Sustainable Infrastructures and the Future of Writing Studies

Cheryl E. Ball

[Kairos index] In January 2016—just six months from now—*Kairos*: *A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* will celebrate its 20th anniversary. Readers familiar with *Kairos* know that it is a peer-reviewed, independent, open-access journal that has been publishing screen-based, hypertextual and media-rich scholarship since 1996.

[Kairos' first index] Since Kairos's first issue, its mission has been to publish scholarship that examines digital, networked, and multimodal composing practices—that's 20 years of *scholarship about* digital writing practices. There are people in this room who had just learned to walk when Kairos, too, took its first steps… when the notion took hold in our field that digital writing needed its own form of scholarship.

[rocket ship] The future of writing studies, my friends, arrived decades ago and has already settled in. But I suspect you know that. So today I'd like to talk about what the field didn't know 20 years ago about digital writing—and I will warn you that some of that history may be uncomfortably close to home, and for that, I apologize in advance, and hope that you'll take these brief microhistories as forewarned examples. So I will also talk about what we need to <u>know</u> going forward—let's say 20 years forward—and what we need to do to plan for that <u>now</u>.

I begin by taking us back to the Year 2002, in which the following three scenes occurred:

Scene 1. **[multi-journal issue]** A reader finds the perfect, multi-journal special issue on electronic publishing to use as a framework for one of her dissertation chapters on digital scholarship. She cites the work, but when reworking the chapter for publication two years later, she finds that not only are a majority of the dozen webtexts missing, but three of the five journals are no longer available, and one of those three journals has been completely scrubbed from the Web. It has been "disappeared," as we say.

Scene 2. **[Krause's webtext in CCCO 1st round**] A tenure-track scholar's webtext is peer-reviewed and published in a new, *online* spin-off of a highly respected, long-running, and institutionalized print journal. The online version is part of a multi-journal special issue on electronic publishing. Less than two years later, and without warning to the author, the online version of this journal is disappeared from the institution's website and is seemingly wiped from institutional memory. There is no record the webtext was ever published within the journal.

Scene 3. **[404]** The editor who suggested that this special issue cross journal borders to showcase five publications that promote Web-based scholarship is—five years later—the only editor standing. Or, rather, editor of the only journal still consistently publishing.

Now, if any of you have run off on your iPhones to check these links yourself, rest assured that *Kairos* Senior Editor Douglas Eyman has recently restored all of the links he could find to the other journals. In almost every case, this required searching for the author or title of the piece on those journals' new index page and finding them linked deep within their interfaces and "redesigned" architecture **[Drupal]**, with the most unfriendly URLs possible. **[404]** But for most of the last 13 years, these pieces were not linked or accessible in the way they were originally intended. This instability and erasure has plagued online publishing in rhetoric and composition, and is nothing short of shameful. I am embarrassed by it, even as I count myself among one of the "lucky" ones who works for the only journal that stood. I tell this story from a position of privilege, but also from a position of having worked my ass off to keep *Kairos* running for much of the last 15 years in various capacities.

However, I want to tell this story today—this history of a broken thing—because even though these scenes are from over a decade ago, our field continues, CONTINUES, to make the same mistakes over and over again. **[turnips]** …. We are scholars of rhetoric, and teachers of digital writing (whether we like it or not), and so we need to resurrect this erased past so that we can learn from our mistakes and teach our students—whether they are students in our undergraduate writing classrooms or our graduate students who will be the next keepers and continuers of our scholarly record—to pay better attention to our infrastructures.

[infrastructures] So what, really, do I mean by infrastructures? Based on our combined decades of experience editing Kairos, Doug Eyman and I talk about infrastructures in digital publishing in three terms: the scholarly, the social, and the technical. I'm going to briefly outline the scholarly and the social aspects in this talk, because I want to focus on one that is perhaps less well-known for this audience, the technical, and how to think rhetorically about technical infrastructures for our scholarly endeavors.

[scholarly] Scholarly infrastructure for the C&W field is slightly different than it is for rhetoric and composition and WPAs more broadly. Each in-discipline has its own scholarly publishing values. The scholarly infrastructure for the larger field of writing studies values co-authorship and collaboration, mixed-methods, narrative writing styles, peer-review and social aspects of writing, process and revision, as well as social justice- and critically oriented pedagogies, student-centered and open-door teaching.

These are things that the field not only researches but (supposedly) adheres to in its scholarship. That is, the scholarly infrastructure is that which supports the field's existent scholarly values. These values change over time, such as when writing studies started to accept more data-driven research in the 1980s. Or when we agreed that multimodality and hypertextuality were acceptable to our scholarly publishing values in the mid-90s. It is true, however, that not all in-disciplines of writing studies accept multimodal scholarship as valid. But, they'd be wrong. ;)

[social] Social infrastructures are those that support the engagement of the field's scholarship. Since I am specifically talking about digital publishing today, let me give you an example from *Kairos*: Peer review at the journal takes place collaboratively across three stages. First, the section editors evaluate whether a submission is ready for the editorial board; then, if a piece makes it past the first stage, the external reviewers provide feedback usually in a group of 5–6; and if a piece makes it past that stage with an R&R, we will assign a staff member to work one-on-one with an author to complete those revisions prior to re-review.

