

June 2022

Disciplinary Faculty Needs and Qualified Tutors in an EFL University Writing Center

Graciela Arizmendi González

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México Facultad de Estudios Superiores Acatlán,
gracielaarizmendi16@yahoo.com

María del Carmen González Videgaray

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México Facultad de Estudios Superiores Acatlán, mcgv@unam.mx

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/wcj>



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#), and the [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Arizmendi González, Graciela and González Videgaray, María del Carmen (2022) "Disciplinary Faculty Needs and Qualified Tutors in an EFL University Writing Center," *Writing Center Journal*: Vol. 40 : Iss. 1, Article 3.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2832-9414.1012>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

Disciplinary Faculty Needs and Qualified Tutors in an EFL University Writing Center

Cover Page Footnote

This research was supported by the Dirección General de Cooperación e Internacionalización (DGECI) [General Direction of Cooperation and Internationalization], under a scholarship for full-time research at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) [Autonomous National University of Mexico], Facultad de Estudios Superiores Acatlán (FESA) [Faculty of Higher Education Acatlan]. Graciela Arizmendi González (postdoctoral researcher) was supervised by María del Carmen González Videgaray (full-time professor), from 2018-2022, during a postdoctoral fellowship sponsored by Dirección General de Cooperación e Internacionalización (DGECI) [General Direction of Cooperation and Internationalization] at Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) [Autonomous National University of Mexico] and Facultad de Estudios Superiores Acatlán (FESA) [Faculty of Higher Education Acatlan]. Graciela's and María del Carmen's research interests are in academic writing in English, L2 postgraduate writers' negotiation of the structure in their research genres, and writing centers in the EFL context.

Disciplinary Faculty Needs and Qualified Tutors in an EFL University Writing Center

Graciela Arizmendi González

(Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Facultad de Estudios Superiores Acatlán)

María del Carmen González Videgaray

(Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Facultad de Estudios Superiores Acatlán)

Abstract This study investigates postgraduate (PGs) and faculty needs concerning academic writing (AW) tutors' qualifications in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. Tutors are the core element of a writing center (WC) (Hays, 2010). These professionals listen to (Burns, 2014), advise, and exchange information (Reid, 1993, in Hays, 2010) collaboratively so students can resolve their writing issues (Hays, 2010). However, in EFL contexts, scant research exists about WCs, writing programs (Molina & López, 2019), and qualifications to recruit tutors (Özer, 2020). Thus, to plan a WC, 24 participants in chemistry were interviewed and surveyed. Findings reveal that EFL PGs expect specialized tutors in target fields, with high English proficiency, experience in teaching, and in writing scientific articles. However, recruitment is challenging as candidate tutors also need support in AW and to help their tutees as writers. Thus, the tutors can be scientists, teachers, or PG students with English, but must be trained in specialized and general English writing and tutoring approaches. The study contributes to knowledge concerning needs in WCs and tutors' qualifications, and it offers possible suggestions to accommodate the PGs' preferences in an EFL context. However, the small sample size and homogeneity of the participants make the results nongeneralizable.

Keywords academic writing needs, writing center tutors, EFL postgraduates

Writing Center Journal

Vol. 40 | No. 1

2022

Introduction to Tutoring in the Writing Center

The research studies needs and qualifications that prospective English as a Foreign Language (EFL) tutors should possess to help EFL postgraduates (PGs) and faculty members that struggle with academic writing (AW) in English. In English-speaking countries, writing tutoring contributes to writers' development,

disciplinary knowledge, and learning (Palfreyman, 2008, in Thaiss, 2012, p. 7). For Ilona Leki (2009), many English as a Second Language (ESL) students learn AW through one-to-one supporting sessions centered on specific needs and negotiation of meaning to acquire the second language (L2). This tutoring support is a crucial and common practice in a writing center (WC) (Özer, 2020), often offered by faculty members (Weber, 2016), PGs, or peers (Tan,

2011). Tutors are often qualified people, with English and AW experience gained throughout education in English-speaking institutions (Vifansy, 2002, in Öztürk, 2011). Thus, they generally lead sessions only in English (Tan, 2011) and follow a tutoring approach centered on students' active role as writers (Eleftheriou, 2019).

Tutors can also be students that receive training to contribute to developing the writers' skills (Gillespie & Lerner, 2004; Ryan & Zimmerelli, 2010, in Molina-Natera, 2017). To Violeta Molina-Natera (2017), training students to be tutors has shown positive results in North and Latin America. Molina-Natera argues that student-tutors encourage tutees to speak overtly about target needs more than when a tutee speaks with a professor who is generally regarded as an authority (p. 18). Tutors can be multilinguals that tutor multilingual writers and use their experiences as language learners while tutoring (Thonus, 2014). In conclusion, professors and students at different degree levels, with different languages, knowledge, or training in writing tutoring can offer advice in WCs.

In Colombia, Argentina, Chile, and Mexico, generally writing workshops predominate, entry courses (Carlino et al., 2010; Molina & Lopez, 2019), and the "remedial," "do nothing," and/or "integrative" initiatives (Skillen, et al., 1998), and there is little institutional involvement to address AW concerns (Carlino, 2012). To Isabel Solé, Ana Teberosky, and Montserrat Castelló (2012), Spanish universities adopting the "do nothing" model avoid teaching speaking and writing communication because academics assume students learned to speak and write in the early years of their education. Speaking and writing abilities are believed to remain static throughout students' lives, and the situation in which these abilities are used is what changes instead. Conversely, universities that teach from a "remedial model" see writing as an autonomous code with universal conventions, centered on grammar and spelling, taught out of context, but transferable to any context (Russell, 1990). Learning reading and writing occurs through exercises that often do not match real practices and are out of the content areas' context (Carlino, 2012).

However, in Argentinian, Colombian, and many Spanish-speaking universities, professors

often require and assess reading and writing, but reading and writing are not among the objects of their instruction (Carlino et al., 2010),¹ and professors omit explanations about how to read and write to complete the assignments. Paula Carlino (2012) holds that disciplinary professors lack support, resources, and activities for professional development, and sufficient knowledge of programs like Writing Across the Disciplines (WAC) and Writing in the Disciplines (WID) in the English-speaking countries.

In longitudinal action research, Carlino (2012) examined and documented her teaching practice; she tried to fill the "how" gap through an "integrative" initiative in the classroom, so students understood and studied the subject content. Carlino asked students to read, write, discuss, connect texts' information, and revise the writing, while she offered feedback. Consequently, students transformed their thinking, built arguments, debated, explained, interpreted, and produced the discipline's discourse.

As WC theory has shown to be effective in English-speaking contexts (e.g., Bromley et al., 2016) like the United States, the implementation of WCs has expanded to EFL contexts in East Asia, Europe (Bräuer, 2012; Chang, 2013), and more recently to Latin American (LA) countries like Argentina, Chile, Puerto Rico, Uruguay, Colombia (the leader with around 40 WCs until 2015), and in Mexican institutions, for example, Instituto Tecnológico de Estudios Superiores Monterrey, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (Molina, 2007; Molina, 2008b, in Molina-Natera, 2012; Molina-Natera, 2014; Molina-Natera & Lopez-Gil, 2019). However, more knowledge of WCs in LA contexts is needed (Carlino, 2012; Molina & Lopez, 2019) and empirical research about factors to recruit tutors (Özer, 2020).

Tutors are WCs' core element, so decisions concerning recruitment are paramount to sustain a WC (Özer, 2020). Thus, according to Elisa Isabel Gavari Starkie and Paula Tenca Sidotti (2017), a WC in a Foreign Language (FL) context can be useful to help students develop as writers. However, the WC model needs to be readapted according to EFL needs and culture (Emerson, 2012; Johnston et al., 2008; O'Sullivan & Cleary, 2012; Tan, 2011), because diversity in student populations exists and it influences how

Arizmendi González

—
González Videgaray

WCs work regarding tutoring and one-to-one interactions with students (Chang, 2013).

Similarly, we need to adjust tutors' qualifications because American WC tutors' native English language advice (Tan, 2011), nondirective collaborative tutoring approach (encouraging students to take control, ownership, and responsibility of their writing by eliciting information), and frequent support in higher-order concerns (HOCs) like thesis, audience, purpose, organization, and development are aspects that often differ in EFL tutors' practice. EFL WC tutors' advice might be often in L1 or by shifting between L1 and L2 (Tan, 2011). EFL tutors often transmit knowledge, transfer language superiority explicitly, correct linguistic errors (i.e., the directive approach), and are focused on lower-order concerns (LOCs) including grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure (Eleftheriou, 2019). Besides, EFL students generally require more extensive advice in writing and the English language (Özer, 2020). To Eleftheriou, EFL students lack experience in nondirective collaborative tutorials, the assumptions involved in the nondirective approach used in American universities, and might be unable to draw intuitively on what sounds correct when writing.

