

**BEHIND THE CURTAIN OF  
SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING**

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

# BEHIND THE CURTAIN OF SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING

*Editors in Writing Studies*

EDITED BY  
GREG GIBERSON  
MEGAN SCHOEN  
CHRISTIAN WEISSER

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
*Logan*

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

© 2022 by University Press of Colorado

Published by Utah State University Press  
An imprint of University Press of Colorado  
245 Century Circle, Suite 202  
Louisville, Colorado 80027

All rights reserved  
Manufactured in the United States of America.



The University Press of Colorado is a proud member of  
the Association of University Presses.

The University Press of Colorado is a cooperative publishing enterprise supported, in part, by Adams State University, Colorado State University, Fort Lewis College, Metropolitan State University of Denver, University of Alaska Fairbanks, University of Colorado, University of Denver, University of Northern Colorado, University of Wyoming, Utah State University, and Western Colorado University.

∞ This paper meets the requirements of the ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

ISBN: 978-1-64642-216-6 (paperback)  
ISBN: 978-1-64642-217-3 (ebook)  
<https://doi.org/10.7330/9781646422173>

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Giberson, Greg, editor. | Schoen, Megan, editor. | Weisser, Christian R., 1970– editor.

Title: Behind the curtain of scholarly publishing : editors in writing / edited by Greg Giberson, Megan Schoen, Christian Weisser.

Description: Logan : Utah State University Press, [2022] | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2022000311 (print) | LCCN 2022000312 (ebook) | ISBN 9781646422166 (paperback) | ISBN 9781646422173 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Editors. | Editing. | Scholarly publishing. | English language—Rhetoric—Study and teaching (Higher)—Authorship.

Classification: LCC PN162 .B435 2022 (print) | LCC PN162 (ebook) | DDC 808.02/7—dc23/eng/20220314

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022000311>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022000312>

Cover photograph © Mario Lisovski/Shutterstock.

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

## CONTENTS

*Foreword: The Shape of Editorial Work*

*Michael Spooner*     vii

*Acknowledgments*     xv

Introduction: Why Consider the Role of Editor?

*Megan Schoen and Greg Giberson*     3

### PART ONE: EDITING JOURNALS IN WRITING STUDIES

1. The Journal You Have

*Kelly Ritter*     15

2. Minutiae Matters: On Editing an Independent Journal

*Laura R. Micciche*     29

3. Growing a Community of Colleagues: Editing *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship*

*Muriel Harris*     39

4. PRE/TEXT

*Victor J. Vitanza*     57

5. Getting Up from a Fall: Five Years as Editor of *WPA: Writing Program Administration*

*Alice S. Horning*     69

6. Opening Spaces in Writing Studies: An Impetus for Change at *Composition Forum*

*Christian Weisser*     78

7. Greater Than the Sum of Its Parts: Enacting an Editorial Philosophy at *College Composition and Communication*

*Kathleen Blake Yancey*     92

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

**PART TWO: EDITING BOOKS AND BOOK SERIES IN  
WRITING STUDIES**

8. The University of Pittsburgh Press Series: Composition, Literacy, Culture

*David Bartholomae and Jean Ferguson Carr* 105

9. Opening a New Chapter: Open-Access Publishing in Writing Studies

*Mike Palmquist* 118

10. Gatekeeper, Guardian, or Guide? Negotiating the Dynamics of Power as an Editor

*Michael A. Pemberton* 139

**PART THREE: PULLING BACK THE CURTAIN: REFLECTIONS  
ON EDITING IN WRITING STUDIES**

11. Reflections: Edit to Learn

*Victor Villanueva* 155

12. Everything Is Rhetoric: Design, Editing, and Multimodal Scholarship

*Douglas Eyman and Cheryl E. Ball* 164

13. *enculturation* and Scholarly Editing as Network Coordination

*Byron Hawk* 181

14. Building a Field through Editorial Work: The Case of Second Language Writing

*Paul Kei Matsuda* 192

15. Making Space for Diverse Knowledges: Building Cultural Rhetorics Editorial Practices

*Malea Powell* 202

16. Won't You Be My Neighbor? How to Build Scholarly Community

*Charles Bazerman* 213

- Afterword: On "Becoming" an Editor

*Greg Giberson* 229

*Index* 237

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

## FOREWORD

### *The Shape of Editorial Work*

Michael Spooner

*University Press of Colorado / Utah State University Press (retired)*

*The Editor* (Rowley 2019), a novel, opens with a scene of a young writer trying to land a publisher for his own novel. After scores of rejections, he hears from a very well-established, very famous, very influential editor. “I like your manuscript,” she says, “but it needs work.”

