LINGUISTIC INCLINATIONS IN QUERY LETTERS

Karen Quick | Montana State University

In traditional publishing, a writer sends out query letters in order to seek representation. Though previous query letter research has examined this document's function when submitted to editors of magazines and journals, query letters submitted to agents for novels have only received attention from within the industry rather than as an object of academic inquiry. This study uses a corpus of query letters for fiction manuscripts to explore whether or not language proficiency and linguistic components bear weight on the success of querying authors. Ultimately, these findings stand as evidence of the empirical impact of language on acquisition odds and encourage further study on the matter.

In the realm of traditional publishing, when a writer feels their manuscript is ready to transcend into the ranks of published novels, the next step for most is to acquire an agent: someone who represents the project on the writer's behalf, acting as an intermediary between the author and potential publishers. Regardless of the agency, the genre, and the agent's personal preferences, all manuscript submission guidelines require the inclusion of one thing: a query letter. Previous query letter research has examined the value of its function and the nuances of its rhetoric when directed at magazines (Jolliffe), nursing journals (Marinello and Hicks), and library science journals (Longmeier and Fagan, "Finding"; Longmeier and Fagan, "Library"). Drawing from Meris Longmeier and Jody Fagan's definition for journal queries, the query letter is a professional document introducing the work and the writer, submitted to literary agents for representation consideration, which can also be defined as similar to a "cover letter for a job" with their degree of formal writing and their quest for writerly employment ("Library" 270). Along these lines, previous cover letter research such as that of Pia Brandt and Philipp Herzberg–which found that language analysis can predict application success–has presented a call for future research to "test if [the] findings hold true in other application contexts and job specializations" (427). Given the noted similarities between cover letters and query letters, perhaps the traditional publishing industry's query letters may be perfect for heeding that call.

My working knowledge of how to craft a query letter stems from nearly a decade's worth of experience as a fiction novel writer and five years spent in the querying trenches. It wasn't until this last fall that I realized that I had never truly stopped to consider what, exactly, made

a query letter effective versus what did not. All of my advice on how to craft these letters was based on what I had picked up from my agented friends, industry experts like agents at conferences, and from a copy of *How to Publish Your Book* by Jane Friedman that I'd been gifted back when I first started querying. At this point last year, fellow writers were beginning to approach me for query critiques and letter advice for their young adult and adult fiction manuscripts. While I was happy to give advice and edits based on my working relationship with rhetoric, grammar, and language, I still felt that there was more I could do. It wasn't until I was prompted by a textual analysis project in one of my writing studies courses that I was urged to answer my earlier question: how does one write a query letter that sings?

My analysis is, in part, an attempt to answer this question. This study concerns itself first with existing in-industry guidelines to establish a baseline for what publishing professionals feel these particular letters should look like. From there, I introduce research in adjacent linguistic fields to explore the implication of query letter language proficiency and linguistic components on the success of querying authors. Ultimately, these results serve to provide potential reasoning as to whether or not there is an empirical definition for what a successful query looks like, along with whether or not the language of query letters should continue to be considered for study both in the publishing industry and as a focus in academic research.

ONGOING CONTEXTS AND CONVERSATIONS

IN-INDUSTRY ADVICE

Several literary agencies have query advice included in their submission pages: Trident Media Group states the letter "should include only a paragraph about yourself, a brief plot synopsis, and your contact information" ("Submissions"). Writers House, however, asks that the query letter contains the writer's "credentials" and "an explanation of what makes your book unique and special" ("Agents + Submissions"). Other agencies, such as Folio Literary Management, have more detailed guidelines: "no longer than one page," with "a catchy but professional introduction" and "details about the project in a short paragraph" ("Submitting Fiction"). Although these agencies are beginning to establish some vague definitions for what a query letter should contain, these guidelines lack the concrete detail necessary to establish what an optimal letter consists of linguistically.

