CHAPTER 6.

"WRITING ISN'T JUST WRITING:" AN INSTITUTIONAL ETHNOGRAPHY APPROACH TO THE WORK OF COMMUNITY WRITING CENTER INSTRUCTORS

Elisabeth Miller

University of Nevada, Reno

Madison Writing Assistance (MWA) is a community writing program initiated in 1999 at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. Originally named "Community Writing Assistance," this grant-funded program provides one-on-one writing assistance to individuals across the city of Madison at public libraries and community centers. Over the past 20-plus years, MWA has grown from one public library site staffed by volunteer graduate students staked out with the sign, "Writing help here!" to an average of eight community sites staffed by paid graduate-student instructors each semester and summer. MWA has come to mean many things to stakeholders: instructors (usually Ph.D.s in rhet/comp or literature, or MFAs in creative writing) call it, as a recent testimonial from a MWA grant proposal reveals, one of the "most meaningful, impactful, and important" parts of their graduate education. Community partners value it for supporting writing, basic computer skills, and employment needs. UW-Madison calls it an important outreach program.

In this essay, I contend that institutional ethnography (IE) is an especially useful methodological lens for building knowledge about a program like MWA, which is uniquely situated between two overlapping institutions: a large public, land-grant mission research university and a mid-size midwestern metropolis—between a university and a community. Analyzing survey responses from current and former MWA instructors as well as program materials, I (a former MWA instructor and administrator) show how taking an IE approach to studying the work experiences and perspectives of MWA instructors expands our knowledge about 1) the tensions that often arise in community and university partnerships, and 2) the work of community writing instructors—contributing to the

broader theory and practice of community literacy programming (Doggart et al.; Grabill; Rousculp). As Patrick Berry writes in his study of prison education programs, while instructors often describe community-focused teaching as the most influential experiences of their professional lives, little attention is paid to their perspectives. It is imperative, Berry argues, to account for instructors' perspectives to avoid falling into the damaging tendency to view community-based literacy instruction as "one-sized and selfless," acknowledging that "the last thing we need is another story of the teacher as savior" (68).

These kinds of knowledge gaps arise, Michelle LaFrance argues, as writing studies "has often been preoccupied with narratives of program design, curriculum development, and management—discourses that tend to standardize, generalize, and even erase the identities, expertise, and labor contributed by diverse participants" (7). An IE approach, instead, "offers a comprehensive and situated means to uncover all the highly specific and individualized ways in which work actually takes shape within institutional settings" (7)—including, in this collection, WAC programs (Elder), first-year writing programs (Nugent et al.), and research focus groups (Book), among other diverse sites. To gather—and "look up" from—instructor perspectives, I emailed a survey to 59 current and former CWA/MWA writing instructors. 30 responded to the survey, a 51% response rate.[1] I decided to ask questions in the form of an open-ended survey for two reasons. I wanted to allow instructors 1) to participate at their own pace, taking the time they needed to answer questions, at their convenience; and 2) to participate anonymously. I wanted to ensure open and honest responses, and I also wanted to encourage both those who did not know me (I worked in instructor and administrative positions with the MWA program for five-and-a-half years) and those who did to share their experiences, without being concerned with revealing their identities to me. I also distributed a short survey to current MWA partners, and I reviewed program documents, including grant proposals from the last five years and website materials from MWA and UW-Madison.

I designed the brief surveys to take an IE approach (see the Appendix). Sociologist Dorothy Smith laid the groundwork for IE as "a method that" first "followed from taking up women's/people's standpoint in the local actualities of the everyday;" not just of "discovering the everyday world as such, but of looking out beyond the everyday to discover how it came to happen as it does" ("Introduction" 3). In this way, IE traces social phenomena in "the experiences of specific individuals whose everyday activities are in some way hooked into, shaped by, and constituent of the institutional relations under exploration" ("Introduction" 18). To attempt to trace these institutional relations in the work of

---

1   IRB approved study.

community writing center instructors, I asked participants to define the mission and work of MWA, to elaborate on concrete experiences with the program, to comment on how they perceive the program's value for the community and for themselves as professionals. In this way, I take up the "orienting concept" of "work" from IE approaches (McCoy 110), which Smith defines as "what people do that requires some effort, that they mean to do, and that involves some required competence" (*The Everyday* 165). In this framing, "work happens at (gears into) the interface between the individual, embodied subject and the physical and social worlds" (McCoy 111).

