

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2020-

---

2020

## Reading Between the Lines: Language Ideologies and Tutor Education Readings

Michele Cintron Toney  
*University of Central Florida*

 Part of the [Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#)  
Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd2020>  
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2020- by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact [STARS@ucf.edu](mailto:STARS@ucf.edu).

---

### STARS Citation

Cintron Toney, Michele, "Reading Between the Lines: Language Ideologies and Tutor Education Readings" (2020). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2020-*. 304.  
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd2020/304>

READING BETWEEN THE LINES: LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND TUTOR  
EDUCATION READINGS

by

MICHELE CINTRON TONEY  
B.A. Rollins College, 2017

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts  
in the Department of Writing & Rhetoric  
in the College of Arts and Humanities  
at the University of Central Florida  
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term  
2020

Major Professor: R. Mark Hall

©2020 Michele Cintron Toney

## ABSTRACT

Language difference and socially-just writing center praxis have long been points of discussion within writing center scholarship. Writing center administrators and tutors recognize that the praxis within their writing centers does not always correspond to their beliefs about working with student writers or the role of the writing center within the academy—particularly in the areas of language equality and social and racial justice—and they acknowledge the impact that course readings have in tutor education. While tutor education readings may not specifically state a particular ideological viewpoint regarding language difference, their discussions of language and rhetorical practices, multilingual writers, and tutoring across difference can indicate certain ideological beliefs. Therefore, I argue the importance of identifying and considering the implicit ideological tenets within these readings, a practice that both reveals possible conflicts between our values and our praxis and recognizes the significant role these readings can play in shaping tutors' ideas about language difference. Using the theoretical lens of language ideologies, I analyze tutor education readings from ENC 4275/5276: Theory and Practice of Tutoring Writing, the UCF University Writing Center's tutor education course for new tutors. Drawing on Horner et al.'s chart of ideological tenets and a writing center-focused chart of ideological tenets I derived from writing center scholarship, I identify tenets of monolingualism, traditional multilingualism, and translanguaging in these readings and illustrate how others can do the same. Through this analysis, I hope to encourage writing center administrators and tutors to implement this practice, enabling them to determine if their tutor

education readings reflect and advance the ideologies they seek to promote inside and outside of their writing centers.

To my friend, Joann Stroup, whose encouragement, prayers, wisdom, and unconditional friendship are an incredible gift.

To my abuelita, Carla Roman, who made it possible for me to enact my Puerto Rican identity in a way no one else could—I wish I could share my research with you.

To my father, Michael Cintron, who instilled in me a curiosity about the world around us and demonstrated to me the thrill of learning all you can about whatever interests you.

To my mother, Dolores Cintron, who opened to me a world of beauty and possibility by teaching me to read at age three, setting me on the path to my life's work in multiple ways.

To my daughters, Scarlett and Autumn, who bring me so much joy and inspiration—you each make my life a little more magical just by being in it.

To my husband, Ken, whose love and support over the last thirty-plus years enabled me to fulfill my childhood dreams and inspired me to take on new ones.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you, Dr. Mark Hall, for your mentorship over the course of this program. Your wicked sense of humor, calm demeanor, and always-open office door made my graduate student experience a positive one, and your thoughtful feedback encouraged me to create a thesis I can be proud of.

Thank you, Dr. Angela Rounsaville, for helping me to articulate my research interests and translate them into a line of inquiry. What I learned from you about writing, literacy, and composition pedagogy was life-changing, and that learning was enhanced by the support you offered outside the classroom. Thank you for seeing and hearing me—my respect and admiration for you is boundless.

Thank you, Dr. Esther Milu, for your kindness in taking on the role of thesis committee member for a graduate student you had not previously met. Your insight into my work was very much appreciated, and your response to my table was one of the highlights of my graduate student career.

Thank you, Andrew Petrykowski, Devon Razey, Kara Delemeester, Rachel Marks, and Rena Perez for providing the emotional support we all needed with our group texts and office-hours chats, Starbucks and Topper's runs, before-class hangouts at Chili's and after-class get-togethers at Bar Louie. Through our collective friendship and solidarity, the phrase *Avengers, assemble!* took on a whole new meaning, and my graduate school experience would not have been the same without each of you.

A special thank you to Rena Perez for your friendship and unending support, which made it possible for me to complete not only this thesis but this program. Through your continual encouragement, which included music videos with personalized lyrics to make me laugh, custom to-do lists to help me focus, and thirteen-hour-long phone-based work sessions to keep me going, you embodied Steve Rogers and Bucky Barnes' friendship motto: *I'm with you to the end of the line*. 'Nuff said.

Lastly, thank you, Feige et al., for the movies and music of the Marvel Cinematic Universe. Whether binge-watching 15 of the first 17 MCU movies during Spring Break to recover from my first year of graduate work, taping pictures of Captain America to the chair in front of my workspace to bribe myself into finishing my course assignments, watching *Captain America: The Winter Soldier* for the 14,000,605<sup>th</sup> time as I graded student work, or listening to my curated playlist of MCU soundtracks on repeat while writing this thesis, the MCU was there for me, and I'm incredibly grateful.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| LIST OF TABLES.....                                | ix |
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....                     | 1  |
| CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE.....    | 7  |
| Writing Centers and Social Justice .....           | 7  |
| Language Difference and Containment .....          | 9  |
| Translingual Practices and Writerly Identity ..... | 10 |
| Writing Center Praxis and Tutor Education.....     | 11 |
| CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY .....                   | 17 |
| Researcher Positionality.....                      | 18 |
| Research Questions.....                            | 21 |
| Research Site and Data Collection Methods.....     | 22 |
| Data Analysis Methods.....                         | 23 |
| Data Reduction.....                                | 23 |
| Theoretical Framework.....                         | 25 |
| Coding Framework .....                             | 29 |
| Coding Scheme .....                                | 33 |
| Coding Process.....                                | 34 |
| CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS & FINDINGS.....             | 40 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Writing Center-Focused Ideological Tenets .....                                | 41 |
| Examples of Coded Data .....   | 44 |
| Contextualizing the Data.....  | 44 |
| Identifying Ideological Tenets .....   | 45 |
| Syntactic Units Coded for Monolingualism and Traditional Multilingualism ..... | 46 |
| Syntactic Units Coded for Translingualism.....                                 | 54 |
| Summary of Findings.....   | 60 |
| CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION.....  | 63 |
| Limitations .....  | 63 |
| Implications for Future Research.....  | 65 |
| Contributions to the Field .....   | 66 |
| APPENDIX A: INITIAL DATA SET READINGS FOR ENC 4275/5276.....                   | 69 |
| APPENDIX B: REDUCED DATA SET READINGS FOR ENC 4275/5276.....                   | 76 |
| APPENDIX C: CONTEXTUAL TABLE OF READINGS.....                                  | 80 |
| REFERENCES .....   | 83 |

## LIST OF TABLES

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Horner et al.'s Language Ideology Table .....  | 30 |
| Table 2: Writing Center-Focused Ideological Tenets..... | 31 |
| Table 2: Writing Center-Focused Ideological Tenets..... | 43 |

## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

As increased globalization creates the need for communicating across multiple cultures and languages, composition scholars are recognizing that individuals are negotiating linguistic boundaries through purposeful, individualized linguistic strategies (Canagarajah 5-6; Horner et al. "Language" 303, 305; Lee 184; Lu and Horner 583-583; Lorimer Leonard 228). In an effort to address the use of these strategies within the composition classroom, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) created the 1974 resolution "Students' Right to Their Own Language" (SRTOL). This resolution caused many compositionists to reconsider their approach to language difference (Horner et al., "Language" 304; Lu and Horner 583), shifting from the perspective of monolingualism to that of traditional multilingualism, an approach that seeks to acknowledge and work with language difference. Yet, even with this approach, Matsuda notes that composition instructors often suggest that students who speak unprivileged Englishes visit the writing center (640, 642) as a way to "solve the problem" of language difference in the classroom. This practice, known as "the strategy of containment" (Coogan qtd. in Grutsch McKinney, "Writing" 68), illustrates how monolingualism's values are still evident within the ideology of traditional multilingualism. Both monolingualism and traditional multilingualism equate language proficiency with fluency, viewing the individual not as a person who speaks more than one language but as two (or more) separate individuals, each of whom must be highly fluent in that language's standard practices (Horner et al., "Toward" 285). In these ideologies, fluency is a key component in determining the individual's acceptance

within a specific language group (285). Rather than respecting diverse language practices, these ideologies work either to eliminate language difference through conformity with dominant language practices or “allow” nondominant language practices within certain spaces (Horner et al., “Language” 306-307), thus reifying through language the cultural and social stratifications present within US society.

In contrast to monolingualism and traditional multilingualism, translingualism regards language difference as the language standard (Lu and Horner 584). Reframing mastery of language as the ability to negotiate language difference in order to communicate with others, translingualism uses language as a bridge rather than a barrier by viewing language and communication as something negotiated by the writer and the reader, emphasizing “mutual intelligibility” rather than fluency (Horner et al., “Toward” 287). Translingualism views language as fluid, so an individual is not considered *bilingual* or *multilingual* but *translingual*—one who is skilled in moving *between* multiple languages through linguistic strategies such as code-switching or language blending (Horner et al., “Toward” 286). For the translingual individual, these strategies are chosen based on her linguistic knowledge and the rhetorical situation rather than a rigid set of rules.

Before going further, I want to discuss my use of the terms *multilingual*, *translingual multilingual*, and *traditional multilingualism* within this study. Alvarez points out the importance of being viewed as a “typical student” for students who use multiple languages, stating, “Coming to the [Bronx Community College] writing center made these multilingual students of color feel as if they belonged somewhere on campus as normal students, not as ESL students” (84).

Greenfield suggests that the act of labeling students with terms such as ESL effectively serves to “profile entire populations of people” and “assumes some students and tutors are neutral in terms of language, culture, identity, and education whereas others (‘ESL students’) are defined by an essential and limited experience” (“Love-Inspired” 123). As a compositionist and writing center researcher with a translingual view of language and language practices who advocates language equality, I respect and acknowledge both Alvarez’s and Greenfield’s views.

For this reason, I want to clarify my meaning when using the terms *multilingual*, *translingual multilingual*, and *traditional multilingualism* in my research. In “Toward a Multilingual Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm,” Horner et al. use the term “translingual multilingualism” to describe a view of multilingualism that recognizes multilingual individuals’ language practices as actively negotiating language boundaries through “a unique and shifting blend of practical knowledge and use of multiple languages” (286). In this study, I draw on Horner et al.’s concept of translingual multilingualism, using the terms *multilingual* and *translingual multilingual* interchangeably when referring to writers drawing on multiple languages, registers, and language practices to move fluidly across linguistic divides, with the intention that both terms include the tenets of translingualism. These individuals include not only those who use World Englishes but also those who use any of the numerous dialects and varieties of English spoken by those living in the United States, such as Chicano English (CE), Native American English (NAE), Appalachian English (AE), and African American Vernacular English (AAVE). Additionally, some scholars argue that monolingual Standard American English (SAE) speakers use multiple registers and exhibit language

difference, making them translingual in their language practices as well (Lu and Horner 585; Lorimer Leonard 243; Horner et al., “Language” 305). Therefore, recognizing the multiplicity and individuality of language difference (Canagarajah 8-9) and acknowledging that the differences exhibited by SAE speakers and speakers of other languages and dialects are not viewed equally (Gilyard 286; Lu and Horner 583), I consider *all* individuals to be translingual. In this study, I reserve the term *traditional multilingualism* for the language ideology born out of monolingualism—the kind of multilingualism that equates fluency with competency and cultural belonging and sees the speaker as two or more individuals with varying levels of fluency.

Despite the field’s recognition of translingualism as a lens through which to view language practices, traditional multilingualism remains the dominant approach to working with speakers of languages other than SAE, not only in first-year composition courses but also in writing centers. In recent years, writing center scholars have begun discussing a translingual approach—if not by name, then by its principles and values—and the role it can play within the work of the writing center, including its ability to address not only praxis (Newman 5; Greenfield, “Love-Inspired” 119) but also issues such as containment (Grutsch McKinney, “Writing” 68-69), identity (Newman 6; Alvarez 86, 88; Denny 101), and social justice (Greenfield “Love-Inspired” 118; Condon and Olson 33). Yet the principles of traditional multilingualism still permeate many of the practices used by writing center tutors when working with writers traditionally identified as multilingual, ESL, ELL, or L2. For example, tutors may view linguistic and rhetorical divergences from SAE as automatic error or linguistic deficiency and assume that multilingual writers want these so-called errors corrected in order to achieve a

“fluent” text. However, some writing center scholars advocate that tutors move away from this view and instead discuss with writers the rationales behind these linguistic and rhetorical choices, a shift in thinking that both sees these strategies as purposeful rhetorical choices and respects diverse language and rhetorical practices (Newman 6, 7; Griffin and Glushko 169). Additionally, writing center scholarship and tutor education guides often frame students who use language practices other than SAE as “different”—a problem to be solved by tutors who are assumed to be white, monolingual, SAE-speaking, and US-born (Greenfield “Love-Inspired” 122; Grutsch McKinney, “Writing” 71). Because writing center scholarship and tutor education guides inform tutors’ approach to tutoring across language difference, these texts can play a significant role in developing their ideas about language and rhetorical practices, in turn influencing their praxis within the writing center, particularly as it relates to their work with multilingual writers. However, writing center scholarship has not yet addressed the assumptions about language and rhetorical practices existing within these texts.

By considering these assumptions, I respond to the call for writing center research that asks what writing centers can do to promote language equality (Alvarez 89; Denny 101; Greenfield “Love-Inspired” 134; Newman 9). My research examines the readings assigned in the University of Central Florida (UCF) University Writing Center’s (UWC) tutor education course for new tutors in order to identify the language ideologies reflected within these readings. In this way, my study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- How do these assigned readings discuss language and language/rhetorical practices?

- How do these readings characterize tutors, multilingual writers, and their work together?
- What actions do these readings suggest tutors should take tutoring across language difference?
- Given these discussions, characterizations, and suggestions, what language ideologies are reflected in the readings used in a tutor education course?