Hence, considering that WCs are shaped and defined by their contexts (Kinhead & Harris, 1993), that different qualifications between English-speaking tutors and EFL ones exist (Eleftheriou, 2019; Tan, 2011), and that research on WCs and qualifications to recruit tutors in EFL contexts is scant (Carlino, 2012; Özer, 2020), the study explored expected tutors' qualifications from PGs' and faculty's views in an EFL context. The study contributes to knowledge concerning WCs' needs and tutors' qualifications the community expects from them. The study proposes to recruit tutors in EFL WCs based on empirical research as Dana Lynn Driscoll and Sherry Winn Perdue (2012) suggest and train them to fulfill the target community's expectations.

EFL University Context

In this EFL university context, advice from writing tutors is crucial so PGs and faculty members can write and publish research articles in English. David I. Hanauer and Karen

Englander (2011) hold that writing in English posits a challenge to publishing scientific knowledge for many university students and professors. This issue is also studied at Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM), Faculty of Higher Education Acatlán (FESA), where Mayra Lorena Díaz Sosa and María del Carmen González Videgaray (2019) report that writing in English is a barrier to publishing in international journals. AW issues have caught UNAM interest to help its community become better academic writers, as Stephen M. North (1984) has suggested, and to increase research publications beyond Mexican frontiers.

Considering that students' AW can be supported through WCs and tutors (Contreras & Ochoa, 2010), UNAM established an AW initiative in English in 2011. Academics took AW workshops at UNAM-Canada and between 2012 and 2014; UNAM-Canada delivered them in Mexico under the support of the Institutional Development Secretary (SDI) and Biological Sciences Postgraduate School. In 2015, the AW office in Postgraduate Study Coordination (CEP) emerged, and from 2016 to 2021, the General Direction of Cooperation and Internationalization (DGECI) coordinated the AW program in English. The AW program aims to develop students' autonomy and confidence, empower researchers, support the teaching of AW for the community, and promote research dissemination internationally. Additional writing initiatives have included workshops for PGs and instructors to write research articles (RA), courses to train instructors, and roundtables led by editors from national and international magazines (DGECI, 2019, August 6). The focus of the workshops has been on progressive writing skills, revision of RAs' structure, and lexico-grammatical features in English (DGECI, 2018a, 2018b, 2019, 2020). In February 2021, DGECI through Susana Kolb Cadwell and Dolores González-Casanova, coordinators of the academic writing program, gave FESA freedom to continue developing its academic writing program online platform and one-to-one tutoring according to FESA needs. Kolb and González-Casanova also informed FESA that the Escuela Nacional de Lenguas Lingüística y Traducción (ENALLT) [National School of Languages, Linguistics, and Translation] at UNAM

is also continuing the academic writing program in English (virtual meeting).

As the university's population ($N = 356,530$) included 30,089 PGs and 2,645 researchers (Agenda Estadística UNAM, 2019) that needed to write in English in diverse disciplines, in 2018, DGECI launched a notice for doctorates interested in AW research and design of writing materials in English. Candidates' profile included a doctorate in education or applied linguistics, a major in AW, in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) to writing and publication, in writing across the curriculum (WAC), in writing in the disciplines (WID), or in ESL/EFL. Candidates needed an English proficiency at or over C1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). Candidates needed to demonstrate experience in working in WCs, developing and implementing AW courses, and teaching writing in ESL/EFL contexts (DGECI, 2018a,b). However, we need to integrate the writing initiatives within a WC and to focus on tutors, especially because for Hernández (2018), at UNAM, the number of PG programs demanding publications in peer-reviewed magazines continues increasing across disciplines. AW continues being limited in language classrooms like in other EFL contexts (e.g., Chang, 2013) regardless of the community's concerns to develop better writers that can publish research and obtain PG degrees beyond the English department.

English and Writing in the Chemistry Faculty

In chemistry, English is paramount for reading, graduation, and worldwide communication. Chemists need to read, write, publish research, and deliver presentations. To help the community, the Chemistry Faculty offers a series (I–VIII) of regular communicative elementary courses throughout a semester and intensive ones between semesters. A book syllabus is used to teach and learn reading, writing, listening, and speaking in undergraduate programs and the courses are connected to PG studies. Advanced perfectionist courses taught include how to publish research, technical English in basic sciences, and advanced technical

English. To be enrolled in advanced perfectionist courses, students need a communicative English level over IV out of VIII. Students that obtain a score of 80/100 in advanced courses cover the English requirement for graduation. Moreover, to support and improve teaching and learning, the faculty possess a portal web, where teachers find pedagogical strategies and materials to teach pre-intermediate level (A1–A2) English according to CEFR. Additionally, students find pedagogical and revised electronic materials, take free English courses, and use online dictionaries. The materials aim to extend English practice, expose students to English, and have students learn at their own pace (Facultad de Química, UNAM, 2022; Vázquez Ramos, 2013).

Alternative support exists at (a) UNAM's Faculty of Higher Education Acatlan's (FESA) AW Program in English platform (FESA, UNAM, 2020), (b) the "Academic Desk" website for the community to foster scientific publications and scientific writing (Escritorio Académico, UNAM, 2019), and (c) the online UNAM courses about how to write a thesis in Spanish, an article, and genres needed at university (Toda la UNAM en Línea, 2019), and which also can be consulted at "How to write common academic genres at university education" by María Isabel Gracida Juárez, Guadalupe Teodora Martínez López, Laura López Pastrana, María Antonieta López Villalva, Concepción Lozada Chávez, Judith Orozco Abad, and Rosa María Zuaste Lugo (2007). However, some resources offered disregard collaborative support or one-to-one sessions, which are necessary to talk about specific writing concerns that might have emerged through self-learning on how to write, writing practice, and experience. Thus, knowing the community's expectations concerning tutors' qualifications might reveal aspects that tutors need to possess and help us plan tutoring training to cover the EFL community's writing needs.

Methodology

Chemistry Faculty Population and Sample Size

Although by 2019–2020 the Chemistry Faculty's population included ($N = 1,233$) professors and

Arizmendi González

—
González Videgaray

($N = 1,082$) PG students (Portal de Estadísticas Universitaria UNAM, 2019–2020), the study focused on PGs and faculty instructors during an AW course delivered by DGECI at this faculty to explore their views on WCs' needs and tutors' qualifications. A group of 24 students and instructors that attended a writing course consented to participate from fields including materials engineering and science, biochemical sciences, sea sciences and limnology, chemistry, chemical engineering, biological pharmaceutical chemistry, master's in teaching for upper middle education, and English teaching. Two PG participants from teaching education and English teaching were included because one was coordinator of English in the Chemistry Faculty and possessed knowledge of chemists' writing needs, and the second possessed experience in advising students in the sciences. Thus, due to accessibility, the study reports results from a convenient sample ($n = 24$) of PGs interviewed and surveyed to have more reliable findings. Twelve participants were males and another 12 females. Sixteen were PG students, eight were chemistry instructors with a PG degree (Table 1), and all were native speakers of Spanish and EFL learners.

Data Collection Techniques and Procedures

Researchers used semistructured interviews (Appendix A) to explore in depth, in a free and spontaneous way (Pollit & Hungler, 1998, in Yuni & Urbano, 2006), participants' thoughts about factors to consider for implementation of a WC and specific tutors' qualifications in the EFL context. Later, a survey (Appendix B) with a sequential equal list of preestablished closed propositions followed by open questions was applied to allow participants to reflect on specific WC aspects (e.g., tutors, training, tutoring) and to express further comments (Yuni & Urbano, 2006) or in-depth details that enabled the study to report more reliable results. The degree of relevance (Likert scale of 1–5, least–most) for specific aspects (e.g., tutors, training, tutoring) in the survey, participants' spontaneous in-depth thoughts from interviews, and further comments from the survey's open answers upon

WCs and tutors were used in a complementary manner as Yuni & Urbano (2006) suggest. The study used different techniques because learning needs vary across individuals, cultures, and time, and because needs should be identified from an individual approach (Tenri & Quraisy, 2018, p. 3) and through multiple data collection techniques such as interview, attitude scales (Richteril & Chancerel, 1977, in Kaewpet, 2009; Hutchinsons & Waters, 1987, in Mohammed & Nur, 2018), and survey, the most widely used instrument (Sönmez, 2019).

