

## Linguistics as a Tool in Teaching Fiction Writing

Donna Jo Napoli

### WHY ENGAGE IN CREATIVE WRITING?

Whether we publish our creative writing or not—that is, whether we write for ourselves only or for strangers, as well—we gain much from creative writing. Creative writing allows us to express ourselves in a fuller range of ways than ordinary conversations and ordinary work-related (or, in the case of students and academics, school-related) writing typically does. Such expression can play a part in helping us to understand the world around us and our reactions to it, because it is often only once we've put something in words that we recognize our own concepts in a coherent way. It is no accident that journal writing has become popular in recent years; many disciplines have recognized the value of engaging in a range of writing types.

There is another practical reason to promote creative writing. Writing is a financially cost-free activity; all you need to do is pick up a pencil. So it is a gift you (the teacher) can give yourself, as well as your students, knowing that all of you can indulge in it and benefit from it your whole lives, regardless of your career paths and economic status.

### HOW LINGUISTICS CAN HELP IN WRITING DIALOGUE

Fiction writing consists of both description and dialogue, where by *dialogue* I mean conversation between two or more characters. In order for fictional dialogue to ring true, it must bear similarities to real dialogue. But in order

for fictional dialogue not to bore us to tears, it cannot be a simple mimic of real dialogue. In this chapter we focus on ways to build an effective mapping from real to rendered (i.e., fictional) speech.

Perhaps the best known rule of fiction writing is this: Write what you know about. And, judging from which fiction books appear on *The New York Times* bestseller list, we might add that you should have a plot that is complex, perhaps involving the underdog winning against the odds and/or discovering hidden resources within herself. But just as important as the information in your book and the intricacies of your storyline is the language you use. If it is appropriate to the world of your story, it can give the sense that you, the storyteller, are trustworthy. Why pick up a fiction book if the storyteller isn't trustworthy, after all?

And that brings us to a major difference between fiction and nonfiction. Why do we read each of them? Certainly we read nonfiction for information and enlightenment about a given area. If we want to learn about sharks, for example, we head for the nonfiction books about the sea. But why pick up fiction (unless, of course, you have to because it's been assigned in a class)? I contend we read fiction in order to widen our own understanding of the world and ourselves through the vicarious experiences offered in the story. The best stories allow us to climb inside the protagonist's skin and walk his path, breathe his air, feel his joys and sorrows and fears and shocks and ecstasies. We can't do that if we don't believe the storyteller; it's as simple as that.

There are several factors that go into developing language that is appropriate to the world of your story. Let's start with a story set in the present time, in your hometown, in which the protagonist has pretty much your physical and social characteristics. The best guide to good language for such a story is your own ear. Write a scene with lots of dialogue among people who are a lot like you, then another with lots of internal monologue of a person who is a lot like you. Read them aloud, preferably into a tape recorder. If you stumble over any sentence because of its structure (i.e., if you read it, then stop and have to begin again after you realize it should have been read with a different intonation contour), rewrite that sentence. If anything feels strange or stilted, rewrite it. Keep rewriting until the dialogue rings true to your ear. The task might well be harder than you expected.

What makes a dialogue ring true? Maybe the most important thing is that what the characters say should be believable, given their personalities and situations. Those are things I cannot begin to teach you in an essay like this and that I have doubts that anyone can really teach you (or anyone else). But I do have some advice: Put yourself into each character's shoes and bring everything you know about people and about the world to bear on figuring out how the characters would behave and talk. Some people are complex, some people give the appearance of being relatively straightforward.

So some of your characters should be complex, while others should be relatively straightforward. And so on.

But there are other factors that have a part in making a dialogue ring true or not—linguistic factors—including rhythm, phrasing, choice of lexical items (vocabulary). That's what we'll focus on here. And that's why you need to read your own fiction aloud, to sensitize yourself to the oral nature of dialogue. We are definitely playing a game when we write dialogue; there are many things that happen in spoken language that cannot happen in the same manner on the page. The job is not to reproduce spoken language faithfully, but to play the game so well that no one notices the gulf between the written word and the spoken word. Language in a story should not call attention to itself; it should serve the vicissitudes and the necessities of the storyline; it should be the skeleton that allows the body of the story to walk around.

