The Long View

Reading an academic journal regularly over a period of years is a familiar activity to instructors. We may read some issues cover to cover while with other issues we skip to the pieces that speak most forcefully to us. And, to be honest, some of the issues pile up as we attempt to stay current with more immediately pressing reading: student work, institutional correspondence. As the time goes by, it becomes normalized to read the issues as they arrive, as we can.

What we lose in those transactions is a clear sense of how the journal has changed or perhaps evolved over the passage of time. As editor of this journal, I confess that I have but a shadowy sense of how the journal may be different—or not-so-different—since my first days in the position. So I think it is quite valuable for readers, contributors, reviewers, and the editor as well to take a long view of the journal once in a while.

In this issue readers will find two features that take such a long view of TETYC. Peter Wayne Moe, in “What Works for Me, and for That Matter, for Us,” examines a decade’s worth of “What Works for Me” in the journal. This genre is described on our website as “brief descriptions of successful classroom activities; 200–750 words.” That description changed a few years back, expanding the genre from just 50–200 words to allow for a bit more elaboration. “What Works for Me” is a distinctive feature of TETYC. College Composition and Communication published “Staffroom Interchange,” but that was long ago. Moe analyzes the past decade of “What Works for Me” in the journal and, as he describes it, examines a “genre in a fraught relationship to academic discourse, a genre that asks readers to consider how the ways we write the classroom affect composition as a field, our teacherly selves, and the students in our classrooms” (p. 364).

Also in this issue, Holly Hassel takes a long view of research published in TETYC. Her starting point is Kip Strasma and Paul Resnick’s 1999 essay “Future Research in Two-Year College English” as she examines well over two hundred published essays in the years since that article appeared. Hassel concludes that her review “reveals the ways in which we have made significant progress in meeting the challenges of the twenty-first century,” but she also issues a call for the future: “It’s more important than ever that our research agenda be matched to the needs of the colleagues and students who both support and benefit from the mission of two-year colleges” (p. 357).

It is difficult to maintain a long view of a journal’s life as we go about meeting our obligations as teachers and scholars, so it seems to me that articles like Moe’s and Hassel’s might spur each of us to ask, “What have I been thinking and doing as a professional over the past decade? Where do I need to go in the next decade?” As the academic year winds down, I hope this issue of TETYC encourages us readers to take such a long view of our own work as we read about what the journal has been reporting since the turn of the century.

—J.S.