# Snapping from the Center: Institutional Absurdity and Equitable Writing Center Administration

Amanda Fields, Elizabeth Leahy, Celeste Del Russo, and Erica Cirillo-McCarthy[1]

Abstract

*Working in unsustainable pandemic conditions has helped reveal the oppressive institutional absurdity we are often subject to. The authors of this article, tenured and tenure-track writing center directors at public universities, have experienced the buildup of pressure as our respective institutions demand more energy, time, and emotion. These pressures, as Sara Ahmed (2017) argued in Living a Feminist Life, lead to "snap"—a painful breakage that, when recognized, can be generative and useful. In this article, we theorize the significance of snapping—a breaking point when it is clearly understood that something must change—in writing center administrative contexts. After identifying the significance and utility of snapping, we fold this concept into a set of working rhetorical strategies that help us resist oppressive institutional absurdity. These strategies—roadblocking, changing the narrative, and coalitioning—can lead to more sustainable and equitable writing center administration practices.*

---

Like many *WPA: Writing Program Administration* readers, we have recently navigated budget cuts, increasing workloads, resource scrutiny, state health policies that contradict CDC guidelines, and more while overseeing operational changes and modality shifts in our writing centers through a pandemic. These conditions laid bare familiar and oppressive institutional absurdities. As our institutions demanded more energy, time, and emotion, the pressure built for us. Such pressure, as Sara Ahmed (2017) argued in *Living a Feminist Life*, leads to "snap"—a painful breakage that, when recognized, can be generative and useful.

Here, we theorize snapping in writing center administrative contexts. This project emerged from shared commiseration among four writing center directors navigating institutional absurdities. Each of us experienced a snap, a breaking point when it was clearly understood that something *must* shift, transform, change. We analyze the pressures that reared up in sharp clarity during the pandemic and led to a feminist snap as we grappled with unsustainable administrative demands. After identifying the significance

and utility of snapping, we fold this concept into a set of rhetorical strategies that resist oppressive institutional absurdity.

By taking up Ahmed's (2017) feminist snap, we hope to encourage transformative interactions among WPAs and institutional entities to work towards more equitable labor conditions. Ahmed showed, as we hope to, that the feminist snap can be generative and discursive. The snap can lead to optimism, to a space where we might imagine new futures for ourselves and our centers. We will describe the significance of connecting emotions and labor in writing centers to the administrative moves we make when we inevitably snap. We cover three rhetorical strategies that have been effective for us: (1) roadblocking, (2) changing the narrative, and (3) coalitioning with accomplices. We follow Ahmed's (2017) lead in believing that "telling the story is part of the feminist battle. A feminist ear can be what we are *for*. The more wearing it is, the more we need to hear" (p. 203). Sharing our stories of navigating writing center administrator (WCA) life during a pandemic allows us to work across institutions to develop connections with other practitioners and puncture through, examine, and subvert everyday absurdities.

## Emotion, Labor, and Workism

The emotional dimension of writing center administrative labor is important for understanding feminist writing center administrative practices. Recent collections such as Adams Wooten, Babb, Costello, and Navickas's (2020) *The Things We Carry: Strategies for Recognizing and Negotiating Emotional Labor in Writing Program Administration*; Morris and Concannon's (2022) *Emotions and Affect in Writing Centers*; and Giaimo's (2021) *Wellness and Care in Writing Center Work* have continued the field's turn towards understanding emotions as a way of knowing. Grutsch McKinney, Caswell, and Jackson (2022) argued that while the emotional dimensions of our work may bring us joy, our labor is often "poorly understood" and "undervalued," leading to "emotional exhaustion" (p. 17). Nelson, Deges, and Weaver (2020) urged WCAs to describe emotional labor as "a critically important strategy for responding to the emotional toll our jobs can take on us" (p. 173). Kleinfeld (2020) argued for a more realistic view of workloads in light of emotional labor. These scholars call for more pragmatic expectations rather than subjecting faculty to unsustainable measures for success or productivity, especially in times of crisis.

