

From the Editors

Jaclyn Rea, Katja Thieme & Anneke Van Enk

We begin this inaugural issue of the new editorial team by warmly thanking Gloria Borrows, Fay Hyndman, and Nadeane Trowse for their dedicated and discerning work on past issues of the journal. Gloria, Fay, and Nadeane took over the editorship of *CJSDW/Rédactologie* in 2000 and oversaw a number of significant changes to it, including a change in name, a broadening of focus and a change in delivery from print to digital. We are honoured to take up their work, and we hope that the changes we have made to the journal and any we make in the future only enhance their efforts.

Frequent readers of *CJSDW/Rédactologie* will have noted that we now have a new website, one which facilitates easier, more efficient interaction between the journal's editors, readers and potential writers. Perhaps more importantly, the new website provides a place where, as Louise Wetherbee Phelps (this issue) might say, scholars who work in the field of writing and discourse studies can "gather and interact" (p. 6). In keeping with Gloria, Fay and Nadeane's legacy, it is our aim to expand the purpose of the journal, to create spaces that allow for the broadening of the community and its contributions.

At the end of her article, Phelps includes a list of strategies to raise institutional support for composition studies as a research discipline in Canada. She suggests that some of these strategies would also help Canadian scholars of writing and discourse place their work more centrally in national and international discussions about current research on writing. As editors, we take Phelps' suggestions to heart as we work to increase the prominence of our association and its journal. However, it seems to us that writing and discourse studies in Canada has at the moment not quite the critical mass that is needed to sustain a twice-yearly output of this journal. While in Canada there is substantial need for instructors of writing and for research about writing, not enough of writing studies professionals are in the secured and resourced positions that allow and encourage them to steadily participate in research conversations like the ones we have in the pages of this journal.

Yet there are also other forms of conversation that can be conducted inside the journal that can be as vital as the conversations implied in research articles. For instance, we might imagine the journal as a space for the quicker give-and-take of opinion pieces, of reports on ongoing projects in writing and discourse studies, and of interviews with practitioners in the fields we study. In an indirect way, the second article of this issue provides some indication of how such a conversation could be staged. Pamela McKenzie and Philippa Spoel describe the discursive hybridity of conversations between midwives

and their clients, thereby highlighting how frequently these conversations move between the structured, professional mode of doctor-patient interviews and the informal, social mode of everyday storytelling. Conversations in the midwife's office fulfil mixed functions and they do so in a collaborative and narrative way. While such hybrid discourse positively represents the contemporary ethos of midwifery work, McKenzie and Spoel note that this mixture of professional and social discourse can also produce uneasy moments.

In relation to future discussions within this journal, we see McKenzie and Spoel's work as a reminder of how the discursive modes of a profession can become more productive if they are open to mingling with other discourses. We imagine that the journal will be able to do more work for our profession if it can become a space for more hybrid discourse, for not only the formalized presentation of new research and new knowledge but also the less formal questions that arise from our experience as professionals living within our diverse lifeworlds. We would love to hear your thoughts about these ideas. Please email us at editor@cjsdw.com with your responses and suggestions.