



2020

A Collaborative Approach to Supporting L2 Students With Multimodal Work in the Composition Classroom and the Writing Center

Lucie Moussu
University of Alberta

Christina Grant
University of Alberta

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Moussu, Lucie and Grant, Christina (2020) "A Collaborative Approach to Supporting L2 Students With Multimodal Work in the Composition Classroom and the Writing Center," *Journal of Response to Writing*. Vol. 6 : Iss. 2 , Article 6.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw/vol6/iss2/6>

This Teaching Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Response to Writing by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

A Collaborative Approach to Supporting L2 Students With Multimodal Work in the Composition Classroom and the Writing Center

Lucie Moussu

University of Alberta

Christina Grant

University of Alberta

Multimodality is recognized as a useful pedagogical tool, but it is often difficult to apply in real-life curricula. Further, expectations on educators and various campus units are increasingly complex and require nimble and innovative partnerships. In this article, Christina, a first-year composition instructor, and Lucie, the university's writing center (WC) director, share their different but parallel paths to "going multimodal" for the first time. They show how they joined forces to determine how best to teach and respond to students' diverse multimodal projects. First, Christina explains how she taught herself and her students about multimodal rhetoric and genres with the help of two dedicated WC tutors. She also outlines how she created a rubric to respond to students' projects throughout their composing processes. Then Lucie shares her initial hesitancy about going multimodal and how she ultimately prepared her tutors to respond to the projects that Christina's students presented. The article concludes with Christina and Lucie discussing the exciting synergy they experienced while working together and with the tutors and the challenges they faced. For composition instructors, tutors, and WC directors interested in adopting multimodal assignments, this article provides ideas and suggestions for teaching, giving feedback, and mentoring.

Keywords: multimodal, feedback, writing centers, L2 writing, mentorship, collaboration

Because of student enthusiasm and expanding ideas about what writing means in the 21st century, composition instructors have been increasingly assigning multimodal¹ projects that combine text, sound, and moving or still images. And, with increasing frequency, students have been taking their multimodal work (e.g., animations, iMovies, Prezi presentations) to the writing center (WC) for feedback. As a result, composition instructors, WC directors, and WC tutors find themselves on joint learning curves—whether they feel ready or not. In this article, Christina, an experienced composition instructor at a large Canadian university, and Lucie, the university's WC director, share their collaborative experiences with “going multimodal” for the first time with the help of WC tutors. They explain why they decided to work with multimodal projects, how they taught students and tutors to “think multimodally,” and how they responded to students’ work both in class and in the WC.

Since 2011, the university's WC has partnered with first-year composition (FYC) courses to embed WC tutors in sections restricted to nonnative English-speaking students (FYC-L2)². After taking Lucie's tutor-training course, these embedded tutors served as a communication bridge between instructors and students. They read assigned class readings, learned about the pedagogical goals behind course activities and assignments, and worked closely with their FYC-L2 assigned instructors and their students. In class, the tutors supported the instructors in various capacities, including facilitating group work, ensuring student participation, participating in role-plays, offering their own perspectives on course material and writing experiences, and giving small presentations. Outside of class, they met weekly with students individually or in small groups to help ensure that everyone stayed on track with readings and assignments. Throughout the semester, Lucie stayed in touch with the FYC-L2 instructors and their embedded tutors to provide mentorship and guidance. This partnership allowed FYC-L2 tutors to observe and practice multimodal teaching methods, to better understand the challenges and strengths of nonnative English-speaking (L2) students, and to help create a sense of community. The tutors also had the chance

1. Anderson et al. (2006) describe multimodal compositions as “compositions that take advantage of a range of rhetorical resources—words, still and moving images, sounds, music, animations—to create meaning” (p. 59).

2. This system is somewhat similar to Writing Fellows programs in the United States.

to be mentored by and work closely with instructors and to observe and appreciate students' steady improvements in language and writing skills (Mullin et al., 2008; O'Meara, 2016).