So let's begin with a question: What are the sorts of things that happen in real conversation that cannot be rendered exactly, that is, with a one-to-one correspondence, on the page? You can imagine them for yourself, but it might be instructive to pull out that tape recorder again and record a spontaneous conversation among three or more people. (Warning: In this situation, you are treating the speakers you record as linguistic informants. Be careful to respect their rights. You must inform them that you have recorded them and get their permission to listen to the tape and use the information you learn from it. If they don't give that permission, you must erase the tape without listening to it. This is all quite tricky, however, since if you tell them ahead of time that you are going to record them, you risk getting self-conscious and unnatural conversation.)

Some of the things you will have noticed are the suprasegmentals, that is, the pitch, intensity, and duration of the sounds. We do not mark the suprasegmentals in our alphabet in English, so it's important for us to discuss how to get across such information in our writing. (Other languages with the same basic alphabet, however, may mark duration, as Latin does on vowels and Italian does on consonants. And pitch can likewise be marked in some languages. However, I know of no language that marks intensity alone, although some mark the combination of intensity, pitch, and duration known as stress.)

Another thing you may have noticed is that the quality of the sounds in a given word may vary from one speaker to another, where by *quality* I mean the technical linguistic definition (not any sort of aesthetic judgment). The vowel in the word *mig* differs from the vowel in the word *mug*—and that difference is called a quality difference. We mark that particular quality difference in those particular words by using a different letter. However, we have a standard spelling for words, even though we have multiple pronunciations for them. So if we want to be faithful to the way a given speaker pro-

nounces words, we need to study effective ways to convey in writing information about quality differences.

A third thing you may have noticed is that speech is not necessarily linear in time. Multiple speakers can speak at once. But writing is, per force, linear. How to present this aspect of speech on the page is a challenge.

The last two things we look at in this chapter are differences in syntax between speakers, and the range of our lexicon (our vocabulary) in conversation and in writing. Unlike the other topics covered in this chapter, these elements of language can easily be rendered in writing. The questions here for dialogue, though, are what effect presenting differences in syntax has, and what effect selecting different elements from our lexicon has.

### THE SUPRASEGMENTALS

Three of the things that you might have noticed are that speech can vary in intensity (loudness), duration, and pitch. These three factors are called the suprasegmentals (“supra” because in a sense they are additional factors for any sound segment—so, for example, you can say [a] loudly or softly, slowly or quickly, in a low tone or a high tone). English does not mark the suprasegmentals in our writing system; our alphabet tells us nothing about them.

Our fictional conversations, however, often need to convey the suprasegmentals. The duration and/or intensity of an utterance varies with whether a speaker is hesitant or decisive or excited or drugged, or whether there’s an echo, or many other factors. Likewise, the intonation of an utterance varies enormously, sometimes being crucial to the meaning of the utterance. So the suprasegmentals are important elements of how an utterance is delivered. Generally, they can be handled relatively effectively on the written page with description.

The speed or dynamics of delivery, for example, can be handled by simply saying explicitly, “he hesitated” or “he spoke haltingly.” But it can also be conveyed by giving other descriptive information, as in the following example, where by the time he utters that final question we know that it is going to be slow and halting:

He looked where she was looking. He took a maddeningly long time doing anything, answering any questions, Dicey thought. “Do you want to hold it?”  
(Voigt, 1982, *Dicey’s song*, p. 186)

It can also be conveyed by repeating letters to show increased duration and by putting dots between words to show halting speech. In this example, we see the rendering of echoed speech:

Jane's voice echoed back across the black water. "Rub a monkeeee's ... tumm-mmy ... with ... yourrr ... heaaaaaaaaa ..." (Sacher, 1995, *Wayside School gets a little stranger*, p. 122)

A dash within a word can tell us about duration and stress. In the following example a monosyllabic word is pronounced as disyllabic:

"It isn't right, Owl," she said, shaking her head at me. "Their own son."  
 "Daughter," I corrected gently. Dawn was getting mixed up. The strain was clearly too much for her.  
 "Wha - at? Daughter!" She turned her gaze from me back to Houle. "That," she said, "is a boy." (Kindl, 1999, *Owl in love*, p. 155)

Dashes or elongated hyphens can also tell us the rhythm with which an overall utterance is delivered. In the next example we get words coming with each bounce on the trampoline:

"Bad-Sam! Bad-Sam!" scolded Lana from the trampoline. (Cleary, 1970, *Runaway Ralph*, p. 125)

Emphatic stress can be handled through italics, as in:

I tell her, "They could be lost forever, don't you *know* that?" (Wolff, 2001, *True believer*, p. 159)

Italics like this, though, are tricky. By doing this, you are directing the reader toward a single delivery of the line in terms of sentential stress pattern. But, in fact, if you go to see different productions of a single play, you will find that different actors deliver the same lines in different ways, particularly with respect to sentential stress patterns. And you might enjoy a surprising interpretation of a certain line by a given actor. In the example I quoted here, I believe the italics were effective—because this book is, in my opinion, written in a kind of prose-poetry. The author has a beautiful command of the rhythm of the lines and is justified in leading the reader. But most of the time I believe that readers should be allowed to supply their own emphatic stress, based on their own interpretation of the text.

In contrast to emphatic stress, which picks out a certain word or phrase for prominence, sometimes an entire utterance has to be delivered a certain way with respect to the complex interaction of all the suprasegmentals in order to be properly delivered in the mind of the readers. Tags before or after a direct quotation can be an effective way of conveying such deliveries. Here's an example:

"Next batter," the ump yelled over at Dad. (Gantos, 2000, *Joey Pigza loses control*, p. 66)

Here we know the intensity of the overall utterance. Other useful tags in this regard involve words like *whisper*, *yelp*, *murmur*, *shout*. Tags can be efficient ways of showing a speaker's emotions, as in:

— Why," he asked accusingly, "why aren't you drinking your tea?"  
 "Tin-tin-tin," I stammered. (Patterson, 1980, *Jacob have I loved*, p. 71)

I'd like to insert a warning about tags at this point, because a misuse of them can make for annoying reading. When would you ever use a tag like "she said"? We generally assume that people are simply saying things unless we are told otherwise (that they are whispering or whatever). So adding such a tag does not give us information about intonation or any other aspect of delivery. When would you use a tag like "she asked"? A direct question will typically end in a question mark (although in the earlier example it does not), whose job is precisely to tell us that what was said is a question. That question mark gives information about intonation, then. So if we have a question mark, we don't need the tag to tell us intonation. In many instances, then, such tags are superfluous. But in other instances a tag like these can serve to identify who's speaking. Often, though, we don't have to interrupt the flow of the text with an identificational tag. We can identify the speaker simply by putting other sentences around the quote, sentences that describe the speaker doing things, as in these two examples, one involving a quoted statement and one involving a quoted question:

"You gooseberry, that's Lake Michigan." Gramps kissed his finger and put it against Gram's cheek. (Creech, 1994, *Walk two moons*, p. 37)

— You could hear Lorraine upstairs for about five minutes. When she came downstairs, she had this picture in her hands.  
 "Who's this?" (Zindel, 1968, *The pigman*, p. 62)

Now here's another question for you about tags: When would you use a tag like "she replied" or "she suggested" or "she repeated" or "she offered"? We know that something is a reply or a suggestion or a repeat or an offer just from the context of the quotation. These tags typically do nothing but identify the speaker. Eschew them unless they are doing a job that needs to be done. And if the only job is one of identification of the speaker, opt for the less intrusive *say*.

What do you think of the tag in this example (which I've made up):

"Where are you going next?" she giggled.

Say it aloud and follow the instructions in the tag. Can you giggle as you say that question? I bet not. The character here may have giggled before speaking or after speaking, but she sure did not giggle the entire time she produced the utterance, because that's not how people talk. Don't use tags like this. Please. Make your tags true to how your characters really talk.

### FAITHFULNESS TO THE QUALITY OF SOUNDS

Another thing that might have troubled you when listening to real conversation is that you aren't sure how to get across the precise way some vowel or consonant was pronounced. The concern here is for faithfulness to the quality of the sounds in a conversation. At least two distinct types of problems come up in this regard. One is that sometimes noises occur which are not lexical items. The other is that we all have different ways of talking, and our pronunciation is generally the part of the grammar that varies the most in this regard. So in one person's speech the word *dog* will rhyme with the word *fog*, but in another person's speech the word *dog* will rhyme with *rogue*. The vowels in the two pronunciations of *dog* differ in quality—the first is a ~~low~~ vowel, the second is a ~~mid~~ vowel.

