# wln

## A JOURNAL OF WRITING CENTER SCHOLARSHIP

# Table of Contents

dents to feel, write, learn, and care *with us* as strategies for survival."

Finally, in Sarah Rice's Tutor Column, she explores what the "new normal" looks like for a tutor who had entered this work in an online or largely online writing center. Rice suggests that talking openly and honestly in writing center sessions about individual challenges of the pandemic years may be potentially discomforting, but ultimately necessary for the writers and tutors who continue to reckon with the impact of the pandemic on their academic careers and writing lives.

## MIDWEST WRITING CENTERS ASSOCIATION

**March 9-11, 2023 | St. Charles, MO, Lindenwood University**
"Gateways Reimagined: Transforming Perspectives in the Writing Center"
Keynote: Heather Brown-Hudson

Submit your proposal and register for the conference at https://www.mwcamembers.org/. For questions, contact Elizabeth Busekrus Blackmon: ebusekrus1@stlcc.edu.

## SOUTH CENTRAL WRITING CENTERS ASSOCIATION

**March 2-4, 2023 | Lubbock, TX, Texas Tech University**
"Inventions and Intentions: (Re)discovering the Unique in the Familiar"

Keynote will be chosen from proposals submitted. Proposal deadline: Jan. 5, 2023. For questions, contact Kristin Messuri: (Kristin.messuri@ttu.edu) or Jennifer Marciniak: (Jennifer.marciniak@ttu.edu). For information about proposals, see https://docs.google.com/document/d/1MpnrFBNxq12RpQmyOY9MxhTuUcIrckQr/edit

## GET INVOLVED WITH WLN

**Interested in serving as a reviewer?** Contact Karen Gabrielle Johnson (KGJohnson@ship.edu).

**Interested in contributing news, announcements, or accounts of work in your writing center to the blog (photos welcomed)?** Contact Anna Sophia Habib (ahabib@gmu.edu).

**Interested in guest editing a special issue on a topic of your choice?** Contact Muriel Harris (harrism@purdue.edu).

**Interested in writing an article or Tutors' Column to submit to WLN?** Check the guidelines on the website: (wlnjournal.org/submit.php).

space to communicate comfort, welcoming, and openness, but that can mean we come to lean on those visual, spatial, and haptic cues. We let the space of the writing center be the space of the writing center. And then when we lost the former, we needed urgently to rebuild the latter. But to rebuild the latter meant returning to something other than our physical foundations. It meant asking, *what does it mean to do this work* right now?

We could name many things we did to keep the center open and functional: we expanded our hours so that students across different time zones could participate; we never closed, even during campus eviction, so that students could experience continuity across at least one campus service. In the remote fall of 2020, we held a series of trainings about Zoom presence, boundary setting in virtual spaces, wellness and anxiety, and other concerns as they cropped up. None of these are spectacular. What we did that changed things permanently for us is to use the moment of fracture to redefine for ourselves, and for the college as a whole, what communication and support for that communication look like on a college campus. This redefinition and expansion in turn opened up our community, strengthened our bonds with different constituencies across campuses, and brought some essential anti-racist, anti-ableist, decolonial aspects of literacy work to the very surface of our practice.

We see the moves we made as replicable, scalable, and available to all of our colleagues at other institutions. Relationships with other institutions have also become even more important as we moved into virtual space. Uprooted from the affordances and limitations of our physical, geographical, and even financial space, we were able to recognize the vital network of collaboration between communication nerve centers on campuses across the country, to hear the echoes of our voices talking about communication, community, and connection coming from places that no longer seemed so distant.

## 1. WRITING ISN'T JUST SOMETHING WE DON'T HAVE TO DO ALONE; IT IS A WAY *NOT TO BE LONELY.*

This is not a new idea, that writing is collaborative; it wasn't new even when Kenneth Bruffee wrote his groundbreaking essay on collaborative learning in 1984. Bruffee's point, that collaboration re-externalizes the "internalized conversation" we've learned from the basic acts of communication by which we develop our ability to write and speak, played out in real time during the pandemic. Students in near-total isolation came to their writing to say something to an audience they needed to imagine, and, in doing so, managed to "create referential connections between symbolic structures and reality," where perhaps those seemed even more tenuous, and "by

doing so maintain[ed] community growth and coherence" (Bruffee 650).

This runs like a *leitmotif* through the literature on writing centers: when writing we are "entering into a conversation" (Graff and Birkenstein xvi). In *Writing Communities*, Steve Parks makes the more expansive point about the way writing can form the connective tissues of the worlds around us: our communities, our families, our multiple identities. Sometimes words are enough, Maggie Nelson ventures in *The Argonauts*, because hollowed out and insufficient though they may be, we have them. What would it mean, she asks, "to punish what can be said for what, by definition, it cannot be?" What we do have is what can be said: "words are good enough." She ends with an image of the "songs of care" we all have for each other, where that song—the "singing line" (3) that connects all of us, as Teju Cole puts it—is sometimes all we have (324).

We saw something of that more visceral need to be heard, cared for, sung to in the virtual year of the pandemic, when students would make appointments with the Writing Center simply to have their words be heard by someone else. It isn't an easy thing to trace, the singing line, but if you look at our WC Online records you begin to see it: students making appointments "just to talk," or because "they didn't know how else to make friends," or because they'd been "reading their drafts alone in their rooms." The premise here is not, or is only very thinly, that they wanted to "work on their writing," develop a professional community, or join a disciplinary conversation. Mostly, they wanted to make a connection and words, for that purpose, were good enough.

Of course, this put pressure on our Writing and Speaking Partners, who were themselves alone in their rooms, or not alone—caring for a mother in chemotherapy, sharing a bedroom with younger siblings, in the kitchen or on the fire escape, ill themselves—and being called on to listen and read in a situation with suddenly much higher stakes. People experienced the pandemic unevenly, we know. Less easy to express is the way people experienced (and continue to experience) the "ethical loneliness" of "being abandoned by humanity or by those who have power over one's life's possibilities" in wildly different ways and degrees (Rankine 23).[1]

This recognition showed us in no uncertain ways why we need to think more about the wellness of our own student staff, physical and mental, intellectual and emotional, because our student consultants are sometimes holding only a thin tissue of words as barrier against an ethical loneliness, the dimensions of which for any

individual person they can barely fathom. And hasn't it always been a little like this? Shouldn't we address this? "As we consider if well-ness and self-care interventions are 'enough,'" write Genie Giaimo and Yanar Hashlamon, "we must consider the material conditions under which we labor, the ways in which we support marginalized workers, and the ways we ethically incorporate wellness and self-care into writing centers" (1). Perhaps we stayed busy in 2020 because our students learned that even the thinnest tissue of words can help make suffering visible, audible, and thus open to response, connection. Perhaps even saying out loud to our students, "this is secondary trauma, this is compassion fatigue" helped, affirmed the things they were feeling, depathologized the exhaustion. And yet, words are not good enough.

## 2. ORAL COMMUNICATION AND SUPPORT FOR SPEAKING ARE NOT ANCILLARY TO WHAT WE DO.

Our incipient Speaking Partner program had been up and running for only seven months, the new Speaking Partners only freshly trained when campus was evacuated. But the pandemic year showed us Speaking Partners could do work that would have been impossible before we started theorizing the need for extensive oral communication support in our Center.

