and discuss a different phenomenon than the
one I intended to originally study and discuss. Rather than tracing linearly, I began to identify the main domains that were working together to amplify the literacy practices identified. Once these domains were identified, places in my data where these domains intersected became the focus of my analysis in order to better understand the complexities behind the development and amplification of these practices.

**Conclusions**

In this chapter, I have outlined the methods of study and the ways my coding scheme was developed and modified as my data revealed new findings that were unexpected. In the following two chapters, I discuss: 1) the three domains that are affecting the amplification of the participant’s practices individually, and 2) the places in which intersections between these worlds in order to provide evidence of the amplification of these practices.
CHAPTER 4: COEXISTING IN SEVERAL WORLDS

When commencing the task of tracing literacy practices from Maggie’s multilingual upbringing to her tutoring, it became clear that doing so would not lead to clear connections. Tracing in this way assumes that other factors outside of these two moments in Maggie’s life are inconsequential. In my data analysis, I found that Maggie’s’ rhetorical attunement may have derived from her multilingual upbringing as many researchers suggest (Lorimer Leonard, 2014; Guerra, 2004). However, this rhetorical attunement was amplified by other factors in her life that helped foster her rhetorical learning. In my two analysis chapters, I argue that the informal and formal learning that occurred in three different domains caused Maggie to develop her already existing rhetorical attunement through an exposure to a rhetorically focused education and training, which leads to a more metacognitive practice that will be discussed in the following analysis chapter.

In this chapter, I highlight three main worlds separately: Multilingual upbringing, University Writing Center, and the Writing and Rhetoric major. Discussing these worlds individually reveals the ways in which each of these domains fostered Maggie’s development and the different ways these worlds influenced those practices. Moreover, I argue that these worlds, although addressed individually, are dependent on one another as demonstrated by the way the values learned in one world helps develop the existence of the other worlds. In the following analysis chapter, I focus on demonstrating examples in which the intersections of these worlds exhibit how these three worlds have worked together to amplify Maggie’s rhetorical attunement and how the values learned in some worlds influenced the existence of others.
Multilingual Upbringing

Maggie’s multilingual upbringing helped foster her own identity and understanding of language and helped initiate her rhetorical attunement through the interactions she is exposed to throughout her literacy development. Growing up learning three languages meant that her language development was a great part of her identity because the ability to shuttle between languages was valued by her family. In many ways, Maggie’s ability to shuttle between languages was enhanced by her language brokering practices. Language brokering is understood as “interpretation and translation performed in everyday situations by bilinguals who have had no special training” (Tse, 1996, p. 486). This practice was one of the initial practices that helped foster a rhetorical attunement as demonstrated in the analysis below.

Maggie grew up in a multilingual household in which she learned English, Spanish, and Russian. Later in life she learned Italian, which she made her minor in college. When asked to list her first language, she responded:

“I don’t know how to answer this question because I...I think I grew up learning English and Spanish at the same time. Um, I learned English, like, in...at home with my mom and my grandmother and...actually, with my mom, and then...and at school. Um, and then I learned Spanish with the babysitter that I had who would, like, kinda force me to speak Spanish because that was all she knew, so she’s like, “I won’t understand what you’re saying and the trouble that you’re getting yourself into.” And then at...around three, I think, my dad taught me Russian.”

Although Maggie grew up knowing three languages, she claims her fluency now are mostly in English, Spanish, and Italian. Due to her exposure to so many languages growing up, she was
brought up with an understanding that her languages were valuable and the more languages she knew the more opportunities she would have. This was apparent in one of our interviews where she discusses the value she places on languages and how she attempted to divulge that to a tutee she was working with:

“I grew up with my grandmother telling me, ‘Oh, it’s a good thing you learned Spanish because it’s going to make you more valuable in the job market,’ and things like that. So, languages, to me, have always been a plus. The more you have, the better…”

Her language development and fluency are something Maggie values and repeatedly mentions the importance of practicing in order to keep fluency. This is prevalent in her conversations about her fluency in Russian because she feels guilty for not developing that language as much her other languages. Language is an important part of Maggie’s identity in many aspects of her life. She finds language to be a community builder when she meets other individuals who also speak various languages. When asked to explain that bond she feels when someone speaks a similar language, she claimed:

“Some sort of mutual ground. Like, a place of, uh, of understanding. Particularly because, especially in the writing center, knowing different languages means that I know what it means to learn a new language. So, when someone else is working on something and they’re learning a language, I’m...it’s more relatable to me, and it’s something that I can understand. Um, so I guess in that way, in the education route, it’s helped, and it’s, like, become something to bond over because of that, just like I share your experience.”

In this quote, Maggie reveals that language acts as a form of community builder because she feels empathy towards those who have had to learn multiple languages. The empathy she feels
relates to her own experiences learning different languages. Specifically, she feels that learning Italian at an older age revealed to her how difficult language learning can be for others. To her, learning English, Spanish, and Russian were easier because she learned them when she was younger. This empathetic feeling is demonstrated in one of the tutoring sessions collected in this study and will be further explained in chapter 5.

One of the practices that was prevalent in her early literacy developments was language brokering for members of her family, specifically for her grandmother and father. In some of these language brokering interactions, there is an element of rhetorical awareness. However, it is through introspection that she considers this awareness to be prevalent because at the time she did not realize it was a practice she was employing. Being aware of the way word choice can further or hinder a rhetorical purpose is evident in her brokering experiences with her father. When asked about using rhetoric earlier in her life, prior to fully understanding the term, she claimed:

“I think I thought about it but I didn’t have a label for it…I think I mentioned in the first interview that my dad would bring things to me to look over. So, in those kind of scenarios, I’m not familiar with… But I had to help him write things in a prison setting. …So, I had to really consider, okay, who is this going to?….Maybe a class assignment, I wouldn’t have taken too much consideration with what the rhetorical situation was. But with his writing, I did, because I knew that it was his job. And I know that there were times where I told him, ‘Well, maybe you should use this other word, because it furthers that kind of…”"
This segment from our post interview suggests that language brokering was a practice that enabled Maggie to heighten her rhetorical awareness through practice. In this segment, she reveals being aware that this situation was more important than her normal classroom assignments. Researchers have revealed that many language brokering children, often feel a sense of urgency in their language brokering due to the repercussions attached to those brokering moments (Weisskirch & Alva, 2002; Rainey et al., 2014). It is evident from her interview segment above, that Maggie is aware of the implications of these reports she is helping her father revise. She compares it to the work she completed in her classroom in which she had no real-world consequences to her writing. Using the incorrect word choice or phrase would not endanger her livelihood.

This rhetorical affinity may have developed through her multilingual upbringing, but it was further augmented through her experiences in the writing center.

University Writing Center

Maggie’s language brokering experiences in her multilingual upbringing has helped develop her rhetorical attunement, but it is in the University Writing Center (UWC) that she begins to shape and develop this practice through the rhetorical instruction she receives in the tutor training course, weekly seminars, and tutoring sessions. Moreover, the environment of the UWC fosters cultural understanding, which the participant values due to an empathy she feels towards people learning a new language due to her own similar experiences. It is this open environment that allows Maggie to feel comfortable enough to access ecological resources and be flexible when tutoring to better assist the writer.
Maggie has been tutoring at the UWC for approximately three years. This writing center, as many others, requires a tutor training course that incorporates writing center theory and weekly tutoring practice that must be complete prior to being hired as a tutor at the center. During the tutoring course, Theory and Practice of Tutoring Writing, students are taught to constantly reflect on their tutoring practice and think of alternative strategies in difficult tutoring situations. In this collaborative environment, discussions about the potential ways a session could have been handled tends to occur among tutors taking the course as well as more seasoned tutors. Metacognitive awareness of tutor practices is fueled by assignments in the course and sustained through weekly seminars once the course is completed. In the tutoring class, the culminating assignment involves audio recording a session, transcribing 15 minutes of the recording, and conducting a discourse analysis of the selected segment. In this assignment, tutors begin to practice reflecting on their tutoring practices in order to promote this behavior moving forward. When tutors finish the course, they continue their education through weekly seminars designed to promote reflective practices by asking tutors to video record tutoring sessions, select a clip, discuss the clip in a group, then present on the learning that occurred during that reflective and collaborative conversation. As part of these weekly seminars, students are encouraged to stay aware of new writing center research through inquiry research projects focused on a specific aspect of the writing center. The projects are completed in groups and presented throughout the semester.

