CHAPTER 7.

TOWARD A DIALOGIC TRANSNATIONAL EXCHANGE IN WRITING STUDIES EDITORIAL WORK

Lisa Arnold
North Dakota State University

Anna Habib
George Mason University

Joan Mullin
University of North Carolina, Charlotte

Terry Myers Zawacki
George Mason University

Abstract. *Scholars promoting linguistic social justice in writing studies and those working within transnational and global contexts of writing share many concerns. However, complications arise in practice and in theory for those working at the intersections. We consider these complications, focusing on three key tensions within the editing and publishing processes that shape these fields: making policy statements that respect language difference while treating different experiences with language as the same; that discuss theoretical but not material dimensions of language; and/or that do not examine whether practices align with or work against neoliberal multiculturalism. We begin with a local example, demonstrating how the WAC Clearinghouse International Exchanges on the Study of Writing book series editors grapple with articulating policies that respond to these tensions within the North American context, not the least of which is the assumption that concepts such as race and linguistic social justice in our scholarship are universals. This local perspective leads to a wider consideration of colonial epistemologies, language ideologies, and dominant research traditions*

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2026.2845.2.07

> *underlying academic publishing practices and thus our research and practices. Throughout, we provide actions which organizations, publishers, editors and authors can use to intentionally interrupt English's privileged position and to build knowledge more inclusively.*

For decades, writing researchers globally have pointed out that the dominance of English, by default, privileges scholars, research methods, theories, and pedagogies from majority-English countries[1] (see ALES, n.d.; Ávila Reyes, 2021; Canagarajah, 2013; Corcoran et al., 2019; Curry & Lillis, 2017; Hamel, 2013). Increasingly, as a result of engaging with international research, there has been a focus in the field on globalizing our professional organizations and publishing practices, with many writing studies scholars pressing for changes to traditional standards for academic writing, writing assessment, and scholarly publication (e.g., Bazerman, 2014; Horner et al., 2009; Poe et al., 2018). The field has revised standards and practices around social, cultural, linguistic, and epistemological difference (see statements such as those from Association for Writing Across the Curriculum [n.d., *AWAC* executive]; Conference on College Composition and Communication [2025]; International Writing Center Association [2010]; National Council of Teachers of English [2025]). These organizations' stated goals and policies express an honest commitment to inclusivity across national and cultural boundaries.

Even as we make these efforts, scholars continue to point to Western epistemologies and standard academic English practices embedded in our research and pedagogies, and, therefore, in the editorial and publication processes which shape the field. In our positions as co-editors of the WAC Clearinghouse International Exchanges on the Study of Writing book series (Zawacki, Mullin, Habib) and as former chairs of the Conference on College Composition and Communication Globalization Committee of Postsecondary Writing Instruction and Research (Zawacki, Arnold), these issues and the complications that emerge from them have become increasingly visible.[2] Even as we are based in the US, our transnational work, which involves collaborations with international colleagues, has required us to consciously cross (linguistic, epistemological, cultural) borders. These transnational collaborations have allowed us to encounter and recognize the limitations of Western frameworks for linguistic social justice[3] outside of the Global North.

1 Throughout we interchange terms commonly used by international scholars to discuss "Anglo-Centered," "Center," and "majority-English" sites, notably the US, Britain, and Australia. Those outside the "Center" are tagged "periphery." Center countries, Europe and those identifying as "Western" and the "Global North" are positioned next to all other countries tagged "Global South."

2 The IE book series can be found at https://wacclearinghouse.org/books/international/.

3 By linguistic social justice, we refer generally to scholarly conversations that complicate English as a lingua franca; "standard" English; Western rhetorical traditions and discursive practices.

For these reasons, in this chapter we highlight the tensions that arise when attempting to disrupt the Western epistemologies that underlie the vast majority of writing studies scholarship. While these tensions arise most visibly in work at the intersections of transnational exchange, we are all embedded in transnational discourse although we may not recognize it as such given the privileged position we occupy within the discourse. In that sense, then, this chapter is relevant to all in the Global North who are invested in supporting linguistic social justice within the field even though they may not be explicitly engaged in transnational scholarship. In what follows, we offer a brief history of efforts by North American professional organizations to recognize and acknowledge the global nature of our work, efforts which, at the same time, bring up complicated questions for editors and publishers.

