

LAGS WORKING PAPERS, FIRST SERIES (1981)

WORKING PAPER NUMBER FIFTEEN

LAGS Protocols: Editorial Procedures

Susan E. Leas

LAGS Protocols: Editorial Procedures

All of the procedures in the editing of the LAGS protocols have been undertaken to improve the quality and accessibility of the materials. The phonetic transcriptions and marginal notes in a given protocol constitute one analogue of its field record, serving as "a guide for subsequent auditions and the composition of other analogues,"¹ but not as an inviolable text in itself. Only the tape-recorded interviews may not be altered; the protocols can, and indeed have been revised, both to add supplementary entries and to improve the accuracy of the existing transcription and marginalia. The editorial programs involved in these processes have included 1) the re-evaluation of the classification of each interview according to community and locality, and of the identifying characteristics of the informant; 2) the proofreading of all protocols by one or more of the editors, along with the addition of cross references; 3) the auditing of questionable items by the editors, with subsequent corrections and explanatory glosses; 4) the complete auditing of 79 records, also involving additions and corrections; 5) the re-copying of 41 early transcriptions to facilitate their future use; 6) the retranscription of 80 field records, either by the original scribe or by another regular LAGS scribe; 7) the replacement of eight marginal interviews with more complete recent field records; 8) the editing of the personal data and community/character sketches prior to publication; and 9) the establishment of an errata list to provide for later revisions of the protocols. Each of these procedures will be described in turn below.

RE-EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION

Beginning in the summer of 1980, and continuing through the early months of 1981, LAGS editors re-evaluated each protocol according to its classification by locality and community and by the characteristics of the informant used in the stamped heading. This procedure was necessary because of alterations in terminology and the meaning of symbols during the course of the project. In the earlier years of fieldwork, interviewers generally classified their records according to the locality in which the informant was living at the time, but in more recent years, the protocol locality was usually the birthplace. In order to remove this inconsistency in the choice of town, the editors reviewed each personal data sheet submitted by the fieldworker and revised by the scribe, making changes wherever appropriate so that the protocol locality would correspond to the birthplace if possible. Since this procedure required the re-stamping of each page of the protocol in which the correction was made, plus corresponding changes in all lists of protocols and other office records, the alterations were kept minimal. Usually if the informant was born in the same county or parish where he resided at the time of the interview, the locality was left the same; the only essential changes were those requiring a different county. In a few cases, the informant mentions his county of birth but does not name a town; in these protocols, the county seat is used as the protocol locality.

At the same time, the editors attempted to verify all locations mentioned by the informant that were recorded on the data sheets, by consulting maps and geographical reference books. When the place-name was not found in any standard source, the tape was audited in an effort to obtain additional information about its location. Some of the unverified places proved to be errors on the part of

the fieldworker or scribe, but others, evidently too small to be listed in official records or no longer in existence, were not found. Any unverified place-name which had been a protocol locality was then changed to a larger town in the same area, usually the mailing address of the informant. Despite the editors' attempt to change as few headings as possible, approximately 40 protocols were ultimately affected by these alterations.²

In reviewing the data sheets, the editors also discovered that a number of changes were needed in the informant characteristics, either because of error or because of a different use of symbols. Of the elements in this classification, including the sex, social class, racial caste, age, educational level, and general perspective, the greatest variance was in the symbols for education. Originally the Arabic numbers 1, 2, and 3 had reflected the fieldworker's appraisal of the informant's education, including not only his formal schooling but also his efforts at self-education and his reading. Later the three numbers were used much more rigidly: 1 for elementary school, 2 for high school, and 3 for college. However, fieldworkers continued to interpret the symbols in various ways: some used the 1 to mean an education up to tenth grade, while others might use a 2 for an informant who had only a fifth-grade formal education but who was widely read and worldly in perspective. In the final classification, the meaning of the numbers was more definite: 1 for less than one full year of high school (i.e., ninth grade); 2 for at least one full year of high school and less than one full year of an accredited liberal arts college; 3 for at least one full year of college, not including technical or trade schools. Almost 100 protocols were reclassified and restamped to make this numbering more precise. At the same time, a few errors in sex, racial caste, and age were also corrected.³

No list of these altered protocols is provided here because all materials relating to them have been changed to agree with the new classifications.⁴ The information provided on the personal data sheets with each protocol and in the Table of Informants (Part II of the Basic Materials) in all instances reflects the revisions rather than the original classifications.

