



Introduction. An Empirically Based Canon for Two Decades of Writing Studies in Latin America

Federico Navarro, Valentina Fahler,
and Jonathan Marine

That's why we now turn the map upside down, and then we finally have a fair idea of our position—not as they want it in the rest of the world. The tip of America, from now on, extending forward, insistently points to the South, our North.

– Joaquín Torres García, *La escuela del sur*, 1935, p. 213

An Empirically Based Canon: The History of and Impetus for This Project

In an increasingly multilingual world, the dominance of English in academic publishing remains a barrier to the global exchange of ideas (Navarro et al., 2022). This is evident in the international field of writing studies, where research and theoretical frameworks from the Global North continue to shape the terms of discourse, while rich, innovative scholarship from the Global South continues to struggle for visibility (Donahue, 2009). This volume arises from the belief that our field, with its deep engagement in the power of language, is uniquely positioned to challenge the traditional center-periphery dynamic in scholarly language use and knowledge production and, in doing so, open new pathways for international scholarly dialogue in writing studies, and beyond.

The original intention of this book was to collect key U.S. writing studies works translated into Spanish as part of the *International Exchanges* book series in the WAC Clearinghouse. Such an editorial project would have contributed to making influential scholarship accessible worldwide. For example, the Spanish translation of *Reference Guide to Writing Across the Curriculum* (Bazerman et al., 2016) aimed to align with our field's commitment to fostering exchanges in languages other than English. However, some time into

this project, we came to realize that such a handbook, although useful, would just reinforce the center-periphery dynamic wherein Northern researchers produce and distribute theoretical models and knowledge about the world that Southern researchers adopt and apply (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018).

It was at this point that we recognized a more meaningful approach: translating key Latin American works into English in order to amplify less-visible scholarship on a global scale and open up pathways for the bidirectional exchange of ideas across international contexts. Moving away from an implicitly unidirectional, colonial pattern, this volume takes a different approach by *bringing scholarship in languages other than English into English* in order to foster a more equitable, multidirectional conversation across countries, contexts, and disciplines.

With this goal in mind, we assembled a team of editors from diverse backgrounds, holding different postgraduate degrees, using different language traditions, and with institutional affiliations from across the Americas to facilitate the kinds of dialogue and analysis necessary to advance this transnational exchange. By shifting the direction of translation, this project not only amplifies Latin American scholarship but also questions the asymmetries that have long shaped the field. This shift in focus could not only serve to amplify the value of knowledge elaborated in languages other than English but also to ensure its visibility and impact on a broader international stage.

A Brief History of Latin American Contributions to Writing Studies

Latin America has a tradition of teaching and researching reading and writing that spans at least half a century. For instance, Paulo Freire's work on critical pedagogy and adult literacy in contexts of social inequality dates back to the 1970s. Similarly, authors like Emilia Ferreiro and Delia Lerner have contributed to early literacy research since the 1980s, while pedagogical insights on guided creative writing at various educational levels were developed by Maite Alvarado and Gloria Pampillo in the 1980s and 1990s. Notably, the journal *Lectura y Vida. Revista Latinoamericana de Lectura*—a Spanish-language publication of the International Literacy Association founded in the early 1980s—was published for three decades and promoted systematic research on literacy, initially focusing on reading. Later, in the 1990s, the influential UNESCO Chair on Reading and Writing in Latin America was created, fostering research and teaching centers, national and regional conferences, and publications across the continent.

However, it was at the turn of the century that knowledge production on reading and writing by practitioners and scholars multiplied, coinciding with universities' efforts to support the learning processes of an expanded student body, the professionalization and growth of the scientific field in Latin America, and the emergence of study associations dedicated to writing in higher education. The terms used to name the field have varied, some linked to other parent disciplines—such as “critical sociolinguistics” or “language pedagogy”—and others referencing the specificity of the object of study—especially *alfabetización académica* or “academic literacy instruction” (Navarro & Colombi, 2022).

Yet, some members of the field argue that the term *writing studies*—similar to terms like discourse studies, media studies, or peace and conflict studies—allows for the inclusion of diverse disciplines with complementary interests in a shared object of study, while also enabling the field to break away from its original disciplinary and institutional affiliations (Bazerman et al., 2017) in search of a distinct body of knowledge. At the same time, the term writing studies implicitly asserts the scientific nature of the field, suggesting systematic methodologies and cumulative evidence, and helps to adopt a lifespan perspective which accommodates research on writing at school, in higher education, in professional settings, or in non-educational contexts.