The CCCC Committee on Globalization of Postsecondary Writing Instruction and Research, convened in 2009 by Charles Bazerman, then CCCC chair, was charged with bringing global contexts of writing to the fore of the field more systematically than, for example, changing organizational names to acknowledge international participation (e.g., International Writing Center Association renamed in 1999; the International WAC Conference in 2006). Prior to publishing the "CCCC Statement on Globalization in Writing Studies Pedagogy and Research" (Conference on College Composition and Communication, 2017), committee members discussed terms such as *international*, *transnational*, and *globalization* extensively, noting important distinctions that are often conflated: While *international* refers merely to the existence of one or more nations in a single context; *transnational* suggests an element of exchange between and among nations; and *globalization* "implie[s] less rigidly defined boundaries and a more mobile meshing of cultures, languages, and nationalities" (Conference on College Composition and Communication, 2017, "Defining Globalization"). As evidenced by the statement, globalization carries important implications for writing studies in that globalization is always-already present in everything we do. However, as committee members noted, research, teaching, and administration often ignore this reality and remain focused on North American contexts of writing pedagogy and practice.

There are exceptions, of course. Among publishers featuring inter- and transnational perspectives on writing (e.g., Routledge, Multilingual Matters), the International Exchanges on the Study of Writing book series (IE) and its Latin American section, published by The WAC Clearinghouse and its print publishing partner, University Press of Colorado, explicitly seek to raise awareness of global contexts of writing and to publish books "that draw on scholarship across national and disciplinary borders to challenge parochial understandings" of Writing Studies (The WAC Clearinghouse, n.d., *International*).

Along with an increased organizational and publisher focus on global contexts of writing, the field has undertaken in recent years a sustained reckoning with the way it is implicated in traditions of social and linguistic injustice, particularly in relation to historically underrepresented groups. To this end, in the early 2020s, CCCC instituted a number of new committees and published several statements that are focused on equity, inclusion, decolonization, and social justice (Conference on College Composition and Communication, 2025). In 2021, the Council of Writing Program Administrators publicly responded to critiques of its organizational members, structure, and documents by halting all public work and soliciting outside counsel to ensure its operations were equitable and inclusive. In 2023, the organization hosted a conference focused on the theme of "Social Justice WPAing," and later published a 2023 Cultural Assessment Report.

Although such organizational committees, publishers, and statements are helpful in bringing attention to social injustice within the field, they cannot necessarily change actual practice. Circulated in 2021, the *Anti-Racist Scholarly Reviewing Practices: A Heuristic for Editors, Reviewers, and Authors* (Cagle et al., n.d.), which informed the Conference on College Composition and Communication's (2023) and the WAC Clearinghouse's (n.d., *Statement*) recent clarifications of editorial practices, signals a shift in this regard. Lauren E. Cagle et al. (n.d.) offer "explicit guidance on anti-racist professional practices … for editors, reviewers, and authors involved in academic reviewing" (p. 2), which has been adopted by or adapted with variations by multiple publishing venues. That said, we want to recognize that for non-US-based scholars, the document and the terms can seem insular and specific to a U.S. context: the term BIPOC, for example, originating and used in the US, relies on a colonial vision of race and assumes that those who are phenotypically black or brown are always positioned as minorities no matter the context. In her article outlining a transnational Black language pedagogy, Esther Milu (2021) critiqued writing scholarship that has assumed all Black students in the US identify as African American and speak or write in Black Vernacular English. As Milu showed through her examples of students with transnational African identities and language backgrounds, we must rethink such assumptions and complicate our understanding of racialized groups. Similarly, the concept of linguistic social justice is likely to resonate differently for those outside the US.

Without a doubt, however, there are many shared concerns among scholars promoting linguistic social justice in the field and those working within transnational and global contexts of writing. However, complications arise in practice and in theory for those working at the intersections. In this chapter we consider these complications by focusing on three key tensions within the editing and

publishing processes-specifically, making policy statements that respect language difference while treating different experiences with language as the same; that discuss theoretical but not material dimensions of language; and/or that do not examine whether practices align with or work against neoliberal multiculturalism. To give a concrete example of how these tensions are felt in practice, we begin with a local context, the IE book series and its statement on language. The latter is an ongoing concern as the series editors grapple with how to articulate a policy that responds to these tensions within the North American context in which we work, not the least of which is the assumption that concepts such as race and linguistic social justice in our scholarship are universals. This local perspective leads us to a wider consideration of the colonial epistemologies, language ideologies, and dominant research traditions upon which our field and the practices of academic publishing are based. As Maria Kuteeva and Taina Saarinen (2022) reminded us, "Writing and publishing shape each other through different established mechanisms (e.g., peer review, author guidelines, style manuals), but there is room for negotiation" (p. 133)—the latter a hopeful note underlying the recommendations for change throughout this chapter.

