



**IT'S 2007. DO YOU KNOW WHERE YOUR EDITOR IS?
Presented by the Text and Academic Authors Association**

KENNEALLY: – 2007. Do You Know Where Your Editor Is? If your editor is in this room, you might want to ask them to leave because we're going to be talking about editors, and it will not be pretty. It never is. Scratch an author, you find somebody who has a problem with his or her editor, and the publisher, and well, we can go on.

Before we get started, I'll just do a little plug for something and make you aware of why we're always trying to speak into these microphones. We are recording many, if not all, of these sessions as part of a project to be able to podcast the various programs on Beyond the Book. You can learn just a little bit about what podcasting is about if you don't already know and to find out what it might mean to you as an author. We do have a handout on podcasting, which is available outside at the handouts table, so I urge you to pick one of those up.

Why don't we just formally begin the program. Good afternoon. Welcome. This is the program called "It's 2007. Do You Know Where Your Editor Is?" My editor, at least for the program this afternoon, is Diane Feldman. My name is Chris Kenneally. I'm the director of author relations for Copyright Clearance Center and have had the opportunity to work with and present with Diane before and I always enjoy the opportunity. So welcome, Diane, and welcome to all of you.

We really do want to try to make this as much of a conversation as we possibly can, so there's no such thing as an interruption in that way. If you have a question immediately, please do just raise your hand or find an opportunity to ask us. For the sake of the recording, I will probably want to restate the question to be sure that everybody knows what it is, but apart from that, please feel free to offer us your input.

I'll just formally introduce Diane. Diane comes to us from Chapel Hill. She is the principal of AuthorCraft Editorial Services, which is online at authorcraft.net. She has been writing and editing professionally for over 20 years. She is currently at work on a project as co-author of a book on user interface design, which will be a

textbook for the computer sciences market, with Carla Merrill. Her extensive experience includes editing medical research manuscripts, scientific references and textbooks, software documentation, corporate procedures, sales communications and training. She is an associate fellow of the Society for Technical Communication and manages the electronic discussion list for the Carolinas chapter of the American Medical Writers Association. So, welcome Diane.

I guess the first place for us to go with all of this is I'm an expert, I'm a writer, why do I need an editor?

FELDMAN: It's precisely because you're an expert. Sometimes being an expert works against you in two major ways.

KENNEALLY: Just for the sake of people who didn't hear. So, as I say, I'm an expert. I know everything. Why do I need an editor?

FELDMAN: Being an expert works against you in two different ways. One is that you become too close to your material. It gets to the point where you don't even see the little errors and inconsistencies that slip in. You've read that text so many times that you substitute what you meant to say for what's actually there. Secondly, as an expert, you're sometimes not always totally in touch with what your audience knows or doesn't know about your topic. Even an editor who isn't a member of your audience at least knows that you've made a leap of logic here, and you don't always recognize that.

So an editor is sort of a reality check for you. They help to ensure that those inconsistencies and errors don't slip in and that unintended assumptions aren't made.

KENNEALLY: The reason I asked the question is one of the premises for this discussion today is that the role of the editor in publishing and many other aspects of media is diminishing. Corners are being cut and the electronic revolution has sped up the process of getting something into print or other kinds of publications, and often leaves us with little time for editing.

And I think part of what we want to try to advocate for is authors' understanding of what editing is about and why, if they don't have an editor, if they don't have an editor doing the kinds of things they want or need, it might be necessary to get an editor themselves.

FELDMAN: Right. This might be a good time to address the word editor. There are lots of different editors, as people in this room are intimately familiar. We're talking specifically about people who prepare text for publication here, not the acquisitions editor, not the journal editor, not all those other kinds of editors. People who prepare text and even, as you'll hopefully learn in this session, even within that sense of the word, there are many kinds of editing.

KENNEALLY: Why don't we move to that. Let's talk about the sorts of editing that you have experience with and that also people should be aware of could be available to them.

