

Article

A Diverse Contributing Body: A Study of Second Language Writing's Influence on Writing Studies in Inkshed

Christin Wright-Taylor

Wilfrid Laurier University

Abstract

In 1961, the CCCC released a report titled “The Freshman Whose Native Language is Not English.” In this report, the chair argued for separate courses dedicated to teaching language-diverse students and staffed by “a linguistic expert, or experts, so that the student may be prepared for and oriented to some of the vagaries of the English language before the Freshman English teacher meets him” (Matsuda, 1999, p. 711). Paul Kei Matsuda (1999) argues that this moment marks the institutional divide between U.S. composition and applied linguistics that would go on to create a vacuum of knowledgeable peers. This vacuum meant that new composition theories interested in language topics in writing were not held accountable by peers trained in applied linguistics. If Matsuda’s assessment of this division of labour in the U.S. is correct, it inspires the question: does the same division of labour exist in a Canadian context? How have these two fields related historically, and what implications does this relationship (or lack thereof) have on the future of writing instruction in Canada’s increasingly language-diverse classrooms? The purpose of this paper is to construct a history of the relationship between these two fields as it pertains to one of Canada’s primary writing organizations: the Canadian Association for Studies in Language and Learning, also known as Inkshed.

This paper first defines the Canadian term for composition, building on Wetherbee Phelps’ (2014) Canadian term “discourse and writing” to create “discourse and writing studies” (DW studies). Next, this paper excavates the *Inkshed* newsletters and conference programs from 1980 onward for evidence of cross-pollination between DW studies and second language (L2) writing. To further explore the relationship between these two areas in Inkshed’s past, this research builds on the work

of Miriam E. Horne who composes a rich picture of Inkshed's development in her book, *Writing in a Community of Practice: Composing Membership in Inkshed*.

The findings from this paper reveal that during the tenure of Inkshed, DW studies and L2 Writing scholarship comingled and remained closely linked through the decades until the organization dispersed. In other words, in the life of Inkshed, there does not appear to have been the same institutional division of labour between DW studies and L2 Writing as there was between composition and applied linguistics in the US.

Ultimately, these findings contribute to the broader narrative of how discourse and writing has professionalized in a Canadian context. They also contribute to the ongoing conversation regarding how writing instructors, writing program administrators, and writing centre professionals can best support culturally and linguistically diverse writers in Canadian classrooms. By drawing on this longstanding relationship with L2 Writing, DW studies scholars and practitioners are uniquely situated to greet the future of higher education equipped with language-based writing theories that are rooted in a community of knowledgeable L2 Writing peers.

Introduction

In 1961, the CCCC released a report titled "The Freshman Whose Native Language is Not English." In this report, the chair argued for separate courses dedicated to teaching language-diverse students and staffed by "a linguistic expert, or experts, so that the student may be prepared for and oriented to some of the vagaries of the English language before the Freshman English teacher meets him" (Matsuda, 1999, p. 711). Paul Kei Matsuda (1999) (writing in an American context) argues that this moment marks the institutional divide between composition and applied linguistics that created a vacuum of knowledgeable peers in composition. As such, composition theories interested in language topics in writing were not held accountable by peers trained in applied linguistics. If Matsuda's assessment of this division of labour in the U.S. is correct, it inspires the question: does this same division of labour exist in a Canadian context? How have these two areas related historically, and what implications does this relationship (or lack thereof) have on the future of writing instruction in Canada's increasingly language-diverse classrooms?

In order to properly frame this research question, it is necessary to define the different terms used between the U.S. and Canada regarding the study and teaching of writing. Distinct cultural differences have shaped how composition and applied linguistics have evolved in their respective countries – Canada and the U.S. The cumulative effect of these cultural differences merits a distinction in

terminology. For that reason, this paper builds on Wetherbee Phelps's (2014) terms by referring to the U.S. field as "rhetoric and composition" and the Canadian field as "discourse and writing studies" (DW studies). When referring to applied linguistics in a Canadian context, this paper studies a particular field within applied linguistics called second language writing (L2 writing).

Previous research reveals that DW studies and L2 writing did not appear to experience an institutional divide in the history of the Canadian Association for the Study of Discourse and Writing/Association Canadienne de Rédactologie (CASDW/ACR) (Wright-Taylor, 2023). If that is true of CASDW/ACR, then what about other Canadian writing organizations? Applying this same research question to the Canadian Association for the Study of Language and Learning (CASLL or Inkshed) deepens the picture of the relationship between these two scholarly areas in a Canadian context. Understanding this historical relationship offers a foundation from which to create writing curricula that accounts for students' linguistic identity. However, no such narrative exists documenting the relationship between DW studies and L2 writing as both evolved in a Canadian context.

This paper aims to construct that narrative in one of Canada's primary writing organizations: the Canadian Association for Studies in Language and Learning (CASLL), also known as Inkshed. This paper excavates the *Inkshed* newsletters and conference programs from 1980 onward for archival research, highlighting any potential cross-pollination between DW studies and L2 writing. To further explore the relationship between these two scholarly areas in Inkshed's past, this research builds on the work of Miriam E. Horne (2012), who composes a rich picture of Inkshed's development in her book, *Writing in a Community of Practice: Composing Membership in Inkshed*.

The findings from this paper reveal that not only did DW studies and L2 writing "cross-fertilize" during the tenure of Inkshed, they remained closely linked through the decades until the organization dispersed. In other words, in the life of Inkshed, there does not appear to have been an institutional division of labour between DW studies and L2 writing in the same way as composition and applied linguistics in the U.S.

Ultimately, these findings contribute to the broader narrative of how the study and teaching of writing has professionalized in a Canadian context. They also contribute to the ongoing conversation regarding how writing instructors, writing program administrators, and writing centre professionals can best support culturally and linguistically diverse writers in Canadian classrooms. By drawing on this longstanding relationship, writing scholars and teachers are uniquely situated to move into the

future of Canadian higher education equipped with language-based writing theories that are rooted in a community of knowledgeable peers.

Terminology

As an American, professionally socialized in first year composition, I entered my Ph.D. research using the American term “rhetoric and composition” or “composition.” It wasn’t long before I ran into a flurry of corrections around terminology in a Canadian context. Early on, a stalwart of the field guided me to the term “writing studies” as the Canadian version of “composition.” Upon submitting the second article manuscript from my dissertation, the editors of CASDW encouraged me to use the term “discourse and writing” as a more specific Canadian version of writing studies. This term also reflected the name of the professional organization and journal. Then, when submitting my third manuscript for publication, I was guided by another editor to the term “discourse and writing studies.”