The rapport that Rowley develops between his writer and editor reprises a stereotype, a theme in vernacular culture that I find strange, or at least strangely persistent. Rowley’s hero sees his editor as judicious, tasteful, supportive, disciplined and disciplining, maternal. Authoritative. He feels unworthy, but she will see something in him. It is as if she knows something she isn’t telling him. She will push him to create his best work, and yes—spoiler alert—he will find his best self in the process.

I mean.

I wonder if, in the folklore of writers, we have imagined this editor to express our yearning for the perfect reader. Response, of course, is vital to writers, and the work of writing becomes a little easier when we invent a superaddressee who knows exactly what we mean and who will nourish and teach and bless us from a place of higher wisdom. From a pedestal, if you will. But for an editor, the danger of a pedestal is that it can become too comfortable; it can turn you into the classic old-timer who presumes a right to advise any youth who clambers onto the next barstool. As I approach full geezerhood myself, I can see the appeal, but good manners suggest that one abstain, and most editors do abstain, I believe.

At the same time, this projection does perceive something real about editorial work. An editor makes judgments, and those judgments can make or break a career. And I don’t mean the easy stuff like “needs

work” or Browning’s fabulous “here you miss/Or there exceed the mark” (first quoted to me by an editor). Larger judgments are more telling, like where a manuscript might deepen or extend, where to find its center, whether to protect its innovations or rein them in. All the developmental possibilities that live in the relation among author, editor, audience, and text. Ultimately, these inform the judgment of whether to publish or not.

I almost wrote “of whether a work warrants publishing or not,” but what goes into editorial judgment is more textured than the simple idea of *deserving* publication. In scholarly and commercial work alike, a great many proposed articles and books are indeed *worthy* to be published—that is, they offer serious subjects maturely reasoned and well expressed—but are declined by an editor for reasons beyond publishability. For example, size of the audience must be considered, and size of the manuscript. The complexity of production is a factor (medium, tables, images, graphs, color, translations, fact-checking, permissions). Staffing and other limitations at the publisher impinge. Profit is the primary question for many publishers. For others, overlap with already published work is part of the calculus. Room in the queue. Fit with the list or the journal.

I want to focus on “fit” here because in it we have a metaphor that very clearly reveals the role and risk of editorial judgment. It is not the final criterion, but, in the dimension of fit, every submission is regarded in light of how well it addresses the editor’s or the publisher’s larger purposes. Does it fit? Rejection letters almost ritually ward off submissions with this idea. “Ultimately, we didn’t feel it was a good fit for us. All best.”

Often, less deliberation goes into the question of fit than one might wish. I have heard editors complain about needing to publish almost whatever comes over the transom. Times can be that lean or quotas that demanding. “Who has time to read a manuscript?” one editor said to me at a conference, lighting up a smoke. “Let the referees do that. I gotta sign thirty contracts this year.” At other moments, editors might find themselves wealthy in submissions and might publish only the trendiest ones, regardless of how “fitting” they might be. At any time, an editor might go into the field actively commissioning work that might fit. And sometimes, say at a vanity press, editorial purposes might deliberately not filter anything.

What is fundamental in fit for scholarly publishers is that an editor operates from some working sense of the discipline they are serving, alongside a sense of their own positionality in relation to that discipline. Greg Giberson, Megan Schoen, and Christian Weisser, with

the contributors to *Behind the Curtain of Scholarly Publishing* know this experientially: an editor reviews more than manuscripts. They judge the discipline, too—where it needs work, where it might be missing or overshooting some mark—and they judge what impact they are personally positioned to have. In 2007, the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion made a similar point, lamenting that institutions in their survey seriously undervalued editing in tenure and promotion decisions. To undervalue editorial work in scholarly journals and essay collections, the committee writes, is especially problematic

when we consider that editors disseminate new scholarship and further the arts, stimulate and direct inquiry in their fields of study, help produce new knowledge, and create communities for discussion and debate within and among disciplines. *Undoubtedly, editors play a critical role in shaping their disciplines.* (40; emphasis added)

\*\*\*

When Laura Di Ferrante, Katie Bernstein, and Elisa Gironzetti founded *E-JournALL: Euro-American Journal of Applied Linguistics and Languages* in 2014, their vision of fit and of their role in shaping their discipline was explicit. They intended to decenter English as the language of international publication in applied linguistics. As they report in their self-study of the first four years of the journal (2019), they felt a critical need for a venue that represented the international character of the field and that leveraged the non-English research conducted in it. They reasoned that valuable work was produced every year by Spanish and Italian linguists, and therefore the field needed a journal as hospitable to work in *those* languages as it was to work in English. They committed to publish at least one article in each of these three languages in every issue of *E-JournALL*. Not translations. They wanted a trilingual journal.

