

# EDITORS' INTRODUCTION

**David R. Russell**

Iowa State University

**Paul M. Rogers**

University of California, Santa Barbara

**Paula Carlino**

CONICET, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Universidad  
Pedagógica Nacional

**Jonathan M. Marine**

George Mason University

Modern scholarship, unlike the old rhetoric, values specialization. That value is reflected dramatically in festschrifts, which make the focus of a scholar's life's work the subject of a volume. With Bazerman the problem is that his specialization, writing, is about as general and ubiquitous an object as possible—second only to, well, rhetoric or communication in other media. And the goal of his research, teaching, and scholarly leadership has been to further broaden the study of writing, to move it beyond its usual disciplinary, pedagogical, and institutional confines (penmanship, literacy, orthography, grammar, rhetoric, linguistics, composition, and so on). He has taken writing in human life as the study of his lifetime.

In this introduction, we editors will not attempt to summarize his biography or contribution. Bazerman has over the decades recounted a number of moments from his life that figured importantly in his work, which we'll mention for reference.<sup>1</sup> Instead, we will attempt to put his contribution into context. David Russell will locate the seeds of his teaching and the research that grew out of it, in terms of developments in writing teaching during his early career. Paul Rogers will note his professional leadership during his mid and later career, particularly his service to what became writing studies. Paula Carlino will note aspects of his character and personality that allowed for his remarkable reach internationally.

---

<sup>1</sup> He has conveniently collected his essays with biographical elements on his web page in the About section under the heading Biography and Overview: [bazerman.education.ucsb.edu/biography-and-overview](http://bazerman.education.ucsb.edu/biography-and-overview)

Finally, Jonathan Marine will explain our rationale for the organization and summarize the contents of the chapters.

## **FROM COMPOSITION TO WRITING STUDIES: SOME MOMENTS IN A LIFE AND A FIELD**

Bazerman created—with the help of many, many others—what amounts to a new field: writing studies. In 2002 he proposed as an object of scholarly inquiry “writing in all its involvement in the world,” in order to give writing “a serious home of its own” (Bazerman, 2002, p. 32). Throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, writing—defined in many radically different ways—had been studied in several disciplinary silos, with little talk across, most notably: in university education departments for teaching initial writing, as part of “literacy”; or in English departments for a very narrow but prestigious sliver of writing, high-end authorship of “literature,” what he archly but accurately termed “the high end of the leisure entertainment business” (Bazerman, 1998, p. 19). In English departments, where he began to specialize in the late 1960s, the budding research on the process of writing was focused almost exclusively on first-year composition courses. There were no upper-level courses on writing (except those in technical communication, typically housed in business and engineering), no graduate programs in writing or composition, no professional organizations beyond the Conference on College Composition and Communication, which had little systematic research on writing. When he conceived writing studies in the 1990s, he did so on the pattern of other new university fields attempting to unite the work going in multiple disciplinary silos: American studies, women’s studies, library & information studies, communication studies, cultural studies, and so on. But it was a long path from the late 1960s, when he began his career, to his proposing the field of writing studies.

## **EARLY STEPS TOWARD TEACHING WRITING AS INVOLVEMENT IN THE WORLD**

In the mid-1960s, when he was an undergraduate at Cornell, the teaching of “English” was in upheaval—like the country itself. A meeting of British and American scholars of English in 1966, the Dartmouth Seminar, provoked a seminal rethinking among the Americans of writing teaching. They began to imagine writing not as a formal discipline like literature and grammar, but as a process of personal development through student-centered teaching and creative exploration. The federal government, under the National Defense Education Act (Strain, 2005), had begun to fund empirical research and curriculum reforms on writing under

Project English, and more broadly, to fund a massive expansion of higher education, drawing in previously excluded groups. Cultural and political shifts during the Vietnam War brought massive increases in humanities enrollments. During his undergraduate years at Cornell (1963-1967), he was “switching majors every six months,” (Bazerman, 2002b, p. 85) which exposed him to a wide variety of discourses and thus prepared him for his work on writing in the disciplines. He eventually landed on English and entered graduate school at Brandeis.

One of the federal education programs attracted Bazerman. In 1968, he entered a special program for graduate students to teach in low-income New York City elementary schools, which came with a deferment from the military draft for the war in Vietnam. Teaching first and third graders for two years at Public School 93K, in Brooklyn's Bedford-Stuyvesant, in the midst of a teachers' strike, taught him that “inner-city schools at that time, with their funding, social, political, and numerous other problems, made it nearly impossible to carry forward a progressive, student-oriented program,” but also taught him “the pleasure of making a difference in other people's lives,” through literacy. And the experience framed his future critical and political approach to literacy teaching (Bazerman, 1999, p. 19-20).

Back at Brandeis for the academic year 1970-71 to finish his Ph.D. in Renaissance literature (a literary period that attracted many other scholars of writing across the curriculum, incidentally, but perhaps not coincidentally), he was a world away from Bed-Sty. He wrote his dissertation on a seemingly esoteric genre: poems on the death of Queen Elizabeth I. But it emphasized (unusually for literary criticism in the late 1960s) the social as well as the aesthetic functions of occasional poetry in Elizabethan society (Jack Goody [1962] had previously taken up Ghanan funeral poems as a window into comparative sociology and anthropology). His dissertation, he said decades later, “foreshadowed my long-standing interests in rhetorical situation and genre” (Bazerman, 1999, p. 21).

The expansion of higher education to previously excluded people desiring to enter various professional worlds, lay behind his first tenure-track teaching position, at the open enrollment Baruch College in Manhattan. There he had many first-generation college students, whom he recalled were like his father, who was himself a first-generation college student during the Depression at the downtown business branch of City College (later to be called Baruch College). It was those students striving to better themselves that took his attention, not the esoteric call of great literature, viewed in the New Critical terms of the time as “verbal icons.” Before tenure, he “gestured toward the kinds of publications my department would recognize” by writing some literary criticism, but after tenure, he “gave up the pretense of literary studies” to focus exclusively but broadly on writing, both in his research and his teaching (Bazerman, 1999, p. 21).

## HOW TO TEACH STUDENTS TO WRITE TO SUCCEED ON THEIR TERMS: FROM WAC TO WID

The massification of higher education, the rethinking of composition in English, and the budding of empirical research in writing begun in the 1960s converged in the 1970s to spark major innovations, led in part by faculty in the CUNY open enrollment colleges such as Baruch. The new focus on basic writing, begun by his CUNY colleague, Mina Shaughnessy, at City College, was designed to transition first-generation and underprepared students into first-year writing.<sup>2</sup> The CUNY Association of Writing Supervisors (CAWS) and the Instructional Resource Center she founded became central to reformulation of writing in higher education in another way, by helping students to transition into the university more broadly: writing across the curriculum (WAC).

