



HANDBOOK



THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH
School of Literatures,
Languages and Cultures



RESEARCHER-LED
INITIATIVE FUND



Contents

About the Handbook	4
About EdJoWriWe	5
Acknowledgements	7
A Conclusion, and an Introduction	8
Schedule	9
The Week's Activities... ..	12
Writing workshops, etc.....	12
Journal Article Writing Workshop	12
One-on-one feedback meetings	12
Lecture: 'How to Begin'	13
On the Spot: Introduction Revisions	13
Writing Clinic: Introduction Presentations.....	13
Lecture: Clarity of Argument	13
Writing Clinic: Clarity of Argument	14
Lecture: Clarity of Language.....	14
Writing Clinic: Clarity of Language	14
Panel discussion and Q&A.....	15
Healthy Writing	17
Workshop: Keeping the Balance: Minimising Stress and Maximising Productivity.....	17
Tai Chi Taster Session.....	17
Walk round Duddingston Loch	18
Walk up Arthur's Seat	18
Drop-in Sessions.....	19
Reflections on Academic Publishing and Writing	20
Six Succinct (Yet Succulent) Pieces of Advice from Dr David Sorfa, Plus One from His Old Masters Supervisor.....	20
Friends and Neighbours: Making the Most of Your Academic Communities	21
Four Phases for Publication	22
On Handling Rejection	24
On Coping with Criticism	25
Two in the Ivory Tower: The Advantages of Collaborative Academic Writing	26

“There is something you find interesting, for a reason hard to explain. It is hard to explain because you have never read it on any page; there you begin.” – Annie Dillard, *The Writing Life*

The Team	30
Contact	31
Further Reading... ..	32
Writing for Academic Journals	32
Writing a Dissertation	32
Style.....	32
The Academic Conversation	33

“...how hard can writing be? After all, most of the words are going to be *and*, *the* and *I* and *it*, and so on, and there’s a huge number to choose from, so a lot of the work has already been done for you.” – Terry Pratchett, *Snuff*

About the Handbook

This handbook is intended both as a guide for participants in EdJoWriWe 2015 and as a resource for anyone else who feels it might be useful to them. The reasoning and aspirations behind EdJoWriWe are set out in ‘About EdJoWriWe’, while the week’s structure and constituent parts are set out in the ‘Schedule’ and under the relevant headings.

In advance of EdJoWriWe itself, we have been collecting anecdotes and advice relevant to academic publishing both from current professionals and from other sources: these are presented under ‘Reflections on Academic Publishing and Writing’ and include some excellently insightful contributions. These will be supplemented by blog posts through the week, which can be found on our website edjowriwe.weebly.com.

This handbook is an updated version of the handbook written by the organisers of the first ever EdJoWriWe, Eystein Thanisch and Muireann Crowley.¹ It owes its form and much of its content to its illustrious predecessor, and current participants can profitably consult the superlative 2013 edition of this publication.

We hope you find this document useful.

¹ Edited by Georgina Barker, in collaboration with Olivia Ferguson, Barbara Tesio, and Laura Beattie.

“A work in progress quickly becomes feral. It reverts to a wild state overnight. It is barely domesticated, a mustang on which you one day fastened a halter, but which now you cannot catch. It is a lion you cage in your study. As the work grows, it gets harder to control; it is a lion growing in strength. You must visit it every day and reassert your mastery over it. If you skip a day, you are, quite rightly, afraid to open the door to its room. You enter its room with bravura, holding a chair at the thing and shouting, ‘Simba!’” – Annie Dillard, *The Writing Life*

About EdJoWriWe

EdJoWriWe 2015 is the result of a successful experiment – the first EdJoWriWe, run by Muireann Crowley and Eystein Thanisch in December 2013, when 21 postgraduate researchers from the School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures (LLC) and the School of History, Classics and Archaeology (HCA) at the University of Edinburgh attempted to complete the first draft of a publishable academic journal article within seven days. ‘Ambitious if not downright foolhardy’ as this undertaking may have been, it was a resounding success. A surprising number (half!) achieved this, and more completed and even submitted their articles in the weeks and months following EdJoWriWe. (My own article was finished in the January following EdJoWriWe, was submitted in the summer, and is currently awaiting peer review.) But most importantly, I think we all left EdJoWriWe feeling newly enthused about our writing, with replenished reserves of motivation, fresh writing techniques under our belts, and even new friends. I was counting on participating again the next year. So when Muireann and Eystein were unable to find volunteers to run EdJoWriWe this year, I agreed (somewhat hesitantly) to take it over – this was a project I was reluctant to see disappear!²

Publishing is essential to a career in academia, but it must often fit around other responsibilities, such as dissertation-writing, teaching, administrative tasks, and the multifarious jobs postgraduates take on during their studies. These obstacles are not unique to postgraduates – the difficulty of apportioning time to researching, writing and publishing haunts academics throughout their careers – but postgraduate researchers find it difficult to rationalise time-not-spent-on-dissertation, both to ourselves and to others. In addition, we are often daunted by the journal article publishing process, which may appear mysterious and somewhat inaccessible. Generously supported by the University of Edinburgh’s Researcher-Led Initiative Fund, EdJoWriWe aims to carve out a dedicated time and space for postgraduate researchers to reflect upon our writing practices and methodologies as we take up the challenge of attempting to write a journal article in seven days. We will be supported through the week by expert guidance and physical sustenance – but most crucially by the other article writers around us, who will become a writing community over the course of the week.

Various workshops, lectures, writing clinics, as well as advice and feedback will be offered throughout the week by academics and writing consultants Dr Lisa SurrIDGE and Dr Mary Elizabeth Leighton, both from the University of Victoria, Canada, who will be writing along with us. We will also have the opportunity to talk to a panel of experienced researchers in the humanities from the University of Edinburgh about the publication process, and to drop-in advisors about issues arising with our articles. This year’s EdJoWriWe will also attempt to address some of the health implications of academic life, both in theory and in practice. Dr Jenny Leeder will run a workshop dedicated to combatting two common problems for PhD students –

² I then added to it, along with fellow EdJoWriWe organiser Barbara: LLC Writes, monthly writing days run by us and our co-organisers Olivia and Laura, is essentially EdJoWriWe in miniature.

“Far away, there in the sunshine, are my highest aspirations. I may not reach them, but I can look up and see their beauty, believe in them, and try to follow where they lead.” – Louisa May Alcott

stress and procrastination. This will be followed by a Tai Chi taster session, and on later days by guided walks to Duddingston Loch and up Arthur's Seat. (We also encourage participants to exercise or get outside independently, and there will (almost) always be healthy food options available!) The week will be rounded off with a (hopefully) well-earned party.

Although EdJoWriWe's ostensible aim is to facilitate production of an article draft, its core aim is more holistic. There is no real imperative for any of us to complete our articles by the end of the week (although that would be nice), so long as we learn, and make progress. Instead, EdJoWriWe assists participants in exploring, exchanging, and experimenting with writing methods and strategies, discovering ways of streamlining academic writing, identifying key tasks involved in producing an article, and de-mystifying the publication process. The focus is on improving the efficacy and efficiency of participants' writing, rather than on the production of a certain quantity of writing, and on reducing some of the anxiety and doubt academic writing can provoke in the most confident of us. All within the context of a supportive and encouraging writing community.

Your team of organisers (George, Barbara, Laura, and Olivia), in whose loving care you have placed yourselves between 27th April and 3rd May, will be working feverishly on articles ourselves. We will therefore be sympathetic – and empathetic – towards the issues that may (and probably will!) arise during this intensive writing week, and can be approached at any point with (probably) any problem during the week.

To sum up: EdJoWriWe is a week-long writing retreat in the heart of Edinburgh. It endeavours to facilitate writing – lots and lots of writing – and self-reflexivity on the writing process, and it aspires to build community through the conversations and guided discussions the week's activities will engender. We are delighted you have decided to embark upon this challenge with us.

