

St. John's University

St. John's Scholar

---

Faculty Publications

Department of English

---

2013

## Of Ladybugs, Low Status, and Loving the Job: Writing Center Professionals Navigating Their Careers

Anne Ellen Geller

St. John's University, [gellera@stjohns.edu](mailto:gellera@stjohns.edu)

Harry Denny

Purdue University, [hdenny@purdue.edu](mailto:hdenny@purdue.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholar.stjohns.edu/english\\_facpubs](https://scholar.stjohns.edu/english_facpubs)



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Geller, A. E., & Denny, H. (2013). Of Ladybugs, Low Status, and Loving the Job: Writing Center Professionals Navigating Their Careers. *The Writing Center Journal*, 33(1), 96-129. Retrieved from [https://scholar.stjohns.edu/english\\_facpubs/7](https://scholar.stjohns.edu/english_facpubs/7)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of English at St. John's Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of St. John's Scholar. For more information, please contact [fazzinol@stjohns.edu](mailto:fazzinol@stjohns.edu).

# Of Ladybugs, Low Status, and Loving the Job: Writing Center Professionals Navigating Their Careers<sup>1</sup>

by Anne Ellen Geller and Harry Denny

## About the Authors

Anne Ellen Geller is Associate Professor, English and Director of Writing Across the Curriculum, Institute for Writing Studies at St. John's University in Queens, New York. She teaches undergraduate and graduate courses in English, and her research focuses on writing centers, writing across the curriculum, faculty and student writers, and co-authorship. She is co-editor of *Working with Faculty Writers* (Utah State UP, 2013) and co-researcher of The Meaningful Writing Project. She is also currently writing a book about National Endowment for the Humanities support for writing programs from 1973 to 1987.

Harry Denny is an Associate Professor of English and Director of the University Writing Center at St. John's University in New York City. He does research on rhetoric, identity politics, composition, and writing center studies. Currently, he is at work on a new book project on contemporary civil rights rhetoric and identity movements.

*I showed up for work on my first day of work and they didn't even have an office for me. The writing center was just an empty classroom filled with just dirt and boxes and ladybugs. Ladybugs, which is actually an omen of good fortune, which is kind of interesting. And so I sat down at a computer I found in the library and I started typing and I typed a philosophy, mission, and goals statement . . . and I thought this is what I'm going to live by . . . I'm going to serve people, but I'm not going to let them push me around, and so I'm just, I'm going to ground myself.*

Not every new writing center professional arrives on the first day of work to find as tangible a symbol of good fortune as the director who arrived to find ladybugs, but many do walk into their offices feeling their futures are promising. They may be pleased to find they've inherited well-furnished tutorial spaces or established peer-tutoring courses. Or they may be welcomed by supportive, cross-disciplinary writing committees or invested deans. And those who start in their positions as their institutions' first full-time writing center directors or first *faculty* writing center directors find other signs they read as auspicious—budgets in place, job descriptions with course releases for “teaching” tutors within the center, and English departments with composition faculty who they believe are welcoming them as equal colleagues. This optimism leads to the development of graduate courses on writing center administration, writing center dissertations, and applause for each new tenure-track writing center position created. Writing center professionals, we tell ourselves, have made it.

The story of coming upon ladybugs on the first day of work is one of many narratives we heard as we conducted this interview study of writing center professionals' (WCPs) lived experiences. We listened as participants described the paths they followed to what they believed would be economic, cultural, social, and intellectual “promised lands,” the positions of privilege in the academy they had long coveted. But for many, the process of developing a career, growing a professional unit, becoming a teacher/scholar/administrator, and building an intellectual agenda also presented challenges. And we have found the individual career trajectories for this cohort of academic and intellectual workers and the challenges they have described to us to be paradigm changing as we have thought about them through the collective and conventional values of English and composition studies.

After we describe the study's impetus and methods, we present themes and insights that emerged from our interviews. Then, we consider what we have learned from this study: the very aspects of WCPs' positions that turn out to be the most important to their success and satisfaction are at tension with the academic cultural actions that feed disciplinary growth and could position WCPs as central agents in the discipline of English. To us, this finding is



troubling and foreboding, for it documents the tensions we see in struggles over intellectual labor and disciplinary identity at the nexus of writing centers, writing program administration, composition scholarship, and English studies. We believe the insights of our study of WCPs foreshadow both great promise and great peril for graduate students, junior faculty, and all those who mentor them and otherwise guide the profession.

### **Well, How Did We Get Here?**

English studies offers much literature deliberating on the state of the profession, considering the training of graduate students for academic careers, and bemoaning the standing and plight of contingent and adjunct labor (Slevin, *Introducing*; Horner; Eisenstein and Petri; Guillory; Slevin, *Next*; Slevin, “Depoliticizing”). Composition studies presents a further subset of these debates, with unique attention to the storied tensions and rivalry between composition and literary criticism (Adler-Kassner; Bloom; Crowley; Gere; Haviland and Stephenson; Ianetta et al.; Hesse; Janangelo and Hansen; Micciche; Miller, “Feminization”; Miller, *Textual*). A theme running through this literature is that compositionists believe that their colleagues don’t value the epistemological, pedagogical, and praxis orientation of their scholarship or the everyday intellectual labor of writing program administration (Dew and Horning; Council of Writing Program Administrators). As we’ll discuss later in further detail, the place of WCPs in these debates is illusory (Balester and McDonald; Ferruci; Gillam; Gillespie et al.; Haviland and Stephenson; Ianetta et al.; Marshall). Ironically enough, on the rare occasion that WPA conversations turn to the place of WCPs, compositionists often enact the very marginalization they themselves often face in relation to wider literary-tilted English studies. WCPs are positioned as a substrata of writing program administration, even further removed from the academic scholarship and intellectual inquiry of English studies. In fact, our choice to use the term “Writing Center Professionals” (WCPs) in this article highlights a distinction that will grow in importance throughout this reporting of our study; that is, the term is meant to be inclusive of all individuals working in a professional capacity

directing and acting as leadership in writing centers. But the people in these positions may not always have clear-cut standing as either administrators or faculty. Often they are both/and. These important nuances signal realities that are bittersweet for the profession: while the range of employment possibilities is wide open, the production pressures (and outlets) for intellectual labor are just as variable, and opportunities for on-campus success are prevalent, how one might gain disciplinary identity and status through work in writing centers remains a question almost no one seems to be able to answer.

This study grew out of an experience we shared at the 2005 International Writing Centers Association (IWCA) Summer Institute (SI) at the University of Kansas. At the SI, a recurrent workshop separates participants into groups by their experience in the field: brand new WCPs, early to mid-career WCPs, and senior WCPs. We facilitated the session for early to mid-career WCPs and asked participants to reflect on their personal, professional, scholarly, and institutional accomplishments, goals, and frustrations.<sup>2</sup> What was shared and discussed in that session struck us as important, under-researched, and yet crucial to understanding the present disciplinary and personal lives of WCPs. After the IWCA SI, we designed a study we hoped would capture the experiences of WCPs who were all roughly at this early to mid-career stage when we interviewed them.

## **What Is the Range of WCPs' Lives and Experiences?**

### *Participants, Selection, and Sampling*

In order to capture the insights of a representative sample of WCPs, we recruited participants from the original group at the IWCA SI breakout session, but we also sought out additional participants who would make the study more closely resemble the complexity of the profession as we have come to know it. For example, some of the SI participants suggested colleagues we did not know who they thought might also want to talk with us. We wanted to hear from WCPs who could speak to working in a variety of institutional contexts and whose narratives would represent a range of experiences.