The Speaking Partner program is designed to problematize, theo-rize, and support *class discussion* on a discussion-intensive small liberal arts campus (an epistemological problem not unique to SLACs, but also relevant in discussion sections at R1 institutions), where "class participation" is a major part of explicit curricular ex-pectations, and being good at talking in a certain way and for cer-tain reasons is a major part of the "hidden curriculum" (Gable). While support for public speaking is the remit of many writing cen-ters, the explicit move to helping students practice class discussion: raising their hands, speaking up in class, asking questions, writing in the Zoom chat, or figuring out how and when to enter the stream of conversation, has been the most important feature of our new program and has seeded other discussions about our normative ex-pectations for the classroom on campus.

The shift resulted in the most sustained collaboration between the Writing Center and the faculty to date. We introduced a (now-an-nual) seminar on oral communication to help prepare our Speaking Partners to work with students on asking questions in class, track-ing discussion, shifting the flow of a conversation, disagreeing, and finding ways to speak out loud in classes that tacitly assumed an exclusionary neurotypicality and monolingualism. Every Friday, a different faculty member from a different discipline gave a seminar

session on oral communication in their own field as it might be related to challenges arising from remote learning, class discussion, and speaking and listening in the pandemic; in the spring, we did the same with visual rhetoric.

This intensive collaboration meant that our colleagues found themselves in the position of helping *build* our program, which made them instant stakeholders and community members. In turn they asked for those students to be embedded in their courses, to help facilitate Zoom discussions, and to meet with students one-to-one, build syllabi, and assess the inclusiveness of their virtual classrooms. The immediate crisis of the pandemic required a collaborative response, and that collaborative response in turn showed all of us our shared concerns around speaking and listening—concerns that run far deeper than anything immediate to a virtual classroom or Zoom room.

Central to our Speaking Partner program is a mission we want to suggest is common to *all* writing and communication centers in ways not always apparent (or legible to administrators): not speaking, but *listening*. During the year of remote learning we saw clearly how listening—now so much harder—needed far more support than speaking. How can I learn from and with you, we heard our students and colleagues asking—and we asked ourselves—if I can't easily talk to you? Are you listening? Is typing the same as talking? What gets lost in the awkward pauses of Zoom class discussions? When we spent those 15 minutes in that breakout room "together" were we really hearing each other? Yes and no. What *was* real about it was the talking and listening that happened. We saw each other; we heard each other. Our ideas shaped each other's thinking; our questions took each of us in new directions. This mutuality is not dependent on physical proximity.

But the loneliness we feel when the Zoom call ends and we're alone with our laptops in our childhood bedrooms is real. Listening suddenly became not only something we do as a matter of course in our learning, but something we needed to draw students' attention to, something we needed to model—something we needed to promise *still existed*. What we learned above all else about our writing center is that it represented the promise that someone was there to listen.

## 3. SUPPORT FOR VISUAL RHETORIC RESTORES SOMETHING THAT SUPREMACIST LOGICS ELIDE.

And finally, the move to remote learning underscored the importance of visual modalities in our work. We've reopened this spring

as the Center for Speaking, Writing, and the Image, supporting the image-saturated way we read, the "talk-like" way we write, and the things for which there are no words.[2] Zoom was a weird proving-ground for this, but it was a proving-ground nonetheless. Suddenly the little-boxed classroom was a visual image the students needed to read differently than their 3D spaces.

But why haven't we always been reading images in our writing centers (some have—we have not)? The answer, as Birgit Brander Rasmussen puts it, is a long and violent history of settler colonialism that determined not only the fate of bodies and lands, but also languages and rhetorics:

> Europe and its descendants in the Americas developed a 'possessive investment' in writing as a marker of reason and civilization. Its purported absence in areas where Europe established colonies often served as justification for conquest. Indigenous forms of writing eventually came to be defined as pictures or mnemonic aids, while alphabetic script, by contrast, has become nearly synonymous with 'writing.' However, such a narrow understanding of writing diminishes the literary diversity of colonial American and perpetuates the legacies of cultural imperialism. (19-20)

Moving to a virtual environment, where students both enjoyed the chat and seemed to see the emoji-potential of that chat as "cheating" (as if the cute laugh-cry face is any less complex than the words it attempts to shorthand), or merely having a laugh, and where we were always looking and reading and speaking all at the same time, made this history of rhetorical subordination something we simply couldn't ignore. There was never "just writing" in acts of communication; Zoom feels a little like at once the frightening isolation of the future and the multiliterate, rhetorically saturated deep end of history.

## 4. CODA: AND YET, THE WRITING CENTER *IS* A PLACE.

While Pomona College, a small residential liberal arts college in Southern California, has its own character, what we've learned and done extends beyond the local. Above all else, what we've learned is that when you strip away the physical space of a writing center, you have the opportunity to see more clearly the network in which it exists and to strengthen the intellectual and emotional collaborations on which it was built. Leaving behind the physical space, strengthening our network by bringing into our ambit images and oral culture, listening and reading, and by bringing in our colleagues from other disciplines, staff members with stories to tell, poetry and aimless conversation, slow reading and silence, we cre-

ated a space where we could rethink the nature of communication in the absence of physical presence, *including* the history-laden colonial walls of our own institution. Throughout his examination of language, expression, and colonial dispossession, *Poetics of Relation*, Édouard Glissant enjoins us again and again to see that "expanse…leap and variance," "the knowledge in motion of beings," the "open circle" make possible a new poetics of relation (207), forms of communication not hierarchical but conterminous, touching, but not colonizing, relational, but not binary. Our program, compelled to leap by COVID-19, opened its circle even wider, reconsidered its expanse, turned toward the poetics not of page, or of place, but of relation.

All that we did we continue to do, and all of what we learned remains true, but we can see other things as true now, also. There are things about the physical space we do need, things we couldn't see so clearly before and value all the more for not having noticed the first time around. We can be alone together in our virtual spaces for many things, but as Roland Barthes writes so beautifully in *How to Live Together*, we might find that we need each other as night falls: being together, he writes: "perhaps simply a way of confronting the sadness of the night together"; "the community," he muses, "prepares to brave the night" (129).

The physical space represents a place where we can *find each other* when everything feels scattered and far flung, and that has real value. Our space is modest, but we now know we can't underestimate the value of being able to point to a space down the path, or on a map, where a student can go and encounter other humans ready and willing to help, to talk, to listen. Re-encountering Stephen North's evocation of the writing center as a "the castoff, windowless classroom (or in some cases, literally closet), the battered desks, the old textbooks, a phone (maybe)," we find we read it differently (433). Yes, a marginalized, under-funded space in many cases (and perhaps an embattled space everywhere, if the existence of "space committees" on the campuses at which we have worked are any indication), but still a place we can point to and say there. *Someone is there who will listen to you*.

The someone matters, we know. The listening matters the most. But now we want to add that the *there* matters a little, also. Something, in this uncertain time, is still there.

### NOTES
1. Claudia Rankine uses the term throughout *Just Us: An American Conversation* (2020). She is quoting Jill Stauffer in *Ethical Loneliness: The Injustice of Not Being*

*Heard* (2015). It is the loneliness of social abandonment, of being left to silence.

2. On "talk-like" writing see for example: https://www.niemanlab.org/2011/06/is-twitter-writing-or-is-it-speech-why-we-need-a-new-paradigm-for-our-social-media-platforms/

## WORKS CITED

Barthes, Roland. *How to Live Together: Novelistic Simulations of Some Everyday Spaces*, edited by Claude Coste. Translated by Kate Briggs, Columbia UP, 2002.

Bruffee, Kenneth. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind,'" *College English,* vol. 46, no. 7, 1984, pp. 635-52.

Cole, Teju. *Blind Spot.* Penguin Random House, 2017.