Additionally, the strong Latin American tradition of university-based publishing companies and scholarly journals has created an active, alternative regional hub of Spanish and Portuguese-written research (Demeter et al., 2022). In the case of writing studies, there are currently three university-based, open-access journals in Latin America specifically dedicated to research on reading and writing across educational levels and contexts that have emerged during the last decade. *Traslaciones. Revista Latinoamericana de Lectura y Escritura* (<https://revistas.uncu.edu.ar/ojs3/index.php/traslaciones>), based in Argentina, is the official publication of the UNESCO Chair on Reading and Writing in Latin America. *Revista Electrónica Leer, Escribir y Descubrir* (<https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/leerjournal>) is the official Spanish-language publication of the International Literacy Association, based in the Dominican Republic in collaboration with Florida International University in the United States. Finally, *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios de la Escritura* (<https://wacclearinghouse.org/rlee/>) is the official publication of the Latin American Association of Writing Studies in Higher Education and Professional Contexts (ALES), in collaboration with the WAC Clearinghouse.

This thriving realm of scholarship is little known or acknowledged beyond the borders of the Americas, let alone recognized as a source of theoretical

or methodological contributions of value (Navarro, 2022). Translations and quotations of such works outside the region remain rare, as scholars located on the periphery and working in languages other than English attract less attention from mainstream venues.

Selecting the Works for This Collection

Once our editorial team decided to undertake a collection of key writing studies articles published in Latin America and translate them into English for a global audience, the project faced another difficult challenge: how to select the works. As active participants in the field, our team could have curated a selection of works *we* deemed central to the development of the field. However, we did not want to create a canon that could be involuntarily influenced by our own positionality. Instead, we aimed to base the selection of these works on their actual influence within the scholarly community.

As a result, we initially explored the idea of an open survey. However, previous experiences have shown that surveys do not necessarily account for what people actually read and quote. In addition, a voluntary survey might end up being slanted toward certain groups, languages, or geographical zones that just happen to answer more.

Finally, we decided to do research to better understand the relative influence of traditions, themes, and perspectives in writing studies in Latin America. We focused on tracing the patterns of citation of Latin America-based authors in journals' special issues on reading and writing research published during the last two decades in the region. Such a decision would not only validate a selection of the most influential authors and works but also provide useful data to understand the configuration, dynamics, and influence of the field.

To identify the most influential authors with Latin American affiliations, we tracked 10 scientific special issues related to reading and writing, published in Latin American scholarly journals between 2000 and 2020: *Signo & Seña* (2006); *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa* (2013); *Signos* (2016); *Grafía* (2016); *Ilha do Desterro* (2016); *DELTA* (2017); *Lenguas Modernas* (2017); *Signo & Pensamiento* (2017); and *Íkala* (2019, two volumes). We documented 335 Latin America-based first authors whose 655 works, published in Spanish or Portuguese (2000–2020), were quoted 875 times in the special issues. The most cited authors in Latin America, excluding self-citations, were Paula Carlino, Giovanni Parodi, Elvira Narvaja de Arnoux, Federico Navarro, Anna Rachel Machado, René Venegas, Estela I. Moyano,

María Cecilia Pereira, Alicia Vázquez, Angela Kleiman, Désirée Motta-Roth, Lucía Natale, Violeta Molina Natera, Virginia Zavala, and Judith Kalman.

Once we identified the authors, the project faced another challenge: how to translate their works into English while respecting the conceptual frameworks and terminological developments specific to the field, and at the same time engaging with a global reader. To address this issue, we decided to invite young scholars and literacy researchers familiar with the subject to participate in this process. We brought in translators from various locations in the Americas, proficient in English, Spanish, and Portuguese, who generously contributed the preliminary versions of these chapters.

Editing the Works for This Collection

The translations in this volume underwent an intensive and unique editing process. For example, we have updated references and adapted graphs and figures to ensure consistency in the translation across chapters. Our editorial team aimed to ensure the highest fidelity to the original works while also contextualizing various specifically Latin American concepts, assumptions, and institutions, but this was not always a straight-forward process. On the one hand, as editors we wanted to be faithful to the original works, and on the other, linguistic incongruities, dated terminology, and disciplinary divisions made complete fidelity difficult, an issue long raised by translators across disciplines (Montgomery, 2000; Venuti, 1995).

Further, as volume editors, we were in the unique position of reading the original works and their translations with an eye toward how this scholarship would be received by an international audience. We approached this process as a critical translation, focusing on the historical meanings of various concepts within the multi-disciplinary contexts of the field of writing studies in order to preserve the intellectual integrity of the original works while making them accessible and relevant to new audiences.