The concept of WAC was just beginning to be developed nationally. As a young English professor teaching almost exclusively composition and developmental writing courses to open admissions students striving to enter various professional fields to better themselves and their families, Bazerman asked an obvious but then little-asked question: What are students reading and writing in their other courses? And he began to systematically investigate, through a survey, that most quotidian of school genres, the research paper. The name of the genre, he found, masked an immensely varied set of tacit teacher expectations, often tied to the discipline and thus to the universe of research, reading, writing, and social action in each field. That led him to study the relationship between reading and writing, what later came to be called intertextuality, before that term from Julia Kristeva (who used it rather differently) became current in the US (Eldred & Bazerman, 1995, p. 8).

WAC's focus was primarily on writing-to-learn, seen as a general cognitive accomplishment. But how does writing support learning? One way, Bazerman felt, is through deepening reading. He developed a teaching sequence for first year composition (FYC) based on the intertextual relationship between reading and writing across the curriculum. Out of that came *The Informed Writer* (1980), one of the first WAC textbooks. But his interest in disciplinary writing led him to look beyond WAC as writing-to-learn in general, to the specifics of writing in different disciplines. He wanted students—and writing teachers and researchers—to be aware of the differing methods, epistemes, and rhetorics operating in

---

2 In Shaughnessy, Bazerman saw a persistent and magnetic leader create a collaborative effort around writing, an effort that became an institution—with a name: basic writing. He would collaboratively found such institutions again and again himself: writing in the disciplines, The Research Network Forum, the Consortium of Graduate Programs in Rhetoric and Composition, Writing Research across Borders, Rhetoricians for Peace, the International Society for the Advancement of Writing Research (ISAWR), and of course writing studies.

the university. The second edition (1985) of his textbook, *The Informed Writer*, was subtitled “*Using sources in the disciplines.*” It included a section on reading and writing in various disciplinary areas, which marked out this new focus in WAC—from writing across the curriculum to writing in the disciplines, or WID, as he termed it (and the term stuck).

Whether WAC or WID, his pedagogy is based on treating seriously students who have chosen other disciplines, and their need to learn its discourse—without trying to convert or rescue them (Eldred & Bazerman, 1995, p. 19). He has always seen the critical power of writing teaching, in a political sense, but has been cautious about wearing his politics on his sleeves in the classroom (though he has been proud to wear it on an armband during a protest, as when he helped to found the Rhetoricians for Peace in the run-up to the second Iraq war) (Bazerman, 2019, p. 45). His writing teaching from his first years at an open admission university was about, as he put it:

demystifying the class secrets of language and literacy. To my mind, teaching writing was such a political act that it never needed any overt political comment or political teaching. In fact, overt politics would distract us from the task of bringing new groups and individuals into positions of economic and social power and might even undermine the motivation of the students, who for the most part were more interested in the fates of themselves and their families than in any politics. (Bazerman, 1999, pp. 22-23)

He later said that textbook writing has been “as much a path of discovery and contribution for me as have been research and theory writing.” It is motivated, for him, by “the practical problem of teaching underprepared college students for the reading and writing in their other courses. The payoff for solving the problem is both immediate and long term: the increased competence of writers as they move through the university and through their lives” (Bazerman, 1999, p. 23).

Had he done nothing but write his innovative textbooks in the 1980s and early 1990s, his place in the profession would be secure, but he went on to make pedagogy the driving force of his increasingly diverse research and theory. He said the uniqueness and reach of his research and theory was “not the result of individual characteristics or personal virtue . . . but precisely because I have become broadly conversant with the standard writing tools and the historical particulars of work within a range of academic disciplines” in order to develop his pedagogy of writing in the disciplines (Eldred & Bazerman, 1995, p. 89). Indeed, he conceived the first volume of his major theoretical work, *A Rhetoric of*

*Literate Action—Literate Action volume 1* (2013), as a guide for advanced writers, while the second volume, *A Theory of Literate Action—Literate Action volume 2*, lays out fully the theory behind the advice (2013b).

## RESEARCH AND THEORY

To put Bazerman's contributions to theory and research in context, we might focus on 1978-1979, which was a crucial year. As a newly tenured associate professor, he waded into the controversies and contradictions out of which his research and theory emerged and continued throughout his career.

## READING AND WRITING

The institutional separation of reading and writing after elementary school was and still often is a fact of American educational life. Literacy was mainly about reading—teaching young children to read initially or teaching “remedial” adults the “basics,” as Bazerman did at Public School 93K and Baruch College, respectively. Writing was thought of as either the low-level skill of transcription of speech to text (again, in elementary or “remedial” schooling) or authorship of literary texts, “classics” studied in English classes. The great middle—where the vast majority of writing goes on—was not studied or taught, with a few exceptions such as “composition” in English classes or business and technical writing in a few university business or engineering departments.

Bazerman challenged that separation from the beginning. He published his first book in 1978, a textbook on reading, not writing, intended for study skills courses usually classified as “remedial” (Wiener & Bazerman, 1978). As we noted, he developed his reading-to-write-to-learn pedagogy in those years, which in 1981 became *The Informed Writer*—the writer informed mainly by reading. In 1978 he gave a paper that outlined a new theory of writing, one based on reading, “A Relationship Between Reading and Writing: The Conversational Model,” which became his first major publication in the field of composition (1980). He was active in the CUNY Association of Writing Supervisors in the 1970s, and co-chaired it in 1978-1979. At their 1978 conference spoke on “The Role of Reading in the Kinds of Writing Students do in College,” based on his survey research (Bazerman & Herrington, 2006).

## WRITING AS A SOCIAL PHENOMENON

This focus on the kinds of reading and writing students do in college in different disciplines and majors, the movement from WAC to WID we noted earlier, required a serious study of those disciplinary differences, something that had

rarely been done. This means, Bazerman said, that WID “tends to have more of a research orientation” than WAC (Eldred & Bazerman, 1995, p. 8). And from the late 1970s, he cast his net widely over a range of possibilities for research on the phenomenon of writing in the disciplines and professions. If writing is a conversation, then it is fundamentally social (though incorporating psychological, linguistic, and other factors). Thus, the social sciences, he reasoned, might offer ways of studying it—a radical idea in English departments then.

## DIVIDE BETWEEN HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

In 1978 he joined a Columbia sociology of science seminar taught by giants in the field, Harriet Zuckerman and Robert Merton, which investigated science as a social institution (Bazerman & Herrington, 2006, p. 59) with systems of communication (mainly specialized reading and writing) through which knowledge is made in the disciplines. In doing so, Bazerman was crossing the great divide between what C.P. Snow called “The Two Cultures,” the sciences and the humanities. Bazerman studied not texts as texts (or “verbal icons,” as the phrase common in literary criticism held) but rather texts in human activity, the sociology and anthropology of writing. In 1979 he began attending meetings of the Society for Social Studies of Science (SSSS), where the rhetoric of science had started to be investigated, as well as the social history and anthropology of science and technology as institutions. The sociology of knowledge and the Project on the Rhetoric of Inquiry (POROI) also provided inspiration.

