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Our first issue illustrated how literacies travel and shift in value and meaning as they move into and across new settings. In that spirit, the research and scholarship in this issue happens at multiple disciplinary sites, around a range of materials and interventions, and across the lifespan. The articles touch upon several value-laden questions: In what ways might scripted curriculum be translated into meaningful literacy and learning practices through collaborative interactions between students and teachers? How do young readers engage graphics used in texts to mobilize meaning? To what extent can appreciation for linguistic diversity be learned through direct instruction? How can systems of mentoring and peer-review facilitate graduate students’ learning to publish in the sciences? And how might critical literacy scholars in education tackle thorny questions related to their own children’s educational opportunities? Across these articles, the teaching and learning of English is documented in PreK through university settings, in individuals’ ongoing literacy development, in the work of sponsoring agents, and in school-based, disciplinary conventions.

In “Rewriting the Curricular Script: Teachers and Children Translating Writing Practices in a Kindergarten Classroom,” Haeny Yoon theorizes the challenges of literacy teaching in an era of standardization and teacher-proof scripts as a task of creative curricular translation. Examining teacher translation practices in a richly textured, four-month observational study of an American kindergarten classroom, Yoon traces how a teacher and her students inventively translate curriculum in ways that broaden the narrowly prescribed understandings of literacy practices implicit in the widely used scripted curriculum. While the translation work necessary for teachers in schools with mandated curriculum has been discussed in the scholarly literature, Yoon further theorizes that translation process and offers fine-grained documentation of how translation work plays out in the day-to-day practices of a teacher and the moment-to-moment interactions of students. Arguing that children themselves can be agentive collaborators in their own learning and actualizing of curriculum, Yoon’s findings present insight into the ways children’s writing practices dialogically develop as teachers and students negotiate curricular texts, literate practices, and their own writing productions.

In their article, “Beyond Concepts of Print: Development of Concepts of Graphics in Text, PreK to Grade 3,” Nell Duke, Rebecca Norman, Kathryn Roberts,
Nicole Martin, Jennifer Knight, Paul Morsink, and Sara Calkins shift from situated pedagogical and literate action to an examination of how young readers engage with graphics in texts. As children learn to read, the authors suggest, they rely on the ever-increasing number of graphics printed with texts to make meaning from and with the words printed on the page. The authors administered a series of 26 tasks to determine the extent to which 60 diverse American children in grades preK to 3 had acquired 8 concepts hypothesized to impact how graphics work in texts. Their findings indicate variation within grade levels in children’s acquisition of concepts of graphics, although more children demonstrated acquisition of a given concept at higher grade levels. Though reading research has begun to trace the precise roles graphics play within texts and processes of reading comprehension, this article extends this line of inquiry by contributing fresh ideas about graphic concept acquisition to the field of childhood reading development. It also has implications for those studying how readers of all ages engage with—and translate across—multiple genres, modalities, and document design features.

In the first two articles, then, translation happens across modalities, around curricular mandates, and in children’s written productions. In the third article, appreciation for American English translates into an appreciation for World Englishes as undergraduate students learn to understand linguistic diversity. The 2011 James Berlin Outstanding Dissertation Award Winner, Ana Maria Wetzl, reports on an intervention she developed and tested that asks American undergraduate students to interact with and appreciate World English varieties and speakers. Wondering how much and in what ways such pedagogical interventions impacted students’ perceptions of World Englishes and of linguistically diverse populations in general, she designed a mixed-method study of 12 mainstream composition courses at a medium-sized university. Though these students seemed to initially prefer American English over World Englishes, their perceptions of World Englishes began to change once linguistic diversity became the focus of the course. Wetzl found that students’ appreciation for American English translated—more than simply transferred—into an appreciation for World Englishes because of their expanded understanding of linguistic diversity.