A vast source of advice within the industry comes from individuals with experience in the writing community: people who have earned offers of representation and have developed a working knowledge of query letter craft. The advice for query letters suddenly becomes more specific: the details of the project now mean the "genre/category, word count, title/subtitle" and "a description of [the] story" at around "150-300 words" (Friedman, "The Complete Guide"). However, some elements maintain their vagueness, such as personal information, described as "something about yourself, usually

50-100 words" (Friedman, "The Complete Guide"). Another author details in her blog post that the letter should "quickly introduce [the] novel with title, word count, and genre;" "summarize [the] book in one or *maybe* two paragraphs;" and include one's "writing credentials," with a note "comparing [the] novel to other similar books" as optional (Hawk). This advice is directly contradicted by another author, who suggests that the book's pitch or plot should be contained in "two to three paragraphs" and that the metadata–the facts and specifications of the manuscript being queried–ought to include "two comps, or 'comparable' titles," as it is "important" for conveying a grasp of the "current market" (Fulmer). While these writing blogs are distinctly predominant and often chief resources for fledgling creators, their advice could also be a direct result of the author's personal—and potentially emotional—experience with publishing. In order to determine if it is possible to empirically define an ideal query letter, the conversations outside of the industry must be considered as well; in short, those within the scope of empirical research studies.

ACADEMIC CONVERSATIONS

In a more academic context, previous research on query letters appears rather varied. One study examined the effectiveness of query letters based on a set of criteria: "writer experience, skill displayed, research, article idea, appropriateness to the market, and overall quality" (Jolliffe 1). While the study seems to suggest that the letters' intended audience was drawn most to the marketable appeal and the writer's skill, this study was conducted on query letters for magazines, not with respect to query letters for full-length fictional novels. More research and advice prevails with respect to Library and Information Science (LIS). One article, in particular, explores how to write a successful query letter to the LIS journal according to its general purpose: a query letter is one's chance to "'sell' [them]selves" to the recipients (Longmeier and Fagan, " Finding" 270). This research responds and expands upon that of Michael Marinello and Rodney Hicks, who establish that the query ought to contain an introduction, which "demonstrates alignment of the work, (. . .) [and] positions the work in context of the (. . .) audience" (147). Such advice serves to further emphasize the importance of the metadata in conveying the manuscript's appeal to readers. Both of these studies, however applicable their findings may be for crafting a query letter to an agent, are written with respect to query letters received by editors. Another article by Longmeier and Fagan, "Library & Information Science Journal Editors' Views on Query Letters," also discusses the appeal and necessity of query letters from the editorial point of view. They suggest that in the context of "professional writing tips for library science, query letters are specifically addressed in the writing of book proposals" (900). While their stance holds true for personal reflections as seen by the blog posts or by examining the official suggestions by various literary agencies, the brunt of peer-reviewed research and analysis of query letter construction does not appear at present to be centered in letters intended for agents in traditional publishing.

Though there are many blog posts, guidelines, paid seminars, and conference workshops available to writers to craft a query letter, there is little uniform definition outside of the three main components of the letter: the metadata, the plot, and the biography. And few of these agent and author-led advice events for querying have examined the actual elemental differences between successful query letter content and unsuccessful query letter content; as such, there exists a gap in the context of publishing where I find myself looking for answers. Do query letter contents for fiction manuscripts differ linguistically from overall writing and, when applicable, traditional story language; if so, do query letter contents differ significantly with respect to the unsuccessful queries or the successful ones? Here, overall writing refers to the language comprising the cumulative categories of writing, such as technical, formal, social, and personal, as defined and outlined by the Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) database (Boyd et al.). Traditional story language is similarly defined as the overall linguistic concentrations of novels and short stories that have been traditionally published and are contained within the LIWC's referential database (Boyd et al.).

METHODOLOGY

Ryan Boyd and Andrew Schwartz decree that psychological language analysis can provide potential insights into the psychological functioning of the language itself. This sentiment is shared and bolstered by Yla Tausczik and James Pennebaker, who have crowned this age as a "technological revolution" for its ability to produce pragmatic analyses and insights into how language functions in a plethora of settings (24). This method of study has been applied to several different fields and research pursuits, from the autobiographies of famous persons to determine their internal processing (Ferrer and Ponterotto) to the necessity of cover letters in appealing to hiring minds (Brandt and Herzberg).

My study is the first to examine query letters with respect to the psychological facets of their language. It employs the LIWC's referential dictionary and database, which is made up of over 12,000 words and 100 dictionaries that underwent a highly nuanced and detailed seven-step process in order to be capable of processing text and rating the diction's categorical prevalences ("How It Works"). Defined in plainer terms, the LIWC "reads a given text and compares each word in the text to the list of dictionary words and calculates the percentage of total words in the text that match each of the dictionary categories" ("How It Works"). By arranging and identifying the language frequencies and inclinations, the program is able to quickly and efficiently highlight any trends in the language, along with what those particular trends relate to in psychological terms. In order to display the raw data and draw descriptive statistics from it, this study also uses IBM's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), specifically the Statistics Version 28.