Georgina Barker³
Barbara Tesio
Laura Beattie
&
Olivia Ferguson

³ This Frankenstein's Monster of an Introduction has been revived by Georgina Barker from the 2013 Introduction by Eystein Thanisch & Muireann Crowley. No electrodes were harmed in the process.

“Possibly, then, writing has to do with darkness, and a desire or perhaps a compulsion to enter it, and, with luck, to illuminate it, and to bring something back out to the light.” – Margaret Atwood, *On Writers and Writing*

Acknowledgements

EdJoWriWe and its spin-off LLC Writes have been made possible by many individuals beyond its team of organisers. We would like to thank them all here, but are aware that some may be unintentionally overlooked, and others may emerge in the course of the week – we hope they will excuse this.

First and foremost we are indebted to the founders of EdJoWriWe, Muireann and Eystein, who have been unstinting in their assistance since we took over the project. For the list of people who inspired and supported the original undertaking, to whom this repeat event is also much beholden, see their Acknowledgements in the 2013 Handbook.

During the early stages of planning the repeat event and setting up LLC Writes, Dr Amy Burge gave excellent advice and encouragement. Administration of the events has run smoothly (thus far) thanks to the assistance of Linda Grieve, Sarah Harvey, Gordon Littlejohn, Dr Ersev Ersoy, Julie Robertson, Corinna Bremer, Anne Budo, Nicola Cuthbert, and Neil Young. I would also like to thank Dr Alexandra Smith for endorsing our funding proposal.

We are exceedingly thankful to the Researcher-Led Initiative Fund for its generous funding of EdJoWriWe for the second year running – we would not have been able to run the event on nearly so grand a scale (if at all) without this crucial backing.

Qianwei He took the beautiful photographs featured on our website, whilst Giorgia Ghergo designed our stylish logos, for which we are suitably grateful.

EdJoWriWe, of course, would be untenable without contributors during the week itself. Various academics – extremely busy, it goes without saying (but I'm saying it anyway) – have offered their time and expertise willingly and generously. Our writing workshop leaders, Dr Lisa Surrige and Dr Mary Elizabeth Leighton, have been unstintingly helpful and enthusiastic, and more generous with their time than I could have dared hope. Dr Robert Irvine, Dr Laura Bradley, Dr David Sorfa, Dr Dorothy Butchard, and FORUM editors Yanbing Er & Sarah Bernstein are assembling to give us the benefit of their accrued wisdom in a panel discussion and Q&A. Dr Jenny Leeder will be curing us (or at least giving us the tools to cure ourselves) of stress and procrastination. And Adrian Martinez is running our Tai Chi taster session. Dr Amy Burge, Dr Anna Groundwater, and Dr Lena Wånggren are holding drop-in sessions. Many of the aforementioned have also contributed pieces for the Reflections section of this Handbook – above and beyond the call of duty.

Finally, Barbara and I would like to thank Olivia and Laura for getting on board our somewhat madcap (and time-consuming) scheme. They have brought fresh ideas and skills to the project; been reliable, and, again, more generous with their time than we could have hoped; and will ensure the continuance of EdJoWriWe and LLC Writes beyond our tenure as organisers, as they will become the lead organisers as of May the Fourth (a date that will hopefully prove as auspicious as it sounds).

Thank you all!

Georgina & Barbara.

*“Manuscripts don't burn.” – Mikhail Bulgakov, *The Master and Margarita**

A Conclusion, and an Introduction

Edinburgh Journal Article Writing Week was an experiment when first it ran in December 2013. (The pronunciation of ‘EdJoWriWe’ is still disputed.) It was founded on the idea that we could make our academic writing less lonely, more efficient, less painful; and that writing for publication, in particular, need not be as daunting as it sometimes seems. EdJoWriWe was designed to apply pressure, so that we could discover what we had in us, but also to provide support and opportunities for learning and development. As St Columbanus (d.615) wrote in his *Regula Monachorum*,

Use of life must be moderated just as toil must be moderated, since this is true discretion, that the possibility of spiritual progress may be kept with a temperance that punishes the flesh. For if temperance exceeds measure, it will be a vice and not a virtue; for virtue maintains and retains many good things. Therefore we must fast daily, just as we must feed daily; and while we must eat daily, we must gratify the body more poorly and sparingly; since we must eat daily for the reason that we must go forward daily, pray daily, toil daily, and daily read.⁴

The results of this experiment, thoroughly charted through EdJoWriWe and beyond, were impressive, with half of the participants achieving the goal of completing a first draft of a journal article within the week, and more doing so in subsequent weeks and months. At least three of these drafts have by now been submitted to a journal.⁵

The consensus of participants looking back on EdJoWriWe 2013 was that the outcome of their specific scholarly undertaking was not as important as what they learned about their own pre-conceptions, habits, weaknesses and strengths. This outcome, however, was only achieved by setting ambitious goals and, essentially, taking risks. So do not be afraid to push yourselves, for many people are there to support you, and you will learn and ‘go forward’, in Columbanus’ words, regardless.

Therefore, with moral and physical sustenance on hand, look after each other, but also be critical and share your own ideas and experiences about argumentation, good writing style, anti-procrastination, or any other relevant topic that might arise. You are all well-honed, well-qualified writers, thinkers, critics, investigators (the list of possible definitions could stretch much further...) who have a lot to teach and learn from each other, and who can shape the provision of this sort of collectivist postgraduate auto-pedagogy for future generations of students and researchers.

Team EdJoWriWe 2013 – Muireann Crowley, Eystein Thanisch, Sarah Sharp, Ella Leith, and Emily Anderson – wish you and everyone else involved all the very best, and will be stalking you on social media with interest.

Eystein Thanisch and Muireann Crowley, Organisers of EdJoWriWe 2013

⁴ G. S. M. Walker (ed. and transl.) *Sancti Columbani Opera, Scriptorum Latini Hiberniae 2* (Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies: Dublin, 1957), p. 127.

⁵ Crowley and Thanisch, *Feedback Survey and Follow-up Survey for EdJoWriWe 2013*.

Schedule

On Monday and Tuesday everyone should aim to arrive at 9. For the rest of the week we have divided the day up for morning people (9-6: larks) and evening people (11-8: owls) to help us all work at the time of day when we work best (although of course you need not adhere strictly to that division). Doors will be open and tea and coffee available at 9 for the larks, and owls should arrive when they can (by 11). On most days elevenses will be from 11-11.20, lunch 1-2, and afternoon tea 3.40-4. We will gather in G2 at 5.30 each day to discuss our progress. Doors will close in the evening when the last person is ready to leave.

We have various rooms available, each providing a different working atmosphere:

- G2** – workshops & lectures; café-atmosphere working (when available)
- G22** – quiet working (occasional conversation fine)
- G23** – Lisa and Mary Elizabeth’s room
- G26** – working to music (played quietly, and provided and agreed by participants)
- 1.1** – silent working
- 1.10** – writing clinics; quiet working (when available)
- Common room** – social and eating room; café-atmosphere working

As well as the common room, the garden is also available for relaxing, eating, and socialising during breaks.

The workshops, lectures, and discussions (including all of Monday’s events) will take place in G2. The one-on-one feedback meetings will be in G23. The writing clinics will take place in 1.10. The drop-ins will be in the common room. Walks will set off from the common room.