FELDMAN: Editors tend to categorize the tasks that they do into a number of categories. It might be four, it might be six, just depending on what you're looking at. Generally, I think of it as four broad categories.

One is often referred to as substantive editing, sometimes called developmental editing, sometimes called structural editing, where the editor is reviewing the organization and flow of the text looking to improve organization, fill in gaps, cut out extraneous material, clarify key points. It's generally something that's done early as a manuscript is in development.

Another phase or level of editing, as they're called, is copyediting, also a very broad category. It can include checking for errors in spelling and grammar and all of that sort of thing, certainly. Checking for inconsistencies of style and usage. Even in this category, you'll find many people define it in many ways, so as will be the theme of this session, you need to know how your editor defines what they're doing.

Another category is format editing where the focus is strictly on the appearance of the manuscript. What do the headings look like? Are there graduated levels of them? Are they consistently done? What do the figures and tables, how do they appear in the text? Are they consistently done? Numbered elements, pagination, that kind of stuff.

And lastly, there is proofreading, which generally refers to a final check of a completed manuscript before it's submitted to the printing process or to posting online. The focus here is on typos, punctuation, missing words, odd page breaks, things like that.

Why are these levels? Partly so that you, the author, and the editor can communicate about what's to be done. Partly because editors themselves focus on different aspects of a manuscript depending on which level they're working on. I always look for typos, but I look for them harder at different phases than at other phases because there's really no point in looking for typos in the substantive editing phase.

KENNEALLY: But does this all mean that every work is going to get at least four reviews if there are these four levels?

FELDMAN: No, but I think almost every work will get two, at least, because as an editor, it's very difficult to look at all of the things all at once. Yeah?

M: I wonder if I might go back to something you said in your introductory remarks about how you look in a global way to make sure that no undue assumptions are being made about the audience's knowledge base. This is something I'm struggling with and continue to maybe at too philosophical a level I should be. But it seems to me as we have more and more immigration, more and more school districts that have more and more students in them where English is not the first language, and even ignoring the readability part, but the whole notion of how much of context of the United States culture can be assumed. When we think about everyday interactions in our personal and business dealings, making reference to, and there's a way of telling a story (inaudible) and having to go back and explain, oh, by the way, if you're not from this country, you might need to have this or that or the other thing explained because you don't really know what this is about, in the same way that I wouldn't know what it's like in Bolivia to engage in the same kinds of interactions.

KENNEALLY: So you're asking about the assumptions that people are – you're sort of questioning the basis for making any assumptions.

FELDMAN: Well, it's difficult. On some level, you have to write for a person because you can't write for everybody, but not a person is going to read your book, so it's definitely a fine line. I think actually it's another reason to have a book edited or to have confidence in an editor. Editors kind of pay more attention to in their education and training and their conferences and so on, to issues that arise about audience targeting or about the kinds of language that are not understood by non-native English speakers and that sort of thing, things that you as the expert in your field aren't necessarily paying a lot of attention to.

KENNEALLY: And I would think that that is their responsibility. Your responsibility is certainly – I take Diane's point as a writer myself. Imagining who you're addressing is always a really critical thing, whether it's somebody that's a colleague, a peer, or whether it's a totally different sort of person. That's always critical. But the responsibility for the broader view really does lie with at least one of these various types of editors, or more.

FELDMAN: Right. And you have to have confidence in them, and if you don't, then maybe you need to get another editor.

I'm thinking, for example, about a – I edited a textbook on biomedical engineering a couple of years back, and there, the author specifically knew that he was going to have trouble hitting the target because he mostly taught to graduate students but the target for the book was not specialists. This was an initial book on biomedical engineering. They knew the engineering part but they didn't know the bio part. And I was repeatedly, in my editing, asking the question, are you confident that your audience will know what this term means? Constantly, because even though he was mindful of it, he was still using those terms anyway.

KENNEALLY: Sure, as a follow-up.

