



01 Mar 2022

Unjust Revisions: A Social Justice Framework For Technical Editing

Sam Clem

Ryan Cheek

Missouri University of Science and Technology, ryancheek@mst.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/eng_teccom_facwork



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#), and the [Technical and Professional Writing Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Clem, Sam, and Ryan Cheek. "Unjust Revisions: A Social Justice Framework For Technical Editing." *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, vol. 65, no. 1, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, 2022, pp.135-150.

The definitive version is available at <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPC.2021.3137666>

This Article - Journal is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars' Mine. It has been accepted for inclusion in English and Technical Communication Faculty Research & Creative Works by an authorized administrator of Scholars' Mine. This work is protected by U. S. Copyright Law. Unauthorized use including reproduction for redistribution requires the permission of the copyright holder. For more information, please contact scholarsmine@mst.edu.

Research Article

Unjust Revisions: A Social Justice Framework for Technical Editing

—SAM CLEM  AND RYAN CHEEK 

Abstract—Background: There is a lack of conceptual framework for how to develop more inclusive practices in the subfield of technical editing. **Literature review:** Some researchers have posited theories, like feminism and rhetorical theory, as ways to conceptualize technical editing. This piece extends that literature into social justice using Walton, Moore, and Jones’s 3Ps heuristic of positionality, privilege, and power. **Research questions:** 1. What ideologies are circulating in technical editing pedagogy? 2. How might technical editing pedagogy become more inclusive? **Methodology:** We conduct a rhetorical analysis of the major academic works in technical editing, including books, textbooks, and academic articles, and compare them to an established framework for social justice in technical and professional communication—the 3Ps heuristic. **Results:** We find that there are strong instrumentalist underpinnings to much of the current literature in technical editing, making the goal of technical editing linguistic conformity to American Standard English (ASE) at the expense of linguistic diversity. We offer a conceptual framework, the inclusive editing paradigm (IEP), to challenge that linguistic hegemony in technical editing and provide technical editors with theoretical and practical foundations for developing a more inclusive editing practice. **Conclusions:** More work needs to be done to shift technical editing in a more inclusive direction. We call on practitioners, academics, and users to contribute to this dialogue.

Index Terms—Rhetorical analysis, social justice, technical editing (TE).

Decades after the field began its humanistic journey [1]—reconciling itself with rhetoric [2], feminism [3], [4], and cultural studies [5]—the social justice turn in technical and professional communication (TPC) profoundly altered the direction of our discipline by inviting us to rethink the purpose and methods of our endeavors [6]. One such endeavor is technical editing (TE). TE is described by Howard [7] as a “pervasive and yet, ironically, overlooked topic in TPC” (p. x). In this article, we begin with a rhetorical analysis of academic literature on TE, outlining trends that work both toward and against social justice aims. Through this rhetorical analysis, we argue that the subfield of TE has only begun to interrogate its instrumentalist foundations and that a framework for conceptualizing social justice work in TE is needed. Drawing on Walton, Moore, and Jones’s [6] 3P heuristic, we then propose just such a framework.

Manuscript received March 14, 2021; revised October 12, 2021; accepted October 13, 2021. Date of publication February 7, 2022; date of current version March 17, 2022. (Corresponding author: Sam Clem.)

The authors are with the Department of English, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322 USA (email: sam.clem@usu.edu; ryancheek@aggiemail.usu.edu).

IEEE 10.1109/TPC.2021.3137666

From the 3Ps of positionality, privilege, and power, we discern and articulate three principles for TE that can serve as a critical intervention into status quo TE practices and turn the subfield toward more inclusive practices. Taken together, these three principles compose what we call the inclusive editing paradigm (IEP), which we argue ought to be adopted as a more socially just approach to TE.

1. To affirmatively attend to differential *positionality* among authors, editors, and audiences, TE should dispense with the rigid enforcement of hegemonic grammars [8] and instead root itself in dialogic participation [9] and an ethics of care [10]–[12].
2. To affirmatively attend to differential *privilege* among authors, editors, and audiences, the subfield of TE must re-evaluate its relationship to instrumental understandings of efficiency. Doing so requires adopting an apparent feminist lens [13] that elevates critical inquiry over rote production.
3. Technical editors must attend to the multiplicities of *power* by becoming knowledgeable about how structural oppression insidiously manifests itself in editing relationships. This means adopting a theory of active equality [14] and understanding themselves as social justice advocates [15] in their theorizing, teaching, and practicing of TE.

Practitioner Takeaway

- Current ideologies circulating in technical editing texts are based in instrumentalist values of efficiency, neo-liberalism, and linguistic conformity to American Standard English at the expense of diversity and inclusion.
 - The subfield of technical editing must make structural, practical, and ideological changes to become more equitable and inclusive.
 - Implementing the inclusive editing paradigm (IEP)—based in ethics of care, redefined efficiency, and coalitional work—practitioners, academics, and users of technical editing can begin moving toward more inclusive, equitable practices.
-

Acknowledging that to be successful, any critical intervention ought to be accompanied by practical takeaways, we incorporate tangible strategies for enacting social justice in TE classrooms, relationships, and workplaces alike throughout our description of IEP. That said, as an initial presentation of our theoretical framework, the takeaways from this article will be most applicable to academics and instructors of TE.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Walton, Moore, and Jones [6] offer a common language for and shared understanding of the coalition building necessary for social justice work in the field of TPC. Part of this shared language, along with oppression and justice, is inclusion, which “exists where everyone’s contributions are sought and valued, and where difference is preserved, not assimilated” [6, p. 9]. It is their conceptualizations of social justice and inclusion, specific to the field of TPC, that we use to analyze previous scholarship in TE and develop a conceptual framework for promoting inclusion in the subfield.

Although it is not central to their discussion, Walton, Moore, and Jones describe in a footnote how excluding all non-ASE language represents “linguistic and societal normalizing” that serves to “marginalize those whose professional personas resist colonial, patriarchal expectations” [6, p. 30]. The newest and best-selling textbooks in TE (see, e.g., [16] and [17]) include lengthy sections on grammar and usage, all exclusively mechanics of ASE. The exclusion of all but ASE represents a way in which TE not only participates in oppression but also codifies that oppression. (This kind of codification is a concern expressed in [6].) The more we exclude other forms of English from the

academy, the more codified that norm becomes, and the harder it is to change.

Regardless, work has been and is being done to center the importance of social justice and inclusion work in TPC. As a heuristic to aid in this effort, Walton, Moore, and Jones offer the 3Ps: positionality, privilege, and power [6]. The first P, positionality, asks researchers to understand how identity is relational, historical, fluid, particular, situational, contradictory, and intersectional [6, p. 65]. Important to their discussion are the ways in which individuals can and do hold multiple, often contradictory identities at once. They highlight how certain identity markers confer expertise. We argue that “technical editor” is indeed one such identity marker that confers expertise in language use and form.

The second P, privilege, prompts researchers to recognize the unearned advantages that come with certain positionalities or identities in certain contexts. The authors describe privilege in terms of five ontological instantiations that construct margins and centers and lead certain individuals and groups of individuals to reside in those often-competing spaces. Privilege is self-validating as folks with privilege can define knowledge and meaning in ways that perpetuate the value of their positions and identities, much the way ASE has been defined and valued. To enact social justice work, Walton, Moore, and Jones [6] claim that we must actively center the knowledge and experience of multiple marginalized identities.

