

INTRODUCTION.

ON THE EDITORIAL CHALLENGES IN WRITING WORLDVIEWS

Christopher Basgier

Auburn University

Terry Myers Zawacki

George Mason University

Magnus Gustafsson

Chalmers University of Technology

Sue Hum

University of Texas San Antonio

Maureen Mathison

University of Utah

In their 2023 International Writing Across the Curriculum (IWAC) conference session, “Considerations of Equity and Inclusion in Academic Publishing,” panelists Joan Mullin, Aimee Taylor, David Blakesley, and Heather Falconer posed a pair of questions central to the future of academic publishing: how can editors remain attuned to emerging trends while staying open to outliers? and how they might avoid replicating entrenched ideas, people, and processes? These questions have been especially pertinent for us as editors of scholarship that emerged from that conference, hosted by Clemson University, as have the panelists’ recommendation that the field look more closely at who is chosen to edit our books and journals, who selects and shapes review boards, and how reviewers are guided in evaluating submissions. Building on their call and extending a tradition of narrative histories in writing across the curriculum (WAC) (e.g., McLeod & Soven, 2006; Palmquist et al., 2020), we aim in this introduction to narrate some of these factors so that readers can understand how this collection came to be in its current form, and to leave breadcrumbs for future editors to follow—or avoid—as they undertake the effort of shaping collections that engage and extend our field’s scholarly focus.

We begin our narrative in the months before IWAC 2023, when our editorial team began to take shape through a combination of open calls, shoulder taps, and proactive requests. After the conference organizers released a call for editors, three volunteers—Chris Basgier, Terry Myers Zawacki, and Justin Nicholes—stepped forward, and, as a trio, brought complementary WAC expertise: international WAC research and L2 writing (Zawacki), WAC administration and teaching with technology (Basgier), and disciplinary belonging and creative writing across the curriculum (Nicholes, who contributed in the early stages before stepping away). In an email exchange, Terry noted the explicit conference focus on social and linguistic justice (e.g., “The role of WAC in addressing social justice/social justice literacy;” “WAC scholars as agents of change”) and, implicitly, on WAC globally (e.g., “WAC as a transnational movement”). She suggested we invite a scholar with expertise in both areas, so we turned to Sue Hum, a member of the WAC Clearinghouse editorial board with experience writing about race in visual rhetoric, Asian-American rhetorics, and quantitative literacy; Sue happily accepted.

At the same time, Magnus Gustafsson and Maureen Mathison—both with substantial transnational work and a commitment to ongoing dialogue between global and domestic WAC scholars—proposed to Mike Palmquist an IWAC volume devoted to work presented by international participants, to appear in the International Exchanges on Writing (IE) series. Given the IE series’ mission, Magnus and Maureen saw an opportunity to showcase WAC’s wide reach and highlight how international adaptations could inform and strengthen US-based initiatives. However, all of us were concerned that pursuing separate CFPs and volumes would fragment rather than integrate the diverse global perspectives emerging from the conference. The question of how to best represent the latter was not merely logistical. It grew from IWAC’s own history: the conference adopted the term “International” in 2006, a moment when major US-based organizations in rhetoric and writing studies were seeking to globalize their reach and foster transnational exchange (See Arnold et al., this volume, for details on these organizational efforts). In the nearly twenty years since, WAC has seen a slow but persistent growth in scholarly exchanges across borders. In a subsequent meeting, the six of us agreed to issue a single, inclusive CFP, one that would cultivate international representation while advancing linguistic and social justice as shared aims of WAC worldwide.

Given this history, it probably will not surprise readers that we were drawn to a specific term in the 2023 IWAC conference CFP as we considered the focus of this volume: *worldviews*. That CFP began by reminding the WAC community of this “crucial moment” and “the role we play in using the power of language to affect *worldviews*” (emphasis ours). Through many conversations about this

collection (and our own CFP), we kept returning to that term, eventually shaping our title, *Writing Worldviews*.

