

Final Conference Program
Writing Centers as Spaces of Empowerment
EWCA Conference 2022

Date: Wednesday, 06/July/2022

8:30am	E1: Conference Opening			
-				
9:00am				
9:00am	P11: Digital Strategies for improving rhetorical issues in student writing	P12: Approaches to Empowering Marginalized Groups	P14: Findings from Social Strategies for Empowerment	P15: Writing Centres as Agents of Empowerment
-	Chair: Monica Broido	Chair: Pamela Bromley	Chair: Klara Dreo	Chair: Micha Gerrit Philipp Edlich
10:45am				
10:45am	B8: Break			
-				
1:15pm				
1:15pm	R1: Roundtable: Empowering Writing Centers: What We Can Learn from Former Directors	R9: Roundtable: Empowering European Writing Centers: Revisiting the 1986 Wyoming Conference Resolution		
-	Chair: Tiane K. Donahue	Chair: Joan Mullin		
3:00pm				
3:00pm	E4: EWCA General Assembly (Election of New Executive Board)			
-	Virtual location: https://unioflimerick.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_5yy5sOYGOSI11Yy			
5:30pm	Chair: Lawrence Cleary			
5:30pm	Chair: Franziska Liebetanz			
5:30pm	K1: Keynote Brad Hughes: Looking At Writing Centers Through Scientific Spectacles			
-	Chair: Franziska Liebetanz			
7:00pm				
7:00pm	E5: Online Networking			
-				
8:00pm	Introduction for first time users of gather town: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=89at5EvCEvk			

Date: Thursday, 07/July/2022

9:00am - 10:45am	P1: Social Writing Strategies Chair: Joy de Jong	P2: Empowering both Traditional and Marginalised Groups Chair: Shareen Grogan	P3: Contesting Traditional Approaches Chair: Birgit Huemer	W4: Workshop: How is Academic Writing Different from Bullshit? and Other Crazy Questions an American Asks His Students in the Czech Republic Chair: Andrea Karsten	
10:45am - 11:00am	B1: Break				
11:00am - 12:45pm	PKP: PechaKucha and Poster Session Chair: Lawrence Cleary	W1: Workshop: Genre Analysis: A tool for empowering student writers of all language and social backgrounds Chair: Andrea Marie Scott	W3: Workshop: Picturing one's research. A tool for academic writers Chair: David Kreitz	W5: Workshop: Writing Center Research as Empowerment – Experiences from The Writing Center Exchange Project (WCEP) Chair: Anja Poloubotko	
12:45pm - 1:45pm	B2: Lunch Break				
1:45pm - 2:45pm	K2: Keynote Karin Wetschanow and Elisa Rauter: "My writing is no longer a shot in the dark". In-House Academic Writing Retreats as Spaces of Student Empowerment Chair: Eva Kuntschner				
2:45pm - 3:45pm	B3: Break				
3:45pm - 5:30pm	P4: Innovations to Traditional Approaches Chair: Warren Merkel	P5: Tutor Agency and Social Justice Chair: Íde Marie O'Sullivan	P6: Writing Centers as Agents of Change Chair: Anja Poloubotko	R6: Roundtable: Empowering Literacy Practices through Writing Center and WAC Collaborations Across Campus Chair: Andrea Marie Scott	W2: Workshop: Translingualism in the Writing Center Chair: Erika Unterperinger
5:30pm - 5:45pm	B4: Break				
5:45pm - 7:30pm	R2: Roundtable: Writing with ADHD and/or dyslexia: Reaching out to a neurodiverse target group Chair: Leigh Ryan	R7: Roundtable: EWCA Summer Institute: Preparing Current and Future Writing Center Leaders Chair: Ella Grieshammer			
7:30pm - 8:00pm	E2: Online Networking Introduction for first time users of gather town: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=89at5EvCEvk				

Date: Friday, 08/July/2022

9:00am -	P7: Re/Deep-thinking Approaches to Tutoring Chair: Birgit Huemer	P8: Informing Peer-tutor Training Chair: Frano Petar Rismondo	P9: Questioning Traditional Writing Centre Approaches Chair: Brigitte Römmer-Nosseck	R3: Roundtable: "Talk doesn't have to be in a single language": Fostering translanguaging in classrooms among multilingual speakers in the 21st Century Chair: Pamela Bromley
10:45am -	B5: Break			
11:00am -	R8: Roundtable: Let's Talk about Doing Research Differently: A Case Study of Academic Cabaret Chair: Klara Dreo			
12:45pm -	B6: Lunch Break			
1:45pm -	K3: Keynote Franziska Gürtl and Lukas Georg Hartleb: Collaborative writing as a way to empower students Chair: Lawrence Cleary			
2:45pm -	B7: Break			
3:00pm -	C1: Writing Centers and WAC: Relationships Between Students and Faculty/Academic Staff Chair: Christopher Martin Anson	C2: What's Up, GewissS? Conference Digest and Digital Poster Walk Chair: Erika Unterpertinger	C3: Peer Tutor Day - Connecting with other Peer Tutors Chair: Katharina Krumpeck Chair: Johanna Lindner	P10: Issues of Transition and Identity Chair: Warren Merkel
5:30pm -	This session is sponsored by the Association for Writing Across the Curriculum		The Peer Tutor Day Space is located in gathertown , at the bottom .	
4:00pm -	R4: Roundtable: Where's the Writing Center? Tutoring Labor's Hidden Antagonisms after the Neoliberal Turn Chair: Micha Gerrit Philipp Edlich			
5:30pm -	E6: Conference Closing			
6:00pm -	E3: Online Networking			
8:00pm	Introduction for first time users of gather town: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=89at5EvCEvk			

Presentations

P11: Digital Strategies for improving rhetorical issues in student writing

Time: Wednesday, 06/July/2022: 9:00am - 10:45am
Session Chair: Monica Broido

Social Media Writing as a means to empower students as writers

Ella Grieshammer, Alina Lira Lorca, Lefkothea Sinjari

E-Mail: ella.grieshammer@phil.uni-goettingen.de

Social media have become an indispensable part of today's world. More and more institutions and companies expect university graduates to have basic knowledge in social media or community management and to be able to write target group-oriented texts. The International Writing Lab at the University of Göttingen responds to this demand by offering students the opportunity to take a certificate in reflective social media practice. Two central workshops within the framework of the certificate teach «Writing for Social Media».

In these workshops, students learn how to write interesting headlines, teasers and posts and experience attributes that make a publication more viral. They run through a social media strategy circle and develop a vision, target group, corporate identity and voice, resulting in composing concrete posts. After feedback and revision, they publish their posts on an Instagram account and thus put them to a practical test. Another focus of the content is science communication on Twitter, which gives students the opportunity to express content from their study field in a way comprehensible to laypersons.

The first evaluation of these workshops on social media writing suggests that taking part in them has various effects on students: 1) a change in perceiving writing, 2) as a result: positive motivational-affective aspects such as motivation, empowerment and self-efficacy and 3) increased writing skills for academic as well as professional writing. In this presentation, we will, in alignment with the conference's focus on empowerment, concentrate on the second aspect: the ways in which social media writing can enhance students' self-esteem as writers.

Integrating virtual politeness: rethinking of a mediatory strategy in linguistic practices

Deniz Erengül

E-Mail: euv184524@europa.uni.de

Since the beginning of the pandemic era, the interactive way of daily-life communication in academic institutions has been almost completely transformed into virtual form. Imitating conversations through forms such as email without physical and visual interactions, such as eye contact and non-verbal language, lacks the most immersive part of the natural way of communicating as well as the sense of empathy. Linguistic politeness is an essential instrument to elicit true emotions and sincerity of acts. As stated in the strategies of politeness (Brown & Levinson 1999), the linguistic usage of politeness plays an important role when expressing necessities as well as apprehensions.

As e-communication constitutes an essential part of academic writing proceedings, various experiences highlight a remarkable variety of linguistic practices of politeness in virtual interactions between students and lecturers (Biesenbach-Lucas 2007:75). Studying the subtleties of characteristic variations of "e-politeness" (ibid.) helps us to induce an awareness for linguistic politeness in institutional discourses. Since it acts as a pacifying influence "...when building interpersonal relationships of mutual respect" (Lestari 2020), it prevents misunderstandings and confusion in such relations. The aim of this paper is to illustrate practices of linguistic politeness as a mediatory approach with empowering qualities for writing centers. In other words, operating with different linguistic stylistics, including communicative components, in collaboration with students would help writing centers to broaden their horizons concerning institutional empowerment in academia.

P12: Approaches to Empowering Marginalized Groups

Time: Wednesday, 06/July/2022: 9:00am - 10:45am

Session Chair: Pamela Bromley

Subverting the neo-colonial structures in academic publishing? Reflexive accounts on writing workshops in Iraq and the limits of empowerment

Sara Maria Camacho Felix, Ariane Smart

E-Mail: s.m.camacho-felix@lse.ac.uk

The rise of non-traditional students in the Global North has resulted in a need to rethink the role and teaching of writing in universities as dominant, exclusionary, and focusing on remedial instruction (Street, 2004). This view is reproduced globally at all levels: from students to scholars. There is a deep-seated imbalance that sees Global Southern academics being disadvantaged in getting published in international journals, with the result of effectively silencing their academic voices whilst Global Northern scholars write for/about them – a continuation of colonial knowledge extractivism (Szeman, 2017; Junko-Aiko & Cortes-Severino, 2017) and maldevelopment (Tortosa, 2019). In this paper, we ask what our responsibilities are, as academics who teach academic writing, in mediating and counterbalancing this neo-colonial system. Is this something we can do without reproducing the neo-colonial structures we are trying to subvert ('us', as UK academics, choosing to empower 'them')? We address these questions by reflecting on an experience delivering a series of writing workshops for academics in Iraq. The aim was not to make our academic colleagues better writers, but rather to mediate different values in different contexts (Grimm, 2009, p. 22). Drawing on the work of hooks (1994, 2002) and Freire (1970), we attempted to disempower ourselves and the hegemonic practices that currently prevent Iraqi voices from being heard internationally. This act of disempowering has resulted in confusion, as we find ourselves in our own 'praxis of stuck places' (Lather, 1998). However, by doing this, we hoped (Freire, 1992; hooks, 1994) to create space for our participants' existing agency and attempt to escape a form of empowerment that is shaped by the Global North.

Academic writing and retention: a discussion of an intervention among undergraduate year students in an Irish university

Irina Rupp

E-Mail: irinaruppo@gmail.com

This paper discusses a four-week intervention designed to help undergraduate students whose writing problems are severe enough to make them consider leaving the University before completing their course of study

In a survey of undergraduate students at NUIG, it was found that students who attributed their contemplation of withdrawal to writing problems faced an array of challenges in the four aspects which according to Helen Sword (2017) constitute the basis of successful academic writing practice: social, artisanal, behavioural, and psychological.

The intervention, consisting of daily emails to students who volunteered to take part in the study, was structured around Sword's idea of the four bases of successful academic writing (2017) and Sarah Haas' model of the writing process (2009). The intervention aimed to shift students' perceptions about the writing process while giving them practical tools for improving their work. After the completion of the intervention, participants were invited for semi-structured interviews. Participants' remarks provide further insight into the unique challenges faced by students who attribute their contemplation of withdrawal to writing problems.

While there is evidence that writing problems play a part in student attrition (Garrett et al. 2017) and that support with writing aids in student retention (Attewell et al. 2006, Bettinger and Long 2005, Baker and Jolly 1999, Lau 2003, Babcock and Thonus 2012, Ruecker 2017, Buyserie et al. 2017), current retention models do not single out writing problems as an individual factor (Tinto 1993, Bean 1983, Bean and Metzner 1985, Seidman 2012). Consequently, institutional retention interventions do not usually include focus on writing. Shedding light on the unique role writing issues may play in student retention is likely to empower struggling students. It can also empower writing centre administrators to emerge as key contributors to solving a problem of major importance to third level institutions.