A related example to invoke here is the number of staff members we have on board: **[staff]** There are currently 33 (!!!) staff members at 30 universities across the US—including Carly Finseth, a brand new hire at Boise State!! For the August 2015 issue, we have a near-record **[current copy-editing list]** 19 webtexts that all 33 of these editors, section editors, and assistant editors have been copy- and design-editing, **[8-stages]** keeping track across our 8-stage production process through a staff wiki and email.

This social infrastructure runs the machine that is *Kairos*. I'm just the wizard. Well, actually, Doug is the wizard, because none of this would run without him. I guess that makes me the Good Witch in this metaphor. **[good witch?]** I think the staff would agree to that.

[training wiki] The staffing is important to point out here because one of the reasons *Kairos* has been able to sustain itself all these years is due to the large, well-qualified, trained, and dedicated staff who volunteer their time to be part of this social and scholarly endeavor. Many of them are graduate students or early-career tenure-track scholars teaching 4-4 loads who spend as many as 10-15 hours a week during production cycles, which can last upwards of three months, 2-3x a year. For the first 10 years of *Kairos*'s life, that wasn't the case—we didn't really have assistant editors, and section editors all worked independently. But it just wasn't sustainable, and a change meant more time hiring and training people. But we've done that work now, and everything is in place to bring in new staff members whenever we need them, which is about every two years.

This hiring and training cycle, and this staffing situation, is radically different from pretty much every other online journal in our field. So I know I'm asking a lot when I'm asking the field, and its editors and potential editors, to learn from our prior mistakes in digital publishing. But, we DO have lessons learned and best practices to share. And since one of writing studies' core scholarly values is collaboration and sharing and working socially, I think it's reasonable to expect some collaboration and sharing and working socially on these matters across publications in our field. Which is why I get SO ANGRY whenever I think about the foolishness of NCTE and their complete lack of regard for scholars' peer-reviewed work in online venues that the institution itself has created.

Which leads me back to my initial scenes of technological failure and our contemporary scene of technical infrastructures. **[technical]**

The technical infrastructure of digital publishing is all about sustainability and preservation, regardless of form, in the rapidly evolving technological ecosystems of the

Internet. There's a reason why *Kairos* was the only journal left standing when link after link, journal after journal, in the multi-journal special issue of 2002 disappeared: The editors had built the technical infrastructure of the journal to withstand the whims of the Internet. The others? They each had their own stories about why things changed and moved. You can see how things changed with these journals in Jeremy Tirrell's mappings from 2009. **[Jeremy Tirrell's vids]** They speak of microhistories yet to be told, but among the social circles of journal editors, we know why, for instance, *Enculturation* disappeared for a few years after it moved from Texas to Virginia: because its lead editor, one of a very small cohort, was trying to get tenure. That's a social infrastructural issue. We know, too, that the *Writing Instructor* and *Academic.Writing* changed content-management systems and thus went on hiatus, some for several years. That is a technical infrastructural problem—and one that the field, as a whole, is still working on.

But I still don't see those gaps in providing archives of the field's scholarship as egregious an example as what NCTE has done with its digital publishing over the years. **[Krause]** Not once, with the first iteration of CCC Online (which seems to have published one, or maybe two issues in 2002); and **[CCC Online Archive]** not even twice, when it started the CCC Online Archive as a metadata resource for the print-journal's articles; but **[CCC Online 3.0]** THREE times, with the latest iteration that was published on a DropBox account instead of the organization's servers, ran for all of one issue before NCTE pulled the plug, and as in the previous cases, **[CCCOnline3.0-NCTELogin]** wiped all traces of it from their website.

Btw, has anyone tried to access the CCC "Web" articles lately? I'll give a shout out to a different Doug – Doug Downs – **[slide: "the future of CCC -- how do we ask about it?"]** who rightly took the CCC's hybrid model to task in his January 7, 2010 email to WPA-l.

None of these publication problems had to be. When the CCC Online journal was still forming, still a twinkle in NCTE's eye, they could have asked for advice. They had a ready cadre of members involved in the 7Cs committee that had expertise in these exact areas, and who had made it known that earlier mistakes could have been avoided had NCTE gotten its constituency involved instead of springing potentially good ideas laden with bad infrastructures on its membership. Once CCC Online was announced, our advice was too late, for the system had steamrolled its way into being.