The many renumerations of the name of this field in Canada belies the significant cultural differences that have shaped its development in the Canadian context. These cultural differences bear explanation. For example, when speaking of the study and practice of writing instruction, Brooks (2002) frames the cultural differences between U.S. and Canadian approaches as American pragmatism versus Canadian philosophical idealism. As Brooks describes it, “Compulsory first-year composition has become ... ‘a well-worn groove’ in American Higher Education supported by a receptive, pragmatic national culture.” (p. 98). Brooks goes on to explain how the U.S. established writing instruction as an accessible approach to higher education growing out of a response to the needs of open enrollment and a growing body of (hitherto) non-traditional students.

In contrast to the U.S. pragmatic approach, Brooks describes a more idealistic approach in Canada. Meanwhile, in Canada, “English departments largely dug their heels in and insisted on a traditional, literary-based liberal arts education for Canadian students” (p. 105). Not to put too fine a point on it, but Canadians viewed the teaching of writing as “American, practical and unintellectual – the hack work” (Brooks, 2006, p. 107). This fundamental difference in the teaching of writing in Canadian higher education sent the path of DW studies on a different trajectory. Graves and Graves (2006) describe the trajectory this way: “The evolution in English departments towards aesthetics and away from the practical (i.e., composition) largely resulted in driving the teaching of writing into curricular structures outside of English: writing centres, various discipline-specific courses, and independent academic units such as the Communications Studies department at Calgary” (p. 2) This decentralized

nature of writing instruction in Canada has impacted the professionalization of the field in Canadian higher education. These cultural differences have given composition and DW studies different loci in each country and subtly different iterations, meriting different terminology for each location.

Similarly, the term "applied linguistics" is the U.S. term for the study of how students learn to speak an added language. This paper is particularly interested in a sub-field within applied linguistics called second language writing (L2 writing). Atkinson et al (2015) describe L2 writing as an "international and transdisciplinary field of study that is concerned with any issues related to the phenomenon of writing in a language that is acquired later in life" (384). When referring to how linguistically diverse students learn to write English in an academic context, this paper will use the term "L2 writing." When speaking about topics or issues of language in education and writing, this paper will use terms such as "language issues" or "language topic." For example, "Inkshed invited paper presentations informed by language topics."

Finally, the term "language-diverse students" combines the research of linguists and compositionists to name students who speak and write in multiple languages. This paper purposely combines applied linguistic and rhetoric and composition scholarship as an homage to Matsuda's critique of the divide between these two fields. From applied linguistics, this paper draws on the work of Ofelia García and Ricardo Otheguy (2020) who argue that terms such as "multilingual" and "plurilingual" insinuate that students acquire language in an additive way: stacking one language upon another. They argue that this additive conception of language learning is misguided. Instead, García and Otheguy demonstrate that language learners utilize a "unitary linguistic system that they build through social interactions of different types, and that is not compartmentalized into boundaries corresponding to those of the named languages" (García & Otheguy, 2020, p. 25). They propose the term "translanguaging" to distinguish how students learn a language. For García and Otheguy, the term "translanguaging" empowers the language learner's sense of agency and identity, allowing them to use whatever form, sign, or language they need in any given situation to demonstrate meaning.

However, García and Otheguy's term is very close to the term "translingualism" -- a theory located in rhetoric and composition. Canagarajah (2013) uses the term "translingual" to signal the way that writers "shuttle between languages," drawing on them to create new and critical pathways for meaning. Like García and Otheguy, Canagarajah acknowledges the fluid way in which language learners draw on a repertoire of language abilities to write. However, in rhetoric and composition, the term "translingualism" has come to name a theoretical perspective. Atkinson et al. (2015), defines

translingualism as “a particular orientation to how language is conceptualized and implicated in the study and teaching of writing” that centers the “agentive use of various language resources” to write (p.384). In other words, translingualism as a theory seeks to decentre the myth of a homogenous writing classroom and empower students to employ all aspects of their language identity in writing.

Like these scholars, this article does not subscribe to the notion that languages are additive nor that students layer one named language on the other. Instead, this research views students' languaging repertoire as complex and amorphous, more like the nodes on a neural network that creates meaning by making multiple and fluid connections across time, space, identity, culture, and context. However, to avoid confusion between the subtle but significantly different usages of the term ‘translanguaging’ in applied linguistics and “translingual” in rhetoric and composition, this article will use the term “language-diverse students/writers” to refer to students who learn, speak, socialize, identify, and write in multiple languages.

Internationalization in Canadian Higher Education Past and Present

Given the break-neck speed of internationalization in higher education in the last decade, questions regarding the relationship between DW studies and L2 writing feel more urgent than ever. Statistics Canada reports that the number of study permit holders in Canada has increased roughly five-fold in the last twenty years, growing from a little over 100,000 in 2000 to 621,600 in 2021 (Crossman et al., 2022).

Not only have the numbers increased, but the quality of internationalization has changed. Roopa Trilokekar (2010) narrates a history of internationalization in Canada that was initially built on collaboration and relationship-building but has since changed. She writes that before the mid-1960s, internationalization in Canadian higher education had its roots “in a traditional Canadian ethos and soft power policy of anti-imperialism and a need for a just and equitable world order ... However, this is now history” (Trilokekar, 2010, p. 144). In other words, Trilokekar posits that before 1960, Canadian higher education engaged internationalization as a form of supporting global development. Jane Knight (2013) confirms this early picture when she writes, “Internationalisation of higher education was originally conceived in terms of exchange and sharing of ideas, cultures, knowledge, and values” (p. 88). However, this early version of internationalization has pivoted under the era of globalization and taken on a darker orientation, one that positions education and students as a commodity, a resource to be plundered for the reputation and wealth of the institution and Canada (Johnstone & Lee, 2017).

Theoretical Framework

Because this paper is concerned with questions of support for language-diverse writers studying in Canadian institutions from abroad, it is essential to understand how these students have arrived in the writing classroom. What has brought them? How are they situated in the institution? We cannot discuss how to best support these students' linguistic and cultural needs with our writing instruction until we see the nature of their place in our classrooms.