Making research writing transparent: From genre to SFL informed design and instruction and back again

Josta Arlene Heyligers

E-Mail: josta.heyligers@aut.ac.nz

I have often used Swales' model (1994) for teaching research writing and corpus approaches for examining consistency and variations in moves across disciplines and speakers of English as a first and addition language (EAL) (e.g. Li & Van Rij-Heyligers, 2011). Swales' 'moves and steps' model has functioned as a workable heuristic for research writing, in particular for EAL students who may be unaware of what is 'required'. Recently, however, Moreno and Swales (2018) have highlighted a function-form gap in Swales' model, causing some fuzzy move boundaries. Examining text from top to bottom, move to step analysis, may neglect how a move is realised and defined in a text. Hence, they propose a bottom-up, step to move analysis, so to better infer move functions, and advocate for text fragment analysis to code certain steps. Genre based Systematic Functional Linguistics (SFL) (Nagao, 2019) may aid in bridging this gap: SFL's field, tenor and mode analysis can provide transparency of the communicative function of steps in text fragments. For teaching, SFL further has a clear social objective: to enhance students' agency to gain access to their communication community by making the language transparent. SFL approaches help to address how a text function is linguistically achieved in writing, using a teaching-learning cycle (TLC) based on: contextualising, modelling, joint construction, independent construction, and comparison (Nagao, 2019; Emi & Fuad, 2015). Despite its social focus, SFL has been criticised for not enhancing students' voice and potential to be change agents in their community. This paper briefly discusses the SFL approach to research writing, SFL relevance to promoting student agency, and the workshops using aspects of SFL. It reports on changes made in the design and presentation of these workshops, provides preliminary student feedback, and concludes with lessons learned in the process.

P14: Findings from Social Strategies for Empowerment

Time: Wednesday, 06/July/2022: 9:00am - 10:45am

Session Chair: Klara Dreo

Empowerment through autonomy: a qualitative study of writing group conversations

Dzifa Vode

E-Mail: dzifa.vode@th-nuernberg.de

Besides the widespread peer tutoring, some writing centers initiate another peer learning format: writing groups. Such writing groups are often moderated but sometimes also autonomous. In these cases, the student group members collaborate on their own terms, without the support of a writing center professional, faculty member or peer tutor. In contrast to peer tutoring, such autonomous writing groups constitute a truly symmetrical peer learning situation where students work “on their writing in a sustained way, over repeated gatherings, for doing, discussing or sharing their writing” (Aitchison and Guerin 2014, S. 7). Research on PhD students shows that academic writing groups lead to positive learning outcomes such as enhancing productivity or developing feedback skills (e.g. Aitchison and Lee 2006, Aitchison 2009). Girgensohn shows how students in autonomous *creative* writing groups build their identity as writers (2007). Interestingly, autonomous writing groups for students working on *academic* texts, have not been investigated yet. In this study, I aim to find out how undergraduate students collaborate in writing groups. Informed by the academic literacies model (Lea and Street 2006), I am analyzing five writing group conversations drawing on both qualitative content analysis and functional pragmatic discourse analysis (e.g. Redder & Rehbein 1999; Rehbein 2001; Ehlich 2007). The results show which topics the students bring into the writing group meetings, e.g. their struggle to understand disciplinary norms and the expectations of their supervisors. The results also demonstrate how the students collaborate by regulating their emotions, co-constructing formulations, sharing knowledge and solving problems—or not. The findings suggest that the autonomy of the writing groups involves risks but also harbors a wide range of learning opportunities and room for empowerment.

“It’s good to know you’re not the only one struggling” – Exploring the empowering potential of peer-reflection on the emotional experience of academic writing

Bernadette Huber

E-Mail: b.huber@uq.edu.au

This paper examines the affordances and challenges of placing emotions at the centre of student conversations. Driscoll and Wells (2020) emphasise the importance of “changing the dominant narrative” in writing centre work from the tendency to avoid emotions and constructing them as mostly disruptive to seeing them as potential for writing centre work to tutor “the whole person”. Several aspects of such a shift have been discussed, such as emotional labour (e.g. Costello, 2021) and addressing emotions in tutor-tutee conversations (e.g. Brown, 2021; Semmler, 2013), but also how emotions could be researched in writing process counselling (Kreitz, 2020; Ruhmann, 2014). But we know less about what a shift towards viewing academic writing as an emotional experience means for conversations among peers. Could talking about the emotional experience of academic writing with peers have an empowering effect? And what role could writing centres play in affecting such a shift?

Based on my PhD project on the emotional experience of undergraduate academic writing, I explore the potential of facilitating peer-reflection on the emotions of academic writing. I gathered data longitudinally in focus groups and interviews which featured reflections on emotions about academic writing and during the writing process. Recurring conversations and workshops with the same participants allow me to explore how peer-reflection on emotions affected participants’ relationship with each other, with academic writing, and with their writing process during the conversations and afterwards. I will discuss affordances and limitations of such a research approach and discuss if and how peer-reflection activities on the emotional experience of academic writing could be applied in writing centre work to empower students to take their writing emotions into their own hands.

Crossing a Boundary? A First Experience with Integrated Writing and Method Consultation

Franco P. Rismondo, Erika Unterperthinger, Brigitte Römmer-Nossek

E-Mail: brigitte.roemmer-nossek@univie.ac.at

Organizationally, academic writing and research methodology usually reside in different realms: Writing is often supported by peer tutors belonging to a writing center, methods are taught within the disciplines and may additionally be supported by specialists of a method center. However, the first two phases of a writing (research) project, involve defining the topic and pinning down the research question. This cannot be done independently of the object and the mode of investigation, thus in everyday writing counselling, methodological considerations frequently play a role. Over time writing peer tutors necessarily acquire some expertise in pointing to common misconceptions, answering questions students feel they should know the answer to (and thus would not dare ask their supervisor), and giving feedback to (mainly Bachelor) students’ initial attempts in operationalizing their research question.

Addressing the question of method explicitly is a sensitive issue, as it may be perceived as crossing the boundary from “neutral” writing counselling to the heart of a discipline. For our pilot “method camp” we therefore sought the cooperation of two study programs and chose a half day open house format to provide a space for asking basic questions (without a feeling exposed) and conceptual work on the projects, like a first orientation, the research question, the initial stages of the research project, planning and practical considerations, or about writing the method section. While it was *not* a goal to provide the depth of expertise a method center would offer or to interfere with the supervisor, we made sure that the peer tutors present had undergone additional qualification and were experienced in a range of the qualitative methods employed in the partnering programs. In our presentation we will share the experiences made with this first “camp”.

P15: Writing Centres as Agents of Empowerment

Time: Wednesday, 06/July/2022: 9:00am - 10:45am

Session Chair: Micha Gerrit Philipp Edlich

Presentation title: Academic Writing Centre: Gatekeeper or enabler with regard to changing modes of academic writing.

Dimitar Angelov, Geof Hill

E-Mail: dimitar.angelov@coventry.ac.uk

Academic writing development and Writing Centres, as loci of practice, have long been perceived as fulfilling a vital but, essentially, remedial role of bringing struggling students in line with existing university standards (Bazerman 2005). However, a growing body of Academic Writing scholarship suggests that a different route for future development is possible. We see alternative possibilities in Shamoon and Burns's idea of the Writing Centre being a place where academics and students get together to discuss research and writing practices, and work together to re-enact and possibly redefine existing standards and norms (1995). Similarly, the whole-institution approach to academic writing proposed by Ganobcsik-Williams (2011) puts the Writing Centre at the forefront of research practice by advocating collaborations with expert as well as novice writers. In these examples, we see a possible new role for Writing Centres as sites of interrogation and innovation where rules are scrutinised, re-imagined and reshaped. Considering such new directions has become particularly pertinent in light of current definitions of research which embrace forms of creative work (OECD 2002: 128); but also in light of the transformative practices emerging from the Academic Literacies approach to writing (Lea and Street 1998; Lillis et al. 2016); and the new technological advancements in knowledge production and dissemination. Given the shifting nature of academic writing, each Centre will choose a philosophy as to whether they support the hegemony of established academic writing norms or actively challenge traditions and empower both researchers and students to new modes of academic practice.

This paper explores the relationship formed between an Academic Writing Centre in the UK and one cutting-edge mode of academic writing as they expose academic discourse communities to new modes of research practice and dissemination.

Cultural Considerations of Establishing a University Writing Center in Norway

Warren Merkel

E-Mail: warren.merkel@anglistik.uni-freiburg.de

Several studies have investigated the challenges of establishing a writing center in a range of contexts (see, for example, Bräuer & Girgensohn, 2012); yet none, to my knowledge, has examined the cultural and institutional considerations of establishing a writing center in a Norwegian institution of higher education. By procuring feedback from pre-service undergraduate students enrolled at a university in Norway, the purpose of this qualitative study was to determine the potential for the students' conceptions – of academic writing specifically and a writing center in general – to influence how a writing center might be established and maintained.

In autumn 2019, I began the initial stages of establishing a writing center, as a professor in the Teacher Education department at Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), while simultaneously teaching undergraduate courses to pre-service English teachers. During the semester, roughly 50 students, as a stage of formative assessment on their final assignments, were required to visit my office for one-on-one writing center sessions.

Surveys were distributed to collect students' feedback on their sessions as well as their conceptions of academic writing. Grimm's (2009) conceptual framework of students as "designers of social futures" (p. 21) underpinned the study's structure, while Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was adopted to collect and data.

Findings reveal that many students appreciated the face-to-face feedback, and would visit the writing center again for feedback on other writing assignments (but not necessarily on writing in general). Further, students noted that writing centers might not be in demand because students feel they must be responsible for their own learning. Students also recommended that obligatory visits to the writing center might help to promote it.

R1: Roundtable: Empowering Writing Centers: What We Can Learn from Former Directors

Time: Wednesday, 06/July/2022: 1:15pm - 3:00pm

Session Chair: Tiane K. Donahue

Empowering Writing Centers: What We Can Learn from Former Directors

Kathleen Shine Cain, Pamela Childers, Leigh Ryan

E-Mail: caink@merrimack.edu

As naturally empowering entities, communities of practice (Lave & Wenger 1991) dismantle hierarchies and build social capital among members (Wenger, McDermott & Snyder 2002). As communities of practice, writing centers contribute to and reflect our identities, allowing us to envision how work in the center transitions to other academic, professional or volunteer work. This idea inspired Hughes, Gillespie, & Kail's (2010) Peer Tutor Alumni Project, which demonstrated the lasting impact of the tutoring experience on tutors' lives, specifically how the concept of collaborative learning served them well in their subsequent work.

These findings inform our project, which examines how writing center experience influences the work of former directors who have retired or moved on to other academic, professional or volunteer endeavors. We are conducting a survey of former directors, to be followed by select interviews, to determine how their identity as directors of a writing center community of practice has influenced them in re-shaping their professional identities, as well as how their experience can be helpful to current directors. This project is particularly relevant to the evolution of writing centers from supporting to challenging oppressive institutional practices by embracing a social justice mission (Grimm 1998, Geller *et al* 2007). We hope to discover what former directors have learned from their experience, how that experience influences their current endeavors, and how they may impact writing centers as communities of practice in the future. Specifically, the testimony of former directors should offer guidance to current directors as they grapple with the tension between institutional demands and the needs of an increasingly diverse student body. Just as the Peer Tutor Alumni Project went beyond simply identifying the impact of writing center work on former tutors, we anticipate that this project will not only provide a clearer understanding of how directors' experiences influence their work beyond the center, but will also open opportunities for former and current directors to collaborate in re-imagining writing center theory and practice.

After an introduction to the project and an overview of responses to date, participants will divide into groups (if possible, according to experience--new directors, veterans, former directors) to discuss our preliminary findings with respect to their own experience and offer suggested questions for follow-up interviews. Reports from groups should help us to determine the relevance of the material to current and former directors, and to identify further avenues of research.

R9: Roundtable: Empowering European Writing Centers: Revisiting the 1986 Wyoming Conference Resolution

Time: Wednesday, 06/July/2022: 1:15pm - 3:00pm

Session Chair: Joan Mullin

Empowering European Writing Centers: Revisiting the 1986 Wyoming Conference Resolution

Lawrence Cleary, Joan Mullin, Gerd Bräuer, Ann-Marie Eriksson, Joseph Essid

E-Mail: lawrence.cleary@ul.ie

Writing Center Directors can speak to the empowerment of writing and student agency, but many are in situations where writing as a field is marginalized, work not respected or understood, pay and/or status not equitable, efforts to change institutional paradigms leading to burnout. In the US, many of these issues were addressed at the 1986 Wyoming Conference. A 2011 reassessment found the spirit of the Wyoming Conference alive and well, but conceded room for more work (McDonald and Schell, 375). The 2016 Indianapolis Resolution (Cox et al.), however, suggests that the spirit is very much drooping.