M: What if it's not a term? What if it is a very popular cultural reference? No matter what our subject matter, it seems to me – I suppose science and mathematics might be different, but anybody writing in humanities and social sciences may find it helpful to make popular cultural references just to help make analogies. They might be a popular television show or popular music. Again, where, if you were brought up in this country, there's a very high probability that you know the reference, and if you didn't, there's a high probability you don't.

FELDMAN: It's a very difficult area because on some level, if you don't include – if you take out every single thing like that, you end up with a pretty bland text. But if you indeed want to get through to your audience, you want to minimize that as much as possible or convey those things in ways that aren't culture-specific. It's tricky. I'm not denying it.

KENNEALLY: Can I ask you back, how have you addressed it yourself? Or does anyone have any feelings about this particular topic? Have you – any of the authors here – come up against this in your own work? You're breaking some new ground there with that.

M: I think they're just not fessing up.

(laughter)

FELDMAN: They don't want to be on the recording.

KENNEALLY: We'll continue the conversation then. Again, please, if you have any comments or questions, just join us.

Diane, one of the things that – and maybe I'll just turn a question out to the audience again. It's our sense that particularly with the electronic revolution, what is happening today is that work is submitted and then almost immediately turned into page proofs, and you've seen that happen in your own work.

FELDMAN: A friend of mine told me recently that he submitted his first draft to his publisher, expecting to get back an edited version where the editor had found those little discrepancies and queried about things they didn't understand, and what he got back was page proofs.

KENNEALLY: Is that an experience anyone here can relate to? Have you seen that in your own works? Are you finding the role of the editor is being maintained at the publishing house you work at, or work with, rather?

M: I've never had that happen.

KENNEALLY: You can imagine it happening, though.

M: But I have found over successive editions that the roles being played have changed a little bit, and it seems like it has been cut back, that for example, my developmental editor does less of that substantive stuff. Now, maybe it's because our titles are more mature and they don't need it because they're brilliant, but I doubt that.

It seems like we see it more in more different stages than we did – than we do now. And most of the real substantive editing is all done in the copyediting stage, it seems to me, and those earlier pieces (inaudible) so on. It's – I don't even see anything back, usually, anymore, in that initial stage where I will submit it to the developmental editor. It's disappointing to me because I want more levels, not less levels.

M: I just had a conversation with my acquisitions editor and my developmental editor last week on a new edition that we're going – a new series we're working on. And I was surprised. We were discussing reviews and (inaudible) reviewers, and I don't think my acquisitions editor or my developmental editor had read any of the chapters that were sent out to review. They were simply talking about what the reviewers said but without having read our work. And that was – I felt very frustrated that they were basing their entire opinion on what reviewers were saying without having looked at our material.

FELDMAN: It's my sense – I have very limited experience, so that's why I really want to know yours. But it's my sense that acquisitions editors do not think of themselves as developmental editors.

M: But this is the developmental editor (inaudible). The developmental editor (inaudible).

F: How often do you go straight from an acquisitions editor to the production editor without somebody (inaudible)?

FELDMAN: I can't speak to that. I don't know the answer.

KENNEALLY: Let's continue the discussion in here and talk about the need to communicate with editors. Why can't you make – we've been, I think, trying to open up some assumptions here for examination. There's an examination to be had with how the author's role with the editor needs to be worked out, and as early as possible.

FELDMAN: Well, that's just it. It seems pretty clear that the level of editing support that's provided by a publisher does vary a lot and is changing. So if you're embarking on this big writing project, you need to know what level of editorial support is going to be provided, so you need to ask your publisher what you can

expect in the way of editing. Are you going to get a copyedit? Are you going to get someone who's going to help you nurture your prose along? Are you even going to get someone who's going to check the commas, as my friend George discovered he did not, so that you can make the decision about whether you want to fill in those gaps yourself.