While the motivations to enroll students from abroad may have begun in a partnership mentality, since the onset of globalization, these same motives have hewn dangerously close to neo-imperialism. Marjorie Johnstone and Eunjung Lee (2017) define neo-imperialism as "a power that benefits from and actively participates in the global system of domination in which the wealth and resources of the third world are systematically plundered by the capital of the Global North" (p. 1074). In other words, while imperialism traded in the exploitation and extraction of concrete goods and resources, neo-imperialism trades in the exploitation and extraction of intellectual goods and resources.

Through their work, Johnstone and Lee (2017) demonstrate how under the auspices of globalization, internationalization has worked to secure power and resources for Canada while draining those same resources from other countries. Kamal Guruz (2011) articulates it clearly when he writes, "Hosting foreign students is intended to spread the host country's cultural and political values" (p. 175). Not only does internationalization advance Canadian culture and values, but it also works to recruit brain power from other countries in service of Canada's innovation, nation-building, and labour market. As Johnstone and Lee (2017) point out, "The international education field has thus become a site to (re)produce the colonial imperial power disparity between the Global North and South, and between the Global West and East" (p.1068). In sum, globalization has made the world smaller and more interconnected, and with it came the expansion of education policy to internationalization: a global foot race to win students that can contribute to the host country's neo-imperial agenda.

To resist and counter these neo-imperial influences, it is important to better understand the location of DW studies in Canada and to what extent it has drawn on influences from L2 writing. When we understand our history, we are better able to face the future. For this reason, narrating the history of the relationship between DW studies and L2 writing allows for intentional scholarship and practice in the present and future, as scholars and teachers of writing work to resist the neo-imperial pull of internationalization. To that end, this paper seeks to contribute to this deeper understanding

by tracing the relationship between these two areas and any ways in which one might have influenced the other in a Canadian context. From there, DW studies faculty and scholars can leverage an historic relationship with L2 writing to build writing curriculum that deconstructs neo-imperial influences in our classrooms.

Methods

Through archival research, this paper builds a narrative of the relationship between DW studies and L2 writing. It takes as its corpus the publication archives hosted by the Canadian Association for Study of Discourse and Writing/Redactologie. Under the "Related Associations" tab, all the Inkshed newsletters published from 1982 to its final publication in 2015 have been digitized. These volumes are organized as "First Inkshed Newsletters," "The Middle Years," and "The Online Years."

To identify L2 writing influences, the volumes from each era of the newsletter were searched for keywords relating to language, Linguistics, applied linguistics, E.S.L. writers, E.S.L. students, contrastive rhetoric, native writers/speakers, non-native writers/speakers, and L2 writing. Additionally, the volumes were searched for the keywords borders/borderless, intercultural, and global/international. When these words appeared in the titles of articles included in the newsletter, the articles were read to gain an understanding of the nature of the conversation regarding language-diverse, visa students during that era of DW studies scholarship.

On the other hand, analyzing the call for papers for the Inkshed conferences proved more difficult as these documents were not centralized in a searchable database. The first step was to go through each issue of the newsletters from 1982 – 2015, pulling any CFPs and programs published in the newsletter. Of the 30 conferences held, 19 Calls for Proposals and 10 programs from the archives were recovered. While time-consuming, this searching and sorting process was not only necessary but expected given the irregular documentation practices of an organization in the early days of its development.

Once as many CFPs and programs as could be recovered were consolidated into a single searchable document, the keywords used to analyze the newsletter issues were used to identify conference topics and papers that revealed a linguistic influence. Where conference programs and "inksheddings" were included, these documents were analyzed for signs of shared influence between DW studies and L2 writing.

While the Inkshed newsletters, CFPs, and conference schedules provided rich archival data for this research, one other significant Inkshed publication was omitted from this discourse analysis: the

Inkshed listserv. The listserv was omitted in an attempt to mirror the scope of research of CASDW/ACR's history (Wright-Taylor, 2023). In other words, this research on Inkshed was conducted in tandem with another study of CASDW/ACR's publications and conferences. Both studies looked at the publications and conferences of both organizations. Future research on the history of DW studies and L2 writing in CASDW/ACR and Inkshed can add to the picture created in these findings by conducting a discourse analysis of the listservs of both organizations.

Findings

The History of the Inkshed Newsletter and Conference

In September 1982, the Canadian Association for the Study of Language and Learning (CASLL) published its inaugural newsletter. Soon, the organization, along with the newsletter, took the nickname *Inkshed* (Horne, 2012). The founders, James Reither and Russell Hunt took this name from a word they found in the Oxford English Dictionary meaning "the shedding of spilling of ink; consumption or waste of ink in writing" (Hunt, 2022). The organization went on to coin the term "inkshedding" meaning, "an activity in which participants respond in writing to a common prompt and then share what they have written with each other" (Horne, 2012, p. 7). Throughout the maturation of Inkshed, the founding members used the practice of inkshedding as both a "heuristic and dialogic activity" that not only created membership but also elevated Inkshed's primary scholarly interests: teaching and language, mainly writing and reading (Horne, 2012, p. 28). "Those who came to Inkshed conferences and participated in other Inkshed activities did so because they chose to pursue the study of language and learning by focusing on facilitating students" (Horne, 2012, p. 29).

Inkshed distinguished itself in this way from its sister DW studies organization, the Canadian Association of Teachers of Technical Writing (CATTW). Roger Graves articulated the different focus of CATTW as offering "an alternative identity, and for people specifically in technical/professional writing" (Horne, 2012, p. 29). It appears that the thrust of the Inkshed newsletter was less to generate scholarly output but more to cultivate a collegial conversation about the practice of teaching writing in a Canadian context. When the organization incorporated in 1994, it articulated its mission as follows: "to provide a forum and common context for discussion, collaboration, and reflective inquiry in discourse and pedagogy in the areas of writing, reading (including the reading of literature), rhetoric, and language" (Hunt, 2022). To that end, the newsletter and conferences offer fascinating

insight into the conversations happening in real-time as this field of DW studies developed through the lens of this particular organization.

