Contents

PIVOTAL STRATEGIES

Introduction

LYNN C. LEWIS

On New Year's Day in January of 2022, I posted a question to my Facebook account: "Informal poll for people in the field of Rhetoric and Writing Studies: what metaphors have you/did you used/use for grad students who change disciplines, i.e., from literature to RWS or Creative Writing to RWS, etc.?"

Eighty-one comments later, I saw a picture emerging: The language used to describe a move to rhetoric and writing studies or composition and rhetoric frequently bore negative valence. A number of posters referred to "coming to the Dark Side" or "defecting" from, presumably, the good guys. Others remembered terms like "retread," "stepchild," and "bastard stepchild," a suggestion that our field lacks authenticity and leeches from more genuine work. One thread highlighted how the field of composition and rhetoric or writing studies was more frequently aligned with terms like "selling out" and "capitulating"—the suggestion here being that although one was more likely to be hired into a tenure-track job and to be able to make a living, this meant one was no longer doing the real, hard, intellectual work.

Three posters, however, made claim to neutral terms and argued, either implicitly or explicitly, that they had never been shamed for their choice of discipline nor had they ever felt demeaned. Fair enough. Still, the immediate consensus was that this question reflected experiences encapsulated in

https://doi.org/10.7330/9781646426331.c000

language choices that floated in the air of classrooms, graduate student coffee rooms, and cheap bars. For a long time, for most of us, choosing to identify with this "bastard stepchild" of a discipline has meant thinking about how we *differed* as well as who we are. We differed from literature because we cared more about writing and pedagogy; we differed from creative writing because what we wrote did not easily fit the designated creative genres. Every time I taught the required graduate student introduction to composition theory and pedagogy, I fielded questions about how writing studies differed from other disciplines. It is not a bad question. But focusing on differences elides the more substantive and well-theorized question of how writing studies became and maintains itself as a discipline.

The field's quest for disciplinarity has drawn the attention of numerous scholars. For example, the 2010 special issue of *CCC*, "The Future of Rhetoric and Composition," includes an important essay by Louise Phelps and John M. Ackerman in which they argue for the continuing need for scholars in composition and rhetoric/writing studies to make "the case for disciplinarity." Focusing on the *Visibility Project*, an initiative meant to ensure the recognition of composition, rhetoric, and writing studies in official databases, Phelps and Ackerman note that "to be recognized as a discipline is a powerful measure of whether we have earned the respect of others" (2010, 181). That recognition, as my informal experiment above demonstrates, continues to be an issue. We still seek respect.

"We" in these sentences calls for unpacking, however. Rhetoric and writing studies has, like many academic disciplines, suffered from terministic screens infused with whiteness. In fact, as Keith Gilyard, Adam Banks, Jacqueline Jones Royster, Susan Kates, and Sharon Crowley among many others have argued, racialized minority voices and bodies have been erased and elided. Nevertheless, their work as scholars and teachers has been integral to the construction of writing studies as discipline. As early as 1999, Gilyard called for continued rigorous attention to archival research in order to redress the problem of elided voices. He underscores his argument with a rich list of Black scholars whose work has been unrecognized but foundational to the field. Drawing on Susan Kates's work, he describes the pedagogy and writings of Haillie Quinn Brown, for instance, who in the early twentieth century developed pedagogical strategies with the then-radical assumption of developmental writing. Gilyard maps the work of Carter Woodson, W. E. B. Du Bois, and Geneva Smitherman, among others, describing how each scholar-teacher influenced the new discipline of composition and rhetoric. As Gilyard puts it,

"We may not always have been in the house of mainstream composition studies, but we were always knocking on the door" (1999, 642–643).

Knocking on closed doors comes with costs. Claiming the discipline as one's own can be costly on individual, community, and programmatic levels. For example, in his description of the effects of racial politics, Vershawn Ashanti Young has detailed the "rhetorical performance" necessary in negotiating his identity as a Black, male professor ("Your Average Nigga"). Stories about claiming a place in writing studies orbit questions of personal identity as well as professional and disciplinary belonging.

Racial politics and the ethics of racial encounters are crucial touchstones in our field now and they have taken on an urgency long overdue in the humanities in general. While this book does not take up the racial politics of our field explicitly, the contributors' stories here cannot help but be inflected by them. While the field has certainly orbited many other issues, problems, and questions, it has never listened hard enough to those knocks on the door.