THE PROOFREADING OF PROTOCOLS

Beginning in the fall of 1979 and continuing through the fall of 1980, LAGS editors systematically proofread each protocol in the collection, for the dual purpose of correcting errors and making cross references. Although ideally, all protocols should have been read by all editors, the time-consuming nature of this task required that most volumes in the collection had only one proofreading.⁵ As a result, many actual or potential errors were not noted, necessitating the creation of the errata list, discussed below. The following proofreading guidelines were observed during the procedure:

Proofreading Guidelines

I. General Considerations

- A. The primary function of proofreading is to correct or to question obvious or possible scribal errors.
- B. The secondary function of proofreading is to cross-reference all protocol items to the most likely line in the protocol (e.g., all instances of the number ten should be cross-referenced to 1.5).
- C. If possible, each protocol should be proofread twice and all questionable items should be audited.
- D. The proofreader should also note whether each protocol is full or incomplete and other strengths and weaknesses such as legibility.

II. Error Correction

- A. Add omitted stress marks whenever the pattern is obvious.
- B. Correct misspelled words in glosses in conventional orthography.
- C. Correct incorrectly labeled verb tenses and other obvious grammatical errors.
- D. Make ambiguous symbols more legible.
- E. Add glosses to indicate tenses and other grammatical features if necessary for clarity.
- F. Make a list of all questionable items, such as probable omitted letters, unlikely phonetics, possible mistaken interpretations, and illegible or incomprehensible passages.

III. Cross Referencing

- A. Make cross references for all primary items, even if part of a compound (e.g., firedogs, 8.3, to dog, 33.1).
- B. Cross-reference grammatical structures, especially if the original lines are blank (e.g., forms of going to 24.7-8).
- C. If lines and margins are already overcrowded, additional cross references may be omitted.
- D. Pay particular attention to long syntactic units (e.g., 39.6-9, 53.4-9), each of which may contain several items to be cross-referenced.
- E. Each cross reference should be entered in the margin as close as possible to other forms of the item on that line.
- F. If space permits, enter all cross references in the margin rather than the base line, and do not write on the bottom line.
- G. Do not cross-reference multiple instances of the same pronunciation unless necessary to show that one pronunciation is dominant in the

~~Idiolect~~ idiolect.

- H. Include as many cross references from the urban supplement as possible (e.g., bag from 116 and 123, music from 130).
- I. Cross-reference items that are not primary work-sheet items but are often needed for Idiolect Synopsis primary and alternate forms, including woman (to 63.2 or 65.2), lawyer (to 67.8 or 68.6) and long (to 40.1).

The cross-referencing procedure evolved to become more elaborate during the course of the work, so that protocols that were proofread during the first few months of the operation will have fewer cross references than those read later in 1980.⁶ As Guideline III-I suggests, the information provided by the marginal references was particularly helpful in the composition of the Idiolect Synopses (Part III of the Basic Materials).

In the LAGS protocols, the cross references are of three types. See references are used when the original line is blank; see also references are used when there is at least one entry on the original line; a text reference indicates that the phonetic string is part of a longer context that is found elsewhere in the protocol. Thus, the entry dogs at 33.1 with the marginal note text 8.3 is part of the firedogs compound. Most see and see also references were entered during the proofreading, although some scribes, notably Pederson and DeVere, made considerable use of them during the transcription. The text references were usually entered by the scribes because the proofreader could not be certain that a word was actually part of a larger context rather than spoken in isolation.