Researchers gathered data from January 14 to 25, 2019. Interviews happened as scheduled and by reading written instructions to each participant. The researcher and interviewee met in the Chemistry Faculty, outside the classroom, to avoid interruptions or being overheard by other participants during the AW course's breaks. Then, to support the interview data and avoid bias, the researchers collected participants' reflections on specific WC aspects (e.g., tutor, training, tutoring) and further comments through the survey's closed and open questions (Appendices A–B).

The main researcher was a postdoctoral researcher responsible for studying, contributing to the implementation of a writing virtual learning environment, leading one-to-one sessions in a multidisciplinary faculty, and designing writing materials. The second researcher supervised the main researcher's study progress and offered academic support. Researchers led no sessions in the Chemistry Faculty and had no previous relationship with participants. Researchers tried to obtain participants' reliable responses by remarking that their participation was voluntary, would not imply any physical or moral risks, nor would they be penalized if they withdrew from the study. Participants were held to have understood the nature of the study and were oriented through the question "What came to your mind when hearing the phrase 'an academic writing center?'"

Concerning content validity, before applying the survey, the program coordinator revised the survey items for comprehensibility based on her experience in the field of teaching and coordinating the AW initiative and her native-like English proficiency. Based on the coordinator's feedback received on survey items'

Table 1. Participants

Pseudonym	Gender	Education	Discipline	Role
Juan&	M	PhD student	Sea sciences and limnology	Student
Simon	M	PhD student	Chemistry	Student
Alexandra+	F	PhD student	Sea sciences and limnology	Student
Isa	F	PhD	Chemistry	Student
Karla	F	PhD student	Chemistry	Student
Pedro	M	MA & PhD	Chemistry	Student
Bruno	M	MA	Chemistry	Student
Daniel	M	MA	Chemistry	Student
Rome	M	MA	Chemistry	Student
CarlosV	M	MA	Science and engineering	Student
Clorofila	M	MA student	Chemistry	Student
Diro	F	MA	Chemistry	Student
Gabs	F	MA	Chemistry	Student
Pepe&	F	MA	Chemistry	Student
Alejandra=	F	MA student	Chemistry	Student
Susana#	F	MA student	Sea sciences	Student
Lalo	M	PhD	Engineering	Instructor
Eli	F	PhD student	Institute of Geology	Instructor
Elizabeth1	F	PhD	Chemistry	Teacher-Instructor
Jo	M	MA	Chemistry	Teacher-Instructor
Ross	M	MA	Chemistry	Teacher-Instructor
Vincent	M	MA	Chemistry	Teacher-Instructor
*Clasa	F	MA	English teaching	Chemistry English Coordinator-Instructor
Maria	F	MA	English teaching	Teacher-Tutor

Notes: Clasa was the only participant that did not answer the survey due to work duties. Instructor: Each of the academics that delivered sessions about academic writing in English for chemistry participants during the training course in the Faculty of Chemistry.

Teacher: Participant instructors that are teachers of English at UNAM.

Tutor: Instructors or teachers that have offered support about academic writing in English from a collaborative perspective or through personalized sessions rather than in a whole group as instructors did.

Professors: Academics delivering classes across disciplines.

comprehensibility, the survey was edited for subsequent application (Appendix B). According to Cronbach's alpha (.75) analysis, the survey items' internal consistency was acceptable.

Data Analysis

Researchers transcribed interviews word by word (Yuni & Urbano, 2006) and did inductive analysis, that is, themes emerged from data. Interview data from each open question was

compiled into 24-row, three-column tables. The first column contained transcriptions of raw data per participant; the second and third columns contained codes concerning students' and instructors' data accordingly (Appendix C Analysis 1a). Then, within another two-column table used to classify students and instructors, repeated/related data (e.g., professor with English experience, with experience in the target genre) was compiled and classified into categories (e.g., experience) that emerged

from each question’s data (Appendix C Analysis 1b), and later statements concerning the data within each category were constructed. For instance, responses to the question “What comes to your mind when you hear the phrase ‘an academic writing center?’” (e.g., specialized people with advanced specialized English; tutors and diverse embedded elements to improve the scientific writing) were grouped within the “specialized staff” category; afterward, a proposition (e.g., “For students, a WC is a place mainly with qualified staff in AW”) about the category was formulated and written under a corresponding students’ or instructors’ column (Appendix C Analysis 1c). Fourth, a summary was done by including all formulated propositions from students’ or instructors’ data concerning a single question (Appendix C Analysis 1d) followed by writing main ideas, to reduce data, about each summary (Appendix C Analysis 1e). Fifth, in other two-column tables to classify students and instructors’ responses, main ideas were compared to reduce data by summarizing similar findings and writing differences (Appendix C Analysis 1f). Finally, summaries were reanalyzed to extract chunks of information that corresponded to a wider theme and to integrate them. For instance, the “tutors’ qualifications” theme contains all instances when instructors or students addressed tutors’ qualifications (e.g., proficiency in English, teaching, experience). This last analysis was used to construct an argument by including instructors’ or students’ similar or different points (Appendix C Analysis 1g). Then, to support qualitative findings, the survey was analyzed by counting frequencies and finally reporting the results in percentages.

Results

Participants’ WC Conceptualization and Tutors as a Core Element

Interviews (Table 2) revealed that participants imagined a physical space in which the focus was on learning to write in English under the support of a qualified tutor, with available paper-based and online writing resources. Indeed, for students and instructors, the specialized tutor was among the most accounted aspect when asked about conceptualizing a WC (Appendix I-Q5). The qualified instructors and personal advisors (Appendix I-Q6) are part of a WC and regarded as relevant (Appendix I-Q7).

Expected Tutors’ Qualifications in an EFL Context

Interviews reveal various qualifications tutors should mainly fulfill to be members of the WC or that the community expects from tutors (Table 3).

Profession and Teaching

Students and instructors expect people with a teaching background such as professors of languages, of different disciplines, of hard sciences, or even translators, and editors of magazines; people that help to write, advise, instruct, teach, and deliver workshops and courses.

Experience and Publishing

Students and instructors expect people with experience as writers, as reviewers, in delivering courses, in teaching the English language, in diverse genres, in a target genre, in writing

Table 2. Sampling Extracts from Students’ and Instructors’ Writing Center Conceptualization and Tutors as a Core Element

Students	Instructors
<p><i>Pepe: ... first a physical space in which you can work, an area to work, where there are available advisors that guide you in the writing of something.</i></p>	<p><i>Elizabeth: ... I know that WCs are physical places in which students and academics take courses, receive personalized support, well one-to-one, about any text in which they have doubts, thus it is like a mixture,... the courses and service of tutoring for people about their texts.</i></p>

Table 3. Frequencies of Expected Qualifications Concerning Prospective Tutors

Category	Students	Instructors	Frequency Totals
Profession	43	25	68
Experience	20	16	36
Discipline	18	15	33
Writing	14	18	32
Proficiency	18	6	24
Trained	13	6	19
Specialized	8	8	16
Genres	4	7	11
Education	2	3	5

research articles, in journals' protocols, and in publishing.

Discipline (i.e., field of study)

Students and instructors expect people from the same field of study in which students and instructors are immersed, tutors from multiple disciplines, and/or from diverse scientific fields; tutors from hard sciences such as chemistry, physics, biology, and the humanities, languages, and letters fields.

Writing

Students and instructors expect people that have worked in writing, have studied writing, have been taught how to teach to write, or have experience in writing. Students and instructors expect people that are strong, focused on, related with, and/or interested in writing, that know, that can help, advise, instruct, teach, and/or give workshops about writing.

Proficiency in English

Students expect more than instructors, people with a high level of English, or mastery of English. Instructors did not specify English proficiency overtly, but based on the specialized and experience features above, instructors seemed to expect tutors with good English proficiency.

Trained

Students expected a little more than instructors; people trained in topics related to AW in English in diverse disciplines.

Specialized People

Students and instructors expected specialized people in languages, in linguistics, in English, in grammar, in writing, in the style of different genres, in diverse fields of study, in translation, and/or in tutoring.

Genres

Students expected a little less than instructors, people that know how to write in different genres including RA and theses, but RA were the most often specified genre. Apart from tutors' knowledge of genres, findings reveal that for PG students the WC should prioritize support in writing RAs, and later theses, books, book chapters, reports, reviews, and posters. For PG instructors, in contrast, the WC should first focus upon a thesis in the L1 followed by a RA in the L2, and later the university genres cited above.

