Editing as Inclusion Activism

Kelly Blewett, Christina M. LaVecchia, Laura R. Micciche, and Janine Morris

T hose of us who work at universities are accustomed to the way diversity and inclusion initiatives become institutionalized. Internal grant applications ask how the proposed research is relevant to a university's mission in relation to diversity; required online surveys are distributed to assure that faculty and staff understand accessibility guidelines; task forces, committees, and planning groups articulate goals related to diversity and inclusion. The application of these rhetorical acts in daily academic life undulates, sometimes visible and meaningful, other times fading into the scenery, becoming background to seemingly more pressing matters. What persists when diversity and

Kelly Blewett, NCTE member since 2016, is a visiting assistant professor of English at Indiana University East, where she teaches writing and pedagogy courses. Her essays, which explore writing pedagogy, reading, and feminist rhetoric, have appeared in *Journal of Teaching Writing*, *CEA Critic*, and *Peitho*. She served as editorial assistant to *Composition Studies* while pursuing her doctorate at the University of Cincinnati. **Christina M. LaVecchia,** NCTE member since 2009, is a postdoctoral research fellow in Mayo Clinic's Knowledge and Evaluation Research (KER) Unit, where she collaborates on research related to patient-clinician communication and shared decision-making. Her other research interests include contemporary composing theories, writing pedagogies, invention, and digital literacies. LaVecchia's work appears in *Composition Forum*, *Harlot*, *Showcasing the Best of CIWIC/DMAC*, and the textbook *How Writing Works: With Readings* (Oxford University Press). She spent four years as editorial assistant to *Composition Studies*. **Laura R. Micciche** is finishing up her six-year tenure as editor of *Composition Studies*. She has been an NCTE member since 2000. Most recently, she is the author of *Acknowledging Writing Partners* (WAC Clearinghouse). Her articles on emotion, writing and grammar pedagogy, feminist theory and practice, and alternative forms of agency have appeared in a wide range of journals and edited collections. Micciche is professor of English at the University of Cincinnati, where she teaches writing, rhetoric, and pedagogy courses. **Janine Morris** is an assistant professor in the Department of Writing and Communication at Nova Southeastern University, where she is also a faculty coordinator at the Writing and Communication Center. Her current research focuses on the affective dimensions of writing center work. Her research on reading, digital composing, and multimodal literacies appears in *CEA Critic*, *Pedagogy*, *Computers and Composition*, and *Composition Studies*. She spent three years as editorial assistant to *Composition Studies* and has been a member of NCTE since 2009.

---

inclusion principles fade from view is systemic inequality, or inequality baked into the systems that make the university function. Unchecked racism, sexism, homo- and transphobia, ableism, and nativism reproduce inequalities that become ordinary, entering into the commonsense of a place—and of a discipline. Where or how to jam the system? To make the ordinary understood as *made* and, with painstaking effort, able to be remade?

We address these questions as they relate to scholarly publishing in rhetoric and composition journals, questions that affect editors and authors as well as those who teach and study in the field. As editorial team members of *Composition Studies* (*CS*), a biannual independent print journal, we detail strategies for creating a "home" for diversity in our field. We write from our self-identified positions as three White, cisgendered, married women—two with young children—and a fourth mixed-race, White-presenting, cisgendered married woman. We all earned doctorates in rhetoric and composition and together have backgrounds in book publishing, gender and sexuality studies, and creative writing. Recognizing our limited perspectives and life experiences, Laura (editor) and Kelly, Christina, and Janine (editorial assistants), wanted *CS* to feature a wide range of voices and perspectives. The assumption guiding us was that scholarship on race, gender, globalism, sexuality, ethnicity, and ability is vital to the growth and expansion of our field and should be robustly represented in the pages of the journal. But we soon realized that waiting for work to arrive by and about underrepresented faculty and students amounted to magical thinking and that editors and editorial teams can and should be viewed as similar to academic job search committees: both must recruit for diversity. Those unaccustomed to having a seat at the table were unlikely to view *CS* as a welcoming home without outreach and expression of interest. If we want equitable representation in our scholarship and in our field at large, we have to create the conditions to make it happen.

A similar idea forms the basis of "total participation" pedagogy, a method "by which [teachers] structure equal participation by every member of the class rather than allowing anyone—whether the professor or a particularly extroverted or intellectually aggressive student—to play the dominant role" (Davidson). The premise of this method is that "you cannot counter structural inequality with good will. You need to design structures that themselves are equal. If you do not, you end up replicating inequality, no matter how good your intention" (Davidson). We contend that, just as equality in the classroom doesn't manifest simply because well-intentioned people want it to, incorporation of diverse perspectives, bodies, and knowledge-making approaches in scholarly conversations requires what we are calling *inclusion activism*. To be inclusion activists, editors must be aware of how power relations operate in a field, be willing to challenge operations that exclude and diminish the experience and knowledge

of some while propping up that of others, and be supportive of those who have not traditionally had access to or representation within field conversations (cf. Ahmed, *Living a Feminist Life*). Inclusion activism is an intentional effort to ensure participation and access as well as leadership opportunities to people of all backgrounds, at all career stages.

Journal editing is a site where inclusion activism is needed in our field, particularly given the importance of journal publishing to emerging and junior scholars and the tendency for journals to operate as echo chambers in which, for example, citation practices reproduce established hierarchies of power. These contexts of editorial inclusion activism are related: scholars working in new areas of research need peer-reviewed venues for their work that value a range of voices and traditions, and journals need to be sites that enlarge and help to grow our scholarly communities rather than follow well-worn grooves. If reviewers or editors suggest that an author cite sources already frequently referenced in the field, precisely because they are recognized as master texts, then a more diverse yet less frequently read set of texts is deprioritized, even delegitimized. As Paula Chakravartty and colleagues contend in their study of the underrepresentation of non-White scholars in communications journals,

> [p]ublication and citation practices produce a hierarchy of visibility and value. This has material consequences on the field's quality of knowledge and on the social, emotional, professional, economic, and political lives of people of color who have traditionally been marginalized within the academy. (257)

To work against the tendency of privilege to beget privilege, we take up Christina V. Cedillo's call to become "active makers of spaces that accommodate diverse experiences in print and in person." Because, as Cedillo notes, "institutionalized communication permits some to enter privileged spaces at the expense of those who are pushed out," we are interested in rethinking the often invisible mechanisms that control forms of work and kinds of authors who make it into the print or web pages of journals.

Journals are entangled with privilege because they continue to be loci for learning field knowledge. In 1984, Robert Connors described a shift from curricular to scholarly knowledge in composition studies, noting that over the previous two decades journals had surpassed textbooks to become "*the* most powerful institutions" in the field (353). Indeed, in composition, where full-length texts did not constitute a significant portion of scholarship until the late 1980s, journals have long been a key site for the production of disciplinary knowledge (Goggin). To that point, scholarship published in key journals is often what gets reproduced elsewhere—this idea informs Brad Lucas and Drew Loewe's identification of the echo effect of *College Composition and Communication (CCC)*. Thus, journals have long shaped the research programs of composition and rhetoric,

and editors are their shapers. Especially with the emergence of journal archive digitization, "editors are memorialized as a public presence forever linked to their corresponding journals because what they say and do . . . is imminently traceable" (Ritter 91).