In what follows, I use IE approaches to interrogate what the "work" of community writing centers means to the instructors who engage in it, "making visible the values, practices, beliefs, and belongings that circulate below more visible or dominant discourses" (LaFrance 5). Specifically, I identify a boss text, and ruling relation, for MWA: "The Wisconsin Idea," a kind of university mission that seeks to expand the "boundaries" of the university to the surrounding community and beyond. I then show how the Wisconsin Idea, while it suggests community and university overlap, in fact conflicts with 1) the standpoint of current and former MWA instructors, particularly their understanding of tensions between the community and university, and 2) other boss texts and ruling relations that guide "writing center" best practices—including non-directive approaches. These conflicts expose how community and university are in fact not synonymous, but rather, are often in tension, and how attempts to import the values of the university into "the community" are, in fact, not social justice. I close by demonstrating how an IE approach to work helps build knowledge of "writing as work" that learns from the on-the-ground experiences of community writers and writing instructors.

"THE WISCONSIN IDEA" AS BOSS
TEXT AND RULING RELATION

"The Wisconsin Idea" is a philosophy, tagline, and ruling relation at the University of Wisconsin—Madison focused on how the "boundaries of the university are the boundaries of the state." Originally credited to the first UW-Madison president Charles Van Hise in 1903, the Wisconsin Idea university still uses this mission today to frame itself as a land-grant institution committed to public engagement, with its website describing the idea as "[o]ne of the longest and deepest traditions surrounding the University of Wisconsin," "signif[ying] a general principle: that education should influence people's lives beyond the boundaries of the classroom." The idea, the website claims, has been "synonymous with Wisconsin for more than a century," a "guiding philosophy of university

outreach efforts in Wisconsin and throughout the world." In an IE approach, the Wisconsin Idea can be understood as a boss text: a term originated (Griffith and Smith 12) "to acknowledge that some texts exert a powerful material and local influence over the everyday work lives of professionals" (LaFrance 80). LaFrance explains how "boss texts" "regulate—and often standardize—practice, mediating idiosyncrasies and variability in local settings" (43).

Though it is not explicitly articulated in MWA's mission or program materials, the Wisconsin Idea permeates the language instructors use to describe the program. Nine of the 30 survey respondents directly refer to the Wisconsin Idea. Seven of those nine occur in response to the question, "How would you describe your understanding of the mission of the MWA/CWA program?" MWA is "a textbook illustration of the Wisconsin idea. Applying a skillset typically limited to academic work to the large population of writers elsewhere in Madison," one responds. Another explains that they have "often heard it referenced in relation to the Wisconsin Idea—the concept that the university exists to serve the broader community and region." Two others define MWA as "an extension of the UW-Madison writing center," an example of how to enact the Wisconsin Idea, which they define as "The walls of the classroom are the walls of the state."

