



UiT The Arctic University of Norway

MUNIN Conference Workshop
*From Gatekeeping to Guidance:
Building Fair and Reflective
Editorial Practices*

Christina Lentz, Linda Hamrin Nesby, Ingri Løkholm Ramberg

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7557/5.8188>

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

edda

Nordisk tidsskrift
for litteraturforskning

Scandinavian Journal
of Literary Research

2025
Årg. 112

4

Structure of this workshop

- Journal
- Values
- Challenges
- Workshop
- Discussion
- Conclusion

Structure of this workshop

Journal

Values

Challenges

Workshop

Discussion

Conclusion

Redaktører

Professor Linda Hamrin Nesby, UiT – Norges arktiske universitet

Professor Silje Solheim Karlsen, UiT – Norges arktiske universitet

Førsteamanuensis Ingri Løkholm Ramberg, UiT – Norges arktiske universitet

Redaksjonssekretær

Lektor Christina Lentz, UiT – Norges arktiske universitet

Redaksjonsråd

Professor Karin Sanders, University of California, Berkeley

Professor Stefanie von Schnurbein, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

Professor Jakob Stougaard-Nielsen, University College London

Professor Anna Williams, Uppsala universitet

Faglig utvalg

Professor John Brumo, NTNU

Professor Reinhard Hennig, Universitetet i Agder

Professor Hans Kristian Rustad, Universitetet i Oslo

Professor Eirik Vassenden, Universitetet i Bergen

Professor Henning Howlid Wærp, UiT – Norges arktiske universitet

Sats: PHi Business Solutions Ltd.

Design omslag: KORD

ISSN online: 1500-1989

DOI: [10.18261/issn.1500-1989](https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.1500-1989)

edda

**Nordisk tidsskrift
for litteraturforskning**

Scandinavian Journal
of Literary Research

2025
Årg. 112

4

Structure of this workshop

- Journal
- Values**
- Challenges
- Workshop
- Discussion
- Conclusion

Core Values

=

Feminist Values

Diversity,
Representation &
Inclusion

Scientific Quality

Transparency

Fairness

Critical Reflection of
Power & Hierarchies

Structure of this workshop

- Journal
- Values
- Challenges**
- Workshop
- Discussion
- Conclusion

**How objective can we be
working in a small field such
as Nordic literature?**

**Diversity,
Representation &
Inclusion**

Scientific Quality

Transparency

Fairness

**Critical Reflection of
Power & Hierarchies**

How objective can we be working in a small field such as Nordic literature?

How do we face selection bias?

Diversity,
Representation &
Inclusion

Scientific Quality

Transparency

Fairness

Critical Reflection of
Power & Hierarchies

How objective can we be working in a small field such as Nordic literature?

How do we face selection bias?

What about the invisible, unpayed work that goes into each edition of EDDA?

Diversity,
Representation &
Inclusion

Scientific Quality

Transparency

Fairness

Critical Reflection of
Power & Hierarchies

How objective can we be working in a small field such as Nordic literature?

How do we face selection bias?

What about the invisible, unpayed work that goes into each edition of EDDA?

Other challenges?

Diversity,
Representation &
Inclusion

Scientific Quality

Transparency

Fairness

Critical Reflection of
Power & Hierarchies

Structure of this workshop

- Journal
- Values
- Challenges
- Workshop**
- Discussion
- Conclusion

Our challenges - shared challenges?

Work in groups and figure out possible solutions for our challenges

Structure of this workshop

- Case
- Values
- Challenges
- Workshop
- Discussion
- Conclusion

Challenge 1:

How objective can we remain while working in a small field such as Nordic literature?

We have already experienced colleagues, former colleagues, PhD students we're supervising or helping, or even close friends who submit contributions to our publication, or request that their books be reviewed.

Examples:

- At UiT, there are only four professors in Nordic literature. One of them has submitted an article. Can we assess this article? Are we impartial enough?
- A colleague has published a book and asked *Edda* to commission a review of it. A lot of authors want to have their books reviewed in *Edda* – are we doing a special favor to a colleague?
- And what about our reviewers: In a small field like Nordic literature, it is likely that reviewers can identify the author based on the topic or even writing style. How can we ensure that reviewers maintain sufficient critical distance?
- Other examples?

Challenge 1:

How objective can we remain while working in a small field such as Nordic literature?

We have already experienced colleagues, former colleagues, PhD students we're supervising or helping, or even close friends who submit contributions to our publication, or request that their books be reviewed.

Solutions:

- Involvement of the editorial board
- Recruitment of three reviewers for our colleague's article
- Finding book and peer reviewers for articles outside the Norwegian and even Scandinavian context

Challenge 2:

How can we face selection bias?

In our editorial work we constantly have to make choices.

Examples:

- The editors decide whether an article is desk-rejected or sent out for review; they choose which books are selected for review (this is very arbitrary!); they determine which PhD defenses are published; and they select the peer reviewers and book reviewers to be approached.
- Even though we want to represent a broad variety of authors at all stages of their career, from different countries and backgrounds and different genres, we still rely on what is submitted (articles) and who actually wants, and is qualified to write book reviews. We also have to commit to high quality standards.

Challenge 2:

How do we face selection bias?

In our editorial work we constantly have to make choices.

Solutions:

- Steady reflection of our own potential selection biases
- Transparency with regard to these challenges
- Extra effort when it comes to early researcher articles
- New genre into Edda: trial lectures which are not peer reviewed

Challenge 3:

What about the invisible, unpaid work that goes into each edition of EDDA?

All stages of the production process include invisible, unpayed and/or little rewarded work

Examples:

- Peer review!!
- Book reviews are more visible than peer review, but are a lot of work and are not considered equal to scientific articles
- Language editing is paid for, but we have experienced that our language editors have not been treated well by the contributors.
- We do a lot of desk rejections of articles that are not good enough, but nevertheless are the result of a lot of work by the authors
- We ourselves are not paid for our work, except from the editorial secretary

Challenge 3:

What about the invisible, unpaid work that goes into each edition of EDDA?

All stages of the production process include invisible, unpayed and/or little rewarded work

Solutions:

- Review-sharing
- Commitment to “protecting” the people working for us as well as possible, and not “leaving the conversation” the second the articles go into language editing.
- Showing gratitude: friendliness, availability, Christmas greetings.
- Acknowledgements as parts of the articles in order to make all contributors more visible
- «unformal» submissions
- feedback on all submitted articles.

Structure of this workshop

- Case
- Values
- Challenges
- Workshop
- Discussion
- Conclusion



UiT The Arctic University of Norway

MUNIN Conference

***From Gatekeeping to Guidance:
Building Fair and Reflective
Editorial Practices***

Christina Lentz, Linda Hamrin Nesby, Ingri Løkholm Ramberg

Change of paradigm