And you might have to be rather assertive about asking the questions because your main contact may not actually know what level of support is provided, or may give you a breezy answer without really giving you a substantive one. So in order to get the level of editing that you want, whether it's going to be from them or you provide it yourself, you want to get very, very specific about what it is they're going to provide.

KENNEALLY: So you really want to know what's planned for the book throughout its life as it's working its way toward publication.

FELDMAN: Right. That's why I've given as a handout on the tables the editing checklist. This is something I developed as part of a proposal for a book that I wanted to edit. I was pitching myself to be the editor of this book on a freelance basis, not from a publishing house. Based on what the client had told me about their project, I determined that these were the things that I wanted to do or that I thought should be done on the first pass through the book.

I also had another page that described what I would do in the second pass. Some of them were the same tasks. Some were different because it's a different focus. But the idea is – as you see, it's quite detailed, and when I had the second pass down there, it was even more detailed.

So I present this to you as a starting point for thinking about making up your own list of things that you want to know from your publisher. Is this going to get done? Is this going to get done? Is this going to get done? And if you want those things to be done, then you'll know – if they say, oh, no, we're not going to do that, then you know that you've got to find someone else who's going to provide those things. And the more detailed, the better.

KENNEALLY: Right. You're sort of looking for that editorial gap, if you will.

FELDMAN: Exactly.

KENNEALLY: When you talk about having it done yourself, what kinds of ways can you approach as an author getting that gap filled in?

FELDMAN: Every author does a great deal of editing themselves, of course, and some do more than others. I do a lot of editing for doctors who barely get anything on the page, much less do much editing of it. But others care a lot more about their prose and edit it a great deal.

In the end, though, I think you do need to plan for someone else to edit it, so you can do that in a number of ways. You can ask a colleague to do it. You can ask your spouse to do it. You can get a graduate student to do it. Or you can hire a professional editor.

KENNEALLY: Can we talk about some of the particular items on the editing checklist and the various categories? Why did you organize it this way and does it help people to think through what can seem like a really daunting task?

FELDMAN: I guess I largely went at it – I'll be totally frank about how I went at it. I stole it from an editing textbook, or an editing reference book. But, not stole it, but I used that as my springboard for making up my list. Because there are a lot of details and even an editor doesn't always think about all the things that they look for. But I organized it largely on the levels of edits. First, I'm going to look at structure and flow. Then I'm going to look at usability. I'm not looking at the words and the commas. I'm looking at how readable is this text. Does it all fit together? Things like that. And as you can see, it gets more into the fine details in the later categories. Are the figures and tables all the – use the same kind of language? Are they numbered properly? That sort of thing.

KENNEALLY: Some questions there, sure.

M: Given this fluid, somewhat (inaudible) editing thing, my wife and prepared a 15-page style guide that's customized to my book so that when the manuscript goes in or we have a new copyeditor, the production editor supplies them with this internal style guide that then guides them so we don't end up having to switch everything back and forth.

FELDMAN: That's a great idea, although I would talk to the publisher about it first because some publishers have their own and they don't want to use your style, so you need to be certain that they're going to abide by your style once you've determined it. And you have to have some confidence that your style is a credible, usable style, too.

M: Well, for instance, the geographical place names. The publisher completely overlooks diacritical marks. Our style guide will carry that. Or misuse of degree symbols, things that are standard in science practice. So nothing is proposed capitalization-wise or otherwise that violates the *Chicago Manual of Style*. But it's just specific guidelines I think they overlook.

FELDMAN: That's a very good point. Especially in specialized fields, there almost always are little quirks that you can't expect a general publisher to necessarily pay a lot of attention to.

KENNEALLY: Can I ask you if that's something you've just started doing recently or you've been doing throughout the life of these books?

M: No. Our first style guide was maybe ten years ago when I had to change back a copyedited material to be correct. They would change it the other way. So it just saves time to have a style guide that comes in with the manuscript.

FELDMAN: It's born of bitter experience.

KENNEALLY: Yes, Michael.