He could cross this great divide in the organization of knowledge because in 1978 he was tenured and no longer had to publish in literature (or pretend to). He got a Fellowship Leave and began publishing exclusively in composition and social science venues. His first scholarly publication was in a collection entitled *The University and the State* (Bazerman, 1978). His chapter was on grants—a genre with profound effects in the post-war world. Grants are about writing to learn (cognitive), he points out: “Grant writing, as any form of writing, helps to clarify and develop thought” (p. 222) But he emphasizes the genre has sociological effects as well, on “pecking order” (p. 225) power relations, self-perception, and also beyond: on the good of society and the state as well as individual good.

He chaired the CUNY Ad Hoc Committee for Graduate Business Writing in 1979, showing his interest in quotidian writing in the professions, an interest that would endure. The recently-organized Association of Teachers of Technical Writing (1973) and the Association for Business Communication (1935) provided other emerging research traditions for writing beyond the usual purview

of English departments—and a window into the worlds of practical writing beyond academe. All these traditions of research touched upon writing and allowed him to explore how they could inform composition/rhetoric—and later writing studies (Bazerman & Herrington, 2006, p. 63).

## **RHETORIC FROM SPEECH TO ENGLISH**

Another institutional split that shaped Bazerman's intellectual world was between the oral and the written. The social and political aspects of communication were traditionally the province of classical rhetoric, which was fundamentally oral. In 1915 professors interested in communication split off from English departments—which then as now was interested in aesthetics—and took rhetoric with it to form speech departments, where they added social science methods to the humanistic methods used to study classical rhetoric. In the 1960s, when some English professors became interested in studying written communication, they turned back to classical rhetoric for theories and pedagogies (though they pretty much ignored social science) (Russell, 2002).

In the summer of 1979 Bazerman attended Richard Young's NEH summer seminar on rhetoric and invention at Carnegie Mellon, where he met many future leading lights in the field who would champion rhetoric in composition—so successfully it came to be called “rhetoric and composition.” Though he learned much from this tradition (his dissertation, after all, was on the communicative aspects of an ancient rhetorical genre, the eulogy), he found classical rhetoric inadequate to understanding the immense specialization of modern writing and life in the age of print (Bazerman & Russell, 1994).

## **CLASSICAL RHETORIC VERSUS COGNITIVE SCIENCE**

The Carnegie Mellon community was then studying writing from a range of perspectives, from ancient rhetoric to cognitive psychology. There he met Dick Hayes from information-processing cognitive psychology and Linda Flower from English, who were pioneering empirical research on “the writing process,” as they termed it. They were modeling in computer simulations the cognitive processes of “expert writers” (some members of Young's seminar even served as research subjects). Though Bazerman was impressed with the research and theory, he again turned to the social sciences—specifically social psychology—to understand the psychology of writing. His therapist, Tony Gabriele, introduced him to the work of Harry Stack Sullivan, an early 20th psychiatrist who focused on how the self is formed through the history of our social relations, mainly communicative. Sullivan looked not at “intrapsychic” but at “interactional”—especially



interpersonal—sources of behavior, including psychotic behaviors. Sullivan's therapy is based on teaching a client to "engage in reflexive self-observations of language behaviors . . . monitor and examine the consequences of my own participation" (Bazerman, 1999, p. 20). And when, in the late 1980s, composition turned away from cognitive science to the old humanist rhetoric more congenial to those trained in English department humanities methods, Bazerman offered a third way, one that had a humanistic social psychology, using methods from the human sciences, such as sociology and anthropology, as well as the emerging "cultural psychology" of Vygotsky's circle, as we'll see (Cole, 1998).

### WRITING AS LITERATE ACTION

Bazerman would continue to take several paths into social science research and theory adaptable to studying writing in human life—writing as an activity, a social action. In doing so he broke with extreme versions of "social construction," such as "deconstruction" from continental semiotics, which denied the possibility of a knowable reality. He published in 1979 a critical review of Latour and Woolgar's groundbreaking *Laboratory Life*, in which he took them to task for treating scientific discourse as fiction, even though science "has a commitment to ever more precise descriptions of ever more closely watched realities" (p. 20).

His path-making first article on WID, "What Written Knowledge Does" (1981) was published in *Philosophy of the Social Science*. It explored different kinds of social action that writing and reading accomplish in different fields. The article used not Kristeva's version of intertextuality, which emphasizes the play of referents, but rather a modification of James Kinneavy's theory, which emphasizes discourse as a tool for being responsible to others' descriptions of their observations of reality—though a final representation of reality may never be fully possible (see his chapter in this collection.) The author, the audience, and the object of discourse are mediated by language, Kinneavy said, but Bazerman adds that the literature in the field—the reading that the author and audience share about the object—is also mediated by the language, through intertextual reference.

On a consultation at the National University of Singapore in 1982 and then returning as a visiting Professor in 1985-86 he found, fortuitously, a complete run of the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* in the university library. That set him on the historical investigation that led to his first book, *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science* (1988). The history of the experimental article, from its origins in letters circulated among gentleman scientists in the 17th century to modern research literature, offered a window on social and practical aspects of writing not much considered before.

## GENRES AS FORMS OF LIFE

The subtitle of *Shaping Written Knowledge* combines key elements for the field of writing studies that would emerge some 15 years later. People shape their knowledge and action in the activity of composing texts—writing is active in the world. Writing is shaped by genre, but genre as more than static form or conventions. Genres, as he would say later, are not only forms of words but forms of life (1994). And experimental articles, like other genres and texts, carry out an activity, in this case the activity of modern science. This insight he drew from a contributor to this volume, Carolyn Miller and her (1984) concept of genre as social action, in turn drawn from continental phenomenological sociology: Adolf Schutz' notion of typification. Humans classify the world so we can act in it, creating social facts (e.g., pieces of paper of a certain size printed a certain way by a certain government can be exchanged for goods and services because we agree they can, not because the pieces of paper have any intrinsic worth). Bazerman applied genre as social action to scientific communication: "The forms of scientific representation emerged simultaneously and dialectically with the activity of science and the social structure of the scientific community. Features of the experimental article developed as part of an agonistic social activity, arguing over experienced events. The experience is shaped by the argument just as the arguments exploit the experience in a public linguistic forum" (Bazerman, 1988, p. 155).

## LANGUAGE AND WRITING: A THEORY OF HOW WRITING IS CONNECTED TO THE WORLD

All aspects of writing, not just its genres, can be viewed as active engagement, and that includes language, which is in Bazerman's view more than a system of signs, to be correctly or properly arranged. Such a "code orientation" to language "hides the motive for writing," its role in the formulation of a complex social event. Bazerman applied Austin's theory of "speech acts" to writing and found in Swales' "move" analysis of scientific article introductions a version of applied linguistics that viewed scientific writing not as disembodied but as a solution to a problem of "establishing a place for one's work within a relevant literature" (1988, p. 149).

