

Alternatives

FLIPPING THE ACADEMIC CONFERENCE, OR HOW WE WROTE A PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL ARTICLE IN A DAY

Journal:	<i>Alternatives</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keywords:	writing, collaboration, academia, conferences, authorship, knowledge-production, neoliberalism, gender, international relations
Abstract:	Is it possible to write a publishable, peer-reviewed academic paper in a day? We attempted this task in 2016, motivated by a desire to find new ways of doing academic work in the face of our growing sense of alienation within the neoliberal academy. This paper provides our analysis of academic alienation and an auto-ethnography of our experiment. We discuss four lessons learned: (1) knowledge as a social relation, (2) time and the academy, (3) gender and collaborative writing, and (4) the contradictions and possibilities of anarchy and authorship. We also offer practical advice for scholars looking to engage in similar collaborations.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **FLIPPING THE ACADEMIC CONFERENCE, OR HOW WE WROTE A PEER-REVIEWED**
4
5 **JOURNAL ARTICLE IN A DAY**
6
7
8
9

10 AU1

11 AU2

12 AU3

13 AU4

14 AU5
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Abstract**

26
27
28 Is it possible to write a publishable, peer-reviewed academic paper in a day? We attempted
29
30 this task in 2016, motivated by a desire to find new ways of doing academic work in the face
31
32 of our growing sense of alienation within the neoliberal academy. This paper provides our
33
34 analysis of academic alienation and an auto-ethnography of our experiment. We discuss four
35
36 lessons learned: (1) knowledge as a social relation, (2) time and the academy, (3) gender and
37
38 collaborative writing, and (4) the contradictions and possibilities of anarchy and authorship.
39
40 We also offer practical advice for scholars looking to engage in similar collaborations.
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Introduction**

47
48 On April 19, 2018 we received an email from the editors of X stating: “After careful
49
50 consideration from the editorial team, we are happy to inform you that we have accepted
51
52 your contribution for publication.” Our manuscript, “Y,” was officially going to see the light
53
54 of day nearly two years after we began the project in a computer lab on the campus of the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 University of Southampton. This paper has a strange origin story. It was the product of an
4 experiment in co-authorship and an absurdly ambitious effort to write a peer-reviewable
5 academic article in one day.
6
7
8

9
10 Our motivations for undertaking this project flowed from a shared sense of
11 alienation from our academic work. The idea of starting the writing process from
12 collaboration—rather than assuming traditional isolated authorship—emerged from a desire
13 to cultivate a practice of sociality in our thinking and writing. Over the course of this
14 successful experiment in collaborative writing we also developed a number of critical insights
15 into the possibilities and limitations of academic writing and collaboration. We found
16 ourselves thinking more clearly about knowledge as a social relation and about how time
17 works within the academy. We also saw how feminist and anarchist commitments and
18 theories made it possible to think critically about the contradictions and possibilities of
19 authorship.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 In this paper we share our experiment with alternative forms, practices, and politics
33 of academic writing. We first explain the theoretical and political concerns motivating our
34 experiment. We then provide an auto-ethnography of the project, how it unfolded, and its
35 many ups and down. We then return to our theoretical analysis to ask: How successful was
36 this experiment, what are its possibilities and limitations, and does it offer a viable alternative
37 to the dominant model of academic knowledge production?
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Alienation and Hierarchy in the Neoliberal Academy**

49

50 Higher education has experienced profound and fundamental transformations in recent
51 decades. Universities around the world are increasingly treated as sources of economic
52 growth and job training, rather than important institutions for the cultivation of democratic
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 citizens, meaningful personal development, and the broader public good (Côté and Allahar
4 2007, Bousquet 2008, Newfield 2008, 2016, McGettigan 2013, Kamola 2019).
5
6 Administrators, accreditors and policy-makers increasingly expect academic research to be
7
8 profitable, academic labour to be efficient, and outcomes to be immediately measurable
9
10 (Slaughter and Leslie 1997, Slaughter and Rhoades 2004). The result has been a profound
11
12 academic speed-up, marked by a growing demand that scholars produce higher volumes of
13
14 published work—with academic hiring, tenure, promotion, and department funding tied to
15
16 our “productivity” (Moten and Harney 1999). These demands are accompanied by a
17
18 pervasive audit culture that tracks our outputs and builds in rewards and punishments based
19
20 on our publishing records (Shore and Wright 2000). The UK REF and its ‘impact’ agenda
21
22 are prime examples.¹
23
24
25
26
27

28 In this context, alienation has come to define much of our scholarly work. Scholars
29
30 produce papers that often feel deeply personal, yet they stop being our property. They
31
32 become things we submit to journals and hopefully get published somewhere so we can put
33
34 them on our CVs. If our institutions feel generous, they pay Open Access fees; otherwise
35
36 our articles are pay-walled and owned by multinational publishing conglomerates. Scholars
37
38 provide the labour of research and peer review for free, while many for-profit publishers
39
40 benefit from the revenues generated by bulk journal subscriptions. Those who are most
41
42 productive, churning out a steady supply of publications, might get an academic job, and
43
44 eventually tenure and promotion. Those who, for a whole variety of reasons, work more
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 ¹ REF refers to the UK Research Excellence Framework – a semi-regular audit of research
52 productivity in the UK. Each academic’s research outputs over the previous five to seven
53 year period are scored on a four-point scale and academic departments are allotted
54 government research funds based upon the department’s grade point average (Blagden
55 2018).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 slowly often find themselves leaving the academy, or existing on its margins. This
4
5 exploitative and top-down structure of academic knowledge production is a curious way to
6
7 create new, meaningful ideas. It is, as Marx foresaw, a way to ensure that all aspects of our
8
9 working life — including the academic conference, the job “market,” tenure, and peer
10
11 review — remain competitive experiences where workers are pitted against each other over a
12
13 pool of scarce resources (Marx 1972, 59-62; see also Rowan 1981, Oliver 1992).
14
15

16
17 Even the most social aspect of academic research—the conference—has become a
18
19 high-stakes, competitive and alienating venue, especially for many graduate students, those
20
21 without full-time employment, and those seeking to move from under-resourced institutions
22
23 (Nicolson 2017). The traditional research presentation anchoring the conference experience
24
25 does not accurately reflect the needs of the vast majority of the academic workforce (King
26
27 2006, Deardorff 2015, Wampole 2015, Rom 2012, 2015). Conferences reproduce many
28
29 hierarchies and exclusions, especially for graduate students, students of colour, people with
30
31 disabilities, women, and those with child-care responsibilities (Alexander-Floyd, Orey, and
32
33 Brown-Dean 2015, Rutherford 2015, Kamola 2017, Bos, Sweet-Cushman, and Schneider
34
35 2017; Price 2009; Henderson, 2019, 2018, 2015; Hodge 2014). Other critical scholars decry
36
37 the ways that academic conferences neglect the valuable knowledge of the very people and
38
39 communities they claim to study (Sixteen Participants 2019).² Indigenous scholars show
40
41 ways that academic conferences re-inscribe settler colonialism, negate indigenous presence
42
43 and contributions, and contribute to the “erasure of Indigenous land and jurisdiction”
44
45 (Coulthard and Simpson 2016, 249; Hunt 2013). Still others express frustration over the slow
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 ² A video of this conference protest is available here:
56 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JXW2NULQV9g> (see also De Jong et al 2019)
57
58
59

1
2
3 pace of gender-based inclusion at major conferences in the field (Henehan and Sarkees
4
5 2009).

