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ABSTRACT

An Analysis of an Intensive English Tutoring Program and the Design of an Academic Writing Reference for ESL Tutors

Candice B. Snow
Department of Linguistics and English Language, BYU
Master of Arts

The majority of English as a Second Language (ESL) students are weaker in reading and writing than in listening and speaking (Matsuda, 2004). Responding to the challenges faced by ESL writers, many university Intensive English Programs (IEPs) often provide additional help by instituting writing centers with trained tutors. However, untrained tutors and even experienced writing tutors may struggle with ESL writing concerns (Harris & Silva, 1993).

This research project analyzes one tutoring program in a university IEP that includes writing feedback as a service for their students. The tutoring service had no consistent training standard for tutoring academic writing, so I conducted a qualitative needs assessment. My assessment included a mixed-methods exploratory analysis of the needs of the tutoring program. The methods included surveys administered to IEP stakeholders (students, tutors, teachers, and administrators) as well as selected follow-up interviews. This investigative study focused on the perceptions of the various stakeholders regarding the effectiveness of the program and potential improvements for tutoring academic writing. Themes from these data shaped the development of a tutor reference guide for academic writing tutor training. Although the themes were gleaned from a specific research context, they offer principles that can be generalized in other writing center contexts.
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PREFACE

In accordance with TESOL MA program guidelines, this thesis was prepared as a manuscript. The intention was for the manuscript to be submitted to the *International Journal of Designs for Learning*, which was selected because of its focus and audience. The *International Journal of Designs for Learning* is an online journal sponsored by Indiana University that publishes experiences that aid learning in any context or field. Because the journal provides a way for researchers to share their knowledge and practice, and appeals to a broad audience, readers of this journal may be interested in this article because it presents the analysis, design, and implementation of a project. Manuscripts that are submitted to this journal should be prepared according to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA) 6th Edition and contain between 5,000 and 9,000 words.

An alternative target journal includes *International Writing Center Association* (IWCA). This journal targets readers specifically in connection with writing centers, but readers of this journal may also be interested in this research because it draws on findings related with second language writing. The IWCA also requires the use of the 6th edition of the APA manual. For scholarly essays submitted, the length requirement maximum is 10,000 words with the suggestion that a 3,000–5,000 word range is more suitable.
Introduction

English as a Second Language (ESL) student attendance has been increasing in English-speaking higher education institutions, particularly in the United States (Hagedorn & Lee, 2005; Andrade, Evans, & Hartshorn, 2014). Admittance to such educational establishments often requires sufficient English language knowledge indicated by accepted English proficiency assessments. However, ESL students may receive high scores on these exams and still struggle with writing various types of discourse (Evans, & Andrade, 2015; Andrade, Evans, & Hartshorn, 2015). Therefore, many academic institutions provide writing centers with trained tutors. The training for tutors often focuses on strategies for providing writing feedback to native speakers and provides tutors with only a few ESL strategies. Conversely, at an Intensive English Program (IEP) that offers tutoring to ESL students, tutors may have training in ESL strategies, but lack sufficient writing tutoring strategies. To better help ESL writers succeed, tutors need sufficient training in writing tutoring strategies and ESL strategies. Even though such tutor training can be challenging time-wise and financially, it is an indispensable investment for ESL writers. I will briefly describe a rationale for why tutors need ESL training and why training tutors in ESL is a challenge; I will also describe the project that resulted from 1) my personal tutoring experience, 2) reviewing relevant literature and materials, and 3) examining perceptions of ESL academic writing tutor training at an IEP.

The Need for ESL Academic Writing Support

Leki (1991) notes that there are a variety of discourse communities, even in the same language, which vary in “preferred length of sentences, choice of vocabulary, acceptability of

---

1 Common English assessments include the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), or the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency (MTELP).
using first person, extent of using passive voice, degree to which writers are permitted to interpret, [and] amount of metaphorical language accepted” (p. 125). Due to the demands of discourse diversity and language proficiency expectations, international students may struggle in meeting writing requirements without the necessary support outside of the classroom. In sociocultural theory, Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development argues that students can be more successful “with collaboration, direction, or some kind of help” (Vygotsky, 1987, p. 209). Noting the challenges that international students face, many university IEPs often provide additional help through instituting writing centers, which can provide meaningful support to ESL writers (Boquet, 2002). However, even with the collaboration that writing centers offer, there may be a mismatch between what writing centers offer and the support that ESL writers need.

Training Challenges in Helping Tutors Address ESL Writing

In my experience as a tutor in several writing centers, I have noticed that tutor training often focuses on providing strategies for the tutor to help writers with content, rhetoric, and critical thinking. Yet, in addition to this macro feedback, ESL students also need micro feedback with mechanics, grammar, and lexical choices. As Eddington (2013) explains, “University-level learners of English as a second language (ESL) face a seemingly insurmountable task when it comes to writing: concurrent to mastering the rhetorical aspects of writing, they must also achieve grammatical accuracy in their production of written language” (p. 1). Even trained writing tutors may still struggle working with ESL writers because of the unique characteristics of ESL writing such as “the unfamiliar grammatical errors, the sometimes bewilderingly different rhetorical patterns and conventions of other languages,” etc. (Harris & Silva, 1993, p. 1). Often ESL students may arrive expecting grammatical editing, when they do not recognize the need for additional assistance with content. As a result, many writing centers train every tutor
in a few second language (L2) strategies, or conversely hire a handful of specialized L2 tutors. While there are some resources that can guide writing centers towards strategies for tutoring ESL writers (see David, 2014), implementing these resources can be financially burdensome and time consuming.

**The Research Project**

What is necessary to improve tutor training in ESL academic writing? This question was the catalyst for a research project investigating a tutoring program at a university IEP where I gathered data from students, tutors, teachers, and administrators. The data guided the development of a project: a reference guide entitled “An Academic Writing Reference for ESL Tutors” designed to help tutors provide more effective feedback in an ESL academic writing context. In preparing for this project, I examined the design context, utilized personal experience, and gathered information to justify a rationale for creating the project.

**Design context.** The context for the project describes components that are necessary to understand the current IEP tutoring program. These components include the environment, the director, the tutors, and the tutorials.

**The environment.** The research project involved an IEP at a prominent university in the western United States. The IEP is a lab school that provides MA candidates in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) with opportunities “to develop excellence in English language teaching, tutoring, curriculum design, materials development, technology use, assessment, evaluation, and research” (The Mission, 2014, para. 1, *emphasis added*). In this context, MA candidates have the opportunity to provide all-skills tutoring for international students who attend the IEP. The majority of the IEP students are preparing to take the TOEFL and are focusing on learning English for Academic Purposes (EAP).
The supervisor. The tutoring supervisor, who is also the IEP office manager, is currently in charge of hiring tutors and advertising for available tutoring positions if there are not enough MA candidates available to fill the positions. Once tutors are hired, the director is responsible for training tutors; however, this is a challenging task because, as office manager, she also has many other important duties.

The tutors. The all-skills tutors hired can be undergraduate or graduate students. The tutors’ experience can range from having no background in tutoring or TESOL, to being enrolled in the MA TESOL program, to concurrently teaching courses at the IEP. Unlike a typical writing center setting, this tutoring program hires a majority of tutors that represent a unique population that is skewed in ESL training, while lacking some writing training. Furthermore, tutors may choose to work only one semester or may continue to work multiple semesters.

The online scheduler, tutorials, and tutoring location. The students can sign up for a tutoring appointment using an online sign-up system where they can choose which tutor they want to work with. The time slots for tutorials are broken into 15-minute intervals, and students can select as many as two 15-minute tutorials per day. Tutorials can also occur on a walk-in basis. The tutoring program location is in a multi-purpose area that serves as a library, computer lab, classroom, study hall, and tutoring center.

Personal observations. I tutored at the target IEP for approximately two years and noticed a mismatch in the IEP’s tutor training in comparison with training I received at three other university writing centers (two of which served both native English and L2 speakers, and one which was exclusively L2 oriented). At other writing centers, I have been trained by four methods: 1) reading required materials, 2) observing tutorials conducted by experienced tutors, 3) being observed by experienced tutors, and 4) participating in regular training meetings about
principles of tutoring and academic writing. However, at the target IEP, tutors received two kinds of generic training and support. First, when hired, tutors received an all-skills packet of information about pronunciation tips, grammar tenses, and grammatical error coding symbols (see Shelley 2014). Second, based on her availability, the office manager led tutor training meetings about once or twice a semester. In these sporadic training meetings, she was only able to cover general information about one or two of the skills taught at the IEP (listening, speaking, reading, grammar, and writing). While this limited training for tutors in an all-skills tutoring program is somewhat helpful, there are areas for improvement, especially for academic writing.

The project. While the current tutoring program is valuable, it needs tutor training improvements. Therefore, I discussed this tutor training inadequacy with the IEP Coordinator, who requested information about how to improve the tutoring program. To determine what enhancements were essential, an in-depth needs analysis was necessary. I surveyed and interviewed stakeholders (students, tutors, teachers, and administrators) to assess their perceptions of tutor training for academic ESL writing. The analysis informed the development of a tutor reference guide for ESL writing tutors.

Analysis

To initiate a complete analysis to inform the design specifications and articulate the design constraints for the project, I incorporated data and information from three sources: a literature review, a materials review, and a needs assessment. First, a review of the literature provided a research basis for the project and a theoretical justification. Then, a review of the existing tutor training materials provided context and determined areas for improvement. Finally, a thorough needs analysis of stakeholder wants, lacks, and necessities (Nation & Macalister, 2009) helped frame the project in terms of feasibility and future adoption of the project.
Background

As part of the needs analysis for this tutor training project, I conducted a brief but careful review of relevant literature, including scholarly publications and tutor training materials. The review of scholarly publications revealed several reasons why additional support for ESL writers is critical. The review of scholarly publications also identified guiding strategies, such as the role of grammar and multimodal tools, that are useful in academic writing tutor training. In addition, the review of tutor training materials enabled me to identify important components for developing survey questions used in the needs assessment.

**Providing ESL writing support is essential.** Boquet (2002) discusses the comparison of writing center work to helping a pregnant woman through a delivery and, specifically, the midwife’s “labor-and-delivery model” where writers come to receive help throughout the entire process of writing (p. 19). Just as a trained midwife brings support to the mother in her delivery process, according to the literature, additional resources and time are necessary to support L2 writers to help alleviate the challenge of L2 writing, especially tutoring.

**L2 Writing is a challenging task.** Boquet (2002) takes the metaphor of the writing center/midwife a step further and questions why descriptions of the writing process are often framed as a “zen-like experience” and explains that the writing process is just as messy and loud as an actual delivery (Boquet, 2002, p. 19). Specific aspects that add to the complexity of the ESL writing process are the expectations of various discourse communities, the writing process itself, and accuracy expectations.

Writing in an EAP setting varies depending on the requirements of the academic institution and discourse community, and “learning to write is part of becoming socialized to the academic community—finding out what is expected and trying to approximate it” (Silva, 1990,
p. 17). Examining this idea, Weigle (2014) comments about discourse complexity that “there are different conventions for publishing articles in different disciplines,” and “certain linguistic or stylistic choices, such as the use of the passive voice, may be considered good writing in one discourse community or discipline but not in another” (p. 223). Learning how to write various types of discourse is part of the academic experience, and the inconsistency within universities can present academic writing challenges to native writers and especially ESL writers.

