1 Introduction

This book looks at editing and publishing programmes in higher education as a specific sector that yields important insights with broader applicability. In particular, it investigates how effectively such programmes prepare graduates for industry and how well these graduates translate this instruction in the workplace. Such an enquiry throws light on a key challenge facing all educators working in practice-based subjects: the need to negotiate tensions between past and present and provide training that prepares students for fast-changing conditions while also conveying long-standing principles. As Albers and Flanagan (2019, p. 3) observe, 'the quality of the courses determines how well students adjust to editing in the workplace and how much time practitioners need to invest in training new employees'. To gauge the state of the discipline, this book takes an international perspective; programmes and their graduates in the following countries were approached to contribute: Australia, Canada, England, Germany, India, New Zealand, Scotland, South Africa and the United States.

This study's research questions pertain to how educators have developed editorial pedagogy for the higher-education sector, particularly in response to ongoing digital disruption of the publishing industry:

- How effectively do the programmes negotiate theory and practice.
- How have students perceived these programmes to be suitable for, or even reflective of, contemporary practice.
- In what ways do these programmes prepare graduates for the workplace – that is, did graduates develop the requisite industry skills at university, and which did they develop 'on the job'.
- How do graduates believe these programmes can be improved, if necessary, to better prepare them for industry.

Nevertheless, this book recognises that it is unrealistic, even unreasonable, to perceive universities as a one-stop shop: 'no program [sic] can ever be agile enough to keep up with every new trend in industry' (Melonçon 2019, p. 179). This is particularly the case when technological developments tend to outpace educators' own skills acquisition and their administrative – as well as political – capacity to build these into established pedagogy. In

turn, it is vital that the publishing industry understands this reality: that administrative, financial and political capacity of universities complicates their appropriate response to market requirements and expectations. Ciofalo (1988, p. 4) was an early witness to such constraints or 'territorial tug of war' (Kruger 2007, p. 3):[1]

> The college needs to respond to industry representations concerning requisite skills and course configurations to prepare college graduates for careers in book publishing. And the industry needs to be realistic about the limitations, economic and pedagogical, of the college in meeting professional needs within a liberal arts format. There's a 'quid pro quo' here.

It remains necessary, however, to assess the effectiveness of university programmes as little research appears to have been undertaken, especially from students' perspectives. This paucity of research has been acknowledged by Chavan et al. (2014, p. 151):

> [S]tudents' perceptions of the quality of the educational services that they are receiving have deep psychological underpinnings and are more multidimensional in nature . . . to date, little is understood about students' perceptions of the quality of service that they are receiving, and how this influences not only the nature of the student experience, but also important marketing outcomes for the tertiary sector such as student satisfaction, recommendation and loyalty.

This book therefore intends to fill the research gap, and in so doing, three key concepts frame the enquiry: *being*, *learning* and *doing*. These

---

[1] According to Kruger (2007, p. 3), 'academia is trying to claim a discipline that has not traditionally been academic, while the publishing industry remains protective of a field that it feels can only be mastered adequately in the "real world"'.

transitioning but interdependent concepts have the potential to form a holistic practice-led pedagogy for students of editing and publishing programmes.

Being: An Editorial (and Publishing) Ontology

A study of literature published on pedagogy and editorial practice uncovers several common debates and dichotomies: the need for more distinct nomenclature to define editors and editorial practice, nature versus nurture and the requisite personal and professional attributes to be a 'good' editor. Such consideration is also applicable to publishing generally.

Nomenclature to Define Editors and Editorial Practice

This section on nomenclature concentrates on defining in more precise terms not *who* editors are – namely their ideal, assumed and/or true attributes (to be considered later in this 'Being' section) – but *what* they are and *how* they perform – that is, their editorial practice. The application of the term *nomenclature* here as a quantifying framework was inspired by Fretz (2017, p. 246), who insightfully explains that:

> unless a single person performs all functions in the publishing workflow, multiple people need to be involved in producing a book or journal. For these various people to share the same understanding of the editorial work involved, they need to be able to communicate their assumptions and expectations clearly to one another. Clear communication depends on shared nomenclature, clear definitions of the terms being used, and a common understanding of the tasks associated with those terms.