6
7
8 This experience of conference alienation initially inspired us to explore the possibility
9
10 of using the academic conference for different purposes. We wanted to see if the academic
11
12 conference could be a place where we deliberately and productively collaborate with other
13
14 scholars in the co-construction of ideas. In 2013 AU3 and AU2 were commiserating at a
15
16 conference about the inherently alienating experience of being academics in the twenty-first
17
18 century. Both were struck by a similar observation: the typical conference experience
19
20 involves busy scholars spending the weeks before a conference frantically assembling papers
21
22 to circulate to panels and discussants who are too busy with their own projects to pay much
23
24 notice. Stressing out about our presentations in the days prior to our panels, only to present
25
26 the material to a small handful of understandably disinterested colleagues. Maybe, if you are
27
28 lucky, you will get a question or two in the last fifteen minutes of the session. On rare
29
30 occasions these questions might even touch upon what you said in the paper, but usually
31
32 they reflect someone else's particular concerns. When the session is over everyone dashes off
33
34 to the next item on their conference schedules. We found these professional conferences
35
36 alienating, unproductive, as well as financially costly and emotionally draining.

37
38
39
40
41 Out of our shared sense of discontentment we raised the question: what if we flipped
42
43 the conference on its head? We wondered what would happen if academics came to a
44
45 conference without a pre-written paper to share. What if people came with nothing but
46
47 themselves, met fellow scholars, and together wrote a paper from scratch? What if this
48
49 proved such an efficient way to write that it was possible to write a paper in a day? Could we
50
51 come together as a group with divergent theoretical, political, intellectual, and
52
53 methodological concerns and, in real time, negotiate, adapt, and bend our own intellectual
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 positions collaboratively? Would it be possible to simultaneously restage the conference as a
4
5 meaningful intellectual encounter, while also producing a publishable outcome legible to our
6
7 employers and the broader disciplines? And what if this collaborative form of knowledge
8
9 production became a defining feature of one's academic conference experience?
10
11

12 Horizontal, collaborative, and hyper-efficient publishing could mean working less, or
13
14 having more time to pursue those (academic or non-academic) projects requiring time above
15
16 and beyond what is recognized by professional accounting metrics. If successful, we
17
18 imagined that after only a couple of such events one could have the requisite CV needed for
19
20 the job market, for tenure, or for the REF. Developing an alternative practices of academic
21
22 knowledge production—ones that result in better thinking, intensive collaboration, as well as
23
24 a reduction in overall writing time—was the inspiration for the workshop at the University
25
26 of Southampton.
27
28
29
30
31

32 **The Practice of Co-Authorship**

33
34 After the initial musing, AU2 moved to England. At BISA 2015, he found himself in a very
35
36 similar conversation with AU5 about how alienating conferences are. Upon sharing the
37
38 earlier discussion with Isaac, AU5 blurted out: “That’s f[antastically] brilliant! You should do
39
40 it!” So AU2 and AU3 spent a good month developing a proposal for a collaborative pre-
41
42 conference workshop at ISA, an application that was promptly rejected. AU2 then secured
43
44 funding from his director of research at University of Southampton. At this point, AU6
45
46 joined in the planning process.³ Yet as we began inviting people to join us, a surprising
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 ³ AU6 participated fully in the original article from the initial workshop through publication.
54 However, AU6 opted not to participate in this article as s/he is currently exploring career
55 opportunities outside the academy for precisely the reasons outlined in the beginning of this
56 article.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 obstacle appeared: we had a very hard time finding interested parties to participate in our
4
5 collaboration.
6

7
8 We received many polite declines to our invitation for the workshop – perhaps
9
10 everyone was busy that day in June. But our strong suspicion was that our initial proposal
11
12 came across as simply bonkers – “Would you like to come to University of Southampton
13
14 and try to write a paper in a day?” We eventually managed to get seven people to commit to
15
16 the workshop on June 13, 2016. The invitation was deliberately open ended; we did not want
17
18 to specify in advance what the paper would be about. Instead, we wanted each scholar to
19
20 write a short 500-word statement about what they were interested in at the moment. That
21
22 was it. We wanted people to bring what they had, and hoped a conversation would culminate
23
24 in the production of a paper. At the last minute two of our participants pulled out for
25
26 personal reasons. So in the end it was just AU1, AU2, AU3, AU5, and AU6.
27
28
29

30 The structure of the workshop was simple. We met at a computer lab at 9:00am and
31
32 stood around in a circle eating pastries and drinking tea as each participant introduced
33
34 themselves and presented their statement. The common theme was violence. During the first
35
36 round we listened to each other without critique. We then began the first brainstorming
37
38 session in which we identified a number of common themes that had emerged. By 11:30am
39
40 we focused on a shared suspicion that Stephen Pinker’s book, *The Better Angels of Our Nature*,
41
42 was profoundly flawed, though none of us could fully articulate why we thought it was
43
44 wrong. We wrote up a rough plan for a paper on the whiteboard and decided to break.
45
46
47

48 After lunch we divided the paper into five sections: literature review, Pinker’s thesis,
49
50 phenomenology, the changing character of violence, and empirical proofs of the theory. By
51
52 2:30pm we had first drafts of section. After reconvening and discussing our progress, we
53
54 returned to the writing, either alone or in pairs depending on our allotted tasks, and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 completed our drafts by 4:00pm. We all worked with AU6 on what empirical data sets we
4 might use to support our argument, and how our theoretical insights might translate into an
5 empirical project. By the end of the day we had around 7,000 words based on our lunchtime
6 outline. Unsurprisingly, this first draft was not terribly good; it read as if five different people
7 had written something and slapped it together. But it also was not terribly bad either, and it
8 did say something that was new *to us*. Over dinner we agreed that, as a next step, each of us
9 would take the paper for an additional day over the summer, rewrite it, and try to shape it
10 into a workable draft.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Our group faced two critical junctures following the day-long workshop. The first,
22 and most important, was our commitment in the months after the workshop to complete a
23 round of revisions that turned a rough draft into a paper we could share with a colleague. To
24 constrain the workload, we developed a guideline that nobody should work on the paper
25 longer than four hours at a time. The document circulated through the authors a number of
26 times, and by late July we had a 12,000-word draft that we were ready to share. At this point
27 we debated what to do, and agreed that we should recruit a reader for feedback. In
28 withdrawing from the Southampton workshop, AU4 had offered to read a draft and offer
29 comments. So we took her up on the offer. She came back with considerable enthusiasm for
30 the project, and brilliant feedback, so we asked if she wanted to come onboard as a co-
31 author. By November we had a draft that all agreed was ready for submission.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 To our surprise in early February 2017 we received an R&R from X on our first
47 attempt. We quickly discovered, however, that we had very different interpretations of how
48 to respond to the decision letter. This prompted a meeting at ISA and then a long Skype call
49 to agree on revisions. We eventually broke this deadlock by creating a spreadsheet that listed
50 each revision request in the decision letter and then assigning it to a specific author. Rather
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 than trying to rewrite the whole thing together, we divvied it up into specific tasks to revise
4 individually. Once the revised draft was completed, AU1 and AU4 read through and rewrote
5 the text line-by-line to bring more consistency to the authorial voice. We submitted the
6 revised version in August 2017 and received a conditional acceptance in November 2017,
7 almost a year from the initial submission.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 This is where things started to break down from a teamwork standpoint. A
15 conditional acceptance is usually the end of the process, requiring just some light revising per
16 editor guidelines, followed by proofing. Two things happened at the conditional acceptance
17 stage, however. First, our conditional acceptance was almost entirely about the voice of the
18 manuscript. With six different authors, the text was clunky with an inconsistent tone and
19 style. We also had significant differences in writing cultures. American Academic writing
20 tends to favor an active voice and strong signposting, whereas British styles may be more
21 literary and indirect. The journal reviewers and editor were also concerned that the paper
22 contained too much literature review. As a result, we spent more time rewriting for style than
23 we did on the first two drafts for substance. We almost missed the submission deadline as
24 we struggled to revise the paper. We introduced new arguments into the conditional
25 acceptance draft and reworked the entire text one more time. We thought we were done, but
26 two weeks after our re-submission we received a second conditional acceptance, which none
27 of us had experienced before.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 At this point we were frustrated. While the requests from the editors were very clear,
47 we disagreed on how to implement them. Eventually, we opted for a “dictator,” one person
48 with managerial control on implementing the new changes. AU2 was appointed dictator.
49 Working with AU1, they set up a workflow where they called each other on Skype and
50 worked during the day, screen sharing a lot of time. This model ensured that two people
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 were always working together on the editing process. It took about fifty hours of writing for
4
5 AU2 and AU1 to completely revise the manuscript. We then handed it to AU4 to line edit,
6
7 and asked the others for comments. This time the manuscript was accepted without
8
9 conditions.
10