Through this line of inquiry, I hope to encourage writing center administrators and tutors to consider the ideological messages about language and rhetorical practices, multilingual writers, and tutoring across difference that are communicated through tutor education readings and whether these messages reflect and advance their intent both in their praxis and their position within the academy.

In this first chapter, I introduce my thesis project, demonstrating the value of research that investigates the language ideologies in tutor education readings and promotes language equality. In my second chapter, I explain the language ideologies of monolingualism, traditional multilingualism, and translanguaging, then relate them to the scholarly conversations in composition and writing center studies regarding language practices. In my third chapter, I position myself as a researcher, thus contextualizing my interpretation of my data, and describe my research methods. In the fourth chapter, I explain my analysis and share my findings. Finally, in my fifth chapter, I provide some conclusions, suggest some questions for further reflection, and offer some possibilities for future research in this area.

## CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

This literature review provides an overview of scholarship related to language ideologies, socially-just praxis, and language difference in writing center studies. The first section, Writing Centers and Social Justice, offers an overview of calls for socially-just writing center praxis, particularly in the area of language difference. The second section, Language Difference and Containment, describes the practice of containment, in which language difference is minimized through composition classes created for so-called “basic” and multilingual writers and by sending students to the writing center. The third section, Translingual Practices and Writerly Identity, explains how tutoring from a translingual perspective pushes against containment, while the fourth section, Writing Center Praxis and Tutor Education, demonstrates the influence language ideologies have on tutor education. Altogether, tracing the impact of language ideologies in writing center studies makes clear the need for scholarship that examines tutor education readings in order to identify the language ideologies they reflect.

### Writing Centers and Social Justice

Language difference and socially-just writing center praxis have long been points of discussion within writing center scholarship. In 1999’s *Good Intentions*, Grimm asks writing center administrators and staff to consider not only “the political implications of writing center work” but also “the cultural assumptions that we bring to [that] work” (29), assumptions that affect our ideas about language, rhetorical practices, and writerly identity. By viewing writing

center praxis through postmodern frameworks such as Street’s ideological model of literacy, which reveals the societal power structures underpinning conceptions of literacy, Grimm suggests that we can see “the ways that literacy practices carry cultural knowledge, ideology, and values” and “acknowledge that literacy practices are cultural rather than natural” (31-33). With this understanding, she argues that writing centers can move away from “performing the institutional function of erasing differences” (xvii) and toward supporting students through more socially-just praxis (107-109). The aim for more socially-just praxis is evident within Villanueva’s call for writing center administrators and staff to acknowledge racism encountered within the writing center—including the racist ideologies existing within language ideologies—and confront it through open discussion (5, 11-12, 16, 18).

Similarly, through the 2010 “Position Statement on Racism, Anti-Immigration, and Linguistic Intolerance,” the International Writing Centers Association (IWCA) address their concerns regarding Arizona’s SB 1070 and HB 2281, Oklahoma’s adoption of English as its official language, and the Arizona Board of Education’s move to keep teachers with accented English out of the classroom. Observing the “implicit and explicit racism” manifested in these acts toward immigrants and people of color, the IWCA maintains that multiple Englishes are used within US society, a linguistic diversity that positively reflects our physical diversity (“Position”). They argue that, in attempting to control language use, legislators and educators in Arizona and Oklahoma are “attempt[ing] to de-legitimize the voices, bodies, and epistemologies of people of color,” in turn establishing an “ecology of fear” that reinforces systemic racism and reifies a “white supremacist view of language and usage” (“Position”), a view synonymous with

monolingualism (Condon and Olson 41). Affirming writing centers' commitment to social justice and supporting the individuals affected by this legislation, the IWCA encourage discussion within the writing center that centers on the ideologies behind these laws, particularly ideologies regarding language.

Given the nature of their work within the academy, writing centers are “perfectly positioned to take the lead in institutional responses to the exigencies of translanguaging” (Newman 5), and writing center scholars are responding to those exigencies by investigating ways in which translanguaging can shape the field's theory and praxis. Newer research not only expands the field's view of multilingual writers to include those using nondominant American Englishes (Denny et al. 100) but also continues in calling the field not only to question how beliefs about language and language practices impact praxis (Condon and Olson 31; Denny et al. 102; Greenfield, “Love-Inspired” 138-139; Greenfield, “Making” 86-87; Latta 18-19) but also to view the writing center as an active participant in social and racial justice (Alvarez 87; Blazer 18; Condon and Olson 33; Diab et al. 1; García 32-33; Wilson 3). As translanguaging spaces, writing centers can work against English monolingualism by respecting all writers' language practices and considering how monolingualism impacts writers' identities (Denny et al. 101; Wilson 4).

### Language Difference and Containment

Although SRTOL acknowledges students' right to use American English dialects and World Englishes in their texts, many composition instructors still expect students to use only SAE in their courses. Historically, language difference within composition classrooms has been

minimized through the practice of containment, in which students who speak Englishes other than SAE are placed in basic or ELL composition courses (Matsuda 648). These courses are meant to support students in learning SAE, which Matsuda acknowledges can be helpful, but they may reinforce the idea that “the college composition classroom can be a monolingual space” (649). Lacking the training necessary to deal with language difference, many composition instructors relegate this difference to issues of grammar and syntax, suggesting editing strategies or referring students to the writing center (Matsuda 640). However, Matsuda suggests that writing tutors are equally ill-equipped to handle language difference (642). This concern about tutor preparedness invites us to consider what writing tutors are taught about language difference and how to negotiate that difference within a tutoring session.

### Translingual Practices and Writerly Identity

Because identity is enacted in an individual’s language practices, tutoring from a translingual orientation means that tutors can support writers’ linguistic agency to communicate in the way they choose (Alvarez 88; Denny et al. 102; Griffin and Glushko 169; Newman 7), helping these students to retain their individual identity within the academy. Revealing to writers the ideological power structures at work within SAE allows writing centers to “serve as agents for students” rather than “fix-it shops for professors and as places to acculturate marginalized students,” thereby equipping students with the power to choose the language practices used in their texts versus leaving that power with the academy (Alvarez 87, 88). Furthermore, when tutors explain the rhetorical work performed through translingual strategies, writers come to see

themselves as competent, not deficient, writers, both increasing their writing confidence and fostering their sense of inclusion in the academy (Alvarez 88; Blazer 22-23; Newman 6).

Writing centers work within an academic ecology that expects conformity to perceived academic writing norms, norms embedded in and exemplified through SAE, but Newman points out that “writing centers, through their evolving experience in examining linguistic multiplicity can explain, demystify, and clarify translanguaging for the whole institutional community” (9). Yet, Denny et al. note the lack of empirical research on multilingual writers and their interactions with tutors (101). Therefore, they call for more research on various aspects of multilingualism, including examining the variety of multilingual writers visiting the writing center and their reasons for visiting, determining how writing centers can affect the academy’s view of language difference, and developing tutor education curricula that helps tutors broaden their understanding of language difference (101-102). In “Twenty-First Century Writing Center Staff Education: Teaching and Learning towards Inclusive and Productive Everyday Practice,” Blazer echoes this last call, insisting, “Writing center staff education must be a primary focus of efforts to affirm in our practice the reality and value of linguistic diversity in our centers,” with tutors learning to help student writers understand the value of their individual language and rhetorical practices as they communicate across various contexts (18-19).

### Writing Center Praxis and Tutor Education

While some writing center scholars recognize the need for a translanguaging approach to writing center praxis, this approach can be hindered by the ways in which writing center research

and tutor education manuals frame both tutors and student writers. Illustrating the binary of the “typical versus atypical writing center session,” writing center scholarship usually assumes that typical sessions “implicitly involve US-born, white, standardized-English-speaking, cisgender, straight, etc. students and tutors” (Greenfield, “Love-Inspired” 122). Similarly, some tutor education manuals “caution that tutors might have to work with students who are ‘different’ in their learning style, writing level, learning (dis)abilities, age, nationality, race (or ‘multiculturalism’), dialect, or gender” (Grutsch McKinney, “Writing” 71). As a result, these texts frame multilingual students as troublesome situations for tutors to “deal” with, thereby framing these sessions—and signifying difference—as problematic (Blazer 21; Brooks-Gillies; Condon and Olson 42; Greenfield “Love-Inspired” 122-123; Grutsch McKinney, “Writing” 71). These ideas about tutors and writers reflect underlying, though perhaps unconscious, beliefs about language, language practices, and the individuals who use them, beliefs that must be addressed in order for the field to work from a translingual orientation. Grutsch McKinney suggests that if tutor education manuals are positioning tutors as white Americans who are monolingual English speakers, othering multilingual writers, and framing difference as negative and troublesome, then these beliefs about identities and language practices are most likely reflected in our writing center praxis (“Writing” 71-72).

In addition to the ideas found within tutor education manuals, the ideas about language that tutors bring to the writing center must also be considered. Brooks-Gillies offers the following commentary regarding this issue:

Writing consultants, frequently undergraduate students who embrace mainstream notions of “good writing” and “proper grammar,” often reinforce notions of remediation and “bettering oneself” through writing center visits, understanding the notion of “Standard English” as a value-neutral good instead of seeing it as a tool that marks, unnecessarily and unfairly, marginalized people and languages, rooting problems in the performance of individuals instead of systemic practices. Grutsch McKinney points out that “beginners will start by mimicking the writing center grand narrative, and so many in the community are always beginners, does this explain why the narrative has such lasting power? In Bartholomae’s words, are we constantly inventing and reinventing the writing center the same way?” She posits, “If a majority of those engaging in writing center discourse stay for only a few years, do they—do we—ever move beyond this?” If we hope to move beyond it, we need to use our stories to change our practices within our consultant education programs. (“Constellations”)

When addressing writers’ concerns, tutors, especially those new to the writing center, draw on knowledge about writing and language difference gained not only through tutor education courses but also through their own experiences, and these ideas play out in varying degrees during their work with student writers. Because some tutors may not remain in the writing center long enough to fully grasp (possibly) new conceptions of language difference presented through tutor education—or may work in a writing center that does not value those conceptions—they may never move past their original conceptions. This circumstance, as Brooks-Gillies points out,

becomes problematic for the field, making it imperative for tutor education to become a focal point of writing center research.

Taken together, these assumptions about language difference, tutors, multilingual writers, and their work together illustrate the need for more reflection, questioning, and research in this area. In “Building a House for Diversity: Writing Centers, English Language Teaching and Learning, and Social Justice,” Condon and Olson acknowledge that the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) Writing Center inadvertently encouraged assimilation through their praxis, a situation that went completely against their mission to support all writers while advocating for social justice within the academy (31). Together, they and the UNL writing tutors came to realize that, by not considering the ideological principles at work within SAE and how these principles affected their ideas about language, they unconsciously reified these principles within their praxis despite being opposed to them (31-32, 39, 44-45). Blazer and Brooks-Gillies note this same problem in their own writing centers. Blazer points out that “even those of us who perceive ourselves to be teaching and learning in highly productive, highly diverse settings are seeing the need to pay more attention” to our assumptions about language and writing center praxis (24). Scholarship such as Greenfield and Rowan’s *Writing Centers and the New Racism* caused her to recognize her “own lingering assumptions represented in critiques of societal and institutional monolingual, monocultural, racist hegemonic structures and practices” (24). Similarly, after reading *Writing Centers and the New Racism*, Brooks-Gillies reevaluated her decision to spend one week of her tutor education course focusing on “supporting English as a Second Language (ESL) writers.” She states, “I was doing more harm than good by reinforcing a practice that

marginalized a particular population of writers and was at odds with my supposed orientation to the discipline in which I claim that I work to empower student writers.” To rectify this problem, she not only considered how she framed multilingual writers to her staff but also assigned course readings that advocated a more translingual orientation to language and writing center praxis, thereby encouraging discussion regarding both “problematic practices” and ways to promote practices that aligned with her goal for “decolonial practice in writing centers.”

Because we are often unaware of the ideologies that affect our view of the world, Condon and Olson urge writing center administrators and tutors to question the ways in which “relationships among language, intellectual ability, individual value, and national belonging” are viewed and discussed within academia and “pay careful attention to what their pedagogical choices signify for and about multilingual writers” (31, 37, 40). For administrators, the shaping of those pedagogical choices occurs partly through the texts they read for their professional development. For tutors, it occurs partly through the readings assigned to them during their initial training. As these readings may play a role in shaping tutors’ ideas about not only language practices but also tutoring across language difference, it is important to identify and consider what language ideologies are embedded within these readings, an examination our field has yet to undertake.

Inspired by Condon and Olson’s realization that changing the unintentionally “assimilationist stance” of their writing center’s tutoring practices required a “culture of inquiry” (32) and responding to Denny et al.’s call for research that explores the ways in which writing centers can “raise consciousness about the politics of accent and linguistics” (101), my study

investigates how tutor education readings reflect the ideologies of monolingualism, traditional multilingualism, and translanguaging through their discussions of language difference, characterizations of tutors and multilingual writers, and suggested approaches for negotiating language difference within a session. In analyzing these readings to identify the language ideologies within them, I seek to encourage writing center administrators and tutors to consider whether their tutor education readings represent the ideologies they want to promote in their writing centers.

## CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

As stated in Chapter One and established in Chapter Two, writing center scholarship has not yet examined tutor education texts for the language ideologies held within them, demonstrating the need for qualitative research that focuses on the ideological aspect of these texts. I respond to this need through my study, describing how tutor education readings illustrate specific language ideologies through their discussions of language and rhetorical practices, tutors and multilingual writers, and tutoring across language difference. In this way, I also answer Hall's call for scholarship involving the "deliberate interrogation of our everyday writing center documents" (14) and Russell's call for composition scholarship that examines "pedagogical materials for their tacit ideologies." Additionally, I draw on Fitzgerald and Ianetta's suggestion that student researchers use theory as a method to investigate and better understand writing center work ("Looking" 209-211). Using the theoretical lens of language ideologies—monolingualism, traditional multilingualism, and translanguaging—I examine tutor education readings for evidence of these ideologies. In doing so, I hope to encourage writing center administrators and tutors to look closely at these texts in order to identify how these ideologies might support or conflict with the ideologies they seek to promote within their writing centers. In this chapter, I offer my research positionality and explain my study's methodology, data collection, and data analysis methods to make clear my research processes.