For example, “linguistics,” conceived in Latin America as, broadly, the study of language, discourse, and literacy, refers in North American contexts to a much more specialized field of study, typically focused specifically on syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Similarly, many active scholars and practitioners in writing studies in Latin America have received a BA in “letters,” a common program in the European and Latin American tradition of philological studies, which combines knowledge of culture, literature, and language that simply does not translate well into the North American educational system. We also struggled with the concept of “alfabetización académica,” which combines the strong tradition of initial literacy instruction in Latin America

with the emergence of higher education writing studies and has served as an umbrella term for the field. For each of these terms, and the many others not represented by these prominent examples, we had to negotiate meaning across contexts, cultures, and disciplines.

In some cases, we faced discomfort in retaining certain conceptualizations and their related terms and terminology that have not aged well, such as the concepts of “mother tongue” or “students’ deficiencies.” As a result, we decided to include translator’s notes (“TN”). These comments written throughout by editors or translators attempt to provide context for global readers. In some cases, we consulted the authors themselves regarding unclear passages or difficult-to-find citations in order to ensure that we were staying faithful to the original works but also maintaining consistency across the chapters included in the volume.

The authors also played a key role in negotiating the republication rights of their works, which were granted by publishers and journals at no cost for this book. Accordingly, we invited all the authors to write a reflection on their works, their influence, and how they think about them differently now, and these reflections are included at the end of each chapter. There, each author could review what they perceived as the contributions that generated interest and impact in the writing studies community, but also reflect on which conceptualizations, proposals, and methodologies they would approach differently today.

Although the selection of the chapters in this book is based on actual citation dynamics and recognition specific to writing studies in Latin America, we felt it was necessary to incorporate critical perspectives that could explain why this book is worth reading for a global audience and what future developments we can expect in the field. With this purpose in mind, we invited a prominent senior U.S. scholar with deep international connections in the writing studies community, Charles Bazerman, to write the preface and discuss the landscape the book presents and the international discussions it establishes. We also invited an experienced and well-recognized Latin American scholar, Natalia Ávila Reyes, to identify the outstanding issues and the paths ahead.

In sum, this was a collectively constructed project, made possible through the generous and selfless contributions of authors, editors, and translators, all united by a shared purpose: to contribute to the conversations and exchanges on writing in the Americas and bring them to a broader global audience for the first time. Perhaps, if AI-based translation continues to gain traction, this volume will serve as an epoch-defining collection: one that purposefully sought to negotiate meaning across a broad network of scholars and scholarship through conversation and interchange.

Writing Studies in Latin America: Seminal works

The fifteen Latin American authors whose pieces are reprinted in this collection have all contributed different perspectives and methodologies while advocating certain themes and traditions to account for reading and writing in higher education. A qualitative and situated analysis of their most influential works might shed light on the regional bibliographical foundation of writing studies in Latin America.

Based on our analysis, Argentinian scholar Paula Carlino is the most influential author in the field of writing studies in Latin America. Twenty-three of Carlino's works received 68 citations from 30 different sources, excluding self-citations. Her book *Writing, Reading, and Learning in Higher Education: An Introduction to Academic Literacy Instruction* (2005) has strongly influenced policymakers, stakeholders, researchers, and teachers across disciplines to support institutional changes related to literacy at the university level. In this book, Carlino discusses the writing-across-the-curriculum movement (e.g., Russell), which was not well known in Latin America at the time, alongside sociocultural (e.g., Ivanič) and sociocognitive (e.g., Flower) approaches to writing and learning. She connects this well-grounded theoretical background to ongoing discussions and initiatives in Latin America, particularly discussing the influence of propaedeutic literacy instruction courses that were introduced in Argentinian undergraduate programs following the mass expansion of public, tuition-free universities in the 1980s.

The opening chapter of this volume, entitled "Writing in Higher Education", originally appeared in Carlino's highly influential 2005 book. It provides detailed accounts of pedagogical sequences and tasks developed in her education courses, which exemplify her theoretical claims. Most notably, Carlino argues that literacy serves as a means for learning within the disciplines and that writing varies according to disciplinary discourses and knowledge-making practices. Therefore, she advocates for the integration of literacy instruction into curricula across disciplines and at various stages of students' academic trajectories. Additionally, she asserts that subject-matter teachers should take responsibility for writing instruction—a controversial stance at a time when writing instruction in higher education was predominantly led by language teachers.