Findings about genres in English as opposed to genres in Spanish are supported with quantitative results as shown in Table 4 and according to the highest relevance from participants' views. For PG students and instructors, writing a RA and its publication in English was needed more than the same genre in Spanish. In Spanish, writing a thesis is the most important genre needing consideration.

Education

Students and instructors expect people with a doctorate and/or master's degree. And although the counts in this theme are low, expected tutors should be PGs because people

Table 4. The Most Relevant Genres to Write at University

Genres	Writing in English			Writing in Spanish		
	Instructors	Students	Totals	Instructors	Students	Totals
Research article	7	16	23	5	9	14
Essay	5	9	14	4	6	10
Scientific protocol	5	9	14	4	8	12
Thesis	5	8	14	5	10	15
Book chapter	3	9	12	3	8	11
Poster	3	12	15	2	9	11
Curriculum	1	12	13	0	11	11

with experience in publishing or with publications are often PGs.

Overall, interviews revealed that profession and teaching, experience and publishing, disciplinary field, writing experience, proficiency in English, trained or specialized tutors, people knowledgeable about target genres and with a high level of education excelled in terms of tutors' qualifications to be considered in an EFL WC, and that the research paper in a target discipline is the most needed genre. The findings are complemented with survey results. Participants reported the need to consider qualifications of the tutoring staff (96%, or 23 cases), training for tutors (88%, 21), and criteria to select tutors (75%, 18). In addition, participants reported the need of support to write research articles (100%, 24), and/or specific genres (88%, 21), to publish research articles (75%, 18), and needs according to faculty context (79%, 19) (Appendix B Survey results). Thus, interviews and surveys results complemented each other, enabling us to present more reliable results.

Discussion

Profession and Teaching Experience

A target profession and teaching experience are qualifications that can be fulfilled as diverse professors in this faculty are chemists. However, teaching experience in English and AW seems challenging to be covered.

Pedro: people that have experience, . . . that have experience in teaching courses, . . .

Alexandra: instructors, people that give workshops, . . .

Bruno: people . . . with a doctorate, that have studied English, . . . people that are related with writing and semantics, aspects related to the language but applied to writing

Experience in Research and Publishing Research Articles

Professors with research and publication experience in English seems a challenging endeavor to cover because the number of professors with publications in indexing journals in English is small. For UNAM, in the subsystem of scientific research, until 2019 there were around 1,771 researchers across bachelor, master, and doctorate studies. Besides, according to the institutes and centers of the subsystem of scientific research (SIC), compiling the scientific articles of institutes, centers, and units of special projects in supporting research and teaching, the research articles published in indexed international journals were 3,718 in total (UNAM Agenda Estadística, 2020). And, specifically in the Chemistry Faculty, according to figures about academic personnel per faculty at UNAM, until 2020 the staff was integrated by 1,069 academics versus 63,982 bachelor, 2,123 master, and 2,397 doctorate students in biological, chemical, and health sciences (UNAM, Agenda Estadística, 2020, UNAM's population per field of study). These numbers indicate big differences concerning professors, publications, and student population, making it difficult for this community to have sufficient

experienced professors in researching and publishing scientific papers in English.

Proficiency in English and Writing

Based on the high English level expected, results suggest that English native tutors would be preferred. However, in the absence of English natives, qualified tutors with a high level of English, writing experience, and publishing in English should come into place, as in Havva Zorluel Özer's (2020) findings. However, recruiting people with linguistic and English writing qualifications in the EFL scientific context is difficult because professors are often still developing these qualifications. Hence, we should design training courses for prospective tutors to receive adequate support. Tutors should know the student's L1, ESL, writing skills, and offer individual guidance according to an evaluation of English proficiency (Thonus, 1993; Wayne Taylor, 2018).

Alexandra: instructors, people that . . . have a strong basis on how writing must be, and obviously, that they have a very good level of English, so they help you know what is inhibiting you

Carla: people with the highest possible English level or necessary English and that have experience in writing in this genre [article], . . . a scientist that has put emphasis on writing and composition, . . .

Knowledge of Different Disciplines' Writing

Professors with knowledge of different disciplines' writing seems a challenging endeavor to cover too. Professors in specific fields might not know writing conventions in fields in which they are not immersed, and the subject matter involved.

Bruno: people from different sciences and with experience in writing, . . . people that are related with writing and semantics, aspects related to the language but applied to writing

Results indicated the need to recruit tutors across disciplines because students come from disciplines different from chemistry. This means to match specialized tutors with tutees from the same study field, which might allow tutors to better understand the context because a tutor with knowledge of a text's context and evaluation criteria of a text gives more effective feedback in real time (North, 1984). However, matching tutors and tutees from the same study field has been a logistical challenge in the United States (Özer, 2020), and it might also be the same in EFL contexts.

In EFL contexts, specialists volunteering to tutor and with English writing experience are scant. Faculty academics have insufficient time and several teaching courses to cover (Leahy, 1990). These qualified people are often full-time professors with scarce availability to work, especially under no-fee conditions for tutors, that is, voluntarily, which is common in EFL WCs (Özer, 2020). Researchers in the EFL context often publish in L1 (Spanish) rather than in English or write in L1 (Spanish) and publish in English. However, researchers achieve English writing thanks to translators, or editing services borrowed from English native-speaking experts (Contreras & Ochoa, 2010).

Moreover, to Özer (2020), qualified PG specialists playing the role of supervisors might help with the research of master and doctorate students regarding content, but not necessarily in L2 language and structure. It is unlikely that PGs' supervisors are highly proficient in English, experienced in AW in English, and knowledgeable of the English and Spanish languages' variations. PGs' supervisors might prioritize content and research contribution rather than supporting students' English AW.

Results were similar to those of Diana Awad Scrocco (2017), who pointed out tutors should be well trained, and Violeta Molina-Natera and Karen Shirley López-Gil (2019), for whom tutors should be qualified and respond to diverse services and functions not limited to teaching and researching. Tutors should prioritize the learning experience and help authors do the process, not be solely proofreaders, that is, people that prescribe, prioritize the product,

Arizmendi González

—
González Videgaray

identify, and correct errors (Harwood et al., 2012; Kyle, 2018).

Texts That Need to Be Written in English by EFL Postgraduates

Like Özer (2020), PG students were already writing a paper under advisors' supervision. And as PG participants are mostly from the hard sciences, they prioritize receiving support in RAs for publication because it is required to obtain PG degrees. Prioritizing writing a thesis in L1 (Spanish) is understandable as English writing is optional at UNAM, and it is from theses that RAs emerge. This situation of writing scientific knowledge in English encourages WC tutors to focus on the RA in this PG EFL university context.

Proposals for a New Writing Center in an EFL Context

As tutors were found to be the WC core element and RA the most needed genre for this scientific community, it can be suitable to recruit faculty teachers in general and train them on topics that specialized tutees require. This is training generalist tutors with the skills needed to accommodate writers from different disciplines and abilities (Özer, 2020). Train them on how to help authors with issues regarding genre, rhetoric, structure, language, and writing aspects (Phillips, 2017). Besides, for Özer (2020) recruiting faculty members guarantees tutor positions for longer periods than when recruiting PG students that leave the position after graduation.

Like Lunsford, Ede, and Arraez (2001) and Lunsford (1991), we advocate for tutors informed by theories of knowledge as socially constructed, collaboration attuned to diversity (i.e., a center Burkean Parlor), in which control, power, and authority are constantly negotiated and shared (p. 97). We suggest linking the English department to the WC development and tutoring. English coordinators and teachers should collaborate and dedicate time for tutoring in their duties. Indeed, in this context, two teachers collaborated as tutors during their free time. Learning while tutoring might allow

them to gain knowledge and publish in English in the future.

When teachers are not available, Özer (2020) points out that tutors can be volunteers, who register for this job, so we need to give additional and special attention to disciplines during tutors' training (Phillips, 2017). Tutors can be PG students invited across disciplines, PGs that took AW courses, or that received tutoring support on research papers. However, they need to be paid; they will provide academic services and as such they need remuneration. Full-time professors who work for free are difficult to recruit as they are generally overworked or full of academic commitments.