In industry, assumptions and expectations are expressed not only from top to bottom (such as from managing editor to in-house and/or freelance editors) but also interdepartmentally (including design, production, permissions, sales and marketing and distribution) and with external stakeholders (who are either freelance, such as proofreaders and indexers, or from offshore, such as typesetters and printers). For academia, according to

Haugen (1990, p. 323),[2] the terminologies of researchers, such as those that focus on composition, have been inconsistent not just among themselves but also with industry:

> Book publishers have been using the term editing for about 200 years, and as publishers began relinquishing editing duties to persons other than themselves, the terms editing and its associated, product-based terms migrated into the professional editing arena. These product-based terms, certainly handy and ready to use, at the same time lacked the kinds of precision researchers would prefer. Some researchers, struggling with these problems, coined their own terms for what they were describing: recasting, reseeing, reconceiving. As a result, these various terms, both the old ones and the new ones, have been used inconsistently from study to study, and sometimes even within the same study.

Flanagan (2019, p. 20) has similarly witnessed the inconsistency more recently among technical communicators: 'They seem to agree that editing is a process, but the process may be defined in terms of technology, rhetoric, actors, activities, and/or disciplines'. Such inconsistencies and lack of standardisation have hindered educators' capacity to connect theory and practice – this is in evidence today, albeit to a lesser extent than that demonstrated by Haugen (1990). This conclusion also points to a paucity of research into editing courses themselves, particularly specialised editing (Albers and Flanagan 2019, p. 2). The nomenclature therefore produced next constitutes the shared vocabulary and editorial understanding for this study – it seeks to connect industry with academia.

[2] Haugen's observations form part of a long-standing critique: years earlier, Ciofalo (1988, p. 3) observed, and advocated, the following: 'Too often higher education for the professions is undertaken with little dialogue exchanged between the institution and the industry it purports to service. Instead, there should be a deep and meaningful connection'.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*) defines *editor*, in the second instance,[3] as '[a] person who prepares an edition of written work by one or more authors for publication, by selecting and arranging the contents, adding commentary'. The term *editor* appears therefore to be derived literally from *edition*, which is defined as 'one of the forms in which a work is published and issued at one point in time' (Hall 2013, p. 180). This definition of *editor* for the modern context, however, pertains particularly to scholarly editors who prepare critical editions of, for example, classical, historical and literary texts. Greenberg (2018, p. 184) observes that scholarly editing is 'sometimes described as . . . post-publication editing' (see also Kruger 2007, p. 6).

For the publishing industry, the *OED*'s third entry is relevant, though complex in nature: 'a person who edits written material for publication or use; one who selects, assesses, or commissions material for publication or broadcast'. The *OED*'s third entry is complex in nature because it refers to two types, or occupations, of editor: the second half of the entry relates to commissioning or developmental editors who are 'responsible for coming up with marketable ideas and matching them to good authors' (Clark and Phillips 2019, p. 156), and the first to copy editors who 'edit copy for printing' – that is, manuscripts. Manuscript editors are often also termed copy editors, line editors or desk editors (Poland 2007, p. 100). Hall (2013, p. 180) insightfully observes the key difference between commissioning and manuscript editors: '[Editorial] tasks can essentially crystalize [sic] around two core functions: first that of commissioning – the "what" of writing; and second that of correcting, smoothing, and rewriting text – the "how" of writing'. Hence, the *how* of editorial practice embodies the central focus of this book.

The *how* does not comprise only 'correcting, smoothing and rewriting', however. The fundamentals, as itemised by Butcher et al. (2006, pp. 1–2) and consistent with practising editors' reality, consist of substantive editing (improving 'the overall coverage and presentation

---

[3] The first definition, 'a publisher of a book', is identified as obsolete.

of a piece of writing, its content, scope, length, level and organization'), 'detailed editing for sense' (not just clarity and concision of language but also fact-checking for accuracy), 'checking for consistency' (which can also be identified during the substantive edit) and providing 'clear presentation of the material for the typesetter' (such as the correct placement of photographs, tables and content to be inserted into margins). Interestingly, Einsohn (2011b, p. 11) stipulates the activities that manuscript editors are not expected to perform: ghost-writing, developmental editing, proofreading and designing publications. Manuscript editors collaborate with numerous stakeholders, such as authors, publishers, designers, typesetters, illustrators, production, permissions and freelance proofreaders and indexers, to bring titles to fruition, either in print or online; the demarcation between these stakeholders in the twenty-first-century publishing house is very distinct. As Poland (2007, pp. 101–102) explains, 'editors undertake three main tasks: structural editing, copy-editing and reviewing proof corrections. Together with book design, and production, these editorial processes may be regarded as key steps in a value-adding chain'.

