

6

FINISHING UP

*I love being a writer.
What I can't stand is the paperwork.*

—Peter DeVries

It is not only a courtesy and good politics to be familiar with the format of a journal or monograph series, it is absolutely essential that you submit material in the manner requested. You may be surprised to discover a wide range of practices and preferences from one publisher, one professional field, and one journal to the next. Practices often vary dramatically from one editor's tenure to the next with the same journal, even when policy statements remain the same. It is the business of an editorial staff to establish the kind and extent of uniformity desired and to ensure that your manuscript fits within certain parameters. To accomplish this, you may be asked to make some unexpected changes to your manuscript, or to make some unanticipated decisions. You will also find that many important decisions have already been made for you. These are the kinds of finishing touches reviewed in this chapter.

The materials that precede and follow the main body of text in a book are known by rather unimaginative labels: **front matter** (also “preliminaries”) and **back matter** (or “end matter”). Most of the same “matters” must also be attended to in journal articles, reports, and chapters in edited collections, albeit in abbreviated fashion. These topics are discussed in the order in which you may think about or be requested to attend to them, rather than where you decide to place them. Some of these matters are intended to draw attention to what you have to report; some are intended to make what you have written more accessible and useful; and some simply allow publishers to maintain their own reputations for quality and consistency. As to both their inclusion and their location—should you have any choice in the matter—you may want to consider the alternatives suggested below.

Finishing up the front matter requires decisions about titles, dedications, prefaces, introductions, forewords, acknowledgments, and the table of contents. It may entail an “About the Author” section; preparation of an abstract; and, for a journal article, identifying key words, descriptors, or index words. There are also final decisions internal to the manuscript that must be made if, to this point, they have been in flux: whether and where to include footnotes or endnotes; whether and where to use tables, charts, and diagrams; and whether or how to use photographs and artwork.

Finishing up the end matter includes attention to the bibliography and, for book-length works, whether to include appendixes or supplements, and whether to prepare either an index or a glossary. That takes care of the formal end matter, but that does not end matters for you as author. Still remaining are your responsibilities for responding to queries by a copy editor and for page proofing. If you are writing your first study, you may long for the day when any of these problems—even the final decision about a title—are the problems that concern you. That may also lead you (mistakenly) to believe that they can be left for later. Giving some thought to them as the work progresses can help you avoid making hasty decisions or having to do chores at the end—such as checking references and getting them into the proper format—that are more efficiently done as the manuscript is developed.

TITLE

A shorthand title may prove adequate in the early stages of a project. That working title, and the date of your current draft, should appear on every page of text. If your working title encapsulates your problem statement and helps to keep you ever mindful of focus, so much the better. Be thinking about possible final titles from the beginning, and jot ideas as they occur. During the long interim between the start-up of a project and a completed first draft, the title is one of the few tangible aspects you can share that both announces and summarizes your study. In a reflective article "From Title to Title," Alan Peshkin, whose several book-length studies on aspects of American communities and education provide excellent models of qualitative research, describes how, during the course of a field study, the evolving sequence of tentative titles reflected his thought processes as he progressively refined his research focus (Peshkin 1985).

Selecting a title is serious work, but it can also be fun. A common practice in scholarly writing is to assign what amounts to a double title. As a consequence, two long, independent, often seemingly unrelated titles, joined by a colon, may be attached to even the shortest of articles. One of these titles may be creative, even catchy. The catchier it is, the greater the need for a subtitle that gives a clear indication as to content. Two of my early favorites among such titles are Suzanne Campbell-Jones, *In Habit*, with the informative subtitle *A Study of Working Nuns* (1978), and Sherri Cavan's *Liquor License: An Ethnography of Bar Behavior* (1966). Janet Spector's *What This Awl Means: Feminist Archaeology at a Wahpeton Dakota Village* (1993) presents a title that correctly promises not only some serious digging but a lively read.

I caution against being too cute. Titles can come back to haunt you and may detract from your purpose. If your first title is on the clever side, its complement, the subtitle (or label, if you think of it that way) should convey the nature of your work. From firsthand experience, I also advise against using unfamiliar words in a title, especially place names about which the pronunciation is uncertain. My first book title included the word Kwakiutl (Wolcott 1967); a later book took the name Bulawayo, a city in Zimbabwe, for part of its title (Wolcott 1974a).

Those names conveyed important information, but I discovered that people often avoided the words, and thus never referred to either book by title, rather than stumble over an incorrect pronunciation. An article or book with a title that one cannot pronounce is not likely to become a topic of conversation.

My partner Norman and I are credited by Ron Rohner for suggesting *They Love Me, They Love Me Not* (Rohner 1975) as the title for his then-newly completed manuscript, but our creative inspiration would have done a grave disservice without Ron's complementary subtitle, *A Worldwide Study of the Effects of Parental Acceptance and Rejection*. Similarly, *Teachers Versus Technocrats* (Wolcott 1977) proved an effective title for a case study of the dynamics of educational change, but it sorely needed its subtitle, *An Educational Innovation in Anthropological Perspective*, to bring it to the attention of my intended audiences. Granted, each of these subtitles is a mouthful, but they helped inform potential readers, and they flashed fair warning of their orientation. I like to chide academic colleagues about their often long titles, but we are not alone. The complete title of a Charles Dickens classic, usually referred to only by the name of its central character, is *The Personal History, Adventures, Experiences & Observation of David Copperfield The Younger of Blunderstone Rookery. (Which He never meant to be Published on any Account.)*

Should a Hollywood studio approach me about making a film based on this monograph, I'll cast about for a snappier title (*Romancing the Keys?*). Until they do, however, my conscience is clear. The present title succinctly and accurately conveys enough about the contents to hold its own in the marketplace of ideas. It is short, but not too short to communicate. Short titles sometimes render a disservice. One that comes to mind is Gregory Bateson's succinctly titled *Naven* (Bateson 1936). Although eventually recognized as an "eccentric classic" (Geertz 1988:17), the book's title only compounded the obscurity in which it remained shrouded for more than two decades. But it would be hard to top *Rc Hnychnyu* (Salinas 1978) for a title guaranteed to scare off any but the most dedicated student able to recognize that the account deals with the Otomí people and language.