11 12 13 14 **Reflections and auto-critique**

15
16 This project started as an experiment designed to address very practical questions about
17
18 academic authorship, alienation, and workload. In many ways this experiment accomplished
19
20 its goals of providing a pleasurable, invigorating, humane, and productive practice of
21
22 academic writing. In addition to learning some practical lessons about co-authorship (see
23
24 Appendix 1), we also gained a number of theoretical and conceptual insights that might
25
26 prove helpful for those interested in pursuing co-writing projects. These insights touch on
27
28 questions about the social relations and practices of knowledge-making, the regulation of
29
30 time within the academy, and the importance of feminist and anarchist theory for
31
32 understanding the challenges and opportunities that come with collaborative intellectual
33
34 work. Taken together, these four insights raise important questions about the possibilities
35
36 and limitations of reconfiguring the conditions of academic knowledge production within
37
38 the neoliberal academy.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 *Knowledge-Making as Social Relations*

47
48 Writing is often solitary, but it does not have to be lonely. Prior to this project, most of us
49
50 had primarily written single-authored papers. In addition, some of us work in isolated,
51
52 teaching-heavy institutional locations. Together, these individualized academic practices
53
54 impact our thinking, resulting in an analytic feedback loop or echo chamber in our heads.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 We found that working together made it possible to get a closer look at how others
4
5 approach intellectual questions, what assumptions they work from but, even more
6
7 importantly, how they approach the argument-making process. For example, AU4 recounts:
8
9

10
11
12 My first task on this project was to read an early draft of the article three
13
14 times (and several sections more often). Each time I was excited and relieved
15
16 to read the argument. As I read it, the draft articulated, explained and
17
18 addressed a profound problem at the heart of IR scholarship that has long
19
20 bothered me but I didn't have the tools, language and methods to tackle....
21
22 I'm not (and have never been) an abstract thinker. Part of this is
23
24 idiosyncratic, part of it is bound up with my research methodology (painfully
25
26 slow and ethnographic). Yet the draft paper articulated something I have
27
28 long been trying to get at ethnographically: the violence of international
29
30 politics perpetrated, masked, remade and reinforced through the very liberal
31
32 institutions that claim to remedy it. It was incredible to see a group people
33
34 write such an ambitious argument at (what is for me) a faster pace. In
35
36 contrast, I am a slow writer and I focus on details. With that in mind, my
37
38 approach was to help rewrite the draft through a long, slow process of
39
40 tinkering with sentences with an emphasis on clarity, legibility, and
41
42 accessibility. I focused a lot on line edits and active sentences.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 The process, in other words, made it possible for each author to contribute their strengths to
51
52 the shared project, while avoiding those elements of the writing process that consume time
53
54 when done individually.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Working with multiple co-authors also meant developing new ways of doing
4 academic work. One of the re-writes involved a four-day-long line-by-line edit (over skype
5 and across a six-hour time difference) where AU1 read the entire manuscript aloud and AU4
6 edited each sentence as needed. The collaborative writing process also meant continually
7 making intellectual concessions. For example, AU5 and AU1 collaborated on drafting the
8 phenomenology section, yet each brought different interpretations of phenomenology. We
9 came to learn that it was vital to set aside our own pet-projects and unique concerns, along
10 with our egos, and to focus on the collaboration. None of us were especially precious with
11 our words, which really helped us work through the multiple revisions of the paper.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 It is essential to trust each other during the revision process. This trust was formed
24 during the day-long summit, which gave us an opportunity to get an up-close look at other
25 people's thinking and writing processes. This made it possible, over time, to rewrite each
26 other's words without asking permission and without tracking every change. It was
27 important to maintain an ethic that no word was precious. As AU2 explained to AU4: "just
28 change what you feel needs to be changed. If it's important enough for the previous author
29 to notice, someone will change it back." This approach not only demonstrated a
30 commitment to the process but also confidence in each other and the group itself.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 *Rethinking Knowledge-Making*

44 Addressing the colonial, white supremacist and patriarchal foundations of our discipline
45 requires us to create alternative practices of knowledge production that push back against the
46 alienating pressures placed upon us by the neoliberal academy (De Jong et al 2019). Indeed,
47 students and scholars increasingly recognize the need to mitigate the pervasive inequities of
48 neoliberal higher education and seek to rebalance citation counts, avoid all-white and all male
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 conference panels, and address the whiteness and eurocentrism of our syllabi.⁴ A number of
4 academic institutions and publishers have incrementally accepted these strategies as best
5 practices (e.g. Brown and Samuels 2018).
6
7
8

9
10 This disciplining of the writing process is compounded by formal and informal
11 barriers to publishing in high profile journals that include (but are by no means limited to)
12 lack of funding, lack of access to elite institutions in the global north, disciplinary norms and
13 networks, English-language dominance, narrow disciplinary agendas, conceptual “misfit”
14 and rigid lexicons (Misalucha 2015, 3, see also: King 2004, Misra, Lundquist, and Templer
15 2012, Roos and Gatta 2009, Medie and Kang 2018, Maliniak et al. 2018).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 To this end, we looked for new ways to engage in knowledge-making. Richa Nagar
24 and her transnational feminist co-authors show how collaborative writing practices can
25 provide opportunities for creative and subversive knowledge-making across many kinds of
26 borders in and far beyond the academy (Sangtin Writers and Nagar 2006, Nagar and Swarr
27 2010, Nagar 2014). Transnational feminist and other decolonial scholars consider ways to
28 engage in knowledge-making that stretch, challenge and disrupt what counts as expert
29 research – and the notion of expertise itself (Rutazibwa 2019). Notably, Sangtin Writers – as
30 well as Nagar’s wide-ranging collaborative work - expose taken-for-granted academic
31 hierarchies and exploitations, question individual claims to knowledge, and re-focus attention
32 on “relational practices of knowledge making” (Sangtin Writers and Nagar 2006; Chowdhury
33 et al. 2016, 1800).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 These transnational feminist and decolonial practices informed our project and they
49 also help us to retrospectively scrutinize closely what it is we have/have not done. Our
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 ⁴ See for example Saara Särämä’s feminist interventions, discussed in Dever & Adkins 2015.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 project is much more narrowly focused on academic (and disciplinary) knowledge-
4
5 production than the far-reaching, border-crossing transnational feminist projects we
6
7 consider here. Yet transnational feminist work points us to ways that collaborative writing
8
9 can help us build new solidarities, share academic skills, and pluralise and deepen our
10
11 understanding of the international. Doing so requires a commitment to “the
12
13 undercommons” (Moten and Harney 2004; Harney and Moten 2013; Dennis 2018) — those
14
15 singular socialities based on refusal and flight within, and from, the university—as possible
16
17 vectors for a radicalized practice of study
18
19
20
21
22