Finally, the third P, power, addresses the ways in which power is distributed relative to privilege and positionality. Using Collins’s [18] concept of domains of power—structural, disciplinary, hegemonic, and interpersonal—Walton, Moore, and Jones [6] offer TPC a theory that centers the

experiences of multiply marginalized and underrepresented (MMU) people. Importantly, they note that although some practices are limited to one domain of power, language use permeates all four. They conclude that “Indeed, exclusion and marginalization happen through language use and through norms of language” [6, p. 123]. As such, TE, which explicitly states and polices language norms, is an apt site of research for social justice work. In fact, Walton et al. mention “problems with editing” [6, p. 126] among the “wicked, complex problems” facing technical editors that “require theoretical perspectives” [6, p. 127].

Several examples of TE scholarship incorporate theory as a way of addressing this wicked problem. We will outline only two of the most recent attempts in this literature review, as the other most relevant examples are used as artifacts of analysis in the research methodology section. Smith argues that the often-taught prescriptive language rules common in TE need to be replaced with a more rhetorical lens. He suggests that incorporating findings from empirical research on TE is one way of adopting such a lens. This return to rhetoric, Smith believes, may help situate TE within the social justice turn in TPC [19].

Popham [20] incorporates feminist theory into TE pedagogy in a chapter titled “Teaching Editing through a Feminist Theoretical Lens.” She identifies three activities in which a feminist lens can be applied to TE:

- Adding an “editorial sense of equality and respect” [20, p. 101]
- Using feminine metaphors to describe editing work
- Emphasizing the role of emotions and empathy in editing

Popham hedges that the intention behind her application of feminist theory to TE is not primarily for social justice aims but rather for showing how theory can inform editing practice. She concludes that texts edited with a feminist framework “may look the same, perhaps exactly the same” [20, p. 106], but the process is different. While Popham’s application of feminist theory to TE is a useful step toward greater inclusion in the subfield, we believe that her argument should be taken further, insisting that both changes in the process and the product are necessary for addressing injustices in the editing process. We offer the IEP as just such a continuation of Smith and Popham’s theoretical frameworks.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Within this context of explicit calls for social justice in TPC and recent attempts at redefining TE through critical theoretical lenses, we pose two questions.

- RQ1.** What ideologies are circulating in TE pedagogy?
- RQ2.** How may TE pedagogy become more inclusive?

METHODOLOGY

Ideologies are rhetorically sustained patterns of belief that influence personal and collective behavior. Ideologically focused rhetorical criticism [21], [22] is a revelatory research methodology useful for exposing underlying value systems that animate and are reproduced by text. We are particularly concerned with revealing hyperpragmatist ideologies circulating in TE pedagogy and practices. Scott, Longo, and Wills [5] critique hyperpragmatism as a “hegemonic ideology and set of practices that privileges utilitarian efficiency and effectiveness” over critical reflection. They also warn that the

main goal of hyperpragmatist pedagogy is to ensure the technical writer’s (and technical writing student’s) professional assimilation. [5, p. 9]

Extending Scott et al.’s critique, we discern similar ideological commitments to presumed objectivity and instrumentalist expediency in TE. In examining and critiquing the rhetoric of significant instructional texts on TE, our rhetorical criticism makes space for the rhetorical invention and articulation of the IEP. Texts that teach or theorize about how to teach TE are an ideal starting point for understanding the ideologies circulating more broadly within TE as an academic and professional field. In choosing artifacts for analysis, we began with the texts presented to us as students in a graduate-level TE course. We identified additional artifacts from the bibliographies of those resources and by keyword searching “TE” in the databases for the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION, the *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, the *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, *Technical Communication*, and *Technical Communication Quarterly*.

Rhetorical critics are empowered to embrace their subjective encounters with texts as generative

examinations of phenomena [23]. Criticism is unique in that it relies on subjective sensemaking that is communicable but not usually replicable. The TE artifacts that we have chosen to weave into a broader tapestry of rhetorical criticism are intended to support a call for more inclusive editing practices—that is, the version of the truth that we are seeking. Our selections are not intended to be read as a wholesale characterization of all TE research to date. We acknowledge that there are counterexamples and counterarguments that could be made in defense of TE as a field and in defense of some of the texts we specifically critique. However, such defenses, even when persuasive, risk leaving intact obscured and problematic ideological commitments to exclusionary practices.

Our performance of rhetorical criticism is not an act of negativity about the field; rather, it is a demonstration intended to give way to more generative and inclusive thinking about how we teach and practice TE. Rhetorical theorist Lester Olson argues that

Judgment distinguishes criticism from other scholarly activities within the humanities Criticism is neither objective nor subjective because criticism solicits an audience's intersubjective assent. A critic asks others to consider a judgment. In response, audiences might not accept a critic's ideas, or may actively engage them to reshape and form their own assessments—all of which enhances an appreciation of "creative productions," even in the absence of consensus [24, p. 252].

We have no doubt that there are teachers and practitioners who already engage in social justice-informed TE, but what we discern through our criticism is a need for more theoretical grounding to justify expanding inclusive approaches to the discipline. The following section is an invention of text built out of the fragments of TE pedagogy. By nature, fragments are incomplete and somewhat arbitrary, but what unifies the texts that we have chosen is their intention to theorize about and teach the practice of TE.

RESULTS

Rhetorical Criticism of TE Artifacts Tracing the genesis of TE back through time leads us to an overprivileged period in the Western intellectual tradition: the Greco-Roman era, where the Hellenistic grammarian Dionysios Thrax wrote the earliest known surviving manual formalizing usage

rules for the Greek language. The manual is thought to have been in use for 15 centuries [25]. We are not the first to recognize this connection to our field, as others have noted the connection between the *techne* (in this context, a handbook) attributed to Dionysios and the discipline of technical communication as we know it today [26], [27]. In modern terms, we might even consider Dionysios's work to be one of the first known style guides. It helped lay the foundation for several millennia of editors elevating linguistic norms to the status of rules. As Dionysios wrote, "without due observance of these rules" writing is degraded, and the "habits of readers [become] ridiculous" [28, p. 4].

Of course, the colonizing dominance of the "Western tradition" has suppressed many alternative theorizations about the nature of language that do not rely on the enforcement of an external grammatical system [29]. Indeed, as Foucault notes that as the grammatical inquiry was formalized as a discipline in the 16th century, it was "based upon the same epistemological arrangement as the science of nature" [30, p. 35], which describes, categorizes, and infers with a ruthlessly detached sense of objectivity. As a result, many of the foundational assumptions behind TE in the western academic tradition have come to rely on an instrumentalist codification and deployment of language.

Fast forward several centuries later to the roots of technical communication as a discipline that was "ancillary to industry" and where the

typical communicator was probably male, perhaps ex-military or a former technician, of middle age, and probably a long-term employee. [31, p. 156]

Not much changed over the course of 2000 years when it came to who was writing the rules for proper writing—mostly cis-men from the dominant ethnic group of the period. Miller's work introducing humanism [1] and axiological concerns [32] to technical writing represented a disciplinary caesura. That is, a fracture was born between instrumentalism and humanism (and now posthumanism) that continues to this day, but TE pedagogy and practice is a niche of our discipline that is still, we argue, overrepresented by exclusionary ideologies.