Being part of this environment for three years, has shaped Maggie’s literacy practices and academic endeavors in many ways. When asked why she became a tutor, Maggie answered:
“At first, it was, like, because I liked English and I was a creative writing major and I was like this when I wanted to do, um... And I wanted to be an English professor. So, it was...kind of fell in line with the kind of career that I wanted. Um, but that changed.”

Maggie explains that her initial reason for becoming a tutor were superficial and it was through time that she began to fully understand the writing center as a place of “cultural understanding.” She claims:

“I think why I wanted to come back, or keep coming back, was because, number...well, one, like, the atmosphere is one that sort of... This was one that I didn’t come up with until later on, that, like, the atmosphere kind of breeds cultural understanding, and...and it’s a place where, like, people aren’t going to criticize you for whatever language skills you have and that sort of thing. It’s just like... It’s kind of a bridge between all of these different things, all these, like, professors expecting you to write all of these awesome paper, and then you struggling to do it. Um, and we kind of served as a bridge, and I really liked that, because I know that there were times that I needed that, and, like, I kind of... Because I know what it’s like to be on the, like...the side that’s not understood sometimes.”

In this segment of the interview, Maggie reveals the role an inclusive environment plays in tutoring and the importance of having empathy, while tutoring. The value Maggie places on cultural understanding can be seen in her multilingual upbringing when she states the empathy she feels towards others learning new languages because she has experienced those moments as well. However, it seems that the writing center’s environment helped her find a place in which
those values aligned. An example of the way the writing center fosters an environment of cultural understanding can be revealed in an anecdote provided by Maggie:

“So, he was having me read the paper, um, and talk it out, and he said that, like... And I don’t want to make any assumptions, because that’s not, like...if he wants to disclose that he speaks Spanish and that’s what he wants to do, then that’s fine. Um, but he did. He was, like... He told me that he was Peruvian and he had just moved here and he really, like...you know, and, like, I told him that I was Hispanic, and he ended up...we had, like, a couple-minute conversation about it. And he started speaking in Spanish, because it made him comfortable, and I tried to switch off to Spanish, and... Because I, like, I told him, if you need...like, if you need to express your ideas clearly and you can’t in English, feel free to go to Spanish, because I’ll understand you....So, we just went on through the...through the rest of the session and he was talking in Spanish and I was talking in English, and it worked out”

Maggie discusses the way in which she code-switched between English and Spanish with a writer because she recognized that a different approach to this session would be more useful for this specific writer’s needs. This anecdote demonstrates the translingual nature of the writing center in that Maggie felt free to access ecological resources to better assist the writer. By acknowledging language as resources, she was better capable of making meaning with the student and better understand how to properly help the student achieve his purpose. As many of these practices I highlight, this particular practice stems from her multilingual upbringing, but in many ways was amplified by the cultural understanding that is prevalent in the UWC. This
environment allowed Maggie to see a place in which these practices were valued and could be further developed.

In many ways, these worlds I’m describing in this chapter are interconnected and develop from exposure to others as can be noted in the previous segment and the one that follows. Beyond the environment fostered in the UWC, one of the aspects of this community that should be highlighted is the role rhetoric plays in this community. Many of the lessons covered in the tutor training course and the weekly seminar courses focuses on teaching tutors about being rhetorically aware of the situation in which their tutee is writing. This focus on rhetoric is ultimately due to the tutoring course being part of the Writing and Rhetoric major and the UWC being part of the Department of Writing and Rhetoric. Maggie explains an example of the many ways in which working as a tutor at the UWC has developed her own understanding of the role rhetoric plays in her tutoring and learning:

“And I don’t know if it’s like this for everybody, but I’ve found that understanding why this thing is the way that it is instead of just accepting it is more useful and better, in terms of learning. And I recognize that early on in my own learning, because I just love that class. So, I guess I’ve tried to apply those same principles, especially with teaching citation styles, because it’s something that’s kind of elusive and nobody knows why you have these citation styles and stuff. So, I always try to connect it to understanding why they’re there. And Dr. Hall was the one that explained this to me, and when he explained this to me, I was like, oh my God. I get it now. And I was having trouble in my tutoring sessions distinguishing between MLA and APA, and I was like, how am I supposed to ever tutor this if I can’t understand the differences? And he was like, ‘This is why.’”
Two important aspects about the role rhetoric plays in her life are revealed in this quote. The first is that an awareness of the rhetorical reasoning has been part of her life from an early age. She recognizes the importance of being aware of the reasoning behind certain choices as a useful tool for her own learning. Also, this rhetorical awareness was demonstrated when she recalled how she used these strategies to help her father find the best language to use in his professional writing. Secondly, the UWC offered an opportunity to further her rhetorical awareness through its education and through the practice of disseminating that knowledge to other writers during tutoring sessions.

Just as these two worlds, multilingual upbringing and the UWC, continue intersect in many ways, they also lead to the addition of the third world that is at play in amplifying the Maggie’s rhetorical awareness.

Writing and Rhetoric Major

Maggie’s introduction to rhetorical education in the UWC helped her apply a name to a practice that originated in her language brokering experiences. Through the education provided and the space of cultural understanding created in the UWC, Maggie became interested in furthering her own rhetorical education by entering the Writing and Rhetoric Undergraduate major. Ultimately, the courses she takes in the major, while still working as a tutor at the UWC, help enhance her rhetorical attunement and develop her tutoring practices through that process.

As mentioned before, Theory and Practice of Tutoring Writing, is a course within the Writing and Rhetoric major. This was the major Maggie decided to study in part because of her own experiences in the UWC:
“I’m invested in people’s education now, and I, like...I started off as a creative writing major, and I switched my major. I switched to writing and rhetoric because of this, because I loved the idea of being purposeful with our moves and everything having some sort of intention. Um, and that was...and, like, meaning making. I found it fascinating. Like, for our transcription analysis, it was so cool. Um, so, that made me come back, because I liked the idea of learning of how I’m producing meaning and how other people are producing meaning and how that works together and all of that.”

Hence, Maggie’s early upbringing allows her to attain a level of rhetorical attunement through her brokering practices, but the UWC serves as a place in which she can further develop that attunement through tutor education and practice. Through her exposure to rhetoric in the UWC, Maggie could provide a name for a practice familiar to her for many years, which ultimately leads her to further enhance her ability.

These three worlds tend to culminate in this major because they prepared her for a rhetorical education and allowed her to provide a name to the practice that was so engrained in her early life. The major also intersects with other worlds such as the UWC because she begins taking courses in the major as she is still tutoring, which ultimately alters her tutoring practices. This is demonstrated in the following segment in which Maggie discusses the way she uses wait time as a strategy in some of her tutoring sessions:

“It comes from the tutoring class and my tutoring experiences. Wait time was a thing I had to teach myself, so that’s definitely…it’s from there. I didn’t necessarily have that kind of… Like, I didn’t know it was a thing, to deliberately give somebody that kind of space to talk and stuff. And I mean, I would do it, but it wasn’t an intentional thing. And
especially not with the intent to get this person to learn something. I would just use wait time because I was giving them the space to talk. But at this point, I had already taken classes in the department that we’re more focused on, integral to understanding rhetorical listening, that sort of thing. And I had already started working on the stuff with my thesis and that sort of thing, so that also had heavy play, because I feel like people need the space to talk about things, and I feel like listening with the intent to understand rather than the intent to answer is ridiculously important.”