## Researcher Positionality

In order to contextualize my study and demonstrate my interest in this research area, I'd like to explain my relationship not only to this study but also to language. My parents—one an immigrant, one first-generation, both Puerto Ricans—speak fluent Spanish and fluent Standard American English with no trace of a Spanish accent. They spoke only English in our home because, according to them, it was easier to speak the language they used on a daily basis when interacting with friends, neighbors, and coworkers than to switch between the two when speaking with me. (Years later, my mother admitted that she preferred not to teach me Spanish because she felt her particular dialect, learned at home, was not “grammatically correct.”) Though I grew up hearing Spanish spoken, I found that it was reserved for phone conversations with my grandmother and extended family or overheard when we visited the Brooklyn and Bronx neighborhoods where they lived. While I picked up a limited amount of Spanish over the years, my SAE language practices reflect those used by most of the residents in the predominantly white and middle-class Northern Virginia suburb where I grew up.

I have never been viewed negatively based on my language practices—rather, I've been applauded for them since early childhood. However, family members and friends, as well as students I've worked with in my roles as a writing tutor and a graduate teaching associate, have had very different experiences. One of my first-year composition students was a white man from Brooklyn; his first language is Italian, and he speaks fluent SAE with a Brooklyn accent. He shared with me how one of his professors suggested that he change his accent because it made him sound stupid and nonacademic. As he related his experience, I realized how familiar it

sounded—so much like the stories my parents had told me. As a first-year student at Long Island University in the early 1960s, my Brooklyn-born mother took a required speech class, a course focused not on teaching public speaking skills but on removing students’ regional accents and vernacular speech. And as a fourth-grade student at Brooklyn’s PS 78 in 1953, fresh off the plane from Juana Díaz, PR, my father was told repeatedly by his teacher that he was stupid, an assumption based on his language use.

My parents understood that using nondominant languages and language practices affected others’ perceptions of their intelligence level, their socioeconomic standing, and their general belonging within predominantly white spaces. They felt the impact of these perceptions in a very real way, watching them change as they mastered dominant language practices. What they didn’t understand what was at the heart of those perceptions—language ideologies. I, too, didn’t understand. But when I read Amy Tan’s “Mother Tongue” in an undergraduate English course, I began to see how these ideologies affected my perception of my paternal grandmother, whom I loved dearly. Arriving in Brooklyn during the mass migration from Puerto Rico in the early 1950s, she spoke only Spanish, eventually learning to speak enough English to communicate fairly easily with non-Spanish speakers. Through the lens of Tan’s essay, I gained a fuller picture of my grandmother and her language practices. I saw that Abuelita’s English wasn’t “broken”—it was just another English, no better or worse than any other. Though she was an incredibly sharp and witty woman who had a good deal to say about a number of subjects, I’d never thought to ask what she thought about them because I (wrongly) assumed that, based on her English fluency, she wasn’t able to talk about them in depth—worse, that perhaps she didn’t think about

them at all. While I realized my mistake, it was too late; she'd passed away two years earlier. But Tan left me with another lesson about language. For the first time, I began to understand the effect of language loss, realizing how my lack of Spanish fluency affected my sense of identity, a direct result of my parents' assimilation into the dominant US culture.

As an undergraduate English major, I learned more about how language works through introductions to Foucault, Derrida, and linguistic and post-colonial theory, and my view of language and language practices began shifting from prescriptivist to descriptivist. This view influenced my work in the writing center at Rollins College, where I spent two years as an undergraduate writing consultant and English grammar tutor. As a graduate teaching associate in the Rhetoric and Composition master's program at the University of Central Florida, I continued tutoring writing, working in the University Writing Center under Dr. R. Mark Hall, the UWC's Director, during the first year of my assistantship. Through Dr. Hall's tutor education course, seminar, and, most importantly, his mentorship, I learned more about writing center praxis and the politics of language and literacy. By the time I began teaching first-year composition during the second year of my assistantship, graduate courses in literacy, rhetoric, composition history and pedagogy, and Critical Race Theory had further shaped my view of language and expanded my understanding of the unbreakable connection between language and identity. Heath, Street, Young, and Canagarajah were particularly influential: Heath for making clear that my SAE language and rhetorical practices were just one of many equally valid practices used within the US, Street for illustrating through his autonomous and ideological models the social and political powers at work within literacy ideologies, Young for encouraging the retention of writerly

identity through individual language and rhetorical practices, and Canagarajah for demonstrating through his ideology of translanguaging how individuals move across linguistic boundaries in order to communicate effectively in various rhetorical situations.

Again and again, the ideas and concepts I read about in my coursework, the experiences of my family members and my students, and my own experiences with language led me to determine that translanguaging was the clearest way to honor individuals and their language and rhetorical practices. Therefore, as I state in Chapter One, I am a translanguager—someone who subscribes to the ideology of translanguaging and works from a translanguaging orientation. Translanguaging, along with my personal experiences, affects my view of the world, including my analysis of the data investigated through this study, and I acknowledge that fact here.

### Research Questions

In the previous section, I explain my positionality to this research, demonstrating my interest in investigating the language ideologies found within tutor education readings. This interest prompted the following research questions:

- How do tutor education readings discuss language and language/rhetorical practices?
- How do these readings characterize tutors, multilingual writers, and their work together?
- What actions do these readings suggest tutors take when working with multilingual writers and tutoring across language difference?

- Given these discussions, characterizations, and suggestions, what language ideologies are reflected in the readings used in a tutor education course?

In responding to these questions through my research, I seek to help writing center administrators and tutors consider how the texts they assign and read for tutor education purposes reflect and advance their beliefs about language and, conversely, how these texts might conflict with those beliefs.

### Research Site and Data Collection Methods

In this research project, I analyze the readings used in UCF's UWC tutor education course for new writing tutors, ENC 4275/5276: Theory & Practice of Tutoring Writing. This course was developed and is taught by Dr. R. Mark Hall, the UWC's Director, and I chose Dr. Hall's course and readings as my research site because they were accessible to me as a researcher. The course is described in his syllabus as follows:

ENC 4275/5276: Theory & Practice of Tutoring Writing is a practicum, which educates student peer tutors to assist writers in UCF's University Writing Center (UWC). All writing consultants are required to complete this course, which provides an introduction to writing center research, theory, and practice. This course is a recommended prerequisite for ENC 5705: Theory & Practice of Composition.

This course will introduce you to the field of writing center studies. You will learn “valued practices” for tutoring writing in the UWC, which provides support to students, faculty, and staff from first-year to graduate in every discipline. In addition to practical knowledge about how to tutor diverse learners effectively, you will study the principles and propositions—the theories—that determine how and why writing centers operate the way they do. Along with practice and theory, you’ll study writing center research and engage in some first-hand writing center research of your own.

Using Dr. Hall’s ENC 4275/5276 Fall 2019 Course Calendar, I compiled a list of the thirty-seven assigned readings, and this list comprised my initial corpus for data analysis (see appendix A).

During the research process, this data set was reduced through analysis.

## Data Analysis Methods

### *Data Reduction*

Not all readings discussing language practices or multilingual writers make that discussion evident in their titles, and not all readings that reference language practices or multilingual writers in their titles discuss them in a way that applied to my research project. Therefore, rather than simply choose those readings that specifically mention translingual, multilingual, ESL, ELL, or L2 writers, I began data reduction through “criterion sampling,” which requires data to meet specific criteria for continued inclusion in a study (Grutsch McKinney, “Strategies” 127). After reading each assigned text from the ENC 4275/5276 course

calendar to determine whether it addressed language or rhetorical practices, offered suggestions for tutoring across language difference, or characterized tutors or multilingual writers in some way related to language use, I compiled a list of the eleven readings that met these criteria, which represents the reduced data set for my project (see appendix B). Following this initial data reduction, I reread each of the remaining texts, thus beginning the coding process.

The texts used as tutor education readings are not written in an ideological vacuum, and while they may not specifically state a particular ideological viewpoint on language, how language practices and multilingual writers are depicted in these texts can indicate certain ideological beliefs and values about language. Russell acknowledges that this type of textual analysis can be complex, with data sometimes proving difficult to categorize and the results “interpretive,” and it was with this awareness that I undertook my analysis. In her study of how first-year composition textbooks discuss the idea of academic language, Russell analyzes the ways in which these texts “construct academic language” as well as “the values embedded in those constructions,” enabling her to determine if they reflect “[composition] scholarship’s commitments towards socially just and inclusive FYC classrooms.” Likewise, the ways in which tutor education readings discuss language practices, characterize multilingual writers, or suggest tutoring across language difference can indicate the principles and values of monolingualism, traditional multilingualism, or translanguaging, allowing me to code these texts for alignment with any of these language ideologies.

## *Theoretical Framework*

### Monolingualism and Traditional Multilingualism

According to Horner et al., the language ideology of *monolingualism* views language as “static, discrete, and defined by specific forms,” requiring speakers to be fluent in standard English language practices (“Toward” 287). Additionally, monolingualism ties English fluency to an individual’s social and citizenship status (“Toward” 287), inexorably linking any deviation from SAE to speakers of nondominant American Englishes and speakers of World Englishes (Lu and Horner 583). Because monolingualism believes knowledge of other languages interferes with English fluency, it considers bilingual speakers as “two monolinguals in one person” (Horner et al., “Toward” 287). This conception of bilingual speakers is also deeply embedded within the language ideology of *traditional multilingualism*. Like monolingualism, traditional multilingualism views language as fixed, distinct, and representative of belonging to a particular culture and nationality, positioning bilingual speakers as two separate individuals residing within one, each fluent in a single language (Horner et al., “Toward” 287). Thus, while monolingualism and traditional multilingualism are two different language ideologies, they share the same foundational tenets that view individual languages as separate and unchanging and value fluency as a marker of belonging (Canagarajah 7-8; Horner et al., “Toward” 287).

## Translingualism

In contrast to these ideologies, *translingualism* views languages and communication as negotiated by the writer and the reader, valuing fluency in making meaning across languages rather than fluency in one specific language. Canagarajah argues that translingualism encompasses two fundamental ideas about language that distinguish it from monolingualism: communication is more than any one language, and it involves not only words but “diverse semiotic resources,” such as symbols or gestures (6). Thus, translingualism is more about meaning making through language and rhetorical practices than achieving proficiency in a given language. For this reason, translingualism also differs from traditional multilingualism, which holds fluency as the communication standard, with fluency occurring only when an individual’s multiple languages remain separate and do not interact (8). In using the term *translingual* versus *multilingual*, Canagarajah acknowledges the hybridity of language and the affordances this hybridity brings to communication practices, thus disrupting the binaries of *monolingual/multilingual* and *native/nonnative speaker* and making clear that languages are not “owned by and natural to certain communities” but are “open to being adopted by diverse communities” to use in the way best suited for their particular rhetorical situation (7-9, 8).

Canagarajah suggests that translingual practices—the various linguistic strategies that individuals use when negotiating language difference—enable speakers and writers to maintain their cultural and social identities while communicating with individuals in other communities, eliminating the need for a shared, established language (2, 5-6). In the introduction to his book *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*, Canagarajah uses his

student's text to illustrate how translingual speakers create new ways of communicating that reflect and enact their individual identities through the languages and practices they possess. Responding to Canagarajah's literacy narrative assignment, the student, Buthainah, chose to use Arabic, French, and English within her narrative, employing the rhetorical practice of codemeshing, in which writers move between multiple languages rather than limit themselves to just one (2). In this way, she met her rhetorical goal to "not merely convey some information about her multilingual literacy development, but to demonstrate or 'perform' it" by enacting multiple aspects of her identity through codemeshing (2).

Although monolingualism would view Buthainah's literacy narrative as nonstandard, Horner et al. argues that translingualism "asks of writing not whether its language is standard, but what writers are doing with language and why" ("Language" 304-305), a view that focuses on rhetorical flexibility rather than linguistic deficiency. As Canagarajah notes, "Once [Buthainah's] peers had figured out her rhetorical objectives, they didn't find it difficult to shift from the monolingual orientation of classroom literacy to an alternate style of reading," using the knowledge they had developed through "communicative practices in the contact zones outside the classroom" to understand and respond to Buthainah's translingual approach to her literacy narrative (2). Buthainah's and her classmates' experiences demonstrate how the common ideas we have about language—that good communication both requires a single language and uses standard language practices—reflect a monolingual perspective, but transnationalism and globalization necessitate a different perspective, one that considers how individuals are drawing on multiple languages and practices as they communicate across and within various groups (1).

It is important to note that translingualism is not “simply another permutation of a catalog of arguments for conventional multilingualism and for tolerating diverse language ‘codes’ and ‘varieties’ and the mixing of these,” as this perspective includes only non-SAE speakers and positions SAE speakers as the norm, outside of translingual scholarship and practice (Lu and Horner 585). Rather, Lu and Horner describe translingualism as a perspective “that recognizes difference as the norm, to be found not only in utterances that dominant ideology has marked as different but also in utterances that dominant definitions of language, language relations, and languages users would identify as ‘standard’” (585). Because language is fluid and the concept of a “standard” language is socially constructed, what appear to be standard language practices do, in fact, evidence varying levels of hybridity (Canagarajah 8; Lorimer Leonard 243; Lorimer Leonard and Nowacek 260). Therefore, Lu and Horner argue that language difference is not a “deviation from a norm of ‘sameness,’” a viewpoint that reifies the existence of a “standard” language from which individuals can deviate, it is the “norm of language use” (584). In other words, language difference is *the* language standard.