I do not claim exceptionalism for writing studies in its complicated becoming. Challenges to disciplinarity have emerged in the humanities as well as the social sciences. Gary Olson has described anthropology's struggles over its identity. In writing studies, struggles over whether we are a service discipline or an intellectual one, whether theory matters when our focus is or should be pedagogy, and similar concerns can be tracked (Olson 2002). As Olson explains, "Anxieties of status and self-definition presented a common topic for discussion and research in the field." Put reductively, the *what* of writing studies was an early obsession for scholars. Olson's edited collection *Rhetoric and Composition as Intellectual Work* not only pushes back at the notion that service is primary but also suggests an early strategy for claiming writing studies as discipline: "The truth of the matter is that rhetoric and composition already is an intellectual discipline," says Olson (2002, xii). While aside Olson's main purpose for the collection, a book arguing for the intellectual worth and weight of its scholars is making a claim to disciplinarity and delineating its borders.

Defining the *what* of writing studies is a move common to the discipline; similar books and journal articles abound. As Heilker and Vandenberg (2015) show in their *Keywords in Writing Studies* collection, how borders have been or should be drawn about the nature of writing studies remains of great interest. Heilker and Vandenberg document the wonderful variety of border tracing; from Wardle and Downs's call for a writing-about-writing curriculum to Charles Bazerman's exuberant argument about the broad interdisciplinary

reach of the field, the lines demarking writing studies are drawn and redrawn across the map of the humanities. While the redrawing of lines is not unique to writing studies, the field's rigorous interrogation of its existence, methods, purpose, and exigencies is certainly unusual.

But what approaches have scholars constructed in order to claim membership in the field? This is the *how* that concerns this book. That is, *how* individuals, programs, and departments strategize their becoming, identifying, and claiming. What are their key—pivotal—strategies? Answers to this question will require tracing the individual exigencies, purposes, rhetorical contexts, and kairotic moments leading to the construction and development of those strategies. They will require interrogation of the exclusion of marginalized voices and conscientious listening. The answers will require stories, in other words.

This collection turns on the notion that we tell ourselves stories in order to claim our discipline. Whether personal, social, communal, or institutional, these stories help us think about what constitutes writing studies and what deliberate, kairotic moves we writing studies scholars make. Only in the last five years or so have undergraduate writing studies majors been possible at some (but not all) universities. That means graduate students may not have arrived with the desire to pursue scholarship in composition and rhetoric or professional writing or writing studies. That means there must have been a shift in their thinking, a change in the questions that intrigued them, the scholars they wanted to read, and the expertise they sought to gain. These students had to locate themselves as writing studies scholars through conscious, purposeful moves. These are stories worth hearing. Likewise, in the 1980s as composition and rhetoric or writing studies emerged as a field or discipline or subject (the terms, while not fungible, shift from year to year), scholars trained in literature or creative writing or other fields reinvented themselves as they invested in the chief concerns of writing studies. Those stories, also, are worth hearing.

Indeed, the process of becoming requires a genuine pivot in thinking not least because there have been so few undergraduate degrees in writing studies until now. While the last five years have seen moderate growth in undergraduate degrees in writing studies, many writing programs and/or English departments still do not offer a Bachelor of Arts degree in writing studies. New graduate students often know little about rhetoric and writing studies when they begin their degree programs and may then unexpectedly find themselves pulled into questions about writing and literacy that they genuinely want to

explore. It is a common phenomenon and a traceable through line among the stories in this book.

Claiming the discipline is not only about individual stories. The birth of standalone writing studies departments, for example, is a notable new phenomenon. What stories are there? As a discipline, we can be and often are lumped together with other "Englishy" fields. What negotiations, emergences, and challenges do writing studies programs face when they are not standalone? My own department houses five different programs: Creative Writing, Literature, Rhetoric and Writing Studies, TESL/Linguistics, and Screen Studies. The department has experienced challenges and occasional tensions around its multidisciplinary construction. As faculty at a Research 1 university, each of us are highly sensitive to the importance and impact of the scholarship and creative work we accomplish. We are also highly sensitive to questions of language and belonging as any multidisciplinary department would be.