23 *Time and the Academy*

24
25 The cultivation of undercommons and collaborative writing practices requires rethinking our
26
27 relationship with time and the temporalities of the academy. Critical scholars contest ways to
28
29 navigate and contest the demands of the neoliberal academy (De Jong et al 2019; Bhambra et
30
31 al 2018; Tuck and Yang 2012). As part of these discussions, scholars discuss ways to
32
33 practically utilize time and institutional privilege. Some feminist scholars seek to combat the
34
35 demands within the neoliberal university by cultivating instead “a feminist ethics of care”
36
37 that privileges “collective action and the contention that good scholarship requires time to
38
39 think, write, read, research, analyze, edit, organize, and resist the growing administrative and
40
41 professional demands that disrupt these crucial processes of intellectual growth and personal
42
43 freedom” (Mountz et al. 2015, 1236, also: Berg and Seeber 2016). On the other hand,
44
45 Meyerhoff and Noterman counter that a politics of slow scholarship relies on and reinforces
46
47 a romanticized view of the university: that the academy was once an inclusive place of quiet
48
49 contemplation, that is now being reduced to market speed-up. Instead, they argue that the
50
51 academy “isn’t broken, but rather it was built this way—shaped in the image of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 modernist/colonial fantasies” (Meyerhoff and Noterman 2017, 24). Rather than calling for a
4
5 return to an imagined slow-paced academy, these authors argue that the current moment
6
7 requires “more and different forms of fast as well as slow scholarship—not for the sake of
8
9 publication metrics, but to enable timely response to current events that academic
10
11 institutions and norms do not currently value” (Meyerhoff and Noterman 2017, 24). One
12
13 strategy Meyerhoff and Noterman offer is to reject the temptation to constantly think of
14
15 academic time in terms of mere scarcity — the continual need for “more hours to work
16
17 within the linear time of capitalist development of time” — and instead actively create
18
19 “*eventful time*,” such that “our work — individually and collectively — can become its own
20
21 productive, self-positing and self-differentiating movement” (Meyerhoff, Johnson, and
22
23 Braun 2017, 487).

24
25
26
27
28 We found that our experiment with collaborative writing provided a taste of what it
29
30 means to treat writing as eventful time. While our article “in a day” ultimately took two years
31
32 to see the light of day, the quality of the hours we spent writing was quite high. Attempting
33
34 to write an article in a day is the very opposite of “slow scholarship”. Yet our collaborative
35
36 writing methodology generated the type of care ethic that slow scholarship advocates. Over
37
38 two years, different authors worked together in creative and deeply meaningful ways,
39
40 cultivating friendships and getting to know each other in ways not possible through the
41
42 standard practices of academic writing. When time is reduced to scarcity, a heaviness,
43
44 exhaustion, and isolation often follow. In contrast, the levity, sense of freedom and
45
46 possibility that accompanied this writing time allowed us to engage in meaningful and
47
48 eventful collaboration.
49
50
51

52
53
54
55 *Gendered Writing*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Attention to the gendered dynamics of academic writing provides a way to examine its social
4 relations and practices more closely. During a conference discussion in 2018 about this
5 project, someone asked about gender representation among the many authors of this paper.
6
7 The questioner implied it was an all-male paper with a woman tacked on at the end for the
8 appearance of gender balance. That question is welcome. Despite a growing trend in
9
10 coauthored work in Political Science, Teele and Thelen (2017) find that most scholarly
11 collaborations in this discipline comprise all-male teams. Moreover, they suggest that men
12 are disproportionately rewarded for participating in coauthoring networks (in terms of
13 hiring, promotion, tenure and future publications) and that women's contributions to
14 coauthored research are often discounted or attributed to male collaborators (Teale and
15 Thelen 2017, 437-39).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 While our initial list of invitees to the project was quite diverse, the Southampton
29 Summit was indeed five white guys. AU4 joined the project after the first draft because she
30 was unable to travel to Southampton for (gendered) reasons. The project came at a time in
31 which AU4 had not been able to write for over a year, a writer's block rooted in a sense of
32 alienation connected to her frustration with academic IR debates and formal disciplinary
33 spaces, including the big conferences. To AU4, the discipline felt increasingly disconnected
34 from the extreme social, economic, political and transnational struggles facing her students,
35 her communities, and herself.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Narrowly-framed questions of gender representation can gloss over important
47 dynamics that are worth parsing out more explicitly: How do dominant knowledge-making
48 practices in IR shape what we (think we) understand about international politics? How and
49 who do these practices serve to in/exclude? How might we rethink these practices? What
50 might such a rethinking mean for how we understand international politics? In brief, we
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 want to suggest that serious scrutiny of knowledge-making practices in IR requires much
4
5 more than counting (gendered) bodies.
6

7
8 A number of research projects have recently highlighted gendered and racialized
9
10 exclusions in academia, including invited presentations, conference panels, and, particularly,
11
12 citation gaps. Researchers examine the gender of authors in high profile IR journals and
13
14 gendered citation patterns in the field (Maliniak, Powers, and Walter 2013). Researchers code
15
16 authors' (presumed) gender and their institutional and geographic locations (Maliniak et al.
17
18 2018). With these important studies in mind, we were impressed by the *X* editors' attention
19
20 to the gendered and racialized citation gaps and their encouragement that we actively address
21
22 this while writing and revising our manuscript.⁵
23
24

25
26 That said, a focus on body counts has some obvious limitations. While this focus is
27
28 important it often conceals the deeper structural inequalities that critical race and feminist
29
30 scholars point to in their critiques of the discipline.
31

32
33 Efforts to promote diversity (in IR bibliographies, for example) often fall short of
34
35 scrutinizing the formal structures of disciplinary knowledge-making practices themselves,
36
37 including the role of the academic conference. Rather than just promoting gender, racial and
38
39 geographic diversity and representation within existing formal academic structures, it is
40
41 important to stand back and consider what kinds of knowledges of the international
42
43 disciplinary institutions in/exclude and reproduce. Doing so is a messy task that requires
44
45 critical conceptual (re)examinations, sociologies and ethnographies of disciplinary
46
47 knowledge-making, and commitment to learn from others (and not just academics). While
48
49 such studies in IR are few (notable exceptions include Lightfoot 2016; Vitalis 2015; Peterson
50
51

52
53
54
55 _____
56 ⁵ We also used the TRIP journal database to scrutinize and expand the bibliography before
57
58 submission.
59
60

1
2
3 2017; Henderson 2013, 2017 and others), transnational feminist scholars, postcolonial
4
5 theorists, critical geographers and indigenous studies scholars have examined the politics of
6
7 knowledge-making practices in much greater depth (see for example Ybarra 2019).⁶
8
9