It is essential to emphasize that Maggie is aware of the strategies she is employing as being present prior to her taking courses in the Writing and Rhetoric department. However, taking those courses not only gave her the language for her practices, but it also helped foster those strategies in other areas of her life.

**Conclusions**

In this chapter, I have discussed the ways Maggie’s multilingual upbringing, the UWC, and the Writing and Rhetoric major have played a role in the development of her rhetorical awareness. Although these worlds were discussed as separate domains, the values learned in each can be traced back to one another further exemplifying the ways in which these three worlds are interconnected in Maggie’s literacy practices. Through her language brokering experiences, Maggie could cultivate a rhetorical awareness as demonstrated through the anecdote about her father’s work memos. However, it was in the UWC and the Writing and Rhetoric major where Maggie became fully aware of her practice and in turn actively refined it.
In the following chapter, I use interview and tutoring session transcripts to illustrate the ways in which these three worlds intersect and argue that these intersections demonstrate the complexities behind her own literacy development and reveal two main practices.
CHAPTER 5: INTERSECTING WORLDS

In this chapter, I will discuss how the three worlds described in the previous chapter are working together to develop the literacy practices Maggie uses in her tutoring sessions today. The previous chapter explained the ways in which the three worlds influenced the presence of one another and the ways they worked together to amplify her rhetorical awareness. This chapter presents a second part of my findings. In this chapter I argue that two practices are revealed in Maggie’s tutoring that were cultivated from her multilingual upbringing, but were later developed by her tutor training, rhetoric courses, and her tutoring practice. These practices include using empathy as a rhetorical approach and rhetorical attunement in her tutoring sessions. Through these two practices, I argue, that we can see the underlying development of a dynamic metacognitive practice developed from the multiple domains of informal and formal learning outlined in the previous chapter. In this sense, her ability to feel empathy towards another multilingual writer due to her similar experiences and her rhetorical awareness stem from her multilingual upbringing; however, it has been enriched by the metacognitive awareness she developed through her tutor education and her major, where she learned to think rhetorically about her actions and imagine the various ways in which a session could progress. This allows her to think critically about the moves she is making, rather than simply react to changes in the session.

To better represent these practices and how these interconnections are at work, segments from the tutoring session videos, literacy history interview, and stimulated recall interview will be used to demonstrate how these intersect. Doing so, allows for a fuller understanding of the
nature of how this metacognitive practice developed and how it functions in Maggie’s tutoring. At times, some of the quotes used in the previous chapter are revisited in order to demonstrate how these seemingly separate worlds are interconnected. Although parts of those interviews are reused, they are used for different purposes than the previous chapter.

**Empathy as a Rhetorical Approach**

In the previous chapter, I discussed the apparent empathy Maggie feels towards multilingual writers who are in the process of learning a new language through her own experiences as a language learner. I also addressed the ways in which that empathy plays a role in her valuing the environment of the UWC, which she argues fosters cultural understanding. In this section, I demonstrate the ways that empathy she feels plays a role in her tutoring sessions. I argue that the empathy demonstrated in her tutoring sessions with multilingual writers employs a rhetorical approach and understanding that played a role in the tutoring interaction and enables her to properly address a sensitive situation.

As mentioned previously, Maggie made reference the writing center’s environment as an open place of acceptance to different cultures and language difference. In the interview below, she made a reference to the presidential election results because she felt that the results indicated that those spaces were not readily available in every facet of her life:

“It’s kind of a bridge between all of these different things, all these, like, professors expecting you to write all of these awesome paper, and then you struggling to...to...to do it. Um, and we kind of served as a bridge, and I really liked that, because I know that there were times that I needed that, and, like, I kind of... Because I know what it’s like to
be on the, like...the side that’s not understood sometimes. It’s nice to... God, this is hard, because of what just happened [Presidential Election Results]. [Laughs] Uh, it’s nice to have a place where you can openly talk about it, openly work through it, um, and know that people are going to understand you and know that people are going to be okay with whatever it is that you’re going through. And I really appreciate that, that kind of common ground that the writing center works as.”

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Maggie values the UWC as a place of cultural understanding because she too can relate to learning a new language and feeling like she too has experienced similar situations as other multilingual writers. Her empathy is confirmed in a segment of the third tutoring session collected for this project in which a multilingual writer discusses why she wrote “American Citizen” on her resume. She was advised to do so because of the origin of her name, the international work experience she has, and her first language being Arabic. The tutor’s reaction to this conversation demonstrates how empathy can be used as a rhetorical approach:

**Tutee:** Well, if I were applying here, I wouldn’t put Jordan, to be honest.
**Tutor:** Okay.
**Tutee:** Because they discriminate here, even though you say they don’t.
**Tutor:** Yeah, I know.
**Tutee:** I mean, one of my... Yeah, the woman. She told me that probably from your name, they don’t call you back, although I’m an American citizen.
**Tutor:** I was going to ask...
**Tutee:** She told me to put it.
**Tutor:** Oh, that’s sad.
**Tutee:** I know. It’s very sad.
**Tutor:** I wanted to ask, and I was like, you don’t need that.
**Tutee:** Where do I put it? Although when I apply, you have to go through the... What do you call it? The signing on of their talent... The website. They ask you if you need a visa or something like that. And I say no, but maybe the actually interviewers, maybe they see me and they see, oh, my name is not from here, it’s foreign, she’s probably not American. I don’t know. I don’t know where to actually put that.
Tutor: How much does she recommend that? Like, have you heard that from various people that you’ve shown your resume to?
Tutee: Yeah.
Tutor: Ask around. See if somebody else recommends it.
Tutee: Okay.
Tutor: Because, I don’t know, I was like, why is that there? You don’t have to prove that to me. But I don’t know if it’s commonplace to do something like that.
Tutee: I mean, her boss is Persian. Whenever they apply for a bid, sometimes they...what do you call it? They disregard them, or they don’t give them the project, because his name is Ali something. But I don’t...
Tutor: Does he put...?
Tutee: Yeah, he has to put for contact information and that stuff.
Tutor: Well, does he put, like, American citizen?
Tutee: I don’t know if he was a citizen. He should be.
Tutor: See, I’m going to research that, too, see what other people say.
Tutee: I’m supposed to be calling...what do you call it? An adviser from the career services. But I’m just too lazy. But I’m going to contact him today. [Laughs]
Tutor: [Laughs] Okay. I understand the feeling. I mean, I think the only time that you would need to have the locations where you got the certifications are like if the company’s an international organization that values...like, they have potential for you as an employee to travel and stuff like that. I think showing that you’ve been to all of these different places and you’ve traveled already kind of shows that you are easily adaptable and you have the skills needed to constantly be moving from one place to another. So, that would be the only time that I would consider putting the locations. Yeah.
Tutee: So, the location of the internships in my previous job, I mean, that counts, right?
Tutor: Yeah. No, you should have those on there, because they’re going to have to...if they’re really interested in that sort of thing, and you’re like a…