Monday

9.00	Doors open for tea and coffee
9.30-10.00	Group introductions and overview of week
10.00-1.00	Journal Article Writing Workshop
1.00-2.00	Lunch – <i>Urban Angel</i>
2.00-3.30	Panel discussion and Q&A with academics from LLC
3.30-4.00	Afternoon tea
4.00-5.45	Workshop: Keeping the Balance: Minimising Stress and Maximising Productivity
5.45-6.00	Break
6.00-7.00	Tai Chi Taster Session

“A schedule defends from chaos and whim. It is a net for catching days. It is a scaffolding on which a worker can stand and labor with both hands at sections of time.” – Annie Dillard, *The Writing Life*

Tuesday

Today's writing: experiment with techniques from Monday's workshops

9.00-1.00 2.00-3.00	One-on-one feedback meetings with Lisa & Mary Elizabeth (<i>by prior appointment – G23</i>)
9.00-9.30	Group discussion, updating writing plans, setting writing targets for the day/week
9.30-11.00	Writing
11.00-11.20	Elevenes
11.20-1.00	Writing
1.00-2.00	Lunch – <i>Urban Angel</i>
2.00-3.40	Writing
3.40-4.00	Afternoon tea
4.00-5.30	Writing
5.30-6.00	Group discussion on success of new writing techniques and the day's targets, updating writing plans
6.00-8.00	Owls' writing

Wednesday

9.00-11.00	Larks' writing
11.00-11.20	Elevenes
11.20-1.00	Writing
1.00-2.00	Lunch – <i>Urban Angel</i>
1.30	Walk to Duddingston Loch leaves
2.00-3.00	Writing / Walk round Duddingston Loch
3.00-4.00	Writing / Drop-in with Dr Lena Wånggren
3.40-4.00	Afternoon tea
4.00-5.30	Writing
5.30-6.00	Group discussion on success of day's targets, updating writing plans
6.00-8.00	Owls' writing

Thursday

9.00-10.00	Larks' writing
10.00-11.00	Writing / Drop-in with Dr Anna Groundwater
11.00-11.20	Elevenes
11.20-12:00	Lecture: 'How to Begin'
12.00-1.00	Writing / On the Spot: Introduction Revisions
1.00-2.00	Lunch – <i>Union of Genius</i>
2.00-3.40	Writing
3.40-4.00	Afternoon tea
4.00-5.30	Writing / Writing Clinic: Introduction Presentations (<i>sign up</i>)
5.30-6.00	Group discussion on success of day's targets, updating writing plans
6.00-8.00	Owls' writing

Send current drafts by 6pm for inclusion in Clarity of Argument lecture

*"Time is an illusion. Lunchtime doubly so." – Douglas Adams, *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy**

Friday

9.00-11.00	Larks' writing
11.00-11.20	Elevenes
11.20-1.00	Lecture: Clarity of Argument
1.00-2.00	Lunch – <i>Tupiniquim</i>
2.00-3.40	Writing / Writing Clinic: Clarity of Argument (<i>sign up</i>)
3.40-4.00	Afternoon tea
4.00-5.00	Writing / Drop-in with Dr Amy Burge
5.00-5.30	Writing
5.30-6.00	Group discussion on success of day's targets, updating writing plans
6.00-8.00	Owls' writing

Send current drafts by 6pm for inclusion in Clarity of Language lecture

Saturday

9.00-11.00	Larks' writing / Walk up Arthur's Seat
11.00-11.20	Elevenes
11.20-1.00	Lecture: Clarity of Language
1.00-2.00	Lunch – <i>Union of Genius</i>
2.00-3.40	Writing / Writing Clinic: Clarity of Language (<i>sign up</i>)
3.40-4.00	Afternoon tea
4.00-5.30	Writing
5.30-6.00	Group discussion on success of day's targets, updating writing plans
6.00-8.00	Owls' writing

Sunday

9.00-11.00	Larks' writing
11.00-11.20	Elevenes
11.20-1.00	Writing
1.00-2.00	Lunch – <i>Piecebox</i>
2.00-3.40	Writing
3.40-4.00	Afternoon tea
4.00-6.00	Writing
6.00-6.30	Group discussion on success of day's and week's targets, future writing plans
6.30-	Party

*"I love deadlines. I love the whooshing noise they make as they go by." – Douglas Adams, *The Salmon of Doubt: Hitchhiking the Galaxy One Last Time**

The Week's Activities...

Writing workshops, etc.

Our writing workshops, lectures, and writing clinics will all be led by the fabulous Dr Lisa Surridge and Dr Mary Elizabeth Leighton. They are also running one-on-one feedback meetings (by prior appointment). Moreover, they will be available for consultation throughout the week, as they will themselves be participating in EdJoWriWe, writing along with us!

Journal Article Writing Workshop

Monday, 10.00-1.00

This 3-hour interactive lecture is a tell-all by journal co-editors Lisa Surridge and Mary Elizabeth Leighton. They will reveal to you everything you ever wanted to know but never dared to ask about how journals work behind the scenes, from blind vetting to editorial decision-making. They will share anonymized examples of actual vetters' reports and will tell the unvarnished truth about what editors look for and talk about at their editorial team meetings. Finally, they will share with you how you can shape your work for a particular journal before submitting it. All of this is designed to give you an insider's view of how best to frame your research for publication.

One-on-one feedback meetings

Tuesday, by appointment

On Tuesday Lisa and Mary will offer optional 20-minute confidential feedback sessions to individual participants who are starting the week with a substantial draft in hand. They will give you an honest assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of your argument and writing, together with suggested strategies for revision.

In order to be eligible for these sessions, you must submit your draft to Lisa and Mary in a Word attachment via email a week before EdJoWriWe starts. They will provide both written and oral feedback on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

Lecture: ‘How to Begin’

Thursday, 11.20-12.00

In this pithy overview lecture, Lisa and Mary will suggest strategies for an effective introduction based on your target journal and your chosen topic.

Come with your laptop and draft introduction and be ready to start revising immediately after the lecture!

On the Spot: Introduction Revisions

Thursday, 12.00-1.00

Applying the principles presented in the ‘How to Begin’ lecture, participants will revise their introductions on their laptops. Mary and Lisa will circulate among participants, offering feedback and on-the-spot advice on introductory strategies.

To participate in this workshop, you need to know your target journal, its readership, and your argument.

Writing Clinic: Introduction Presentations

Thursday, 4.00-5.30 (sign-up required: max. 8 participants)

Following this morning’s introduction revision workshop, participants will briefly share their revised introductions by projecting them onscreen and receive feedback from the group and from workshop leaders. This supportive workshop sets a tone of success for the remainder of the week and allows each participant to observe and learn from others’ successful strategies.

Lecture: Clarity of Argument

Friday, 11.20-1.00

Based on their experience as journal editors and Lisa’s expertise in teaching legal writing, Lisa and Mary will share best practices for communicating your argument. They will emphasize context- and point-first structures geared toward creating an educated reader who follows your argument, appreciates your research, and understands your critical intervention.

If you wish to have your writing featured in this lecture (anonymously, of course!), please email Lisa and Mary your current draft by Thursday of EdJoWriWe at 6 p.m.

“Keep a small can of WD-40 on your desk – away from any open flames – to remind yourself that if you don’t write daily, you will get rusty.” – George Singleton

Writing Clinic: Clarity of Argument

Friday, 2.00-3.40 (sign-up required: max. 8 participants)

Following the lecture on clarity of argument, participants are invited to revise their drafts collaboratively based on the principles presented in the lecture. Participants will share their revisions by projecting them onscreen and will benefit from feedback from other participants as well as from workshop leaders. This supportive workshop allows each participant to observe and learn from others' successful strategies.

If you wish to participate in this workshop, you must submit your current draft by Thursday of EdJoWriWe at 6 p.m., so that Lisa and Mary can make recommendations for strengthening it.

Lecture: Clarity of Language

Saturday, 11.20-1.00

Words, words, words: diction matters, order matters, verbs matter. In this lecture, Lisa and Mary will share strategies that editors use to make your prose sing. Why not use these in advance so that your article will have a better chance of acceptance?

If you wish to have your writing featured in this lecture (anonymously, of course!), please email Lisa and Mary your current draft by Friday of EdJoWriWe at 6 p.m.