Computerized databases have added another reason for including critical locator words somewhere in a title or subtitle, especially for book-length works. If important identifying words do not appear in the title, the work will not come up in a computer search and may not attract attention in a publisher's catalog. The cute alternative title suggested above, *Romancing the Keys*, is a good example of a bad example. And try to guess how *Bird by Bird* might have been catalogued on an electronic bibliography had Anne Lamott not added the subtitle *Some Instructions on Writing and Life*.

THE FRONT MATTER

It may seem a bit obvious that so-called Front Matter goes at the front of a book. Except for a Table of Contents, augmented perhaps with an executive summary, I am not convinced that loading up with customary Front Matter baggage is a great idea. Let me review some of these "matters" with an eye to placing them elsewhere (i.e., at the back of the book instead of the front) or eliminating them altogether. This may be another of those times when you need to put yourself in your readers' shoes. Readers are anxious to get to the heart of the study; this is no time for you to get in their way!

Dedication. Academic authors sometimes go overboard with the well-intended but subject-to-abuse practice of dedicating works, particularly works of limited scope or modest appeal. My suggestion is to acknowledge the help and support of others (including those spouses and offspring who, it would seem, somehow did manage to convey the sense of isolation they suffered during the writing) rather than express gratitude or affection in a dedication. I think that dedications should be reserved for the finest of works and the most special of people. With lots of special people in mind, I have been able to resist encumbering anyone with a dedication thus far. It's always tempting, but I intend to hold out a bit longer. It's your call, of course. If you insist on indulging yourself, keep the dedication simple.

Preface. Prefaces, like any prefatory statement, serve the important function of setting forth the purposes and scope of what lies ahead.

They give the author the opportunity to invite the reader to come in for a closer look, with the blessing of the publisher, who probably views this as an opportunity to sell the book to a potential buyer. If you originally submitted a formal prospectus with the hope of gaining the publisher's interest in publishing, you might think of a preface as a sort of "second wave" prospectus written to attract and appeal to a broader audience now that the work is in print.

Yet something seems to happen to many authors when the time (finally!) comes to write a preface. Written last, and often in a style too revealing and personal for an author we have not yet met, they are placed where they will be read first. As author, you may wish you could address your reader in a direct, personal way about your work, but if that is your purpose, I suggest you do it later. Save your reflections or confessions, and even your acknowledgments, until readers know more about your study and may appreciate an opportunity to know more about you. In lieu of a Preface, consider concluding with an Epilogue or a literal Afterword, or add Personal Reflections or a Final Note to serve as postscript.

If you do write a preface, keep in mind that it is the book or monograph that you are introducing, not yourself. If you have already accomplished this in an Introduction (see next section), consider whether you really want to add what may prove to be little more than another, albeit shorter, introduction. Don't be tempted at the last moment to upstage the whole writing project that has been consuming you. Browse the works of authors you admire to see how, or whether, they began their accounts with a preface and whether, in your judgment, the preface really contributed anything.

Introduction. Preparing an Introduction separate from the text presents another temptation for academic throat-clearing. I recommend against writing a stand-apart introduction, for it is likely to be little more than a longer and more formal preface in disguise. Chapter 1, page one, is where the reader should meet the author, and nothing should stand in the way of their meeting immediately. Of course, Chapter 1 can be *titled* Introduction, or an Introduction can serve as Chapter 1; in either case, the author gets right at the substantive matter of the text. What is written later by way of reflection can also appear later, rather than be allowed to

distract or detract. If more explaining is necessary, the Introduction itself probably needs to be rewritten.

Foreword. Perhaps you (or your publisher) would like someone else to do that throat clearing for you. There are obvious advantages in bestowing that honor, and it is not unlikely that whoever is invited to write a Foreword will reciprocate by lauding your work or otherwise attesting to the importance of your study. But you never know whether someone will rise to the occasion and do both you and your study good service. Soliciting a Foreword carries a bit of a risk.

In the interest of getting the reader to the text as quickly as possible, my general recommendation is to dispense with both an Introduction and a Foreword. But there are exceptions. In a monograph series, it is likely that the editor(s) of the series will want to introduce each new volume, so the Foreword (or Editor's Introduction, as it was labeled in the first edition here) is assigned rather than solicited. And none of us is adverse to having someone say a few kind words about us or our work or offer explanations better offered on our behalf than by ourselves.

In an earlier study (Wolcott 1974a), I included both a Foreword and an Introduction, each authored by a different individual. The study dealt with urban African drinking, and I felt that it would be good for the book, and for me, to be introduced by a recognized specialist on that topic. I also owed a huge debt to Hugh Ashton, the anthropologist-cum-administrator who had made the study possible and whose blessing I wanted to secure for the completed work. I was pleased that both individuals I invited were willing to prepare statements by way of introduction. Subsequently, there have been other times when I wanted someone else's words to validate my own. That is what these devices can do. Think of the decision about whether to include them as a strategic one in which the intrusion should be genuinely needed and warranted.

Acknowledgments. In *The African Beer Gardens of Bulawayo*, I placed the Acknowledgments with the other front matter. It hadn't yet occurred to me that I didn't have to put them there just because everyone else did. Now that the idea has occurred to me, I place my acknowledgments

(also *acknowledgements*, the preferred British spelling) at the back of a book. That's where I feel they belong.

I received an early lesson about the importance of acknowledging others from my mentor, George Spindler. The Spindlers were among my first house guests after I completed doctoral studies and had accepted a full-time academic appointment at the University of Oregon. The evening they arrived, I eagerly shared with them a draft of a paper I had been invited to write, tentatively titled "Concomitant Learning." Spindler arose early the next morning, but to my disappointment, I found him looking through materials *he* had written (my library contained most of them) rather than reading my new draft. He had already read and "enjoyed" my article, he assured me, but he expressed disappointment at my failure to credit him as source or inspiration for the concept that provided my title and rationale. He had been searching through his own writing for the citation I could and should have made. "But you've never written about it," I explained, reaffirming what I already knew and he was beginning to realize. "I got the *idea* from you, but you only suggested it in seminar discussions. There was no publication to cite."