Although it cannot be witnessed from the transcription, in the segment above, Maggie’s body language and facial expressions indicate her discomfort with the advice the tutee received from career services because she too has felt microaggressions of this kind herself. This session is one of the richest sessions collected because after recording the session, Maggie expressed to me that this session was the best at demonstrating her ability as a multilingual writing tutor and what she believes sets her apart from other tutors. In her stimulated recall interview, she even mentions that she does not believe a monolingual tutor would have caught the tone the tutee used when
describing her fears of being marginalized due to her name and her cultural background. It was
due to her own experiences that she felt she could address this situation and have a conversation
regarding the student’s experiences. In the segment below, she explains why this session was
emblematic of her tutoring practices as a multilingual writing tutor:

“Okay, I guess it’s a sort of empathetic feeling, that, like… I don’t know. I don’t know
how to frame it because I know people that might not have gone through those
experiences are also feeling it right now, so I don’t know how to separate it from that.
But essentially, I guess the reason that I felt that way was because me coming from….So,
it’s like, you go through these experiences and you understand what it means to speak
another language, to be slightly different or separate or whatever it is from your peers, if
that’s the case….But yeah. I think it’s more about the empathy and I think it’s more about
this sort of awareness that there are experiences outside of your own that make people
feel certain ways, because I caught the anger in her voice and I caught the anger in her
face, and her expressions were… Like, I don’t know if another tutor… I don’t know. I
can’t say. But another tutor might not have caught…like, might have just brushed over
that and sort of not necessarily acknowledge it. Not that I’m saying that they would have,
but I guess I felt more capable. I felt like it wasn’t my place because I don’t necessarily
understand her particular experiences, but I felt like it was my place, as somebody who
comes from a background that has all of these varied experiences.”

This ability to read the tutee’s body language and tone allowed the tutor to open up a
space where they could discuss the implications of using “American Citizen” in the resume. I
would argue that this finding furthers the idea that she is rhetorically attuned and explains why
multilingual individuals have this ability since Maggie reveals why she felt the need to address that situation due to her own personal and similar experiences. Maggie states, “because being multilingual, at least to me, isn’t necessarily just about language. It’s about culture, it’s about understanding other perspectives, it’s about being able to cross perspectives and understand that one isn’t necessarily the same as the other, and you have to respect those.” I took this to mean that part of being multilingual to the tutor means being able to recognize and respect difference in culture and cultural understanding due to similar experiences living between different cultures.

Underlying the empathy demonstrated in the session, I argue, is a rhetorical approach employed in the session. Her ability to recognize that although she could empathize due to similar experiences, it was not her place to directly make a connection to her own experiences. She felt it was not her place to assume she fully understands the writer’s experience. Therefore, her approach to the session was to rely on a focus on the genre conventions of the resume. By using that strategy, she is finding solutions to problem, while still supporting the writer and letting her know the situation she is in is “sad” and should not be commonplace. Maggie states in her stimulated recall interview that she could feel empathetic to the writer’s situation, but decided not to impose her own experiences because doing that would indicate that her experiences are the same as the tutee’s. Maggie’s awareness of that potential outcome indicates that her choices made in the session are rhetorical and purposeful.

This awareness of the potential outcomes if different approaches were taken in the session is relevant to the tutor education she received from the UWC. However, this empathy that she acknowledges as being a part of her multilingual experiences demonstrates that these
two worlds are intersecting and working simultaneously. Moreover, if we trace back to her multilingual upbringing, it becomes clear that this manner of thinking was apparent in her language brokering experiences with her father, where she had to think about the ways language could be perceived depending on the wording and sentence construction. In those moments of brokering, she had to be aware of the various ways the language would be interpreted and the ways that interpretation could lead to different outcomes for the prisoners in question. Therefore, this awareness of the potential outcomes of her decisions as well as her empathy are both practices that she developed through her multilingual experiences, but it is through tutor education that this ability is further developed and practiced.

**Rhetorical Attunement**

Rhetorical attunement is a practice that was prevalent in Maggie’s language brokering experiences, but was further developed with the introduction of the rhetorical situation in the UWC and the Writing and Rhetoric major. This concept is one that is relevant to Maggie’s tutoring sessions in various forms. She uses the rhetorical situation to teach concepts and help writers make decisions about their writing, by asking the writer to think about the purpose and audience the writing is intended for. Moreover, Maggie uses the rhetorical situation when making decisions about what approaches to tutoring would work best for the specific writer. This is demonstrated by the differences between her multilingual and monolingual tutoring sessions.

In the session with the multilingual writer, the tutor calls on her knowledge of the rhetorical situation to properly word and revise the list of languages the tutee is fluent in when
working on her resume and uses the concept to help herself and the writer make appropriate decisions regarding word choice in the resume:

**Tutor**: Fluent, like, what kind of fluency? Like, would you say...? Or, you know, your intermediate German and the Arabic, would you say that it’s conversational, professional fluency? Like, I would define it a little bit more.  
**Tutee**: English is fluent. Arabic is my mother tongue, or my mother language, sorry.  
**Tutor**: Okay. So, then you can say... Did you learn...? What about the German?  
**Tutee**: Okay. English, I learned it when I was in school. I was young. Arabic was my first language. German, I learned it when I was 18 till 23.  
**Tutor**: Okay. So, what I do on my resume is, whatever... English is my native language, so I put native, and then I would put...for English, I would put, for you, bilingual, because that shows almost like more fluency than fluent. And then German, you can say, like...  
**Tutee**: Conversational. It’s more conversational.  
**Tutor**: Yeah. I would say conversational.  
**Tutee**: Okay. So, would it be in separate bullet points? Some people told me, don’t put English, because they’re going to think, “Oh, you’re a foreigner.” It’s like an additional language. That’s why I didn’t have my languages, but last time, the employer told me, “Oh no, add that.”  
**Tutor**: I think languages are a plus. Me speaking. I’m not the employer. I also don’t... I’m not going to say anything, but... I was also questioning the American citizen thing, so I’m coming from that perspective. I don’t know what makes you most comfortable and what you think would be best. I have it on mine as different bullet points with each one, and I was born in the U.S., so I still have English as native and I have Spanish as bilingual.  
**Tutee**: You write that?  
**Tutor**: Yeah, I write that.  
**Tutee**: You don’t write bilingual in Spanish?  
**Tutor**: No, I put English, parentheses (native), Spanish, parentheses, (bilingual), and then I have... I’m trilingual, so I also have Italian, and then I have conversational.  
**Tutee**: You’re Italian?  
**Tutor**: Yeah.  
**Tutee**: Okay. I’m going to write native English and Arabic, and I’m going to write conversational German. That’s better. I’m not going to write fluent in English.

The discussion about the languages the tutee is fluent in, brings about a conversation about the issues that may arise from her nationality, as was mentioned earlier. The tutee feels insecure about the way her name, international work experience, and languages will be perceived. She wants to avoid appearing foreign; therefore, finding an effective way in which to
include English is imperative. In the interchange, it is important to notice that both the tutor and the tutee are aware of an audience they are writing to properly portray the tutee.