In addition to mastering discourse complexity, novice writers may also face the challenges of learning the writing process. Learning this process in a native language can be challenging, and this is especially true of learning to write academically in another language. Weigle (2014) suggests that ESL writers can transfer writing language proficiency from their first language to another language, but “a certain level of language proficiency is required before such transfer can occur” (p. 223). For novice writers, learning the writing process takes time and practice. This difficult process can be eased with the help of a competent tutor who can assist the writer through the stages, including revision.

Even with an understanding of the expectations of the discourse community and the writing process, according to Weigle (2014), “Written language tends to be more formal, use more complex structures, and be more carefully planned than spoken language . . . . thus errors that might be permissible in speaking are often more stigmatized in writing” (Weigle, 2014, p. 224). Depending on the first language (L1), even highly proficient ESL writers may struggle with learning and successfully applying certain grammatical structures (Harris & Silva, 1993). Even ESL students with extensive language training may need further mentoring and support to be successful academically.
**Tutoring helps ESL writers.** Researchers have acknowledged the challenge facing ESL writers and teachers in the classroom (Harris & Silva, 1993; Myers, 2004). Because of the rhetorical, grammatical, lexical, and mechanical demands of academic writing, having additional time and feedback outside of classroom learning is essential as ESL writers continue to hone and develop their academic writing skills. Harris and Silva (1993) note, “For a variety of reasons, these students need the kind of individualized attention that tutors offer, instruction that casts no aspersions on the adequacy of the classroom or the ability of the student” (p. 525). Tutors can provide guidance to novice writers as they apply what they learn in the classroom. The individual learning environment tutoring provides is ideal for helping novice writers with the writing process and with identifying writing errors.

Another justification for why writers need ESL tutors is that tutors can help with error identification. While some critics might argue that error correction is not valuable (Truscott, 1996), others may justify that writers need help with error identification (Ferris, 1999). ESL writers aim to produce clear, meaningful writing, but many times have difficulty in identifying their own writing errors. This is because it is often difficult for students to be able to self-identify errors intuitively (Harris & Silva, 1993). Identifying student errors can also be a time-intensive task because Myers (2004) explains that “language acquisition emerges from learners wrestling with meaning in acts of communicating or trying to communicate. That is exactly what ESL students are doing in writing centers, person to person” (p. 64).

Myers (2004) emphasizes that developing competency in L2 writing takes time and needs consistent feedback: “Repeating a correction is not a capitulation to some stubborn student trait; it is simply acknowledging the real nature of what is a genuinely long and messy process” (p. 57). Many times students want, and even expect, additional writing feedback beyond what
teachers can practically provide in the course of one semester (Evans, Hartshorn, McCollum, & Wolfersberger, 2010). Tutoring can provide essential one-on-one feedback to ESL writers. However, Thonus (2001) recommends, “Tutors should be trained to become neither servants of instructors nor their critics, but rather writing instructors of a different sort, supportive yet independent of the classroom” (p. 78).

**Tutor training is essential for L2 Writing.** The need for ESL tutors is clear, but trained tutors are more effective, especially regarding academic writing. When training tutors, it is important to keep in mind two things: 1) writing is more than good grammar, yet ESL tutors still need training in grammar; and 2) strategies and resources provided to tutors may help improve the feedback they give to ESL students.

**No current ESL writing tutor training standard.** Reigstad and McAndrew (1984) emphasize the need for tutor training: “Whether a few tutors work in a writing lab or all students tutor each other in class, the essential prerequisite is training” (p. 1). Bruce and Rafoth (2009) echo the same idea in their statement, “There is an urgent need for trained tutors to work with ESL writers, both in the United States and around the world” (p. xii). However, there is not a standard consensus about how to train tutors in ESL strategies, which may be the result of the recent emerging communication between writing center researchers and linguistic researchers. Therefore, writing centers typically focus on training tutors in general writing strategies. For many writing centers, training tutors in ESL strategies may be supplemental. Some writing centers may have more flexibility in choosing to train tutors in ESL strategies, but in a setting where tutoring is exclusive to ESL students, such as an IEP, training tutors in ESL writing tutoring strategies is essential.
**Training in grammar and writing.** For tutors, giving effective feedback to writers is a process of training and experience (Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2014). Academic writing tutors may face common ESL errors such as “missing articles, ‘wrong’ prepositions and verb endings, and unusual sentence structures that ‘just don’t sound right’” (Cox & Matsuda, 2009, p. 42). Because tutors will specifically face complex grammatical errors, it is important to help tutors recognize their role as a writing collaborator, rather than a textbook or instructor, because they do not need to be grammarians in order to successfully help ESL students. Harris and Silva (1993) emphasize, “Tutors are there to help with the whole spectrum of writing processes, not to be talking grammar handbooks” (p. 530). This knowledge can be reassuring to tutors who are not confident in their linguistic expertise. While often writers are looking for an editor, tutors are not just grammar janitors sent to “sanitize” writing (Boquet, 2002, p. 21).

ESL writing tutors address more than grammar. Boquet (2002) acknowledges, “Students strive to produce antibacterial texts . . . . Yet their allegedly germ-free texts result in resistant strains of commentary, and even such sanitized texts as our students routinely produce are deemed unwashed” (p. 21). Yet, tutors acting as editors does not follow the typical writing center model. As North (1984) famously notes, writing centers should “produce better writers, not better writing” (p. 438). Therefore, tutors can help identify and explain errors, but that is not typically feasible for a larger essay. Many times, for novice writers, the focus is on composition strategies. According to Reigstad and McAndrew (1984), tutors and writers need to learn about basic steps in the composing process including collecting, connecting, rehearsing, drafting, developing, clarifying, and editing (p. 22). In other words, Reigstad and McAndrew suggest tutors should be trained to know that they do not have to be grammar experts but can help with process writing rather than product writing.
**Training in helpful strategies and resources.** Several strategies and resources can provide tools for tutors to enable student success. In order to build ESL writers’ knowledge and confidence, tutors can utilize scaffolding, or “a learning opportunity in which a more expert tutor teaches a less expert student to answer a question, correct an error, or perform a task without telling the student the answer or doing the work for him or her” (Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2014, p. 54-55). Furthermore, to teach this skill, “writing center directors can instruct and scaffold tutors in how to instruct and scaffold students” (Mackiewicz & Thompson, 2014, p. 75). Some scaffolding may occur in the form of templates. Graft and Birkenstein (2006) “found that students who otherwise struggled to organize their thoughts, or even to think of something to say, did much better when . . . provided . . . with templates” (p. xi). While some may argue against using templates with the idea they create passive learners, a counterargument to keep in mind with ESL writers is that templates are often necessary to build a base before developing the ability to manipulate the language autonomously. In addition to scaffolding, providing resources for tutors, such as specific writing samples, can enable more effective feedback (Fitzgerald & Ianeta, 2016).

**Insight from tutor training reference materials.** In this section, I identify materials currently used to train tutors at the IEP tutoring program. Additionally, I reveal other tutor training references used in developing the reference guide and references used in developing questions used in the needs assessment surveys.

**IEP tutor training materials.** Materials currently used for tutor training at the targeted IEP include a packet of handouts given to tutors when hired. The IEP handouts gave information regarding writing that included one page about grammar tenses and another page about grammatical error coding symbols. If I were choosing a midwife who had received the training
that only two pages of handouts can provide, I would rethink my choice of midwife unless there were absolutely no other options available.

**Resources helpful in developing needs assessment survey questions.** In preparing for the needs analysis, four tutoring training materials were especially helpful in my formation of the needs assessment survey questions—two were specifically for ESL tutoring, and two of which were for all writers. The first was an online bibliography of ESL writing tutoring related articles compiled by David (2014) that provided resources for balancing grammatical and rhetorical feedback and more. The second was Bruce and Rafoth’s (2009) book *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*, which includes information that orients tutors to ESL students, tutoring sessions, and general topics including avoiding appropriation, different cultural perspectives, linguistics, and varying attitudes. The third resource was a general writer’s reference developed by Locey and Dobkins (2005) entitled “The Write Stuff” (2005) that orients student tutors and writers to the writing process, formatting, plagiarism, citation styles, and error correction symbols. The fourth was Reigstad and McAndrew’s (1984) article for general writing tutors entitled “Training Tutors for Writing Conferences,” which introduces four tutor training principles: 1) Tutors should establish and maintain rapport with students, 2) the writer should do the work, 3) higher order concerns (HOCs) should be addressed before lower order concerns (LOCs), and 4) tutors do not have to be experts. These resources were particularly helpful in developing some questions for the surveys used in the needs assessment.

**Resources helpful in developing the reference guide.** Six tutoring training materials were especially helpful in the formation of the reference guide. The first four include resources previously listed: David’s (2014) bibliography, Bruce and Rafoth’s (2009) book, Locey and Dobkins’ (2005) reference, and Reigstad and McAndrew’s (1984) article. Another training
material that proved helpful included a ESL writer resource developed by Hallen (1991) entitled “A Student’s Guide to ESL Composition,” which highlights university’s policies, course expectations, grading rubrics, writing assignment specifications, and writing samples (first draft, second draft, peer review, final draft, and professor evaluation). An additional general tutor resource used was Fitzgerald and Ianeta’s (2016) book *The Oxford Guide for Writing Tutors*, which offers tutors a history of writing centers, theory, practice, second language acquisition, and other tutoring strategies. Principles and materials from these resources were essential in helping develop the final project: a tutor reference entitled “An Academic Writing Reference for ESL Tutors.”

**Needs Assessment**

Conducting a needs assessment was crucial to ascertain stakeholders’ (students, tutors, teachers, and administrators) perceptions of wants, lacks, and necessities at the IEP’s tutoring program (Nation & Macalister, 2009). To develop the assessment, I first discussed strengths, weaknesses, and constraints of the program with the tutoring program director. From that discussion and from literature I reviewed, I created survey and interview questions that I submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval. After I received IRB approval, during the fall 2014 semester I surveyed and interviewed stakeholders to identify the IEP tutoring program effectiveness and improvement suggestions in regards to tutoring academic writing. In this section, I will describe the needs assessment surveys and interviews as well as the IEP program constraints.

**Needs assessment surveys.** I asked participants to complete a survey that included some questions that were the same for each stakeholder and questions that were tailored to each stakeholder group—the majority of which were open-ended. Questions that were the same for
each stakeholder asked about demographics, education level, tutorial time adequacy, positive program aspects, and possible program improvements. Questions that were tailored to obtain the unique perspective of each group included how students felt about feedback received from tutors, how tutors felt about the training they received, what teachers wanted tutors to help with, and the familiarity of administrators with the program. For the sake of brevity, I will not address all answers to questions given in the surveys. However, I quantified some question responses, and coded the open-ended question responses to find important themes. Because there were no other coders, inter-rater reliability was not established. In this section, besides participant background information, I have provided salient themes specifically chosen to help improve the IEP tutoring program including tutorial time adequacy and desired areas of addition tutor training.

**Survey responses about demographics and education level.** All survey participants were asked questions regarding demographics and education level. I administered surveys to approximately 210 participants at the IEP, and had 109 survey respondents, including 73 students, 10 tutors, 13 teachers, and 13 administrators. All participants were age 18 or older. Stakeholder demographics are arranged in descending order in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Tutor</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Admin.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to the extensive number of countries that stakeholders represented, I quantified the countries into demographic categories that made the data accessible. The highest student demographic was Hispanic; and the highest tutor, teacher, and administrator demographic was North American.

*Academic level students.* There are two levels of students at the IEP: a Foundations division and an Academic division (see Figure 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELC Level</th>
<th>Placement (ACTFL)</th>
<th>Course Goal (ACTFL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Foundations Prep</td>
<td>NL-NM</td>
<td>NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Foundations A</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Foundations B</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Foundations C</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Academic A</td>
<td>IM-IH</td>
<td>IH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Academic B</td>
<td>IH</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University Prep</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>AM-AH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1.* Sample ELC Levels and Equivalent ACTFL Proficiency Level.

