

Rejected: Unspoken Controversies, Hyper-revision, and the Hidden Costs of Publication in Writing Center/Studies

Publishing, a mainstay in academic disciplines, is not a neutral or uncomplicated practice. For many scholars, publishing can be a herculean task made more complex by reviewer feedback and hyper-revision practices. Many articles have been written about the complexities and intersecting challenges in academic publishing, from plagiarism controversies (Awasthi, 2019), to how exploratory and creative research is inhibited by the metrics and standards of well ranked journals (Agafonow et al., 2024), and the citational inequities and bibliographic biases that drive impact factor scales. Gender, racial, linguistic, and geographic bias, as many studies have shown, is rampant in academic publishing (Drieschová, 2020; Conklin & Sing, 2022; Lee et al., 2021; Thien, 2023). In writing center studies, for example, Alexandria Lockett (2019) aptly identifies the taxes placed on Black graduate students, which includes a writing tax that impedes production and publishing.

This special issue of *Praxis* aims to explore the publishing, revision, feedback, and writing experiences of practitioners in writing center studies and the broader discipline of writing and rhetoric. There are many ways to engage in this call, and we are particularly interested in submissions that address the personal and autoethnographic experiences of publishing, as well as empirical research on the state of journal publishing in our field which may include data on publishing and citational politics. This is also an opportunity for those who have experienced hyper-revision and have been either repeatedly rejected by journals in the field or experienced (more than 3) rounds of feedback/revision to return to these pieces and potentially submit for publication (all submissions will go through a mentorship-based peer reviewed process).

It is no secret that many of us have experienced significant barriers to publishing in writing center studies and the broader field of composition and rhetoric. Some of this might have to do with the rejection of writing center research in more mainstream composition journals, and it may also have to do with the preferences, feedback, and training of reviewers or even journal editors. While this issue is a chance to bring articles to publication that were previously rejected, it is also a chance to make meaning out of such rejections and investigate the state of publication in our field. We invite submissions that illuminate personal and narrative experiences of our field's publication and feedback processes, and the ways in which publishing affects your material working conditions.

Please see potential topics and the submission timeline below.

Potential topics for inclusion in this special issue:

- Share an article draft that has gone through extensive rounds of revision (please include prior feedback) but was ultimately not published (share experience with the publication and feedback/revision process as a foreword).
- Autoethnographies of experiences with publishing/reviewing/editing in the field.
- Rhetorical analysis of feedback from reviewers and/or editors (de-identified).
- Empirical research that studies the state of publication in the field, such as surveying or interviewing journal reviewers/editors about their experiences or surveying/interviewing scholars in the field about their publication/feedback/revision experiences.
- “State of the field” pieces about the publication process in writing center/writing studies, especially thinking about who and what gets published (or doesn’t). Meta-analysis of journals in WC/writing studies welcome.
- Praxis pieces on how we can create on-ramps instead of barriers to publication and professionalization in the field.
- Praxis pieces on what it looks like to center pleasure, fun, play, etc. in the publication cycle.
- Thought pieces on alternative research practices such as slow research, non-blind peer review, and/or life studies research.
- Other ideas, interventions, experiences, experiments, or studies on publication and feedback processes in writing center/writing studies that intervene in our system and offer constructive and productive ideas.

Submission Timeline:

- **Pitch/Project Deadline*:** December 1, 2024
- **Acceptance of Proposals:** December 2024 – January 2025
- **Full Manuscripts Due:** May 2025
- **Manuscripts Sent to Reviewers:** May 2025
- **Editors’ Decisions and Feedback to Authors:** July 2025
- **Final Drafts Due:** August 15, 2025
- **Page Proofs:** October – November 2025
- **Issue Publication:** December 2025

*If submitting project pitch/proposal, 500 words maximum; if submitting project draft, please include the full draft with data/content.

If you have questions, reach out to Dr. Genie Nicole Giaimo at genie.n.giaimo@hofstra.edu and Sam Turner and Alexandra Gunnells at praxisuwc@gmail.com.

Submissions (in the form of project proposals or project drafts) should be sent via email to praxisuwc@gmail.com and genie.n.gaiimo@hofstra.edu by December 1, 2024.

Genie N. Gaiimo, Hofstra University, Special Issue Guest Editor

Sam Turner, University of Texas–Austin & *Praxis* Co-Managing Editor

Alexandra Gunnells, University of Texas–Austin & *Praxis* Co-Managing Editor

References

Agafonow, Alejandro, and Marybel Perez. "When an A is not an A in Academic Research, or How A-Journal List Metrics Inhibit Exploratory Behaviour In Academia." *Journal of Interdisciplinary Economics*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2024, pp. 105–121.

Awasthi, Shipra. "Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct: A Systematic Review." *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, vol. 39, no. 2, 2019, pp. 94–100.

Conklin, Michael, and Satvir Singh. "Triple-blind review as a solution to gender bias in academic publishing, a theoretical approach." *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 47, no. 12, 2022, pp. 2487–2496.

Drieschová, Alena. "Failure, Persistence, Luck and Bias in Academic Publishing." *New Perspectives*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2020, pp. 145–149.

Lee, Sohui, Julie Prebel, and Elizabeth Kleinfeld. "Rethinking Publishing In Writing Center Studies: Imagining an Anti-Racist, Decolonial, Anti-Ableist Publishing Model." International Writing Center Association. Virtual Conference. October 20–23, 2021.

Lockett, Alexandria. "Why I call it the Academic Ghetto: A Critical Examination of Race, Place, and Writing Centers." *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, vol. 16, no. 2, 2019.

Thien, Nguyen Hoang. "Reducing the Risk of Bias in Academic Publishing." *European Science Editing*, vol. 49, 2023, e90942.