The scope of the challenge they faced was daunting; one might call their mission quixotic if it weren't so deeply substantial. Not only do almost all academic journals in their discipline (as well as in writing studies and many other disciplines) publish monolingually in English, but this dominance of English also creates a double bind for scholarship. First, research published in English is less accessible to readers in non-English and so-called periphery contexts (Canagarajah 1996). And further, authors from “periphery” communities now routinely neglect those journals that do exist in other languages, electing instead to write for English-only journals.

Describing the situation, Di Ferrante, Bernstein, and Gironzetti (2019) argue that A. Suresh Canagarajah's center/periphery conception

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

is just as apt in 2019 as it was in 1996 when he first wrote of it. Despite the many advantages of evolving communication that have come with globalization, they point out, most of the economic, technological, colonialist, and other forces that set conditions in place for English-language dominance remain today. And distortions in the demographics of published work are accumulating as a consequence. They write,

While the internet, exchanges via email, and online publishing opportunities have reduced the exclusion and isolation of peripheral communities, the hegemony of English-language publications over any other language remains a strong influence in scholars' choice of publication venues, topics, and styles of scholarly debate. (106).

I mention these coeditors' self-study here because it shows editors not just acknowledging but also truly forwarding their responsibility to make judgments and embracing the clear ideological shape of the judgments they make. If English is becoming hegemonic as it institutionalizes across the global academy, these coeditors say, then individual editors and publishers must examine their *solamente inglés* choices.<sup>1</sup> In this context, then, the choice to hold open a multilingual niche in their own discipline is a necessary, important gesture of critique and reparation. It argues that the erasure—that is, the accumulating ignorance—of what is discoverable via non-English languages is deforming their field because, remember, they perceive the hegemony of English beyond the simple choice of venue, arguing it also influences the “topics and styles of scholarly debate.” In this context, their experiment with *E-JournALL* exposes the illiteracy at the root of monolingualism.<sup>2</sup> This is what informs their idea of editorial fit, and it becomes the shape of their influence on the discipline.

Closer to home for this volume, Sandra Tarabochia, Aja Martinez, and Michele Eodice describe the vision that led them to establish the online journal *Writers: Craft & Context*. Their first issue was released in 2020, and in their editors' introduction, they use precisely the terms I am interested in here: *fit* and *shape*. “The three of us are aware of meaningful work, including our own, that would never ‘fit’ in the current landscape of scholarly publishing. . . . [T]he field is missing out by failing to be shaped by those [unrepresented] voices and projects” (1). These coeditors' purpose, like that of Di Ferrante, Bernstein, and Gironzetti, is quite consciously to re/shape their field in some way, to have an impact with new editorial choices. The time has come, they say, for writing studies to make itself hospitable to “new knowers who resist privileging only argument and evidence bound in traditional forms and

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

genres. We wanted to show, not tell, how we value lived experience, epistemic diversity, and the ways art can help us understand writers and writing” (2).

Di Ferrante and colleagues’ choice, and Tarabochia and colleagues’ choice, remind us that editors work within the same context that writers do. We are all constrained by context, yes, and of course we want to be relevant to it. But we are not only bound; we also address our context, and our editorial choices incrementally challenge it, transform it, reshape it. Di Ferrante, Bernstein, and Gironzetti have already made a difference. At this writing, Tarabochia, Martinez, and Eodice are just setting out to do so. Quixotic or not, and whether or not they ultimately displace the windmills they aim for, they are changing the shape of what is possible to think in their disciplines. Not just for the present moment, either; their impact will be visible for some time to come.

\*\*\*

I have complained elsewhere that those of us who make a career in editorial acquisitions too rarely get a chance to consider our profession in systematic, theoretical ways (Spooner 2002). We may be—indeed I believe we *are*—serious and reflective thinkers, but professional editors seldom produce published scholarly reflection *on editing*. We work at the threshold of academe, yet we seem not to think of our profession as a domain of knowledge-making in the way (true) academics think of their disciplines. In addition, of course, our institutions reward only the *practice* of acquisitions, not building a knowledge base under it; possibly, they see a risk of intellectual distraction should editors turn to writing.