The needs assessment focused on Academic level students involved in higher level writing who were placed in the following sublevels: Academic A (AA), Academic B (AB), and University Prep (UP). Students in these levels took an institutional level placement test at the beginning of the semester as well as classroom level diagnostics conducted by the teachers to confirm their correct placement. I taught 14 of the students who participated in this study, but I did not personally administer the surveys to my students; instead, I asked a teacher who taught my students in a different skill area to administer the surveys.
Tutors. The education level of the tutors ranged from having a TESOL Certificate\textsuperscript{2}, to having a Bachelor’s Degree, to being enrolled in an MA program. The experience of tutors at the IEP ranged from tutoring only one semester to tutoring six or more semesters. The experience with prior ESL training ranged from on-the-job experience, to having a TESOL minor, to having a TESOL certificate, to having a Master’s degree, and “other.” Those who selected “other” cited training examples such as working for Writing Fellows,\textsuperscript{3} teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students online, and having other work experience.

Teachers. Teachers participating in the program are required to have at least a TESOL certificate or higher. Many of the teachers were concurrently enrolled in an MA TESOL program.

Administrators. The administrators are required to have a Master’s degree or higher. Administrators included the IEP Director, Assistant Director, Technology Coordinator, Curriculum Development Coordinator, Testing Coordinator, Student Life Coordinator, Office Manager, and members of the Executive Council. Executive Council members have multiple responsibilities: supervising a skill area, teaching at least two classes, conducting research projects, and so forth. They are also responsible for any changes made at the IEP and would therefore have the final decision in approving new curriculum proposals. Because several administrators have taught at the IEP or currently teach at the IEP, I created a combined survey for administrators that included many of the questions from the teacher survey.

\textsuperscript{2} Tutors may have had either a graduate or an undergraduate TESOL Certificate; however, this survey did not distinguish which kind of certificate the respondents had obtained.

\textsuperscript{3} Writing Fellows is a writing tutoring program hosted by the university where a tutor is paired with a general education (GE) class, attends the class, and helps students one-on-one on writing assignments outside of class time.
Survey responses about adequacy of tutorial time. In addition to being asked about demographic and educational information, all stakeholders were asked to offer their perception of whether the time allotted for writing tutorials was adequate. Ninety of the 109 survey respondents answered this question. Table 2 displays the tally of the compiled answers for individual stakeholders in descending order.

Table 2

Perceived Adequacy of Tutorial Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Tutor</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Admin.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I quantified the ranking categories by combining the numerical results for very adequate, adequate, and somewhat adequate as “adequate”; I combined the results for somewhat inadequate, inadequate, and very inadequate as “inadequate”. Overall, 57.8% of stakeholders felt the tutorial time was adequate, 30% felt the tutorial time was inadequate, and 11.1% felt neutral about tutorial time, 1.1% selected “other”, and 17.1% did not respond.

Academic students. When asked to explain their responses about tutorial time adequacy, student responses varied. Some of the salient themes that reoccurred were 1) the idea that the adequacy of time depended on the assignment; 2) students needing revision, correction, explanation, or rewriting advice take more time; and 3) for UP academic writing, the time was not enough.

Teachers. When asked to explain their responses about the adequacy of the time in IEP tutorials, teacher responses varied. Some of the salient responses included the ideas that 1) longer essays may need more time, 2) students may inundate the system with multiple revisions, and 3)
higher level assignments need more time. One teacher commented that time adequacy was student dependent:

It depends on the students. If they are interested in learning more AND they need more time for their writing, then 15-30 min is not adequate. Some students need a lot of explanation and guidance. For most, 30 min is plenty (you have to stop at some point!).

Another teacher expanded on the student dependent theme:

It depends on what the student wants to improve on. Some students come with the expectation of getting all grammar mistakes corrected, and that's very not likely because their papers are long. Also, getting the students to think on their own takes time, even just to help them with structure in one paragraph.

Thus, according to teacher comments, the students’ expectations, ability, and preparedness may be factors in effective tutorial time management.

Administrators. When asked to explain their responses about tutoring time adequacy, many administrators responded that the time was adequate for shorter essays. One interesting comment highlighted why it was adequate:

I think 30 minutes is fine for an essay. The students don't feel that [it] was because they want the tutors to look through the entire essay. I think it's ok if the tutor can look through portions of it, give feedback and show the students how they can apply the feedback to the rest of the essay. 15 minutes is too short for an essay, but just right for a paragraph.

This information suggested that tutors need flexibility in moderating the time of their tutorials depending on student preferences and paper length.
Overall, the responses to this question aligned with my expectations that the tutorial time was inadequate for higher level academic essays. I was surprised how many stakeholders felt it was adequate for AA students, but I was not surprised how many stakeholders commented in their explanations that they felt it was inadequate for AP and UP students because of the length requirements for these essays.

*Survey responses about desired areas of tutor training.* The second salient theme, after perceptions of tutorials time adequacy, included two survey questions regarding additional tutor training. The first question asked tutors, teachers, and administrators to select specific literature-based writing strategies in which tutors should receive additional training. The second question asked tutors, teachers, and administrators to select IEP curriculum-based writing categories in which tutors should receive additional training.

*Specific writing strategies for tutor training.* For this survey question, I selected several writing strategies from scholarly articles and books written about general writing tutor training. Then, I asked tutors, teachers, and administrators to select all writing tutoring strategies that they felt were important for tutor training. Table 3 compiles the responses, and strategies appear in descending order according to preference. Those who selected “other” did not supply additional suggestions.
Table 3

Writing Tutoring Strategies Derived from the Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Tutoring Strategies</th>
<th>Tutor</th>
<th>Teach.</th>
<th>Admin.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balancing writer ownership and providing feedback</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing grammatical feedback with rhetorical feedback</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching reading an ESL student’s paper as a whole</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting goals to manage the time during a writing session</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching gender and cultural dynamics in a tutorial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying different learning styles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying different personality types</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being comfortable with silence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking the ice with students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this information, the highest number of tutors wanted training in balancing writer ownership of the paper and providing feedback. Ten teachers indicated wanting tutor training on balancing grammatical feedback with rhetorical feedback, followed closely by nine teachers indicating an interest in tutor training for balancing writer ownership and providing feedback as well as approaching reading an ESL student’s paper as a whole. The majority of administrators wanted both training on how to balance writer ownership and feedback as well as balancing grammatical and rhetorical feedback. Overall, the largest number of stakeholders selected that tutors should be trained on how to balance writer ownership of the paper with providing feedback and the second largest number of stakeholders selected of balancing grammatical feedback with rhetorical feedback. The responses to this question brought a natural order to importance of these tutor training strategies. I was surprised how setting the agenda was only considered the fourth most important topic, but the top four strategies I feel represent essential tutor training strategies.

*Specific IEP writing categories for tutor training.* For this survey question, I selected writing categories by identifying components of the academic IEP writing curriculum. Then
tutors, teachers, and administrators indicated all writing categories they felt would enhance tutor training. Table 4 compiles the answers in descending order according to preference.

Table 4

*Writing Categories Derived from IEP Writing Course Outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Categories</th>
<th>Tutor</th>
<th>Teach.</th>
<th>Admin.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IEP Writing Objectives (Foundations vs. Academic)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL Essays (Independent and Integrated)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA 101 (Formatting, Quoting, Citing, and Referencing)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Accuracy (Purpose and Symbols)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism (The Spectrum of Plagiarism, Turnitin.com)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Vocabulary (IEP Focus and Resources)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest number of tutors selected that tutors should have IEP Writing Objective training. The majority of teachers selected that tutors should have grammar training. The largest number of administrators selected that tutors should have IEP Writing Objective training. From tutors, teachers, and administrators’ data combined, IEP Writing Objectives was the highest selected writing category for tutor training. Overall, the responses to this question logically aligned with importance of tutors knowing course objectives to better help students achieve such expectations.

*Needs assessment interviews.* A question on the survey asked participants if they would be willing to complete an interview clarifying any answers from their survey. From those who selected they would be willing to be interviewed, I selected eight participants to interview, including two students, two tutors, two teachers, and two administrators. These stakeholders represented a broad range of perspectives: one student who frequently used the tutoring program and one who used the program less frequently; one tutor who had other training with Writing Fellows and another who only had tutored a semester at the IEP; one teacher who taught writing several times and one who taught writing only a few times; and one administrator who directed a
writing center at another university and one who previously tutored in the IEP program. My own students were purposefully not selected to be interviewed to avoid creating a vulnerable population. After interviewing the stakeholders, I coded the open-ended question responses to find important themes. Because there were no other coders, inter-rater reliability was not established. The following sections outline the overall themes identified from these interviews.

**Students should be prepared for tutorials.** One emergent theme was that students who have an idea of what they want to focus on during the tutorial are more likely to perceive that a tutorial is successful. Having a rubric readily available (if one was provided by the teacher) is also helpful for the tutors.

**Tutors need specialized training.** One student’s ironic comment seemed to sum up the theme that that tutors need training: “If you have a lost student and a lost tutor, it is going to be a very interesting meeting.” Several comments suggested different areas in which to train tutors. The first was that tutors need training on the level expectations of the IEP. Additionally, tutors need training on grammar, organization, and integrating sources. Furthermore, comments showed that training should include peer observations and work policies outlined in the IEP handbook. Also, training should be available in a manageable platform such as Canvas (the online course management system currently being used by the IEP).

**There are not enough tutors.** Both students and teachers commented that there should be more tutors available because of the number of students at the IEP. Students commented that to compensate for the lack of tutors, they tried to rely on native speaking roommates or Study Buddies for help. Teachers commented that they would recommend that AB and UP students

---

4 Study Buddy is a program where native English speaking university students studying another language are paired with IEP students so that both students can practice their target language with a native speaker of the language.
should visit the ESL writing center on campus that provided help to matriculated students as well as IEP students because the teachers felt that the few tutors available at the IEP should be utilized for lower level students.

*The time is inadequate for longer or complicated essays.* All stakeholders commented that the time for tutorials was adequate for some assignments, but it depended on two main factors. One factor was the length of the writing assignment. For example, in AA classes, assignments can be shorter, but in AB and UP classes, assignments are longer (see Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Writing Goals and Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic A</td>
<td>2-4 page essays; 30-minute TOEFL essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic B</td>
<td>4-6 page essays; 30-minute &amp; Integrated TOEFL essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Prep</td>
<td>6-8 page essays; 30-minute &amp; Integrated TOEFL essays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2. Sample Academic Writing Goals and Assignments.*

The other factor was how familiar the student was with the assignment because the entire tutorial could be spent explaining the purpose of the assignment and the requirements of the assignment.

*Teachers should provide clear expectations of assignments.* Several teachers and administrators commented that sometimes students received inaccurate feedback from tutors primarily for two reasons. One main reason tutors provided inaccurate feedback could be the lack of training. Another reason tutors provided inaccurate feedback could be that the assignment expectations were unclear. These assignments could be made clearer by having the teachers provide transparent rubrics and sample assignments.

*General improvement suggestions for the tutoring program.* Stakeholders offered many different suggestions to help improve the tutoring program. The first was to improve the online scheduler by creating profiles for the tutors so that students could select tutors based on tutors’ individual strengths. The second was to provide tutors with more resources, such as writing
textbooks, grammar textbooks, and style guides. Another suggestion was to allow students to use “Thank You Card”\(^5\) vouchers to purchase additional tutoring time. Additionally, one suggestion was to provide a different location to enhance the environment for writing tutoring.