Technically (and luckily), I was correct, as his search revealed. That wasn't the entire lesson, however. "No matter where or how you encounter them," he counseled, "always give credit for the sources of your ideas. It's so easy to do; so appropriate to good scholarship . . . and so appreciated." Never again have I limited my acknowledgments only to people whose ideas are in print.¹ And I, too, have "so appreciated" that courtesy when extended to me!

As with much of the front matter, however, acknowledgments can be placed at the end rather than at the beginning of the text. That is where they belong. They are less distracting there, and by the end of the manuscript, readers should better understand what is being acknowledged. A preferred form for general acknowledgments (e.g., inspiration, reviewers of early drafts, even particularly helpful anonymous reviewers) in many scholarly journals is to contain them in a first and unnumbered endnote, followed by numbered endnotes that, among other things, may include additional acknowledgments or permissions.

It is the traditional *place* assigned to acknowledgments to which I object, not the practice of acknowledging. I make an effort to share as much credit as I can without compromising confidentiality necessary for the reporting itself. An idea borrowed from novelist James Michener is to keep lists of those who help at each stage of the work and to acknowledge their contribution in the same sequence. I keep a log of the names of those who assist in any important way during the course of a study or preparation of a manuscript, not just those involved with the final draft. It took seven paragraphs to acknowledge all of the help I received with the research and revisions of *Teachers Versus Technocrats*. I do not recall anyone faulting *that* section as overwritten.

About the Author/About the Book. To whom do you think falls the task of preparing those brief but glowing sketches that accompany articles and chapters or appear on back covers and dust jackets? Chances are it will fall to you. Should you be asked to prepare a bio, accept the assignment as another opportunity to recruit readers and establish your authority to do the kind of research addressed in your report. What you say about yourself should link the study to your experience, expertise, and career; this is not the place to share the joy you derive from gardening or listening to music. Of your experience and past accomplishments, be specific and to the point. I appreciate authors who cite their *relevant* previous works by year and title, as opposed to those who claim to have published "several books and numerous articles on a wide variety of topics."

Sometimes, a parallel statement titled "About the Book" accompanies the author sketch just described. Such a statement is not intended as a reader's guide as much as a short history of how the book came to be written and its place in the author's career. If offered in lieu of an abstract, it probably needs to be up front as a preface, although my preference is to join these short pieces, About the Author and About the Book, and place them at the back, as I have done here. The reader who seeks such information can locate it easily enough. My rationale for placing all such material at the back is that readers are likely to be interested in knowing more about the author, or the role of the study in the author's career, or the people who helped along the way, *after* reading and assessing the contents than before. Attention should remain on

what the author has to say rather than to his or her credentials. If you feel, or if, for marketing purposes, your publisher insists, that this information serves a vital function by way of introduction, so be it. In dissertations, this function is performed by presenting a candidate's abbreviated vita; if the author wants to say more, it must be done in the text itself.

Table of Contents. I have extolled the virtues of preparing an early draft of a Table of Contents as a valuable tool, not only for subsequently organizing data but for organizing the field research as well. In the final stages of preparing a book-length study, the Table of Contents, with its chapter headings and subheadings, needs careful review in terms of appropriate titles, parallel treatment of like categories, and the sequence for unfolding the account. One way you can make a critical appraisal of the contents of the Contents is to pull out and list separately all headings and subheadings and to examine them in relation to each other. Do they provide an adequate structure to hold the account together and a workable sequence for developing it? Authors of briefer statements (articles, chapters in an edited volume, research notes or brief communications in journals) should recognize that their headings and subheadings constitute an implicit Table of Contents deserving the same critical attention.

Preparing a formal Table of Contents is another occasion requiring difficult decisions about level of detail. There is no universal formula, but trade-offs between as-much-as-possible and as-little-as-possible are fairly obvious. If you do not provide something by way of an abstract or a more explicit guide for your readers, the Table of Contents offers the only overview of what you are presenting, except in rare cases when a back cover or book jacket provides summary information.

As a general guideline, the more concise the Table of Contents the better. When contained on a single page, the Contents serve as both an outline and a reader's guide. The problem with a brief, eye-catching, bare-bones Table of Contents is that chapter headings may not convey an adequate sense of the scope and depth of your study, particularly if you employ conventional chapter titles from the standard I-H-M-R-D sequence (Introduction, Hypotheses, Method, Results, Discussion). I

hope you feel free to make your chapter titles more informative and more interesting than that. If you do not include an Index (dissertations never do, and neither do most qualitative/descriptive studies), the Table of Contents provides the only guide for anyone trying to locate material within the study. So, there is a case for providing a detailed one.

How to decide between a succinct Table of Contents and an elaborate one? You probably won't be given a choice; the publisher's preferences ordinarily prevail. But if you do have a choice, this is one more instance where your purposes and your intended audience can inform your decision. "More" may be better, sacrificing elegance for thoroughness to convey the depth of your inquiry. In dissertations and unpublished reports, a detailed Table of Contents is not only appropriate but essential. As a compromise between too much and too little, consider making your chapter titles as helpfully descriptive as possible and then expanding individual chapter descriptions to an overall limit of what will fit on a single *printed* page.

Among several books near at hand as I write, it appears that monographs and shorter, single-authored books tend to observe the one-page format. Textbooks and edited collections have Tables of Contents that may continue for several pages, staking an implicit claim to comprehensiveness. Should writing and editing prove your *métier* and you someday find yourself author or editor of a huge compendium, you might do what Russ Bernard has done for his comprehensive text *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (Bernard 2000). He provides readers with a "Brief Contents" (two pages in this case) followed by an expanded "Detailed Contents" (11 pages here) giving the major subheadings within each chapter.

The Abstract or Précis. It should be apparent that with the exception of a Table of Contents, I am not wildly enthusiastic about packing the front matter with the material usually placed there: dedications, prefaces, introductions, acknowledgments. But one possible category appears too infrequently: some sort of executive summary to call the attention of potential readers to what you have to report, even perhaps to suggest how the busy reader (i.e., one whom you suspect will read only hurriedly, if at all) might approach the reading.