Shaping how MWA instructors talk about and interpret their work, the Wisconsin Idea operates as boss text and as a "ruling relation." As Smith clarifies, ruling relations are "extraordinary yet ordinary:" ("Introduction" 8) what LaFrance explains as "powerful social and workplace norms" that "draw upon and influence institutional patterns, such as hierarchies, allocations of resources, and work processes" (32). These relations become invisible insofar as they can be understood as "just how it's done," but they in fact "coordinate and/or organize daily experiences and practices, influencing what people do and how they do it across space and time" (32). That kind of tacit uptake of the Wisconsin Idea is apparent in MWA instructors' responses. Beyond explicit naming, respondents use related language invoking a link or bridge between community and university: "My understanding of the mission," one instructor explains, "is that it seeks to bridge community-university divide by offering free writing instruction to community members on any project they may bring." Likewise, other instructors use the "broader" and "beyond" language of the Wisconsin Idea: MWA, other instructors assert, "exists to serve the broader community and region," "to make the best knowledge and practice of one-to-one writing instruction to writers beyond the University." This outreach mission characterizes the Wisconsin Idea—"benefiting" and "serving" the community: MWA, instructors claim, aims "to help build partnerships between the university and the surrounding community in order to use university resources for the benefit of the community," and "to serve the writing needs of the Madison community."

COMPLICATING "THE WISCONSIN IDEA": MWA INSTRUCTORS' CONFLICTING STANDPOINTS, BOSS TEXTS, AND RULING RELATIONS

While the influence of the Wisconsin Idea as a boss text and ruling relation for MWA is apparent, an IE analysis of instructors' survey responses reveals how community writing instructors' on-the-ground work, and perspectives on that work, conflict with and complicate the Wisconsin Idea's easy conflation of university and community. First, I show how instructors grapple with tensions between community and university—and how they identify as belonging, or not belonging, in either location. Second, I interrogate how tensions between the boss text and ruling relation of "good writing center pedagogy" complicates the Wisconsin Idea's call for simply "extending" into the community.

1) Instructor Standpoints: Community and University Disconnects

As LaFrance notes, while "ruling relations enable institutional ethnographers to trace broad social patterns, 'standpoint' helps the ethnographer to uncover the disjunctions, divergences, and distinctions experienced by individuals within those groups" (35). Survey responses reveal how the Wisconsin Idea is challenged by examining MWA instructors' standpoints—particularly their sense of how community and university often conflict. While they are members of the university, instructors' description of their work in MWA reveals a more complex relationship between university and community than the Wisconsin Idea's "extending of the university into the community" accounts for. Several instructors identify a sense not of "extension" or blending between "university" and "community," but rather of a "community-university divide." Drawing a clear boundary-line between their experiences inside and outside of the university, five respondents use the terms "campus bubble," "UW bubble," "academic bubble," and "grad school bubble." "It is easy to stay in the campus bubble," one writes, and community writing instruction "helped me to feel more connected to the Madison community."

In addition to the spatial metaphor of an academic "bubble" and getting outside of that bubble that appears in instructors' responses, four instructors referred to tensions between community and university in their own experience of being graduate students. After saying that they "hoped" that the MWA program "would support social justice by partners [sic] with members of the local community and helping them reach their own goals," one instructor refers specifically to their own family's "blue collar background": "both my parents were first generation college students. Sometime working in the university felt distant from my own

background, and I wanted the benefits of my field and of my own education to reach my uncles, my cousins, my grandparents—and those with similar literacies." Another straightforwardly acknowledges, "I needed to be outside of the space of Helen C. White (the English building), and frankly enjoyed the walk to the Library and enjoyed being with the people I met there. It felt very familiar."

Feelings of familiarity or distance, associations with walking in neighborhoods, invocations of family, or not fitting at the university, frame the way instructors explain their decisions to participate in MWA. Describing the benefits of MWA, one instructor notes how it provided "a break from school, a break from the research university. I never felt like I belonged at an R1 and MWA was one of the things that helped me make it through the program." Another sums up the physical and metaphorical spaces and gaps between university and community, citing MWA as "a connection to the university—right up the street, but so inaccessible."