Because editing provides opportunities to determine whose voices are foregrounded in our discipline, editorial practices can—and we argue, should—open ports of entry for those new to making and sharing knowledge. For example, to read in journals names that sound like yours, experiences that resemble yours, or source material that resonates with what you know is to become habituated to access. Likewise, when nothing you recognize about the world is granted visibility, you become habituated to absence. The regularity of access and absence is anchored in what Cedillo describes as "normate assumptions . . . [that] can and do become part of a racist, ableist apparatus that promotes other -isms." How can we disrupt normate assumptions through sustainable change in publishing structures? How can we do it without reinforcing institutional diversity—the kind of logic that adds diverse faces to university websites but not classrooms, that creates diversity task forces including no people of color?

We're not certain we have the best answers to these questions, but we use this opportunity to think through and offer some starting points—some from our own experience, but many more that help us to imagine how we can do better and invite others to join us. After a brief overview of editorial practices and how they have been (under)studied, we discuss internal strategies that support inclusion activism: recruiting diverse reviewers who have expertise and interest in evaluating scholarship by non-majority scholars, establishing citation guidelines, reconsidering anonymized review, appointing diverse review board members, and installing manuscript mentors. Then, we discuss external strategies: attending special interest group meetings and panels at national conferences, direct emailing, following up on manuscripts that receive a revise-and-resubmit designation, and soliciting submissions beyond the standard research article to ensure diversity of epistemology and genre, not only of scholar identity. We conclude by considering how editors and editorial teams might inspire broader collective action in the field that takes the form of public and accessible crowd-sourced bibliographies of work by minority scholars and formalized training and mentoring programs for new editors. For us, knowledge-making is not only about naming what we know but also making space for what we *need* to know, what we have not yet established as central to the field through decades of research. Enlarging the kinds of claims the field can make, and on whose behalf, is what's at stake in inclusion activism.

While much of our discussion is ostensibly pitched toward editors, we also write to graduate students and junior faculty who want a better understanding of

publication processes; to scholars at all levels who want to publish their work but might feel alienated from dominant discourses; to faculty who mentor graduate students and want to make visible the built ecosystems that produce the works read, discussed, and cited in seminars; and to those who have never envisioned themselves as editors—if not you, then who will put themselves in the pipeline? A small minority of our field's members regularly publish (and fewer still participate in editorial processes); we want to encourage a broader coalition of contributors who can initiate and sustain new lines of inquiry. Such systemic change requires people to think together across locations, to recognize that all of us have a stake in this discussion about one of the field's most crucial and visible professional functions—publishing—and to volunteer ourselves for participation.

Understanding Editorial Work

How exactly can journals sustain a commitment to equity of voices, perspectives, and experiences when editors change, and with them priorities and agendas? How can such priorities become structured into the publishing wing of our field? When we have both independent journals that are not affiliated with national organizations (*CS*, *Literacy in Composition Studies*, *Kairos*, *enculturation*, *Journal of Multimodal Rhetorics*), and journals sponsored by national organizations or publishing houses (*CCC*, *College English* [*CE*], *Composition Forum*, *Pedagogy*, *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, *Rhetoric Review*, *WPA*, *The Writing Center Journal*, *Research in the Teaching of English*, *Peitho*), is it possible to advance diversity and inclusion initiatives across differently affiliated journals?

Before addressing these questions, we want to acknowledge our generic use of *editor*, *editorial teams*, *editorial process*, and *editorial board* throughout this article. We recognize that, depending on the journal, an *editor* may be a single person, a pair, or a collaborative group responsible for publishing an online, print, or hybrid scholarly journal; an *editorial team* might include copyeditors and proofreaders (as does *CS*), general office managers, email correspondents, peer reviewers, mentors, design consultants, digital archivists, and ambassadors to the field; *editorial process* could refer to editors or editorial teams who vet manuscripts, assign reviewers, work on production, code text, digitize assets, and fact-check; and *editorial board* can signify an honorific group of scholars or an active group who reviews manuscripts, prepares manuscripts for publication, decides on special issue topics, votes on incoming editors, and serves as advisors to authors and/or editors. With these variances in mind, when referencing our own experiences, we use *editor* to denote both an editor-in-chief (Laura) and a collaborative team of editorial assistants (Kelly, Christina, and Janine) whose work includes vetting newly submitted manuscripts, light and heavy copyediting,

proofreading, and acting as ambassadors for the journal within the discipline. Elsewhere, when envisioning how inclusive editing might be enacted, we refer to a general editor and editorial team, process, and board—essentially, composites of the varied roles described above that are meant as pragmatic shorthand, not as representative of all journals' processes in writing studies.

In calling attention to the very terms we use to describe editing as a practice, we are trying to avoid flattening on-the-ground forms of editorial work. Melissa Ianetta suggests that existing scholarship on editing often has this effect because it tends to "obscure the range of editorial activities and ideals, leaving few traces of precedent to aid future editors" (160). Of the scholarship on editorial work, most focuses on publishing trends within particular journals and emphasizes what Derek Mueller refers to as "discipliniography" (13), or what those trends tell us about the field's historical development (cf. Detweiler; Goggin; Phillips et al.; Pullman; Ritter; Tirrell). For example, Kelly Ritter's microhistory of NCTE editorial reports generated between 1954 and 1979 by editors of *CE* and *CCC* reveals insights about those journals' growth during this time, particularly as a result of editorial shaping. However, her emphasis is on how we can use these documents to understand our past, rather than how to practice editing. Echoing this gap between historical documents and applied editing, Ianetta reports that she found nothing on "good practices in and resources appropriate to conducting editorial work" (159).

Among the few studies of editorial work in the field, Fredric Gale's 1998 "Composition Journals and the Politics of Knowledge-Making" may be the most detailed. He presents interviews with editors of composition journals and consolidates editors' roles into roughly two categories: conservatives, who view a journal as a reflection of the community's interests and current conversations, and liberals, who intervene to lead conversations, determine important areas of study, or "even" recruit articles that move the field in a new direction (202). Representing the former stance is past *CCC* editor Richard Gebhardt, who felt the journal "should follow more than lead, publishing papers that reflect the interest of the sponsor, in this case, CCCC [Conference on College Composition and Communication]" (qtd. in Gale 202). In contrast, Gary Olson of *JAC* claimed that editors should "choose articles that do not merely reflect the ongoing conversation; they should anticipate future concerns and interests and 'encourage scholarship that moves in that direction'" (qtd. in Gale 203). In his interview, Joseph Harris, another former *CCC* editor, described editors as leaders but noted that their material is limited by the work submitted. Former *Rhetoric Review* founder and editor Theresa Enos describes reviewers as playing a "more active role in shaping the conversation than editors have" (qtd. in Gale 202). Elsewhere, familiar metaphors of hosts, gatekeepers, and facilitators emerge in

virtually any discussion of editorial roles. Connors, writing in 1984, described journals as "filters of community opinion" and "vehicles for redistribution of authority—both institutional and intellectual—in a field" (352). Noting the limits of these metaphors, Summer C. Sparks calls for new "dynamic metaphor[s]" (155) for editorial work that position editors as "a central node in a professional network" (154). In taking stock of these views of editorial practice, we advocate for editors to take what Gale would classify as a "liberal" stance: resist maintaining the status quo and actively lead the field toward scholarly directions and editorial policies that correct historic underrepresentations.