Writing Clinic: Clarity of Language

Saturday, 2.00-3.40 (sign-up required: max. 8 participants)

Following the lecture on clarity of language, participants are invited to revise their drafts collaboratively based on the principles presented in the lecture. Participants will share their revisions by projecting them onscreen and will benefit from feedback from other participants as well as from workshop leaders. This supportive workshop allows each participant to observe and learn from others' successful strategies.

If you wish to participate in this workshop, you must submit your current draft by Friday of EdJoWriWe at 6 p.m., so that Lisa and Mary can make recommendations for strengthening it.

*“As to my promise to you in a former letter that there should be some product of this country excursion, I cannot confirm it to any great extent: for I have become so attached to idleness that I cannot be torn from its arms. Accordingly, I either enjoy myself with books, of which I have a delightful stock at Antium, or I just count the waves – for the rough weather prevents my shrimping! From writing my mind positively recoils.” – Cicero, *Letters to Atticus* (trans. Evelyn Shuckburgh)*

Panel discussion and Q&A

Monday, 2.00-3.30

Six academics from the LLC have generously agreed to join us at EdJoWriWe and give us the benefit of their experience and insight into the world of academic writing and publication.

The discussion will be structured around the following topics:

Personal experiences: panellists' reflections and formative experiences on academic writing.

Positioning an article: the purpose(s) of an academic article, where to place it and how to write it accordingly.

Peer review, etc.: receiving feedback, working with peer reviewers and editors, dealing with rejection.

Afterlife of an article: the effect of a published article on the postgraduate's career and subsequent research.

Further discussion will be guided by questions from participants.

Our panellists are:

Dr Robert Irvine (English Literature)

Dr Laura Bradley (German)

Dr David Sorfa (Film Studies)

Dr Dorothy Butchard (English Literature)

FORUM editors Yanbing Er & Sarah Bernstein (English Literature)

“Getting an education was a bit like a communicable sexual disease. It made you unsuitable for a lot of jobs and then you had the urge to pass it on.” – Terry Pratchett, *Hogfather*

Dr Robert Irvine is Senior Lecturer in English Literature. His research focuses on literature and political ideas from the late seventeenth to late nineteenth centuries. He edited Robert Louis Stevenson's *Prince Otto* (1885) for the New Edinburgh Edition of Stevenson's works (2014). His *Selected Poems and Songs* of Robert Burns for OUP (2013) was published as a World's Classics paperback in 2014.

Dr Laura Bradley is Senior Lecturer in German and Postgraduate Director of the Graduate School of Literatures, Languages, and Cultures. She is Principal Investigator on the AHRC project 'Who's Watching Who?' Her research interests focus on the relationship between culture and politics in Germany, and she has published widely on Brecht and on theatre censorship in the GDR.

Dr David Sorfa is Senior Lecturer in Film Studies at the University of Edinburgh and editor-in-chief of the journal *Film-Philosophy*. He has written on Michael Haneke, Jan Švankmajer, Czech cinema and a broad range of film-related topics. He has particular interests in film-philosophy, phenomenology, the work of Jacques Derrida and film adaptation.

Dorothy Butchard completed her PhD in 2014 and is currently a postdoctoral tutor at the University of Edinburgh. She was co-editor of the postgraduate journals *Forum* and *Ecloga* during 2011-12 and 2013-14, and has articles published or forthcoming with Edinburgh University Press, Routledge Companions, Symbiosis and Gylphi Press.

Yanbing Er is a second year PhD candidate in the Department of English Literature. Her dissertation explores the relationship between Continental feminist philosophy and contemporary women's writing. She is serving as the co-editor of *FORUM: The University of Edinburgh Postgraduate Journal of Culture & the Arts* in the year 2014/15.

Sarah Bernstein is a second-year PhD candidate in English literature. Her research focuses on post-war writing by women and its engagement with the social sciences and the British Welfare State. She is serving as the co-editor of *Forum* from January-December 2015.

"It's a bad case o' the thinkin' he's caught, missus. When a man starts messin' wi' the readin' and the writin' then he'll come doon with a dose o' the thinkin' soon enough. I'll fetch some o' the lads and we'll hold his heid under water until he stops doin' it, 'tis the only cure. It can kill a man, the thinkin'." – Terry Pratchett, *A Hat Full of Sky*

Healthy Writing

Workshop: Keeping the Balance: Minimising Stress and Maximising Productivity

Monday, 4.00-5.45

This workshop focuses on a couple of common demons for PhD students – stress (worrying about work) and procrastination (putting work off). It offers an explanation of the physiological effects of stress and the psychological roots of procrastination. It then proceeds to highlight possible ways to manage our minds and bodies better to minimise our stress and maximise our productivity.

The workshop is experiential in nature – it includes discussions in small groups; stimulating exercises for self-reflection; and some facilitator input with suggested further resources. Note, to everyone's relief, no role-play is required, but hopefully the workshop will still offer some elements of entertainment!

Dr Jennifer Leeder has been one of the Assistant Directors of the Student Counselling Service, University of Edinburgh for two and a half years. Before this, she worked as a counsellor at the University of Wolverhampton for 10 years. Jenny completed her PhD at Edinburgh 1996-1999 in the then Faculty of Arts and Humanities, so has a particular soft spot for students studying for PhDs here!

Tai Chi Taster Session

Monday, 6.00-7.00

Loose clothing and comfortable footwear should be worn for this class

Tai Chi Chuan is an internal martial art whose forms are favoured by people as a form of exercise because of its soft appearance and its low impact. The meditative aspect of the art is rooted in Taoism and Zen traditions. The hand form is what most people think of when they think of Tai Chi; it is composed of a flowing sequence of movements that gently exercise the joints and muscles. In Five Winds Tai Chi Chuan there are two hand forms. Both forms are essentially the same sequence of movements, and the real difference between them is the style in which the movements are performed. The Square Form, taught to beginners, is performed to a fixed count which helps beginners remember the movements and keep in time during group practice. The Round Form, taught after the square form has been learnt is smoother, more flowing and does not rely on a fixed count. The square and round forms parallel writing: when taught to write, we first learn the shapes of the individual letters, and the style of writing is akin to printing. Once that has been mastered, we move on to 'joined-up' writing.

*“Ill-fitting grammar are like ill-fitting shoes. You can get used to it for a bit, but then one day your toes fall off and you can't walk to the bathroom.” – Jasper Fforde, *One of Our Thursdays Is Missing**

As a form of self-defence, Tai Chi Chuan has been described as ‘the art of overcoming hardness with softness’. ‘Pushing hands’ practice shows us that if we do not resist, but instead move with the opposing push, and absorb and redirect its energy, then we can defeat the aggressor with relatively little expenditure of energy. This has been called ‘the art of letting your opponent have his own way’, and it is through the continual practice of the applications from the form that we learn to overcome our own instincts and learn to apply the theory of Yin and Yang in self-defence.

Adrian Martinez has a long-standing interest in embodied mindfulness and is a senior instructor in the Five Winds School of Tai Chi Chuan, where he has trained for 28 years in the Chen-Wu style as taught by Sifu Ian Cameron who trained with Sigo Chen Tin Hung in Hong Kong in the 1970s. In that time he has competed and won medals in both British and European competitions and taught many kinds of Tai Chi and chi-kung classes to students of all abilities and ages. Before meeting Sifu Cameron he had been a practitioner and teacher of Yang style tai chi as well as practising Judo, Aikido and Lau Gar Kung fu.

One (or more) of your organisers will also lead two guided walks during EdJoWriWe, subject, of course, to weather and demand. Each walk should take between one and two hours.