Chilean scholar Giovanni Parodi is the second most influential author in the field of writing studies in Latin America. Eighteen of Parodi's works are cited 36 times by 26 articles in special issues, excluding self-citations. Parodi's "Written Genres: Towards a Comprehensive Understanding from a Socio-Cognitive Perspective" (2008) is the influential introductory chapter

of his edited book *Academic and Professional Genres: Discursive Approaches to Knowing and Doing*, published in Chile. Parodi's contributions and influence in the field are twofold. On one hand, he was a tireless promoter of institutional initiatives for development and academic exchange. He transformed the journal *Signos* into the most influential and highest-ranked venue in Latin America for language and writing studies. He also established a graduate school and trained a cohort of students through his highly regarded MA and PhD programs in linguistics, many of whom are now influential figures in the field. Furthermore, he fostered international academic networks, regularly bringing global scholars to Latin America to participate in research projects, courses, and conferences, and he strengthened regional institutions such as the UNESCO Chair.

On the other hand, Parodi developed theoretical and methodological proposals within the framework of applied linguistics, drawing from both textual and cognitive perspectives, which have had a significant impact. In his chapter, he advances a conceptualization of genres—particularly professional and academic genres in higher education—that seeks to reconnect cognitive, contextual, and textual factors. In subsequent works, he investigated these aspects using methodologies such as corpus linguistics and eye-tracking.

Like Carlino's work, Parodi's contribution is both theoretical and programmatic, polemical and pedagogical in style, and widely cited as a foundational framework by other scholars in the field. They also share a focus on academic and professional genres and contexts, with a strong interest in innovating university education across different disciplines and ensuring access to the ways of thinking and communicating within academic disciplines. However, their theoretical foundations differ: Carlino is rooted in educational psychology and the sciences of education, while Parodi is grounded in discourse studies and applied linguistics.

Argentinian scholar Elvira Narvaja de Arnoux is the third most influential author in the field of writing studies in Latin America, with a total of 22 citations to ten works by nine different articles in special issues, excluding self-citations. Her article "The Impact of Peers' and Experts' Readership on the Revision of Thesis Excerpts" (2006) discusses both the theoretical foundations and the textual impact of a thesis writing workshop designed to help graduate students complete their MA theses. After gathering students' perspectives on writing challenges, the workshop's key pedagogical strategies include rewriting sections of their theses in response to both instructional guidance and peer feedback, as well as producing hybrid, epistemic genres such as the *thesis back cover*. This approach not only aims to improve the quality of students' texts but also familiarizes them with the expectations of their

respective scientific discourse communities, including refining their understanding of academic genres. Unlike the contributions of Parodi and Carlino, this chapter presents empirical evidence drawn from an action-research study framed within Arnoux's own theoretical approach.

Just as she pioneered first-year writing courses in Argentina and Latin America in the late 1980s—see Pereira's chapter for more details, Arnoux's 2006 article and a subsequent book published in 2009 were groundbreaking. They anticipated the current interest in graduate writing research, drawing from her experience implementing writing workshops in MA programs since 2004. Particularly noteworthy is her integration of French discourse studies (e.g., Maingueneau) and language pedagogy (e.g., Bronkard) with socio-cognitive writing studies (from Vygotsky to Bereiter and Scardamalia), resulting in a uniquely Argentinian, discourse-based, and critical approach to writing instruction.

Argentinian scholar Federico Navarro's "Think Globally, Act Locally: How to Design an Academic Writing Course for Students Entering University" (2017) is one of eight works he published during the 2010s that have been cited 18 times by 14 articles in special issues, excluding self-citations. The article contextualizes discussions and teaching proposals for reading and writing in Latin America, a region marked by socioeconomic inequalities in university access and completion, yet also by the recent expansion of higher education participation and the existence of partially or fully subsidized tuition at its most prestigious universities. Additionally, the chapter addresses and seeks to synthesize some of the tensions and conflicts between the field's foundational assumptions and the disciplinary traditions that have historically shaped writing studies in Latin America. It does so within a context where the field has reached greater maturity and self-recognition, with an increasing body of scientific research and the establishment of key milestones in its development.

In particular, the chapter provides operational and eclectic definitions—such as semiotic capital, academic language, epistemic potential, and writing campus—allowing any educator or language professional to conceptualize their role in writing instruction. It also outlines nine fundamental theoretical principles essential for those looking to develop literacy instruction programs. Lastly, it grounds its theoretical discussion in a concrete writing across the curriculum initiative at an Argentinian university, which included faculty training, curricular innovation, and the development of teaching materials. Ultimately, this is a programmatic and forward-looking text, aligning with the contributions of Carlino and Parodi, yet authored by a scholar belonging to the next generation within the field.