This emphasis on writing as social action in the world drew him to the American pragmatists, who explored the relation between mind, self, and society, especially Mead, but above all he drew on the Russian "troika" of Vygotsky, Leont'ev, and Luria. Vygotsky's viewed language as a cultural tool that allowed for coordinated activity, and transformed simultaneously cognitive capacities, the

social world, and the material world in which humans act. Vygotsky gave Bazerman a way to get past both the naïve view of language as a direct description of reality and the cynical view of language as a socially constructed code without anything knowable beyond (Bazerman, 2013b).

Vygotsky's theory—combined with the social psychology of Leont'ev into "Activity Theory"—made the history of language use a crucial question. The theory sought to explain both individual learning and development, and social/institutional stability and change, as practices of using language and other tools in certain "stabilized-for-now" (Schryer, 1993) ways. Here Miller's concept of genre as social action became useful for seeing how written genres—and the practices they organize—develop over time, connecting thoughts and deeds, the past and the future. Bazerman would expand Miller's theory of genre to consider not just single genres but systems of intertextually connected genres, enacting social intentions and coordinating actions over time. After his book on the history of a genre in science, his research took up a series of activity systems mediated by systems of complex written genres: such as the patent system (1994), and the complex written systems that allowed inventions in the laboratory to move beyond it into the wider world. His second book of historical research, *The Languages of Edison's Light* (1999b), chronicles not only the documentary history of the invention of electric light, but also the documentary process by which this invention organized massive institutions, wielding vast power and organizing vast resources.

When Bazerman made his case for a discipline of writing studies two decades ago (2002), he did so by laying out three syntheses, each a charge for the study of writing: historical, theoretical, and practical. Together these "tell the same story, for the theory is an attempt to understand how we live our lives at the unfolding edge of history, using literacy in the ways that make most sense for us in our lives, to continually make a future from our own skills and choices as writers" (p. 38). He ultimately synthesized his theoretical insights in his two volume *Literate Action*—the phrase encompassing the connection between reading, writing, and human activity. And he would also in 2004, with Paul Prior and others, produce a manual for empirical research using a range of methods culminating in an activity theory methodology, which he used for several collaborative empirical projects. He organized scholarly efforts to provide other resources necessary to the existence and health of a field of study, such as handbooks, publishers, and bibliographic tools (Bazerman, [Ed.], 2008). And recently he launched a large-scale effort around the broad question of "lifespan" studies of writing, how writing develops and changes across the lives of individuals (Bazerman et al., 2018).

This brief sketch has pointed to his early and abiding interest in writing as the strategic exercise of agency and writing as purposeful action within "emergent

structures of texts that conditioned the situation for future action.” He concluded, “Even my professional service as editor, creator of professional forums, and departmental administrator are informed by these perspectives” (Bazerman, 2002b, p. 90). We now turn to Paul Rogers for an account of his leadership and service.

## **SERVICE TO WRITING STUDIES**

Throughout his career, Bazerman engaged deeply with a number of professional organizations related to writing: the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), and its higher education branch, College Composition and Communication (CCC). In these organizations, and others, he contributed reliably as a committed member within the formal structures of these organizations' committees and subcommittees. At the same time, he consistently sought to advance the status of what was to become writing studies by instigating projects, programs, and entirely new organizations. The quality of his service across these activities, combined with the impact of his work and scholarly publication, ultimately positioned Bazerman as the recognized, international ambassador for writing studies, in the US, Europe, Asia, and South America, and as a serious cultural broker who was able to bring people together across disciplinary and geographical boundaries, as Paula Carlino's section explains.

His engagement with organizational structures, both those which he founded and those established organizations with whom he worked, were instantiations of Bazerman's vision of the social role of written texts in bringing about change, noting that “the best way to assure a text some enduring life is for it to gain a central role in an enduring institution, such as a church, university, or a government not troubled by coups, revolutions, or reconstitutions” (Bazerman, 2013, p. 52). In what follows I look briefly at some of the highlights of Bazerman's accomplishments in the service of writing studies, in particular his work as organizational leader in NCTE and CCC, as an activist for social justice and open access publication, and as a driving force in advancing writing research.

While Bazerman's service and leadership to NCTE and the CCC ultimately took place at the highest levels of these organizations—he served on NCTE's Executive Committee, and as Assistant Chair, Program and Associate Chair, and Chair of the CCC from 2007-2009—these preeminent roles came about after decades of service to both organizations as a member and active citizen. At what might be considered the pinnacle of his visibility and leadership in the CCC, as the program chair of the 2008 CCCC annual meeting in New Orleans, Bazerman used that platform to advance a broader vision of writing studies, as evidenced by the plenary speakers he invited to speak to the members of the CCCC. Notably, and in addition to prioritizing the voices of respected

educators and journalists from New Orleans who spoke on the aftermath of the tragic handling of the Katrina hurricane disaster, he invited famed New Yorker journalist Seymour Hersh, who broke the stories on the My Lai massacre and the torture taking place in Abu Ghraib prison; archeologist and art historian Denise Schmandt-Bessarat, who published groundbreaking work on the earliest origins of writing; psychologist James Pennebaker, who documented empirically the medical impacts of trauma writing; feminist sociologist Dorothy Smith, whose work on textually mediated social organization and the documentary society revealed the ways in which writing and power relations permeate our daily lives; and, educational psychologist Charles “Skip” MacArthur, who presented work in a plenary session on the importance of explicit writing education from the earliest years of schooling. In reflecting on these plenary choices, Bazerman noted, “The speakers I invited were people largely from outside the world of composition which I thought the field would benefit from hearing to extend the vision of what is relevant to our work” (personal communication).

Bazerman’s activity with NCTE and the CCCC resulted in his receiving both organizations’ highest honors. In 2018, NCTE presented Bazerman with the James Squire Award, which is “given to an NCTE member who has had a transforming influence and has made a lasting intellectual contribution to the profession.” Specifically, the award is given in recognition of “outstanding service, not only to the stature and development of NCTE and the discipline which it represents, but also to the profession of education as a whole, internationally as well as nationally.” The Squire Award Committee Chair at the time, Doug Hesse, noted in his selection remarks, “Charles Bazerman not only meets this standard: he sets it for all of us.” Two years later, Bazerman received the CCCC 2020 Exemplar Award which recognizes “a person whose years of service as an exemplar for our organization represents the highest ideals of scholarship, teaching, and service to the entire profession. The Exemplar Award seeks to recognize individuals whose record is national and international in scope, and who set the best examples for the CCCC membership.” In Bazerman’s service to NCTE and CCCC he sought to bring about change within existing systems while simultaneously opening up spaces for new activity.

### **BAZERMAN’S ADVOCACY: SOCIAL JUSTICE AND OPEN ACCESS**

As reflected in his 2008 CCCC conference, Bazerman’s leadership extended beyond his concern for the discipline to issues of social justice, as he has chronicled in his autobiographical piece entitled “The Work of a Middle-class Activist: Stuck in History.” One particular example of this focus can be seen in his work in founding the Rhetoricians for Peace (RFP) in 2002, around the time of the

buildup to the 2003 Iraq War, to which he was staunchly opposed. Designed to leverage the possibilities of new technologies, in particular listservs and social media, the RFP brought together and galvanized a geographically distributed group of colleagues who were a notable presence at the CCCC annual meetings, including during 2003, when the bombing of Iraq began. The RFP became a formal organization and accomplished a great deal of work in developing and making available pedagogical and scholarly resources to fight misinformation and doublespeak, and in standing in opposition to the rhetoric of continual war.