Moreover, some actions that have occurred after this research was completed can be useful for other EFL tutors. In this context, the WC's coordinator organized monthly tutors' meetings so PG students across disciplines, teachers, and the writing coordinators can discuss tutoring experiences. EFL tutors shared and tried to learn collaboratively about tutoring (booked online on the platform), how to lead sessions, how sessions unfold, and how to improve as tutors and the sessions. Tutors used a pre- and follow-up form (available on the WC booking platform) to consult before and after a tutoring session. Another useful action taken in this EFL context was to invite guest speakers or current ESL PGs studying in English-speaking countries and in different disciplines to share their writing issues, strategic solutions, and suggestions. These sessions were recorded for future consults.

It is necessary to request collaboration with writing experts to tutor a couple of PGs through videoconferencing and record sessions for later tutor training purposes. Offer regular courses that aim to develop tutors' writing, writing in specific and specialized genres, language, and unknown structures (Farrell, 1994) before opening a WC and throughout the semesters. Instead of just replicating training courses that demonstrate how to conduct a tutoring session, how to improve the tutoring practice, and how to investigate collaboratively, because these objectives allow us to theorize practice, construct knowledge, and keep a functional center (Zhang, 2018),

tutors should attend tutoring sessions to observe what works and reflect on what should be adapted. As more PGs play the role of tutors, we should not assume they know how to support both UGs and PGs, or that they will stay as tutors when graduating. PGs should be trained to guide PGs and to train future or substitute PG tutors. According to Talinn Phillips (2017), many WCs have created programs of writing to aid PG students. However, tutors have not been trained to work with PG students (p. 41) and believe that strategies used with UGs can also be applied to work with PG equivalents (Farrell, 1994).

Besides, as the Chemistry Faculty is one of the university's faculties with a specific unit for teaching and learning English and academic activities to master Spanish usage, we suggest tutoring in English and in Spanish by linking this Chemistry Faculty's unit to the WC's tutoring program. Coordinators and instructors from the Chemistry Faculty's initiatives should offer AW tutoring in the WC. The institution must allocate the WC's budget to implement tutor training and pay tutors for their services. These suggestions might sustain a WC, and tutors contribute to the achievement of the university community's writing needs.

Unlike American universities' tutors, EFL tutors were novices in tutoring service. They were teachers of EFL and PG scientific students with English proficiency, ongoing research, and who took short (4 hours) training courses to lead tutoring sessions. Tutors were volunteers from different disciplines and were learning in tutoring practice by sharing knowledge among themselves in monthly meetings. Tutors were people willing to help and share with other students and learn through tutoring.

Implications and Conclusions

This scientific community feels unknowledgeable, unconfident, alone, with no tutors and insufficient L2 AW support, specifically for the RA in hard sciences. Hard sciences' professors are generally scientists rather than AW tutors, scientists that do not always possess experience in English, writing, genres, or L2 publications. Thus, WCs need to recruit faculty and students

to be trained as tutors that also deliver courses about transferable skills that permit students to gain confidence as writers and effectively write scientific papers in English. Confidence contributes to students' self-worth as writers, interest, attention, perseverance, effort, and it reduces anxiety (Pajares, 2003).

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Dirección General de Cooperación e Internacionalización (DGEI) [General Direction of Cooperation and Internationalization], under a scholarship for full-time research at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) [Autonomous National University of Mexico], Facultad de Estudios Superiores Acatlán (FESA) [Faculty of Higher Education Acatlan]. Graciela Arizmendi González (postdoctoral researcher) was supervised by María del Carmen González Videgaray (full-time professor) from 2018 to 2022, during a postdoctoral fellowship sponsored by Dirección General de Cooperación e Internacionalización (DGEI) [General Direction of Cooperation and Internationalization] at Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) [Autonomous National University of Mexico] and Facultad de Estudios Superiores Acatlán (FESA) [Faculty of Higher Education Acatlan]. Graciela's and María del Carmen's research interests are in academic writing in English, L2 postgraduate writers' negotiation of the structure in their research genres, and writing centers in the EFL context.

Note

To know more about what professors think and do about reading (R) and writing (W) in programs to form teachers, 544 subject-professors from 50 national institutions were surveyed. Results showed 47% of professors intervene in the initial and ending stages of required assignments. Professors explain techniques, orientate students, correct final products, but omit guidance, disregard feedback, do not help students implement or solve possible difficulties while implementing techniques, do not accompany students during the process, and do not help them develop as writers. Thirty-seven percent of professors teach writing in class by explaining and

Arizmendi González

—
González Videgaray

exchanging thoughts interactively with their students; 16% of professors do not give precise writing activities; and just a few dedicate time to giving advice. Professors tell students what to write, or correct what is wrong, but miss helping students control their writing skills. Courses and workshops are extracurricular and focused on students' difficulties. Teachers suggest implementing writing activities in the disciplines and classes; however, their suggestions lack "how?"

References

- Bräuer, G. (2012). Academic literacy development. In C. Thaiss, G. Brauer, P. Carlino, L. Ganobsick-Williams, & A. Sinha (Eds.), *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places* (pp. 467–484). WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press.
- Burns, W. (2014). Critiquing the center: The role of tutor evaluations in an open admissions writing center. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 11(2), 1–6. <http://hdl.handle.net/2152/62039>
- Bromley, P., Northway, K., & Schonberg, E. (2016). Transfer and dispositions in writing centers: A cross-institutional, mixed-methods study. *Across the Disciplines*, 13(1). <https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/bromleyetal2016.cfm>
- Carlino, P. (2012). Who takes care of writing in Latin American and Spanish universities? In C. Thaiss, G. Brauer, P. Carlino, L. Ganobsick-Williams, & A. Sinha (Eds.), *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places* (pp. 485–498). WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press.
- Carlino, P., Iglesia, P., & Laxalt, I. (2010, September). Leer y escribir en la formación de profesores secundarios de diversas disciplinas: Qué dicen los docentes que se hace. Memorias de las Jornadas Nacionales "Lectura, escritura y aprendizaje disciplinar." Facultad de Ciencias Humanas, Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto, Córdoba, Argentina. <https://www.aacademica.org/paula.carlino/135.pdf>
- Chang, T.-S. (2013). The idea of a writing center in Asian countries: A preliminary search of models in Taiwan. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 10(2). <http://www.praxisuwc.com/chang-102>
- Contreras, A. E., & Ochoa, J. R. J. (2010). *Manual de redacción científica: Escribir artículos científicos es fácil después de ser difícil. Una guía práctica*. Ediciones de la Noche.
- Díaz-Sosa, M. L., & González-Videgaray, M. (2019). *Independencia intelectual de académicos de la FES Acatlán*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Facultad de Estudios Superiores (FES) Acatlán.
- Dirección General de Cooperación e Internacionalización. (2018a). <https://www.unam-internacional.unam.mx/academic-writing>
- Dirección General de Cooperación e Internacionalización. (2018b, November). Programa de escritura académica en inglés. UNAM, DGEI. Ciudad de México, México. <https://www.unam-internacional.unam.mx/doc/convocatorias/academic-writing/aw-convocatoria-en-n.pdf>
- Dirección General de Cooperación e Internacionalización. (2019, August). Programa de escritura académica en inglés. UNAM, DGEI. Facultad de Estudios Superiores Acatlán. Naucalpan de Juárez, Estado de México.
- Dirección General de Cooperación e Internacionalización. (2020, January). Encuentro internacional para el intercambio de mejores prácticas en materia del apoyo a la escritura académica. Academic skills programme, University of Bath / Programa de escritura académica en inglés, UNAM, DGEI. Escuela Nacional de Lenguas, Lingüística y Traducción. Ciudad Universitaria, Ciudad de México.
- Driscoll, D. L., & Perdue, S. W. (2012). Theory, lore, and more: An analysis of RAD research in the *Writing Center Journal*, 1980–2009. *Writing Center Journal*, 32(1), 11–39. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43442391>
- Eleftheriou, M. (2019). Multilingual, Middle-Eastern students' varied responses to directive and non-directive strategies in peer tutoring. *TESOL International Journal*, 14(1), 65–84. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1244101>
- Emerson, L. (2012). Developing a "Kiwi" writing centre at Massey University, New Zealand. In C. Thaiss, G. Brauer, P. Carlino, L. Ganobsick-Williams, & A. Sinha (Eds.), *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places* (pp. 313–323). WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press.
- Escritorio Académico, UNAM. (2019). <https://www.unamenlinea.unam.mx/recurso/escritorio-academico>
- Facultad de Química, UNAM. (2022). Idiomas. <https://quimica.unam.mx/alumnos/apoyos/idiomas/#es>, <https://quimica.unam.mx/alumnos/apoyos/idiomas/#ingles>
- Farrell, J. T. (1994). Some of the challenges to writing centers posed by graduate students. *Writing Lab Newsletter*, 18(6), 3–5. <https://www.wlnjournal.org/archives/v18/18-6.pdf>