Gable, Rachel. *The Hidden Curriculum: First Generation Students at Legacy Universities.* Princeton UP, 2021.

Giaimo, Genie, and Yanar Hashlamon, "Guest Editors' Note." *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship,* vol. 44, no. 5-6, February 2020, p. 1.

Glissant, Édouard. *Poetics of Relation*. Translated by Betsy Wing. U of Michigan P, 1997.

Graff, Gerald, and Cathy Birkenstein. *The Say/I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing*, 3rd ed. W.W. Norton & Co., 2016.

Grutsch-McKinney, Jackie. *Peripheral Visions for Writing Centers.* U of Colorado P, 2013.

Nelson, Maggie. *The Argonauts.* Graywolf P, 2015.

North, Stephen. "The Idea of a Writing Center." *College English*, vol. 46, no. 5, 1984, pp. 433-46.

Parks, Stephen. *Writing Communities: A Text with Readings.* Bedford's/St. Martin's, 2016.

Rankine, Claudia. *Just Us: An American Conversation.* Graywolf P, 2020.

Rasmussen, Birgit Brander. Queequeg's *Coffin: Indigenous Literacies and Early American Literature,* Duke UP, 2012.

Stauffer, Jill. E*thical Loneliness: The Injustice of Not Being Heard.* Columbia UP, 2015.

## MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA WRITING CENTERS ASSOCIATION

**February 8-10, 2023 | Education City, Doha, Qatar**
"Writing Centers: Multidisciplinary and Multimodal Spaces for Engagement"

Contact: Conference co-chairs: Sahar Mari: sahar.mari@qatar.tamu.edu, and Nicole Abiad: nlmace@vcu.edu; conference website: http://menawca.org/conference-2023

# Notice, Ask, Explore: Transforming Peer Observation into Dialogic Reflection

Megan Kelly, Kelly Krumrie, Juli Parrish, and Olivia Tracy
University of Denver

"I wanted tutors to see themselves as and act as a necessary part of a community of learners whose work as tutors included making sense of the work of tutoring" (Camp 1).

"After [...] discussing our video clips and following the notice, ask, explore technique, I had a few takeaways ... we had very similar questions/concerns for our own consulting, but our questions for each other varied based on the context of the video" (consultant reflection).

Our writing center's pandemic-prompted shift online has changed how we see consulting. We mean that literally: our approach to observation—a foundational practice—has been unexpectedly transformed. Zoom has helped us see recorded consultations as preservable texts that allow consultants to teach and learn from one another. Before this shift, our observations were synchronous and in-person; consultant or director observers would seek permission from writer and consultant, sit nearby, take notes, and then debrief. In spring 2020, our abrupt transition online prompted us to ask new questions about these training and reflection practices: How could we observe in Zoom? How could we prioritize peer-centered approaches when physically distanced? How could we redesign observations to facilitate learning? These questions have changed our practices: our consultants now "observe" not by sitting in on consultations but by choosing clips of their session recordings to share and discuss through the framework of *noticing*, *asking*, and *exploring* (NAE).

This article demonstrates the value of reframing observations, using recorded consultations as texts (Hall, *Around*) that promote dialogic reflection in small-group discussions (Mattison; Hall, "Theory"). R. Mark Hall prompts us to "recast [reflection] as dialogue among tutors" (84), and we expand this under-

standing beyond written reflection to include conversation. These recordings—and the noticing, asking, and exploring—circulate in our Writing Center and enhance our understanding of *what*, *how*, and *why* we observe.

In the process of solving an ostensibly simple problem—how can we facilitate meaningful observations in Zoom?—we have redefined key ideas about what we're observing, what observation involves, why it's important for consultants to discuss their own and others' consulting, and how those conversations matter. Having consultations preserved as texts helps us articulate what we've captured and reimagine what observation can do. Whereas conversations about consulting once relied on memory and note-taking, consultants now engage with a concrete audiovisual text. Just as important, they observe their own practices; they pause, analyze, and view again. This activity, in small-group discussion, fosters growth and transformation through dialogic reflection.

## NOTICE: OBSERVATION IS NOT JUST OBSERVATION

Our Writing Center has always prioritized observation. As directors, Juli and Megan work with a staff of about 30 undergraduate and graduate consultants who consult in synchronous in-person and online consultations and participate in assessment and design. Kelly and Olivia, former consultants, played pivotal roles in developing the model we discuss here. Our staff engages in observation-based reflection year-round. This begins with introductory training, including a course on writing center theory and practice, when they watch or participate in and reflect on consultations from three perspectives: observer, writer, and consultant. This process helps staff learn how consultations work. After initial training, consultants participate in at least one observation each quarter: sometimes with peers, watching and reflecting on one another's sessions; other times with directors. In all cases, observers take a descriptive, non-evaluative approach that seeks to name what observers notice without centering the observer's judgment, attempting to ascribe the consultant or writer's intent, or inferring the effects of particular choices.

Pre-pandemic, we worked to articulate our observation goals, guided by key questions: What *is* our goal? and Who is observation *for*? (Camp; Hall, "Theory"). We acknowledged that observations play a role in norming practices and formative assessment, but in situating our work in reflective learning theories (Yancey), we positioned observed *and* observer as learners. This approach was informed by Kelly's background in Montessori instruction, where the point of the observation often is not the evaluation of the observed

but the critical reflection of the observer (Montessori). Helping consultants understand observation as an essential consulting skill and practice noticing and describing before evaluating is pivotal. Many writing center practitioners claim observation as key to training, as "one of the best ways you'll develop as a tutor" (Gillespie and Lerner 61). Through observation, consultants discover new options (Gillespie and Lerner 66), receive peer feedback based on individual consulting goals (Camp 4-5), and engage in peer-focused assessment while reflecting on individual practices (Van Slembrouk). Research has also explored consultant impressions of the evaluative nature of observation and reflection, as well as how to transform those impressions (Lawson).

Two threads of this conversation have resonated with us: observation as a method for peer learning and reflection's potential dialogic role. Scholars have discussed how peer observation during training can build rapport among tutors (Munger, Rubenstein, and Burow 3) and create a "community of learners'' (Camp 1); however, conversations have mostly centered on one-to-one observations or individual reflections, less often exploring how groups might discuss the text of a consultation together (although Hall explores this in his analysis of written reflections in a community of practice; see "Theory"). Many have also considered reflection's essential role in observation, including journaling as observer and tutor (Munger, Rubenstein, and Burow 4-5), completing prompts in post-observation forms (Van Slembrouk; Lawson), and responding to questions as part of the observation (Gillespie and Lerner 65). We ground our understanding in Kathleen Blake Yancey's concept of reflection as "*inventing practice, in the course of which the tutors* invent themselves" (192, italics in original).

However, when we asked consultants to do this work before the pandemic, the observation structure constrained what was possible. Typically, the observer would sit near a consultation, take descriptive notes, and generate questions. If time allowed, the observer and consultant might talk. The disconnects were logistical and conceptual. We were asking consultants to do complex work in a short amount of time without showing how each observation was a chance for them to develop their skills. That is, we emphasized the act of watching at the expense of the more important activities of noticing, asking, and exploring, activities made more generative through discussion.

## ASK: WHERE'S THE DIALOGIC IN OUR DIALOGIC REFLECTION?
While our original process focused on individual observation and reflection, our evolving model has turned Yancey's "inventing prac-

tice" into a dialogic, collective, peer-learning process. We have found that participating in small groups allows consultants to "expand the possible choices they have during a consultation" (Mattison 45). The absence of the dialogic in our pre-pandemic model was less pronounced because consultants talked in informal ways, such as debriefing after a difficult session. Our physical presence in the Writing Center enabled a community to form around shared practices that were observed and enacted, however casually.