Yet Gilyard warns that translingualism can flatten language difference, working against the intent of SRTOL to prevent underrepresented students—particularly African Americans—from being penalized for nondominant language practices by turning all writers into “a sort of linguistic everyperson, which makes it hard to see the suffering and the political imperative as clearly as in the heyday of SRTOL” (284-285). Furthermore, he finds that translingualists do not always acknowledge that language difference is viewed positively for some and negatively for others, noting that “not all translingual writers are stigmatized in the same manner” (286). While

some translingualists do acknowledge this fact (Lee 186-187; Lu and Horner 583), Canagarajah reminds us that “[t]ranslingual practice therefore calls for a sensitivity to similarity-in-difference (i.e., appreciating the common practices that generate diverse textual products) and difference-in-similarity (i.e., appreciating the mediated and hybrid composition of seemingly homogenous and standardized products)” (9). This sensitivity can be cultivated through “analyses of language, diversity, and power that steer clear of any formulation that might be interpreted as a sameness-of-difference model” (Gilyard 286). By using these kinds of analyses to consider how a translingual lens changes our view of composition, translingualists seek to normalize nondominant language practices and further address issues related to language difference in all areas.

### *Coding Framework*

To provide a framework for my coding scheme, I used Horner et al.’s language ideology table from their article “Toward a Multilingual Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm” (287). This table, which I have reproduced below (see table 1), lists the main beliefs and principles about language and language practices for monolingualism, traditional multilingualism, and translingualism, thus giving me a starting point for identifying these ideological tenets within a reading.

*Table 1: Horner et al. 's Language Ideology Table*

| Monolingual Model   | Traditional Multilingual Model  | Translingual Model   |
|---|---|--|
| Languages are static, discrete, and defined by specific forms   | Languages are static, discrete, and defined by specific forms   | Languages and language boundaries are fluctuating and in constant revision   |
| Fluency in other languages is deemed a threat to fluency in English   | Multilinguals have discrete fluencies in more than one discrete, stable language                          | Multilinguals are fluent in working across a variety of fluctuating “languages”  |
| Non-English speakers should try to achieve an “appropriate” target in English language practice to be considered “fluent” | Fluency in each discrete language is determined by achieving an “appropriate” target of language practice | Focus is on mutual intelligibility rather than fluency; language use has potential to transform contexts and what is “appropriate” to them |
| Fluency in multiple languages threatens intelligibility   | Fluency in each discrete language determines membership in language group                                 | Code-switching, borrowing, and blending of languages are understood as the norm  |
| English language is linked to social identity and citizenship   | Language is linked to social identity and citizenship   | All language use is an act of translation; language use values transnational connectivity  |
| “Bilingual” is imagined as two monolinguals in one person   | “Bilingual” is imagined as two monolinguals in one person   | “Bilingual” is imagined as a unique and shifting blend of practical knowledge and language use   |

(Horner et al., “Toward” 287)

In addition to using the breakdown of each language ideology offered by Horner et al.’s table, which helped me to recognize these ideological tenets within a syntactic unit, I drew on the understanding I gained through reading writing center scholarship. One of my research questions asks how tutor education readings characterize multilingual writers, tutors, and their work together, while another asks how these readings suggest tutors should respond when working across language difference. Those characterizations and suggestions are visible within writing center praxis—the ways in which writing centers think about and work with student writers and

their texts. As Horner et al.’s table was not created for the same purpose as the research I undertake here, it does not always address elements of these characterizations and suggestions as they relate to writing center praxis.

Therefore, in order to account for ideological tenets of monolingualism, traditional multilingualism, and translingualism noted by writing center scholars but not expressed in Horner et al.’s table, I created a supplementary table (see table 2). While I explain in more detail how I originated this table in Chapter Four, I offer a brief explanation here. Through a synthesis of the writing center scholarship discussed in Chapter Two, I compiled some writing center-focused ideological tenets into the table shown below, with the scholarship cited next to each description for the reader’s ease of reference. It should be noted that the authors cited in the Monolingual Model and Traditional Multilingual Model columns of my table do not suggest taking up these viewpoints. Rather, in pointing out how these models are reflected in writing center praxis, they encourage us to move away from them.

*Table 2: Writing Center-Focused Ideological Tenets*

| Monolingual Model   | Traditional Multilingual Model  | Translingual Model  |
|---|---|---|
| Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are evidence of writerly deficit (Grutsch McKinney, “Writing” 68-69) | Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are evidence of writerly deficit (Grutsch McKinney, “Writing” 68-69) | An individual’s linguistic strategies/language practices and culturally-based rhetorical practices are valuable tools for meaning making (Blazer 22-23; Newman 7) |

| Monolingual Model  | Traditional Multilingual Model   | Translingual Model   |
|--|--|--|
| Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are considered error that requires correction (Condon and Olson 42-43)  | Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are considered error that requires correction (Condon and Olson 42-43)  | Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are discussed with the writer to understand her intent and do not automatically require correction (Newman 6, 9)            |
| Requires assimilation into SAE academic prose (Alvarez 88; Blazer 22; Condon and Olson 31-32)  | Requires assimilation into SAE academic prose (Alvarez 88; Blazer 22; Condon and Olson 31-32)  | Values writerly agency when using academic prose (Alvarez 88; Denny et al. 102; Griffin and Glushko 169; Newman 5)   |
| Power structures at work within language ideologies are not discussed (Alvarez 87; Griffin and Glushko 168; Latta 18-19)   | Power structures at work within language ideologies are not discussed (Alvarez 87; Griffin and Glushko 168; Latta 18-19)   | Power structures at work within language ideologies are discussed in order to support writerly agency (Alvarez 87-88; Condon and Olson 35; Greenfield, "Love-Inspired" 132, 139) |
| Assumes tutors are typically white, US-born, monolingual SAE speakers (Greenfield, "Love-Inspired" 122; Grutsch McKinney, "Writing" 71)                              | Assumes tutors are typically white, US-born, monolingual SAE speakers (Greenfield, "Love-Inspired" 122; Grutsch McKinney, "Writing" 71)                              | Recognizes that tutors are a diverse group using a variety of languages (Denny et al. 101)   |
| Multilingual writers are problems to be dealt with (Blazer 21; Brooks-Gillies; Condon and Olson 42; Greenfield, "Love-Inspired" 122; Grutsch McKinney, "Writing" 71) | Multilingual writers are problems to be dealt with (Blazer 21; Brooks-Gillies; Condon and Olson 42; Greenfield, "Love-Inspired" 122; Grutsch McKinney, "Writing" 71) | Individual writers are meaning makers with multiple linguistic and rhetorical resources (Denny et al. 101; Latta 21-22; Newman 6)  |
| Multilingual writers are a homogenous group whose cultural, linguistic, and educational experiences are essentially the same (Greenfield, "Love-Inspired" 122-123)   | Multilingual writers are a homogenous group whose cultural, linguistic, and educational experiences are essentially the same (Greenfield, "Love-Inspired" 122-123)   | All writers are individuals with unique cultural, linguistic, and educational experiences that impact their language and rhetorical practices (Grimm, <i>Good</i> 13)            |

### *Coding Scheme*

In my coding scheme, the first component is an a priori code derived from the names of the three language ideologies for which I coded: *Monolingualism*, *Traditional Multilingualism*, and *Translingualism*. These codes not only identify the explicit use of these terms but also note their implicit presence within a reading's language. The second component of my codes categorizes that language for context using the subcodes *Advocate*, *Explain*, or *Critique*. These subcodes describe how the reading's language engages with the ideology:

- *Advocate*: advocates a particular viewpoint, action, or practice
- *Explain*: explains an issue, idea, or scenario
- *Critique*: critiques what the author(s) sees as a problematic stance, assumption, attitude, or practice

Finally, the third component of my codes further categorizes my data by identifying the ideological tenet(s) illustrated through the coded text. These tenets are taken from those listed within the two tables previously mentioned (see table 1 and table 2). Together, the last two code components not only categorize but contextualize how an ideological tenet is represented through the coded text, making clear that, while a tenet may be signified, it is not necessarily condoned. Overall, my three-component codes demonstrate how a piece of coded text represents an ideological tenet through its discussion of language and rhetorical practices, tutors and multilingual writers, and working across language difference.

### *Coding Process*

Because my research questions considered ideological tenets (and therefore, the language ideologies themselves), I used Saldaña's "Values Coding" (89) to code my data. This coding method allowed me to capture the "values, attitudes, and beliefs" about language within each reading (89), as I considered how they discussed language practices, multilingual writers, and working across language difference. To ensure that I had chosen the coding method best suited to my research project, one that would enable me to identify and categorize these discussions, I performed a coding "pilot test" on the first two readings in my reduced data set, answering the following questions in Saldaña's list of "General criteria for coding decisions" to determine if this coding method worked well for my line of inquiry:

- Is the coding method(s) harmonizing with your study's conceptual or theoretical framework?
- Is the coding method(s) related to or addressing your research questions?
- Are you feeling comfortable and confident applying the coding method(s) to your data?
- Are the data lending themselves to the coding method(s)?
- Is the coding method(s) providing the specificity you need?
- Is the coding method(s) leading you toward an analytic pathway?

The 'bottom line' criterion is:

- As you're applying the coding method(s) to the data, are you making new discoveries, insights, and connections about your participants, their processes, or the phenomenon under investigation? (50-51)

After coding the two readings and reviewing my answers to Saldaña's questions, I found that Values Coding provided me with the appropriate coding method for my research. Saldaña notes that

Values Coding also requires a paradigm, perspective, and positionality. If a participant states, "I really think that marriage should only be between one man and one woman," the researcher is challenged to code the statement any number of ways depending on the researcher's own system of values, attitudes, and beliefs. Thus, is this participant's remark to be coded: V: TRADITIONAL MARRIAGE, B: HETERONORMATIVITY, or A: HOMOPHOBIC? If the goal is to capture the participant's worldview or personal ideology, then the first and second codes are more grounded in his perspective. But if the study is critical ethnography, for example, then the latter code may be more appropriate.

*Values Coding is values-laden.* (93; emphasis added)

Because my goal was to identify the ideological values expressed in the readings I analyzed and not to give my opinion of those values, I used codes that captured former purpose, as Saldaña suggests.

In order to code a relatively large amount of data quickly and make identifying ideological tenets easier, I chose paragraphs as my "syntactic unit" of data (Grutsch McKinney, "Analyzing" 128), using these syntactic units as my unit of analysis. In keeping the syntactic unit

at the paragraph level rather than the sentence level, I retained the context of the data within the paragraph, which was especially important when only a portion of the paragraph contained data relating to my research.

Working through the list of readings in my reduced data set (see appendix B), I reread printed copies of each reading paragraph by paragraph, looking for key words and phrases within the readings that signaled the ideological tenets of monolingualism, traditional multilingualism, or translanguaging. When I encountered these instances, I coded them manually using the following process. If the entire paragraph discussed language or language practices, characterized tutors or multilingual writers, or suggested actions to take when tutoring across language difference, I coded the paragraph as a whole, drawing a line around the entire paragraph and noting in the margin what language ideology, engagement with that ideology, and ideological tenet(s) it represented. For paragraphs including sentences that indicated an ideological tenet as well as sentences that did not, I drew a line not only around the paragraph but also around the sentences illustrating the ideological tenet, then coded that data for its ideology, engagement, and tenet. Naturally, instances of the language ideologies for which I was coding were not always contained neatly within their own separate paragraphs, evidencing the messiness Russell describes when analyzing data of this type in this way. Many times, they were mixed together, and ideologies, engagement, and tenets had to be teased out of the data in order to be coded appropriately. For example, a paragraph might critique the tenet of one ideology and advocate the tenet of another. In these cases, I drew a line around the paragraph and around each piece of data within the paragraph, giving each piece of data its own three-component code.

Another paragraph might contain explanations of two or more tenets from one ideology, so, in addition to coding the paragraph for its ideology and engagement, I listed each of the tenets it explained as the third component of the overall code. Paragraphs containing no data related to my research questions were marked with an *X* to show that they were not coded and, therefore, not included in my analysis.

Once I had performed this first coding pass, I began a second coding pass, reviewing my coded data for coding accuracy and recoding syntactic units when necessary. For example, I may have changed the ideology and engagement codes for a piece of data, or I may have added one or more tenets to the third component of its code. As I reviewed each piece of coded data, I typed the syntactic unit into one of three tables I created to hold this data, with one table reserved for each language ideology. Once filled, these tables allowed me to see more clearly any emerging patterns within my data. During this part of the coding process, I considered adding the codes *Characterization* and *Action* to my second set of codes (*Advocate*, *Explain*, and *Critique*), as some of the coded data seemed to engage with the ideologies in these ways. Ultimately, I determined that these pieces of data were either advocating, explaining, or critiquing a particular characterization or action; therefore, I chose to preserve my three original codes. To further check the accuracy of my coded data, as Hesse-Biber suggests (327, 329), I asked a colleague (one familiar with the three language ideologies as well as writing center praxis) to review my tables, which helped me to confirm my coding choices and make decisions about any codes I was still questioning.

When entering data into my coding tables, if I had outlined a piece of data within a syntactic unit, I put in bold the words, phrases, or sentences I had outlined. This step allowed me to retain the connection between a piece of data and its corresponding code provided by my outlines. Additionally, some syntactic units appear on more than one table. For example, if a syntactic unit contained more than one piece of coded data and those pieces did not engage with the same ideology in the same way, that unit was entered into the corresponding area of the appropriate table for each piece of coded data.

As my syntactic units consist of whole paragraphs, most of which are lengthy, it would be difficult to replicate even a small portion of my tables here. Instead, I offer an illustration of how my coding scheme works to categorize my data through the examples below:

- *Monolingualism – Advocate – Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are considered error that requires correction*: the code for a syntactic unit that suggests writing consultants should assume all multilingual writers want their textual errors to be corrected
- *Monolingualism – Explain – Languages are static, discrete, and defined by specific forms*: the code for a syntactic unit that explains (but does not advocate) the belief held by some faculty members that there is only one “correct” way to write within the academy
- *Monolingualism – Critique – Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are evidence of writerly deficit*: the code for a syntactic unit that problematizes the

view that language practices differing from SAE are incorrect and demonstrate the writer's lack of intelligence

Because codes enable researchers to “locate key themes, patterns, ideas, and concepts that may exist within their data” (Hesse-Biber 317), each component of my coding process allowed me to analyze the ways these readings discuss language and rhetorical practices, characterize both tutors and multilingual writers, and suggest working across language difference. In Chapter Four, I discuss this coding process further using examples from my analysis.

## CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

As I explain in Chapter Three, I created a table of writing center-focused ideological tenets to assist me in coding my data. I also noted that my coding process, which included putting my coded data into tables, made it possible to see emerging patterns in my data. In this chapter, I explain how I developed my table, discuss data patterns resulting from my analysis, and demonstrate in more detail how I performed the coding process. By sharing how I determined the ideological function of a particular syntactic unit, I illustrate how writing center administrators and tutors can perform this process on the readings they choose and/or read for educational purposes.

In her analysis of how academic language is discussed in first-year composition textbooks, Russell notes that “because I am interested in how these textbooks construct the documentary reality of our classrooms and programs, the remainder of my discussion positions the textbooks, as opposed to the authors, as authorial agents.” Likewise, when discussing my analysis and findings, I refer to the readings I analyzed by their titles, not their author(s), in order to make clear that my research focuses on the texts themselves. To reiterate my study’s purpose, I seek to encourage writing center administrators and tutors to consider the language ideologies within texts used for tutor education; therefore, my goal in this chapter is to explain why I developed my table of writing-center focused tenets and describe how the readings I analyzed discuss language and rhetorical practices, characterize tutors and multilingual writers, and recommend working across language difference. Because the purpose of this study is to

investigate what ideological tenets are contained within the readings and not to critique the readings themselves, I make no quantitative claims about the analyzed readings either individually or as a whole. Additionally, my analysis makes no claims or connections related to the writing center administrator's choice to use these readings for tutor education purposes, as this type of inquiry is not within the scope of my study. Therefore, rather than discuss the number of codes for each ideology or the number of readings that reflect a particular ideology, I discuss my findings in qualitative ways.

#### Writing Center-Focused Ideological Tenets

As I began coding my data during my pilot test, I found that the tenets listed in Horner et al.'s chart (see table 1) captured many of the ideological viewpoints I encountered within the two readings I examined. However, I soon realized that some of the ideas expressed in these readings clearly evidenced tenets of multilingualism, and translanguaging, but they could not be coded using the tenets offered by Horner et al. While Horner et al.'s table addresses the idea that identity and national belonging are tied to language ("Toward" 287), it does not address the connection between power and language. Yet translanguaging-oriented writing center scholars believe this connection must be explained to writers in order to support writerly agency (Alvarez 87-88; Condon and Olson 35; Greenfield, "Love-Inspired" 132, 139). In this way, tutors can "avoid a silent professor-knows-best stance and talk about the values, ideologies, arbitrariness, and contextual constraints that bear on [a student's] decision making" (Grimm, *Good* 96-97) and enable writers to decide for themselves what language and rhetorical practices they will use in a

given rhetorical situation. And though Horner et al.'s table makes clear monolingualism and traditional multilingualism's shared requirement for fluency ("Toward" 287), it does not discuss how that requirement might appear in the context of a writing center session, in which tutors may encourage assimilation into SAE unintentionally through their praxis or assume writerly error or deficit based on a writer's language and rhetorical practices (Alvarez 88; Blazer 22; Condon and Olson 31-32, 42-43; Grutsch McKinney, "Writing" 68-69). Lastly, as Horner et al.'s chart was not meant to cover writing center-specific issues, it does not consider how the three ideologies view tutors and multilingual writers, an important consideration when examining writing center readings for their orientation toward language (Blazer 21; Brooks-Gillies; Condon and Olson 42; Greenfield, "Love-Inspired" 122-123; Grutsch McKinney, "Writing" 71). Therefore, through a synthesis of these writing center-focused ideas noted in writing center scholarship, I created a table that allowed me to account for ideological viewpoints otherwise unaccounted for in the readings analyzed (see table 2). I designed my table as a way to help me identify ideological tenets for the purpose of this study; however, by the end of the study, I realized that it could offer a valuable framework to other scholars researching issues related to language ideologies. In this way, my table, which is reproduced below, serves as a finding of this study.

Table 3: Writing Center-Focused Ideological Tenets

| Monolingual Model   | Traditional Multilingual Model  | Translingual Model   |
|---|---|--|
| Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are evidence of writerly deficit (Grutsch McKinney, "Writing" 68-69)               | Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are evidence of writerly deficit (Grutsch McKinney, "Writing" 68-69)               | An individual's linguistic strategies/language practices and culturally-based rhetorical practices are valuable tools for meaning making (Blazer 22-23; Newman 7)                |
| Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are considered error that requires correction (Condon and Olson 42-43)             | Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are considered error that requires correction (Condon and Olson 42-43)             | Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are discussed with the writer to understand her intent and do not automatically require correction (Newman 6, 9)            |
| Requires assimilation into SAE academic prose (Alvarez 88; Blazer 22; Condon and Olson 31-32)   | Requires assimilation into SAE academic prose (Alvarez 88; Blazer 22; Condon and Olson 31-32)   | Values writerly agency when using academic prose (Alvarez 88; Denny et al. 102; Griffin and Glushko 169; Newman 5)   |
| Power structures at work within language ideologies are not discussed (Alvarez 87; Griffin and Glushko 168; Latta 18-19)                | Power structures at work within language ideologies are not discussed (Alvarez 87; Griffin and Glushko 168; Latta 18-19)                | Power structures at work within language ideologies are discussed in order to support writerly agency (Alvarez 87-88; Condon and Olson 35; Greenfield, "Love-Inspired" 132, 139) |
| Assumes tutors are typically white, US-born, monolingual SAE speakers (Greenfield, "Love-Inspired" 122; Grutsch McKinney, "Writing" 71) | Assumes tutors are typically white, US-born, monolingual SAE speakers (Greenfield, "Love-Inspired" 122; Grutsch McKinney, "Writing" 71) | Recognizes that tutors are a diverse group using a variety of languages (Denny et al. 101)   |

| Monolingual Model  | Traditional Multilingual Model   | Translingual Model  |
|--|--|---|
| Multilingual writers are problems to be dealt with (Blazer 21; Brooks-Gillies; Condon and Olson 42; Greenfield, “Love-Inspired” 122; Grutsch McKinney, “Writing” 71) | Multilingual writers are problems to be dealt with (Blazer 21; Brooks-Gillies; Condon and Olson 42; Greenfield, “Love-Inspired” 122; Grutsch McKinney, “Writing” 71) | Individual writers are meaning makers with multiple linguistic and rhetorical resources (Denny et al. 101; Latta 21-22; Newman 6)                                     |
| Multilingual writers are a homogenous group whose cultural, linguistic, and educational experiences are essentially the same (Greenfield, “Love-Inspired” 122-123)   | Multilingual writers are a homogenous group whose cultural, linguistic, and educational experiences are essentially the same (Greenfield, “Love-Inspired” 122-123)   | All writers are individuals with unique cultural, linguistic, and educational experiences that impact their language and rhetorical practices (Grimm, <i>Good</i> 13) |

### Examples of Coded Data

#### *Contextualizing the Data*

In order to gain a clearer picture of how each reading frames these discussions, I created a table (see appendix C) that lists the readings in the order they appeared on the ENC 4275/5276 syllabus and notes the title, author(s), publication date, original format, intended audience, and a brief summary for each. Organizing the readings in this way allowed me to consider the publication date, original format, and intended audience, which helped me to contextualize not only what research and ways of thinking were prevalent at that time but also the purpose of the reading in its original medium and for its original audience, which was not always writing-center focused. Overall, in identifying each reading’s original rhetorical situation, this table provided

me with a fuller picture of each reading's context during data analysis, in turn enabling me to be more mindful when making coding decisions and avoid making preemptive judgments about the ways in which a syntactic unit was working.

### *Identifying Ideological Tenets*

While these readings rarely, if ever, state explicitly a specific tenet of monolingualism, traditional multilingualism, or translanguaging from the tables shown in Chapter Three (see table 1 and table 2), they do leave clues that can help us determine the values and beliefs they hold regarding language and rhetorical practices, multilingual writers, and working across language difference. These clues can be found in the language used by these readings in their discussions of these topics. By examining this language, the values held by each reading become clearer, making it possible to identify their correlating ideological tenets.

In the sections that follow, I describe emerging patterns regarding the prevalent tenets and types of engagements each ideology evidenced across the readings and offer examples of coded syntactic units. Through these examples, which illustrate a variety of code configurations, I demonstrate the process of determining the language ideology, level of engagement, and ideological tenets indicated by a syntactic unit, a process that can be replicated by writing center administrators and tutors with readings they assign and read for tutor education purposes.

### *Syntactic Units Coded for Monolingualism and Traditional Multilingualism*

In terms of their engagement with the ideology of monolingualism, no readings contained syntactic units with language advocating monolingualism tenets. Rather, language suggesting tenets of monolingualism either explained or critiqued them. Of the ideological tenets I identified within these readings, the following three occurred most frequently and with equal regularity:

- *Languages are static, discrete, and defined by specific forms*
- *Requires assimilation into SAE academic prose*
- *Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are evidence of writerly deficit.*

Across the readings, language that reflected the tenets of traditional multilingualism appeared less frequently than language reflecting monolingualism or translanguaging. Even so, I found that instances of language indicating tenets of traditional multilingualism demonstrated all three types of engagement—advocate, explain, and critique—the only ideology of the three to do so. Of those instances, the following ideological tenets were signified most often:

- *Assumes tutors are typically white monolingual SAE speakers*
- *Multilingual writers are problems to be dealt with.*

In order to code a syntactic unit for the ideology of traditional multilingualism, I found that I needed to determine first whether its viewpoint aligned more with traditional multilingualism or with monolingualism. This distinction proved difficult at times.

Monolingualism heavily influences traditional multilingualism's values regarding language (Horner et al., "Toward" 285-286), causing overlap across the two ideologies' tenets, with some

tenets repeated across both ideologies and others sharing similar wording. For example, the tenet *Languages are static, discrete, and defined by specific forms* appears under both the monolingualism and traditional multilingualism columns in Horner et al.'s table (see table 1), and the tenet *Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are evidence of writerly deficit* appears in both the monolingualism and traditional multilingualism columns in my table (see table 2). Likewise, in Horner et al.'s table (see table 1), though the monolingualism tenet *Fluency in other languages is deemed a threat to fluency in English* and the traditional multilingualism tenet *Multilinguals have discrete fluencies in more than one discrete, stable language* express slightly different ideas about language, these ideas come from similar belief systems, in which English language fluency is considered essential.

Eventually, I determined that a syntactic unit illustrated a tenet of traditional multilingualism when it appeared to assume that multilingual writers would or should want their writing to demonstrate English language fluency but did not assume they would stop using languages other than English altogether. In other words, if the syntactic unit assumed that a multilingual writer's text should appear as English-fluent as possible (though some difference could be expected in terms of accent) and did not expect the writer to use only English outside of the academy, then it was coded for traditional multilingualism. Some of the readings in my study were originally intended to address multilingual writers' grammar usage, and I kept this context in mind while considering the discussions within them.

### Example 1

This example paragraph from “Tutoring ESL Students: Issues and Options,” an article in a rhetoric and composition-focused academic journal, contains language illustrating the two most frequently-occurring tenets of traditional multilingualism:

In the peer training course in our writing center, peer tutors are especially eager to meet and work with ESL students, but their initial contacts can be somewhat frightening because some unfamiliar concerns crop up. To the untrained tutor’s eye what is most immediately noticeable is that a draft written by an ESL student looks so different. Vocabulary choices might be confusing, familiar elements of essays are missing, and sentences exhibit a variety of errors--some we can categorize, some we cannot. Tutors’ first concern is often a matter of wanting some guidance about where to plunge in. Where should they start? New tutors who have not yet completely internalized the concept of the tutorial as focusing only on one or two concerns think initially it is their responsibility to help the writer fix everything in the draft in front of them. As tutors learn the pedagogy of the tutorial, they become more comfortable with selecting something to work on for that session, but they still need suggestions for a hierarchy and some sense of what is most important. (526)

The language in this paragraph (and in the reading overall) does not suggest that multilingual writers should use English only or that their writing should have no trace of an accent; therefore, it does not indicate a monolingual viewpoint. However, it does characterize tutors, their

interactions with multilingual writers, and multilingual writers' texts in a way that suggests a traditional multilingual perspective.

By describing tutors as “especially eager to meet and work with ESL students” and their first interactions with multilingual writers as “somewhat frightening because some unfamiliar concerns crop up” (526), this paragraph both positions tutors as monolingual SAE speakers and frames their interactions with multilingual speakers and their texts as fearful. Furthermore, the language in the paragraph's third sentence implies that multilingual writers' texts are difficult to understand, error-filled, and lacking in some way. In positioning tutors as monolingual SAE speakers and characterizing tutoring sessions with multilingual writers as potentially fearful due to tutors' lack of exposure to language and rhetorical difference, this syntactic unit promotes the viewpoint that tutors are monolingual SAE speakers (Greenfield, “Love-Inspired” 122; Grutsch McKinney, “Writing” 71) and that multilingual writers are problems to be dealt with (Blazer 21; Brooks-Gillies; Condon and Olson 42; Greenfield, “Love-Inspired” 122; Grutsch McKinney, “Writing” 71). Again, to contextualize this viewpoint, I found no instances of language indicating that multilingual writers should not use languages other than English or that their writing should not have a written accent, which would indicate a monolingualism perspective.

For this reason, I coded this paragraph as follows:

- *Traditional Multilingualism – Advocate – Assumes tutors are typically white monolingual SAE speakers / Multilingual writers are problems to be dealt with.*

As illustrated in this example, I found that the difference between coding for monolingualism or traditional multilingualism mostly centered on two points: whether the syntactic unit expected

multilingual writers to use only English in academic spaces, and whether it allowed for a written accent.

When coding, I also needed to determine the difference between language indicating traditional multilingualism and language indicating translanguaging. Both ideologies recognize language difference, which can make them appear to have similar overall values toward language. To distinguish the difference between them while coding, I found it helpful to draw on Greenfield's and Grutsch McKinney's arguments regarding the language used in many writing center tutor training manuals. In "Love-Inspired Praxis: Towards a Radical Redefinition of Writing Centers," Greenfield explains,

In contemporary discourses, assumptions about normal sessions (which implicitly involve US-born, white, standardized-English-speaking, cisgender, straight, etc. students and tutors) serve to alienate people who do not embody dominant social identities and whose ways of engaging in the writing center are necessarily different as well. As other scholars have noted, students and tutors who do not fit the norm are either completely erased from writing center discourses or relegated to the sidelines as aberrations to be dealt with through some mysterious and unmanageable means. . . .

