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NOTES

NOTES FOR THE INTRODUCTION

1. Names of students have been changed. Names of tutors are used with their permission.

2. The suggestion that we “just tutor” has been used on Wcenter as a means of calling for a return to a simpler version of life in the writing center, one unencumbered by politics, administrative concerns, potential conflicts. A life where some idealized tutor and some idealized student sit together and work, free from such constraints. This is of course never the case. I would like to take this opportunity to encourage readers to think again about the use of the term just, following Davis, following Lyotard, who calls attention to the word’s double entendre: “merely” and “justly.” Though Davis notes that the purpose of her project is in fact “to issue a call to ‘just [“merely”] laugh’”(9), it is not the purpose of my project to issue a call to “just tutor.” Along with Davis, however, I do hope this project urges readers, as it has urged me, to consider what it means to teach justly.

3. Deleuze writes, “Practice is a set of relays from one theoretical point to another, and theory is a relay from one practice to another” (qtd. in Bouchard 1997, 206).

NOTES FOR CHAPTER ONE

1. I employ the term “center” as the preferred descriptor for these spaces, though it should be noted that many schools operate writing “labs” and some operate under terms that identify them as neither “clinics” nor “labs” nor “centers.”

2. Pemberton does not actually consider the lab metaphor among the three metaphors he takes up.
3. Other composition theorists have also written about this fledgling field’s reliance on the scientific method/s. See, for example, James Berlin, Peter Carino, Neal Lerner, and Elizabeth Boquet.

4. See Nancy Grimm’s *Good Intentions: Writing Center Work for Postmodern Times* for a more nuanced consideration of the ways that writing centers function as both regulatory and liberatory mechanisms for discursive practices.

5. Ehrenreich worked as a maid for one of these cleaning services for three weeks as part of the research for this article.

6. Nineteenth century quarantine signs in the United States varied slightly according to illness, but most contained the following general warning: “Keep Out of This House By Order of the Board of Health; Carrier of [insert here], a Communicable Disease.” For examples, see the website of the National Library of Medicine [www.ihm.nlm.nih.gov].

7. Here are Haraway’s thoughts on blasphemy: “Blasphemy has always seemed to require taking things very seriously. . . . Blasphemy protects one from the moral majority within, while still insisting on the need for community. Blasphemy is not apostasy. Irony is about contradictions that do not resolve into larger wholes, even dialectically, about the tension of holding incompatible things together because both or all are necessary and true. Irony is about humour and serious play” (149).

8. I single out Leahy’s article precisely because this piece represents the fullest and most direct articulation of the sense of community in the writing center. Though Leahy’s piece was published nearly a decade ago, the assertion of writing center community among writing center staff has not changed. One recent example occurs in the December 2000 Wcenter thread “Being a Tutor.”

9. It could be argued (and has been argued) that current writing center philosophy is consistent with, and has been significantly influenced by, feminist pedagogical philosophy. See, especially, Woolbright.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER TWO

1. Here I must thank Derek Owens for pointing me to this source.

2. An exception to this general rule is outlined in Sarah Davis’s recent *Writing Lab Newsletter* article, “Something from Nothing: The
Story (I Love to Tell) of the Development of the Writing Lab at Chowan College.”

3. The text of Lerner’s refutation is published in the September 2001 Writing Lab Newsletter.

4. In an endnote to the published version, Lerner also comments on several other quantitative studies of writing center effectiveness (one of which is Stephen Newmann’s, another one of the studies Harris cites), charging that the results of these studies are subject to similar questions of statistical rigor and validity.

5. At Fairfield, the two processes—tenure and promotion to associate professor—are effectively linked.

6. In his end of the year address to faculty (summarized by the Secretary of the General Faculty), Fairfield University President Aloysius Kelley called this a “challenging year for community relations.” “Severe limitations,” he said, were placed on the use of the practice field: “Lights must be removed, the bleachers repositioned, and sound levels have been imposed.” He also warned that the battle was not over as the neighbors were seeking to “impose more restrictions” on the planned construction of a lacrosse/soccer field.

7. Of course, Hendrix himself owes a great debt to many musicians, perhaps most notably Buddy Guy, who was playing around with the tricks Hendrix made famous long before Hendrix was on the scene.

8. The traditional mirroring model for writing center work is an outgrowth of the Rogerian non-directive model used in counseling. This model has tutors “mirror” students’ questions back to them, rather than encouraging tutors to answer those questions or to engage in meaningful dialogue with the students about their concerns.

9. Rafoth directs the writing center at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, where I worked as a graduate student. I do hope Ben intended the double entendre in this section heading: complicating does matter.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER THREE

1. At Fairfield, this course is a semester-long three-credit course. Therefore, the references I make to my own staff education assume such a model. I am aware, however, that not all writing centers educate tutors in such a course. The staff education program at
Rhode Island College, from which most of the data for this chapter was derived, is not a credit-bearing course. Instead, all tutors, beginning and returning, attend weekly sessions for no credit through much of every summer.

2. The RIC tutors were asked to write brief individual, autobiographical descriptions for the book. These descriptions are reproduced here exactly as they were sent to me.

3. Meg’s description is the result of a round-robin writing activity—i.e., written collectively—by the tutors.

4. All formal and informal interviews with the tutors and with Meg were conducted between May 2000 and September 2000, with the exception of the follow-up interviews, which were conducted in June 2001. Email correspondence was collected between November 2000 and April 2001.

5. A copy of this packet of materials from the Summer 2000 workshop is housed in the archives of the RIC Writing Center.

6. Even the choice of readings grows out of local tutoring situations. Next summer, tutors will be reading *First They Killed My Father* by Laung Ung in response to several moving sessions this past year with Cambodian students.

7. All journals are housed in the archives of the RIC Writing Center.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER FOUR

1. Shortly after the beginning of her first semester as a tutor, Donna unfortunately had to quit working at the writing center. Her life challenges proved incompatible with the necessary routine of work in the writing center. Everyone’s loss.