COMPLICATING LANGUAGE POLICIES AND PRACTICES: THE LOCAL CONTEXT

Aware early on of the need to address these tensions, the IE co-editors created a "Statement on Language for Submission and Publication" that begins by recognizing that "the language of publication is often a political and identity decision," that "different regions, languages, and traditions develop their own relatively specific perspectives and methodologies to address their own interests and research problems," and that "this diversity … often prevents an equal international exchange of scholarship."[4] While a forceful political statement, the co-editors have wrestled with what this recognition of difference *means in practice.* The submission guidelines offered on the site signal to authors that the series is open to diverse voices and texts but will also be looking for "strong scholarly merit" as determined through "rigorous peer review." Strategically, this advice is aimed not only at authors but also at external audiences to reassure them that, while IE is an open-access series, it follows standard review processes. With these relatively general guidelines, authors are called to imagine the degree of openness that series editors and reviewers might, in practice, bring to their reading of the text.

4 The statement is available at https://wacclearinghouse.org/books/international/guidelines/language-policy/.

Similarly, the IE internal peer review form prompts reviewers to be mindful of "contextual, cultural, and linguistic differences" while also asking whether there is a "sound organization," a "logical and readable structure," a "well-researched" and/or "adequately explained and detailed" topic with "connections to related studies,"[5] all generally accepted criteria for scholarly work transnationally. The problem for reviewers and thus for editors and publishers, however, lies in the ways these criteria are taken up from a Global North perspective. Even when prompted to be aware of rhetorical and textual variations, reviewers, particularly those in U.S. institutions, will likely first draw on discoursal forms with which they are most familiar and then imagine, in a sense, the variations that might be acceptable for books in IE, a series under the umbrella of a U.S.-based organization. Given this tacit bias in Western traditions, the editorial group has been grappling for some time to describe what our assertions about openness mean in practice, how to fairly read alternative texts and diverse voices, and even how to define "alternative."

With these concerns foremost in articulating policies, the editors have considered asking that *all* submissions include an explanation of the rhetorical tradition on which the text is based and how the richer language and cultural experience readers will encounter is integral to the project. While well-intended, such a request would put the responsibility onto to authors to explain how and why they are conforming to or departing from Western academic conventions rather than trusting readers to be open to difference. The former—an explanation of rhetorical and textual choices—follows a model Suresh Canagarajah (2022) enacted that generally respects "the expectation of coherence around a unified thesis," signaling to readers that he is "an insider to academic norms" while, at the same time, including features from his Sri Lankan academic community. His goal with this layered approach was to "subtly recontextualize" the work to achieve a positive uptake by reviewers and editors (2022, p. 116). He advised, however, that this kind of "complex policy work" must involve gradual, small-scale changes (2022, p. 112).

While writers who are enacting translingual, transcultural difference can cue readers, as Canagarajah did, we see two complications around this position: First, it relies on setting the alternative against the dominant, thus reinforcing the dominant, a point Bruce Horner made in a conversation with Theresa Lillis (2015). Second is the assumption that writers who are breaking from academic strictures are conscious of this intention, are exercising their agency, and are also able, as Canagarajah advised, to "rescale" their use of "vernacular and multilingual resources" to fit the publication (2022, p. 124). As many of the scholars we

5 IE peer review form available on request from series editors.

cite here have argued, however, a writer's agency is always limited not only by the publications for which they write but also by the traditions that are valued within their local contexts. Anna Kristina Hultgren and Julia Molinari (2022) noted, while largely agreeing with Canagarajah's concept of "agentic communicative practices," that the question is "the extent to which social actors (here academic writers) are free to make their own communicative choices (agency) and the extent to which those choices are shaped by colonial social structures, be it norms, ideologies, or material resources (structure)" (p. 51). With these complications in mind, we IE editors continue to weigh the positive and negative implications of following Canagarajah's model, among the latter the risk of positioning certain authors as "the other." Taken more broadly, either option—asking for an explanatory statement vs letting the work stand on its own—means that reviewers, editors and publishers will need to adjust their readerly dispositions to be open to texts and writers from outside their own contexts.

COMPLICATING PUBLISHING PROCESSES: THE LARGER CONTEXT

Decolonial scholars acknowledge that we in the Global North cannot undo the past; instead, our responsibility lies in recognizing the damage done by this colonial history and, in response, "bring[ing] to the foreground other epistemologies, other principles of knowledge and understanding" (Mignolo, 2007, p. 543). "Linguistic justice," therefore, requires "an enactment of the politics of difference defined not just in U.S. terms but rather developed across rhetorical traditions and writing cultures," which, Ligia A. Mihut (2020) suggested, requires us to critique monolingualism while also promoting "linguistically-rich practices" (p. 270). To make *meaningful* and *lasting* change in the publication processes for writing studies, we must complicate, and perhaps slow down, our conception of what change looks like, dwelling "in the borders" (Cushman, 2016, p. 235) while we consider how to revise our understandings of linguistic justice for international, transnational publication contexts.