The manner in which the fundamentals are executed is typically determined by both the sectors in which editors work and the manuscript copy itself. Ileene Smith related in her interview with Greenberg (2015, p. 50) her transition from a university publisher to the trade press Farrar, Straus and Giroux (FSG):

> It was also highly procedural, and that took some getting used to. In a university press there are publications committees and acquisitions panels and all kinds of things like that, which were new to me. There were sometimes very good things that resulted from these procedures but university presses don't tend to be as editorially driven as trade presses. This house – FSG – is very, very editorially driven.

In terms of content, for example, editors in the educational publishing industry tend to project, manage and/or edit highly complex and illustrative manuscripts, frequently written by multi-author teams and according to

specific curricula. The complexity of editing these manuscripts is exacerbated by manuscript length; for example, tertiary texts often comprise 800–1,000 pages once typeset (Donoughue 2007, p. 212). Typical editorial responsibilities include completing manuscript appraisals to assess the structure, content and presentation of unedited manuscripts (substantive editing); ensuring page extent, budgets and schedules are maintained; editing and styling manuscripts on-screen (copy-editing for spelling, grammar, punctuation, style, consistency and accuracy); compiling artwork and permissions lists and editing artwork and photographic and text briefs; approving commissioned artwork; liaising with publishers, permissions, production, in-house editors and managing editors, authors and freelance proofreaders and indexers; marking up (i.e. correcting or annotating) typeset pages by hand or, most often, on-screen (Hargrave 2014, p. 213); and amalgamating the corrections of authors, publishers and proofreaders into an editorial master set to be forwarded to production. This inventory reveals the diverse administrative tasks that editors in the educational publishing industry are required to complete, in addition to the manuscript edit.

The present reality, particularly for in-house editors, is that the 'percentage of the workday spent on [editing] has greatly decreased' (Albers and Flanagan 2019, p. 3) because of the twenty-first-century gig economy's preference for hiring contract and freelance staff to limit project costs. Nevertheless, all editors are expected to perform these tasks whenever necessary and more according to the digital environment in which they work, with minimal supervision and financial outlay. According to Karen Lee (2019, p. 17), chief executive officer of the Institute of Professional Editors (IPEd), the national professional association for Australian editors:

> The editors of tomorrow will be digitally savvy communication consultants, coders, teachers, mentors and advocates for accessibility and inclusivity. Novels, textbooks, government reports, corporate documents, self-published books, scripts, social media, mainstream media, websites, apps, blogs, marketing materials and more – editors' skills will make them shine.

Nature versus Nurture

Einsohn (2004, 2011a) has regularly asked the questions: 'Are Editors Born or Made?' Are aspiring editors born with the necessary drive and aptitude to become competent editors and succeed in the publishing industry (or any other industry where they are able to use their editorial expertise)?[4] That is, are drive and aptitude innate to the self, or can they also be formally cultivated, with all individuals obtaining similar levels of proficiency? Einsohn (2011a, p. 1) uses the terms *native talent* and *teachability* when considering the two states and concludes that ability can be taught but cannot be achieved for every individual who seeks to be an editor: 'No scientist has identified an editorial gene, and we have no documented reports of the muse Redactia visiting babies in their bassinets. Yet some people do seem better suited to editorial work than others'. Einsohn's conclusions agree with those previously given by Upton and Maner (1997, p. 2): 'Many [editorial attributes] can be enhanced and developed by training and experience, but a good editor will come to his or her profession with the kernel of these skills present and will build upon innate abilities'; as well as by Targ (1985, pp. 13–14): 'A working, qualified editor of books must read. He must have read from the earliest days of his childhood. His reading must be unceasing. The lust for printed matter is a biological thing, a visceral and intellectual necessity; the urge must be in the genes'. Indeed, for Targ, becoming an editor amounts to a 'calling' (p. 3) – it is more than an occupation but an editor's 'fate' (p. 20).