This roundtable calls for action around four specific issues while also seeking other pressing issues that can counter the status of writing centers, their directors, and staff.

Panelists will lay out the issues that are continually raised by European writing center staff:

- Funding for Professional Development & Respect for Scholarship;
- Finding a Work-Life Balance and Avoiding Burnout;
- Providing Evidence for the Efficacy of Centres/ Income Generation;
- Navigating institutions to create stability, equity and promotion for WC positions.

(40 min.)

Audience participants will then break into groups, each elaborating on one of the topics and designing solutions. The goal of the roundtable is not merely commiseration but finding the means for action.

(20 min.)

Groups will report on proposed solutions, and these will be recorded. Given the list, participants will be asked to consider how as a group, European writing centre directors and staff might work on something comparable to the U.S.'s Wyoming resolution, which created professional standards, salary levels, standards for working conditions, and a grievance process with the right to censor those institutions not complying. This was unanimously voted on by those in writing's professional organization and has been instrumental in addressing some of the equity issues across the U.S.

(30 min.)

P1: Social Writing Strategies

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 9:00am - 10:45am

Session Chair: Joy de Jong

Writing as empowerment – collaborative writing strategies as emancipatory support for students in and beyond the Activist Writing Center

Lena Eckert

E-Mail: leckert@europa-uni.de

If we see and teach writing not as a containment of thought but as liberation, we might be able to bring students to a new understanding and experience of writing. I want to propose an understanding of teaching writing that can empower students to their own thinking.

For philosopher Gilles Deleuze, “writing is a question of becoming, always incomplete, always in the midst of being formed, and goes beyond the matter of any livable or lived experience. It is a process that is a passage of Life that traverses both the livable and the lived. Writing is inseparable from becoming: in writing, one becomes-woman, becomes-animal or vegetable, becomes-molecule . . .” (Deleuze 1998: 1). The challenge for students and their collaborations often, however, seems to be their understanding of writing and their understanding of authorship as something classifying and codifying. I argue that if we teach to “treat writing as a flow, not a code” (Deleuze, 1995: 7) we might be able to empower students to find their own voice in writing. Therefore, if we can teach students not to „hide behind the modernist conceit that writing is universal, authoritative, and finalizable” (Pensoneau-Conway et al. 2014: 322) we might be able to make them realize that writing is quite the opposite: It is always specific and personal, vulnerable, necessarily neglecting, processural and it can be democratic. By actually letting them experience the necessary incompleteness of one’s own and each others’ writing by writing together and in the vein of becoming, one might enable the embodied and performative dimensions of “the tender together/apartness of writing” (see Wyatt 2010: 730). Collaboration can be “a mutually beneficial and well-defined relationship” with a commitment to “a jointly developed structure and shared responsibility; mutual authority and accountability for success” (Mattessich et al. 2001: 59).

Styling your thesis in the STEM sciences: Negotiating conventions in multilingual writing groups

Anna Brockhaus, Lukas Daum, Ute Henning

E-Mail: ute.henning@tu-darmstadt.de

The so-called style of scientific texts can encompass aspects as different as word choice, grammatical complexity, how to give references or how to mark a text as belonging to a particular genre. While scientific writers are, to varying degrees, free to choose how to style their texts, many writer’s handbooks for students and style sheets from university teachers prescribe strict rules. Students of the STEM sciences do not have much opportunity to learn about or navigate these style conventions until they start writing their thesis, and thus they tend to prefer clear, normative instructions over non-directive guidance through a system of conventions of varying degrees of rigidity. In addition, their writing processes involve more than one language, as they may use at least both English and German (or another language) in their reading, writing, note-taking and conversations about their thesis – a fact which many are wary of and therefore do not use to their advantage.

The task of writing their thesis is an enormous challenge for many of these students. Writing centers can support them not only through one-to-one peer tutoring with a process-oriented approach, fostering their self-efficacy as well as writing strategies. We see another opportunity in writing groups, as these have considerable potential to provide a space for reflections on scientific style – quite apart from reflections on writing strategies or a productive atmosphere for writing flow, both well-documented in the literature.

We will present the new interdisciplinary and multilingual writing groups for students of the STEM sciences at TU Darmstadt who are writing their bachelor or master thesis (set to begin in the fall of 2022), focusing on how the groups can be a platform for style discussions and how they can empower students to make stylistic choices.

P2: Empowering both Traditional and Marginalised Groups

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 9:00am - 10:45am
Session Chair: Shareen Grogan

Sorry for My Bad English: Grammar, Punctuation, and Empowerment in ESL/EFL Writing Centers

Eva Marik, Kuan-Chun Chen

E-Mail: m7744davis@gmail.com

In order to gain self-esteem in writing and feel empowered, ESL/EFL writers frequently strive for better command of various aspects of a foreign language. Researchers in different countries have identified the major difficulties with grammar that some ESL/EFL writers face (Javid & Umer, 2014; Ariyanti & Fitriana, 2015; Ho, 2016). Ho (2016) summarizes the difficulty "into key themes, such as limited vocabulary, grammar issues, lexical choice problems, insufficient rhetorical knowledge of disciplinary research genres". These studies above may have emphasized the role of grammar to different degrees, but they all indicate that grammar is one major issue. In an L1 setting, however, these problems are mostly identified as LOCs and are largely dismissed by the nondirective approach agenda (Glover & Stay, 1995; Chromik, 2002; Carter, 2016; Kim, 2018). This neglect of the ESL/EFL context may result in misapplying the American non-directive model in the ESL/EFL context (Harbord, 2018).

Similarly, punctuation is not always merely a LOC in ESL/EFL writing centers. Five main distinctions are made when categorising the functions of the modern English punctuation system (Petit, 2003; Steinhauer, 2003; Petit & Tollance, 2016; Nouri, 2018; Trask, 2019). However, punctuation does not function universally across languages. How to teach punctuation in the classroom has usually been neglected (Dawkins, 1995; Hirvela et al., 2012; Salman et al., 2017), and literature on peer tutoring has ignored this topic completely. Based on the presenters' tutoring experience at the Research and Writing Center at the University of Tübingen in Germany, this paper explores the roles of grammar and punctuation in an ESL/EFL environment and argues that the distinction between LOCs and HOCs may not always be the most useful model when tutors aim to empower ESL/EFL writers, who are often rendered the most vulnerable because of their English proficiency.

Writing Needs More Than a Brain: Resource Networks as Means of Empowerment

David Kreitz, Ella Grieshammer

E-Mail: kreitz@zqs.uni-hannover.de

In our presentation we:

- (1) Introduce writing as a network activity and its theoretical background,
- (2) Discuss the creation of networks as empowerment and resource issue,
- (3) Describe a method by which resource networks can be analyzed by writers and writing researchers.

(1) Actor-network theory (see overview in Belliger/Krieger) posits that nothing exists outside networks of relationships and that all the factors involved in these networks (objects, ideas, processes, ...) are on the same level. Whereas Cognitive Models focus on what goes on in the mind of the writer, such a network perspective integrates material and social aspects of writing. One cannot write without using instruments – you need pen, chalk, computer, some device to make visible your thoughts. Even more: it is not only your brain and your body manipulating instruments, but we also interact with other people (i.e. literacy brokers (Lillis/Curry 2006), gatekeepers (Habibie/Hylland 2019), writing consultants, friends, colleagues), texts (literature read, text produced so far); we use ordering systems for thoughts and literature.

(2) In the context of empowerment one can ask: How do writers create these networks for their writing? Who can access which social, material, technological resources to build a network? And who is unable or even barred from establishing benefitting networks of things and people?

(3) To reflect on and possibly optimize this network of resources, we used the method of resource-mapping – building on ego-centered network maps (McMarty et al. 2007, Hollstein) – which allows students to get an overview of their resources, and talk to others about their writing needs, tools, experiences, and helpful collaborators.

Presenting resource maps created by PhD students in a writing workshop at a German University, we highlight the method's possibilities for managing the writing process as well as discuss its potential for SOTL research.

P3: Contesting Traditional Approaches

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 9:00am - 10:45am

Session Chair: Birgit Huemer

Writing centers in Russia and beyond: extending audiences, teaching conventions, changing educational contexts

Irina Korotkina

E-Mail: irina.korotkina@gmail.com

The demand for writing centers in Russia is driven by the governmental policies aimed at transforming universities into global research centers. The target audience of writing centers is therefore academics, urged to publish internationally, although the audience is limited due to insufficient knowledge of English. As academic writing in the national language is inexistent, and the national publishing tradition obsolete, tutees have little knowledge of international rhetorical and publishing conventions, which implies the dominance of the directive approach. Similar problems are encountered in other post-Soviet states where Russian remains the *lingua franca* of academic communication. Based on comparative analysis, the study systematizes the problems faced by Russian writing centers and offers ways of overcoming them by applying a metalinguistic approach which involves flexible analytical models and bilingual teaching and tutoring. This helps diminish the dominance of the directive approach, extend the audience, foster the development of academic writing in higher education, and train teachers of writing in both languages. By enhancing trainees' reflections on their pedagogical experiences and critical views of the overall pattern of national educational and publishing traditions, the metalinguistic approach empowers them to promote academic writing conventions in multiple disciplinary contexts regardless of the language. The study resulted in publishing a manual on academic writing in Russian (2015) and a monograph on institutional and methodological prospects of developing writing centers in the country (2018). A recently designed online course is aimed at attracting an even wider audience. The efficacy of the approach is further challenged by the intention of several Central Asian universities to create a network of bilingual writing centers; we also believe that a trilingual model may help them reestablish the role of native languages in academic communication, thus contributing to the status of national identity.

Fostering Academic Literacy in the Writing Center

Shawn Raisig, Lisa Landreh

E-Mail: shawn.raisig@uni-tuebingen.de

Peer tutors at writing centers are often trained to work with tutees on various issues, including developing a research question, focusing broad ideas, incorporating sources, and identifying language problems. While these concerns might first seem like difficulties with academic writing and/or EAP, they are often rooted in struggles with academic literacy (Lea & Street, 1998; Lillis, 2019; Rienecker, 2019). In such tutoring sessions, these problems must take a back seat to the larger issue at hand, namely empowering the tutee to engage with a text and understand the multiplicity of factors that affect their understanding of and ability to write on the topic (Rhead, 2019; Papen & Thériault, 2017; Gimenez and Thomas, 2016).

Much research has promoted academic literacy at the curricular and institutional levels (Bräuer & Girgensohn, 2012; Wingate, 2019). While the presenters agree with such calls, this presentation seeks to deepen the discussion about the specific role the writing center can play in fostering academic literacy (Bräuer, 2012).

The presenters both worked on the German government-funded "Projekt Studienstart", designed to help new students acclimate to university. Using a multimethod research approach, in which a qualitative analysis of 60 student essays from this project was conducted, followed by select interviews analyzed using conversational analysis, the presenters will provide indications of struggles with academic literacy and discuss the following:

- (How) can we see evidence of problems with academic literacy in students' writing?
- (How) can peer tutors be trained to identify that the main problem with some students' writing is academic literacy?
- What can peer tutors do in individual tutoring sessions to foster academic literacy?

Training peer tutors to foster academic literacy in the writing center ultimately empowers tutees to take ownership of their ideas and choices in their writing and further develop their own identity as scholars.

W4: Workshop: How is Academic Writing Different from Bullshit? and Other Crazy Questions an American Asks His Students in the Czech Republic

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 9:00am - 10:45am

Session Chair: Andrea Karsten

How is Academic Writing Different from Bullshit? and Other Crazy Questions an American Asks His Students in the Czech Republic

Joe Lennon

E-Mail: zhoulennon@gmail.com

I would like to share a set of materials and activities for writers which I have been developing in response to some big (and to this audience probably not uncommon) institutional and cultural challenges. Over the last year, with the help of a few overworked and underpaid colleagues, I have taken baby steps toward establishing a Writing Lab at the Masaryk University Language Centre in Brno, Czech Republic. There are only a few writing centers in this country, but there is a glaring need for them. Almost all of our students are required to write and/or publish in English, but many of them have never taken a writing course in their native language, let alone in English. Even fewer have been given individual or peer feedback on their work, or been asked to consider their audience, or articulate the larger reasons they are writing. While we try to convince administrators that a Writing Lab is essential, I am also trying to empower students and transform their practice by redesigning my classroom-based writing courses (the work I actually get paid for) to incorporate more elements inspired by my experience as a writing center tutor and in creative writing workshops. I have developed a set of short essays, accompanied by writing activities, which prompt students to begin dialogues that can increase their self-awareness as writers. Each essay introduces a provocative word pair (some examples: "formal/informal"; "abstract (n.) / abstract (adj.)"; "academic writing / bullshit") and offers different ways to interpret the relationship between the two concepts. In the workshop, I will show you how I use these materials in the classroom, and how they might be adapted for use in a writing center. I hope this leads to a larger discussion about how to introduce Central European writers to English-language writing cultures.