The cross-referencing procedure, however, although helpful to the reader of the protocol, is secondary in importance to the location and correction of errors in the notation. For this reason, the auditing program was under-

taken before the proofreading was complete and pursued for as long as time permitted.

AUDITING OF QUESTIONABLE ITEMS

Continuing through most of 1980, the editors attempted to resolve the problems in protocol entries noted through the proofreading by a systematic auditing of all questioned items.⁷ Though this was often a straightforward and simple operation, involving the use of the scoring beside the item in the protocol to find the position on the tape in the field record, the procedure became more difficult when the item being sought occurred in conversation. In the latter instance, it was usually necessary to listen attentively to a five-to-ten-minute segment of the tape, waiting for the form to occur. When a conversational form was not scored by the scribe, the auditor had no means of locating it. Consequently, though most of the proofreaders' questions were answered through the auditing program, a few of the mysteries remained unsolved. In a few cases, the meaning of the utterance was as mysterious to the auditor as it had been to the proofreader.

In general, the four editors took care of their own protocols in terms of auditing and making corrections. This process accounted for over 750 of the 1,118 protocols, leaving only the records transcribed by DeVere, Edmundson, Richardson, and Pendergrass to be audited. Those of Edmundson, usually neat and uncomplicated, presented the fewest problems, while the fuller protocols of the other three scribes were often much more difficult to work with. Since it was not known early in 1980 whether there would be time to audit all the records with questioned entries, the protocols of those four scribes were divided into two lists: high priority (those protocols with long lists of possible errors and incoherent notation) and low priority (those protocols

with only a few questions by the proofreaders). Ultimately, all of these field records were audited for the problems noted, and almost all of the problems were resolved, either by the addition of a marginal gloss to explain the context or by a change in the phonetic notation itself.

COMPLETE AUDITING

The auditing of questionable items, above, confirmed a fact already known by the editors: that any given protocol could probably be improved by a complete audition, both to correct phonetic inaccuracies and to add items from conversation omitted in the original transcription. Had time been unlimited, many of the field records would have been audited in their entirety, either by the original scribe, or, in the case of scribes who were no longer on the staff, by one of the editors. As an experimental program to determine the value of such a large-scale operation for the improvement of the quality of the protocols, Leas began auditing the records transcribed by Edmundson, particularly those that were likely to contain a high proportion of conversational items.⁸ Very few of the phonetic notations were altered during this procedure, for its primary purpose was to add items from conversation and to expand marginal glosses. Ultimately, 58 of Edmundson's 125 protocols were audited in this manner; some of them were found to need few additions, and others were extensively revised. This program of auditing was forced to an end by the arrival of the photographer from University Microfilms International, since the materials for microform publication had to be considered complete at that time. The auditing procedure seldom turned an incomplete protocol into a complete one, but sometimes did significantly improve the fullness of a volume. These 58 protocols are listed in table 1.