The fourteen participants we write about here are a representative



slice of the profession. Based on an analysis of the membership of the International Writing Centers Association (IWCA) in 2009, 53% of WCPs occupy administrative positions and 47% hold faculty lines.<sup>3</sup> Our sample represented a 57/43% administrative/faculty split. While gender and ethnicity cannot be determined from the membership list, 65% of our participants were female, 35% male; three of our participants identify as WCPs of color. Five of our participants hold master's degrees, while nine possess doctorates (see appendix). Our sample was also representative of the profession's institutional diversity; we selected participants who represent not just research-intensive university WCPs, but also those working at comprehensive, small liberal arts, and two-year colleges. All of this profile data parallels an earlier study of the status of WCPs (Balester and McDonald). This sample size also adheres to qualitative sampling ideals because we sought a purposive representation of participants, and our subsequent coding and analysis raises both unique and common insights.

The participants' professional trajectories represent two paths that mirror dominant models for writing center administration: administrative professionals and tenure-track faculty (Patton and Vogt). Administrative professionals' responsibilities may prioritize full-time labor and teaching in writing centers, but they may be just as likely to have classroom teaching obligations (teaching composition or tutor-training courses), making their interactions with students like those of their tenure-stream colleagues. Most have twelve-month contracts and are required to work a full-time week. Some are classified at levels similar to administrative or secretarial positions while others may be at the level of a vice provost or dean. Research-intensive universities are more likely to have staff WCPs, whereas other institution types suggest no clear trend toward administrative or tenure-stream WCP appointments.

The tenure-track faculty we interviewed had positions organized, in some way or another, in relation to the conventional categories of teaching, research, and service. They tended to have course releases from classroom teaching for the work related to administration of the writing center. At the time of interviews, however, none of our faculty participants knew with certainty how their tenure and promotion

committees would make their decisions.

A third professional trajectory in our sample represented a newer sort of position, namely, a non-tenurable faculty line. Some participants in such positions had the responsibilities we might associate with graduate faculty, serving on comprehensive exam committees or as dissertation advisors, not only when graduate students had topics related to writing centers, but also when other tenure-track and tenured composition and rhetoric faculty were overwhelmed by students. Though hybrid positions varied among institutions, some of these WCPs held departmental voting rights and had the opportunity for promotion if not tenure while others were barely integrated into an English department and held departmental affiliation in name only. Despite such immense variations, one of the major findings of this study is that the lived experiences of writing center directors are not as different as their position configurations might suggest, and this finding raises material, ideological, and disciplinary implications for debates concerning the mentoring of entry-level professionals and graduate students.

The participants in this study learned their administrative jobs in a variety of ways, including sheer immersion as well as sustained advising from mentors, former graduate school faculty, and other allies. Across interviews, it was clear that some of the most everyday responsibilities were the toughest for WCPs to learn. Remembering the first time she fired a tutor, for example, a participant commented, “It’s a little different than giving someone an F in English 101. I mean, that’s not easy either, but. . . .” Even those WCPs who had been mentored did not anticipate how challenging the start of their professional lives would be. Asked to think back and describe her first year in her first full-time WCP position, one participant, who had worked in a writing center as a graduate student, offered these metaphors: “a hurricane, a maelstrom, a tidal wave.” Our study participants were no longer experiencing these firsts but were close enough to them to remember them well.



## *Procedure*

Before we conducted our research, we developed a protocol that was reviewed and approved by our institutional review board. Our study is rooted in the use of qualitative interviewing, using a core set of open-ended questions (and impromptu follow-up) across all our participants (Seidman). We asked participants to give us a narrative of their early years as writing center directors and to speculate about what made some experiences more intense than others. Then, we asked participants to consider their recent years in the profession and reflect on what events stuck out. We invited each participant to tell the story of coming to writing center work, whether that was as an undergraduate, graduate student, or professional. Mindful of the initial SI breakout session energy around WCPs' negotiation of the personal, the profession, and the institution, we also asked each participant to reflect on accomplishments, tensions, and goals in each of those areas of their lives.

Both researchers participated in each interview session, all of which were digitally recorded with permission. Most of the interviews were conducted face-to-face at the sites of national conferences, although three were conducted via Skype or speakerphone. Following each interview, we debriefed with the participant. Many participants thanked us for providing an opportunity for reflection, noting that, unless they had recently interviewed for a new position, they had little time and no other opportunities to think back over their careers. Once participants had left the interview, we debriefed and collected our first impressions of the interview. Over the months that followed, we listened and re-listened to the digital records and coded and re-coded. Working both individually and collaboratively, we created categories emerging from the data and then identified themes. That process represents our commitment to grounded theory generation as best articulated by Corbin, Strauss, and Glaser. As we developed the study into draft form and presented versions of it, we shared our core themes with the participants for their response.

## *The Study's Major Themes*

Our participants talked a great deal about the type of positions they



had, in part because we asked questions about their current positions, how they chose these positions, and what it was like to work in them. In addition, WCP position configuration is an ever-present conversation within the field, making it unsurprising that interviewees' comments in this area were somewhat lengthy, sometimes even citing the opinions others offered about their positions. Finally, we heard interviewees weighing the pros and cons of their positions. Ultimately, what we came to understand from the variations on this theme is that writing center directors who find themselves in administrative appointments realize their academic route for advancement is unclear. Writing center directors in tenure-track positions question how intellectual labor is understood and how academic membership is conferred locally and disciplinarily. We present this data within a theme we call "The Administrative Route versus the Faculty Route."

Institutional status actually appears to have an inverse relationship with individual satisfaction among our fourteen study participants. Staff professionals may lack academic status and have fewer future prospects for advancement in academic ranks, but they seem "happier." Many were able to do what they wanted to do in the everyday and had grown their writing center positions in the ways they desired. Tenure-track professionals, by contrast, are aware they possess academic clout and future prospects for further advancement in academic ranks, but feel more torn in the everyday and feel more pressure to produce, whether by growing their writing centers, involving themselves in their home departments, or publishing. Overall, however, all of our participants noted aspects of their work that they "loved." Through their search for who they wanted to be on their campuses and in the profession, we heard participants adjusting their positions to come to terms with their current professional conditions as well as their imagined and desired professional trajectories. We give examples of these renegotiations and adjustments in the section "Renegotiating, Re-imagining, Reaching the WCP Position."

We also heard numerous descriptions of the wide variety of everyday activities of WCPs. The more we pressed participants on the specifics of this labor, the more they began to speak into how that work did—or did not—fit within their earlier conceptions of

what their lives in writing centers would be like. Hearing participants describe the reality of everyday writing center work in relation to what they thought writing center work might be or could be or should be, led us to one of the study's major implications: we question how WCPs' intellectual labor does—or does not—fit into disciplinary conceptions of intellectual labor in English or composition studies, more commonly understood as research and scholarship and most commonly disseminated through publications. Our participants' descriptions of their day-to-day work is presented in “Charting the Everyday Labor of Writing Center Professionals.”

We offer deeper investigations of each theme below. While these are not the only themes raised by our study, these are the themes that we believe speak most directly into the tensions of work as a WCP. In the implications section at the end of this article, we suggest it is time to revise the ways we think about WCPs' position configurations, we argue that we should wonder what type of intellectual labor is valued and rewarded for WCPs, and we consider what type of intellectual labor would allow WCPs disciplinary status beyond their local writing centers and beyond their institutions. We also suggest we should think about the degree to which professional identity in writing centers should or should not be measured in relation to disciplinary identity in English and composition studies.