In one of the first anthologies specifically dedicated to the topic of TE, Zook [33] reviewed all the

literature from the Society for Technical Communication (STC) proceedings and journals from 1965 to 1974 to identify the most pressing issues in TE. Some common topics found were style and mechanics and increasing productivity and efficiency. There are, though, some notable exceptions that begin to acknowledge the relational and humanistic importance of TE. For example, Briggs [34] emphasizes that dialogue cannot be forced or prescribed and argues for using Martin Buber's concept of I-thou communication as a keystone for editing by dialogue. Osborne [35] preempts scholars such as Slack et al. [36] in recognizing the contributory role of technical editors in adding and modifying meaning.

One of the foundational texts for TE is Dragga and Gong's *Editing: The Design of Rhetoric* [37]. This book extends Miller's humanistic rationale for technical writing, arguing that "Editors are artists" [37, p. 11] and establishing rhetorical theory as the philosophical foundation of editing practices. The authors structure the book into the four rhetorical cannons—*invention, arrangement, style, and delivery*—to outline how editors can use rhetorical theory to achieve the objectives of editing: accuracy, clarity, propriety, and artistry. As a rhetorical process, editing is never static [37, p. 217] and is always contextual: "It is the editor's job to see that ideas receive expression appropriate to their importance, complexity, aim, and audience" [37, p. 14].

That brings us to the present day, where two prominent and recently published texts on TE deserve some attention for what they do and do not do in advancing TE theorizing and practice to become more inclusive. First is a comprehensive and career-focused 2020 TE textbook by Cunningham, Malone, and Rothschild [17]. Although the authors claim that their textbook provides "an expanded and capacious view of TE" [17, p. xi], their pedagogical approach carries exclusive rhetorical entailments. A significant portion of the book is dedicated to directives about how best to enforce linguistic norms by identifying, categorizing, and controlling errors in documents. To be fair, as we will continue to point out, it is not necessarily these authors whom we are criticizing, but a collection of discursive practices circulating in the field that we argue conceal injustices in status quo approaches to TE.

In fact, Cunningham et al. make a nod in the right direction.

Editing for social justice is using your authority as an editor to ensure equity, if not equality, for audience members as well as others who might be affected by the document. This ethical responsibility requires an awareness of the ways in which wealth, privilege, and status (among other things) operate in society. [17, p. 33]

We agree with this statement but find further discussion on the topics of ethics or social justice lacking. For example, according to the glossary, ethical issues are addressed in only 20 of the book's 496 pages. In the second chapter, the authors encourage editors to plan ahead for their projects by thinking through a number of questions. The tenth question that they pose is, "What legal and ethical issues must be considered?" In this section, issues of ethics are relegated to one paragraph claiming ethical documents "should not be discriminatory" [17, p. 33].

Several discussions of ethics are separated from the main text in pop-up boxes. In the pop-up box titled "Inclusiveness and Sensitivity in Copyediting," which in our opinion contains the deepest discussion of inclusive editing ethics, they encourage editors to "treat all readers and users fairly and with respect" and to be inclusive by

not seem[ing] to disparage anyone on the basis of gender, race, age, marital status, ethnic or religious group, sexual orientation, physical attributes, health or disability status, or country of origin. [17, p. 286]

These specific calls for inclusivity break from previous textbooks and thus indicate a trend in the field. We argue, though, that ideologically, ethics and social justice remain minimized concerns that contrast against the otherwise instrumentalist ideologies of editing for ASE.

In another section of the text titled "Is the document well written and designed?" the authors claim that

Writers who learned English as a second or foreign language (ESL or EFL) sometimes require much editing for style and copyediting for grammar and usage. In fact, a significant percentage of respondents in a survey of editors state that editing the writing of ESL authors was the more challenging aspect of their work. [17, p. 244]

This framing of multilingualism is informed by what Gonzales calls the deficit model [38], where “multilingualism is positioned as an ‘issue’ or communicative ‘problem’ to be overcome” [38, para. 31] rather than an asset to be valued, as others have advocated. For example, Cardinal et al. [39], in presenting Multilingual User Experience (UX), argue that linguistic diversity should be interpreted as a valuable opportunity rather than an obstacle.

Another recent publication in TE is Flanagan and Albers’ edited collection, *Editing in the Modern Classroom* [40]. Aside from Popham’s chapter on feminist theory in TE [20], there are limited references to ethics or social justice in the book. In fact, in the last chapter, Melançon [41] argues that a lack of attention to ethics is common among undergraduate and graduate TE courses. This observation leads us to believe that the oversight is common across the field of TE: if we teach TE without attending to ethics, our students will go on to practice TE without attending to ethics.

In 2017, Lang and Palmer lamented the static nature of TE, claiming TE, as it is currently taught, might be better called “classical editing” [42, p. 298]. After reviewing common textbook and course descriptions for TE courses, alongside job postings for editor positions, the authors concluded that TE classes and textbooks tend to be text-based editing with a focus on copyediting, grammar, and markup [42, p. 302]. For Lang and Palmer, this approach to TE does not meet the needs of the marketplace, which they argue requires multimodal editing skills. One of their conclusions is that copyediting and grammar should become a supplemental course. This course would refresh students on the fundamental skills (not only writing correct, standard, edited English but the ability to articulate and fix errors in said work) [42, p. 307]. Important to our discussion is our disagreement with the insistence that there is a clear and correct form of English that should be imposed and that neoliberal market values should determine the content and structure of our TE courses.

The best-selling TE textbook, according to Lang and Palmer [42], is Rude and Eaton’s *Technical Editing* [16]. Indeed, this text was assigned in the graduate TE course that we took together, where the idea kernels for this manuscript first started popping. Rude and Eaton apply a rhetorical view of editing, arguing in the preface that editors are not “grammar janitors, people who clean up mistakes on paper.” Rather, editors “must also offer much more: analysis, evaluation, imagination, and good

judgement” [16, p. xix]. This framing, though, seems a bit belied by the half of the text focused on rote copyediting skills. It is also worth noting that invoking the custodial profession in such a derogatory way is a bit classist—a point that becomes much clearer under the IEP precisely because it seeks to elucidate machinations of power in the editing process.

In our opinion, Rude and Eaton lean too heavily on the instrumental needs of corporations without first acknowledging how power and exclusion often mark such communities. For example, in “Editing for Global Contexts,” chapter author Maylath acknowledges that although English is not the most common first language, as there are far more Chinese and Spanish speakers globally, the lingua franca of international editing is English thanks to “the spread of the former British Empire and the later dominance of U.S. military and business power” [43, p. 302]. This fact is posited without any interrogation of the ethics of accepting it as normal and acceptable. Evidencing and compounding this problem, Maylath also points out that

writing in a single language is often far cheaper than paying for multiple translations and localization for each language, nation, or region. [43, p. 302]

There is an instrumentalist efficiency [13] embedded in his logic—linguistic erasure justified by economic expediency.

To be clear, we do not mean to imply that any of the aforementioned authors are unethical people—our criticism is aimed at exposing the underlying ideological commitments to instrumentality and hyperpragmatism that TPC scholars and practitioners have embraced over the course of many generations of teaching and practicing TE. Those who have written TE textbooks may not believe that they have constructed texts built on corrective grammars and a deficit model, but that, we argue, is because instrumentalist ideology conceals such insight. This is one reason why a part of the IEP must be reconsidering the need for prescriptive mechanics in TE.