As a first step, it is important to recognize that the term "linguistic justice" can carry different meanings globally, just as English—particularly academic English—carries different stakes for a variety of users worldwide. In other words, scholars in the US cannot assume that there is universal agreement about what "linguistic justice" means, nor can Global North scholars determine what the role of English is or should be worldwide. Organizational statements must be understood within the sociohistorical context from which they have emerged, which includes acknowledging the material, lived experiences of language as pluriversal rather than universal.

We complicate the idea of linguistic social justice by focusing on three key tensions in play in editorial processes:

1. Acknowledging that languages themselves are different, yet making decisions that treat all experiences of language difference as the same;
2. Discussing language as theoretical, without acknowledging its embodied, material dimension; and
3. Making policy statements but not examining whether practices are undermining or aligning with neoliberal multiculturalism.

Importantly, we seek to describe these tensions for two reasons: first, to respond with suggestions about how we can change publication processes in writing studies and second, to begin balancing our field's Anglo-centered and Western foundations.

Tension one is informed by a still-prevalent notion that all experiences of language difference are the same (see also Gilyard's critique, 2016). Joel Heng Hartse & Ryuko Kubota (2014) described their experiences of copyediting and pointed out the limits of various theories of language difference and challenges to English as an academic *lingua franca*, as these theories do not "address what is actually practiced or expected" (p. 79). Similarly, Hultgren & Molinari (2022) pointed to the idealistic conceptions of writerly "agency," maintaining they be problematized within the context of existing structures that, in reality, limit agency-in this case, the influential, powerful publishing institutions centered on and driven by scholars in the Global North (p. 48). Cushman (2016) stated the problem directly: "Emancipatory projects in composition studies [and academic publishing] fall short of their social justice goals because they critique a content or place of practice without revealing and altering their own structuring tenets" (p. 239). This tension is highlighted when, on the one hand, scholars strive to support language differences, but the reality is that gatekeepers such as publishers and the larger academic audience require conformity to seemingly "standard" expectations (Heng Hartse & Kubota, 2014). Editors and reviewers can also get caught up in these tensions, falling prey to a tacit, faulty logic that flattens difference, as Asao B. Inoue (2021) points out, by assuming that achieving a universal communicative style is just how things are. As a result, editors can end up valuing Global North styles with "straightforward" language and methodological approaches, assuming that their standards are universal. They may equate fairness with sameness, editing out a voice that does not conform to recognized Western forms of reason, order and coherence. Because of their positions within a wider system that values "straightforward" styles, editors may face resistance from publishers when they accept alternate styles. On the other hand, they may also be labeled as champions of the status quo when legitimately asking authors

for additional explanation or evidence, because, for example, one's stylistic preference may be conflated with what is actually needed to substantiate a claim.

At the same time, those living and working in Global South contexts often experience greater professional rewards from publishing in English-medium journals in the Global North, considered prestigious because of the dominance of the language and publishing structures. Consequently, local or regional publications can be devalued and bypassed (Ergin & Alkan, 2019). This can lead to a problematic cycle in which even scholars from the Global South prioritize and promote English-language publications and publishers in the Global North (Lillis et al., 2022). Change to existing processes and structures must therefore occur in both publication contexts. However, scholars examining these tensions often conclude that those positioned within Anglophone and colonial traditions of writing and publishing inherently limit the change that can be possible (Lillis et al., 2022).

Canagarajah (2022) was more hopeful, as we noted earlier, arguing that we in writing studies must understand the relationship between structure and agency as a dynamic interplay that allows for multilingual scholars in particular to transform academic publishing. At the same time, the subtle changes he made, he admitted, have depended upon his own stature as a full tenured professor, as well as recent scholarly conversations about "decolonial movements [which] are introducing alternate genres and rhetorics for academic writing" (2022, p. 122). Ultimately, he arrived at a similar conclusion to Heng Hartse and Kubota (2014) and Hultgren and Molinari (2022), maintaining that authors have to adopt strategies that suit their topic, objectives, genre, journal, and discipline, to which we want to add, and to the extent that they are conscious of the sociolinguistic possibilities available to them. There are no generic recipes or rules on textual resistance suitable for scholars universally, Canagarajah said. Both "structure" and "change" are too often presented problematically as a dichotomy (another tension), when in fact both can exist at the same time (Canagarajah, 2022, pp. 124–125).