10 For example, Lightfoot's *Global Indigenous Politics* (2016), does pay attention to the
11
12 complex ways that indigeneity, geographic location, institutional location combine to shape
13
14 knowledge-making in/about IR. Her meticulous and far-reaching work examines the
15
16 contributions of indigenous scholars, activists and practitioners to international relations
17
18 theory and praxis, even as these critical contributions have not always been widely
19
20 acknowledged as IR. In doing so, Lightfoot shows how situated knowledges and political
21
22 praxis shape both disciplinary and political agendas, concepts, categories, and in/exclusions
23
24 in international relations, from UN meetings to IR reading lists.
25
26

27
28 Relatedly, our writing process challenged each of us to scrutinize the often-unstated
29
30 social relations that enable (or limit) our academic work. AU4 observed how the theoretical
31
32 commitments of the paper played out in the writing process:
33
34

35
36
37 ... I want to say something about the people involved in this paper. I noticed
38
39 that they each went above and beyond out of their way to reach out to
40
41 provide me and others with support and collaboration within and beyond
42
43 this project. These efforts included speaking up about gendered racism in
44
45 formal academic spaces (big wig conference panels), co-creating spaces for
46
47 anti-colonial knowledge-making at ISA (spaces that included my students),
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 ⁶ See for example the collaborative transnational work of the Sangtin writers (2016), Richa
55 Nagar (2010; 2014), and the North West Detention Center Resistance's Hunger Strikers
56 Handbook (2017).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 providing extensive comments on works in progress, to encouraging me and
4 others to put ideas into writing. I venture that these small and large practices
5 go far beyond “hacking the academic conference” (as we initially described
6 our project). I understood these efforts to cultivate relationships, spaces and
7 social practices as attempts to challenge and transform the discipline’s narrow
8 agenda, rigid paradigmatic organization, and impoverished central concepts.
9
10 I’m incredibly grateful for this group, its experimental and imaginative
11 practices, and its substantive contribution. I don’t take this lightly and I hope
12 I can take these examples to inform my own academic work in the future,
13 including my teaching and community collaborations.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 When developing collaborative writing projects, it is vital to consider gender representation,
29 as well as race, class, disability, and many other forms of diversity. Were we to run this
30 experiment again, we would spend more time at the outset reflecting on how we went about
31 inviting participants. While our initial invitation list was gender balanced, we ended up with a
32 “manel” at the original workshop as several women had to decline participation for (often
33 gendered) reasons. Yet as AU4 points out, feminist academic practice cannot simply be
34 reduced to body counts and narrow questions of representation. It is of course certainly
35 possible to have a gender balanced panel or even an all-female panel while leaving many
36 academic hierarchies and patriarchal and colonial practices in place. Despite the gender
37 imbalance in our initial attempt at a one-day writing workshop, our hope is that our
38 collaborative technique can be developed and expanded for future feminist-informed
39 research.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Anarchy is what the authors make it*
4

5 Our collaborative writing project highlighted the problems of governance in the writing
6 process. It forced us to rethink the authorial voice and the ways that groups are constituted
7 in order to ensure the processes of writing are consonant with our desired ends (Prichard
8 2017; Kinna, Prichard and Swann 2019). The formal constraints of the peer-reviewed journal
9 article format posed one major obstacle. Our own desire to produce academic knowledge
10 differently came into tension with the editorial policies of journals and their socio-political
11 regimes of discipline. For example, even while remaining committed to horizontal
12 organization, the formal constraints pushed us to the conclusion that we needed more
13 dictatorial oversight. These tensions created an opportunity to re-examine the question of
14 authorship.
15
16

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

When we think of authorship, we tend to think in terms of control, authority, and identifiable points of expression. The word itself derives from the Latin: to originate, to lead, and later in old English “to command.” In other words, the author *is* an identifiable authority, a leader in their field, someone amassing social capital in the struggle for recognition and a career. Authorship in its standard guise proceeds on the basis that conceptual vocabularies are settled or bracketed. When writing alone, such issues can perhaps be overlooked more easily. Complexity, power and the tensions generated by representation are much easier to obscure and streamline when we articulate our individual voices. After all, we are trained to speak as if in command of our subject matter. We speak with authority yet we (as individual authors) remain disciplined by the governmentality of the neoliberal academy. We must *be* productive writers with content and ideas attributable to us as individuals. These ideas must be original, citable, and fundable, with the ultimate aspiration of attaining a permanent position at an elite institution (perhaps), with a large

1
2
3 grant, and a team of students and junior scholars that accompany us on our explorations to
4
5 the outer boundaries of knowledge.
6

7
8 As Barthes (1994) famously argued, by the 1970s, this account of the author had
9
10 died. Authorship, from his perspective was the re-presentation of that which was absent.
11
12 Our conceptual vocabularies are always already part of and shaping of our ‘world hoods’ (see
13
14 also Colson 2018, Berenskoetter 2016, Heidegger 1996, 59-67). A traditional claim to
15
16 ‘authorship’ consists of three separate premises that follow the logic of representation more
17
18 broadly (Cohn 2006, 22). First, the claim that a text speaks without its author; second, that
19
20 the author speaks through the text; and, third, that the meaning of a text is consistent with
21
22 the author’s intentions. Each of these three claims is epistemically dubious and politically
23
24 suspect. But if we cannot appropriate meaning, claim dominium such that ideas can be
25
26 attributable, conclusively, to one person, what is the alternative?
27
28
29

30
31 The epistemic and ethical foundationlessness of the authorial voice generates real
32
33 political difficulties that an anarchist politics is uniquely well situated to resolve.⁷ If
34
35 authorship is socially constituted, its democratization and co-constitution is one means to
36
37 reclaim alienated labour. The democratic communalization of authorship ensures the
38
39 emergent properties of collective labour can be communally attributable (Lawson 2012,
40
41 Prichard 2017).
42
43

44
45 Our co-writing experiment exposes five key features of the authorial process, which,
46
47 once better understood, we feel enable better collaboration and better writing. The first
48
49 structure is the external socio-political environment in which the collective writing took
50
51 place. Our initial impetus and first writing day were shaped through-and-through by the
52
53
54

55
56 ⁷ See also Dennis’ discussion on the “unmarked scholar” (2019)
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 structures of the neoliberal university, including the time pressures placed upon us to
4 produce, as individuals, quality work that may not be possible in any great quantity. Access
5 to academic funding shaped all aspects of the initial workshop, allowing participants to
6 travel, stay in town, and for all of us to continue work over dinner afterwards, while it
7 excluded other from participating in the first place. The neoliberal university constituted the
8 group of authors, as well as the conditions of our labor, but also the possibility of resistance.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 After recognizing the emergent quality of the initial group, the second governance
18 process sought to engage and challenge these dominations directly *through the process of writing*
19 *itself*. These involved the anarchistic decision-making we adopted, like go-rounds, consensus,
20 and mutual aid, and the voluntary empowerment of a ‘dictator’ in the latter stages of the
21 project. The day itself was also structured by all participants in ways that ensured that it met
22 our needs in terms of writing styles, personal time, and other commitments.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Third, this writing process helped us to identify and manage expertise and the plural
and intersecting hierarchies that developed through the writing process itself. Whether it was
in terms of writings styles, or subject knowledge, experience with/as journal editors, and so
on, each was negotiated and the hierarchy agreed consensually. Authority/authorship
became a process of deferring to authority, delegating authority, and, most importantly
perhaps in a collaborative process, relinquishing authorship and authority over words
themselves.