The field's fetishization of multilingual students is one of the most strikingly visible manifestations of our conservative fidelity to a standard identity and set of methods in the writing center. The "problem" of how to "deal" with ESL students or international students (often falsely imagined as synonymous) persists as a special topic of interest in our writing center publications, conferences, and other forums, never to be

resolved. The premise itself, of course, is flawed. It assumes some students and tutors are neutral in terms of language, culture, identity, and education whereas others (“ESL students”) are defined by an essential and limited experience. (122-123)

Likewise, in “Writing Centers Tutor (All Students),” Grutsch McKinney observes,

One guide, almost comically, tells the tutor he or she will work with different students, but “you will be happy to know that there is no need to develop a new approach to tutoring for these students. Instead, we can build on our general tutoring strategies to accommodate the special traits of different students.” As such, the guides are making outlandish assumptions about their readers, the tutors. The assumption is that tutors will not have a learning disability or a first language other than English, as Kiedaisch and Dinitz pointed out, but also that that tutor *and* student will likely be white, of high ability, young, and American. Telling tutors to be aware of “differences” defines “normal” sessions, too. (71)

As both Greenfield and Grutsch McKinney point out, writing center tutor education manuals often assume that tutors are white, monolingual SAE speakers and that multilingual writers and their texts are problematic, thus misidentifying tutors and misrepresenting multilingual writers (“Love-Inspired” 122-123; “Writing” 71). These assumptions, particularly those regarding multilingual writers and their texts, more closely reflect the ideology of traditional multilingualism, which sees fluency as the adherence to a language standard and expects writers to meet that standard (Horner et al., “Toward” 287)—in this case, SAE. This view contradicts that of translingualism, which sees fluency as the ability to communicate “across a variety of

‘fluctuating’ languages” (Horner et al., “Toward” 287) and views difference as the language standard (Lu and Horner 584, 585).

In the readings I analyzed, I observed instances of language signaling a traditional multilingual view within their discussions of tutors, multilingual writers, and tutoring across language difference, some of which I discuss here. I want to point out that the meaning I identify within the language used in these examples might be unintentional. It could be intended to suggest an awareness of the concerns that new tutors may have when working with writers presenting texts the tutors feel unqualified to collaborate on—writers that could, for example, include students in other disciplines or graduate students—and this language is meant simply to acknowledge that situation. However, it is worth considering that, rather than alleviate tutors’ concerns, this language may offer tutors a rationale for those concerns instead. In other words, when reading words like *fear* and *confusing*, tutors may be unintentionally encouraged to continue viewing multilingual writers as problematic and abnormal. Also, it is interesting to note that all instances of this language were located in readings focused on writing center praxis for working with multilingual writers, a finding that substantiates Greenfield’s and McKinney’s assertions.

In a syntactic unit from “Tutoring ESL Students,” tutors are told that multilingual writers’ texts will present “unfamiliar grammatical errors” and “sometimes bewilderingly different rhetorical patterns and [language] conventions”—errors, patterns, and conventions that tutors, “who bring to their work a background of experience and knowledge in interacting effectively with native speakers of English, are not adequately equipped to deal with” (525). This language

presumes that tutors are ill-equipped to “deal with” language and rhetorical difference because they are unable to explain deviation from SAE (525); however, they will feel more comfortable once they receive some instruction on grammar and rhetorical patterns that will help them to explain why a multilingual writer’s grammatical and rhetorical choices are incorrect. “Before the Conversation” assumes that US-born student writers’ “strongest language is English” (1) and observes, “Because they share so much with their domestic peers, writing center tutors may find [Generation 1.5] students *easier to work* with than international or visa students” (6; emphasis added). Similarly, “Reading an ESL Writer’s Text” uses the word “fear” to characterize tutors’ feelings as they begin working with multilingual writers and suggests that tutors encountering language and rhetorical difference may feel “lost or frustrated” (43).

Taken together, the language in these examples, which characterizes tutors and their feelings about working across language difference as well as multilingual writers and their texts, exemplifies the notions that tutors are US-born, monolingual SAE speakers and that multilingual writers and their writing are problematic because their texts present difference in a way not easily understood or corrected by an SAE-speaking tutor. In this way, the language identified in these examples reflects the tenets of traditional multilingualism, which expects English language fluency (Horner et al., “Toward” 287), believes tutors are typically US-born, monolingual speakers of SAE (Greenfield, “Love-Inspired” 122; Grutsch McKinney, “Writing” 71), and views multilingual writers as problems to be solved (Blazer 21; Brooks-Gillies; Condon and Olson 42; Greenfield, “Love-Inspired” 122; Grutsch McKinney, “Writing” 71).

The examples in this section clarify how I determined if a syntactic unit reflected the values held by traditional multilingualism versus monolingualism or translanguaging through its view of tutors, multilingual writers, and tutoring across language difference. Using the determiners I describe in my coding process, writing center administrators and tutors can recognize similar language in their readings, identify how that language engages with the ideology of traditional multilingualism—does it advocate? explain? critique?—and then decide if that engagement corresponds to their own beliefs about language. In the next section, I discuss how to identify language reflecting translanguaging.

### *Syntactic Units Coded for Translanguaging*

Within the readings analyzed, language indicating tenets of translanguaging appeared more frequently than language indicating those of the other two ideologies. I found no syntactic units with language that critiqued tenets of translanguaging—all instances of language suggesting these tenets either advocated or explained them. Of these tenets, the following four occurred most frequently; the first appearing with the highest frequency overall, and the last three appearing with equal frequency among them:

- *Focus is on mutual intelligibility rather than fluency: language use has potential to transform contexts and what is “appropriate” to them*
- *Multilinguals are fluent in working across a variety of fluctuating “languages”*

- *Power structures at work within language ideologies are discussed in order to support writerly agency*
- *Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are discussed with the writer to understand her intent and do not automatically require correction.*

As I discuss in the previous section, translanguaging and traditional multilingualism both acknowledge language difference, but each takes a different approach. To help me determine which of these ideologies applied to a syntactic unit, I looked for language signifying these approaches, which are essentially characterized in the following ways: traditional multilingualism prioritizes a language standard by valuing English-language fluency as a marker of cultural belonging, while translanguaging prioritizes writerly agency by valuing the retention of individual identity expressed through language practices (Horner et al., “Toward” 287). Using these determiners, I was able to establish whether a syntactic unit’s viewpoint aligned more with translanguaging or with traditional multilingualism.

### Example 2

An example paragraph from the IWCA speech “New Conceptual Frameworks for Writing Center Work” contains language explaining three of the four most prevalent translanguaging tenets:

The third writing center is a diverse, busy, often noisy, public space with many large windows instead of solid walls. The work of this center is visible to all who pass through

the hallway. Many domestic and international cultures, dialects, and languages are visible and audible, embodied by the people who work there, as well as by the resources collected there. A large Geochron clock hangs on the major wall, representing the movement of time in the world. The staff is large and diverse, a mix of many different disciplines and racial and cultural identities. Distinctions between higher and lower order concerns are not an issue in this writing center; writing coaches respond to the queries that students bring, and these queries are as likely to focus on context, on multimodal texts, on oral presentations, or on knowledge-management challenges in a lecture-based course as they are to focus on a draft being revised for an English class. The students who work in the writing center are often students who used the writing center, particularly during their first two years in college when they were negotiating transitions between home literacies and academic literacies and coming to understand the power relations of the university. In this writing center, communication problems are understood as emerging from competing contexts with implicit expectations about appropriate genres, styles, and discourses rather than from a lack within students or from a failure of their previous schooling. Students are understood as shuttling back and forth between contexts and developing the competencies to engage productively in the power relations of these contexts. Writing coaches are the experienced travelers who can make explicit the often unspoken conventions, values, styles, and assumptions of competing discourses. (13-14)

In its description of a writing center, this paragraph characterizes the tutors in the following way:

“The staff is large and diverse, a mix of many different disciplines and racial and cultural

identities” (14), and “[m]any domestic and international cultures, dialects, and languages are visible and audible, embodied by the people who work there” (13). This language signifies the idea that tutors come from multiple countries and use a variety of languages and dialects, both US and international (Denny et al. 101)—they are not just US-born, SAE speakers. The paragraph’s last three sentences suggest that language difference implies ability in negotiating multiple languages rather than deficit in one language (Horner et al., “Toward” 287; Newman 6, 9), with tutors acknowledging and explaining to writers the power structures underpinning particular language and rhetorical practices, thereby enabling writers to decide what practices best fit their individual rhetorical situation (Alvarez 88-88; Condon and Olson 35; Greenfield, “Love-Inspired” 132, 139).

Through its description of a writing center scenario, the language in this paragraph explains several values of translingualism. Therefore, I coded it as follows:

- *Translingualism – Explain – Recognizes that tutors are a diverse group using a variety of languages / Multilinguals are fluent in working across a variety of fluctuating “languages” / Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are discussed with the writer to understand her intent and do not automatically require correction / Power structures at work within language ideologies are discussed in order to support writerly agency.*

So far, the examples of coded syntactic units in this chapter are taken from readings originally intended for a writing center audience. However, it is important to remember that readings discussing topics other than writing center praxis may also contain instances of

language signaling the three ideologies. Therefore, I offer an example from a reading outside of writing center scholarship as my final example of a unit coded for translanguaging.

### Example 3

This paragraph from “Cross-Cultural Conferencing,” a chapter in a book intended for composition instructors that explores conferencing across language difference with student writers, is an example of a syntactic unit from a reading intended for an audience of composition instructors:

Sociolinguists assume that all communication is meaningful. As teachers, we need to learn to ask not just ourselves but our students “Why?” Mina Shaughnessey gave us this lesson again and again as she studied the writing of her “remedial” students, those “Others” the university had been forced to admit. With each choice of a word, each selection of a piece of punctuation, a student writer is constructing writing that is purposeful, is revealing knowledge both common and idiosyncratic. And we are lucky that we do not have to figure out this sometimes-puzzle alone—we have the student, the writer herself to ask. (119)

Overall, the language in this paragraph acknowledges that student writers make purposeful rhetorical choices in the ways they compose their texts and recommends that composition instructors ask about those choices when they have questions regarding those choices rather than automatically viewing them as error. In this way, this paragraph advocates the translanguaging beliefs that writers are meaning makers who actively draw on their individual linguistic and

rhetorical practices (Denny et al. 101; Latta 21-22; Newman 6) and that linguistic and rhetorical difference should be discussed with writers in order to understand their choices rather than viewed as error requiring automatic correction (Newman 6, 9). Therefore, I coded this paragraph as follows:

- *Translingualism – Advocate – Individual writers are meaning makers with multiple linguistic and rhetorical resources / Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are discussed with the writer to understand her intent and do not automatically require correction.*

In addition to demonstrating how to identify ideological tenets, this example illustrates the importance of creating Table 2 for my coding process, as these tenets, which are derived from writing center scholarship, helped me to develop representations of how the values of monolingualism, traditional multilingualism, and translingualism are expressed in writing center praxis, even if the reading itself is not writing center-oriented. For example, the tenet *Language and rhetorical practices differing from SAE are discussed with the writer to understand her intent and do not automatically require correction* enabled me to account for this implicit ideological belief within this paragraph's language, a belief that would have been unaccounted for had I relied solely on Horner et al.'s chart.

## Summary of Findings

Russell observes that “no representation or discussion of academic language can be neutral,” and, as shown in my findings, the same holds true for discussions of language and rhetorical practices, tutors and multilingual writers, and tutoring across language difference. Across the readings analyzed in this study, I found that no readings advocated monolingualism or critiqued translanguaging, with most syntactic units evidencing a translanguaging orientation toward language. However, this orientation was not the case for readings focused specifically on multilingual writers. Of these six readings, all but one indicated a traditional multilingualism viewpoint on tutors, multilingual writers, and tutoring across language difference. This finding confirms Greenfield’s and McKinney’s concerns regarding the ways that tutor education manuals frame tutors and multilingual writers, a viewpoint that may encourage tutors to see multilingual writers and language difference as problematic (“Love-Inspired” 122-123; “Writing” 71).

As illustrated by the examples in this chapter, identifying the ideologies of language underpinning the discussions in these texts requires reading between the lines in order to uncover their implicit beliefs. In doing so, writing center administrators and tutors can determine whether these readings align with their values for writing center praxis. Writing center administrators acknowledge that the praxis within their writing centers does not always correspond to their beliefs about the role of the writing center within the academy and their work with student writers, particularly their views of the writing center as a locus of social justice, antiracism, and socially-just praxis (Blazer 20-24; Brooks-Gillies; Condon and Olson 31-32, 39, 44-45). They

also acknowledge the impact that readings have on tutor education, noting not only the importance of selecting readings that support their orientation toward language and promote antiracist praxis (Blazer 27-28; Brooks-Gillies; Condon and Olson 33-36, 40) but also how these readings can signify their values regarding language difference (Brooks-Gillies; Condon and Olson 40). Underscoring the importance of ideological awareness for promoting social and racial justice within the writing center, Grimm states, “Real change occurs when we examine and revise what George Lakoff calls the unconscious cognitive models that we humans use to understand the world. Significant change in any workplace occurs when unconscious conceptual models are brought to the surface and replaced with cognitive ones” (“New” 16). But these hidden ideologies must be made visible if they are to be replaced—without the means to uncover them, they may go unnoticed. Without my Writing Center-Focused Ideological Tenets table (see table 2), many of the underlying ideological values contained in the readings I examined would have been overlooked and unaccounted for—across the three ideologies, six of the nine most frequently occurring tenets identified in the readings come from my table. This finding demonstrates the need for my table and its tenets, which describe how each of the ideologies view issues specific to writing center praxis. In creating my table, I offer a framework for identifying ideological values related to writing center praxis, one that writing center administrators, tutors, and researchers can use to identify and consider the unconscious models of language in the texts they examine.