Here we note that it is also important to raise distinctions among possible definitions of both "alternative" and "linguistic difference," which carry implications for editorial policies around linguistic justice: On the one hand, "linguistic difference" can be identified according to lexicogrammatical, often sentence-level, features of writing (Heng Hartse & Kubota, 2014). On the other hand, "linguistic difference" and "alternative" can be identified as sociolinguistic features of writing informed by a variety of cultural and rhetorical traditions (Canagarajah, 2022). With clearer definitions of what editors, reviewers and publishers mean by these terms, we will all be better able to make editorial recommendations and decisions to support linguistic justice. As well, as Heng

Hartse and Kubota (2014) recommended, copyeditors—which we would expand to editors and reviewers in general-should always ask themselves, "why do I want this change [in the text] to be made?" (p. 81). But, as the IE series editors have found, it is also important that publishers, editorial boards, and series editors continually revisit and clarify their policies and practices around linguistic social justice. This is particularly true when considering the larger cultural and ideological systems within which these groups operate and must negotiate.

Real change only happens when individuals and those involved in the publishing process commit to questioning and revising their worldviews, which also includes translating rather than skipping over citations that provide another perspective, such as "La dictadura del inglés en la ciencia: El 95% de los artículos se publica en esa lengua y solo el 1% en español o portugués" (Hernández Bonilla, 2021). We must also read scholarship outside our usual zones of readership—for example, Natalia Ávila Reyes (2021) in the Latin American section of the IE series, or Kegiso Jacob Sello's (2019) "Multilinguisme et injustice sociale linguistique au Botswana." Such intentional reading practices by publishers, reviewers, and editors would inform a review and revision of extant policy statements on language and publishing from groups working with/in the tensions produced by Anglophone centers while also expanding their cross-cultural and cross-linguistic understanding. Further, we also strongly recommend "Rethinking English as a Lingua Franca: A Position Statement," (Navarro et al., 2022), which in eight languages "challenges assumptions made about the use of English as a lingua franca" and seeks to identify "the impact of such assumptions on trajectories of knowledge production and uptake, and legitimize the use of multiple languages for transnational scholarly exchange" (see also Curry & Lillis, 2017).

One problem, however, in efforts to read "beyond" scholarship written in English is that non-English publications receive fewer citations overall, precisely because they are not read, and thus they may not be easily found in the usual indices consulted in English. However, there are multiple available resources for finding international scholars, including, for example, many of the publications of the International Exchanges and Perspectives series, which include references to scholars outside of the US as well as the Global North context, while the Latin American section of IE features multilingual books and references. Searching sites of large publishers such as Routledge, Multilingual Matters, and joining organizations like the International Society for the Advancement of Writing Research (n.d.), ALES: Latin American Association of Writing Studies in Higher Education and Professional Contexts (n.d.), European Association for the Teaching of Academic Writing (n.d.), and the Middle East-North Africa Writing Centers Alliance (n.d.), as well as associated transnational listservs will take one to scholars, conferences, scholarship and conversations that can help to shift

one's scholarly worldview. Once the scholarship is read, it needs to be included through citation. Our chapter here, directed primarily to a wide Global North audience, has intentionally cited both recognized translingual and decolonial scholars as well as scholarship not as well known outside of the US.

A second tension, which connects to the first, challenges us to discuss language beyond its theoretical dimension alone by acknowledging its embodied, material dimension. Decolonial theory, in fact, encourages us to move away from "graphocentric" to geopolitical orientations toward language that acknowledge the role of the body and material conditions (e.g., Baca, 2009; Canagarajah, 2024). Lisa R. Arnold (2021) furthered this point, arguing that we should conceive of different lived experiences of language more concretely as "weight," a term that, she argued, emphasizes "the value attached" to language as "experienced on the ground by all language users," which "produces material consequences in everyday life" (p. 190). To account for this understanding in terms of publishing, we suggest that editors and reviewers adopt a collaborative orientation, in which the body and biography of authors are invited into the editorial process. For example, we see value in Canagarajah's (2024) suggestion—made in the context of writing pedagogy but just as applicable in the publishing context—that textual norms and standards should be developed collaboratively. Authors can be encouraged to "draw from their own values and resources" (p. 300) and propose adaptations to editorial norms or policies that will more effectively contextualize their submissions and more fully represent their lived experiences of language. At the same time, as mentioned earlier, authors should not bear the whole burden of explaining their own positionality as in relation to Western dominant practices. In addition, publishers, editors, and reviewers must work to adjust their orientations as readers to contexts outside the Global North and invite voices and perspectives that may be unfamiliar or challenging.