Early on in the pandemic, we tried recreating physical observations in Zoom, where, after writers gave permission in our appointment form, observers watched with video and microphone off, but this approach could not replicate that larger ecology of informal observation and conversation. With everyone in separate breakout rooms, consulting remained private, invisible. Additionally, we noted staff and writer discomfort at the specter of the Zoom lurker. We asked our staff what we should change, and their answers prompted innovation that shaped our practice during the pandemic.

First, we *recorded*: Zoom made this easy. Recorded consultations could be watched and discussed outside the immediate moment. This technology helped make something ephemeral more permanent; consultations could be shared and circulated. However, our schedule would not permit us the leisure to watch every video. As important, we resisted a structure requiring that all work be visible. Issues of surveillance persisted; consultants knew recordings could be accessed and watched at any point, and a few expressed reluctance. However, we only archived recordings with permission. Second, we *selected*: this mitigated surveillance. When consultants chose clips, the range of consultations our staff could reasonably view expanded, as did the range of consulting moves they could observe. Consultant choice emphasized their agency. Third, we *refocused*: watching short clips allowed more time for dialogic reflection, specifically for noticing, asking, and exploring (NAE). Olivia drafted a framework to use NAE in small-group discussions that gave our staff more time to learn and develop those critical moves.

Over the course of the next four quarters, we developed the model we now use: consultants choose when to record, always confirming writers' permission. Before scheduled small-group meetings, each consultant selects one or two 5-10-minute clips to share. The groups meet, watching and discussing each clip, with the NAE sequence structuring the discussion. As a last step, each consultant further reflects in a brief note, naming one thing noticed, one

asked, one explored. Whereas we previously valued written reflections as the primary site of learning, we now recognize the importance of the meeting itself, when consultants use the NAE framework in conversation with each other and engage in this dialogic reflection.

## EXPLORE: PEER LEARNING AND INSIGHTS

Our dialogic reflection model centers agency and gives consultants practice in resisting evaluation, an important and difficult stance to take in consulting. Developing skills in listening, noticing, asking questions, and considering alternatives helps consultants learn to describe texts and consultations instead of critiquing or evaluating them. While observations tend to generate primarily written texts for limited audiences, clip discussions create opportunities for consultants to place "familiar and unfamiliar ways of seeing [...] into dialogue with one another so as to produce insight—knowledge" (Yancey 192), and to share these ideas directly with one another. As consultants watch and discuss clips, they engage in a reflective process that makes observing like consulting: dialogic and developed in community.

This model is still relatively new, and we have not had the opportunity to study its impact on learning in a systematic way, but we can share some early, anecdotal feedback from consultants' written reflections. We are listening to their perspectives and considering their insights as we evolve and refine our process. Early reflections suggest that clip discussions encompass a wide range of concepts and approaches that we address in our training: the emotional connection between a writer and their writing, trauma-informed approaches to consulting, power dynamics, writer agency, body language, silence, and choices about sentence-level interventions, to name a few. The discussion framework seems to support self-awareness about individual consulting, as consultants observe their own work reflected back to them in new ways. At times, this awareness helps them articulate why they do what they do; other times, it opens up possibilities.

We have found NAE to be a powerful heuristic for guiding consultants in discovering different ways of asking questions and in naming alternate strategies, as the following excerpts from their notes suggest. For example, NAE—as a lens to review consultation moments that might otherwise be lost or forgotten—invites consultants to notice practices they weren't initially aware of:

> "[W]e caught me talking a lot and very fast; it gave little room for the writer to add their own comments."

> "I found myself asking more leading questions or not asking as in depth questions because I thought I already knew the answer. This also led to more evaluative language."

They also *ask* new questions about their consulting:

> "This conversation has caused me to reflect in (sic) my own writing and writing in general. To what degree is an emotional connection to writing necessary or helpful for a writer? How can we frame discussions about this topic and/or strategy for writing?"

> The discussion "reminded me that my unconscious mediation of silence could be more conscious. Do I actively consider when silence would add to my sessions, rather than just 'feeling it out'? What are some silence strategies I can use that would avert the anxiety I am currently trying to avoid in my sessions?"

And they *explore* possibilities for future sessions:

> The "content and area of focus for the consultation directly intersected w/my racial identity (and happened to be triggering), and I chose not to name that element of identity as present in our consultation. In retrospect, and after today's conversation, I wish I had."

> "What I am taking away from this session is 1) there are so many ways to approach consulting and 2) when in doubt, just ask questions!"

In both discussions and reflections, we see the kind of learning we hoped for; consultants name specific strategies, consider possibilities, and generate insights that develop their approaches. They notice, ask about, and explore their own and their peers' consultations. We also find evidence of how hard it can be to resist evaluation, in consultations and during observations; this skill requires consistent practice. Further, though consultants recognize the importance of asking questions, we continue to explore how to move consultant learning from recognition to application by asking more genuine and generative questions during consultations.

It is worth noting that the NAE model invites consultants to recognize the limitations of recordings, which don't capture everything that happens during a session. Consultants have noticed, for example, that when working in Google Docs, as opposed to sharing a screen, the recording shows only consultant's and writer's faces, not the writing or how it was engaged. These observations are useful for discussing body language or question asking, but reorganization or sentence-level work is more challenging to discuss. Recordings also don't capture Zoom chat, which we encourage consultants

to use to make note-taking visible in online sessions. Consultants notice what is not there as well as what is; as we continue to develop the model, we will work to explore alternatives that offer a range of visible and invisible consulting moves.

## CONCLUSION

In person again, we are discovering new exigencies for developing and using the "notice, ask, explore" framework. We are curating a library of representative recordings that showcase consultants demonstrating curiosity, asking genuine questions, and guiding writers in productive and generative ways. However, consultants recording and selecting their own clips and watching them with peers remains a vital part of this process. We continue to have a high volume of online consultations, but even in person, consultants can use Zoom to record via a laptop set up on the table. We are also working to understand the limitations of a model centered on watching videos to consider how to revise for accessibility. Emphasizing discussion over viewing is a step in the right direction.

In each iteration of our model, we have recognized that observation is a skill in itself; consultants must learn how to observe just as they learn how to consult. Hall articulates well this relationship among observation, reflection, and tutoring: "underlying reflection is the assumption that one has an informed critical framework already in place for thinking about tutoring practices" ("Theory" 82). NAE creates a "critical framework" based on the idea that tutoring and observing are analogous processes. What the consultant does with the text/writer is what the observer does with the consultation observed; both are—ideally and with practice—descriptive and reflective. Selected clips from recorded sessions ground collaborative discussion and transform observation into a process of dialogic reflection.

At the same time, these methods prompt consultants to have agency in improving their skills and in shaping conversations about future practices. For example, our consultants regularly conduct research, and our initial observation model and the NAE framework were designed by Kelly and Olivia while they were consultants. Kelly and Olivia's participation in this design shows another kind of agency and peer learning: they were not just using their observation experiences to teach and learn from one another but also taking an active role in developing new approaches to training and consulting for the center as a whole.