While this title echoes the aspirational “international” in the IWAC conference name, it also gestures to the multiplicity of views—a world of views—represented in the scholarship gathered here. During and after the conference, we sought to honor that multiplicity by engaging with as many panels and recorded talks as possible, listening for the diverse contexts and commitments that shape WAC research worldwide. At the same time, we knew we wanted to include perennial WAC concerns, such as building, sustaining, and assessing WAC programs. Like Kenneth Burke’s terministic screen, each chapter—and the collection as a whole—offers both a way of seeing and a way of not seeing (as Yancey notes in a different context in her chapter in this volume).

Indeed, we also understood that our work as editors was not neutral. In shaping this collection, we were also *shaping* which worldviews would be heard, and which remain outside its frame. For example, our CFP specifically asked for “empirically driven theoretical work” and “theoretically informed reflective teaching narratives.” While we sought to be inclusive, this phrasing signaled our intention to foreground scholarly approaches rather than more personal stories. In this way, then, our CFP also illustrates how our title, *Writing Worldviews*, can be read as both description and action: as editors, we quite literally “write” which worldviews become legible. We enact this shaping collectively—speaking here in one editorial voice—and individually, through our own positionalities, interests, and commitments.

As writing studies scholars working within a cross-disciplinary field, we recognize that collaboration continually activates and tests disciplinary distinctions. We must be deliberate in recognizing the affordances of different disciplinary worldviews, examining how epistemological differences shape what constitutes evidence, how reductionist and systemic impulses coexist in our scholarly work, and how every argument is situated within a social context (see Eigenbrode et al., 2007). We remained mindful of these distinctions in our reading of and responses to chapter proposals and our subsequent revision suggestions. Some—the linguistic and the conceptual, for example—were easier to identify; others were more difficult to negotiate as we moved across a spectrum of worldviews, especially regarding authors’ use of evidence, or their balance of analysis with synthesis. Developing functional and meaningful criteria that honor these complexities is demanding work, one that editors and readers share. While editors carry responsibility for this task, readers also share in it: they must recognize their own positionality—their worldviews—and the explicit or implicit criteria they bring to the act of reading. In this generative process, texts *and* worldviews are co-constructed—tested, affirmed, or revised—through the reciprocal acts of editing and reading.

This negotiated co-construction is inseparable from our own positionalities as editors and readers. As predominantly White scholars situated within Western academic traditions, we were mindful that our interpretive habits would shape how we read and responded to contributions. We asked how we might read beyond our own assumptions—to recognize work grounded in different epistemologies, rhetorical practices, and cultural logics—without reinscribing the very hierarchies we hoped to unsettle. At the same time, we recognized that the shared disciplinary commitments of the IWAC community often produced a certain coherence: contributors responded to the CFP with rigor and imagination, drawing on frameworks that, while diverse, largely aligned around WAC’s familiar research and programmatic concerns. In this sense, the process of editing became another instance of *writing worldviews*, a reciprocal act of reading, interpreting, and reshaping the field’s horizons. Through these exchanges, contributors, editors, and future readers participate together in redefining what counts as knowledge, whose voices are amplified, and how WAC imagines its global reach.

And lastly, on this point, we want to emphasize that the individual chapters presented here are also writing and rewriting existing worldviews via the methods and theories the authors apply to languages, identities, nations, research, rhetorical practices, pedagogies, and program building. Indeed, we are heartened by the strong attention to social and linguistic justice in chapters across domestic (US) and international contexts, evidence of an emerging disciplinary worldview on these concerns.