Steve Simpson’s case study further advances the issue theme by exploring translation as interpretation and sponsorship of disciplinary writing expectations in the sciences. Using a systems-based approach to track the process by which a graduate student learned to prepare scientific articles for publication, Simpson offers a nuanced exploration of the systems of feedback and collaboration in the sciences that supported a Brazilian doctoral student’s development as an academic writer in the sciences. The article demonstrates how the focal student undertook multiple layers of interpretation to develop his writing, translating the feedback from mentors and peers to prepare scientific articles for journal submission and revision. In particular, the systems approach to the process of learning reveals the sponsoring activities necessary for the ongoing professionalization of this student and his peers. Offering both an analytical framework and a case study profile of an international student learner, the article expands what writing scholarship knows
about how feedback relationships and systems (particularly with advisors and to a lesser degree with committee members) can support or hinder graduate student writing development in the disciplines. The analysis further illuminates where, in such feedback systems, additional interventions might be fruitful—for example, courses or other teaching and mentoring practices that broaden the feedback system beyond advisors.

While translation is one theme cutting across articles in this issue, another is developmental literacy. These articles present findings related to learners across the lifespan who have various stakes in literacy learning. The development of literacy, as these essays together demonstrate, is an ongoing practice for all readers and writers; spanning a lifetime, literacy development is facilitated by the interplay of textual elements and modalities, sponsoring agents, dialogic interactions in classrooms and other communities, pedagogical interventions, and feedback systems.

The articles, read as a collective, suggest as well that literacy development can be hindered by a lack of instructional and peer collaboration resources, draconian policies, rigidly scripted curriculum, and language biases.

In the Forum essay, Amanda Godley takes up another aspect of literacy development: opportunity. As a self-described white, middle-class literacy scholar whose educational research in the teaching of English has centered on issues of social equity, and as a civic activist whose educational advocacy work has been publicly recognized, Godley openly considers the ethical and emotional dilemmas surrounding the placement of her own children in the gifted and talented program in the urban public school they attend. Educational opportunities like gifted and talented programs, as Godley points out, often favor those (such as her own children) who already have access to ample learning and literacy resources at home and in their communities. How children’s development is tracked in schools has long been a matter of hot debate; Godley offers a window into how this debate becomes a lived decision impacting her children’s social worlds and opportunities as well as the emotional life of her family. She illustrates the uncomfortable ways in which her identities, commitments, and work as a scholar, educational activist, and parent come into conflict with one another and lead her to question her work and motivations in each of these domains.

The essay points toward the oft-unspoken ethical paradox facing many critical literacy researchers, one discussed by Bourdieu (1998) and others: in deconstructing how power and privilege circulate in sites and systems of language and literacy learning and teaching, critical scholars often find themselves handsomely rewarded for their intellectual products and performances (e.g., recognition and payment garnered through articles such as those appearing in RTE, books, commercial literacy programs, videos, expert testimony in courts, etc.), even while the systemic conditions they critique continue to inequitably disenfranchise learners across the lifespan. Godley reminds us that literacy learning, teaching, and development are always socially, culturally, and ideologically fraught processes and that literacy scholars and researchers—as well as their children—are embedded in, and often benefit from, these systems of privilege.
Finally, the annual annotated bibliography has become a long-standing RTE tradition, although some may wonder about its continuing relevance in the day of Google Scholar and other on-line search engines. After considerable debate and discussion with the NCTE production team, the editorial board, the outgoing editorial team, and Professor Richard Beach, we have decided to continue this tradition as part of the Forum section of the journal. The high download rates for the annotated bibliography in the past decade suggest that it continues to serve as a useful resource for many in the field. Professor Lori Helman has taken the lead on the annotated bibliography this year, assembling a team of scholars from around the globe to contribute to the effort. A brief introduction to the annotated bibliography appears in the print journal, and a PDF of the complete bibliography is freely available at the RTE website: http://www.ncte.org/journals/rte/biblios

**Peeking behind the Editorial Curtain**

The diversity of articles in the issue, as well as the diversity of the authors, prompts us to engage in some metacommentary about our editorial process and the process of knowledge-making we envision for the journal during our editorship. One facet of our vision for the journal is showcasing emerging voices in the field of English education from a range of disciplines. In line with this goal, we’re particularly pleased to present the research of Haeny Yoon, Ana Wetzl, Steve Simpson, Rebecca Norman, Kathryn Roberts, Nicole Martin, Jennifer Knight, Paul Morsink, and Sara Calkins.

