

## **Table of Findings**

The *Great Margin* (2020) was a community writing project underpinned by two new pedagogical resources: *Dare to Write?* and *The Writer's Cycle*. The wider project entailed five years of collaborative research into inclusive writer development praxis. This project contributed to a growing body of research that seeks to foster greater empathy and equality in the arts. The table of findings below highlights key insights emerging from this project. For a full narrative account, please read the Great Margin Contextual Report.

Findings	PG.	Where was this evidenced or shared on The Great Margin project?	What existing body of work does this extend, develop or compliment?
On Civic Cultures of Writing, We-Relations and Empathetic Spaces The research examined writing as a process of co-creation through which different subjectivities can be explored within a community of care. Schutz (1967) argues that intersubjectivity also plays a part in how we come to understand the world. He describes the 'we relationship', whereby individuals share an experience with each other and thus begin to build a shared view of the world. Reflections on my personal experiences led me to consider the ways in which memory is essential to our relationships and our ability to make sense of the world together – to 'grow old together' as Schutz puts it.	4, 11-16, 24-29	Findings relating to the theme of civic cultures were discussed in workshops. The finding is further discussed and evidenced in <i>Memory for</i> <i>Futures</i> (on the Field Notes	Materasso, 1997 Delgado, 2018; Schutz, 1967 Sambrook, 2015; Adams et al., 2014; Ellis et al., 2011, Miller, 2008; England, 1994.

<i>The Great Margin</i> takes Schutz's approach and seeks to update it. It looks to create an empathetic civic space where subjectivities coexist. It sets out to create a 'reciprocity of perspective' with and between 'marginalised' people. It recognises that the 'we' is not always a cohesive whole. Maria Delgado has eloquently argued that the 'we' is 'not a single unit' and that 'it may not always be united'. As the project progressed and as I reflected on producing the final output, I came to understand filmmaking as an advanced form of readership. Adichie (2013) and Zadie Smith (Patterson, 2012) have argued that reading should be challenging, and I think that the same is true of any interpretive process that starts with the premise of civility.		section of the GM website)	Harraway, 1988
On Mapping Writing Cultures Our literature review and analysis of our mapping data revealed significant barriers for underrepresented writers, and a need for greater equality and support (Saha and Lente, 2020; Shaw, 2020). However, my team identified a lack of understanding surrounding what 'support' looked like in practice. Through our mapping process, we found that different types of support can facilitate personal growth, confidence, wellbeing, and/or professional development . It was revealed that not everyone joins writing groups to become 'better writers' and/or 'published authors'; some seek to develop well being and connect with others. We identified a myriad of motivations, identities, and habits that new and emerging writers inhabit and which impact how the writers interact with writing ecologies. This led to the production of <i>The Writer's Cycle</i> , a pedagogical resource that aimed to make intuitive creative writing pedagogy more explicit, tangible, and thus more accessible for adaptation across contexts. <i>The Writer's Cycle</i> is a public facing resource and formed the basis for my own curatorial methodology.	6-8	Findings relating to our 'mapping' activities were discussed in <i>The</i> <i>Writer's Cycle</i> on the NAWE website, and in the first two sets of the Field Notes section of the GM website). We shared our mapping methodology in workshops.	Benjamin, 2002; Duxbury et al., 2015, Brook, T. 2008
<b>On material cultures of writing</b> I observed that facilitators often use notebooks not only as a writing tool, but also as a material practice to convey values (such as a sense of fun, agency or personalisation). Facilitators often use indoor spaces as an extension of the notebook, encouraging participants to scribble on walls or notice boards to enable collaborative and shared experiences of writing.		l shared findings about 'material cultures' via the DTW Library, and through my GM field notes.	Kirtley et al., 2020; Alldred and Fox, 2015; Smith, 2012; Petry, 2011; Seidner, 1999 MacFarlane, C., 1955