Fourth, the demand to be inclusive and consensual meant a continual agonistic to-
and-fro, ensuring that the outcome, whether a single line-edit or the decision about which
journal to publish in, reflected and was able to meet the needs of the group. Our
disagreements were hugely productive. AU5 must have made the case against making the
distinction between ‘causal and constitutive’ on at least four occasions, but was overruled. In

1
2
3 AU5s view there is no non-causal causation; constitutive processes are causal too. This
4
5 challenge forced AU1 and AU5 to think through and justify the framework they adopted.
6

7
8 Finally, authority and authorship became more complex and emergent once *X*
9
10 became involved in the process. It is perhaps ironic that the *X* review process was highly
11
12 vertical and yet none of us objected to *X*'s demands. We were all excited and eager to please.
13
14 While some of us adamantly rejected the request for a table, we produced one anyway.
15
16 Fixing editorial demands that we eliminate the passive voice were irritations, but also
17
18 revelations. So much of what AU5 achieved from the co-writing process was being forced to
19
20 learn the Toulmin method and the specifics of US writing styles. There was also much less
21
22 consensus at this stage. The pressures and prize of publishing in *X* meant we did as we were
23
24 told by the Editor at *X* and by our elected dictator, AU2.
25
26

27
28 At times, these tensions were very productive because of our acts of resistance to
29
30 them. Our collaboration was a process of managing and responding to these five processes
31
32 so that the output remained a common property developed in ways consistent with the
33
34 principle of mutual aid. This co-writing experiment was interesting as a
35
36 sociology/ethnography of collaboration and consensus, of authority and the emergence of
37
38 writing, authorship and control. Authorship is never reducible to the author, it is always an
39
40 emergent property, an assemblage, of authority structures and competing interests, skills,
41
42 capacities, and so on. We might say that a peer reviewed journal article is an assemblage of
43
44 things, an anarchic product, one that has no final point of authorship. What was interesting
45
46 about our project was the way that multiple, sometimes competing centres of power
47
48 emerged and receded in importance, with no final point of authority, an anarchy of sorts.
49
50 While the project supervened on our collaborative inputs (author redacted), all collaborative
51
52 writing needs its own constitutive process. It must be conscious, consensual and changeable.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Conclusion

The collaborative writing process succeeded beyond our wildest expectations, despite a number of obstacles. None of us could have imagined publishing an article in one of the top journals in the discipline after a one-day workshop. The paper contains ideas that individual contributors have thought deeply about, and there are parts where one authors is the only person to have engaged that work or possesses key technical and methodological skills. It is a weird and rewarding experience to read an article and see it as one's own, yet not quite "mine."

The experiment also raised a number of theoretical questions about representation, knowledge production, and authorship. We look forward to running this experiment again and seeing what remains constant and what changes across different iterations. At the very least, participating in this effort has created a different political imaginary concerning what academic knowledge production might look like. We hope more people will experiment with integrating collaborative writing into professional conference settings. Doing so, we believe, will create unique and dynamic opportunities to meet, engage, and develop meaningful intellectual relationships with people across the academy.

Can a group of near strangers write a paper in a day? No, but you should definitely try the impossible.

APPENDIX 1: Practical advice

For those interesting in trying to co-write an article in a day, here is some practical advice:

- 1
2
3 1. We found that having our summit in a computer lab was really helpful. Make sure to
4 bring a flash drive. Even in a computer lab, translating documents across computers
5 can be tricky (and time is of the essence!). Having access to a whiteboard or
6
7 chalkboard is also helpful.
8
9
- 10
11
12
13
14 2. By accident, the paper ended up being a theoretical argument framed around a
15 specific text: “What is wrong with Steven Pinker’s argument?” While we had to push
16
17 Pinker further into the background during the revision process, this focus initially
18
19 lent coherence to a writing project that might otherwise have become far too
20
21 nebulous. In re-running this experiment, one option would be to start with some
22
23 structuring prompt. If we had intentionally organized the Southampton Summit this
24
25 way, it would have been possible, for example, for everyone to come having read
26
27 Pinker’s book, and maybe even arrive with some pre-writing. On the other hand, we
28
29 found that our completely open slate allowed for emergent, horizontal collaboration
30
31 that might have been lost if the project started out overly framed and focused.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
- 39 3. Having an outside reader who joined the project after an initial draft ended up
40
41 clarifying the project. It also helped us work against any notions of “whose section is
42
43 whose.” It might be worth considering building this feature into future iterations.
44
45
46
47
- 48 4. After our initial eight-hour session at University of Southampton, it might have been
49
50 helpful to have another day (or two) to keep hammering things out. By the end of
51
52 the one-day summit, we were simultaneously exhausted and exhilarated. We could
53
54 see something exciting coming into focus, but we all had to leave early the next
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 morning. Having another day or two together would have streamlined the drafting
4 phase of the project quite considerably. One could imagine a day of writing, reading
5 the completed draft, a dinner, drinks, sleep, breakfast, an outing or activity, general
6 conversation, an afternoon of group or individual writing, lunch, check-in, re-
7 compile the draft, dinner, drinks, repeat. But, then again, the severe time constraints
8 may have helped to spur creativity and productivity.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

- 19 5. Group dynamics are very important. You need to trust and respect each other, and
20 not be too precious about your writing. To this end, we did not use track changes
21 during the editing process. Instead, we created a new document each time the
22 document circulated to a different co-author. When track changes were used, it was
23 largely to highlight something that was unclear or to pose a question. The practice of
24 editing the text directly proved an important part of the process. You have to let go
25 of your writing early on. Trust your co-authors and help with the subsequent editing,
26 rather than insist on a 'party line edit'. The key is to have a strong sense of the
27 interconnected nature of the process and goal. What emerges will not be what any
28 one author wanted, but might be what you all preferred (without knowing it before
29 hand). Co-writing created a mechanism to facilitate trust and respect.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

- 46 6. We opted for the functionality of Word over the shareability of Google Docs. This
47 meant that version control became a serious issue early on. As we began circulating
48 drafts, we used a shared Dropbox folder and each author saved a new version of the
49 paper with the date of revision in the title. As Dropbox cannot support two authors
50 working on the document at the same time, we established a clear circulation order
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and timeline. This helped everyone stay on point and it encouraged shared
4
5 monitoring. If Ilan had completed his tasks and turned it over to Jonathan, for
6
7 example, Jonathan felt responsible to build on Ilan's work, and the pressure to get
8
9 revisions to Jonneke by the agreed upon date.
10
11
12
13

- 14 7. Working with six authors with different writing styles was challenging at times. Some
15
16 of us wrote very poor first drafts and then cleaned them up over time. Others liked
17
18 to outline and elaborate on an outline. Make time for discussion at the outset about
19
20 writing processes, writing styles, and target journals (each of which have their own
21
22 style guidelines). We ended up modifying Word documents because that was the only
23
24 software system with which everyone was familiar. In retrospect, some effort to learn
25
26 about a collaborative writing system early on could have saved us time.
27
28
29
30
31
- 32 8. Managing citations can be challenging. Some of us use Zotero or EndNote, others
33
34 just write citations manually. In this project we ended up with over 180 citations,
35
36 which would be unwieldy and a lot of work to enter manually. Again, we could have
37
38 learned to use a shared reference manager, such as Zotero.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Bibliography