2) BOSS TEXTS IN CONFLICT: THE WISCONSIN IDEA, WRITING CENTER BEST PRACTICES—AND BEYOND

In addition to disconnects in instructors' standpoints, an IE analysis of instructors' responses also exposes a tension between the boss text and ruling relations of the Wisconsin Idea and the boss texts and ruling relations of writing center pedagogy and practices. As the community-based arm of a university writing center, MWA employs the one-to-one talking-about-writing model that characterizes best practice in academic writing centers. Most of MWA's staff have completed writing center training and served as academic writing tutors for some time. As instructors describe teaching in the MWA program, they note how writing Center pedagogical principles and strategies are sometimes inadequate, even inappropriate, for the support desired and required by community writers.

DIRECTIVE/NON-DIRECTIVE METHODS

Many MWA instructors refer to and challenge some of the most foundational ruling relations in writing center practice: particularly directive vs. nondirective methods and the emphasis on the writer versus the writing product. The most commonly cited framing of these writing center "ruling relations" can be traced to Stephen North's boss text for writing center studies: "The Idea of a Writing Center." In that piece, North claims that "[o]ur job" in writing centers "is to produce better writers, not better writing" (483). That is, writing centers should focus on the student, not the paper; on process, not product. Tutoring methods should avoid "appropriating" writers' ideas by not being too "directive" and should, instead, focus on a writers' growth in ways they can take on to their next

assignment (Brooks). While writing center scholarship (Shamoon and Burns) has substantially complicated any facile divide between "directive" and "non-directive," the responses of many MWA instructors demonstrate how nondirective methods may be insufficient for community contexts—even less liberatory than they have been imagined in university writing center approaches.

One instructor reflects at length about the "pretty big disconnects" they observe between writing center "pedagogical training" and "some of the flexibility and savvy required to consult with community members." "For instance," they go on, "I feel like in my training, non-directiveness was celebrated as an aspirational tutoring value—especially as it was positioned in binary terms against 'directiveness,' which was positioned as having more to do with control, authority, and not valuing what a writer wanted." However, at MWA, they "found that non-directive and facilitative orientations to tutoring often didn't work when applied with writers who were struggling to cultivate genre expertise, technological literacies, or maybe just wanted to hear advice from someone they felt 'knew more about writing than them.'"

When asked to describe "one or two vivid memories of working with the CWA/MWA program (a patron, a project, etc.), this instructor elaborates on the second session they ever conducted and the fraught results of their "taking a really non-directive approach, asking a lot of facilitative and open-ended questions." The instructor recalls that

> this approach totally didn't work with this writer. To most of my questions, he said, "I'm not sure. That's why I'm asking you, as an expert." And that totally threw me for a loop because, for the most part, the sort of dialogic, question-posing style of tutoring I'd used was fairly successful with university students. And so I recall, from this point on, thinking to myself, "Maybe what I know about tutoring writing, and what I've done so far isn't quite going to cut it in different settings when there are different stakes what with this person's personal/job/life situation."

In this MWA instructor's on-the-ground work, the boss text/ruling relation endorsement of "non-directive," "process v. product-focused" instruction comes into crisis as they wonder if what they "know about tutoring writing" is insufficient for a community writing context. Instructors like this one describe how the work of community writing—with its "different stakes" focused on jobs and life situations, and with community members looking for "expert" support—pushes back on the Wisconsin Idea's aim to simply "extend" the university to the community. Here, university writing center methods fail to "cut it." Rather, working with MWA

"taught" them, one instructor noted, "that meeting students where they were often meant leaving behind 'best practices' or the ongoing emphasis on process not product. When a person needs a cover letter for a job, they need a product."

Likewise, the urgency of the writing situation—often a job application to acquire vital work—changed the teaching context: "we had very little time to teach everything the partner [patron, client] needed to know about the genre, stylistic expectations, grammatical expectations, computer skills, etc. We taught the most critical ones, but the goal there, as explained to me by the organization, was a product (usable job materials in little time), not a long, slow learning process." Producing a "paper" like a resume or cover letter in one hour, for instance, may be more important than gaining and refining genre knowledge of resumes over several sessions. Or put another way: that hour may be the only option for time, and that literate product (or lack of it) has a very immediate material consequence. While the boss text/ruling relation of the Wisconsin Idea advocates for extending the boundaries of the university to the boundaries of the community, state—even globally—it does not necessarily provide context or tools for what happens there: how should university-based knowledges, methods, ways of communicating be employed? Translated? Shifted? Rejected? As the reflections of MWA instructors reveal, university-based writing center best practices, such as non-directive tutoring methods, cannot merely be "extended" into community contexts.