Whether inside or alongside explicitly editorial conversations, it's clear that scholars have not been as attentive to inclusion as we should have been. For example, Gary Olson and Todd Taylor's *Publishing in Rhetoric and Composition*, which focuses on "examining issues in scholarly publishing," has little to say about historically underrepresented scholars and the particular obstacles they face, despite aiming to "demystify the processes of producing scholarship" (2). Almost echoing our earlier point about intentionally structuring equality, Olson and Taylor open their collection by noting the many voices our field is *not* hearing:

> Despite the fact that there are over 11,000 members of the Conference on College Composition and Communication . . . only a relatively small number of these compositionists regularly produce books and articles. Part of the reason why many professionals do not attempt to author their own scholarship or fail to get their scholarship published is a lack of familiarity with the politics, conventions, and procedures of publishing scholarship . . . . [this book] affords insight into these issues so that more professionals can successfully enter the ongoing scholarly conversations. (1)

Olson and Taylor place the burden of learning field conventions and publishing procedures on aspiring scholars, not on editors or reviewers who curate, offer feedback, and control the gates.

In contrast, Enos's contribution to Olson and Taylor's book shifts the burden of meeting the community's expectations for publishing from authors to editors. Between 1982 and 1997, Enos researched the percentage of articles by women in rhetoric and composition journals. Based on the first surveys reported in 1990, Enos found "stark and shocking" disparities between the number of male- and female-authored articles during the period of 1982 through 1988. In the most prestigious journals, "far more men were published than women" (60), though by 1995 this shifted, leading to more published work by women. Enos attributes this shift to changing perspectives of editors, who came to see their roles as "more than gatekeepers," and to changing "some peer review policies and procedures" (60). She also notes that "broadening the definition of scholarship" in rhetoric and composition to include work that moved beyond

the "traditional German model of research and quantitative evaluation" (61) led to more gender-balanced publications. While today we might question the presumption of gender identity that guided Enos's study, as well as the alignment of hard research with male scholars, we accept Enos's invitation to explore how editors can be advocates for inclusion, how editors and the policies and procedures they create are partly responsible for the field as we come to know it.

In addition to correcting the underrepresentation of women in composition scholarship that Enos documents, efforts to make race, class, sexuality, language difference, and disability more visible in our field and in our scholarship have been underway since the 1990s. In terms of field visibility, CCCC is leading the way: available grants and awards recognize sexual and gender minority advocacy (Stonewall Service Award) and fund travel for minority scholars from underrepresented groups (Scholars for the Dream Travel Award), scholars from Mexico or Central or South America (The Luiz Antonio Marcuschi Travel Awards), faculty from tribal institutions (Tribal College Faculty Fellowship), and researchers studying disabilities (Disability in College Composition Travel Awards) and sexual and gender minority experiences (Gloria Anzaldúa Rhetorician Award; "CCCC Grants and Awards"). The Lavender Rhetorics Award for Excellence in Queer Scholarship honors a book, article, or dissertation that intervenes in writing studies scholarship ("CCCC Grants and Awards"). In terms of scholarly visibility, the Cultural Rhetorics Conference and associated journal *Constellations: A Cultural Rhetorics Publishing Space*, both sponsored by Michigan State University, foreground the rich work being produced in relation to methodologies, practices, and theories understood as always culturally inflected. In addition, the growing body of scholarship on race (A. Banks, *Digital*; Gilyard; Inoue and Poe; Ruiz and Sánchez; Villanueva), sexuality (Alexander; W. Banks; Morrison; Rhodes and Alexander; Waite), language difference (Canagarajah, *Translingual*; Matsuda; Smitherman), place (Canagarajah, *Geopolitics*; Reynolds; Webb-Sunderhaus and Donehower), indigenous rhetorics (King et al.; Lyons; Monroe; Powell and Riley-Mukavetz) and disability (Lewiecki-Wilson et al.; Yergeau) illustrates growing recognition that literacies and knowledges are meaningful only as relational concepts and practices marked by difference. We argue editors must extend this inclusive, relational lineage to journals in the field because they have considerable power, as Connors notes, to make or break careers and areas of study:

> Those who are often published, reviewed, and cited may advance from obscurity to eminence in a field with startling rapidity; similarly, groups with distinct political, philosophical, or methodological claims can be aided or nearly silenced by the decisions of journal editors. (352)

As this discussion suggests, our view of editors aligns with the activist roles described by Olson and Connors. Editors are agents, even when they are serving an organization's journal. When editors select reviewers, work with incoming content or encourage content, and individually create or collaborate with editorial board members on special issues or sections, they are making active decisions that shape the field's research program. Moreover, in each instance, editors are also building and sustaining relationships. With this in mind, we turn our attention now to the internal (in-house) and external (public-facing) strategies editors can use to build relationships that enact and sustain inclusion activism.

Sustaining Inclusion: Internal Strategies

Given the minimal scholarship on editorial practices and the absence of models for sustaining inclusiveness in journal publishing, we sketch here some strategies aimed at addressing both. First, we acknowledge that *inclusion*—like *diversity*, *difference*, *equity*, and *social justice*—threatens to function as a non-performative term. The more the word circulates and becomes expected in names of institutional offices (e.g., Office of Equity and Inclusion) and/or progressive-minded initiatives, the more likely it will achieve and mean less. We are mindful that repetition and mobility can just as effectively drain power from concepts as it can make them stick. With that caution in mind, we retain *inclusion* because, when linked to concrete practices, we believe consequences that transform workflow are possible.

Also, inclusion evokes fair and equitable representation, participation, and the desire to learn about what we don't yet know. Our thinking about inclusion is connected to a recognition that we learn with and through others. In that sense, inclusion signals a responsibility one feels toward community, a sense that we are better when "we" expands, gets challenged, and is modified over time. In a study of what she calls "endarkened" (opposed to enlightened) feminist epistemology, which signifies "how reality is known when based in the historical roots of Black feminist thought" (662), educational researcher Cynthia Dillard describes field researchers' responsibilities to the communities studied in terms of a symbiotic relationship. "To know something," she writes, "is to have a living relationship with it, influencing and being influenced by it, responding to and being responsible for it" (673). We find this rendering of the researcher-researched relationship generative for editorial work and the symbiotic relationships that editors and editorial teams should have with the communities we serve. As we understand the role of editors, they influence and are influenced by community; they are responsive to needs, gaps, fissures within that community; they are

responsible to the community that exists and the one that *could* exist if more members were shaping it.

To formalize these beliefs, editors and editorial teams have choices. Beginning with how we think about reviewers is a promising start, particularly when recalling Enos's point that reviewers play a "more active role in shaping the conversation than editors" (qtd. in Gale 202). We would modify this statement to say that editors and reviewers are interconnected. After all, in most cases, editors *choose* reviewers (be they internal or external) and can determine how much or little to rely on reviewer recommendations, and a great deal rides on those choices. At the nuts-and-bolts level, editors have to consider whether an external reviewer is likely to respond to a request for a review, navigate an online submission manager (where present), complete the review in a reasonable time frame (submission managers track and archive the number of days it takes a reviewer to complete the task), and be willing and available to conduct a second review if a piece is revised and resubmitted (depending on the journal and its process). Regarding content, reviewer participation is crucial, and this is where inclusion activism can significantly shape the process. In order to ensure that work by and about underrepresented communities is read by those best prepared to support and assess it, editors must recruit a diverse group of reviewers, potentially even including reviewers outside or alongside the discipline who have expertise relevant to a submission. Reviewers, along with editors and editorial teams, shape the content that collectively stands for "field knowledge," making diversity at this level critical to inclusive efforts.