Condon and Olson suggest that, in order to “create and sustain conditions for learning in which tutors and writers could do their best work, together” (33), the tutors in their writing center

found it necessary to investigate their ideas and assumptions about language practices, allowing them to “productively challeng[e] social and institutional forms of and tolerance for racism and xenophobia” (33). It is this kind of investigation and engagement that motivated my study, in which I examine the language ideologies held within a group of tutor education readings. Based on my findings, I argue that performing this kind of analytical work is one way to begin aligning our praxis to our values and continue addressing systemic racism within the academy.

## CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

Through this study, I establish why we need to consider what ideological tenets of monolingualism, traditional multilingualism, and translingualism reside in tutor education readings, share my table of writing center-focused ideological tenets, and demonstrate how to identify ideological tenets within a reading. My findings highlight the importance of examining how our praxis—particularly the ways in which we educate tutors—aligns with our values regarding social justice and antiracism. In doing so, my research encourages writing center administrators and tutors to continue “noticing [our] own complicity in problematic practices” (Brooks-Gillies, “Constellations”) so that we can change them, a practice enabling us to work toward dismantling systemic racism rather than reifying it.

### Limitations

The readings analyzed in this study were taken from the course calendar for ENC 4275/5276, the tutor education course for new UWC tutors, which is offered once a year during the fall semester. However, it is not the only tutor education course provided by the UWC. In both the fall and spring semesters, the UWC also offers ENC 5933: UWC Seminar. This ongoing course, which UWC tutors are required to take every semester after completing ENC 4275/5276, is intended to provide continuing tutor education, and, therefore, technically falls within the scope of my study. To provide a more complete picture of the readings used to educate UWC

tutors, my initial data set could have included the readings assigned in ENC 5933 for AY 2019-2020.

While course readings are always assigned in ENC 5933 during fall semesters, inquiry-based research projects form the basis of coursework in the spring semester, so readings are not always assigned during this semester. Although course readings were assigned for the fall and spring semesters of ENC 5933 for AY 2019-2020, I chose to focus my research solely on the readings in the Fall 2019 semester of ENC 4275/5276 for two reasons. First, ENC 4275/5276's course readings represent the first texts that could potentially frame new tutors' perceptions of language difference and multilingual writers, perceptions that tutors are likely to put into practice during their first year of tutoring. Second, tutors may work in the UWC for just one or two semesters, so they may never engage with ENC 5933's readings. The readings in ENC 4275/5276, however, have been read and discussed by all tutors working in the UWC during any given semester. For these reasons, I chose not to include the Fall 2019 ENC 5933 readings in my study (no readings were assigned for the Spring 2020 semester). As a result, I recognize that the findings of this research project provide a more limited picture of UWC tutor education readings in general and the language ideologies within those readings in particular.

Additionally, I could have developed a more comprehensive understanding of my data set through interviewing Dr. Hall, the UWC's director. This method would have allowed me to acknowledge his process for choosing course readings, his purpose in choosing the specific readings analyzed in this study, his perspectives on language difference, and the readings he was unable to fit into his course calendar due to time constraints. However, as he is serving as my

thesis chair, I chose not to interview him for this study, thereby avoiding any conflict of interest regarding my research.

### Implications for Future Research

Researchers interested in the line of inquiry investigated in my study could build on this study in various ways. By interviewing the director of a writing center in conjunction with analyzing the readings from her tutor education course, researchers could not only identify her views on language and tutoring across difference but also consider how those views correspond to the ideological values promoted by her assigned readings. Additionally, while I focused solely on the tutor education readings from one institution, other researchers could analyze readings across multiple institutions with differing student populations.

Interviews with tutors, particularly new tutors, would provide another perspective to this study. While the scope of my study did not include a consideration of tutors' evolving ideas about language difference, researchers might perform a longitudinal study in which tutors are followed over the course of an academic year in order to determine their ideas about language difference just prior to the beginning of the fall semester, at the end of the fall semester, and at the end of the spring semester. In such a study, tutors could be asked about the impact of course readings on their beliefs about language difference and their effect on their praxis.

In terms of textual analysis, the line of inquiry I follow in this study would work well with other texts created by and used in writing centers, such as in-house tutor education manuals, tutoring resources, and writing center mission statements and websites.

## Contributions to the Field

My study responds to calls for research that examines the texts used within writing centers (Hall, Introduction 14), investigates the implicit ideologies contained in educational texts (Russell), and advances language equality (Alvarez 89; Denny 101; Greenfield “Love-Inspired” 134; Newman 9). In order to identify ideological tenets within tutor education readings, I synthesized writing center scholarship to create a table that illustrates how these values appear in writing center praxis (see table 2), and this table can be used by writing center administrators, tutors, and researchers for similar purposes. While my study emphasizes the importance of identifying these ideological tenets in order to raise awareness of their existence, the work does not end there, as further reflection is needed. To facilitate that reflection, I offer the following list of questions to be used after identifying the tenets within a reading:

- What tenets are embedded in the reading?
- How does the reading engage with these tenets? Are they advocating? Explaining? Critiquing?
- Given the ideological tenets you’ve identified within the reading and considering their engagement with those ideologies, do the tenets advanced by the reading correspond with your ideas about language difference?

Once this work is complete, writing center administrators and staff can determine whether or not to include a reading in a tutor education course or use it as a tutor resource. Additionally, administrators can look for readings containing specific ideological beliefs they wish to highlight

(those they agree and disagree with), then use these readings to prompt discussions with their staff about these beliefs.

As Blazer notes, “Aligning ideals, especially complex and highly contested ones, with everyday practice takes many experiences, persistent reflection, and lots of time” (24). The practice of recognizing and considering the underlying beliefs and values represented in tutor education readings requires time and effort, but it is essential if we want to ensure that we do not unintentionally reify hegemonic language practices through our praxis. As I finalized the last two chapters of my study, the overall contribution that my research makes to the field was made painfully clear by the murders of Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, and George Floyd. Across the United States and all over the world, many white people began acknowledging by name the systemic racism experienced by Black people, Indigenous people, Brown people, and other people of color on a daily basis—talking about it, reading about it, posting about it, and protesting against it. While I appreciated this new awareness, I also read Instagram posts, blogger emails, and corporate statements offering platitudes such as *We aren’t born racist* and *We just need to love each other* as solutions to the problem of systemic racism. Yes, newborns aren’t racists, and yes, we do need to love each other. But neither of these statements work against the systemic racism so deeply embedded in our society because they don’t acknowledge its cause. Systemic racism exists because of the ideologies that perpetuate it—including ideologies of language.

Therefore, in an effort to take part in dismantling the systemic racism perpetuated through the ideologies of monolingualism and traditional multilingualism, my study’s

examination of language ideologies in tutor education readings encourages awareness of implicit beliefs about language in order to advocate language equality within the writing center, the academy, and society as a whole. Grimm reminds us that what writing tutors learn in the writing center equips them “to critically and creatively engage the future” (“New” 12). The implicit beliefs in these readings can play an important role in shaping tutors’ ideas about language difference, ideas they take with them long after they leave the writing center. If we want tutors to learn how to think critically about systemic racism and engage in antiracist action both in and out of the writing center, we must be aware of the implicit ideological values within our tutor education readings.

**APPENDIX A: INITIAL DATA SET READINGS FOR ENC 4275/5276**

The following list of thirty-seven readings comprises the initial data set for my project. The readings are listed in chronological order based on their place in the ENC 4275/5276 course calendar for the Fall 2019 semester. The course calendar was last revised by Dr. Hall on November 14, 2019, and my list was created on December 10, 2019, the day of the course's final exam, in order to reflect accurately the texts that were assigned during this course.

### **Week 1**

Leahy, Richard. "What the College Writing Center Is--and Isn't." *College Teaching*, vol. 38, no. 2, 1990, pp. 43-48.

Lunsford, Andrea. "Collaboration, Control, and the Idea of a Writing Center." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, 1991, pp. 3-10.

Wardle, Elizabeth, and Doug Downs. "Threshold Concepts of Writing." *Writing about Writing: A College Reader*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Bedford/St. Martin's, 2017, pp. 6-21.

### **Week 2**

Class canceled due to Hurricane Dorian – no readings assigned

### **Week 3**

Ambrose, Susan A., et al. *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*. Jossey-Bass, 2010, pp. 3-8.

Fitzgerald, Lauren, and Melissa Ianetta. "Tutoring Practices." *The Oxford Guide for Writing Tutors*. Oxford UP, 2015, pp. 47-82.

#### **Week 4**

Fitzgerald, Lauren, and Melissa Ianetta. "Tutoring Writing In and Across the Disciplines." *The Oxford Guide for Writing Tutors*. Oxford UP, 2015, pp.139-157.

Sommers, Nancy. "Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers." *Composition and Communication*, vol. 31, no. 4, 1993, pp. 378-388.

Grenier, Alexis. "Tutoring in Unfamiliar Subjects." *A Tutor's Guide: Helping Writers One to One*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., edited by Ben Rafoth, Henemann, 2005, pp. 115-120.

#### **Week 5**

Carter, Michael, et al. *Effective Composition Instruction: What Does the Research Show?* Center for Communication in Science, Technology, and Management. NC State U., 1998, pp. 6-11.

Clark, Irene. "Addressing Genre in the Writing Center." *Writing Center Journal*, vol. 20, no. 1, 1999, pp. 7-32.

Fitzgerald, Lauren, and Melissa Ianetta. "Tutor and Writer Identities." *The Oxford Guide for Writing Tutors*. Oxford UP, 2015, pp. 109-138.

#### **Week 6**

Harris, Muriel, and Tony Silva. "Tutoring ESL Students: Issues and Options." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 44, no. 4, 1993, pp. 525-537.

Block, Rebecca. "Disruptive Design: An Empirical Study of Reading Aloud in the Writing Center." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2016, pp. 33-59.

## Week 7

Black, Laurel Johnson. "Power and Talk." *Between Talk and Teaching: Reconsidering the Writing Conference*. Utah State UP, 1998, pp. 39-60.

Black, Laurel Johnson. "Gender and Conferencing." *Between Talk and Teaching: Reconsidering the Writing Conference*. Utah State UP, 1998, pp. 61-85.

Leki, Ilona. "Before the Conversation: A Sketch of Some Possible Backgrounds, Experiences, and Attitudes Among ESL Students Visiting a Writing Center." *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., edited by Shanti Bruce and Ben Rafoth, Boynton/Cook, 2009, pp. 1-17.

Hall, R. Mark. "Valued Practices for Building a Writing Center Community of Practices." *Around the Texts of Writing Center Work: An Inquiry-Based Approach to Tutor Education*. Utah State UP, 2017, pp. 15-41.

## Week 8

Grimm, Nancy M. "New Conceptual Frameworks for Writing Center Work." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2009, pp. 11-27.

Tseng, Theresa Jiinling. "Theoretical Perspective on Learning a Second Language." *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., edited by Shanti Bruce and Ben Rafoth, Boynton/Cook, 2009, pp. 18-32.

Matsuda, Paul Kei, and Michelle Cox. "Reading an ESL Writer's Text." *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., edited by Shanti Bruce and Ben Rafoth, Boynton/Cook, 2009, pp. 43-50.

## **Week 9**

Capossela, Toni-Lee. "Correcting Surface Errors." *Harcourt Brace Guide to Peer Tutoring*, Harcourt Brace, 1998, pp. 49-59.

Bean, John C. "Dealing with Issues of Grammar and Correctness." *Engaging Ideas*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Jossey-Bass, 2011, pp. 66-86.

Cogie, Jane, et al. "Avoiding the Proofreading Trap: The Value of the Error Correction Process." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1999, pp. 7-31.

## **Week 10**

Gilewicz, Magdalena, and Terese Thonus. "Close Vertical Transcription." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2003, pp. 25-49.

Bourman, Kurt. "Raising Questions about Plagiarism." *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., edited by Shanti Bruce and Ben Rafoth, Boynton/Cook, 2009, pp. 161-175.

Council of Writing Program Administrators. "Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism: The WPA Statement on Best Practices." Jan. 2003, <http://www.wpacouncil.org/node/9>. Accessed 21 Aug. 2016.

## **Week 11**

Black, Laurel Johnson. "Cross-Cultural Conferencing." *Between Talk and Teaching: Reconsidering the Writing Conference*. Utah State UP, 1998, pp. 87-119.

Black, Laurel Johnson. "The Affective Dimension." *Between Talk and Teaching: Reconsidering the Writing Conference*. Utah State UP, 1998, pp. 121-146.

Gilewicz, Magdalena. "Sponsoring Student Response Groups in Writing Center Group Tutorials." *Writing Groups Inside and Outside the Classroom*, edited by Beverly J. Moss, Nels P. Highberg, and Melissa Nicolas, Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004, pp. 63-78.

#### **Week 12**

Black, Laurel Johnson. "Possibilities." *Between Talk and Teaching: Reconsidering the Writing Conference*. Utah State UP, 1998, pp. 147-167.

Johnson, JoAnn. "Reevaluation of the Question as a Teaching Tool." *Dynamics of the Writing Conference: Social and Cognitive Interaction*, edited by Thomas Flynn and Mary King, NCTE, 1993, pp. 34-39.

#### **Week 13**

Thompson, Isabelle, and Jo Mackiewicz. "Questioning in Writing Center Conferences." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2014, pp. 37-71.

#### **Week 14**

Daniels, Sharifa, et al. "Writing Centers and Disability: Enabling Writers Through an Inclusive Philosophy." *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2015, pp. 20-26.

Thonus, Terese. "Tutoring Multilingual Students: Shattering the Myths." *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2014, pp. 200-213.

#### **Week 15**

Learner, Neal. "Situated Learning in the Writing Center." *Marginal Words, Marginal Work?: Tutoring the Academy in the Work of Writing Centers*, edited by William J. Macauley, Jr. and Nicholas Mauriello, Hampton, 2007, pp. 53-73.

Hall, R. Mark. "Coding for Common Rhetorical Moves." *Around the Texts of Writing Center Work: An Inquiry-Based Approach to Tutor Education*. Utah State UP, 2017, pp. 86-91.