Examination of emotions can serve as a site of inquiry and action. In recent work on harnessing emotions to develop meaningful administrative responses, Cirillo-McCarthy and Leahy (2022) advocated for a process of

listening, reflecting, and responding as a way to contextualize our emotional response to conflict. Our work builds on this idea; however, while we advocate for listening, reflecting, and responding, and while we agree that slowing down and sitting with our emotions can be generative, we want to be more cognizant of rhetorics of absurdity that we must disrupt. Listen, reflect, respond, and disrupt. We find the concept of an emotional epistemology that centers embodied experiences useful when the limits of our patience and emotions are tested (Jaggar, 1989; Micciche, 2011, 2016).

Therefore, acknowledging emotional labor is crucial. Sicari (2022) argued that not only is emotional labor intellectual, but also, without acknowledging that labor, we reproduce unsustainable conditions. Our jobs are emotionally draining not just because of the relational aspects of our work but because of institutional absurdity. Compelled to continue our work despite obstacles during a pandemic, the four of us connected in group chats and met in weekly lunchtime Zoom sessions (we labeled these meetings "Radical Sandwiches" in our calendars). We were noticing increasingly absurd demands within our universities, and our commiseration quickly turned to theorizing. In our view, institutional absurdity is best discerned by the ways in which communication and expectation manifest tangibly across the university in conflict with our values. In other work, we used annual reports to illustrate ways in which this particular genre reproduces absurd expectations that conflict with our values and obscures emotional labor (Cirillo-McCarthy, Del Russo, Fields, & Leahy, 2023). In these reports and elsewhere, WCAs can consistently push back on misconceptions of writing center practices. We explain what we do, convey the centrality of writing across the institution, and seek to educate faculty and students about the value of collaboration, reflection, and multifaceted writing processes. Whether we are proactive or reactive in these explanations, "We deplete ourselves further as our institutions become more and more extractive" (Giaimo, 2022, para. 15). The COVID-19 pandemic couldn't have made this clearer.

Writing at the beginning of the pandemic about the precarity of writing center labor, Giaimo (2020) warned of "moments where we need to simply say that enough is enough. We may be subtly pressured to perform through coercive Pollyannaish stories our institutions highlight featuring employee 'grit' and 'resilience'" (para. 21). Giaimo (2022) has sharply critiqued the "workism" culture that pervades academia, lamenting "the frenzied approach to work" (para. 8) made visible particularly in the pandemic. Workism asks us to feel a commitment to an institution akin to family. As such, workism culture infects academic narratives about sacrifice and even martyrdom—no exaggeration if we consider the numerous stories of

immunocompromised teachers steeling themselves to head into the pandemic classroom if they wish to keep their jobs. Still, while many academics strive to make labor more apparent, few (if any) WCAs could state with certainty that we reject workism. After all, we perceive our writing centers as communities for mentoring. We take our work home with us, including emotional responses to absurdity. We make ourselves readily available to talk with tutors, students, and administrators in person and online. Even writing in the collective "we" indicates a commitment to workism and an inherent tie between workism and identity.

The four of us are writing center directors at public universities in the South and Northeast. Erica and Amanda are tenure-track, and Celeste and Beth are tenured. However, all four of us were pre-tenure when we enacted the strategies we are sharing. Each of us has worked in writing centers as administrators, students, and contingent workers, and we recognize that positionality and labor conditions greatly influence the power to demand change. From these standpoints, though, we perceive the need for a radical reframing of what we expect from our institutions. We try to use our privilege as white women to build more just working spaces. Examining how we are implicated as white feminists (but may also be empowered when we snap) is one way to rethink these implicit connections among workism, emotion, and labor.