Let's start with noises that aren't part of lexical items. They can simply be described, as in "she burped" or "she made a raspberry at him" or "I heard a loud crack." But an author can also try to convey them through (somewhat) phonetic spelling, as in:

"O-o-o-uggg." Chris's arm flailed the air, his accusing finger pointed here, no, there; it pointed everywhere. (Raskin, 1968, *The westing game*, p. 29)

Variation in pronunciation offers similar choices. I asked you earlier to write a conversation in which all the characters have a similar sociolinguistic background to your own. The point was to show you that even with this kind of simplifying restriction, writing good dialogue is difficult. Of course, though, much of the time a conversation involves people of different sociolinguistic backgrounds—so the various participants in the dialogue will be using somewhat different grammars. An author can simply state that a certain character has, for example, a New Jersey accent and leave it at that. The reader then can assume the job of trying to imagine how that character sounds or not. (And, of course, a reader from Jersey might be frustrated, wanting to know whether we're talking south Jersey, such as Camden, or north Jersey, such as Trenton, or coastal Jersey, such as Atlantic City, and whether the speaker is upper class or lower class, and so on.) Or the author can state that a certain character is only two years old and has babyish speech. Then when quotes are given by that character, the

lux  
tense

a little more

EP-7

1) Only people from  
really south N.J.  
consider Trenton  
'north Jersey.'

2) (two) years old

reader is left to imagine what *babyish* entails. In the example that follows, the author gives the quotation in ordinary spelling, but then describes how the character speaks:

"Up here," the voice says, a faint southern accent softening the words.  
(Cormier, 1977, *I am the cheese*, p. 146)

Alternatively, the writer can try to guide our pronunciation through creative (somewhat) phonetic spelling, as in:

"Whaddaya think?" (Spinelli, 1982, *Space station seventh grade*, p. 42)

Here the author is letting us know that we should read the whole conversation in an informal register, applying rules of phonology that belong to fast, casual speech. With this spelling, the author is driving home the easiness of the relationships between the characters.

That can be pushed harder, as in:

"Lissen now, mates. You lot stay in the ditch an' keep yer heads down. As for you scurvy oarpullers, you don't breathe a word, just follow me an' try to look hard done by, haharr, though that shouldn't be too hard. Mind though, if one of you steps out o' line the crew in the ditch'll deal with ye . . ." (Jacque, 1991, *Mariel of Redwall*, p. 178)

Here many of the words have spelling intended to give us alternative pronunciations to the standard.

In the next example, the author uses ordinary spelling in the quote followed by a description of the character's accent, but then adds examples of the character's particular way of speaking using creative spelling:

"It's chilly, still," she says, in a small, firm voice when she is close enough to be heard, her hands stuffed down deep inside her raincoat. It is a voice I love. In many ways it was her voice I loved first, the sharpened midwestern vowels, the succinct glaciated syntax: Binton Herbor, himburg, Gren Repids. (Ford, 1986, *The sportswriter*, p. 11)

Examples like these are effective. But caution should be your guide in these cases. No two people speak alike. And you cannot get across the range of quality of sounds that occur in speech without actually using the International Phonetic Alphabet (or some equivalent). But if you did that, you'd be bombarding the reader with too much information (if the reader could understand you at all, that is). All you want to do is give enough information about the sounds so that you can make your point to the reader. What is your point? Will it become important to the reader that a certain character is



a non-native speaker of English, for example? Then just a small reminder now and then is enough. And notice that it is a lot easier to understand the written version of a foreigner's speech if you use ordinary spelling but arranged in a foreign syntax—allowing the reader to supply the foreign pronunciation. Creative spelling might just lead to incomprehensibility. Here's a nice example of effectiveness in this regard:

When it was all over, and Billy's fish was squashing all the other fish in the fish box, Sanji reached out and shook Billy's hand. "How you feel, *haole* boy?"  
 "Like something Tomi's dog coughed up."  
 Sanji laughed and said, "If was me, I cut the damn line, already." (Salisbury, 1994, *Under the blood-red sun*, p. 60)

The foregoing example raises another issue involving not just sound but meaning, as well. Sometimes speakers will introduce words from other languages into their conversation, like *haole* above. The reader may not know what these words mean or how to pronounce them. You, the writer, must ask yourself why you include those words. If it is just to give a flavor of the time and place (in this example, of the cultural mixing in Hawaii), then it may not be necessary that the reader know either the meaning or the pronunciation of the particular lexical items. If, instead, the meaning of a word is essential to the progress of the story, then you might give it in as unobtrusive a way as possible:

"He must be the son of a *padrone*, one of the bosses." (Woodruff, 1997, *The orphan of Ellis Island*, p. 34)

The Italian word *padrone* means "boss"—as the author has deftly told us. But we don't need to know how the word is pronounced; it simply doesn't matter to the story. Give only the information necessary to make your story go forward (as this author did). Don't get caught up in complications unless they pay off.