CHAPTER ORGANIZATION

We turn now to our process of developing sections and chapter sequences for *Writing Worldviews*, an action that also speaks to the role of editors in shaping the material context in which authors’ worldviews are presented, read, and received. In shaping the volume, we editors spent considerable time weighing different visions for naming the sections and the number of sections to include, a discussion that involved making nuanced distinctions among chapters that largely overlapped in their attention to themes of social and linguistic justice, whether as a central focus or related to program building and sustainability. Our conversations, on Zoom and email, about section names and how to classify chapters reminded Terry of Jorge Luis Borges’ description of a fictional taxonomy in a likely apocryphal ancient Chinese encyclopedia:

On those remote pages it is written that animals are divided into (a) those that belong to the Emperor, (b) embalmed ones,

(c) those that are trained, (d) suckling pigs, (e) mermaids, (f) fabulous ones, (g) stray dogs, (h) those that are included in this classification, (i) those that tremble as if they were mad, (j) innumerable ones, (k) those that are drawn with a camel's hair brush, (l) others, (m) those that have just broken a vase, (n) those that resemble flies from a distance. (1964, p. 108)

After much deliberation, we agreed to organize chapters into three broad sections, which, despite inevitable overlaps among mermaids, suckling pigs, and stray dogs, would most nearly represent the prevailing concerns of each chapter: Histories and Futures; Equity, Access, and Social Change; and Programmatic Perspectives.

HISTORIES AND FUTURES

The first section—Histories and Futures—includes chapters that recount moments of growth and change in the field and consider possible futures in the context of larger social, political, technological, and scholarly influences on our programs and practices. We lead with the chapter “What Do the Next 50 Years Hold for WAC/WID Research? A U.S. Perspective” by David Russell, a noted WAC historian. Russell describes promising directions for US-based WAC and writing in the disciplines (WID) research, given what has already been accomplished through collaborative work across the related fields of writing studies, linguistics, discipline-based educational studies, and other fields that study writing as a human activity. Three trends, he predicts, will affect all of these research traditions—social justice, multimodality, and artificial intelligence—in the next fifty years of WAC.

Adopting an even wider lens for considering potential directions for WAC, Caitlin Martin, Mandy Olejnik, Elizabeth Wardle, and Angela Glotfelter draw our attention to impending—and troubling—threats to higher education in general in a post-democratic policy regime. In “Boundary-Crossing During Challenging Political Times: An Exhortation and Heuristic for WAC as Site of Deep Change,” they suggest that the current U.S. climate calls for WAC leaders to extend our expertise beyond our programs and institutions, applying a WAC “ethos,” bolstered by changemaking strategies to ensure that efforts towards reducing disparities and inculcating social justice will continue in higher education and beyond.

The two chapters that follow, by Ligia Mihut and Kathleen Blake Yancey, both honored as IWAC plenary speakers, offer histories of and reflections on similarly pressing WAC concerns: linguistic justice and the effects of artificial intelligence (AI) on teaching with writing and “writing itself.” Mihut’s wide-ranging chapter,

“Linguistic Justice: Rights, Policies, and Practices from a Transnational Perspective,” argues that WAC scholars are uniquely positioned to address inequities in teaching, writing, and research practices. As evidence, she gives a historical account of the drafting, implementation, and critiques of the landmark 1974 resolution “Students’ Right to Their Own Language” (SRTOL). She suggests that SRTOL, for all of its limitations, is a model for ground-up approaches to change.

Yancey’s “unconventional” chapter, “Historicizing WAC: Change in the Context of Continuity,” is also concerned with change over time, in the field and in our practices. While new technologies have changed, for better or worse, the ways in which we teach writing, the challenges presented by generative AI, she suggests, are very different in kind and degree from other challenges to the field that have been taken up in its scholarship. Yet, she proposes, rather than seeing AI as a unique challenge, we might think of our response to it as one of the many “braided strands of activity” that comprise the field, a field characterized by continuity rather than by bounded stages of development.

In the last chapter in this section, “Creative Nonfiction Across the Curriculum?” Doug Hesse turns our attention from scholarly production to the value of writing creative nonfiction in courses across the curriculum (CNAC). He connects creative nonfiction to expressive writing with its conceptual roots in WAC, and he points to the current absence of expressivism in the WAC scholarship as a pedagogical loss. The benefits of CNAC for students, he argues, are many, including learning to make connections across knowledge domains. He offers suggestions for a range of CNAC assignments suitable for both composition and cross-curricular faculty.