In Fall 2016, Lucie teamed up with Christina, who was scheduled to teach two FYC-L2 sections, to take the partnership between the WC and composition instructors a step further. Driven by her own research and experience, Christina had already integrated diverse media—including art—into her classroom. Meanwhile, across the campus, Lucie had realized that her tutor-training course no longer fully met the increasingly diverse needs of WC users. Lucie's research had reinforced her observations that “as modes change in student composition, so will the nature of the tutorial itself. Instead of ‘outlines’ of essays, students bring in storyboards of their PowerPoint presentation or video projects for tutors to look at” (Lee & Carpenter, 2014, p. xviii). While Lucie was initially unsure of how to negotiate this shift in the WC, Christina leaped headlong into this collaborative opportunity (Lunsford, 1991) and, with Lucie's blessing, brought her two FYC-L2 tutors along for the ride.

In the following first-hand accounts, Christina explains why she invited multimodality into her course, the tools and response strategies she adopted and adapted, and how she worked with her assigned tutors. Lucie then describes how she introduced multimodality to her staff, how she modified her tutor-training syllabus, and how she mentored her tutors. Finally, Christina and Lucie discuss some highlights and challenges they encountered and offer teaching, mentoring, and feedback suggestions to instructors, tutors, and WC directors who want to embrace the excitement of multimodal assignments.

In Christina's Words: “Jumping In and Making It Work”

For many years, I assigned two major papers in my first-year Writing-About-Writing³ composition course. Both my students and I were ready for a change. While I felt that the academic paper was still invaluable for teaching students how to think about and share complex ideas in sustained ways, I concurred with Takayoshi and Selfe (2007) that “moving and still images, sounds, music, colour, words, and animations” (p. 2) were the

3. Writing-About-Writing is an approach to writing instruction that makes rhetoric and composition studies the content of the course.

current rhetorical reality. Further, I agreed with Selber (2004), who argues that in a relevant and responsible modern curricula, “an emphasis on [text] alone simply will no longer do” (p. 135). Therefore, I resolved to replace one of my major paper assignments with a project that invited students to think, play, and produce beyond the printed page. I sensed that L2 students would especially benefit from the inclusiveness, collaboration, learning potential, and fun of multimodal composition.

I soon realized, however, that as Khadka and Lee (2019) observed, “multimodality—so highly hailed in scholarship as a means of preparing writers and communicators of the future—is largely ignored in most writing classrooms” (p. 4). Resolved to make multimodality a part of my curriculum, I began to learn how to teach multimodality and gained confidence from what I knew to be true: Rhetoric was still rhetoric, audiences still had needs and expectations, and genres still had required conventions.

My original paper assignment asked students to research, synthesize, and expand on a course topic (e.g., internal versus external revision or rhetorical grammar). I used to teach topics such as genre conventions and quotation integration, to implement conventional grading rubrics for written papers, and to guide students toward helpful resources, such as Purdue’s OWL and the university’s WC. I also responded to drafts in individual conferences. As I integrated multimodality as a new collection of genres in my classroom, I adapted, adopted, and learned to achieve similar objectives (Elola & Oskoz, 2017).

Fortunately, the university’s teaching and technology resource centers provided pedagogical suggestions and warned me about criticisms I might face (e.g., the charge of watering down assignments) and counseled me on addressing them (e.g., developing robust rubrics). They also taught me the rudiments of Goanimate, Voicethread, and iMovie and provided essential tips on audio and video production.

To my delight, I discovered that excellent resources were hidden in plain sight: YouTube and, to a certain extent, my WC tutors and the students themselves (Thompson, 2013). In only 15 minutes, for example, a WC tutor showed the students and me how to use InShot to cut and splice a video together on our smartphones. When software questions arose, students would either know something about it or could find a relevant

YouTube video—their natural way of sourcing information. So, unlike in the world of academic papers, I didn't need to worry about being the primary expert.