TABLE 1

EDMUNDSON PROTOCOLS AUDITED BY LEAS

T	053.08	Atlanta	CG	282.01	New Brockton	FO	501.03	El Dorado
W	061.02	Morrow	CH	286.01	Mexboro	FP	506.02	Lake Village
W	062.05	Fayetteville	CL	299.02	Laurel Hill	FT	523.05	Blanchard
Y	067.05	Macon	CM	301.04	Barrineau Park	FV	529.02	De Ridder
Z	068.01	Barnesville	DB	210.02	Elbridge	FX	537.01	Marksville
AE	091.01	Florence	DE	321.01	Arp	GE	579.01	Greenville
AJ	106.01	Coleman	DF	322.02	Bolivar	GF	585.01	Fort Worth
AK	109.01	St. Marys	DI	330.02	Holly Springs	GI	616.01	Beaumont
AM	117.05	Valdosta	DI	335.01	Sherard	GI	616.04	Port Arthur
AN	121.01	Moultrie	DK	340.01	Toxish	GJ	619.01	Galveston
AW	153.01	St. Augustine	DL	346.03	Taylor	GL	628.01	Tivoli
AX	157.01	Paola	DL	346.04	Oxford	GQ	664.01	McAllen
AX	160.01	Lake Wales	DN	352.01	Macon			
AZ	183.08	Miami	EB	406.01	White Chapel			
BN	226.04	Huntsville	EC	408.02	Bogalusa			
BP	230.06	Florence	ED	410.01	Livingston			
BS	238.02	Winfield	EE	417.07	New Orleans			
BV	244.06	Duncanville	EG	429.02	Bayou Sorrel			
CB	264.01	Greensboro	FG	458.02	Little Rock			
CD	272.03	Montgomery	FH	459.01	Greenbrier			
CD	273.01	Burkville	FK	481.01	Mena			
CE	275.01	Abbeville	FN	491.02	De Queen			
CE	278.01	Geneva	FN	494.01	Texarkana			

The auditing of the 21 protocols listed in table 2 was undertaken for a similar purpose. These are all among the early transcriptions of Leas, and were felt to need improvement in phonetic accuracy as well as fullness of entries. The first nine protocols transcribed by Leas, in the fall of 1976, were all recopied and rebound after the auditing to improve their general appearance as well as their content. The user of the LAGS materials who wishes to evaluate the work of a particular scribe should note this list of 21, with the realization that these protocols, through having been altered in 1979-80, do not necessarily represent Leas' early style.⁹

RECOPYING

In addition to the nine protocols recopied by Leas, noted in table 2, 41 early transcriptions were recopied by Pederson. This list, appearing in table 3, includes many of Pederson's interviews in East Tennessee, particularly those transcribed in 1971-72, plus a few records in Georgia and Alabama, some of which are even earlier in date.

A number of the Georgia and Alabama protocols on this list were made using the 85-page short work-sheet format, later rejected in favor of the 104-page form. These transcriptions were copied into the 104-page work sheets by students; both Pederson's original transcription and the student's copy were bound together. Since this double protocol proved unwieldy to handle and the students' interpretations of the original phonetic strings were sometimes mistaken, Pederson recopied them in his own hand in the 104-page format, after which they were rebound as single protocols.

The other protocols recopied by Pederson were selected because of variant line use. When the project first began, little attention was paid to the specified line number on each page; entries were simply entered until

TABLE 2

LEAS PROTOCOLS AUDITED BY LEAS

DD 317.02	Jackson	*FU 526.02	Natchitoches
DF 322.04	Bolivar	*FX 536.02	Enterprise
DJ 335.02	Friars Point	*FZ 544.01	Lake Charles
DN 351.01	Columbus	GB 558.03	Pine Flat
DO 356.01	Chester	GC 567.03	Marshall
*FI 465.03	Marshall	GF 586.03	Dallas
*FJ 471.01	Winslow	GH 611.03	Huntsville
*FK 479.02	Fort Smith	GJ 618.02	Houston
*FK 480.01	Gate	GN 645.02	San Antonio
*FR 515.03	West Monroe	GN 645.08	San Antonio
*FT 523.03	Shreveport		

*recopied

TABLE 3

PROTOCOLS RECOPIED BY PEDERSON

A 001.01	Laurel Bloomery	*G 017.07	Knoxville
A 001.02	Laurel Bloomery	I 023.01	Lenoir City
A 001.03	Shady Valley	J 026.01	Sequatchie Valley
A 001.04	Neva	J 026.02	Crossville
A 002.01	Carter	R 047.01	Rome
A 002.02	Shell Creek	S 049.01	Ducktown
A 002.02	Shell Creek	T 052.05	Atlanta
B 004.01	Leesburg	T 053.02	Atlanta
B 004.02	Leesburg	V 058.01	Tallapoosa
B 005.01	Jackson Chapel	X 063.01	Newnan
C 006.01	Big Creek	X 063.02	Newnan
C 006.02	Holston Valley	X 063.03	Newnan
C 006.03	Holston Valley	Y 067.01	Macon
D 009.01	Rankin	Y# 026.01	Monticello
D 009.02	Bat Harbor	Y# 028.01	Sparta
D 009.03	Cosby	AC# 046.01	Lollie
E 014.01	Little Sycamore	AC# 049.01	Statesboro
F 015.01	Wear Valley	AP 126.01	Newton
*F 016.02	Maryville	BV 244.01	Fosters
*G 017.01	Knoxville	BX 251.01	Montevallo
*G 017.05	Knoxville		