Brazilian scholar Anna Rachel Machado's article, "The Construction of Didactic Models of Genres: Contributions and Questions for Genre Teaching" (2006), co-authored with Vera Lúcia Lopes Cristovão, is one of her 16 works which are cited 18 times by nine articles in special issues, excluding self-citations. It seeks to develop a didactic approach to language teaching centered on discursive-textual genres, as they are commonly referred to in Brazil. It explicitly addresses diverse social contexts and introduces the concepts of transposition and didactic sequence (particularly those organized around genres) to construct didactic models of genre. This model focuses on linguistic elements—such as lexicon, textual sequences, and cohesion—to facilitate didactic interventions. The main theoretical framework adopted is the socio-discursive interactionism of Swiss origin, which has had a significant influence in Brazil and is widely applied to the teaching of Portuguese as a first language in the school system. In a characteristically Brazilian and Latin American eclectic gesture, this approach is combined with applied linguistics perspectives, particularly those oriented toward English as an additional language.

Unlike the previously discussed works, this chapter shifts its focus to the school system. Its engagement with discursive genres is not only theoretical and pedagogical but also extends to public policy, teacher training, and the implementation of national curricular guidelines that incorporate the concept—similar to the chapter by Brazilian scholar Ángela Kleiman. Like most chapters in this book, this contribution is both theoretical and programmatic. Notably, as in the other two Brazilian-authored chapters, this text demonstrates a strong interest in mapping writing research in the country, offering classifications, evaluations, and an identification of theoretical consensus and gaps that require further development.

Argentinian scholar Estela Moyano's "Academic Writing Throughout the Undergraduate Years: An Institutional Program" (2010) systematizes a pioneering writing across the curriculum initiative implemented at an Argentinian university. The program fosters collaboration between language experts and disciplinary professors to support student writing development. One of the chapter's most original contributions, as seen in other chapters of this book, is its situated eclectic approach: it integrates principles from the rhetoric and composition tradition in the United States with the genre-based pedagogy of systemic functional linguistics from Australia, all within the context of a Latin American public university with free tuition. In total, eight of Moyano's works are cited 12 times by eight articles in special issues, excluding self-citations.

Moyano's chapter advocates for a robust and functional theory of language—understood as a system of meaning-making resources in context—in

writing teaching. It places key linguistic concepts at the core of pedagogy and classroom practice—such as *hyper-Themes* and *Appraisal*. It highlights the role of linguistic awareness and genre awareness, promoting the progressive development of student autonomy in reading and writing tasks, with a focus on the discursive, lexicogrammatical, structural, and contextual features of academic genres. Like Parodi, Moyano calls for an expanded study of the academic and professional genres circulating in higher education. Additionally, the chapter transcends certain tensions in the field between discourse studies and educational psychology by advocating for peer negotiation and collaboration, where both disciplinary and language specialists learn from each other.

Similar to the approaches of Carlino, Arnoux, and Navarro, Moyano's proposal is programmatic: it combines eclectic theoretical frameworks with real classroom initiatives rather than presenting an empirical research study. Its influence in the Latin American context can be attributed, in part, to its rejection of remedial and deficit-based approaches. Instead, it establishes a model of writing support at advanced undergraduate levels.

Chilean scholar René Venegas' "Discursive Procedures of Knowledge Attribution in Linguistics and Philosophy Theses Across Two Academic Levels" (2013) is co-authored with Paulina Meza Guzmán and Juan David Martínez Hincapié. Following the call made by Parodi and Moyano, this chapter reflects the growing interest of writing studies in Latin America over the past decade in understanding the written genres produced by undergraduate and graduate students. Rather than adopting a deficit perspective, as was more common in the field's early developments, this work is driven by a genuine effort to better understand the mechanisms of knowledge construction and their variations across disciplines and educational stages. In total, six of Venegas' works are cited 11 times by six articles in special issues, excluding self-citations.

The chapter focuses on the often opaque and little-known conventionalized discursive practices of academic genres in specific educational contexts. It is the first strictly empirical chapter in the book, employing a quantitative methodology with a strong focus on textual analysis. While the research findings may have implications for writing pedagogy, as evidenced by the subsequent book published in 2015, this is also the first chapter that does not include questions about teaching and learning in its research design.

Argentinian scholar María Cecilia Pereira's "Reading and Writing in the Common Basic Cycle (CBC): A Memoir of Experiences in a Semiology Course" (2006) is a published conference paper that has circulated widely on the internet as a Word document corresponding to an oral presentation, which provides insight into the significance of oral exchanges in events that

are increasingly specialized in the teaching and research of writing in Latin America. Pereira authored four texts in the corpus, which were cited eight times across seven articles.

This chapter offers a first-person insight into the early stages of what may be the first and most influential first-year writing program in Latin America. The interest in teaching academic reading and writing in higher education emerged in a social and historical context marked by the restoration of democracy and demands for greater civil rights in Argentina in the mid-1980s. This period also saw the massification of university enrollment and the establishment of preparatory programs to support the transition from secondary education to university.