I am standing at the front of the faculty meeting with a four-page handout. The handout details the widespread use of the term "writing studies" and I am making the argument that our program should be granted permission to change our name from Rhetoric and Professional Writing to Rhetoric and Writing Studies. The director of our program has just offered our rationale for the change, and it is my job to provide evidence that the term is widely used and widely accepted by people in our field.

This is our program's second attempt to make the argument. The first, an abysmal failure, was met with strong opposition from one of our department's five programs and mild puzzlement from the other three. We were directed to attempt to "work it out" with the program whose faculty were objecting. This, too, was an abysmal failure. So, after a year's delay and multiple attempts at negotiation, we are proposing the change again.

Our junior faculty are wary of making the argument once more. They are rightfully weary of what has to come to feel like an overly vitriolic debate since some are so strongly opposed to our change, and junior faculty, not yet tenured, feel targeted. But we all believe the change is essential; our current program name fails to capture what we really teach, research, and write about and is, for us, simply outdated.

As I stand in front of the faculty, I feel some confidence. Evidence of the widespread use of the term "writing studies" is present at peer institutions, in job ads, in CFPs, conference calls, recent book titles, and book series, so I have plenty to say. But as I walk faculty through the evidence, I also find myself

feeling as if I have been reduced to bargaining for my discipline's identity, insisting on its significance, and asking permission to use the descriptors it has birthed. My pivotal strategy in this story was to locate and demonstrate the prevalence of the term "writing studies." While not particularly innovative, the strategy worked in this case because my audience was unaware of the term's prevalence, and I was able to show its acceptance across a range of academic writing artifacts familiar to them: for this rhetorical context and kairotic moment, the strategy was pivotal.

My approach was dependent on the labors of past scholars who struggled to name a discipline notable for its messy insistence on blurring boundaries. As early as 1989, writing program administrators (WPAs) Armstrong and Fontaine described their experiences, noting that "we feel that the creative power of naming then is particularly important in an emerging discipline such as Composition" (1989, 9). They note the challenge of making an informed decision about naming their own positions as WPAs, their staff and graduate student assistants, and even the content of their pedagogy. They also see the emergence of the discipline as demanding not only inquiring into the *what* of the field but also presenting an opportunity to name. Challenges necessitating negotiations permeate their stories. This is familiar still.

The question of naming and defining will likely persist especially as the field continues to evolve. Claire Lauer's (2012) "What's in a Name: The Anatomy of Defining New/Multi/Modal/Media Texts" reminds writing scholars that "defining terms . . . helps us discover what we value and where we stand in relation to what has been said and done before." Given the ever-changing nature of the field—despite efforts to "name what we know" or delineate "threshold concepts"—Lauer's point helps explain the field's necessary focus on this question.

Yet, as I think about the approaches our program took to persuade other faculty that our name change was reasonable, more questions emerge. What are the essential approaches to claiming the discipline? How do such claims work at programmatic, collective, and individual levels? Arguing for a particular name or disciplinarity requires strategic and tactical approaches. Similarly, claiming space or identity as a writing studies scholar demands exigency, agentive movement, and commitment. Given Gilyard's reminder of Black scholars knocking at the door, how should writing studies understand—and amplify—the experiences of underrepresented groups? Writing studies lauds its openness to racialized minorities, working class, and queer teacher-scholars, but what does it really mean to say "Yes, I belong *here*"?

In order to claim the discipline, whether as an individual, a program, or a department, two critical components must be in place. First, the field must convince outsiders that it exists and that its existence matters. Second, the field must achieve some insider consensus about its characteristics, methods, and values. On the other hand, consensus must account for the ever-shifting nature of writing studies and recognize that it is always contingent and always in need of renewal. Writing studies scholars have worked and continue to work at persuading outsiders and achieving consensus, if only briefly, within.