THE BOUNDARIES OF COMMUNITY WRITING INSTRUCTION

As with instructors' reflections on belonging (or not) in the university and the community, the in-between-ness of community writing center work also arises from its situatedness between institutions. In these in-between contexts of community writing, an IE analysis helps us to understand how the boss text/ruling relations of university writing centers—focusing on a non-directive, process approach—may be inadequate for addressing the needs of community writers. In response, a question recurs throughout instructors' efforts to define their work: what, exactly, is inside (and outside) the bounds of community writing center instruction? Advertising for MWA (like university writing centers) invites community members to bring in any writing—of any genre, at any stage—that they are working on. However, the range of genres and rhetorical contexts community writers face proves to be quite wide. In addition to methods and best practices coming under pressure, the very roles of instructor and student/patron/writer are unsettled in community contexts. As one instructor observes, "Academia is constructed to minimize the ambiguity of the relationship between any two people working together in an academic setting. Much of the apparatus of the writing center—the scheduling infrastructure, the

physical details of the site—was built to replicate something like the dentist/patient relationship." "MWA interactions," the instructor observes, are "much more ambiguous: writers were sometimes just looking for an audience who would listen to them or who would stamp an approval of their work, or they were mistrustful of my feedback and advice no matter how carefully I (thought I) couched it. I'm not sure I ever learned to negotiate the ambiguity of that relationship." This ambiguity in MWA instructors' roles arises, in part, out of the failure of boss texts/ruling relations of the Wisconsin Idea and university-based writing center best practices to guide and support community writing center work. In turn, MWA instructors are left grappling with what methods for writing support they should develop and deploy, how to adapt to a range of (often high-stakes) genres, and how to negotiate their role as community writing instructors.

Several instructors reflect on the methods for instruction they develop in community contexts. "It was nothing like typical writing center work," one instructor explains of working with one of MWA's longest-running patrons—a woman writing her medical memoirs: "Basically, she told us stories and asked us to transcribe them. Since she came back every week, I got to know her very well and learned a lot from her about small town and farm life in the upper Midwest. Mostly, she needed an enthusiastic, curious listener who could help draw out more of her stories." Another instructor shares a memory of a regular patron who "would bring with him each week a sheaf of lined looseleaf paper, covered from top to bottom with the man's handwriting, usually in pencil. He would talk for an hour or so with great energy and apprehension about his project. Never once did he show me a single page of writing."

Others reflect on dealing with unfamiliar genres. One recalls "working with a woman who was writing a letter to a lawyer to ask for help to appeal her sister's conviction of some kind" and being "in WAY over my head, but somehow we corralled a nearby library patron who was a retired lawyer (I think?) to help us and eventually the three of us all had our hands on the keyboard almost writing together—and then one of the writer's kids also came over and sat in her lap." These complex, high-stakes writing tasks, and their often substantial demands for genre knowledge, require being "super resourceful and fast" or, says the instructor who shared the experience of the appeal letter, "okay with floundering or saying I just didn't know." "We didn't always know the genres that people were working with," one instructor reflects, "and something I knew I wasn't the one the person should be consulting. With that, I also understood that I might have been their only option." MWA instructors identify both urgent demands (sometimes long lines for especially job-focused writing support and a feeling of "pressure to move through them quickly") and scarcity of resources to support community members. The combination of pressure and sometimes ambiguous

expectations further stresses these interactions. Patrons may bring unrealistic expectations, says one instructor, that MWA staff "will spontaneously know how to write or phrase something perfectly and that's particularly challenging. It can be difficult to set clear expectations about we can do as instructors."