*urban supplement added

the page was filled. In addition, since the transcriptions were at that time intended to be read only by the original scribe, neatness was not taken into account. The recopied versions are among the easiest protocols in the collection to work with.

Finally, four of the East Tennessee protocols were recopied because the urban supplements were added in the summer of 1978. The original binding of the protocols could not accommodate the 27 additional pages from the supplement; therefore, in the course of transcribing the supplements in 1979, Pederson also recopied the rest of the four protocols so that their style of entry would be consistent.

RETRANSCRIPTION

When the initial LAGS fieldwork was in progress in the early 1970s, the nature of the scribal work was not clearly defined. Several of the volunteer fieldworkers at this time, notably Anne Malone Fitts, C. W. Foster, and Christine W. Unger, transcribed their own field records. Other early field records were transcribed by various LAGS staff members who had limited training in phonetics and completed only a few protocols. In order to minimize the discrepancies among scribal practices, it was decided at a later time that all LAGS protocols would be the work of the eight regular scribes.¹⁰ It was therefore necessary to retranscribe all of those protocols that had been done by students or volunteers from the earlier phase of the project. Of the 80 protocols in the list in table 4, 68 were retranscribed for this reason, the work being shared among the scribes currently on the LAGS staff.

The remaining 12 protocols were retranscribed by others because of several different problems. In order to provide a constant norm across the

TABLE 4

RETRANSCRIPTIONS

<u>Protocol</u>	<u>FW</u>	<u>S1</u>	<u>S2</u>	<u>Protocol</u>	<u>FW</u>	<u>S1</u>	<u>S2</u>
H 019.01	LP	AD	LP	Y 065.01	JH*	BR	MB
H 019.02	LP	CWU	LP	Y 065.05	PS	BR	MB
I 021.01	LP	AD	SL	Y# 037.01	LG	LD	LP
J 024.01	LP	BR	LP	Z 070.02	AB	JE*	SL
K 028.01	LP	BR	LP	AC#042.01	BR	JE*	SL
K 028.02	LP	CWU	LP	AD 086.04	AB	PE	LP
L 031.02	LP	AD	SL	AM 117.03	BCR	BR	SL
M 032.01	CWF	CWF	SL	AQ 130.01	SE	BR	SL
M 032.03	BR	BR	SL	AU 143.01	BCR	BR	SL
M 032.04	BR	CWU	SL	AU 144.01	CG	BR	GB
M 032.05	BR	AD	SL	BD 196.01	BR	AD	SL
M 032.06	TC	CWU	SL	BK 217.01	CWF	CWF	SL
M 032.07	DBT	AD	SL	BN 226.01	JE	CWF	GB
M 032.09	DBT	AD	SL	BO 227.01	CWF	CWF	SL
N 034.01	BR	CWU	MB	BO 227.02	GAK	CWF	MB
Q# 006.01	BB	JE*	SL	BP 229.01	CWF	CWF	LP
Q# 006.02	SW	GM	SL	BP 230.01	AB	CWF	MP
R 047.01	CWU	CWU	LP	BP 230.02	MN	CWF	MB
R 047.02	CWU	CWU	LP	BR 234.01	JH	PE	LP
S 051.01	BR	JE*	LP	BS 238.01	EC	CWF	MB
S# 009.01	IR	JE*	SL	BS 239.01	YF	CWF	MP
S# 012.01	AC	GM	GB	BU 243.01	NSB	AMF	MB
V 059.01	BAS	JE*	SL	BU 243.02	NSB	AMF	MB
W 061.01	PT	BR	SL	BU 243.04	CWF	AMF	SL