Walk round Duddingston Loch

Wednesday, 1.30-3.40ish

Walk up Arthur’s Seat

Saturday, 9.00-11.00ish

“Many who have ‘plied their book diligently,’ and know all about some one branch or another of accepted lore, come out of the study with an ancient and owl-like demeanour, and prove dry, stockish, and dyspeptic in all the better and brighter parts of life. Many make a large fortune, who remain underbred and pathetically stupid to the last. And meantime there goes the idler, who began life along with them—by your leave, a different picture. He has had time to take care of his health and his spirits; he has been a great deal in the open air, which is the most salutary of all things for both body and mind; and if he has never read the great Book in very recondite places, he has dipped into it and skimmed it over to excellent purpose. Might not the student afford some Hebrew roots, and the business man some of his half-crowns, for a share of the idler’s knowledge of life at large, and Art of Living?” –
Robert Louis Stevenson, *An Apology for Idlers*

Drop-in Sessions

Over the course of the week, several University of Edinburgh academics will be visiting the EdJoWriWe participants in 19 George Square as drop-in advisors, giving us the valuable opportunity to discuss our work informally on a one-to-one basis. Each advisor will take up residence in the common room for an hour, and will be available for informal consultation by participants. All have a wealth of experience of article writing and editing, and no matter the topic of your research they will be able to help – for instance, with questions of structure, focus, or argumentation, or simply as sounding boards for your own concerns and ideas.

Wednesday, 3.00-4.00

Dr Lena Wångren is a Research Fellow with the Department of English Literature. Her research interests focus on questions of gender in late nineteenth century literature and culture, and she is also interested in literary and cultural theory, intersectionality, feminism and pedagogy. She has edited several journal issues, as well as a book collection, and has also co-authored journal articles with fellow researchers.

Thursday, 10.00-11.00

Dr Anna Groundwater is AHRC Research Fellow on the Ben Jonson's Walk to Scotland 1618 project. She is the Director of the Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, and the Research Methods Co-ordinator in the Graduate School of History, Classics and Archaeology. She lectures on early modern Scottish and British history, and has published widely in this field.

Friday, 4.00-5.00

Dr Amy Burge works with tutors and demonstrators in the Institute for Academic Development and was previously a Teaching Fellow and the Research Methods Co-ordinator for the Graduate School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures. She has published research on gender and sexuality, medieval romance, contemporary historical fiction and popular culture.

“Descriptive writing is very rarely entirely accurate and during the reign of Olaf Quimby II as Patrician of Ankh some legislation was passed in a determined attempt to put a stop to this sort of thing and introduce some honesty into reporting. [...] Quimby was eventually killed by a disgruntled poet during an experiment conducted in the palace grounds to prove the disputed accuracy of the proverb ‘The pen is mightier than the sword,’ and in his memory it was amended to include the phrase ‘only if the sword is very small and the pen is very sharp.’ – Terry Pratchett, *The Light Fantastic*

Reflections on Academic Publishing and Writing

We asked our contributors to this year's EdJoWriWe if they could share some thoughts, experiences, or advice about writing for publication, and their response was fantastic. The reflections you are about to read below are diverse and thought-provoking. They are also fun! (As are the ones in last year's handbook – personally, I used them as pre-writing procrastination...) Happy reading.

Six Succinct (Yet Succulent) Pieces of Advice from Dr David Sorfa, Plus One from His Old Masters Supervisor

Hmm, I think I can sum up my 'advice' quite succinctly:

1. There is no secret to getting published. Read the journal's instructions, follow the formatting and submit something of the required word length.
2. It doesn't matter who you know. You should be submitting to journals that use double-blind peer review.
3. You cannot judge the quality or originality of your own work. That's the job of the peer reviewers.
4. Don't get discouraged by rejection or harsh criticism.
5. Always have a five year plan.
6. Write 200 words a day.

That's it!

I would also add one more bit of advice, which is what my Masters supervisor (who went on to win the Nobel Prize for literature...) told me about an essay that he'd (vaguely) praised:

'Go to the library and find a journal that you think will be interested in publishing your piece. Send it to them. They might publish it.'

I did. They did.

Best advice I ever had and it started my academic career.

“Get it down. Take chances. It may be bad, but it's the only way you can do anything really good.” – William Faulkner

Friends and Neighbours: Making the Most of Your Academic Communities

Amy Burge

A colleague of mine has a saying about Graduate School: that it is like a cocktail party. At the start of your Masters or PhD, you enter the room, to see groups of people standing around, having fascinating conversations on obscure-sounding topics. Initially, you might be overwhelmed. You sidle up to a group of people and listen in on their conversation. But eventually, you find that you can add a comment here, or throw in a question there; eventually, you too are able to join the conversation and join the party.

Cocktails aside, this is ultimately what academia is (or should be) all about: communities and conversations. Helpfully, this is also an easy way to get started with publishing.

First of all, make use of your immediate communities. Start a reading/writing group with your peers where you comment on and critique each other's work. When I was a PhD student I set up a group with some friends and it was great for keeping me on track with my writing (external deadlines are more persuasive than deadlines only with yourself) and for getting experience reading other people's work in progress.

Reading groups, seminar series and research networks (such as the University of Edinburgh's Gender History Network, for example) are good places to hear about what is going on in terms of research and publishing.

Equally, pay attention to the conversations going on around you more widely. Some of my publications have come about because I heard about a call for papers on an email mailing list, or someone mentioned it at a research seminar. Some of these more specific calls (e.g. for a special issue of a journal) are slightly easier ways to get an initial publication.

Conferences are often followed by special issues in associated journals or edited book collections. Don't let your conference paper just sit there, but try and work it up into an article that you can publish.

However, it is helpful to know which conversations to listen in on. This is something to bear in mind when you're figuring out the journals in your field. When you read a journal, you are eavesdropping on a conversation.⁶ What you need to ask yourself is: do I want to be part of *this* conversation, or should I go and find another group of people (i.e. another journal) to talk to? Targeting the right journal for your article is key to maximising your chances of successful publication.

⁶ I am indebted to another colleague for this anecdote.

“A word aptly spoken, just as one written, cannot be cut out by an axe.” – Nikolai Gogol, *Dead Souls*

Four Phases for Publication

Dorothy Butchard

Writing articles can be overwhelming. Here are a few tips to save time and stay focused.

PHASE#1: Choosing the Topic

Unless you already have a specific topic you want to discuss, it can be very hard to choose. Here's my advice:

- ❖ **Write fresh, if it suits you.** In my experience, it can be useful to write an article closely related to your PhD, but not necessarily in the thesis – or at least not yet. Condensing a 12000-word chapter to a 4000-8000 word article might *sound* simple but it can be a very frustrating process. If you find this, try using an article deadline as motivation to finish a *new* piece of writing which will enhance progress on your thesis. This can also be a great way to repurpose ideas which will not make it into the final PhD.
- ❖ **Be targeted.** It helps to have a specific journal or book in mind. Pick a target journal and look at recently published articles, themes, editors' interests. Research the field to check your approach is original; you don't want to discover too late that a near-identical article already exists. Make sure the publication you choose has a thorough review process so you will get feedback on your article.
- ❖ **Speak at conferences.** Conferences are a fantastic way to try out new topics, gather reactions and feedback. You may encounter people who will want to publish your work in the future. There's also the possibility of special editions and books on related themes. Both my first two publications, a book chapter and a journal article, are results of conferences I'd spoken at quite early in my PhD.

