NCPTW and IWCA to Hold Joint Conference in 2003

By Ben Rafoth, Director of the Writing Center at Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Two national organizations for tutors and writing center directors will come together for the first time for a conference to be held October 23-25, 2003, in Hershey, Pennsylvania. Approximately 700 people are expected to attend. The International Writing Centers Association (IWCA) and the National Conference on Peer Tutoring in Writing (NCPTW) will meet at the Hershey Lodge and Convention Center, located in Hershey (near Harrisburg). The conference will feature presentations by undergraduate and graduate student tutors as well as writing center directors from around the country and the world. Anyone interested in tutoring, participating in writing centers, and the teaching of writing is invited to submit a proposal and to attend the conference. Undergraduate and graduate students who work as tutors in their college or university writing centers are especially encouraged to participate. Information about submitting a proposal, registering for the conference, and accommodations will be posted on the website as it becomes available.

The Hershey Lodge features a grand fireplace and college-like atmosphere, with all guest and meeting rooms in close proximity. There is a large indoor pool along with a whirlpool, sauna, fitness room, a game room. There are numerous dining and eating facilities in the Convention Center, which adjoins the Lodge. Walking and fitness trails are available too. Nearby fun includes Hershey Theme Park and Chocolate World. They will be open for the dates of our conference, and a get-together for conference attendees there is being planned. The conference planning committee includes Jon Olson, Michele Eodice, Harvey Kail, Paula Gillespie, Al DeCiccio, Marcy Trianosky, and Ben Rafoth (chair). For more information, visit: www.wc.iup.edu/2003conference or contact Ben Rafoth at: brafoth@iup.edu.
Staff Editorial

We are pleased to bring you our latest issue, which has a fun theme. In the spirit of collaboration with the NCPTW and the MWCA (and next year with the IWCA), we’ve included articles from writing center directors and tutors from across the world. On page five, there is an article about a writing centre in Hungary. Although they don’t use peer tutors, what they do is similar, and we thought it interesting to show you what they do in other countries. We’ve also included some fun and informative articles as well as new Tutor Guru and Dangling Doodlers’ pages.

You also might notice a few articles by our own staff. Since this newsletter strives to be at the forefront of writing center dialogue, let us be the next to say: KEEP TALKING! We solicited several times for manuscripts, both via email and at tutoring conferences, only to receive either few responses or silence. This is also the case with the National Peer Tutor Listserv which has been silent for months.

In the fall, a new staff will take our place to keep this newsletter going, so these are our last words as interns for The Dangling Modifier. Our editor Traci is graduating with a B.S. in Psychology and a minor in French. She plans to work for a year then go to graduate school for Health Psychology. Sara is graduating with a B.A. in English and is going to graduate school to attain a Master of Education in Curriculum and Teaching Instruction with Certification in English. Becky is graduating with a B.A. in English. Alex still has a year left before graduation (with dual majors in English and Philosophy). He is stepping down as managing editor so he can focus on classes, but he will contribute an article this fall about his experience at the NCPTW in Kansas and hopefully next year’s Hershey conference. In the fall of 2003, he hopes to be in a MFA program for creative writing.

We’re revealing ourselves to you in hope that you will share your writing selves to our audience. “Tutors finding creative ways to share who they are with other people—through poetry, through art, through music, through conversation, through writing—and by example encouraging other people—tutors, students, teachers—to share who they are as well,” says Elizabeth Boquet. The point is to heat up the dialogue and turn the noise into a harmonious groove. We encourage you to submit articles about aspects of tutoring you find interesting. Thank you to everyone who contributed to this issue. As always, we would like to thank Penn State and the University Learning Centers for their support. Peace! ☼
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as they explore the fair. The intent is to affirm both undergraduate and graduate research in a new and intriguing environment. We hope to include over 50 presenters during this special session. The conference will be very focused on peer tutors, as it has been in the past, and we look forward to seeing what everyone has to offer.