Likewise, the ambiguity of instructors' roles further complicates navigating new genres and interactions. One instructor notes the complexity, for instance, of handling "professional moments with people who are older than me, making sure they don't stay over time and things like that." Another reflects on an "unpleasant experience" working with a patron who questioned her "ethnic position," asking "questions about 'where I am from' or talk about 'I know another person from X country' instead of engaging with writing. It was a tricky situation because I didn't know how to establish good boundaries and I didn't feel like the authority in the room (compared to how I feel as a TA in a classroom)." These moments make especially vivid how both the Wisconsin Idea and some university-based writing center best practices (as boss texts/ruling relations) fail to offer on-the-ground strategies and support for community writing instructors.

"WRITING AS WORK" AND "WORK AS WRITING" IN A COMMUNITY WRITING CENTER

Using IE to analyze the work of MWA instructors provides a powerful way to interrogate how boss texts and ruling relations like the Wisconsin Idea and writing center best practices (despite their best intentions) that circulate in universities may fail to account for—or even conflict with—community contexts. I close by discussing the value of an alternative ruling relation that emerges from instructors' reflections on their work as community writing center instructors, from MWA program materials, and from an IE approach to "work": that writing is work, and work is writing. (See Miley in this volume for a similar discussion of how research conducted by undergraduate tutors build their knowledge of a kind of "thirdspace" of the work of writing centers).

Analyzing MWA's grant proposals over the last five years reveals a "ruling relation" in MWA's mission "to help Madison-area residents use the written word to live rich and productive lives:" a focus on writing as doing, writing in use, or writing as work. Taken from a librarian at the longest-running MWA location, one quotation that recurs across MWA's grant proposals reinforces this ruling relation: "People are hard at work trying to live their lives as responsible citizens, workers, students, business people, helpers, and neighbors," the librarian writes. "MWA recognizes that 'ordinary' people have a need to communicate information in a host of different ways and need help doing it. MWA helps to do this hard work better." In this framing, writing is work, and work is writing, and it

is the work of community writing instructors to support the work of everyday writers. As Deborah Brandt argues in her tracing of the divergent histories of reading and writing, while reading has been linked with moral and religious instruction, writing has long been tied up with work. Writing *is* work.

MWA instructors' responses support this perspective on writing as work (and their work to support it). One instructor observes how MWA has revealed to them "all the different ways in which people use literacies in their everyday lives from legal documents, to religious websites, to personal narratives, to children's books to job materials." Another instructor notes how they "became aware of a much wider range of literacy activities that people take part in, and how big a role literacy plays in their lives in so many different ways. So it widened my perspective on what it means to teach writing and in what diverse contexts writing matters." Practically speaking, another instructor says the experience they gained supporting a range of writers and writing projects "provided me with a lot of writing consulting/teaching credibility. For years, I felt I could say 'Yes, I've worked on that kind of document, or something like that,' about almost anything, from cookbooks to professional websites to business plans"—a very useful set of experiences as this instructor went on to a Ph.D. program in rhetoric and writing studies.

In addition to building their flexibility and knowledge as teachers, the experience of supporting writers and their work exposed for instructors "A broadened definition of writing! I also learned about how members of the community actually use writing to advocate for themselves and for their cause." The ways that writing is work and is wrapped up in people's lives with getting work done is articulately expressed by one instructor:

> I think my work with community members in MWA helped me understand writing isn't just writing: inscription of words onto a page or screen. So much of what I did was help participants navigate legal forms, local and state agencies, learn computer software/hardware, and more. In a real-world sense, MWA helped me understand how everyday people navigate a range of texts, infrastructures, and institutions.