PKP: PechaKucha and Poster Session

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 11:00am - 12:45pm
Session Chair: Lawrence Cleary

Let's build our writing center together: Peer-tutor empowerment at an early stage of the process.

Ute Reimers

E-Mail: reimers@anglistik.uni-siegen.de

At the time I was writing this abstract, one year had already passed since I applied for the first EWCA Summer Institute to receive support for initiating a writing center at our university. By that time, my colleague and I had undertaken many discussions with decision makers over the course of two years and developed a detailed concept for our future writing center. One year later (in my 2020 abstract), I was proud to report on the progress: A pilot project in which we finally train the first peer tutors at our university. Today (in 2022), we already conducted three rounds of peer tutor training! In our training, we first provided our participants (25 in total) with intense background knowledge on the writing process and consultation strategies. Subsequently, it was our particular concern to empower them to actively shape their university's writing center at this stage of the process, since they are closest to the largest target group - the students - and therefore the real experts (cf. Girgensohn 2012, 134). Hence, a whole project day was dedicated to a) designing a draft for our ideal writing center based on the special needs of the students at this particular university, b) researching other writing centers' offers and comparing their context with ours and c) investigating our university's strategic plan to find out how our writing center can become part of and serve this institution (cf. O'Sullivan & Cleary 2015, 21). Our aim was to bring these aspects together and collaboratively develop a mission statement for our future writing center. This mission statement then formed the basis for negotiating next steps with responsible decision makers. In my PechaKucha, I will contextualize our project, present the structure of the peer-tutor training, elaborate on the methods used to compile our mission statement, present the results of our project day and report on what we achieved with them afterwards.

Empowering Student Writers and Writing Tutors in Multilingual Contexts: A Case Study of Leuphana's Writing Tutor Program

Micha Gerrit Philipp Edlich, Dagmar Knorr

E-Mail: micha.edlich@leuphana.de

In higher education in general and writing programs and writing centers in particular, multiliteracy and multilingualism have increasingly become, for a variety of reasons, the norm rather than the exception, and, perhaps more importantly, students' diverse linguistic backgrounds have been recognized by many, in a marked departure from earlier pedagogical positions and practices, as valuable assets with a potential for empowerment. Recent theoretical work in composition and rhetoric on multilingualism and translanguaging in particular and several important empirical studies conducted around the world have provided compelling evidence for the need to develop and implement translanguaging practices in writing programs and at writing centers both in countries such as the U.S.A. or the U.K. and beyond. How to properly respond to this need remains subject to debate, but it is safe to assume that the complex shifting conditions, rife with potential for empowerment and innovative pedagogical practice, also pose a major challenge for those tasked with supporting students with diverse linguistic backgrounds as they, to use David Bartholomae's memorable phrase, begin or continue to "invent the university" and their disciplines. The consequences of a commitment to translanguaging pedagogies and practices certainly include a reconsideration of how writing centers hire and train staff members and undergraduate and graduate writing tutors. One of the questions is how directors, experienced staff members, and administrators can prepare new team members in a way that ultimately allows students to be in charge of their language, their writing, and their development. This contribution discusses how the staff members at the multilingual Schreibzentrum / Writing Center at Leuphana University in Lüneburg, Germany, draw on the German and English literature on multilingualism and translanguaging to prepare new undergraduate and graduate writing tutors for their work in a multilingual setting with multilingual writers.

Tiny Seeds Grow into Mighty Trees: Case of Ilia State University, Georgia

Maia Rogava

E-Mail: maia.rogava@iliauni.edu.ge

The Centre for Academic Writing at Ilia State University, then the only writing centre in Georgia, was established in 2014. The initial aim was to help first-year students (four faculties) develop academic writing skills in Georgian by offering a mandatory academic writing course within the Bachelor's General Module. The guiding principle was to help students become better, more confident writers, boost their motivation, and help them acquire all the skills to function effectively in the academic environment.

At that time, the mission seemed impossible. Why? There was no dedicated space, no unified academic writing curriculum, limited or no teaching material, and only a draft syllabus. We employed twenty-five teachers. Most of them favoured lecturing, used outdated teaching methods, and had limited or no experience teaching academic writing. Our students lacked motivation and had poor academic reading, critical thinking, and writing skills. The question was, how could the Centre survive and perform its function? We assumed that the atmosphere of teamwork and collaboration balanced with autonomy would boost confidence in teachers to take control of their professional development and free them from a *know-all* or *problem-fixer* image. We also decided to introduce a flipped-classroom approach to our teaching, implement the practice of using reading notes, and involve students in the regular peer review practice within each academic writing course. We have revised and developed our syllabi.

We started research using ethnographic methods in three directions to answer the question and test the hypothesis.

- 1) Teacher observation process: over the semesters we followed five teachers who worked at the Centre from the start. This process included observations, monitoring contributions, materials writing and development, work with novice teachers, eLearning space organization, and feedback analysis.
- 2) Apprenticeship results analysis: *old* colleagues *observed* all novice teachers. This process involved session observations and reflections, content analysis of video-recorded sessions and feedback.
- 3) First full-fledged internship: this new format was piloted in the autumn of 2021. The Centre allocated four former students (Masters) to four experienced *old* teachers. The interns were fully involved in the course, planned and delivered some sessions

themselves, contributed to eLearning space organization, and gave feedback to students. Moreover, they were encouraged to participate in the regular Centre-delivered seminars.

The lessons learnt are rather important. First of all, continuing professional development should be a guiding principle of the Centre's policy. Secondly, both internship and apprenticeship formats create a suitable environment for nurturing new, confident academic writing teachers, empowering them to start their independent paths.

Today we have a unified academic writing curriculum in Georgian and English offered to all faculties at three academic levels; dedicated space (physical and virtual), and our materials (including an in-house developed toolkit); a well-trained and constantly developing team of teachers who deliver our courses, work as tutors, run regular seminars, conduct workshops, training sessions and masterclasses. We have already conducted two academic writing in-house conferences and participated in several local and international conferences. We do research and share the results, experience gained, and lessons learnt to other universities in Georgia. We already have a follower - a new academic writing centre recently founded at the Caucasus University.

Building a Czech Phrasebank to Support Writing Development in Universities

Kamila Etchegoyen Rosolová, Alena Kasparkova

E-Mail: etchegoyen@langdpt.cas.cz

Phrasebanks are resources that list the most frequent phrases related to the different sections and rhetorical moves found in published texts. These resources can be very useful in supporting student writing, allowing students to access authentic texts and learn from linguistic and rhetorical patterns, and phrases used in these texts. Writing pedagogies across Europe have been gaining on importance as publishing pressures mount and writing plays a key role in student assessment. When John Morley compiled the Academic Phrasebank of the University of Manchester (<https://www.phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk/>), he intended to support writing development primarily among English learners. However, it turned out that his phrasebank began to be widely used also by Anglophone writers. Following the example of the Manchester Phrasebank, linguists in several other countries have started developing phrasebanks in their national languages. In the Czech Republic where writing pedagogies are in their nascent stage, we are also seeking to develop resources to strengthen support to student writing development and we believe a Czech phrasebank might serve this purpose. This poster maps the initial stages of our efforts where we look at experience from abroad. More specifically, we examine recently developed phrasebanks (e.g. Jürine, 2018; Morley, n.d.; <http://www.frazynas.flf.vu.lt>; <https://tools.kib.ki.se/referensguide/frasbank/>) and relevant literature (e.g. Godfrey, J., 2019; Graf, G. and Birkenstein, C. 2018; Rienecker, Jørgensen & Jakobsen, 2020) to identify lessons to learn from as we prepare to develop our own phrasebank. The Czech Academic Phrasebank will be linked with a corpus of research articles published in Czech for writers to be able to see the phrases in context. This mapping of existing phrasebanks can be useful for anyone who is seeking to learn more about academic phrasebanks and the use of corpus linguistic approaches in writing support services.

Writing Mentoring: One Program - Three Ways of Empowerment

Brigitte Römmer-Nossek, Eva Kuntschner, Erika Unterpertinger, Klara Dreo

E-Mail: brigitte.roemmer-nossek@univie.ac.at

We present the current stage of development of the University of Vienna's Writing Mentoring Program. Starting from a pilot involving two Bachelor study programs, the Writing Mentoring is now offered in cooperation with 30 (mainly BA) study programs and in English. The basic training initially developed has evolved and now serves as Module 1 of an subsidiary curriculum comprising 3 Modules and 15 ECTS. Its title „Akademisch Schreiben entwickeln, vermitteln und beforschen – Ausbildung zum/zur SchreibmentorIn“ roughly translates as „developing, teaching, and researching academic writing – writing mentor education“. Students qualified in this program experience empowerment in three ways:

1. As writers: While the education writing mentors receive aims at tools supporting others, they frequently report how much it helped them to develop as writers.
2. As mentors: By helping others to help themselves, writing mentors experience self-efficacy and enjoy empowering others.
3. As researchers: In the second and third module groups of writing mentors carry out their own writing research project, which is recognized in a small conference in the end of the semester as well as by being published in „zisch : zeitschrift für interdisziplinäre schreibforschung“.

The poster presents the structure of the programme as well as data from the regular evaluations.

W1: Workshop: Genre Analysis: A tool for empowering student writers of all language and social backgrounds

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 11:00am - 12:45pm
Session Chair: Andrea Marie Scott

Genre Analysis: A tool for empowering student writers of all language and social backgrounds

Carly Elena Carly

E-Mail: c.crane@em.uni-frankfurt.de

This workshop introduces participants to genre analysis as a pedagogical strategy for advancing students' genre awareness and rhetorical flexibility. *How does genre awareness empower students with diverse backgrounds?* Novice academic writers often perceive academic genres as mystifying, void of context, and unmoored from rhetorical purpose; they do not yet understand how authorial purpose and disciplinary values manifest in linguistic features. For international students, generation 1.5 students, and socioeconomically marginalized students, who likely lack familiarity with culturally significant genres, scaffolded analysis of the genres they need to write is empowering writing instruction. Analysis of a genre's purpose, its conventions (of structure, register, authorial voice, argumentation), and, importantly, the degree to which it can vary across disciplines and contexts grant students access to the language of that genre and enable students to write successfully within it.

The workshop will begin with a discussion of genre as social action, and the role that genre-based pedagogy might already play in participants' writing center work. Discussion questions might include: *How do you address genre and generic conventions with students? How do you address or support disciplinary genres or writing conventions?*

Participants will then try out genre analysis themselves. They'll read several samples from the same genre—e.g., a book review—in order to analyze its purpose, audience, authorial voice/presence, structure, register, argumentation (how strongly are claims stated? what counts as evidence?), and sentence-level features.

In the final section of the workshop, I will present a few examples of how I apply genre analysis in my own writing center work and invite participants to generate ideas for how they might apply genre analysis in their own writing centers.

W3: Workshop: Picturing one's research. A tool for academic writers

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 11:00am - 12:45pm

Session Chair: David Kreitz

Picturing one's research. A tool for academic writers

Joy de Jong

E-Mail: j.c.dejong1@uu.nl

The most frequently used hand-out in our Writing Centre is the template for "Picturing Your Research". In this workshop, I want to present the model behind it and the template itself, and give participants the opportunity to experience how it works.

The majority of our tutoring sessions are about structure (organisation). Three aspects of structure are covered frequently: (1) structuring the writing process; (2) structuring the research; (3) structuring the text. Assuming that most EWCA-colleagues are rather familiar with aspects 1 and 3, I will focus on aspect 2: structuring the research.