There has been some attempt within the field to reconceptualize the need for prescriptive mechanics, which could be considered an inclusive practice. Connatser [44] calls for the inclusion of “organic grammar” in accepted writing practices. Organic grammar might be considered what the field of linguistics has long labelled “heritage

language,” a language that is often acquired orally and often from a very young age. Mirroring the idea found in Rude and Eaton that technical editors are specialists in language [16, p. 8], Connatser continues, “an expert is someone who not only knows the rules but also knows when to break them” [44, p. 265]. In this way, he suggests that the acceptance of organic grammar aids the “silent speech” of the reader [44, p. 272].

We agree with Connatser’s overall argument that prescriptive grammar should be eased but would go further to include not only the organic grammar of what are presumably well-educated Americans (from the examples given) but also the grammar of non-heritage speakers of English. Insisting that technical editors be language experts (and by “language,” Connatser seems to mean ASE) limits the inclusion of the field to people with the access and ability to learn the strict standards of scholarly English, even if they may already be experts in their own forms of English. This limitation furthers the idea that “others” must be literate in two cultures—the dominant culture and their own.

Audience awareness, which, should MMU readers be centered as intended audiences, could pose a potential for inclusive practices, is a priority in effective technical communication, and that fact is reflected in the literature on TE. Albers [45] emphasizes the importance of comprehensive editing to increase human–information interaction. Rude and Eaton [16] also devote considerable space to teaching comprehensive editing in their textbook. That said, Albers’s study shows that many graduate editing students struggle to identify and express global-level editing comments. By editing comprehensively, editors engage with problems in a text that impairs human–information interaction. Although some editors are tentative in making global changes because they might change the author’s voice, Albers responds that “The job of an editor is not to preserve an author’s voice, but to preserve the organization’s voice and reputation” [45, p. 124]. Whether the organization is the academy or a business, the agency and identities of editors and authors are negatively impacted by such an orientation in TE. ASE grammar and mechanics rules set out in TE textbooks are a significant way in which technical editors are trained to normalize and sometimes eviscerate the unique voices of authors; this, as Albers seems to suggest, is a result of teaching that the editor’s primary obligation is to an organization rather than an author whose writing the editor has been entrusted with.

Before moving to the next section, where we do the constructive work of inclusive paradigm building, it is important to emphasize that our criticism should not be taken as a condemnation of authors but as a necessary, even if polemical, precursor to paving a more inclusive path for TE. We know that there are many TE academics and professionals who care deeply about social justice and are working every day to create better futures for their students, peers, organizations, and communities. Nonetheless, exclusionary practices are often a result of the paradigmatic investments that we have collectively made as a discipline, which can be obscured by discourse. Criticism is the work of critical thinking and is a process rather than a product. We have little doubt some will disagree with our characterizations; however, we hope to have at least demonstrated an exigency for new paradigmatic work in TE that incorporates recent groundbreaking social justice theorizing circulating in TPC more broadly.

Inclusive Editing Paradigm Having already identified the ideologies of existing literature in TE, we now draw on social justice ideologies and Walton et al.’s [6] 3Ps heuristic to establish a more inclusive framework for the field. In this section, we will outline the core principles of an IEP. Throughout our description, we propose practical approaches to implementing these principles. That said, inherent in IEP is an understanding that any editing practice should be localized and contextualized to the intersections of positionality, privilege, and power that might exist in the editing situation. For that reason, we hedge that not all approaches would be appropriate in all editing situations. We suggest these approaches as a starting point for further conversation about how to implement a more inclusive TE practice.

Dialogic Participation Through an Ethics of Care: As demonstrated in our rhetorical analysis of TE scholarship, there is a desire in the field to police language. Norms and preferences are articulated as rules to be applied through stringent enforcement—a practice that is several millennia old. Contesting this process of linguistic policing in editing pedagogy is critical because language is the medium through which cultural hegemony is produced and reproduced. Technical editors are deputized to standardize and normalize the chaos of language. In accepting this role, editors serve powerful cultural interests over authors and audiences alike. Editing can be a discursively violent process of establishing authority over creative expression—a way to contain the radical

potentiality of language to liberate instead of suppressing. A social justice approach to teaching editing must be cognizant of the way that ASE is rooted in and helps to sustain structural oppression.

We should train editors that their job is to care for a text rather than police it. This starts by recognizing that ASE is an “oppressor’s language” and that we must enable and empower authors to “make English do what we want it to do” by “tak[ing] the oppressor’s language and turn[ing] it against itself” and “liberating ourselves in language” [8, p. 175]. By privileging collaboration over correction [10], editors become enablers of the radical potential of texts to disrupt cultural hegemony. In a grammar of care approach, the editor’s role is to facilitate revolutionary relationships capable of challenging instead of colluding with the desire of powerful institutional interests that suppress creative liberatory expression. An editor that takes a grammar of care seriously recognizes both the arbitrary and yet powerful nature of discourse to either support or intervene in cultural logics of normalization.

Drawing on a body of feminist theorizing known as ethics of care [11], [12], we contend that hegemonic grammar of ASE may be productively countered by teaching aspiring technical editors to adopt a grammar of care in their professional endeavors. Held writes that

the central focus of the ethics of care is on the compelling moral salience of attending to and meeting the needs of the particular others for whom we take responsibility. [11, p. 10]

Technical editors and the writers that they work with must take responsibility for attending to and meeting one another’s needs. The same goes for TE instructors and their students. Pedagogy rooted in an ethics of care, as Shevalier and McKenzie [46] have argued, is more culturally responsive than traditional approaches—an effect, we argue, that is needed in TE practices as well. Monchinski succinctly argues for such an approach to pedagogy, writing that a pedagogical ethic of care “recognizes and celebrates the primacy and importance of human relationships” [12, p. 131].

In practice, the editor(s) and author(s) might start the editing process by acknowledging their humanity. This could include a short conversation about how individuals are feeling at the moment or important situations the person is going through in

life outside of the editing context. In this pre-editing space, those involved begin to recognize and account for their positionality. They might discuss how each of them came to be working on this document and why. For example, Clem often edits academic articles written by nonheritage English speakers. She might use this time to establish her positionality as a heritage English speaker and an editor dedicated to social justice and reflect on how that positionality might affect her work on that particular document. In this way, a relationship between the editor and author can begin to form and take primacy. From there, dialogue can be used to deepen that relationship.

We believe that inclusive TE must involve good faith dialogue as a critical component. Dialogue encourages technical editors to communicate extensively with authors about the intended audience and message of the text and identify the author’s and editor’s positionality and privilege in relation to the present rhetorical situation. Inclusive editing is not an independent practice to be done in isolation. Applying Allman’s [9] description of dialogue to TE, we emphasize the difference between discussion and dialogue. For Allman, discussion results in students acquiring or offering knowledge for instructor assessment, whereas the objective of the dialogue is to

use the knowledge or thinking of each member of the group, together with the people who are external to the group ... to critically investigate the theme or issue that the group is considering or seeking to understand more critically. [9, p. 163, italics original]

In this sense, dialogue is not a simple exchange of thoughts and ideas but rather a critical co-construction of knowledge. Allman emphasizes that this form of communication is a continuous, counterhegemonic process [9]. This conceptualization of dialogic communication runs in sharp contrast to the editing process’s communication “chain” described in TE textbooks [17]. This chain analogy creates a sense of hierarchy and linearity, and the example that they provide of this communication chain between author-editor-audience comes in the form of various stages of “cleaning up” the text and getting approvals from various stakeholders. In this context, editors serve as just one cog in the editing machine, one link in the chain, rather than centering and celebrating the humanity of that position. We propose a complete restructuring of this hierarchical conception of editing.