In addition to mobilizing resources, I learned how to respond to students' attempts at aural and visual rhetoric and to create rubrics to grade a wide range of mixed media projects. I used the following key teaching tools: (a) sequenced multimodal proposals, (b) storyboarding, and (c) universal multimodal evaluation rubrics.

Sequenced Multimodal Proposals

I asked each group to present three increasingly specific project proposals to the class in order to give students useful feedback during their composing processes. First, the students declared their topics and work schedules. Near the middle of the semester, they walked the class through storyboards of their videos or animations or displayed rough sketches of pamphlets or posters. Toward the end of the semester, the groups presented their nearly finished projects and asked for feedback from classmates, tutors, and me on content, form, and production elements such as voice quality, pacing, and background music.

This system of reporting—combined with repeated, respectful, and immediate spoken and written responses from and conversations with their peers and me (Shvidko, 2015)—achieved my feedback goals. As the students articulated their rhetorical choices, my tutors and I immediately responded to both strengths and shortfalls. For L2 students, the reporting offered several additional benefits: They practiced talking in English and gained confidence, they learned to think on the spot in English, and they realized they didn't need “perfect” English to communicate. Further, they were relieved and empowered to realize that *everyone* struggles through a messy and recursive revision process, and they learned how to engage with and respond to each other's work in an effective and supportive manner (Macklin, 2016).

Storyboarding

I had long responded to drafts of the two paper assignments with a range of comments on strengths and weaknesses. I now had to evaluate a *mélange* of images, text, and sounds. From the beginning, my tutors

and I had worried about how to respond in process. Searching online, I stumbled upon the visual drafting method of storyboarding. These cartoon-like serial sketches let creators plan, organize, and revise their ideas before heavily investing in production (Bell, 2011). I taught my students how to storyboard by drawing crude stick-figure examples, offering links to resources, and providing a storyboard template. The first storyboard reports were a mixed bag, but the students gained knowledge and ideas from feedback and most were eager to make changes. Because I simply responded to the students' storyboards without giving a grade, I boosted their willingness to take risks.

Like the sequenced reports, storyboarding also offered some notable advantages for multilingual students. First, the L2 students appreciated that their writing load was reduced since they did not have to write multiple drafts of papers. Second, storyboarding helped them overcome a common problem: distilling and organizing complex ideas. The sketching process made their ideas and sequencing—or logical flow—visible to both themselves and others. Third, doing storyboards drew upon a wider range of skills than written drafts, such as conceptualizing, planning, drawing, writing, and presenting. For L2 learners who were conditioned to fear and struggle with English writing, storyboarding was both freeing and empowering.

Universal Multimodal Response Rubric

I consulted widely while I created my multimodal response rubric. I first asked an education instructor who assigned a senior-level multimodal project to share her rubric. Then, I requested feedback from my colleagues on my draft rubric. Finally, I honed my rubric with my students' input.

Specifically, I retained the three main response strands in my multimodal rubric that I had always used for my writing assignments: “communication/rhetoric,” “content knowledge,” and “language/grammar/form.” To flesh out the expectations within each strand, I first “zoomed out” to think of the general choices all rhetors make—such as organization and transitions. I then “zoomed in” to account for the multimodal composer's special “moves”—such as choosing images and sounds and adjusting

spacing (i.e., how quickly the scenes change). However, my most valuable guide to creating the rubric shown in Figure 1 was carefully observing where students needed more guidance; for example, narrowing topics, creating strong openings, keeping a consistent style, and listing acknowledgments at the end.