This year’s keynote speaker will be Elizabeth Boquet, Writing Center Director and associate professor of English at Fairfield University in Fairfield, Connecticut and author of the recently released book, Noise From the Writing Center. (For more on Boquet see page 3.) For entertainment, a local jazz combo will play at a Friday evening reception from 5-7 pm. Following the reception, we encourage our guests to discover historic downtown Lawrence. Visitors will have a number of restaurants and bars to choose from as well as movie theatres and live music. For a glimpse of Lawrence culture, check out www.Lawrence.com. Kansas City is only about 35 miles from Lawrence. For further information about lodging, transportation, local area information, and registration go to: www.writing.ku.edu/neptw-mwca/ ☼
Making Noise with Elizabeth Boquet

By Alex Doehrer

This year’s Keynote Speaker at the 19th annual NCPTW will be Elizabeth Boquet, Writing Center Director and associate professor of English at Fairfield University in Fairfield, Connecticut for the past eight years and author of a new book, Noise from the Writing Center.

Michelle Eodice, the Writing Center Director at the University of Kansas and this year’s conference chair, first saw Boquet give a speech at NEWCA (Northeast Writing Center Association). “She introduced the idea of noise in her talk, using Jimi Hendrix as the example of how we can ‘re-tune’ our guitars and amps to make new noises,” said Eodice. “In the writing center, that noise might not be familiar or pleasant to our ears (at first), but it would certainly get our attention. I appreciated the creative way she led us to ask new questions about our practices.”

Eodice chose Boquet as a keynote speaker for a few reasons. “I was predicting some real interest in her book. It will be a welcome conversation starter. A book that gets all the people in writing centers thinking and talking to each other,” said Eodice. “Beth is dynamic as a person—a good thinker, a good listener and she is quite a good singer too. She values the stories of our daily practices and looks to illuminate the ideas we all bring to writing center work—making both theories and practices visible, lively and useful.”

As a grad student at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Boquet helped to organize the NCPTW. “In a sense, NCPTW was the first professional conference I ever attended,” said Boquet. The topic for her keynote address will follow the conference theme of ‘Learning with Tutors.’ “Over the past two years, I have been revising our writing center staff education course,” said Boquet. “In the process, I have relied on tutors to help me retool the course. This year, two current tutors are team-teaching the course with me. So, for my talk, I will be focusing on some of what I have learned from teaching with them.” Boquet received her B.A. in English at Nicholls State University, in Thibodaux, Louisiana, where she worked as an undergraduate tutor. She then went on to receive an M.A. in English (with an emphasis in linguistics) from the University of Southern Mississippi. And finally, she earned a Ph.D. in English (with an emphasis in rhetoric and linguistics) from Indiana University of Pennsylvania. “Writing centers were really the first place where I experienced what I consider to be critical unease in teaching and learning,” said Boquet. “I never liked classrooms very much, even as a student, and I still don’t. I had always been a solid, if relatively unengaged, student in the classroom; and it wasn’t until I worked in a writing center that I really came to see how people learn and how they get taught and what the relationships between those two things might be…I liked working with students outside the boundaries of the traditional classroom.”

Boquet is active in IWCA (International Writing Center Association) and will be the next co-editor (with Neal Lerner) of Writing Center Journal. “I am very excited about having the opportunity to serve as one of the editors, particularly because I wanted to find a way to give back some meaningful service to the writing center community,” said Boquet.

Comments about Boquet’s book include: “Her book offers a distinct perspective on writing center pedagogy by developing a theory of ‘noise’ and excess unique to the education of writers and tutors in the writing center. The work draws upon both academic and popular culture (including a chapter entitled ‘Channeling Jimi Hendrix’) and offers a sophisticated and provocative theoretical view that can benefit all writing center directors and tutors.”

Boquet has lots of little goals for herself, including learning to play the guitar well enough to accompany herself and retiring someplace where it doesn’t snow every year. “An overarching goal is to keep learning,” said Boquet. “I think it’s very important for teachers to challenge themselves as learners all the time. I think it’s important for tutors to find fresh challenges in their work, and that’s part of how I see my job as a writing center director—as assessing strengths and weaknesses of individual tutors and finding challenges that allow them to work on their weaknesses and play to their strengths.” ☼
The professor passes a pile of papers to the first student in each row. As the papers make their way to the back of the room, faces drop and eyes roll. It’s amazing how the fear and frustration of a minor writing assignment causes students to develop a fear of the written word. As tutors, our job is to alleviate that fear.

Unfortunately, the fear and discomfort with writing may begin at a young age. Take the movie *A Christmas Story*, for example—you know, the one where Ralphie wants the Red Ryder gun for Christmas. The teacher of Ralphie’s English class announces a writing assignment, and all the students moan and whine. The night before the due day, they sit in their bedrooms, head in hands, and brainstorm ideas for their “themes.” With good ideas, students (both in the movie and in real life) will become excited, and diligently write with amazing diction, great sentences, and fabulous content—or so they think. Their papers will return with crimson markings from front to back and an unpleasing grade written in forbidden red ink, surrounded with comments trashing the writer’s masterpiece.