- FES Acatlan, UNAM. (2020). Academic writing one-to-one sessions. <https://academic-writing.acatlan.unam.mx/>
- Gavari Starkie, E. I., & Tenca Sidotti, P. (2017). The historic evolution of centres of academic writing. *Revista de Educación*, 378, 9–29. <https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2017-378-359>
- Gillespie, P., & Lerner, N. (2004). *The Allyn and Bacon guide to peer tutoring* (2nd ed.). Pearson Longman. <https://www.thefreelibrary.com/Gillespie%2c+Paula%2c+and+Neal+Lerner.+The+Allyn+and+Bacon+Guide+to+Peer...-a0198354564>
- Gracida, J. M. Y., Martínez, M. G. T., López, P. L., López, V. M. A., Lozada, Ch. C., Orozco, A. J., Zuaste, L. R. M. (2007). *El quehacer de la escritura: Propuesta didáctica para la enseñanza de la redacción en el ámbito universitario*. UNAM. https://portalacademico.cch.unam.mx/materiales/libros/pdfs/librocch_quehacerescritura.pdf
- Hanauer, D. I., & Englander, K. (2011). Quantifying the burden of writing research articles in a second language: Data from Mexican scientists. *Written Communication*, 28(4), 403–416. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088311420056>
- Harwood, N., Austin, L., & Macaulay, R. (2012). Cleaner, helper, teacher? The role of proof-readers of student writing. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(5), 569–584. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.531462>
- Hays, G. (2010). Learners helping learners in an EFL writing center. In A. M. Stoke (Ed.), *JALT2009 Conference Proceedings*. JALT. <https://jalt-publications.org/archive/proceedings/2009/E013.pdf>
- Hernández, M. (2018, June). Impulso a artículos científicos en inglés. Internacionalización de la UNAM. *Gaceta Digital UNAM*, 4971. <http://132.247.70.75/index.php/gum10/article/view/86415>
- Johnston, S., Cornwell, S., & Yoshida, H. (2008). Writing centers in Japan. *Osaka Jogakuin Daigaku Kenkyuu Kiyuu*, 5, 181–192. http://www.wilmina.ac.jp/ojc/edu/kiyo_2008/kiyo_05_PDF/11.pdf
- Kaewpet, C. (2009). A framework for investigating learner needs: Needs analysis extended to curriculum development. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 6(2), 209–220. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237267088_A_Framework_for_Investigating_Learner_Needs_Needs_Analysis_Extended_to_Curriculum_Development
- Kinthead, J. A., & Harris, J. (1993). *Writing centers in context: Twelve case studies*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Kyle, B. R. (2018). Merging tutoring and editing in a Chinese graduate writing center. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 15(3), 23–33. <http://hdl.handle.net/2152/68074>
- Leahy, R. (1990). What the college writing center is—and isn't. *College Teaching*, 38(2), 43–49. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27558391>
- Leki, I. (2009). Before the conversation: A sketch of some possible backgrounds, experiences, and attitudes among ESL students visiting a writing center. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (Eds.), *ESL writers: A guide for writing center tutors* (2nd ed., pp. 1–17). Boynton/Cook.
- Lunsford, A. (1991). Collaboration, control, and the idea of a writing center. *Writing Center Journal*, 12(1), 3–10. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43441887>
- Lunsford, A., Ede, L., & Arraez, C. (2001). Working together: Collaborative research and writing in higher education. *Profession*, 7–15. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25607178>
- Mohammed, A. S. E., & Nur, H. S. M. (2018). Needs analysis in English for academic purposes: The case of teaching assistants at the University of Khartoum. *HOW*, 25(2), 49–68. <https://doi.org/10.19183/how.25.2.409>
- Molina-Natera, V. (2012). Escritura a través del currículo en Colombia: Situación actual y desafíos. *magis, Revista Internacional de Investigación en Educación*, 5(10), 93–108. <http://magisinvestigacioneducacion.javeriana.edu.co/>
- Molina-Natera, V. (2014). Centros de escritura: Una mirada retrospectiva para entender el presente y futuro de estos programas en el contexto latinoamericano. *LEGENDA*, 18(18), 9–33. <http://erevistas.saber.ula.ve/index.php/legenda/article/view/5205>
- Molina-Natera, V. (2017). Resolución de conflictos en las tutorías de escritura según la teoría pragmadialéctica. *FOLIOS primera época, primer semestre*, 45, 17–28. <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/folios/n45/n45a02.pdf>
- Molina, V., & López, K. (2019). Estado de la cuestión de los centros y programas de escritura en Latinoamérica. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, 78, <https://doi.org/10.17227/rce.num78-8066>
- North, S. M. (1984). The idea of a writing center. *College English. National Council of Teachers of English*, 46(5), 433–446. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/377047>

Arizmendi González

González Videgaray

- O'Sullivan, I., & Cleary, L. (2012). The regional writing centre at the university of Limerick. In C. Thaiss, G. Brauer, P. Carlino, L. Ganobsick-Williams, & A. Sinha (Eds.), *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places* (pp. 261–270). WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press.
- Özer, H. Z. (2020). Staffing an EFL writing center: Issues and perspectives. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344312053_Staffing_an_EFL_Writing_Center_Issues_and_Perspectives
- Öztürk Akcaoglu, M., (2011). *An assessment of academic writing needs of graduate students*. Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University. <http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12613608/index.pdf>
- Pajares, F. (2003) Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 139–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560308222>
- Phillips, T. (2017). Shifting support for shifting identities: Meeting the needs of multilingual graduate writers. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 14(3). <http://hdl.handle.net/2152/61736>
- Portal de Estadísticas Universitaria UNAM, Población Escolar y Personal Académico por zona Geográfica, Población Escolar en el Campus de Ciudad Universitaria, 2019–2020, <https://www.planeacion.unam.mx/subdireccion-de-sistemas-de-informacion-estadistica/>.
- Russell, D. (1990). Writing across the curriculum in historical perspective: Toward a social interpretation. *College English*, 52, 52–73. <https://doi.org/10.2307/377412>
- Scrocco, D. A. (2017). Reconsidering reading models in writing center consultations: When is the read-ahead method appropriate? *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 14(3), 10–20. <http://hdl.handle.net/2152/61733>
- Skillen, J., Merten, M., Trivett, N., & Percy, A. (1998). The IDEALL approach to learning development: A model for fostering improved literacy and learning outcomes for students. *Proceedings of the 1998 Australian Association for Active Research in Education Conference*. <http://www.aare.edu.au/98pap/ski98343.htm>
- Solé, I., Teberosky, A., & Castelló, M. (2012). Academic communication strategies at postgraduate level. In C. Thaiss, G. Brauer, P. Carlino, L. Ganobsick-Williams, & A. Sinha (Eds.), *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places* (pp. 365–375). WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press.
- Sönmez, H. (2019). An examination of needs analysis research in the language education process. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 7(1), 8–17. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331813254>
- Tan, B-H. (2011). Innovating writing centers and online writing labs outside North America. *Asian EFL Journal*, 13(2), 391–418. <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/PDF/Volume-13-Issue-2-Tan.pdf>
- Tenri, A. A., & Quraisy, H. (2018). Needs analysis of the English writing skill as the base to design the learning materials. *SHS Web of Conferences* 42, 00050, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20184200050>
- Thaiss, C. (2012). Origins, aims, and uses of writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places. In C. Thaiss, G. Bräuer, P. Carlino, L. Ganobsick-Williams, & A. Sinha (Eds.), *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places* (pp. 5–22). WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press.
- Thonus, T. (1993). Tutors as teachers: Assisting ESL/EFL students in the writing center. *Writing Center Journal*, 13(2), 13–26. https://d31kydh6n6r5j5.cloudfront.net/uploads/sites/242/2019/11/WCJ13.2_Thonus.pdf
- Thonus, T. (2014). Tutoring multilingual students: Shattering the myths. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 44(2), 200–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2014.906233>
- Toda la UNAM en Línea. (2019). <https://www.unamenlinea.unam.mx/>, <https://www.unamenlinea.unam.mx/recurso/english-media-unidades-tematicas-en-ingles-de-la-cuaed>, <https://www.unamenlinea.unam.mx/recurso/escritorio-academico>, <https://www.unamenlinea.unam.mx/recurso/82339-como-escribir-una-tesis>, <https://www.unamenlinea.unam.mx/recurso/83911-centro-de-ensenanza-de-idiomas>
- Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Dirección general de planeación: Agenda Estadística 2008–2021. <https://www.planeacion.unam.mx/subdireccion-de-sistemas-de-informacion-estadistica/agenda/agenda-2008-2021/>
- Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Agenda Estadística 2020. Personal Académico. Académicos por dependencia 2020. <https://www.planeacion.unam.mx/Agenda/2020/disco/#>
- Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Agenda Estadística 2020. Subsistema de