We hope that other writing centers might adapt our practices to their own contexts. That might involve recording online consulta-

tions in Zoom or using a laptop to record an in-person consultation. More critically, it might involve finding new ways to implement our notice, ask, explore framework—which has emerged for us as the unexpected, and lasting, outcome of our pandemic-prompted use of Zoom—with in-person consultations. We hope to apply NAE to other practices, from the structure of a consultation itself to our observations and assessments of the writing center's day-to-day procedures, while continuing to invite collaboration among consultants and directors. Without noticing what's happening, asking questions, and exploring the possibilities emerging in our transition to Zoom consultations, we would not have recorded and created the replayable consultation texts that have become essential to consultant discussion and training, and which helped us develop the dialogic reflection we'd been missing.

## NOTES

## WORKS CITED

Camp, Heather. "Context Matters: Incorporating Tutor Development into the Writing Center." *Writing Lab Newsletter*, vol. 31, no. 9, 2007, pp. 1-5, wlnjournal.org/archives/v31/31.9.pdf.

Gillespie, Paula, and Neal Lerner, editors. *The Longman Guide to Peer Tutoring*, 2nd ed., Pearson, 2008.

Hall, R. Mark. *Around the Texts of Writing Center Work*. Utah State UP, 2017.

---. "Theory In/To Practice: Using Dialogic Reflection to Develop a Writing Center Community of Practice." *Writing Center Journal*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2011, pp. 82-105. JSTOR, https://www.jstor.org/stable/43442358.

Lawson, Daniel. "Peer Observation, Reflection, and Evaluation Practices in the Writing Center: A Genre Pedagogy Approach." *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2018, http://www.praxisuwc.com/lawson-152.

Mattison, Michael. "Someone to Watch over Me: Reflection and Authority in the Writing Center." *Writing Center Journal*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2007, pp. 29-51. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/43442824.

Montessori, Maria. *The Advanced Montessori Method:* Volume 1. Clio, 2002.

Munger, Robert H., Ilene Rubenstein, and Edna Burow. "Observation, Interaction, and Reflection: The Foundation for Tutor Training." *The Writing Lab Newsletter,* vol. 21, no. 4, 1996, pp. 1-5, wlnjournal.org/archives/v21/21-4.pdf.

Van Slembrouk, Jane. "Watch and Learn: Peer Evaluation and Tutoring Pedagogy." *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal,* vol. 8, no. 1, 2010, http://www.praxisuwc.com/van-slembrouck-81.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "Seeing Practice through Their Eyes: Reflection as Teacher." *Writing Center Research: Extending the Conversation*, edited by Paula Gillespie, Alice Gillam, Lady Falls Brown, and Byron Stay, Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002, pp. 189-201.

# Pandemic Luxuries: Writing Centre Care in a Precarious World

Julia Lane, Mohsen Hosseinpour Moghaddam, Kate Elliott, and Mackenzie Graves
Simon Fraser University

**JULIA LANE**

**MOHSEN HOSSEINPOUR MOGHADDAM**

**KATE ELLIOTT**

**MACKENZIE GRAVES**

Writing centre literature frequently connects carework and the desire for physical space to be cozy and homelike. Indeed, Jackie Grutsch McKinney notes that it is "striking" that "the design of so many writing centres, despite differences in location, size, mission, population served, staff, and so forth, is governed by this metaphor of home" (7). What are the possibilities when writing centres no longer operate through a *metaphor* of home, but actually slip into one another's homes? During the COVID-19 pandemic, writing centre tutors and students engaged with one another from their homes, and from a variety of other spaces outside the academic institution.

Writing centre collaboration has followed many trajectories of thought about complex relationships between capitalist logics of market-exchange, luxury, carework, and concepts of home and writing centres. We were struck by the way writing centres have evaded, albeit imperfectly, market-exchange logic in the neoliberal university precisely by being situated as non-formal spaces of care. This positionality provides us with "the luxury to care" (Pistone), but it simultaneously results in writing centres being un(der)valued. Positioning writing centres as home spaces resonates here too, since homes, although necessities, have also been commodified as "investment opportunities." The bigger picture discussions of capitalism, market-exchange, care-as-commodity, and home-as-commodity are beyond our current scope. However, we wish to recognize the complex ways writing centres are subject to and also subvert broader academic and socio-cultural expectations.

**Note on the authors' photos:** These photos have a limited colour palette and reduced file size to reduce their carbon impact. Recognizing that collective action and systemic change are necessary to address the present climate crisis, we encourage others to consider using less carbon intensive images for websites and other media—although not all will have such cool visual effects!"

We focus on the opportunities that the virtual turn in response to the COVID-19 pandemic created to slip out of the institution and into new relationships marked by more radical forms of care. Hi'ilei Julia Kawehipuaakahaopulani Hobart and Tamara Kneese define radical care as a "set of vital but underappreciated strategies for enduring precarious worlds," as a "feeling with, rather than feeling for, others," and as an "affective connective tissue between an inner self and an outer world" (1-2). We apply these understandings of radical care to our experiences with writing centre work.

## COLLABORATIVE AUTOETHNOGRAPHY

Autoethnography is sometimes described as "insider ethnography," or studies conducted by researchers who are already part of the community they write about. Arthur Bochner and Carolyn Ellis' conception of evocative autoethnography extends this understanding by describing it as research that offers a "critical response to disquieting concerns about silent authorship, the need for researcher reflexivity, or as a humanizing, moral, aesthetic, emotion-centered, political, and personal form of representation" (47). We add "collaborative" to autoethnography here because this paper includes first-person narratives alongside ideas and analysis that arose from our conversations and collective writing.

The autoethnographic approach allowed us to think *with* and *about* our experiences together (Phillips et al.), mirroring Hobart and Kneese's understanding of radical care as feeling with another. This process has pushed us to think and feel not only with one another as co-authors, but also with our own recalled writing centre experiences prior to, during, and beyond the virtual turn.

## WINDOW SWAPPING: SLIPPING THROUGH PORTALS OF RADICAL CARE

My name is Julia. I am a Writing Services Coordinator at a Student Learning Commons. I have been the direct supervisor for the three other co-authors. I hold a doctorate in Arts Education, and I am relatively early in my writing centre career. I am a white settler living on unceded Coast Salish lands, and I self-identify as a cis-femme mother and writer. I invite you to travel with me back to the day after our university announced that it was "canceling all on-campus classes and activities in an effort to stop the spread of COVID-19."

*We see each other's videos come up on screen and giggle, a little nervously. "Hi, thanks for being willing to meet like this. The world is… strange right now." "Yeah, I am really glad we were still able to connect. Plus, it's cool being able to see your kitchen behind you. I like those cabinets."*

*"Thanks. My partner and I built this house. I've thought about going into interior design, but I am trying out this degree …"*

So began my first virtual consultation. I was struck by how an off-handed compliment provided a window into the student's life beyond the classroom. Of course, this potential for connection always exists in consultations. But, there was something specifically intimate about this moment, as I not only learned a fact about the student, but was simultaneously welcomed into her kitchen.

I did not yet know that my own kitchen island would soon become my virtual office, just as I was unaware of the many forms of slippage I would experience as my identities of mother and writing centre professional settled into the same time and space, often my kitchen. Kitchens are recognized as uniquely meaningful sites in the Indigenous research methodology known as *kitchen table conversations* or dialogues. In their kitchen table talk, artists Cathy Mattes (Michif) and Sherry Farrell Racette (Algonquin/Metis/Irish) explain that the kitchen table is "where some of the best learning occurs. When we gather [...] around food and tea, we relax into easy conversation, lending to a safe space for dialogue and knowledge sharing." Virtual consultations did not allow us to share food or tea, but they did let us slip out of the institution and into more easy conversations and connections.