In the inaugural *Inkshed* newsletter, James Reither, a faculty member in the English department at St. Thomas University, narrated the organization's genesis. He and his colleague Russell Hunt, also a faculty member in the English department at St. Thomas University, had been travelling to conferences in the U.S. to participate in writing and reading. In Reither's words, they got caught up in the "'revolution' going on there in the fields of writing and reading/theory and pedagogy" and were increasingly frustrated that the "heat from that revolution was doing little to raise the theoretical and pedagogical temperature" in Canadian universities (Reither & Hunt, 1982, p. 2). Reither states that he and Hunt felt "cut off" from the scholarly advances happening in rhetoric and composition in the U.S., England, and Australia. As such, Reither and Hunt sought to create a community of like-minded scholars in Canadian higher education.

Through the creation of *Inkshed*, Reither and Hunt found an abundance of faculty from different parts of the Canadian academy who were eager to understand and sharpen their theory and practice of teaching writing. They spread the word, asking people to send in names of colleagues, teachers, and researchers interested in joining this community. In her ethnography on the *Inkshed* community, Miriam Horne (2012) writes that the "driving force behind the creation of the *Inkshed* newsletter ... [was] the opportunity to collaborate, network, and draw from resources of other Canadian practitioners" (p. 32). Horne quotes *Inkshed* member Stan Straw, who identifies the uniquely diverse nature of *Inkshed*: "Inkshed is unique in that it invites English department people, writing centre people, writing program people, even people from business and government, and *people from education* [emphasis his] to be a part if they choose" (2012, p. 31). Straw goes on to use the word "cross-fertilization" as a description for the unique identity of the *Inkshed* community. Over the years, contributors and editors for the newsletter represented a healthy cross-section of departments across the Canadian academy and illustrated Straw's point.

A finalized list of contributing editors and their departments throughout the lifespan of the newsletter is as follows:

Table 1: Department and Institution Affiliations for Inkshed Editors

Department	Institution	Editor
Applied Linguistics and Discourse Studies	Carleton University	Graham Smart
Communication, Media and Film	University of Calgary	Jo-Anne André
Communication, Media and Film	University of Calgary	Doug Brent
Communications	York University	Mary-Louise Craven
Communications, Media and Film	University of Calgary	Barbara Schneider
Curriculum, Teaching and Learning	University of Toronto	Mary Kooy
Education	McGill University	Anthony Paré
Education	University of Winnipeg	Pat Sadowy
Education	University of Manitoba	Sandy Baardman
English	Memorial University	Phyllis Artiss
English	Simon Fraser University	Richard M. Coe
English	Mount Saint Vincent University	Susan Drain
English	University of British Columbia	Judy Segal
English	St. Thomas University	Russ Hunt
Humanities	York University	Leslie Sanders,
Writing Centre	University of Toronto	Margaret Procter
Writing Programme	St. Thomas University	Jim Reither
N/A	Nova Scotia College of Art and Design	Kenna Manos
N/A	Manitoba Teacher's Association	Laura Atkinson
N/A	Nova Scotia College of Art and Design	Jane Milton
N/A	University of Michigan	Marcy Bauman

A Language Foundation

The influence exerted on DW studies through L2 writing is evident in the very foundation of the newsletter. The first newsletter addresses explicitly the parameters of the organization, which include areas and fields rooted in language topics. The editors write that the newsletter is for teachers of writing and reading who are interested in: "cross-disciplinary approaches to studying the nature, acquisition, and uses of language and language processes -- as, e.g., contributions from linguistics~ sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, text linguistics, anthropology, philosophy (as, e.g.,

Speech Act Theory, Ordinary Language philosophy, semiotics)" (Reither & Hunt, 1982, p. 1). We see in this list a robust representation of scholarship influenced by language and language acquisition.

This emphasis on language issues remained a guiding focus of the newsletter but was slightly rearticulated with the maturation of the publication. By early 1995, the brief description at the top of the newsletter was reworded to include the following: "Inkshed provides a forum for its subscribers to explore relationships among research, theory, and practice in language acquisition and language use" (Brown et al., 1995, p. 2). The newsletter kept this interdisciplinary language in its banner until 2012 when the opening description of the purpose of the newsletter was dropped entirely in favour of a quick summary of the contents of each newsletter.

A Diverse Contributing Body

In making it clear the Inkshed newsletter functioned as a gathering place for faculty from different disciplines who teach and research writing, the editors created a publication where contributors from both DW studies and language-based disciplines brought their research, collaborated on ideas, and shared their work. One of the best examples of this collaboration comes from the second volume, the first issue published in 1983, in which Reither compiled a list of professionals who volunteered their time and expertise to consult writing programs across Canada. Thirty-six academics representing nine provinces put their names forward as consultants. The provinces represented by these educators were: Alberta (4), British Columbia (I.Z.), Manitoba (I), New Brunswick (3), Nova Scotia (I), Ontario (9), Prince Edward Island (I), Quebec (2), and Saskatchewan (2) (Reither 5/6).

Of the 49 areas of expertise, 13 appear to come from disciplines that includes some focus on language topics. The numbers in parentheses after the areas of expertise represent the number of consultants offering support in that category.

Table 2: Writing Support Consultants

Mainstream Writing Support	Linguistic/L2 Writing/ESL Support
Advanced / Intermediate Composition (2)	Bilingual Education (1)
Communication Theory (1)	Course Design--ESL (1)
Course Design--Composition (5)	ESL--Teaching ESL Writing (5)
Critical Apologetics (1)	ESL--Testing (1)
Developmental / Remedial Writing and Reading (1)	Language Learning (1)
Editing for Publication (2)	Lexicology (1)
Elocution and Voice Production (1)	Linguistics / Linguistic Theory (3)
Evaluation of Writing (4)	Reading Process--French (1)
	Second-Language Composition--French (1)

<p>Figurative Language (1) Inquiry — Teaching of (1) Language Arts--Theory of (1) Literacy and Literary Values (1) Literacy "Crises--Sociology of (1) Literature--Theory of Teaching (2) Northrop Frye, Literature, and Education (1)</p> <p>One-to-One Conferences and Tutoring (6) Philosophy of Education (1) Polanyi (Michael) and the Teaching of Writing (1) Practical Writing (1) Process-Centered Pedagogy: Reading--Theory and Practice (2) Process-Centered Pedagogy: Writing--Theory and Practice (6) Programme (Writing) Design (1) Reading--Psychology of (1) Reading Process (4) Revision--Theory and Practice (2) Rhetoric--History of (1) Rhetoric--Practice of (2) Rhetoric / Stylistics (1) Scoring--Holistic (2) and Primary Trait (1) Semiotics (2) Teacher Training--especially re: Teaching Writing (2) Technical Writing (2) Testing (2) Writing Development—K through Maturity (1) Writing Process--Theory and Teaching (7) Writing Skills--Lecturing about (5)</p>	<p>Semantics--Linguistics (1) Testing--ESL (1) Whole Language Theory, and Teaching Reading (1) Whole Language~ Theory, and Writing in the Literature Classroom (1)</p>
---	---