Usually, academic writing is about research, be it an empirical and/or a literature survey; we often write about something we didn't know before. This is specifically true for students working on a Bachelor or Master (or PhD) thesis. For thesis writers, it can become quite confusing how several elements of their research can be mapped together. Heinze Oost (1999) developed a model which appears to be a powerful tool for students in getting a clear picture of their research. A template with checkpoints derived from the model, stimulates academic writers to evaluate and elaborate the 'what', 'why' and 'how' of their research or research plan. Interestingly, these what, how and why are interconnected, which ensures a strong, logically consistent construct.

I will present the model and the template, and give participants the opportunity to experience how it works. The workshop will entail: (1) brief explanation of the model, (2) examples of how students fill out the template, (3) participants working with the model by picturing their own piece of research, (4) different ways (pedagogies) to use the model in a tutoring session in the writing centre or in a writing course or workshop.

W5: Workshop: Writing Center Research as Empowerment – Experiences from The Writing Center Exchange Project (WCEP)

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 11:00am - 12:45pm

Session Chair: Anja Poloubotko

Writing Centre Research as Empowerment – Experiences from The Writing Centre Exchange Project (WCEP)

Katrin Girgensohn, Ann-Marie Eriksson, Íde O'Sullivan

E-Mail: girgensohn@europa-uni.de

In this workshop, we share experiences of a research-driven exchange project. The project to be reported targeted an organisational perspective on writing centre work by researching ongoing institutional work in three European writing centres at different developing stages: the European University Viadrina, Germany; the University of Gothenburg, Sweden; and the University of Limerick, Ireland. The Writing Centre Exchange Project (WCEP) was conducted within the framework of participatory action research and designed to explore what similarities and differences emerged in terms of the Girgensohn's (2018) model of institutional work of writing centre directors.

Collaboration among writing centres in the form of visiting each other's institutions and sharing materials and ideas is, luckily, a common practice within the professional field (Harris 2001). The WCEP, however, was more. The WCEP showed us the value of taking an organisational perspective on writing centre work. Using Girgensohn's empirically-developed theoretical model as a heuristic for conducting structured observations, interviews and focus groups turned this project into much more than a mutual visiting experience.

Coming with a research agenda helped the visitors to gain access to, and focus on, institutional conditions in the three different centres. First, it offered the visitors possibilities to develop shared interests regarding organisational perspectives of writing centre work that could be pursued in each of the respective writing centres. Secondly, it gave the visiting researchers permission to meet important stakeholders and ask what might otherwise have been inconvenient questions for university management, for example. Thirdly, the research agenda paved the way for introducing and elaborating preliminary findings together with writing centre staff members, which turned out to be important institutional work in itself. As part of this workshop we will describe and exemplify results from this kind of collaborative research both in terms of what centre representatives, like ourselves, can learn from taking an outsider's perspective on our own institutions and in terms of the institutional work and empowerment that was produced through the project itself. We will share insights gained through the WCEP project as a whole but focus especially on a research method that has been labelled "fishbowl" that we adopted and used to allow participation of the stakeholders in interpreting the data. To demonstrate the value of this method, we will share our experiences and research results and then invite EWCA participants to take part in a genuine, digital fishbowl activity to discuss the WCEP findings together with us.

P4: Innovations to Traditional Approaches

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 3:45pm - 5:30pm
Session Chair: Warren Merkel

What's Wrong with an Expert? A Defense of Professional Tutors

Shareen Grogan

E-Mail: shareen.grogan@umontana.edu

Despite data from the Writing Centers Research Project that reveals that more than 46% of participating institutions employed faculty, professional, and graduate students in their center, in the United States, peer tutoring is presented as the norm. So much so that US publications about writing centers don't even have to mention that they are talking about peer tutors. For example, in Grutsch McKinney's *Peripheral Visions of Writing Centers* (2013), only undergraduate and graduate tutors are mentioned; professionals are not. While Denny, Nordlof, and Salem (2018) suggest that professional tutors might provide improved help to working class students, nowhere in their article do they explicitly state that the tutors at their respective institutions are undergraduate tutors. It is simply assumed.

Peer tutoring is considered more than just the norm—it is seen as the gold standard. In Writing Centers, we *collaborate*, and peeriness seems to be a prerequisite of that collaboration

This grand narrative has damaging effects. First, it does not reflect the work that is actually happening at our institutions, and it prevents us from interrogating that work. It is part the "lore" (see Kjesrud 2015), that obscures our thinking and inquiry. Second, it marginalizes the work that many of us are engaged in. Third, it can keep our focus on what the tutors are doing rather than on what our clients are learning.

In this presentation, I will trace this "grand narrative" of writing centers and question notions of collaboration, expertise, mentoring, and conversing about writing.

Asynchronous Online Tutoring as Empowerment

Thomas Philip Earles

E-Mail: tearles@umd.edu

Even before the current global pandemic, writing centers often offered online tutoring and other digital services in order to increase accessibility and empower student populations living on and off campus, with diverse learning styles, educational backgrounds and needs. Building on the work discussed in my article, "How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love Asynchronous Online Tutoring," which covered the planning and implementation of our asynchronous online writing tutoring service at the University of Maryland, this presentation will discuss how students and tutors use that service.

The University of Maryland writing center employs approximately 60 tutors to conduct approximately 10,000 tutoring sessions each year with a very diverse student population. When we first implemented our asynchronous service, we intended it to primarily serve students in online and blended writing classes, as well as commuters who lived far from campus. While we knew it could never exactly match what we do in face-to-face sessions, we knew that it was essential to offer some sort of comparable service to students in distance learning courses. An additional benefit, we assumed, would be its ability to better serve students with diverse learning styles, who might not prefer the face-to-face interaction traditionally offered in the Writing Center. But does asynchronous tutoring offer a comparable learning experience to students who otherwise cannot or choose not to use the writing center's services at a brick-and-mortar location? Does it empower students to become better writers, and in what ways? Does it primarily serve the populations it is intended for, who we assume might use it? In light of so many writing centers moving their entire operations online during much of the pandemic, questions like these become even more important, as does how we think about tutor labor in the asynchronous modality.

Ultimately, through demographic data, survey responses, and interviews with students and tutors, this presentation will attempt to answer the questions of who is using the asynchronous service, why they are using it, and how they are using the writing advice that tutors provide. It will also consider the effects this modality has on tutor morale and well-being.

Empowerment für den Einsatz von Mehrsprachigkeit in akademischen Schreibprozessen – Mehrsprachigkeitsorientierte Schreibdidaktik

Melanie Brinkschulte, Irina Barczaitis, Ella Grieshammer, Monica-Elena Stoian

E-Mail: mbrinks@gwdg.de

Dass Schreibende ihre individuelle Mehrsprachigkeit für akademische Schreibprozesse einsetzen, ist mittlerweile umfassend untersucht (z.B. Dengscherz 2019). Dabei nutzen Schreibende ihre Mehrsprachigkeit u.a. für das Entfalten von Gedanken oder zur Konzentration auf Inhalte während des Schreibprozesses. Eine Didaktik und Methodik, damit Studierende erlernen, ihre sprachlichen Ressourcen und ihre soziokulturellen Hintergründe (z.B. Literalisierungen, Lernbiographien) für das akademische Schreiben zu nutzen, ist im deutschsprachigen Raum bisher in Ansätzen verfügbar (z.B. Lange 2015).

Das Internationale Schreiblabor der Universität Göttingen – Abt. Interkulturelle Germanistik – hat im Rahmen der Internationalisierung von Studienprogrammen basierend auf Erkenntnissen der Mehrsprachigkeitsforschung und Schreibwissenschaft ein didaktisches Konzept entwickelt, erprobt und evaluiert: Das Programm MultiContext – Akademisches Schreiben in mehrsprachigen Kontexten – eröffnet Studierenden Lernfelder, ihre individuelle Mehrsprachigkeit als Empowerment zu verstehen und konstruktiv für das eigene Schreiben zu nutzen. MultiContext richtet sich an Studierende aller Fächer, insbesondere in internationalen Studiengängen. Die Lehrveranstaltungen in MultiContext zielen darauf ab, dass Studierende ihre individuellen sprachlichen Repertoires reflektieren, indem sie beispielsweise ihre individuellen Bildungserfahrungen und sprachlich-kulturellen Hintergründe in Schreibprozesse einbringen lernen und reflektieren, wie diese ihr Schreiben beeinflussen.

Die Materialien und Aufgaben(arrangements) für eine mehrsprachigkeitsorientierte Schreibdidaktik werden Hochschullehrenden durch eine Publikation zugänglich gemacht: Das im Sommer 2022 bei UTB/wbv erscheinende Buch enthält neben einem Überblick zur Mehrsprachigkeitsforschung und -didaktik praktische Handreichungen für Fachlehrende aller Disziplinen, Schreibtrainer:innen und -berater:innen sowie Lehrkräfte für Fremdsprachen. Kategorisiert sind die Aufgaben nach den Phasen des Schreibprozesses sowie übergreifenden Lernfeldern wie die Sensibilisierung für die eigene Mehrsprachigkeit oder die Entwicklung von Reflexionskompetenz.

In diesem Vortrag stellen die vier Autorinnen exemplarisch Aufgaben mit ihrer Rückkopplung an theoretische Konzepte der Mehrsprachigkeitsforschung vor und erläutern, wie Lehrkräfte das Buch nutzen können. Da das Buch auf Deutsch erscheint und lediglich ein Teil der Arbeitsblätter zweisprachig Deutsch und Englisch ist, denken wir, dass es sinnvoll ist, den Vortrag auf Deutsch zu halten.

P5: Tutor Agency and Social Justice

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 3:45pm - 5:30pm
Session Chair: Íde Marie O'Sullivan

Agency and Acquisition of Tutor's Craft in an Embedded Tutoring Program for Composition Classes

Iwona Ionescu, Grace Kohansby

E-Mail: iionescu@rider.edu

We present a case-study of our pedagogical practice, an embedded tutoring (ET) program for English composition classes at a small private university in the U.S.A. ET is a type of student support based on the Supplemental Instruction (SI) model (Strømme-Bakhtiar et al., 2021), also known as Peer Assisted Study Sessions (PASS) or Peer Assisted Learning (PAL). ET is beneficial for different fields of study (Marshall et al., 2019; Mendoza, 2021), including English composition (Bleakney et al., 2020; Titus et al., 2014). To discover the potential benefits of our ET program beyond the tutees' improvement in writing skills and grades, we analyzed peer tutors' reflections collected after each session and at the end of the semester. We found that the program provides an opportunity for peer tutors to work on skills such as collaboration and leadership. By supporting students, peer tutors develop their confidence and sense of agency. ET also leads to a shift in power from professors to peers, which motivates tutors to engage in activities that go beyond the scope of their duties. Some peer tutors support the supervisor with training materials, organize and hold additional workshops and freewriting events, collect data and prepare their own conference presentations, or contribute to publications. We will share two perspectives—of a supervisor and an embedded tutor—on ways in which peer tutors are encouraged to play an active role in their own growth as writers, tutors, and professionals. The main question we are trying to answer is “To what extent are our program and tutor training empowering our peer tutors so they grow academically and professionally?” Our findings may also apply to contexts where only individual peer support is offered as tutor development can be promoted in similar ways.

Cosmopolitanism in Writing Center Practice: Empowering a Translingual Orientation

Brian Joseph Fallon, Sarah Blazer

E-Mail: brian_fallon@fitnyc.edu

This presentation explores the dimensions of a writing center teaching and learning environment in which there is an explicit stance against standard language ideology and active work to evolve and sustain a culture of social justice work on behalf of translingual writers. Our IRB-approved research documents peer tutors' evolving perspectives and practices and demonstrates the under-appreciated role tutors can and do play in changing the conditions for translingual writers.

As Watson (2018) and others have noted, many practitioners are ideologically committed to social justice work but underprepared to enact productive practices. Our research provides sought-after illustrations of translingual perspectives and practice, adding to contributions like Krall-Lanoue's (2013) and Stanley's (2013) invaluable documentation of translingual written feedback and classroom teaching practice. Tutors' evolving pedagogical approaches will thus be a significant focus of this presentation. Tutors indicate that writers' imagined sense of the powerful influence of the “nameless, faceless” unsympathetic professor (Schreiber and Wooten, 2019) and other potential audiences is a significant obstacle to their efforts to challenge standard language ideology.