Louise Phelps's work with the Visibility Project exemplifies an approach to persuading outsiders. For Phelps, seeing that rhetoric and composition did not exist in numerical taxonomies of disciplines created by the National Research Council (NRC) and other groups meant "we had discovered a hidden mechanism that was playing a major role in keeping the field invisible." As she details in an interview, "Basically there is information disseminated about fields through statistics and databases that count and describe things like programs, degrees, and faculty, using discipline-based codes. As a field we weren't represented in the codes, not just in the NRC taxonomy but in an array of others. They reinforce each other because they're so interconnected" (Rodrigue 2013). Phelps's work to ensure composition and rhetoric was included was strategic and important to the discipline claiming a space for itself. Phelps, working with John Ackerman and the Doctoral Consortium, developed strategic approaches to making composition and rhetoric visible that included demonstrating that the number of students graduating with PhDs was comparable to already recognized and sustainable disciplines as well as surveying doctoral programs and gathering vast quantities of data. As Phelps and Ackerman explain when detailing two critical cases where rhetoric and writing studies was elided in the codes, "Each of these cases is a classic instance of rhetorical work. Each involved a complex collaborative process of research, data gathering, invention, and communication that was fraught with obstacles and difficulties" (2010, 186).

This work rendered the discipline visible because investigating and learning the complexities of institutional coding and then arguing for inclusion effected change at multiple levels on a broad scale. Departments and programs seeking to stake a claim can call on the codes to instantiate their arguments. The focus on outsider views threads through the stories in this book.

As the chapters in this collection will demonstrate, the question of naming and defining has given rise to a number of pivotal strategies as well as tactical approaches to the problem of claiming the discipline. However, the exigencies

leading to the stories in these chapters vary in ways that reflect our cultural moment. Two particular exigencies shine here: the first lies in the overwhelming necessity of committing to antiracist practices and listening to the voices of BIPOC people. The second is the unsustainable and permeating sense of precarity in writing studies as well as other disciplines in the humanities.

The field's current focus on antiracist practices is evident in the flurry of position statements now appearing on the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) website, especially since 2016. These include statements on ensuring equitable hiring practice and a diverse candidate pool as well as numerous useful and important statements on language, such as the "Statement on Language, Power, and Action" and "This Ain't Another Statement. This is a Demand for Black Linguistic Justice." Likewise, the venerable WPA-L listserv has, for the first time in its long history, developed participation guidelines whose goal is, as Working Group member Iris Ruiz wrote to the listserv in a June 2020 email, "to move the list to a more equitable and inclusive climate."

Listening to BIPOC voices and those of people underrepresented in the academy describing the moves they must use to claim writing studies as discipline is an important goal for this book. The effects of racial politics, as Vershawn Ashanti Young and Keith Gilyard, among many others (Kynard, Perryman-Clark, Ore, and others), have at last become less elided, although work remains. The recent more focused (and belated) attention to underrepresented voices in the academy necessarily complicates questions about scholars claiming the discipline. In fact, these voices have yet to be heard as loudly as they should be, and this edited collection seeks to provide space for their important stories.

As Young demonstrates, the decision graduate students make to become writing studies scholars and claim writing studies as their own requires strategic thinking. While Young's rhetorical performance will be familiar to many scholars of color as a necessary tactic, writing studies scholars of color must not only perform but also engage with an unlikely discipline that, for some humanities scholars, lacks gravitas. This, too, shapes teacher-scholars' sense of how they may claim writing studies as their own. Chapters by Karen R. Tellez-Trujillo, Khadeidra Billingsley, Raymond D. Rosas, and Antonio Byrd detail their experiences as BIPOC writing studies scholars.

Precarity, a second troubling exigency, has increased in the last decade and it too surfaces in the chapters of this book. The term "precarity" here refers to the growing number of adjunct and non-tenure-track positions in the

humanities and, especially, in writing studies. As Eileen Schell points out in her introduction to Seth Kahn, Willliam B. Lalicker, and Amy Lynch-Biniek's (2017) *Contingency, Exploitation, and Solidarity: Labor and Action in English Composition*, "the economic conditions of higher education have shifted over the past thirty plus years due to increasingly neoliberal, corporatized, and privatized models of higher education." Contingency and precarity are symptoms of this economic reality, pressurized by the COVID-19 pandemic economy. The number of advertised positions has been in a steady decline since 2010, and Jim Ridolfo's rhetmap (n.d.), which provides a list of available jobs each year, shows a precipitous drop during two years of pandemic and little sign of recovery.

Meanwhile, writing programs and departments dependent on contingent labor attempt to locate ethical practices while facing the shrinkage of humanities disciplines in general. Two chapters from this collection foreground this complicated space: "Embracing Failure: A Newly Independent Department's Attempts at Writing Its Own Script" by Brooks, Dadas, Fields and Restaino and Ersheid, Koenigsburg, McVeigh, Pearson, and Kahn's co-authored "Claiming and Being Claimed by Writing Studies: Negotiating Identities for Creative Writers Teaching Composition."