**Constraint analysis.** Reviewing the current tutoring program at the IEP helped identify constraints that may or may not affect the development of additional tutor support resources. These constraints include the time allotted for tutorials, the high rate of tutor turnover, and the administrative workload.

**Tutoring appointment time.** The IEP tutoring program limits appointments to two 15-minute tutorials per day. Many times students have several skill area assignment requirements. As a result, while a 15-minute to 30-minute appointment may be adequate for some smaller assignments, given the diversity in writing assignments, larger assignments may require additional time. Also, any tutor training materials developed should help tutors meet student needs in a limited time frame, such as a reference or quick access to support materials.

**High tutor turnover.** Additionally, high tutor turnover can present a challenge in creating the curriculum for additional tutor training. Because of the diversity of tutor backgrounds and high-turnover rate, it can be difficult to train tutors consistently and thoroughly, especially in academic writing; therefore, concise training is imperative.

**Administrative workload.** The heavy load of administrators at the IEP corresponds to the frequency of tutor training. Currently there are some trainings conducted on various topics. However, they are sporadic and not consistent with new tutors as they are based on the availability of the tutor administrator. Any additional curriculum developed for tutor training

\(^{5}\) A Thank You Card is a form of currency used at the IEP to reward good behavior. These cards can be exchanged for prizes like candy, school supplies, water bottles, cinch bags, and T-shirts.
would require an administrator to continue ongoing training and would therefore need to be manageable, unless a part-time tutor trainer is hired.

**Analysis Results**

Based on the analyses of the literature, the existing materials, the needs assessment, and constraint analysis, I was able to frame and constrain a reference guide that could help strengthen the tutoring program at this IEP. First, I identified principles from the literature (see Figure 3) that are necessary in developing tutor training as well as reviewed constraints of the IEP (see Figure 4).

**Guiding Principles from the Literature**

1) Tutors need training  
2) Tutors need training in writing and grammar  
3) ESL writing tutors need additional strategies and resources

*Figure 3. These guiding principles helped inform the reference guide.*

**IEP Constraints**

1) High tutor turnover  
2) Tutoring session length  
3) Administrative workload and sustainability

*Figure 4. These constraints helped inform the reference guide.*

The guiding principles from the literature justified the need for tutor training and revealed aspects of writing tutor training that are essential when working with ESL students. The constraints identified essential aspects to consider before developing tutor training materials.
Furthermore, the needs analysis revealed two content areas for tutor training. The first included common writing strategies that stakeholders identified as high priority for tutor training (see Figure 5). The second showed IEP writing categories that that stakeholders identified as high priority for tutor training (see Figure 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Balancing giving the writer ownership of the paper and providing feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Balancing grammatical feedback with rhetorical feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Approaching reading an ESL student’s paper as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Setting goals with students to manage the time during a writing session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Desired writing strategies from the analysis that informed the reference guide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEP Writing Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) IEP Writing Course Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) TOEFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) APA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Linguistic Accuracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Desired IEP writing categories from the analysis that informed the reference guide.

Keeping in mind principles from the literature and constraints of the environment as well as content areas identified by needs assessment, I developed a reference guide that addressed priorities identified by the literature and IEP stakeholders for tutor training in an ESL writing context.
Data from the analysis proved to be invaluable in outlining the design for a reference guide for ESL writing tutors. Prominent curriculum developers, Nation and Macalister (2009), recommend reviewing lacks, wants and necessities before developing a curriculum. These aspects of curriculum development were essential in developing the needs assessment for the project. Additionally, a well-known author in the writing center field, Steven North (1984) argues “that writing curricula need to be student-centered” and should define “its province not in terms of some curriculum, but in terms of the writers it serves” (p. 438). One aspect of the needs assessment reflected the importance of the tutorial being student-centered as it revealed that tutors should have additional training in balancing student ownership of a paper when tutors provide feedback. Furthermore, understanding the context of student levels by understanding the IEP writing objectives was also a priority. As a result, I created a reference guide that included this student-centered information. Both curriculum principles and writing center principles helped build background information necessary to create the reference guide. The following section describes the reference guide design process and challenges that resulted in the finished product. It also provides decisions made regarding the content and format of the reference guide.

**Design Challenges**

In designing the reference guide, one challenge was addressing the constraints of the training curriculum. The needs assessment identified three constraints: high tutor turnover, tutoring session length, as well as administrative workload and sustainability. High tutor turnover is not a unique challenge in writing centers. Keeping in mind that the tutor may only work for one semester, and that the training should to be brief for purposes of manageability, I made sure that the main reference guide sections for tutor training were less than 10 pages of material. I
addressed the next challenge of only having a 15-minute tutorial length by providing easy-to-access reference materials for the tutor in the appendices including sample essays and resources. The challenge of administrative workload and sustainability was the hardest to address because there should always be training, but the current tutor director doubles as the administrative assistant for the IEP, so training is sporadic. One aim is that the reference guide will not just become “one more thing to do” for the tutoring director, but a way to provide specific materials that the tutoring director can consistently cover briefly with new tutors. Finally, if a future researcher implements and evaluates the reference guide, and concludes that it is manageable, then this reference guide can become a sustainable staple in writing tutor training.

Content

The reference guide includes preface information, three main tutor training sections, and appendices. The following paragraphs detail information about the sections included in the reference guide.

Preface information. Before the actual tutor training material, the reference guide includes a note to stakeholders and an explanation of how to use the reference guide.

A note to stakeholders. The note provides context for the reference guide by explaining that it is the result of a graduate student’s TESOL MA project. It further explains some details of the needs assessment that were important in creating the reference guide. Then it concludes with acknowledgements for those who participated in the needs assessment and the creation of the project.

How to use the reference guide. Informal group feedback provided by the IEP administrators suggested that the reference guide should begin with an introduction of how to use the guide. The added page included information to help the reader understand the organization of
the reference guide. It explains that the first three sections have important components necessary for tutor training and should be read carefully by tutors, and that the appendices provide tools that give context to the training material.

**Tutor training sections.** Three main tutor training sections detail relevant IEP policies, the writing level course information and objectives, and tutoring strategies. To keep the required reading for this reference guide concise, the essential information identified from the needs assessment is included in this part of the guide.

**Relevant IEP policies.** The IEP has an online handbook for teachers as well as students that clearly outlines IEP policies and procedures including some from the university that hosts this IEP. However, since there is no current tutoring handbook that delineates these rules clearly to tutors, these rules were added to this reference guide to convey important policies for university and IEP employees. I selected two relevant policies from the handbook. The first policy outlined rules of the location where the tutoring program was held, which involved a computer lab. The second policy outlined behavioral expectations of those employed by the university.

**The Computer Lab.** This subsection provides a brief explanation of the rules of the location of the IEP tutoring program. Because the tutoring program is in a multi-purpose location that includes a study center, a library, and a computer lab, there are policies tutors need to know. The first is the hours of operation during the semester. Another policy tutors need to be aware of is the policy that food and drink are prohibited in the computer lab. Additionally, the reference guide includes other media usage policies tutors need to be aware of for the computers in the study area. Finally, the reference guide includes a point of contact for any questions regarding policies in this location.
Behavior. This subsection provides an overview of the university policies regarding English use, dress and grooming, as well as recently updated IEP dating policies.

**IEP writing course information and objectives.** In response to the needs assessment’s inclusion of the most advanced writing topics and writing categories for tutor training, this section includes an overview of the IEP’s writing class levels and objectives.

**Academic writing class levels and assignments.** This subsection provides a brief overview of the levels at the IEP (see Figure 1). Knowing the names of the levels is useful as a sample to show how the various levels correspond to ACTFL levels (novice, intermediate, advanced, and superior) and sub-levels (low, mid, and high). Additionally, this subsection provides an overview of common writing assignments for the academic writing courses.

**IEP academic writing curriculum objectives.** The IEP curriculum development team has designed the academic writing curriculum objectives, which are available as an online curriculum portfolio (Curriculum Portfolio, 2016). This section in the reference provides tutors with a basic overview of the level writing expectations at the IEP. Each level objective provides three descriptions: function, text, and comprehensibility. Function defines requirements of the class in tense, vocabulary, syntax, formality, and concept description. Text describes length and cohesive device requirements. Comprehensibility defines which audience would be able to read and understand the assignment. These three ideas combined define the IEP’s academic writing course objectives.

**Tutoring strategies.** This section includes a list of effective strategies tutors can use during ESL academic writing tutorials. The selected strategies included in this section were based on the highest responses from the needs assessment as topics stakeholders felt tutors needed additional training in. Specifically, these topics cover giving the writer ownership of the
paper, giving balanced feedback for rhetoric and grammar, reading the ESL student’s essay as a whole, and setting the agenda. In the reference guide, the strategies have been placed in a more logical sequence. For example, agenda setting was placed first because that is what should be addressed first during a tutorial. Next, giving the writer ownership, re-titled as “avoid appropriation”, was included after agenda setting because this may help a tutor avoid making corrections or suggestions at a higher level than the student is comfortable with. Finally, giving balanced feedback for rhetoric and grammar as well as reading the ESL student’s essay as a whole were combined into one section as these topics overlap in strategies, for example, addressing HOCs such as organization before LOCs such as punctuation.

**Appendices.** Five appendices utilized the strategy of providing tutors with a multi-modal toolkit (Fitzgerald & Ianeta, 2016) of resources and sample essays for tutors. As a result, the appendices have samples of assignment expectations, sample essays, and helpful links and resources. This information was included in the appendices for the purpose of keeping the reference guide concise. This organization does not require that tutors read materials in the appendices from cover to cover, but provides context for the essential information included in the first three sections of the guide.

**Sample academic essay rubric.** The interviews revealed that several writing teachers (often novice writing teachers) send students with writing assignments that have no rubric. Therefore, to help tutors understand possible academic writing expectations for students, a sample academic writing essay rubric was included. The sample essay rubric, while not necessarily comprehensive, could provide some sample expectations for academic essays.

**Sample academic essays.** Because of the requirements of academic writing assignments for length, use of a citation style, lexical complexity, content, and organization, having a sample
of an essay from each level can help clarify writing expectations for tutors. *The Oxford Guide for Writing Tutors* (Fitzgerald & Ianeta, 2016) also emphasizes in their multi-modal toolkit that having sample essays can be especially helpful for tutors. Because the academic writing courses require various assignment lengths and modes, the reference guide includes three sample essays of varying length (three pages, seven pages, and eight pages) and varying modes (compare and contrast, cause and effect, and argument).

**Helpful links.** In *The Oxford Guide for Writing Tutors* (Fitzgerald & Ianeta, 2016), the authors encourage providing tutors with resources as a way to enhance tutors’ multi-modal toolkits. To accomplish this, the reference guide includes links to online resources as well as reference information for print resources. The online resources cover high ranked topics from the needs assessment that were not included in the reference guide for feasibility and brevity. These topics include the TOEFL, APA, grammar, and linguistic accuracy. Also, the links included in this section were shortened so that tutors with printed copies do not have to type long URLs to search for the information, which is especially important considering the time constraints of the tutorial sessions. In the reference guide, the topics were listed in alphabetical order for tutor convenience. Also listed were print resources including two writing tutor training books for ESL tutors: *The Oxford Guide for Writing Tutors* (Fitzgerald & Ianeta, 2016) and *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors* (Bruce & Rafoth, 2009).