49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Alexander-Floyd, Nikol G., Byron D'Andra Orey, and Khalilah Brown-Dean. 2015.
4
5 "Professional Conferences and the Challenges of Studying Black Politics." *PS:*
6
7 *Political Science and Politics* no. 48 (2):319-232.
8
9
10 Barthes, Roland. 1994. "The Death of The Author." In *Media Texts, Authors and Readers: A*
11
12 *Reader*, edited by David Garddol and Oliver Doyd-Barrett, 166-170. Clevedon: Open
13
14 University.
15
16
17 Bell, L. 1987. "Hearing All Our Voices: Applications of Feminist Pedagogy to Conferences,
18
19 Speeches, and Panel Presentations." *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 15 (3/4): 74-80.
20
21
22 Berenskoetter, Felix. 2016. *Concepts in World Politics*. London: Sage.
23
24
25 Berg, Maggie, and Barbara K. Seeber. 2016. *The Slow Professor: Challenging the Culture of Speed in*
26
27 *the Academy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
28
29
30 Bhabra, Gurminder K., Dalia Gebrial, and Kerem Nişancıoğlu, eds. 2018. *Decolonising the*
31
32 *University*. London: Pluto Press.
33
34
35 Blagden, David. 2018. "Politics, Policy, and teh UK Impact Agenda: The Promise and
36
37 Pitfalls of Academic Engagement with Government." *International Studies Perspectives*.
38
39
40 Bos, Angela L., Jennie Sweet-Cushman, and Monica C. Schneider. 2017. "Family Friendly
41
42 Academic Conferences: A Missing Link to Fix the 'Leaky Pipeline'?" *Politics, Groups,*
43
44 *and Identities*.
45
46
47 Bousquet, Marc. 2008. *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low-Wage Nation*.
48
49 New York & London: New York University Press.
50
51
52 Brown, Nadia E., and David Samuels. 2018. "Introduction to Gender in the Journals,
53
54 Continued: Evidence from Five Political Science Journals." *PS: Political Science &*
55
56 *Politics* 51, no. 4: 847-48.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Chowdhury, Elora Halim, Laura Pulido, Nik Heynen, Lainie Rini, Joel Wainwright, Naeem
4
5 Inayatullah, and Richa Nagar. 2016. "Muddying the Waters: Coauthoring Feminisms
6
7 across Scholarship and Activism." *Gender, Place & Culture* 23, no. 12 (December):
8
9 1800–1812.
10
11
12 Cohn, Jesse S. 2006. *Anarchism and the Crisis of Representation: Hermeneutics, Aesthetics, Politics*.
13
14 Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press.
15
16
17 Colson, Daniel. 2018. *A Little Philosophical Lexicon of Anarchism From Proudhon to Deleuze*.
18
19 Translated by Jesse Cohn. Chelmsford: Minor Compositions Press.
20
21
22 Côté, James E., and Anton L. Allahar. 2007. *Ivory Tower Blues: A University System in Crisis*.
23
24 Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
25
26
27 Coulthard, Glen, and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson. 2016. "Grounded Normativity /
28
29 Place-Based Solidarity." *American Quarterly* 68, no. 2: 249–55.
30
31
32 De Jong, Sara, Rosalba Icaza, and Olivia U. Rutazibwa (eds). 2019. *Decolonization and*
33
34 *Feminisms in Global Teaching and Learning*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
35
36
37 Deardorff, Michelle D. 2015. "Reconsidering teh Scholarly CONference for teh
38
39 Contemporary Academic." *PS: Political Science and Politics* no. 48 (2):315-318.
40
41
42 Dennis, Carol Azumah. 2018. "Decolonising Education: A Pedagogic Intervention." In
43
44 *Decolonising the University*, eds. Gurminder K. Bhambra, Dalia Gebrial, and Kerem
45
46 Nişancıoğlu. London:Pluto Press, 190–207.
47
48
49 Dever, Maryanne, and Lisa Adkins. 2015. "All Male Panel: Interview with Saara Särmä."
50
51 *Australian Feminist Studies* 30, no. 85 (July 3): 283–88.
52
53
54 Harney, Stefano, and Fred Moten. 2013. *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning and Black Study*.
55
56
57 Wivenhoe & New York: Minor Compositions.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Heidegger, Martin. 1996. *Being and Time*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. Albany: State
4
5 University of New York.
6
7
8 Henderson, Emily F. 2015. "Academic Conferences: Representative and Resistant Sites for
9
10 Higher Education Research." *Higher Education Research & Development* 34, no. 5
11
12 (September 3): 914–25.
13
14 Henderson, E. F. 2018. "Feminist Conference Time: Aiming (Not) to Have Been There." In
15
16 Y. Taylor and K. Lahad (Eds), *Feeling Academic in the Neoliberal University : Feminist*
17
18 *Flights, Fights and Failures*, 33-60) Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan US.
19
20
21 Henderson, E. F. (2019). "Academics in Two Places at Once: (Not) Managing Caring
22
23 Responsibilities at Conferences." In R. Finkel, B. Sharp, & M. Sweeney (Eds.),
24
25 *Accessibility, Inclusion, and Diversity in Critical Event Studies*, 218-229. London; New York,
26
27 NY: Routledge.
28
29
30 Henderson, Errol A. 2013. "Hidden in Plain Sight: Racism in International Relations
31
32 Theory." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* no. 26 (1):71-92.
33
34
35 Henderson, Errol A. 2017. "The Revolution Will Not Be Theorised: Du Bois, Locke, and
36
37 the Howard School's Challenge to White Supremacist IR Theory." *Millennium: Journal*
38
39 *of International Studies* no. 45 (3):492-510.
40
41
42 Henehan, Marie T., and Meredith Reid Sarkees. 2009. "Open Doors and Closed Ceilings:
43
44 Gender-Based Patterns and Attitudes in teh International Studies Association."
45
46 *International Studies Perspectives* no. 10:428-446.
47
48
49 Hodge, Nick. 2014. "Unruly Bodies at Conference." *Disability & Society* 29, no. 4 (April 21):
50
51 655–58.
52
53 Hunt, Sarah. 2014. "Ontologies of Indigeneity: The Politics of Embodying a Concept."
54
55 *Cultural Geographies* 21, no. 1 (January): 27–32.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kamola, Isaac. 2017. "Memories from Conferences Past: Reflections on Academic
4 Knowledge Production." *Borderlands* no. 16 (2):1-13.
5
6
7 Kamola, Isaac. 2019. *Making the World Global: US Universities and the Production of the Global
8 Imaginary* Durham: Duke University Press [forthcoming].
9
10
11
12 Kinna, Ruth, Alex Prichard, and Thomas Swann. 2019. "Occupy and the Constitution of
13 Anarchy." *Global Constitutionalism* no. 8 (3): 357-90.
14
15
16
17 King, Charles. 2006. "Reforming the Conference Presentation, or What We Can Learn from
18 Hollywood." *PS: Political Science and Politics* no. 39 (4): 875-77.
19
20
21 King, David A. 2004. "The Scientific Impact of Nations." *Nature* no. 430:311-16.
22
23
24 Lawson, Tony. 2012. "Ontology and the Study of Social Reality: Emergence, Organisation,
25 Community, Power, Social Relations, Corporations, Artefacts and Money." *Cambridge
26 Journal of Economics* no. 36:345-385.
27
28
29
30 Lightfoot, Sheryl. 2016. *Global Indigenous Politics: A Subtle Revolution*. New York: Routledge.
31
32
33 Maliniak, Daniel, Susan Peterson, Ryan Powers, and Michael J. Tierney. 2018. "Is
34 International Relations a Global Discipline? Hegemony, Insularity, and Diversity in
35 the Field." *Security Studies* no. 27 (3):448-484.
36
37
38
39 Maliniak, Daniel, Ryan Powers, and Barbara F. Walter. 2013. "The Gender Citation Gap in
40 International Relations." *International Organization* no. 67 (4):889-922.
41
42
43
44 McGettigan, Andrew. 2013. *The Great University Gamble: Money, Markets, and the Future of Higher
45 Education*. London: Pluto Press.
46
47
48
49 Medie, Peace A., and Alice J. Kang. 2018. "Power, Knowledge and the Politics of Gender in
50 the Global South." *European Journal of Politics and Gender* no. 1 (1-2):37-53.
51
52
53 Meyerhoff, Eli, Elizabeth Johnson, and Bruce Braun. 2017. "Time and the University."
54 *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* no. 10 (3):483-507.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Meyerhoff, Eli, and Elsa Noterman. 2017. "Revolutionary Scholarship by Any Speed
4
5 Necessary: Slow or Fast but for the End of the This World." *ACME: An International*
6
7 *Journal for Critical Geographies*:1-31.
8
9
- 10 Misalucha, Charmaine G. 2015. "The Challenges Facing the Global South: Perspectives from
11
12 the Philippines." *Bandung: Journal of the Global South* no. 2 (7):1-6.
13
- 14 Misra, Joya, Jennifer Hicke Lundquist, and Abby Templer. 2012. "Gender, Work Time, and
15
16 Care Responsibilities Among Faculty." *Sociological Forum* no. 27 (2):300-323.
17
- 18 Morley, Louise, and Val Walsh. 2002. *Feminist Academics: Creative Agents for Change*. Taylor &
19
20 Francis.
21
- 22 Moten, Fred, and Stefano Harney. 1999. "The Academic Speed-Up." *Workplace: A Journal for*
23
24 *Academic Labor* (4):23-28.
25
- 26 Moten, Fred, and Stefano Harney. 2004. "The University and the Undercommons: Seven
27
28 Theses." *Social Text* no. 22 (2):101-115.
29
- 30 Mountz, Alison, Anne Bonds, Becky Mansfield, Jenna Loyd, Jennifer Hundman, Margaret
31
32 Walton-Roberts, Ranu asu, Risa Whitson, Roberta Hawkins, Trina Hamilton, and
33
34 Winifred Curran. 2015. "For Slow Scholarship: A Feminist Politics of Resistance
35
36 through Collective Action in the Neoliberal University." *ACME: An International E-*
37
38 *Journal for Critical Geographies* no. 14 (4):1235-1259.
39
- 40 Nagar, Richa. 2014. *Muddying the Waters: Coauthoring Feminisms Across Scholarship and Activism*.
41
42 Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield: University of Illinois Press.
43
- 44 Nagar, Richa, and Amanda L. Swarr. 2010. "Theorizing Transnational Feminist Praxis." In
45
46 *Critical Transnational Feminist Praxis*, edited by Amanda Lock Swarr and Richa Nagar,
47
48 1-20. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Newfield, Christopher. 2008. *Unmaking the Public University: The Forty-Year Assault on the Middle*
4
5 *Class*. Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press.
6
7
8 Newfield, Christopher. 2016. *The Great Mistake: How We Wrecked Public Universities and How*
9
10 *We Can Fix Them*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
11
12
13 Nicolson, Donald J. 2016. *Academic Conferences as Neoliberal Commodities*. Springer.
14
15 North West Detention Center Resistance. 2017. "The Hunger Strikers Handbook."
16
17 <http://www.hungerstrikershandbook.org/>.
18
19 Oliver, Mike. 1992. "Changing the Social Relations of Research Production?" *Disability,*
20
21 *Handicap & Society* 7, no. 2 (January): 101–14.
22
23
24 Peterson, V. Spike. 2017. "Rethinking, Returning, Reflecting." *Alternative Politics/Alternativ*
25
26 *Politika* no. 9 (3).
27
28 Prichard, Alex. 2017. "Collective Intentionality, Complex Pluralism and the Problem of
29
30 Anarchy." *Journal of International Political Theory* no. 13: 360-377.
31
32
33 Price, Margaret. 2009. "Access Imagined: The Construction of Disability in Conference
34
35 Policy Documents." *Disability Studies Quarterly* 29, no. 1.
36
37
38 Rom, Mark Carl. 2012. "The Scholarly Conference: Do We Want Democracy and Markets
39
40 or Authority and Tradition?" *Journal of Political Science Education* no. 8:333-51.
41
42
43 Rom, Mark Carl. 2015. "Reinventing the Scholarly Conference: Reflections from the Field."
44
45 *PS: Political Science and Politics* no. 48 (2):311-314.
46
47
48 Roos, Patricia A., and Mary L. Gatta. 2009. "Gender (In)Equality in the Academy: Subtle
49
50 Mechanisms and the Production of Inequality." *Research in Social Stratification and*
51
52 *Mobility* no. 27 (3):177-200.
53
54
55 Rowan, John. 1981. "A Dialectical Paradigm for Research." In *Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of*
56
57 *New Paradigm Research*, edited by Peter Reason and John Rowan. John Wiley & Sons.