While the robust rubric addressed the need for overall guidance, I still had to help the students understand what each item “looked like.” As the tutors and I oversaw the students’ developing projects, we kept a sharp eye out for various issues, including the use of too many ideas or unexplained terms, monotonous or unintelligible voices, dizzying pace, irrelevant images, and abrupt transitions. When we encountered such shortfalls, we challenged students with questions: How does that image help your message? Would your intended audience understand that term? Can viewers process information that fast? We found that we had to teach the rubric item by item and provide examples, which we accumulated on the go. Once students understood the rubric, however, most of them found great satisfaction in explaining how their choices served their messages. Based on how students talked about their decisions in oral reports and in private conferences, I believe they gained a deeper grasp of genre and writing by using the multimodal rubric than other students had when using my rubrics for paper assignments.

Experts have long urged composition educators to take new approaches in teaching multilingual students to think and write in English, and I see multimodal composing as a powerful option. Takayoshi and Selfe (2007) argue that moving beyond only using texts engages students in ways that papers rarely do and revitalizes peer-to-peer interest and feedback. Also, when we assign value to collaboration—integral to group projects—we move away from valorizing only what Johnson-Eilola (1998) calls the “production paradigm” (i.e., individual product). Instead, we move toward embracing the “connection paradigm” (i.e., negotiation), as students collaboratively reorganize and re-represent existing texts “in ways that are meaningful to specific audiences” (p. 24).

Besides these ideological justifications, my L2 students seemed to almost forget about their language problems as they dove into their projects. Motivated by a fresh and creative multimodal playground, students

Figure 1*Multimodal Project Response Rubric***Multimodal Project Response Rubric****COMMUNICATION/RHETORIC (Does your MM project do the job you intend it to do?)**

- Suitability of mode(s) to audience/execution
- Purpose is made clear to viewer [early/at end]
- Rhetorical choices to interest, engage, inform, persuade, convince, motivate, etc. [not too much/not too little info, well chosen, clearly explained, makes sense]
- Organization of writing & visuals (e.g., placement of elements, focus, transitions, clarity, beginning/middle/end; overall cohesion)
- Effectiveness/appropriateness of rhetorical appeals (ethos, pathos, logos)
- Energy & intonation in voicing/narration to engage audience [vs. dull or distracting presentation]
- Genuine usefulness/understandability for intended audience / summary of message &/or call to action as appropriate [i.e. at end]
- Creativity in any rhetorical element (e.g., use of different languages, original artwork)

CONTENT/KNOWLEDGE (Is this related to course content, and do you understand it?)

The project topic is:

- Connected to a significant topic(s) from the course
- Accurate &/or explanation of writing studies &/or other specialized terms
- As appropriate: At least 2 sources from course well-chosen/used & correctly cited (APA or MLA~ usually on final panel)
- Connects personal experience with outside/expert knowledge (not just expert or general knowledge) [has YOU in it—not just a ‘lecture’ from other sources]

LANGUAGE/GRAMMAR/FORM

- Effectiveness of multiple modes working together
- Language register/style appropriate for audience
- Concision
- Achieves MWAFF (Most Widely Accepted Form): few or no language, grammar, spelling, and/or mechanical errors—in written &/or scripted spoken parts
- Production: Audience can easily see, hear, read, & follow [moderate production standards expected]
- Professional polish (project could actually be used outside the classroom or as a model to show future students)
- Adheres to min/max length (audio/video: 3–4 min.; text/visual projects as agreed with instructor)

learned more than they realized about rhetoric and modes as well as about collaboration—another skill L2 students often fear and lack (Zhen and Warschauer, 2017). By the final class day of popcorn and showtime, they were proud to reveal their English audiovisual or graphical creations. I also discovered that going multimodal drives home a central point for my students: Writing is not just for getting a grade or for teachers; it's for communicating.

In Lucie's Words: "From Trepidation to Determination"

Christina enthusiastically adopted a multimodal approach to teaching and feedback. I, on the other hand, was slower to adapt to the necessary shift. I had, over the years, learned a lot about multimodal composing from conference presentations, but I put off updating tutoring pedagogy for multimodal assignments; the task had always seemed excessively time consuming and expensive. But with Christina's FYC-L2 students now challenging WC tutors with multimodal assignments, and my FYC-L2-dedicated tutors also needing multimodal support, I could no longer ignore the issue.