**Format**

The reference guide has been written in the form of a booklet and is intended to be printed and distributed to each tutor because some tutorials are not conducted using a computer. Extra copies could also be stored in the IEP’s tutoring program location. The reference guide’s headings are in APA, but the content is not double-spaced to reduce the number of pages for
enhanced accessibility and to reduce printing costs. In addition, having the reference guide provided as an electronic PDF (for tutors who have their own laptops) could be helpful for tutors to be able to search the document quickly and click on the links for added convenience.

**Conclusion**

Many researchers acknowledge that writing in an EAP context is complex and challenging for ESL students. To help ESL writers, academic institutions’ writing centers offer one-on-one support via trained tutors. However, even trained tutors may struggle helping ESL writers, and often writing support programs do not agree on which materials should be used to train tutors in ESL strategies. A review of literature revealed that ESL writing tutors need specific training writing and grammar. Additionally, ESL resources such as grammar textbooks and sample essays are helpful for tutors. One particular context, a university IEP, was examined to discover what areas of training stakeholders (students, tutors, teachers, and administrators) perceived would best enhance their tutor training for academic writing. The needs assessment revealed that stakeholders most desired first, tutor training in balancing ownership of the paper when tutors provide feedback, and second, the specific IEP writing course objective information.

Themes from the analysis were used to create an ESL tutor training reference guide for academic writing. The reference guide includes sections that address areas identified as high priority for tutor training from the needs assessment, such as writing course objectives and tutoring strategies. The reference guide also includes additional materials for added context, such as a sample essay rubric, sample essays, and helpful resources. Future research is needed to implement and evaluate the reference guide. Furthermore, future research could produce additional guides for other skills being tutored at the research project’s IEP.
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A Note to Students, Tutors, Teachers, and Administrators

Fall 2016

“Whether a few tutors work in a writing lab or all students tutor each other in class, the essential prerequisite is training” (Reigstad and McAndrew, 1984, p. 1).

Because of the complexity of second language academic writing tutoring, this reference guide was created for second language academic writing tutors. This reference guide was written for novice tutors who may have no writing tutoring training as well as those who may have some background in writing tutoring. The reference guide is the result of a needs assessment that involved surveying and interviewing several ELC students, tutors, teachers, and administrators. The reference guide meets needs that were revealed in the surveys and interviews; it includes training in ELC writing course objectives and writing tutoring strategies. Users should feel free to adapt the reference guide to emerging aspects of the dynamic curriculum at the ELC.

In creating this reference guide, I would be remiss if I did not thank those who helped the project come to fruition. I wish to thank, first and foremost, those who helped edit the project, particularly Dr. Norman Evans, Dr. Cynthia Hallen, Dr. Ben McMurry, and Nick David, for shaping this sculpture from clay, to kiln, to glaze, and beyond. I wish to gratefully acknowledge the many contributions of Dr. James Hartshorn and Dr. Grant Eckstein as they helped provide extensive feedback. Also, I wish to thank the executive council members at the ELC, particularly Arwen Wyatt and Judson Heart for their inspiration, ideas, support, and enthusiasm. Finally, for the teachers, tutors, students, and others who also freely gave of their time to help provide feedback, I express my gratitude.
How to Use This Reference Guide

The aim of this reference guide is to help train tutors to prepare for ESL academic writing tutorials. Because tutors come from a variety of backgrounds, this reference guide will provide them with tools to help make writing tutorials more effective. Scholarly articles, a needs assessment, and the input of experienced tutors informed the content of the guide. All ELC tutors should carefully read the first three sections in this reference guide in order to become acquainted with ELC policies, ELC writing courses, and effective tutoring strategies (pp. 1-7). In addition to these three important training areas, the guide includes five appendices of reference materials that can be consulted as needed (pp. 8-30). These materials provide context for the first three sections of the reference guide. The appendices include a sample academic essay rubric, example student essays from a variety of levels and types, as well as helpful resources and links.
SECTION 1: Relevant ELC Policies

All ELC Policies that are included below are adapted from the BYU ELC Student Handbook (2014), which is accessible online at http://www.elc.byu.edu. Handbooks for students and teachers have been available, but no tutor handbooks had previously been available. This section of the reference guide fills that gap by providing some of the important policies that affect tutors at the ELC.

The Computer Lab and the SASC

The computer lab and SASC have tutors, equipment, and software to help students learn English, such as books, movies, and CDs. There are also programs to help students prepare for standardized examinations, such as the TOEFL and GRE tests. The following rules apply to both the computer lab and the SASC:
1. No food or drink is allowed in the computer lab or SASC at any time
2. Students must speak quietly and show respect to all lab teachers and fellow students
3. Students must speak English. Students who break the rules will be asked to leave and may lose their privileges to use the computer lab or SASC.

Computer Lab Rules

1. Never “save” computers with personal belongings (e.g. coats, bags, etc.). If you are gone for more than 5 minutes, your things will be removed so others can use the equipment. Please go to Room 103 to find your abandoned belongings.
2. Do not violate copyright laws. It is illegal to duplicate or download copyrighted material (e.g. TOEFL CDs, books, videos, music, etc.).
3. Labs are closed between classes and may not be used during class without your teacher present.
4. Prepare to leave 10 minutes before the lab closes. (Return materials, print documents, save work, etc.)

SASC Rules

1. Never write in any materials you check out.
2. Never take TOEFL materials or DVDs home.
3. Return checked-out materials on time (e.g. library books, TOEFL materials, etc.). If you don’t, you will be charged a late fee.
4. Students can sign up for tutorials one in advance online at http://elc.byu.edu/tutoring/day.php?day. Tutors may not be scheduled more than 2 days in advance. Writing tutors should not be expected to correct all of the paper. Students should ask tutors for help with one or two areas (e.g. organization, transitions, etc.)
5. If you bring your own movie to watch on the computers, it cannot be R-rated or higher.
Behavior

Students at the English Language Center should be mature, responsible, and considerate of others. They must treat your teachers, classmates, and the office staff with respect. Students who persist in displaying negative behavior towards teachers, fellow students, or staff may be dismissed. Because our school is also a church, we expect that everyone will treat the building and its furnishings with care and help to keep it clean and beautiful.

English Use

The ELC is an English language school. As such, students are expected to speak English as much as possible in and out of class. Teachers will insist that students speak English all the time they are in their classroom. We expect students will do the same outside of class. Students are here to improve their English, the greatest language development will occur when students are using English.

Dress and Grooming Standards

Members of the BYU community commit themselves to observe the following standards, which reflect the direction of the Board of Trustees and the Church publication For the Strength of Youth. The Dress and Grooming Standards are as follows:

Men. A clean and well-cared-for appearance should be maintained. Clothing is inappropriate when it is sleeveless, revealing, or form fitting. Shorts must be knee-length or longer. Hairstyles should be clean and neat, avoiding extreme styles or colors, and trimmed above the collar, leaving the ear uncovered. Sideburns should not extend below the earlobe or onto the cheek. If worn, moustaches should be neatly trimmed and may not extend beyond or below the corners of the mouth. Men are expected to be clean-shaven; beards are not acceptable. Earrings and other body piercing are not acceptable. Shoes should be worn in all public campus areas.

Women. A clean and well-cared-for appearance should be maintained. Clothing is inappropriate when it is sleeveless, strapless, backless, or revealing; has slits above the knee; or is form fitting. Dresses, skirts, and shorts must be knee-length or longer. Hairstyles should be clean and neat, avoiding extremes in styles or colors. Excessive ear piercing (more than one per ear) and all other body piercing are not acceptable. Shoes should be worn in all public campus areas.

Dating & Romantic Relationships

In accordance with BYU policy, ELC teachers, tutors, administrators, or staff are not allowed to date or maintain a romantic relationship with students for whom they have a direct supervisory role. Supervisors must approve exceptions.
SECTION 2: ELC Writing Classes and Objectives

The ELC has two main levels: Foundations and Academic. The Foundations writing courses focus on sentences, paragraphs, and multi-paragraph compositions or basic essays. The Academic writing courses focus on varying lengths of essays that incorporate research and require the use of proper citations and referencing.

Each of the class levels corresponds with the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) levels (see Table 1). These levels are novice (N), intermediate (I), advanced (A), and superior (S). Each of these levels have three sublevels of low (L), mid (M), and high (H) respectively.

Table 1
Sample ELC Levels and Equivalent ACTFL Proficiency Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELC Level</th>
<th>Placement (ACTFL)</th>
<th>Course Goal (ACTFL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Foundations Prep</td>
<td>NL-NM</td>
<td>NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Foundations A</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Foundations B</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Foundations C</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Academic A</td>
<td>IM-IH</td>
<td>IH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Academic B</td>
<td>IH</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University Prep</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>AM-AH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Academic Writing Classes

The Academic writing classes require students to write essays that expand on the basic essay structure introduced in the Foundations C writing classes. Where Foundations level essay topics are personal, Academic level topics are abstract. As students progress through each Academic class level, the amount of pages required for each essay increases (see Table 2). Furthermore, the research requirements and academic reading requirements increase in difficulty with each Academic level class. The essays may come from several modes including classification, comparison-contrast, cause-effect, argumentative, etc. The writing assignments of the Academic classes may require the students to practice using academic vocabulary list (AVL) words, which come in packets that the students purchase from the ELC.

In addition to research essays, academic students practice the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL®) essay tasks—the 30-minute and Integrated essays (Table 2 shows the tasks required for each level). The first task requires students to respond to a prompt with a 30-minute essay. The second requires students to read a passage for three minutes, listen to a lecture for two minutes, and respond to a prompt addressing both the reading and listening in 25 minutes.
Table 2
*Sample Academic Writing Goals and Assignments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Writing Goals and Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic A</td>
<td>2-4 page essays; 30-minute TOEFL essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic B</td>
<td>4-6 page essays; 30-minute &amp; Integrated TOEFL essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Prep</td>
<td>6-8 page essays; 30-minute &amp; Integrated TOEFL essays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information about TOEFL essays, citation styles, or other resources for academic writing and grammar, see Appendix E: Helpful Links and Resources. Because the length of the assignment may affect the adequacy of time in a tutorial, setting an agenda with the student is key to enabling a successful tutorial (see Section 3).

**ELC Course Learning Outcomes**

Figure 1 shows the course learning outcomes for each of the academic courses created by the ELC curriculum development team. Each course outcome is divided into three subsections: 1) function—or the ability of the student to use vocabulary, syntax, time frames, and personal or abstract topics; 2) text—expectations of the vocabulary, length, and cohesive devices; and 3) comprehensibility—the ease of a native speaker understanding the text and whether errors impede meaning.

*Figure 1. Academic Writing Course Outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Academic A   | **Function:** Students are able to meet all practical writing needs. They are usually able to write in all major time frames. They use basic vocabulary and syntax that typically corresponds to spoken language. They produce texts about personal topics, everyday events and situations in concrete terms, such as work and/or school experiences. They sometimes produce texts about personal topics in abstract terms. They are able to write in informal situations and in some formal situations.  
**Text:** Students usually write texts with multiple paragraphs. They use some basic cohesive devices in texts to connect ideas within and between paragraphs.  
**Comprehensibility:** Students can usually be understood by those unaccustomed to non-native writing, though there will likely be gaps in comprehension due to significant errors. |
| **Academic B** | **Function**: Students are able to meet basic academic writing needs. They consistently write in all major time frames with some control. They have minimal control of academic syntax and vocabulary. They produce personal, general and some academic texts in concrete terms. Students will occasionally produce texts about academic topics in abstract terms. They are able to write in most informal situations and in some formal situations.