Along these lines, the IE editors have been discussing how editors of multilingual volumes might want the option to identify the editorial choices that construct the collection. Editors of two recent edited collections (Corcoran et al., 2026; Donahue et al, 2025), for example, are including statements about how choosing the languages for different chapters in their collections not only involves a sociolinguistic right for authors but also is an editorial obligation for linguistic social justice in global knowledge exchanges. Such statements or intertextual acknowledgements further make visible our constructed assumptions about language, location, and the "weight" of an individual's relationship, or attachment, to certain language(s) and linguistic forms, all of which influence our uptake and knowledge building as readers and writers. The IE series has also instituted an advisory board comprising scholars from different countries, languages, and rhetorical traditions. With their collaboration, the editorial

group seeks to adapt editorial policies and reviewing practices so that these may more effectively describe submission expectations that fully recognize and invite diverse lived experiences of language.

A third tension underlying editorial processes in writing studies, and which connects to the previous two, centers on the risk of uncritically supporting diversity, hybridity, multiculturalism, and multilingualism. Kubota (2016) referred to this uncritical multi/plural turn as a form of "neoliberal multiculturalism" that "assumes color-blindness and support [for] diversity-but only the kind of diversity that privileges the multicultural, hybrid, cosmopolitan (rising) middle class over the monocultural, non-hybrid, parochial working class" (p. 488). In other words, as editors and reviewers we should be careful that our openness to linguistic diversity and language difference does not privilege certain forms of difference while neglecting others. We also need to take care not to assume that our approach to social justice is always "emancipatory" or that it is emancipatory for all. Further, we should acknowledge that our liberatory efforts, while well-intentioned, can sometimes reinforce a power differential of the West trying to liberate "the rest."

Those of us who are situated in the Global North and committed to linguistic social justice and anti-racist or decolonial efforts in our editorial work can unwittingly reinforce power differentials when we expect authors (from both the Global South and the Global North) to subscribe to these same ideological stances. Accounting for linguistic diversity and assuming a translingual orientation as readers, editors, and reviewers are undeniably important moves, but authors may actively choose to conform to *lingua franca* standards for reasons that are essential to their careers, livelihoods, reputations (and, sometimes even their own decolonial or anti-colonial efforts). As Nancy Henaku (2023) explained in a podcast:

> a lot of the time we think that decolonization is this one thing, but decolonization could be different things for different groups based on their own historical relationships with the colonial project. But also, people think if we "do" decolonial work, then [the injustices will] all end. You have to constantly do [the work] because power keeps morphing in different ways in response to new developments. Currently neoliberalism is complicating the ways in which we analyze and experience power in everyday life.

In this regard, doing the work of linguistic equity in publishing (and in other spaces) requires reflexivity, recursivity, and criticality, and the recognition that policy statements are only one part of a much longer project that involves the complex and complicated work of putting statements into practice.

Ultimately, Western traditions are not primary to but are *part of* the international. Writing studies as conceived in the US does not exist in the same way outside of it, and conceptions of what "writing" or "writing pedagogy" means may differ considerably across contexts. Many in our bibliography have compared different writing approaches used by scholars from the Global South to those from the Global North, highlighting the "way the burdens of writing, relevance, and theory production are distributed along patterns of global inequality" (Ergin & Alkan, 2019, p. 259). Editorial work in and outside of the Global North must recognize the limitations of our approaches and definitions and seek out complexifications across borders.

CHANGE IS COMPLICATED AND SLOW: STEPS WE CAN TAKE

Scholars from the Global North do not often feel compelled to offer rich descriptions of our local contexts or to qualify the value of our claims—unless asked. Those deeply enculturated in Western rhetorical and structural conventions tend to assume that readers are positioned similarly, are (or will become) familiar with the dominant standards and will understand these as privileged and universal, not tied to geography or national origin. To change these assumptions, we editors and reviewers must first reflect on our own participation in maintaining the power of global academic hierarchies which are perpetuated throughout the publication process. And, as we have argued here, we must work within our own spheres of influence to counter these systemic hierarchies by continually making them visible (see Ergin & Alkan, 2019).

Editors and reviewers can do this by:

- seeking out, prioritizing, and learning from North-South and South-South collaborations;
- pushing publishers, and reviewers and readers, to be open to scholarship from the Global South and, further, not to question why authors are citing this scholarship (as Global South and non-Anglo authors widely report);
- reading and citing non-English articles in Global North publications to encourage multiple views and inclusion in citation indexes;
- working with translations both to and from dominant languages to explore the situatedness of research traditions, methods, questions, articulations;
- attending conferences outside of our comfort zones and taking time to listen and engage in conversations outside of sessions (i.e., don't dominate); and

- hosting webinars that address the value of plurilingual publications and research; that explore an issue from international perspectives; that take up terms and unpack them from a dialogic transnational perspective, the term "linguistic social justice," for example.