Students survive the difficult writing assignments and the forced plummet of their confidence through secondary school. Years later, they go to college; they come to us. Suddenly, papers are demanded in every class—essays, journals, reports. This anxiety of writing – this fear – cannot be escaped. Their faces drop, and their eyes roll. Sunken souls find themselves entering the infamous “Writing Center” and wondering what happens behind those doors. We hope that they leave with a diminished fear of writing.

Students sign in, grudgingly pass their papers across the table, and say, “Can you edit these changes for me?” My reply is a friendly one: “No. But you can read the paper to me and we can work on revision and editing techniques together.” Their faces show utter confusion as if they had never heard the word “revision” before.

Reading their own papers aloud always awakens their fears, but with pen in hand, they begin to read and find mistakes on their own—not all of them of course, but some. As they read, I write comments on my blank sheet of paper. (I never write on their paper as that rekindles the fear of the bright red pen; in fact, I am always sure to not use red ink.) After they have finished reading, the ice is broken, and discussion commences. I offer suggestions like: “Your introduction should be captivating.” “Tell a story; set a scene.” “Grab your reader.”

Slowly the students begin to nod as if understanding this foreign lingo of writing. They smile and seem pleased with themselves, and little by little, the image of red ink may be erased with our help. If we can achieve that goal, maybe, just maybe, writing becomes fun again.

---

Want to See your Name in Lights?

Okay, how about in print?

If you have an article on writing or tutoring and you would like the opportunity to see it published, send it to us!

Send submissions to: danglingmodifier@psu.edu

The Dangling Modifier
The Center for Excellence in Writing
Penn State University
206 Boucke Building
University Park, PA 16802
Writing Consultations at Central European University: One Teacher’s Approach

By John Harbord, Director of the Language Teaching Center of the Central European University, Budapest, Hungary

The Language Teaching Centre (writing centre) at Central European University (CEU) offers writing support in the form of tutorials (known as consultations) within the context of the university’s academic English support programme. CEU is a graduate English language university of social sciences and humanities, most of whose students’ first language is not English. These students have a high level of spoken language with TOEFL ranging from 550 to 670, but often have limited experience in formal writing and are working in an academic environment where they need to write academic papers and a master’s thesis effectively in English at near-native speaker level. Consultations are combined with and follow from a more conventional course in graduate level academic writing. The Centre also has an extensive self-access website, (www.ceu.hu/ltc/sfaccess.html) which students are taught to use and encouraged to refer to in order to solve their writing problems.

Teacher-Student Approach

Our teacher-student approach differs significantly from the peer tutoring approach used in many universities in the United States. We do encourage students to work in consultation with a peer whenever possible and train them in techniques for peer evaluation and feedback, but the situation of our university does not allow students who receive even a partial stipend to be employed or paid for any work they do. Therefore, we cannot staff our centre with peer tutors. Instead, we are forced to opt for a professional, “expert” approach. While we are aware that we do not know the students’ field as well as they do, we try to provide a high level of expertise in all aspects of writing and to apply techniques that will guide students to make their own improvements and changes in line with what they are trying to say. Our extensive experience (up to 35 half-hour consultations a week each at peak times over several years) provides us with an overview that makes our insights valid. The fact that we teach classes and give tutorials is also an advantage, as one and the same person sees the student’s problems in class and deals with those in consultation. Similarly, seeing the students’ problems in consultation allows us to adapt the content or pace of the class to suit the needs of the group.

In almost all cases, a student brings a draft of some pages of her own written work to a 30 minute meeting with a writing instructor with whom she has agreed to meet in advance. This draft is usually e-mailed to the instructor by attachment the day before the consultation. At the beginning of the year, when the students are new to the university, these texts will have been set as written tasks by the same instructor during the introductory writing course, but later they will be authentic pieces of academic writing such as research papers, critiques, statements of purpose or parts of a thesis. We accept both texts that are aimed at fulfilling the requirements of a student’s degree (course assignments) and texts that are relevant to a student’s future career or study (resumes, cover letters, statements of purpose). We are also willing to accept articles that students wish to publish.