At the same time, we feature the work of seasoned literacy scholars Nell Duke and Amanda Godley. Publishing these senior scholars, with whom we have had close professional ties, as well as several of the emerging scholars who are former or current students at Michigan State University (MSU), has prompted us to articulate (a) what constitutes a conflict of interest for our editorial team and (b) how we will handle such conflicts going forward. In consultation with former editors, members of the editorial board, and the AERA Conflict of Interest policy (http://legacy.aera.net/uploadedFiles/Conflicts_of_interest_Policy_AM10.pdf), we have developed several guidelines for handling conflicts of interest:

- If the author is an employee at MSU, we will recruit a guest editor for the manuscript.
- If one of us has published with an author within the past five years, the other editor will take the lead on the manuscript.
- If one of us has taught or supervised the work of an author or if the author is a former student from one of the editors’ departments at MSU, the other editor will take the lead on the manuscript. If both editors have worked with the author in a teaching or mentoring capacity, we will recruit a guest editor for the manuscript.
- If an author is a close personal friend of one of the editors (defined as a person whose home we would feel comfortable staying in when visiting his or her area), then the other editor will take the lead on the manuscript.
While these points will guide us, our policy for handling conflicts of interest will no doubt continue to evolve over the course of our editorship.

In striving to cultivate new voices in *RTE*, we conceptualize much of the editorial work we do as pedagogical in nature: with the help of our reviewers, we want to build the capacities of a new generation of scholars for creating high-impact scholarly writing that expands the collective knowledge base across a range of subfields within literacy studies. As part of this pedagogy, we’d like to offer 10 tips to new authors. We suspect, too, that these tips might prove useful to authors new to publishing in the social sciences.

**Ten Tips for First-Time Authors**

1. **Study the journal Submission Guidelines carefully.** Make sure that your manuscript conforms to the submission guidelines. Common errors include (a) not including a word count on the manuscript or exceeding the 10,000-word limit (inclusive of references, tables, figures, etc.), (b) not formatting the manuscript properly in APA style, (c) not blinding the manuscript, and (d) submitting a manuscript with an abstract that does not successfully articulate the significance and/or findings of the article. If you have a question about some aspect of the guidelines, ask a trusted mentor or contact the editorial team. We will be happy to respond to your questions.

2. **Discuss your ideas with the editors.** We are available for such face-to-face conversations at conference roundtables or “meet the editors” sessions at the annual meetings of the National Council of Teachers of English, the Literacy Research Association, the Conference on College Composition and Communication, and the American Educational Research Association. We are also traveling to international conferences to recruit manuscripts for the journal, including for example the International Society for the Advancement of Writing Research. Making contact with the editors will allow you to learn whether they are interested in receiving manuscripts in your area and how you might shape the paper to make it more relevant to the current conversation in the journal. To make the most of a conversation with the editors, come prepared to share one or two ideas or papers you are currently working on. Bringing a one-page document with talking points can help you clearly communicate your ideas with the editors.

3. **Be persistent with your manuscript.** See the submission process as an opportunity to receive feedback from others who are also pursuing your area of study. You have an opportunity not only for substantive learning, but also for procedural learning about how to write and revise an academic article in the social sciences. The reviewing process at *RTE* is vigorous. Upon submission, at least three members of the editorial team read the manuscript to determine whether it will be sent out for review. Manuscripts sent out generally receive three to four reviews. We have been fortunate to assemble an incredibly accomplished, talented, and intellectually diverse editorial board and reviewer pool to maintain the integrity of that process. (Please get in touch if you would like to review for the journal!)
If you receive a “revise and resubmit” decision, keep in mind that these decision letters and reviews are averaging eight pages. Receiving such extensive reviewer and editorial feedback can sometimes feel daunting. Try to keep in mind that an editorial “revise and resubmit” letter aims to guide your revision process, with the goal of helping you interpret the revision suggestions. If a decision letter leaves you feeling uncertain, confused, or daunted, consult with trusted colleagues and mentors or with the lead editor for your manuscript.

4. **Take your revision process a few steps at a time.** Revision suggestions typically ask for two or more areas to be substantially revised. Stage your revisions in passes. A first pass might address the framing of the essay, while another might address the methodology, and so on. Don’t try to do a revision all at once or in just one sitting. Divide the revision tasks into manageable stages.