This essay collection sought narratives across three categories: (1) researched narratives about arriving to the discipline, especially those stories that detail how, why, and under which institutional, cultural, or social constraints professionals made writing studies their scholarly and pedagogical foci; (2) historiographic or ethnographic studies of writing studies program-building either within or outside an English department; and (3) theorized examinations of the strategies necessary to claiming the discipline of writing studies. The eleven chapters of this book represent a strong sampling of the categories.

The book is divided into three sections. They are Kairos and Opportunity, Negotiations and Resilience, and Allegiance and Identification. These sections emerged organically from accepted contributors' drafts; like focuses, experiences, and stories were quickly evident across essays. The section titles do not identify strategies for claiming writing studies. Instead, they identify the conditions the writers identified as essential to their own experiences. However, this is not to say that these themes or conditions exist only for the titular section. Rather, they represent strands that run through every essay; they help structure the stories, but their colors dominate more clearly. For example, "negotiation" can be mapped across all eleven essays, whether between faculty member and institution, institution and state government,

student and teacher, or writer and sense of self. The twenty-one voices in this book (I include Cedillo, who wrote the final words, and myself in this count) recognize each of these conditions as integral to our experiences as teacher-scholars seeking to claim writing studies as our own.

Section I: Kairos and Opportunity

The first section represents authors for whom the experience of claiming the discipline has been structured by opportune time and place. The right time and place are important to every story about claiming writing studies and always require commitment to a writing studies identity, of course. But the authors in this section call on them forcefully and, to some extent, fiercely.

Lauren Bowen and Laurie Pinkert provide important historical context in their "Political, Personal, and Pedagogical Imperatives: Tactical Disciplinarity among Early Members of Writing Studies." Focusing on the strategic moves needed to claim the discipline, Bowen and Pinkert describe results from their interviews of twenty-seven retired writing studies scholars. Their analysis provides a first look at how the fraught or nonexistent recognition of disciplinary identity necessitated careful attention to kairos and to space for opportunity so that these early writing studies scholars could situate themselves in a just-coming-into-being discipline. Put differently, these are, as Bowen and Pinkert note, "origin stories" whose narrative arcs can help elucidate later origin stories.

Suellynn Duffey's standpoint as a scholar working in the field since the 1970s takes a long view on claiming the discipline that is, nevertheless, built on what she calls the "embodied and relational." Duffey argues for the importance of stories in order to identify key disciplinary birth moments but also asks that scholars refuse the notion that the current moment exists without connection to all the moments before. Kairos and opportunity permitted Duffey's explorations, and her commitment to rhetoric gave her impetus to seek out scholars outside of the literature department, as did many scholars, before writing studies emerged as discipline.

Duffey notes the significance to the CUNY open admissions policy and the important "Students' Right to Their Own Language" declaration, among other initiatives, noting, however, the shortcomings that failed to empower racially minoritized students as hoped. Above all, Duffey's chapter demonstrates how commitment to student learning has always been a pivotal strategy to claiming a place for writing studies.

The ellipsis or invisibility of writing studies has not, unfortunately, dissipated as Tara Wood's "Strategizing Disciplinarity, Disciplinary Strategies" chapter demonstrates. Writing from the position of a newly hired writing program administrator (WPA) for a struggling first-year composition program, Wood argues for what Laura Micciche has called "slow agency" (quoted in Wood, this volume). While state and university mandates constrict Wood's curriculum revisions, she also finds moments of opportunity to enact first, slow changes. Committed to antiracist assessment, Wood engages in deep reflection in order to locate kairotic moments where, at the least, conversations about antiracist practices can occur. For WPAs, Wood finds, claiming writing studies as discipline requires attentiveness to "the when and where."

The last chapter in this section, "Embracing Failure: A Newly Independent Department's Attempts at Writing Its Own Script," by co-authors Ron Brooks and Caroline Dadas with assistance from Laura Fields and Jessica Restaino, takes Wood's argument about the complications of working within state and university constraints a step further as they document the labor and birth of a writing studies department. An unfriendly English department and supportive upper administration delivered an opportunity, kairotic in its meshing of right time, right place, and right people. However, as Ron Brooks, the founding department head learned, the desire to be utterly collaborative in form ran into challenges much akin to what Wood experienced. Their essay draws on queer methodologies because this approach allows for analysis of the development and circulation of norms as well as imaginative tactics embracing messiness and allowing failure. The chapter breaks ground in the newness of the experience it describes but also demonstrates how well queer methodologies can enrich the story and give rhetors a way to name their experiences.