To compile a corpus of query letters, I presented a call for query letter submissions to colleagues and strangers alike in the writing community via the #WritingCommunity hashtag on social media (namely, the platform formerly

known as Twitter), obtaining writers' permission to use letters they voluntarily submitted to me for the purposes of this analysis. From an initial number of 38 letters, 20 letters were selected at random to form the corpus, specifically with ten random successful queries and ten random unsuccessful queries. Each letter was labeled using a simple alpha-numerical system, with the queries referenced by the letter "Q" followed by a number ranging from 1-20 to reflect its place in the sample. The individual letters then underwent a cursory pass to remove identifying information, such as social media handles and email addresses. I hand-coded each based on three key elements: "P" for the plot of the novel being pitched, "B" for the biographical information about the author, and "M" for the novel's metadata. Each of the 20 letters was entered into the LIWC program and analyzed for word count, and nine categories chosen from the LIWC database, namely "I" words, positive tonal language, negative tonal language, social words, cognitive processing, allure, moralization, analytic language and authentic language (see below for further details). The queries were then divided into the three elemental parts established above and reintroduced to the LIWC accordingly. Lastly, the letters were divided one final time between the queries that received offers of representation versus the ones that did not. The numbers produced by the LIWC were then transferred into the SPSS and analyzed accordingly (see Appendices 1-4 for a full account of the data).

The participants were members of the writing community, some of whom I knew prior to their decision to volunteer and some of whom I did not. I did not ask for, nor did I require, the submission of demographic information such as gender, identity, or age. I did not receive explicit permission to quote the actual letters, so I have not included them directly.

RESULTS

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OVERVIEW

The queries averaged a length of 320.80 words long. Divided into the three primary components, the plot held the highest average word count of 189.10 words, with the biography averaging 62.15 and the metadata averaging 66.30 (see table 1). These findings do align with Friedman, in that the plot's range of 106.00 to 310.00 adheres to her advice of keeping the story's description at around "150-300 words" (Friedman, "The Complete Guide"). This may further suggest that it is the range most frequently used by querying authors. However, the biography's range of 0.00 to 175.00 does not align as well with her suggestion of "50-100 words" (Friedman, "The Complete Guide"). Indeed, two queries lacked a biography entirely; five queries lacked a full biography section, though they contained at least one of its elements; two queries lacked a full metadata section, though they contained at least one of its components.

As stated in the methodology, this study sought to examine whether or not the various concentrations of elemental components in the queries differed significantly from their concentrations as reflected in overall writing and traditional story language. The LIWC averages for these two modes of writing serve as a reference from which the query letters could be compared, with "LIWC Averages" indicating that the variable correlates to the LIWC's overall writing average and "LIWC Story Averages" indicating it correlates to the LIWC's average for traditional story language (see table 1).

"I" WORDS

"I" words are those words that refer to the self, such as "I," "me," and "my" (Boyd et al.). This variable, in particular, was selected in order to see to what degree the self is referred to in the queries, paying particular attention to the biographical section, assuming the more authors had to say about themselves in terms of relevant experience, the more they would need to use personal pronouns. Studying the Descriptive Statistics Overview revealed that none of the mean statistics for the frequency of "I" words in the queries were similar to the LIWC's overall frequency of 4.27: the overall query had a mean of 1.93; the plot's was .11; the metadata's was 1.58 (see table 1). Predictably, of the four groups, the biography was the only one that contained a prevalence of "I" words above average, with a mean of 6.79 (see Table 1). Seeing as the current in-industry advice and academic conversation has solidified the biography as the part of the query letter that is designated for introducing oneself and one's applicable publishing experience, this increased frequency may be indicative of the high concentration of words required to refer to the self in order to speak on one's accomplishments and grounds for writing the manuscript.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics Overview

	LIWC Averages	LIWC Story Averages	Full Query Means	Plot Means	Biography Means	Metadata Means
Word Count			320.8	189.1	62.15	66.3
I Words	4.27	3.22	1.93	0.12	6.79	1.58
Allure	6.95	5.48	4.71	4.89	5.43	4.02
Moralization	0.26	0.21	0.43	0.55	0.05	0.28
Analytic	49.63	60.28	79.66	75.8	72.15	87.52
Authentic	49.95	39.78	14.34	9	47.33	18.3