By contrast, when writing scholars turn to editing, they write about their editorial work with great interest, as we can see in the current volume. Among other purposes, the chapters that follow mean to take us behind what may seem a few mysteries of scholarly publishing—choosing a venue, preparing for submission, interpreting a response, and others. Between the lines here as well, we can see the contributors examining the contours of the individual niches they set out to make.

It strikes me that writing scholars are especially suited for this kind of reflection and even for editorial work itself, because writing studies is steeped in response theory, and an editor is, if nothing else, a professional responder. Never the perfect one, never the “real” reader. But through our judgments, we function as a proxy for an audience, and we live with the knowledge that our judgments are always contingent and always depend on how well we anticipate that audience. Therefore, the editor’s first task is not to advise, correct, or persuade, but to

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

understand—to understand both the writer and the audience they imagine—from a place much like what Lisa Blankenship calls “rhetorical empathy” (2019). This place may be on a barstool, but I don’t think it will be on a pedestal, because alongside the writer—not above—is the angle from which one can best review a manuscript, assess the needs of a discipline, and judge the possibilities in one’s own relation to both. And it is this turn of mind that predisposes scholars of writing to keep an ongoing eye on their own editorial practice. Ideally, they discipline themselves as much as they do a writer. It is their occupation to understand writers, but even more it is their *præ*occupation because they identify as writers themselves. So, where writing scholars do editorial work, we hope to find editors who do not accept the pedestal, whose conceptual stances cannot be captured in a convenient archetype. In the hands of writing scholars, then, editorial practice should become rhetorical practice, and we can see in this volume how that can happen.

The contributors here understand the many shades of response to writing like Cyrano understands the expressive potential of his nose, to borrow Louise W. Phelps’s amusing metaphor (Phelps 2000). That is, in framing a response to an individual text, their approach is multiple and nuanced. These editors appreciate that a response is a text, too—a text that will be, in Phelps’s terms, hermeneutic, rhetorical, transactional, critical, aesthetic, and so on. And in the larger sense, each of the editors writing here understands that the long bibliography of works they have acquired amounts to their own ambitious text of response to their entire discipline. Each contributor to *Behind the Curtain of Scholarly Publishing* is one of those judicious editors whose judgments, which may have seemed quixotic even to themselves at times, in the end framed a significant and unique niche—one that in turn added shape to the discipline of writing studies.

Quixote, of course, is more than a caricature, and a discipline is more than a windmill. My hopeful view is that a discipline is much less static, much more dynamic and responsive than we often feel it is. And I read the collective role of the editors here from this perspective. Each one in their own way has shaped what is possible to think in writing studies, and the impact of their presence will be visible for years to come.

## NOTES

1. Hat tip to Victor Villanueva, the first one I heard use this ironic wordplay.
2. One wonders what the field of writing studies might learn if it were possible for our journals to publish an article in Spanish, Arabic, or Japanese in each issue, or if books like this one could always include a non-English chapter.

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

## REFERENCES

- Blankenship, Lisa. 2019. *Changing the Subject: A Theory of Rhetorical Empathy*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Browning, Robert. 1989. "My Last Duchess." In *Robert Browning: Selected Poems*, 25–26. London: Penguin.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 1996. "'Nondiscursive' Requirements in Academic Publishing, Material Resources of Periphery Scholars, and the Politics of Knowledge Production." *Written Communication* 13 (4): 435–472.
- Di Ferrante, Laura, Katie A. Bernstein, and Elisa Gironzetti. 2019. "Towards Decentering English: Practices and Challenges of a Multilingual Academic Journal." *Critical Multilingualism Studies* 7 (1): 105–123.
- MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion. 2007. "Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion." Modern Language Association. file:///C:/Users/Owner/AppData/Local/Temp/taskforcereporto6o8.pdf.
- Phelps, Louise W. 2000. "Cyrano's Nose." *Assessing Writing* 7 (1): 91–110.
- Rowley, Steven. 2019. *The Editor*. New York: Putnam.
- Spooner, Michael. 2002. "An Essay We're Learning to Read: Responding to Alt.style." In *ALT DIS: Alternative Discourses and the Academy*, 155–177. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook-Heinemann.
- Tarabochia, Sandra L., Martinez, Aja Y., Eodice, Michele. 2020. "Editors' Introduction." *Writers: Craft & Context* 1 (1): 1–5.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to acknowledge and thank all of the people who responded to Greg's original listserv request for the names of important and influential editors in the field. He received over one hundred separate responses, which often included heartfelt stories about how an editor or editors had a significant impact on their lives and careers that have always stuck with them.