Fortunately, Mendelsohn's (2012) words reassured me when she explained the tutor's role in the composing process:

The [tutor's] role is not to know how to use every piece of technology that composers walk in the door with but to help them develop . . . strategies to answer their own questions. . . . In other words, the [tutor] needs to help the composer learn to find the answers, not to have an answer. (p. 107)

I started reading about multimodalities and discussing different aspects of the issue during our staff meetings and my tutor-training course. As I explain below, first, my tutors and I talked about rhetorical skills transfer; then, we sought to learn from experts; and finally, we started thinking about concrete steps to "multimodalize" our WC and update the tutor-training course. What surprised me most was how seamlessly tutors blended their existing and new knowledge when talking with students about their multimodal projects.

Fitzgerald and Ianetta (2016) reminded me that the basic principles of WC tutoring remained the same, no matter the format of the work students brought into the WC. Whatever the genre, tutors and students must always think about audience, tutoring is always about interaction and helping others, and students always want to communicate some information to specific audiences through various rhetorical means (Sheridan & Inman, 2010). An important first step for me, then, was to overtly address these overlaps. First, I needed to provide my tutors with a new repertoire of communication tools. Then, I had to teach them how to interpret, evaluate, and manipulate visual information as expertly as they did with verbal information (Archer, 2011). And finally, I needed to help tutors transfer what they already knew about rhetoric, discourse analysis, genres, and the writing process to new modes of communication. For example, I started class discussions with questions such as the following:

- Have you personally ever engaged with or created multimedia materials such as posters, videos, or podcasts?
- What experiences do you have with visual representations of numerical data in scientific papers?
- How are stories developed in comic books through colors, shapes, sizes, typography, and lines?
- How do voice, sound effects, and music choices influence your podcast listening experiences?
- How are arguments organized to support ideas in a documentary?
- What deliberate choices (e.g., typefaces, images, contrasts) do students make as they construct and present knowledge on a poster?

The resulting conversations helped tutors realize that they were already using the appropriate terminology to discuss the effectiveness of various rhetorical choices even outside the WC, in everything they were reading, listening to, and watching. Therefore, they felt less apprehensive and more enthusiastic about going multimodal.

Over the past 13 years, the student-tutors I have trained in my courses have come from a wide range of programs of study, and their knowledge of technology has, in general, been greater than mine. I tapped into this knowledge by discussing various forms of communication in different disciplines, capitalizing on my student-tutors' own experiences and expertise

while boosting their confidence (Appleby-Ostroff, 2017). For example, a student-tutor had created a short video for a business class, which we watched together. We analyzed the sequence of information, the informal tone, the use of graphs, the conscious and unconscious rhetorical moves, the use of transitions, and the appropriateness of information.

Christina and her dedicated FYC-L2 tutors also regularly presented at our staff meetings. They shared what they were learning, and we discussed the issues they had encountered with students' projects. For example, Christina explained how many L2 students used robotic voices in their videos instead of their natural voices in an effort to avoid sounding foreign. However, the students did not realize the limitations of that choice, particularly that a robotic voice imposed a monotone rhythm and often mispronounced specialized terms. Another significant lesson that Christina and the dedicated FYC-L2 tutors taught us was the importance of engaging with and responding to students' content and rhetorical choices early in their composing processes—ideally during the conception or storyboard stage—before they started transferring their ideas onto multimedia platforms (Bell, 2011). In doing so, we could head off their urges to engage more with the new technologies than with message content.