PHASE#2: Getting it written

You have a fantastic topic, you know what you want to say, but there are any number of reasons you may drag your heels when it actually comes to writing it. A few points to remember:

- ❖ **Deadlines arrive sooner than you think.** Academic journals sometimes seem to work on a kind of prehistoric timescale. If you've found a suitable call for papers or have a deadline in mind, it may be 6 months away. Don't wait 5 months before starting work; give yourself time to write, edit and seek advice on your article. If you find it hard to concentrate, try writing in short bursts (using the *pomodoro* technique or a detailed writing plan).
- ❖ **Good articles take time, but it doesn't have to be perfect.** Your article will remain in the public domain, with your name on it, for the foreseeable future. You should feel confident about its quality, and this usually takes time and effort to achieve. On the other hand, remember it doesn't have to be an utterly flawless masterpiece. It will go through a review process and you'll have several chances to reconfigure minor aspects you are unhappy with.
- ❖ **Swapping drafts is invaluable.** The process of swapping drafts with friends and colleagues was one of the most important things I discovered at EdJoWriWe 2013. Your peers' opinions can be extremely helpful when developing your

“Leonardo, by virtue of his genius, started many things and didn't complete any of them.” – Giorgio Vasari, *Lives of the Artists*

writing. Equally, reading and commenting on someone else's work helps clarify your own habits and errors.

- ❖ **Fear is the enemy!** Unless you're gifted with supreme self-confidence, the publication process can seem overwhelming. The first time I submitted an article, I dreaded the prospect of receiving anonymous criticism from expert reviewers. This anxiety slowed me down, I over-edited, and added unnecessary new material. It's only in retrospect I realise these were elaborate delay tactics. Be confident, work hard, and recognise when your article is good to go.

PHASE#3: Formatting and bibliography

The world of academic publishing is a fiendish maze of *very slightly* different requirements for formatting, citations, footnotes, etc. If you have a publication in mind, check their guidelines before you start. If you don't, there are ways to make alterations easier:

- ❖ **Use citation software (but wisely).** I swear by Zotero; others use Mendeley or EndNote. These systems automate the process of adding citations and creating a bibliography. Bear in mind, however, that they are only as good as the information you enter, so make sure all fields are completed, with accurate information. My all-time favourite error in a bibliography was a letter written by Virginia Woolf, cited as 'Email. 1922'. Be thorough, and always double-check.
- ❖ **Use formatting styles in your word-processing software.** It's possible to set a distinct style for paragraphs, headings etc. – most word processors do this automatically. You can then modify the styles of your whole document with one setting. This can be a godsend when reformatting further down the line.

PHASE#4: Saying goodbye (and hello again)

Once you've sent your article off, you might wait a long, *long* time to receive feedback and editors' decisions. Don't be dispirited – it's not unusual to wait months for a response. Once you get news, it can be difficult to return to your article after a long break. But persevere, you're getting there!

- ❖ **Rejected / Resubmit.** Hopefully the reviewers' feedback will be constructive. Use the advice to rewrite and send it off to another publication, or to resubmit if you've been invited to. If comments are dispiriting or unhelpful, send the article to your supervisor and fellow researchers for advice. This is a learning experience and your next article will be much, much better for it.
- ❖ **Substantive / Major Revisions.** In many ways this is ideal for an early-career article. It usually means an expert sees potential, but has taken time to suggest ways to improve. Occasionally, you may disagree with comments, or reviewers may conflict. In this case, contacting the editor(s) to explain your case can resolve the problem, though it's advisable to get advice from others first.
- ❖ **Minor Revisions / Accept.** Congratulations! But check carefully before your final submission – reviewers don't always catch minor errors.

Although the publication process can be daunting, it's also tremendously rewarding in the end. Here's to seeing your name in print, very soon.

“Write. Rewrite. When not writing or rewriting, read. I know of no shortcuts.” –
Larry L. King

On Handling Rejection

Yanbing Er

Having served on the editorial side of a postgraduate journal for close to a year now, I must admit that I hadn't given much thought to our process of rejecting an article. *FORUM* is highly regarded among existing postgraduate academic journals, and we typically receive a large number of submissions with each themed issue. This means that after going through a rigorous peer review process by postgraduates in the School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures, only a select few articles will be chosen for publication. Since the *FORUM* co-editors make sure that all feedback we relay is helpful and friendly, however, every author will receive extensive recommendations and get the chance to resubmit their articles elsewhere. Or at least, that's what I've been telling my slightly deflated self whenever the time comes to send out yet another host of rejection emails... Of course, the sentiment is rather different when you're on the receiving end of such feedback. We all know that we must face rejection (hopefully not too often!) during the course of our careers as academics, but this anticipation doesn't make it any easier to bear. As writers we are often too attached to our words, and I'm sure I speak for many of my colleagues as well as myself that it can sometimes be difficult to take critique – however constructive – into consideration.

For me, it's been an oddly reversed journey working into my first publication: I've been privy to the inside workings of an academic journal even before submitting an article to one. This, at first glance, is seemingly counterintuitive, but has in fact helped to address many of my concerns in working up the courage to put my work 'out there'. The fear of rejection is (and will always be, I think!) a looming presence for me, but it's been greatly assuaged by treating the entire process as a rewarding experience rather than a daunting challenge. Being extensively involved in refining someone else's article and overseeing its development into a publishable form in *FORUM* has taught me that rethinking my own work with the help of other critical perspectives is never a bad thing. Since I know the amount of time that goes into a fair and comprehensive peer review process, I'm a lot more patient with waiting for feedback. And since I'm aware of just how much effort peer reviewers (and oftentimes these are busy academics) put into suggesting improvements for an article, I'm also a lot more appreciative of said feedback, and willing to rework my writing for the better. Subjecting my work to close scrutiny will probably always be a slightly scary process, but remembering these lessons as I step down as co-editor of *FORUM* next semester should make it far easier as I continue to develop my publications strategy in the future.

“We are all apprentices in a craft where no one ever becomes a master.” – Ernest Hemingway

On Coping with Criticism

Sarah Bernstein

Some of the best advice I've been given about writing is 'Don't be so precious', by which was meant, I think, that I ought to learn to let go. It's difficult, particularly when you're writing a PhD and it feels at times as though your work is all you are. I've spent hours tuning a single sentence only to have my supervisor pencil in a tiny question mark beside it in the margins. Sometimes it feels like a tiny question mark is enough to kill a person.

But, you know, it won't.

So, let's say you've submitted your first article. When you finally get a response, you find out you're being asked to make revisions. You read through the reviewers' reports quickly, with your eyes half-shut, and see that some of the feedback seems, right away, as though it's going to be useful. So, good. But some of the feedback, you find, is making you bristle. The reviewers seem to you to have missed the point, or they seem to be trying to make your essay about something else, or they've suggested you consult material on what seems like a completely different topic. How do you deal with this? You want to get published, but you're not sure you can make the necessary revisions. You're not sure you even want to.

At this point, I've found it useful to put the feedback very far away and do something else. Eat a sandwich. Go for a walk. Feverishly clean your whole flat. Take some time to think over the readers' reports before actually sitting down to revise.

I've been told the bristle is normal. It's good to remember, though, that the reviewers are trying to be constructive. Having served on *Forum's* editorial board, I know how much work goes into the peer-review process and how much careful consideration goes into making a decision on a manuscript. Reviewers also have a certain critical distance, which is important. Sometimes I've worked so closely on a piece of writing that it's difficult for me to identify problems that would be obvious to anyone else. So a second look is always going to be useful. When you come back to revise your piece, try to figure out where the reviewers are coming from. Perhaps they've missed the point because you haven't clearly stated your point. Maybe the material they've suggested you consult deserves a look, at least. Try to keep in mind that the feedback isn't an evaluation of your personal qualities or your merit as an academic. We can become very protective of our own work, but it's important to remember to keep some critical distance.

"And don't you know, that you don't have to be afraid of words?" – Luigi Pirandello, I giganti della montagna / Giants of the Mountain

Two in the Ivory Tower: The Advantages of Collaborative Academic Writing

Dr Lisa Surridge & Dr Mary Elizabeth Leighton

We are sitting in Lisa's office on Easter Monday, eating salad and apples, drinking tea, laughing a lot, and writing a conference paper as well as the short treatise on collaboration that you are now reading.

Lisa has her feet on the desk. Mary is typing.