EQUITY, ACCESS, AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Following the wider perspectives offered above, the chapters in the second section—Equity, Access, and Social Change—feature theoretical and qualitative inquiries into pluralistic and socially just WAC work. While the worldviews of chapters in the first section are positioned principally in U.S. higher education, Joseph Franklin’s chapter, “Baking in the Disposition: The WAC World through Transnational Lenses,” offers a transnational worldview that calls into question the uniqueness, and thus the value, of nationally defined models of WAC (and higher education). He reviews recent scholarship challenging the meanings of key terms—multilingual, translingual, international, global, transnational—being used in the work on social and linguistic justice. These terms, he explains, are often linguistically static and bounded by place. He proposes the term “ideological disposition” to better reflect the “transing,” or “boundary-unsettling,” work WAC leaders can do.

Of course, such “transing” is easier said than done. In their chapter “Toward a Dialogic Transnational Exchange in Writing Studies Editorial Work,” Lisa Arnold, Anna Habib, Joan Mullin, and Terry Myers Zawacki demonstrate the difficulties in establishing and maintaining publishing policies on language difference in an international context, where differing language ideologies circulate and intersect with the material realities of North American academic publishing. They name three key tensions in these policies: treating experiences with language as the same, failing to consider material dimensions of language, and not examining whether recommended practices align with or work against goals that writers may have.

Returning to a U.S. pedagogical context while still focused on tensions around language difference, Jessa Wood and Shawna Shapiro’s chapter, “Beyond the Binary: Using Critical Language Awareness to Navigate Conventions for Antiracist WAC,” speaks to a persistent desire among WAC professionals for practical pedagogical strategies that can promote social justice. Drawing from interviews with WAC practitioners, they describe the tension surrounding instruction on disciplinary writing conventions as either assimilationist or empowering, and they argue for resituating the debate within the context of critical language awareness (CLA). CLA, they argue, can allow WAC professionals to promote student agency, render disciplinary discourses accessible, generate space for students to bring their own assets to their writing, and foster advocacy for historically marginalized languages in institutional policy.

In her chapter, “Connecting Racial and Linguistic In/justice in Writing Across the Curriculum: Toward a Raciolinguistic Approach,” Keli Tucker extends this conversation by introducing raciolinguistics to WAC. Raciolinguistics attends to the interrelationships between linguistic discrimination and racism, which she illustrates at work in various writing pedagogies. In response to the ongoing existence of linguistic racism across the curriculum, Tucker urges WAC to recognize the limitations of existing pedagogies and work toward justice by advocating for linguistic diversity and an asset-based mindset in writing classrooms across disciplines.

Shifting the focus from classroom pedagogy to institutional policy, Analeigh E. Horton, Aimee C. Mapes, and Emily Jo Schwaller, in their chapter, “Strategic Interventions and Compromises in Institutional Assessment: Changing the Story of Student Writing at a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI),” provide an anti-racist account of three institutions as they collaborated with their state board of education to revise assessment for the written communication requirement to include linguistic social justice. Through a rich recounting, the authors tell a tale of negotiation and action, as they leveraged their knowledge of assessment to “move the needle” to enact change.

In between the levels of state language policy and classroom pedagogy, other factors can act as barriers to access or facilitate the success of marginalized students, a point Thomas Polk makes with his model of holistic access, derived from qualitative case studies of two students' experiences with undergraduate research. In "Holistic Access," Polk suggests that gaining access requires minoritized students to call upon a range of competencies that extend well beyond the intellectual, including developing a network of cultural, social, and human resources and aligning that network with the knowledges privileged by the institution, the program offering research opportunities, and the program gatekeepers.