## Theorizing the Snap and Its Utility

Ahmed's (2017) feminist snap reframed our focus from the individual to the institution, allowing us to identify the functions and damage of workism culture. Further, Ahmed offered useful language for emotions, conflicts, and their effects on mental load. The feminist snap is the breaking point at which we respond to built-up pressures. Ahmed (2017) provided a metaphor of a snapping twig:

> When a twig snaps, we hear the sound of it breaking. We can hear the suddenness of a break. We might assume . . . that the snap is a starting point. A snap sounds like the start of something, a transformation of something; it is how a twig might end up broken in two pieces. A snap might even seem like a violent moment; the unbecoming of something. But a snap would only be the beginning insofar as we did not notice the pressure on the twig. If pressure is an action, snap is a reaction. Pressure is hard to notice unless you are under that pressure. Snap is only the start of something because of what we do not notice. (pp. 188-189)

From Ahmed's work, we examine the role of the snap in our temporality, including the pressures of time, performance, and labor. WCAs are often praised for their adaptability or resilience. Each of these terms indicates the ability to handle more pressure, which elides the realities of unsustainable conditions. Ahmed (2017) described resilience as "a technology of will" that "functions as a command: be willing to bear more; be stronger so you can bear more" (p. 189). The idea of resilience

> becomes a deeply conservative technique, one especially well-suited to governance: you encourage bodies to strengthen so they will not succumb to pressure; so they can keep taking it; so they can take more of it. Resilience is the requirement to take more pressure; such that the pressure can be gradually increased. (Ahmed, 2017, p. 189)

Resilience, like hypercapitalism, can result in depleted resources across writing centers, classrooms, offices, and homes, and it can even affect our attitudes beyond academia. We must be able to critique the concept of resilience to unravel narratives that keep us firmly on the capitalist hamster wheel.

The snap draws our attention to the pressure that caused it so that we can reassess our work and examine absurd expectations. Naming absurdities can allow us to use our rhetorical training to resist and reframe the narratives we tell about ourselves, our work, and our centers, thus challenging the status quo that expects a particularly high level of performance regardless of context. In the pandemic, absurd demands from our institutions moved us toward the snap.

At first, snapping made us think that we were the problem. When we snap, we often emote, and people don't tend to like it when feminists emote. As Ahmed (2017) explained, while responsibility is often placed on those who have snapped, "a feminist politics might insist on renaming actions as reactions" so that the one who snapped can "show how her snap is not the starting point" (p. 189). Through reflection and commiseration, we realized that workism and its accompanying absurdities are the problem. We realized that snapping could lead us to rhetorical strategies that could serve us in that moment and beyond. Still, we're acutely aware that precarity and positionality influence not only the ways in which WCAs respond rhetorically to the snap but also whether they feel empowered to do so. As a result, we have identified three types of strategies through which a variety of responses could be organized:

1. Roadblocking, which includes saying no, stalling, and setting boundaries. This strategy is useful when your work balance is in

danger or when time is of the essence. It is an immediate response to absurd expectations.

2. Changing the narrative, which includes reframing, renaming, repeating, or naming absurdity. We use this after the snap brings our attention to absurd demands and when there is time and opportunity to speak back to absurdities.
3. Coalitioning with accomplices, which demands the most time but potentially has the largest impact because it is a way to amplify speaking back to absurdities by finding ways to speak to each other.

*Roadblocking*

The first strategy is to create a roadblock that delays or shuts down whichever absurdity barrels your way. We have each engaged in roadblocking, usually by saying no to an unreasonable request or running out the clock when there's an unreasonable deadline for a response. This strategy can be difficult to practice, particularly if we conflate doing more with demonstrating value. As Deacon (2015) argued, many newer WCAs feel pressured to "continually justify their center's worth" (p. 12). This may result in WCAs taking on labor that "does not clearly relate to their center's mission, fall within the parameters of their job description, or fit comfortably into their slice of reassigned administrative time" (pp. 12-13).

Still, we are conditioned to think saying no is dangerous and uncollegial. Women, BIPOC, and openly queer administrators may feel this pressure to appease others in the name of collegiality. For WCAs who were already overextended, pandemic-induced austerity measures intensified the pressure to say yes. We urge WCAs to consider the real constraints of their positions and their centers because positionality influences which rhetorical strategies are viable. Employing roadblocks can help WCAs set realistic boundaries, affirm writing center values, and shine a light on unsustainable workloads and labor practices.