To facilitate these practical and conceptual choices toward inclusive review, journal staff must continually update their databases of external reviewers to reflect the changing and wide-ranging needs and values of a field. If a majority of reviewers are specialists in argumentation theory, for instance, you can bet their reviews will ask an author to import ideas from that body of research, regardless of an article's content. This is not to say that reviewers are doing a poor job—far from it, we have found the majority of reviewers to be generous, supportive, and careful with their recommendations. Our point is that reviewers bring a slant. Journals need reviewers who together bring a range of slants so that work under review is read by those who appreciate the inherent value of transculturalism, story-based methodologies, or second-language learners' transition from high school to college, to take a few recent examples from submissions to *CS*. "Inherent value" is important because those who create work that challenges or expands knowledge-making in a field are too often required to justify its value in a system that has already and repeatedly named what it knows—and by omission, what it doesn't (want to) know.

Readers may object to the idea that all journals need a diverse reviewer base (in terms of content knowledge and sociocultural affiliation) given that journals specialize in specific content and methods. We are implicitly arguing that certainty about who we are and what we do is a conservative force exerting pressure on who we can become. In other words, foreclosing what counts as valid research, methodology, or theory in a given journal presumes a staticness that opposes inclusion as a sustainable goal. Constructing a composite of reviewer comments we have read or received, for example, we have learned that qualitative research is always preferred over textual studies, historical research must be comparative, and when talking about materialism, you have to begin with Martin Heidegger. Echoing these kinds of assumptions that articulate norms within a field or subfield, Kendall Leon, during the Opening General Session of the 2012 CCCC Convention in St. Louis, shared the story of being told in a job interview that "some of what these Chicanas [she was citing in her dissertation] were saying had been said by this theorist named Foucault" (qtd. in Powell 395).

As becomes increasingly clear the more ensconced one is in academic knowledge-making, most ideas have precedents. We'd venture that most paths could lead back to an authoritative White male thinker if one were determined to make them do so. However, ideas emerge from embodied experiences, get articulated in a variety of ways, and take on different resonances when attached to lived experiences. That's the point Leon goes on to make:

> I didn't cite Foucault, whom I adore, because instead I cited Chicanas precisely because their writing, their theory, comes from a place that, as Cherríe Moraga writes, is emergent from the "physical realities of our lives" (21). What was lost on this scholar was the intentionality of my practice, the intentionality in citation, in making a lineage worth building upon. (qtd. in Powell 395)

Lest we suggest that citational paths are normed only by insistence on traditional pathways, we note that a similar move sometimes emerges as well in reviews by interventionist scholars of color when offering feedback to manuscripts by self-identified scholars of color. Norming might manifest in judgments about which African American scholars to cite, for example, and whether it's appropriate to cite from a back catalogue or a more recent publication. While such suggestions can be generative and warranted in particular contexts, in others they have a disciplining effect, suggesting there is a right and wrong lineage to cite. What's helpful in navigating this terrain and in sustaining inclusive principles is to consider whether an author is being intentional and "making a lineage worth building upon," as Leon puts it, or is reproducing a lineage already established for less context-specific reasons.

For both editors and writers there is a lot at stake with citational practices, which do more than outline a body of work or reference influential scholarship that frames one's own. In her discussion of feminist citation practices and diversity work, Ahmed links citations to memory and debt: "Citation is how we acknowledge our debt to those who came before; those who helped us find our way when the way was obscured because we deviated from the paths we were told to follow" (*Living* 16; cf. A. Banks, "Ain't"; Robillard). What diversity workers have to confront, she notes, is "disciplinary fatalism: the assumption that we can only reproduce the lines that are before us" (*Living* 150), calling to mind the lesson Leon received about Foucault. As editors and editorial teams, we are already attuned to the sources that writers use and don't use to support their arguments. The tedious work of copyediting makes this aspect of scholarship abundantly clear. We can use what we learn from this close view of companion texts to prompt reviewers to be attentive to how source-use reinforces, contradicts, or challenges the overall work of an argument. We can also develop citation policies that establish best practices for a given journal, stipulating, for instance, that authors reference a minimum number of non-White researchers in the course of making any argument (cf. Ahmed, *Living* 15).

And rethinking the value of anonymized review systems, tacitly referenced in our above description, is worth consideration as well. Precedents exist for peer review of non-anonymized manuscripts. *Kairos*, for example, assigns multiple reviewers to manuscripts who then discuss the piece and its potential fit in the journal ("Submissions"). The journal's three-tiered review process gathers editorial board members, editors, mentors, and authors together with the intention "to publish the webtext if the author or authors complete the revisions requested in consultation with the editors and editorial board" ("Editorial Board").

Some scientific journals, too, conduct collaborative peer review in which researchers, editors, and designated reviewers together discuss a manuscript. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* has a particularly interesting and multi-tiered process. After passing through an initial editorial review and, if required, "technical corrections," a submission is moved into what's called "public peer review," described as follows:

> The discussion phase represents a unique opportunity to engage in an iterative and developmental reflective process. During this phase interactive comments can be posted by designated referees (anonymous or named) and all interested members of the scientific community (named). All participants are encouraged to stimulate further deliberation rather than simply to defend their position. This enhancement lead process is offered to maximize the impact of the article. Normally, every discussion paper receives at least two referee comments. Authors are invited to take an active role in the debate by posting author comments as a response to referee comments and short comments of the scientific community as

soon as possible in order to stimulate further discussion by interested scientists. ("Interactive Public"; see also Burley; Tennant; Zearfoss)

This is step four in an eight-step peer-review process, an intricate community-based, collaborative system that is a far cry from standard review practices of humanities journals. These examples underscore that review processes need not be uniform in order to be valid and rigorous (indeed, involving more stakeholders in decision-making strikes us as *more* rigorous than the typical process). While *CS* has not strayed from its established anonymized review process, we see the value in locating change here to support inclusion. A community of reviewers, editors, and authors making their thinking visible is more likely to generate nuanced feedback from multiple perspectives than are two reviewers working in isolation from one another in the case of anonymized review (even when reviewers sign their names, as many often do in writing studies).

Another internal strategy that can support inclusion activism is appointing an editorial board composed of scholars who represent multiple interests, institution types, and traditions of thought within a field. Doing so is practical, as an editorial board can provide direction, present diverse viewpoints, and suggest changes. At *CS*, editorial board members select new editors and review at least one manuscript a year, but otherwise are not involved in routine decision-making. We believe *CS* could benefit from a more active board, particularly because it is an independent journal, not responsible to a host organization and its members, which translates into minimal oversight of editors (though we realize this may not be true for all independent journals). An active editorial board with more defined roles could add a layer of accountability to ensure the long-term sustainability of an independent journal, as well as to help articulate inclusive goals and strategies for achieving them. An active board that is intentionally inclusive can also signal to prospective authors that "your work is welcome here," particularly when writers see their colleagues, peers, and mentors listed in the masthead of a journal. Ideally, too, even editorial board members who typically have limited direct roles in a journal's day-to-day management might begin to think of themselves as potential editors, as in the pipeline to serve as hosts of scholarly conversations. This gets at a larger reality: writing studies needs diverse leadership at the helm of journals (and other publishing venues). We return to this idea in the conclusion where we also note that CCCC/Two-Year College English Association's (TYCA) Editorial Fellowships, created in 2017, represent concrete strides toward preparing diverse leaders for editorships ("CCCC/TYCA Editorial").

Finally, we want to note the important role of mentors within journal eco-systems. For example, *Peitho* has a mentor program for authors whose submission shows promise, but is not yet ready for review ("Mentoring"). Likewise, *Kairos*

assigns mentors to work with authors during the revision stage, and *CS* recently asked former editor Bob Mayberry to serve as an editorial consultant, essentially a mentoring position. Mayberry's primary task is to work with authors of color who submit manuscripts of great promise and who wish to receive another level of support before resubmitting their work for review. While this process does not guarantee acceptance, it's an effort to provide extra support to authors whose voices and experiences are underrepresented in field scholarship. It's also an effort to encourage writers to resubmit after receiving a revise-and-resubmit decision, particularly important given that less than half of prospective *CS* authors who receive this designation end up resubmitting their work for review within six months. The internal strategies described here can be effectively complemented by editorial teams' external efforts to work as inclusion activists, our focus in the next section.