Another important contribution of Bazerman's has been his activism in support of open access publication (see Palmquist's chapter in this volume). His leadership in this area has involved an enormous amount of focused effort, demonstrated by his extensive body of editorial work (see Publications of Charles Bazerman in this volume) as well as his work with other key collaborators in breaking new ground in open access publishing, an area of work that was rife with complexity and difficult challenges (e.g., the implications of open-access online publication for tenure and promotion decisions; the stability, credibility, and visibility of online publications; and, the challenges associated with the financing and marketing of open access publications). Bazerman's work on open access began in the early days of the internet, when in 2003 he along with David Russell and Mike Palmquist published one of the first open access online scholarly publications *Writing Selves/Writing Societies*. Bazerman's investment and energy for open access publishing has been ongoing (as Palmquist recounts in his chapter) and has always involved him having "skin in the game," especially in his support and activity with the WAC Clearinghouse, but also in making easily accessible his considerable body of scholarship on his personal website ([bazerman.education.ucsb.edu](http://bazerman.education.ucsb.edu)).

## ADVANCING WRITING RESEARCH

Bazerman's contributions to the field have been especially substantive in advancing writing research. For example, in 1988, Bazerman originated, organized, and chaired the Research Network Forum, whose ongoing mission has been to "mentor new and established researchers in rhetoric and composition studies." As Chair of the CCCC he also created the Research Impact Award and the CCCC Advancement of Knowledge Award. He was also an early founder and active member of the Consortium of Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition, which brought together graduate programs, faculty members, and graduate students to build research capacity and advance scholarly publication.

Perhaps Bazerman's most notable leadership activity, given its international reach, has been his work in founding the International Society for the

Advancement of Writing Research (ISAWR), an organization that embodies his multidisciplinary and complex view of writing and its role in human societies around the world. Dissatisfied with the lack of emphasis on empirical work in the CCCC conferences, Bazerman set out initially to provide a focused home for writing researchers. In 2003 Bazerman hosted a regional conference (i.e., California focused) at the University of California, Santa Barbara entitled “Writing as a Human Activity” from which this festschrift derives its title. And again in 2005, he hosted a national level conference “Writing Research in the Making,” whose title reflected Bazerman’s view that the field of writing studies was still in the early stages of grounding itself on an empirical foundation. The success of that conference led to the first Writing Research Across Borders (WRAB) conference in 2008. The title of this conference announced that there were indeed real boundaries in the activities associated with research on writing: methodological, epistemological, disciplinary, educational, political, and geographic. At the same, the conference encouraged the crossing of those borders by facilitating dialogue among researchers from various disciplines and research traditions.

Together with a distinguished “scientific committee” of leading writing researchers from around the world, Bazerman succeeded in gathering together writing researchers at all career stages and from across a broad range of research traditions and geographies to share empirical research on writing in multiple international venues. The quality of presentations and thoroughness of the conference planning helped to build momentum for the subsequent conferences in Washington, D.C. (2011), Paris (2014), and Bogota (2017). All of the WRAB conferences resulted in the publication of volumes of empirically grounded research, on which Bazerman served as lead editor: *Traditions of Writing Research* (2009), *International Advances in Writing Research* (2011), *Research on Writing: Multiple Perspectives* (2017), and *Knowing Writing: Writing Research across Borders* (2020). At the 2011 conference, the scientific committee gathered and voted to create the International Society for the Advancement of Writing Research (ISAWR). Bazerman was elected as ISAWR’s inaugural chair.

Bazerman’s scholarly reputation—as well as his rhetorical savvy, empathy, curiosity, and intercultural skills developed over many years—were essential in weaving together a global, international, and indeed interdisciplinary organization. Such an achievement in academia seems especially remarkable given the propensity for intellectual turf battles and the contentious nature of scholarly discourse across disciplinary and epistemological boundaries. Although Bazerman has cycled through the leadership of the organization (his term as immediate past chair ended in 2020), the organization remains vital and is scheduled to host WRAB VI in Trondheim, Norway, in 2023; and, at the time of this publication planning activities underway for WRAB VII to be held in 2026.

It is important to note that Bazerman's global and national level leadership activity has been accompanied by a tangible and practical commitment to the faculty at his home institution, the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB). Bazerman served two terms as Chair of the Program in Education in the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, and beginning in 2016, Bazerman created an endowment for an ongoing competitive faculty research award the "Bazerman Fellowship" for faculty in the UCSB Writing Program. The fellowship provides a sabbatical during which a faculty member can pursue research that will inform and enrich their teaching and advance knowledge in the field. Bazerman also sponsors lunches for the faculty where topics generated by the faculty are discussed in an open, scholarly, and convivial forum.

Bazerman has the ability to zoom in on the smallest details of organizational structure, governance, and finance and to zoom out to the broadest levels of theoretical framings and interdisciplinary discourse. His unique blend of strategic and organizational savvy, intellect, and willingness to get the work done underlie the effectiveness of his efforts. Bazerman's high standards of personal integrity have also undergirded his activity on every level and no doubt have contributed to the longevity of his influence and leadership legacy. In addition to deep commitment to high ethical standards, those who know him well have witnessed his deep empathy and humanity, his cross cultural and social emotional sensitivity, and his great ability to connect with people from around the world, to which Paula Carlino turns now.

## **PERSONAL CONNECTIONS: INTERNATIONAL REACH**

Bazerman (whom I will refer to as Chuck in this final section on personal connection) not only disseminated his research on writing power, genres, disciplines, socialization, knowledge, writing anxiety, teaching, learning, and related issues. He also connected with others, especially his students (elementary, undergraduate, and graduate), but also with colleagues near and far geographically. One hallmark of these interactions was Chuck's curiosity and interest in understanding his students' and colleagues' points of view. Even as he made his own work known, he also wanted to know about his interlocutors and listened to their stories and ideas. Convinced that the construction of a field of study requires a collective work, he weaved numerous personal links. He stated, "I feel great pride in working with colleagues across the US and now internationally in bringing such enormous changes to the teaching of writing" (Bazerman, 2019, p. 43).

In Santa Barbara, for the first Writing Research Across Borders (WRAB) conference in 2008, he convened writing researchers from five continents, many of them the most widely read authors in the field. But he also made a point of



including nascent scholars from peripheral regions on his roster and supported their travel with funding he specifically arranged (in partnership with his close colleague in the University of California system, Chris Thaiss). All participants felt welcome at this watershed event organized by Chuck, with his eagerness to include and integrate. Many retain the excitement of meeting their favorite authors “in person” and chatting with them at the welcome reception, or on the lovely school bus that Chuck provided to transport them. When an inexperienced scholar asked him if in his project to globalize writing research he considered that English would be the only language, he shared the concern with the organizing committee to accommodate the request, so that papers in source languages would be accepted, accompanied by some written support in English. Chuck was behind every detail of the conference: from personally writing the individualized mailings to providing memorable treats and snacks for the intervals between sessions. Many of us wondered where he found the time to do this.