Beth began saying no during the summer of 2020. This resolve came after a period of intense labor exploitation wherein she had to cover an associate dean's responsibilities, without additional compensation, while managing her suddenly remote writing center. Snapping helped her become more attuned to the labor expectations on her campus, especially how these expectations did not always address pandemic impacts on workloads and budgets. While planning for fall, she learned her tutoring budget would not be fully funded until a few weeks into the semester. Additionally, funds she secured for an assistant director position were to remain on indefinite

hold. However, there was an expectation that her center would remain open the same number of hours per week and that she would continue to offer instruction and special programming for faculty around campus.

For Beth, snapping forced her to say no, temporarily cutting the center's hours and turning down instruction requests until her tutoring budget was restored. Beth was two years away from applying for tenure and promotion in the library, where she was the only writing studies faculty member in a service-oriented department, so saying no felt risky. However, in an environment where she and her colleagues were constantly expected to do more with less, she realized the only response was to do less with less. Instead of stretching herself and her staff more thinly, Beth used this opportunity to be explicit about the limits of her time and resources, which ultimately helped demonstrate the ongoing need for an assistant director position (finally funded in 2022).

Meanwhile, Erica snapped when she realized she was saying yes to too many last-minute instruction requests. Faculty workshop requests increased dramatically during COVID, and Erica and her staff worked to accommodate every request to show the value of the writing center. As a pre-tenure faculty member only two years into her role, Erica was eager to showcase her center's expertise and provide support for faculty. However, faculty were not always thoughtful about ways to integrate these workshops into their semesters or respectful of Erica or her team's time. One instructor, who had rescheduled already due to having COVID, called Erica the wrong name and informed her that only four students would be participating in the workshop Erica had spent hours creating for a complicated senior capstone project.

Snapping helped Erica realize the need to set strict boundaries and time standards for workshop delivery. She and her staff developed a structured process for requesting instruction, including asking faculty to articulate clear learning goals with their requests and emphasizing that workshop work was collaborative. In these examples, the generative aspect of the snap is clear: it's not just "no," it's "no AND here is a new, more equitable way to do things." "No AND" can also be a rhetorical strategy for WCAs who do not feel like they can say "no" without material consequences.

Saying no can be a simple act of avoiding burnout; we have felt ourselves reaching the breaking point, and it was the only strategy we could find that brought some relief. Snapping is the exigency for saying no, and upon reflection, it affords us the opportunity to notice the conditions that led to our "no" response. Snapping offered Beth an opportunity to be more mindful of the work she said yes to, and to feel confident in saying no. Saying no aligned with Beth's value of cultivating an ethic of care in the writing

center and her administrative work. It was also generative because it helped Beth reflect on how much work she was doing with an asymmetrical payoff for her and the writing center and advocate for additional resources. For Erica, snapping helped generate more ethical ways to support faculty and students—ways that do not deplete but instead invite a shared workload.

### *Changing the Narrative*

Changing the narrative involves a subversion of rhetorical strategies: reframe, refocus, repeat. These are strategies that WCAs often learn from interacting with and observing other administrators. To shift the narrative, we often employ rhetorical repetition related to a consistent through-line. Administrative austerity rhetorics take on many forms, such as talk of being "all in this together" as a team or family. Along with this, student retention in whatever way it can happen will be emphasized over student development and well-being, and quantitative data is valued for its seeming concreteness more than qualitative nuance. When we snap at these common narratives, we have an opportunity to change them.

The pandemic assisted us in changing narratives in response to austerity and emergency rhetorics. At Amanda's campus, quarantine hit in a matter of hours. Computer monitors flashed an emergency message ordering everyone to leave campus immediately, including emptying out the dorms. Amanda fled to the writing center and threw Girl Scout cookies at tutors as they left ("Take them home!" she yelled, as if this were the most important thing in the world). While she fretted about weird stuff, her staff went home, got online, and texted her to check in. Staff emailed students, managed to shift a few to online appointments, and walked them through the new process. They did this because Amanda had initiated online training several weeks before. This was one kind of reframing that simply came from a gut-led foresight about the virus.

Over the next week, as quarantine protocols swept the state, Amanda was placed on a student support committee. The writing center had been the only support service that was ready to go; others required at least a week to transition to remote services. Next, the university decided that all student workers would be paid whether or not they worked. Everyone on Amanda's staff kept working anyway, saying they appreciated checking in online and reassuring anxious students who had been kicked to asynchronous coursework.