Like many WC directors, I lacked a large budget and dedicated in-house technical support, so I took advantage of the resources both outside and within our institution. For example, I invited a specialist from Technologies in Education to give a tutorial on presentation tools (e.g., Prezi, iMovie), and I encouraged tutors to take advantage of workshops offered by the university's learning and technology centers. When facing particularly tough challenges, I recalled Pemberton's (2003) advice: "We have to ask ourselves whether it is really the CW's responsibility to be all things to all people" (p. 21). Undoubtedly, acquiring a few multimedia programs such as the Adobe Creative Suite would be a helpful next step in adapting to the multimodal tutoring landscape. However, some of these tools are expensive, and it would be time consuming for everyone to learn about all the fast-growing multimedia applications.

Soon, the effects of our collaborative efforts started becoming apparent in the positive feedback tutors received from Christina's students and Christina herself. Word of mouth informed other students on campus that

the WC could help with multimodal assignments. Additionally, our multimodal shift significantly impacted our WC community. For example, one tutor admitted that she used to see posters as mere summaries of papers. Now, she understood that posters also needed to grab people's attention, should include an element of suspense (i.e., make the audience want to know more), and can reflect the author's personality. Two tutors also began working on a video to explain WC services to the campus community. One tutor created Prezi presentations to complement our handouts while another researched how to make our services more accessible to students with learning disabilities. A further tutor offered to start a WC e-zine to stay in touch with previous tutors. Some of Christina's students enjoyed our collaboration so much that they interviewed several tutors about WC philosophy and created videos and pamphlets about the value of peer tutoring and the importance of WCs. I saw that many of my tutors became eager to learn more. They used their multimodal talents and skills not only to help Christina's students more effectively but also to contribute to the improvement and growth of our WC, which was now on its way to becoming a multiliteracy center (Balester et al., 2012). This adventure had an invigorating effect on the WC as a whole.

In the end, tutors cannot be experts in all genres and disciplines, but they can still effectively support students with diverse writing assignments. Tutors can also successfully help students with multiple modes of communication, even without fancy computers and expensive software. The key is to continually learn from experts and one another, to negotiate and co-create knowledge, and to trust in their tutoring skills and experience—all while decentering their authority and learning to ask the right questions.

Thanks to this collaborative and fun experience, I realized that regardless of current multimodal know-how or limited equipment or budgets, any WC can offer meaningful support for students working across multiple modes. In spite of my own insecurities, I discovered that, in manageable increments, I could mentor my tutors and integrate new knowledge into my tutor-training course.⁴

4. A few semesters later, *Multimodal Composing: Strategies for Twenty-First-Century Writing Consultations* (Sabatino & Fallon, 2019) was published, and it is now an assigned textbook in the tutor-training course.

Final Thoughts by Christina and Lucie

We both faced multiple small and large challenges on this adventure. For example, we sometimes came up with solutions and found resources too late to optimally help current students and tutors. However, we used them in later semesters as we kept collaborating and learning. Also, we discovered that some information technology support units in the university were compartmentalized and that they still have big gaps in their abilities to provide WC tutors, instructors, and students with the resources and tools they need. Additionally, while the FYC-L2 tutors gained volumes of tutoring, collaborating, and technical acumen, they sometimes felt a bit hesitant and had to work overtime. They felt great pride the following semester, however, when they helped train future WC tutors and FYC-L2-dedicated tutors on responding to multimodal assignments.

Another significant positive and unexpected outcome we both noticed was in the new ways we mentored the FYC-L2 tutors. Christina's decision to assign multimodal projects shifted how we both conceptualized these tutors' roles and responsibilities. With paper assignments, the FYC-L2 tutors' duties included responding to and helping to fix students' predictable writing problems with content, organization, and form. With multimodal assignments, tutors had to transfer those response strategies to multiple modes, a shared and unpredictable learning process. In the classroom and during weekly small-group meetings, tutors performed usability testing on the FYC-L2 students' experiments with new technologies and discussed issues of sounds, images, interactivity, accessibility, and navigation. Instead of leading class discussions on readings, tutors led discussions as both peers and experts on the benefits and disadvantages of different applications, software, and other multimedia tools. We strongly believe that our tutors benefitted from the type of learning environment that Lunsford defines as "a theory of knowledge as socially constructed, of power and control as constantly negotiated and shared, and of collaboration as its first principle" (1991, p. 97).