The abstract is the most common form for presenting such information. Professional journals require that an abstract be included with any major article submitted for publication. Publishers sometimes make a similar request of an author submitting a longer manuscript, although they usually end up writing such copy themselves because abstracts are a crucial marketing tool. That may explain why glowing previews characteristic of book jacket blurbs contrast so markedly with impersonal author-abstracts found in professional journals. Most academics can't get pumped up enough to write a pitch for their own books, although none of us is adverse to having someone do it for us.

Guide to the Reader. An abstract or *précis* or executive summary can prove helpful to readers and thus is indirectly of benefit to the author as well. We should encourage their wider use. An author can be of even greater service by supplying a Guide to the Reader, not a bad idea with scholarly monographs that might otherwise be overlooked because of their very thoroughness. If it is truly a guide, rather than an abstract in disguise, it also may indicate where to locate specific topics within the text.

The earliest use of an executive summary that I recall in qualitative research appeared in a monograph by Murray and Rosalie Wax and Robert Dumont, Jr., *Formal Education in an American Indian Community*, originally published in 1964 and reissued in 1989. The entire study, 126 pages in length, including 11 pages of Appendix, stands as a model of field research and succinct reporting, particularly for its effort to reach an audience of practitioners. Yet even with so brief a report, the authors immediately catch a reader's attention with a three-paragraph (double-spaced, even on the printed page!) "Guide to the Reader" to convey the gist of their message to those they fear might not pause long enough to discern it for themselves. The opening paragraph of their Guide appears here as Figure 6.1.

Note the special reading assignment for "skeptics and critics" in the final sentence. That caution marked a recognition by the senior authors (sociologist Murray Wax, anthropologist Rosalie Wax) that their qualitatively oriented approach—not well recognized outside their respective disciplines at the time—would be subject to scrutiny by

A GUIDE TO THE READER

Those who must skim the pages of reports as they run from crisis to meeting to office are advised to turn to the chapter titled "Summary and Recommendations," which has been written with them in mind. Readers who wish to examine a picture of a contemporary Indian reservation and who are indifferent to the preliminaries of a research investigation are advised to turn to the second chapter, titled "Ecology, Economy, and Educational Achievement." Skeptics and critics will want to read not only the first chapter ["Perspective and Objectives of This Research"] but also the Appendix ["Research Procedure"] before proceeding into the heart of the text.

Figure 6.1. Example of an Effective Executive Summary
SOURCE: Wax et al. 1964:v. (Titles in brackets added.)

methodologists, although probably of little concern to busy practitioners. Alas! This summary seems to have been one of too few occasions when someone made use of the idea in a descriptive monograph. It is an idea whose time apparently has not yet come, although it remains a familiar feature in report writing.

Key Words and Descriptors. When submitting an article to a professional journal, you will probably be asked to supply some key words or descriptors to appear with it. As a journal editor, I was surprised at how little thought authors seemed to give to a standing request for index words. It was the practice of our journal to include several key words at the beginning of each article, and subsequently to use those words to compile an index for the volume year. Too few authors seemed able to put themselves in the position of a reader searching an index to locate relevant materials. For the *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, as an example, "anthropology and education" was not particularly help-

ful as an index topic. Choose words and phrases that communicate your research *problem* or research *setting*, rather than your fieldwork techniques. Think how little information is conveyed by "participant observation" as a locator term.

The Poster Session as a Form of Abstract. The executive summary has a counterpart in the idea of the poster presentation at professional meetings. Poster sessions have become increasingly popular as an alternative form for presenting information, especially at conferences, where it is necessary to accommodate a large number of presenters. The popularity of such sessions may be greater among program organizers than among presenters, although certainly there are researchers who dread the thought of having to prepare and present a formal paper. For a poster session, the researcher prepares a visual display—including printed text, maps, diagrams, photos, and artifacts—that summarizes the problem addressed, how it was researched, and the outcomes of the investigation. Typically, the researcher is present during a specified period when the poster is on display to converse with interested viewers who circulate among a number of such exhibits.

The invitation to participate in a poster session ought to be regarded as a welcome exercise for qualitative researchers. Anyone who has participated in a poster session might consider how something similar could make a useful addition to a written report. Should your proposal to present a paper at some future conference be met with an assignment to a poster session—something especially likely to happen to neophyte researchers—take the opportunity to explore how succinctly you can convey the essence of what you have been doing and what you have learned. Don't just post a copy of the paper you hoped to present; if you need long explanations, prepare a supplementary handout that gives more detail. Use the space allotted to provide a clear and succinct overview of what you have done, in the same manner that a newspaper headline is meant to entice us into wanting to find out more. Remember to feature your own name and a contact address, and also highlight your statement of purpose, unless you are planning to make a career of being obscure. Of course your name is not yet likely to be linked with the research you are reporting—that's why you're there, remember!

Dissertation Abstracts. Graduate students face an unexpected (and not particularly welcome) task when informed that, weeks before they are scheduled to defend and subsequently to submit the final faculty-approved copy of their dissertation, they must submit in final form an abstract for *Dissertation Abstracts*. That is a requirement at virtually all institutions of higher learning. For years, the collected abstracts have been published as bound volumes circulated nationally and internationally; today, they can be filed electronically as well. This is the *only* widely circulated announcement that will ever appear about most dissertations. Too often, writing this brief but important statement is left for the last minute, at which time the author dashes off a hasty synopsis that, instead, ought to be concise, highly informative, and carefully written.

Having to encapsulate one's major professional preoccupation of the past months—or years—into the inviolable word limit of an article abstract for a journal, or of one's dissertation study for *Dissertation Abstracts*, can seem like the last straw. Fortunately, it *is* about the last straw, a signal to celebrate that a major effort is finally nearing completion. As with anything you write, give time and thought to preparing your abstract, review it editorially, try it out on others, and ask someone to read it aloud to you. An abstract affords a valuable opportunity to inform a wide audience, capture potential readers, and develop or expand your interactive professional network. Whether others will pursue the reading of your complete text may depend entirely on their assessment of this tiny sample of your writing, including its style. Once again, emphasize problem and content, not fieldwork techniques.

THE BODY OF THE TEXT

With the content of your study firmly in place, some further decisions must be made as to where things go. Footnotes serve as a prime example, although, like several related decisions, this one may already have been made for you. There are also some things you can do to improve readability independent of the text, such as giving careful attention to

headings and subheadings, paragraphing, and the judicious use of graphics. These topics are discussed briefly here.