These four chapters instantiate the attentiveness necessary to writing studies scholars as they claim their discipline. Moments for action may slip by easily. Identifying and acting on these kairos-infused opportunities unquestionably marks a key strategy for claiming the discipline.

Section II: Negotiations and Resilience

The four essays in this section trace the many negotiations and state of resilience necessary to claiming the discipline. Kairos and opportunity remain discernible in this section. In "Claiming and Being Claimed by Writing Studies: Negotiating Identities for Creative Writers Teaching Composition," Alison Ersheid, Lisa Koenigsburg, Maureen McVeigh, Nancy Pearson, and

Seth Kahn write from varied positionalities: The first four are creative writers whose working lives are embedded within writing studies, unlike Kahn who is a tenured writing studies scholar. A focus on teaching writing, elemental to the fields of creative writing and writing studies, links these co-authors as well as a commitment to student learning. These five, like so many, negotiate identities as union activists, poets, and writers as well as teacher-scholars. The chapter identifies these negotiations to the backdrop of material labor and the possibility of tenure for that labor, dangled and withdrawn for years. While the story ends happily, the tension between claiming and being claimed by resonates throughout.

As in Ersheid et al.'s essay, Cynthia Johnson acknowledges the complications of labor as a writing studies scholar in her chapter "From Pell Grants to Tenure Track: Precarity and Labor as a Disciplinary Pathway." Johnson notes that her privilege as a white person clashes with being queer and from a disadvantaged class background. Her whiteness helped make it possible for her to mask the potentially "unacceptable" aspects of herself, yet her desire to mask these and gain professional status led her to accept extraordinarily demanding terms of labor and compensation. As she argues, financial precarity and affective labor may inflect the lives of graduate students across disciplines. However, within the field of writing studies, while the unspoken commitment to heavy material labor remains, effective and persuasive arguments deconstructing notions of professionalism, destandardizing language, have been emerging and these, Johnson says, helped her claim her place as a writing studies scholar. These commitments have enabled her to negotiate what feels impossibly tangled and, finally, to speak.

The scholars in this section see resilience as integral to their efforts to claim identities as writing studies teacher-scholars. In "Finding Resilience in Writing Studies at the United States-Mexico Border," Karen Tellez-Trujillo, like Johnson, finds resilience through the work of the writing studies scholars she has studied. Living among borders has costs, especially given the dominating and aggressive presence of white male scholars in her graduate student experience, and so the voices of feminist scholars in particular have given her space to make her claim. Now a new assistant professor, Tellez-Trujillo sees language as both freeing and imprisoning and, having written her way through to resilience, looks for the same markers of struggle and achievement in her students' writing.

Section III: Allegiance and Identification

This section includes four scholars whose life experiences have inspired a keen sense of what allegiances they require from the discipline. While contributors in sections I and II name explicit claiming strategies, section III contributors foreground their embodiment as underrepresented members of academia and commitment to social justice and equity through which they locate the language they evolve and story they create. For these contributors, strategizing identification resonates as crucial affective labor. Likewise, for them, locating opportunity and finding resilience are necessary conditions to their stories.

In "Being the Only One: The Embodiment and Labor of Tokenism," Khadeidra Billingsley describes her experiences as a Black woman and graduate student at a predominantly white school. Her embodiment in white eyes has enforced the status of token, and Billingsley movingly explains the weight, burden, and cost of that tokenism. Her essay responds to Black feminist scholars such as Kynard, Perryman-Clark, Robinson, and others whose refusal to be silent and commitment to their identities inspires. For Billingsley, telling her story will not only provide strategies—and, perhaps, comfort—to young scholars facing similar burdens but also represents her commitment to the discipline and to making a path amid "complexity and confusion." Telling her own story emerges as a key tactic in the face of the burden heaved onto her back.