Despite the writing center's smooth pivot and resulting campus praise, Amanda was hit that next spring with the news that two longtime graduate assistant (GA) positions in the writing center would be cut. She was

informed of this a few weeks before the semester was set to start and after the GA paperwork had been signed. From administrators, she heard about grave financial losses; she also heard that, of course, she would get those GA lines back if she could make this sacrifice now. Over the course of three weeks, she created a roadblock by repeating, "No. I know how this goes. Once you lose something, you don't get it back." She had snapped. Then she refocused, reframed, and repeated.

Historical context was key to refocusing. The GA lines in the writing center were two of the oldest on campus. Graduate students, with part-time contingent instructors, sustained the fledgling writing center for years until the university hired a director. Amanda emphasized this history to clarify the graduate students' and writing center's roles in institutional success. But this wasn't enough. She reframed using institutional and administrative repetition that created a through-line: She emphasized student retention rather than development and well-being. In other cases, she might have described how working in a writing center offers transferable skills as well as job opportunities. She might have presented evidence of the touching support tutors provided students and vice versa in online synchronous sessions.

In this context, though, such reasoning would have been futile. Instead, she took up the idea of graduate student retention, knowing that the university was having trouble with this population particularly at the level of capstone projects and theses and especially with the capstone projects of graduate students in nursing, who were relentlessly working at hospitals alongside faculty. And even though she knew that any staff member could work with any writer, she also reasoned that graduate students are more comfortable with graduate student tutors. Eventually, she retained the GA lines and scrambled to fill them.

When she was then told that there would be a 10% cut across the board for every department and program, she continued to reframe. She took up the language of being all in this together, a team, something upper administration was using to explain why belt-tightening was warranted. The writing center was a true team; the administrative logic was flawed. A 10% cut to a department may mean not bringing in a speaker or limiting printer copies. A 10% cut to the writing center meant people—namely, the very students the university wished to retain, who had worked remotely, on their own devices, in a quarantine, even though they would have been paid regardless. She continued with the through-line about student retention. She repeated herself until she was left alone.

That time, it worked. She retained the GAs. There were no cuts to the writing center budget. She also threaded this through-line into her annual reports, trying to make it clear: This one will fight when somebody tries to

take something from students. This one will snap. She snapped because she was enraged at the audacity and glaring contradiction of telling faculty it is their responsibility to retain students and then requesting that they cut the hours of or let go of highly skilled student tutors. There is great risk in snapping and in setting these boundaries. In this case, thankfully, a raging snap flowed into a narrative shift and material hope.

### *Coalitioning with Accomplices*

Where roadblocking is a more immediate action we can take when faced with an absurd request (or absurdity) and where changing the narrative is a strategy we use when we have some time to reflect and reframe, our third strategy—coalitioning with accomplices—is only cultivated over time. Coalitioning asks WCAs to draw agency from and turn towards our relationships with others. It potentially has the largest effect because it is a way to identify accomplices who can amplify our response to absurdities. Stone and Cirillo-McCarthy (2021) described coalition work as a snowball: "As interpersonal connections are made and trust is established, a coalition's work picks up speed and space, gathering more collaborators, expanding not only its range but its power" (p. 132). In previous scholarship, we have described how cross-institutional coalitioning can lead us toward "a pedagogy of resistance and equitable transformation" (Cirillo-McCarthy, Del Russo, Fields, & Leahy, 2023, para. 4). As a way forward, coalitioning with accomplices might be our most powerful rhetorical strategy for affecting local change.

Ahmed (2017) described the snap as the "feminist hope" that contributes to a "feminist communication system" (p. 211). Without the snap, we are unable to identify the "situation that demands our collective impatience" (Ahmed, 2017, p. 211) and, therefore, collectively respond. A feminist communication system builds coalitions and identifies accomplices, a term we are decidedly choosing over allies, as Neisha-Anne Green (2018) made the clear distinction that accomplices go beyond allies to take risks and forfeit or angle their privilege. Accomplices choose to make waves to support others, using their privilege to amplify marginalized voices.