## **Interview Themes**

### *The Administrative Route versus the Faculty Route*

One current across our interviews—a pattern that parallels ongoing debates in the field—centers on how WCPs enter the profession, the configuration of WCPs' positions, and the perceived value of both this route and destination. Nearly all of our participants developed a connection with writing centers while in graduate programs, although some were first undergraduate tutors. Eight of our fourteen participants set out to become writing center directors, while chance led the others into the field. A number took on directorships as entry-level career moves following training in composition programs. A subset came to writing centers as the product of career shifts, having never intended to direct a writing center.



Despite a lean economic environment for higher education over the last decade, participants in our study felt their employment was secure. We didn't hear narratives of people who feared loss of institutional support for their positions, although tenure-track participants in faculty positions had typical concerns about whether they would be tenured. Overall, participants reported high satisfaction with their jobs, though many of them longed for changes in the structure or longer-term trajectory of their career paths. Only one person expressed conflict about status as a consequence of education or academic credentialing. The other WCPs who possessed non-doctoral degrees didn't feel pressure to become further credentialed, though they acknowledged the limitations created by their educational backgrounds, particularly if they harbored ambitions to be folded into academic departments as tenure-stream faculty.

Participants who held administrative positions didn't appear overly concerned about whether their jobs might undermine the potential for or promise of tenure-stream faculty positions in writing centers for others. They were very aware their career paths were distinct and fundamentally differently from their faculty peers. One participant recalled her choice, "I saw the lives of tenure-track faculty and I didn't want that." For her, a scholar-in-the-garret lifestyle ran counter to the more social, dynamic life she imagined she would experience as a staff administrator. And, as another director in an administrative position pointed out, having a tenure-track position in writing might mean gaining some type of "authority" or "cachet" but within English might still be as meaningless disciplinarily as having an un-tenurable administrative position.

Across position types, a number of participants understood their jobs as professionally plateaued and had the sense they had few options to grow their positions for greater, or even just different, institutional status without leaving their writing centers. Some sought to grow the scope of their units, taking on additional management opportunities to extend their programs, and assuming a larger administrative portfolio that bridged to high-level institutional governance. People making these sorts of moves were also the more senior participants.

While administrative-track WCPs appeared to have relatively secure ethos as administrators and reported fairly high satisfaction



with the everyday of their positions, faculty-track participants reported a great deal of angst en route to tenure. The tenure-track WCPs were understandably hyper-aware that their professional agenda items often contradicted one another, from explaining the labor involved with administering a writing center to non-writing center-savvy senior colleagues even while still doing that labor, to making time to move a coherent individual research agenda forward even while balancing other necessary local research and writing, as for assessment projects and annual unit reports.

In hybrid positions, writing center directors claimed to enjoy the best of both types of positions, yet ended up with colleagues who were confused. As one participant said: “People don’t really know what to do with me, I think. Because I’m the only clinical faculty member and the English department has never ever had a clinical faculty member before.” And these WCPs themselves were sometimes confused, too. In follow-up conversations as we shared preliminary results, one WCP in this study admitted to consciously choosing a non-tenure-track position, but said she found herself doing a great deal of the work of a faculty member anyway. For example, she was a non-tenure-track/clinical faculty person advising dissertation writers in a research-intensive (R1) university’s doctorate granting English department. While common in the sciences, the humanities have little experience with non-research-stream faculty mentoring graduate students, and such work is confusing when factored into the protocol for compensation or advancement for such faculty-administrator hybrids. Such WCPs spoke of fantasy lives in writing centers, utopias where the drawbacks of their current positions would be resolved. Those other worlds of what could be, should be, or ought to be came up in participants’ descriptions of the everyday realities of their lives in writing centers. The utopias we heard represent visions of writing centers professionalism and disciplinarity that have powerful implications, and yet they sometimes sound like justifications. As one participant reflected:

I do, at times, feel that I would have more credibility if I were associated with a department, if I were in a faculty line, if I were tenure track rather than administrative. On the other hand, I’ve really learned to appreciate most of the upsides. I don’t have the publish or perish, so research I take on is

by choice. I want to. I do create time for it, and it is in my job description, which is nice. I had to negotiate for that. And I also like the fact that I am 100% writing center. That is so fabulous not to be torn. I mean I've taught also at times, and I do enjoy the classroom, but since we have a course that goes with, I am teaching, and of course, you teach every day in the writing center. So I really, I like the 100%-ness of it. It's nice that they dedicate a whole person.

Without “publish or perish,” WCPs have less pressure to disseminate their research. Without classroom teaching responsibilities, they have more time, energy, and intellectual space to devote to developing writing centers as teaching and learning spaces. And yet, without disseminating research, without classroom teaching, and without departmental affiliation, they end up, whether they are in faculty or administrative positions, with less credibility in the eyes of their faculty colleagues who have lives committed to a department and devoted to publication and classroom teaching.

### *Re-Negotiating, Re-Imagining, Reaching the WCP Position*

We heard the majority of our participants clearly delineate the distinction between positions they initially held from the position they now held, as they had grown it. That is, many professionals had taken a position, which they then went on to develop and change through negotiation with their institutions, supervisors, or colleagues. The stories of how people came to their jobs, while compelling, weren't as powerful as what we heard about how participants then went on to think about growing their positions and their descriptions of where they saw themselves heading and developing as professionals and scholars. For example, one WCP described revising a job description to more fully account for the reality of the position:

The other full-time, non-tenure-track people in our department have no research expectations at all, but I have this very small, but meaningful expectation. . . . They never had a full-time writing center director, and I think they kind of designed it on the fly. . . . But my percentages are all over the place. I have 60, 25, 10, 5. 60% writing center assignment, which I just



upped from 50% . . . 25% teaching, one a semester, 10% service and 5% research. It was kind of like, build your own.

It is important to note for implications we will offer later in this piece, that some participants did not as clearly separate their own individual development, a research agenda, for example, from the development of the writing center itself.

Tenure-stream faculty talked—and talked—about everyday intellectual labor and its standing in relation to scholarship, teaching, and/or service. They described how the demands for that labor could grow exponentially and in unexpected ways. For example, one faculty participant described falling into composition studies in graduate school and developing a passion for it. In the first years of her first job out of graduate school, when she was comfortable teaching a full complement of composition courses, her chair asked her to take on the writing center, assuming it would be a natural extension of her expertise. This story reflects the common assumption that familiarity with composition studies equates with writing program administration or writing center work. For this participant, her position was ever broadening, since as a “lone compositionist” on campus, she was perceived by administration as the “go-to” person on all matters related to writing, even when they didn’t necessarily smoothly fit her experience. Reflecting on how her department understood her portfolio of responsibilities in relation to her progress toward tenure, she too said, “They really don’t get me.”

However participants came to their positions or cleaved out new or symbolic re-weighting of their everyday work, those in staff positions, in particular, felt the varied ways a WCP’s position did or didn’t have cachet. Most appeared to have made conscious choices to bracket the “bad rep” given to such positions in disciplinary discourse and so took such work regardless of the reputed baggage. One participant remembered being admonished by graduate advisors within her program *not* to take a professional track position in a writing center. Such positions, she was warned, were low status, even from the perspective of the seemingly self-aware, low-status composition world. Her goal ought to be a “gold standard” tenure-track position or nothing. But she took a non-tenure-track job, and she reported a great



deal of professional satisfaction and few regrets, although she did imagine her advisor's advice would be "you've been there for a little while, you have some publications, now it's time to move on." From this WCP, we had the sense that hearing her advisor's voice in her head sometimes interrupted an otherwise satisfying professional life.