Rather than assuming that the editor holds a privileged position as a language expert, dialogue establishes all stakeholders as co-creators of knowledge. In this sense, editors use their knowledge (of form and grammar, perhaps, but also of lived experience and caring) along with the knowledge of the other stakeholders to critically investigate the document. Editing, then, moves from a place of prescriptive, hegemonic “fixing” to a space of counterhegemonic dialogue. The editor is asked not to assume correctness or expertise but rather co-create meaning and correctness with those affected by the text. Dialogue leverages the technical editor’s intermediary position to restructure the power dynamic between author–editor and editor–audience.

IEP would entail several changes to editing processes. A significant amount of the TE literature is dedicated to editor commenting strategies. Boettger, for example, describes strategies for creating constructive comments, comments written to convince the author to accept the comments and, thus, improve the document [47, p. 49]. We argue that this strategy insists on persuasion and assessment rather than dialogue. That said, Boettger outlines a very common process in editing as it is now: the editor is sent an existing document, the editor suggests fixes to the document via direct changes to the text or comments, the author reads those comments and decides whether to accept or reject the suggestions.

Dialogic participation would insist that practice of merely accepting/rejecting comment suggestions is insufficient for inclusive editing. Comments might be used to highlight moments of confusion or to pose genuine—rather than guiding—questions. Ideally, a dialogue would not be relegated to comments and track changes alone; those might serve as a mere starting point for conversation. In situations where synchronous dialogue is not possible, we could imagine the value of using chat messengers, such as Discord or Slack, to facilitate more frequent, less structured dialogue than emails and reports. Instances of communication should be iterative and interactive, back-and-forth, particularly at the beginning of the editing process so that the editor and author can learn together what is effective or not in the text, co-creating expectations for the document.

Reconceptualizing Efficiency in the Editing Process: For decades, researchers in TPC have critiqued the field’s preoccupation with instrumentalist forms of efficiency. As a “God term” [48, p. 351] for the

discipline, efficiency is a prized skill and quality of technical communicators and their work products. Training editors to enforce ASE language norms in what they edit commits to a paradigm of efficiency in writing/reading that reproduces a problematic ethic of expediency [2] rather than an ethic that embraces cultural and linguistic diversity in writing. Frost’s apparent feminist methodology [13] suggests a rearticulation of the term “efficiency,” one that redirects focus away from energy spent on a task toward the quality of the task, with particular emphasis on the people affected by the tasks. This reconceptualization, Frost claims, is necessary for achieving “ethical, effective, socially just technical communication” [13, p. 16].

We can use Frost’s apparent feminist understanding of the word “efficiency” to critique current practices in TE. Frost warns that the danger of efficiency is that it

can easily become so embedded as a cultural value that it is no longer explicitly discussed—the shifting balance of energy expended versus goodness done is not articulated—and it is then a small step to using efficiency to justify racism, sexism, ableism, and other evils. [13, p. 17]

Traditional conceptions of efficiency have led technical editors to become practitioners of exclusion and linguistic oppression. The “correctness” of ASE grammar and mechanics has become naturalized, even when it is not an inherently natural subject. Take, for example, this excerpt from a popular TE textbook.

[Readers] may be impatient with delays and distractions caused by reading. Unnecessary information, difficult words, clumsy sentence patterns, unusual structures or style, missing information, or difficulty in finding information diverts readers from the content and task. [16, p. 19]

Later in the book, the authors reiterate,

When readers encounter variations from established structure, they may become frustrated and also lose confidence in the information. [16, p. 251]

From these two examples, we understand that the objective of a technical editor is to increase the reader’s efficient use of a text in the sense that more content can be covered in less time. Efficiency is achieved by conforming to the readers’ expectations, recreating existing structures, and not “distracting” the reader with “unusual” forms.

This is the kind of efficiency based on energy expended rather than goodness done that Frost critiques. When TE textbooks instruct the reader to “correct” spelling, punctuation, and grammar, errors and mistakes are those that do not conform to ASE. In this way, efficiency becomes synonymous with singularity. Linguistic singularity can quickly become an example of the “other evils,” comparable to and perhaps part of the racism, sexism, and ableism that Frost describes in her critique of efficiency.

At risk in this ASE hegemony is the potential for linguistic diversity. Gonzalez and Baca make an explicit call for developing cultural and linguistic diversity in online technical communication programs [57]. Although the context of their article is online instruction, the authors highlight how linguistic diversity is and should be considered an asset rather than a challenge to overcome. They call for TPC instructors to teach students to “rhetorically enact their diverse languages and communicative practices for various audiences” rather than rely solely on ASE [49, p. 276–277], and to learn to “liste[n] to, identif[y], and replicat[e] linguistic variation ... rather than adhering to ‘neutral’ or normalized languages” [49, p. 277]. In this way, Gonzalez and Baca have recognized the value that variation rather than singularity holds for our students and the eventual audiences that they write for.

We believe that this concept is fruitful in the context of IEP and call on editors to listen to, identify, and replicate linguistic variation rather than strictly enforcing ASE. Through dialogue, as presented in the previous section, editors can position themselves in a constant state of development, learning from the author about how to identify and replicate the variations in the language that the author is attempting to create. One small yet potentially paradigm-shifting move that technical editors can make is to start the dialogue with this question: What language do you want to base this text on? We have been taught that “correct” language is congruent with ASE but that this is not the only option available. As Gonzalez and Baca assert [49], expanding conversations beyond different named languages (e.g., English, Mandarin, Urdu) and into the nuances and diversity within named languages is a way of bringing race and culture into the picture.

Starting a dialogue with inquiry rather than assumption is a way of destabilizing the authority of hegemonic grammar. Inquiry is curiously

respectful where instrumentality is dominantly inflexible; inquiry provides critical power tools [36] to editors to better understand differences and challenge gatekeeping practices, while instrumentality applies norms as rules to regulate writing processes; inquiry contests power in language while instrumentality operationalizes power differentials by rigidly maintaining the hierarchy between editor (who knows best) and writer (who must defer to the editor to get their work out).

To develop diversity in instructors, Gonzalez and Baca suggest professional development that includes translation and bilingual training [49], a suggestion that we also find applicable in the case of IEP. TE should include translation and bilingual training as part of professional development activities. In this way, editors can build competency in identifying and listening to texts written in languages (named or otherwise) that they may be initially unfamiliar with. MMU communities [6] have long been required to become fluent in numerous languages—those of their communities and those of the dominant elite. IEP seeks to shift that necessity of multi/translingualism from the authors to the editors. Once editors have been trained in and practiced identifying and implementing other forms of language, they may be better equipped to advocate for MMU audiences and authors.

By honoring linguistic variation, TE can move away from a technocratic understanding of efficiency toward Frost’s apparent feminist understanding of the term, where the “notion of efficiency relies on the existence of diversity for its value” [13, p. 17]. For an inclusive, socially-just paradigm of TE, the current understanding of efficiency, whose overwhelming emphasis is on energy spent, must be challenged.

There is currently a self-perpetuating aspect to the use of ASE in technical documents: technical editors are trained to use ASE exclusively based on the understanding that one standardized language is easier—more efficient—for readers who are not required to “muddle through” difference; readers then come to expect only ASE, thus justifying the editor’s exclusive use of that form. IEP seeks to disrupt this cycle. It seeks to retrain authors, editors, and audiences to value and seek difference rather than conformity. Part of this retraining involves allocating more time for the editing process and integrating editing throughout the development process of the text, starting at the beginning.