Providing extra support for faculty across Canadian institutions engaged in teaching writing was the goal of the editors. This list demonstrates that faculty from disciplines with a focus on language education were invited to influence writing teachers as they created writing curriculum. This type of cross-pollination between L2 writing topics and DW studies looks similar to how applied linguistics and rhetoric and composition intermingled in the U.S. prior to 1950 (Matsuda, 1999). However, the intermingling of L2 writing and DW studies in Inkshed during these years, suggests that the division of labour which drove applied linguistics into a separate scholarly field in the U.S., appears not to have been institutionalized in the same way in Canada. Inkshed continued to publish a healthy representation of content from DW studies and L2 writing until it disbanded in the mid-2010s.

Evidence of Cross-Talk at Inkshed Conferences

This cross-talk between the two fields can also be traced in the Inkshed Conferences. Between 1990 - 1993, the Inkshed newsletter made it a priority to publish the programs of the conferences for Inkshed VII -- X7 - 10. However, in most cases, the editors did not consistently publish the programs throughout the organization's life. Instead, they favoured publishing the inksheddings that occurred in response to the individual sessions from the conferences. As a result of this unique focus, the editors seem much more interested in publishing the dialogue that came out of the conferences, giving those of us studying the Inkshed organization a rare glimpse into the type and quality of conversations happening as Inkshed sought to define the identity of DW studies in Canada.

Where all three pieces of documentation for a conference (CFP, Program, and Inksheddings) were available, these documents afforded a glimpse into the conversations that occurred at the conference. One conference, Inkshed VII, offered one such insight.

In 1989, Inkshed put out a CFP for their 7th annual conference at Mount Saint Vincent University. The title of the conference was "Marginalia and Other Rhetorics." In the CFP, the conference organizers explicitly invite proposals and papers on language-diverse writers: "It may be fruitful to look at E.S.L. and at literacy in all its definitions, 1990 being the Year of Literacy and literacy being the CCTE conference theme"(Drain, 1989, p. 16). A year later, Kay L. Stewart, the acting Editor, published abstracts from each of the papers presented at the conference, along with a curated selection of written responses to those papers from attendees. She does this to invite further discussion and thought from Inksheddors who could not attend. However, she also creates a valuable glimpse into the kind of scholarly dialogue happening at Inkshedding conferences for those reading a few decades later.

Of the 13 papers presented, one contains some scholarship about language-diverse writers. The paper was presented by Ann Beer, from McGill University. Her paper titled "Writing, Computers, and 'Quiet Voices': What Happens to Minority Students in the Computer-Assisted Writing Class?" investigates the impact of computer technology in the writing classroom on students who are considered "minority" through a "combination of gender and ethnic or economic pressures" (Beer, 1990, p. 13). Beer's paper centres the cultural and linguistic diversity of students learning in Canadian writing courses and introduces the topic of technology in L2 writing scholarship.

Even more interesting than the language focus in the papers presented at Inkshed are the responses to each paper recorded by conference attendees. Stewart's choice to publish these

"inksheddings" reveals "cross-fertilization" among presenters and attendees during this era of DW studies. Broken down by section, here is the tally of the various faculties represented by the inksheddings for each of the sessions at the conference.

Session 1: 'Exploring Literacy — A Workshop,' presented by Jamie MacKinnon, Bank of Canada, and Lorri Neilson, Mount St. Vincent University.

Table 3: Session 1-- Inkshedder Affiliations

Inkshedder	Department	Institution
Russ Hunt	English	St. Thomas University
Pat Sadowy	English	University of Manitoba
Roger Graves	English	Ohio State University
Deanne Bogdan	History and Philosophy	Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Session 2: "Defining and Defying Margins," presented by Phyllis Artiss, Memorial University.

Table 4: Session 2 -- Inkshedder Affiliations

Inkshedder	Department	Institution
Heather Graves	English	Ohio State University
Allan Neilsen	Faculty of Education	Mount St. Vincent University
Anthony Pare	Faculty of Education	McGill University
Trevor Gamble	College of Education	University of Saskatchewan
Judith Millen		Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Session 3:

- "The Feminization of Literacy," presented by Elspeth Stuckey, Rural Education Alliance for Collaborative Humanities, South Carolina
- "Writing on the Margins: The Sessional Lecturer in the Academic Discourse Community," presented by Hilary Clark, S.F.U, University of Saskatchewan.

Table 5: Session 3 -- Inkshedder Affiliations

Inkshedder	Department	Institution
Russ Hunt	English	St. Thomas University
Patrick Dias	Faculty of Education	McGill University
Nancy Carlman	Private Sector Consultant, spent 8 years in Faculty of Education and English Department	Vancouver, Simon Fraser University
Katherine McManus	Writing Centre	Memorial University
Alice Pitt		Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Jack Robinson		Grant MacEwan Community College
Coralie Bryant		Winnipeg School District

Session 4: "Writing Instruction Inside/Outside Canadian University English Departments," presented by Roger Graves, Ohio State University

Table 6: Session 4 Inkshedder Affiliations

Inkshedder	Department	Institution
Kenna Manos	English	Nova Scotia College of Art and Design
Deborah Kennedy	English	Mount St. Vincent University
Phyllis Artiss	English	Memorial University
Roy Graham	Faculty of Education	University of Manitoba
Doug Vipond	Psychology Department	St. Thomas University
Graham Smart		Bank of Canada
Fred Holtz		Halifax School District

Session 5:

- "Valuing Otherness: Teaching Sameness?" presented by William Boswell, McGill University.
- "Self and Other in Teaching Writing: A Modified Rogerian Approach," presented by Jack Robinson, Grant MacEwan Community College

No Responses

Session 6:

- "The Pedagogy of Engagement and Identification: Marginalizing Non-Mainstream Literature," presented by Stan Straw, University of Manitoba