**Week 16**

Hall, R. Mark. "Problems of Practice: Developing an Inquiry Stance Toward Writing Center Work." *Around the Texts of Writing Center Work: An Inquiry-Based Approach to Tutor Education*. Utah State UP, 2017, pp. 125-141.

**APPENDIX B: REDUCED DATA SET READINGS FOR ENC 4275/5276**

The following list of eleven readings comprises the reduced data set for my project; it retains the readings in their chronological order on the Fall 2019 ENC 4275/5276 course calendar. To indicate weeks during which readings were assigned but were not included in my data set, I have used the notation *No readings chosen* to make this circumstance clear.

**Week 1**

Wardle, Elizabeth, and Doug Downs. “Threshold Concepts of Writing.” *Writing about Writing: A College Reader*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2017, pp. 6-21.

*A College Reader*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2017, pp. 6-21.

**Week 2**

Class canceled due to Hurricane Dorian—no readings assigned

**Week 3**

No readings chosen

**Week 4**

No readings chosen

**Week 5**

Carter, Michael, et al. *Effective Composition Instruction: What Does the Research Show?* Center for Communication in Science, Technology, and Management. NC State U., 1998, pp. 6-11.

Fitzgerald, Lauren, and Melissa Ianetta. “Tutor and Writer Identities.” *The Oxford Guide for Writing Tutors*. Oxford UP, 2015, pp. 109-138.

## **Week 6**

Harris, Muriel, and Tony Silva. "Tutoring ESL Students: Issues and Options." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 44, no. 4, 1993, pp. 525-537.

## **Week 7**

Leki, Ilona. "Before the Conversation: A Sketch of Some Possible Backgrounds, Experiences, and Attitudes Among ESL Students Visiting a Writing Center." *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., edited by Shanti Bruce and Ben Rafoth, Boynton/Cook, 2009, pp. 1-17.

## **Week 8**

Grimm, Nancy M. "New Conceptual Frameworks for Writing Center Work." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2009, pp. 11-27.

Matsuda, Paul Kei, and Michelle Cox. "Reading an ESL Writer's Text." *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., edited by Shanti Bruce and Ben Rafoth, Boynton/Cook, 2009, pp. 43-50.

## **Week 9**

Bean, John C. "Dealing with Issues of Grammar and Correctness." *Engaging Ideas*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Jossey-Bass, 2011, pp. 66-86.

Cogie, Jane, et al. "Avoiding the Proofreading Trap: The Value of the Error Correction Process." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1999, pp. 7-31.

## **Week 10**

No readings chosen

**Week 11**

Black, Laurel Johnson. "Cross-Cultural Conferencing." *Between Talk and Teaching: Reconsidering the Writing Conference*. Utah State UP, 1998, pp. 87-119.

**Week 12**

No readings chosen

**Week 13**

No readings chosen

**Week 14**

Thonus, Terese. "Tutoring Multilingual Students: Shattering the Myths." *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2014, pp. 200-213.

**Week 15**

No readings chosen

**Week 16**

No readings chosen

## **APPENDIX C: CONTEXTUAL TABLE OF READINGS**

| # | Reading   | Format   | Purpose   | Audience   | Yr. Pub. |
|---|---|--|---|--|----------|
| 1 | Wardle, Elizabeth, and Doug Downs. "Threshold Concepts of Writing."   | Section of an FYC textbook chapter                             | Explains some key writing threshold concepts  | FYC student writers  | 2017     |
| 2 | Carter, Michael, et al. "Effective Composition Instruction: What Does the Research Show?"   | White paper  | Explains two approaches to writing instruction  | NC State faculty/grad students/administrators                  | 1998     |
| 3 | Fitzgerald, Lauren, and Melissa Ianetta. "Tutor and Writer Identities."   | Chapter in a tutor training textbook                           | Explains how to work across difference  | Writing center tutors  | 2015     |
| 4 | Harris, Muriel, and Tony Silva. "Tutoring ESL Students: Issues and Options."  | Article in a rhetoric and composition-focused academic journal | Explains how to teach tutors to work with multilingual writers                            | Writing center administrators and composition instructors      | 1993     |
| 5 | Leki, Ilona. "Before the Conversation: A Sketch of Some Possible Backgrounds, Experiences, and Attitudes Among ESL Students Visiting a Writing Center." | Chapter in an ESL-specific tutor training manual               | Explains that multilingual writers have a variety of individual identities                | Writing center tutors  | 2009     |
| 6 | Grimm, Nancy M. "New Conceptual Frameworks for Writing Center Work."  | Address to attendees at an IWCA conference                     | Explains how assumptions about language and literacy affect writing center praxis         | Writing center administrators and tutors at an IWCA conference | 2009     |
| 7 | Matsuda, Paul Kei, and Michelle Cox. "Reading an ESL Writer's Text."  | Chapter in an ESL-specific tutor training manual               | Explains the linguistic differences tutors may encounter in a multilingual writer's draft | Writing center tutors  | 2009     |
| # | Reading   | Format   | Purpose   | Audience   | Yr.      |

|    |  |  |  |   | Pub. |
|----|--|--|--|---|------|
| 8  | Bean, John C. "Dealing with Issues of Grammar and Correctness."                                  | Chapter in a book that helps professors create writing assignments | Discusses sentence-level error and suggests responses to those errors              | Faculty outside of the English department | 2011 |
| 9  | Cogie, Jane, et al. "Avoiding the Proofreading Trap: The Value of the Error Correction Process." | Article in a writing center-focused academic journal               | Offers strategies for encouraging multilingual writers to locate and correct error | Writing center administrators             | 1999 |
| 10 | Black, Laurel Johnson. "Cross-Cultural Conferencing."  | Chapter in a book about student-teacher conferencing               | Discusses conferencing across difference   | Composition instructors                   | 1998 |
| 11 | Thonus, Terese. "Tutoring Multilingual Students: Shattering the Myths."                          | Article in an education- and literacy-focused academic journal     | Discusses assumptions about tutoring multilingual writers                          | Writing center administrators             | 2013 |

## REFERENCES

- Alvarez, Nancy. "On Letting the Brown Bodies Speak (and Write)." *Out in the Center: Public Controversies and Private Struggles*, edited by Harry Denny et al., UP of Colorado, 2018, pp. 83-89. *JSTOR*, doi:10.7330/9781607327837.c006.
- Black, Laurel Johnson. "Cross-Cultural Conferencing." *Between Talk and Teaching: Reconsidering the Writing Conference*. Utah State UP, 1998, pp. 87-119.
- Blazer, Sarah. "Twenty-first Century Writing Center Staff Education: Teaching and Learning towards Inclusive and Productive Everyday Practice." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 35, no. 1, Fall/Winter 2015, pp. 17-55. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/43673618](http://www.jstor.org/stable/43673618).
- Brooks-Gillies, Marilee. "Constellations Across Cultural Rhetorics and Writing Centers." *Constellating Stories*, special issue of *The Peer Review*, vol. 2, no. 1, Spring 2018, <http://thepeerreview-iwca.org/issues/relationality-si/constellations-across-cultural-rhetorics-and-writing-centers/>.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. Introduction. *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. Routledge, 2013, pp. 1-18.
- Condon, Frankie, and Bobbie Olson. "Building a House for Linguistic Diversity: Writing Centers, English-Language Teaching and Learning, and Social Justice." *Tutoring Second Language Writers*, edited by Shanti Bruce and Ben Rafoth, Utah State UP, 2016, pp. 28-52. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt19jcgwf.6](http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt19jcgwf.6).
- Diab, Rasha, et al. "A Multi-Dimensional Pedagogy for Racial Justice in Writing Centers."

- Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2012, pp. 1-8. BASE,  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2152/62145>.
- Denny, Harry, et al. "Multilingualism: Review." *Out in the Center: Public Controversies and Private Struggles*, edited by Harry Denny et al., UP of Colorado, 2018, pp. 99-103. JSTOR, doi:10.7330/978160732837.p002.
- Fitzgerald, Lauren, and Melissa Ianetta. "Looking through Lenses: Theoretically Based Inquiry." *The Oxford Guide for Writing Tutors: Practice and Research*, Oxford UP, 2016, pp. 209-221.
- . "Tutor and Writer Identities." *The Oxford Guide for Writing Tutors*. Oxford UP, 2015, pp. 109-138.
- García, Romeo. "Unmaking Gringo-Centers." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2017, pp. 29-60. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/44252637](http://www.jstor.org/stable/44252637).
- Gilyard, Keith. "The Rhetoric of Translingualism." *Translingual Work in Composition*, special issue of *College English*, vol. 78, no. 3, Jan. 2016, pp. 284-289. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/44075119](http://www.jstor.org/stable/44075119).
- Greenfield, Laura. "Love-Inspired Praxis: Towards a Radical Redefinition of Writing Centers." *Radical Writing Center Praxis: A Paradigm for Ethical Political Engagement*, UP Colorado, 2019, pp. 106-140. doi:10.7330/9781607328445.c004.
- . "Making a Better World: Rearticulating a *Raison d'Être* for Writing Centers." *Radical Writing Center Praxis: A Paradigm for Ethical Political Engagement*, UP Colorado, 2019, pp. 85-105. doi:10.7330/9781607328445.c003.

Griffin, Kathi R., and Tatiana Glushko. "Caught between the Promise and the Past: A View from the Writing Center." *Composition Studies*, vol. 44, no. 2, 2016, pp. 167-171. *ProQuest*, <https://login.ezproxy.net.ucf.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/1873941972?accountid=10003>.

Grimm, Nancy Maloney. *Good Intentions: Writing Center Work for Postmodern Times*. Boynton/Cook, 1999.

---. "New Conceptual Frameworks for Writing Center Work." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2009, pp. 11-27.

Grutsch McKinney, Jackie. "Analyzing and Interpreting Your Data." *Strategies for Writing Center Research*, Parlor Press, 2016, pp. 123-138.

---. "Writing Centers Tutor (All Students)." *Peripheral Visions for Writing Centers*, Utah State UP, 2013, pp. 57-80.

Hall, R. Mark. Introduction. *Around the Texts of Writing Center Work: An Inquiry-Based Approach to Tutor Education*, Utah State UP, 2017, pp. 3-14.

---. Syllabus for ENC 4275/5276: Theory & Practice of Tutoring Writing, University of Central Florida, Fall 2019. *RMarkHall.com*, [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pNnhGg4\\_\\_kLZTrPK8h83UjAdYFYEgerLFQTsSPRWhxk/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pNnhGg4__kLZTrPK8h83UjAdYFYEgerLFQTsSPRWhxk/edit).

Harris, Muriel, and Tony Silva. "Tutoring ESL Students: Issues and Options." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 44, no. 4, 1993, pp. 525-537.

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy. "Analysis and Interpretation of Qualitative Data." *The Practice of*

- Qualitative Research: Engaging Students in the Research Process*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Sage, 2017, pp. 306-339.
- Horner, Bruce, et al. "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach." *College English*, vol. 73, no. 3, Jan. 2011, pp. 303-321. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/25790477](http://www.jstor.org/stable/25790477).
- Horner, Bruce, et al. "Toward a Multilingual Composition Scholarship: From English Only to a Translingual Norm." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 63, no. 2, Dec. 2011, pp. 269-300. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/23131585](http://www.jstor.org/stable/23131585).
- International Writing Centers Association. "Position Statement on Racism, Anti-Immigration, and Linguistic Intolerance," International Writing Centers Association, 9 Nov. 2010, [www.writingcenters.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/06/Arizona\\_Statement\\_final1.pdf](http://www.writingcenters.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/06/Arizona_Statement_final1.pdf). Accessed 10 Sep. 2019.
- Latta, Mark. "Can't Fix Anyone: Confronting Our Historical Love Affair with Deficit Thinking." *Writing Lab Newsletter*, vol. 44, no. 3-4, Nov./Dec. 2019, pp. 17-24.
- Lee, Jerry Won. "Beyond Translingual Writing." *Toward Writing Assessment as Social Justice*, special issue of *College English*, vol. 79, no. 2, Nov. 2016, pp. 174-195. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/44805916](http://www.jstor.org/stable/44805916).
- Leki, Ilona. "Before the Conversation: A Sketch of Some Possible Backgrounds, Experiences, and Attitudes Among ESL Students Visiting a Writing Center." *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*, 2nd ed., edited by Shanti Bruce and Ben Rafoth, Boynton/Cook, 2009, pp. 1-17.

- Lorimer Leonard, Rebecca. "Multilingual Writing as Rhetorical Attunement." *College English*, vol. 76, no. 63, Jan. 2014, pp. 227-247. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/224238241](http://www.jstor.org/stable/224238241).
- Lorimer Leonard, Rebecca, and Rebecca Nowacek. "Transfer and Translingualism." *College English*, vol. 78, no. 3, Jan. 2016, pp. 258-264. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/44075116](http://www.jstor.org/stable/44075116).
- Lu, Min-Zhan, and Bruce Horner. "Translingual Literacy, Language Difference, and Matters of Agency." *College English*, vol. 75, no. 6, July 2013, pp. 582-607. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/24238127](http://www.jstor.org/stable/24238127).
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition." *College English*, vol. 68, no. 6, 2006, pp. 637-651. *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/25472180.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei, and Michelle Cox. "Reading an ESL Writer's Text." *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*, 2nd ed., edited by Shanti Bruce and Ben Rafoth, Boynton/Cook, 2009, pp. 42-50.
- Newman, Beatrice Mendez. "Tutoring Translingual Writers: The Logistics of Error and Ingenuity." *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, vol. 14, no. 3, 2017, pp. 5-9.
- Russell, Alisa LaDean. "The Politics of Academic Language: Towards a Framework for Analyzing Language Representations in FYC Textbooks." *Composition Forum*, vol. 38, Spring 2018. [www.compositionforum.com/issue/38/language.php](http://www.compositionforum.com/issue/38/language.php).
- Saldaña, Johnny. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Sage Publications, 2009.
- Villanueva, Victor. "Blind: Talking about the New Racism." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2006, pp. 3-19. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/43442234](http://www.jstor.org/stable/43442234).