Nevertheless, Einsohn (2011a, p. 3) cautions with the caveat that the romantic 'love to read' sentiment is not a sufficient innate prerequisite that leads naturally to becoming a capable editor. This sentiment does appear to be a consistent starting point though if one looks at the career profiles of established professionals published in industry journals. For Australian editor and fiction writer Glenys Osborne (2009, p. 14), '[It] started with

---

[4] Albers and Flanagan (2019, p. 11) believe the 'title of "editor" is highly endangered. Although the editor is disappearing from the corporate workspace, the editing still happens. Each writer becomes a writer/editor working with the other members of their group. Or they work as a writer on one project and are charged with editing another'.

a book . . . The sensation of connecting with another's experience affected me profoundly. I think that's where I became both a passionate reader and a try-hard, would-be writer'. At sixteen, Osborne obtained her first position in the publishing industry as a proofreader's assistant. Robert Watkins (2013, p. 11), who climbed from account manager to head of literary and head of illustrated at Hachette Australia Books, narrated his precocious beginnings in a similarly nostalgic fashion: 'Ever since I was a young boy I could always be found with a book in hand. So it made sense, at the age of 16, to apply for a job at a bookstore'. Returning to Einsohn's (2011a) caveat, it seems that although an innate 'calling' is not a prerequisite, the innate drive to be an editor is without doubt beneficial as success within the profession requires stamina to respond to, and survive, editing's highly meticulous, administrative albeit rewarding nature.

Attributes of a 'Good' Editor

People have enumerated, and judged, the attributes of a 'good' editor for hundreds of years with consistent agreement. In *Orthotypographia*, the first trade manual for editors and published in Leipzig in 1608, Hornschuch (1972, p. 8) determined that 'it [was] necessary for anyone wishing to perform this task to have a knowledge of both languages [that is, Latin and Greek]; in addition he must have extremely good eye-sight, which he needs not so much for smaller letters, but for reading precisely every syllable of every word, and indeed every letter' (see also Hargrave 2019, pp. 19–20). From the outset, therefore, editors were expected to be well read and educated, as well as unfailingly pedantic. Approximately seventy years later, in *Mechanick Exercises or, The doctrine of handy-works. Applied to the art of printing*, the first printer's manual published in English for the English print trade (Hargrave 2019, p. 19), Moxon (1683, pp. 260–261) echoed similar sentiments and supplemented the list: correctors 'should [be] well skilled in Languages', 'very knowing in Derivations and Etymologies of Words, very sagacious in *Pointing*, skilful in the *Compositors* whole Task and Obligation, and endowed with a quick eye to espy the smallest *Fault*' (emphasis in original). Editors were therefore expected to have expertise in not just etymology and spelling, grammar and punctuation (known as 'pointing'), but also in understanding, overseeing and correcting the typeset

page – the labour of typesetters (or 'compositors') and printers (Hargrave 2019, pp. 44–45).

Much more recently, Targ (1985, pp. 13–14) avowed the 'unceasing' importance of reading to editors, cultivated 'from the earliest days . . . of childhood'.[5] The well-known reasoning behind this is that future editors acquire knowledge of, and the aptitude to interrogate, texts' 'language, registers and . . . subtleties' (Kruger 2007, p. 3) through this lifelong experience. For Upton and Maner (1997, p. 2), editors 'must possess . . . sound knowledge of grammar and usage, flexibility, good judgement, and an eye for consistency and detail'. While admitting that 'only a handful of editors can truly be called "great"', Harnum's (2001, pp. 182–185), enumeration of 'the great editor' includes salesperson, financial realist, press and author advocate, optimist and joymonger. Butcher et al. (2006, p. 1) similarly perceive that a 'good copy-editor is a rare creature: an intelligent reader and a tactful and sensitive critic; someone who cares enough about perfection of detail to spend time checking small points of consistency in someone else's work but has the good judgement not to waste time or antagonize [sic] the author by making unnecessary changes'; adding to the list, Kruger (2007, p. 5) points to editors' ability to 'immerse oneself wholly in a text, to pay simultaneous attention to different textual aspects and levels'.[6] According to Einsohn (2011a, pp. 1–2), furthermore, the 'teachable novice' should also have attained an 'untiring and sharp eye, the ability to read at different speeds, and a good visual memory', a 'well-tuned ear', a 'solid sense of logic', '[editorial] clairvoyance' and 'computer skills', which are crucial for the twenty-first-century editor or, indeed, any

[5] Interestingly, Kruger (2007, p. 2) has found a more recent proponent of this 'traditional' ideology, South African publisher Arthur Atwell, who commented online in 2005 that '[good] editors are not made in editorial training courses. As children, good editors read voraciously, nurtured like great sportspeople from an early age. As a result they understand literary detail, subtlety, and the big picture both intuitively and explicitly, and they are ruthless critics of their own work'. See also Law and Kruger (2008, p. 480).

[6] I would counsel against total immersion, particularly for beginners, as maintaining a critical perspective is vital when appraising and correcting content.