M: The publisher who has cut back on the level of editing, (inaudible) essentially copyediting, going to have any interest in discussing a grant to the author for hiring his own editor?

KENNEALLY: Just in case anybody didn't hear, because where you are is a fan, I think, the question really is whether or not a publisher who is not going to do much of a high-level edit going to grant some fee so that the author can go hire an editor?

FELDMAN: I wish somebody could – I can't speak to that, I'm afraid. I think it probably depends very much on the field. I edit a great deal of science and usually the authors of those books are granted – apart from the publisher. Their grant comes from NSF or something like that. And they do write the editing cost into that grant proposal. But I doubt very much that textbook publishers would be willing to do that. Although it certainly is something to talk about. I think that's an excellent point. And if you have any pull with your publisher, if they care about you, they may be perfectly willing to grant that to you. That's a great question. Does anyone have any experience with that?

KENNEALLY: That actually makes a good segue to going on the search for an editor. How does one go about finding somebody?

FELDMAN: It's not really easy to know. For example, that biomedical engineering text person hired me because I had posted signs on bulletin boards in the research buildings at Duke University. But I guess it's like any other service. Certainly check with colleagues to see what their experience has been and if they can recommend people. You can Google editorial services and find a great range of people and companies that provide editing services and at least start there by reviewing some of these sites and getting a feel for what kind of companies are out there and whether any of them particularly specialize in the kind of writing that you're doing or if they specialize in the particular audiences that you're dealing with. Or even if you just get a good feel for how that website is put together and who the people are involved.

KENNEALLY: But there are some things to watch out for there, obviously –

FELDMAN: There are.

KENNEALLY: – in a straight ahead Google search, right?

FELDMAN: For sure. As you know, it's like going to the Yellow Pages. And there are, I'm sorry to say, a lot of hacks out there. There are a lot of people, editors, who view their job as looking for the commas and the typos and turning things around as quickly as they can, and not to have a relationship with the author, and not nurturing your text. If you're simply looking for commas and typos, that's your person. But if you're looking for something else, you'll be very disappointed if you get that kind of editor. So you need to look carefully at their site to get a feel for whether they are that way and have a talk with them.

KENNEALLY: And somebody who is going to tell you how much it costs without seeing the manuscript is probably someone not to work with.

FELDMAN: Absolutely, yes. I was amazed. When I did a little Google on editorial services, I found that there were companies out there who are perfectly willing to quote a price based on how long the manuscript is without ever seeing how complex it is, how well-written it is. These are obviously people who are not going to be devoting a great deal of attention to the text. They're strictly going to get through it as quickly as they can doing the commas and the typos and that's all you're going to get.

M: (inaudible) spellcheck for me?

FELDMAN: Yeah, exactly. Again, if that's what you're after, that's great.

I want to go back briefly to ways to look for people. Googling is probably not the best way, but it will give you a feel for what's out there. There's a group called the Editorial Freelancers Association. That's probably a great place to look.

KENNEALLY: I think in the case of the Society for Technical Communication, you'll talk about them in just a moment, where they offer certification and training and so forth. Does EFA do likewise?

FELDMAN: I don't believe that they do.

KENNEALLY: But they at least document who these people are.

FELDMAN: They know who the people are. And the thing is that people don't join. It costs money to belong to these associations and it costs money to go to their meetings and so on, and the only people who do that are people who are serious about their professions, largely, is what it comes down to.

KENNEALLY: Explain who the STC is and what they do to train and certify their people.

FELDMAN: I'm an active member of that group. That's why I mentioned them. Mostly, they are technical writers, but a good many editors are active in that association as well. And once again, it's a question of their involvement. People who are just hack technical writers or just hack editors don't get themselves involved in an organization like that. So just by virtue of being involved, very often you can have some more confidence that these are people who take their professions seriously. And technical writers, I think, are particularly well-qualified to be editors because they've trained to communicate difficult material.

M: What's the name of that organization?

FELDMAN: The Society for Technical Communication.