**Text**: Students use a limited number of cohesive devices in texts and may resort to redundancy or awkward repetition. They are able to combine and link sentences into texts of multiple paragraph length but may lack the ability to consistently maintain coherence among paragraphs. Students incorporate some organizational conventions of academic writing but may also use atypical organizational conventions.

**Comprehensibility**: Students can be understood by those unaccustomed to non-native writing, although some additional effort may be required. Errors sometimes interfere with understanding. |
| **University Prep** | **Function**: Students are consistently able to meet a range of academic writing needs. They consistently write in all major time frames with good control. They use a wide range of academic syntax and vocabulary correctly. They produce personal, general, and academic texts in concrete terms and will sometimes produce texts about academic topics in abstract terms. Students have some success in adapting their language to fit the audience, material, context, and time constraints. They are able to write in most informal situations and in some formal situations.

**Text**: Students use a variety of cohesive devices in texts that may include several well-organized and connected paragraphs. They incorporate organizational conventions of academic writing. They provide abundant language with some elaboration to support their writing.

**Comprehensibility**: Students can be understood without difficulty by those unaccustomed to non-native writing. Errors do not interfere with understanding but may occasionally be distracting. |
SECTION 3: ESL Writing Tutoring Strategies

In conducting a writing tutorial, it is helpful to identify effective strategies. Section three first provides strategies about effectively setting an agenda with an ESL writer. Then the section includes strategies about allowing the writer to retain ownership of the paper. Furthermore, there are strategies about providing balanced feedback and approaching an ESL essay as a whole. Finally, additional multimodal strategies are introduced.

At the beginning of the tutorial, the tutor should discuss the student’s priorities for the tutorial to understand what the student is expecting, whether that is brainstorming, outlining, organizing, revising, or any other part of the writing process. During some tutorials, tutors may easily identify improvements a student can make in their writing, and spend the whole session addressing global issues such as a thesis statement. However, at the end of the tutorial, the student might feebly ask if the tutor can quickly check their subject verb agreement as their teacher is grading focused solely on this principle for this draft. Such a mismatch in expectations is often the case when there is no agenda negotiated between a tutor and a student. It can be helpful to ask the student if the teacher provided an assignment description or rubric to help understand the purpose of the assignment. If the tutor discovers additional principles that would be helpful for the student to know along the way, it is important to be transparent and renegotiate the tutorial focus with the student, especially when tutorials are limited in time. At the end of the tutorial, asking if the student has any further questions, or helping the student reflect on what was discussed and creating an action plan can help make the tutorial more helpful for the student. To aid in the process of agenda setting, steps to negotiate an agenda from the chapter “Tutor and Writer Identities” in *The Oxford Guide for Writing Tutors* (Fitzberald & Ianetta, 2016, pp. 116-117) and are listed below.

**Deciding Together on the Agenda**

1. Ask the writer what the agenda should be
2. Analyze the assignment and context
3. Read the writing
4. Negotiate the priorities for the session
5. If the writer has no writing, help him/her get started
6. Wrap up
7. Reflect

Having someone else look at your writing may make writers feel very vulnerable. Once the agenda is negotiated, there are several things tutors can do during a tutorial to make the environment more friendly, inviting, and effective. In Bruce and Rafter’s (2009) book *ESL writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*, Theresa Jinling Tseng’s chapter “Theoretical Perspectives on Learning a Second Language” includes these and other helpful strategies listed as follows.

**Second Language Acquisition Tutor Strategies**

1. Recognize learners’ strengths.
2. Provide a friendly and encouraging ambiance in the writing center.
3. Draw learners’ attention to the target structure they need to learn.
4. Have conversations with learners to figure out what they can do with or without assistance.
5. Provide appropriate help at the right time.

When conducting tutorials, another balancing act tutors perform is to address global issues and higher order concerns (HOCs) before local issues and lower order concerns (LOCs). A tutor may encounter a student that is only interested in a LOC such as punctuation, yet their essay may lack a HOC such as a clear thesis statement. If this is the case, agenda setting would be important, and it will be important to explain why it is better to focus on getting the thesis to represent the essay content well before addressing sentence-level corrections. However, flexibility in itself can be a successful strategy as some ESL tutorials may be solely need linguistic corrections based on the assignment expectations. After reading the essay with the student, here are some helpful strategies for how to approach an ESL student’s essay as a whole and provide balanced feedback, which came from the chapter entitled “Where Do I start?” in One on One with Second Language Writers (Reynolds, 2009, pp. 3-15).

Providing Balanced Feedback and Approaching an ESL Essay as a Whole

1. Do I understand the general points of the essay?
   - General points include the thesis statement, controlling idea, focus point, statement of purpose, main idea, etc.
2. Do I think the essay fits the goal(s) of the assignment?
   - Does the student have a rubric, assignment description, or prompt with them?
   - What kind of title, if any does the genre typically have?
   - Does it have a fixed organizational structure?
   - What are the parameters for length?
   - If it includes citations, what style format is used?
3. Do I recognize an organizational strategy? Is it effective?
   - Review markers signaling a statement of purpose, transitional words and phrases (in addition, on the other hand, etc.), etc.
4. Is the writing interesting?
   - Recognize that the purpose of the text and characteristics of the typical reader may affect whether something is interesting.
   - Good writing is more than technical precision—review the eloquence of language, the novelty of the argument, the ability to synthesize information from different texts, etc.
5. How bothered am I by the language? Am I bothered in spite of what the essay says or because I can’t understand what the writer is saying?
   - Work on language errors that impede meaning first.
   - Once the student has worked out the purpose for writing, audience expectations, organization and created a coherent presentation, then work on linguistic choices.
6. What is the strongest aspect of the writing?
   - Build confidence by pointing out to the student what they are doing well.
   - Avoid generally positive statements like “This paper is good,” but provide specific feedback like “You transition well from this paragraph.”
Tutors also need to be aware of power dynamics during a tutorial. Because the teacher-student feedback dynamic can be intimidating for many students, in many writing centers, the tutors are peers for the purpose of encouraging more negotiating during tutorials. However, often in an ESL environment, students may feel like tutors are an equivalent to teachers, and students may believe every suggestion for improvement is correct and necessary. Because of this sensitive power dynamic, tutors should emphasize that the writer is the owner of the paper and the writer can accept or reject decisions they feel enhances or detracts from the intended meaning. To help the writer feel ownership of the writing, when tutors make suggestions, they should clarify the purpose and meaning of the suggestion so the student can make an informed decision. For error correction, it is important to include the writer in helping make the corrections where possible. Also, for some levels, students may make many errors, but finding a pattern in the errors may help provide focused feedback that will not overwhelm the student so that they do not become tired and begin accepting every correction automatically. In Bruce and Rafoth’s (2009) book *ESL writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*, Carol Severino’s chapter “Avoid Appropriation” includes these and other helpful strategies listed as follows.

**Avoiding Appropriation**

1. Address expressed needs.
2. Ask the writer to participate in reformulative decisions.
3. Avoid misrepresenting the student’s language level; ESL students of an intermediate level shouldn’t have advanced papers after a few visits to the writing center.
4. Accord the ESL writer authority.
5. Select particular passages to work on; prioritize revisions.
6. Explain the recommended changes.

Learning to be an effective tutor is a journey. It is okay as a tutor not to know all the answers. However, tutors can and should use resources to help students discover answers to questions during tutorials. If tutors are not sure how to cite APA books off the top of their head, referring to the OWL Purdue website with the student can help the student how to better use the resource. Appendix E provides many additional resources that can be used to help tutors find answers to student questions regarding a variety of topics such as APA, grammar, linguistic accuracy, TOEFL, etc. Also, reviewing sample essays with the student can help the student to better understand the vision of their writing assignment. In Appendices B, C, and D, there are sample student essays provided including an Academic A comparison-contrast essay, an Academic B cause-effect essay, and a University Prep argumentative essay, respectively. The chapter “Tutor and Writer Identities” in *The Oxford Guide for Writing Tutors* summarizes the aforementioned multi-modal tutoring strategies that are helpful during tutorials, which are listed below (Fitzberald & Ianetta, 2016, pp. 116-117).

**Multi-modal Toolkit Tutoring Strategies**

- *Make use of grammar resources*, such as handbooks and online resources, such as the Purdue Online Writing Lab. You can work through these with the writer in visual, auditory, and even kinesthetic ways.
- **Have sample student papers on hand** so you can show writers concrete examples of how information can be presented and what “good” academic writing looks like.

When tutoring ESL writers, there are many things tutors need to be aware of regarding wait time, culture, linguistics, and grammar as well as prioritizing how to address such ideas. Some strategies to address these ideas are compiled from several sources including Bruce and Rafoth (2009) and Eckstein (2016).

**Other ESL Strategies**

- **Allow for wait time.** It’s important to remember that ESL writers frequently need more wait time after questions or when they are working on problems for themselves, so don’t be afraid of long silences. One way or another—by sigh or tone—the writer will let you know when he is ready for your intervention (Bruce & Rafoth, 2009, p. 74).
- **Understand cultural differences.**
  - Asian—revere authority, book-learning, memorizing, tell-do
  - Latin—appreciate authority, social interaction, oral emphasis, learn through experience
  - Middle Eastern—equal authority (for males), negotiation, oral only, learn through familial help
- **Show kindness in culturally—and linguistically—sensitive ways.**
  - Avoid hedging; make praise obvious and limit giving it.
  - Modify small talk according to student background (less for Asian).
- **Help students read, understand, and dissect the prompt.**
- **Be a cultural, rhetorical, linguistic informant.**
  - Tell them what you think they are saying in their essay
  - Ask them questions to find out what they do or do not know about culture, language, etc.
- **Tell students what to expect in a tutorial and ask if they agree.**
  - Most students know grammar better than native speakers.
  - Teach and use meta-language.
- **Learn technical grammar.**
  - Especially where vocabulary is involved.
  - Mark errors without necessarily explaining the error.
  - Expect L2 students to figure out grammar/editing.
  - Look for one or two patterns and explain them thoughtfully.
- **Attend to grammar.**
- **Emphasize that you are just one additional perspective on their writing.**
- **Emphasize audience awareness and rhetorical choices.**
- **Be a cultural, rhetorical, linguistic informant** (Eckstein, 2016).
APPENDIX A: Sample Academic Writing Essay Rubric

Assigning a grade to writing, and specifically to a writing assignment is often a difficult task because of the complexity of writing. The teacher must make both the goals of the class and the assignment goals clear to the student writers. One way to do this is to write a rubric for the assignment. This sample essay rubric was created as a reference and is not intended to be a be-all-end-all rubric, but a beginning. Assignments are meant to be individualized, and so are rubrics. However, this rubric can be used to improve tutors’ knowledge of some common academic writing expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluency:</strong> The essay has the appropriate number of pages (2-4; 4-6; 6-8).</td>
<td>/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization:</strong> The essay appropriately models the essay type (compare-contrast, cause-effect, argument, etc.).</td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content (Introduction):</strong> The essay has a hook, background information, and a thesis statement that uses the funnel organization.</td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content (Body Paragraphs):</strong> The body paragraphs have topic sentences, supporting sentences, and conclusion sentences. The body paragraph support has at least one quotation or paraphrase per paragraph.</td>
<td>/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content (Conclusion):</strong> The conclusion summarizes, quotes, discusses, redefines, or considers implications of the main points in the conclusion paragraph, and uses an effective conclusion strategy that correlates with the essay type. The final statement is strong.</td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content (Unity &amp; Coherence):</strong> For paragraph unity, all sentences connect to the topic. For essay unity, all paragraphs connect to thesis statement. For coherence, there is a logical flow of ideas and good use of connector words/phrases such as unlike, therefore, in contrast, etc.).</td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary:</strong> An appropriate amount of academic vocabulary is used well. Second person is avoided. Unspecific words (good, bad, just) and contractions are avoided.</td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy:</strong> The essay has been edited for mechanical errors including spelling, grammar/sentence structure, and punctuation.</td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formatting:</strong> The essay is typed, uses Times New Roman 12 point font, has 1” margins. The paragraphs are indented, there are no extra spaces between paragraphs, and page numbers are included in the top right-hand corner.</td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title Page:</strong> The title page is formatted correctly and has the header at the top with a running head. The header is in ALL CAPS. The full title of the essay, the student’s name, the date, and the university are centered on the title page.</td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-text Citations:</strong> The essay has at least five in-text citations that are properly cited (either direct quotations or paraphrases). All direct quotations have signal verbs. All paraphrases are paraphrased well and do not plagiarize.</td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong> At least five academic references are used and are cited correctly on the references page.</td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points:** /200
Chuseok vs. Thanksgiving

Have you ever heard about Chuseok? Chuseok is the Korean version of Thanksgiving, and Koreans celebrate this holiday by having a family reunion. Chuseok and Thanksgiving involve the celebration of good harvest. Even though the meanings are similar, there are differences followed by these reasons: the date and history of the celebration, the foods eaten, and the events.