Satisfying everyday experiences were also interrupted by local institutional cultures and protocol that promised to put staff WCPs in their place or force them to fight back. In one such case, a participant remembered the negotiation necessary for adding research initiatives to a portfolio of responsibilities:

I had to fight to gain status as a PI [principal investigator] for my own research projects because I was not faculty and I had to convince them that I would be doing these research projects according to my job description, that I wasn't interested in directing dissertations. I had no business doing faculty work, but even as an administrator there's research to be done. . . . I had to get approval from the department head and a letter of support from the department head and a letter of support from the Dean's office and that went to the institutional review board, and the first time I applied they said no because even though the dean's office wrote a letter of support, they weren't entirely keen on me having that status. . . . I think it's been very beneficial because we're trying to develop research projects with the undergraduate tutors and if I'm the person who is there round the clock year round, it makes sense for me to be their PI.

What struck us is this participant's explicit work to counter perceptions that she/he was usurping the role of faculty by seeking to do research; instead, this participant made it part and parcel of her/his professional responsibility as an engaged writing center director, who sees research projects as a form of teaching and learning with consultants at this institution. And yet, that was not an easy argument for others to understand, accept, or embrace when "PI," especially at a research university grounded in disciplinarity, is a research faculty owned role.

### *The Everyday Labor of Writing Center Professionals*

Over and over again in interviews, we heard all of our participants talk about the overwhelming work of directing a writing center day-to-day

and the ways that work seemed to fill their time. They also expressed the desire to embrace just about every new initiative presented to them—or that they themselves came up with—sometimes because they were excited about the initiative and sometimes because they felt pressure to take it on. They offered comments like: “I suffer from I think I can do it all” or “Every writing center person works too much. We want to feel useful.”

The typical work WCPs described included fielding passing questions and offering presentations as the local writing expert. Participants told us about composing texts—there were annual reports to be created, committee memos to be written, writing assessment activities to report. Many respondents were involved in the creation of writing center staff and faculty development. Others were actively involved in creating new programs and initiatives. The everyday administration of writing centers involved, our participants noted, accounting, budgeting, human resources performance appraisals, the logistics of hiring and payroll, and the mechanics of prepping, educating, and monitoring staff. Everyday labor made the lives of writing center directors driven, if not frenetic, in their pace. For example:

I don't think I fully appreciated how much different it was to be a graduate student administrator and working with people in something that had already been going and being the person in charge and having to make these split second decisions and everybody asking me questions that I hadn't considered about administrative, technical sorts of things that ended up overwhelming any kind of theoretical thing I wanted to do.

We did not encounter any WCPs whose self-reported daily lives seemed idle or static. These participants were always busy, often with little or no staff support—in their centers, they were *the* local budget manager, *the* office supervisor, *the* administrative assistant, even before their day-to-day labor led them to headier program leadership, development, or assessment. When they weren't controlling the chaos of competing demands on their time and energy, many of these writing center directors worked to grow their units, believing that extension was tantamount to success. As one participant attested,

I doubled the size of the writing center in two years, so I doubled basically



my work in two years. Then I was on every committee that you could think of. Two-dozen hiring committees, committees for diversity, committees for different programs, so I've done a lot like that and a lot in the state. . . . I was doing a lot of extra work.

Of course, extra work and success bred visibility and attention, and visibility and attention led to recognition as effective administrators. What followed were more opportunities for these WCPs to further extend their crowded portfolios of responsibilities. Many of our participants were even involved professionally beyond their campuses, for example, in state, regional, or national writing center or rhetoric and composition organizations.

Nuts-and-bolts writing center direction and measurable—or at least noticeable—writing center growth appeared the means to the most rewards institutionally, whether those rewards were recognition, raises, or tenure. As we will discuss in our implications section, though most institutions reward their WCPs for leadership, engagement, and administrative efficacy, we wondered whether WCPs were aware of how their everyday labor diminished attention to research, that traditionally disseminated intellectual work from which academic status in a discipline is conferred, and by which a discipline grows. Attention to the local nitty-gritty can function at the peril, in almost every sense, of the disciplinary, not just for individual WCPs, but also for the wider profession itself.

## **What Are the Implications?**

### *Transcending the Tenure-Track or Not Tenure-Track Dichotomy*

Again and again, when new writing center director positions are created or established writing center positions are advertised, we hear a familiar question: Why isn't this position tenure track? From everything we heard in our interviews, we suggest a deeper conversation that transcends such framing. Instead, talk needs to revolve around consideration of what institutional or departmental cultures will support and what WCPs need for individual, institutional, and disciplinary evolution. We believe institutions and departments need to better weigh local professional needs and constraints against trajectories for individuals' self-actualization within the discipline.



In this study, both staff and faculty WCPs told us about their desire for writing center positions that would provide them with more satisfying professional experiences. But the more satisfying professional experiences they sought were not necessarily aligned with position classification. While both faculty and staff sought greater respect, more collegiality, and additional opportunities for conducting research, faculty WCPs consistently felt pulled in different directions and heard mixed messages about the usual trinity of scholarship, teaching, and service in relation to their programmatic responsibilities. Faculty WCPs also wondered explicitly about their place in disciplinary and departmental structures even when their faculty status, in fact, positioned them within a discipline and department. Staff WCPs sought to overcome the ways their positions constrained their teaching and supervision of students as seen, for example, in the story we tell above about the WCP seeking status as PI. Staff WCPs also pondered the ambiguity and inequity of their paths to promotion, job security, and compensation in terms of both salary and benefits. Yet staff and faculty directors alike yearned for, understandably, the sanctuary of tenure or security of employment. We found no evidence during our study, or following it, that any of our participants lost their positions for reasons of substandard performance or reallocation of resources. Hence, while the anxiety was real, the reality for these fourteen participants was that they had chosen career pathways that were relatively secure even if they were not always free of fraught politics.

Quite simply, whether a writing center position is a staff or faculty line does not address quality of life issues attended to at different institutions in different ways. WCPs' positions—so often cast as desirable for their human-to-human understanding and the possibilities inherent in their marginality—turn out to be, predictably, just as bound in the traditions of academia and local institutional context as any other position. We suggest as institutions and departments consider future writing center positions, they think simultaneously about what position configuration will best support the growth and development of the institution's writing center and what position configuration will best support the growth of an individual writing center director's career trajectory, including the director's

scholarly, teaching, and personal life. But we also want to recommend that institutions have a responsibility to think about how their WCPs will be able to best contribute to disciplinary evolution. Looking back at our study's findings, we now wonder if most positions—staff and faculty alike—are created with only the first, the growth and development of the institution's writing center, in mind. We believe what is beneath the surface narratives for the position configurations of WCPs are two more profound factors driving an institution's focus toward a writing center and away from the professional who directs it: the legacy of the generation of writing centers that came into existence as institutional band-aids for socio-cultural changes that higher education did not fully understand (Boquet) and the need to respond to current-day institutional concerns, often not entirely dissimilar from those challenges of the past.