Let me assure you that I am not here to blame the editor, who, as a tenure-track scholar at the time, could not have known all the problems he was about to face (and that was part of NCTE's poor decision-making). I blame them for knowing it had technical resources in its social infrastructure—humans in its membership who knew well the technical obstacles they faced and could have helped—but NCTE decided not to ask, or worse, after repeating the same mistake multiple times didn't think to.

When people ask me why I don't go to CCCC anymore, I tell them this broken history of technical infrastructure.

How can writing studies have a future when our major organization repeatedly and unilaterally expunges, expurgates, and exiles our peer-reviewed scholarship? All for lack of technical infrastructure? I'm here to tell you that it's not that hard to make a website persevere. **[Kairos index]** *Kairos* has been doing it successfully for 20 years. We've had our stumbles—a month offline last summer that forced us to move servers unexpectedly; the four days offline in 2009 when Germans stole our domain name; the one or two complicated pieces that we had to host on other servers along the way and then forgot to move…. These are not happy moments in my *Kairos* history. I am embarrassed by them.

[Kairos design guidelines] But we've learned quickly from all of these errors, and made strides towards best practices that have and will continue to make the journal a viable place to publish over the next 10-20 years (if the Web lasts that long...) We are constantly reflecting on our practices and interrogating our workflows regarding technical infrastructure, scholarly expectations, and the social capital that serves as the economic engine for *our* particular journal.

As the landscape of knowledge production becomes increasingly a digital, networked endeavor, it is incumbent upon us to make sure that all of our scholarship is consistently findable, usable, and sustainable. **[slide:] accessibility, usability, and archivability**. These best practices for sustainability in digital publishing focus on three key aspects of technical infrastructure: accessibility, usability, and archivability. [We have been calling this "sustainability" but I am attentive to that word's mission creep.]

1. [slide: Accessibility needs to be supported in order to reach the widest possible audience]. While originally shaped by a focus on users who rely on adaptive technologies the techniques that provide greater access, publishing with an eye towards accessibility benefits all users. For *Kairos*, accessibility means open-access (of the *libre* model); requiring rich author-created metadata such as alt attributes on images, alternate media formats, and transcripts for all audio and video-based media. Accessibility also means consideration of the user's access to bandwidth and the constraints that come with limited access (our server logs show visitors from over 180 countries, many of whom have slow modems or are connecting through cellphones).

2. **[slide: Usability includes navigational schema and the apparatus that helps the reader use the text]**. In some ways, usability intersects with scholarly infrastructure as we strive to make webtexts more easily used for research purposes by adding metadata, making sure the text is open to copying and re-mix, and providing ways to easily cite the works we publish. Usability also applies to the editorial and revision functions—creating texts that can be easily revised is an important part of digital publishing and the teaching of digital writing. For instance, *Kairos* asks authors to use non-proprietary softwares and languages to compose. **[No Wix, Weebly, or iWeb. Even question Word and Wordpress. Basically, anything that begins with a W]**. This allows all of our editorial staff to access the 'neath text with minimal effort as we copy- and design-edit the piece during production.

3. **[slide: Archivability requires preserving texts and providing a means for users to find past iterations in the event that a journal (or artifact) moves or changes its primary URL].** The discussion around archiving and preservation of digital artifacts changes daily. This is not an issue to be solved once and for all, but to monitor and adjust as new technologies, new media, and new genres emerge. As a participant in the "Access/ibility for Digital Publishing" seminar I held last week said, "Don't tell me that your WordStar 4.0 document won't open. You just don't have the right hardware and software to open it with." It's unreasonable, however, for us as scholars to maintain technical systems that would allow us to open every digital file on the planet far into the future. But if we prepare our texts with the idea that—in 20 years, or, even in 5 years—some human, or

alien, or tenure reader **[slide: WPA-404]** might need to open the CWPA 2008 conference program, then we need make that possible.

Here are three of *Kairos*'s sustainability guidelines for all authors **[Slide as follows]**:

- We need to be able to archive everything we publish, so we cannot accept webtexts hosted on third-party sites (like WIX and Weebly).
- We strongly encourage authors to use standard, non-proprietary formats (HTML 5, CSS, etc.) rather than Flash or other embedded proprietary media or template engines.
- Upon acceptance, we will need copies of all embedded media files, and all 3rd-party sites that host files must be shared with the journal in order to facilitate editing and archiving.

Technical infrastructure is in some ways simpler (because there are known best practices like the W3C guidelines) *and* more challenging for digital publishing (because fewer journal editors have the technical expertise to run servers and networks). In writing studies, where academics are more professionally mobile than in other fields, the social and technical infrastructures intersect as editors and publishers move from one institution to another, sometimes bringing their journals with them and sometimes leaving them behind.