Textbooks on TE, including Rude and Eaton [16] and Cunningham, Malone, and Rothschild [17], lament that editing practices are too often relegated to an end-product activity, where editors receive existing documents and a limited timeline for editing. These circumstances discourage dialogue. In other areas of TPC, we can identify where shifts have begun to take place that value the quality of the product over time spent. For example, Colton and Holmes argue that technical communicators should include closed captions as an integral part of video production as an act of social justice [14]. Producing closed captions can be a time-consuming task, but it is one that adds quality and equality to the product. So, too, must TE build equality and equity into its processes. Doing so entails starting a dialogue with editors from the beginning of the drafting process rather than at a back-end checkpoint and incorporating technical editors as collaborators throughout the creation process. In this way, the value of technical editors is relocated from an end-product service to ongoing symbolic-analytic work, as proposed by Johnson-Eilola [50].

Active Equality Through Advocacy: Following Cheek's characterization of neoliberalism as "a socio-political-economic philosophy that subordinates the institutions of government to market forces" [51, p. 8], neoliberal pedagogy in this article may be understood as the cooptation of the public good that we call education by corporate philosophy and interests. Much of the work featured in Flanagan and Albers' edited collection, for example, couches its exigence in terms of training editors to be better servants to their future corporate employers [40]—a theme that unfortunately runs through too much of higher education. Lang and Palmer explicitly implicate the ineffectiveness of TE courses for not "meet[ing] the marketplace demands for new editing competencies" [42, p. 307].

Perhaps no critical pedagogist's writing about the neoliberal usurpation of higher education is more cited than Henry Giroux, who has made a career of theorizing resistance strategies to the corporate takeover of public education institutions. Giroux writes that

higher education is increasingly defined as an adjunct of corporate power and culture No longer vibrant political spheres and ethical sites, public spaces are reduced to dead spaces. [52, p. 55]

We contend that traditional editing pedagogy is rife with neoliberal ideology. Why enforce arbitrary "rules" of language? Why learn "correct" and "incorrect" ways of producing thought through symbolic form? Why do teachers have a responsibility to promote ASE grammatical practices? Too often, the answer to these questions is that educators have a responsibility to inculcate employable skills so that our graduates can obtain and maintain employment. Although we concede that it is ethical to help students navigate an otherwise unjust economic system, how we do so matters. The university should resist, not indulge, its role as a site of corporate power, and on an admittedly small scale, editing educators can aid in such resistance by replacing neoliberal pedagogical justifications and impulses with a practice of active equality.

The linguistic oppression inherent in strict adherence to ASE has been long noted. For example, the Conference on College Composition and Communication's "Students' Right to Their Own Language" statement, which affirms that students have a right to use the "dialects in which they find their own identity and style," was first adopted in 1974, nearly 50 years ago [53]. So although the presence of this injustice has been long acknowledged, large-scale changes in the institutions—whether they are academic, professional, or social—in which technical editors find themselves to structurally affirm the value of linguistic diversity have perhaps yet to occur.

Shelton recognizes how the field of TPC is often in tension between its stated humanistic values and the practical needs of the workforce [54]. Lang and Palmer's argument for TE to teach both fundamental skills (i.e., correct ASE) and multimodal editing because those are the needs of the marketplace demonstrates this tension that leaves linguistic diversity as valuable only insofar as employers value it [42]. This position, in which editors might be able to recognize the injustice of linguistic singularity but are waiting for liberal institutions to validate and distribute justice, can be interpreted as the passive equality described by Colton and Holmes [14].

Drawing on Colton and Holmes's concept of active equality as social justice praxis [14], as well as Shelton's call to shift the TPC field out of neutrality [54], we believe that technical editors should begin verifying the equality and human dignity of both authors and audiences through the practice of TE.

Active equality implies that individuals can and should enact socially-just actions that are integral to equality but have not yet been institutionalized. In the context of TE, those actions include centering the experiences of MMU authors and audiences, advocating for MMU communities, and rejecting the hegemony of ASE.

IEP reiterates the claims of Walton et al. [6] that MMU communities and individuals must be intentionally centered in our considerations of equality and equity. The audience is already a key consideration in TE literature. Albers, for example, suggests that human-information interactions, or how people interact with the information in the text, should be the top priority of technical editors and TE instructors [45]. The focus of editors must be shifted, he claims, from sentence-level comments to editing for the overall content, where the audience's interaction with the text is the main concern. IEP supports this primary concern for the audience and his suggestion that "audience needs should become a staple of the technical communication curriculum" [45, p. 122].

What IEP would contribute to Alber's conclusions, though, is a more nuanced, explicit discussion of who gets included and who gets excluded when performing audience analysis. Albers acknowledges the existence of multiple audiences, but a socially-just approach must go beyond a general acceptance that multiple audiences exist and include intentional conversations about the effects of texts on MMU audiences, even when MMU individuals are not the intended primary audience of the text.

For Jones, focusing on the human experience and humanistic values of TPC means "deconstructing and dismantling hegemonic ideologies" to "remove the objectifying power of the dominant" [15, p. 346]. In this sense, a human focus to TPC, and in this case editing, is inseparable from social justice. Discussions of positionality, privilege, and power must be incorporated into the design and editing of all documents. As Costanza-Chock reminds us, "design always involves centering the desires and needs of some users over others" [55, p. 77], but the choice about which users occupy that privileged space is a political decision, one that should be made intentional and apparent. As technical editors, we must advocate for the desires and needs of MMU audiences to be centered rather than marginalized.

In practice, this means that technical editors should be researching which audiences are privileged and which are underrepresented in any given rhetorical situation. We recognize that this task might be difficult for editors, particularly because the positionality and privilege of the editor might, in some situations, make it difficult to identify structures of power and oppression. To put it in terms of Walton et al. [6], not all editors will be able to recognize oppression in all situations, let alone reveal, reject, or replace those instances of oppression. For this reason, their call for coalitions is an important and necessary component of IEP.

Coalitions, driven by MMU groups and experiences, can help inform IEP. Coalitional knowledge can help technical editors recognize instances of oppression and determine appropriate responses. Walton et al. describe a coalitional approach that

requires those who are not living at the intersections of oppression to approach change-making with humility; to listen more than they speak or lead; and to sometimes divest themselves of self-serving plans, ideas, and ways forward. [6, p. 134]

In this sense, coalitions are based on relationships of humility and caring.

Again, as in ethics of care, individuals, particularly MMU individuals, are centered to ensure that equality and social justice remain constant objectives. Since the summer of 2020, in forums such as the ATTW list-serv, some editors of journals in the field of TPC have made explicit claims to include antiracist and inclusive practices into their publishing practice. This is an important step toward building coalitions for more inclusive TE. But as Colton and Holmes remind us, editors should not wait for changes to institutionalize before enacting social justice [16]; editors should begin practicing IEP.

We would like to concretize this section with an example. We work and study at a predominantly White institution in the western US. In April 2020, as part of our university's response to COVID-19, hand-washing and social distancing instructions were posted on the walls of buildings across campus. These instructions would fall into the criteria for technical communication as described by the STC. Of the four COVID-19 safety-related posters hung around campus, three included images of people or people's skin. In all instances,

this skin was White-coded. These included images of hands being washed, faces expressing symptoms of COVID-19, and hands that belong presumably to a doctor (given the stethoscope and white jacket visible in the image).