This is true in lots of ways. Consider this example:

Buhlaire swore right in Aunt Digna's face. (Hamilton, 1991, *Plain city*, p. 87)

Here we don't know the words that were said, and we don't need to know them. We know exactly what we need to know: how they were considered by the protagonist. The author didn't get caught up in details that might have derailed the story.

This is fiction you're writing—not linguistics, and not poetry (or not usually), and not a report of reality. Language is simply the vehicle for the story. Let it be useful, but don't let it take over.

ED-?  
 'above' / OK?

ED-?  
 The Italian word  
*padrone* / ital?

## LINEARITY OF WRITING VERSUS NONLINEARITY OF SOUNDS

One of the biggest differences between conversation in the air and its representation on the page is that the first need not be linear in time but the second must be. That is, two or more noises can be coincidental in time—a background noise plus a speaker's voice, for example, or two speakers talking at once—but you cannot superimpose one line of text over another (not if you want the reader to be able to read it, that is). Nevertheless, you have to include these realistic elements in your dialogue if you want your readers' trust.

One way to do it, of course, is to state that everyone is speaking at once and then to give samples of what they said. Another way is to give just a hint of what people say, using dashes to show they didn't finish or they were cut off, as in:

"You know—" said his mom.  
 "Yeah—" said Dave.  
 "It's already so late—"  
 "Wasting time—"  
 "So close to home—"  
 "Movers aren't coming 'til tomorrow afternoon—"  
 "Make better time—"  
 "The boy's exhausted—"

Asa watched this dialogue pass between them, looking up from the highways of Colorado. (Brooks, 1992, *What hearts*, p. 188)

We can't be sure whether any of the previous dialogue overlapped, but the dashes are suggestive.

*That* This example brings out an important point: In speech we often don't finish our sentences. Sometimes that's because we are interrupted, as in:

"When the overall man got back in line I said, "Thank you, sir, I really tried to get—" But he popped me in the back of the head, hard, and said, "Next time don't be gone so long." (Curtis, 1999, *Bud, not Buddy*, p. 48)

But even when we're not interrupted, we speak in fragments, particularly if we're answering questions, and we count on context to make our utterances comprehensible.

## SYNTACTIC VARIATION

Earlier I've warned against trying too hard to be true to the sounds of real speech. At the same time, I've stressed the fact that there is a lot of variation in language. You know that very well. When the phone rings and you

ED-?  
 Standard practice  
 is  $\frac{1}{m}$  dashes here.

ED-?  
 1) The preceding,  
 example brings ...  
 2) When ... Thank  
 you ... get - ...  
 said, Next ...  
 longo ... (Curtis,

ED-?  
 Earlier I've  
 warned ... I've

answer it to a person you've never heard before, you can tell a great deal about that person from hearing just a few words. You can usually tell if it's an elderly person or a small child, a male or a female, someone from around your local area or someone from another area of the country (and depending on your experience, you might be able to guess what that area is), a native speaker of the language or a non-native (and, again, depending on your experience, you might be able to guess at the native language of the person). You can sometimes tell the race of the person, and often whether the person is highly educated or barely educated. You might feel quite sure you know this person is upper class or lower class. And, given the associations we have with certain combinations of geographical area, educational level, and financial-social class, you might even feel like you can guess at the ethnicity or religion of the person.

Your ear is trained. For our purposes in this chapter, it doesn't matter how it got trained, it did. Use that knowledge. If you have a 6-year-old in your story, that person should speak differently from the teen in the story, who should speak differently from the 40-year-old parent, who should speak differently from the 70-year-old grandparent. If there's a child in your story who just moved here from Thailand, that child should speak in a distinct manner, and a different manner from the child who just moved here from Atlanta, Georgia, and so on.