We would also like to acknowledge and thank the countless other people behind that editorial and publishing curtain that make it possible for us scholars and editors to share our work with the world. While this volume focused primarily on the work of the editor "in charge," we recognize that the vetting and publishing of scholarship, like the production of it, is a complex and collaborative effort. Without all of those people, some of whom are paid, while most are not, none of us could do our work.

We would also like to thank Mandy Olejnik, a newly minted PhD as of the printing of this volume, for her work on developing and editing the index for this collection. Congratulations, Mandy!

Finally, we would like to thank the contributors. It was a pleasure to work with you all.

**BEHIND THE CURTAIN OF  
SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING**

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

## Introduction

### WHY CONSIDER THE ROLE OF EDITOR?

Megan Schoen  
*Oakland University*

Greg Giberson  
*Oakland University*

The purpose of this book is to elucidate the often behind-the-scenes work of editors in the field of writing studies to help both new and seasoned scholars, as well as the field's future editors, to understand this important role in shaping the discipline and how to successfully enter into publishing in the discipline. We believe the book will be useful to anyone currently working to publish in writing studies, or who hopes to someday work as an editor in writing studies, or who simply wants to better understand what editors in writing studies do on a day-to-day and year-to-year basis and how that work has contributed to the growth and development of the field itself historically. For readers to better understand the genesis of this collection and to provide some context for it, we first would like to add very brief versions of our own editorial histories and how we came to believe there is value in the personal histories, philosophies, experiences, and advice we have gathered in the following chapters.

\*\*\*

#### MEGAN

When Greg first invited me to collaborate with him on this book, I immediately thought of my own initiation into the world of editing. I can still remember the bright summer afternoon when I received the excited call from my friend and fellow Purdue graduate student Joshua Prenosil, a call that launched my work with what would become *Present Tense*. I was sitting in my parents' backyard in Ohio while home visiting

when I picked up my phone. Josh had been inspired by John Schilb's 2008 James Berlin Memorial Lecture in which Schilb notes a dearth of timely publications in writing studies about sovereign political power, partially due to the length of the publishing process. Josh was afire with inspiration to fill this gap with a new journal that would quickly publish rhetoric studies on contemporary political and social issues. The editorial team Josh began assembling that day consisted entirely of graduate students, including me. What this opportunity meant for us was that we had to learn how to become editors at the same time we were learning how to write and publish in the field. So, for me, the roles of editor and scholar have always been inextricably linked since my early days as a burgeoning academic—even as I made lots of mistakes developing into both. At the time, a collection like this one would have been extremely useful to help me understand the experiences of the field's most prominent and long-standing editors as I tried to learn how to become both a researcher and an editor myself.

#### GREG

Much as it did for Megan, journal editing is something that sort of came to me, as opposed to something I sought out. When Alice Horning took over as editor of *WPA* in 2009, I was in my third year as an assistant professor at Oakland University. I remember one day bumping into her in the hall, and she pretty much informed me (and two other junior faculty peers in the Department of Writing and Rhetoric) that we were to be the new assistant editors of the journal. I'm sure there was more of a discussion/invitation, but that is how I remember it. When Alice brought me on, I was (patiently) waiting for my first edited volume to be officially published (*The Knowledge Economy Academic*) and was finalizing the manuscript for my second (*What We Are Becoming*) (Giberson and Moriarty 2012). When my coeditor of *The Knowledge Economy Academic* (Giberson and Giberson 2009), who happens to be my brother, and I began work on that first collection, neither of us had any experience with editorial work. After developing the idea, we stumbled around in the dark for several months trying to figure out how to disseminate our CFP, what processes to put in place to vet submissions (assuming we ever got any), how to write a prospectus, how to select potential publishers, and so on. That collection is somewhat unique, as it is international in scope and inherently interdisciplinary, so there were unique challenges relating to all the questions and gaps we had to fill in pursuit of publication, but after much trial and error, we were able to do so.

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

Upon reflection, one of the things we were really lacking throughout that project was an understanding of what it means to work as editors. We had to figure it out on our own, step by step, sometimes forward, many times back. Needless to say, the second and third collections went much more smoothly for me, as I had gained some important experience and perspective on editorial work that, in no small part, led me to conceive this collection. I'll write in much more detail in the "Afterword" about the development of this collection, but suffice it to say that, like Megan, I would have benefited immensely as an emerging scholar and editor from such a volume. As a new editor, I could have avoided many of the mistakes I made and pitfalls I encountered. As a new scholar, I would have had a better understanding of what editors really do, why they make decisions they make, and how to better prepare my own work before submitting it for consideration. When we first dip our toes into the world of academic publishing, everything is new and confusing. The work editors do is central to making that world work, and until now, it has been rather opaque and hidden. We hope this volume opens that world up a bit.