Early in the pandemic, a friend and colleague shared the website window-swap.com, which allows you to "open a new window somewhere in the world." As we co-authors reflected on the virtual turn, we discussed it as window-swapping: the opportunity to travel without leaving home; to open windows not only into others' spaces, but also into the "intimate and banal details" (Davis as qtd. in Hobart and Kneese 1) of another's life. We offer our reflections as "evocative stories" (Bochner and Ellis). We have not erased or flattened the differences in our experiences and perspectives. Instead, we engage the messiness that is writing centre care.

## STRATEGIES FOR ENDURING PRECARIOUS WORLDS
My name is Mohsen. I am an immigrant to Canada from Iran. English is not my first language; I started learning English at twenty. I did my bachelor's and master's in English language teaching in Iran before coming to Canada in 2012 to do a second master's in Education. I am currently a PhD student in Education. I have been working as a Graduate Writing Facilitator for almost four years.

Being a nonnative speaker/writer of English, I feel more comfortable teaching in a virtual space. In a physical space where I am surrounded by other people, there is always the question of legiti-

macy. I'm not suggesting that others think that I am not a legitimate writing advisor; this is a feeling that I, as an EAL writer/speaker, have. Questioning my legitimacy arises more when I am surrounded by white native speakers as I am teaching something (academic writing in *English*) that belongs to white people. My race, skin colour, accent, and even nationality all play a role in how I am viewed by others (Canagarajah).

Similarly, students who are learning across language, cultural, and racial barriers feel their precarity in the institution as a daily experience. These students, too, might carry with them feelings of illegitimacy and inauthenticity (Kramsch). Students attending Canadian universities are expected to be highly proficient in English language skills and competent in academic writing. Thus, EAL students might feel illegitimate and precarious because of their (perceived lack of) language proficiency.

As a common sense survival strategy, instructors often send EAL students to visit us to "fix their writing." On campus, students are taken to an open writing consultation space where they may be surrounded by white, native English speakers. Being observed may make these already-precarious students hyper-aware that others "doubt the legitimacy of their admission," as with Alexandria Lockett's description of her resistance to visiting the writing centre. Although we try to provide support, the instructor and university's expectations do not allow us to enact radical care; we are expected to fix students' writing and therefore required to treat them like they are lacking. Rather than being a strategy for survival, a visit to the writing centre can entrench students' precarity.

While not a perfect solution, virtual writing consultations create opportunities for radical care. And, I have noticed that more EAL students visit me virtually. Students have more choice about where they join a virtual consultation from, and they often talk more freely about why they visited the tutor, perhaps because they aren't being observed and don't risk being labeled students "in need" or "at risk." Students can even turn their videos entirely off, allowing them to connect without being seen. Students may use this option to decentralize parts of themselves that they worry might be negatively judged by others. Virtual consultations therefore better position the writing centre as a place to learn and share strategies for surviving the precarious world of academia, perhaps especially for those who experience the most acute academic precarity.

## FEELING WITH, RATHER THAN FEELING FOR
My name is Mackenzie. I first began my writing centre work as a

Writing and Learning Peer Educator, but my term was cut short by the pandemic. I was hired as Graduate Writing Facilitator in September 2021, as the university returned to in-person instruction. I am a white, cis-male settler, and I am the youngest co-author—what some might term a "digital native." I'm also the least fond of virtual consultations. Throughout the virtual turn, I have maintained an affinity for in-person work, and this sentiment has been echoed by many students I work with. However, I don't believe it is necessary to pit virtual against in-person. Rather, the practice of radical care in writing centre work necessitates flexibility and a high degree of choice for tutors, students, and staff. After all, the provision of care necessitates accessibility *of* the care provided.

The primary aspect of virtual consultations I find limiting is that, for me, they carry an innately impersonal element. Because we are no longer in a shared physical space, virtual consultations can create barriers to organic connection, causing the tutor and student to feel removed from one another. This distancing makes it more difficult for me to put myself in the student's shoes, and, as a consequence, I find it easier to feel *for them*, rather than *with* them. By this, I mean that instead of fostering and engaging in an intimate, collaborative process in which I experience empathy for the individuals with whom I work, virtual methods promote a more sympathetic stance: I understand the students' concerns but do not feel them myself. Furthermore, the virtual consultation software we use presents students' assignments front and centre, while only providing a small window in the top corner for video conferencing. As a result, students and tutors alike are attending centrally to the piece of writing, rather than to each other. The focus of these consultations is the product itself, not the individuals involved. For me, this set up puts the focus on "academic" results, thus dampening the shared feeling and acknowledgment of "non-academic" concerns that I have often experienced during in-person consultations.

## AFFECTIVE CONNECTIVE TISSUE: LINKING AN INNER SELF TO AN OUTER WORLD

My name is Kate. A Graduate Writing Facilitator since 2018, I assisted the writing centre's virtual shift when the pandemic began. I am a white settler completing PhD research that uses virtual spaces for collaborative storytelling. As a public high school teacher, I was offered access in 2010 to technology for virtual connection. My students and I slipped through pre-Zoom portals, swapping windows with activists and climate scientists. Virtual space became the connective tissue that joined us.

In the newness of the pandemic, the virtual was familiar, as was the

facilitation space: one person arrived with writing, and one with a reader's eyes. Our shared learning environment was enhanced by what flowed from my homespace to theirs, from theirs to mine: a glass jar filled with paint brushes that jostled as the student searched for a pen, steam rising from a white cup.

*"They are so noisy," she apologizes. I had been wondering about the loud, non-human voices. The student tells me she lives at the edge of a tropical forest. It is 4:00 a.m. in her time zone, and birds in the forest are waking up. I am suddenly aware of the gift of someone else's life—and ecosystem—leaking into my much-less-interesting home space.*

How do I compare the multisensory virtual portal with the industrial learning space of the writing centre: unremarkable flooring, uniform tables, and chairs whose plastic form is shaped to cup an *average* body—not an *every*body. Within the neutralized space of the physical writing centre, we asked students to revise sensory passages, while the windows beside us remained closed, buffering the sounds and sensations beyond. The pandemic required us to throw those windows open, connecting our sensory worlds.

The two-way flow of sensory landscapes through shared portals mimics the flows of learning I experience as a writing facilitator: in helping students, I am nourished by their ideas. I see universities as ecologies. Sharon Feiman-Nemser seeks a "connective tissue [to hold] things together within or across different phases of learning" (1049)—a cohesive infrastructure across learning spaces, phases, and events. Writing centres perform this connective role: students flow through from all parts of the university, seeking care for their learning. The pandemic enhanced this flow by allowing intimacies of the different worlds we inhabit to slip in, slip out, and to commingle in a shared virtual space.

## SLIPPING OUT, SLIPPING IN
McKinney's call for a more critical reading of writing centre spaces, including recognition that there is no universal and culturally-neutral "home space," aligns with Romeo Garcia's observation that "in this global current, difference seems to matter less and less, and with the erosion of local culture due to the production of homogenized global spaces …, it seems commonplace to flatten and/or erase the coexistence of other histories" (41). In attempting to create "cozy, home spaces" within institutions by furnishing writing centres with "round tables, art, plants, couches, and coffee pots" (McKinney 6), we are complicit in flattening conceptions of both home and care. This flattening includes the association between

"care" and feelings of "comfort" and "coziness." Of course, writing centres have never been equally comfortable or cozy for all. Garcia puts it succinctly: "For me, the writing center is neither my safe space nor my home" (48). Using the lens of radical care allows us to extend this point by examining how associating care with good feelings of coziness and comfort ultimately undermines the potential for writing centre carework. In perpetuating this association, we may unwittingly undermine the actual potential of our care by positioning ourselves as spaces to help students feel better *about* their writing, instead of as networks of "affective connectivity" that empower students to feel, write, learn, and care *with us* as strategies for survival.