The WCPs of this study—in the sheer diversity of how their positions were configured and have been reconfigured—provide powerful models of making lives and alternative professional identities in and adjacent to English studies. While traditionally configured faculty positions—with their attention to research, teaching, and service—have served disciplines, departments, and institutions, and the scholarly careers of many of the faculty in them, the traditionally configured faculty position may not be best for the growth of writing centers or for the satisfaction of individual WCPs. For example, a faculty WCP who has stewarded a writing center to the point at which it serves its university well by almost every possible metric might be well primed for leadership beyond her or his unit, toward a professional trajectory that operates parallel to routes conventional to faculty lines. How does this WCP get mentored, and to whom should she or he turn for advice? Or imagine a WCP situated within student services at an institution that is faculty-centric (that is, governance is heavily invested in faculty support and buy-in). How does a WCP outside the culture of departments and colleges navigate that terrain, and where does she or he go to learn the protocol that governs navigation of such terrain, whether the goal is to build collaborations or get advice about publication? And, as we will describe below, even traditionally configured faculty positions may not, counter-intuitively, help us make our place in a discipline.



Many continue to rally around the tradition of tenure-stream writing center positions. We have been struck, however, that by embracing the cold material reality of all corporatized higher education has to offer, usually outside of the confines of traditional departments, many WCPs are making satisfying lives for themselves with responsibilities very similar to those of tenure-stream faculty. But in this extracurricular terrain, where professionals operate beyond the radar or off the grid of faculty culture and protocol, there is no tenure to provide a safe harbor from the shifting tides of institutional favor and priorities. While faculty WCPs are no less subject to the changing tides of institutional priorities that often leave a writing center or similar unit underfunded, WCPs, whose work conditions have little or no security of employment, know the profound risk and uncertainty that comes with “at will” contracts. Under these circumstances, we wonder just how much leeway exists for advocacy, edgy research, or innovative education programs, and to what degree decisions about evaluation and renewal are made from metrics and measures beyond the control of a single individual or isolated leadership team. We ask hiring institutions to think carefully and honestly about the lived realities of WCPs and what will be gained and lost for all stakeholders, including the discipline of English studies, by the decisions made about the configurations of WCPs’ positions. And, in the strongest terms possible, we advise individuals entering the profession (and those mentoring them) to think about the costs and benefits of each configuration of the WCP’s position. Future generations of WCPs selecting jobs should consider the negotiations that will be required in both types of positions and among colleagues in a range of institutions, for each variation confers and withholds status in material and meaningful ways.

### *Advancing Oneself/Advancing a Discipline*

Embedded in the question of whether the WCP should be tenure stream or not is an unresolved dynamic about how one advances as an individual professional and how an inherently cross/post/inter-disciplinary field grows itself through practitioners. A respect for intellectual labor understood as traditional knowledge creation and



circulation, as distinct from, and superior to, the service or intellectual work of administration appears to explain a tacit cultural bias among our participants for a writing center director with faculty standing. We also repeatedly heard our participants valorize the place of scholarship, a valuing which we believe reveals its currency in the academy. And yet, when our participants raised the idea of scholarship they were describing it in a different way than its description by those WPAs who hope to gain recognition for more complicated (even pragmatic) notions of the intellectual labor of writing program administration.

Our respondents' coveting of a practiced "life of the mind" was most obvious in interviews with WCPs in faculty positions at teaching-intensive institutions. One WCP, for example, told us about the joy of being invited by colleagues to a theory reading group: "I didn't talk a lot. But it was great to be able to listen to people talk about something I understand besides administration. . . . It was so nice to be able to talk about something intellectual . . . something I didn't know I was missing until it happened." This notion of intellectual labor—that talking about or writing about something like "theory" is different than talking and thinking about something like "administration"—shows the degree to which the thinking of our participants sometimes closely mirrored those attitudes about intellectual labor that academics in writing program administration have long sought to change.

At the local, institutional level, this study reveals that the intellectual labor WCPs engage in appears to have changed very little since Valerie Balester described it almost twenty years ago:

Directors are called upon to write budgets and reports, recruit and train staff, prepare educational materials, design and fill out countless forms, make appointments, communicate with writing instructors and staff, train faculty from various disciplines in writing instruction, write grants, organize workshops and mini-courses, teach classes for tutors, placate irate students and faculty—and so on. (168)

In many ways, what we learned is that these everyday realities of WCPs' positions can perpetuate WCPs' exclusion from conventional academic culture. WCP positions, however, whether they are staff or faculty, should be designed to work against this separation.

Without material institutional support, individual encouragement, collegial exchange, or substantive requirements to take their expertise beyond the institution, participants in our study were less likely to prioritize disseminating research or scholarship via traditional routes.<sup>4</sup> Participants told us they realized they could work toward greater self and collective initiative—and perhaps needed to: “We need to challenge each other more,” one said. Worn out from intellectual labor on behalf of the writing center and the institution—and sufficiently rewarded for that work—another offered, “I have money and support to write/research [but] I don’t have energy or enthusiasm to get excited about it.” “The impulse to ‘do it now, write about it later’ is strong, making me wonder if the books and articles will be a late career activity for me,” a third later told us during our participant check, further explaining that “there is so much I want to do *now* that it makes it hard to prioritize that writing work over the more immediately rewarding daily collaborative work within my writing center.”

For many of these participants, such deferred intellectual labor was a Faustian bargain of sorts for self and for the discipline. Comfort and satisfaction with their everyday work left our participants feeling a bit guilty about future professional prospects (Would a lack of scholarly productivity restrict their professional opportunities?) and raising questions about where the field might be headed (Are we a discipline? Are we a sub-discipline within English? Within composition studies?). With so few WCPs contributing to development of disciplinary scholarship in conventional outlets, and with little local penalty or reward for not contributing, we gained a sense that many WCPs were not even leveraging local everyday labor as their scholarship. Though WPAs have long made a cogent case for the intellectual labor of administrative work, we heard some WCPs reflecting on whether and when they might be conflating ordinary administrative work with any scholarly expertise they had brought to the role or were developing from their involvement in writing center leadership. As one WCP said, describing a moment of realization experienced at an academic conference, “I knew that I ran the writing center well. I knew because of our statistics and people were using it a lot and people seemed to respect me on campus. But as a scholar, I didn’t have any scholarly



identity, and I think that's what came out of the conference." Even with these doubts and questions about their individual identities on their minds, the WCPs we interviewed didn't seem to question whether they were contributing to the development of their local writing centers or to the concept of writing centers in general.

A more sustained process of doubting, believing, and even advocating for a professional identity has long been an ongoing project for those who have held administrative positions in English departments as WPAs. For WPAs, everyday intellectual labor has long included a wide range of planning, implementing, executing, and assessing activities, all service work that's largely invisible and, possibly, distasteful to disciplinary peers who do not possess administrative or managerial responsibilities as part of their faculty portfolios (Janetta et al.; Strickland). WCPs, as a subset of WPAs, clearly do this same work in the university community, but the everyday labor for WCPs also includes a wider range of administrative activities (as we detail above in "The Everyday Labor of Writing Center Professionals" section) that full-time staff members in departments typically complete for conventional WPAs. Our point is not that WCPs do a more/different work than other WPAs; rather that WPAs have long argued for the valuation of their everyday intellectual labor as *both* service work *and* scholarship. Their point has been, in essence, that effective administrative work is wholly engaged with scholarly practice and ought to be evaluated and held on par with conventional outlets for such work (e.g., peer-reviewed publications). This labor can equal scholarship, especially when WPAs and WCPs present their work utilizing the Council of Writing Program Administrators' "Intellectual Work" statement. In fact, the CWPA statement suggests that intellectual labor parlays expertise and education capital expended toward any facet of program development and administration is a proxy of sorts for vetted and disseminated scholarship in publishing outlets. Quite simply, through the lens of the CWPA "Intellectual Work" statement, administrative expertise put into practice through successful leadership, however construed, is equivalent to expertise in print.