- 1
2
3 Rutazibwa, Olivia U. 2019. "On Babies and Bathwater: Decolonizing International
4
5 Development Studies." In *Decolonization and Feminisms in Global Teaching and Learning*,
6
7 Teaching with gender, eds. Sara De Jong, Rosalba Icaza, and Olivia U. Rutazibwa.
8
9 Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, Ch.15.
10
11
12 Rutherford, Amanda. 2015. "Conquering the 'Lumbering Dinosaur': Graduate Student
13
14 Experiences at Political Science Conferences." *PS: Political Science and Politics* no. 48
15
16 (2):324-327.
17
18
19 Sangtin Writers, and Richa Nagar. 2006. *Playing with Fire: Feminist Thought and Activism Through*
20
21 *Seven Lives in India*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
22
23
24 Shore, Cris, and Susan Wright. 2000. "Coercive Accountability: The Rise of Audit Culture in
25
26 Higher Education." In *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and*
27
28 *the Academy*, edited by Marilyn Strathern, 57-89. London & New York: Routledge.
29
30
31 Sixteen participants of the "Crossing Borders" conference in Lesbos, Greece, July 2016.
32
33 2019. "Intervention." In *Decolonization and Feminisms in Global Teaching and Learning*,
34
35 Teaching with gender, eds. Sara De Jong, Rosalba Icaza, and Olivia U. Rutazibwa.
36
37 Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, Ch.14.
38
39
40 Slaughter, Sheila, and Larry L. Leslie. 1997. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the*
41
42 *Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
43
44
45 Slaughter, Sheila, and Gary Rhoades. 2004. *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets,*
46
47 *State, and Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
48
49
50 Teele, Dawn Langan, and Kathleen Thelen. 2017. "Gender in the Journals: Publication
51
52 Patterns in Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics* no. 50 (2):433-47.
53
54
55 Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization:*
56
57 *Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1(1): 1-40.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Vitalis, Robert. 2015. *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International*
4
5 *Relations*. Ithaca and New York: Cornell University Press.

6
7 Wampole, Christy. 2015. The Conference Manifesto. In *Opinionator*. New York: New York
8
9 Times.

10
11 Ybarra, Megan. 2019. "On Becoming a Latinx Geographies Killjoy" *Society & Space* (blog).
12
13 <http://societyandspace.org/2019/01/23/on-becoming-a-latinx-geographies-killjoy> [Accessed
14
15
16
17 June 24, 2019]

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review