Micki McGee writes, "that capitalism has a care problem is by no means a new observation" (39). Similarly, it is not a new observation that writing centres are constructed as spaces where carework can take place on campus. According to Renee Pistone, formal classrooms are not easily able to engage a "caring tutoring approach" because they are constrained by time, resources, and a one-to-many teaching framework (10). Writing centres, on the other hand, "have the luxury" of caring (Pistone). In this paper, we have posed the question of whether the COVID-19 pandemic has opened new possibilities for care, challenging us to recognize that our care is not, in fact, a luxury, but a radical necessity of our work.

Through the virtual turn, we physically slipped out of the institutional space, and conceptually slipped out of our habituated understandings of the writing centre and our roles within it. In these moments, the writing centre was less a space than an "affective connective tissue" of humans engaging in the shared work of caring—caring with one another about the high stakes work of learning and writing in precarious times.

### WORKS CITED

Bochner, Arthur, and Carolyn Ellis. *Evocative Autoethnography: Writing Lives and Telling Stories.* Routledge, 2016.

Canagarajah, Suresh. "Multilingual Identity in Teaching Multilingual Writing." *Reflections on Language Teacher Identity Research*, edited by Gary Barkhuizen, Routledge, 2016, pp. 67-73.

Feiman-Nemser, Sharon. "From Preparation to Practice: Designing a Continuum to Strengthen and Sustain Teaching." *Teachers College Record*, vol. 103, no. 6, 2001, pp. 1013-55.

Garcia, Romeo. "Unmaking Gringo-Centers." *The Writing Center Journal*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2017, pp. 29-60.

Hobart, Hiʻilei Julia Kawehipuaakahaopulani, and Tamara Kneese. "Radical Care: Survival Strategies for Uncertain Times." *Social Text*, vol. 38, no. 1(142), 2020, pp. 1-16.

Kramsch, Claire. "Authenticity and Legitimacy in Multilingual SLA." *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2012, pp. 107-28.

Lockett, Alexandria. "Why I Call it the Academic Ghetto: A Critical Examination of Race, Place, and Writing Centers." *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, vol. 16, no. 2, 2019, pp. 20-33.

McGee, Micki. "Capitalism's Care Problem: Some Traces, Fixes, and Patches." *Social Text*, vol. 38, no. 1(142), 2020, pp. 39-66.

Phillips, Louise Jane, Maria Bee Christensen-Strynø, and Lisbeth Frølunde. "Thinking with Autoethnography in Collaborative Research: A Critical, Reflexive Approach to Relational Ethics." *Qualitative Research*, 2021, pp. 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1177/14687941211033446

Mattes, Cathy, and Sherry Farrell Racette. "Métis Kitchen Table Talk on Methodologies of Making." *Ociciwan*. http://www.ociciwan.ca/project-14 Accessed 22 Apr. 2022

McKinney, Jackie Grutsch. "Leaving Home Sweet Home: Towards Critical Readings of Writing Center Spaces." *The Writing Center Journal,* vol. 25, no. 2, 2005, pp. 6-20.

Pistone, Renee A. "Writing Center Tutors Have the Luxury to Focus on Individual Student Care Giving as Opposed to Formal Classroom Settings That Are Less Care Centered." *English Language Teaching*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 10-12.

WindowSwap. https://www.window-swap.com/ Accessed 28 Apr. 2022.

## NORTHEAST WRITING CENTERS ASSOCIATION

**April 1-2, 2023 | Durham, NH, University of New Hampshire**
*"Unbound: The Un-CFP"* - Keynote: Clarissa Walker

Please submit proposals to https://unh.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9RKgyOYSy2SjsYS. Deadline is Jan. 2, 2023. For questions about the submission process, please email Susan DeRosa (derosas@easternct.edu) or Molly Parsons ( molly.parsons@keene.edu).

For questions about the conference, please contact NEWCA co-presidents, Cyndi Roll and Meaghan Dittrich at newaconference@gmail.com. Website: https://newcaconference.org/conference/2023-2/.

## ONLINE WRITING CENTERS ASSOCIATION

**April 13-14, 2023 | Virtual**
*"Modality and the Online Writing Center"*

There are no conference registration fees; however, an OWCA membership ($5-15 for students and $40 for professionals)  is required to attend the conference and/or access conference materials. Contact information for the conference chairs, Kim Fahle and Erika Maikish: owca-conference@onlinewritingcenters.org.

# Tutors' Column: "Navigating the 'New Normal' with Abnormal Discourse"

Sarah Rice
Dickinson College

**SARAH RICE**

The impacts of COVID-19 over the past two years, not only as a physical health crisis but also as a mental health, social, economic, and humanitarian crisis, have affected even the most basic aspects of our lives. Still, we tend to reduce and ignore these monumental changes within our private and public lives. Since beginning to return to a new, post-pandemic life, the troubling effects of the pandemic on each individual are becoming more obvious and more important to address. In my role as a writing tutor, then, failing to address the very different, very personalized effects of COVID-19 on myself and my peers only continues to hurt our already grief-stricken community.

Although writing centers provide a safe place for tutors and writers to become better writers and scholars, we typically achieve this through normal or "academic" discourse. This type of interaction, as described by Kenneth Bruffee, promotes "conversation within a community of knowledgeable peers" who accept and follow "the same paradigms and the same code of values and assumptions" (213). A strong sense of normal discourse within writing centers means a strong sense of collaborative learning, but it does not account for the less universalized ideas and experiences of those involved. Downplaying or ignoring the individual effects of COVID-19 among varying demographics, as unintentionally done through normal discourse, certainly makes it easier for us to conceptualize, emotionally manage, or remove ourselves from the pandemic. The appeal of this silence is obvious when fear, grief, and painful memories act as the alternatives. Easier is not necessarily better, though, as I quickly learned during my first year as a tutor.

It was September 2021, the beginning of my sophomore year, when I held my first peer tutor session. That same day was also the first time I stepped foot into our college's writing center. Armed with four months of virtual tutor training, three observations over Zoom, two "co-tutoring" sessions over Zoom, and one positive attitude, I felt as

prepared as I could be.

Forty-five minutes later, as my first-ever tutee left our writing center, I felt like a complete failure. After living in a socially distant bubble for months on end, I completely neglected the differences in mood and discourse between virtual and in-person interactions. The writer, let's call her Mary, came to the session with an essay for her first-year seminar. She expressed concern about her first college paper, but also mentioned stress about juggling academics, relationships, and extracurriculars in the college environment; I remember her being on the verge of tears while verbalizing fears about time management and whether or not she could handle the responsibilities of a college student. During the first minutes of the session, I felt helpless. On a personal level, I struggled to empathize with her. Rather than dealing with time management and social concerns, I spent my first year of college worrying about COVID-19 while trying to find a Wi-Fi connection for my virtual classes.

Still, I had no trouble engaging in normal discourse with Mary. Both of us being members of the same college community and both wanting to be better writers, we were able to establish a normal discourse centered around academic writing. Just as Bruffee describes, we conversed about "the subject and the assignment" and the "relationship between student and teacher," important things "pursuant to writing" (Bruffee 213). According to Bruffee's pedagogy of normal discourse, Mary and I had a successful session. So why did I feel so dissatisfied?