An understanding of writing as work learns from how "writing isn't just writing"—but a tool for "navigating" legal, technological, economic aspects of the institutions we work within every day. The work of community writing center instructors, then, is about supporting that navigation.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE & THEORY

In closing, I want to briefly highlight how a ruling relation of "writing as work"

pushes back on both the Wisconsin Idea and writing center boss texts/ruling relations and the ways they reduce both instructors' backgrounds and perspectives and community writers' complex literacy contexts and needs.

1) TRAINING & SUPPORTING INSTRUCTORS

My IE analysis of instructors' description of their work in MWA reveals the boss texts and ruling relations of the Wisconsin Idea and of university writing center best practices fail to account for the complexity of the work on the ground of MWA—potentially limiting both instructors and writers. Instructors' reflections on their own backgrounds are more complex than a "university" affiliation reveals. Rather than conflating the two as the Wisconsin Idea does, community writing centers would do well to acknowledge how the backgrounds that instructors bring with them to community writing instruction are valuable assets, and including space for reflections on instructors' own (dis)connections to communities or to the university.

Similarly, the genres and needs of community writers are not the same as those that commonly appear in university writing centers. The time-intensive nature of resumes, the high stakes of documents such as immigration paperwork or legal appeals or even life memoirs, and the ways that such genres are often tied to bureaucracy, all create challenges for instructors. These factors in community writing necessitate, as instructors reflect, a "broadened definition of writing" as more than "just writing," that must be addressed in training community writing instructors, as examples from practice, challenging scenarios, and shared insights from experienced instructors can be productively shared. Ambiguous roles, too, in programs that blend university and community, highlight the need for increased support from both institutions. It is essential to address both the patrons' and the instructors' comfort and safety: for instance, MWA has begun having patrons sign forms agreeing to conduct and to limited use of sessions, and onsite support from librarians or community center staff is absolutely invaluable.

2) THEORIZING COMMUNITY LITERACY PROGRAMS THROUGH IE

I reiterate here Smith's "generous conception" of work in IE as "what people do that requires some effort, that they mean to do, and that involves some required competence" (*The Everyday* 165). As Timothy Diamond finds in his IE study of nursing assistants, much of the work people do is not officially "charted," and IE research encourages us to identify and theorize about "about work where we didn't think it existed" (50). Analyzing the work of community writing instructors yields

a similar finding: that writing is work, not only insofar as it supports vocations, but as in the IE definition of making something happen, of putting effort in. As already evident in MWA program framing, a notion of work—and writing as work—is a powerful argument for the mission and value of community literacy programming. Literacy educators, researchers, and program advocates have long grappled with the complexity of making arguments for our programs that do not resort to literacy myth and literacy crisis logics (Branch; Street). While aligning literacy with an IE conception of "work" does not eliminate these thorny problems, it does, I argue, contribute untapped insights from the on-the-ground work and standpoints of community writing instructors. These insights expose how university (such as the Wisconsin Idea) and field-wide (such as writing center best practices) boss texts and ruling relations may fail to account for the realities of community writing and community writing instruction. Uncritically extending the ruling relations of universities into communities risks failing to serve, and further marginalizing, community writers.

IE offers a particularly powerful method to literacy researchers' efforts push back on this marginalization by generating a finer-grained articulation of the centrality of writing and literate activity to the institutions we navigate everyday—from immigration processes and webs of documents (Vieira) to infrastructures such as "government and commerce" (Vee 51) to the economies we inhabit (Brandt). As Jeffrey Grabill claims, "institutions give literacies existence, meaning, and value"—and both literacy and institutions cannot be understood apart from one another (7). Taking an IE approach to the work of community writing instructors, I have aimed to contribute to those efforts: highlighting how boss texts and ruling relations may oversimplify and, ultimately, hold back community/university connections—including instructors and writers. Taking an IE approach, the "work" of MWA instructors is far more complex: influenced by instructors' backgrounds and sense of belonging (or not), challenged by the ways writing center pedagogies do (or do not) translate to community contexts, and defined by "writing as work."