<u>Protocol</u>	<u>FW</u>	<u>S1</u>	<u>S2</u>	<u>Protocol</u>	<u>FW</u>	<u>S1</u>	<u>S2</u>
BV 244.05	CWF	CWF	GB	DU 379.03	CWU	CWU	GB
†BW 249.03	CWF	PE	SL	DU 379.04	CWU	CWU	SL
BX 251.02	AMF	AMF	GB	DU 379.05	CWU	CWU	SL
BX 251.03	AMF	AMF	SL	DV 382.01	CWU	CWU	SL
BZ 258.01	AMF	AMF	SL	DY 396.01	CWU	CWU	SL
BZ 258.02	AMF	AMF	SL	DY 396.02	CWU	CWU	LP
BZ 258.04	AMF	AMF	SL	DY 396.03	CWU	CWU	MB
BZ 260.01	JPB	AMF	SL	DZ 400.01	CWU	CWU	SL
CC 268.02	DS	PE	LP	EA 401.03	GM	JE*	GB
DA 304.01	EC	PE	LP	EA 402.01	CWU	CWU	SL
DC 316.01	EC	PE	LP				
DE 320.01	MB	GB	GB				
DE 320.02	MB	JE*	LP				
DG 324.08	JT	GR	LP				
DG 324.09	JT	PE	LP				
DJ 333,01	EC	PE	LP				
DL 346.05	EC	PE	SL				
DQ 364.01	CWU	CWU	SL				
DQ 365.01	CWU	CWU	SL				
DR 371.04	BR	AD	LP				
DU 379.01	CWU	CWU	MB				
DU 379.02	CWU	CWU	GB				

†different informant

*see Appendix

LAGS territory, Pederson transcribed a record in each grid unit. Since in a few of the units, all records had already been transcribed, it was necessary to select one of these from each unit and to retranscribe it. This procedure accounts for most of the additional items in table 4. In addition, because a scribe's first protocol is often not representative of his later style, several of these early efforts by individuals were retranscribed, either by Pederson or by the original scribe. In order to provide a basis for comparing the phonetic norms of Richardson with the other scribes, Pederson also retranscribed one of her protocols, not an early effort, but rather, one in which her normal practices of phonetic transcription were established. Finally, in auditing BW 249.03, an incomplete record, Leas discovered that this was a joint interview, and the informant's wife actually did more talking than the informant himself. Thus, this record was retranscribed entirely, using the wife as informant.

REPLACEMENT INTERVIEWS

During the evaluation of the collection of field records prior to the terminal editing of protocols, several problems were discovered. Two of the original interviews done by Pederson had missing reels; though the transcriptions for those reels existed, the data could not be verified.¹¹ Therefore, interviews with similar informants were conducted in the same localities: in Dahlonga by Pederson and in Atlanta by Leas. The evaluation of the Atlanta materials disclosed that there were no samples of speech from that urban center of informants younger than 33. Consequently, Leas interviewed three younger natives of that city. Because the coverage in Atlanta was already disproportionately large, these three new interviews were substituted for

previously transcribed student interviews.

All of the LAGS scribes who were born within the territory (Bailey, Bassett, Edmundson, Leas, and Pendergrass) were interviewed as LAGS informants themselves, with protocols transcribed by Pederson. Leas had been interviewed by Pederson several years previously, using the short form of the work sheets, before the urban supplement was devised. Consequently, this protocol needed revision; rather than an update of the existing record, a new interview was done by Bassett, preserving the same accession number.