PROGRAMMATIC PERSPECTIVES

Our final section again begins with a wide view on programmatic development and sustainability before turning to chapters focused on local circumstances and practices. In "WAC Visibility: Rhetorical Strategies for Establishing and Maintaining Programmatic Awareness and Engagement," Christopher Basgier explores specific rhetorical strategies informing WAC program visibility-making. Although WAC scholars point to the need to make our programs visible to a range of institutional audiences, there remains little research that examines in detail the rhetorical thinking underlying the strategies faculty and administrators use to achieve visibility. To fill that gap, Basgier describes survey results and interview findings from his research with WAC program leaders at a range of institutions that show they are aware of the multiple audiences for their websites, newsletters, social media, and annual reports and that they strive to cultivate a consistent and flexible program ethos and recognizable brand.

Where Basgier highlights strategies for cultivating program visibility, Lacey Wootton, in "Deep Accountability: Motivating Obligations in Disciplinary Writing Instruction," reminds us that even the most well-designed programs must be sensitive to local institutional and rhetorical circumstances, which include and exceed the officially sanctioned structures of WAC or related initiatives. Wootton's chapter draws on her institutional ethnography to reveal how WAC faculty's intrinsic motivations exceed the boundaries of institutional accountability. WAC instructors, she finds, consider a constellation of influences—colleagues' engagement, disciplinary values, and students' learning needs—that reframe writing-intensive teaching as an ethical and communal practice rather than a bureaucratic one.

In "WAC: The Research University's *Mezzaterra*," Cameron Bushnell, Clemson's host of the 2023 IWAC conference, is also interested in the motives faculty and department heads have for engaging in, or resisting, WAC initiatives. Recalling the lessons she learned from Art Young, her mentor at Clemson and foundational

WAC scholar, she suggests that establishing a “middle ground,” or “*mezzaterra*,” is a necessity if one is to be an effective WAC leader. There’s an art (Art) to creating collaborative spaces—cultural hubs—that can overcome the territoriality that disciplinary faculty often exhibit when new programs or initiatives are introduced. Following her description of how Art modeled *mezzaterra*, she turns to a threat to WAC sustainability from Clemson’s current research focus and the three cross-curricular initiatives she’s undertaken to counter that threat.

Over any program’s lifespan, its reach and influence tend to ebb and flow, as Kimberly Harrison, Ming Fang, and Christine Martorano describe in their chapter, “Realizing the Potential of WAC Micro-credentials: Driving Program Growth on New Paths,” which outlines their response to funding cuts and waning faculty participation. With the COVID-19 pandemic acting as a jump start to new initiatives, such as aligning with online teaching hubs, the authors highlight ways to cultivate an equitable writing culture at their Hispanic-serving institution by partnering with the Office of Micro-Credentials to offer both faculty- and student-facing WAC micro-credentials. In addition to the WAC course they designed for faculty, the authors describe the WAC micro-credential they developed for students, a unit embedded in select disciplinary courses and designed by faculty who’ve gone through the microcredentials mini-course.

Heidi Nobles, T. Kenny Fountain, and Ashley Hurst detail another kind of strategic partnership in “Partnering, Scaffolding, and Adapting: Lessons Learned from a Multi-Year Project to Embed WAC across a BSN Curriculum.” They describe the practicalities of developing, implementing, and assessing a WAC model that draws on existing course materials, focuses on transfer across the nursing curriculum, and encourages evidenced-based pedagogical practices. Although rooted in a nursing program, the authors provide a portable model of a WAC partnership that can be adapted to other contexts.

Of course, the portability of such programmatic initiatives is not always smooth, particularly when WAC is exported to contexts outside of the US, as our next two chapters illustrate. In “WAC Emergence in English as a Foreign Language Contexts: A Tale of Two Japanese Universities,” Alex Way asks how WAC operates in English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) universities in Japan. As an answer, he compares two such programs to demonstrate both the promise and the challenge of implementing English for academic purposes (EAP) to internationalize the curricula, an effort met with varying degrees of success. He shows that, while EMI might be idealized in international contexts, it is not fully realized at the local level, where institutional considerations must be taken into account.