Chuck had endearing exchanges with researchers from several continents. His relationship with Latin America, where his engagement was most extensive, illustrates his activism in favor of the democratic distribution of knowledge. Chuck always sought to know what was being done, researched, and discussed in Latin America. He traveled, participated, gathered, organized, and shared knowledge, academic initiatives, camaraderie meetings, *a cappella* singing (he has studied voice for many years), and warm affection in countless occasions and countries of the region. As in other continents, he organized joint research, stimulated exchange, hosted doctoral and postdoctoral fellows, reached remote points on the map, and paid his own travel expenses to be able to dialogue with local research groups. He agreed to work in the garages of private homes, because some public and free institutions in impoverished countries did not have better spaces. Carrying his leather briefcase crammed with resources, he generously distributed his books, CDs, and chocolates, offered comments on works in progress, took an interest in the history of Latin American dictatorships in the past and the struggles of their peoples, as well as interest in the local music. He asked to visit the Buenos Aires opera house, at the foot of which he indulged in a tuneful “O sole mio.”

Chuck’s written work goes hand in hand with his personal attitude and social deployment: “I wanted my scholarship to have the kind of power I sought in my own poetry—a power to articulate meanings important to me . . . a power to touch other people’s minds and emotions as it gave shape to unarticulated experiences and feelings” (Bazerman, 2001, p. 183).

In Mexico, he became an expert on the flavors of pozole while leading research and making friends. At the SIGET’s closing banquet in Caxias do Sul, Brazil, he connected colleagues from different countries: “You will understand each other,

you have ideas in common.” That introduction was the seed of numerous joint activities, and of an enduring friendship among those introduced to each other. He did the same in other cases. Chuck brought people together, helped them grow, valued the regional uniqueness, and gave a place as peers to those who were starting their careers. He shared his life stories, his family origins, his artistic tastes, and he listened to those who welcomed him in different countries. He did not fail to attend the final dance of a congress even when he had a broken leg.

Meeting Chuck has been surprising at first for many academics from diverse regions. In addition to his openness, curiosity, enthusiasm for sharing, lyrical singing, and willingness to bring researchers together, we are amazed by the breadth of his approach. When he talks about writing, he invites us into the myriad of angles with which writing practices can be considered:

Research in writing across the curriculum, writing in the professions, writing in the workplace, and writing in the public sphere are far more than studies of instrumental exercises in the conventions of getting things done. They are studies in how people come to take on the thought, practice, perspective, and orientation of various ways of life ... and how we organize our modern way of life economically, intellectually, socially, interpersonally, managerially, and politically through the medium of texts. (Bazerman, 2002, p. 35)

Thus, when in interviews and in academic publications he refers to his origins, his personal journey, his motivations, his ethical and political stance, his psychotherapy, he does so in consonance with the idea that “writing is a major medium of participating in society and developing one’s life with the contemporary complex literate world” (Biography and Overview).

For years now, in his emails at the bottom of his signature has appeared the following legend:

זַנְאָרגאַמײַ וּפֿ קלאָפֿ אַ זײַא וַטאַטש עטקינייראַפֿ יד

ني رجاهم لآ نم ةم آيه ةدحتم لآ تاي اولوا

Los Estados Unidos es una nación de inmigrantes.

The U.S. is a nation of immigrants.

History will judge.

Those of us who have known him are not surprised. His academic activity and his work, at bottom, are part of the inclusive and democratizing political vision with which he avoided enlisting for the war and began his profession as an elementary school teacher with a disadvantaged population. In this sense, the

broad view of writing as a human activity (and not as a form or as a norm) was motivated by the man who needed to expand his humanity in the expansion of the field of study to which he devoted a good part of his life.

The following chapters, introduced now by Jonathan Marine, celebrate and extend that broad view.

## THE ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLECTION

As a part of the preparation for this volume, the editorial team reviewed many different examples of festschrifts including those written for Tony Dudley-Evans, James Kinneavy, and Jack Goody to which Bazerman had contributed. His contributions to these volumes were of particular interest to us in shaping the tone of the volume; in particular we noted that his chapters in those festschrifts stand out as clear examples of straightforward scholarly discourse and are devoid of hagiography. Thus, in crafting this volume we sought to emulate this approach.

Inviting authors to the festschrift was in many ways an easy task. Bazerman has worked closely with many scholars around the world, hosting many as visiting scholars at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He has also worked with a great many doctoral students, all of which provided for us a large pool of potential contributors. Our challenge was in narrowing that list to a group of scholars in a way that was somehow representative of Bazerman's global reach and disciplinary influence (and with apologies to the many scholars we had to leave out). Factors in our invitation process included considerations of gender, geography, and disciplinary specialization, which are reflected in the final list of contributing authors. Prior to inviting authors, we reviewed their published scholarship to identify the ways in which and degrees to which they had cited Bazerman in their own work.

Given that Bazerman's career and work were so multifaceted, we faced a special challenge of grouping the chapters in a coherent order that would capture the major themes in his scholarship. Fortunately for us, we had some assistance in that task as Bazerman himself has codified and categorized his own work on [Researchgate](#), [Google Scholar](#), and his own [research website](#).<sup>3</sup>

We took all of this information into account as we began the process of organizing the contributions to this volume. As outlined in the earlier sections of this introduction, Bazerman's interests began with problems associated with the learning and teaching of writing in elementary school and college and writing across the curriculum, which were grounded in his own early experiences

3 These websites can be found, respectively, at [researchgate.net/profile/Charles-Bazerman](https://researchgate.net/profile/Charles-Bazerman), [scholar.google.com/citations?user=JIWTQUAAAAAJ&hl=en&oi=ao](https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=JIWTQUAAAAAJ&hl=en&oi=ao), and [bazerman.education.ucsb.edu/research-themes](http://bazerman.education.ucsb.edu/research-themes).

teaching students to write. Accordingly, we grouped together contributions focused on these types of phenomena in Section I: Academic & Scientific Writing and in Section II: Writing Pedagogy. In thinking about the typified conventions of the academic and scientific article, Bazerman became interested in social conceptions of genre which led him to explore varying applications of genre and activity. As a result, we clustered contributions in this regard in Section III: Sociology of Knowledge & Organizational Communication and in Section IV: Activity Theory. Bazerman's contributions to establishing research networks and a global community of writing researchers throughout his career are evidenced in Section V: Writing Research Development. We conclude with Section VI: New Media & Technology, which includes chapters on the emerging effects of media and technology on writing and composition subjects to which Bazerman has addressed in a number of his contributions.