To keep communication channels open, Christina and her tutors regularly snatched moments during and after class to trade thoughts. They also used a paper teacher-tutor journal that they passed back and forth after each class, which helped them catch and record problems and solutions.

Team problem-solving (Shvidko, 2015) now often replaced teacher problem-solving. For example, while working one-on-one with Christina's students on storyboards during weekly tutorials, tutors noticed some students struggling to organize masses of information. The tutors wrote about those and other concerns in their shared journal, talked about them with Christina, and found solutions. Then, they shared what they had learned with current tutors during the following WC staff meeting. In the past, both Christina and Lucie trained and counted on FYC-L2 tutors to clarify to the students what was taught in class and to guide them through their paper assignments. Now, these tutors became junior colleagues: The tutors dynamically and creatively—and sometimes more quickly and effectively (O'Meara, 2016)—helped solve problems that arose from the multimodal class projects, students' struggles, and WC tutor training.

The partnership aspects were critical to the success of this experiment, and they benefitted every single participant (O'Meara, 2016). Christina's L2 students received support both in and out of class and learned how to engage with each other's work and respond to new genres in respectful and collaborative ways (Maklin, 2016). Christina learned volumes about teaching and responding to multimodal assignments—including how best to intervene in the production process—and benefitted from the support, knowledge, and junior collegiality of her FYC-L2 tutors. The FYC-L2 tutors gained myriad opportunities to develop insights into how L2 students learn and to acquire new technical, pedagogical, and leadership skills. Lucie, meanwhile, found encouragement and inspiration to learn more about multimedia and how to collaboratively train her tutors to respond to new genres. Finally, all WC tutors developed critical 21st-century response skills to support the students' expanding repertoire of academic work.

In the end, the positive outcomes of this multimodal shift far outweighed the difficulties. Because we plowed the way, our FYC colleagues are now more aware of multimodal pedagogical and collaborative opportunities; they also know that WC tutors, including FYC-L2 embedded tutors, will be ready to support them.

As we step back and look at the bigger picture of going multimodal, we identify two major takeaways. Our first is that any instructor, WC, or

tutor can assign, work with, and respond to multimodal assignments. We do not need elaborate training programs, expensive equipment, or a big budget to be successful. All anyone really needs is drive, trust, resourcefulness, collaborative support, and perseverance. The necessary human and technical resources are there—we all just need to find and build upon them. Above all, we must remember that the multimodal landscape is already our students' natural territory.

Our second main takeaway is that while collaboration is central to the work of WCs (Lunsford, 1991) and increasingly expected in classrooms, we may need to forge nontraditional partnerships to support students in multimodal composing and provide new learning opportunities to WC tutors (O'Meara, 2016). To keep pace with rapidly evolving pedagogies and help keep universities relevant, we must all dare to climb out of our comfortable knowledge and territory silos. In this spirit, we should work to break new multimodal ground together. Yes, times are changing, but transitions have always been the daily work of instructors, WCs, and tutors. Multimodality—with all its inherent partnerships, mentoring, and creative response opportunities—is simply one of the latest and most exciting manifestations.