Staff education can facilitate tutors' pedagogical development through exposure to scholarship from a variety of disciplines (e.g. Olson, 2013; Matsuda and Cox, 2009); mindful testing of approaches; and sustained, written reflection on practice. Analysis of tutors' written reflections on a private staff blog shows how they resist monolingualist, deficit perspectives of translingual writing and focus on discussing options and building meta-linguistic and rhetorical awareness. We cultivate what Canagarajah (2013) refers to as dialogical cosmopolitanism in writing center practice and staff education, which “enables self-awareness and self-criticism, as communities don't just maintain their difference and identity but further develop their cooperative dispositions and values” (196). Our analysis of tutors' written reflection reveals that a practice-based cosmopolitan dialogic can lead to shifts in knowledge, practice, and attitudes regarding language ideology and empowering a translingual orientation.

Empowering the Empowers – Training Supervision as a Learning Format for Peer Tutors-in-Training

Eva Kuntschner

E-Mail: eva.kuntschner@univie.ac.at

Many applicants for peer tutor training state “wanting to help” as their main motivation. Upon closer examination, this attitude is, however, often deficit-oriented: help other students make fewer mistakes. The idea of empowerment, on the other hand, is based on the belief that the potential and the resources necessary to reach one's goals exist in everyone (Stark 2004, 538) and is thus the opposite of deficit-oriented thinking.

This shows that empowerment-oriented peer tutoring program must support their peer tutors in developing a resource-oriented attitude. It is my hypothesis that this can be achieved by empowering the peer tutors. At the University of Vienna, I have used the well-theorized (cf. Hassler 2011, Krause 2012) learning format of training supervision to provide peer tutors-in-training with the structure for developing such an attitude.

In 2019 I conducted an explorative qualitative study with peer tutors trained at the University of Vienna between 2016 and 2018. The focus group participants were asked to discuss how training supervision supported them in developing their peer tutoring skills. Analyzed with the Documentary Method the data showed that the participants perceived training supervision as highly supportive concerning:

- the reconciliation of theory and practice into an individual “professional concept” (Hassler 2011, 36),
- the development of their personal “role” (van Kaldenkerken 2014, 76) as peer tutors,
- the development of the skill of “professional reflection on action” (Steinhardt 2005, 67).

The study participants described the development of these skills as a highly empowering experience. As one respondent stated: “After one semester of training supervision I felt able to say: ‘I am a peer tutor, and I can do this!’” In this talk I will present some of the central findings of my study, along with an outline of the historical roots of training supervision and its key theoretical concepts.

P6: Writing Centers as Agents of Change

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 3:45pm - 5:30pm

Session Chair: Anja Poloubotko

Empowerment Amid Institutional Change

Joe Essid

E-Mail: jessid@richmond.edu

For the book *Writing Centers at the Center of Change*, Brian McTague and I surveyed writing-center professionals from many types of institutions, about change in the last decade. The nearly unanimous response was “change happened.” We seek to understand in more detail this response, particularly how centers have worked to empower students at a time of constant institutional change.

Some points of concern inform the work that goes into this proposal. While Caswell, McKinney, & Jackson (2016) found writing centers “in good standing” among faculty and students (p. 199), only two years later, 5 of the 9 directors profiled had changed jobs (J.G. McKinney, personal communication, Oct. 2, 2018). That figure sounds good, when compared to turnover among senior administrators (Higher Ed Direct). Given this and other structural changes described by our authors, we plan to return to our respondents for methods that preserve our pedagogical integrity and autonomy, amid rapid institutional change.

We will gather from respondents empirical data and potential strategies for adapting to change:

- How do you empower students in an environment that is not in flux?
- How does empowerment change amid change?
- What strategies work best for a center facing rapid institutional change?

We will share specific examples of when respondents faced change yet continued to empower students in our increasingly neoliberal universities.

Conceiving of Writing Centers as Enclaves of Different Practices: Reconfiguring Social Spaces and Institutional Relationships in Universities

Bronwyn T Williams

E-Mail: bronwyn.williams@louisville.edu

Writing center scholarship often highlights the ways in which the distinctive, less directive, non-graded, and individualized instruction that takes place within our centers can make them distinctive social and pedagogical spaces within universities. Yet there is a simultaneous argument that writing centers are often institutionally vulnerable and cautionary discussions of whether it is possible to engage in or promote our differences within the indifferent, or even hostile, administrative and ideological structures of the larger university. Despite their size and possible vulnerability, the daily practices and institutional positioning of writing centers can help change conversations and work toward a different vision, political approach, and institutional presence. I draw on Victor Friedman's concept of “enclaves of different practice” to discuss how writing centers can draw on their pedagogical and participatory values and practices to work as spaces of institutional change in universities increasingly driven by ideologies of standardized assessment and commodification. If, as Friedman advocates, institutions can be changed from the “inside-out” through attention to empowering relationships and reconfiguring social spaces, we can explicitly identify and promote pedagogical and political values that ground our writing center work. I will discuss how our writing center explicitly frames and promotes our practices and values, such as radically dialogic, long-term, approaches to learning, attention to student perceptions of agency, an ethic of “hospitality” and participatory administrative structures that create the environments from which futures can emerge that sustain our values, yet leave room for improvisation and serendipity. Our ongoing goal, in our daily practices and our planning, is to create and talk about humane, and learning-focused experiences for students that push against dominant, corporate conceptions of the university, writing, and students as enrollment numbers or customers or data to be assessed.

R6: Roundtable: Empowering Literacy Practices through Writing Center and WAC Collaborations Across Campus

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 3:45pm - 5:30pm

Session Chair: Andrea Marie Scott

Empowering Literacy Practices through Writing Center and WAC Collaborations Across Campus

Kelly S. Terzaken, Beth Carroll, Sarah Zurhellen, Julie Karaus, Mary Neal Meador, Miles Britton

E-Mail: terzakenks@appstate.edu

In this proposed roundtable, presenters will describe how the University Writing Center (UWC) at Appalachian State has acted as a change agent in establishing empowering literacy practices throughout and beyond our institution. Over the past fifteen years, writing professionals from the UWC and WAC programs have collaborated with multiple units and individuals to empower students, faculty, and programs to meet new needs and offer support related to writing. Through these collaborations, we have built a writing culture on campus that involves every discipline and touches every student.

This process of enacting change to empower literacy work began by moving the UWC out of the English Department and into an independent unit, a move that immediately brought many more writers from across the university through the door. Soon after the move, the university revised its general education curriculum, and since 2009, students in every major take a dedicated writing course during each of their four years as undergraduates. This vertical writing curriculum is supported through initiatives and collaborations among many units and programs, with the University Writing Center and Writing Across the Curriculum generating the mechanisms for that support.

With a focus on empowering students and literacy practices on campus, roundtable presenters will offer different perspectives from their work with UWC and WAC programs: writing center consultants' work with students, writing center administrators' strategies for program development, and writing faculty's work with students and other writing professionals. Roundtable presenters will describe their successful initiatives and collaborations and consider strategies for initiating these changes at other institutions.

W2: Workshop: Translingualism in the Writing Center

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 3:45pm - 5:30pm

Session Chair: Erika Unterpertinger

Translingualism in the Writing Center

Spencer Harrison, Jacob Stovall, Abigail Kremer

E-Mail: sharri53@uic.edu

In this workshop, participants will produce mini- literacy autobiographies/counterstories. These narratives blur traditional boundaries and empower writers by synthesizing personal narrative, academic writing conventions and non-traditional practices such as “code-meshing” and the inclusion of non-scholarly genres. Multiple anti-oppressive theories call for these kinds of narratives including Critical race theory (Condon et. al 2020), Queer theory (Habza and Denny 2020), Feminist theory (Miley 2020), Disability theory (Bukowski and Brueggemann 2020), and Translingualism (Canagarajah 2013). These kinds of narratives empower all writers to utilize their whole repertoire of linguistic ability, express fuller meanings, and challenge their own biases. After engaging in this linguistic examination, educators (WC staff and tutors) are then better able to empower all writers’ ability to find such opportunities in their own writing (Blazer 2015). These methods develop writing autonomy and situate the WC as an agent of change to improve the entire writing community of their home institution and beyond. This is achieved through internal workshopping, discussion, pedagogy, and communal self-reflection, combined with outward facing blogs – representing tutors and writers to amplify traditionally marginalized voices – to spread awareness to a larger audience of the efficacy of such mixed genre writing (Blazer 2015).

The presenters will lead participants in a 60-minute writing workshop exploring these methods. Strategies to be presented include optimal areas in academic writing to employ code-meshing, personal narratives, and creative writing techniques. This workshop will be followed by a 30-minute sharing of reflections and discussion on how to maximize the effectiveness of these practices as well as strategies on how to tailor programs to meet both the internal and external needs of the participants’ individual WC contexts. One topic of discussion is on successful co-operation between WCs and their housing institution to transform the writing pedagogy of the housing institution at large.

R2: Roundtable: Writing with ADHD and/or dyslexia: Reaching out to a neurodiverse target group

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 5:45pm - 7:30pm

Session Chair: Leigh Ryan

Writing with ADHD: Reaching out to a neurodiverse target group

Juliane Homann

E-Mail: j.homann@stw.berlin

Academic writing challenges all students one way or another. However, students with ADHD experience increased difficulties in for e.g. focussing, motivation, task- and time management; highlighting the need for additional support in the writing process.

In this roundtable discussion, we will first take a brief look at the impact of ADHD on the writing process and corresponding recommendations of writing center practice as described for instance by Batt (2018), Blazer (2015) and Murphy (2020). Then we will briefly examine the context and reason for this roundtable discussion: an information event for students writing with ADHD, hosted by a joined initiative of the writing center, the psychological and barrier-free counselling service of the studierendenWERK Berlin. The aim of the information event is a) to provide students of the 20 partner institutions with an overview about free support opportunities, and b) to give them a safer space for exchange among themselves about writing with neurodiverse conditions. Similarly, the aim of this roundtable discussion is to initiate a dialogue between participants; to share insights and experiences, identify growth opportunities and pitfalls that might be related to this target group, and to brainstorm further questions and formats that could be used to support and counsel students with ADHD in the framework of academic writing didactics. Together, we want to think about how we can empower students with ADHD to overcome their writing anxieties and mitigate their struggles in the writing process.

R7: Roundtable: EWCA Summer Institute: Preparing Current and Future Writing Center Leaders

Time: Thursday, 07/July/2022: 5:45pm - 7:30pm

Session Chair: Ella Grieshammer

EWCA Summer Institute: Preparing Current and Future Writing Center Leaders

Pamela Bromley, Lawrence Cleary, Shareen Grogan, Sona Khachatryan, Franziska Liebetanz

E-Mail: pambromley@gmail.com

At the EWCA retreat in summer 2018, friends and board members of EWCA gathered to consider the organization and how it might best advance its mission to establish an infrastructure for Writing Center goals, practice, and scholarly research. After fruitful discussion, they agreed to host a European writing center summer institute, or SI (EWCA Board). Following the model of International Writing Centers Association's SI in the United States, begun in 2003, the goal the European SI was to bring together new and experienced writing center professionals from all contexts to learn new approaches and refine their work as leaders, administrators, mentors, and researchers (IWCA, "Summer Institute"). Early SI organizers believed that this model provided an important venue for professional development in a growing field with high turnover (Gillespie et al.). Since then, leaders and participants from around the world have come together at the IWCA SIs and formed meaningful connections that have led to conference presentations, publications, and long-standing collaborations (Babcock et al.; IWCA, "Summer Institute Leadership Track"). Similar opportunities are now occurring at the regional level (Ryan). To adapt this idea to the European context, leaders emphasized not only themes common to the SI in the US (such as peer tutor education, working with faculty and administration, and research and publication) but also themes that are especially relevant in this region (including multilingualism, grants, and exchanges). The first EWCA SI was hosted by the Writing Center at the European University Viadrina in August 2019 with leaders and participants from 16 countries (Schreibzentrum Viadrina). In this roundtable, past and future leaders, participants, and hosts of the SI in the US and in Europe reflect on their experiences and how the experience has empowered their writing center work and talk with attendees about themes and possibilities for future Institutes!

P7: Re/Deep-thinking Approaches to Tutoring

Time: Friday, 08/July/2022: 9:00am - 10:45am

Session Chair: Birgit Huemer

How peer tutors look back: education and development through writing center work

Griet Coupé

E-Mail: griet.coupe@ru.nl

Students who are active as peer tutors at a writing center, develop many skills in a relatively short time: not only do they acquire knowledge about good texts and effective writing processes, they also learn coaching and didactic skills. Thus, these student tutors develop their academic skills in a special way: instead of focusing only on their own writing skills, they are concerned with the writing processes of other students. What is the effect of this? Does it make them better writers? And does it have any other benefits?