## **OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS**

### **Paula Carlino – “New Cognitive Practices in a Master’s Thesis Proposal Writing Seminar”**

Carlino explores Bazerman's notion that genres shape the ways of thinking of those who participate in them, as genres influence cognitive activity according to the social practices that they help organize. The chapter analyzes videotaped classroom interactions in a master's thesis proposal writing seminar and identifies five types of specialized cognitive practices in which master's students engage. The chapter also characterizes an interactive pedagogy at the heart of the seminar, and in particular joint reviews, which were carried out in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. These collective reviews are both a device for genre learning and a methodological resource that provides insight into the intellectual processes of those who write and talk about texts by exploring how genre-mediated writing not only transforms knowledge, but also the knower.

### **Fatima Encinas & Nancy Keranen – “Case Studies on Chance Encounters in Literacy Development in Latin American Researchers”**

Encinas and Keranen illustrate the importance of the often-unacknowledged role chance encounters play in academic literacy and career development. As the role of chance encounters is rarely identified in career development strategies and research, the authors seek to fill this gap by examining and understanding the factors involved in chance encounters and their role in academic career development. Based on four case studies drawn from a cohort of science writers and research in Latin America, the authors explore the personal and environmental determinants which appear to have influenced, or led to, fortuitous

chance encounters in order to speak to the potential pedagogical interventions which might positively contribute to academic literacy and career development.

**Ken Hyland – “Changing Times; Changing Texts”**

Building on Bazerman's contention that scholars construct a “stable rhetorical universe” within which their ideas make sense to others, and in particular how the research article as a genre was a response to a particular historical context, Hyland uses a corpus of 2.2 million words drawn from learning journals in four disciplines at three periods over the past 50 years in order to explore the ways the fragmentation and specialization of research has impacted knowledge construction practices in the disciplines.

**Montserrat Castelló – “Situated Regulation Writing Processes in Research Writing. Lessons From Research and Teaching”**

Using Bazerman's conception of writing regulation in the context of cross-disciplinary research on writing, Castelló argues for the significance and the role of situated writing regulation processes in research writing and discusses recent empirical results that validate the research on writing regulation from a socially situated approach. In reflecting on how teaching can increase our understanding of how research writing regulation works, the author argues that we can help students to intentionally decide on how, when, and why to use their resources, and suggests ways to facilitate and teach writing regulation to promote research writer development.

**Lucia Natale – “Writing at the University and in the World of Work: Interrelationships and Learning in the Beginning of Professional Activity”**

In the context of the expansion of the university system in Latin America at the end of the 20th century and into the beginning of the 21st, Natale explores how genres and the written production of specific texts confront college graduates as they enter into the professional contexts. By interviewing students as they enter into their careers, the author seeks to illuminate the relationships between genres and textual practices in the transition from academic to work environments. In doing so, Natale raises important considerations for teachers and researchers of writing as they design writing curriculum in higher education.

**Liliana Tolchinsky & Anat Stavans – “Cultural Shaping of Standpoint and Reasoning in Analytical Writing”**

Tolchinsky and Stavans foreground analytical writing as an important element in the activity systems which comprise the many educational and professional contexts which writers inhabit. Through investigating the relative dependence

of textual organization on different rhetorical and cultural traditions, Tolchinsky and Stavans sketch the differing forms of reasoning which characterize Israeli and Spanish rhetorical traditions. By intervening in discussions surrounding the place of analytical writing in different rhetorical traditions, the authors are able to make a broader call for deeper investigations into the distinctions between how writers from differing cultural traditions carry on their social participatory performance.

### **Joanne Yates – “Genre Change Around Teaching in the COVID-19 Pandemic”**

Yates acknowledges the role of Bazerman's work on genre in her own oeuvre before offering a lengthy and detailed narrative of instructional platforms, administrative decision-making, and Zoom/hybrid teaching in the School of Management at MIT during the COVID-19 shutdown. She draws on Zoom recordings, PowerPoint decks, administrative memos, and interviews, in describing the changes that faculty and administrators made in response to the pandemic emergency regulations imposed by the State of Massachusetts, MIT, and the Sloan School of Management. Her findings suggest that the pandemic shaped the varying genres of communication which educators and administrators drew upon to navigate and manage the impact to their teaching, and in doing so shed light on how the shift in MIT's genre repertoire can help us to better understand organizational change more broadly.

### **Mike Palmquist – “Opening Up: The Enduring Legacy of Chuck Bazerman's Turn Toward Open-Access Publishing”**

Beginning with anecdotes of Bazerman's early involvement in and sponsorship of the WAC Clearinghouse, Palmquist sketches a picture of how scholars in the field of writing studies have long played a central role in exploring the use of technology to support writing and the teaching of writing. By showing how the field has changed in this regard over time, Palmquist makes the argument that new approaches to digital publishing resemble in many ways the decentralized networks which activity theory can help us to understand more deeply and offers a framework for the success of publishing collaboratives, using the WAC Clearinghouse as the central example.

### **Karyn Kessler and Paul Rogers - “Writing and Social Progress: Genre Evolution in the Field of Social Entrepreneurship”**

Drawing on Bazerman's work on genre and activity, Kessler and Rogers present a case study of writing as a tool of mediation in human activity and in particular the genre of the profile and its role in establishing the field of social

entrepreneurship. Drawing on interviews, surveys, and textual analysis of internal strategic documents from the world's 5th ranked NGO, Ashoka, the chapter focuses on the origin of the genre of the profile, the tensions between textual regularities and the need for genre change, and the impact of the genre on the development of a newly identified field of activity (social entrepreneurship) and a new set of actors (social entrepreneurs).

**Clay Spinuzzi – “Two Paths Diverge in a Field: Dialectics and Dialogics in Rhetorical Genre Studies”**

Arguing that Bazerman's synthesis of Vygotskian and Bakhtinian theory has had robust influence over the field, Spinuzzi explores the distinctions between dialectics and dialogics which respectively characterize the anchoring conceptions on which these two diverging theoretical perspectives are based. Because dialectics and dialogics provide different understandings of how meaning emerges, Spinuzzi contends that there is an underlying tension in Bazerman's work which has implications for our understanding of rhetorical genre studies more broadly.

**Yrjö Engeström – “Writing for Stabilization and Writing for Possibility: The Dialects of Representation in Everyday Work with Vulnerable Clients”**

Drawing on Bazerman's (1997) argument for understanding the foundational role of discourse in the structuring of professional activity systems, Engeström analyzes three types of representational instruments developed and used with vulnerable clients in order to provide a radically empowered new grasp of their future activity. Through discussing the possible transitions and iterative movement between the contextualized-emic, the decontextualized-etic, and the recontextualized-prospective modes of representation and writing, Engeström argues for a new model of the politics of deliberative shifts in representation.

**Wu Dan & Li Zenghui – “A Review on Second Language Writing Research in China”**

Dan and Zenghui present a review of L2 writing research in China in order to gauge the changes and trends of the work in CSCI foreign language studies journals from 2001-2020. Through a rigorous selection process, they identified 601 empirical research articles. In the main, they found that L2 writing research in China is on the rise, with the proportion of empirical studies slightly decreasing over time as the range of methods and methodologies utilized expanded. With English writing research receiving more attention, Dan and Zenghui call on Chinese L2 writing researchers to continue to try new writing instructions methods and increase their communication and collaboration with international colleagues.