<b>On whole community approaches and Social Enablers</b> Local social-actors (such as librarians and bookshop owners) help to facilitate the co-creation of welcoming spaces to foster belonging and a 'whole' community or a 'habitus of practice' to support engagement with writing. Beyond the schoolgates, the places in which participants explore writing (for example, local town halls, shop windows, parks, and nature sites) can become an extension of the notebook, facilitating opportunities for participants to actively engage with the world around them through writing.	9-11, 15, 18, 20-22 28.	I shared findings about enablers through the DTW Atlas, through the producers scheme, through my field and through the innovative design of the GM.	Harper, 2010; Wenger, 2001 cited in Nelson and Cole, 2012; Lave and Wenger, 1991; Langdon, 1997; Latour, 1987; MacFarlane, 1955
<b>On Modes or 'Modalities' of Writing</b> Curators can also approach creative writing through the lens of 'modes'. Thinking about modalities of writing (in the classical linguistic sense of the word) attunes curators to their own intentions and to those of the writers that they hope to support. A modal approach enables facilitators to develop a meaningful creative writing pedagogy. Further, the modal approach may make it easier to adapt creative writing pedagogies across contexts.	8, 20-21,	I shared findings relating to modes through my GM field notes via the producers scheme, and through KE events.	Lutkewitte, 2014 Dicks et al., 2006
<b>On the Performativity of Writing / Writing as Sign-Act</b> I used <i>The Writer's Cycle</i> to create a communal space where writers and facilitators could engage as social-actors within a public arena. The structure and design of this community space for writers may be equivalent to participatory environments produced in other disciplines such as 'forum theatre', and is supportive of both mesa and meta-performative experiences. Looking at creative writing pedagogy through the lens of performativity showed that writing may result in new literary products. It can also lead to the production of new forms or styles of writing. For example, in <i>I Even Dream in Haiku</i> , poems were adapted from a purely textual form to a multimedia filmic form. In addition, participants in writing projects may start to see themselves as producers, not just consumers of literature. This may bring about changes to cultural perceptions of what literature is, what we value as 'quality writing', and why. Sign-acts resemble, in some ways, the concept of performativity. However, whereas performativity focuses on the potential of language to bring something into being, by way of contrast, the theory of 'sign acts' draws our attention to multiple different ways of making meaning (material, social, intentional and performative).	0-11 19-22, 24-25 31-32,	l shared findings relating to performativity through KE events and through my GM field notes.	Schutz, 1970

<ul> <li>On Curating Inclusive Writing Cultures</li> <li>The Writer's Cycle is a resource for exploring the curation of inclusive writing cultures. A curator might begin their project by asking: What is my intention in setting up this intervention? How can the culture of writing that I want to see be manifested, enabled, and adapted? What resources for support (material, social or modal) might be available to me? They can then break down this question through a systematic review of The Writer's Cycle, and through the lens of available resources for support such as modes, materials, and social-actors. For example, through the process of exploring the use of my creative writing pedagogy across several curatorial contexts, I identified four key elements that can help make writing cultures more inclusive:</li> <li>1. To establish a welcoming environment that fosters belonging, it's helpful to focus on co-designing tangible writing cultures using local material resources, where these are available.</li> <li>2. To build an accessible culture of support, and to open up more choices for participants, it is useful to connect to enablers: i.e. to social-actor networks and to places that provide a habitus for writing.</li> <li>3. Where you are looking to adapt your creative writing education practice to a new context (for example to online environments), it can be advantageous to pay attention to the significant modes within your pedagogy.</li> <li>4. When you want to develop writing spaces that facilitate personal and cultural transformation, it's useful to review your writing pedagogy through the lens of performativity.</li> <li>This approach can be regarded either as a methodology for inclusive writer-development based on 'design-thinking' and/or as a curatorial practice that is mobilised through a series of non-linear sign-acts. Communicable knowledge is produced through the intersection of writing/research (understood as acts of sense-making/teleological enguiry).</li> </ul>	19-23,	l continually shared emerging findings about the curation of inclusive cultures through the course of the research. For instance through NAWE workshops, through working papers, through the innovative design of the GM and, finally, through the summative output.	Gilbert, 2020. Hew, 2016 Fox and MacPherson, 2015
On interpretation (as a Phenomenological Process)	11-14,	Findings	Berger and
It is generally understood that creative research is a process, not just a 'product'. However, there is less consensus on how we discuss and make visible this process. Thus, as well as our summative output – a website and a body of films exploring writing from the margins during a time of mass isolation – <i>The</i> <i>Great Margin</i> contributed to a wider understanding of the processes of multi-model sense-making. Schutz writes of the difference between the 'sign object' and the 'sign act' (in other words, the difference between a finished work	16, 25,	relating to this theme were shared through my GM field notes and through events with public participants.	Mohr, 1982; Berger, 1972; Yoo, 2017; Brook, 2008; Melrose, 2007; Dawson, 2003 Deleuze, 2004 Hofstadter, 1999