It is very difficult beyond these basics to identify common approaches that all instructors use. In observing each other, we find that each of us uses a somewhat different range of techniques. I will describe how I work; it can be assumed that some of the things I do apply to my colleagues but that we do not all work in the same way.

As my approach is more informed by experimentation and reflection than by reading books, I will also not offer any sources and theoretical bases for my way of working.

Consultation Format

I ask the student to begin the consultation by explaining the nature of the text, her purpose in writing, who she is writing for and her position on the subject. At this stage, I ask the student not to refer to or read from the text. In this way, I hope to get a global view of what the student thinks she is doing and to put her in the active role. Having seen the paper in advance, I can compare what I am told and what I see to what extent the oral explanation and the text are compatible. Based on this, I can suggest or agree with the student on an area or areas of focus. If this is a first consultation, the focus is likely to be very broad (structural examination); if it is a second consultation on (see Tutoring in Europe on page 6)
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the same paper, it will probably be more narrow (paragraph and sentence level examination). The student then reads aloud from her text the part or parts that have been agreed upon for discussion, some of which I may have highlighted during my reading for rapid reference during the consultation. I may interrupt during reading or wait till the end of a sentence or paragraph before intervening. I try to give feedback on the comprehensibility of the text and the student’s success in achieving her desired aims, normally focusing on the area agreed with the student. However, I use my sensitivity if it becomes clear that the main problem lies elsewhere. I identify problems and elicit student self-correction or offer alternatives where the student is unable to self-correct. Finally, as a result of the interaction, the student goes away with a development focus to work on for the next consultation with the same or a different text.

Below, I have tried to identify some of the principal ways in which I, as a teacher, may intervene. In brackets I provide some examples of what I might say to the student in each case.

**Eliciting**

I ask the student to talk at length about the purpose, genre and audience of the text or a part of it. (So, tell me, what’s this paper all about? Who’s it for?)

**Global meaning**

I ask for the summary of a paragraph, usually to focus on a topic sentence or section. (So what is this paragraph about? What’s the main idea?)

**Use of sources**

I ask the student to distinguish which ideas in the text are drawn from her research reading and which are drawn from her own analysis. (Whose idea is this? or Do we need a name in the text here?)

**Linkage**

I ask for clarification of how sentences, paragraphs, sections or ideas relate to each other. (What’s the connection between this sentence and the next one?)

**Audience/Info**

I question the student’s expectation of the reader’s knowledge. (Do you think your reader knows this? Do you need to give a bit of background here?)

**Incomprehension**

I express incomprehension and ask the student to clarify. (I can’t see what you’re trying to say here. Can you explain?)

**Rephrasing**

I ask the students to rephrase an idea in simpler or more formal language. (This sentence is quite long and complex. Could you explain it to me simply? or Ok, how could you say that in a slightly more formal way?)

**Questioning**

I question the precise relationship between a word or a phrase and its intended meaning. (You used the word ‘exacerbated’ here. What exactly do you mean by that? or Can you give me a synonym for ‘exacerbated’?)

**Setting priorities**

The student and I agree on goals for the next consultation. (Ok, so what do you want to work on between now and the next time I see you?)

All in all, given the limitations and possibilities of our special situation—professional writing consultations—we have developed a system that best meets our students’ needs. I believe this writing support to be effective, and student feedback, both informal and formal, seems to suggest that it is. ☼
Learning To Help Students
By Lincoln Mitchell, Writing Consultant at Brigham Young University,
Salt Lake City, Utah

I was very worried when I began my writing fellow career this semester because I didn't feel qualified. The writing fellow title carried a mystical quality, and I wasn't sure I belonged in that world. However, as time went by, I became more and more confident in my abilities. As a result, I started to get more and more out of being a peer tutor. In particular, I started to develop my own philosophy or system for peer tutoring. This philosophy is designed to help the students get the most out of the experience and hopefully get a good grade. As I worked with the students, I began to feel that there are several critical characteristics of a good tutoring experience, such as having a friendly relationship, having an individual approach, and setting clear expectations.

A friendly relationship with students is so important because they will not express their true concerns and feelings unless they feel comfortable. They are very worried I will think less of them after reading their papers. Therefore, students should know you are just like them, and that you are not there to judge them. After this type of relationship is established, the rest of the process becomes much easier.