**Natalia Ávila Reyes, Elizabeth Narváez-Cardona, and Federico Navarro – “Twenty Years of Reading and Writing Research in Latin America: Lessons Learned From the ILEES Initiative”**

This chapter traces twenty years of literacy and language research in Latin America in order to show the pioneering role of the ILEES organization in cohering the differing goals and focuses of writing research across the Southern Hemisphere. The panoramic view offered by this chapter helps to illuminate a more robust and interdisciplinary definition (and identity) of the institutionalization and professionalization of reading and writing research in Latin America. By giving more shape and form to this growing disciplinary community, the authors are able to present a clearer understanding of the configuration of reading and writing studies in Latin America, and in doing so, offer important considerations that strengthen its future scope.

**Jack Andersen – “Rethinking Genre as Digital Social Action: Engaging Bazerman with Medium Theory and Digital Media”**

Turning to media theory in order to understand digital forms of communication, Andersen discusses three of Bazerman's (1988, 1994, 1997) main works on genre in order to rethink genre as social action and contend that searching for information is a genre itself, a form of typified digital action. Arguing that digital media disrupt many traditional forms of communication, this chapter critically examines how to understand the role of genre and typified communication on and in activity systems and the people actively involved in them. If communication is transformed with and within digital media, and Anderson believes it is, then it is important to open a discursive space in which to examine the implications of understanding digital forms of communication.

**Otto Kruse and Christian Rapp – “What Writers Do with Language: Digital Inscription Technologies Require a Fresh Look at Formulation Theory”**

Attempting to match formulation theory to the new technological realities of digital writing, Kruse and Rapp draw on Bazerman's conception of the orderliness of language in order to frame a reconsideration of the role of inscription in digital and non-digital contexts in the construction of meaning. The chapter moves to a consideration of genre, audience, reader empathy, and then to words, lexicons, and word usage, connectives, phrases and multi-word-patterns, the need for grammar, the automaticity of text routines, and two kinds of language generation—with extended examples. Arguing that writers use certain linguistic units to accomplish their aims, the authors attempt to further clarify the role of language and the relation between language and thought with respect to operational units and in doing so account for the relationship between inscription and thinking.



## Carolyn R. Miller – “Genre Formation and Differentiation in New Media”

Miller reflects and builds on Bazerman’s work on genre theory and specifically *the medium* as an element of genres and their formation. Through drawing on media, she seeks to push beyond Bazerman’s focus on the literate and discursive elements of genre formation into the auditory and visual so as to emphasize the multimodality of genre. Arguing that the particular affordances of the letter genre encouraged functional adaptations to new social circumstances and needs, and the functional utility and satisfactions of those adaptations in turn encourage replication and typification, Miller amplifies Bazerman’s emphasis on the social grounding of genres by focusing on the interplay between social relations, exigence, and medium in the formation, and transformation, of genres.

## REFERENCES

- Bazerman, C. (1978). The grant, the scholar, and the university community. In S. Hook, P. Kurtz, & M. Todorovich. *The University and the State* (pp. 221-226). Prometheus Books.
- Bazerman, C. (1979). [Review of the book *Laboratory life: The social construction of scientific facts*, by B. Latour & S. Woolgar]. *Sage Library of Social Research*, 80, 14-20.
- Bazerman, C. (1980). A relationship between reading and writing: The conversational model. *College English*, 41(6), 656–661.
- Bazerman, C. (1981). *The informed writer*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Bazerman, C. (1985). *The informed writer: Using sources in the disciplines*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bazerman, C. (1994). Systems of genres and the enactment of social intentions. In A. Freedman, & P. Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the new rhetoric* (pp. 79–101). Taylor and Francis.
- Bazerman, C. (1998). Looking at writing: Writing what I see. In T. Enos & D. Roen (Eds.), *Living Rhetoric and Composition* (pp. 15–24). Erlbaum.
- Bazerman, C. (1999b). *The languages of Edison’s light*. MIT Press.
- Bazerman, C. (2002). The case for writing studies as a major discipline. In G. Olson (Ed.), *The Intellectual Work of Composition* (pp. 32–38). Southern Illinois University Press.
- Bazerman, C. (2003). Rhetorical research for reflective practice: A multi-layered narrative. In C. N. Candlin (Ed.), *Research and Practice in Professional Discourse* (pp. 79-94). City University of Hong Kong Press.
- Bazerman, C. (2011). The work of a middle-class activist: Stuck in history. In S. Kahn (Ed.), *Activism and Rhetoric: Theories and Context for Political Engagement* (pp. 61-70). Routledge.
- Bazerman, C. (2013). *A rhetoric of literate Action: Literate action volume 1*. The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press.

- Bazerman, C. (2013b). *A theory of literate action: Literate action volume 2*. WAC Clearinghouse.
- Bazerman, C. (2019). The work of a middle-class activist: Stuck in history. In *Activism and Rhetoric* (pp. 190–200). Routledge.
- Bazerman, C. (2020). What written knowledge does: Three examples of academic discourse. In *Landmark Essays* (pp. 159–188). Routledge.
- Bazerman, C. (2021). The Ethical Poetry of Academic Writing. *Educação, Sociedade & Culturas*, nº 58, 183-192. <https://doi.org/10.24840/esc.vi58.152>
- Bazerman, C. (Ed.). (2008). *Handbook of research on writing: History, society, school, individual, text*. Erlbaum.
- Bazerman, C., Applebee, A. N., Berninger, V. W., Brandt, D., Graham, S., Jeffery, J., Matsuda, P. K., Murphy, S., Rowe, D. W., Schleppegrell, M., & Wilcox, K. C. (Eds.). (2018). *The lifespan development of writing*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Bazerman, C., & Herrington, A. (2006). Circles of interest: The growth of research communities in WAC and WID/WIP. In S. McLeod (Ed.), *Inventing a Profession: WAC history* (pp. 49–66). Parlor Press.
- Bazerman, C., & Prior, P. A. (2004). *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices*. Routledge.
- Biography and overview | Charles Bazerman*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 10, 2022, from <https://bazerman.education.ucsb.edu/biography-and-overview>
- Cole, M. (1998). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Harvard University Press.
- Eldred, M. (1995). Charles Bazerman: Writing is motivated participation: *Writing on the Edge*, 6(2), 7–20.
- Goody, J. (1962). *Death, property and the ancestors: A study of the mortuary customs of the LoDagaa of West Africa*. Stanford University Press.
- Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, 151–167.
- Russell, D. R. (2002). *Writing in the academic disciplines: A curricular history*. SIU Press.
- Schryer, C. F. (1993). Records as genre. *Written Communication*, 10(2), 200–234.
- Wiener, H. S., & Bazerman, C. (1978) *Reading Skills Handbook*. Houghton Mifflin.