References

- Appleby-Ostroff, S. (2017). Designing effective training programs for discipline-specific peer writing tutors. *Canadian Journal for Studies in Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, 27, 69–94. <https://doi.org/10.31468/cjsdwr.604>
- Anderson, D., Atkins, A., Ball, C., Homcz, K., Selfe, C., & Selfe, R. (2006). Integrating multimodality into composition curricula: Survey methodology and results from a CCCC research grant. *Composition Studies*, (34)2, 59–84. <https://compstudiesjournal.com/archive/>
- Archer, A. (2011). Dealing with multimodal assignments in writing centres. *The Writing Lab Newsletter*, 35(9/10), 10–13. <https://wlnjournal.org/archives/v35/35.9-10.pdf>
- Balester, V., Grimm, N., Grutsch McKinney, J., Lee, S., Sheridan, D. M., & Silver, N. (2012). The idea of a multiliteracy center: Six responses. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 9(2), 1–10. <http://www.praxisuwc.com/baletser-et-al-92>
- Bell, C. (2011). Assessing scholarly multimedia: A rhetorical genre studies approach. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 21(1), 61–77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572252.2012.626390>
- Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2017). Writing with 21st century social tools in the L2 classroom: New literacies, genres, and writing practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, 52–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.04.002>
- Fitzgerald, L., & Ianetta, M., (2016). *The Oxford guide for writing tutors: Practice and research*. Oxford University Press.
- Johnson-Eilola, J. (1998). Negative spaces: From production to connection in composition. In T. Taylor & I. Ward (Eds.), *Literacy theory in the age of the internet* (pp. 17–33). Columbia University Press.
- Khadka, S., & Lee, J. C. (2019). *Bridging the multimodal gap: From theory to practice*. Utah State University Press.
- Moussu, L., & Grant, C. (2020). A collaborative approach to supporting L2 students with multimodal work in the composition classroom and the writing center. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 6(2), 129–146.

- Lee, S., & Carpenter, R. (Eds.). (2014). *The Routledge reader on writing centers and new media*. Routledge.
- Lunsford, A. (1991). Collaboration, control, and the idea of a writing center. *Writing Center Journal*, 12(1), 3–10. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43441887>
- Macklin, T. (2016). Compassionate writing response: Using dialogic feedback to encourage student voice in the first-year composition classroom. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 2(2), 88–105. <https://journalrw.org/index.php/jrw/article/view/60>
- Mendelsohn, S. E. (2012). *Rhetorical possibilities: Reimagining multiliteracy work in writing centers* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin]. <http://hdl.handle.net/2152/ETD-UT-2012-08-5908>
- Mullin, J., Schorn, S., Turner, T., Hertz, R., Davidson D., & Baca, A. (2008). Challenging our practices, supporting our theories: Writing mentors as change agents across discourse communities. *Across the Disciplines*, 5. <https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/fellows/mullin.pdf>
- O'Meara, K. D. (2016). Providing sustained support for teachers and students in the L2 writing classroom using writing fellow tutors. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 2(2), 66–87. <https://journalrw.org/index.php/jrw/article/view/53>
- Pemberton, M. (2003). Planning for hypertexts in the writing center . . . or not. *The Writing Center Journal*, 24(1), 9–24. <http://www.pitt.edu/~writcen/PlanningForHypertexts.pdf>
- Selber, S. A. (2004). *Multiliteracies for a digital age*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Sheridan, D., & Inman, J. (Eds.). (2010). *Multiliteracy centers: Writing center work, new media, and multimodal rhetoric*. Hampton.
- Shvidko, E. (2015). Beyond 'giver-receiver' relationships: Facilitating an interactive revision process. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 1(2), 55–74. <https://journalrw.org/index.php/jrw/article/view/35>
- Moussu, L., & Grant, C. (2020). A collaborative approach to supporting L2 students with multimodal work in the composition classroom and the writing center. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 6(2), 129–146.

- Takayoshi, P., & Selfe, C. (2007). Thinking about multimodality. In C. Selfe (Ed.), *Multimodal Composition* (pp. 1–12). Hampton Press.
- Thompson, P. (2013). The digital natives as learners: Technology use patterns and approaches to learning. *Computers & Education*, 65, 12–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2012.12.022>
- Zheng, B., & Warschauer, M. (2017). Epilogue: Second language writing in the age of computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, 61–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.05.014>

Copyrights

© JRW & Authors.

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Moussu, L., & Grant, C. (2020). A collaborative approach to supporting L2 students with multimodal work in the composition classroom and the writing center. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 6(2), 129–146.