The Radboud Writing Lab in Nijmegen has been in existence for over 15 years, which makes it the oldest writing center in the Netherlands. Our 15th anniversary was an occasion to reflect on what our tutors have learned and what they take with them from their time at the writing center. We have conducted a survey among all former tutors, inspired by an American study by Hughes, Bradley and Gillespie (2010). Our study shows that tutoring is an important first professional experience that empowers tutors not only in their study career, but also in their later professional life and even in their personal life.

This presentation will discuss the results of our research and consider the implications for Academic Skills education in general and for writing centers in particular. One of our conclusions is that 'talking about writing' as a didactic method deserves a greater role in writing education.

A Journey towards developing a model for empowerment: A North-West University Case Study

Zander Janse van Rensburg, DJ Cloete, Monique Rabe

E-Mail: zander.jansevanrensburg@nwu.ac.za

Impact measurement has proven to be a difficult task in the writing centre context. For the most part, writing centre scholars have attempted to prove the efficacy of writing centres by presenting various forms of anecdotal data. There are, however, a few studies that have moved beyond these findings. A survey of empirical research yielded few results. Senior *et al.* (2010), for example, conducted an investigation to find possible correlations between writing centre attendance and progression and achievement. Although these findings were indicative, it still doesn't provide clues whether writing centre intervention is, in fact, the main contributing factor to student progression and achievement. We concluded that the writing centre success is an enigma which constitutes a systematic and holistic research approach. Building towards this goal, we designed a two-fold mechanism, inspired by Babcock *et al.* (2012) and Mackiewicz and Thompson (2015), in an attempt to guide our understanding as to what happens in a writing consultation session. This mechanism consists of three questionnaires: evaluator, consultant, and student. The student and consultant completes their respective questionnaires at the end of the session, whereas the evaluator will observe audio-visual recordings. By profiling a typical consultation, we can compare it to the fundamental philosophy of writing centre practice, namely "better writers, not better writing" (North, 1984:436). This can, in turn, determine whether the fundamental philosophy is in fact attainable. It implies, *inter alia*, the following research question: "How does profiling a typical writing consultation session influence how we empower our tutors so that they too can develop better writers in the Southern African context?". If this mechanism is successful, it can set novel quality standards which would, in turn, determine new standards for training South African tutors.

Revisiting Directiveness: Co-Constructed Narratives as Empowerment in Writing Centers

Kuan-Chun Chen

E-Mail: m7744davis@gmail.com

Peer tutoring has been widely considered to be student-centered, collaborative (Girgensohn, 2012, 2018), and self-reflective (Roscoe & Chi, 2007). Some studies have focused on questions asked in tutoring sessions (Roscoe & Chi, 2007; Thompson & Mackiewicz, 2014; Munje, Nanima, & Clarence, 2018). Munje *et al.* (2018) emphasize the importance of "approaching students as peers, rather than as lecturers or experts." Such an approach undoubtedly values students' agency over authoritative/directive intervention and is a continuation of the nondirective tradition in writing centers.

This paper aims to understand tutoring sessions as the process of co-constructing a subconscious narrative with tutees. Narratives imply the making sense of events or experiences and function as a meta-level device that requires reflection on past events. This paper conducts a philosophical analysis on the assumptions of nondirective tutoring and argues that the dichotomy between nondirective and directive tutoring is often based on a goal-oriented logic. The nondirective approach intends to "produce better writers, not better writing" (North, 1984), and this statement points to a goal.

I propose that an ideal nondirective tutoring should instead be framed in the co-construction of a narrative while the students do not know they are the main constructors of their works and that narrative. Tutors act as catalysts in tutoring sessions; the main purpose of catalysts is to facilitate the chemical reactions, not to participate in the chemical reactions. Nondirective tutoring should be marked not only by questions, but also by the narratives tutees can construct after tutoring sessions. When tutees look back on tutoring sessions, they feel more confident because they have a sense of being the main agent of problem solving and critical thinking. This can then be the source of empowerment and forms tutees' own writing identity (Oliveira, 2016) and "authorial voice" (Nelson & Castelló, 2012) in academic writing.

P8: Informing Peer-tutor Training

Time: Friday, 08/July/2022: 9:00am - 10:45am

Session Chair: Frano Petar Rismondo

„The time has shaped me fundamentally as a person“—The Peer Writing Tutor Alumni Research Project reloaded

Dzifa Vode

E-Mail: dzifa.vode@th-nuernberg.de

As early as 1978 Kenneth Bruffee observed that peer tutoring empowers both the student and the tutor:

„Besides learning to write better as they teach others to write, the tutors develop intellectually through a process of social exchange focused on a series of problems in judgment which emerge from their own work, and which must be resolved collaboratively.“ (Bruffee, 1978, p. 453).

More than thirty years later, Kail, Gillespie und Hughes (2010, 2015) started the Peer Writing Tutor Alumni Research Project (PWTARP), a mixed-method study in three writing centers. Here, 126 US-American alumni completed a survey containing both open-ended and closed questions. Their answers brought evidence to what has been clear to most writing center professionals intuitively: “that their education and experience as peer tutors played a crucial role in their developing much further and in sophisticated ways the skills, values that they claim” (Kail, Gillespie und Hughes, 2015). In this study, we reproduced the PWTARP design to investigate what skills, abilities, and values peer tutors in Germany, Austria and Switzerland took with them (n=103). In this talk, we will compare and discuss study design and results of the PWTARP and its German counterpart.

Empowering writing tutors: inverted classroom and blended learning as promising meta strategies?

Annabel Kramp, Lisa Scholz

E-Mail: lisa.scholz@zq.uni-mainz.de

Writing tutors should be empowered to carry out their work in consultations and workshops in a self-reliant, self-confident, self-organized, and proactive manner (Thomas and Velthouse 1990, Short 1994, Duhon-Haynes 1996). We link these goals to Fymer, Shulman, and Houser's understanding of learning empowerment as "the process of creating intrinsic task motivation by providing an environment and tasks that increase an individual's sense of self-efficacy and energy" (1996, p. 182f.). Taking this into account, we promote empowerment by didactic and methodological approaches, such as the combination of a blended learning concept with content design through the inverted classroom. For example, Owston (2015) shows that blended learning can activate Thomas and Velthouse's (1990) four dimensions of empowerment and especially strengthens the dimension of choice. Similarly, in relation to Inverted Classroom, Nie (2015) observes that students perceive themselves as more competent and influential and attach more importance to instruction. Both approaches can support prospective writing tutors by encourage the concept of self-regulated learning which emphasizes independence and responsibility in the context of individual learning management (Istiqomah, Yunikawati, Irwansyah 2022). Based on this, it seems obvious on the one hand that an inverted classroom - even in a fully digital blended learning design, due to the pandemic - can increase empowerment (Fisher et al. 2021) of writing tutors. On the other hand, studies have also shown negative effects of inverted classroom, such as a lack of communication between participants and instructors (Tang et al. 2020). Considering this, additional structural elements such as collaborative work and the possibility to select content according to one's own interests as well as independent time management are intentionally integrated into our training programme. So does certain learning content, such as reflecting on one's own role as a writing tutor, or casework, i.e., practising text feedback under realistic conditions and using real student texts. Based on the advantages and disadvantages of the didactic settings discussed in the literature, we present the use of inverted classroom in combination with blended learning in the implementation of our extracurricular training of writing tutors in more detail and discuss how we try to promote the empowerment of our writing tutors through this.

A Working Alliance: Framing the Tutor-Tutee Relationship

Monica Broido, Harriet Rubin

E-Mail: monic@tauex.tau.ac.il

The writing center tutor-tutee relationship is a delicate one. On one hand, in a short time, the tutor must analyze a writing sample and provide the student with guidance for becoming better, independent and more proficient writer. On the other hand, the student has to trust the tutor, internalize the advice, and implement changes. What makes this possible? How can this process be managed for it to be most effective? We believe that as in any helping relationship, a certain level of trust and connection is crucial for change to take place. We propose framing the tutor-tutee relationship as a Working Alliance, a concept borrowed from psychology, which according to Larose et al. is "likely to facilitate interpersonal engagement and collaboration" and is composed of three key elements: (1) a respectful and friendly partnership between tutors and tutees; (2) an agreement on the goals or expected outcomes; and (3) an agreement on the activities and responsibilities designed to achieve these goals. To examine whether this model can be applied to writing center relationships, we conducted in-depth, semi-structured interviews with our tutors and tutees at the Tel Aviv University Language Center. The results of the discourse analysis of these interviews revealed that all three components must be present for the interaction to be effective; should one be missing, the whole enterprise fails. Additionally, we found that this framework can serve not only as a diagnostic tool for understanding the dynamics of the relationship and for early detection of potential problems, but also as a powerful pedagogical tool for training prospective tutors working in one-on-one environments.

P9: Questioning Traditional Writing Centre Approaches

Time: Friday, 08/July/2022: 9:00am - 10:45am
Session Chair: Brigitte Römmer-Nossek

Writing Centers as Agents of Change in Turkey? A Comprehensive Survey

Elif Demirel

E-Mail: elif6171@gmail.com

The writing center occupies an important place in the knowledge-making process of higher institutions at both undergraduate and graduate levels (Liggett, Jordan, & Price, 2011). Another important function of the writing center is to initiate institutional change in the approach towards writing practices and pedagogy. However, the importance of writing centers in the academic community has only been started to be recognized in Turkish higher institutions for a decade or two. One of the first examples of a writing center in Turkey is Sabancı University writing center which was started in 2000 whose detailed profile has been provided (Tokay, 2012). Currently, there are writing centers in various higher institutions in Turkey. In order for writing centers in Turkey to be able to function as change agents empowering literacy in Turkish higher institutions, first more research needs to be done which investigates the methodological and philosophical issues on which these centers are grounded. There are such surveys have been carried out in the world regarding writing centers (Masiello & Hayward, 1991), (Bräuer & Girgensohn, 2012), (Chris, Gerd, Paulo, Lisa, & Aparna, 2012) ; however, a similar survey study has not been done in Turkey to date. Thus, the purpose of this study is to investigate the question of what methodologies and underlying philosophies the writing center communities in Turkish Higher institutions employ to make knowledge about writing, writers and learning to write and thus to act as change agents in their institutions. For this purpose, in the context of this study, a structured online survey will be conducted with all writing center administrators, tutors and peer tutors who function in the existing writing centers hosted by higher institutions in Turkey in order to provide a detailed profile of the existing writing centers.

Students and faculty in dialogue about writing. “Question time” in an interdisciplinary meeting of university teachers, disciplinary writing fellows, and the writing center

Andrea Karsten

E-Mail: andrea.karsten@upb.de

This contribution presents a reflective study based on material taken from an interdisciplinary meeting in the context of a discipline-sensitive writing fellow program. Building on an Academic Literacies perspective, this writing center program aims at making literacy practices an object of discourse among status groups and adding transparency to writing practices both within and across disciplines. In the program, tandems of one faculty member and one student from the same discipline – trained to be a writing fellow by the writing center – work together.

What are the effects of the program on teachers' and writing fellows' ideas about academic writing practices and their respective roles in helping students participate in them? To address this issue, a corpus of questions was elicited – but not answered – during an interdisciplinary meeting at the end of the program. The questions were to deal with academic writing and students' texts, and they were to be addressed to the different status groups: writing fellows, teachers, and the writing center. During the meeting, the questions were individually formulated by teachers and writing fellows, then read out in small interdisciplinary and inter-status groups.

These questions – as questions – give insights into the reflective potential of the program's discipline-sensitive design. They were analyzed by the writing center to make teachers' and writing fellows' implicit beliefs and aims concerning student writing visible. Findings from this analysis are discussed against the theoretical background of the program: What was the reflective and possibly transformative work that working as a writing fellow or teacher in the program gave rise to? Do teachers' and writing fellows' reflections meet the program's goal to “uncover” disciplinary writing practices? What is the role of the writing center in training students to become disciplinary writing fellows – how transformative (or normative?) is its contribution?