ALLURE

Given the query letter's function as a business or sales pitch from writers to agents, it became especially pertinent to examine the prevalence of allure in the queries as well. The coding for this particular facet of linguistic examination focuses on words that are indicative of a motive or desire, such as "know," "have," or "like" (Boyd et al. 12). Because the LIWC categorizes allure as a facet of motive, perhaps the allure of a query influences an agent's desire in offering representation. The mean for overall allure in average writing was 6.95 (see table 1). In comparison, the average concentration of allure in both the overall queries–with a mean of 4.71–and the individual plot, biography, and metadata sections–with means of 4.89, 5.43, and 4.02, respectively–were all under the average (see table 1). This may suggest that the actual inclusion of motivational language is not a key component of the queries.

MORALIZATION

One finding that stood out, in particular, was the frequency of moralization-coded language in both the overall queries and the plots, specifically. In this case, moralized language exists in any words that impose a moral dichotomy or stance upon the literature, such as words like "wrong," "honor," "deserve," and "judge" (Boyd et al. 11). Of the four variables, only that of the overall queries and the plots were noticeably larger than the LIWC's overall average of .26 and the LIWC's story average of .21 (see table 1), with the plot specifically being more than double those averages with its mean

of .55 (see table 1). A possible explanation for this result may be that because the query's plot is specifically designed to introduce the protagonist(s) along with the obstacle that they encounter and what stakes are present, oftentimes the plots contain a choice the character is forced to make: head versus heart; mind versus matter; duty versus love; so on and so forth.

ANALYTIC LANGUAGE

Analytical language was coded to identify any metrics of "logical" or "formal thinking" (Boyd et al. 11); in this case, it is most likely that the LIWC was detecting the latter when processing the language present in the query letters. Much like an office email, these letters have standard opening and closing remarks that were noticed in all 20 of the letters. These letters, with their polite openers of "Dear Agent" and respectful closings that thanked the agent for their "time and consideration," seem to suggest a widespread understanding and employment of formal writing regarding query letter construction. Concerning the degree of analytical language in these letters compared to writing elsewhere, the descriptive statistics revealed that all four variables contained higher grades of analytic writing than both of the control variables (see Table 1). The highest of all four belonged to the metadata, with a mean of 87.52 (see Table 1). Seeing as the metadata seeks to classify the manuscript based on several objective elements as defined by the current in-industry advice–more specifically, the word count, genre, title, intended audience, comparable titles, and content warnings–this evidence would suggest that this is

also the section that retains the most detached, formal and objective language to convey these essential details.

AUTHENTIC LANGUAGE

In stark contrast, the frequency of authentic language does not seem to share in the statistical fervor of the analytic coding. Authentic language has been defined as any language that denotes "perceived honesty" or "genuineness" (Boyd et al. 11). This coding was selected as a counter for the analytic language to see exactly how the two would compare and contrast. This time, when comparing the variables to the controls, each sits distinctly below the averages for the overall language authentic frequency (see Table 1). The only variable that came close to meeting the average was that of the biographical section. I found myself likening this data to what I would expect to see in a cover letter: though the document strives for professionalism and businesslike conduct, it also demands a certain degree of authenticity that would be found in the section where the candidate (or in this case, the querying author) is expected to introduce their previous relevant experience.

UNSUCCESSFUL VERSUS SUCCESSFUL QUERIES

Of the 20 letters that comprised the original corpus, half were queries that never resulted in an offer of representation, while half were the letters that landed the writers their agents. In order to see whether or not there were any differences between the language of successful queries and unsuccessful queries, the LIWC's stats for unsuccessful queries were compiled and compared to the compiled stats for the successful queries (see table 2). From there, IBM's SPSS Statistics program was used again to run the descriptive statistics for the queries to minimize inserting human bias and error into the calculations.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Unsuccessful Queries Versus Successful Queries

	LIWC Av.	LIWC Story Av,	U. Full Query	S. Full Query	U. Plot	S. Plot	U. Biography	S. Biography	U. Metadata	S. Metadata
Word Count			312.8	328.8	178.9	199.3	67.1	57.2	63.1	69.5
I Words	4.27	3.22					7.83	5.5		
Allure	6.95	5.48	4.84	4.58						
Moralization	0.26	0.21			0.32	0.78				
Analytic	49.63	60.28	75.17	84.15	73.06	78.54	74.21	69.56	83.77	91.27
Authentic	49.95	39.78	20.53	8.15	13.52	4.5	45.92	49.09	26.37	10.23

My initial observation was that the mean statistics for the unsuccessful queries were dissimilar to those of the successful queries. The first notable difference was that, on average, the successful queries were longer than the unsuccessful ones (see Table 2). Even when examining the outliers for both, the successful queries had higher word counts overall. This may be the result of several confounding variables: that the unsuccessful queries have less to say, that their writers were consciously reluctant to write longer queries, or that they were unconsciously unaware of the length's impact.