Some of this rhetorical awareness demonstrated in the exchange above came from being aware of the audience and making distinctions between the way she approached certain situations depending on the person involved. This seems to be a practice she developed at a young age, but didn’t fully understand until she learned about the concept in her writing and rhetoric courses. One example of this rhetorical awareness at work before her upper-level courses is the way she helped her father make rhetorical choices when writing incident reports as a prison correctional officer in which he had to inform the reader who was at fault:

“I’m not familiar with… I mean, I am now, but I wasn’t then, with the prison system, necessarily, and how writing happens in prisons and things like that. But I had to help him write things in a prison setting. So, I had… Like, I wasn’t necessarily really young. I was in high school and stuff when he started bringing memos and emails to me and stuff like that that he wanted to send out that were a little bit more high stakes. So, I had to really consider, okay, who is this going to? It wasn’t like… Maybe a class assignment, I wouldn’t have taken too much consideration with what the rhetorical situation was. But with his writing, I did, because I knew that it was his job. And I know that there were times where I told him, “Well, maybe you should use this other word, because it furthers that kind of…” So, he’s making an incident report about an inmate who had a fight or something, and he would expressly say, like, the COs have already mentioned that this is
the person that was at fault. So, I have to write this in a way that kind of swings the court decision so that it’s in this person’s…”

When doing so, the tutor expresses how using certain language helped her father sway the reader to blame a particular prisoner over another. This example indicates that though the rhetorical situation was a concept she learned as a student in our writing and rhetoric major, she was making rhetorical decisions in her writing and language brokering prior to being exposed to the concept in higher-education. This practice can be seen in two of the tutoring sessions collected for this project. The session discussed above, with a multilingual tutee, she uses the rhetorical situation when discussing what should and shouldn’t be included in her resume due to her fear of being stereotyped due to her name and cultural background. In this session, they discuss what each decision and the way it is phrased can be interpreted by a specific audience in order to find the appropriate way to make her knowledge of various languages as an asset, rather than making her othered. By specifically adding certain terms to indicate fluency in each language, the tutee could not only demonstrate which languages she was fluent in, but also use words like “native” to indicate she is fluent in English, even if it is not her first language.

It is also clear from the session that the tutor is not the only one that demonstrates a rhetorical attunement. The multilingual tutee herself demonstrates that she too has an awareness of the way words can be perceived. When she decides to use “native” for both English and Arabic, she is insisting that doing so will be the only way she won’t be othered. You can see in her decision-making process that she is calling on similar experiences as well as advice provided to her in different situations in order to make decisions about the way she wants to represent her languages in a resume. The rhetorical attunement prevalent in this session might have something
to do with both tutor and tutee being multilingual writers, which authors have claimed makes them more rhetorically aware of their own writing (Lorimer Leonard, 2014; Guerra, 2004).

Similarly, in the second tutoring session collected, the tutor discusses the rhetorical implications behind using certain citation styles over others:

Tutor: Okay. So, this is what... I had a professor that once explained to me, because I was like, why in the world do we have all these different citation styles? Why can’t we just have one universal one and just use that? And he explained to me that the citation styles reflect value from the communities that use them. Have you learned it like that?

Tutee: No, because honestly, I learned... The classes I’m taking, I don’t necessarily need it. So, it was never talked about. It was never... Yeah.

Tutor: So, basically, MLA is typically used by English, humanities, that sort of thing, and then APA is typically used by sciences and business and that sort of thing.

Tutee: Okay.

Tutor: So, for example, with MLA, if you’re writing a paper on Shakespeare and you have a citation from somebody...like, this is the explanation for the in-text, you have a person that you’re quoting that did an analysis of a Shakespeare play back in the ‘50s. That doesn’t matter. Like, the fact that it was done in the ‘50s doesn’t matter to them, because it’s still relevant. It’s an analysis of Shakespeare that doesn’t...you know.

Tutee: Okay.

Tutor: But with APA, because it’s more science-focused and that sort of thing, if you’re citing somebody from the 1950s, it matters, because that information would typically be considered no longer credible, the science has changed so much, or that fields that use APA have changed so much. So, typically, you do last name of the author, the year of publication, and then, if you have a page number, you do the page number, but the page number isn’t a thing that you have to do, particularly if it’s online. If you have a book or something, then you do do it, but otherwise, you don’t. And it would be... So, that’s why they have the last name of the author here, and then right after the last name, they put the date or the year. And then right after they finish the quote, they put the page number and the quote.

Tutee: Oh, okay. So, this, I would have put, like, Cockerel, like just normal, and then put the quotation...like, put this, quotations like this? And then... Okay. So, I would put his last name, and then no parentheses, just the year, because normally, I thought it was just like parentheses, last name, year, page number, just at the end
of a quote. You know what I mean? I didn’t know it was actually thrown in different spots.

Although this is not something she learned early in her life, she claims that growing up it was easier for her to learn a concept, if she understood the purpose or rhetorical reasoning behind the concept. This concept relates to her own rhetorical awareness growing up, which she demonstrated in her language brokering experiences with her father. However, the way she was introduced to this approach to teaching the differences MLA and APA stems from her own experiences in the UWC:

“Dr. Hall was the one that explained this to me, and when he explained this to me, I was like, oh my God. I get it now. And I was having trouble in my tutoring sessions distinguishing between MLA and APA, and I was like, how am I supposed to ever tutor this if I can’t understand the differences? And he was like, ‘This is why.’”

Therefore, the ability to understand concepts rhetorically, think rhetorically, and teach rhetorical concepts stem from a multilingual upbringing, but are further developed in through the education she received from the UWC and the Writing and Rhetoric major.

Maggie’s rhetorical awareness existed prior to tutoring and taking courses in the major; however, her brokering practices have also changed due to the amplification of her rhetorical attunement in these other areas. Maggie reflects on the ways her language brokering has changed below:

“It wasn’t like that so much before. Before, I was more straightforward. I would just kind of give my dad or my grandmother or whatever the language that they needed. And now it’s more like… I don’t know why or where it came from. I don’t know. Maybe it’s
because my dad has been here longer and he knows more. I mean, since I was a kid, I always saw him as someone that was fluent in the language, in English, because I never noticed, I guess. But he pushes back more often now, and I think before, he didn’t push back, and that was why I was just giving the answers, I guess. And then now, it’s more like, well, why…?”

The change from simply providing an answer to explaining “why” certain choices are made during brokering interactions demonstrates that her own tutoring experiences are affecting the brokering interactions she has, mainly with her father. This demonstrates the complexities involved in the ways these worlds intersect and proves that simply tracing these strategies through a cause and effect approach simplifies the complexity of literacy development and learning and assumes that Maggie learns in isolation from any other factors in her life.

One of the main findings from my research is that the Maggie’s tutoring sessions with monolingual versus multilingual appear different, which reveal a rhetorical awareness and approach on the part of Maggie. She discusses the way she accommodates different tutees based on their specific needs and their own knowledge of the language:

“I think when I’m tutoring somebody that I don’t think is a multilingual writer, I might not use the same... Well, I try to do a lot of, like, wait time, anyways. Um, but I think with a writer that’s not multilingual, I might do wait time for things like ideas and concepts, and...and structure in an organization, and that’s where the bigger issues, um... And then like smaller things, like grammar and that sort of stuff, I will sort of pass off and just, like, explain it and check for some sort of, like, understanding, and then see if they can apply it, but, like, it won’t be as... I won’t worry about it as much. And then with
a multilingual writer, like, who’s... A lot of times, multilingual writers will express interest in specifically learning grammar. So, I will pay more attention to it. Um, and I will do, like... The moves are different in the sense that I will use the wait time there, rather than for the more global concerns. And I might say something, like, explain something, and then wait until, like... I won’t explain it again and I won’t point it out again until they do.”

In the first tutoring session collected, she works with a monolingual writer who she provides long instances of wait time and only interjects when she feels that the student will not find the correct language. However, when working with certain multilingual students, she is more aware of their needs and their abilities and might provide more help and less wait time. When discussing where this rhetorical awareness stems from, she argues that it comes from tutor education and her courses in writing and rhetoric:

“It comes from the tutoring class and my tutoring experiences. Wait time was a thing I had to teach myself, so that’s definitely…it’s from there. I didn’t necessarily have that kind of… Like, I didn’t know it was a thing, to deliberately give somebody that kind of space to talk and stuff. And I mean, I would do it, but it wasn’t an intentional thing. And especially not with the intent to get this person to learn something. I would just use wait time because I was giving them the space to talk. But at this point, I had already taken classes in the department that we’re more focused on, integral to understanding rhetorical listening, that sort of thing. And I had already started working on the stuff with my thesis and that sort of thing, so that also had heavy play, because I feel like people need the
space to talk about things, and I feel like listening with the intent to understand rather than the intent to answer is ridiculously important.”