We are using two screens: the little one on Lisa's Mac laptop and the big one that we bought with our research grant when we realized that our collaborative writing practice was here to stay, despite doubts expressed by past department chairs (who cautioned Mary against throwing out the model of the lone academic before she had achieved tenure and promotion) and colleagues (who may suspect that we are not very productive, given the peals of laughter that emanate from Lisa's office whenever we are writing together).

We started collaborating almost by accident. It was May 2004. Lisa had been invited to contribute an article on a Victorian animal for an essay collection. We were sitting in a Toronto auditorium waiting for Toni Morrison to get an honorary degree. To pass the time, Lisa (in a gesture of collaboration – or flagrant opportunism) asked surrounding Victorianists which animal they considered the most interesting for such an article. Someone answered, 'the crocodile'. Before the end of the day, we had decided that writing a crocodile article together would be more fun than any of our individually planned projects for the summer – and besides, we had a guarantee of publication. We went daily to the library, sitting side by side in the stacks, hunting through *Punch* from 1841 to 1900 in search of crocodiles. Over the summer, we learned that we shared research priorities, moving from data to hypothesis rather than the other way around, as we had realized that many colleagues tended to do. We also found common ground in our love of meticulous digging to unearth the background (political, cultural, historical) of the various crocodile images that we found. In addition to these similar research methods, we found that we enjoyed and benefited from working side by side. We were energized by each other's questions, which weren't always the same as our own, and we learned from each other's unexpected observations.

That summer, the university's dominant model of research alone in the ivory tower ceded for us to something more like a graduate seminar, in which one's best work is pushed forward by the questions of one's colleagues. Many of us take for granted that we will lose this rich collaborative atmosphere once we complete our graduate coursework and launch into solo dissertation research and writing. However, both of us had personal experience of previous collaborations, Mary with a group of fellow graduate students who had co-edited a special issue of a journal and with a co-author on a journal article, and Lisa with her co-editor and slightly senior colleague, Richard Nemesvari, of Broadview Press's edition of *Aurora Floyd*. We decided by the end of

“There's a reason every book, even one that isn't very serious, is shaped like a suitcase.” – Sergei Dovlatov

the summer to co-edit an anthology of Victorian non-fiction prose; a few years later, we undertook a co-authored book on Victorian illustrated serial fiction (now nearing completion); and we also co-edit (along with a larger collaborative team) *Victorian Review*, Canada's only interdisciplinary journal of Victorian studies. Our teamwork has brought us productivity, academic success, interpersonal support – and a great deal of pleasure and (dare we say it?) fun.

In what follows, we'll try to answer questions you might be thinking about as you consider whether collaboration might work for you.

Why collaborate?

If you find academic writing painful and anxiety producing, you might consider collaboration as a solution. We have both found that working together alleviates writer's block and prevents us from procrastination in which we might otherwise engage. Obviously, this positive effect depends on your personalities and how you react to one another. We cultivate a relaxed and supportive writing space in which we feel able to complete each other's sentences, question each other's ideas, and ask bluntly, 'Do we know what we're talking about?' We make writing together fun. Our collaboration has buoyed us through difficult times: we both have children; we both juggle family demands and work; we have carried on collaborating through Lisa's father's death from cancer and Mary's maternity leaves. Collaboration involves accepting each other's limits, even as it helps us to surpass those limits.

What does collaboration look like in practice?

We choose to write in the same office, on the same computer, with one of us typing and the other commenting. However, there are very different models of collaboration. Lisa edited her Broadview edition with Richard in the very earliest days of email, spanning 3000 miles between Victoria and Antigonish, Nova Scotia (on the other coast of Canada). They divide their work strategically, with Richard tracking down editions of *Aurora Floyd* in the British Library while Lisa drafted footnotes in Victoria and looked after her very young son, then newly in daycare. Mary co-authored a special issue introduction and a journal article by round robin, with each collaborator contributing certain paragraphs and everyone involved in final editing. The main point is to work out ahead of time what your game plan is and how it will benefit all of you. You also need to be honest if and when you feel that an undue burden has fallen upon one party.

With whom might you collaborate?

Our experience of collaboration suggests that successful co-authors should have shared values on standards of writing and research, but that they may bring very different skills and backgrounds to the table. A team in which authors do not have the same standards can never succeed; however, a team in which people have

"I think perhaps the most important problem is that we are trying to understand the fundamental workings of the universe via a language devised for telling one another where the best fruit is." – Terry Pratchett

different skill sets may be ideal. The model of science collaboration suggests the benefits of different skill sets among members of a research team, and we find that this applies to humanities collaboration as well. When we started work on our book, Mary had considerably more knowledge of book history than Lisa, and Lisa had a single-authored book under her belt. When Lisa started collaborating with Richard, he had an edition of Hardy's *The Trumpet Major* out with Oxford UP; she knew a lot about sensation fiction but had never produced a scholarly edition. As these combinations suggest, you can benefit from difference and challenge in a collaborative team. You also need the ability to be frank about what you do and do not know.

Disadvantages

While research grants are now shifting to promote collaboration and interdisciplinary research, and while social scientists and scientists generally work and publish in collaborative paradigms, our collaboration, which started over a decade ago, initially did not fit a recognizable model for successful humanities scholars. In our experience, therefore, the main disadvantage of collaboration has been the numerical devaluing of our work by humanities chairs and deans, for whom the single-author model remains predominant; for salary assessment purposes, they tend to count each of our scholarly works as half a work, which seems fair until you realize that our colleagues in social science endure no such chopping and dividing. In addition, Mary had to be very strategic in her tenure and promotion application to ensure that assessors would welcome her participation in a collaborative team and not see it as evidence of shirking work. Since Lisa became a full professor fairly early in our collaboration, she bore less risk.

Advantages

A journalist who observed our collaboration jokingly called it a 'Vulcan mind meld'. While it may strike others as odd to sit in a room together, pressing one another's ideas, launching possible sentences, and laughing at one another's typographical errors, we have found that we have together surpassed what we could have attained individually. For both of us, publishing an article in *Victorian Studies* had been a career-long goal; in fact, Lisa had long joked that if she succeeded in doing so, she would take early retirement immediately because she would have no career goals left. Our 2008 *Victorian Studies* article on text-image relations in mid-Victorian illustrated serial fiction therefore marked a rubicon for both of us: we had each submitted single-authored articles to that journal prior to our collaboration, but had been refused. Collaboration not only gave us an intellectual edge, but gave us the nerve to revise and resubmit where previously we had shelved our single-authored articles instead of taking up the journal's invitations to revise them. We were brighter and braver as a team.

“So long as I remain alive and well I shall continue to feel strongly about prose style, to love the surface of the earth, and to take a pleasure in solid objects and scraps of useless information. It is no use trying to suppress that side of myself. The job is to reconcile my ingrained likes and dislikes with the essentially public, non-individual activities that this age forces on all of us.” – George Orwell, *Why I Write*

What can collaboration do to your writing practice?

Nothing – or everything. It all depends. If you flourish in isolation and love the silent convent of your thoughts, then forget about it. If, however, you find academic writing isolating, frustrating, or depressing, then you might consider what teamwork could bring to your career. Do you welcome challenge as a form of collaboration? Do questions stimulate your thoughts? Do you work better when you laugh? If the answer to any of these questions is yes, then you might contemplate what form collaboration could take in your research or teaching life.

What can non-collaborators learn from collaborative writing practices?

As research has shown, peer editing makes us better writers. You do not have to write together to benefit from another person's eyes and insights. Indeed, we view our participation in this year's EdJoWriWe as a form of collaboration with you all. We hope that you will take away from our workshops self-knowledge about what helps you to write well, a willingness to ask for help when you need it, and an openness to offering help to your fellow academic writers.