As the pandemic summer semester approached, Celeste (pre-tenured) was asked to pare down the writing center schedule to "essential workers" and work on a proposal to justify her summer contract and the work of tutors during the lower—usage summer months. Summer programming from the writing center extended beyond tutoring hours to include participation in summer bridge programs for first-generation students, neurodivergent populations, international students, new and transfer students, and

orientations. Coalitioning with writing center accomplices on campus—such as the first-year writing coordinator and scheduler, the MA program coordinator, student service coordinators representing affected student groups also asked to justify their summer workloads and programming to upper administration and financial stakeholders, and all who also articulated the value of the summer months in preparing student groups for success—led to a successful outcome. Celeste and fellow accomplices amplified the need for summer hours and pushed against absurd demands grounded in rhetorics of austerity. Building and cultivating these relationships takes time, but they are crucial for this last strategy and a key component in sustainable work conditions during times of crisis and otherwise.

## Conclusion

Strategically acknowledging and making use of the inevitable pressure and snap in our work seems integral to our health. The pandemic exposed much of the inequity ingrained in our systems, and sustaining our health and work feels crucial not only for ourselves and our centers but for the health and transformation of higher education. Beyond COVID, we hope these strategies continue to be applicable and useful. If we continue with the status quo, if we don't call out absurdity, we risk the survival of so much. As Ahmed (2017) noted, survival "refers not only to living on, but to keeping going in the more profound sense of keeping going with one's commitments . . . Survival thus becomes a shared feminist project" (pp. 235-6). Survival is a collaborative effort.

We share these stories, then, to demonstrate how we have used the feminist snap to clarify our administrative values. Not every WCA has the support or stability to respond to institutional absurdity in these ways. But we know they've snapped, too, and we invite them to consider ways to respond to absurdity that protect their health, their centers, and their values. Snapping, while stressful, served our decision-making and was generative in developing rhetorical strategies to respond to pandemic absurdities. Our hope is that these stories offer readers and writing center administrators a framework (and permission!) to snap, reflect, recenter, and respond rhetorically in and beyond the pandemic.

## Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the editors, Jacob Babb and Jessie Blackburn, for creating space for these important conversations and for their enthusiasm for amplifying voices of writing center administrators. We also wish to thank our anonymous peer reviewers. Their feedback was extremely helpful not

only in finalizing this draft, but also as we consider future directions for this work.

## Note

1. This is a feminist collaborative project, and as such, all authors contributed equally.

## References

Adams Wooten, Courtney, Babb, Jacob, Costello, Kristi Murray, & Navickas, Kate (Eds.). (2020). *The things we carry: Strategies for recognizing and negotiating emotional labor in writing program administration*. Utah State University Press.

Ahmed, Sara. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Duke University Press.

Cirillo-McCarthy, Erica, Del Russo, Celeste, Fields, Amanda, & Leahy, Elizabeth. (2023). Writing center reporting strategies that subvert institutional absurdities. *The Peer Review, 7*(1). https://thepeerreview-iwca.org/issues/issue-7-1-featured-issue-reinvestigate-the-commonplaces-in-writing-centers/writing-center-reporting-strategies-that-subvert-institutional-absurdities/

— & Leahy, Elizabeth. (2022). Listening, reflecting, responding: Toward a metic intelligence for writing center administrators. In Janine Morris & Kelly Concannon (Eds.), *Emotions and affect in writing centers* (pp. 237-253). Parlor Press.

Deacon, Andrea. (2015). The problem of "opportunity": Negotiating a writing center administrator's WAC(ky) public identity. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal, 12*(2), 11-16. http://www.praxisuwc.com/journal-page-122

Giaimo, Genie N. (2020). Laboring in a time of crisis: The entanglement of wellness and work in writing centers. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal, 17*(3). http://www.praxisuwc.com/173-giaimo

— (Ed). (2021). *Wellness and care in writing center work.* Press Books.