WORKS CITED

Berry, Patrick. *Doing Time, Writing Lives: Refiguring Literacy and Higher Education in Prison*. Southern Illinois University P, 2017.

Branch, Kirk. "Literacy Hope and the Violence of Literacy: A Bind That Ties Us." *College English,* vol. 79, no. 4, 2017, pp. 407-20.

Brandt, Deborah. *The Rise of Writing: Redefining Mass Literacy*. Cambridge UP, 2015.

Brooks, Jeff. "Minimalist Tutoring: Making the Student Do All the Work." *Writing Lab Newsletter,* vol. 15, no. 6, 1991, pp. 1-4. https://www.wlnjournal.org/archives/v15/15-6.pdf.

Diamond, Timothy. "'Where Did You Get the Fur Coat, Fern?' Participant Observation in Institutional Ethnography." *Institutional Ethnography as Practice,* edited by Dorothy Smith. Rowman & Littlefield, 2006, pp. 45-64.

Doggart, Julia, et al. "Minding the Gap: Realizing Our Ideal Community Writing Center." *Community Literacy Journal,* vol. 1, no. 2, 2007, pp. 71-80.

Grabill, Jeffrey T., 2001. *Community Literacy Programs and the Politics of Change.* State University of New York P, 2001.

Griffith, Alison I., and Dorothy E. Smith. *Under New Public Management: Institutional Ethnographies of Changing Front-Line Work.* University of Toronto P, 2014.

LaFrance, Michelle. *Institutional Ethnography: A Theory of Practice for Writing Studies Researchers.* Utah State UP, 2019.

McCoy, Liza. "Keeping the Institution in View: Working with Interview Accounts of Everyday Experience." *Institutional Ethnography as Practice,* edited by Dorothy Smith. Rowan & Littlefield, 2006, pp. 109-26.

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

Rousculp, Tiffany. *Rhetoric of Respect: Recognizing Change at a Community Writing Center.* NCTE, 2014.

Shamoon, Linda K., and Deborah H. Burns. "A Critique of Pure Tutoring." *Writing Center Journal,* vol. 15, no. 2, 1995, pp. 134-51.

Smith, Dorothy. *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology.* Northeastern University P, 1987.

---. "Introduction." *Institutional Ethnography as Practice,* edited by Dorothy Smith. Rowman & Littlefield, 2006, pp. 1-12.

Street, Brian. *Literacy in Theory and Practice.* Cambridge UP, 1984.

Vee, Annette. "Understanding Computer Programming as a Literacy." *Literacy in Composition Studies,* vol. 1, no. 2, 2013, pp. 42-64.

Vieira, Kate. *American by Paper: How Documents Matter in Immigrant Literacy.* University of Minnesota P, 2016.

"The Wisconsin Idea." *University of Madison Wisconsin.* https://www.wisc.edu/wisconsin-idea/. 2020.

APPENDIX. CWA/MWA INSTRUCTOR SURVEY QUESTIONS

1. What year did you graduate (or do you expect to graduate) from UW-Madison?
2. What program are/were you enrolled in?
3. What is your current occupation?
4. How many terms (counting semesters and summers) did you work with the Community Writing Assistance/Madison Writing Assistance program?
5. At which MWA/CWA sites do/did you work?
6. What led you to decide to work with CWA/MWA?
7. How would you describe your understanding of the mission of the CWA/MWA program?

8. Describe one or two vivid memories of working with the CWA/MWA program (a patron, a project, etc.).
9. What would you describe as the primary benefits to you of participating in CWA/MWA?
10. What would you describe as the primary benefits to the community/community members of the CWA/MWA program?
11. What was most challenging about working with the CWA/MWA program? What, if anything, helped with those challenges (or could have helped)?
12. How, if at all, has working with CWA/MWA influenced you as a professional?
13. How, if at all, has working with CWA/MWA influenced you as a person?
14. Are there any other aspects of your work with the CWA/MWA program—experiences, benefits, challenges—that you wish to address?