- “The Rhetoric of Silence,” presented by Robert Graham, University of Manitoba

Table 7: Session 6 -- Inkshedder Affiliations

Inkshedder	Department	Institution
Kay Stewart	English	University of Alberta
Deanne Bogdan	History and Philosophy	Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Session 7:

- “Writing, Computers, and ‘Quiet Voices’: What Happens to Minority Students in the Computer-Assisted Writing Class?” presented by Ann Beer, McGill University
- “Women and Schooling,” presented by Katherine McManus, McGill University

Table 19: Session 7 Inkshedder Affiliations

Participant	Department	Institution
Lynn Holmes	English	Seneca College
Kenna Manos	English	Nova Scotia College of Art and Design

Session 8:

- “Women’s Voices: Gender and Writing,” presented by Heather Graves, Ohio State University
- “One Woman’s Voice: Laura Goodman Salverson —Singing Out Her Song in a Strange Land,” presented by Barbara Powell, University of Regina

Table 20: Session 8 Inkshedder Affiliations

Inkshedder	Department	Institution
Betty Holmes	English	Seneca College
Ann Beer	Faculty of Education	McGill University
Elsbeth Stuckey		Rural Education Alliance for Collaborative Humanities, South Carolina

Session 9: “Beyond (Dis)identification: Feminist Approaches to Teaching ‘A&P,’” presented by Deanna Bogdan, Alice Pitt, and Judith Miller, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Table 21: Session 9 Inkshedder Affiliations

Inkshedder	Department	Institution
Susan Drain	English	Mount St. Vincent University
Hilary Clark	English	University of Saskatchewan

A glance through these tables reveals a healthy mix of faculty from both English and Faculty of Education, which suggests that during this time the teaching of writing existed primarily in these two departments across Canada. This is noteworthy because the presence of Faculty of Education would have introduced early L2 writing scholarship to the Inkshed conferences, as L2 writing found its footing in Canada in Education departments (Wright-Taylor & Heng Hartse, 2024).

The content of the actual inksheddings further reveals the type of dialogue that occurred in these sessions between early scholars in DW studies and L2 writing. In her response to Session 3, Alice Pitt of OISE identifies herself as a sessional lecturer for her department. She writes, "I have one foot in the door of Continuing Studies at U of T. I and almost every other Ph.D. student I know supplement whatever funding (if any) we have by teaching E.S.L." (Pitt, 1990, p. 5). Pitt identifies herself as an E.S.L. instructor attending a DW studies conference. Her presence is evidence of the type of cross-talk happening during this conference between scholars from more traditional DW studies courses and scholars from L2 writing courses.

In response to Session 4, Roy Graham, from the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba, explicitly labels his inkshedding "From outside the English Department" and continues to share how writing instruction is situated differently in his department. He writes that in his department, "writing is used as a tool for learning and that, consequently, all would-be teachers from whatever subject area must begin to explore that connection" (Graham, 1990, p. 10). Graham's perspective situates writing instruction in the context of teaching teachers who will go on to teach in all subject areas, including E.S.L. His perspective offers a unique insight for his fellow writing instructors in English departments nationwide and reveals another way in which conversations across DW studies and L2 writing comingled at Inkshed VII.

This type of comingling of theories and approaches seems to have continued in Inkshed through the end of the decade. In 1999, CASLL hosted Inkshed XVI at Hotel Mont Gabriel in Quebec. The conference title was "Finding Each Other in a Hall of Mirrors: Negotiating Goals and Values in Language." Though inksheddings were not published for this conference, the program reveals that out of 31 papers, 11 appear to include scholarship based on language issues.

Further Emphasis on L2 Writing Scholarship at Inkshed Conferences

While Conference VII is the only conference published in Inkshed that contains all three artifacts for the conference (CFP, Program, and Inkshedding), other conferences demonstrate influence from L2 writing via their CFPs. Of the 19 CFPs recovered from the archives, a keyword search reveals there may be influence from L2 writing at five other conferences:

Inkshed III — 1986: "Research contexts: To what extent does our research into reading and writing take account of 'real' language contexts? Can it? Must it?" (Dias & Paré, 1985, p. 1). This invitation to examine the "real" language contexts of students created the opening for the following conference presentation from Peter Hynes of the University of Saskatchewan, English Department: "Writing Across the Official Languages: Bilingualism at the Glendon College Writing Workshop" (Dias & Paré, 1986, p. 2).

Inkshed IV — 1987: The CFP for this conference states explicitly a goal of cross-dialogue with teachers of English: "A deliberate effort will be made to structure a professional dialogue involving as wide a cross-section of English language teachers as possible" (Straw & Johnson, 1986, p. 12).

Inkshed VIII — 1991: The CFP includes this prompt for presentations: "How will increased multi-culturalism affect schools and schooling?" (Dias, 1990, p. 27). Ostensibly, this question invites scholarship on language-diverse students in the writing classroom. However, the extent to which this CFP generated cross-talk between L2 writing and DW studies is unclear since no published program exists.

Inkshed XI — 1994: The CFP certainly opens the door for L2 writing when it states the theme, "How Do People Learn to Write?" asks the following questions: "How do these cultures enable or inhibit learning to write?" and "How does what we know about young children learning to write (and speak) help us understand how young adults learn to write?" (Paré, 1993, p. 24/25).

Whether or not these questions engendered presentations from an L2 writing perspective is unclear since there is no record of the program in the archives.

Inkshed XVI — 1999: The theme for this year's conference was "Finding Each Other in a Hall of Mirrors: Negotiating Goals and Values in Language," and the CFP directly opened the door for L2 writing with wording that included specific mentions of language instruction: "Walking through the hall of mirrors of language and literacy education..." and "Discussions no longer centre on academic written language in a North American context; instead they move among many forms

of communication: international, technological, intercultural, visual, oral, and physical" (Beer & Ledwell-Brown, 1998, p. 23).

In response to this CFP, the conference included an entire session dedicated to the writing needs of language-diverse writers. The session was titled "Language Goals in the Multicultural Classroom" and included the following presentations (Kooy & Procter, 1999, p. 19):

- "Language and Communication in the Multicultural Classroom" by Patrick Allen.
- "Finding the Balance in Ontario Immersion Programs: Addressing the Needs of Francophone Students from Multi-bilingual Family Backgrounds" by Josée Makropoulos.
- "Holding the Wire: Working Via E-mail with E.S.L. Students" by Margaret Procter.