Furthermore, each student needs to be treated individually. When I focus on tailoring my conference specifically for the individual, I find that both the student and I enjoy the conference and get more out of it. During my first few tutorials, I focused on outlining each paper's strengths and weaknesses, and this method resulted in different responses to each paper. However, as I gained more experience, I tried to focus on helping the students create unique and powerful arguments (which was what the professor wanted), but somewhere in this second process, I lost the individual focus. Perhaps I lost the individual focus because I was trying to improve the arguments by forcing my opinions on other people's papers. It seems like a simple thing to say -- that papers need to be considered individually -- but, in reality, falling into a pattern when responding to papers is easy. That’s why we must remember our individual approach.

Finally, I think it is very important for students to have a clear understanding of what is expected of them. This is particularly important the second or third time students have their papers reviewed because students sometimes try to get away without putting their full effort into the rough drafts. In cases where the students visit multiple times, the shock of having someone else read their paper has worn off, and they are not so ashamed of the quality of their work anymore. They just come in with a very poor draft and expect the tutor to magically turn it into an "A" paper.

In order for the tutoring process to be more effective, students should feel comfortable, must receive individually tailored responses, and have and follow clear guidelines. If these criteria are met, I can magically help them turn their papers into ones that might get the grade they want.

“Students usually try to apologize for the quality of the papers before I have even read them.”

The Dangling Modifier Mission Statement

The mission of the Dangling Modifier is to provide a national forum for ongoing conversation among peer tutors in writing. The Dangling Modifier is designed to stimulate discussion, to promote national peer tutor activities, and to share helpful information among writing centers across the nation. The editorial staff strives to select pieces that are interesting, controversial, unique, and well-written.
At Penn State’s Writing Center, Soma Kedia shines as both a peer tutor and an enthusiastic leader. This ambitious English and psychology dual major and neuroscience minor has served as a dedicated tutor for nearly three years and as an innovative peer tutor co-coordinator during the past year. She specializes in tutoring personal statements and especially enjoys creative writing.

When asked how she has managed to stay motivated as a writing tutor, Soma replied, “It’s the one student who actually wants to learn” that keeps her going. Seeing the lightbulb spark in a student’s mind enables Soma to reconnect with her own enthusiasm for writing, which she has maintained since she was a young child. Even her email address, which contains her short story character mrs picKle, further demonstrates that Soma and her writing are inseparable. According to Soma, “Mrs. Pickle was the title of the very first short story I ever wrote when I was five years old, and I spelled it mrs picKle. The story was about how mrs picKle and her family ‘exaspered’ from the grocery store and got eaten . . . I think I was a very disturbed child.”

In addition to her vivid imagination, her position as peer tutor co-coordinator has allowed her to not only use her leadership skills, but also to apply her creativity in The Writing Center and beyond. Some English faculty members at Penn State expressed a need for a workshop series in which tutors collaborate to develop and present workshops they think other students will find both interesting and beneficial. Soma quickly became involved with this project and then expanded it to include more participation and topic ideas from other tutors at The Writing Center.

These interactive workshops usually last about an hour and focus on various aspects of writing ranging from resumes and cover letters to grammar and citations. Workshops act as an intermediary between tutoring and classroom learning by granting students the tools they need to become more effective writers. According to Soma, “the [workshop] series is a concept to provide useful writing skills to the general PSU population.” Most of the workshops are geared toward first-year students, and they often take place in a satellite location near the freshman residence area.

As for Soma’s goals for the series, she hopes to provide a service for students to obtain help in areas where they most need it and have difficulty finding assistance elsewhere. Also, she wants to “help the general PSU public to be as excited about writing as we [tutors] are.” The series provides increased publicity for the Writing Center as well.

Complementing her objectives for the workshop series, Soma also has set goals for other tutors and for herself. She would like to develop tutoring specialties among the staff in areas such as grammar, ESL, and learning disabilities. By tutoring a specific writing concern, tutors will be able to better help writers, and the writers will most likely demonstrate greater responsiveness to tutors. Like many tutors, Soma aspires to become more proficient in various phases of tutoring.