The “Reading and Writing Workshop” began to be offered in the 1990s, although it was only formally integrated into the curriculum a decade later. Unlike previous initiatives that focused on study techniques, comprehension, and learning strategies, this workshop placed emphasis on reading and writing. It emerged as a cross-disciplinary subject spanning various undergraduate programs at the University of Buenos Aires, reaching thousands of students each year. The course taught students to engage with theoretical texts from semiotics and discourse analysis to critically approach a variety of texts, including academic, journalistic, and literary works. This theoretical and methodological framework shaped some of the pedagogical choices, as well as the critical and metalinguistic approaches found in writing classrooms, influencing the later development of writing studies in the region.

Alongside the workshop, research was conducted to explore the so-called “difficulties” encountered by these new student populations in the context of free, non-selective university education—an inclusive phenomenon unique to Argentina. However, studies also identified the strategies of successful readers and writers. All in all, this chapter is not merely anecdotal; rather, it sheds light on how this experience served as a crucible for the emergence of a new generation of practitioners and researchers in Argentina and Latin America.

Argentinian scholar Alicia Vázquez’s “Teaching and Learning at the Undergraduate Level: Knowledge, Ideas, and Writing Practices in Academic Contexts” (2009), co-authored with Ivone Jakob, Luisa Pelizza, and Pablo Rosales, is one of six of Vázquez’s works which are cited eight times by six articles in special issues, excluding self-citations. The chapter presents systematically collected empirical evidence; however, rather than analyzing patterns of written language use, it investigates the relationship between writing and learning in higher education. The chapter presents four studies conducted over a decade aiming to assess the impact of writing-focused instruction on learning and the quality of student communication, and comparing different groups—e.g., high

performance vs. low performance students, or students writing about topics vs. students discussing topics. The research design explores various dimensions, such as tasks, conceptions, writing processes, and text quality, employing complex and creative methodologies to uncover underlying cognitive processes—such as interviews and rubric-based text analysis.

A particularly noteworthy aspect of this chapter is that it not only examines what students do but also investigates the tasks assigned by instructors and their connection to teachers' conceptions of writing. The chapter concludes with general findings derived from empirical evidence, offering valuable theoretical insights. Unlike the more common approach of using theory as a premise to justify educational initiatives or partial data, this study follows a logic in which theory is constructed, corroborated, or challenged based on empirical data. For example, the chapter points out that writing does not automatically promote learning in a linear fashion; rather, appropriate instructional contexts are necessary to achieve this goal.

Brazilian scholar Angela B. Kleiman's "Literacy and its Implication for First Language Teaching" (2007) is part of the eight texts she authored which were cited eight times by three articles across special issues, excluding self-citations. Like Machado's, this chapter focuses on writing in the Brazilian school system, although its theoretical framework is based on the new literacy studies (e.g., Street). Kleiman emphasizes the importance of non-school uses of writing and argues that the goal of education should be to address the multiple literacy practices of social life, viewing writing as a social practice rather than an individual skill. Her approach is rooted in an interest in genres and meaningful communicative situations in students' lives. She advocates for fostering experimentation and discovery when students write in a new genre for the first time.

Additionally, Kleiman urges language teachers to use meaningful social practices within the community—through literacy projects—as a guiding principle for instruction. However, she also acknowledges the challenge of this approach due to the sequential and segmented organization of school curricula. She argues that teachers, as literacy agents, should be aware of their students' cultural and literacy backgrounds and that the teaching of written language should not become a space of inequality and exclusion. In sum, this chapter stands out for its sociocultural, critical, and inclusive perspective on the teaching of written genres in school settings.

Brazilian scholar Désirée Motta-Roth's "Critical Genre Analysis: Contributions to Language Teaching and Research" (2008) is theoretical, programmatic, and eclectic, providing a cartography of ongoing research in Brazil. Alongside her influential textbook *Text Production at the University* (2010),

coauthored with Graciela Rabuske Hendges, Motta-Roth's work was cited seven times by seven articles in special issues, excluding self-citations. The chapter aims to articulate some of the most influential traditions in discourse studies and composition studies, which are often read together in the region. It exemplifies what scholars have termed the "Brazilian blend" (Bazerman, 2016), which, to a certain extent, also reflects a broader Latin American blend.

Specifically, Motta-Roth seeks to integrate various traditions, including applied linguistics, composition, systemic functional linguistics, socio-discursive interactionism, and critical discourse analysis, to support genre analysis and teaching across different cultural contexts. Drawing on Fairclough, for example, she emphasizes the importance of considering the sociocultural context of genres. Similarly, her advocacy for a holistic perspective on genres, which constitute the daily routines of individuals within specific environments, is particularly valuable.