of art and the process of creating it). He suggests that every artefact is surrounded by 'fringes' that connect its past and future elements. These fringes, he says, 'are the stuff poetry is made of; they are capable of being set to music, but they are not translatable.' This suggests that when we study poetry, we are studying the expressive development of an emerging intersubjective social life. As noted elsewhere, one of my aims was to update Schutz's phenomenology. The findings that emerged relate, mainly, to a new understanding of writing curation as a sign-act that enables a range of perspectives to collide, supporting participants to make subjective and intersubjective sense of a world in crisis. Through this process, participants (I include myself) reconstructed language-scapes. In doing so, we reconnected to ourselves, to each other, to our histories and our futures. Writing acts are personal, yet require interpretation. Whereas performativity focuses on that which writing brings into being, reviewing curation as the interface of multiple 'sign-acts' enabled me to look more closely at how my personal and intellectual process of sense-making intersects with the lived experiences of other people. In the final analysis the research is best represented through an account of my research 'story' which allowed me to explore the relationship between my			
narrative and the experiences of project participants.			
On Poetry as a Technology of Interpretation In the midst of Covid-19, there were limited opportunities for face-to-face interaction. The Great Margin explored how 'presence' and 'humanity' can be felt and experienced within an online context. It also looked at poetry as a form of technology, highlighting shifts in the use of this expressive language online. We found that microforms of writing were popular during lockdown. Perhaps this was because the short form makes it easier for participants to establish rituals of regular writing and sharing. For example, Amanda White invited Daily Haiku participants to suggest or vote on writing themes on a daily basis. The short form, combined with Amanda's invitational mode, supported the establishment of performative	25,	Findings relating to this theme were shared through my GM field notes, through the summative outputs and through events with public participants.	Harper, 2014 Boal, 2000 and 2002; Brecht, 1964
'touchstones'. These anchored participants in a writing habitus, and provided an impetus to write together, even when we were constrained by a lack of access to material resources. The research revealed and explored how multimodal technologies can disrupt our relationship to traditional modes of literary interpretation. The relationship between writing, technology, and community was shown to be an important feature of the interpretative experience. Initially, interpretation was facilitated through the creation of an online forum which			Harter et al., 2009; Eisenstein, 1949, 1977, and 1994. Morin, 2005 Astruc, 1948 Michelson,

Zoom meetings and events broke down the 'fourth wall' between writers and readers. However, this did not automatically mean that these spaces were more inclusive or diverse (Girardi and Sched, 2021). To make these spaces inclusive, the facilitator of the event or project had to think carefully about how to design the space in order to make sure that different voices were heard and different stories told.			
<b>Risks of Interpretation</b> In a project such as this, acts of interpretation can be extremely effective, but they can also come with risks. Marginalisation and isolation are incredibly personal and important subjects, to be handled with care. An act of interpretation can risk moving away from the cultural significance of the written piece. Projects such as this require deep acts of listening and empathy in order to ensure the integrity of the pieces are not lost in interpretation. This requires close collaboration, regular contact, and honest yet sensitive feedback, both from the creatives involved as well as from the group leaders, editors, filmmakers, and researchers.	28-29	l shared these findings through workshops, conference papers and through the producers scheme.	Rendle-Short, R, 2020
Interpretation as an Editorial Process: The findings suggest that greater training is required, both for writers on the margins and the curators, facilitators, and mentors that seek to amplify these voices. More training is required to ensure that those conducting mentorship are aware of wider machinations in the industry and how their marginalised students' confidence and ability to articulate their work will enable them to participate as a writer in the long term.	29	I shared these findings through workshops, conference papers and through the GM fieldnotes (esp. the Art of Interpretation)	Kean and Larsen, 2016
<b>Cultural Archives and Imbalances in Perception</b> The project developed understanding about the cultural significance of collective memory. To facilitate lockdown filmmaking, I used online archives. I found scant footage representing participants from diverse backgrounds. This 'locks out' those already excluded from culture and highlights a need to replenish cultural archives with more inclusive expressive forms. Nonetheless, the research revealed that through writing from the margins, people can meaningfully participate in civic life and contribute to the reinterpretation of culture in crisis.	29	l shared these findings through workshops, conference papers and through the GM fieldnotes (esp. through the Art of Interpretation)	Taylor and Jordan-Baker, 2018; Caswell et al., 2016

<b>Can we Speak from the Margins?</b> The project was launched with optimism. However, our findings highlight ongoing challenges for those who seek to fully enable writers to speak from the margins. In embarking on this project, we wanted to develop a more participatory approach to writer development. This was achieved, but some issues (such as the lack of diversity within public archives and the challenge of	30-31,	Findings relating to this theme were shared through my GM field notes, through the summative outputs and	Spivak, 1988
imbalances of perception) led us to reflect on the limitations of creative praxis, especially for those who face the most severe and persistent forms of isolation. As is sometimes seen in crisis, the pandemic has led to the loss of established anchors on a mass scale. This has been accompanied by a potential loss of hope and a struggle to imagine futures. Within this context, <i>The</i> <i>Great Margin</i> is presented as a poetic form of orientation and anchoring, delivered through participatory forums, and as a collection of shared memories. Ultimately, the research created a rhizomatic space at once varied and unified, where many perspectives matter and coexist, and where participants can meaningfully contribute to reinterpretations of culture. Further research might explore how we can expand our 'collective memory' to embrace a wider pool of knowledge and voices from		through events with public participants. Also shared these findings through workshops and conference papers.	
the margins.			