—. (2022). Continuing to labor in a crisis: Counternarratives to workism culture. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal, 19*(2). http://www.praxisuwc.com/192-giaimo

Green, Neisha-Anne. (2018). Moving beyond alright: and the emotional toll of this, my life matters too, in the writing center work. *Writing Center Journal, 37*(1), 15-34. https://doi.org/10.7771/2832-9414.1864

Grutsch McKinney, Jackie, Caswell, Nicole, & Jackson, Rebecca. (2022). Studying emotion and emotional labor over time and in context. In Janine Morris & Kelly Concannon (Eds.), *Emotions and affect in writing centers* (pp. 3-19). Parlor Press.

Jaggar, Alison M. (1989). Love and knowledge: Emotion in feminist epistemology. *Inquiry, 32*(2), 151-176. https://doi.org/10.1080/00201748908602185

Kleinfeld, Elizabeth. (2020). From great to good enough: Recalibrating expectations as WPA. In Courtney Adams Wooten, Jacob Babb, Kristi Murray Costello, & Kate Navickas (Eds.), *The things we carry: Strategies for recogniz-*

*ing and negotiating emotional labor in writing program administration* (pp. 237-250). Utah State University Press.

Micciche, Laura R. (2011). For slow agency. *WPA: Writing Program Administration, 35*(1), 73-90.

— (2016). Staying with emotion. *Composition Forum*, *34.* https://compositionforum.com/issue/34/micciche-retrospective.php

Morris, Janine, & Concannon, Kelly (Eds). (2022). *Emotions and Affect in Writing Centers*. Parlor Press.

Nelson, Matthew T., Deges, Sam, & Weaver, Kathleen F. (2020). Making visible the emotional labor of writing center work. In Courtney Adams Wooten, Jacob Babb, Kristi Murray Costello, & Kate Navickas (Eds.), *The things we carry: Strategies for recognizing and negotiating emotional labor in writing program administration* (pp. 161-176). Utah State University Press.

Sicari, Anna. (2022) Hitting a brick wall and the women who do the work: Is this the same old story? *College Composition and Communication, 73*(3), 562–592.

Stone, Erica M., & Cirillo-McCarthy, Erica (2021). Recursive interventions: A coalitional approach to anti-racist pedagogy at Middle Tennessee State University. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, *44*(3), 132–137.

**Amanda Fields** is assistant professor of English, writing center director (Central Connecticut State University), and editor in chief of *Literary Mama*. Fields co-edited *My Caesarean: Twenty-One Mothers on the C-Section Experience and After* (The Experiment Press, 2019), the Silver winner of the 2019 Foreword INDIES, and *Toward, Around, and Away From Tahrir: Tracking Emerging Expressions of Egyptian Identity* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014). Fields' work has been published in *Writing Center Journal, Children's Literature Association Quarterly, The Peer Review, Kairos, Sexuality Research and Social Policy, Journal of Adolescent Research, Brevity, So to Speak, Nashville Review, Indiana Review,* and others.

**Elizabeth (Beth) Leahy** is director of the writing and communication center at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC) and UC Foundation associate professor in the library's Department of Research and Public Services. Beth's research interests include feminist writing center administration, writing center assessment, and composition histories of border spaces. Her work is featured in *Rhetoric Review*, *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, *The Peer Review*, and edited collections including *Emotions and Affect in Writing Centers* (Parlor Press, 2022).

**Celeste Del Russo** is associate professor in writing arts and writing center director at Rowan University. Her research interests include tutor education for social justice, access, and inclusion. These areas impact her work with K–12 educators in her role as a site co-leader for the Rowan University Writing Project. Her work has been published in *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship* and edited collections including *Linguistic Justice on Campus: Pedagogy and Advocacy for Multilingual Students* (Multilingual Matters, 2021) and *Emotions and Affect in Writing Centers* (Parlor Press, 2022). Her favorite part of writing center work is feminist-ing with colleagues.

**Erica Cirillo-McCarthy** is assistant professor of English and director of the Margaret H. Ordoubadian University Writing Center at Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU). She teaches writing and rhetoric courses for the English department and for MTSU's new Public Writing and Rhetoric undergraduate major. Her scholarship, which centers feminist and antiracist writing center administrative practices, has been published in *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship*, and in edited collections.