Sustaining Inclusion: External Strategies

Behind-the-scenes strategies can be transformative; there's great value, too, in making priorities and values visible in an effort to underscore how a field "conversation" constitutes a habitus, which, borrowing from Pierre Bourdieu's understanding of the term, is made of structured, durable practices that seem natural and inevitable rather than generated by access and privilege. As Bourdieu puts it, habitus is "history turned into nature" (78). A habitus is a composite of dispositions consisting of "linguistic competence and a cultural competence and . . . all the objective structures of which they are the product, structures which are active only when *embodied* in a competence acquired in the course of a particular history" (81). Thus, when certain linguistic, cultural, and embodied practices and experiences are not part of the common sense of an intellectual and pedagogical habitus, their exclusion gets reproduced, seeming to be an effect of objective processes (open submission periods, editorial assessment, anonymized review) rather than of structures built by and for other linguistic, cultural, and embodied practices and experiences. In an effort to work against the homogenization of a disciplinary habitus, external strategies that we describe in this section include soliciting manuscripts directly, attending events (special interest and caucus panels and workshops) where editorial teams can learn about emerging areas of scholarship and encourage participants to submit their work, and publishing genres beyond standard articles to make room for different forms of knowledge-making.

The *CS* staff has found success in directly soliciting manuscripts instead of depending on diversity to follow in the flows of existing channels. It is well-established that intentional outreach and demystification of process can benefit those not accustomed to reading their work or seeing themselves represented in

field conversations (for just a few examples, see Gutiérrez y Muhs et al.; Inoue; Martinez; Villanueva; Young). Outreach is already a tenet of hiring processes and graduate recruitment; in popular culture, Samantha Bee, television host of the political news program *Full Frontal*, used an anonymized and demystified submission process for scripts that resulted in a writers' room consisting of 50 percent female and 30 percent non-White writers (Morris). Mystification and intimidation are strong barriers to publication in the field at large: take as evidence the need for Olson and Taylor's collection cited earlier in this article; *Women's Ways of Making it in Rhetoric and Composition*, which aims to mentor women in the discipline toward advancing and thriving in their careers (Ballif et al.); or the forthcoming collection edited by Dànielle Nicole DeVoss and John Gallagher, *Explanation Points: Publishing in Rhetoric and Composition*, which offers short, practical advice on publishing in the field, from getting started to "moving on" post project. We also find telling the regular professionalization activities offered in graduate programs and professional venues on topics like submitting to academic journals, revising a dissertation into a book, and developing writing groups, all of which are devoted to pulling back the curtain on how academia works. For non-White researchers, distance from how academia works may be even more deterring than for White researchers who do not doubt belonging based on skin color (though they may in relation to other things), or who seldom walk into seminars or conference rooms where they are racial minorities.

   Early in our work on the journal, we made a point of attending special interest and caucus panels and workshops at conferences to learn about emerging areas of scholarship and to encourage participants to submit their work to *CS*. At the CCCC Convention, for example, we attended conference sessions featuring Scholars for the Dream recipients and members of special interest caucuses (and sought out such opportunities at other national conferences). After attending Exploring Latinidad in the West: A Workshop Sponsored by the NCTE/CCCC Latinx Caucus in 2013, Laura contacted SIG members via email, inviting them to consider *CS* as a possible home for their work. We began to receive more submissions by and about faculty of color, leading to a special issue in 2016, *Composition's "Global Turn": Writing Instruction in Multilingual/Translingual and Transnational Contexts*, and the 2017 publication of a forum on Latinx composition and rhetorics as well as to a steady stream of articles, course designs, and book reviews addressing underrepresented populations and issues. Simultaneously, we increased our visibility and accessibility at conferences by participating in the editors' roundtable at the Research Network Forum at the CCCC Convention, volunteering at the independent journal editors' booth in the exhibit hall and participating in a journal editors' workshop along with editors of other independent journals (*enculturation*, *Literacy in Composition Studies*, and *Across the Disciplines*).

One of our most successful outreach efforts was in persuading authors that revise-and-resubmit wasn't an empty promise, but that we truly wanted to see their work revised and published in the journal. Early on, Laura began assigning deadlines for resubmissions when sharing reviews with authors; this noticeably increased resubmissions by revise-and-resubmit decision recipients. The open-endedness of many revise-and-resubmit designations, along with the typical range and depth of feedback provided by reviewers, can discourage writers who experience this invitation as really closer to a rejection than an acceptance. When an editor can help to parse and prioritize reviewer feedback, sometimes indicating which areas of feedback seem most and least pertinent to the argument a writer wants to make, revising can seem more surmountable. In addition, setting a date—on the face of it, a fairly minor, arbitrary move—establishes an endpoint for which a writer can plan. A fixed date is a deadline, and if there's one thing that most academic writers need, it's a deadline. More to the point of our thesis, though, reaching out to writers working in underrepresented areas of the field, letting them know that we haven't forgotten about that article and that we're awaiting the revision is another way of saying your voice and work belong in these pages.

However, we wonder if inviting work by and about scholars of color and sending reminder emails about revised manuscripts goes far enough. Does it risk accepting mere tokenism as the remedy for White-dominated publications? In *On Being Included*, Ahmed reminds us that addressing institutional diversity is difficult work that, if not done right, can result in the sense that diversity outreach manifests as mere *hospitality*, rather than transformation. That is, for people of color who critique institutions, Ahmed writes,

> Our talk about [W]hiteness is read as a sign of ingratitude, of failing to be grateful for the hospitality we have received by virtue of our arrival. This very structural position of being the guest, or the stranger, the one who receives hospitality, allows an act of inclusion to maintain the form of exclusion. (43)

Editorial outreach needs to go beyond hosting the occasional piece by a scholar of color, therefore, and further manifest in more complete transformations of the scholarly publishing landscape. This is a slow, methodical process that requires sustained commitment, which is challenging given that most journals change hands every three to five years and each editor brings a distinct stance or focus, whether explicitly stated or not. Large-scale change can and should start with individual editors and editorial teams, but for sustainability, the charge must also be taken up by larger collectives: by reviewers, who open the gates to new genealogies; by editorial boards, who can set initiatives into concrete policy that outlasts cyclic changing of editorial hands; and by professional organizations,

which, through written statements and resolutions, set standards for the field. While corrective change will not automatically follow from such organizational statements (see Staci Perryman-Clark, David E. Kirkland, and Austin Jackson's examination of the legacy of the 1972 Students' Right to Their Own Language Resolution), they can provide crucial focusing energy and coherence.

For inclusion to move beyond token representation, editors and editorial teams must work to increase the diversity of genres and modes that are published in scholarly journals. Calls to expand the forms sanctioned by the discipline have existed for some time, though primarily aimed at arguing that we expand the forms we teach (A. Banks, "Ain't"; Shipka; Sirc), particularly in light of increased access to and acceptance of new media (Sheridan et al.; Yancey). More crucially, scholars Kristine Blair, Gail Hawisher, and Cindy Selfe have asked editors to reconsider what we count as scholarship, and decolonial work by cultural rhetorics scholars has challenged the powerful imperial entrenchment of Western traditions, reasoning, and culture (Cobos et al.; McKerrow; Monroe; Powell; Winterowd). These efforts have opened opportunities for pursuing, say, narrative forms that foreground or include cultural traditions and personal experience (Bratta and Powell) and that consciously challenge dominant narratives and explanations of disciplinary practices, as do "counterstory" methods informed by critical race theory (Grijavla; Haas; Martinez).