Motta-Roth explores articles from the field to discuss methodological approaches, such as the necessity (or lack thereof) of direct contextual observation. She also situates her contribution within the international and local history of the field in Brazil, highlighting the influence of the concept of discourse genres on the Brazilian school curriculum (PCN). In sum, this chapter lays the groundwork for the necessity of a "hybrid perspective" to account for the complex and multidimensional nature of genres.

Argentinian scholar Lucía Natale's "Professional Literacy Instruction During the Undergraduate Years: Between the University and the Workplace" (2014), co-authored with Daniela Stagnaro, is an empirical study that seeks to map the discourse genres used by higher education students, following the call of Parodi and other scholars. The research is framed within a writing-across-the-curriculum program that follows students through different educational stages. This program could refine its approach and make curricular recommendations based on the collected evidence. In total, Natale authored four texts which were cited seven times by six articles in special issues, excluding self-citations.

The chapter's most significant contribution lies in its expansion beyond the educational context to examine writing and the experiences of advanced students in internships or graduates in professional settings. In doing so, it broadens the range of social contexts that can be explored through writing research.

Colombian scholar Violeta Molina Natera authored four texts which were cited seven times by five articles in special issues, excluding self-citations. Her chapter "Writing Centers: A Retrospective View to Understanding the Present and Future of Writing Center Programs in the Latin American Context"

(2014) historicizes and maps writing centers and programs in Latin America while linking them to the specialized North American scholarship on writing program administration. In doing so, this chapter—along with Molina’s other works—introduces into Latin America and Spanish-language scholarship a research and administrative tradition that was previously little known in the region. This work later contributed to the proliferation of writing centers, particularly in Colombia and Mexico.

Furthermore, with its focus on the dynamics and culture of writing centers, the chapter engages in discussions with first-year writing courses and writing-across-the-curriculum and disciplinary writing initiatives, shifting attention toward student-centered tutoring and the training of peer tutors.

Peruvian scholar Virginia Zavala’s “Academic Writing and Student Agency” (2011) is one of six works she authored which were cited seven times by four articles in special issues, excluding self-citations. Drawing from critical sociolinguistics and new literacy studies, Zavala places student agency at the center of her analysis, focusing on how students negotiate and challenge the hegemonic contexts and discourses of higher education. In Zavala’s perspective, context is not merely an additional level or component; rather, racial, socioeconomic, and ethnolinguistic factors fundamentally shape the educational trajectories of writers. Understanding these trajectories, she argues, requires an ethnographic and qualitative perspective, with thick descriptions that capture their complexity.

To illustrate and substantiate her theoretical proposal with empirical evidence, the text presents two case studies of students who speak Spanish as an additional language at a Peruvian university and who develop vernacular forms of writing in academic settings (such as an “academic diary”). Additionally, the chapter highlights the tensions between the forms of evidence and knowledge construction required by academia and those valued by some students—issues often overlooked in more traditional approaches to writing pedagogy.

With this chapter, Zavala anticipates many of the contemporary concerns in the field while simultaneously problematizing concepts often taken for granted, such as language, culture, learning, and literacy. She emphasizes the notions of situated social practice and communities of practice, challenging the field’s predominant focus on cognitive processes (skills) and linguistic products. Overall, the chapter lays the foundation for an inclusive pedagogy of writing, advocating for explicit instruction; recognition of student agency and resistance in creating alternative, hybrid, and original genres and discourses; promotion of rhetorical negotiation (as opposed to mere adherence to hegemonic norms); and the encouragement of students to develop their own academic voice, rather than imposing rigid rules and conventions.

Finally, Mexican scholar Judith Kalman's article "Access to Written Culture: Social Participation and Appropriation of Knowledge in Everyday Reading and Writing Events" (2003) focuses on adults' access to literacy. Like Zavala, this work embraces and promotes a strong sociocultural research tradition, in this case from Mexico, employing an ethnographic case study methodology that challenges hegemonic conceptions of writing, pedagogy, and learning. Kalman draws on Lave and Wenger, Bakhtin, Vygotsky, Rogoff, Wertsch, Chartier, among others, to explore intersubjective, situated, and active learning processes in reading and writing. In total, Kalman authored seven texts which were cited seven times by two articles in special issues, excluding self-citations.

This is the only chapter in the book that does not focus on the school system or higher education but rather on adult literacy, particularly among poor women in rural areas. It also establishes connections with Zavala's work by observing, characterizing, and theorizing participation in written culture in everyday language use contexts, such as reading religious texts or keeping inventory in a small neighborhood store, in contrast to school classrooms that are often unwelcoming and lack significance for non-traditional students.