"I" WORDS

Not every mean examined reflected this trend, though. I inspected the biographical sections of the queries for each group to see whether or not there was a linguistic difference between the two, namely a variance in the frequency of words that refer to the self. Initially, I felt that if the query letter contained more talk about the writer's publishing accomplishments to date, the agents would feel they were a better candidate. However, the frequency of "I" words in the failed queries ended up being higher, with a mean of 1.83 versus a mean of .47 for the successful queries (see Table 2). This directly contradicted the original assumption by suggesting that this part of the letters factors differently than previously hypothesized. It is worth mentioning here that two of the successful queries that were picked during the random selection lacked a biographical section. Drawing from previous LIWC research that suggests the usage of "personal pronouns" can "reflect attentional allocation" (Tausczik and

Pennebaker 30), this might offer a window into the reader's perception of the writer and their work. Furthermore, given that readers pick up on signals about writer identity in anonymous review processes (Tardy and Matsuda), it may be that queries highlighting a greater focus on the self through the heightened use of first-person are perceived negatively by readers.

MORALIZATION

As shown in the initial descriptive statistics, there was a large concentration of moralized language in the section that serves to pitch the story's premise. The mean concentration of moralization in the unsuccessful queries was .32; in the successful ones, it was .78 (see Table 2). I returned to my corpus and noticed that the unsuccessful queries that had the highest counts of moralized language were also the queries that, while they did not receive an offer of representation, they did have the most requests (either for a partial submission of the first three chapters or 50 pages, or a full request of the complete manuscript) based on the data each writer provided to me. This substantial finding suggests that the ability of the writer to clearly elaborate on the moral dilemma the character is confronted with in the story is a significant factor in the agent's decision, be it to request further material or offer representation. The strength of these findings prompts a secondary question similar to Brandt and Herzberg's about whether cover letter language is indicative of application decisions and is perhaps suitable for further research: given the plot summary's ability to moralize lends itself so intimately to the query's ultimate verdict, is

this section all that is necessary to predict the letter's success?

ANALYTIC LANGUAGE

The successful queries had a higher concentration of analytic language, or formal writing, with a mean of 84.14 versus a mean of 75.12 (see Table 2). The unsuccessful ones catered more towards warm, either informal or personalized diction, as supported by the finding above about increased uses of the first person. Two of the queries (one successful, one unsuccessful) in the corpus were made exclusively to send to one agent and, as such, contained more personalized diction that addressed a specific individual. This leads me to suggest that, as Longmeier and Fagan suggest, treating the query letters as a business proposal is more effective than a connective pitch. Speaking from my own experience, I do feel that this held true for me: the projects I pitched wherein I attempted to personalize my query for every agent ultimately fizzled out faster and earned fewer requests than the ones in which I employed a more impersonal tone.

DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

These results suggest that there is a distinct difference between query letter language and average writing, be it overall writing or traditional story language. Between the letters that died in the querying trenches and the ones that went on to earn their writers an agent, this LIWC research also reveals key differences in linguistic components between successful and unsuccessful query letters. However, I acknowledge that descriptive statistics and analysis aside, my corpus size stands to potentially limit the significance of these findings. Where the numbers that drove the overall mean up higher were concentrated primarily in the successful queries, such as was the case with the moralization and the analytic language, this was not the case for the "I" words in the biography. This raises a question of the biographical information's importance, one that this analysis cannot answer definitively here, and calls for further study with an increased corpus. Similarly, more LIWC research could be conducted to suggest more strongly whether or not a query letter's success can be defined by particular linguistic elements. Other questions include whether personal demographics impact the resulting textual and statistical analysis and also whether the particular fictional genre being queried makes a difference; I did not specify a genre, other than that the manuscript was fictional in nature.