In other words, disrupting the traditional scholarly essay is not simply another form of aesthetic diversity or clearance for writing "the personal." Not all forms of knowledge-making can or should fit within the conventions of any one mode, whether typical scholarly article; a multimodal essay; a researched argument formatted as a replicable, aggregable, and data-supported (RAD) article; or a linear narrative. Rather, making space for mode and genre diversity can disturb established hierarchies. Canons, after all, ingrain not just contents and histories but also epistemological and scholarly conventions. Inclusion activism means seeing as made norms for authorial perspectives, performances, tones, and registers; articulation of argument; invention and citation; and more. Consider, for instance, how many nondominant traditions value dialogic thinking or approach creativity, invention, and/or evidence through remix practices. Or, consider for example Plateau Indian rhetorical traditions, as described by Barbara Monroe, which privilege "suspended thesis, either delayed or unstated altogether, coupled with suspenseful arrangement" (xviii). These are just a few of the possibilities that exist outside the dominant article-writing paradigm. And by advocating that we challenge norms around knowledge and making, we are asking the field to (re)consider what factors determine the "quality" of research and writing in our field, and how they might be in danger of being shaped by White supremacy and other forms of nativism.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

As the four of us responded to this call and spent time reflecting on our past and present editorial work with *CS*, we've come to acknowledge ways in which we can strengthen and formalize our own approaches to inclusion activism. For example, moving away from an anonymized peer-review process, toward something tiered or mentor-based, could significantly transform the politics of publishing by making an internal process visible and creating a dialogue about work in progress sensitive to differences of all kinds. The understanding that we have more work to do reminds us that making equality is an ongoing process. Toward that end, we conclude by suggesting two ways forward that we believe will help to advance inclusion activism: one, creation of a publicly accessible, crowd-sourced method by which to document authorship, and two, formalized training and mentoring for editors in the field.

As we have been arguing, knowledge-making editorial practices are not only about naming what we know but also making space for what we *need* to know. Related to that is developing a better understanding of authorship, or who is given space to make knowledge: Who most frequently publishes and in what venues? What work is being cited? What isn't? Having data at our fingertips will help us better understand how to intervene in unbalanced representation across the field. Chakravartty and colleagues argue a similar point in the context of their study of communications journals:

> For sustained accountability to representational disparities in our field, future research must be able to rely on nuanced methodological approaches to account for race, caste, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, religion, and other globally racialized markers of majority-minority difference. Our ability to understand why existing and potential disparate patterns exist depends on our ability to produce additional forms of data that allow us to do so. Developing ways to allow individual self-identification and thereby collect anonymous demographic information through our professional organizations and/or journal submission processes would be a place to start. To do this, of course, it will be necessary to develop mechanisms that track potential disparate outcomes while paying necessary attention to individual identity preferences, privacy concerns, or potential threats posed to minority communities under surveillance. (262)

Recently, Diane Kelly-Riley and Tiathla Macklin, editor and associate editor of the *Journal of Writing Assessment* (*JWA*), have begun working toward better accounting of diversity in journal citations. In CCCC Convention presentations, Kelly-Riley has described methodologies that account for diverse authorship, like examining pronoun usage and performing web searches and using publicly accessible information on sites like ResearchGate, LinkedIn, university and personal websites, and social media to determine authorial race and gender. Both

Macklin and Kelly-Riley have also presented data from case studies examining representations of diversity in the work cited by *JWA* authors, finding "unsurprisingly" that 84 percent of cited first authors were White males, that people of color were rarely cited, and that most second authors cited were White.

We suggest more sustained and widespread efforts complementing the work of Kelly-Riley and Macklin to give the field a clear understanding of where we are with diversity now, as well as to create paths for change moving forward. Crowd-sourcing might be an ideal methodological complement, allowing for collaborative confirmation of data and/or self-identification. Models like Heidi Harris and colleagues' *Bedford Bibliography of Research in Online Writing Instruction*, a crowd-sourced, editable, and digital collection of annotations, might provide a framework for tracking author identities and affiliations. Collecting and making work by underrepresented scholars visible is crucial, both for allowing scholars who join our call for inclusion activism to consciously amplify minority voices and, more simply, for assisting future scholars in identifying new, diverse voices and bodies of work to draw from. In addition, such efforts may productively disrupt what Stephanie A. Shields calls the "false sense of normalcy" that privilege can abet, a "lack of consciousness" that arises not from "exclusionary impulses," but rather from "a limited experiential horizon" (33). Moving forward, it's imperative that we are aware of who is missing from the collective scholarly "we"; to earn that awareness, we need stories and counterstories, analysis, and data.

A second initiative we advocate is establishing training and mentoring systems for new journal editors. As Beth Luey writes, "few journal editors have any training for their positions. They are chosen by their colleagues or by a publisher because of their reputation as scholars, and preparation for the job usually involves little more than a meeting with the previous editor and ritual handing down of files" (112). For new journal editors, there are few structures in place to help them successfully navigate their editorial positions. While published advice and guidebooks can be incredibly useful (e.g., Gaillet and Guglielmo), the situations that individual authors and editors operate under vary, which is why mentoring partnerships might be useful to help people navigate their local contexts. One promising mentoring effort is the new CCCC/TYCA Editorial Fellowships, which explicitly encourage applications from "members of underrepresented groups, especially Black, Latinx, Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders, as well as scholars/teachers from HBCUs, HSIs, and community colleges" ("CCCC/TYCA Editorial"). To expand this effort, others in the field might adapt established mentoring models that already exist for new WPAs (Almjeld et al.; Christoph et al.; "CWPA Mentoring Project"; Gaillet) and early career scholars (Feder; Skurzewski-Servant and Bugenhagen; VanHaitsma and Ceraso) to serve editors-in-training.

While intentionally fostering mentoring relationships would help individual editors to find footing, it would also be useful to establish dialogue among editors across different contexts. Editor roundtables are a frequent feature of national conferences in composition and rhetoric; however, the audience for roundtables is typically scholars interested in submitting work. While such roundtables undoubtedly demystify publishing procedures, editors could also benefit from the chance to network about the nuts-and-bolts of editorial work. Revising editorial guidelines, responding to changes in style guides, and navigating peer review are only a few of the topics that would merit purposeful dialogue, transparency, and sharing. Such meetings, which might function as conference workshops, would also be ideal spaces for trading notes on inclusion activism within the local context of each journal. Just as we have institutes for writing program administration, digital composing, and research methods, so we might also consider institutes for editorial work. In such an environment, experienced editors could work alongside newcomers and offer a highly immersive, relational training ground. In short, the relational model of editing for which we've been advocating entails purposefully facilitating relationships among editors at various stages of their careers. Mentorship and training would not only make the work of editing less invisible and daunting for individuals but also create more coherence and community across the discipline.

One of the biggest challenges to editing practices we see is how to implement widespread change so that individual editors of singular journals are not working in isolation or on the margins of the field. We need individual and local moves, but we also need a broader collective response from the field and from our organizations. We find compelling Jana Argersinger and Michael Cornett's point that "[e]diting at its best is collaborative, community-oriented, knowledge-building work" (106). Groups like the Council of Editors of Learned Journals can offer models for position statements and best practices that our field could expand and adopt. A statement of knowledge-making best practices issued by CCCC and developed in collaboration with editors, scholars, and graduate students could encourage a more overt articulation of our values. We could also turn to the sciences for models, drawing examples from established councils, organizations, and courses that provide editors networking and support opportunities, while also offering frameworks for considering ethical issues, guiding principles, and metrics related to authorship and citation (e.g., Council of Science Editors). Such work is crucial to inclusion activism, which has the potential to create a new normal. As field members, we have a responsibility to challenge exclusionary practices and to support and include voices traditionally denied.