When Clem brought the issue up to other graduate students in technical communication, there was an overwhelming opinion that since the majority of students on campus identify as white, this move by the publishers was not only justified but a good example of audience analysis. The IEP, however, helps to expose this situation as an instance of injustice because power relations were not taken into account. While neither of us participated in the design or editing of these texts, our experiences with institutional documents lead us to believe that they went through various levels of “sign off” before being posted. Given this reality, we would propose an IEP approach to creating and editing those documents that approximate the following steps.

1. A system for perpetual and ongoing dialogic communication between editors and authors should be set up at the beginning of the project and maintained throughout the project. We suggest that collaborative project management tools, such as Slack or Discord, may be very helpful in facilitating communication between and beyond the exchanging of drafts. Collaborative writing software should also be leveraged wherever possible because editing and writing are better understood as intertwined and without cleanly distinguishable phases.
2. Potential stakeholders, with a particular emphasis on MMU communities, should be identified alongside mechanisms of accountability for authors and editors. As part of this process, all participants in the writing process must reckon with their own positionalities, biases, privileges, and assumptions that may affect their interactions with a text. Is everyone in the Zoom room White? If so, that fact may conceal injustices such as the overrepresentation of White folks in a technical communication artifact.
3. Disagreements or uncertainties should be approached with a grammar of care and inquiry rather than prescription. For instance, should the drafts of these documents show a repeated representation of White-coded skin to the exclusion of all other skin tones? Taking stock of power means that the editor might prompt the authors to consider the entailments of that choice in the context of historical anti-Blackness and other racial caste systems maintained by White supremacy.
4. Simply instructing the author to change the tones would be counterintuitive to IEP as it would further entrench the power dynamics of editor-as-expert, even if the product was more socially just. Instead, we expect the editors to pull from knowledge built through their participation in coalitions to advocate for MMU audiences—in this case, students of color. They might draw on long-term, mutually beneficial relationships that they have formed with MMU stakeholders in the community, such as the university’s multicultural center.
5. It is important at this point to emphasize the dangers of extractive research—that is, research for self-serving purposes (for a more in-depth discussion of extractive design research, refer to Costanza-Chock [55]). We are not suggesting in this example that editors exploit information from entities such as the multicultural center. Rather, we encourage editors to inform themselves by reading scholarships written by MMU individuals and groups and by building meaningful, intersectional, nonextractive coalitions with community partners.
6. Finally, we believe that the role of the editor does not end at publication. Even when we approach editing with the best intentions, there may be unintended consequences of the documents that editors help produce. Perhaps this is the case with the COVID-19 posters that the designers and editors simply did not consider matters of equality thoroughly enough. Wittkower, in a piece on antidiscriminatory design, describes how even when antidiscriminatory processes are in place, mistakes will be made [56]. The difference, though, lies in how we respond to those mistakes; antidiscriminatory design—or for us, inclusive editing—must respond from a place of deep humility to recognize and revise when mistakes are made.

IEP and the 3Ps: When a technical editor receives a document to edit, the first question they should ask themselves is, *Is this text something that I am supposed to be able to understand or access?* In this way, editors must acknowledge their positionality. To answer this question, technical editors must understand their personal identities (at that exact editing moment). Using dialogue, they must work with the author to understand the specific context in which the text was written: Who, specifically, is the intended audience? What,

specifically, is the intended message? Assumptions are not to be made.

The second question that the technical editor should ask themselves is *Why am I being asked to edit this?* This question addresses the privilege of the technical editor. Editing puts a person in a particular position of privilege; they can either confirm or refute the knowledge claims made in the text, as well as the mechanics and language used to make those claims. Who is being asked to do that work? Members of the same community? Outside experts (“experts” in ASE)?

Eaton et al. found that 90% of authors usually follow copyediting comments and 72% usually follow comprehensive editing comments [57, p. 135]. This shows the power that an editor can have over texts. Because of this power, it is important for technical editors to ask a third question before and throughout the editing task: *How can I help ensure that MMU audiences are considered during the editing process?* With this question, we emphasize how editors should make a conscious, critical assessment of the power associated with the TE position as it relates to the context of the text that they are editing. Inclusion in editing must be centered around the margins, and this means drawing on the strength and knowledge of intersectional coalitions. With these considerations in place, we believe that TE can

begin its shift from an exclusive to inclusive practice.

CONCLUSION

In the last section of their book, Walton et al. [6] present the four Rs. A part of this argument is that not all actors are positioned equally in systems of privilege and power. We recognize that not all practitioners or instructors of TE will be able to reveal, reject, or replace exclusive editing practices. There are innumerable limitations to when and how we can begin dismantling the hegemony of ASE, a fact underlined by our own use of ASE in this article. We do hope, though, that this article presents readers with the opportunity to recognize the discrimination and detriment that noninclusive editing practices can produce. We propose IEP as a starting point in a long-lasting dialogue about how the subfield of TE can become more inclusive and who and what the title “technical editor” can potentially encompass. We encourage stakeholders in TE—practitioners, instructors, researchers, users—to continue this dialogue about the contours of inclusive TE within their own contexts and lived experiences. We particularly wonder about and leave for further investigation the ways in which concepts of rigor potentially impede inclusive practices in TE and whether and how editors might inclusively edit texts outside of their own heritage languages.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. R. Miller, “A humanistic rationale for technical writing,” *Coll. English*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 610–617, 1979.
- [2] S. B. Katz, “The ethic of expediency: Classical rhetoric, technology, and the holocaust,” *Coll. English*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 255–275, 1992.
- [3] M. M. Lay, “Feminist theory and the redefinition of technical communication,” *J. Bus. Tech. Commun.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 348–370, 1991.
- [4] L. J. Gurak and N. L. Bayer, “Making gender visible: Extending feminist critiques of technology to technical communication,” *Tech. Commun. Quart.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 257–270, 1994.
- [5] J. B. Scott, B. Longo, and K. V. Wills, *Critical Power Tools: Technical Communication and Cultural Studies*. New York, NY, USA: State Univ. New York Press, 2006.
- [6] R. Walton, K. R. Moore, and N. N. Jones, *Technical Communication after the Social Justice Turn: Building Coalitions For Action*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2019.
- [7] T. Howard, “Series editor’s preface,” in *Editing in the Modern Classroom*, S. Flanagan and M. J. Albers, Eds. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2019.
- [8] B. Hooks, *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 1994.
- [9] P. Allman, *Critical Education against Global Capitalism: Karl Marx and Revolutionary Critical Education*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense, 2010.
- [10] H. Cafferty and J. Clausen, “What’s feminist about it? Reflections on collaboration in editing and writing,” in *Common Ground: Feminist Collaboration in the Academy*. New York, NY, USA: State Univ. New York Press, 1998, pp. 81–98.
- [11] V. Held, *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press, 2006.
- [12] T. Monchinski, “Chapter four: Critical pedagogies and an ethic of care,” *Counterpoints*, vol. 382, pp. 85–135, 2010.
- [13] E. A. Frost, “Apparent feminism as a methodology for technical communication and rhetoric,” *J. Bus. Tech. Commun.*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 3–28, 2016.