As Federico Navarro explicitly stated (Lillis, et.al. 2022), changing academic publishing practices "is a political call for social justice in global research … " not an erasure of any voice, but a rich "cross-fertilization between nations, languages and identities" (47-47.16). That cross-fertilization, that kind of rich exchange, requires decentering Global North perspectives and policies, reorienting Western readerly dispositions and habituated publishing practices, dwelling *in* the borders while reading *across* borders and languages, reflexive practice and collaborative action. Realizing linguistic social justice means acknowledging the tensions and complexities around the idea itself and then moving forward, incrementally and mindfully, towards change.

REFERENCES

ALES: Latin American Association of Writing Studies in Higher Education and Professional Contexts. (n.d.). *Home page*. Retrieved March 18, 2026, from https://www.estudiosdelaescritura.org/home-english.html.

Arnold, L. R. (2021). Weighing English: Accounting for power in translingual writing. In T. Silva & Z. Wang (Eds.), *Reconciling translingualism and second language writing* (pp. 190–198). Routledge.

Asociación de Lingüística y Filología de América Latina. (2017). Por una ciencia y educación superior pública, gratuita, crítica, humanista e intercultural, basada en modelos plurilingües de investigación y docencia. Retrieved September 22, 2025, from http://www.mundoalfal.org/sites/default/files/proyectos/ConvP8.pdf

Association for Writing Across the Curriculum. (n.d.). *AWAC executive committee statement on antiracism and social justice.* Retrieved March 18, 2026, from https://tinyurl.com/54yex6fu/

Association for Writing Across the Curriculum. (n.d.). *International collaboration committee*. Retrieved March 18, 2026, from https://wacassociation.org/committee/international-collaborations-committee/

Ávila Reyes, N. (Ed.). (2021). *Multilingual contributions to writing research: Toward an equal academic exchange*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2021.1404

Baca, D. (2009). Rethinking composition, five hundred years later. *Journal of Advanced Composition, 29*, 229–242.

Bazerman, C. (2014). Sisters and brothers of the struggle: Teachers of writing in their worlds. *College Composition and Communication, 65*(4), 646–654.

Cagle, L. E., Eble, M. F., Gonzales, L., Johnson, M. A., Johnson, N. R., Jones, N. N., Lane, L., Mckoy, T., Moore, K. R., Reynoso, R., Rose, E. J., Patterson, G.,

Sánchez, F., Shivers-McNair, A., Simmons, M., Stone, E. M., Tham, J., Walton, R., & Williams, M. F. (n.d.). *Anti-racist scholarly reviewing practices: A heuristic for editors, reviewers, and authors.* Retrieved March 18, 2026, from https://docs.google.com/document/d/1lZmZqeNNnYfYgmTKSbL2ijYbR4OMovv6A-bDwJRnwx8/edit?tab=t.0#heading=h.x3763zo5d2qe

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2022). Language diversity in academic writing: Toward decolonizing scholarly publishing. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *17*(2), 107–128.

Canagarajah, S. (2024). Decolonizing academic writing pedagogies for multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly, 58*(1), 280–306.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2017, November). *CCCC statement on globalization in writing studies pedagogy and research*. Retrieved March 18, 2026, from https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/globalization

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2023, April). *Statement on editorial ethics.* https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/editorial-ethics

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2025). *CCCC position statements*. Retrieved March 18, 2026, from https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions

Corcoran, J., Englander, K., & Muresan, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Pedagogies for publishing research in English: Local initiatives supporting international scholars*. Routledge.

Corcoran, J. N., Payant, C., Sarmento, S., Colombo, L., López-Gopar, M., Córdova Hernández, L., & Patterson, F. (2026). *Plurilingual Perspectives on Scholarly Writing for Publication: Within, através y au-delà des frontières nas "Américas."* The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2026.2821

Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2020, July 17). *WPA-GO statement on anti-racist assessment*. https://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sd/news_article/313021/_PARENT/layout_details/false

Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2023). *Council of writing program administrators summer conference 2023: Social justice WPAing: Talking the talk AND walking the walk.* https://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sp/conference_program

Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2023). *Cultural assessment report*. https://associationdatabase.com/aws/CWPA/asset_manager/get_file/902726?ver=1

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2017). Problematizing English as the privileged language of global academic publishing: Policies, perspectives and pedagogies. In M. J. Curry & T. Lillis (Eds.), *Global academic publishing. Policies, perspectives and pedagogies* (pp. 1–20). Multilingual Matters.

Cushman, E. (2016). Translingual and decolonial approaches to meaning making. *College English*, *78*(3), 234–242.

Donahue, Tiane, & Gannett, Cinthia (Eds.). (2025). *Supporting international writing studies research: Cultivating capacity through international exchanges*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2025.2470

Ergin, M., & Alkan, A. (2019). Academic neo-colonialism in writing practices: Geographic markers in three journals from Japan, Turkey and the US. *Geoforum, 104*, 259–266.