Likewise, Radhika Jaidev details the obstacles to establishing and growing a Centre for Professional Communication at the Singapore Institute of Technology. In “Connecting the Dots from Academic Literacies to Professional

Communication Competence,” Jaidev presents efforts to help students learn about the similarities and differences between academic and professional literacies to prepare them for the workforce after graduation. In the process, she also illustrates the challenges that can arise when such institution-wide efforts necessitate fundamental curricular changes, including faculty resistance, accurate knowledge about existing literacy instruction across the curriculum, and the time needed to create and deliver professional development.

Illustrating a successful WAC adaptation to the provision of discipline-based English writing and language instruction, Jose Lai, Alan Ho, Olive Cheung, Amy Dai, Ella Leung, Carmen Li, and Steven Yeung, in their “Critical Reflection on a Three-Pronged Approach to Second Language Enhancement: Formal Core Language Curriculum, Non-Formal English Across the Curriculum Movement, and Student-Centered Peer Tutoring Scheme,” recount a dynamic approach to implementing English across the curriculum, a cross-institutional initiative in Hong Kong. Their approach, the authors explain, was motivated by increasing student diversity at their bilingual institution and the lack of informed literacy instruction prior to students enrolling in disciplinary programs. The three-pronged approach they describe includes required discipline-focused courses offered by the English language teaching unit; a community of practice model that involves faculty and helps them to integrate both writing and language instruction in their courses; and a peer tutoring program developed along the lines of those in the US.

Returning to the US, we close this section with another successful model of WAC programmatic transfer, a chapter by Alex Arreguin and Stacy Wilcox, who describe partnering with Miami University to adapt a sensemaking model of WAC to the context of a multi-institutional community college system in Arizona. Their chapter, “Crafting a Rhetorical Odyssey: Pioneering a Writing Across the Curriculum Program at a Community College,” moves us to a wider WAC context—the community college—that too often goes unnoticed in the WAC literature. Recognizing this omission, the authors describe a four-part heuristic—allying, navigating, framing, and brokering—for operationalizing WAC at the two-year college. The rhetorical work involved in these activities, they argue, offers a productive framework for anyone interested in building and sustaining a WAC program at open-access institutions.

Appropriately, their chapter brings us back to the themes of equity, access, and social and linguistic justice that resonate throughout the chapters in this volume. We hope readers will benefit from learning about new directions of thought on these themes, as well as other established and developing worldviews, presented by all of our authors. Indeed, we believe *Writing Worldviews* offers a promising picture of the ways in which we can meet future challenges

and the opportunities these afford as WAC, with its place-based adaptations, continues to become an increasingly globalized movement. At the same time, this collection underscores that editing is itself a political act—one that determines which voices are amplified and how our field imagines its future—so we offer it not only as a collection of chapters that transform the initial conference presentations into fully developed research and theoretical contributions but also as an invitation to future editors and writers to take up that work with vision, courage, and justice.

REFERENCES

- Borges, J. L. (1964). *Other inquisitions, 1937–1952* (R. L. C. Simms, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
- Eigenbrode, S. D., O'Rourke, M., Wulfhorst, J. D., Althoff, D. M., Goldberg, C. S., Merrill, K., Morse, W., Nielsen-Pincus, M., Stephens, J., Winowiecki, L., & Bosque-Pérez, N. A. (2007). Employing philosophical dialogue in collaborative science. *BioScience*, *57*(1), 55–64. <https://doi.org/10.1641/B570109>
- McLeod, S. H., & Soven, M. I. (Eds.). (2006). *Composing a community: A history of writing across the curriculum*. Parlor Press.
- Palmquist, M., Childers, P., Maimon, E. P., Mullin, J. A., Rice, R., Russell, A., & Russell, D. R. (2020). Fifty years of WAC: Where have we been? Where are we going? *Across the Disciplines*, *17*(3/4), 5–45. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2020.17.3.01>