KENNEALLY: Which I believe is at stc.org.

FELDMAN: Right. And when you go to stc.org, you can drill down to chapters in your area, and then you'll be steered to a site for the chapter in your area, and very often, you'll find resumes and whatnot of the editors who belong to that local chapter.

KENNEALLY: One of the things that – because it's the nature of the Internet – is that you may find that what seems to be the right editor for you is someone who lives on the other side of the country, and you've had some experience with editing at long distance. Talk about that and talk about if you're going to go down that road, how you should approach it, what are the things you should be careful about and so forth.

FELDMAN: It's entirely possible to have a long-distance editorial relationship, but there are things – that's complicated. It's, after all, a communication relationship, and so you've got to set up the communication to overcome the obstacles of that geographic distance.

My very favorite way to edit is sitting right there with my author and talking over the wonderful text together, but that doesn't always happen. I have wonderful clients who I have great relationships with who I've never met, who live in Europe, but you need – both of us have to be much more attentive to making sure that we're not making any assumptions, that we are taking extra pains about being clear and communicating with each other.

For example, I go to quite a bit of trouble with a long-distance client to specify exactly where in the text I'm – besides editing the text, I provide a whole separate set of pages with my questions and remarks about why I changed something or suggestions for changing something, and I write it out in great detail when I'm not going to be able to talk with the author because, obviously, I'm writing it out and so

so I need to be sure that they know what I'm talking about. If you're not getting that from a long-distance editor, then you're going to have to take the steps to see that that happens.

And actually, it works both ways. For example, I had a client recently who told me, oh, edit this thing I just sent you to conform with the instructions for this journal. Well, it wasn't an article for that journal, and it wasn't anything that looked like anything that that journal would publish, so I thought, well, I know he's got a relationship with these people. Maybe they're going to publish this special little manuscript that's quite different from anything they normally do. But I was just struggling. I didn't know how to format it or put it together based on what this journal publishes. Well, it turns out that that's not what he meant at all and it wasn't – he only meant that if you have to capitalize things in a certain way, go with this style because that happens to be the journal this group uses, but we're just doing this ourselves for that group. Well, if he had told me that in the first place, I could have spared a lot of angst. So communication is important.

KENNEALLY: With the facility of electronic communication comes the question of at what point do you want to move from online editing and the exchange that can happen online to actually working with hardcopy, and even though this is 2007, people are still editing with hardcopy. Talk about that and why as an author you need to be prepared at a certain stage to go to the hard copy.

FELDMAN: It really does vary with the person, but almost every editor I know wants to at some point look at a hardcopy version of the text. My preference is to do that toward the end because sometimes that printed page, there's just something about it that has you able to see things that you didn't see online.

And then there's that whole track changes thing. If you want to know what the editor has done to your copy, you're going to ask them to use the facilities that the word processors provide, but my God, it ends up being unintelligible if there's a great deal of editing.

So sometimes it's – it's obviously more awkward to be sending hardcopy back and forth, and sometimes it's totally out of the question, but at some point, I think it's probably a really good idea, especially in the developmental editing stage because you may be moving huge paragraphs around or even into different chapters and that just gets to be much too awkward to read in an online edited version.

I want to say one more thing about working remotely from someone, and that is that if at all possible, I highly recommend that you try to meet at least once or have a webcam visit or something. It makes a really big difference to establish a person-to-person relationship, even if it's only one time. And if you're working with someone on developmental stages of your project, I really strongly suggest that you not try to do it entirely by e-mail, that you schedule phone calls intermittently to

talk over the larger issues that are difficult to communicate by just writing your questions or concerns.

KENNEALLY: If we do decide as authors to go with a private editor, can you talk about some things to look at in the contract that that will – that will be in that contract and what some of the expectations are around fees, how the fees are structured and so forth?