One of the most effective ways to introduce language variation into your text is through exploiting differences in syntax. Consider this example:

“When you due?” Geneva asks.  
 Ma looks at her fingers, her face calculating. “Probably March. I carry long.”  
 Geneva asks, “You seeing a doctor?”  
 Ma looks at the five of us. “I’ve got plenty experience. Haven’t needed a doctor yet. Always use midwives. You wouldn’t happen to be a midwife, would you?” (Hesse, 1998, *Just juice*, p. 35)

Here one character, Geneva, omits auxiliary verbs from her questions. This is a syntactic characteristic that makes her distinct from certain other characters in the book. Ma, on the other hand, often omits the subject “I.” Again, this syntactic pattern makes us able to recognize her dialogue immediately as belonging to her.

Another difference in syntax between speakers is that some people use fancier language in conversation than others. That is, they use longer sentences, with more embeddings (subordinate clauses). This difference often has no connection to sociolinguistic factors. That is, you can find both well-educated and poorly educated speakers who do this—both upper class and lower class speakers who do this. Instead, this trait is strongly related to

personality, and, as such, can be exploited beautifully in fiction to help us understand a character. Consider this passage:

“Louis, my son,” he began in his deep, resonant voice, “this is the day we have long awaited—the day of your return to our sanctuary in the Red Rock Lakes. No one can imagine the extent of our joy or the depth of our emotion at seeing you again, you who have been absent from our midst for so long, in lands we know not of, in pursuits we can only guess at. How good it is to see your countenance again! We hope you have enjoyed good health during your long absence, in lands we know not of, in pursuits we can only guess at—”

“You’ve said that once already,” said his wife. “You’re repeating yourself. Louis must be tired after his trip, no matter where he’s been or what he’s been up to.” (White, 1970, *The trumpet of the swan*, pp. 68–69)

The “he” here is a father swan, whose pleasure at making announcements comes across perfectly. Notice how he uses a somewhat archaic phrasing in “in lands we know not of.” Putting *not* after the main verb gives an archness that reinforces the overall impression of self-importance. And juxtaposing his exaggerated complexity with the mother swan’s simplicity underscores once more.

### CHOICES OF WHICH LEXICON TO EMPLOY

The last example also brings out an important point. The father swan uses the lexical items *awaited*, *midst*, *countenance*. These are not particularly difficult words. By high school, most native speakers of English in the United States, at least, will know these words. Yet they undoubtedly add to the impression of fanciness in the father swan’s speech. Why?

Students, as high schoolers, use thousands of words in their daily interactions. Between talking to friends, older relatives, teachers, employers, coaches, and so on, high school students use a range of words that I’ve seen estimated at around 8,000 at the very least. That’s their speaking lexicon. But their reading lexicon is far larger. It is certainly double that, and might even be as large as 40,000 or 50,000 words. Precise figures are hard to confirm, but the general statement is not: High schoolers command a vast reading lexicon. Words like *countenance* are from that reading lexicon. In fact, such a word is from the reading lexicon of all of us—we simply don’t go around talking about people’s countenances. When you insert a word from your reading lexicon into a direct quote, it affects the passage. It can make the passage seem fancy, as in the example with the father swan, where we understand him to be making a speech rather than simply having a conversation.

But another effect it can have is to make speech seem old. Many of the words of our grandparents, for example, feel fancy to us, even though they were part of the ordinary, daily lexicon of our grandparents when they were young. So to us, these fancy words get associated with oldness. And this association can be useful to the fiction writer. You might well want to write a story that has language in it that you cannot possibly hear. For example, let's say you set your story in a faraway time and place, as in:

"Power," Jasper said.  
 "I'll match your power act for act."  
 "You challenge me?"  
 "I challenge you."

Vetch had dropped down to the ground, and now he came between them, grim of face. "Duels in sorcery are forbidden to us, and well you know it. Let this cease!" (LeGuin, 1968, *A wizard of Earthsea*, p. 57)

None of these words is unfamiliar. Yet by using *challenge* instead of *dare*, *forbidden* instead of *not allowed*, *cease* instead of *stop*—these choices from our reading lexicon inserted into direct quotes—the author impresses on us the distance in time and place between our world and the world of the story.