During several of his field trips, Bassett made an effort to update incomplete interviews from earlier years by locating the original informants. In most instances, this task proved to be impossible, for the informants had moved away, died, or had forgotten having participated in the project to begin with. He was more successful in Kosciusko, Mississippi, where he located the subject of an interview begun several years earlier by Crist; again, rather than supplementing the existing record, he conducted an entirely new interview, replacing the previous version.

Finally, the editors decided to delete a record classified as Anniston, Alabama, because the informant was born in Georgia, even though he had moved to Anniston at a relatively early age. One of Bassett's trips to this part of Alabama produced two additional field records from Calhoun County, one of which was then used as a substitute for the rejected interview.

All of the replaced interviews described above have been preserved, both as field records and protocols, but none of those originals will appear in any analysis of LAGS data. The replacement interviews are listed in table 5.

TABLE 5

REPLACEMENT INTERVIEWS

<u>Unit and County</u>	<u>Locality</u>	<u>FW</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>Reason</u>
Q# 004.01	Dahlonega	LP	LP	1 reel of original interview missing
T 053.01	Atlanta	MB	LP	update of earlier interview
T 053.04	Atlanta	SL	SL	replacement of student interview
T 053.07	Atlanta	SL	SL	1 reel of original interview missing
T 053.12	Atlanta	SL	SL	replacement of student interview
T 053.13	Atlanta	SL	SL	replacement of student interview
DO 359.04	Kosciusko	MB	LP	update of earlier interview
BW 249.01	Piedmont	MB	LP	original informant born out-of-state

EDITING DATA SHEETS

The personal data sheet and community/character sketch published with each protocol are the edited versions of the single-page data sheet submitted by the fieldworker and supplemented by the scribe. In order to preserve the informant's privacy, fulfilling the promise of anonymity, several editorial operations were necessary.

First, the name and address of the informant, preserved on the handwritten data sheets in the event that it might be necessary to contact an interview subject at a future time, were omitted. Usually any reference to the names of family members was also deleted, except for cases in which the locality or a local geographical feature was named for one of the informant's ancestors; this information is often preserved for its historical significance. Most of the other information on the scribe's version of the data sheet was included, through the section on the informant's spouse. The original community sketch, sometimes brief or non-existent and sometimes quite lengthy, was usually preserved verbatim.

The majority of changes in the data sheets involved the character sketch of the informant by the fieldworker and/or scribe. While many of these required few alterations, others included physical descriptions, negative character traits, and additional comments which might give offense or might make it possible to identify the interview subject despite the deletion of the name and address. Though many of these passages are interesting and amusing, some giving valuable insights into the personality of the informant, the consideration of the preservation of his anonymity prevailed. All comments regarding linguistic features were retained, as well as remarks concerning the informant's attitude toward the interview and toward language.

ERRATA LIST

Because the proofreading of the protocols, as described above, was conducted under less than ideal circumstances, a number of errors in the protocols were not noted prior to publication. As the contents of each protocol are entered into the computer during the concordance program, the editor who prepares the conversion into conventional spelling and proofreads the printout of each day's work will find many of these additional errors. The more significant of these will be designated as probable scribal error in the concordance itself, and all of them should be listed for possible future correction. These errata will include omitted stress marks, omitted syllabic consonant marks, misspelled words in marginal glosses, inaccurate grammatical labels, and scribal misinterpretations, as well as phonetic errors. Upon its completion, at the conclusion of the concordance program, the list will be available for users of the LAGS materials.

As the LAGS Guide says, "Only the field record is inviolate; the protocol is a set of working papers, subject to addition and revision until publication."¹² To carry the working-paper principal somewhat further, the protocol may be revised even after publication by the substitution of a new microfiche, so that the items from the errata list may eventually be incorporated in the text. Perhaps, when there is world enough and time, it may even be possible to complete the auditing of the field records in order to supplement the protocols in their present form, or to revise them completely by the use of typescripts of entire interviews.