WORKS CITED

Ahmed, Sara. *Living a Feminist Life*. Duke UP, 2017.

———. *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Duke UP, 2012.

Alexander, Jonathan. *Literacy, Sexuality, Pedagogy*. Utah State UP, 2008.

Almjeld, Jen, et al. "Organic Mentorship: A Feminist Model to Support Scholars and Leaders." *Surviving Sexism in Academia: Strategies for Feminist Leadership*, edited by Kirsti Cole and Holly Hassel, Routledge, 2017, pp. 216–24.

Argersinger, Jana, and Michael Cornett. "Everyone's Argus: The Journal Editor in the Academy." *Profession 2009*, pp. 105–11.

Ballif, Michelle, et al. *Women's Ways of Making It in Rhetoric and Composition*. Routledge, 2008.

Banks, Adam J. "Ain't No Walls behind the Sky, Baby! Funk, Flight, Freedom." *CCC*, vol. 67, no. 2, 2015, pp. 267–79.

———. *Digital Griots: African American Rhetoric in a Multimedia Age*. Southern Illinois UP, 2010.

Banks, Will. "Queering Outcomes: Hacking the Source Code of the WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 36, no. 1, Fall/Winter 2012, pp. 204–8.

Blair, Kristine, et al. "The Electronic Landscape of Journal Editing: 'Computers and Composition' as Scholarly Collective." *Profession 2009*, pp. 160–67.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice, Cambridge UP, 1977.

Bratta, Phil, and Malea Powell. "Introduction to the Special Issue: Entering the Cultural Rhetorics Conversations." *Cultural Rhetorics*, special issue of *enculturation*, vol. 21, 2016, enculturation. net/entering-the-cultural-rhetorics-conversations.

Burley, Rachel. "Peer Review in the 21st Century: Openness, Experimentation, and Integrity." *Information Services & Use*, vol. 37, no. 3, 2017, pp. 259–61. doi: 10.3233/ISU-170850.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. *A Geopolitics of Academic Writing*. U of Pittsburgh P, 2002.

———. *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. Routledge, 2012.

"CCCC Grants and Awards." *Conference on College Composition and Communication*, cccc.ncte.org/ cccc/awards.

"CCCC/TYCA Editorial Fellowships." *Conference on College Composition and Communication*, cccc .ncte.org/cccc/editorial-fellowship.

Cedillo, Christina V. "What Does It Mean to Move?: Race, Disability, and Critical Embodiment Pedagogy." *Composition Forum* vol. 39, 2018, compositionforum.com/issue/39/to-move.php.

Chakravartty, Paula, et al. "#CommunicationSoWhite." *Journal of Communication*, vol. 68, no. 2, 2018, pp. 254–66.

Christoph, Julie Nelson, et al. "Three Models of Mentorship: Feminist Leadership and the Graduate Student WPA." *Performing Feminism and Administration in Rhetoric and Composition Studies*, edited by Krista Ratcliffe and Rebecca Rickly, Hampton Press, 2010, pp. 93–106.

Cobos, Casie, et al. "Journals in Composition Studies." *College English*, vol. 46, no. 4, 1984, pp. 348–65.

Council for Writing Program Administrators. "The CWPA Mentoring Project." Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2012. http://wpacouncil.org/mentoring-project.

Davidson, Cathy. "Introduction: How and Why to Structure a Classroom for Student-Centered Learning and Equality." *HASTAC*, 5 Dec. 2016, www.hastac.org/blogs/cathy-davidson /2016/12/05/introduction-how-and-why-structure-classroom-student-centered.

Detweiler, Eric. "'/' And '-'?: An Empirical Consideration of the Relationship between 'Rhetoric' and 'Composition'." *enculturation*, 27 Oct. 2015, enculturation.net/an-empirical-consideration.

DeVoss, Dànielle Nicole, and John Gallagher, editors. *Explanation Points: Publishing in Rhetoric and Composition.* U of Colorado/Utah State UP, forthcoming.

Dillard, Cynthia B. "The Substance of Things Hoped for, the Evidence of Things Not Seen: Examining an Endarkened Feminist Epistemology in Educational Research and Leadership." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, vol. 13, no. 6, 2000, pp. 661–81.

"Editorial Board and Review Process." *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, kairos.technorhetoric.net/board.html#review.

Enos, Theresa. "Gender and Publishing Scholarship in Rhetoric and Composition." Olson and Taylor, pp. 57–72.

Feder, Toni. "Combatting Professional Isolation through Mutual Mentoring." *Physics Today*, April 2016, pp. 29–30.

Gaillet, Lynée Lewis. "Introduction." *Stories of Mentoring: Theory and Practice*, edited by Lynée Lewis Gaillet and Michelle F. Eble. Parlor Press, 2008, pp. 3–12.

Gaillet, Lynée Lewis, and Letizia Guglielmo. *Scholarly Publication in a Changing Landscape: Models for Success.* Palgrave MacMillan, 2014.

Gale, Frederic G. "Composition Journals and the Politics of Knowledge-Making: A Conversation with Journal Editors." *JAC*, vol. 18, no. 2, 1998, pp. 197–211.

Gilyard, Keith, editor. *Race, Rhetoric, and Composition*. Boynton/Cook, 1999.

Goggin, Maureen Daly. *Authoring a Discipline: Scholarly Journals and the Post-World War II Emergence of Rhetoric and Composition*. Lawrence Erlbaum, 2000.

Grijalva, Regina A. McManigell. "Discovering Our Mothers' Gardens: Cultivating Diverse Resources for the Emergence of a New Paradigm in Higher Education." *Urban Review*, vol. 50, 2018, pp. 177–92.

Gutiérrez y Muhs, Gabriella, et al., editors. *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. Utah State UP, 2012.

Haas, Angela M. "Wampum as Hypertext: An American Indian Intellectual Tradition of Multimedia Theory and Practice." *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, vol. 19, no. 4, 2007, pp. 77-100.

Harris, Heidi, editor. *The Bedford Bibliography of Research in Online Writing Instruction*. Bedford/St. Martin & Macmillan, 30 Oct. 2018. community.macmillan.com/docs/DOC-5039-the-bedford-bibliography-of-research-in-online-writing-instruction.

Ianetta, Melissa. "Dull Duty and Discretionary Power: Looking for the Editor in Writing Studies." *College English*, vol. 77, no. 2, 2014, pp. 157–64.

Inoue, Asao B. *Antiracist Writing Assessment Ecologies: Teaching and Assessing Writing for a Socially Just Future*. WAC Clearinghouse/Parlor, 2015.

Inoue, Asao B., and Mya Poe. *Race and Writing Assessment*. Peter Lang, 2012.

"Interactive Public Peer Review." *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics: An Interactive Open-Access Journal of the European Geosciences Union*. www.atmospheric-chemistry-and-physics.net/peer_review/interactive_review_process.html.

Kelly-Riley, Diane. "Methodological Challenges of Counting Diverse Authorship." 2018 CCCC Convention, 16 Mar. 2018, Kansas City Marriott Downtown: Colonial Ballroom, Kansas City, MO. Conference Presentation.