Inkshed XXI – 2004: The theme of this year's conference was "Desiring the Wor[ld]: Students, Teachers, Disciplines, Institutions," and it opens intellectual space for L2 writing when it asks potential conference goers to consider addressing in their papers, "diversity and desire: the challenge of internationalisation" (Nash, 2003, p. 21) (Nash, 2003, p. 21). Whether or not this conference included panels and papers from L2 writing scholars is uncertain as the program is not available.

An analysis of the keywords in these CFPs reveals at least an openness to topics that would have invited L2 writing in panels and papers. Whether or not that influence occurred at each of the conferences listed is unclear. However, the analysis of the CFP, program, and inksheddings from Inkshed VII reveals that DW studies was open to and inflected by L2 writing and engaged in dialogue with instructors and scholars working with L2 writing perspectives.

Discussion

To return to the original research question: did DW studies and L2 writing experience the same division of labour in Canada as rhetoric and composition and applied linguistics in the U.S.? This narrative history of Inkshed's publications, conferences, and scholarly conversations would suggest "no." It appears that in the life of Inkshed, DW studies and L2 writing did not experienced an division in the same way that rhetoric and composition and applied linguistics did in the U.S.. In addition, recent research on the history of the Canadian Association for Studies in Discourse and Writing (CASDW) reveals similar findings. It appears that in the life of CASDW, DW studies and L2 writing also did not experience an institutional divide in the same way that rhetoric and composition and applied linguistics did in the U.S. (Wright-Taylor, 2023). If this is the case, Inkshed and CASDW's

examples provide some exciting possibilities for the future of DW studies as it seeks to support language-diverse students in the Canadian writing classroom.

First, understanding the historical relationship between DW studies and L2 writing may give current DW studies scholars a foundation for countering and resisting the neo-imperial influences. Like DW studies, L2 writing scholarship has long been attuned to the social and political forces that demand particular levels of communication competence from language-diverse students (Atkinson et al., 2015). As such, L2 writing theories have adapted frameworks that "respect the strength inherent in linguistic variation, recognize the importance of context and local knowledge, and accept the mutable nature of norms" (Williams & Condon, 2016, p. 12). In other words, L2 writing scholarship is also aware of the neo-imperial forces at play and has been working to counter those forces through a robust tradition of scholarship, especially around the myth of the native speaker (Firth & Wagner, 2007). What better partner to have in the work against neo-imperial influences than L2 writing scholarship which has been supporting language-diverse students since its inception? Pooling common resources and scholarship can create a more robust and sturdy response to the neo-imperial influences driving language-diverse students into our writing classrooms.

Given the depth of research on language-diverse speakers in L2 writing, others who have studied the disciplinary divide in the U.S. have called for future collaboration. Scholars such as Jill V. Jeffery, Michael J. Kieffer, and Paul Kei Matsuda (2013) have "advocated for composition studies and second language writing scholars to work together to develop a new writing construct" (Williams & Condon, 2016, p. 3). These scholars are writing in a U.S. context. How much better for Canadian DW studies and L2 writing scholars who work in a context where the disciplinary divide seems not to have institutionalized in the same way? Based on analysis of CASDW's history and Inkshed's history, DW studies and L2 writing scholars and practitioners seem to have a history of cross-pollination that runs up to the current moment.

This paper calls for DW studies scholars to embrace this historical relationship and seek new ways to collaborate with our L2 writing peers to create writing curricula that resists the postcolonial influence of neo-imperialism. For an example of how DW studies might draw on L2 writing to shape curriculum that troubles English Only ideologies, Williams and Condon (2016) outline two areas of common ground.

First, grammar: as DW studies faculty seek to teach grammar in a way that empowers the linguistic capacity of students, they can draw on the rich history of Systematic Functional Linguistics (SFL), a functional linguistics framework that has evolved out of second language studies in Australia. Rather

than approaching grammar as guided by rigid rules of correctness and incorrectness, SFL defines grammar as a “systematic resource for making and exchanging meaning ... through acts ... which simultaneously construe experience and enact social relationships” (Halliday & Webster, 2009, p. 5). This view places grammar within a “system network” that writers negotiate through a series of agentive decisions (Williams & Condon, 2016, p. 13). What might future grammar lessons look like in a writing-intensive course or a writing centre appointment if DW studies teachers and tutors applied the L2 writing framework of SFL? How might this change the way assignments are designed and rubrics marked for linguistically-diverse students? How might this inform the kinds of questions a tutor or writing centre professional utilizes to guide a linguistically-diverse student’s writing?

Another area in which DW studies can draw on L2 writing scholarship is in relation to genre. Both DW studies and L2 writing scholarship acknowledge the rhetorical nature of genres. DW studies scholars along with L2 writing scholars would say in unison that genres are “socially situated,” “exist within complex, interconnected webs,” and “transmit meaning [as well as shape meaning] through use” (Williams & Condon, 2016, p. 14). For these reasons, DW studies scholars might find Tardy’s (2009) Venn diagram of overlapping domains of genre knowledge informative as they teach genre in the writing classroom. Tardy identifies four domains: rhetorical knowledge, formal knowledge, subject-matter knowledge, and process knowledge. This sort of complex and nuanced approach to genre empowers linguistically-diverse students who may not be familiar with North American genre norms. If not careful, genre can be reductive and taught as prescriptive. However, what might future genre lessons look like if they were rooted in L2 writing’s approach? How might L2 writing’s scholarship on the social construction of genre norms fortify writing assignments and assessments in writing-intensive courses? Grammar and genre provide just two examples of how DW studies scholars and teachers can draw on the pre-existing relationship with L2 writing scholarship to inform writing curriculum and practice for an increasingly, language-diverse student population.

Future Research

While the potential for fruitful partnership exists, there is room for future research to investigate more closely how this relationship between DW studies and L2 writing has influenced the writing curriculum, research and teaching practices in a Canadian context. For example, does this relationship address neo-imperial influences in writing assignment design, assessment, and pedagogy? This question merits exploration because due to the decentralized nature of writing instruction in Canadian higher education, writing syllabi are designed and delivered by both L2

writing scholars and DW studies scholars. See for example the contributing members from Table 2, where faculty from across the curriculum are delivering writing instruction and pooling their common resources as consultants for one another. In this list we see faculty from disciplines that specialize in DW studies and faculty from disciplines that specialize in L2 writing. Both are teaching writing in Canadian classrooms. In addition, see the inksheddings from the 7th annual Inkshed conference where faculty teaching writing represent both the English Departments and Faculty of Education departments. Unlike in the U.S., these faculty pooled resources through the Inkshed community until Inkshed disbanded.