With her zealous determination for writing, Soma is able to spend many sleepless nights working on her ideas for the workshop series and The Writing Center. Soma’s philosophy on tutoring and writing strongly parallels the viewpoint of Anne Lamott, who is recognized mostly for her book *Bird by Bird: Instructions on Writing and Life*, in which she asserts, “people tell me you can’t teach writing. And I think, who are you, God’s dean of admissions?” ☪
Perpetual Disruptions: The Art of Pet Words

By Sara Kasper & Becky Zell

Have you met people who use the same word or phrase so often that their language becomes distracting? Did you ever wonder if that word reflects some aspect of their personality? We refer to these reoccurring words as pet words. As writing tutors, we see hundreds of written words in every session. Because the beginning of a session may be nerve-wracking and hurried, tutors can often feel more alienated from the tutee than a fellow peer should. Looking at word usage and patterns can provide significant insight into the personalities of those we tutor and will allow us to then form some type of bond with our tutee. To demonstrate this idea, two staff members from The Dangling Modifier have analyzed each other’s words in relation to the other’s personality.

Becky says…
Sara and I met in English 250, a training class for prospective writing tutors at Penn State. We are also staff members of The Dangling Modifier. Through these activities, I got to know Sara—and her writing—really well. I have noticed that her written and spoken language comments on her personality.

Sara often uses words such as “perhaps” and “though.” These words of ambiguity reflect Sara’s indecisiveness when making decisions. At times of uncertainty, she relies upon language; however, the language tends to represent her irresolute manner.

When asked about some of her favorite words, Sara lists “unadulterated” and “cosmopolitan.” To the average listener, “unadulterated” sounds like a cousin of the word “adultery,” an obvious evil. However, “unadulterated” really means pure. This incongruence suggests that Sara lives vicariously through the word, even though it has a distinctly different meaning than one would expect. Although Sara has lived in Pennsylvania her entire life, she manages to escape the mundane through “cosmopolitan.” This word reflects a worldly, sophisticated lifestyle.

Sara says…
My fellow peer tutor in writing, Becky Zell, is a perfect subject for a pet word examination, for she is a fan of such transitional words as “however,” “therefore,” and “although.” Could this imply that she likes change since she uses these transitional words quite frequently? Or could this imply that she despises change? Interestingly, her use of these transitions in writing defies her fear of transformation in reality.

They allow her to experience change without experiencing the real-life emotions associated with change. In essence, these words serve as exploratory tools: Becky may never fully embrace life alterations, but she may begin to appreciate them through her exploration of literary transitions. Furthermore, Becky enjoys the words “superfluous” and “perpetual.” She thinks they are pretty sounding, which may mean she has a playful nature and thus enjoys experimenting with various words. And in fact, Becky, the same little girl who once loved to dress Barbie in her pretty pink outfits, is the same girl that loves to dress her papers with pretty, delicate words. Becky’s preference for these graceful words indicates her composed and consistent personality.

In contrast, Becky—an athletic and adventurous girl—also prefers somewhat coarse and unsophisticated words such as “rampant” and “razzmatazz.” Her inclination for these particular words suggests she is an energetic, audacious, and sassy individual who loves to challenge her limits. Indeed, Becky’s partiality for such words mirrors her passion for life.

We say…
As we have displayed, it is very possible for a tutor to understand a tutee on a more personal level by simply examining a tutee’s habitual word usages. After all, a tutee’s pet words are probably being used for some reason, whether it is a subconscious attraction or a strong inclination for particular words. Either way, a tutor can possibly form valuable perceptions about a tutee’s personality and thus better prepare him/herself for how to best interact with the tutee; this can only result in potentially powerful peer rapport. So be aware of your tutee’s pet words so as to not only help yourself, but to remind your tutee that they—perpetual disruptions—can often generate rather distracting prose. All in all, the use of pet words is an art. And this art should be appreciated and applied to peer tutoring.
Dear Tutor Guru:

I recently tutored a student who was working on a living will. A living will! I thought it was a big joke at first. I mean, what college student is concerned with a living will when he/she probably has an English paper due by the end of the week? So there I was, a 22-year-old tutor with little life experience and legal knowledge, attempting to analyze a will. In essence, I felt like an inflated ignoramus. I felt completely incapable of providing useful suggestions and credible opinions. Consequently, the tutee sensed my discomfort with the topic and thus responded to me in a condescending manner. I was humiliated, especially after asking most of the questions during the session rather than answering any of my tutee’s questions. How can I prevent this catastrophe from happening again? Please help!