\*\*\*

To the best of our knowledge, there are no other published books that duplicate the content and scope of this project. Numerous advice books abound on general academic publishing (Belcher 2009; Henson 2005; Rocco and Hatcher 2011), but there are no current books about publishing in writing studies solely and explicitly from the perspectives of journal and book editors in the field. In the 1990s, there were a handful of books by writing studies scholars on academic publishing. For example, Joseph M. Moxley authored *Publish, Don't Perish: The Scholar's Guide to Writing and Publishing* (1992) and *Becoming an Academic Writer: A Modern Rhetoric* (1994). Moxley went on to coedit with Todd Taylor *Writing and Publishing for Academic Audiences* (1997). While these scholarly publishing texts were composed by writing studies scholars, the books were designed primarily for a general academic audience, and the perspectives were largely those of successful authors rather than those of editors. Gary Olson and Taylor's (1997) edited collection *Publishing in Rhetoric and Composition* offers advice about academic publishing specific to the field and from editors' perspectives but with a focus on later-stage composing and final manuscript submission. Moreover, in the more than twenty years since its publication, the landscape of academic publishing in writing studies has vastly changed. Maureen Goggin's (2000) *Authoring a Discipline: Scholarly Journals and the Post-World War II Emergence of Rhetoric and Composition* recounts a history of the field's development

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

through its scholarly journals and their editors, but the book's scope does not include practical advice for writing studies scholars trying to publish in these journals. Some articles and book chapters provide editing perspectives about specific subfields within writing studies, such as George Hayhoe's (2010) "Editing a Technical Journal" in Avon Murphy's edited collection *New Perspectives on Technical Editing*, but what has been missing in the field is a compilation centered entirely on the perspective of editors across the spectrum of writing studies.

More recently, the March 2019 special issue of *College English* with the theme "Scholarly Editing: History, Performance, Future" (Ianetta 2019) brings together articles by multiple editors in the field to discuss their role in shaping the past, current, and future directions of writing studies. Like this important special issue, *Behind the Curtain of Scholarly Publishing* extends insights about the role of editors and publications in writing studies but with a larger cross-section of editors and publications represented and with a specific goal of bringing to light the often unknown aspects of journal and book editing for those hoping to better understand how to make their own meaningful contributions to scholarly conversations in the discipline.

Two other recent publications from Utah State University Press / University Press of Colorado are useful companions to *Behind the Curtain of Scholarly Publishing*. The first, *Explanation Points: Publishing in Rhetoric and Composition* (Gallagher and DeVoss 2019) gives advice from successful scholars about best practices for publishing in the field. The second, *Talking Back: Senior Scholars and Their Colleagues Deliberate the Past, Present, and Future of Writing Studies* (Elliot and Horning 2020), provides insights from many of the field's best-known scholars about the discipline's history and ongoing development. Both suggest practical wisdom about the field, including publishing in it, from many of the field's most notable members, many of whom are or have also been editors.

While similarly sharing the collective knowledge of seasoned scholars in the field, *Behind the Curtain of Scholarly Publishing: Editors in Writing Studies* is distinct in focusing exclusively on the perspectives of journal and book editors in writing studies for an audience of both new and seasoned scholars in the field hoping to better understand the editor's role and the publishing process in our discipline. Additionally, we believe the book offers deep historical context, sound practical advice, and inspiration for the field's next generations of journal and book editors.

\*\*\*

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

Writing studies scholarship has a rich history, and one way to trace that history is through the progression of its publication venues, including journals and book presses. Such a tracing was famously performed by Robert J. Connors in “Journals in Composition Studies” (1984). Douglas Hesse revisited and updated Connors’s project in 2019 with his article “Journals in Composition Studies, Thirty-Five Years After.” Because publications are so central to the shaping of any discipline, the editors who helm those journals and book presses are both reflections and vanguards of the discipline at a particular moment of its history. The authors featured in this book have served as editors for many of the extant journals both Connors and Hesse chronicled, including *College English*, *College Composition and Communication*, and *Composition Studies*. They also represent newer publishing platforms Hesse acknowledges came into being long after Connors surveyed the field’s publications, such as *Kairos*, *enculturation*, and *constellations*. These editors have helped shape the field’s scholarship and, by extension, the discipline itself. Their stories illustrate the history of writing studies while also providing insights about the current status and future direction of the field, which is eminently useful for other scholars wishing to publish, as well as for burgeoning editors who will someday assume these mantles of editorial leadership. Moreover, many impressions of the field Hesse gleaned from studying its publications are themes explored by the editors in this collection, including the continued growth of subdisciplines like writing across the curriculum, the rising impetus to interrogate power and politics in our scholarship, the increased focus on second language learners and writing in languages beyond English, the expanding prominence of independent journals, the ascending influence of digitality and online publication, and the surge of open-source scholarship. Finally, both Connors and Hesse identify the proliferation of journals and other publishing platforms as a sign of writing studies becoming fully instantiated as a discipline—a boon perhaps for academic respectability but also a challenge in maintaining a cohesive scholarly identity. The variety of journals and books represented by the editors in this collection seems to underscore Connors’s prediction and Hesse’s confirmation that writing studies has asserted a rightful place in academic discourse through its growing body of diverse scholarship, though perhaps at the expense of a unified scholarly community with shared knowledge and purpose (Hesse 2019, 392–393). The fact that so many journals and book series now exist means writing studies scholars have many options for submitting their work, a welcome circumstance to be sure. But such an abundance of choice also requires thorough research about how and where