Given that research devoted to query letters remains at present largely unexplored, the potential for further study that reflects either previous research or contemporary factors is rather high. Tardy and Matsuda were able to discern how, where anonymized manuscripts were examined by journal editors, elements of authorial identity were assumed; having agents conduct an anonymized query letter read could further expand the results of this research[1]

---

1. After this research was conducted, generative AI came to our attention, and I was struck by its ability to create query letters of its own with a few basic prompts. It could be of merit to have letters written by artificial intelligence compared to those written by humans to see if agency does in fact play a crucial role in determining query letter success.

Tausczik and Pennebaker point out that the study of language and psychology's interwoven nature is "in its earliest stages" (30). Regardless of the field, the document(s) examined, and the nature of its creation, the value of continuing to broaden the scope of this field and its findings is monumentally high. Be it that the query letter language itself is what elicited the offers of representation or that it was some other extraneous, confounding variable, the queries examined in my rhetorical analysis do, in fact, reflect a significant difference in the concentrations of certain linguistic elements with respect to the LIWC's average language and average traditional story language. I believe that to be reason enough for why a query letter's linguistic construction deserves sincere consideration.

MOVING FORWARD: THE FUTURE OF TRADITIONAL QUERYING

This research contributes evidence in support of a query letter's linguistic impact on its subsequent success, creating a framework for empirically defining what a query ought to look like as well as encouraging the current discussion to consider the linguistic components more closely alongside the elemental components. Further research may serve to broaden publishing's horizons by making querying more accessible, especially with regard to groups that have been historically marginalized by traditional publishing. It is my firm hope that this research presents encouraging statistical evidence in favor of considering language as a tool for directly impacting and improving a querying writer's chances for success. Furthermore, I believe this study stands to advocate for the continued use and merit of examining query letters (and other genre texts) with respect to their psychology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

WORKS CITED

"Agents + Submissions." *Writers House, A Literary Agency*, https://www.writershouse.com/submissions.

Boyd, Ryan L. et al. The Development and Psychometric Properties of LIWC-22. *LIWC*, 2022, https://www.liwc.app/static/documents/LIWC-22%20Manual%20-%20Development%20and%20Psychometrics.pdf

Boyd, Ryan L., and Andrew H. Schwartz. "Natural Language Analysis and the Psychology of Verbal Behavior: The Past, Present, and Future States of the Field." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, vol.40, no. 1, 2021, pp. 21–41, https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X20967028.

Brandt, Pia Magdalena, and Philipp Yorck Herzberg. "Is a Cover Letter Still Needed? Using LIWC to Predict Application Success." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, vol. 28, no. 4, 2020, pp. 417–29, https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12299.

Ferrer, Caitlin, and Joseph Ponterotto. "Exploring the Final Years of the Life of John F. Kennedy Jr.: A Mixed Methods Psychobiographical Case Study." *Qualitative Report*, vol. 25, no. 10, 2020, pp. 3583–3601, https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2020.4504.

Friedman, Jane. *How to Publish Your Book*. The Great Courses, 2015.

———. "The Complete Guide to Query Letters." *Jane Friedman,* 18 Dec. 2022, https://www.janefriedman.com/query-letters/.

Fulmer, Erin. "The 5 Essential Ingredients of an Effective Query Letter." *Erin Fulmer,* 7 Mar. 2022, https://erinfulmer.com/2022/03/07/five-ingredient-query-letter/.

Hawk, Tiffany. "How to Write a Query Letter That Wows Literary Agents + Template." *Tiffany Hawk,* https://www.tiffanyhawk.com/blog/how-to-write-an-awesome-personalized-query-letter.

"How It Works." *LIWC*, www.liwc.app/help/howitworks.

Jolliffe, Lee. *Magazine Article Placement: How Editors, Regular Contributors, and Novice Writers Rate Query Letters*. 1989, https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED311507.

Longmeier, Meris M., and Fagan, Jody C. "Finding a Good Fit Faster: Tips for Writing Query Letters to LIS Journals." *College & Research Libraries News*, 2021, vol. 82, no. 6, pp. 269–77, https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.82.6.269.

———. "Library and Information Science Journal Editors' Views on Query Letters." *College & Research Libraries*, 2021, vol. 82, no.6, pp. 899-922, https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.82.6.899.

Marinello, Michael, and Rodney W. Hicks. "Reemphasizing the Value of Query Letters in the Digital Age." *Journal of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners*, vol. 31, no. 3, 2019, pp. 147–48, https://doi.org/10.1097/JXX.0000000000000200.