Arguably, this ability to understand the type of support the tutee needs can be a reason behind Thonus’ (2014) claim that “multilingual tutoring by multilingual tutors may be superior to any other model” (p. 207). However, Maggie doesn’t see this ability or awareness of the individual needs of tutees as a skill, but feels guilty for approaching each tutee differently. In part, she claims she feels more of a bond or connection to multilingual writers because she finds languages to be interesting and a place for bonding.

Metacognitive Practice

Through Maggie’s tutoring sessions, it is clear that her multilingual upbringing helped cultivate a rhetorical awareness and empathy towards others learning and practicing a new language. Through her tutor training and the rhetoric courses she has taken in the Writing and Rhetoric major, she has amplified these practices in ways that helped her enrich a rhetorical awareness of her practices. This enriched awareness is what I refer to as a metacognitive approach to her tutoring sessions. This metacognitive approach helps her think of the various ways in which her actions in her tutoring can lead to different outcomes. The metacognitive practice, is derived from the multiple domains that were highlighted in the previous chapter. In Maggie’s early life, we can see a rhetorical awareness of her actions through the language brokering experiences with her father. As she decides the appropriate language to use in her father’s incident report, she is demonstrating an awareness of the way her language can sway the
reader to understand the incident a certain way. However, this rhetorical awareness is later amplified in the UWC tutor training and weekly seminars. As discussed in the previous chapter, the course is conducive to promoting reflection on their tutoring choices through various assignments. In the tutoring course, there are observation analysis reports where tutors observe another tutor and reflect on the ways one session could have been approached in different ways and the outcomes that may have from that change. Later in the semester, tutors are asked to do the same in the final assignment for the course, which asks tutors to write a discourse analysis of one of their own tutoring sessions. The learning continues in their weekly seminars where tutors participate in video case discussions, where they conduct a similar analysis to a video recorded tutoring session of their choosing. These practices are further enhanced through major, where the tutor claims she learned the language for her rhetorical practices and further enhanced her knowledge through theory and practice.

We can see the ways her metacognition is apparent in the tutoring sessions and practices highlighted in the sections above. For instance, her ability to feel empathy towards another multilingual writer due to her similar experiences has been enriched by the metacognitive awareness she developed through tutor education, where she learned to think rhetorically about her actions and always imagine the various ways in which a session could ensue. This allows her to think critically about the moves she is making, rather than simply react to changes in the session. It helped her make the decision to demonstrate her empathy, while respecting the writer’s individual experiences.

In this chapter, I have used tutoring sessions and interviews to argue the ways in which the three domains discussed in the previous chapter have amplified her rhetorical knowledge and
developed a metacognitive practice that Maggie uses in her tutoring practice. In the next chapter, I discuss the main conclusions from my findings and the implications of those findings to our field of study.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS & IMPLICATIONS

In the previous two chapters I have outlined my main findings and claims and have used segments from the interviews and tutoring sessions collected to support those claims. In this chapter, I summarize my main findings, limitations, implications for future research, and contributions to the field. The results of this study have demonstrated the complexities of tracing literacy practices over time and the ways various domains of informal and formal learning contribute to the development of literacy practices. Those domains each contribute in various ways and it is in those intersections that amplification of those practices can be fully understood. The study only followed one participant, which allowed for a closer inspection of the ways those practices have been influenced by various types of learning. However, though the study reveals some useful information that can help us better understand the literacy practices of multilingual writing tutors, we cannot use my study to make generalizations about these students.

The findings of this study identified the issues with tracing literacy practices linearly. I argue that doing so oversimplifies our understanding of the way literacy practices are created and developed over time. As the data revealed, more than one domain of learning is responsible for the development of literacy practices and so identifying practices derived from a multilingual upbringing and tracing how they transform in a tutoring session doesn’t acknowledge the complexities of literacy development. Moreover, I claim that three worlds are interacting together to amplify my focal participant’s literacy practices: multilingual upbringing, UWC, and the Writing and Rhetoric major. Therefore, I claim that Maggie’s language brokering experiences advanced her rhetorical awareness, even if she was unaware of rhetorical concepts. However, her integration into the UWC tutor training course, weekly seminars, and tutoring
allowed her to begin developing her rhetorical attunement. It was further heightened by her rhetorical theory course in the Writing and Rhetoric major, which helped her to recognize the concepts behind the actions she was already taking in her brokering and tutoring experiences. This hyperawareness of these concepts, I argue, helped her to develop a metacognitive practice in which she constantly negotiates strategies in her tutoring to better understand which approach would be the most beneficial in her study.

Contributions to the Field

My study aimed to trace the literacy practices of multilingual writing tutors that stemmed from their multilingual upbringing and linguistically diverse repertoire. In doing so, I learned that tracing those practices linearly was not an adequate method because it does not fully represent our understanding of literacy practices in the ways they develop from formal and informal education and training (Barton and Hamilton, 1996). However, by refocusing my study to examine the ways various domains are involved in the development and amplification of my participant’s literacy development, I could provide a new method of better understanding what makes multilingual writing tutors different than monolingual writing tutors. This process also helped me better understand the ways in which their linguistic repertoire played a role in those differences.

In writing center research, studies exist where the focus is on the linguistic differences of multilingual writing tutors as a valuable quality. For instance, Lape (2013) argues for the proliferation of Multilingual Writing Centers in which multilingual writing tutors would work to develop the linguistic and rhetorical skills of tutees. Others, like Thonus (2014), argue that
multilingual writing tutors are more adept at tutoring other multilingual writers (p. 207). However, these authors do not explain what makes these tutors better prepared for tutoring these writers and what skills they use that other tutors do not. My findings shed light into the possible ways in which multilingual writing tutors develop and amplify a rhetorical awareness and the ways their experiences help them better empathize with their tutees. Therefore, my study contributes to this conversation offering one close examination of a multilingual writing tutor and her specific literacy practices.

In similar studies focused on multilingual writers, scholars have found that the ability to move between languages and cultures helps develop the rhetorical skills of multilingual writers, even if they may not be fully aware of the learning that is occurring (Guerra, 2004; Lorimer Leonard, 2014). Guerra (2004) furthers this idea by claiming that their abilities can be further developed when multilingual writers become aware of their rhetorical ability. The findings of my study can attest to these scholars’ findings and further their arguments by providing an account of the way a multilingual writing tutor developed a rhetorical awareness early in life through her language brokering practices, but later amplified her rhetorical awareness through her training and education received in the writing center and UCF’s Writing and Rhetoric major.

Canagarajah’s book, *Tranlingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*, discusses the concept of ecological resources when he argues “Siva knows that in these contact zone encounters one has to be supportive and collaborative...Besides Siva knows how to use ecological resources to make meaning in translingual contexts. He can combine clues such as gestures, objects, setting, topic, and other features to help in intelligibility and communicative success” (p.35). In other words, ecological resources refer to any tool or
approach used to better assist in making meaning in communication. One of the main codes derived from my analysis is a metacognitive practice apparent in her tutoring sessions. In that practice, we see Maggie making decisions based on her understanding of the potential ways in which a session can be approached and the outcomes those different approaches would have in the session. This finding relates back to Canagarajah’s concept of ecological resources. This is revealed in the following example from Maggie’s tutoring: Maggie discusses the way in which she code-switched between English and Spanish with a writer because she recognized that a different approach to this session would be more useful for this specific writer’s needs. By acknowledging language as resources, she was better capable of making meaning with the student and better understood how to properly help the student achieve his purpose. This particular practice stems from her multilingual upbringing where she was rhetorically aware of the ways the words used could be interpreted in her language brokering experiences, but was later amplified by her tutor training and the Writing and Rhetoric major.