5. **If you receive a “revise and resubmit” or “reject and resubmit” letter, you are free to resubmit.** In either case, taking the revision process seriously will increase the odds of an eventual acceptance. By “seriously,” we mean writing a detailed letter (to be submitted with the revised manuscript) addressing all the issues identified in the decision letter and in the reviews as though you are speaking with the reviewers. You need not make all the suggested changes, but you do need to persuasively show how you have substantively addressed the reviewers’ and editors’ concerns. A “revise and resubmit” signals that you should substantially revise portions of your text. While a “revise and resubmit” decision can indicate a range of needed revisions, you should take such a decision as an encouragement to revise. A “reject and resubmit” signals that while reviewers and the editorial team see promise in the work, you would need to substantially rewrite large portions—if not most—of your text for the manuscript to be publishable in *RTE*. If you receive a “reject and resubmit,” you should consider whether the manuscript in its present form (or near to its present form) might be a better fit at another venue. If you do decide to rework a manuscript that received a “reject and resubmit” decision, keep in mind that the manuscript will be treated as a new submission, albeit one that has already benefitted from the peer review process.

6. **Learn about and involve yourself in the discourse communities populated by *RTE* authors.** Go to the research-strand presentations at the annual conference of the National Conference of Teachers of English. Go to the NCTE Assembly for Research Mid-Winter Conference and the annual meeting of the Literacy Research Association. Attend presentations by active researchers at the Conference on College Composition and Communication Annual Convention. Go to the meetings of the International Association for the Advancement of Writing Research. Especially seek out presentations given by authors, at these or other venues, who are publishing in *RTE*. Sign up to serve as chair or as a discussant for presentations and panels in these venues or, better yet, take it upon yourself to organize panels or symposia bringing together scholars working in your area. When you do go to conferences, seize opportunities to build relationships with other scholars who are doing work relevant to your research. Finally, volunteer to serve as a reviewer for *RTE*.

7. **Cite previous articles published in *RTE* in your manuscript.** This practice helps demonstrate that your paper emerges from and contributes to the ongoing

---

**Notes:**
- The original text contains references and citations that are not visible in this excerpt.
- The text is a guide on how to respond to revision and resubmission letters from academic journals.
- The advice is tailored for manuscripts submitted to *Research in the Teaching of English* (RTE).
- The document is part of a scholarly discussion on the process of academic publication and revision.
conversation happening in the pages of the journal. It also helps you increase the impact of the journal, which in turn makes publication in *RTE* that much more notable.

8. **Pay attention to the quality of your abstract.** The abstract can influence the reception and future impact of your manuscript. High-impact abstracts usually include: (a) a statement of the problem addressed in the manuscript: Why is this research needed now? What previous scholarship are you responding to? (b) a brief description of the methodology, (c) an outline of your findings (we see this feature as critical), and (d) a statement about the significance of the study. Please limit abstracts to 250 words.

9. **Write clearly.** Manuscripts tend to do better in the review process when they are clearly written. Clear writing is accomplished at the discourse level (meaning how the parts of the text, and the argument as a whole, work together) and also at the sentence level. Work to make all sections of your manuscript contribute to its overall argument and coherence. Topic sentences and strong transitions can help reviewers see the flow of your overall logic in the manuscript. The whole article should have an internal consistency: the methodological choices need to make sense in light of the literature review and the conceptual framework, the findings and analysis need to link back to the framing material and to the questions posed in the opening framework, and so on. Peter Smagorinsky (2008), a former editor of *RTE* and a member of our editorial review board, offers valuable advice on how to accomplish coherence with the methodology section as the “epicenter.” To develop clear writing at the sentence level, we urge you to circulate the manuscript to trusted colleagues for feedback on clarity of writing before submitting. If you believe your sentence-level writing is weak, or if someone suggests it needs improvement, it may be helpful to solicit editorial assistance before submitting. You can also learn to do sentence-level editing independently by following Wendy Belcher’s (2009) terrific sentence-level writing diagnostic (pp. 235–265).

10. **Consult Wendy Belcher’s book, *Writing Your Journal Article in 12 Weeks*.** It offers specific direction and advice about revising manuscripts for publication, with a particular emphasis on developing arguments for academic fields of study. The book makes explicit many of the rules that newcomers to academic publishing may find difficult to crack.
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