My fear of conflict with the writer led me to avoid and ignore our different personal and academic experiences, particularly concerning the effects of COVID-19; as much as I wanted to help ease Mary's anxieties, I did not know how to handle the differences between our first years of college. (Granted, Mary and I are traditionally aged students at a residential college; what is unusual for us is not necessarily unusual for students who commute, work full time, or have children.) Because I did not have a typical freshman year, and because I completed my tutor training online, I felt a crippling sense of illegitimacy. Ironically, trying to avoid these feelings of illegitimacy limited my understanding of the Mary's situation. In our new world where a coronavirus disease has claimed over six million lives, where mental and emotional wellbeing is just as precarious as physical wellbeing, where the distinction between reality and virtuality becomes less clear each day – normal discourse is simply not powerful enough.

To facilitate more individualized and, consequently, more effective tutoring sessions, we tutors must embrace and promote Richard Rorty's "abnormal discourse." Abnormal discourse occurs when

"someone joins in the discourse who is ignorant of [an agreed-upon set of] conventions or who sets them aside"; this process complicates rather than maintains pre-existing knowledge (Rorty 320). By encouraging the inclusion of knowledge beyond the traditional sphere of academia, abnormal discourse creates tension within conversations involving people with differing perspectives. Abnormal discourse, in embracing idiosyncrasy, ultimately functions "to resist the hegemonic power of normal discourse and to struggle for individual voices" (Gale 66). This "struggle for individual voices" became especially prominent as a global pandemic restricted our individual agency in nearly every way possible. Because COVID-19 has become so intertwined in our lives throughout the past two years, it is impossible to have an open discussion about traditional college experiences without also mentioning the pandemic's influence on these topics. Ignoring the personal effects of COVID-19 ultimately limits the discussions and work achieved during tutoring sessions.

Recognizing the relationship between differing types of knowledge and experiences, such as emotional burnout from the pandemic and how that burnout relates to work habits, allows writers and tutors to engage in a more honest conversation. When we open our tutoring sessions to include the complexities associated with living through a pandemic, we also open our sessions to generate new knowledge about tutor-writer relationships and effective and inclusive tutor strategies in a post-pandemic world.

Since abnormal discourse inherently pushes past the boundaries of traditional academic discourse, the process of incorporating it into our sessions involves discomfort. I felt this discomfort with Mary, as the idea of openly acknowledging our struggles related to COVID-19 seemed like admitting weakness and an inability to manage difficult situations. My fear of not being competent prevented me from having this vulnerable conversation. Performing normal discourse certainly protected my ego and maintained some of my blissful ignorance, but the memory of Mary's unresolved personal anxieties at the end of our session cautions against the surface-level solutions provided by normal discourse. In retrospect, I could have discussed "similarities" between our first-year college struggles, talked about Mary's personal struggles and its effect on her academic work, suggested resources for Mary's wellbeing, and/or given Mary a few moments to vent about her anxieties. After meeting Mary, experiencing and largely avoiding discomfort within our session, but also experiencing the incompleteness and dissatisfaction at the end of our session, I knew that a potentially  uncomfortable session would always be better than one that did not allow for personal growth. I began to realize that my most effective and enjoyable sessions were not the ones in which I avoided all personal topics of COVID-19; instead, the

sessions that involved open and honest conversations about the effects of COVID-19 held the most success.

Unsurprisingly, I still felt like a failed tutor during these first few sessions using abnormal discourse. This feeling of failure did not reflect my tutoring capabilities though, but rather the discomfort I experienced while practicing abnormal discourse. During this process of embracing the unknown and learning to participate in abnormal discourse, it is important to remember that difference and discomfort do not indicate incompetence; only through discomfort is growth possible. Ultimately, the initial discomfort I experience during abnormal discourse sessions encourages an increased sense of empathy and listening skills that transfers into both my personal and professional life.

Over two years have passed since the onset of COVID-19, yet the rippling effects of this crisis continue to alter our everyday lives. We live in a world of new normals, one with widespread vaccines, KN95 masks, and meetings via Zoom, and our writing centers are no exception to this altered sense of normalcy. Fully embracing this new normal, rather than avoiding it out of fear or discomfort, also means fully embracing abnormal discourse. And while this type of discourse can be intimidating at times, it is also a reminder that abnormality does not indicate failure, but rather a brave pursuit of knowledge and personal growth.

## WORKS CITED

Bruffee, Kenneth. "Peer Tutoring and the 'Conversation of Mankind.'" *The Allyn and Bacon Guide to Writing Center Theory and Practice*, edited by Robert W. Barnett and Jacob S. Blumner, Longman, 2001, pp. 206-18.

Gale, Xin Liu. *Teachers, Discourses, and Authority in the Postmodern Composition Classroom*. State University of New York, 1996. ProQuest Ebook Central, https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/dickinson/reader.action?docID=3406953.

Rorty, Richard. *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature: Thirtieth Anniversary Edition*. Princeton UP, 2009. JSTOR, https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvc77b6z.

---

## SECONDARY SCHOOLS WRITING CENTERS ASSOCIATION

**March 17-18, 2023 | Arlington, VA, George Mason University**
*"Writing at the Center: SSWCA & NVWP Conference 2023"*

**Because this year's conference is a partnered conference with the Northern Virginia Writing Project**, we also welcome others who have a stake in writing instruction and writing practices more generally. For further information, contact the conference chair, Jenny Goransson: jggoransson@gmail.com; conference website: http://sswca.org/conference/sswca-2023/.

# Conference Calendar

**February 8-10, 2023: Middle East/North Africa Writing Centers Association, Education City, Doha, Qatar**
Contact: Sahar Mari: sahar.mari@qatar.tamu.edu, and Nicole Abiad: nlmace@vcu.edu; conference website: http://menawca.org/conference-2023

**February 9-11, 2023: Southeastern Writing Centers Association, Memphis, TN**
Contact: Hosted by Christian Brothers University; confere++++nce website: https://southeasternwritingcenter.wildapricot.org/conference.

**March 2-4, 2023: South Central Writing Centers Association, Lubbock, TX**
Contact: Kristin Messuri: (Kristin.messuri@ttu.edu) or Jennifer Marciniak: (Jennifer.marciniak@ttu.edu); information about proposals: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1MpnrFBNxq12RpQmyOY9MxhTuUcIrckQr/edit

**March 9-11, 2023: Midwest Writing Centers Association, St. Charles, MO**
Contact: Elizabeth Busekrus Blackmon: ebusekrus1@stlcc.edu; conference website: https://www.mwcamembers.org

**March 17-18, 2023: Secondary School Writing Center Association, Arlington, VA**
Contact: Jenny Goransson: conference@sswca.org; conference website: http://sswca.org/conference/sswca-2023/

**April 1-2, 2023: Northeast Writing Centers Association, Durham, NH**
Contact: Cyndi Roll and Meaghan Dittrich: newcaconference@gmail.com; conference website: https://newcaconference.org/conference/2023-2/

**April 13-14, 2023: Online Writing Centers Association, virtual**
Contact: Kim Fahle and Erika Maikish: owca-conference@onlinewritingcenters.org; conference website: https://www.onlinewritingcenters.org/conference.

# WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship

**Editor:**      Muriel Harris (harrism@purdue.edu)

**Blog Editor:**   Anna Sophia Habib (ahabib@gmu.edu)

**Subscriptions, Archives, Resources, and Submissions:**
Visit www.wlnjournal.org for subscription information, free archive access, resources, and manuscript submission guidelines.

WLN

A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship

TWENTY SIX DESIGN LLC

52 Riley Road #380

Celebration, FL  34747

wlnjournal

WLNjournal