"Submissions." *Trident Media Group Literary Agency*, 8 Nov. 2019, https://www.tridentmediagroup.com/submissions/.

"Submitting Fiction." *Folio Literary Management,* https://www.foliolit.com/fiction-queries.

Tardy, Christine M., and Paul Kei Matsuda. "The Construction of Author Voice by Editorial Board Members." *Written Communication*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2009, pp. 32–52, https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088308327269.

Tausczik, Yla, and James Pennebaker. "The Psychological Meaning of Words: LIWC and Computerized Text Analysis Methods." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2010, pp. 24–54. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X09351676.

APPENDIX 1: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS BROAD OVERVIEW

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
QWordCount	20	208.00	213.00	421.00	320.8000	11.67985	52.23389	2728.379	-.259	.512
PWordCount	20	204.00	106.00	310.00	189.1000	11.37469	50.86918	2587.674	.283	.512
BWordCount	20	175.00	.00	175.00	62.1500	9.92771	44.39805	1971.187	.683	.512
MWordCount	20	117.00	21.00	138.00	66.3000	7.20968	32.24267	1039.589	.804	.512
QIWords	20	5.42	.00	5.42	1.9275	.30269	1.35366	1.832	1.304	.512
PIWords	20	1.32	.00	1.32	.1060	.07535	.33699	.114	3.212	.512
BIWords	18	9.84	.00	9.84	6.7933	.58945	2.50082	6.254	-1.124	.536
MIWords	20	7.27	.00	7.27	1.5815	.47479	2.12334	4.509	1.507	.512
QPosTone	20	5.38	1.37	6.75	3.5540	.33663	1.50543	2.266	.884	.512
PPosTone	20	6.66	.66	7.32	2.7755	.35439	1.58486	2.512	1.340	.512
BPosTone	18	12.94	1.35	14.29	4.7517	.89701	3.80567	14.483	1.469	.536
MPosTone	20	11.63	.00	11.63	4.5230	.65836	2.94428	8.669	.748	.512
QNegTone	20	3.49	.38	3.87	2.1485	.22135	.98989	.980	-.303	.512
PNegTone	20	4.61	.76	5.37	2.6520	.33373	1.49247	2.227	.491	.512
BNegTone	18	2.56	.00	2.56	.4533	.21576	.91541	.838	1.757	.536
MNegTone	20	6.76	.00	6.76	1.5350	.46223	2.06717	4.273	1.174	.512
QSocial	20	12.05	4.81	16.86	11.0420	.66628	2.97970	8.879	-.256	.512
PSocial	20	15.12	6.58	21.70	13.8075	.99953	4.47001	19.981	.057	.512
BSocial	18	24.00	4.57	28.57	10.2967	1.29005	5.47322	29.956	2.293	.536
MSocial	20	8.61	1.39	10.00	5.8370	.63613	2.84486	8.093	.251	.512
QCogProc	20	10.61	4.75	15.36	8.7265	.55260	2.47131	6.107	.686	.512
PCogProc	20	8.36	5.79	14.15	10.2465	.57612	2.57649	6.638	-.306	.512
BCogProc	18	15.86	1.28	17.14	7.8572	1.09099	4.62866	21.425	.521	.536
MCogProc	20	14.29	.00	14.29	6.5095	.94200	4.21277	17.747	.174	.512
QAllure	20	6.20	1.49	7.69	4.7105	.35635	1.59366	2.540	-.143	.512
PAllure	20	9.61	1.39	11.00	4.8920	.45820	2.04915	4.199	1.177	.512
BAllure	18	14.29	.00	14.29	5.4261	.92186	3.91112	15.297	1.199	.536
MAllure	20	11.28	.72	12.00	4.0175	.57887	2.58881	6.702	1.639	.512
QMoral	20	1.80	.00	1.80	.4270	.11093	.49609	.246	1.334	.512
PMoral	20	2.41	.00	2.41	.5485	.15499	.69315	.480	1.374	.512
BMoral	18	.83	.00	.83	.0461	.04611	.19563	.038	4.243	.536
MMoral	20	1.96	.00	1.96	.2830	.13442	.60116	.361	1.913	.512
QAnalytic	20	57.77	35.72	93.49	79.6560	3.19577	14.29192	204.259	-1.878	.512
PAnalytic	20	52.58	41.18	93.76	75.8030	3.07598	13.75619	189.233	-1.165	.512
BAnalytic	18	75.25	18.12	93.37	72.1450	5.72714	24.29818	590.402	-1.469	.536
MAnalytic	20	28.54	71.44	99.98	87.5240	2.18025	9.75036	95.070	-.230	.512
QAuthentic	20	49.30	.35	49.65	14.3415	3.01032	13.46258	181.241	1.616	.512
PAuthentic	20	49.10	.03	49.13	9.0095	2.42992	10.86694	118.090	2.827	.512
BAuthentic	18	86.67	1.32	87.99	47.3300	8.16024	34.62097	1198.612	-.161	.536
MAuthentic	20	56.21	.47	56.68	18.3035	4.48179	20.04318	401.729	.991	.512
Valid N (listwise)	18									