## REFERENCES

- Brooks, B. (1992). *What hearts*. New York: HarperCollins.  
 Cleary, B. (1970). *Runaway Ralph*. New York: William Morrow.  
 Cormier, R. (1977). *I am the cheese*. New York: Dell.  
 Curtis, C. (1999). *Bud, not Buddy*. New York: Delacorte Press.  
 Creech, S. (1994). *Walk two moons*. New York: Scholastic.  
 Ford, R. (1986). *The sportswriter*. New York: Vintage Books.  
 Gantos, J. (2000). *Joey Pigza loses control*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.  
 Hamilton, V. (1991). *Plain city*. New York: The Blue Sky Press.  
 Hesse, K. (1998). *Just juice*. New York: Scholastic.  
 Jacque, B. (1991). *Mariel of Redwall*. New York: Philomel.  
 Kindl, P. (1993). *Owl in love*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.  
 LeGuin, U. (1968). *A wizard of Earthsea*. New York: Parnassus.  
 Patterson, K. (1980). *Jacob have I loved*. New York: HarperCollins.  
 Raskin, E. (1978). *The westing game*. New York: E. P. Dutton.  
 Sacher, L. (1995). *Wayside School gets a little stranger*. New York: William Morrow.  
 Salisbury, G. (1994). *Under the blood-red sun*. New York: Delacorte Press.  
 Spinelli, J. (1982). *Space station seventh grade*. New York: Little, Brown.  
 Voigt, C. (1982). *Dacey's song*. New York: Atheneum.  
 White, E. B. (1970). *The trumpet of the swan*. New York: Harper & Row.  
 Wolff, V. E. (2001). *True believer*. New York: Atheneum.  
 Woodruff, E. (1997). *The orphan of Ellis Island*. New York: Scholastic.  
 Zindel, P. (1968). *The pigman*. New York: Bantam Starfire.

# Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers

Sondra Guideman  
187 Canon Drive  
Orinda, CA 94563  
Telephone (925) 386-0202 FAX: (925) 386-0203  
email: sg12345@aol.com

## Instructions for the Correction of Page Proofs

The author is responsible for all proofreading of pages against the manuscript. Please note that no author's alterations are allowed in page proofs because the manuscript was reviewed for a check of copyediting before typesetting, at which time content changes were to be made. After proofreading, if author's alterations are required, they will be charged to the author.

The instructions listed will facilitate accurate correction of your page proofs at minimal cost. Please follow them carefully. A list of common proofreader's marks is attached; please use them because they greatly expedite the typesetter's correction of your material.

### Instructions

1. Proofread the page proofs against the original manuscript. The author is totally responsible for reading and correction of his/her material. This material will not be proofread further after it has been returned to LEA.

Check the headings separately; check hyphenation separately; Check running heads and page numbers separately. Running heads should be no more than 48 characters.

2. Mark corrections clearly.

In the text line where the correction is to be made, insert a caret ( ^ ) or one of the appropriate proofreader's marks and cross out any incorrect material. Do not write in the correction above or below the text line.

In the margin of the proof, indicate the correction and write any corrections there; or, using the proofreader's marks, indicate what needs to be done. For long inserts and reference inserts, attach a separate sheet, making sure that the inserts are typewritten, not handwritten. Do not cut proofs apart or opaque and retype over proofs for any reason. Please initial the upper corner of each page as you finish it.

3. Do not indicate any corrections on the manuscript, which will be kept at LEA for reference purposes only. It will not be rechecked at LEA nor will it be sent to the typesetter again. Any corrections or further comments are to be placed on the original proof or on a separate sheet of paper.

4. Answer all remaining queries attached to the manuscript. The copyeditor indicated queries in the margins of the manuscript, most of which you should have answered when the manuscript was returned to you for a check of the editing. However, some queries cannot be answered at the time of the copyediting check (such as in-press

items in the references) and/or the production editor may have additional queries.

Please examine the entire manuscript for any unanswered queries (but write them on the page proofs only). If a change is necessary, indicate the change as a correction and be sure that the material in the proof is marked exactly as you want it to appear.

5. Check the placement of figures and tables. Do not change the position of figures and tables unless absolutely necessary. Note that such changes affect the author and subject indexes.