Final Remarks

The selection of authors and texts in this volume provides a general overview of the development of writing studies in Latin America over the past two decades, and one that we hope can help point toward future directions for the increasingly global field of writing studies.

This collection integrates diverse theoretical traditions—including discourse studies, language pedagogy, educational psychology, educational management, and critical sociolinguistics—bringing them together in innovative and critical ways enabled by a peripheral perspective. References come from a range of languages and origins, both within and beyond Latin America, particularly from France, Switzerland, Australia, the United States, Spain, the United Kingdom, and Russia. Though the authors come from different countries—Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Peru—the social contexts they describe share similarities, set within a Latin American continent marked by inequality yet characterized by a history of advocacy for educational equity.

The issues and interests addressed within this volume primarily focus on higher education, but also extend to the school system, professional workplace, and through adult literacy. While some of the most influential texts are traditional empirical studies, the majority introduce, develop, and propose

theoretical frameworks, while also creating and advocating for programmatic visions in order to guide the field's development. Overall, critical perspectives, social commitment, disciplinary hybridity, and intercontinental dialogues serve as key defining traits of the field, and by extension this volume.

We hope that this book offers English-speaking readers an opportunity to engage with the rich tradition of writing studies in Latin America originally developed in both Portuguese and Spanish, translated by a team of translators and editors representative of the rich multilingual, multidisciplinary, and cross-cultural landscape of the continent. This translation process not only reflects the linguistic diversity of Latin America but also brings forward the unique theoretical perspectives and practical insights that have shaped the field of writing studies globally.

By offering this book to English-speaking readers, we invite them to consider how writing is understood, practiced, and taught across cultural boundaries in the hope of expanding the global conversation on literacy and composition across borders linguistically, disciplinarily, and nationally. At the same time, we hope this book will help to surface unresolved issues of interest and the future conceptual frameworks that the field will need in the coming decades, as a transnational effort with contributions from Latin American, and beyond.

References

- Bazerman, C. (2016). The Brazilian Blend. In E. G. Lousada, A. D. O. Ferreira, L. Bueno, R. Rojo, S. Aranha, & L. Abreu-Tardelli (Eds.), *Diálogos brasileiros no estudo de gêneros textuais/discursivos* [Brazilian dialogues about textual-discursive genres studies] (pp. 645-650). Letraria.
- Bazerman, C., Ávila Reyes, N., Bork, A. V., Poliseli-Correa, F., Cristovão, V. L., Tapia Ladino, M., & Narváez Cardona, E. (2017). Intellectual orientations of studies of higher education writing in Latin America. In S. Plane, C. Bazerman, F. Rondelli, C. Donahue, A. N. Applebee, C. Boré, P. Carlino, M. Marquilló Larruy, P. Rogers, & D. Russell (Eds.), *Research on writing: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 281-297). The WAC Clearinghouse; CREM. <https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2017.0919.2.15>
- Demeter, M., Goyanes, M., Navarro, F., Mihalik, J., & Mellado, C. (2022). Rethinking de-Westernization in communication studies: The Ibero-American movement in international publishing. *International Journal of Communication*, 16, 3027-3046. <https://doi.org/https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/18485/3805>
- Donahue, C. (2009). "Internationalization" and composition studies: Reorienting the discourse. *CCC*, 61(2), 212-243.
- Mignolo, W., & Walsh, C. (2018). *On decoloniality: concepts, analytics, praxis*. Duke University Press.

- Montgomery, S. L. (2000). *Science in translation: Movements of knowledge through cultures and time*. University of Chicago Press.
- Navarro, F. (2022). The unequal distribution of research roles in transnational composition: Towards illegitimate peripheral participation. In C. Donahue & B. Horner (Eds.), *Teaching and studying transnational composition* (pp. 17-33). Modern Language Association.
- Navarro, F., & Colombi, M. C. (2022). Alfabetización académica y estudios del discurso [Academic literacy instruction and discourse studies]. In C. López Ferrero, I. E. Carranza, & T. Van Dijk (Eds.), *Estudios del discurso / The Routledge Handbook of Spanish Language Discourse Studies* (pp. 495-509). Routledge.
- Navarro, F., Lillis, T., Donahue, T., Curry, M. J., Ávila Reyes, N., Gustafsson, M., Zavala, V., Lauría, D., Lukin, A., McKinney, C., Feng, H., & Motta-Roth, D. (2022). Rethinking English as a lingua franca in scientific-academic contexts. A position statement. *Journal of English for Research Publication Purposes*, 3(1), 143-153. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jerpp.21012.nav>
- Venuti, L. (2005). Translation, history, narrative. *Meta*, 50(3), 800-816.