APPENDIX 2: LIWC AVERAGES FOR CHOSEN VARIABLES

	N	Mean
LIWCAvlWords	1	4.2700
LIWCAvPosTone	1	3.5000
LIWCAvNegTone	1	1.5400
LIWCAvSocial	1	8.1600
LIWCAvCogProc	1	10.4400
LIWCAvAllure	1	6.9500
LIWCAvMoral	1	.2600
LIWCAvAnalytic	1	49.6300
LIWCAvAuthentic	1	49.9500
LIWCStorylWords	1	3.2200
LIWCStoryPosTone	1	2.1800
LIWCStoryNegTone	1	1.7500
LIWCStorySocial	1	10.5000
LIWCStoryCogProc	1	8.7000
LIWCStoryAllure	1	5.4800
LIWCStoryMoral	1	.2100
LIWCStoryAnalytic	1	60.2800
LIWCStoryAuthentic	1	39.7800
Valid N (listwise)	1	

APPENDIX 3: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR UNSUCCESSFUL QUERIES

	N Statistic	Range Statistic	Minimum Statistic	Maximum Statistic	Mean Statistic	Std. Error
DQWordCount	10	187.00	213.00	400.00	312.8000	19.44096
DPWordCount	10	137.00	106.00	243.00	178.9000	16.83743
DBWordCount	10	154.00	21.00	175.00	67.1000	14.60476
DMWordCount	10	107.00	21.00	128.00	63.1000	11.15492
DBIWords	10	5.92	3.92	9.84	7.8300	.61658
DQAllure	10	5.40	2.29	7.69	4.8430	.47580
DPMoral	10	1.46	.00	1.46	.3220	.15840
DQAnalytic	10	56.17	35.72	91.89	75.1670	5.14503
DPAnalytic	10	47.78	41.18	88.96	73.0640	5.07101
DBAnalytic	10	75.25	18.12	93.37	74.2100	7.88002
DMAnalytic	10	26.97	71.44	98.41	83.7740	2.84483
DQAuthentic	10	49.30	.35	49.65	20.5290	5.19655
DPAuthentic	10	49.10	.03	49.13	13.5180	4.31055
DBAuthentic	10	86.67	1.32	87.99	45.9200	11.50097
DMAuthentic	10	56.21	.47	56.68	26.3730	7.75388
Valid N (listwise)	10					

APPENDIX 4: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR SUCCESSFUL QUERIES

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
SQWordCount	10	152.00	269.00	421.00	328.8000	13.55794
SPWordCount	10	166.00	144.00	310.00	199.3000	15.48121
SBWordCount	10	120.00	.00	120.00	57.2000	14.04975
SMWordCount	10	101.00	37.00	138.00	69.5000	9.63126
SBIWords	8	8.54	.00	8.54	5.4975	.92509
SQAllure	10	5.43	1.49	6.92	4.5780	.55307
SPMoral	10	2.41	.00	2.41	.7750	.25483
SQAnalytic	10	38.68	54.81	93.49	84.1450	3.48884
SPAnalytic	10	40.51	53.25	93.76	78.5420	3.54497
SBAnalytic	8	71.42	18.12	89.54	69.5638	8.81593
SMAnalytic	10	26.06	73.92	99.98	91.2740	2.97526
SQAuthentic	10	16.21	1.70	17.91	8.1540	1.65832
SPAuthentic	10	13.14	.38	13.52	4.5010	1.35363
SBAuthentic	8	85.56	1.68	87.24	49.0925	12.26724
SMAuthentic	10	33.22	3.27	36.49	10.2340	3.19631
Valid N (listwise)	8					