Whereas WPAs have long fought for an expansive notion of intellectual labor (that is, service as scholarship), our participants

weren't, outside the context of the research-intensive institution, facing situations where they had to leverage service as scholarship. Some of our participants did mention the Council of Writing Program Administrators' "Intellectual Work" statement, and those who did didn't feel pressure to justify intellectual labor *in* scholarship if no one was complaining about the presentation of everyday intellectual labor *as* scholarship. They experienced few material penalties, in other words, for not disseminating knowledge in peer-reviewed publications or monographs. Our participants craved intellectual labor as scholarship for self-actualization and personal and professional status. Most troubling for the field is that, for the WCPs of our study, effective program administration and leadership did not require making a case for the importance of published scholarship. So, still lurking unchallenged is the protocol for becoming a part of and growing a discipline: if advancing a field and oneself within it involves the consumption, production, and dissemination of new knowledge, whether through conference proposals and presentations, or, more importantly, vetted publication, what might it mean to exempt oneself or for significant parts of a community of professionals not to participate in its own collective/social construction of knowledge?

We do believe there is one significant difference between WPAs, especially those who oversee and write about composition programs, and WCPs. WPAs are professionally positioned as interlocutors who can dialogue with other faculty peers in an academic/disciplinary context. To be blunt, WPAs, who are housed within English departments or independent writing departments, are members of an academic club. While conventional WPAs are almost always wholly complete faculty personages, with all the academic privilege and identity that such positions invest, a majority of WCPs do not share those experiences. Frequently, they are on the outside of academic culture looking in, yearning to contribute and complicate conversations that often advance without their active participation, yet lacking incentive, opportunity, or tools to do so. In the context of working across campus and being perceived as marginalized in the academy, the humanities, English studies, and even composition studies, when WCPs don't publish, they perpetuate their own marginalization and invisibility by withdrawing, by intent or *de facto*,



from any of the “larger” disciplinary domains to which they might align.

Even those study participants who felt pressure to present scholarship did leverage conventional scholarship, often non-writing center scholarship, for status. They played by the dominant disciplinary rules, in other words. For example, at least one of our participants made an uncomfortable choice to deprioritize writing center scholarship and return to literary scholarship. Concerned writing center research might not resonate with an English department-based tenure and promotion committee; this participant augmented a review file with literature articles and presentations. Reflecting on that strategic move, the participant commented: “I guess I managed to cover my ass, because I showed, okay, look I can, if you don’t like my comp and writing center work, okay, here’s my lit. Is that good enough? You know, that sort of thing. So that was a little bit weird.” At the research-intensive university, in the tenure stream, this participant represented a larger common experience the literature supports, the necessity of making one’s scholarship resonate in departments where English studies are understood through a distinctly literary lens and where the intellectual work of composition studies is often viewed as substandard. So the burden is on junior faculty to articulate their disciplinary fit, even if the message is contradictory to the individual’s local programmatic success, personal professional goals, or the standing of the field of writing center studies.

Over and over again, in the wider scholarship on the place of and tensions inherent to composition studies, historians and critics alike bemoan the tier system of intellectual work in English studies. They speak to the privileging of literary scholarship and the grudging tolerance of writing instruction. Of course, this higher-order versus lower-order divide isn’t unique to English. Comparable analogies can be drawn to other disciplines that splinter into perceived theoretical/pure/hard versions and their applied/praxis/grounded counterparts. But in English, and perhaps across the broader humanities, scholars persist in an academic culture rooted in dissemination and vetting of original work, intellectual capital on the page that confers and accrues in powerful ways. The quantity and quality of published scholarship is crucial to one’s ethos as a “real” academic.

For most of the WCPs in our study, participation in research

actually turned out to be quite broadly conceived and practiced, and, as we have already noted, we found little evidence that individuals at non-research intensive institutions faced any jeopardy for *not* actively pursuing conventional research disseminated in peer-reviewed journals or monographs published by university or academic presses. Ironically, staff directors at both research and non-research-intensive colleges and universities in this study were just as “productive” or engaged in liberally understood scholarly agendas as faculty directors at non-research-intensive colleges and universities, publishing an article here or there in *The Writing Center Journal*, for example, or presenting regularly at regional and national conferences. And faculty at teaching-intensive institutions, in particular, seemed certain they had quite a bit of leeway when it came to publication. As one participant noted: “I think they want ‘activity.’ I don’t think there’s a department that would require any set number of publications.”

From this paradoxical implication – that WCPs outside of research-intensive institutions, no matter what their position type, advance professionally even as their successes don’t grow the discipline’s status or complicate its intellectual evolution – it may seem that we value too strongly traditional print/publication routes for disseminating scholarly knowledge as the currency for academic intellectual capital. But to reiterate what we pose above, as WCPs we may become agents in our own intellectual/disciplinary marginalization if we are not disseminating scholarly knowledge through publication and are instead mired only in everyday intellectual labor of the type described by our participants. Why strive to have WCPs in faculty positions if our day-to-day activities and disciplinary status are exactly the same as they were in 1992 when Balester argued for their revision? Is it simply to ensure the job security provided by tenure? What’s the place of writing centers if we don’t grow and value our own scholarship within rhetoric and composition and English studies? Why, we would ask, have *College English* and *College Composition and Communication* each published only one article related to writing centers in the last ten years (Boquet and Lerner; Carter)? Just as the advancement of composition studies and all the aligned academic conversations are concentrated in the voices of those putting scholarship into currency, the situation is all



the more magnified the context of WCPs where even fewer individuals contribute to the dialogue.

In that anomalous *College English* essay, Boquet and Lerner argue that writing center icon Stephen North sought an audience larger than his writing center colleagues, so he published in *College English* to “appeal directly to those professional colleagues who were outside of writing centers and, more important, who might view them as little more than triage stations in the battle against illiteracy” (173). By the end of this article the authors assert that the research and scholarship of writing centers must be “integrated into our research streams and our mainstream scholarly conversations” (186). We believe our study reiterates that call.<sup>5</sup> The tragic news here, for our field, is that we can now see how WCPs are bound up in a tension among advancing their writing centers, themselves, the profession, and the discipline. If attention to how WCPs’ inquiries sit within the discipline of English is not valued, cultivated, and challenged, why are we surprised to find year in, year out, that successful individuals working as WCPs claim only passing, tenuous, or fleeting identities as both practitioners *and* scholars?

*On the Outside Looking in: Embracing the Liminal  
Politics of Professional Identity*

The experiences of the WCPs in this study tell us quite a bit about what disciplinarity or disciplinary identity is in English, whether writing center work “fits” and how it could. The search for who we are, what we do, and the constant struggle to make a case for both to our literary peers, parallels (maybe even overlaps with) the experiences of the more broadly defined WPA, but one critical difference for WCPs stands in the way. By and large, the frame of reference and consciousness of WPAs is from the standpoint of an inherently disciplinary faculty identity and the liminality of which WPAs speak so eloquently references the experiences of someone whose primary core sense of academic self is most commonly already grounded within a conventional department—English—or a newer department—Writing or Writing Studies. This, of course, has something to do with the fact that the composition programs WPAs

oversee have traditionally sat firmly within English departments or exist as independent units that have been formed as the FTEs of composition courses have traveled with the writing faculty. WPAs also possess, by and large, terminal degrees and graduate training (whether in composition or literary studies) that further inscribe them, at least provisionally, as club members of the academic world and in English.

