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INTRODUCTION
Chapter 1

Writing an

DARYL J. BEM

You have conducted a study and analyzed the data. Now it is time to write. To publish. To tell the world what you have learned. The purpose of this book is to enhance the chances that some journal editor will let you do so.

If you are new to this enterprise, you might find it helpful to consult two additional sources of information. For detailed information on the proper format of a journal article, see the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA, 1994) and recent articles in the particular journal to which you plan to submit your manuscript. The Publication Manual also devotes 15 pages each to two topics that are not discussed in this chapter: the rules of English grammar and the appropriate terms to use when referring to gender, ethnicity, or sexual orientation. For renewing your acquaintance with the stylistic elements of English prose, you can read Chapter 2 of the Publication Manual or any one of several style manuals. I recommend The Elements of Style by Strunk and White (1999). It is brief, witty, and inexpensive.

As noted in the Preface, this book focuses on the report of an empirical study, but the general writing suggestions included in this chapter apply as well to the theoretical articles, literature reviews, and methodological contributions that also appear in the professional journals.¹

¹ Some of the material in this chapter has been adapted from Bem (1987, 1995).
PLANNING IT

Which Article Should You Write?

There are two possible articles you can write: (a) the article you planned to write when you designed your study or (b) the article that makes the most sense now that you have seen the results. They are rarely the same, and the correct answer is (b).

The conventional view of the research process is that we first derive a set of hypotheses from a theory, design and conduct a study to test these hypotheses, analyze the data to see if they were confirmed or disconfirmed, and then chronicle this sequence of events in the journal article. If this is how our enterprise actually proceeded, we could write most of the article before we collected the data. We could write the introduction and method sections completely, prepare the results section in skeleton form, leaving spaces to be filled in by the specific numerical results, and have two possible discussion sections ready to go, one for positive results, the other for negative results.

But this is not how our enterprise actually proceeds. Psychology is more exciting than that, and the best journal articles are informed by the actual empirical findings from the opening sentence. Accordingly, before writing your article, you need to analyze your data. Herewith, a brief sermonette on the topic.

Analyzing Your Data. Once upon a time, psychologists observed behavior directly, often for sustained periods of time. No longer. Now, the higher the investigator goes on the tenure ladder, the more remote he or she typically becomes from the grounding observations of our science. If you are already a successful research psychologist, then you probably haven’t seen a live human participant for some time. Your graduate assistant assigns the running of a study to a bright undergraduate who writes the computer program that collects the data automatically. And like the modern dentist, the modern psychologist rarely even sees the data until they have been cleaned by human or computer hygienists.

To compensate for this remoteness from our participants, let us at least become intimately familiar with the record of their behavior: the data. Examine them from every angle. Analyze the sexes separately. Make up new composite indices. If a datum suggests a new hypothesis, try to find further evidence for it elsewhere in the
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data. If you see dim traces of interesting patterns, try to reorganize the data to bring them into bolder relief. If there are participants you don’t like, or trials, observers, or interviewers who gave you anomalous results, place them aside temporarily and see if any coherent patterns emerge. Go on a fishing expedition for something – anything – interesting.

No, this is not immoral. In fact, there are now textbooks and computer packages explicitly designed for this kind of exploratory data analysis. The rules of scientific and statistical inference that we overlearn in graduate school apply to the “Context of Justification.” They tell us what we can legitimately conclude in the articles we write for public consumption, and they give our readers criteria for deciding whether or not to believe us. But in the “Context of Discovery,” there are no formal rules, only heuristics or strategies. How does one discover a new phenomenon? Smell a good idea? Have a brilliant insight into behavior? Create a new theory? In the confining context of an empirical study, there is only one strategy for discovery: exploring the data.

Yes, there is a danger. Spurious findings can emerge by chance, and we need to be cautious about anything we discover in this way. In limited cases, there are statistical techniques that correct for this danger. But there are no statistical correctives for overlooking an important discovery because we were insufficiently attentive to the data. Let us err on the side of discovery.

**Reporting the Findings.** When you are through exploring, you may conclude that the data are not strong enough to justify your new insights formally, but at least you are now ready to design the “right” study. If you still plan to report the current data, you may wish to mention the new insights tentatively, stating honestly that they remain to be tested adequately. Alternatively, the data may be strong enough and reliable enough to justify recentering your article around the new findings and subordinating or even ignoring your original hypotheses.

This is not advice to suppress negative results. If your study was genuinely designed to test hypotheses that derive from a theory or are of wide general interest for some other reason, then they should remain the focus of your article. The integrity of the scientific enterprise requires the reporting of disconfirming results – even if only to warn other researchers about pursuing the same fruitless path.
But this requirement assumes that somebody out there cares about the hypotheses. Many respectable studies are explicitly exploratory or are launched from speculations of the “I-wonder-if...” variety. If your study is one of these, then nobody cares if you were wrong. Contrary to the conventional wisdom, science does not care how clever or clairvoyant you were at guessing your results ahead of time. Scientific integrity does not require you to lead your readers through all your wrongheaded hunches only to show – voila! – they were wrongheaded. A journal article should not be a personal history of your stillborn thoughts.