- investigación científica. Investigadores por nivel de estudios 2019. <https://www.planeacion.unam.mx/Agenda/2020/disco/>
- Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Agenda Estadística 2020. Subsistema de investigación científica. Productos de investigación publicados. <https://www.planeacion.unam.mx/Agenda/2020/disco/>
- Vázquez Ramos, J. (2013). El flogisto ilustrado. Estudiantes de la Generación 2014. <https://quimica.unam.mx/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/flogistoespecialred.pdf>
- Wayne Taylor, Z. (2018). Escritura Sau NTAWV PAGESULAT, and writing: A content analysis of ESL/ ELL writing center services provided by public flagship institutions. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 15(2), 3–8. <http://hdl.handle.net/2152/65592>
- Weber, J. L. (2016). Resources. Starting a writing centre. <http://writingcenters.org/starting-a-writing-center/>
- Yuni, J. A., & Urbano, C. U. (2006). *Técnicas para investigar 2. Recursos metodológicos para la preparación de proyectos de investigación* (2nd ed., Vol. 2). Editorial Brujas.
- Zhang, J. (2018). Review of Around the texts of writing center work: An inquiry-based approach to tutor education, by R. Mark Hall. *Praxis. A Writing Center Journal*, 15(3), 54–56. <http://hdl.handle.net/2152/68077>

Arizmendi González

—

González Videgaray

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Interview

Name _____

Day _____ Date _____ Time _____ Faculty _____

Instructions: Please answer the following questions:

1. How is your writing in English?
2. What could help you be a better writer?
3. Do you think that writing support should be offered? Why?
4. In what way do you think that writing support should be offered?
5. What comes to your mind when you hear the phrase “an academic writing center”?
6. What aspects do you think are involved in a writing center?
7. Which of those aspects do you consider as the most relevant? Why?
8. What role do you think that writing centers play?
9. Whom should writing centers be concentrated?
10. What kind of skills should be offered in writing centers?
11. For what kind of individual support would you come to the center?
12. For what kind of individual support would you meet the writing center staff?
13. How many supporting sessions in the writing center would be sufficient for you? Why?
14. What kind of materials would you ideally expect to find in a writing center?
15. How would you advertise the services offered by the writing center?

16. How would you like your writing progress were assessed in the writing center?
17. What kind of activities should be the focus of a writing center?
18. What type of texts/genres (e.g., research articles, essays, thesis) should be the focus of a writing center?
19. What kind of services would you suggest to the writing center to reinforce the users' writing production?
20. Who would you like to have on the writing center staff? Why?
21. What useful learning resources/events (e.g., conferences, conventions) would you suggest to the writing center to refine the written prose?
22. What kind of equipment (e.g., printers, scanner, copiers) would you like to find in the writing center?
23. How do you imagine the organization of facilities in the writing center?
24. Would there be other activities that the staff of the writing center could offer beyond the center?
25. What qualifications would you consider in selecting tutors?
26. Whereabouts would be appropriate to install the writing center in this institution? Why?
27. Would you like to add something else?
28. Is there another aspect unaddressed about writing that you would like to discuss further?
(Adapted from Hanauer & Englander, 2013, p. 65)

Unreal situation:

Imagine that UNAM earned one million pesos to create a writing center to help your work as a researcher/scientist. What would be the best way to use this money to facilitate the dissemination of research? (Adapted from Hanauer & Englander, 2013, p. 65)

Arizmendi González

—
González Videgaray

Appendix B

Survey

Name _____ Email _____

Date _____ Faculty _____

Pseudonym _____

Instructions: Please check (✓) a box per proposition about what you consider a priority to build an academic writing center at UNAM. Use the scale 1–5: 1 = less relevant, 5 = most relevant.

Appendix B.

Factors to be considered for an academic writing center according to relevance

Propositions	Values					NA
	(1 least)	2	3	4	(5 most)	
	<i>Physical space and staff</i>					
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
	<i>Conceptual design of the writing center</i>					
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						

- 17 Specific needs according to each department/division
- 18 Specific needs according to each student context
- 19 Consideration of time to offer assistance in the writing center
- 20 Consideration of time dedicated for each individual session
- 21 Consideration of support for groups of special interests
- 22 Determine criteria to select tutors
- 23 Training tutors
- 24 Refine/update the center according to research emerging on the writing center daily basis

Service offered in the center

- 25 Individual support for users
- 26 Instruction or support according to a user's specific needs
- 27 Offer workshops
- 28 Strategic writing activities available on paper version
- 29 Offer general writing support
- 30 Offer support about writing for specific genres (research articles, essays, protocols, curriculum vitae . . .)
- 31 Offer advice about academic writing of specific texts/genres in English
 - A Research article
 - B Essay
 - C Scientific protocol
 - D Thesis
 - E Book chapter
 - F Poster
 - G Curriculum vitae
- 32 Offer support about academic writing of specific texts/genres in Spanish
 - H Research article
 - I Essay
 - J Scientific protocol
 - K Thesis
 - L Book chapter
 - M Poster
 - N Curriculum vitae

Arizmendi González

—

González Videgaray

- 33 Attention to writing across the disciplines
- 34 Support to publish research articles
- 35 Offer strategies to manage writer anxiety
- 36 Access to online autonomous learning tutorials
- 37 Access to online writing resources
- 38 Offer support via email
- 39 Offer support via Skype
- 40 Library with writing supporting resources for students
- 41 Library with diverse writing resources for tutors
- 42 Offer conferences delivered by special guests
- 43 Application of English writing diagnostic exams

Administration of the center

- 44 Budget for materials (copies, printings)
- 45 Promotion/dissemination of offered services
- 46 Register of visitors per day and time to identify busy hours
- 47 Individual files to follow up users
- 48 Make strategic connections with other writing centers
- 49 Keep connections with departments (engineering, humanities, English)
- 50 Keep connections between the writing center and writing in the classroom
- 51 Chart with name, role, and photo of the staff at the center
- 52 Design an attendance diploma for users

Constructive feedback

- 53 Mailbox for complaints or suggestions (constructive evaluation upon offered services and staff)

B. Instructions: Answer briefly the following questions:

- 1. Which factors could contribute effectively to develop students' and academics' writing skills in English?

-
2. In what way the factors listed in 1 could contribute to developing students' and academics' writing skills in English?

-
-
3. Other comments

Arizmendi González

—

González Videgaray

Appendix C

Analysis 1a

I-Q5: What comes to your mind when hearing the phrase “an academic writing center”?

Transcriptions	1st analysis Students	1st analysis Instructors
<p>Susana: I imagine that is like people that have an advanced level of English, I think that is something that is quite advanced and very specialized.</p>	<p>Specialized people with advanced and specialized English</p>	
<p>Elizabeth: I am a little familiarized with this, I know that writing centers are physical places where students and academics can go to take courses, receive personalized support, well, one-to-one support about any text that they have doubts. So, it is like the mixture of what I told you, that there are two views: one is the courses and the other is the service that can be given to the people that need support for their texts.</p>		<p>Physical place A place to take courses, receive personalized or individual support about texts and doubts</p>

Appendix C

Analysis 1b

I-Q5: What comes to your mind when hearing the phrase “an academic writing center”?

Students Themes	Instructors Themes
<p>Specialized staff: specialized people with advanced specialized English, tutors, and diverse embedded elements to improve the scientific writing, place with advisors to solve doubts about written texts in English, an area with advisors that guide you on how to write, advisors, a trained team to advice, instruct, and support students and academics and other external people to improve writing in English, with specialized people in grammar, advisors, writers, director, team of trained people to advise, instruct, and support</p>	<p>Specialized staff: a space with professionals, advisors, qualified staff, technical advisors to improve manuscripts such as thesis, research reports, articles publication, advisors like teachers of English, with MA or PhD, experts in English</p>

Appendix C

Analysis 1c

I-Q5: What comes to your mind when hearing the phrase “an academic writing center”?