In addition, this article encourages writing scholars to collaborate with L2 writing scholars on research and teaching. What would future writing instruction that has intentionally invited and solicited accountability from L2 writing peers look like? How might such a writing approach leverage both DW studies frameworks and L2 writing frameworks to resist and counter the neo-imperial influences shaping writing curricula for language-diverse, visa students?

The good news is that Canadian DW studies scholars are not starting from scratch with these research questions. Unlike our counterparts in the U.S., who have to work to bridge a divide that has been in place for over 50 years, Canadian DW studies scholars appear to have a rich history of influence from L2 writing. These relationships appear to be intact and active even until the publishing of this article. Let us build on this history to meet this moment of internationalization in Canadian writing classrooms.

References

Atkinson, D., Crusan, D., Matsuda, P. K., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., Ruecker, T., Simpson, S., & Tardy, C.

(2015). Clarifying the Relationship Between L2 Writing and Translingual Writing: An Open Letter to Writing Studies Editors and Organization Leaders. *College English*, 77(4), 383–386.

Beer, A. (1990). Writing, Computers, and “Quiet Voices.” *Inkshed*, 9(1), 13.

Beer, A., & Ledwell-Brown, J. (1998). Inkshed Conference XVI. *Inkshed*, 16(3–4), 23–24.

Brooks, K. (2002). National Culture and the First-Year English Curriculum: A Historical Study of “Composition” in Canadian Universities. *The American Review of Canadian Studies*, 32(4), 673–684.

Brown, J., Craven, M.-L., Greenwald, T., Rehner, J., Sheese, R., Spencer, J., Sanders, L., & Vanstone, G. (Eds.). (1995). Front Matter. *Inkshed*, 13(3), 2.

- Canagarajah, S. (2013). Introduction. In *Literacy As Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms* (pp. 1–10). Routledge.
- Crossman, E., Choi, Y., & Hou, F. (2022). *International students as a source of labour supply: A summary of recent trends* [Economic and Social Reports]. Statistics Canada.
- Dias, P. (1990). Call for Proposals: Inkshed 8. *Inkshed*, 9(2), 27–29.
- Dias, P., & Paré, A. (1985). The Social Contexts of Writing and Reading. *Inkshed*, 4(4), 1.
- Dias, P., & Paré, A. (1986). Tentative Program for Inkshed III. *Inkshed*, 5(2), 2.
- Drain, S. (1989). Call for Papers. *Inkshed*, 8(4), 16–17.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (2007). On Discourse, Communication, and (Some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA Research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 757–772.
- García, O., & Otheguy, R. (2020). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(1), 17–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1598932>
- Graham, R. (1990). Responses. *Inkshed*, 9(1), 10.
- Graves, R., & Graves, H. (Eds.). (2006). *Writing Centres, Writing Seminars, Writing Culture: Writing Instructio in Anglo-Canadian Universities*. Tafford Publishing.
- Guruz, K. (2011). *Higher education and international student mobility in the global knowledge economy*. State University of New York Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Webster, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Continuum companion to systemic functional linguistics*. Continuum.
- Horne, M. E. (2012). *Writing in a Community of Practice: Composing Membership in Inkshed*. Inkshed Publications.
- Hunt, R. A. (2022, August 16). *Inkshed* [Education]. Wikipedia. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inkshed>
- Jeffery, J. V., Kieffer, M. J., & Matsuda, P. K. (2013). Examining conceptions of writing in TESOL and English Education journals: Toward a more integrated framework for research addressing multilingual classrooms. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 28, 181–192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2012.11.001>
- Johnstone, M., & Lee, E. (2017). Canada and the Global Rush for International Students: Reifying a Neo-Imperial Order of Western Dominance in the Knowledge Economy Era. *Critical Sociology*, 43(7–8), 1063–1078. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920516654554>

- Knight, J. (2013). The changing landscape of higher education internationalization—For better or worse? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 17(3), 84–90.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2012.753957>
- Kooy, M., & Procter, M. (Eds.). (1999). Preliminary Program: Inkshed XVI. *Inkshed*, 17(1), 19–21.
- Matsuda, P. K. (1999). Composition studies and ESL writing: A disciplinary division of labor. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(4), 699–721.
- Nash, R. (2003). Inkshed 21. *Inkshed*, 20(3), 21–22.
- Paré, A. (Ed.). (1993). Inkshed 11: How Do People Learn to Write? *Inkshed*, 12(1), 24.
- Pitt, A. (1990). Responses. *Inkshed*, 9(1), 5.
- Reither, J. A., & Hunt, R. A. (1982). Introduction. *Inkshed*, 1(1), 1–5.
- Straw, S., & Johnson, N. (1986). *Call for Proposals: Inkshed IV*. 5(6), 12.
- Tardy, C. M. (2009). *Building genre knowledge*. Parlor Press.
- Trilokekar, R. D. (2010). International education as soft power? The contributions and challenges of Canadian foreign policy to the internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education*, 59(131), 131–147.
- Wetherbee Phelps, L. (2014). The historical formation of academic identities: Rhetoric and composition, discourse and writing. *Canadian Journal for Studies in Discourse and Writing/Redactologie*, 25(1), 3–25.
- Williams, J., & Condon, F. (2016). Translingualism in Composition Studies and Second Language Writing: An Uneasy Alliance. *TESL Canada Journal*, 33(2), 1.
<https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v33i2.1234>
- Wright-Taylor, C. (2023). “Bilingual Always”: A Study of Second Language Writing’s Influence on Writing Studies in the Canadian Association for the Study of Discourse and Writing/Redactologie. *Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, 33, 99–126.
<https://doi.org/10.31468/dwr.951>
- Wright-Taylor, C., & Heng Hartse, J. (2024). “Grandparents for the Next Generation”: Building on Alister Cumming’s History of L2 Writing in Canada. *TESL Canada Journal*, 40(1), 11–40.
<https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v40i1/1383>