Other scholars in applied linguistics have advocated for translanguaging or a more inclusive use of language in pedagogy by allowing multilinguals to use all their languages and language varieties (Otherguy, Garcia, and Reid, 2015; Sayer, 2013). They argue against the suppression of languages in education because it overlooks the potential benefits of mixing both languages. Although my study does not focus on the implications of mixing languages in a classroom setting, it does illuminate the positive ways shuttling through various languages can be beneficial in the literacy and rhetorical development of multilingual writers. Additionally, some of my interview findings attest to the ways code-switching between languages in a session with a multilingual writer can better assist the writer in developing their ideas and think through
complex concepts. Although the study did not contain a tutoring session in which that practice was demonstrated, it does help support the arguments of these authors who advocate for translanguaging in pedagogy.

In communications studies, language brokering refers to children of immigrant families who advocate for their parents and communities by interpreting information in situations where their families’ inability to communicate contributes to social inequality (Tse, 1996). Current scholarship on language brokering focuses on the detrimental developmental and psychological consequences of exposing young children to stressful situations that they are not prepared to cope with due to their cognitive level of development. These documents tend to be of high importance; therefore, the children feel pressure to develop cognitive and literacy skills to better prepare them for such situations (Rainey et al. 2014; Weisskirch & Alva, 2002). Though some scholarship addresses how language brokering affects the acculturation process of young children, little research has been conducted to understand how the effects of language brokering in other areas of their lives. My study contributes to this research because it illustrates the way language brokering helped the participant develop a rhetorical awareness to language and was further developed by other institutions that enabled the participant to develop a metacognitive practice she uses in her tutoring sessions.

As mentioned in my introduction, we, as composition instructors, have a responsibility to better address multilingual writers in our classrooms. From my study, we can begin to understand how we can accommodate those students and develop their skills. For one, being open to various types of multilingual writers with various language and literacy backgrounds is important to fully understand the ways in which those past practices may influence them today.
Secondly and most importantly, having a viewpoint in which we see the language differences these students bring to the classroom as an asset, rather than a deficit can help us begin thinking about the ways we can amplify some of those already existing practices. As my study revealed, rhetorical education can help amplify some of those practices that are already present in their language repertoire. My study also argues for writing centers to diversify their staff. The diversification of tutors offers opportunities to foster literacy practices that are already existing in ways that can lead to new and more effective tutoring approaches.

More importantly, my study contributes to writing center education in that it demonstrates the ways a rhetorically-based tutor education that focuses on a continual reflection of the tutoring strategies fosters a reflexive metacognitive practice that enables tutors to think critically about their practice and develop ways of dealing with different situations in tutoring. This metacognitive practice is not only fueled by the rhetorical approach to tutor education, but through a combination of that approach and the reflective element to this education. Through a purposeful and transparent practice of bridging connections between learning experiences, tutors can make connections between domains of informal and formal learning to better develop their own understanding of their learning process, which leads to a more purposeful reflective process.

This reflection across several domains of learning extends beyond the writing center to the Writing and Rhetoric major as well. As Maggie demonstrated, through the process of reflecting on her multilingual upbringing, the UWC, and the Writing and Rhetoric major she could bridge together her learning and develop a metacognitive practice in which she was hyperaware of the various possibilities in her tutoring approach. Encouraging this type of reflection in our tutors and students in the major can also help foster a metacognitive practice
that can be used beyond tutoring sessions, but in other aspects of their lives. This type of purposeful and transparent connections is what we strive for in the students within the major in their capstone course. By teaching students to more actively engage in this type of reflection throughout the major, it could lead to far deeper connections between their learning that can lead to the kind of metacognitive practice apparent in Maggie.

Although this study cannot generalize about multilingual writers and writing tutors as a whole, it does contribute to the previous research focusing on the skills and abilities other scholars have argued multilingual writers obtain through their linguistic repertoire and offers some insights into the importance of rhetorical education and encouraging a purposeful reflective process. Continuing this type of research with a more diverse group of participants could lead to more conclusive findings that can better illuminate our understanding of the literacy development of these individuals.

Limitations

There were several limitations to this study, particularly regarding the number of participants and the sample size of the data collected. Although the UWC has a diverse group of tutors, when recruiting participants, there were few tutors working at the UWC that were qualified for this study. When I attended the weekly seminars in order to recruit participants, many tutors were interested, but were not able to do so because they did not identify as a multilingual writing tutor. After I spoke to the tutors in the recruitment process, only two participants expressed interest in my study. However, one of those participants had to withdraw from the study for personal reasons. Although a case study on one participant provided a rich
look into the literacy practices of multilingual writing tutors, it does not allow for generalizations to be made regarding my findings because I simply don’t have multiple perspectives to draw from in this study.

Another limitation to this study was the sample size of the tutoring sessions collected. Although the collection of tutoring sessions was random, the process of collecting the three tutoring sessions was complicated by the participant’s limited schedule at the UWC and my own availability to visit the UWC, since I had to be present before the recording to ask the tutee for consent. Moreover, the three sessions collected cannot fully encompass all of the practices prevalent in the participant’s tutoring sessions. However, the sample can provide us with some insight into some of the practices developed overtime and helped us begin to understand what factors aided in the development.

One final important limitation to discuss is my own research positionality. As a multilingual individual myself, it was important for me to remain as unbiased as possible during my data collection process. I did this by avoiding inputting my own perspectives into the interviewing process, specifically the stimulated recall interview where Maggie reflected on segments of her own tutoring sessions. However, it is important to discuss the affordances of my positionality as well. As a multilingual individual with a background in rhetoric and composition and tutoring, a deeper relationship was built between Maggie and myself due to our similar experiences. This relationship allowed for a space in which Maggie felt she could disclose information about her tutoring practices and multilingual upbringing that she might not have if our experiences were not similar.
Implications for Further Research

Due to the limitations in the data collected for this study, as mentioned above, it would be useful for future research to replicate this study with several qualified participants and more tutoring sessions in order to make more conclusive generalizations about the literacy practice development of multilingual writing tutors. To begin with, a study focused on multilingual writing tutors should be designed in a writing center that has a higher proliferation of multilingual writing tutors or a cross-institutional study should be designed if the writing center in which the study is taking place does not have many multilingual writing tutors. The multilingual writing tutors that are selected for the study should have a variety of language and cultural backgrounds in order to understand how those differences may or may not have an effect in the development of literacy practices.

The amount of tutoring session recordings collected for this study were not extensive enough to fully encompass all the practices in my participant’s tutoring; therefore, a study in which more tutoring sessions are collected and analyzed might led to more findings that support, refute, or concede the findings and conclusions made in this study. Having the ability to collect various sessions might lead to better results because more conclusive findings can be made regarding the ways multilingual writing tutors approach various tutoring situations. Although a session was collected in this study where both the tutor and tutee are multilingual, it might be interesting to see how different a session may look if both the tutor and tutee speak the same language. My data alludes to what those sessions may reveal through the literacy history and stimulated recall interviews, but they were never analyzed in an actual tutoring session.
Beyond expanding the data collection of this study, one follow-up study that could be developed could focus on the way language functions as a community builder for my participant. My study did not focus on this particular finding, but this bond felt through language may be related to the empathy my participant feels when tutoring multilingual students. It is through learning a new language and going through similar experiences that this bond is created. This bond can be further studied in tutoring sessions in which both the multilingual writing tutor and tutee both speak the same language. The study might focus on the ways those interactions may lead to a new dynamic in the tutoring session. This might lead to more findings regarding the role empathy plays in tutoring sessions and the learning process, specifically, when two multilingual writers are collaborating.
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APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM FOR TUTOR PARTICIPANT
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Informed Consent for Multilingual Writing Tutors

Title of Project: Tracing Literacy Practices of Multilingual Writing Tutors

Principal Investigator: Somaily Nieves, M.A. Rhetoric & Composition Candidate

Faculty Supervisor: Dr. Angela Rounsaville, Ph.D

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Whether you take part is up to you.