NOTES

1. Lee Pederson, "Tape/Text and Analogues," American Speech 49 (1974): 13.
2. For assistance in the verification of place-names, the editors are indebted to the Branch of Geographic Names, United States Geological Survey Topographic Division, particularly Roger Payne, Donald Johnson, and Donald Orth, and to LAGS consultant Audrey Duckert, who provided many practical suggestions for the work.
3. The reader of the protocols should note that a few earlier volumes reflect a different use of symbols: the designation A or B after the educational level, signifying insular or worldly general perspective, was formerly represented by the symbols / and #, respectively. Protocols that were recopied, retranscribed, or altered in other ways have the A/B in this position, but several instances of the older symbols remain. In a few early protocols, no symbol appears after the educational level; for the appropriate A/B distinction, the reader should consult the data sheets.
4. Most of the physical labor involved in the restamping of the changed protocols was accomplished by Nora Pederson and Dawn Sutton, who also verified the lengths of several hundred interviews of which the duration had not been recorded by the scribe.
5. All protocols in the collection were proofread by Leas. Pederson proofread all protocols from East Tennessee, Middle Tennessee, West Tennessee, Upper Georgia, half of Lower Georgia, and scattered volumes elsewhere. Bailey and Bassett proofread their own transcriptions.
6. The proofreading by Leas was, for the most part, in order by scribe, beginning with DeVere and Edmundson, continuing with Bailey, Bassett, and Leas, and concluding with Richardson, Pendergrass, and Pederson. As a result, the protocols of Pederson are likely to contain fuller cross references than those of DeVere and Edmundson.
7. Virtually all of this auditing was done by Bassett, with some assistance from Bailey and Leas.
8. The fieldworkers who were particularly skillful in producing conversational records are Bailey, Bassett, Crist, and McKemie. Records of other fieldworkers, including Rutledge and McCall, may have extended conversational passages but often follow the work sheets more strictly.
9. This observation applies also to Bailey's first record, DE 320.01, which was not only audited but completely retranscribed, after Bailey had completed the rest of his transcriptions.
10. I.e., Bailey, Bassett, DeVere, Edmundson, Leas, Pederson, Pendergrass, and Richardson. Four protocols were transcribed by Raven I. McDavid, Jr., to provide a link with other atlas projects.

11. One other field record, not included in this discussion since it was not specifically replaced by a regular fieldworker, was lost prior to the inventory of the collection. Although the protocol, transcribed by DeVere, still exists, no use can be made of it because of the missing record.

12. Lee Pederson, A Compositional Guide to the LAGS Project. (2d ed.; Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1981), p. 9.

FIELDWORKERS AND SCRIBES

All fieldworkers and scribes whose initials appear in tables 4 and 5 are identified in alphabetical order according to initials. In the case of duplicate initials, the second fieldworker or scribe is distinguished by an asterisk (*).

AB	Allyne Baird	LD	Louise DeVere
AC	Anne Cheek	LG	Larry Gardner
AD	Anne Dunlap	LP	Lee Pederson
AMF	Anne Malone Fitts	MB	Marvin Bassett
BAS	Betty A. Shackelford	MN	Mary Norwood
BB	Beverly Burroughs	MP	Mike Pendergrass
BCR	Barbara C. Respass	NSB	Nancy S. Boren
BR	Barbara Rutledge	PE	Polly Edmundson
CG	Carolyn Griffin	PS	Phronia Smith
CWF	C. W. Foster	PT	Pearl Todd
CWU	Christine W. Unger	SE	Sandy Edwards
DBT	David Bruce Taylor	SL	Susan Leas
DS	Donald Starwalt	SW	Sue Walter
GAK	Glen A. Keenan	TC	Tom Clotfelter
GB	Guy Bailey	YF	Yvonne Foster
GR	Gail Richardson		
EC	Edward Crist		
GM	Gordon McKemie		
IR	India Richardson		
JE	Janet Evans		
JE*	Judy Evans		
JH	Jenny Higginbotham		
JH*	Jackie Hutcheson		
JPB	Janice P. Brill		
JT	Jean Tucker		