to submit. The chapters in *Behind the Curtain of Scholarly Publishing* offer the wisdom of editors across the spectrum of our field's work to assist scholars in preparing and sending out their manuscripts.

All the editors featured in this book develop a conceptual framework based on their personal experiences and the particular publications for which they have worked; within that specific framework, they present concrete advice for scholars. In doing so, they provide insights into editing and publishing in writing studies grounded in the ethos of individual publishing venues in the field while also providing wisdom that transcends particular publications to create a vision for successful scholarship in our discipline. Each chapter explores, in different ways based on the unique experiences and styles of the individual authors, the following:

- individual authors' editorial histories and philosophies and the different influences and experiences that contributed to those histories and philosophies;
- reflections on their editorial accomplishments, contributions, and influences as editors and how they understand their role in relation to the text, content, the scholar, and the many other considerations inherent in the complex work of scholarly production;
- advice for new, emerging, and seasoned scholars designed to offer insight into the relationship editors have with the authors they work with, the scholarship they help produce, the decisions and interventions they must make, and the challenges they face(d).

The book is divided into three sections, starting with concrete historical accounts and moving toward broader, more theoretical explorations of the role of editors in writing studies. Part 1, "Editing Journals in Writing Studies," includes historical retrospectives of editors reflecting on their work at prominent scholarly journals in the field and advice for authors and editors based on that work. In chapter 1, "The Journal You Have," Kelly Ritter discusses her position as editor of *College English* from 2012 to 2017 and her belief in the importance of editors serving the journal's mission rather than their own scholarly agendas. Chapter 2, "Minutia Matters: On Editing an Independent Journal," features Laura Micciche providing insights gained from her role as editor of the discipline's longest-running independent print journal, *Composition Studies*. Next, Muriel Harris recalls the concomitant emergence of writing center studies and *WLN* in chapter 3, "Growing a Community of Colleagues: Editing *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship*." Victor Vitanza follows with chapter 4, "*PRE/TEXT*," an innovative and experimental history of the equally innovative and experimental journal it chronicles. In

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

chapter 5, “Getting Up from a Fall: Five Years as Editor of *WPA: Writing Program Administration*,” Alice Horning reflects on her editorial position at *WPA* and the role of editors as sponsors in the discipline. Christian Weisser, longstanding and still current editor at *Composition Forum*, expounds on the growth of open-access journals in chapter 6, “Opening Spaces in Writing Studies: An Impetus for Change at *Composition Forum*.” In chapter 7, “Greater Than the Sum of Its Parts: Enacting an Editorial Philosophy at *College Composition and Communication*,” Kathleen Blake Yancey recollects her editorship at *CCC*, including the differences between her initial plans and the actual unfolding of her work on one of the field’s most prominent journals.

Part 2, “Editing Books and Book Series in Writing Studies,” moves beyond individual journals to include the perspectives of book-series editors and presses to provide rich histories and sound advice about editing and publishing in these venues. In chapter 8, David Bartholomae and Jean Ferguson Carr explain their roles as editors of the *Composition, Literacy, Culture* series at the University of Pittsburgh Press, recounting their efforts to find and publish books they “believe in.” Next, in chapter 9, “Opening a New Chapter: Open-Access Publishing in Writing Studies,” Mike Palmquist gives a fascinating account of the emergence of writing across the curriculum as a field of study and the WAC Clearinghouse as a burgeoning home for much of that nascent field’s work; central to that story was the decision to make available the clearinghouse’s books and journals in open-access format. In chapter 10, “Gatekeeper, Guardian, or Guide?: Negotiating the Dynamics of Power as an Editor,” Michael A. Pemberton explores the issue of editorial authority and control through his experience as editor of both the journal *Across the Disciplines* and the book series *Across the Disciplines Books*.