King, Lisa, et al., editors. *Survivance, Sovereignty, and Story: Teaching American Indian Rhetorics*. Utah State UP, 2015.

Lewiecki-Wilson, Cynthia, et al., editors. *Disability and the Teaching of Writing: A Critical Sourcebook*. Bedford/St. Martin's, 2008.

Lucas, Brad E., and Drew M. Loewe. "Coordinating Citations and the Cartography of Knowledge: Finding True North in Five Scholarly Journals." *Changing of Knowledge in Composition:*

Contemporary Perspectives, edited by Lance Massey and Richard Gephardt, Utah State UP, 2011, pp. 264–82.

Luey, Beth. "The Profession of Journal Editing." *Profession 2009*, pp. 112–18.

Lyons, Scott Richard. *X-Marks: Native Signatures of Assent*. U of Minnesota, 2010.

Macklin, Tialitha. "Empirical Representations of Race and Sex in Citation Pages." 2018 CCCC Convention, 16 Mar. 2018, Kansas City Convention Cetner: Bartle Room 2007, Kansas City, MO. Conference Presentation.

Martinez, Aja Y. "A Plea for Critical Race Theory Counterstory: Stock Story vs. Counterstory Dialogues Concerning Alejandra's 'Fit' in the Academy." *Composition Studies*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2014, pp. 33–55.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in US College Composition." *College English*, vol. 68, no. 6, 2006, pp. 637–51.

McKerrow, Raymie. "Corporeality and Cultural Rhetoric: A Site for Rhetoric's Future." *Southern Communication Journal*, vol. 63, no. 4, 1998, pp. 315–28.

"Mentoring." Coalition of Feminist Scholars in the History of Rhetoric and Composition. 2018. cwshrc.org/resources/mentoring/.

Monroe, Barbara. *Plateau Indian Ways with Words: The Rhetorical Tradition of the Tribes of the Inland Northwest*. U of Pittsburgh P, 2014.

Morris, Alex. "How Samantha Bee Crashed the Late-Night Boys' Club." *Rolling Stone*, 30 June 2016. www.rollingstone.com/tv/tv-news/how-samantha-bee-crashed-the-late-night-boys-club-104583/.

Morrison, Margaret, editor. *Queer Rhetoric*, special issue of *Pre/Text*, vol. 13, nos. 3-4, 1992.

Mueller, Derek. *Network Sense: Methods for Visualizing a Discipline*. WAC Clearinghouse, 2017.

Olson, Gary A., and Todd W. Taylor, editors. *Publishing in Rhetoric and Composition*. SUNY P, 1997.

Perryman-Clark, Staci, et al., editors. *Students' Right to Their Own Language: A Critical Sourcebook*. Bedford/St. Martin's, 2015.

Phillips, Donna Burns, et al. "College Composition and Communication: Chronicling a Discipline's Genesis." *CCC*, vol. 44, no. 4, 1993, pp. 443–65.

Powell, Malea. "Stories Take Place: A Performance in One Act." *CCC*, vol. 62, no. 2, 2012, pp. 383–406. www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/CCC/0642-dec2012/CCC0642Address.pdf.

Powell, Malea, with Andrea Riley-Mukavetz. "Making Native Space for Graduate Students: A Story of Indigenous Rhetorical Practice," King et al., pp. 138–59.

Pullman, George. "A Brief History and Technical Overview of the Current State of *JAC Online*, with a Few Observations about How the Internet Is Influencing (or Failing to Influence) Scholarship: Or, Who Says You Can't Find *JAC Online*?" *enculturation*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2002, english.ttu.edu/kairos/7.x/jac/JAC-history.html.

Reynolds, Nedra. *Geographies of Writing: Inhabiting Places and Encountering Difference*. 1st ed., Southern Illinois UP, 2007.

Rhodes, Jacqueline, and Jonathan Alexander, editors. *Sexual Rhetorics: Methods, Identities, Publics*. Routledge, 2015.

Ritter, Kelly. "Journal Editors in the Archives: Reportage as Microhistory." *Microhistories of Composition*, edited by Bruce McCormiskey, UP of Colorado, 2016, pp. 90–116.

Robillard, Amy E. "'Young Scholars' Affecting Composition: A Challenge to Disciplinary Citation Practices." *College English*, vol. 68, no. 3, 2006, pp. 253–70.

Ruiz, Iris D., and Raúl Sánchez, editors. *Decolonizing Rhetoric and Composition Studies: New Latinx Keywords for Theory and Pedagogy*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Sheridan, David M., et al. *The Available Means of Persuasion: Mapping a Theory and Pedagogy of Multimodal Public Rhetoric*. Parlor, 2012.

Shields, Stephanie A. "Waking up to Privilege: Intersectionality and Opportunity," Gutiérrez y Muhs et al., pp. 29–40.

Shipka, Jody. *Toward a Composition Made Whole*. U of Pittsburgh P, 2011.

Sirc, Geoffrey. *English Composition as a Happening*. Utah State UP, 2002.

Skurzewski-Servant, Missy, and Marilyn J. Bugenhagen. "Career Navigation of Female Leaders in Higher Education: The Importance of the Mentor-Protogé Relationship." *Surviving Sexism in Academia: Strategies for Female Leadership*, edited by Kristi Cole and Holly Hassel. Routledge, 2017, pp. 225–32.

Smitherman, Geneva. *Talkin and Testifyin: The Language of Black America*. Wayne State UP, 1986.

Sparks, Summer C. "From Gatekeepers to Facilitators: Understanding the Role of the Journal Editor." *College English*, vol. 77, no. 2, 2014, pp. 153–57.

"Submissions." *Kairos*, kairos.technorhetoric.net/submissions.html.

Tennant, Jonathan P. "The State of the Art in Peer Review." *FEMS Microbiology Letters*, vol. 365, no. 19, Oct. 2018. doi.org/10.1093/femsle/fny204.

Tirrell, Jeremy. "A Geographical History of Online Rhetoric and Composition Journals." *Kairos*, vol. 16, no. 3, 2012, kairos.technorhetoric.net/16.3/topoi/tirrell/.

VanHaitsma, Pamela, and Steph Ceraso. "'Making It' in the Academy through Horizontal Mentoring." *Peitho*, vol. 19, no. 2., 2017, pp. 210–33.

Villanueva, Victor, Jr. *Bootstraps: From an American Academic of Color*. NCTE, 1993.

Waite, Stacey. *Teaching Queer: Radical Possibilities for Writing and Knowing*. U of Pittsburgh P, 2017.

Webb-Sunderhaus, Sara, and Kim Donehower, editors. *Rereading Appalachia: Literacy, Place, and Cultural Resistance*. UP of Kentucky, 2015.

Winterowd, W. Ross. "Literacy, Linguistics, and Rhetoric." *Teaching Composition: Twelve Bibliographic Essays*, edited by Gary Tate, Texas Christian UP, 1987, pp. 265–90.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake. "Made Not Only in Words: Composition in a New Key." *CCC*, vol. 56, no. 2, 2004, pp. 297–328.

Yergeau, Melanie. *Authoring Autism: On Rhetoric and Neurological Queerness*. Duke UP, 2017.

Young, Vershawn Ashanti. *Your Average Nigga: Performing, Race, Literacy, and Masculinity*. Wayne State UP, 2007.

Zearfoss, Ruth. "How I Learned to Stop Worrying about Peer Review and Love Collaboration." *Cross Talk*, Cell Press, 15 Sept. 2017, crosstalk.cell.com/blog/how-i-learned-to-stop-worrying-about-peer-review-and-love-collaboration.