

Editing exercise: answer sheet

1. Introduction should note the meaning of bold locators (major discussions in this case).
2. Subheading 'The Field' should be duplicated at 'F' and also at 'T' (to be consistent in this index, where other pictures are double entered at 'The'. Not always necessary). Some indexers would prefer a cross-reference 'abstract painting, see also The Field' rather than a subdivision. In this case the subdivision takes no more space and is quicker for the user. However, be very careful when using subs such as this one that you pick up all examples – if there are any other abstract paintings they should also be listed here (or otherwise none at all should be listed). 'If you pick it up, pick it up throughout'.
3. Too many undifferentiated locators at 'archetypes'. Either delete some (if not that significant) or add subdivisions to distinguish them.
4. The first locator for fish under 'biblical references' (35-36) should probably be in bold (it is bold at the entry 'fish').
5. 'Coleridge' could possibly be in a fuller form, however, I don't usually believe in adding detail that is not in the text so it doesn't worry me.
6. Filing of subdivisions under 'consciousness' is inconsistent – in the first one 'in' is ignored in filing, while in the last two 'in' is taken into account in filing.
7. 'Creativeness' and 'creativity' should be combined, as should 'women, images of' and 'women in images'. (If they are used with subtly different meanings this should be clarified with a phrase or qualifier).
8. The subdivisions under 'creativity' are too long and wordy and are inconsistently written. Consider:
 - Degas on
 - Prometheus myth and
 - Proteus myth and
 - Woodward on
9. The two entries on 'depression' should be more clearly distinguished. The entry 'dips in landscapes (depressions)' at page 52 suggests that the top 'depression' entry should be 'depressions (dips in landscapes)'. (A somewhat contrived example, sorry).
10. The reference from 'emotional dynamics' to 'feeling tone' is a blind reference, ie, there is nothing there. The same is true of references to 'feeling tone' from 'Jung' and 'value quality', from 'hidden worlds' to 'subjective approach to art', from 'unconscious' to 'subconscious', and from 'portraits' to 'figure'. Blind references are a risk when you delete an entry late in the editing process and don't check for its relationship to other entries in the index. It may be that the references should simply be deleted, but it may be that there is another entry they should be referring to.
11. The subdivisions of 'imagination' have been separated by the column break. A 'continued' line on the second column would be useful, and is crucial if the break goes from a right-hand page to a left-hand page.
12. There should be a reference from 'portraits' to 'self-portraits'.
13. 'Self-portraits' should file after 'Self-portrait as...' (whether using word-by-word or letter-by-letter filing). It has been automatically misfiled because it is misspelt as 'portaits'. This misspelling has carried over to the reference from 'Woodward, Margaret'. This can happen with indexing software that uses autocomplete to complete cross-references.

14. If 'The Followers' is intentionally indexed at 'The', then 'The Field' and 'The Burden' should also be filed at 'The'. 'The sacred' has been double entered at 's' and 't' because 'the sacred' has a special meaning. The same could be done for entries such as 'the dead' which has a different meaning to 'dead'.
15. 'Curtin ...', 'WAIT', and 'Western Australia...' should all have the same page numbers, or references should be made from one to another. In this case 'Curtin...' has three locators, while 'WAIT' and 'Western Australia...' have three between them. Because 'WAIT' and 'Western Australia...' file together they could be combined into one entry, eg, 'Western Australia Institute of Technology (WAIT, now CUT)'. There is no need for a reference from 'CUT' to 'Curtin...' as they file next to each other. If the abbreviation 'CUT' was well-recognised it could be added as a qualifier (as WAIT has been).
16. The entries for 'Woodward, Lionel' have been split because three use 'Mr' and one doesn't. This type of error is common when entry form is changed late in the editing process. Note that the omission of the title changes filing order. To avoid this some people add titles in parentheses at the end of the entry. The use of titles here is probably excessive and adds to clutter. The entry for 'Yellow House' has been split because of a different amount of qualifying information. This was probably caused by late editorial changes as with the omission of 'Mr'.