- [14] J. S. Colton and S. Holmes, "A social justice theory of active equality for technical communication," *J. Tech. Writing Commun.*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 4–30, 2018.
- [15] N. N. Jones, "The technical communicator as advocate: Integrating a social justice approach in technical communication," *J. Tech. Writ. Commun.*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 342–361, 2016.
- [16] C. D. Rude and A. Eaton, *Technical Editing*, 5th ed. Boston, MA, USA: Pearson Education, 2011.
- [17] D. H. Cunningham, E. A. Malone, and J. M. Rothschild, *An Introduction to Editing in the Workplace*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press, 2020.
- [18] P. H. Collins and S. Bilge, *Intersectionality*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2020.
- [19] J. Smith, "Extended abstract: Using empirical data to inform technical-editing pedagogies," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Prof. Commun. Conf.*, 2020, pp. 192–194.
- [20] S. L. Popham, "Teaching editing through a feminist theoretical lens," in *Editing in the Modern Classroom*, S. Flanagan and M. J. Albers, Eds. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2019, pp. 91–108.
- [21] S. Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice*, 4th ed. Long Grove, IL, USA: Waveland Press, 1989.
- [22] M. C. McGee, "The 'ideograph': A link between rhetoric and ideology," *Quart. J. Speech*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 1980.
- [23] T. Borchers and H. Hundley, *Rhetorical Theory: An Introduction*. Long Grove, IL, USA: Waveland Press, 2006.
- [24] L. Olson, "Concerning judgement in criticism of rhetoric," *Rev. Commun.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 251–256, 2012.
- [25] R. H. Robins, "Dionysius thrax and the western grammatical tradition," *Trans. Philological Soc.*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 67–106, 1957.
- [26] T. Fögen, "Technical literature," in *A Companion to Greek Literature*. Chichester, UK: Wiley, 2016, pp. 266–280.
- [27] J. Hanna, "Diagram for analysis," *Tech. Commun.*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 327–333, 1994.
- [28] D. Thrax, *The Grammar of Dionysios Thrax*. St. Louis, MO, USA: R. P. Studley, 1874.
- [29] E. Bernárdez, "Non-western concepts of language: Are they of any use for the scientific knowledge of language?," *Computense J. English Studies*, vol. 25, pp. 9–25, 2017.
- [30] M. Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York, NY, USA: Vintage Books, 1994.
- [31] K. Staples, "Technical communication from 1950–1998: Where are we now?," *Tech. Commun. Quart.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 153–164, 1999.
- [32] C. R. Miller, "What's practical about technical writing?," in *Technical Writing: Theory and Practice*, B. E. Fearing and K. Sparrow, Eds. New York, NY, USA: Modern Lang. Assoc. America, 1989, pp. 14–24.
- [33] L. M. Zook, *Technical Editing: Principles and Practices* (Anthology Series 4). Washington, DC, USA: Society Tech. Commun., 1975.
- [34] N. A. Briggs, "Editing by dialogue," *Tech. Commun.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 10–13, 1969.
- [35] H. F. Osborne, "Criticism and creativity," in *Technical Editing: Principles and Practices*, L. M. Zook, Ed. Washington, DC, USA: Soc. Technical Commun., 1975.
- [36] J. D. Slack, D. J. Miller, and J. Doak, "The technical communicator as author: Meaning, power, authority," *J. Bus. Tech. Commun.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 12–36, 1993.
- [37] S. Dragga and G. Gong, *Editing: The Design of Rhetoric*. Amityville, NY, USA: Baywood, 1989.
- [38] L. Gonzales, "Translation as technology: From linguistic 'deficit' to rhetorical strength," in *Racial Shorthand: Coded Discrimination Contested in Social Media*, C. Medina and O. Pimentel, Eds. Logan, QLD, Australia: Comput. Comp. Digit. Press, 2018.
- [39] A. Cardinal, L. Gonzales, and E. J. Rose, "Language as participation: Multilingual user experience design," in *Proc. SIGDOCAMC Int. Conf. Design Commun.*, 2020, pp. 1–7.
- [40] S. Flanagan and M. J. Albers, *Editing in the Modern Classroom*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2019.
- [41] L. Melançon, "A field-wide view of undergraduate and graduate editing courses in technical and professional communication programs," in *Editing in the Modern Classroom*, S. Flanagan and M. J. Albers, Eds. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2019, pp. 171–190.
- [42] S. Lang and L. Palmer, "Reconceiving technical editing competencies for the 21st century: Reconciling employer needs with curricular mandates," *Tech. Commun.*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 297–309, 2017.
- [43] B. Maylath, "Editing for global contexts," in *Technical Editing*, C. D. Rude and A. Eaton, Eds., 5th ed. Longman, UK: Pearson, 2011, pp. 300–317.
- [44] B. R. Connatser, "Reconsidering some prescriptive rules of grammar and composition," *Tech. Commun.*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 264–275, 2004.
- [45] M. J. Albers, "Editing for human-information interaction," in *Editing in the Modern Classroom*, S. Flanagan and M. J. Albers, Eds. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2019, pp. 109–127.
- [46] R. Shevalier and B. A. McKenzie, "Culturally responsive teaching as an ethics-and care-based approach to urban education," *Urban Educ.*, vol. 47, no. 6, pp. 1086–1105, 2012.
- [47] R. K. Boettger, "How does that make you feel? The psychological dimensions of editorial comments," in *Editing in the Modern Classroom*, S. Flanagan and M. J. Albers, Eds. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2019, pp. 47–65.
- [48] K. Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*. Los Angeles, CA, USA: Univ. California Press, 1969.
- [49] L. Gonzales and I. Baca, "Developing culturally and linguistically diverse online technical communication programs: Emerging frameworks at University of Texas at El paso," *Tech. Commun. Quart.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 273–286, 2017.
- [50] J. Johnson-Eilola, "Relocating the value of work: Technical communication in a post-industrial age," *Tech. Commun. Quart.*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 245–270, 1996.
- [51] R. Cheek, "Political technical communication and ideographic communication design in a pre-digital congressional campaign," *Commun. Design Quart.*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 4–14, 2020.

- [52] H. A. Giroux, *Neoliberalism's War on Higher Education*. Chicago, IL, USA: Haymarket Books, 2014.
- [53] Conference on College Composition and Communication, "Students' right to their own language," 1974. [Online]. Available: <https://prod-ncte-cdn.azureedge.net/nctefiles/groups/cccc/newsrtol.pdf>
- [54] C. Shelton, "Shifting out of neutral: Centering difference, bias, and social justice in a business writing course," *Tech. Commun. Quart.*, vol. 29, pp. 18–32, 2019.
- [55] S. Costanza-Chock, *DesignJustice: Community-Led Practices to Build the Worlds We Need*. Cambridge, UK: MIT Press, 2020.
- [56] D. Wittkower, "Principles of anti-discriminatory design," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Ethics Eng., Sci. Technol.*, 2016, pp. 1–7.
- [57] A. Eaton, P. E. Brewer, T. C. Portewig, and C. R. Davidson, "Examining editing in the workplace from the author's point of view," *Tech. Commun.*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 111–139, 2008.

Sam Clem received the B.A. degree in History from the University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, USA, in 2009, and the M.A. degree in Teaching from Pacific University, Eugene, OR, in 2011. She is currently working toward the Ph.D. degree in Technical Communication and Rhetoric with Utah State University, Logan, UT, USA. Her current research interests include technical editing, translation, and faculty development.

Ryan Cheek received the B.S. degree in Sociology from Weber State University, Ogden, UT, USA, and the M.A. degree in Communication from the University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY, USA. He is currently working toward the Ph.D. degree in Technical Communication and Rhetoric with Utah State University, Logan, UT, USA. His research interests include political technical communication and the rhetoric of health, justice, and technology.