Students Themes	Instructors Themes
<p>For students, a writing center is a place mainly with qualified staff in academic writing, advanced level of English, advisors to solve doubts about texts written in English, advisors guiding you in how to write, a work team to advise, instruct, and offer support to students, academics, and external individuals in academic writing in English.</p>	<p>For instructors an academic writing center is a place with professional people, advisors, qualified staff, offering technical advice to refine written prose such as thesis, informative texts, research articles, publication of research papers, advisors similar to teachers of English, but with a MA or a PhD, and experts in English language.</p>

Appendix C

Analysis 1d

I-Q5: What comes to your mind when hearing the phrase “an academic writing center”?

FOR STUDENTS

For students a writing center is not only a concept referring to a physical space, but a place comprising various interconnected elements including qualified staff, diverse writing services, and resources for various types of academic audiences. The center entails personal with an advanced level of English, foundations in writing, playing diverse roles (e.g., teachers, editors, advisors, i.e., advising on how to solve doubts, guiding, supporting, and instructing to students), academics, researchers and individuals interested in writing better or on how to write academic texts in English.

FOR INSTRUCTORS

Like students, instructors regard a writing center as a physical place, institution, or office with classrooms or cubicles, qualified staff, services, and learning resources. In other words, a place with specific areas to take group courses with professionally trained people who achieved an MA or a PhD degree in English letters and/or sciences. Staff playing the roles of teachers, translators, and advisors. Advisors resembling English teachers, experts in English language and in the teaching of English in specific disciplines but offering technical and individual advice to refine diverse written academic genres including research articles, publication of research papers, theses, and informative texts. People that understand what writers want to express, how they want to express it, and for whom they want to express it

Arizmendi González

—

González Videgaray

Appendix C

Analysis 1e

I-Q5: What comes to your mind when hearing the phrase “an academic writing center”?

Main ideas: For the students, tutors, physical space, printed and electronic resources, new pedagogy, individual assistance, and services are some of the factors conceptualizing a writing center.

Main ideas: For instructors, the physical space, learning resources, trained tutors, individual advice about writing and genres, services, follow-up, electronic resources, diagnostic exams, services for all levels of higher education are some of the factors conceptualizing a writing center

Appendix C

Analysis 1f

I-Q5: What comes to your mind when hearing the phrase “an academic writing center”?

For the students, **tutors, physical space,** printed and **electronic resources,** new pedagogy, **individual assistance,** services are some of the factors conceptualizing a writing center.

For instructors, the **physical space,** learning resources, **trained tutors, individual advice** about writing and genres, services, follow-up, **electronic resources,** diagnostic exams, services for all levels of higher education are some of the factors conceptualizing a writing center.

- 5.1 Students and academics conceptualize a writing center as a physical space that entails trained tutors, individual assistance or advice, and electronic resources. Students’ conceptualization of the center also includes printed resources and a new writing pedagogy. For instructors, the WC also involves learning resources, knowledge about writing genres, writing services for PhD, MA, and BA students, following up students, and application of diagnostic writing exams.

Q19: Who would you like to have in the writing center staff?

Q25: What qualifications would you consider to select the tutors?

Students would like to have in the writing center staff with high proficiency in English, teachers of English, experience in publication, experts in writing and academic writing, researchers with background in writing, experts in genres for specific areas, linguists, staff within and across the discipline(s), approachable staff, PhD studies, magazine editors.

Instructors would like to have in the writing center staff with good level of English, instructed in teaching English, linguists, pedagogues, specialists with written publications in English and various genres, multidisciplinary tutors, with knowledge of the writing process, lots of experience in writing ability, genre knowledge, staff from different disciplines because writing is different in each field.

- 19.1 Students and academics would like tutors in the center had a high proficiency level in English, instructed in the teaching of English, experienced in publications in English, experts in academic writing and processes, linguists and specialist researchers from diverse disciplines with writing background, and experts in genres for specific areas.
- Students also would like the tutors were approachable, with a PhD degree, and editors of magazines.
- Instructors would like tutors had genre knowledge per discipline because writing is different in each field.
-

Appendix C

Analysis 1g

Tutors' qualifications and selection

27. Students remark a need to consider differences between linguists and scientists.
6. The most relevant aspect when conceptualizing a writing center, for both students and academics, is the staff or tutors.
19. Students and academics would like tutors in the center had a high proficiency level in English, instructed in the teaching of English, experienced in publications in English, experts in academic writing and processes, linguists and specialist researchers from diverse disciplines with writing background, and experts in genres for specific areas.
19. Students also would like the tutors were approachable, with a PhD degree, and editors of magazines.
24. Students suggest that to select writing center tutors, tutors need to have a PhD, be members of National System of Research (SNI), they are focused on writing, if they are from different areas of study, if they have publications, if they have experience in delivering courses, if they have experience in the different writing processes, if they have knowledge of English and genres, if they studied abroad or if they are from overseas.
-

Appendix I-Q5

What do you imagine when hearing the phrase “an academic writing center”?

I-Q5: What do you imagine when hearing the phrase “an academic writing center”?

Students—emerging themes, 2nd análisis	Instructors—emerging themes, 2nd análisis
<p>Specialized personnel: Personas especializadas con nivel avanzado de inglés especializado; Tutores y elementos varios juntos para mejorar la escritura científica; Lugar con asesores para resolver dudas de escritos en inglés; Un área con asesores que te guíen a como redactar; Asesores; Equipo de trabajo capacitado para asesorar, instruir y apoyar a estudiantes, académicos, y externos a mejorar la escritura en inglés; Con gente especializada en gramática; asesores, redactores, director; Equipo de trabajo capacitado para asesorar, instruir y apoyar</p>	<p>Specialized personnel: un espacio con profesionales, Asesores, personal calificado de asesoramiento técnico para mejorar manuscritos como tesis, informes, investigación, publicación de artículos; Asesores como los maestros de inglés, con MA o PhD, expertos en inglés</p>
<p>Physical space: Lugar con asesores para resolver dudas de escritos en inglés, un espacio físico; Un centro de idiomas enfocado en habilidades de escritura en inglés; Departamento de asesoría para escribir artículos; Un lugar para corregir estilo; Como un escritorio público, Un lugar físico, especializado y eficaz, planeado, salón, clases, no muy grande, muy especializado, Una escuela; Oficinas</p>	<p>Physical space: Lugar físico para estudiantes y académicos, un lugar para tomar cursos, Institución, Una institución física, Oficina, Un área interconectada a otra pero que se enfoque en el desarrollo de la escritura académica</p>
<p>Services: Enseñanza de escritura de textos científicos, Criterios de revistas; Lugar con asesores para resolver dudas de escritos en inglés; Un área con asesores que te guíen a cómo redactar; Apoyo para mejorar la escritura; Equipo de trabajo capacitado para asesorar, instruir y apoyar a estudiantes, académicos, y externos a mejorar la escritura en inglés; Agilizar la revisión para someter un artículo a publicación en journal; Centro con cursos en inglés; Sobre comprensión de lectura y escritura desde lo básico a lo complicado; apoyo para expresar resultados, traductor con conocimiento científico; Lugar especializado en el desarrollo de estrategias, técnicas para enseñar a escribir adecuadamente en inglés</p>	<p>Services: tomar cursos, recibir apoyo personalizado, sobre textos en específico que tengan dudas, Cursos y Apoyo individual para sus textos; asesorías, Un centro que beneficie en revisión, protocolo de publicación, publicación internacional, que comprendan lo que quiero decir, cómo lo quiero decir y para quién lo quiero decir, apoyo a escritura, sesiones, trabajo sobre textos, tareas y seguimiento, desarrollar la escritura, revisar trabajos, un lugar de apoyo para promover la publicación en inglés; para mejorar manuscritos como tesis, informes, investigación, publicación de artículos; para discutir dudas de investigación, revisión de investigación y la opinión de investigación</p>

Appendix I-Q6

What aspects are part of a writing center?

I-Q6: What aspects are part of a writing center?

Students	Instructors
Personnel: Instructors, Instructors, Instructors well trained, trained staff, Instructors, trained Professors, writers, editors	Personnel: Group of professors, trained staff, Translator, professors, scientists
Profile: with good level of English, writing background, English dominium,	Profile: trained in Teaching English, from specific disciplines, person with English letters profile,
Services: workshops, personal tutoring, courses, training, instructors, trained students, courses, tutoring,	Services: individual tutoring
Training: qualified training to instructors	

Appendix I-Q7

Which aspects would you consider most relevant? Why?

I-Q7: Which aspects would you consider most relevant? Why?

Estudiantes	Instructores
Personnel: Instructors, staff, advisors, professors, professors, experts in English, linguists, scientists,	Personnel: staff with English, translator