European Association for the Teaching of Academic Writing. (n.d.). *Home page.* Retrieved March 18, 2026, from https://www.eataw.eu/

Gilyard, K. (2016). The rhetoric of translingualism. *College English, 78*(3), 284–289.

Hamel, R. E. (2013). El campo de las ciencias y la educación superior entre el monopolio del inglés y el plurilingüismo: Elementos para una política del lenguaje en América Latina. *Trabalhos em Linguística Aplicada, 52*(2), 321–384.

Henaku, N. (Guest). (2023, April 14). Decolonization and the writing center (no. 26). Audio podcast episode. In W. Li, E.Namubiru, A. Habib (Hosts), *Slow Agency*. *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship*. https://wlnconnect.org/2023/04/14/e26-henaku/

Heng Hartse, J., & Kubota, R. (2014). Pluralizing English? Variation in high-stakes academic texts and challenges of copyediting. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 24*, 71–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.04.001

Hernández Bonilla, J. M. (2021, July 26). La dictadura del inglés en la ciencia: El 95% de los artículos se publica en esa lengua y solo el 1% en español o portugués. *El Pais*. https://tinyurl.com/bddum54s

Horner, B., & Lillis, T. (2015). Looking at academic literacies from a composition frame: From spatial to spatio-temporal framing of difference. In T. Lillis, M. Harrington, & S. Mitchell (Eds.), *Working with academic literacies: Case studies towards transformative practice* (pp. 327–337). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2015.0674

Horner, B., NeCamp, S., & Donahue, C. (2009). Toward a multilingual composition scholarship: From English only to a translingual norm. *College Composition and Communication*, *63*(3), 269–300.

Hultgren, A. K., & Molinari, J. (2022). The limits of translingualism: In search of complementary forms of resistance. *Apples-Journal of Applied Language Studies 16*(3), 48–68. https://doi.org/10.47862/apples.114738

Inoue, A. B. (2021, July 03). The habits of white language (HOWL). *Asao B. Inoue's Infrequent Words.* Retrieved March 18, 2026, from http://asaobinoue.blogspot.com/2021/07/blogbook-habits-of-white-language-howl.html

International Society for the Advancement of Writing Research. (n.d.). Home page. https://www.isawr.org/

International Writing Center Association. (2010, November 09). *Position statement on racism, anti-immigration, and linguistic intolerance.* Retrieved March 18, 2026, from https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LKn9SWIBCWbHTHngU8G-CFx1IrRYBF_wOxOdkNYRRSU/edit?tab=t.0

Kubota, R. (2016). The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory, and neoliberal multiculturalism: Complicities and implications for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics, 37*(4), 474–494.

Kuteeva, M., & Saarinen, T. (2022). Translingual and translocal perspectives on writing: An introduction. *Apples-Journal of Applied Language Studies, 16*(3), 1–8.

Lillis, T., Curry, M. J., Nygaard, L., Feng, H., Mfengu, A. Navarro, F., Cárdenas, M. L., Gentil, G. (2022, August 7). *Writing for publication globally: Evaluation regimes, knowledges, digital practices* [Video]. American Association of Applied Linguistics

invited colloquium, Language Learning Roundtable. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KGgLsQFVhNI

Middle East-North Africa Writing Centers Alliance. (n.d.). *Home page*. Retrieved March 18, 2026, from https://menawca.com/

Mignolo, W. D. (2007). Delinking: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. *Cultural Studies, 21*(2–3), 449–514.

Mihut, L. A. (2020). Enacting linguistic justice: Transnational scholars as advocates for pedagogical change. In A. Frost, J. Kiernan, & S. Blum Malley (Eds.), *Translingual dispositions: Globalized approaches to the teaching of writing* (pp. 269–294). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2020.0438.2.12

Milu, E. (2021). Diversity of raciolinguistic experiences in the writing classroom: An argument for a transnational Black language pedagogy. *College English, 83*(6), 415–441. https://doi.org/10.58680/ce202131357

National Council of Teachers of English. (2025). *Resources: Position statements*. Retrieved March 18, 2026, from https://ncte.org/resources/position-statements/

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, June). 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; https://www.escriturayaprendizaje.cl/elf/

Poe, M., Inoue, A. B., & Elliot, N. (Eds.). (2018). *Writing assessment, social justice, and the advancement of opportunity*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2018.0155

Sello, K. J. (2019). Multilinguisme et injustice sociale linguistique au Botswana. *Multilinguales, 11*. https://doi.org/10.4000/multilinguales.4012