Your overriding purpose is to tell the world what you have learned from your study. If your results suggest a compelling framework for their presentation, adopt it and make the most instructive findings your centerpiece. Think of your data as a jewel. Your task is to cut and polish it, to select the facets to highlight, and to craft the best setting for it. Many experienced authors write the results section first because it can serve as the outline for the overall story of the article.

But before writing anything, analyze your data!
End of sermonette.

For Whom Should You Write?

Scientific journals are published for specialized audiences who share a common background of substantive knowledge and methodological expertise. If you wish to write well, you should ignore this fact. Psychology encompasses a broader range of subjects and methodologies than do most other disciplines, and its findings are frequently of interest to a wider public. The social psychologist should be able to read a Psychometrika article on logistic regression; the personality theorist, a Science article on hypothalamic function; and the congressional aide with a BA in history, a Journal of Personality and Social Psychology article on attribution theory.

Accordingly, good writing is good teaching. Direct your writing to the student in Psychology 101, your colleague in the Art History Department, and your grandmother. No matter how technical or abstruse your article is in its particulars, intelligent nonpsychologists with no expertise in statistics or experimental design should be able to comprehend the broad outlines of what you did and why. They should understand in general terms what was learned. And above all, they should appreciate why someone – anyone – should give a damn.
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The introduction and discussion sections in particular should be accessible to this wider audience.

The actual technical materials – those found primarily in the method and results sections – should be aimed at a reader one level of expertise less specialized than the audience for which the journal is primarily published. Assume that the reader of your article in Psychometrika knows about regression, but needs some introduction to logistic regression. Assume that the reader of the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology knows about person perception but needs some introduction to dispositional and situational attributions.

Many of the writing techniques suggested in this chapter are thus teaching techniques designed to make your article comprehensible to the widest possible audience. They are also designed to remain invisible or transparent to your readers, thereby infusing your prose with a “subliminal pedagogy.” Good writing is good teaching.

WRITING IT

The primary criteria for good scientific writing are accuracy and clarity. If your article is interesting and written with style, fine. But these are subsidiary virtues. First strive for accuracy and clarity.

The first step toward clarity is to write simply and directly. A journal article tells a straightforward tale of a circumscribed problem in search of an answer. It is not a novel with subplots and flashbacks but a short story with a single, linear narrative line. Let this line stand out in bold relief. Clear any underbrush that entangles your prose by obeying Strunk and White’s (1979) famous dictum, “omit needless words,” and by extending the dictum to needless concepts, topics, anecdotes, asides, and footnotes. If a point seems tangential to your basic argument, remove it. If you can’t bring yourself to do this, put it in a footnote. Then, when you revise your manuscript, remove the footnote. In short, don’t make your voice struggle to be heard above the ambient noise of cluttered writing. Let your 90th percentile verbal aptitude nourish your prose, not glut it. Write simply and directly.

The second step toward clarity is good organization, and the standardized format of a journal article does much of the work for you. It not only permits readers to read the report from beginning to end, as
they would any coherent narrative, but also to scan it for a quick overview of the study or to locate specific information easily by turning directly to the relevant section. Within that format, however, it is still helpful to work from an outline of your own. This enables you to examine the logic of the sequence, spot important points that are omitted or misplaced, and decide how best to divide the narrative between the introduction and final discussion.

An article is written in the shape of an hourglass. It begins with broad general statements, progressively narrows down to the specifics of your study, and then broadens out again to more general considerations. Thus:

The introduction begins broadly: “Individuals differ radically from one another in the degree to which they are willing and able to express their emotions.”

It becomes more specific: “Indeed, the popular view is that such emotional expressiveness is a central difference between men and women. . . . But the research evidence is mixed…”

And more so: “There is even some evidence that men may actually . . .”

Until you are ready to introduce your own study in conceptual terms: “In this study, we recorded the emotional reactions of both men and women to filmed . . .”

The method and results sections are the most specific, the “neck” of the hourglass: [Method] “One hundred male and 100 female undergraduates were shown one of two movies . . .”

[Results] “Table 1 shows that men in the father-watching condition cried significantly more . . .”

The discussion section begins with the implications of your study: “These results imply that sex differences in emotional expressiveness are moderated by two kinds of variables . . .”

It becomes broader: “Not since Charles Darwin’s first observations has psychology contributed as much new . . .”

And more so: “If emotions can incarcerate us by hiding our complexity, at least their expression can liberate us by displaying our authenticity.”
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This closing statement might be a bit grandiose for some journals – I’m not even sure what it means – but if your study is carefully executed and conservatively interpreted, most editors will permit you to indulge yourself a bit at the two broad ends of the hourglass. Being dull only appears to be a prerequisite for publishing in the professional journals.