First of all, there are slightly different dates and history of the celebration between Chuseok and Thanksgiving. Chuseok occurs on August 15th using the lunar calendar; for example, this year, Chuseok was on Sep 19, 2013. They usually give three days to celebrate Chuseok. On the other hand, Thanksgiving is celebrated on the fourth Thursday of November in the United States. Similar to Chuseok, there are extra days in order to celebrate the holiday. In addition, here is some history about Chuseok and Thanksgiving. Chuseok originates from the celebrations of the harvest moon done by ancient shamans, which were a part of the first religions in Korea. They offer many grains and fruits from the first harvest of the year to their ancestors. In contrast, Thanksgiving originates from honoring the early settlers and their first harvest. Since 1970, many Americans have gathered each Thanksgiving to remember their ancestors. As a consequence, each day is a holiday in their own country, but it has different history.
Second, these two holidays have different kinds of special food, and people eat them during the holiday. Chuseok’s special food is *songpyeon*, which is a Korean traditional rice cake. *Songpyeon* can contain many different kinds of ingredients such as cinnamon, beans and sesame seeds. In addition, they gather with extended family every Chuseok, sharing foods such as vegetable pancakes and *japchae*, which is stir-fried vegetables and meat, and they catch up with each other by sharing thoughts and how they have been doing recently. In contrast, Thanksgiving in the United States consists of having a large meal with family, and they generally eat a large roasted turkey as a main dish. Also, geese and ducks are now sometimes served instead of the Thanksgiving turkey. They also eat mashed potatoes, stuffing, and cooked vegetables as side dishes. Therefore, *songpyeon* and roasted turkey are very important special food in each country.

Lastly, there are different kinds of activities during Chuseok and Thanksgiving. Most Koreans have a memorial ceremony in the morning of Chuseok which is called *Charye*. It is a kind of ritual that gives thanks to ancestors and reminds the ancestors that family thinks about them. Koreans prepare a lot of food which has been harvested from the corresponding year. Furthermore, they place rice, soup, and fruits on the table, but the type of foods differ from each region. After that, people bow to their ancestors with the prepared food. Then they eat those foods and enjoy themselves while visiting relatives’ houses. On the other hand, American people also spend time with their family during Thanksgiving, but Thanksgiving is also famous for a shopping season which is called Black Friday. It is the biggest shopping day of the year as a day after Thanksgiving. Most major stores open their shop early and offer highly discounted prices during the Thanksgiving season. Because of these distinctive activities, people have a good time
and make good memories with their family.

For these reasons, although both Chuseok and Thanksgiving contain the same meaning as holidays, they have interesting differences between them. In the case of celebration dates, even though they both celebrate their holiday after the harvest, they celebrate on different dates. For the main food, while Koreans usually eat rice cake, American people prepare a roasted turkey. In terms of events, whereas Koreans regard their ancestors with much importance, Americans do not. Even though there are differences caused by their culture, Koreans and Americans still both enjoy their holiday in their own ways.
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EFFECTS OF DIVORCE ON CHILDREN

Not long ago, people used to look forward to getting married or having children; however, throughout the years, people have started to think differently. Now, people think that marriage is only a temporary relationship, and they do not think about the effects that a parental separation could have on the lives of their children. Therefore, when a couple has problems in their relationship, they do not hesitate to disengage their links. This idea has become more popular over time because divorce is more common, and many people believe that divorce is the easiest way to solve families’ problems. Nevertheless, there are families that even if they have problems in their marriage, they work hard to fix those problems and keep their family together. These families understand that the disintegration of a family produces a domino effect in their lives, and even more so in the life of a child. The world should understand that divorce produces a negative impact on children’s lives in different ways: their relationships, in the process to develop a behavior, and in the economic situation. When children experience a parent’s divorce, they are more likely to be involved in crime, vandalism or robberies; struggle developing a definite behavior, or struggle identifying their masculine or feminine role in the society; and focus more on obtaining money to survive, rather than focusing on their academic performance.

Feelings of depression and anger influence children to start to behave differently and to experiment with new things. These feelings are derived from the process of the divorce. Commonly, the process of a divorce may include verbal and physical abuse, and children are exposed to these kinds of cruel scenes. The results of this are that children may absorb all these feelings, and they start to experience depression and anger. Explaining more about this subject, Behrman and Quinn (1994) state that “most children exhibit a variety of signs of disturbance in
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The months after the separation, including . . . sadness, anger, [and] aggression . . .” (p. 6). This statement explains the psychological impact and effects that a divorce causes on children, meaning that children’s emotions are affected. In addition, divorce is an experience that leaves a mark in children’s lives. This is why when children who are victims of a divorce, grow up, they may do so by questioning why their parents’ divorce and oppressing bad feelings they feel.

Expanding more on the effects of a divorce on children, scientists have shown that children that experience a parents’ divorce are more likely to change and have relationships with people that might lead them to delinquency. This is a serious issue and the root of delinquency. Cherlin et al. argue that “adolescents from divorced families are more likely to engage in delinquent behavior and early sex, and to exhibit emotional distress” (as cited in Clarke-Stewart, Vandell, McCartney, Owen, & Booth, 2000, para. 3). These scientists explain that there is a higher probability for children that experience a divorce to have some problems in their behavior. As mentioned in the first part of this argument, feelings of anger and depression make children start to find a way to forget their problems, so they may start to be involved in gangs, drugs, and promiscuity. Most of the time, children that are involved in these kinds of activities do not realize what they are doing: they just do this to feel better and to be outside of the house. The reality is that they become involved in dangerous activities that can bring them bigger consequences.

Additionally, children need the presence of both parents at home in order to be able to receive the influences of both parents. The process of developing a definite behavior in children, the process to identify their masculine and feminine behavior, is strongly related to the presence
of both parents in a house; however, there is more evidence that shows that the absence of a father, a masculine figure, in a house produces a higher influence in the behavioral development of children. Choi and Jackson (2011) argue that “children whose fathers are involved with them have better behavioral outcomes compared with children in single-parent families with absent fathers” (para. 3). This argument shows the importance of a father in the process of developing a behavior in children, and it shows a contrast between the behavior of children with both parents in the house and with children that have only one parent in the house. The absence of a father in a house produces an imbalance in children’s behavior because they miss one parental figure in the house. The lack of one parent in a house can produce difficulties in the process of developing a behavior for children, and it can cause children to behave similar to the parent or guardian that remains with them in the house.

The absence of a parent in the house makes an impact on children’s behavior. Teenagers that do not have a father or mother figure in the house struggle developing a definitive behavior. As mentioned above, there is more evidence that shows that absence of a father in a house produces a bigger impact in children’s lives. Therefore, fathers have a really important role in a family, especially for boys. Fischer (2007) explains that “boys need a male role model in order to develop a healthy masculine self-image and appropriate sex-typed behavior” (p. 7). This explanation shows that a father is extremely important for a boy in the process of developing masculine behavior and behavior that encourages boys to be hard workers. Moreover, boys need their fathers to be guided and corrected by them. Fischer also (2007) says that “boys are more inclined to disobey their mother’s rules than their father’s, leading to problems in
supervision of boys in particular” (p. 7). In this statement, Fischer shows that a family needs both parents in order to have control and discipline over the children. A father supports the mother when she tries to discipline her children and vice versa. The lack of one parent in a house is really bad for the development of a child’s personality. These are some effects that the absence of a father produces on the coexistence of a family.

There is not much evidence of the effects of the absence of a father figure on girls. However, there is evidence that shows that girls are more likely to desire to succeed and become better person in the future. Kalmijn (1994) states the next opinion that in “regard to girls, competing influences may mitigate any negative effects of divorce since divorced mothers are more likely to be in the labour market, and daughters of working mothers have higher career aspirations” (as cited in Fisher, 2007, p. 6). This argument shows that girls are sometimes inspired to work hard to improve their lives, and it also says that divorce sometimes makes girls to desire to obtain high education and be self-sufficient. This is some of the evidence that can be found about the effects of divorce in girls.

Another effect of divorce is that it produces an economic imbalance in a family, and at the same time, this economic imbalance generates a deficit in a child’s academic performance. Families are formed by a father, a mother, and their children. Normally, the head of the family, the father, is the one that sustains the family economically. Therefore, when a father leaves a family, an economic imbalance happens in the family because the source of income in a family is not there anymore. This imbalance affects children as well. A study that was done by Behrman and Quinn (1994) says, “Perhaps the most obvious effects are changes in children living’s
The opinion of these two researchers is that a divorce produces an impact in the life of a child economically and emotionally. At the same time, the lack of money influences the development of a child’s academic performance. Habitually, separated families concentrate their efforts to earn money and find a way to obtain the goods they need in order to survive. Children are needed to go out and work to help sustain the welfare of the family. Therefore, with their minds focused on surviving, children miss other important aspects of their lives such as education. This happens because they are working and studying at the same time. As a result, they get tired, and they cannot perform well in school. In summary, the economic imbalance of a divorced family can affect children in their academic performance because they are forced to work and study at the same time.

The lack of some resources affects children in their education, and welfare. Clarke-Stewart, Vandell, McCartney, Owen, & Booth, (2000) state that “children from divorced families have . . . poorer academic performance” (para. 3). This statement explains that children that experience a divorce struggle with their academic performance. These days, students need money in order to be able to obtain all the knowledge that educational institutions offer. Educational institutions are giving assignments to their students that require Internet connections and even purchasing a computer. Therefore, children that cannot afford these necessities have a disadvantage compared to others. The result of this is poor academic performance. In the same research Clarke-Stewart et al. (2000) state that “children from intact families performed significantly better than children from divorced families on school achievement” (para. 4). This statement shows the contrasts between children from divorced families and non-divorced
families. This information shows an unhappy statistic that should be addressed so every child that has experienced a divorce could be able to perform well in its academic development.