My comments throughout the monograph deal only with the preparation of written text, not with alternative forms of textual representation such as ethnopoeitics or performance texts such as ethnotheatre. **Performance texts** have narrators, drama, action, and shifting points of view with materials that are variously “turned into poems, scripts, short stories, and dramas that are read and performed before audiences” (Denzin 1997:91). Frankly, I’m too old, too traditional, and too wedded to a text-dependent career to be a major player in such efforts.² Keep in mind that there are a lot of us old and/or traditional types around. I think it prudent for anyone tempted by these innovative approaches to do the “printed text thing” first, before exploring less conventional alternatives for getting the message out. Furthermore, as Amanda Coffey cautions, such textual practices expose the author to new forms of critical scrutiny, “not only to ‘getting it right’ as a social researcher but also as a more or less successful poet, playwright or creative writer” (1999:152). But even a purely textual approach can be supplemented and enhanced to appeal to a wider range of readers, as well as to assist readers wishing to use a text as a resource. Let me review some of them.

Headings, Subheadings, and Paragraphs. Unless you write seamless prose, take a final look at your use of headings and subheadings and at the length of your paragraphs. Short sentences and short paragraphs make for comfortable reading, although academic authors are not inclined to write that way. If you can find no other basis for dividing up your long paragraphs into two or three shorter ones through efforts at editing, then be arbitrary about it. Give your readers a break by taking one yourself. There is no hard and fast rule, but in general, there ought to be at least two or three paragraph breaks on a standard 8½ × 11 page.

Consider as well whether readability would be improved by the insertion of more headings and subheadings. When important points seem not to draw the attention they deserve, or when the text seems to jump abruptly from one subtopic to the next, the addition of a heading or subheading may help signal the transition. I mention these devices as writing tricks here because if you haven’t been able to break up your text

through relentless editing, then you must do it mechanically, with an eye toward achieving an aesthetic balance between space and text.

Footnotes or Endnotes. Notes that accompany text are properly considered text rather than front or back matter. Nevertheless, with some publishers, certain traditions, and most journals, they too often *follow* the text rather than accompany it. That is, notes are placed at the end of each separately authored article or chapter, or at the back of an authored book. Although you may have no choice as to where the notes will be placed, you certainly have control over the number and quality of them.

One resolution to the dilemma of seeing the notes separated from text is to write without them. All of your references—to your field notes or interviews, to sources formally cited, to ideas gleaned from others, even your editorial asides—can be embedded in parentheses within the text where they appear. That may result in some long, unwieldy sentences, and you may find yourself deleting entries because they interrupt rather than enhance the text. Perhaps you will discover that you do not need the notes after all.

If you find that you cannot dispense with footnotes, try to keep them to a minimum, and exert what influence you can to keep them near the text that prompts them. If you are given no choice in these matters, it is because they are considered to be questions of format and style dictated by tradition and, in journal publication, by economies of time and money. It used to cost more to keep footnotes on the page corresponding with text because lines of type had to be moved (literally, by hand) to accommodate them. Computerization has eliminated this as a technical problem, but old habits die hard, and journals and publishers can prove as hidebound as academic disciplines in leaving things as they were. Journal articles are not usually so lengthy that it is a burden to locate accompanying notes printed at the end of an article. With longer works, I find it utterly exasperating to have to search for endnotes that have been collected along the way and deposited at the back of a book.

Only for fields such as history and biography, which seem to thrive on citations to other sources, can I think of a convincing rationale for separating notes from text. Even there, the consequence—and resulting

paradox—is that scholars writing in these traditions are forever interrupting themselves, sometimes giving their footnoting such attention that it takes on a life of its own to comprise a study-within-a-study. Although well established in the disciplines where it is practiced, excessive footnoting does not provide a good model for field-oriented researchers whose primary sources deserve primary billing. We may be chided by scholars in other disciplines for “making up our own data,” but that ought to show to advantage in the type of data we have to present and the authoritative manner in which we present it.

I write early drafts without footnotes. I allow myself considerable excess in using parenthetical comments within sentences, occasionally writing a parenthetical paragraph as well. During revision, I reexamine these parenthetical comments to see if I can incorporate them into the text. Any remaining tangents, explanations, and asides are reviewed critically with an eye for turning them into footnotes. My earlier preference was to avoid footnotes entirely (the first edition had none). That was no doubt a legacy from the days when we worked with typewritten manuscripts and footnoting presented a typing nightmare. Clever word processing programs now keep track of them for us.

The advantage of such notes is that they allow the main text to go forward without interruption. Some authors use footnotes effectively, and a few delight us with them, but I regard them as something of a habit-forming affectation in academic writing. Like underlining and using quotation marks to set off “cute” words, as we did in the old days, or using *italics* and **boldface** through word processing today, footnoting can lose its effectiveness through overuse. Footnotes themselves can be as disruptive as the nesting sets of parentheses that characterize the writing of some academics.

Authors who want to avoid the footnoting ritual yet make their sources and explanatory comments readily available have yet another option. Instead of indicating endnote references in the text, one can credit all quoted sources and provide additional comments in a final section devoted to (end)notes supplementing the text. A brief repetition of original text or an excerpt from quoted material is sufficient to make identification easy.³

Charts, Diagrams, and Tables. Until you create a manuscript of your own, you may not be aware of the proper and distinct formats for tables, charts, diagrams, figures, maps, and so forth, or customary ways of representing statistical data. This is the kind of detail to which publishers (and graduate schools, if you are writing a thesis) pay close attention. You will undoubtedly be informed that you are expected to provide camera-ready copy if your text is accompanied by figures or other artwork. Exactly what constitutes camera-ready material varies widely depending on the technological expertise and the extent of publisher assistance or control, so it is essential to understand, in each case, what is required and who is best able to do it.

When preparing a manuscript without a particular publisher in mind, you ought to be able to anticipate most of the conditions that will later be laid down. The time to get tabular material in order is when you prepare it initially. Formatting is part of it. Attention paid to detail as you proceed will later pay off handsomely when you can attend to new problems rather than have to circle back to redo or recheck everything you present in table form.