Billingsley's allegiance to Black women who have come before and will come after her despite the everyday violences she experiences as "the Only One," echoes in Raymond Rosas's "Literacy and Disciplinarity: Vignettes of Struggle and Identification." For Rosas the violences arise first through language. These are inscribed through his embodiment as Chicano/Puerto Rican and experiences as classed and raced and as a survivor of the US opiate epidemic. Rosas locates his allegiance to writing studies through his commitment to equity in linguistic and literacy practices and sees the discipline as a site where such initiatives are truly possible. Rosas's reasons to choose writing studies as discipline push him to his chief strategy: he intends to write himself into the discipline and allow himself the power of hope.

In "Cognitive Dissonance," Alison Wells Zepeda explores the tensions arising from her embodiment, beliefs, and values. She believes in the power of language; like Rosas, Zepeda privileges how language has informed and shaped her identity and the questions she has asked of herself and of the

discipline. Yet she also values affect, material feminisms, and the interactions between thing and environment. These complicated relationships as well as Zepeda's continual returns to language as primary suggest that she, like Billingsley and Rosas sees writing into and around the discipline as her once and future strategy.

Antonio Byrd's chapter, "Writing into Inclusion from the Margins," echoes the calls from Billingsley, Rosas, and Zepeda for ethical languaging. The murder and violence occurring in Ferguson, Missouri, honed Byrd's awareness of the margins of the discipline and underscored the necessity of traversing his racial positionality and the whiteness embedded in the discipline. Byrd investigates his own story and considers how his literacies were first informed by white writers whose scholarship dominated his early educational experiences. Not until his doctoral studies and Ferguson did Byrd realize how linguistic racism had shaped his literacies and, like the other authors in this section, he came to read and write himself as Black man and as a writing studies scholar into the discipline.

Christina V. Cedillo closes the book by amplifying the importance of story and highlighting how embodiment shapes and is shaped through writing studies. Cedillo underscores—as does the accumulative power of the book's chapters—the significance of story as pivotal strategy in claiming writing studies.

While all the chapter contributions engage with the question of pivotal strategies, their approaches, points of tension, and subjects differ. Likewise, methodologies differ depending on what questions the contributors chose; these range from qualitative mixed method (Bowen and Pinkert) to autoethnography (Byrd, Rosas, Billingsley, Tellez-Trujillo among others) to institutional ethnography (Brooks, Dadas, et al., Kahn et al.) to personal reflection and autobiography (Duffey). Each section opens with a brief interlude or introduction foregrounding the themes and conditions integral to the section.

These scholars' critical awareness of their embodiment and identity inspire their writing. They do not, however, only turn inward as they write. They are keenly aware of the politics and cultural expectations of the moment: they struggle to value their own voices, knowing they, like the scholars who came before them, will always need to adapt, always need to stand up, and always be in the moment of claiming the discipline.

References

Armstrong, Cherryl, and Sheryl J. Fontaine. 1989. "The Power of Naming: Names That Create and Define the Discipline." *Writing Program Administration* 13 (1–2): 5–14.

Gilyard, Keith. 1999. "African American Contributions to Composition Studies." *College Composition and Communication* 50 (4): 626–644.

Heilker, Paul, and Peter Vandenberg, eds. 2015. *Keywords in Writing Studies*. Logan: Utah State University Press.

Kahn, Seth, William B. Lalicker, and Amy Lynch-Biniek, eds. 2017. *Contingency, Exploitation, and Solidarity: Labor and Action in English Composition*. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2017.0858.

Lauer, Claire. 2012. "What's in a Name? The Anatomy of Defining New/Multi/Modal/Digital/Media Texts." *Kairos* 17 (1). http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/17.1/inventio/lauer/index.html.

Olson, Gary A. 2002. *Rhetoric and Composition as Intellectual Work*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Phelps, Louise Wetherbee, and John M. Ackerman. 2010. "Making the Case for Disciplinarity in Rhetoric, Composition, and Writing Studies: The Visibility Project." *College Composition and Communication* 62 (1): 180–215. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27917890.

"Rhet Map: Mapping Rhetoric and Composition." n.d. Rhet Map. Accessed March 1, 2021. http://www.rhetmap.org/.

Rodrigue, Tanya. 2013. "A Portrait of a Scholar . . . In Progress: An Interview with Louise Wetherbee Phelps." *Composition Forum* 27 (Spring). http://compositionforum.org/issue/27/louise-wetherbee-phelps-interview.php.