REWWRITING IT

For many writers revising a manuscript is unmitigated agony. Even proofreading is painful. And so they don’t. So relieved to get a draft done, they run it through the spell checker – some don’t even do that – and then send it off to the journal, thinking that they can clean up the writing after the article has been accepted. Alas, that day rarely comes. Some may find solace in the belief that the manuscript probably would have been rejected even if it had been extensively revised and polished; after all, most APA journals accept only 15–20% of all manuscripts submitted. But from my own experience as an editor of an APA journal, I believe that the difference between the articles accepted and the top 15–20% of those rejected is frequently the difference between good and less good writing. Moral: Don’t expect journal reviewers to discern your brilliance through the smog of polluted writing. Revise your manuscript. Polish it. Proofread it. Then submit it.

Rewriting is difficult for several reasons. First, it is difficult to edit your own writing. You will not notice ambiguities and explanatory gaps because you know what you meant to say and you understand the omitted steps. One strategy for overcoming this difficulty is to lay your manuscript aside for awhile and then return to it later when it has become less familiar. Sometimes it helps to read it aloud. But there is no substitute for practicing the art of taking the role of the nonspecialist reader, for learning to role-play grandma. As you read, ask yourself, “Have I been told yet what this concept means?” “Has the logic of this step been demonstrated?” “Would I know what the independent variable is at this point?” This is precisely the skill of the good lecturer in Psychology 101: the ability to anticipate the audience’s level of understanding at each point in the presentation. Good writing is good teaching.
But because this is not easy, you should probably give a copy of a fairly polished manuscript to a friend or colleague for a critical reading. If you get critiques from several colleagues, you will have simulated the journal's review process. The best readers are those who have themselves had articles published in psychological journals but who are unfamiliar with the subject of your manuscript.

If your colleagues find something unclear, do not argue with them. They are right: By definition, the writing is unclear. Their suggestions for correcting the unclarities may be wrongheaded; but as unclarity detectors, readers are never wrong. Also resist the temptation simply to clarify their confusion verbally. Your colleagues don't want to offend you or appear stupid, so they simply mumble "oh yes, of course" and apologize for not having read carefully enough. As a consequence, you are pacified, and your next readers, the journal's reviewers, will stumble over the same problem. They will not apologize; they will reject.

Rewriting is difficult for a second reason: It requires a high degree of compulsiveness and attention to detail. The probability of writing a sentence perfectly the first time is vanishingly small, and good writers rewrite nearly every sentence of a manuscript in the course of polishing successive drafts. But even good writers differ from one another in their approach to the first draft. Some spend a long time carefully choosing each word and reshaping each sentence and paragraph as they go. Others pound out a rough draft quickly and then go back for extensive revision. Although I personally prefer the former method, I think it wastes time. Most writers should probably get the first draft done as quickly as possible without agonizing over stylistic niceties. Once it is done, however, compulsiveness and attention to detail become the required virtues.

Finally, rewriting is difficult because it usually means restructuring. Sometimes it is necessary to discard whole sections of a manuscript, add new ones, and then totally reorganize the manuscript just to iron out a bump in the logic of the argument. Don't get so attached to your first draft that you are unwilling to tear it apart and rebuild it. (This is why the strategy of crafting each sentence of a first draft wastes time. A beautiful turn of phrase that took me 20 minutes to shape gets discarded when I have to restructure the manuscript. Worse, I get so attached to the phrase that I resist restructuring until
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I can find a new home for it.) A badly constructed building cannot be salvaged by brightening up the wallpaper. A badly constructed manuscript cannot be salvaged by changing words, inverting sentences, and shuffling paragraphs.

Which brings me to the word processor. Its very virtuosity at making these cosmetic changes will tempt you to tinker endlessly, encouraging you in the illusion that you are restructuring right there in front of the monitor. Do not be fooled. You are not. A word processor—even one with a fancy outline mode—is not an adequate restructuring tool for most writers. Moreover, it can produce flawless, physically beautiful drafts of wretched writing, encouraging you in the illusion that they are finished manuscripts ready to be submitted. Do not be fooled. They are not. If you are blessed with an excellent memory (or a very large monitor) and are confident that you can get away with a purely electronic process of restructuring, do it. But don’t be ashamed to print out a complete draft of your manuscript; spread it out on table or floor; take pencil, scissors, and Scotch tape in hand; and then, all by your low-tech self, have at it.

If, after all this, your manuscript still seems interesting and you still believe the results and interpretation of your study, submit it.

SOME MATTERS OF STYLE

Metacommens

It is often helpful to give readers of an article an early overview of its structure and content. But beyond that, you should avoid making "metacommens" about the writing. Expository prose fails its mission if it diverts the reader’s attention to itself and away from the topic; the process of writing should be invisible to the reader. In particular, the prose itself should direct the flow of the narrative without requiring you to play tour guide. Don’t say, “Now that the three theories of emotion have been discussed, we can turn to the empirical work on each of them. We begin with the psychoanalytic account of affect. . . .” Instead, move directly from your discussion of the theories into the review of the evidence with a simple transition sentence such as, “Each of these three theories has been tested empirically. Thus, the psychoanalytic account of affect has received support in studies that. . . .” In the results