The same can't be said of WCPs, who just as often as not are exterior to academic departmental culture. For those whose identities or credentials do place them within a department, the familiar narratives of struggling to legitimize oneself still exist. But continued, respected participation in a discipline, as much research of WPAs' experiences reveals, relies on traditional print or, more recently, digital publication. WPAs arrive on campus as experts in some disciplinary area, often in compositions studies and grow their administrative chops through time and effort. But the discipline—whether we call it English, English studies, composition studies, or something else—is elastic enough to include WPAs because expertise is the currency of this field, and its expression comes through the circulation and challenging of that expertise. The WPA dialogue within English and within composition studies, whatever the ideological shape and material consequences, frames its participants as interlocutors.<sup>6</sup>

The collective experiences of our participants paint a foreboding picture of the place of WCPs and their work *as* disciplinary in ways that an ever-winnowing professoriate would (or wouldn't) recognize. Disciplines know and grow themselves in relation to the amount and quality of research and scholarship produced, yet we saw relatively few consequences for tenure-stream faculty WCPs failing to substantively contribute or push conversations through conventional publication, and we found few WCPs in positions at R1 institutions that have conferred upon themselves the function of research engines. In effect, the WCP at the R1 university, as a general trend, has been policed out of the conventional faculty ranks, and the WCP at such institutions is a highly productive administrative member, often with affiliate or provisional status as graduate faculty after years of proving one's ethos as a "real" scholar or legitimate member of the club. Or the director at a R1 university is a faculty "director" in name only, and a full-time WCP (some of whom are represented in this study) without



faculty status oversees the day-to-day operations of the writing center, including much of the teaching and learning that happens there. We saw no evidence from our participants that a local embrace of expansive conceptions of intellectual labor was viewed in disciplinary circles in ways that complicated existing debates or made room for different trajectories. Local intellectual labor and service remains confined to campus and doesn't contribute to the disciplinary growth in ways most conventional academics would recognize.<sup>7</sup>

We want to end with a story one of our study participants told us about an interaction at the yearly CCCC conference. Is it an isolated anecdote or urban legend, or is it telling folklore that we've yet to come fully to terms with?

It's like a colleague was joking with me not long ago . . . and this was a guy in comp, by the way. We met at the Cs and we were talking. He was saying, he was asking about my paper and I was asking about his. He was saying yea, writing center work, we all know that's not real scholarship. And I was like, you just said that's not real scholarship and you want me to drink with you now? You know, and when people say I didn't really mean that, they really meant it.

As auspicious a time as it seems for WCPs, we believe this participant's story—and others like it that we heard but don't have space to include here—reveal the degree to which a professional identity in writing centers is still not understood as a professional identity in English or composition studies. This is, in part, because disciplinary identity in English—and in composition studies—is still defined in such traditional ways. Why is it, we continue to ask ourselves, that so many participants in our study had such satisfying everyday teaching and learning lives and so much professional success in positions that are considered by their peers to have such low status that they can't claim being "true" or "legitimate" professionals in an academic field? On the flipside, as academics in the humanities persist in hashing and rehashing who counts as intellectuals and what measures up as intellectual labor, we continue to ask ourselves, why wouldn't a rational individual select a professional path off the tenure track that assures personal satisfaction and ample growth? The answers, of course, are inherently local and contingent to the moment

and the individual, but the collective experience points to divergent paths into the academy taken by WCPs.

Whether or not a WCP finds ladybugs on the first day of work, this study suggests we're a community of professionals—individually and collectively—who willingly make the best of the conditions we inherit. Our tolerance for rising to the occasion—like meeting writers where they are, instead of where we'd ideally find them—is our greatest asset and our greatest threat. It makes us a set of professionals who value diverse intellectual identities and embrace almost everyone and anyone as authentic interlocutors. That very expansiveness makes us confident, if scatter-shot, about who we are, what we value, and our place in the academy. No wonder we remain the butt of our disciplinary colleagues' sarcasm even though we value what we do everyday and are, in turn, so valued in each of our writing centers and on each of our campuses.



## NOTES

1. The authors wish to thank our anonymous reviewers and Neal Lerner for helpful feedback. We also want to acknowledge an IWCA Research Grant awarded to support this research. Though we declined the monetary support, we appreciated the validation of our project. We both thank the St. John's University Faculty Writing Initiative (co-sponsored by the Center for Teaching and Learning and the Writing Across the Curriculum Program), which provided the space and opportunity to advance this project. While we were writing and revising, each of us held a St. John's University Summer Support of Research Grant, and we are grateful for our institution's support. Finally, we thank our research participants, for without them this project would not have been possible.

2. Without getting into the specifics of our careers, we do want to note, as we did throughout this study with our participants, that between us we have held at least six positions that span the professional configurations we heard about at the SI and went on to explore in this qualitative study.

3. Harry was treasurer of the International Writing Center Association (IWCA) at the time and maintained its membership site.

4. Rebecca Jackson and Jackie Grutch McKinney confirm the disconnect between the everyday intellectual labor of collecting data for internal/institutional reporting needs and the disciplinary intellectual labor of doing the same work to disseminate knowledge in a wider, extra-institutional sense through any conventional medium of academic exchange (3).

5. One of our *WCJ* manuscript reviewers said, "I think you might argue more strongly for promotion on service. Think Boyer." Again, our research actually confirms this reviewer's suggestion, revealing that WCPs who highlight Boyer-like service find a very viable path to promotion and local and individual professional success. Where we differ in our thinking from this reviewer is that we believe this path has long worked against WCPs gaining disciplinary credibility and continues to do so.

6. It is important to note that not all WPAs carry the same clout in the world of composition studies and too many are as likely to be distrustfully constructed as—or feel like—disciplinary interlopers as insiders (Janangelo; Walcher, Janangelo and Roen).

7. Boquet and Lerner note:

The function of scholarship to achieve status is, of course, a long-standing academic tradition, at least when it comes to the path toward tenure, promotion, and other institutional rewards. Achieving individual institutional status is far different than achieving institutional status for a writing center or writing program. And achieving status for an entire field based on the reception of its scholarship is fraught with difficulty. (185)

## APPENDIX: THE STUDY'S WRITING CENTER PROFESSIONAL (WCP) PARTICIPANTS

<b>WCP</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Institution Type</b>	<b>Credential</b>	<b>Field</b>	<b>Ethnicity of WCP</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Route into Profession</b>
A	Faculty	Comprehensive	Ph.D.	Comp	White WCP	M	Intentional
B	Hybrid	Research-1	Ph.D.	Comp	WCP of Color	F	Intentional
C	Faculty	Small liberal arts	Ph.D.	Comp	White WCP	M	Intentional
D	Staff	2-year/ Community College	MA	English	White WCP	F	Accidental
E	Staff	Research-1	Ph.D.	Humanities	White WCP	F	Accidental
F	Faculty	Comprehensive	Ph.D.	Comp	WCP of Color	F	Accidental
G	Faculty	Research-1	Ph.D.	Comp	White WCP	F	Intentional
H	Staff	Research-1	MA	English	WCP of Color	F	Intentional
I	Staff	Research-1	MA	English	White WCP	F	Intentional
J	Staff	Comprehensive	Ph.D.	English	White WCP	M	Intentional
K	Staff	Research-1	MA	English	White WCP	M	Accidental
L	Staff	Research 1	Ph.D.	English	White WCP	F	Intentional
M	Staff	Comprehensive	MFA	English	White WCP	M	Accidental
N	Faculty	Small liberal arts	Ph.D.	Comp	White WCP	M	Intentional