In part 3, “Pulling Back the Curtain: Reflections on Editing in Writing Studies,” prominent journal editors portray a theme of editing through the lens of personal editing experience, moving from the more historical accounts of parts 1 and 2 to more explicit theorizing of editorial work. Many of the authors in part 3 draw on experience in editing multiple publications in the field. Each chapter develops a conceptual framework of editing through which to understand the editorial role. In chapter 11, “Reflections: Edit to Learn,” Victor Villanueva describes how his desire to work as an editor for multiple special issues, book collections, and book series was fueled by excitement to broaden his own disciplinary knowledge and also to foster more research from scholars of color. Douglas Eyman and Cheryl E. Ball contribute chapter 12, “Everything Is Rhetoric: Design, Editing, and Multimodal Scholarship,” which offers

their collaborative philosophy of rhetoric's centrality to all good scholarship, including the multimodal scholarship they have edited and published for years at *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology and Pedagogy*. Next, Byron Hawk's chapter 13, "enculturation and Scholarly Editing as Network Coordination," describes the origin of *enculturation: a journal of rhetoric, writing, and culture* as a distributed network of labor. In chapter 14, "Building a Field through Editorial Work: The Case of Second Language Writing," Paul Kei Matsuda recalls his editorial history as an effort to grow scholarship on second language writing. Next, Malea Powell, founding editor of *constellations: a cultural rhetorics publishing space* and current editor of *CCC*, seeks to "highlight some ways to engage in Indigenous and cultural rhetorics practices as an editor" in chapter 15, "Making Space for Diverse Knowledges: Building Cultural Rhetorics Editorial Practice." Finally, Charles Bazerman concludes the collection with chapter 16, "Won't You be My Neighbor? How to Build Scholarly Community," which pulls from his experiences editing special issues and book series to demonstrate the myriad ways editing contributes to the establishment and maintenance of scholarship as communal practice.

We hope readers enjoy drawing back the curtain to see the often-occluded but deeply significant work of writing studies editors through the years as they forged the publications and scholarly trajectories that continue to define our discipline.

## REFERENCES

- Belcher, Wendy Laura. 2009. *Writing Your Journal Article in 12 Weeks: A Guide to Academic Publishing Success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Connors, Robert J. 1984. "Journals in Composition Studies." *College English* 46 (4): 348–365.
- Elliot, Norbert, and Alice Horning, eds. 2020. *Talking Back: Senior Scholars and Their Colleagues Deliberate the Past, Present, and Future of Writing Studies*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Gallagher, John, and Dànienne Nicole DeVoss, eds. 2019. *Explanation Points: Publishing in Rhetoric and Composition*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Giberson, Tom, and Greg Giberson, eds. 2009. *The Knowledge Economy Academic and the Commodification of Higher Education*. New York: Hampton.
- Giberson, Greg, and Tom Moriarty, eds. 2012. *What We Are Becoming: Developments in Undergraduate Writing Majors*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Goggin, Maureen Daly. 2000. *Authoring a Discipline: Scholarly Journals and the Post-World War II Emergence of Rhetoric and Composition*. New York: Routledge.
- Hayhoe, George F. 2010. "Editing a Technical Journal." In *New Perspectives on Technical Editing*, edited by Avon J. Murphy, 155–180. New York: Routledge.
- Henson, Kenneth T. 2005. *Writing for Publication: Road to Academic Advancement*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
- Hesse, Douglas. 2019. "Journals in Composition Studies, Thirty-Five Years After." *College English* 81 (4): 367–396.

Copyrighted material  
Not for distribution

- Ianetta, Melissa, ed. 2019. "Scholarly Editing: History, Performance, Future." Special issue, *College English* 81 (4).
- Moxley, Joseph M. 1992. *Publish, Don't Perish: The Scholars Guide to Academic Writing and Publishing*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Moxley, Joseph. 1994. *Becoming an Academic Writer: A Modern Rhetoric*. Lexington, MA: DC Heath.
- Olson, Gary A., and Todd W. Taylor. 1997. *Publishing in Rhetoric and Composition*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Rocco, Tonette S., and Timothy Gary Hatcher. 2011. *The Handbook of Scholarly Writing and Publishing*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Taylor, Todd W., and Joseph Moxley. 1996. *Writing and Publishing for Academic Authors*. 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.