FELDMAN: Sure. You'll want to talk about which levels of editing are going to be accomplished, which editorial tasks you are expecting them to do or which ones they're expecting to do for you so that you have a common understanding. You might say, please do a copyedit, and that person defines copyedit in a different way than you do, so that's why I really, really strongly recommend the checklist so that you have a common understanding of what's going to be done.

You'll want to talk about the schedule. If you're giving them a relatively short manuscript, how long is it going to take them to do it? If you're talking about a large project, a book-sized project, I recommend that you do it in phases. You don't turn the whole book over at once, but rather a few chapters at a time in some logical breakup and how soon you can expect that back from them. And you work together to develop a phased-in schedule for getting the work done.

You'll want to come to an agreement on how the text will be transmitted, how it will be marked up and how it will be returned to you. What can you expect to get back from the editor?

And you'll want to come to an agreement about how you'll communicate. Do you want to schedule regular telephone calls? Do you want to work entirely by e-mail or however it is you're going to work? You want to at least address that subject. There are editors who expect not to have to communicate with you. Those are the people you don't want to hire. By having that conversation, at least, you'll know that.

And of course, you'll want to talk about price.

KENNEALLY: So let's talk about price. What are some expectations you can have about what people will charge?

FELDMAN: There are various ways that editors go about charging, and even – there are editors who charge by the page. There are editors who charge by the word. But the best editors will do so on the basis of having read your manuscript or a substantial portion of your manuscript in the first place.

Actually, most commonly, most charge by the hour. Some charge by the project. It really doesn't matter how they charge. What's important is that you get an estimate from them. You have every right to get an estimate from them, and you might be

might be talking about a range, because it's difficult to know exactly how long something's going to take, especially based on just reading a sample. But you have every right to expect that it will be within a certain range, or that if they see that it's going to go beyond that range, that they alert you at this point or that point in the project.

If you encounter an editor who doesn't want to see a sample, I suggest that you don't work with them because they obviously – they're just the comma people.

Prices vary a great deal. It depends a lot on how much expertise is required of the editor, how familiar they are with your target market, how familiar they are with your field. For example, I work in science, and a level of expertise is required beyond what an editor in another field might need, so prices vary with that expertise.

For a light edit of a non-technical manuscript, you can expect to pay between \$30 and \$50 an hour, figuring six to eight double-spaced pages per hour. Hourly rates are going to go up with the level of experience and expertise required. As I said, scientific and technical material commands a higher price. It may be \$60 to \$100 an hour.

The more complicated the text and the greater the extent of the editing required, the lower the number of pages per hour that can be done. On the other hand, if your editor who's charging a high price because they have a lot of expertise can get through the manuscript more quickly because of that expertise, then there's that tradeoff there about how much time it's going to take them.

KENNEALLY: Can I ask you a question about your own assessment of authors today as far as what the general state of their manuscripts is for you as an editor? You probably see a range, but just give us an idea from your perspective. Are there things you would suggest that authors do more of, less of, be more attentive to?

FELDMAN: It really does vary a great deal. I see a lot of work of non-native English speakers, and naturally that's got its different challenges than for those of native English speakers. Some people are really good writers. Some people are not. Some people are really good writing about one aspect of their work and not so great about others.

I think as a writer it's always a good idea to try to step away from your project for a while and take another look at it. I can tell when a person has done that and they've come back to it with fresh eyes and can see where they made logic leaps and things like that.

I guess if your goal is to minimize the amount of editing your professional editor has to do, the more of the editing tasks you have to take on yourself, but you have to feel confident that you can perform those in a way that you can perform them

effectively. For example, often I work with scientists who really don't care that much about the expense because they have a big grant or because they make a lot of money themselves, and so they're happy to get the stuff on the page and let me fix it. But not everybody is in that situation and so you might need to do more than that.

KENNEALLY: I suppose, and to your point – your name is?

M: Paul.

KENNEALLY: Paul. And I'm guessing from the way you phrased your question earlier that you're in the humanities. Is that –

M: Communication law.