- The purpose of this study is to explore the distinct experiences some multilingual writing tutors have had due to their position as mediators of multiple languages and see how these experiences inform their tutoring practices. This tracing of their practices will be employed through the lens of literacy practices and events as understood in New Literacy Studies.

- Participation requires a 30-minute literacy history interview. The literacy history interview will be audio recorded and transcribed for future analysis.

- Participation requires video recording during two Writing Center consultations (about 45 minutes each). You will then participate in a follow-up 30-minute stimulated recall interview for each recording of your tutoring sessions. The stimulated recall interview will be audio recorded and transcribed for future analysis.

- Since you must tutor as part of your job position, this study only requires a total of approximately 1 hour and 30 minutes outside of your tutoring sessions.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study.

Study contact for questions about the study or to report a problem: If you have questions, concerns, or complaints contact Somaily Nieves, Graduate Student, Rhetoric and Composition M.A. Program, College of Arts and Humanities by phone at (954) 610-1780 or by email at somaily.nieves@ucf.edu. You may also contact Angela R. Rounsaville PhD., Faculty Advisor, Assistant Professor, Writing and Rhetoric department, College of Arts and Humanities by email at angelar.rounsaville@ucf.edu.

IRB contact about your rights in the study or to report a complaint: Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB). This research has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. For information about the rights of people who take part in research, please contact: Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246 or by telephone at (407) 623-2901.
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Informed Consent for Multilingual Writing Tuttee

Title of Project: Tracing Literacy Practices of Multilingual Writing Tutors

Principal Investigator: Somaily Nieves, M.A. Rhetoric & Composition Candidate

Faculty Supervisor: Dr. Angela Rounsville, Ph.D.

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Whether you take part is up to you.

- The purpose of this study is to explore the distinct experiences some multilingual writing tutors have had due to their position as mediators of multiple languages and see how these experiences inform their tutoring practices. This tracing of their practices will be employed through the lens of literacy practices and events as understood in New Literacy Studies.
- You will participate in a video recorded tutoring session. No other participation is required from you.
- Participation requires only the length of the tutoring session (approximately 45 minutes in length).

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study.

Study contact for questions about the study or to report a problem: If you have questions, concerns, or complaints contact Somaily Nieves, Graduate Student, Rhetoric and Composition M.A. Program, College of Arts and Humanities by phone at (954)610-1780 or by email at somaily.nieves@ucf.edu. You may also contact Angela R. Rounsville PhD., Faculty Advisor, Assistant Professor, Writing and Rhetoric department, College of Arts and Humanities by email at angela.rounsaville@ucf.edu.

IRB contact about your rights in the study or to report a complaint: Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB). This research has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. For information about the rights of people who take part in research, please contact: Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3248 or by telephone at (407) 823-2901.
APPENDIX D: SAMPLE INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

FOR TUTOR PARTICIPANT
RESEARCH INSTRUMENT: SAMPLE INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR TUTORS

INTRODUCTION
Introduce self and project.

Introduce interview process: With your consent, this interview will be video recorded. The interviews will be transcribed, and files will be stored in a security enabled computer file, to be accessed for reference if needed. You may also refuse to answer any questions or say that you need to stop the interview or the recording.

Describe project goal for the interview: At this point, you have graciously agreed to talk with me about your literacy history and your two selected tutoring sessions. The purpose of the interview is (1) to talk generally about your reading and writing history; (2) to describe your thought process and moves made during the sections of your tutoring session we are viewing together; and (3) to talk about how those decisions were influenced or not influenced by your previous literacy history.

Describe eventual benefits: to help us better understand how the relationship between the participants’ literacy histories their tutoring practices.

Literacy History Interview Question Examples (initial interview)
1. What are your earliest memories of reading and writing in any language?
2. What are your most memorable memories of reading and writing in any language?
3. What languages did you speak at home growing up?
4. What languages do you speak today? How often do you speak in a particular language? Where do you speak in a particular language?
5. What sorts of schools did you attend?
6. What was your reading and writing education like growing up?
7. In what languages did you read and write, while growing up? Which did you prefer to do?
8. Who do you remember helping you with your reading and writing in any language?
9. Who do you remember helping with reading and writing in any language?

10. What led you to become a writing tutor?

11. What languages do you speak while tutoring? If more than one, how do you decide?

**Stimulated recall interview questions (focused on tutoring sessions)**

*These are only sample questions. The exact content of the questions will change depending on the moves being made during the tutoring session.*

1. Tell me what you notice yourself doing in this segment of your tutoring session?

2. Why did you decide to do that in the session?

3. What previous experiences did you draw on when making that decision (personal or tutoring experiences)?
APPENDIX E: RECRUITMENT SCRIPT
RECRUITMENT SCRIPT

Hello everyone,

Some of you may already know me because I was a graduate tutor for the University Writing Center (UWC) about a year ago. For those of you that don’t, I am Somailey and am currently a graduate student in the rhetoric and composition M.A. program. I am in my last year of the program, which entails writing a thesis. I’m here today because I am hoping to get some of you involved in my thesis project if you are interested. My project is focused on multilingual writing tutors, like myself, and is seeking to find the relationship between their literacy background and their current tutoring practice.

For this study, I am looking for two multilingual writing tutors that have grown up speaking or listening to more than one language growing up. For example, growing up the only language we spoke in my house was Spanish. As I’ve gotten older, we have begun speaking a mixture of English and Spanish, but that only began in recent years. One of my early memories growing up was helping my parents translate important documents or translating conversations for them in different scenarios. I think those moments have stayed with me because of the many years I was a peer tutor. I began noticing how those experiences were mimicked in my own tutoring practice, especially when I tutored other multilingual writers. I found myself code-switching between English and Spanish and at times even translating content in those sessions. Of course this is just an example of one of my own experiences growing up, but if you feel like you have had similar experiences, I think you would be a good candidate for my study.

If you did decide to participate in the study, it would only entail about an hour and a half to two hours of participation total. This will be broken up into different meetings, so you won’t have to sit with me for a total of two hours on one day. I would begin by conducting a literacy history interview, where I ask about your experiences with reading and writing growing up. This would only take around 30 minutes. Next, I will ask you to record two tutoring sessions. I know Dr. Hall and Dr. Tripp ask you all to record your tutoring throughout the semester already. I could use any of those videos for my study. This means that you won’t have to record yourself any more than your current requirement. Finally, we will have what I call a stimulated recall interview for each tutoring session you record. In these interviews, we will watch segments of the tutoring session you recorded and talk about your practice. Each stimulated recall interview will be 30 minutes in length.

I think your participation in this study could benefit you in that it could help you reflect on your own practice and learn a bit more about it. Also, I am willing to help you all in any way I can. I am currently in a graduate program, so I can help those of you interested in getting into a graduate program with your application materials. I have also applied and have been accepted
into two conferences, one being IWCA. I can offer help if you are planning on applying to present at any conference.

Please let me know if you are interested in being a part of this study. Dr. Hall, Dr. Tripp, and Mariana all have my contact information, but I will give you all my information as well. My email is somaily.nieves@ucf.edu. My office is also in Colbourn Hall 304D. I can always come chat with you at the UWC or in my office if you would like to know a bit more about the project. Thank you.
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