## WORKS CITED

- Adler-Kassner, Linda. *The Activist WPA: Changing Stories About Writing and Writers*. Logan, UT: Utah State UP, 2008. Print.
- Balester, Valerie M. "Revising the 'Statement': On the Work of Writing Centers" in "Symposium on the 1991 'Progress Report from the CCCC Committee on Professional Standards.'" *CCC* 43.2 (1992): 167–71. Print.
- Balester, Valerie M., and James McDonald. "A View of Status and Working Conditions: Relations Between Writing Program and Writing Center Directors." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 24.3 (2001): 59–82. Print.
- Bloom, Lynn Z. "Moving Forward: This Forward." *The Writing Program Administrator's Resource: A Guide to Reflective Institutional Practice*. Eds. Brown, Stuart C., Theresa Enos, and Catherine Chaput. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2002. ix–xvi. Print.
- Boquet, Elizabeth H. "'Our Little Secret': A History of Writing Centers, Pre- to Post-Open Admissions." *College Composition and Communication* 50.3 (1999): 463–82.
- Boquet, Elizabeth H., and Neal Lerner. "Reconsiderations: After 'The Idea of a Writing Center.'" *College English* 71.2 (2008): 170–89. Print.
- Carter, Shannon. "The Writing Center Paradox: Talk about Legitimacy and the Problem of Institutional Change." *College Composition and Communication* 61.1 (2009): 133–52. Print.
- Corbin, Juliet M., and Anselm L. Strauss. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles: Sage, 2008. Print.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators. "Evaluating the Intellectual Work of Writing Administration." 1998. Web. 30 Apr. 2013.
- Crowley, Sharon. "How the Professional Lives of WPAs Would Change If FYC Were Elective." *The Writing Program Administrator's Resource: A Guide to Reflective Institutional Practice*. Ed. Stuart C. Brown, Theresa Enos, and Catherine Chaput. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2002. 219–30. Print.
- Dew, Debra Frank, and Alice Horning. *Untenured Faculty as Writing Program Administrators: Institutional Practices and Politics*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor, 2007. Print.
- Eisenstein, Paul, and Ken Petri. "Working-Through Professional Fantasy: Changing the Myths We Live By." *Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 31.3 (1998): 45–64. Print.
- Ferruci, Stephen A. "Composition's Professionalism vs. the Writing Center Director: Rethinking the Director as a Teacher." *The Writing Instructor* (2001). Web. 23 Apr. 2013.
- Gere, Anne Ruggles. "The Long Revolution in Composition." *Composition in the Twenty-First Century: Crisis and Change*. Ed. Lynn Z. Bloom, Donald A. Daiker, and Edward M. White. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1996. Print.
- Gillam, Alice. "The Call to Research: Early Representations of Writing Center Research." *Writing Center Research: Extending the Conversation*. Ed. Paula Gillespie, Alice Gillam, Lady Falls Brown, and Bryon Stay. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum, 2002. 3–21. Print.
- Glaser, Barney G. *More Grounded Theory Methodology: A Reader*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology, 1994. Print.
- Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm L. Strauss. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory; Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine, 1967. Print.
- Guillory, John. "Preprofessionalism: What Graduate Students Want." *ADE Bulletin* 113 (1996): 4–8. Print.
- Haviland, Carol Peterson, and Denise

- Stephenson. "Writing Centers, Writing Programs, and WPAs: Roles by Any Other Names?" *The Writing Program Administrator's Resource: A Guide to Reflective Institutional Practice*. Ed. Stuart C. Brown, Theresa Enos, and Catherine Chaput. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2002. 377–92. Print.
- Hesse, Douglas D. "Politics and the WPA: Traveling Through and Past Realms of Expertise." *The Writing Program Administrator's Resource: A Guide to Reflective Institutional Practice*. Ed. Stuart C. Brown, Theresa Enos, and Catherine Chaput. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2002. 41–58. Print.
- Horner, Bruce. "Traditions and Professionalization: Reconceiving Work in Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 51.3 (2000): 366–98. Print.
- Ianetta, Melissa, Linda Bergmann, Lauren Fitzgerald, Carol Peterson Haviland, Lisa Lebduska, and Mary Wislocki. "Polylog: Are Writing Center Directors Writing Program Administrators?" *Composition Studies* 34.2 (2006): 11–42. Print.
- Jackson, Rebecca, and Jackie Grutsch McKinney. "Beyond Tutoring: Mapping the Invisible Landscape of Writing Center Work." *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal* 9.1 (2012): 1–11. Web. 23 Apr. 2013.
- Janangelo, Joseph. "Notes on Comp: When 'WPA' Work Hints at Suspicion." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 34.1 (2010): 117–40. Print.
- Janangelo, Joseph, and Kristine Hansen. *Resituating Writing: Constructing and Administering Writing Programs*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1995. Print.
- Lerner, Neal. "Introduction to a List of Dissertations and Theses on Writing Centers, 1924-2008." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 33.7 (2009): 6–9. Print.
- Marshall, Margaret J. "Sites for (Invisible) Intellectual Work." *The Politics of Writing Centers*. Ed. Jane Nelson and Kathy Evertz. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2001. 74–84. Print.
- Micciche, Laura R. "More Than a Feeling: Disappointment and WPA Work." *College English* 64.4 (2002): 432–58. Print.
- Miller, Susan. "The Feminization of Composition." *The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary*. Ed. Richard Bullock, John Trimbur, and Charles Schuster. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1991. 39–53. Print.
- . *Textual Carnivals: The Politics of Composition*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1991. Print.
- Murphy, Michael. "New Faculty for a New University: Toward a Full-Time Teaching-Intensive Faculty Track in Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 52.1 (2000): 14–42. Print.
- Patton, Martha D., and Jo Ann Vogt. "The Center Will Not Hold: Redefining Professionalism in the Academy." *Untenured Faculty as Writing Program Administrators: Institutional Practices and Politics*. Ed. Debra Frank Dew and Alice Horning. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor, 2007. 137–52. Print.
- Seidman, Irving. *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences*. 2nd ed. New York: Teachers College P, 1998. Print.
- Slevin, James F. "Depoliticizing and Politicizing Composition Studies." *The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary*. Ed. Richard Bullock, John Trimbur, and Charles Schuster. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1991. 1–21. Print.
- . *Introducing English: Essays in the Intellectual Work of Composition*. Pittsburgh Series in Composition,



Literacy, and Culture. Pittsburgh, PA: U of Pittsburgh P, 2001. Print.

---. *The Next Generation: Preparing Graduate Students for the Professional Responsibilities of College Teachers*. Washington: Association of American Colleges, 1992. Print.

Strickland, Donna. *The Managerial Unconscious in the History of Composition Studies*. Carbondale, IL: Studies in Writing and Rhetoric/ Southern Illinois UP, 2011. Print.

Walcher, Sheldon, Joseph Janangelo, and Duane Roen. "Introducing 'The CWPA Mentoring Project' and Survey Report." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 34.1 (2010): 84–116. Print.