There are important decisions regarding the level of information that accompanies such material. As discussed earlier, the guiding rule is that tables and figures must be accompanied by sufficient information that they stand alone; they should not be dependent on prose within the text to make sense. Careful attention to subheadings can help, but the choice of a clear, accurate, and adequate title for each table, chart, or diagram is the most important feature. Tables themselves can be accompanied by their own independently numbered footnotes to offer fuller explanation, such as why percent figures do not sum to 100% or why the *N*s vary from entry to entry.

A Note on Using Statistics in Qualitative Study. I was surprised, even a bit disappointed, to see that the use of simple descriptive statistics seems to have declined in recent years, at least among sociocultural anthropologists publishing in their own journals (Chibnik 1999). Whether statistics have a place in any particular study must, of course, be judged in terms of focus and purposes, but it may be time to remind ourselves to count or measure whatever warrants being counted and

measured and to summarize and report statistically when appropriate. I do not recommend including a table or two simply to make an article appear more scientific, but there are times when a great deal of data can be summarized in a table. There also are quantitatively oriented readers among our audiences who are consoled when they find such treatments in our studies. If you have a preference for uninterrupted prose, consider summarizing relevant data in tabular form presented as appendixes (discussed below).

Artwork and Photography. At several points, aesthetic and practical decisions (i.e., cost and feasibility, permissions) must be made about how a manuscript will look. These include whether photographs or other artwork are to be included, as well as stylistic questions about type size, font, and even whether to use icons or drop-cap letters at the beginning of chapters. If you are publishing in a journal or an ongoing series, most decisions have already been made. With the publication of a book, there are some one-of-a-kind decisions to be made, at least as far as you, the author, are concerned—provided someone is thoughtful enough to ask your opinion. My experience is that as publication draws near, there are so many details to be taken care of that decisions about the artwork—the cover design in particular—are likely to be forestalled and then, at the last minute, rushed. The only power you may be able to exercise is to veto ideas that do not seem to work or that threaten the overall integrity of the production.

Authors seem willing to leave these matters to chance, as though choices like the cover design or color are none of their business. I know of few academic authors genuinely delighted with the cover art for their books, and some have been quite dejected by outcomes over which they felt they had no control. Although you are unlikely to have final authority, it certainly won't hurt to make your preferences known. Would you rather have impressionistic art, a mechanical design, an abstraction, or something quite lifelike? Do you want the cover to reflect something of the contents of the book, or simply to be aesthetically pleasing? You might send the publisher color photocopies of covers that appeal to you and explain what you like about them. In that way, you may influence the cover decision in spite of being denied a final say.

I am also surprised at the number of people who have told me that the cover design influences whether they even bother to browse a book. The best cover design I have had—a cartoon-like sketch of two knights jousting, reflecting the combative mood in *Teachers Versus Technocrats* (1977)—was drawn not by a cover artist but by a friend (Jerry Williams) who was the set designer for the university's theater department. I told him what I envisioned; he was able to capture the idea with pen and ink.

Fieldwork often includes photography, and photos certainly can enhance text, just as poor reproductions, or photos only tangentially relevant to the text, may detract from the overall quality of the finished product. Don't succumb to allowing anything schlocky to compete with text you have struggled to polish. If a picture is still worth a thousand words (pre-inflation), keep in mind that photos of poor quality can detract by at least the same amount. As a guideline, if you feel you ought to apologize for the quality of any of your photographs—even if they're the only ones you have—why not leave them out? Avoid having to make the apology. Conversely, if your photographs are of superior quality, do more to feature them. Integrate them with the text, perhaps even select one (or form a collage of several) for the cover.

THE BACK MATTER

Appendixes and Supplements. Appendixes (or Appendices, following the Latin) are auxiliary materials added at the back. Tables, charts, maps, and diagrams critical to the text ordinarily appear with it, but there may be additional material that an author wishes to make available. A practice among qualitative researchers is to excerpt relatively brief portions of important material—interviews, especially—in the text, augmented by fuller typescripts in an appendix. In that way, detailed information can be made available for the technical reader without burdening the text with lengthy transcripts. Similarly, interview schedules or questionnaires are sometimes included in an appendix. Such plans may be thwarted by a publisher on the grounds that the material is of limited interest and can be obtained through direct

contact with the researcher. (We never quite dissuade ourselves of the belief that our readers are deeply interested in every last detail of our studies.)

Another use of an appendix is to provide additional illustrative material or case histories that supplement the main text without interrupting the account. When one's audience is presumed to be quantitatively oriented, yet the researcher feels that descriptive data provide critical information and perspective, an appendix can supply such information without requiring explanation or apology. My hope is that "closet" qualitative researchers who are aware of the potential contribution that these approaches make, yet who are reluctant to go public on their behalf, might follow a progression in their work that increases the qualitative dimension a little at a time. Case histories or comparable descriptive material can be slipped unobtrusively into an appendix in one's earliest studies, subsequently to be given more prominence (e.g., incorporated into the main text), still later achieving chapter status, and eventually given center stage. The progression from a rigidly quantitative approach to an essentially qualitative one in the careers of some research luminaries should not go unremarked.

The terms *Supplement* or *Supplementary Materials* can be used interchangeably with Appendixes. If the additional materials are so voluminous that they are bound separately, they are usually labeled as a Supplement. A caution: The bulkier those appendixes or supplementary materials become, the more you need to ask whether you still believe that data speak for themselves. If data do speak for themselves, there ought to be a great demand for original field notes and full-length interview protocols. Is there?

References/Bibliography. The most important back matter in scholarly publishing, and of immense help to professional colleagues, is the section for references. To readers familiar with the literature in a particular field, an author's list of references provides a quick and fairly reliable guide to his or her disciplinary or professional orientation, as well as to the depth and currency of that orientation. When I need a quick gauge on researchers whose works are unfamiliar to me, I check their "quoting circle"—the authors and studies they cite.

Although the two labels, References and Bibliography, continue to be used somewhat interchangeably, a distinction between them has come to be widely recognized in this age of information (and publication) overload. Bibliographies retain their traditional definition as “lists of works” on a subject, the kind of comprehensive-but-focused guide to the literature prepared by resource librarians or someone pursuing a highly specialized interest. There was a time when a scholar making a new contribution was expected to provide a comprehensive list of all previously published material in the field. Those lists were properly called *Bibliographies*.