“If the real world were a book, it would never find a publisher. Overlong, detailed to the point of distraction – and ultimately, without a major resolution.” – Jasper Fforde, *Something Rotten*

The Team

Lead organisers:

Georgina Barker is writing her PhD on ‘Reception of Classical Antiquity in Post-1953 Russian Poetry’, and is amazed that she still has not been forced to choose between Russian and Latin, which she studied at Worcester College, Oxford. The Wolfson Foundation generously supports her research, and doesn't seem to mind when she spends her time organising things like this instead. Having astounded herself with her productivity at EdJoWriWe last year, she hopes EdJoWriWe 2015 will work similar wonders. Her Red Lored Amazon parrot Rosie upstages her frequently.

Barbara Tesio completed an MSc in Comparative Literature at the University of Edinburgh, and is now continuing her academic career by pursuing a PhD in Scandinavian Studies at the same institution under the supervision of Dr Bjarne Thorup Thomsen. Bilingual in Italian and Danish, she has always been interested in different languages and cultures. Her research concerns Karen Blixen's works, with a particular focus on the relationship between language, displacement and identity.

Co-organisers:

Laura Beattie recently completed an MA in English Studies at the Freie Universität Berlin and, having returned to Scotland, is now working on a PhD at Edinburgh dealing with utopianism in Shakespeare's plays. She did her undergraduate at St Andrews in English and Latin, which led to her interest in the early modern period because it allows her to happily combine the two. She is very excited to be involved in LLC Writes and looking forward to EdJoWriWe 2015.

Olivia Ferguson is writing her PhD on caricature and Romanticism, under the supervision of Dr Tom Mole. She works as an admin assistant at the Centre for the History of the Book. Before moving to Edinburgh, she completed degrees at McGill University and the University of Victoria. Her research is supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) and the Wolfson Foundation.

“I cannot, when I write, think always of myself and what is elegant and charming in femininity; it is not on these terms or with such ideas, that I took pen in hand.” –
Charlotte Brontë

Writing workshop leaders:

Mary Elizabeth Leighton and **Lisa Surridge** both serve on faculty in the Department of English at the University of Victoria, Canada. Lisa Surridge is the author of *Bleak Houses: Marital Violence in Victorian Fiction* and co-editor of *Aurora Floyd* (Broadview 1998). Her work appears in *Victorian Literature and Culture*, *Dickens Studies Annual*, *Victorians Institute Journal*, *Women's Writing*, *University of Toronto Quarterly*, *Victorian Review*, *Brontë Society Transactions*, *Victorian Newsletter*, and *Carlyle Studies Annual*. Mary Elizabeth Leighton's work has appeared in *Victorian Periodicals Review*, *Notes and Queries*, *Topia: Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies*, *Excavatio: International Review of Zola and Naturalism*, and *Essays on Canadian Writing*. Together, they are co-editors of *The Broadview Anthology of Victorian Prose 1832-1900* (2012) and of *Victorian Review*, Canada's only Victorian-studies journal. They are currently co-writing a book on illustrated serial fiction. Their jointly authored work appears in *Victorian Studies*, *Victorians Periodicals Review*, *The Blackwell Companion to Sensation Fiction*, *The Cambridge Companion to Sensation Fiction*, *Victorian Literature and Culture*, *New Readings in Victorian Illustration*, and *Dickens in Context*. They have appeared on panels and run workshops concerning academic publication at VISAWUS, NAVSA, and VSAWC conferences.

Contact

You may contact EdJoWriWe's lead organisers via its email address: edjowriwe@gmail.com, or in person in 19 George Square during EdJoWriWe (please try to find George or Barbara before resorting to disturbing Laura or Olivia).

You can also interact with EdJoWriWe via Twitter @edjowriwe (<http://www.twitter.com/edjowriwe>) and through its blog (<http://edjowriwe.weebly.com/blog.html>).

We will be asking for contributions to the blog through the week – not only an excellent opportunity to hone your writing skills, but also qualifying for the 'Other Writing' section of your academic publications C.V.!

“For the first time in her life Granny wondered whether there might be something important in all these books people were setting such store by these days, although she was opposed to books on strict moral grounds, since she had heard that many of them were written by dead people and therefore it stood to reason reading them would be as bad as necromancy.” – Terry Pratchett, *Equal Rites*

Further Reading...

...naturally

Writing for Academic Journals

- ❖ *Writing for Academic Journals* (2009), Rowena Murray.
http://dutmoodle.dut.ac.za/moodle/pluginfile.php/35793/mod_resource/content/1/Murray_2005_-_Writing_for_academic_journals.pdf
 Murray's handbook is a comprehensive guide to writing for academic journals, including advice for dealing with particular problems: turgid writing, procrastination, and the fear that 'I haven't done any research'.
- ❖ *Writing your Journal Article in Twelve Weeks: A Guide to Academic Publishing Success* (2009), Wendy L. Belcher.
 A highly methodical guide to planning, revising, and submitting an article in twelve weeks. You'll probably want to pick and choose from it, adapting the suggestions to your own schedule; for example, Belcher leaves 'Reviewing the Related Literature' until Week Five.

Writing a Dissertation

- ❖ *Writing your Dissertation in Fifteen Minutes a Day: A Guide to Starting, Revising, and Finishing your Doctoral Thesis* (1998), Joan Bolker.
 Now a classic, this guide puts continuous writing at the centre of the research process. Bolker gives advice on freewriting, working with daily writing goals, and how to create a 'writing addiction'.

Style

- ❖ *MLA Style Manual and Guide to Scholarly Publishing* (3rd ed., 2008), Modern Language Association of America.
 Looks dull, but it's more than a primer on citation formatting. The *MLA Style Manual* advises on submitting manuscripts to publishers, dealing with legal issues surrounding publication... and of course the inevitable tricky citation.
- ❖ *Stylish Academic Writing* (2012), Helen Sword.
 Sword's animated prose is an antidote to the stodge and jargon that tend to infect academic writing. And she's done her research too: the book's based on her analysis of books and articles over one hundred exemplary writers recommended to her by their peers.

“The greatest part of a writer's time is spent in reading, in order to write; a man will turn over half a library to make one book.” – Samuel Johnson

The Academic Conversation

- ❖ *They Say / I Say: The Moves That Matter in Academic Writing* (2nd ed., 2009), Cathy Birkenstein and Gerald Graff.

http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic862425.files/They_Say_I_Say.pdf

A short common-sense guide to presenting your ideas as part of a broader academic conversation. Includes ‘Templates for Agreeing and Disagreeing Simultaneously’.

‘To make an impact as a writer, you need to do more than make statements that are logical, well supported, and consistent. You must also find a way of entering a conversation with others’ views – with something ‘they say.’

- ❖ ‘Why is Academic Writing So Academic?’ (20 February 2014), Joshua Rothman for *The New Yorker*. <http://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/why-is-academic-writing-so-academic>

Joshua Rothman’s thought-provoking take on the ‘ambiguous mission’ of academic writing.

‘Academic prose is, ideally, impersonal, written by one disinterested mind for other equally disinterested minds. But, because it’s intended for a very small audience of hyper-knowledgeable, mutually acquainted specialists, it’s actually among the most personal writing there is. If journalists sound friendly, that’s because they’re writing for strangers. With academics, it’s the reverse.’

“Whilst strolling in the mountains I came across a host of multicoloured stones.
 This one was rolling around in the dirt, I sniffed out that one under the earth.
 This one beguiled me with its shape, I liked the colour of that one.
 I toss them all into my sack, and drag it along behind me.
 Perhaps, later, in the valley, their shine and colour will fall away,
 In the morning light they will melt into a heap of cobblestones,
 For it is easy to make mistakes, when wandering waist-deep in clouds.
 All the same, I hope that when I strew them out in the taberna,
 A plebeian will say: ‘How bright!’, and a connoisseur: ‘How rare.’” – Elena Shvarts,
Kinfia (trans. Georgina Barker)