6. Mark printer's errors (PE) and author's alterations (AA). If an error appears in the proofs but not in the manuscript, it is a printer's error, marked (PE) and will be corrected at the typesetter's expense. All other changes are considered author's alterations and are marked (AA). All author's alterations are charged against the author's account because all queries were to be answered before typesetting on the copyedited manuscript. Some exceptions are queries for in-press dates, and queries involving citation of page numbers in your chapter/book.

#### How to Keep Costs Minimal

Avoid nonessential changes, such as insertion or deletion of words or punctuation for stylistic reasons that do not alter the content.

If you substitute a word or phrase, please make the substitutions as close to the same number of characters (letters and spaces between words) as the deleted material.

If, after careful consideration, you feel that you must insert some material, add it at the end of a paragraph.

Do not transpose words (Expensive), but transposition of paragraphs is relatively inexpensive.

Avoid changes in mathematical formulas, tables, and other illustrative material (very expensive). All such changes will be charged against the author's account.

#### After Proofreading

Return the original set of page proofs and the manuscript to Sondra Guideman, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 187 Canon Drive, Orinda, CA 94563.

Return materials within 7 days of receipt via first-class mail, if over 200 miles, send via air mail.

If you are involved in preparation of author/subject indexes, prepare your entries from the duplicate set of page proofs after the priority job of proofing is complete. Final index copy is due at LEA within 2 weeks of our receipt of your proofed material.

PROOFREADERS' MARKS AND SAMPLE COPY

⊖ Delete	↔ Transpose	⊕ Superscript
○ Close up	⊥ # m VA Equalize space	⊕ Subscript
⊖ Delete and close up	□ Indent 1 cm	?/ Question mark
↓ Push down lead that prints	ll Insert lead between lines	!! Exclamation point
⊖ Broken letter	⊖ ll Take out lead	=/ Hyphen
# Space or more space	stc Let it stand	(/) Parentheses
9 Reverse; turn over	⊖ Spell out	[/] Brackets
¶ Begin a paragraph	1-1 Em dash	on lig Use ligature
JL Center	1-1 En dash	wf Wrong font
] Move to right	○ Period	lf Lightface type
[ Move to left	∧ Comma	bf Boldface type
— Lower letters or words	;/ Semicolon	romi Roman type
— Raise letters or words	:/ Colon	ital Italic type
Align type vertically	∨ Apostrophe or 'single quote'	cups CAPITALS
== Straighten line	U/V Quotation marks	sm. c. SMALL CAPITALS
Λ Insert from margin	run m No paragraph	lc Lower case

The following passage shows the use of proofreaders' marks. They are placed in the margins and corresponding marks are inserted within the copy to indicate where a change is to be made. If a line has more than one correction or change, the marginal proofreaders' marks are separated by diagonal lines.

H
O
#
[
⊖/9
9
[
/9
sq #
lc
o/run m
tr
tr
tr
romi
∧
ital
⊖/)
cap
/c
∧
D/V

For whatever reason—and they are not entirely clear—dictionaries have become a sort of speciality of the English-speaking world. A possible explanation may be sought in the size of the vocabulary, since English seems to have more words and more uses for words—many more than a million named uses—than any other known language. Speakers of English have uncommon need for dictionaries, and Americans, who constitute the largest single body of English speakers and who have been uncommonly well provided with the means of buying reference works, have augmented this need with what would seem to be a mania for linguistic correctness, a zeal for rectitude which they have built into their elaborate school systems.

This, for whatever reason, the speakers of no other known language have ever brought to fruition (work as such) the Oxford English Dictionary (also called A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles) whose editors endeavored to trace every use of every word that has ever gained wide currency in the native tongue. The creation of the modern American desk dictionary is scarcely less remarkable. American lexicography has its own glories and its own character. The founder of the American school was Noah Webster, whose An American Dictionary of the English Language (1828 and frequently revised) enlarged, was a truly remarkable work, especially for its day and place. A New world still very much a colony, socially and intellectually, of the old, Webster was untiring and self-assertive as Samuel Johnson himself, and if he was less well read and probably less intellectually endowed, he suffered from no false modesty and he possessed a genius for definition. His work was rivaled in many ways by that of his onetime employee, Joseph E. Worcester, and the "War of the Dictionaries" waged between the successors to Webster's volume and Worcester's A Dictionary of the English Language (1860), lent to lexicography the zest of a sporting event.