Today, such Renaissance thoroughness is seldom seen and not ordinarily expected. It has become increasingly difficult to remain up-to-date and in command of the relevant literature, even in highly specialized subfields. Those who doggedly try to keep up with what everyone else is writing seldom find time for commensurate writing of their own. As a result of this information explosion—in quantity, if not always in quality—bibliographic thoroughness expected in an earlier day has been replaced by expediency. Instead of compiling comprehensive bibliographies, we are now expected to provide references *only* to works specifically mentioned in the text, which are now labeled References or References Cited. The guidelines as to what constitutes a legitimate reference are quite explicit: If no citation appears in the text, an item is not to be included in the references. As one academic journal advises contributors, if you can follow the logic, “All entries in the reference list must be cited in the text and vice versa.”

Inexperienced authors are often caught unaware, creating extra work for conscientious editors—and possible embarrassment for themselves—when informed that they have included among their references works not cited or, the complementary sin, that they have included citations in text for which no reference is provided. Inventorying such irregularities is one of the early and easier tasks for a copy editor.

One drawback of the current practice is that for any and every reference an author wants to include, a citation *must* appear somewhere in the text. Journal articles often contain a telltale sentence listing in perfunctory fashion all the ought-to-be-mentioned classics that, quite likely,

will not be mentioned again. One way around such rigid citation practice is to combine the reference and bibliographic functions under a more flexible title such as “References and Select Bibliography” or “References and Further Reading.” A specialized topic might even warrant a separate list for “Recommended Readings.” Another alternative, the only option for complying with most journal formats, is to review the classics in a footnote (or endnote) listing important prior works, perhaps noting how one’s intended contribution fits among them. Because citations appearing in footnotes are included among the references, the classics receive due recognition without the shoddy treatment sometimes apparent when they are simply listed in pro forma fashion within the body of the text.

Embedding critical citations in the text rather than in footnotes or endnotes not only reduces the need for footnoting but also weans us from the practice of employing Latin abbreviations unfamiliar to today’s scholars. In place of “*ibid.*,” “*loc. cit.*,” or “*op. cit.*,” when a citation is to the work previously cited, only a page reference is required. When the citation is to a different work, or there is any possible confusion, simply repeat the author’s name and year of publication, along with specific reference to page numbers, as appropriate.

If we could now get authors to stop putting a period after “*et*” when they abbreviate the phrase “*et alia*” in reference to multiple authors, our ignorance of Latin would no longer be so apparent. In the meantime, some thoughtful programmer would do the academic world a favor by including “*et.*” among the misspellings to be rounded up at spell-check time.

Along these same lines, in the first citation to a multiple-authored work, *all* authors ordinarily are identified, even if it seems that every graduate student on the project—or doctor in the hospital—got in on the act. In subsequent reference to the same citation, “*et al.*” is acceptable after naming only the first author. Some guidelines suggest rather arbitrarily that you needn’t list all authors (except for the full citation that must appear in the References) if there are more than six. In any case, authorship shared among several contributors is not a common practice among qualitative researchers. It is a legacy from laboratory science in

which authorship is shared among those who participate in the theoretical or experimental work as well as in the write-up.

In qualitative research, where the writing can make or break a study, I suggest that only the principal author(s) be identified. Minor collaborators, field assistants, or seminar members can be identified in the Acknowledgments, where they do not confound citations or imply authorship. Given current interest in collaborative research, coupled with misgivings about the lack of adequate recognition that collaborators have sometimes received in the past (particularly with life history accounts), we find authorship shared more generously today. The authors of “other people’s stories” seem especially careful to acknowledge each party’s role in what is regarded as authorial partnership.

As with many of the details reviewed in this chapter, you may have no choice about reference style once a study is accepted for publication. An editor may send you a style sheet; refer you to a recent publication, journal issue, or Web page; or point you to whichever style manual (and edition) currently serves as standard. Graduate schools typically expect dissertation writers to follow current practice in their academic discipline as exemplified in its leading journals.

Although you may have no choice in selecting the style for a particular publication, these are discretionary matters, and you can take comfort in recognizing the wide range of practices extant. My personal choice for reference style is that of the *American Anthropologist*, which is the style followed here. I like it not only because of its obvious link with the ethnographic tradition but for several other attractive features. It is clean (no quotation marks, parentheses, or underlines/italics unless they appear in the original); it is complete (no abbreviations; capitalization follows the original source; authors’ full names may be used); and it is elegant (authors’ names appear only once, on a separate line that precedes reference to their works, listed chronologically beginning with the earliest).

Working in an anthropological tradition in the psychologically dominated field of educational research, I have often found it ironic to be directed to put my references into APA style (i.e., consistent with the current edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psycholog-*

ical Association), especially when presenting or discussing research carried out in an ethnographic tradition. Admittedly, however, APA renders a service by offering a widely accepted standard for authors and editors alike, just as the Modern Language Association of America offers authors in the humanities its *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*. I urge researchers pursuing ethnographically oriented fieldwork to familiarize themselves with “AA style” and employ it if given that option. However, in the broad field of qualitative research, or in a discipline like sociology that recognizes no single style as standard, the best general advice is to be consistent in following the style of one of the major journals in the field.

Glossary. The Latin root of this term refers to a difficult word requiring explanation. A glossary is an alphabetized list of such words. An author also may supply a list of abbreviations or foreign terms appearing in the text, accompanied by explanations or definitions. The question of whether readers might benefit from such help offers a final opportunity to reflect on one’s intended audience(s). We lose track too easily of how specialized our research topics become, or how much insider language we have adopted for our own. If you are writing only for your fellow insiders, there will be no need for such lists. But are you? Technical terms come first to mind, but postmodern authors might have found broader appeal had they recognized that not even their everyday language was shared by all.

Index. For years, I managed to escape the alleged drudgery of having to prepare an index. When it finally became necessary to prepare one, I was surprised at how the task resembled organizing data of any kind. Having now created an index for three of my books, including this one, I have been pleased with the result and surprised at how helpful and accessible an index can be, even to the author. Indexes make our studies infinitely more useful as scholarly resources. I hereby acknowledge that the absence of an index in my earlier books (anything published prior to 1995) is a serious shortcoming.