Sincerely,

Igno Ramus

---

Dear Exxxtra,

Fortunately, the Guru has several alternatives for you to thoughtfully consider. If your aura has been damaged, the Guru advises you to kindly ask another tutor to take over your session and engage in a critical dialogue on the intricacies of the written English language with the curious student. Depending on how comfortable you feel, you could simply pretend that your eyes had been blind to the naked figure on the screen and freely offer insightful direction to the student. As another possibility, the Guru proposes you could openly communicate to the student what you observed and effectively move on with the session. These are only guides provided by the Guru, and they serve to grant you only a sample of the limitless answers in our vast universe of ideas. Rely on your heart to discover the solution that will peacefully comfort your soul, and you will attain the karma you desire. 😊

Yours,

Exxxtra Embarrassed
The Dangling Doodlers’ Page

Match the word with its meaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anastrophe</th>
<th>a. use of words alike in sound but different in meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anaphora</td>
<td>b. repetition of words derived from the same root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Anadiplosis</td>
<td>c. repetition of the same word or group of words at the beginnings of successive clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chiasmus</td>
<td>d. figure of speech in which a part stands for the whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Polyptoton</td>
<td>e. deliberate use of understatement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Synecdote</td>
<td>f. substitution of one part of a speech for another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Paronomasia</td>
<td>g. inversion of the natural or usual word order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Anthimeria</td>
<td>h. reversal of grammatical structures in successive clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Periphrasis</td>
<td>i. substitution of a descriptive word or phrase for the proper name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Litotes</td>
<td>j. repetition of the last word of a clause at the beginning of the next clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now see if you can find the above words hidden below!
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CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

The 2002 NCPTW Ron Maxwell Award for Distinguished Leadership in Promoting the Collaborative Learning Practices of Peer Tutors in Writing

Deadline for Nominations: August 31, 2002

The NCPTW Ron Maxwell Leadership Award is given annually to a professional in the National Conference on Peer Tutoring in Writing organization who has contributed with distinction to undergraduate student development through promoting collaborative learning among peer tutors in writing. The award recognizes an individual for dedication to and leadership in collaborative learning within writing centers, for aiding students in taking on more responsibility together for their learning; thus, for promoting the work of peer tutors. Its presentation also denotes extraordinary service to the evolution of this conference organization.

Such leadership may be demonstrated in a variety of ways, including but not limited to:

- Building a record of bringing peer tutors to present at the Conference
- Giving service to the NCPTW through hosting the Conference, serving as program chair, leading in the search for future sites, etc.
- Fostering leadership skills among peer tutors
- Showing evidence of leadership in collaborative learning on the home campus
- Developing innovative peer tutoring programs in the home community
- In general, welcoming and meeting new challenges in leading a center guided by a collaborative learning philosophy

While other aspects of a candidate’s professional performance—e.g., work with professional tutors, writing center research and publication—are respected by the NCPTW and are surely interrelated, this award is intended to recognize meritorious work in an area too little acknowledged.

Selection Process: An awards committee (consisting of past award recipients and Ron Maxwell) reviews nominations and chooses an annual recipient. A plaque and a $200 cash prize are funded by an endowment from Ron and Mary Maxwell.

Nomination Process: Send nominations by August 31, 2002, to Jon Olson via email jeo3@psu.edu, fax (814) 863-9627, or a letter addressed to Maxwell Award, Center for Excellence in Writing, Penn State University, 206 Boucke Building, University Park, PA 16802-5900. For more information, consult http://www.chss.iup.edu/wc/ncptw or call (814) 865-9243. Please provide the nominee’s name, title, affiliation, postal address, email address, and phone number. Support the nomination with as much evidence as time permits. The committee admires distinguished writing, but it also welcomes quick and sketchy nominations.

Award History: At the 1997 NCPTW in Lexington, KY, Maxwell received a plaque from the conference organizers in recognition of his leadership in the organization. Twila Yates Papay of Rollins College received similar recognition at the 1998 NCPTW in Plattsburgh, NY. Maxwell’s endowment ensured that such recognition would continue, and the NCPTW board insisted that the award bear the Maxwell name. Molly Wingate of Colorado College received the inaugural 1999 NCPTW Ron Maxwell Leadership Award, Jean Kiedaisch of University of Vermont received the 2000 award, and Kevin Davis of East Central University received the 2001 award.

Thank you for reading our Spring 2002 issue! It is you, dear reader, who’s keeping the dialogue going. Please, put our web address:
www.ulc.psu.edu/Dangling_Modifier/index.htm
in your favorite’s folder, and check back periodically for new issues and conference pictures. – DM STAFF
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