Divorce is no less than a tragedy in a family. Its effects produce a huge impact on the lives of the people that are involved in it, especially children. Children are affected emotionally, physically, psychologically, and academically. A divorce can lead a child to have bad relationships that might cause him or her to be involved in act of delinquency. Divorce also affects children in the development of their behavior. The absence of one of the parents produces an imbalance in a family, and children might not develop the right behavior that corresponds to their gender. Lastly, divorce produces a strong impact in the economic situation of a family. Children are truly affected by this impact because it makes children more focused on earning money and finding a way to obtain what they need in order to survive. The impact that is produced by divorce leaves a mark that last for a long time in a family. Families go years trying to find out the way to solve their critical situation. A couple should try to fight against the different issues that produce a divorce in order to prevent their children from a long time of suffering.
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On June 26, 2013, the Supreme Court of the United States struck down Section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) of 1996, which denied the federal benefits to same-sex marriage (Schwartz, 2013). The Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the House of Representatives (BLAG) appealed the underlying case, Windsor v. United States, to the Supreme Court on December 7, 2012, expecting the Supreme Court to reverse the decision of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, but was frustrated by the final ruling. The ruling of the Supreme Court signified a milestone of same-sex marriage (Schwartz, 2013). Due to the decision, although states still possess their sovereignties over the definition of marriage, they are now prohibited from denying the federal benefits to same-sex marriage that is recognized in other states (Windsor, Kaplan & Robert, 2013). This result has aroused numerous debates over the review process, which was centered on the equal-protection clause within the Fourteenth Amendment. After analyzing the ramifications of provisions implicated by Windsor, Strasser (2013) concludes, “[B]ecause such bans [in DOMA] undermine rather than promote societal and individual interests, they should be struck down on rational-basis grounds and certainly cannot withstand more demanding scrutiny” (p. 320). Though the legal considerations involved are complicated, the critical examinations of those issues converge to the same conclusion—Section 3 of DOMA is unconstitutional, and the ruling is thus legally tenable.

After the 40-year engagement between Edith Windsor and Thea Spyer, in order to realize their dream before their deteriorating health conditions became fatal, they finally wed in Ontario, Canada in 2007 (Applebome, 2012). At that time, New York had not yet legalized same-sex marriage but recognized foreign same-sex marriage that was granted in foreign countries, in this
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Canada. Thea Spyer died in 2009 and bequeathed her entire estate to her spouse, Windsor. Since DOMA denied the benefits of same-sex marriage, including the exemption from estates taxes for properties left by one’s spouse, the Federal Government levied a $363,053 estate tax against Windsor on her inheritance. Windsor thus filed a lawsuit against the United States, contending that Section 3 of DOMA violated the principle of equal protection incorporated in the Fifth Amendment (United Stated v. Windsor). The District Court ruled against the United States, and the Second Circuit Court affirmed the decision. Unsatisfied with the decision, BLAG then appealed to the Supreme Court, which subsequently upheld the Second Circuit Court’s decision and reaffirmed the unconstitutionality of Section 3 of DOMA.

In reaching the conclusion, the Supreme Court reviewed Windsor v. United States through equal-protection jurisprudence. Though the U.S constitution has commanded that States are prohibited from “[denying] to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws” since 1868 (U.S. Const. amend. XIV), the interpretation of equal protection has been changing until present time. One of its ramifications, the equal-protection jurisprudence on issues concerning sex-orientation was established by the landmark Supreme Court case, Romer v. Evans (1996). In Romer, the Justice concluded that the equal protection required that “a law must bear a rational relationship to a legitimate governmental purpose,” and applied this principle to statutory classifications (Windsor, Kaplan, & Robert, 2013). This principle, Section 3 of DOMA, which excluded gay couples from legal marriage, was doubtful and thus should undergo critical examinations.

Along with the principle of equal protection, courts have to decide the tier of review
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when dealing with related issues. From low intensity to high intensity, the tiers of review include rational basis scrutiny, intermediate scrutiny to heightened scrutiny, and in Windsor, the Supreme Court applied heightened scrutiny to inspect Section 3 of DOMA under the requirement of the Equal Protection Clause (The Editorial Board, 2013). As Professor John Hart Ely (1980) observed, heightened scrutiny requires the ends and the means of a law to exclusively and tightly relate to each other, which means “there is only one goal the classification is likely to fit that closely . . . and that is the goal the legislators actually had in mind. If that goal cannot be invoked because it is unconstitutional, the classification will fall” (p. 146). As a result, DOMA cannot satisfy the assembly unless it has accomplished important and constitutional interests.

Defending DOMA, BLAG identified several interests that were articulated by congress in 1996. First, BLAG argued that DOMA could relieve the financial burden of the Federal Government by “avoiding the fiscal impact of expanding the class of Federal beneficiaries” (Windsor, Kaplan, & Robert, 2013). Section 3 of DOMA exclusively limited the federal benefits for marriage to married straight couples, and by this term relieved the Federal Government from the potential financial burdens resulting from the benefits granted to married gay couples. BLAG attempted to utilize this “governmental, important interest” to justify the congressional desire of DOMA (Windsor, Kaplan, & Robert, 2013).

Yet, BLAG’s argument about the financial interest of the Federal Government was unfounded. In order to justify DOMA, the classification that excluded a certain group had to be substantially relevant to the purported interest. As the principle of equal protection advanced in
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*Romer*, a statutory classification failed when it “targets a narrowly defined group and then imposes upon it disabilities that are so broad and undifferentiated as to bear no discernible relationship to any legitimate governmental interest” (*Romer v. Evans*, 1996). The discernible, substantial relationship indicates that the classification should be the only means or the most efficient mean to accomplish the interest. In respect to DOMA, if the purpose of the exclusion was to decrease the financial expenditure of the Federal Government, limiting the benefit to same-sex marriage could advance the interest to a higher extent than the current one. In addition, in 1996 the legislators did not acquire sufficient information about the fiscal consequences of DOMA (*Windsor, Kaplan, & Robert*, 2013). It thus could not be “the goal the legislators actually had in mind” (Ely, 1980, p. 146). Hence, the Supreme Court, as well as the Second Circuit Court and the district court, correctly rejected BLAG’s financial arguments defending DOMA.

Another federal interest BLAG put forth to justify DOMA is that DOMA maintained the national uniformity among state law and federal law (*Clement*, 2013). According to Clement (2013), “If [Windsor’s] claim is successful, the Federal Government would have to confront similar choice-of-law questions in all the jurisdictions that retain the traditional definition” (p. 34). The disparate laws could increase the burden of State and Federal Government by an excessive amount of litigations requiring courts to fill the gap between laws. To attain uniform rules, the court had to decide between the universal denial and granting of the benefits to same-sex marriage. Considering the cost of implementing the law, the one conforming to the majority is the desirable one. Since the majority of states currently did not recognize same-sex marriage, denying the benefits of marriage to married gay couples was the permissible choice.
Contrary to what BLAG asserted, DOMA was actually detrimental to the uniformity of law. DOMA distinguished married straight couples from married gay couples “while imposing uniformity between married and unmarried gay couples” (Windsor, Kaplan, & Robert, 2013, p. 26). Also, Section 3 of DOMA contradicted other Federal law such as the one stipulating the health plan. In states recognizing gay marriages, employers were required to adopt the same policy on all legally recognized spouses, including both same-sex and straight couples. However, in respect to healthcare plans and other benefits, the federal law demanded employers to discriminate against same-sex couples. This unquestionably burdened employers by enforcing discrepant laws on them. Accordingly, DOMA was not only irrelevant to the purported purpose but also adverse to the interests that BLAG alleged DOMA could advance.

Sacrosanct federalism, one of the fundamental tenets within the U.S. Constitution, was another interest that proponents of DOMA stated to refute the Supreme Court’s ruling. Federalism prevented states’ sovereignties from being intruded by other states and the federal sovereign. Under federalism, the definition of marriage was a part of state’s autonomy as well. The Supreme Court held in *New State Ice Co. v. Lievmann (1932)* that “it is one of the happy incidents of the federal system that a single courageous [s]tate may, if its citizens choose, serve as a laboratory; and try novel social and economic experiments without risk to the rest of the country” (p. 311). This is also one of the purposes the Congress identified in 1996 to justify DOMA— “protecting democratic self-governance” (H.R. Rep. No. 664. 1996). Therefore, the Supreme Court’s ruling against DOMA confronted federalism and violated states’ right by imposing a uniform definition of marriage upon all states (Clement, 2013).
Similar to other alleged aims and purposes upholding DOMA, Section 3 of DOMA advanced nothing relevant to the integrity of federalism. Furthermore, it is actually inconsistent with the guaranteed right of states to exercise democratic self-governance. Since the benefits such as the exemption from the inheritance tax were an essential part of marriage, by denying these benefits to married gay couples, Section 3 indeed undermined state’s sovereignty.

According to Windsor, Kaplan, and Robert (2013),

As for the alleged interest in “preserving each sovereign’s ability to define marriage for itself,” DOMA is a statute through which the Federal Government adopted a particular definition of marriage that nullifies the marriages of gay couples for all purposes under Federal law. (p. 27)

Resorting to federalism to vindicate the classification implemented in DOMA had proven futile.

Pursuant to equal protection, Section 3 of DOMA failed the heightened scrutiny for the lack of substantial relevance to all asserted purposes and goals. Though the debates about the ruling continued, it had highlighted two important developments in same-sex marriage and the future jurisprudence on concerning issues. First, receiving the benefits originally granted to opposite-sex marriages, gay couples now enjoy rights that were inconceivable in the era where people deemed gay people criminals. Second, Windsor established a precedence that bound the future cases regarding the classification distinguishing people by sexual orientation. In the past, the Supreme rarely accepted the certiorari that centered on sexual orientation issues, yet Windsor has signified a persuasive holding that demands the courts should at least grant a hearing to those
cases. Both of these noticeable developments were based on two factors: the ruling of the
Supreme Court against the Section of DOMA and, more importantly, the legal grounds
supporting it.
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APPENDIX E: Helpful Links and Resources

Tutors do not need to know everything about writing. However, knowing helpful resources can provide two benefits. First, tutors can help find answers to student questions, and second, tutors can introduce students to resources while demonstrating how to use them. The following resources are particularly helpful when tutoring academic writing. The online resources include links to popular ESL tutorial topics regarding APA, grammar, linguistic accuracy, and the TOEFL as well as general tutoring resources. These topics are listed in alphabetical order for convenience. Essential tutor training books have also been included.

Online Resources

APA
The OWL / Purdue Website provides a very comprehensive overview of APA with specific examples of in-text citations and references as well as sample essays.

- OWL / Purdue Website (https://goo.gl/ZxueXg)

General Tutoring Resources
The BYU Writing Center website offers handouts in a variety of subjects that are helpful for tutors as well as links to videos, resources, blogs, and writing center journals.

- BYU Writing Center Handouts (https://goo.gl/kvJu3B)
- BYU Writing Center Tutoring Resources (https://goo.gl/DjMYs8)

Shawna Shapiro’s ESL Tutor Training Workshop provides tutors with information on strategies for working with ESL students; the most common errors made by ESL students; ESL backgrounds, strengths, and challenges, etc.

- Working with Multilingual (ESL) Students (https://goo.gl/bT5jeH)

Grammar
The Online English Grammar website provides answers to questions about nouns, adjectives, adverbs, determiners, verbs, speech, punctuation, and relative clauses.

- Online English Grammar (https://goo.gl/WvnddC)

The Azar grammar website provides helpful PowerPoints for grammatical concepts at a beginning, intermediate, and advanced level.

- Azar Grammar (https://goo.gl/353lXu)

Linguistic Accuracy
The ESL tutor website provides an overview of Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback (DWCF) with an overview of error correction symbols and example paragraphs.

- ESL Tutor Information (https://goo.gl/2OifE1a)

TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language)
The ETS website provides free resources for the writing portion of the TOEFL test.

- Sample Writing Responses (https://goo.gl/faEl0d)
- Sample Writing Rubrics (https://goo.gl/91VYbT)
Books


References