R3: Roundtable: “Talk doesn’t have to be in a single language”: Fostering translanguaging in classrooms among multilingual speakers in the 21st Century

Time: Friday, 08/July/2022: 9:00am - 10:45am

Session Chair: Pamela Bromley

“Talk doesn’t have to be in a single language”: Fostering translanguaging in classrooms among multilingual speakers in the 21st Century

Loren Leong

E-Mail: lorenleong@gmail.com

This paper discusses the important skill set of translanguaging in classrooms in the 21st century due to increased transnational mobility. As people travel, their language travels with them, and they usually pick up a second language in a country whose main language is not that of their mother tongue. The locals who meet and interact with these travellers or immigrants, will get to learn another language. With the rise of multilingualism, a monolingual mindset can be a great impediment to maximizing a learner’s linguistic potential in a multicultural society. It is essential that schools, universities, language learning institutes, and writing centres acknowledge the pedagogical advantages of translanguaging and celebrate the Multilingual Turn (Conteh & Meier 2014) in today’s learning environment. The term “Translanguaging was coined by Welsh author Cen Williams in 1994, as an extension of the concept of languaging, the discursive practices of interlocutors, but with the additional feature of using multiple languages, often simultaneously. Garcia (2009) states that translanguaging helps learners develop their way of knowing, content, language, social emotional identities and foster a more equitable society. It also aids in transcultural communication and writing processes. To explore these ideas, we examine translanguaging, which includes languaging, as a theoretical framework that is critical to ideas about language, knowledge, learning, mono-, bi-, and multilingualism.

Building on this framework, we embark on a roundtable discussion on the understanding of translanguaging in multilingual and multicultural educational spaces, and pedagogical learning in various translanguaging spaces. In this discussion, we focus on language learning institutes and writing centres in Austria, where German is the dominant working language and is often used in day-to-day interactions.

R8: Roundtable: Let's Talk about Doing Research Differently: A Case Study of Academic Cabaret

Time: Friday, 08/July/2022: 11:00am - 12:45pm

Session Chair: Klara Dreo

Let's Talk about Doing Research Differently: A Case Study of Academic Cabaret

Dimitar Angelov, Geof Hill

E-Mail: dimitar.angelov@coventry.ac.uk

In the wake of OECD redefining research to embrace forms of creative work (OECD 2002: 128), and with signalling from multiple events that have similarly applied creativity to all elements of research (for example, the UK Big bang exhibition, which showcased creative ways of presenting quantitative data), there has been a revolution of different ways of conceptualising, writing and presenting research. As one example of such creative academic practice, cabaret (mentioned in Brown 2014: 68-69) is innovative but also elusive. It may even be contested whether it counts as entertainment or research!

The proposed roundtable discussion will begin with a fifteen-minute introduction to the genre of academic cabaret, which will include both song and narrative exposition. Following this sample presentation, the participants in the session will be invited to respond to a series of prompts exploring the boundaries between academic and non-academic meaning-making, the role of subjectivity and personal identity in research and writing (Ivanič 1998; Hyland 2002), as well as problems of empowerment through the subversion of established disciplinary writing models, explored by Academic Literacies theory (Lea and Street 1998; Lillis et al. 2016). By engaging in an egalitarian discussion with academics and writing development practitioners, the authors will establish a community of practice (Wenger 1998) that will challenge their own and the audience's pre-existing assumptions of traditional and innovative academic writing, and will seek to arrive at a new, and possibly shared, understanding of academic cabaret as a template for future developments in research. Also discussed will be the role of the Writing Centre in spearheading innovation and forward thinking about research, which can be achieved as part of a whole-institution approach to academic writing support and development (Ganobcsik-Williams 2011).

K3: Keynote Franziska Gürtl and Lukas Georg Hartleb: Collaborative writing as a way to empower students

*Time: Friday, 08/July/2022: 1:45pm - 2:45pm
Session Chair: Lawrence Cleary*

Collaborative writing as a way to empower students

Franziska Gürtl, Lukas Georg Hartleb

E-Mail: franziska.quertl@uni-graz.at

Writing texts collaboratively is a widely assigned task in higher education. When students deal with collaborative writing tasks, they encounter specific challenges that go beyond the pitfalls of individual writing. These difficulties are discussed in interdisciplinary and heterogeneous fields of research. Looking at this body of research from an empowerment perspective, recent contributions quantitatively analyzed how collaborative writing may help students to improve their writing skills and the quality of their written work. However, how students subjectively perceive collaborative writing processes has not been analyzed systematically so far if one disregards literature on English as a second language. In a research project currently underway, we analyze what challenges students face in collaborative writing settings, what working practices they use in these processes, and what possible solutions may be deduced from their experiences. To address these research questions, we conducted a qualitative empirical study which places the students' perspectives at the center.

In our presentation, we will focus on the students' experiences of collaborative writing processes and the perceived challenges associated with collaborative writing. We will discuss some of these challenges in detail and outline how they are related to the students' working practices, the class requirements, and the professors' role as facilitators. Particular emphasis will be placed on the complex coordinating processes which students navigate during the course of their writing projects: For example, students must allocate specific writing and research tasks within the group; additionally, they need to consolidate their individual ideas about the writing product and the organization of the writing process. In extensive discussions, students verbalize individual writing practices and preferences that usually remain implicit. We argue that these negotiation processes enable students to grow as academic writers. To conclude, we will discuss how didactic scenarios employing collaborative writing tasks may empower students to further develop the quality of their written work as well as refine their writing skills.

P10: Issues of Transition and Identity

Time: Friday, 08/July/2022: 3:00pm - 5:30pm

Session Chair: Warren Merkel

Small Changes, Empowering Results: How Writing Centers Can Use “Small Teaching” to Enhance Inclusivity

Andrea Marie Scott

E-Mail: Andrea.Scott@pitzer.edu

Research from the scholarship of teaching and learning—and the sociology of education—emphasize the need to cultivate belonging on our campuses, particularly for first-generation and other minoritized students (Kezar & Maxey, 2014, p. 31; Nunn, 2019). The reasons for this are many. Relationship-rich educations, as forty years of research have shown, correlate positively with student success (Astin, 1977; Mayhew et al., 2016; Strayhorn, 2012; Tinto, 1987). Students thrive when there is a constellation of opportunities for meaningful connection with faculty, staff, and peers in an environment of high expectations and high support (Felten & Lambert, 2020). There is now a consensus in the literature that it's not enough to simply encourage students to take responsibility for their own educations; institutions play an active role in shaping salient forms of belonging (Bensimon, 2007; Brown McNair et al., 2020; Nunn, 2021). What role can and should writing centers play in actively fostering inclusivity and well-being on campuses? And given the resource-intensive nature of relationship-rich work, how can we cultivate forms of belonging in sustainable ways? This presentation draws on the concept of “small teaching”—a model of professional development that favors small changes over big overhauls (Darby & Lang, 2019; Lang, 2021)—to theorize an approach to fostering inclusivity in our centers. Throughout the presentation, I will seed reflective questions situated in current research with the goal of leaving you with one actionable change you can make to your teaching, tutoring, or administration.

Empowering multilingual peer tutors in a multi-geographic environment – Considering labels, linguistic realities, and establishing inclusion in multilingual Writing Centers

Richard Garrett, Yasmin Rioux

E-Mail: rgarrett@dwci.edu

Coming from more than twenty countries, approximately 94% of students, and therefore our tutees and tutors, at Divine Word College in Iowa, USA, are classified as “international students”. Being surrounded by a uniquely diverse educational setting enabled us to not only examine our own bilingual identity but also that of the multilingual tutors and multilingual tutees at our institution. Clearly, this setting affected all aspects of the Writing Center context including tutor training, assessment of tutor training effectiveness, tutor recruitment, relevant sources for training, etc. In addition, one of the most crucial underlying constants were the need to not “other” the Writing Center contributors (tutors and tutees) by solely focusing on their language learner or multilingual status, which is oftentimes the case in ESL, EFL, or ESOL settings (Costino & Hyon, 2007; Harklau, 2000; Ortmeier-Hopper, 2008; Rioux, 2016), but to empower them by using their broad skills and prior knowledge.

We aimed at addressing the following research question: *How do we effectively design a tutor training that addresses and incorporates our tutors' and tutees' uniquely diverse linguistic backgrounds while empowering and not reducing them?* In order to avoid limiting the students' sense of self-ascribed and externally constructed identities (Costino & Hyon, 2007; Harklau, 2000; Ortmeier-Hopper, 2008; Rioux, 2016) by imposing and honing in on restrictive labels while still trying to take into account the realities of multilingual writers, we had to be mindful of several specific tutor recruitment and training considerations, **such as the inclusion of ELL/ESL materials that deal with student-specific issues (pronunciation, multilingual writing developments, etc.) or how much to focus specifically on ELL/ESL aspects, not “just” writing tutoring.** It was therefore a primary focus and cornerstone of the tutor training design strategy to ensure that the multilingual aspect of everyone's identity was respected and considered, but didn't become central to all aspects that affect the multifaceted space that marks the Writing Center to avoid imposing potentially reductionistic labels on all involved (Ortmeier-Hopper, 2008).

To empower the tutees and tutors then, we underscored their prior knowledge and unique skill set that several multilingual students possess as they encounter the local language as language learners therefore possessing a syntactical understanding of the language that is oftentimes superior to their peers (Balster, 2012; Williams & Severino, 2004). Instead of examining and focusing on multilingualism as potential hindrance in language tutoring, we maintained that multilingual tutors bring a wealth of linguistic experience, knowledge, and skills to their position as peer tutors.

Analyzing and focusing on the narrative reflections of the former and current directors of the mentioned Writing Center, we argue that exploring the richness of a multicultural writing center is not only important when constructing and creating tutor training opportunities, but that it is integral to the integrity of all involved. By exploring and incorporating our tutors' linguistic backgrounds, we can increase inclusivity, equity, and empowerment while increasing the effectiveness of the Writing Center and its various components. We rely on **qualitative research** design of a case study and analyze our own reflective narratives and present our findings. The **goal** of our presentation, therefore, is to share firsthand insights into a unique learning experience that encompasses all stakeholders of our Writing Center and has the potential to empower multilingual writing tutors, tutees, and student writers. In our presentation we share our tutor training design, its specific components, and our perceptions and reflections regarding its effectiveness.

R4: Roundtable: Where's the Writing Center? Tutoring Labor's Hidden Antagonisms after the Neoliberal Turn

Time: Friday, 08/July/2022: 4:00pm - 5:30pm

Session Chair: Micha Gerrit Philipp Edlich

Where's the Writing Center? Tutoring Labor's Hidden Antagonisms after the Neoliberal Turn

Tony Iantosca

E-Mail: anthony.iantosca@kbcc.cuny.edu

Tony Iantosca

Anthony.iantosca@kbcc.cuny.edu

Academic Coordinator--Center for Academic Writing Success (CAWS)

Kingsborough Community College (CUNY)

Brooklyn NY

Proposal: For this roundtable discussion, I hope to continue expanding the focus of writing center scholarship as many scholars have recently encouraged us to do (Grimm 2009; Grutsch-McKinney 2013; Greenfield 2019). I will offer a manuscript in progress as a starting point for this discussion. Engaging primarily with theoretical works, I will make brief remarks on the central theses of this manuscript to foster lively and critical discussions that I hope will enrich and deepen our understanding of the place of writing center work in our world.

Abstract: In this paper, I attempt a re-positioning of the societal role of the writing center tutor in the production of value in the neoliberal academy (Harney & Moten, 1999; Monty 2019). This leads to a focus on the writing tutor's parallels with, and divergences from, the changed character of labor in the service sector. Further interrogating these parallels, I turn to recent scholarship on neoliberalism and deindustrialization and the rise of what many feminist scholars have called the feminization of labor (Morini 2007; McDowell 2009). Exploring the limits of such parallels, I then seek a redefinition of writing center labor, borrowing from and adapting cultural studies and social constructionist theory (Berlin 1988; Cooper 1994; Clark and Healy 2001) to join it with a feminist study of the ethics of caring labor (Kittay 2009; Nier-Weber 2017). In the inherently social and caring orientations towards knowledge production, I find writing center labor's hidden antagonisms towards the neoliberal individualist ideology that has fundamentally reshaped colleges and universities. This re-positioning of the writing center uncovers the empowering potentials already latent in our work, as tutors can encourage in students an awareness of interdependence, care and sociality in the composing process.