A publisher may insist that an index be provided. The task can be hired out if you have neither the time nor the patience for compiling it yourself. Time is a real concern: Indexing cannot be completed until page

proofs are in hand, and at that point, virtually everything else has been taken care of, so at the last minute, the author can be the one who holds up the works. This is not a problem if you have anticipated this step and prepared a working draft of the index. And no doubt, the best person to prepare an index is the person who wrote the book. As William Germano points out, “No one but the author can do the index the way the author wants it” (2001:178). That is the person most keenly aware of its underlying purpose and concepts, not just someone plodding mechanically through the text concordance-like to identify key words.

Software programs designed to assist with indexing tend to pull one in the latter direction, because they deal more readily with key words than with key concepts, although indexing is but one more example of how microcomputers can assist in compiling and organizing data from the ground up. However, my author-compiled indexes were compiled in the opposite way: top down. I was guided in each instance by the stated purposes and intended audience of the book and by the major ideas and concepts one might expect to be addressed in it. I also borrowed useful subject headings from the indexes of several books comparable to mine. From the borrowed lists and my own inventory of likely headings, I compiled a working draft of the new index. Then, I began testing my developing index against the text, adding needed categories, consolidating them, and deleting redundant or unused ones until I had a fairly comprehensive index. This, in turn, was fine-tuned in the process of paginating it against page proofs. Publishers may have their own guidelines as to format. The *Chicago Manual of Style* provides an authoritative general source.

I compiled a name index separately from the subject index for each book. The former was easy to do and enabled me to double-check whether I had included all the authors I had cited, and vice versa. By identifying it as a Name Index rather than an Author Index, I could include *all* individuals mentioned, not just those cited as authors. An opposite guideline prevails in preparing a Subject Index: To warrant inclusion, topics should not simply be mentioned but should be *developed* within the text. A subject index can become as complete and as detailed as its compiler chooses to make it. It can also be an unwitting victim of space restrictions, for it is the only section where the allotted

number of pages can be decreased at the last minute to meet stringent page limits determined at printing.

I am told that authors who provide their own indexes tend to compile shorter ones with each new book. If that is true, is it because they get better at it or because they grow weary of the chore? I know for certain that, having indexed books of my own, I now fully appreciate, and *expect*, an index in academic books written by others.

Page Proofs and Proofing. The rush I feel when I receive page proofs of a forthcoming work is at once literal, figurative, and ambivalent. After what always seems inordinate delay, an author cannot help but wonder at receiving either the copyedited manuscript or printer's proofs by overnight mail with instructions to correct and return everything within 72 hours! With page proofs, the rush is also sensory, often more exciting than seeing the finished product several weeks or months later.

The ambivalence stems from the realization that words that have been in flux for so long are quickly “setting up,” about to become permanent. In this final pass, you are asked only to ensure that what *will* appear in print corresponds with your manuscript. You can catch the printer's follies, but you may have to live with your own.⁴ If you have been asked to provide a disk along with the hard copy of your manuscript, you may be surprised to discover that *you* are the source of some of the errors that have made their way into the final copy. If you are able to negotiate even minor changes at this late stage, you also may be required to accompany your request with funds to cover additional costs. Most likely, you will be instructed to do absolutely no rewriting. The lesson is straightforward and so is the moral: The time for editing is past.

Therefore, regardless of how weary you may have grown of your manuscript, how anxious you are to be done with it, force yourself to read it one last time before you send it off. Visualize your words as though they have appeared in a book or journal. This *is* the version that counts. It may not be too late to make critical changes, although you won't make any friends by doing so this late. Better to see yourself as gradually letting go, for in a sense, the manuscript is no longer in your hands. Make sure you keep a backup copy of any last-minute changes or corrections,

and send the page proofs back, ready for the printer. Your manuscript has begun a life of its own.

END GAME

- ✎ Carefully read and follow the guidelines for submitting manuscripts. You may be able to negotiate some requirements, but in general, you will be expected to know and observe format specifications.
- ✎ Don't allow the seemingly small tasks associated with finishing up to be given short shrift as last-minute details attended to hurriedly. Your final title and Table of Contents, your bibliographic citations, your abstract, your indexes—anything you prepare may be judged as a sample of your scholarship and writing. Be sure they are accurate, informative, and well written.
- ✎ Don't overburden the account with prefaces, introductions, forewords, acknowledgments, dedications, and so on. Get to the point. If you want to chat more informally with readers, consider doing so at the conclusion of your study, when they are better able to decide whether they would like to know more about you or your work.
- ✎ When making additions to your bibliography or inserting quoted material from informants or other sources, get the detail you need, get it right, and be done with it. Don't leave to the last minute the chore of checking details when it is so much easier to get things right the first time.

Notes

1. In that regard, I had better acknowledge George Spindler as the source of the idea introduced earlier of theory as "making work," lest he get after me again! We discussed some of the material presented in Chapter 4 during a visit in May 2000.

2. However, I have been collaborating as dramaturg with Professor Johnny Saldaña, Department of Theatre, Arizona State University, on a scripted performance adapted from the Brad Trilogy (see Wolcott 1994:Ch. 3, 7, 11) titled "Finding My Place." The 90-minute "performance text" was presented at the "Advances in Qualitative Methods" conference in Edmonton, sponsored by the International Institute for Qualitative Methodology, University of Alberta, February 2001. For more on performance texts or performance ethnography, see Denzin 1997, Ch. 4; McCall 2000.

3. For an example, see *Culture: The Anthropologist's Account* (Kuper 1999), in which 247 pages of text are followed by 38 pages of explanatory notes and citations. Only one formal footnote appears in the body of the text, accompanied by the author's observation that footnoting itself is "a particular focus of deconstructionist analysis" (p. 214).

4. Even if you have worked closely with the copy editor, this will be your only chance to check *all* changes made to your manuscript. Copy editors work on your behalf, but they work *for* the publisher, and changes they deem improvements are incorporated directly. When copyediting was done on hard copy, changes were easy to detect. Now that most copyediting is done on disk, request that a copyedited disk on which changes can be highlighted be sent for your approval.