KENNEALLY: Communication law? Which sounds more – well, style is something that –

M: I don't have any of that.

KENNEALLY: Right. And I was thinking that that must be the hardest part for an editor to work with someone on, is not simply becoming aware of what their style is, but helping them develop it as well. Do you take an active – let me ask you this way. How active a role do you take and how active do you think you can be in helping people with style where it's appropriate?

FELDMAN: Well, it's a very touchy business. Many authors are attached to their style and don't want an editor to mess with their style, and that's – they're the client, so I don't assume anything at first. I assume that they've written it the way they want it. I make suggestions but I don't mess with the style very much.

But as I work with an author – and this is why it's really great if you can establish an ongoing relationship with an editor. As I work with an author, I begin to get a sense of how much I can intrude or how much they want me to intrude. And the very, very best relationships are the ones where I am kind of a writing coach. But that doesn't always work that way, and sometimes it isn't necessary. Sometimes I get beautiful stuff where I only have to do the commas, but most often, people don't hire editors for that.

KENNEALLY: And certainly, the coaching part. I think that's a nice way to put it because coaches, they aren't necessarily the champion themselves. Some of them just – but they know the intimate details of the business or whatever the endeavor is and can point out some of the things that the expert themselves can overlook.

FELDMAN: Exactly. I think probably seasoned authors who have published many things have less and less need for a professional editor. But someone who's just

beginning their publishing career within their field can learn a great deal from working with an editor.

And as we said earlier, even the seasoned author needs someone to do that reality check to make sure there aren't any unintended assumptions or errors that just slip in there and can't be seen anymore by the person who produced the text.

KENNEALLY: Just to sort of sum up and then try to go to some questions here, some of the great teams in writing of course are editor-writer relationships, and I want to ask people here in the audience whether they feel that that is something that they've gained from. Have you felt that way? I see at least one hand. Paul.

M: Oh, yeah. This last time around, my publisher and I got so much more than we had any right to assume from copyeditors, from the lawyer. The legal citation format, for example, was (inaudible) not my strong suit. She pointed out that – not only fixing that stuff but pointing out a couple of really glaring, embarrassing errors that got into the earlier editions of the book. (inaudible) just wonderful.

KENNEALLY: Has anyone else had that kind of heartwarming experience, or is rather the opposite, that you become frustrated by –

END OF SIDE

KENNEALLY: – generally that their relationships are good or not what they would like them to be.

M: Unfortunately, Maxwell Perkins is dead.

(laughter)

KENNEALLY: Yes, I was thinking of him, actually, when I said that. But having said that, Robert – it's Robert, right? Do you feel that your relationships over time, just as an insight into publishing today, they were better before or the same or –

M: I've only had one DE in the last four books. They just stepped over that stage. Our off-campus production editor is excellent and the copyeditor she has is excellent, so I'm able to take that stuff and meld it in to produce the final copy, but that's – oh, and by the way, not having the DE saves them \$20,000 or \$30,000, and I've asked if we don't have a DE, can the net of the book come down a little bit? (inaudible). I don't know. That's hard to say, I'm very happy with the off-campus stuff and scared to death that we would ever do an in-house book (inaudible).

KENNEALLY: What about other experiences here? Any questions at all for Diane or some information to share? Sorry, I didn't see you hand before.

F: I was just going to say that I had a developmental editor for the fourth edition and she was fantastic. It was great to have another pair of eyes looking it over and she was absolutely wonderful. And then when I went to the fifth edition, the publisher said, oh, we decided that you really don't need a developmental editor. I was really disappointed and then I found out that I was the developmental editor and they immediately saved the \$20,000, \$30,000 and sent me all of the changes to make myself. So I think they're fantastic and any time I can have one, I will.

KENNEALLY: I want to thank you, Diane Feldman, for joining us. Thank you in the audience here. I think we have another program in about less than five minutes so we'll get off the stage. And thank you to the organizers of the TAA conference for inviting us here.

(applause)

END OF TAPE