As the economics of publishing further erodes the capacity to produce and mail out new print texts, there is a gradual shift to more online venues, including those for long-form and data-driven scholarship: from the WAC Clearinghouse to Computers and Composition Digital Press, the University of Michigan's Sweetland series, and the Research Exchange. It has been our experience at *Kairos* that writing studies tends to overlook the technical as not a core element of writing practices, and we aim to correct that, at least in terms of digital scholarship and electronic publication.

So this is how we fix broken things: Most authors and editors have a strong sense of the scholarly infrastructure (peer-review, placement in appropriate directories and bibliographies, the apparatus that authors need for tenure and promotion), as well as the social infrastructure specific to each journal's institutional and disciplinary context and mission. We—as authors, editors, publishers, teachers, and organization members—remind ourselves to carefully consider all three forms of infrastructure when working with digital texts **[slide: scholarly, social, technical]**, and to reach out to those of us who have histories and experiences that we are happy to share, particularly with the lesser-known technical infrastructures of composing and publishing. This attention to the infrastructures of digital publishing should begin to infuse general writing curricula as we prepare students for writing contexts that already begin with "born-digital" as a standard approach rather than an innovation that only technorhetoricians may engage.

REFERENCES

Blakesley, David, Douglas Eyman, Byron Hawk, Mike Palmquist, and Todd Taylor, eds. 2002. *A Special Multi-journal Issue of Kairos, Enculturation, Academic.Writing, CCC Online, and The Writing Instructor on Electronic Publication*. Retrieved March 20, 2014, from http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/7.x/index.html.

Eyman, Douglas, and Cheryl E. Ball. 2015. "Digital Humanities Scholarship and Electronic Publication." In *Rhetoric and the Digital Humanities*, edited by Jim Ridolfo and William Hart-Davidson, 65-79. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Krause, Steve. 2002. "Where Do I List This on My CV? Considering the Value of Self-Published Websites." Retrieved October 1, 2014 from https://web.archive.org/web/20021021040043/http://www.ncte.org/ccc/www/2/54.1/krause_copy.html.

---. 2007. "Where Do I List This on My CV? Considering the Value of Self-Published Websites-Version 2.0." *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* 12 (1). Retrieved October 1, 2014, from http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/12.1/binder.html?topoi/krause/index.html.

McIntire-Strasburg, Janice. 2002. "*Modern Chivalry* and the Case for Electronic Texts." *The Writing Instructor* 2 (5). Retrieved October 1, 2014, from http://www.writinginstructor.com/essays/mcintirestrasburg.html.

Muir, Edward. 1994. "Microhistory." In *Encyclopedia of Social History*, edited by Peter Stearns, 619-621. New York: Routledge.

Muir, Edward and Guido Ruggiero. 1991. *Microhisotry and the Lost Peoples of Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Nichols, Cynthia. 2002. "Responding in Kind: Down in the Body in the Undergraduate Poetry Course (Thoughts on Bakhtin, Hypertext, and Cheap Wigs)." *Enculturation: A Journal of Rhetoric, Writing, and Culture* 4 (1). Retrieved October 1, 2014, from http://enculturation.net/4_1/responding.

Pullman, George. 2002. "A Brief History and Technical Overview of the Current State of *JAC Online*, with a Few Observations about How the Internet Is Influencing (or Failing to Influence) Scholarship: Or, Who Says You Can't Find *JAC Online*?" *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* 12 (1). Retrieved October 1, 2014, from http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/7.x/binder.html?jac/JAC-history.html.

Salvo, Michael, and Mick Doherty. 2002. "*Kairos*: Past, Present and Future(s)." *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* 12 (1). Retrieved October 1, 2014, from http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/7.x/binder.html?kairos/title.htm.

Sands, Peter. 2002. "World Wide Words: A Rationale and Preliminary Report on a Publishing Project for an Advanced Writing Workshop." *Academic.Writing* 3. Retrieved October 1, 2014, from http://wac.colostate.edu/aw/articles/sands_2002.

Tirrell, Jeremy. 2009. *Mapping Digital Technology in Rhetoric and Composition History*. Retrieved March 20, 2014, from http://people.uncw.edu/tirrellj/mappingrc.

---. 2012. "A Geographical History of Online Rhetoric and Composition Journals." *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* 16 (3). Retrieved March 20, 2014, from http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/16.3/topoi/tirrell/index.html.

Webb-Peterson, Patricia. 2002. "Writing and Publishing in the Boundaries: Academic Writing
in/through the Virtual Age." *The Writing Instructor* 2 (5). Retrieved October 1, 2014, from http://www.writinginstructor.com/essays/webb.html.

Whithaus, Carl. 2002. "Think Different/Think Differently: A Tale of Green Squiggly Lines, or Evaluating Student Writing in Computer- Mediated Environments." *Academic.Writing* 3. Retrieved October 1, 2014, from http://wac.colostate.edu/aw/articles/whithaus2002.